## Lay Framing: 1:40

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being. Its hedonistic act-util Independently prefer:

#### [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 B] No act-omission distinction – governments have to yes/no policies which means that choosing to omit is an act itself so side constraints freeze action C] Actor specificity comes first because different agents have different obligations. We have to look at how the government make decisions

#### [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.

#### [3] theory:

#### [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, not philosophy majors. Fairness and education since it’s a lens through which we engage the res.

#### [4] Pain and pleasure are intrinsically valuable – to justify beyond that runs into moral incoherence. Moen 16,

**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 // RCT by JPark

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

#### [5] Extinction hijacks and side constrains the framework – it o/w and comes first

**Pummer 15** [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

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)

## Contention: Climate Strikes: 2:20, 1:47

#### Climate Change is ongoing, current checks have not solved. We are still on path to experience catastrophic warming. BBC 1

“What Is Climate Change? A Really Simple Guide.” BBC News, BBC, 13 Oct. 2021, https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-24021772.

World temperatures are rising because of human activity, and climate change now threatens every aspect of human life. Left unchecked, humans and nature will experience catastrophic warming, with worsening droughts, greater sea level rise and mass extinction of species. We face a huge challenge, but there are potential solutions. What is climate change? Climate is the average weather in a place over many years. Climate change is a shift in those average conditions. The rapid climate change we are now seeing is caused by humans using oil, gas and coal for their homes, factories and transport. When these fossil fuels burn, they release greenhouse gases - mostly carbon dioxide (CO2). These gases trap the Sun's heat and cause the planet's temperature to rise. The world is now about 1.2C warmer than it was in the 19th Century - and [the amount of CO2 in the atmosphere has risen by 50%](https://www.carbonbrief.org/met-office-atmospheric-co2-now-hitting-50-higher-than-pre-industrial-levels). Temperature rises must slow down if we want to avoid the worst consequences of climate change, scientists say. They say global warming needs to be [kept to 1.5C by 2100](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-45678338). However, unless further action is taken, [the planet could still warm by more than 2C](https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/weather/climate-change/effects-of-climate-change) by the end of this century. A report in 2021 by the Climate Action Tracker group calculated that the world was heading for [2.4C of warming by the end of the century.](https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-59220687) If nothing is done, [scientists think global warming could exceed 4C](https://www.carbonbrief.org/what-is-a-4c-world) in the future, leading to devastating heatwaves, millions losing their homes to rising sea levels and irreversible loss of plant and animal species.

#### Current government policy action is not enough. We need social movements with at least 3.5% of the population to gain traction and create a social movement capable of saving the planet. Current strikes fail to gain traction with people unwilling to participate in civil disobedience. Legalizing the unconditional right to strike solves by making climate strikes not a form of civil disobedience. SERHAN

Serhan, Yasmeen. “CAN 3.5 Percent Save the Planet?” The Atlantic, Atlantic Media Company, 8 Nov. 2021, https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2021/11/cop26-climate-activism/620641/.

