Framing

I negate and value morality

Research shows that morality must come from physical phenomena, not a priori knowledge – implies util since morality must be based on empirical outcomes

Papineau 7 (David, "Naturalism," Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2007.)

In the middle of the nineteenth century the conservation of kinetic plus potential energy came to be accepted as a basic principle of physics (Elkana 1974). In itself this does not rule out distinct mental or vital forces, for there is no reason why such forces should not be 'conservative', operating in such a way as to compensate losses of kinetic energy by gains in potential energy and vice versa. (The term 'nervous energy' is a relic of the widespread late nineteenth-century assumption that mental processes store up a species of potential energy that is then released in action.) However, the conservation of energy does imply that any such special forces must be governed by strict deterministic laws: if mental or vital forces arose spontaneously, then there would be nothing to ensure that they never led to energy increases. During the course of the twentieth century received scientific opinion became even more restrictive about possible causes of physical effects, and came to reject sui generis mental or vital causes, even of a law-governed and predictable kind. Detailed physiological research, especially into nerve cells, gave no indication of any physical effects that cannot be explained in terms of basic physical forces that also occur outside living bodies. Thus, for example, consider J.J.C. Smart's (1958) thought that we should identify mental states with brain states, for otherwise those mental states would be "nomological danglers" which play no role in the explanation of behaviour. Or take David Lewis's (1966) and David Armstrong's (1968) argument that, since mental states are picked out by their causal roles, and since we know that physical states play these roles, mental states must be identical with those physical states. Again, consider Donald Davidson's (1970) argument that, since the only laws governing behaviour are those connecting behaviour with physical antecedents, mental events can only be causes of behaviour if they are identical with those physical antecedents.

Pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable – they're where we reach the end of the line in matters of value

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

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.

Thus, the standard is maximizing expected well being.

Prefer:

1] Actor specificty:

A – governments have to aggregate since collective actions necessarily benefit some people while hurting others either due to resource tradeoffs or scope of effect, deontic side constraints freeze action.

B – no act omission distinction for governments since policies create permissions and prohibitions so authorizing action cannot be an omission since the state assumes culpability in regulating the public domain.

Takes out and turns calc indicts, consequentialism might be hard but it's not impossible, and the alternative is no action which is worse; and actor spec outweighs since different actors have different ethical standings.

2] No intent foresight distinction:

A – if we foresee a consequence it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen.

3] Lexical prereq – a. can't access any value if we're dead b. you can't properly perform ethical calculus if you're under threat of death or pain.

4. Extinction comes first under any framework.

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)

Econ DA

The Economy is improving right now, Conerly 21

Bill Conerly (Dr. Bill Conerly is a business-focused economist, Forbes contributor, and Duke Ph.D), Forbes, "World Economy Will Grow Rapidly In 2021", 3/18/2021, https://www.forbes.com/sites/billconerly/2021/03/18/world-economy-will-grow-rapidly-in-2021/?sh=1129e1094acf. Accessed 6/26/2021 [AV].

The global economy will accelerate in 2021, though with significant variation around the world. The world will benefit from vaccinations, both directly in fewer illnesses and indirectly as lockdowns and fears subside. It will take most of 2021 and into 2022 for the full benefits of vaccination to be felt, and maybe even longer in poorer countries, but America's major trading partners should look good next year. **The OECD recently reported**, "Prospects have improved over recent months with signs of a rebound in goods trade and industrial production…. **Global GDP growth is now projected to be 5.6% this year** …. **World output is expected to reach pre-pandemic levels by mid-2021**." **The International Monetary Fund predicts similar growth**. Skepticism about the statements of political organizations make sense, but consider the consensus forecast gathered by FocusEconomics. They survey on-the-ground economists around the world, averaging country **forecasts** and then adding up to a global average. (They also provide regional averages for those interested in, say, South America.) The latest compilation **puts world economic growth at 5.2% in 2021 and 4.1% next year.** Their **forecasters put the greatest quarter-to-quarter gain in the second quarter of this year.**

