#### [1] Actor specificity A] governments must aggregate because their policies benefit some and harm others so the only non-arbitrary way to prioritize is by helping the most amount of people

#### [2] It’s a lexical pre-requisite. Threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose.

#### [A] Topic lit – most articles are written through the lens of util since they’re crafted for policymakers and the general public to understand who take consequences to be important,

#### [4] Only pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable – all other values can be explained with reference to pleasure.

Moen 16 [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI

I think several things should be said in response to Moore’s challenge to hedonists. First, I do not think the burden of proof lies on hedonists to explain why the additional values are not intrinsic values. If someone claims that X is intrinsically valuable, this is a substantive, positive claim, and it lies on him or her to explain why we should believe that X is in fact intrinsically valuable. Possibly, this could be done through thought experiments analogous to those employed in the previous section. Second, there is something peculiar about the list of **additional intrinsic values** that counts in hedonism’s favor: the listed values have a strong **tend**ency **to be** well **explained as things that** help **promote pleasure and avert pain.** To go through Frankena’s list, **life** and **consciousness** are necessary presuppositions for pleasure; **activity**, health, and strength **bring about pleasure;** and happiness, beatitude, and contentment are regarded by Frankena himself as “pleasures and satisfactions.” The same is arguably true of beauty, harmony, and “proportion in objects contemplated,” and also of affection, friendship, harmony, and proportion in life, experiences of achievement, adventure and novelty, self-expression, good reputation, honor and esteem. Other things on Frankena’s list, such as understanding, wisdom, freedom, peace, and security, although they are perhaps not themselves pleasurable, are important means to achieve a happy life, and as such, they are things that hedonists would value highly. Morally good dispositions and virtues, cooperation, and just distribution of goods and evils, moreover, are things that, on a collective level, contribute a happy society, and thus the traits that would be promoted and cultivated if this were something sought after. To a very large extent, the intrinsic values suggested by pluralists tend to be hedonic instrumental values. Indeed, pluralists’ suggested intrinsic values all point toward pleasure, for while the other values are reasonably explainable as a means toward pleasure, pleasure itself is not reasonably explainable as a means toward the other values. Some have noticed this. Moore himself, for example, writes that though his pluralistic theory of intrinsic value is opposed to hedonism, its application would, in practice, look very much like hedonism’s: “Hedonists,” he writes “do, in general, recommend a course of conduct which is very similar to that which I should recommend.”24 Ross writes that “[i]t is quite certain that by promoting virtue and knowledge we shall inevitably produce much more pleasant consciousness. These are, by general agreement, among the surest sources of happiness for their possessors.”25 Roger Crisp observes that “those goods cited by non-hedonists are goods we often, indeed usually, enjoy.”26 What Moore and Ross do not seem to notice is that their observations give rise to two reasons to reject pluralism and endorse hedonism. The first reason is that if the suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values are potentially explainable by appeal to just pleasure and pain (which, following my argument in the previous chapter, we should accept as intrinsically valuable and disvaluable), then—by appeal to Occam’s razor—we have at least a pro tanto reason to resist the introduction of any further intrinsic values and disvalues. **It is ontologically** more **costly to posit a plurality of intrinsic values and disvalues, so in case all values admit** of explanation by reference to a single **intrinsic value and** a single intrinsic **disvalue, we have reason to reject more complicated accounts.** The fact that suggested non-hedonic intrinsic values tend to be hedonistic instrumental values does not, however, count in favor of hedonism solely in virtue of being most elegantly explained by hedonism; it also does so in virtue of creating an explanatory challenge for pluralists. The challenge can be phrased as the following question: If the non-hedonic values suggested by pluralists are truly intrinsic values in their own right, then why do they tend to point toward pleasure and away from pain?27

#### [5] Reducing existential risks is the top priority in any coherent moral theory

Plummer, PhD, 15

(Theron, Philosophy @St. Andrews http://blog.practicalethics.ox.ac.uk/2015/05/moral-agreement-on-saving-the-world/)

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

## Economy DA: 2:10, 1:50

#### The Global Economy is stabilizing and set for increases in 2021 but is still vulnerable to shocks

**World Bank 6-8** 6-8-2021 "The Global Economy: on Track for Strong but Uneven Growth as COVID-19 Still Weighs" <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>

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.