Although world leaders were gathered in Glasgow for the United Nations Climate Change Conference last week, Greta Thunberg said change wouldn’t be coming from within the summit’s halls. “That is not leadership—this is leadership,” Thunberg [said](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/video/2021/nov/02/you-can-shove-your-climate-crisis-up-your-arse-greta-thunberg-sings-at-cop26-video) of, and to, her fellow activists. “This is what leadership looks like.” The way many environmental campaigners, including Thunberg, see it, they are the ones who helped create the space for governments to take more decisive action on climate change—an issue that has attracted growing levels of concern across the [world’s advanced economies](https://www.pewresearch.org/global/2021/09/14/in-response-to-climate-change-citizens-in-advanced-economies-are-willing-to-alter-how-they-live-and-work/), including from a majority of people in the [United States](https://apnews.com/article/climate-joe-biden-science-environment-and-nature-only-on-ap-1e48e3315d2e0b618ccaa4a8d466e057). Through protests, school strikes, and other nonviolent actions, they have been credited with raising public awareness about the seriousness of the climate crisis, and the need for governments to solve it. Yet despite these efforts, many climate activists I spoke with recently lamented that COP26 was failing to meet the urgency of the moment. A major question facing today’s climate movement is what critical mass is required to compel governments to take its demands more seriously. If millions of people aren’t enough to pressure leaders to take drastic and enforceable action on climate change, how many are? And what will it take for others to be moved to join them? There isn’t a magic figure guaranteed to tip the balance in favor of widespread climate mitigation, of course. But some environmental campaigners have worked with a particular number in mind: [3.5 percent](https://www.nonviolent-conflict.org/resource/success-nonviolent-civil-resistance/). This comes from the work of the political scientist Erica Chenoweth, whose research found that nonviolent movements require the active participation of at least 3.5 percent of a population in order to achieve serious political change. This so-called 3.5 percent rule was derived from Chenoweth’s study of hundreds of protests from 1900 to 2006, and has made an impact on contemporary movements, including Extinction Rebellion, an international climate-advocacy group based in London whose founders [cite](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2019/may/01/extinction-rebellion-non-violent-civil-disobedience) Chenoweth as a source of inspiration (the group [publicly states](https://extinctionrebellion.uk/act-now/) that it needs the involvement of 2 million people, or roughly 3.5 percent of the British population, in order to succeed). When I interviewed Chenoweth [last year](https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2020/09/belarus-protests-women/616288/), they explained their findings in a more matter-of-fact way: Nonviolent protests are more successful than their violent counterparts because they are better at eliciting broad and diverse support from the societies in which they take place. This makes these movements more inclusive, and also more innovative. These kinds of protests don’t necessarily succeed because they appeal to the morality of those in power, but rather because they effectively constrain a government’s options by undermining its support in various pillars of society, such as bureaucrats, the media, and business elites. If 3.5 percent of a country’s—or the world’s—population backs any one issue or policy proposal, that is a substantial enough voting bloc, consumer market, and workforce to get those in power to pay attention. The climate movement has already demonstrated this kind of influence. Fridays for Future, which was started by Thunberg in 2018 as a solitary school strike in protest of climate inaction, has since attracted millions of participants around the world and earned Thunberg [an international platform](https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2021/08/greta-thunberg-far-right-climate/619748/), as well as high-profile meetings with world leaders and global institutions. In Britain, Extinction Rebellion has been credited with influencing Parliament’s 2019 decision to declare a climate emergency and commit to reaching net-zero carbon emissions by 2050, making the country the first major economy to do so. In the United States, the youth-led Sunrise Movement has been widely recognized for its role in elevating the climate crisis on the national agenda. But with [few exceptions](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2019/sep/27/climate-crisis-6-million-people-join-latest-wave-of-worldwide-protests), none of these efforts has been able to surpass the 3.5 percent threshold. Part of the challenge comes down to the fact that many of these movements were [stymied by the pandemic](https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2020/04/protest-demonstration-pandemic-coronavirus-covid19/610381/), which forced them online. Others have been vilified for their more disruptive tactics: Extinction Rebellion, as well as its U.K.-focused offshoot, Insulate Britain, has become notorious for its commitment to civil disobedience, which has at times involved blocking bridges, freeways, and public transport. A recent poll found that less than [20 percent](https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/survey-results/daily/2021/09/03/3ee46/1) of Britons have a positive view of Extinction Rebellion. Insulate Britain, which has been on the receiving end of [negative press](https://www.newstatesman.com/comment/2021/10/insulate-britain-show-the-danger-of-elevating-the-cause-above-human-lives) over its recent spate of road blockages, has also seen a [decline](https://yougov.co.uk/topics/politics/articles-reports/2021/10/08/three-weeks-motorway-climate-change-protests-publi) in public support. The way many within these movements see it, their goal isn’t to inconvenience people; it’s to help raise awareness about the seriousness of the challenge we are all facing, and to be just disruptive enough to compel those in power to act. “Most of the people in [Extinction Rebellion] and other climate activists don’t actually want to be doing this,” Christina See, an Extinction Rebellion spokesperson in New York City, told me of the [recent road closures](https://twitter.com/XR_NYC/status/1452617031640039435). “But we’re also looking at the future and saying, ‘Okay, what is our future going to be like unless we fight for action now?’” [Read: We’re heading straight for a demi-Armageddon](https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2021/11/how-bad-will-climate-change-get/620605/) In many ways, this argument makes sense. The inconvenience posed by these groups pales in comparison with the kind of disruption that awaits if the climate crisis is left unresolved. Some of the more extreme weather events fueled by climate change, including [flash floods](https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/extreme-weather-events-in-kerala-linked-to-climate-crisis-experts-101634668375094.html), [wildfires](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/aug/05/people-dead-as-wildfires-continue-to-rage-across-southern-europe), and [heat waves](https://www.politico.eu/article/europe-fries-in-a-heat-wave-made-more-intense-by-climate-change/), are already being experienced. Not only is climate science on climate activists’ side, but they also feel that history is too. “The suffragettes were vilified,” Tracey Mallaghan, a spokesperson for Insulate Britain, told me, in reference to the more violent arm of Britain’s suffragist movement. “If you look back at history, it’s always been a small percentage of the population fighting until it changes. And then everybody agrees that it was always that way and should have been done.” But unlike their historical counterparts, climate activists don’t have the luxury of time. For this reason, environmental campaigners such as Rupert Read have been calling for the formation of a “[moderate flank](https://greenworld.org.uk/article/politics-paradox)”—one that he believes can attract a broader base of public support and, in turn, accelerate the movement’s aims. It’s not that Read is averse to Extinction Rebellion’s civil disobedience—in fact, we spoke the day after a hearing in [his trial](https://twitter.com/GreenRupertRead/status/1408517883865538561), in which he has been charged with criminal damage for his participation in an Extinction Rebellion protest last year. But he believes that in order for it and other like-minded movements to be successful, they need to galvanize those who wouldn’t necessarily want to engage in civil disobedience. When I asked Read what this moderate flank would look like, he told me that some iterations of it already exist, in the form of workplace-oriented groups such as Lawyers for Net Zero and Parents for Future, a network inspired by Thunberg’s movement. These kinds of organizations can help bring the climate movement closer to the 3.5 percent prescribed by Chenoweth, but Read said he doesn’t think even that will be enough to achieve the kind of drastic societal change that environmental campaigners are agitating for. “You need to have a large body of people who are going to be actively in support, and an even larger body of people who are going to be willing to make the kinds of changes that you’re after,” Read said. “That’s one reason why … we have to be careful about overly polarizing strategies.” While they may differ on tactics, if all climate campaigners can agree on one thing, it’s that “volume matters,” Clare Farrell, a co-founder of Extinction Rebellion, told me, noting that even if COP26 fails, it could at the very least motivate more people to get involved, however they choose to. “That’s the message that I hope people are going to get after the COP: Nobody’s coming to save us.”