Strikes lead to a higher rate of inflation. Sweet 07,

Tim Sweet, Sci Hub, "Sci-Hub | The Connection Between Strikes and Inflation. Management Research News, 1(1), 4–4 | 10.1108/eb027672", 2007,https://sci-hub.do/https://doi.org/10.1108/eb027672. Accessed 6/26/2021 [AV]

The main finding reported in this paper is that, during the recent wave of strikes in industrial countries, the upsurge in **strikes preceded, rather than followed, the increase in price inflation**. It is argued that **a crucial element of the inflation** of the post-war years in the industrial market economies **has been** the development of competitive wage bargaining. **A** wage-wage **spiral can** easily **emerge from this process**, and we have suggested a number of ways in which such a spiral may begin. These methods of entry can essentially be divided into two types. First, those which result **from** shocks or pressures external to the wage bargaining mechanism itself, such as **devaluation**, 'oil crises', **tax increases** or **profit rises** leading to dissatisfaction with the **growth of wages**, **or** specific **demand pressures**. Wage increases in some particularly sensitive sectors will occur quickly in response to these pressures and develop into a competitive wage bargaining spiral. Second, there may be pressures or mechanisms inherent to the competitive wage

bargaining system which can produce a wage-wage spiral, such as sequential wage bargaining and productivity agreements. The first group essentially cover reactions to absolute reductions, or lower rates of increase than would otherwise have been obtained, in real disposable incomes. A full understanding, by workers, of the impact of these factors on their real take-home pay has occurred only in more recent years, Whereas in the past the (intended) expenditurereducing effects of devaluation and taxation have taken effect without any significant reaction on the part of **workers** to restore their real purchasing power, they **are** now more fully **aware of the impact of inflation and taxation on their earnings.** There is a nearly total absence of both 'money illusion', and what we may call 'tax illusion'. Thus **to meet their aspirations of rising living standards workers desire wage increases sufficient to offset** both **inflation** and taxation. This process has become more important as **communications and education have widened their impact**. The second group of causes, and the competitive wage bargaining mechanism itself, have similarly increased in importance as education and information have spread. But it is also true that the problem of **competitive wage bargaining lead**ing **to inflation**, for whatever cause, is more likely to occur in an expanding economy and one which is fully employed, than in an economy with under-utilised capacity In an expanding economy the pressure on demand, the labour shortages in particular industries or regions, and shortages of skills are all more likely to produce wage increases leading to a competitive wage bargaining spiral. There will tend to be a general increase in wages through time, making it more likely that relative wage changes will occur, producing the conditions for a wage-wage spiral.

Inflation leads to an economic recession. Dorfman 21,

Jeffrey Dorfman, Forbes, "Inflation Is Still Bad For The Economy", 8/16/2021, https://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffreydorfman/2016/08/19/inflation-is-still-bad-for-the-economy/?sh=7f4307f54340. Accessed 6/26/2021 [AV]

Most importantly**, high**er **inflation is bad for capital investment**, **mean**ing **lower accumulation of productive capital which leads to slow**er **economic growth** for decades into the future. **Businesses are less interested in building factories using today's dollars if the products made have to be sold in the future in exchange for dollars that are worth less thanks to inflation**. A **smaller capital stock means** lower labor productivity, which means **slower wage growth**. These remaining costs of inflation are profound and potentially large. Louis Woodhill has documented that **high**er **inflation periods have low**er **levels of investment, lower real GDP growth, and higher unemployment**. In 2011 Atlanta Federal Reserve Bank President Dennis Lockhart expressed this insidious cost of inflation quite well: "The benefit of price stability—low and stable long-term inflation—is that it reduces the risk associated with longer-term decision-making and avoids the drag on the economy that uncertainty creates. Uncertainty about the long-term trend of inflation imposes a cost in the form of lower investment, misallocation of resources, redistribution of wealth, and other distortions. These distortions can be quite profound over time." Thus, while it is certainly worth paying attention to new research suggesting one aspect of inflation may not impose the costs we previously thought it did, **there are** still **plenty of negative outcomes from inflation** left. The math is clear that, on balance, **inflation is** still **a bad thing for our economic health**. Luckily for all of us, inflation has remained quite low since the recession, in spite of the Fed's

best efforts to goose it upwards. The Fed should work to continue this state of affairs. If anything, the Fed should be moving their inflation target lower, not higher.