#### Strikes kill the economy – Engineering News 18

Reporter, Creamer Media. “Strikes And Their Economic Consequences.” Engineering News, 2018, www.engineeringnews.co.za/article/strikes-and-their-economic-consequences-2018-10-01/rep\_id:4136#:~:text=Strike%20action%20results%20in%20less,or%20to%20lost%20production%20time. // LHP PS

**After conducting intensive research\* into the topic of strikes and labour unrest, the Mandela Initiative came to several conclusions**. One of these was that the right to strike is made up of a delicate balance between the [power](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/power) of firms and the rights of employees, and is considered a sign of a healthy democracy “Whilst there are potential benefits from strikes (e.g. better work morale, lower absenteeism, or improved labour productivity), **strike action also brings about numerous direct and indirect economic costs that can be high, depending on duration, number of workers involved and divisions affected,” the Initiative confirmed.** According to labour expert Suleyman Alley, there are seven key causes of labour unrest: [health](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/health) hazards in the workplace; excessive working hours; low wages; demand for leave with pay; discrimination; inadequate working tools; and aggressive behaviour of managers towards employees. While several activities can be taken in an effort to prevent strikes from occurring or escalating, in the South African context, the tendency towards violent outbursts seems to outweigh reasonable action**. “Strikes and labour unrest have marked negative impacts on the employees themselves, the employers and their stakeholders, the government, consumers, and the economy,” advises Jacki Condon**, Managing Director of Apache [Security](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/security) [Services](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/services). “The negative effects on international trade include the hinderance of economic development, creating great economic uncertainty – especially as the global media continues to share details, images and videos of violence, damage to property and ferocious clashes between strikers and [security](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/security).” **Strike action results in less productivity, which in turn means less profits. Labour Law expert, Ivan Israelstam confirms that; “The employer is likely to lose money due to delayed**[**service**](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/service)**to clients or to lost production time. The employees will lose their pay due to the no work, no pay principle. If the strikers are dismissed they will lose their livelihoods altogether.”** This year alone, Eskom, Prasa, various [manufacturing](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/manufacturing) plants, Sasol and the Post Office have faced crippling strikes – to name but a few. Condon argues that there are more immediate consequences to consider than loss of income. “**As the socio-economic issues continue to affect South Africans across the board, tensions are constantly rising,**” states Condon. “Businesses must protect themselves, their assets, [business](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/business) property, and their non-striking employees from violence and intimidation.” Condon believes that this requires the deft hand of well-trained and highly qualified close protection operatives. These operatives provide not only protection, but video evidence as well, ensuring those responsible for damage can be held to account. “The key is to create a strategic partnership with a reliable [security](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/security) provider. Plans must be put into place to protect businesses against vandalism, physical assault, property invasion and intimidation during labour unrest,” concludes Condon.

#### Strikes skyrockets unemployment rates – kills the economy – empirically proven – Tenza 20

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

**Generally, South Africa's economy is on a downward scale. First, it fails to create employment opportunities for its people. The recent statistics on unemployment levels indicate that unemployment has increased from 26.5% to 27.2%.**[**28**](http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004#back_fn28)**The most prominent strike which nearly brought the platinum industries to its knees was the strike convened by AMCU in 2014. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 24 June 2014. It affected the three big platinum producers in the Republic, which are the Anglo American Platinum, Lonmin Plc and Impala Platinum**. It was the longest strike since the dawn of democracy in 1994. As a result of this strike, **the platinum industries lost billions of rands.**[29](http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004#back_fn29) According to the report by Economic Research Southern Africa, **the platinum group metals industry is South Africa's second-largest export earner behind gold and contributes just over 2% of the country's Gross Domestic Product** (GDP).[30](http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004#back_fn30) The overall metal ores in the mining industry which include platinum sells about 70% of its output to the export market while sales to local manufacturers of basic metals, fabricated metal products and various other metal equipment and machinery make up to 20%.[31](http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004#back_fn31) **The** research indicates that the **overall impact of the strike** in 2014 **was driven by a reduction in productive capita**l in the mining sector, **accompanied by a decrease in labour available to the economy**. This resulted in a sharp increase in the price of the output by 5.8% with a GDP declined by 0.72 and 0.78%.[32](http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004#back_fn32) South Africa's primary source of income is through employment; the state relies heavily on the income taxes it collects from employed people**. The implication is that unemployment has a negative effect on the state while if more people are employed, their income tax will add to the government's coffers. Unemployment means that people are unable to support themselves and their families, conversely the state has an obligation of ensuring that such people sustainable means in the form of social assistance.**[**33**](http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004#back_fn33)**The state, together with the private sector, bears the responsibility of alleviating poverty in society.** Unemployment is a real contributor to poverty. Other factors that contribute to poverty include a general lack of education, lack of relevant skills in certain areas such as science, inequality, inherited past practices and structural problems such as low wages supporting big families, low domestic savings, the ongoing electricity shortage from 2013 to 2015 threatening investors, low levels of business confidence, severe drought, reduced fiscal capacity, and the growing risk of stagflation. In **addition, a lengthy strike comes with a threat of job losses in vulnerable sectors such as mining, metals and agriculture**. It is also believed that protracted strikes contribute towards weakening the country's local currency (the South African rand). All these factors put a strain on the already struggling economy of South Africa.