#### Climate change causes extinction we have to act now.

Specktor 19 [Brandon; writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years; "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, 6/4/19; <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html>] LHP SV

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes**; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of** [lethal heat conditions](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly **one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert**. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations**, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in **nuclear war, are likely**. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

## Contention: Democracy: 2:50

#### American democracy is currently under siege by the politics of Donald Trump. The 2020 attempted coup was just the beginning. 2024 could destroy American democracy entirely.

PILKINGTON 21 Pilkington, Ed. “'Terrifying for American Democracy': Is Trump Planning for a 2024 Coup?” The Guardian, Guardian News and Media, 14 Nov. 2021, [https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/nov/14/trump-president-2024-election-coup-republicans. //](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/nov/14/trump-president-2024-election-coup-republicans.%20//) LH HL

At 1.35pm on 6 January, the top Republican in the US Senate, Mitch McConnell, stood before his party and delivered a [dire warning](https://www.rev.com/transcript-editor/shared/_BVl6g_r_ZHl4d0d8oIEIgxEKf9aCpcassr2QQRLz9GCqZd22ybzoq_ZrGp8D3L6nVb6YIYZTGjOgxSTld6RbTbtCfo?loadFrom=PastedDeeplink&ts=0.38). If they overruled the will of [81 million](https://www.cnn.com/election/2020/results/president) voters by blocking Joe Biden’s certification as president in a bid to snatch re-election for the defeated candidate, Donald Trump, “it would damage our Republic forever”. Five minutes before he started speaking, hundreds of Trump supporters incited by the then president’s false claim that the 2020 election had been stolen broke through Capitol police lines and were storming the building. McConnell’s next remark has been forgotten in the catastrophe that followed – the inner sanctums of America’s democracy defiled, five people [dead](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/01/11/us/who-died-in-capitol-building-attack.html), and 138 police officers injured. [He said](https://twitter.com/atrupar/status/1346888522825932802?ref_src=twsrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1346888522825932802%7Ctwgr%5E%7Ctwcon%5Es1_&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Fnymag.com%2Fintelligencer%2F2021%2F01%2Fwatch-mcconnell-give-speech-against-overturning-election.html): “If this election were overturned by mere allegations from the losing side, our democracy would enter a death spiral. We’d never see the whole nation accept an election again. Every four years would be a scramble for power at any cost.” Eleven months on, McConnell’s words sound eerily portentous. What could be construed as an anti-democratic scramble for power at any cost is taking place right now in jurisdictions across the country. Republican leaders loyal to Trump are vying to control election administrations in key states in ways that could drastically distort the outcome of the presidential race in 2024. With the former president [hinting](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-2024-campaign-candidacy/2021/10/03/73af3b12-21f8-11ec-b3d6-8cdebe60d3e2_story.html?utm_campaign=wp_politics_am&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter&wpisrc=nl_politics&carta-url=https%3A%2F%2Fs2.washingtonpost.com%2Fcar-ln-tr%2F34df06a%2F615ae3799d2fda9d41fae2f8%2F598ab7509bbc0f682602add6%2F12%2F50%2F615ae3799d2fda9d41fae2f8) strongly that he may stand again, his followers are busily manoeuvring themselves into critical positions of control across the US – from which they could launch a far more sophisticated attempt at an electoral coup than [Trump’s effort to hang on to power](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/oct/30/trump-2020-election-steal-presidency-coup-inside-story) in 2020. Trump holds a rally in Perry, Georgia, in September. Photograph: Sean Rayford/Getty Images The machinations are unfolding right across the US at all levels of government, from the local precinct, through counties and states, to the national stage of Congress. The stage is being set for a spectacle that could, in 2024, make last year’s unprecedented assault on American democracy look like a dress rehearsal. The Guardian has spoken to leading Republican election experts, specialists in voting practices, democracy advocates and election officials in swing states, all of whom fear that McConnell’s warning is coming true. “In 2020 [Donald Trump](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/donaldtrump) put a huge strain on the fabric of this democracy, on the country,” said Ben Ginsberg, a leading election lawyer who represented four of the last six Republican presidential nominees. “In 2024 the strain on the fabric could turn into a tear.” Since Joe Biden was inaugurated on 20 January, Trump has dug himself deeper into his big lie about the “rigged election” that was stolen from him. Far from