Economic crisis leads to global conflict -- this is empirically proven

Qian Liu, World Economic Forum, "The next economic crisis could cause a global conflict. Here's why | World Economic Forum", 11/13/2018, https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why. Accessed 6/26/2021 [AV]

In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929. As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another **economic crisis** – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy. If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake **could extend far beyond the economy**. According to Harvard's Benjamin Friedman, **prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or** even **war**. For example, **during the Great Depression**, US President **Herbert Hoover signed the** 1930 **Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act**, intended **to protect American workers** and farmers **from foreign competition**. **In** the subsequent **five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun**. To be sure, **WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors**; there is no standard path to war. **But** there is reason to believe that **high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict**. According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, **a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis.** Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels.

Escalation to nuclear war occurs rapidly even at low levels of conflict, Boehlefeld , 20

(Kathryn Boehlefeld , assistant professor of military and security studies at Air University's Air Command and StaffCollege and a faculty member for the School of Advanced Nuclear Deterrence Studies (SANDS), 2020, accessed on 6-23-2021, Media.defense, "Sticks and Stones", https://media.defense.gov/2020/Nov/23/2002540351/-1/-1/1/BOEHLEFELD.PDF)/PE

Nuclear weapons tend to make nuclear adversaries wearier of engaging in conventional warfare with one another because they fear inadvertent escalation: that a **war[s]** will **spiral** out of control **and end** in a **nuclear** exchange even if the war's aims were originally fairly limited. However, this fear has not fully prevented the Chinese and Indian militaries from engaging in skirmishes, like the one that occurred in June 2020. Where does escalation toward nuclear war start, and what does this conflict teach both us and major world players

about the dangers and opportunities associated with low levels of conflict between nuclear powers? **Escalation to nuclear use may occur as a deliberate** and premeditated **choice or** inadvertently **as the result of a security dilemma, the offensive nature of militaries, and/or due to the fog of war.2** This article argues that the Sino-Indian border dispute demonstrates that the drivers of inadvertent **escalation** may **be [is] present even at exceptionally low levels of conflict. Thus,** even though nuclear weapons induce caution, **there are good reasons to worry about the dangers of inadvertent escalation** to nuclear use despite the longstanding global

That causes nuclear winter and extinction. Starr ’17

(Steven; director of the University of Missouri’s Clinical Laboratory Science Program, senior scientist at the Physicians for Social Responsibility, Associate member of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, expert in the environmental consequences of nuclear war; 1/9/17; “Turning a Blind Eye Towards Armageddon — U.S. Leaders Reject Nuclear Winter Studies”; https://fas.org/2017/01/turning-a-blind-eye-towards-armageddon-u-s-leaders-reject-nuclear-winter-studies/; Federation of American Scientists; accessed 11/24/18; TV) [AV]

The detonation of an atomic bomb with this explosive power will **instantly ignite fires** over a surface area of three to five square miles. In the recent studies, the scientists calculated that the **blast, fire**, and **radiation** from a war fought with 100 atomic bombs could produce **direct fatalities** comparable to all of those worldwide in World War II, or to those once estimated for a “**counterforce**” **nuclear war** between the superpowers. However, the **long-term environmental effects** of the war **could** significantly disrupt the global weather for at least a decade, which would likely **result in** a vast **global famine**. The scientists predicted that **nuclear firestorms** in the burning cities would cause at least five million tons of **black carbon smoke** to quickly rise above cloud level into the stratosphere, where it could not be rained out. The smoke would circle the Earth in **less than two weeks** and would form **a** global **stratospheric smoke layer** that **would remain for** more than **a decade**. The smoke would absorb warming sunlight, which would **heat the smoke** to temperatures near the boiling point of water, producing **ozone losses of** 20 to **50 percent** over populated areas. This would almost double the amount of UV-B reaching the most populated regions of the mid-latitudes, and it would create UV-B indices unprecedented in human history. In North America and Central Europe, the time required to

