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### Advantage 1: Nukes

#### Strikes are key to safety of nuclear weapons facilities, Williams 10-18

[Martin Williams, 10-18-2021, "Clyde nuclear base emergency staff to strike from tomorrow over safety fears", https://www.heraldscotland.com/news/homenews/19655524.clyde-nuclear-base-emergency-staff-strike-tomorrow-safety-fears/, date accessed 10-24-2021] //Lex AT

EMERGENCY workers at the home of Britain's nuclear weapons on the Clyde are set to strike over "major safety concerns" after managers slashed firefighter numbers. Action has been previously been given the go-ahead following a ballot of workers after managers proceeded with cuts to eight posts from the specialist fire safety crew at HM Naval Base Clyde, a reduction in strength of 15 percent, with the a union describing it as an "an accident waiting to happen". Unite members working for outsourcing services firm Capita [Business](https://www.heraldscotland.com/business_hq/) Services will now start strike action from Tuesday in a dispute over cuts to fire and rescue crew levels, and a lack of consultation. The Unite members on the Clyde employed by Capita, who provide onsite fire cover for both Faslane and Coulport naval bases, have been involved in an overtime ban since September 16 but are now stepping up their action to include discontinuous strike action. The six-hour strike action will take place on Tuesday and Thursday and on October,26 and 28. The cuts were confirmed to staff earlier this year by Capita which won the contract in 2020 for fire response services from the Ministry of Defence and insists the cuts would actually improve safety. The union Unite [Scotland](https://www.heraldscotland.com/news/homenews/) hasslammed the decision taken by Capita management in consultation with the Ministry of Defence to press ahead with cuts to fire crews alongside the lack of promised new fire vehicles and updated equipment. The trade union representing around 45 fire safety crew workers has made repeated representations to Capita management which have raised ‘more concerns’, in addition to those around staffing levels. Debbie Hutchings, Unite industrial officer, said: “Unite’s members are stepping up their industrial action this week at Coulport and Faslane due to the ongoing concerns around safety. This dispute is about our members not being given the assurances and guarantees over their [health](https://www.heraldscotland.com/news/health/) and safety in fire response situations, and the training which has been promised to cover such responses.” “We have been in dialogue with Capita since their decision to press ahead with cutting the fire response services at the bases, but more concerns have been raised throughout this process. Unite remains open to dialogue with Capita but our members have simply had enough and feel that their employer has not yet done enough. The workers will be taking strike action in the interests of their safety, and the safety of the public.” Her Majesty's Naval Base, Clyde is the navy's headquarters in Scotland and is best known as Britain's nuclear weapons base, in the form of a fleet of four Vanguard-class submarines equipped with Trident nuclear missiles and five other Astute and Trafalgar-class nuclear-powered attack submarines. Workers believe the cuts impair the abilities of the onsite fire crews to do their jobs properly, particularly, in relation to incidents that would involve wearing breathing apparatus. Capita has previously stated that they intend to mitigate safety risks due to the cuts through an investment in new technology to reduce fire risk". But workers have said they are not aware of any new technology which would address ongoing safety concerns.

#### Fires are a huge threat to nuclear explosions—UK is on the brink, Ritchie 14

[Dr Nick Ritchie, 2014, "Nuclear risk: the British case", University of York, https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/78773/1/Nuclear\_risk\_paper.pdf, date accessed 10-24-2021] //Lex AT

Nuclear deterrence is a risky business: it is fallible, its effects are contingent on context, and escalation of a conflict to the actual use of nuclear weapons cannot be ruled out. In fact, the successful practice of nuclear deterrence between states requires the perceived probability of the use of nuclear weapons to be high. This form of nuclear risk is compounded by the routine safety problems of running a national nuclear weapons enterprise. The data on such safety risks is striking. In the UK context alone we outline 16 submarine collisions since 1979, 266 submarine fires in the past 25 years, numerous safety shortfalls with nuclear-armed submarines and at the Atomic Weapons Establishment, 158 fires at the Atomic Weapons Establishment between 2000-2011, and serious unresolved safety concerns with the Trident warhead. These two dimensions of nuclear risk – deterrence and safety – are outlined below. Considering the very harmful and potentially catastrophic consequences of a nuclear weapon explosion, the existence of nuclear weapons generates an unacceptable risk. The international community has worked hard over the past century to regulate and constrain the means of violence at the disposal of states, most recently through further regulation of the arms trade. Yet nuclear violence remains unencumbered despite the very severe risks nuclear weapons pose. This risk can be eliminated through rapid progress to a world free of nuclear weapons. The early negotiation of an international treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons, even without the participation of nuclear-armed states, would be an important contribution towards this goal.