cooling on the subject, he has continued to amplify the false claim in ever more brazen terms. Advertisement Initially he [condemned](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/01/13/trump-condemns-capitol-violence-a-week-after-riot-as-he-faces-second-impeachment-trial.html) the violence at the US Capitol on 6 January. But in recent months Trump has emerged as an unashamed champion of the insurrectionists, calling them [“great people”](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/07/11/trump-jan-6-insurrection-these-were-great-people-499165) and a [“loving crowd”](https://www.cnn.com/2021/07/21/politics/trump-january-6-loving-crowd-cnntv/index.html), and [lamenting](https://www.msnbc.com/rachel-maddow-show/ahead-rally-trump-goes-new-lengths-defend-jan-6-rioters-n1279424) that they are now being “persecuted so unfairly”. Trump [recorded a video](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/trump-ashli-babbitt-reopen-investigation/2021/10/11/af4ed070-2a7b-11ec-8ef6-3ca8fe943a92_story.html) last month praising Ashli Babbitt, the woman shot dead by a police officer as she tried to break into the speaker’s lobby, where Congress members were hiding in fear of their lives. Babbitt was a “truly incredible person”, he said. Michael Waldman, who as president of the Brennan Center is one of the country’s authorities on US elections, told the Guardian that Trump was normalizing the anti-democratic fury that erupted that day. “He has gone from being embarrassed to treating 6 January as one of the high points of his presidency. Ashli Babbitt is now being lionized as this noble martyr as opposed to a violent insurrectionist trying to break into the House of Representatives chamber.” Over the past year Trump has spread the stolen election lie far and wide, [telling supporters](https://www.rev.com/blog/transcripts/donald-trump-perry-georgia-rally-speech-transcript-september-25) at his regular presidential campaign-style rallies that 2020 was “the most corrupt election in the history of our country”. He has used his iron grip over the Republican party to cajole officials in [Arizona](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/may/14/arizona-election-audit-recount-ballots-maricopa-county), [Pennsylvania, Texas, Wisconsin](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2020-ballot-reviews-trump/2021/09/24/ab054aac-1d4d-11ec-8380-5fbadbc43ef8_story.html?utm_medium=social&utm_source=twitter&utm_campaign=wp_main) and other states to conduct “audits” of the 2020 election count in further vain searches for fraud. Texas lawmakers at the state capitol in September. Photograph: Tamir Kalifa/Getty Images One of the most eccentric of these “audits” (or [“fraudits”](https://www.nbcnews.com/think/opinion/arizona-s-election-fraudit-trump-s-big-lie-are-still-ncna1278329), as they have been called) was carried out in Arizona by a company called Cyber Ninjas, which had virtually no experience in elections and whose owner supported the “Stop the Steal” movement. Paradoxically, even this effort [concluded](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/sep/24/republican-audit-arizona-bigger-lead-biden) that Biden had indeed won the state, recording an even bigger margin for the Democratic candidate than the official count. The idea of the stolen election continues to spread like an airborne contagion. [A poll released this week](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/nov/01/republicans-violence-save-us-poll) by the Public Religion Research Institute found that two-thirds of Republicans still believe the myth that Trump won. More chilling still, almost a third of Republicans agree with the contention that American patriots may have to resort to violence “in order to save our country”. Waldman said the big lie is now ubiquitous. “The louder Trump yelled the more his supporters thought he was telling the truth. Increasingly the institutional machinery of the Republican party is organized around fealty to the big lie and the willingness to steal the next election, and that is terrifying for the future of American democracy.” Ned Foley, a constitutional law professor at Ohio State University, said the current moment is “unique in American history”. He called it “electoral McCarthyism”. Foley sees parallels between Trump and the anticommunist panic or “red scare” whipped up by senator from Wisconsin Joe McCarthy in the 1950s. “What’s unique about Trump and about what he’s trying to do in 2024 is that he’s applying McCarthy-like tactics to voting, and that’s never happened before.” Electoral McCarthyism is being felt most acutely at state level. In several of the battlegrounds where the 2024 contest largely will be fought and won, a clear pattern is emerging. Trump has endorsed a number of Republican candidates for key state election positions who share a common feature: they all avidly embrace the myth of the stolen election and the lie that Biden is an impostor in the White House.The candidates are being aggressively promoted for secretary of state positions – the top official that oversees elections in US states. Should any one of them succeed, they would hold enormous sway over the running of the 2024 presidential election in their state, including how the votes would be counted.