get a painful sunburn at mid-day in June could decrease to as little as six minutes for fair-skinned individuals. As the smoke layer blocked warming sunlight from reaching the Earth's surface, it would produce the **coldest** average **surface temperatures** in the last 1,000 years. The scientists calculated that global **food production would decrease** by 20 to **40 percent** during a five-year period following such a war. Medical experts have predicted that the shortening of growing seasons and corresponding decreases in agricultural production could cause up to **two billion** people to perish from **famine**. The climatologists also investigated the effects of a nuclear war fought with the vastly more powerful modern **thermonuclear** weapons possessed by the United States, Russia, China, France, and England. Some of the thermonuclear weapons constructed during the 1950s and 1960s were 1,000 times more powerful than an atomic bomb. During the last 30 years, the average size of thermonuclear or "strategic" nuclear weapons has decreased. Yet today, each of the approximately 3,540 strategic weapons deployed by the United States and Russia is seven to **80 times** more powerful than the atomic bombs modeled in the India-Pakistan study. The smallest strategic nuclear weapon has an explosive power of **100,000 tons of TNT**, compared to an atomic bomb with an average explosive power of 15,000 tons of TNT. Strategic nuclear weapons produce much larger nuclear firestorms than do atomic bombs. For example, a standard Russian 800-kiloton warhead, on an average day, will ignite fires covering a surface area of 90 to 152 square miles. A **war** fought with hundreds or thousands of U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons would **ignite immense nuclear firestorms** covering land surface areas of many thousands or **tens of thousands** of square miles. The scientists calculated that these fires would produce up to **180 million tons** of black carbon soot and **smoke**, which would form a dense, **global stratospheric smoke layer**. The smoke would remain in the stratosphere for 10 to **20 years**, and it **would block** as much as **70 percent of sunlight** from reaching the surface of the Northern Hemisphere and 35 percent from the Southern Hemisphere. So much sunlight would be blocked by the smoke that the noonday sun would resemble a full moon at midnight. Under such conditions, it would only require a matter of days or weeks for daily minimum **temperatures** to **fall below freezing** in the largest agricultural areas of the Northern Hemisphere, where freezing temperatures would occur every day for a period of between one to more than two years. Average surface temperatures would become colder than those experienced 18,000 years ago at the height of the last Ice Age, and the prolonged cold would cause average rainfall to decrease by up to 90%. Growing seasons would be completely eliminated for more than a decade; it would be **too cold and dark** to grow food crops, **which would doom the majority of the human population.** NUCLEAR WINTER IN BRIEF The profound cold and darkness following nuclear war

became known as nuclear winter and was first predicted in 1983 by a group of NASA scientists led by Carl Sagan. During the mid-1980s, a large body of research was done by such groups as the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE), the World Meteorological Organization, and the U.S. National Research Council of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences; their work essentially supported the initial findings of the 1983 studies. The idea of nuclear winter, published and supported by prominent scientists, generated extensive public alarm and put political pressure on the United States and Soviet Union to reverse a runaway nuclear arms race, which, by 1986, had created a global nuclear arsenal of more than 65,000 nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, this created a backlash among many powerful military and industrial interests, who undertook an extensive media campaign to brand nuclear winter as “bad science” and the scientists who discovered it as “irresponsible.” Critics used various uncertainties in the studies and the first climate models (which are primitive by today’s standards) as a basis to criticize and reject the concept of nuclear winter. In 1986, the Council on Foreign Relations published an article by scientists from the National Center for Atmospheric Research, who predicted drops in global cooling about half as large as those first predicted by the 1983 studies and described this as a “nuclear autumn.”

Climate DA

In the squo, big businesses are taking action against climate change, Murray 19

Tom Murray , Forbes, "The Businesses That Are – And Are Not – Leading On Climate Change", 11/8/2019, https://www.forbes.com/sites/edfenergyexchange/2019/11/08/the-businesses-that-are--and-are-not--leading-on-climate-change/?sh=5ee00da37aa1