#### Econ decline results in nuclear war through diplomacy decline. Tønnesson 15

**Tønnesson** Tønnesson, Stein [Tønnesson is a research professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in Norway and the leader of the East Asia Peace program at Uppsala University in Sweden.]  “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace.” International Area Studies Review, *Vol. 18, pgs. 297-311*, 2015

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 right. 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); andfourth, 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** t**he 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, interrupting 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 – nuke war fallout creates Ice Age and mass starvation. Starr 15

Starr, Steven [Steven Starr is the director of the University of Missouri's Clinical Laboratory Science Program, as well as a senior scientist at the Physicians for Social Responsibility. He has been published in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and the Strategic Arms Reduction (STAR) website of the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology] “Nuclear War: An Unrecognized Mass Extinction Event Waiting To Happen.” March 2015 AA

**A war fought with 21st century strategic nuclear weapons would be more than just a great catastrophe in human history. If we allow it to happen, such a war would be a mass extinction event that**[**ends human history**](https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StarrNuclearWinterOct09.pdf)**. There is a profound difference between extinction and “an unprecedented disaster,” or even “the end of civilization,” because even after such an immense catastrophe, human life would go on. But extinction, by definition, is an event of utter finality, and a nuclear war that could cause human extinction should really be considered as the ultimate criminal act**. It certainly would be the crime to end all crimes. **The world’s leading climatologists now tell us that nuclear war threatens our continued existence as a species. Their studies predict that a large nuclear war, especially one fought with strategic nuclear weapons, would create a post-war environment in which for many years it would be too cold and dark to even grow food.** Their findings make it clear that **not only humans, but most large animals and many other forms of complex life would likely vanish forever in a nuclear darkness** of our own making. **The environmental consequences of nuclear war would attack the ecological support systems of life at every level. Radioactive fallout produced not only by nuclear bombs, but also by the destruction of nuclear power plants and their spent fuel pools, would poison the biosphere. Millions of tons of smoke would act to**[**destroy Earth’s protective ozone layer**](https://www2.ucar.edu/atmosnews/just-published/3995/nuclear-war-and-ultraviolet-radiation)**and block most sunlight from reaching Earth’s surface, creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last for decades.** Yet the political and military leaders who control nuclear weapons strictly avoid any direct public discussion of the consequences of nuclear war. They do so by arguing that nuclear weapons are not intended to be used, but only to deter. Remarkably, the leaders of the Nuclear Weapon States have chosen to ignore the authoritative, long-standing scientific research done by the climatologists, **research** that **predicts virtually any nuclear war, fought with even a fraction of the operational and deployed nuclear arsenals, will leave the Earth essentially uninhabitable.**

## Tech DA: 1:24, 1:10

#### Innovation is high now – Tannen 21

Tannen, Janette. “Pandemic Spurs a Burst of Technology Innovation.” University of Miami News and Events, 7 Nov. 2021, <https://news.miami.edu/stories/2020/08/pandemic-spurs-a-burst-of-technology-innovation.html>. // LHP SV

But COVID-19 has been a boom for technology and, according to University of Miami experts, these innovations are destined to transform how we do business and almost every other facet of life—from how we communicate, educate, recreate, and entertain to how we seek medical care, design new homes, and perhaps even choose who we live with. “Tech companies are enabling digital productivity,” said Ernie Fernandez, vice president of information technology and the University’s chief information officer. “And this is not just a temporary COVID-19 response—these companies will continue to provide value in a world where digital technology is going to persist.” Geoff Sutcliffe, a computer science professor, added that amid the unfortunate misery and death, the pandemic has some silver linings. “We are privileged to be living through an industrial revolution, with computing at the core of it,” he said. “Suddenly, this is how we do life and it will change our economic lives completely.”