#### The plan stabilizes democracy –

#### [1] Rights protection – strikes are fundamental to democratic citizenship – that solves power imbalances and communication while improving freedom – OHCHR 17:

“UN Rights Expert: ‘Fundamental Right to Strike Must Be Preserved.’” OHCHR, 2017, www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=21328&LangID=E. // LHP PS

As stated in my 2016 thematic report to the General Assembly (A/71/385), **the right to strike has been established in international law for decades, in global and regional instruments, such as in the ILO Convention No. 87 (articles 3, 8 and 10), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (article 8), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (article 22), the European Convention on Human Rights (article 11), and the American Convention on Human Rights (article 16). The right is also enshrined in the constitutions of at least 90 countries.** **The right to strike has in effect become customary international law. The right to strike is also an intrinsic corollary of the fundamental right of freedom of association**. **It is crucial for millions of women and men around the world to assert collectively their rights in the workplace, including the right to just and favourable conditions of work, and to work in dignity and without fear of intimidation and persecution.** Moreover**, protest action in relation to government social and economic policy, and against negative corporate practices, forms part of the basic civil liberties whose respect is essential for the meaningful exercise of trade union rights. This right enables them to engage with companies and governments on a more equal footing, and Member States have a positive obligation to protect this right, and a negative obligation not to interfere with its exercise.** Moreover, protecting the right to strike is not simply about States fulfilling their legal obligations. **It is also about them creating democratic and equitable societies that are sustainable in the long run.** **The concentration of power in one sector – whether in the hands of government or business – inevitably leads to the erosion of democracy, and an increase in inequalities and marginalization with all their attendant consequences. The right to strike is a check on this concentration of power.**

#### [2] Participation – the plan fosters civic participation – that’s vital to democracy and cements the election – McElwee 15:

McElwee, Sean. “How Unions Boost Democratic Participation.” The American Prospect, 16 Sept. 2015, prospect.org/labor/unions-boost-democratic-participation/. // LHP PS