The science on climate is clear and **more than 680 companies are responding by setting science-based greenhouse gas reduction targets**. Just yesterday, **McDonald's announced the first-ever signing of large scale virtual power purchase agreements, which will support wind and solar projects.** The combined 380 MW in expected renewable energy generation is the **equivalent taking over 140,000 cars off the road for one year**. With this announcement, McDonald's is demonstrating progress against its Scale for Good climate commitments announced last year, and setting an exciting example for other restaurants to follow. **During Climate Week, Microsoft upped its renewable portfolio to more than 1,900 MW – enough to power 1.5 million U.S. homes**. This brings the company one step closer to meeting its science-based target. That same week, **Google announced the largest-ever renewable energy procurement deal, to purchase a 1.6-gigawatt "package" that makes its total clean energy portfolio large enough to power Uruguay. While this is an exciting demonstration of leadership, it's not enough to satisfy employees, who, according to Alan Murray at Fortune, are "demanding** the businesses they work for step up to the plate." Earlier this week, Google employees called on the company's executives to "commit to and release a company-wide climate plan," noting that "These demands have been set by workers across the tech industry, including Amazon and Microsoft." Collaborating for Scale One **of the most powerful examples of collaboration for scale is Project Gigaton, an initiative between Walmart, environmental groups and over 1,000 suppliers to cut a billion tons of greenhouse gas pollution from the company's global supply chain by 2030**. This transformational effort has **already resulted in nearly 94 million metric tons of avoided emissions.** Just last week, **Tyson Foods announced a new partnership with Proforest,** an organization focused on sustainable natural resource management, to help the company assess deforestation risk across its global agriculture supply chain. Given that commodity production is a major driver of deforestation globally, it's essential for companies like Tyson to measure deforestation risk so that they can appropriately manage it and build a more sustainable food system. As investors are increasingly demanding transparency on climate risk, Tyson's move is also just smart business. Accelerating Environmental Innovation A new Environmental Defense Fund report found that 92% of business leaders believe emerging technologies can boost ROI and sustainability – yet only 59% of executives are making investments in these technologies. One in three leaders surveyed for the report said their organization lacks awareness on specific technologies – a clear contributing factor to this 33-point opportunity gap. Insufficient knowledge about emerging tech may be why many leading companies are looking to entrepreneurs to close that gap for them. **AB InBev** for example**, established the 100+ Accelerator program to provide funding to start-ups to help the company solve sustainability challenges and make progress toward its 2025 climate goals**. Participants in the accelerator's inaugural year included companies that are using blockchain to empower smallholder farmers and predictive tech to maximize trucking loads. Just this week**, Google announced a** similar **program "to help and encourage startups working on sustainability products.**" Other companies are choosing acquisition as a way to deploy tech for sustainability. Moody's, for example, announced it acquired a majority stake in Four Twenty Seven, a company that provides "data, intelligence, and analysis related to physical climate risks." The deal will boost Moody's efforts to incorporate climate risk into economic modeling and credit ratings.

The tech that big corporations need to fight climate change is very expensive

Eavis and Krauss, 21 (Peter Eavis and Clifford Krauss, 2-22-2021, accessed on 6-28-2021, The New York Times, "What's Really Behind Corporate Promises on Climate Change?", https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/22/business/energy-environment/corporations-climate-change.html)/PE

The company's plans show how emissions could go up over all even when a business has set a goal to cut them. Cargill wants to reduce its emissions in its global supply chains by 30 percent per ton of production by 2030, a target it made no progress on at the time of measurement in 2019, according to Science Based Targets. But overall emissions in its supply chains may not fall by that amount because of increases in production. "It depends on how our business grows, and that's hard to predict," Ms. Kolling said. By contrast, deep-pocketed tech firms have probably made the most progress. Now they are setting even more ambitious targets. Google wants all its operations to be consistently powered by energy sources that do not release greenhouse gases by 2030, but that could be difficult to achieve because the output of wind and solar farms is still small in some countries. Microsoft wants to be "carbon negative" by 2030 even including Scope 3 emissions. That goal [which] will almost certainly require extracting carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. Those technologies are nascent and could be very expensive. And for all these ambitious targets, even some executives argue that the current voluntary approach won't ensure the required reduction in emissions.

Strikes lead to lost profits

Creamer 18

Creamer Media Reporter , Creamer Media, "Strikes And Their Economic Consequences", 10/1/2018, https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/article/strikes-and-their-economic-consequences-2018-10-01/rep_id:4136

"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 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." 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 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."