#### Violent strike efforts are increasing – they slow innovation, specifically in the tech sector.

**Hanasoge 16** [Chaithra; Senior Research Analyst, Market Researcher, Consumer Insights, Strategy Consulting; “The Union Strikes: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly,” Supply Wisdom; April/June 2016 (Doesn’t specifically say but this is the most recent event is cites); https://www.supplywisdom.com/resources/the-union-strikes-the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly/]//SJWen

The result: Verizon conceded to several of the workers’ demands including hiring union workers, protection against outsourcing of call-center jobs, and employee benefits such as salary hikes and higher pension contributions, among others and thus bringing an end to the strike in June.

The repercussion: The strike witnessed **several instances** of **social disorder**, **violence** and **clashes**, ultimately calling for third party intervention (Secretary of Labor – Thomas Perez) to initiate negotiations between the parties. Also, as a result of the strike, Verizon reported **lower** than **expected revenues** in the **second quarter of 2016**.

Trade unions/ labor unions aren’t just this millennia’s product and has been in vogue since times immemorial. **Unions**, to **ensure fairness** to the working class, have **gone on strike for better working conditions** and employee benefits since the **industrial revolution** and are as strong today as they were last century. With the **advent of technology and advancement in artificial intelligence**, machines are grabbing the jobs which were once the bastion of the humans. So, questions that arise here are, what relevance do unions have in today’s work scenario? And, are the strikes organized by them avoidable?

As long as the concept of labor exists and employees feel that they are not receiving their fair share of dues, unions will exist and thrive. Union protests in most cases cause work stoppages, and in certain cases, disruption of law and order. Like in March 2016, public servants at Federal Government **departments across Australia** went on a series of **strikes** over failed pay negotiations, **disrupting operations** of many **government departments** for a few days.  Besides such direct effects, there are many **indirect effects** as well such as **strained employee relations**, **slower work processes**, **lesser productivity** and **unnecessary legal hassles**.

Also, union strikes can **never be taken too lightly** as they have prompted major overturn of decisions, on a few occasions. Besides the **Verizon incident** that was a **crucial example** of this, nationwide strikes were witnessed in India in March and April this year when the national government introduced reforms related to the withdrawal regulations and interest rate of employee provident fund, terming it as ‘anti-working class’. This compelled the government to withhold the reform for further review. In France, strike against labor law reforms in May turned violent, resulting in riots and significant damage to property. The incident prompted the government to consider modifications to the proposed reforms.

However, aside from employee concerns, such incidents are also determined by a number of other factors such as the country’s political scenario, economy, size of the overall workforce and the unions, history of unionization, labor laws, and culture. For example, it is a popular saying that the French are always on strike as per tradition (although recent statistics indicate a decline in frequency). In a communist government like China, strikes have steadily risen in number. In 2015, China Labor Bulletin (CLB), a Hong Kong-based workers’ rights group recorded 2,700 incidents of strikes and protests, compared to 1,300 incidents in 2014. Most of them have stemmed out of failure by the government to respect the basic rights of employees and address labor concerns.

Interestingly, unions have **not been able to gain a strong foothold** in the **IT-BPO industry**. While many countries do have a separate union to represent workers from the sector, incidents of strikes like Verizon **have been relatively lo**w.  However, workplace regulations, in addition to other factors mentioned could be a trigger for such incidents, even if on a smaller scale. For example, a recent survey that **interviewed several BPO employees** in India revealed that while **forming a union** in the BPO sector was **difficult**, irksome workplace regulations such as constant surveillance, irregular timings and incentives have prompted employees to express their resentment in smaller ways such as corruption of internal servers and so on.  Such risks are further enhanced in a city like Kolkata, which carries a strong trade union culture.