Labor organizer Helen Marot once observed, "**The labor unions are group efforts in the direction of democracy."** What she meant is that more than simply vehicles for the economic interests of workers (which they certainly are), **labor unions also foster civic participation for workers**. And nowhere is this clearer than in voter turnout, which has suffered in recent years along with union membership. Indeed, **new data from the Census Bureau and a new analysis of American National Election Studies data support the case that unions' declining influence has also deeply harmed democracy**. In 2014, voter turnout was abysmal, even for a midterm. Census data suggest that only 41.9 percent of the citizen population over 18 turned out to vote. However, as I note in my new Demos report [Why Voting Matters](http://www.demos.org/publication/why-voting-matters), there are dispiriting gaps in turnout across class, race, and age. **To examine how unions might affect policy, I performed a new analysis of both Census Bureau and American National Election Studies data. The data below, from the 2014 election, show the differences in voter turnout between union and non-union workers (the sample only includes individuals who were employed, and does not include self-employed workers). While only 39 percent of non-union workers voted in 2014, fully 52 percent of union workers did.** As part of ongoing research, James Feigenbaum, an economics PhD candidate at Harvard, ran a regression using American National Election Studies data suggesting that **union members are about 4 percentage points more likely to vote and 3 points more likely to register (after controlling for demographic factors) and individuals living in a union household are 2.5 points more likely to vote and register.** This is largely [in line with the earlier estimates](https://www.nber.org/papers/w9992.pdf) of Richard Freeman. **Other research has found an even stronger turnout effect from unions**. **Daniel Stegmueller and Michael Becher**[**find that**](http://daniel-stegmueller.com/files/StegmuellerBecher_UnionTurnout_web.pdf)**after applying numerous demographic controls**, **union members are 10 points more likely to vote.** What's particularly important is **that unions boost turnout among low- and middle-income individuals. In a 2006 study, political scientists Jan Leighley and Jonathan Nagler**[**found that**](http://www.nyu.edu/gsas/dept/politics/faculty/nagler/leighley_nagler_unions06.pdf)**, "the decline in union membership since 1964 has affected the aggregate turnout of both low and middle-income individuals more than the aggregate turnout of high-income individuals."** In 2014, the gap between unions and non-union workers shrunk at the highest rung of the income ladder. **There was a 15-point gap among those earning less than $25,000 (40 percent turnout for union workers, and 25 percent turnout for non-union workers).** Among those earning more than $100,000, the gap was far smaller (49 percent for non-union workers and 52 percent for union workers). Individuals living in union households are also more progressive than those in non-union households. I examined 2012 ANES data **and find that union households aren't largely different from non-union households on many issues regarding government spending, but they are more likely to have voted for Obama, identify as Democratic, and support a robust role for the government in reducing income inequality**. **When looking at union members specifically, the gaps become slightly larger.** More upscale union members are far more progressive than their non-union counterparts. Non-union households with an income above $60,000 oppose government intervention to reduce inequality by 11 points, with 32.2 percent in favor and 43.4 percent against. But richer union households support government intervention, with 42.5 percent in favor and 29.9 percent opposed. As Richard B. Freeman has pointed out, "union members are more likely to vote for a Democrat for the House or Presidency than demographically comparable nonunion voters." He similarly finds that "unionism moves members to the left of where they would be given their socioeconomic status," in line with the data I examined from 2012. A [2013 study](http://sf.oxfordjournals.org/content/91/3/895.abstract) by Jasmine Kerrissey and Evan Schofer finds that **union members are not only more likely to vote, but also more likely to belong to other associations, and to protest.** **They also find that these effects are strongest among people with lower levels of education, suggesting that unions may help mobilize the least politically active groups**. **A**[**recent study**](http://www.researchgate.net/publication/276378628_What_Accounts_for_the_Union_Member_Advantage_in_Voter_Turnout_Evidence_from_the_European_Union_2002-2008?ev=pubfeed_top&_iepl%5BviewId%5D=55ef22e95cd9e3370e8b45ef&_iepl%5Bordinal%5D=1&_iepl%5Bcontexts%5D%5B0%5D=literature&_iepl%5BinteractionType%5D=publicationView)**of European countries finds union members vote more and identifies those aspects of union membership that contribute to the higher turnout. Other studies support the idea that civic participation creates a feedback loop that leads** **to higher voting rates**. Another factor is that union members make more money, and higher income is correlated with voting behavior. **Finally, union members are encouraged by peers and the union to engage in politics, which also contributes to higher levels of turnout.** It's not entirely surprising that politicians who savage unions often share a similar contempt for the right to vote. **Democracy in the workplace leads to democracy more broadly throughout society.** W**orkers with more democratic workplaces are more likely to democratically engage in in society.** Further, when unions and progressives demonstrate that government can benefit them, Americans are more likely to want to participate in decision-making. For all these reasons, unions play a unique and indispensable role in the progressive project. As Larry Summers, certainly not a leftist, [recently argued](http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonkblog/wp/2015/09/11/larry-summers-stronger-unions-must-be-part-of-the-national-agenda/), "the weakness of unions leaves a broad swath of the middle class largely unrepresented in the political process."

#### Extinction – multiple warrants - **Kendall-Taylor 16**:

[Andrea; Deputy national intelligence officer for Russia and Eurasia at the National Intelligence Council, Senior associate in the Human Rights Initiative at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington; “How Democracy’s Decline Would Undermine the International Order,” CSIS; 7/15/16; <https://www.csis.org/analysis/how-democracy%E2%80%99s-decline-would-undermine-international-order>/]//SJWen