If these corporations can't afford to invest in these technologies, then they cannot stop climate change in time

Corporate action is K2 solving climate change-corporations have the most power to do so

Axelrod 19

Josh Axelrod focuses on issues including public land protection and conservation, renewable energy siting on public lands, limiting oil and gas development on public lands, energy transmission, and climate policy. Since joining NRDC in 2013, Axelrod has also developed expertise in oil spill response and preparedness, forest management, forest product production, forest carbon dynamics, fossil fuel production in Alberta's tar sands, North American fossil fuel transport, the health impacts associated crude oil, and Arctic resource development. He holds a bachelor's degree from Middlebury College and a J.D. from American University's Washington College of Law.

February 26, 2019. Joshua Axelrod. "Corporate Honesty and Climate Change: Time to Own Up and Act." NRDC, NRDC, 27 Feb. 2019, www.nrdc.org/experts/josh-axelrod/corporate-honesty-and-climate-change-time-own-and-act. 6/23/2021 HJ

Government and individual actions are vital to addressing climate change, but **corporations, with their** outsized **influence and power** in today's world, **have a**n even **large**r **role** to play. **They are able to drive policy change**, shape **consumer preferences, and** rapidly **respond to** the necessities of **climate change at a scale and pace beyond any other** political or private **entity**. Meaningful **corporate action is** not only **necessary** as climate change accelerates by the day, it is a global obligation. As some of the entities most responsible for putting us in the crisis we're in today, it's time for companies to take full responsibility for their climate footprints.

Ending climate change is uniquely dependent on big businesses. We cannot stop climate change soon enough if big businesses cannot invest in the tech needed to do so.

Humans will face extinction if we don't stop climate change now

Specktor, 19 (Brandon Specktor, 6-4-2019, accessed on 6-24-2021, Live Science, "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims", https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html)/PE

It seems every week there's a scary new report about how man-made climate change is going to cause the collapse of the world's ice sheets, result in the extinction of up to 1 million animal species and — if that wasn't bad enough — make our beer very, very expensive. This week, a new policy paper from an Australian think tank claims that those other reports are slightly off; the risks of climate change are actually much, much worse than anyone can imagine. According to the paper, climate change poses a "near- to mid-term existential threat to human civilization," and there's a good chance society could collapse as soon as 2050 if serious mitigation actions aren't taken in the next decade. Published by the Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration in Melbourne (an independent think tank focused on climate policy) and authored by a climate researcher and a former fossil fuel executive, the paper's central thesis is that climate scientists are too restrained in their predictions of how climate change will affect the planet in the near future. [Top 9 Ways the World Could End] 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 (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. 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 (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, 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 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."

Palmer 19
Writing about Amazon and e-commerce, News associate @CNBC
emissions by 2050. In 2017, President Donald Trump withdrew the United States from the landmark accord — a decision that has since attracted widespread scrutiny. Additionally, Trump

and Bezos have sparred on several occasions, with Trump focusing his ire on the newspaper Bezos owns, The Washington Post. Bezos' plan comes as Amazon faces mounting pressure from employees to address its environmental impact. At Amazon's annual shareholder meeting in May, thousands of employees submitted a proposal asking Bezos to develop a comprehensive climate-change plan and reduce its carbon footprint, though it was ultimately rejected. The proposal was built on an employee letter published in April that accused Amazon of donating to climate-delaying legislators and urged the company to transition away from fossil fuels. Additionally, over 1,000 Amazon employees have said they plan to walk out on Friday as part of the Global Climate Strike, of which Google and Microsoft employees also plan to participate. The employee walkout represents the first strike at Amazon's Seattle headquarters in the company's 25-year history, according to Wired. When asked about the employee walkouts, Bezos said that while he doesn't support all of Amazon employees' demands, he understands why people are passionate about climate change. Among the specific demands Bezos said he doesn't support is ending AWS' cloud contracts with fossil fuel companies. "The global strike tomorrow, I think it's totally understandable," he said. "We don't want this to be the tragedy of the commons. We all have to work together on this." He added that Amazon is committed to looking at its campaign contributions to determine whether they include "active climate deniers." The company also intends to focus more lobbying efforts in Washington around political solutions to climate change, Bezos said.
Or