#### Victories like the aff mobilizes unions in the IT sector.

**Vynck et al 21** [Gerrit De; Carleton University, BA in Journalism and Global Politics, tech reporter for The Washington Post. He writes about Google and the algorithms that increasingly shape society. He previously covered tech for seven years at Bloomberg News; Nitashu Tiku; Columbia University, BA in English, New York University, MA in Journalism, Washington Post's tech culture reporter based in San Francisco; Macalester College, BA in English, Columbia University, MS in Journalism, reporter for The Washington Post who is focused on technology coverage in the Pacific Northwest; “Six things to know about the latest efforts to bring unions to Big Tech,” The Washington Post; https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/01/26/tech-unions-explainer/]//SJWen

In response to **tech** company crackdowns and lobbying, gig workers have **shifted their strategy** to emphasize building **worker-led movements** and increasing their ranks, rather than focusing on employment status as the primary goal, says Veena Dubal, a law professor at the University of California Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco. The **hope** is that with **President Biden in the White House and an even split in the Senate**, legislators will **mobilize** at the federal level, through the **NLRA or bills such as the PRO Act**, to **recognize gig worker collectives as real unions**.

#### Technological innovation solves every existential threat – which outweighs we cannot solve extinction without negative innovation.

**Matthews 18** Dylan. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the **future**. It’s reasonable to suggest that those **quadrillions** of future people have, accordingly, **hundreds of thousands of times** more moral weight than those of us living here **today** do. That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future.” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most **literal** thing it could mean is preventing human **extinction**, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly **part** of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address **specific threats** to humanity (which he calls “**targeted**” approaches to the far future) have to **complement** “**broad**” approaches, where instead of trying to **predict** what’s going to kill us all, you just **generally try to keep civilization running as best it can**, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with **potential** extinction events in the **future**, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future **doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation**; it also means **acting on pressing needs now**. For example: We’re going to be **better prepared** to prevent extinction from **AI** or a **supervirus** or **global warming** if society as a whole makes **a lot of scientific progress**. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of the **best thing**s we can do for the **far future** is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls “lost Einsteins” (**potential innovators** who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: improve **incentives** and **norms** in **academic work** to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X ”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.” Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.

## AFF

#### Extinction and death outweighs:

#### 1] Moral Uncertainty – philosophers have been arguing over what is the most ethical theory for thousands over years, and still have not reached a 100% true conclusion. This means that any chance that we are uncertain about ethics means we should save the future possibility of doing so i.e. preventing death.

#### 2] Sequencing Question – in order to do \_\_\_\_\_ (say whatever the aff framework thinks is good) you must be alive in the first place. You can not act on their ethical theory if you are dead.

#### 3] 3 Choices – either a] their framework can explain why death is bad and thus means my impacts come first b] their framework cannot explain why death is bad but should be rejected because governments have an obligation to ensure safety, and use intuitions to explain why life is good c] they actively think death is good which you should reject on face for moral repugnanceq

#### No impact -- Extinction from warming requires 12 degrees, far greater than their internal link, and intervening actors will solve before then

Sebastian Farquhar 17, leads the Global Priorities Project (GPP) at the Centre for Effective Altruism, et al., 2017, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf

The most likely levels of global warming are very unlikely to cause human extinction.15 The existential risks of climate change instead stem from tail risk climate change – the low probability of extreme levels of warming – and interaction with other sources of risk. It is impossible to say with confidence at what point global warming would become severe enough to pose an existential threat. Research has suggested that warming of 11-12°C would render most of the planet uninhabitable,16 and would completely devastate agriculture.17 This would pose an extreme threat to human civilisation as we know it.18 Warming of around 7°C or more could potentially produce conflict and instability on such a scale that the indirect effects could be an existential risk, although it is extremely uncertain how likely such scenarios are.19 Moreover, the timescales over which such changes might happen could mean that humanity is able to adapt enough to avoid extinction in even very extreme scenarios. The probability of these levels of warming depends on eventual greenhouse gas concentrations. According to some experts, unless strong action is taken soon by major emitters, it is likely that we will pursue a medium-high emissions pathway.20 If we do, the chance of extreme warming is highly uncertain but appears non-negligible. Current concentrations of greenhouse gases are higher than they have been for hundreds of thousands of years,21 which means that there are significant unknown unknowns about how the climate system will respond. Particularly concerning is the risk of positive feedback loops, such as the release of vast amounts of methane from melting of the arctic permafrost, which would cause rapid and disastrous warming.22 The economists Gernot Wagner and Martin Weitzman have used IPCC figures (which do not include modelling of feedback loops such as those from melting permafrost) to estimate that if we continue to pursue a medium-high emissions pathway, the probability of eventual warming of 6°C is around 10%,23 and of 10°C is around 3%.24 These estimates are of course highly uncertain. It is likely that the world will take action against climate change once it begins to impose large costs on human society, long before there is warming of 10°C. Unfortunately, there is significant inertia in the climate system: there is a 25 to 50 year lag between CO2 emissions and eventual warming,25 and it is expected that 40% of the peak concentration of CO2 will remain in the atmosphere 1,000 years after the peak is reached.26 Consequently, it is impossible to reduce temperatures quickly by reducing CO2 emissions. If the world does start to face costly warming, the international community will therefore face strong incentives to find other ways to reduce global temperatures.

### Democracy AND Climate – Solvency

#### Democracy will catastrophically delay action on climate change---authoritarianism is necessary to ensure rapid state-led transformation

Mann & Wainwright ’18 (Geoff, teaches political economy and economic geography at Simon Fraser University, where he directs the Centre for Global Political Economy, Joel *Climate Leviathan: A Political Theory of Our Planetary Future*, pp. 38-40, ME)

Relative to the institutional means currently available to capitalist liberal democracy and its sorry attempts at “consensus,” this trajectory has some distinct advantages with respect to atmospheric carbon concentration, notably in terms of the capacity to coordinate massive political-economic reconfiguration quickly and comprehensively. In light of our earlier question—how can we possibly realize the necessary emissions reductions?—it is this feature of Climate Mao that most recommends it. As the climate justice movement struggles to be heard, most campaigns in the global North are premised on an unspoken faith in a lop-sided, elite-biased, liberal proceduralism doomed to failure given the scale and scope of the changes required. If climate science is even half-right in its forecasts, the liberal model of democracy is at best too slow, at worst a devastating distraction. Climate Mao reflects the demand for rapid, revolutionary, state-led transformation today. Indeed, calls for variations on just such a regime abound on the Left. Mike Davis and Giovanni Arrighi have more or less sided with Climate Mao, sketching it as an alternative to capitalist Climate Leviathan.35 We might even interpret the renewal of enthusiasm for Maoist theory (including Alain Badiou’s version) as part of the prevailing crisis of ecological-political imagination.36 Minqi Li’s is arguably the best developed of this line of thought, and like Arrighi he locates the fulcrum of global climate history in China, arguing that Climate Mao offers the only way forward: [U]nless China takes serious and meaningful actions to fulfill its obligation of emissions reduction, there is little hope that global climate stabilization can be achieved. However, it is very unlikely that the [present] Chinese government will voluntarily take the necessary actions to reduce emissions. The sharp fall of economic growth that would be required is something that the Chinese government will not accept and cannot afford politically. Does this mean that humanity is doomed? That depends on the political struggle within China and in the world as a whole.37 Taking inspiration from Mao, Li says a new revolution in the Chinese revolution—a re-energization of the Maoist political tradition—could transform China and save humanity from doom. He does not claim this is likely; one need only consider China’s massive highway expansions, accelerated automobile consumption, and subsidized urban sprawl.38 But he is right that if an anticapitalist, planetary sovereign is to emerge that could change the world’s climate trajectory, it is most likely to emerge in China.