It is rare that policymakers, analysts, and academics agree. But there is an emerging consensus in the world of foreign policy: threats to the stability of the current international order are rising. The norms, values, laws, and institutions that have undergirded the international system and governed relationships between nations are being gradually dismantled. The most discussed sources of this pressure are [the ascent of China](http://nationalinterest.org/feature/how-china-sees-world-order-15846) and other non-Western countries, Russia’s assertive foreign policy, and the diffusion of power from traditional nation-states to nonstate actors, such as nongovernmental organizations, multinational corporations, and technology-empowered individuals. Largely missing from these discussions, however, is the [specter of widespread democratic decline](http://www.journalofdemocracy.org/article/facing-democratic-recession). Rising challenges to democratic governance across the globe are a major strain on the international system, but they receive [far less attention](http://www.iiss.org/en/publications/survival/sections/2016-5e13/survival--global-politics-and-strategy-april-may-2016-eb2d/58-2-03-boyle-6dbd) in discussions of the shifting world order. In the 70 years since the end of World War II, the United States has fostered a global order dominated by states that are liberal, capitalist, and democratic. The United States has promoted the spread of democracy to strengthen global norms and rules that constitute the foundation of our current international system. However, despite the steady rise of democracy since the end of the Cold War, over the last 10 years we have seen dramatic reversals in respect for democratic principles across the globe. [A 2015 Freedom House report](https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/01152015_FIW_2015_final.pdf) stated that the “acceptance of democracy as the world’s dominant form of government—and of an international system built on democratic ideals—is under greater threat than at any point in the last 25 years.” Although the number of democracies in the world is at an all-time high, there are a number of [key trends](file:///C:\Users\PMeylan\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\5V2CJVRN\160715_KendallTaylor_DemocracysDecline_Commentary.docx#http://www.journalofdemocracy.org/article/democracy-decline) that are working to undermine democracy. The rollback of democracy in a few influential states or even in a number of less consequential ones would almost certainly accelerate meaningful changes in today’s global order. Democratic decline would weaken U.S. partnerships and erode an important foundation for U.S. cooperation abroad. [Research demonstrates](file:///C:\Users\PMeylan\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\5V2CJVRN\160715_KendallTaylor_DemocracysDecline_Commentary.docx#http://cmp.sagepub.com/content/18/1/49.abstract) that domestic politics are a key determinant of the international behavior of states. In particular, democracies are more likely to form alliances and cooperate more fully with other democracies than with autocracies. Similarly, authoritarian countries have established mechanisms for cooperation and sharing of “worst practices.” An increase in authoritarian countries, then, would provide a broader platform for coordination that could enable these countries to overcome their divergent histories, values, and interests—factors that are frequently cited as obstacles to the formation of a cohesive challenge to the U.S.-led international system. Recent examples support the empirical data. Democratic backsliding in Hungary and the hardening of Egypt’s autocracy under Abdel Fattah el-Sisi have led to enhanced relations between these countries and Russia. Likewise, democratic decline in Bangladesh has led Sheikh Hasina Wazed and her ruling Awami League to seek closer relations with China and Russia, in part to mitigate Western pressure and bolster the regime’s domestic standing. Although none of these burgeoning relationships has developed into a highly unified partnership, democratic backsliding in these countries has provided a basis for cooperation where it did not previously exist. And while the United States certainly finds common cause with authoritarian partners on specific issues, the depth and reliability of such cooperation is limited. Consequently, further democratic decline could seriously compromise the United States’ ability to form the kinds of deep partnerships that will be required to confront today’s increasingly complex challenges. Global issues such as climate change, migration, and violent extremism demand the coordination and cooperation that democratic backsliding would put in peril. Put simply, the United States is a less effective and influential actor if it loses its ability to rely on its partnerships with other democratic nations. A slide toward authoritarianism could also challenge the current global order by diluting U.S. influence in critical international institutions, including the [United Nations](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/christopher-walker-authoritarian-regimes-are-changing-how-the-world-defines-democracy/2014/06/12/d1328e3a-f0ee-11e3-bf76-447a5df6411f_story.html) , the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Democratic decline would weaken Western efforts within these institutions to advance issues such as Internet freedom and the responsibility to protect. In the case of Internet governance, for example, Western democracies support an open, largely private, global Internet. Autocracies, in contrast, promote state control over the Internet, including laws and other mechanisms that facilitate their ability to censor and persecute dissidents. Already many autocracies, including Belarus, China, Iran, and Zimbabwe, have coalesced in the “Likeminded Group of Developing Countries” within the United Nations to advocate their interests. Within the IMF and World Bank, autocracies—along with other developing nations—seek to water down conditionality or the reforms that lenders require in exchange for financial support. If successful, diminished conditionality would enfeeble an important incentive for governance reforms. In a more extreme scenario, the rising influence of autocracies could enable these countries to bypass the IMF and World Bank all together. For example, the Chinese-created Asian Infrastructure and Investment Bank and the BRICS Bank—which includes Russia, China, and an increasingly authoritarian South Africa—provide countries with the potential to bypass existing global financial institutions when it suits their interests. Authoritarian-led alternatives pose the risk that global economic governance will become [fragmented and less effective](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00396338.2016.1161899?journalCode=tsur20#.V2H3MRbXgdI). Violence and instability would also likely increase if more democracies give way to autocracy. [International relations literature](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/1995-05-01/democratization-and-war) tells us that democracies are less likely to fight wars against other democracies, suggesting that interstate wars would rise as the number of democracies declines. Moreover, within countries that are already autocratic, additional movement away from democracy, or an “authoritarian hardening,” would increase global instability. Highly repressive autocracies are the most likely to experience state failure, as was the case in the Central African Republic, Libya, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen. In this way, democratic decline would significantly strain the international order because rising levels of instability would exceed the West’s ability to respond to the tremendous costs of peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, and refugee flows. Finally, widespread democratic decline would contribute to rising anti-U.S. sentiment that could fuel a global order that is increasingly antagonistic to the United States and its values. Most autocracies are highly suspicious of U.S. intentions and view the creation of an external enemy as an effective means for boosting their own public support. Russian president Vladimir Putin, Venezuelan president Nicolas Maduro, and Bolivian president Evo Morales regularly accuse the United States of fomenting instability and supporting regime change. This vilification of the United States is a convenient way of distracting their publics from regime shortcomings and fostering public support for strongman tactics. Since 9/11, and particularly in the wake of the Arab Spring, Western enthusiasm for democracy support has waned. Rising levels of instability, including in Ukraine and the Middle East, fragile governance in Afghanistan and Iraq, and sustained threats from terrorist groups such as ISIL have increased Western focus on security and stability. U.S. preoccupation with intelligence sharing, basing and overflight rights, along with the perception that autocracy equates with stability, are trumping democracy and human rights considerations. While rising levels of global instability explain part of Washington’s shift from an historical commitment to democracy, the nature of the policy process itself is a less appreciated factor. Policy discussions tend to occur on a country-by-country basis—leading to choices that weigh the costs and benefits of democracy support within the confines of a single country. From this perspective, the benefits of counterterrorism cooperation or access to natural resources are regularly judged to outweigh the perceived costs of supporting human rights. A serious problem arises, however, when this process is replicated across countries. The bilateral focus rarely incorporates the risks to the U.S.-led global order that arise from widespread democratic decline across multiple countries. Many of the threats to the current global order, such as China’s rise or the diffusion of power, are driven by factors that the United States and West more generally have little leverage to influence or control. Democracy, however, is an area where Western actions can affect outcomes. Factoring in the risks that arise from a global democratic decline into policy discussions is a vital step to building a comprehensive approach to democracy support. Bringing this perspective to the table may not lead to dramatic shifts in foreign policy, but it would ensure that we are having the right conversation.

#### Link turn – unions and bargaining power increase productivity, that reduces the risk of investments.

**Ongweso ‘20**

**[Study Finds Unions Make Companies More Productive,** [**https://www.vice.com/en/article/z3bjn9/study-finds-unions-make-companies-more-productive**](https://www.vice.com/en/article/z3bjn9/study-finds-unions-make-companies-more-productive)**, Edward Ongweso Jr, April 29 2020] [SS]**

**A study on the effects of union density (union employees as a percentage of the total number of employees) published last week found that tax subsidies for Norwegian unions led to "substantial increases" in firm productivity and wages, increases that grew even larger the more productive a firm was or the more bargaining power a union had. Researchers established a correlation between union density, wages, and productivity by first looking at how tax subsidies affect union membership. Using data collected by the Norwegian Tax Authorities and Social Services, the study examines the whole Norwegian population of workers, workplaces, and firms from 2001 to 2012. To calculate productivity, researchers relied on Statistics Norway’s Capital Data Base which provides data on value-added per worker and firm revenues, along with other production inputs, investments, and prices. In Norway, union membership fees are a tax-deductible allowance, meaning the size of the tax subsidy can affect demand for union membership and thus union density. From 2001 to 2012, the subsidy has increased over 400 percent while the average membership fee rose 150 percent, meaning the subsidy grew from 7 percent to 21 percent of the union membership fee by 2012. From here, researchers established correlations between the tax subsidy, the price and probability of union membership, union density, and the average wages paid by firms and productivity. They found that the higher the subsidy rate, the higher the rate of unionization and thus union density. The higher the union density, the higher the firm’s productivity, and the higher its workers’ wages. The study also found that not only does the subsidy rate "clearly” influence the unionization rate, but if it was kept at 2001 levels, union membership would have dropped 3 percent while firm productivity would have been 6 percentage points lower by 2012. ADVERTISEMENT As for why tax-subsidized union density increases productivity, the researchers highlight a few potential reasons. One is simply that unions provide a "voice" for workers that results in longer tenures, better feedback mechanisms, and incentivizes firms to invest more in workers and their workplaces with local bargaining units able to efficiently direct those resources. Another may be that tax subsidies have a greater effect on union demand at small firms with some unionization than at larger firms with either significant or no unionization. As a result, the tax subsidies may help push unionization efforts over the threshold necessary to demand a trade union agreement in Norway (10 to 25 percent). Such agreements can have a “profound influence” on a firm's policies and organization of work in ways that improve productivity. This may also be why tax-subsidized union density increases wages: researchers suggest that higher union density means greater ability to bargain over wages and this effect is most observable in high-productivity firms.**