### Link

#### Climate change policies aren’t feasible – SMALL 1

Small, Diane. “Why the Climate Strike Is a Useless Act.” Eluxe Magazine, 3 Apr. 2020, https://eluxemagazine.com/culture/articles/why-the-climate-strike-is-a-useless-act/. // LHP HL

Let’s consider a more realistic example: Germany. The country is deeply committed to [renewable energy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Renewable_energy), and the country has been called “[the world’s first major renewable energy economy](https://www.renewableenergyworld.com/2009/04/03/germany-the-worlds-first-major-renewable-energy-economy/#gref)“. However, even this ecological powerhouse only used around [35% green energy in 2018](https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelshellenberger/2019/05/06/the-reason-renewables-cant-power-modern-civilization-is-because-they-were-never-meant-to/#52bf5b70ea2b), and as much of Germany’s renewable electricity [comes](https://www.cleanenergywire.org/factsheets/germanys-energy-consumption-and-power-mix-charts) from biomass, which scientists [view](https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelshellenberger/2019/03/07/with-ethanol-and-biomass-no-longer-viewed-as-green-will-other-renewables-soon-follow/#b819dd97fb98) as polluting and environmentally degrading, as it does from from solar. The country has also run into [numerous technological, economic and political problems](https://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/german-failure-on-the-road-to-a-renewable-future-a-1266586.html) that are stifling its progress in this arena, and [Der Spiegel](https://www.spiegel.de/international/germany/german-failure-on-the-road-to-a-renewable-future-a-1266586.html) cites a recent estimate that it would cost Germany €3.4 trillion ($3.8 trillion) – or seven times more than it spent from 2000 to 2025 – to increase solar and wind three to five-fold by 2050. That’s a pretty hefty spend for one of the richest countries in the world – one that would be impossible to achieve for poorer nations. Do the climate strikers realise that only the teeniest, tiniest of countries can run on green energy? And that even those with the best intentions to do so are having serious difficulties? No strike of any magnitude will change that.

#### Climate strike pushes no policy, actually causes harms – SMALL 2

Small, Diane. “Why the Climate Strike Is a Useless Act.” Eluxe Magazine, 3 Apr. 2020, https://eluxemagazine.com/culture/articles/why-the-climate-strike-is-a-useless-act/. // LHP HL

Protests can play an important role in our society – but only when the objective is clear. Stop the War protests mean just that, for example. But the ‘climate strike’ has no clear, realistic goals whatsoever. It’s easy to complain, but it’s much harder to come up with – let alone demand – serious, viable solutions. Green energy is a noble goal, but so far, it’s not viable for fuelling most countries – far from it. And even when it works, it often comes with its own issues: for example, China’s ‘green energy’ [Three Gorges Hydroelectric Dam](https://www.internationalrivers.org/campaigns/three-gorges-dam) displaced 1.2 million people, killed countless numbers of animals and plants, and flooded pristine forests. The Climate Strike is a caprice; a feel-good event that seems to be at least partly designed to give [totally un-eco-friendly companies like Vivienne Westwood](https://eluxemagazine.com/magazine/vivienne-westwood-is-not-eco-friendly/) a bit of a greenwashing boost, while acting as something of an excuse for workers and students to bunk off and join a huge street party. They may feel that they’re doing something positive for the environment, but in the end, they will accomplish nothing. There’s no doubt the planet needs saving, but gathering a bunch of impassioned protestors (many of whom are too young to vote, even) with zero feasible demands for change is a waste of energy. If people really want to ‘strike’ in an effective way, real sacrifice is necessary. We must lower our energy use. Reduce our consumption. Boycott some of the biggest corporations on the planet. But it seems too few are willing to make those sacrifices.

# 2nr

Overview: Working strikes destroy our unstable economy through lost productivity and mass unemployment. Tanked economy links to nuclear war that causes extinction.

Extend the Uniqueness the Global Economy is stabilizing and set for increases in 2021 but is still vulnerable to shocks

Extend the link, strikes kill worker productivity and lead to mass unemployment. This couples and kills the economy

Extend the impact, internal economic conflict turns external, nuclear war. Nuclear war causes extinction

Overview: Global tech development is good right now. 1AC increase strikes that tank the tech industry. That prevents and solvency for tech development to solve extinction impacts.

Extend the uniqueness, global tech development right now is competitive and up. The ACs strikes gain foothold onto tech industry that kills productivity/innovation.

Extend the impact, tech development controls internal link to all extinction impact solvency.

#### Frontlines:

A/T climate change: On Innovation: [1] Innovation is key to solving climate change, current infrastructure to move away from oil energies is nonexistent, we need innovation to solve.

On solvency: [1] Covid was a rapid threat, innovation is key for producing our ability to respond to future pandemics, we should just stop producing medicine. Also covid solved by creating a vaccine.