#### One explosion escalates,

Roth and Burn 17, 9-28-2017, Matthew Bunn is a professor of practice at the Harvard Kennedy School. A former advisor in the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, Nickolas Roth is a research associate at the Belfer Center’s Project on Managing the Atom at Harvard University."The effects of a single terrorist nuclear bomb," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, <https://thebulletin.org/2017/09/the-effects-of-a-single-terrorist-nuclear-bomb/>, 3/29/20)//ww BJ

The scale of death and suffering. How many would die in such an event, and how many would be terribly wounded, would depend on where and when the bomb was detonated, what the weather conditions were at the time, how successful the response was in helping the wounded survivors, and more. Many estimates of casualties are based on census data, which reflect where people sleep at night; if the attack occurred in the middle of a workday, the numbers of people crowded into the office towers at the heart of many modern cities would be far higher. The daytime population of Manhattan, for example, is roughly twice its nighttime population; in Midtown on a typical workday, there are an estimated 980,000 people per square mile. A 10-kiloton weapon detonated there might well kill half a million people—not counting those who might die of radiation sickness from the fallout. (These effects were analyzed in great detail in the Rand Corporation’s Considering the Effects of a Catastrophic Terrorist Attack and the British Medical Journal’s “Nuclear terrorism.”) On a typical day, the wind would blow the fallout north, seriously contaminating virtually all of Manhattan above Gramercy Park; people living as far away as Stamford, Connecticut would likely have to evacuate. Seriously injured survivors would greatly outnumber the dead, their suffering magnified by the complete inadequacy of available help. The psychological and social effects—overwhelming sadness, depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, myriad forms of anxiety—would be profound and long-lasting. The scenario we have been describing is a groundburst. An airburst—such as might occur, for example, if terrorists put their bomb in a small aircraft they had purchased or rented—would extend the blast and fire effects over a wider area, killing and injuring even larger numbers of people immediately. But an airburst would not have the same lingering effects from fallout as a groundburst, because the rock and dirt would not be sucked up into the fireball and contaminated. The 10-kiloton blast we have been discussing is likely toward the high end of what terrorists could plausibly achieve with a crude, improvised bomb, but even a 1-kiloton blast would be a catastrophic event, having a deadly radius between one-third and one-half that of a 10-kiloton blast. These hundreds of thousands of people would not be mere statistics, but countless individual stories of loss—parents, children, entire families; all religions; rich and poor alike—killed or horribly mutilated. Human suffering and tragedy on this scale does not have to be imagined; it can be remembered through the stories of the survivors of the US atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the only times in history when nuclear weapons have been used intentionally against human beings. The pain and suffering caused by those bombings are almost beyond human comprehension; the eloquent testimony of the Hibakusha—the survivors who passed through the atomic fire—should stand as an eternal reminder of the need to prevent nuclear weapons from ever being used in anger again. Global economic disaster. The economic impact of such an attack would be enormous. The effects would reverberate for so far and so long that they are difficult to estimate in all their complexity. Hundreds of thousands of people would be too injured or sick to work for weeks or months. Hundreds of thousands more would evacuate to locations far from their jobs. Many places of employment would have to be abandoned because of the radioactive fallout. Insurance companies would reel under the losses; but at the same time, many insurance policies exclude the effects of nuclear attacks—an item insurers considered beyond their ability to cover—so the owners of thousands of buildings would not have the insurance payments needed to cover the cost of fixing them, thousands of companies would go bankrupt, and banks would be left holding an immense number of mortgages that would never be repaid. Consumer and investor confidence would likely be dramatically affected, as worried people slowed their spending. Enormous new homeland security and military investments would be very likely. If the bomb had come in a shipping container, the targeted country—and possibly others—might stop all containers from entering until it could devise a system for ensuring they could never again be used for such a purpose, throwing a wrench into the gears of global trade for an extended period. (And this might well occur even if a shipping container had not been the means of delivery.) Even the far smaller 9/11 attacks are estimated to have caused economic aftershocks costing almost $1 trillion even excluding the multi-trillion-dollar costs of the wars that ensued. The cost of a terrorist nuclear attack in a major city would likely be many times higher. The most severe effects would be local, but the effects of trade disruptions, reduced economic activity, and more would reverberate around the world. Consequently, while some countries may feel that nuclear terrorism is only a concern for the countries most likely to be targeted—such as the United States—in reality it is a threat to everyone, everywhere. In 2005, then-UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan warned that these global effects would push “tens of millions of people into dire poverty,” creating “a second death toll throughout the developing world.” One recent estimate suggested that a nuclear attack in an urban area would cause a global recession, cutting global Gross Domestic Product by some two percent, and pushing an additional 30 million people in the developing world into extreme poverty. Desperate dilemmas. In short, an act of nuclear terrorism could rip the heart out of a major city, and cause ripple effects throughout the world. The government of the country attacked would face desperate decisions: How to help the city attacked? How to prevent further attacks? How to respond or retaliate? Terrorists—either those who committed the attack or others—would probably claim they had more bombs already hidden in other cities (whether they did or not), and threaten to detonate them unless their demands were met. The fear that this might be true could lead people to flee major cities in a large-scale, uncontrolled evacuation. There is very little ability to support the population of major cities in the surrounding countryside. The potential for widespread havoc and economic chaos is very real. If the detonation took place in the capital of the nation attacked, much of the government might be destroyed. A bomb in Washington, D.C., for example, might kill the President, the Vice President, and many of the members of Congress and the Supreme Court. (Having some plausible national leader survive is a key reason why one cabinet member is always elsewhere on the night of the State of the Union address.) Elaborate, classified plans for “continuity of government” have already been drawn up in a number of countries, but the potential for chaos and confusion—if almost all of a country’s top leaders were killed—would still be enormous. Who, for example, could address the public on what the government would do, and what the public should do, to respond? Could anyone honestly assure the public there would be no further attacks? If they did, who would believe them? In the United States, given the practical impossibility of passing major legislation with Congress in ruins and most of its members dead or seriously injured, some have argued for passing legislation in advance giving the government emergency powers to act—and creating procedures, for example, for legitimately replacing most of the House of Representatives. But to date, no such legislative preparations have been made. In what would inevitably be a desperate effort to prevent further attacks, traditional standards of civil liberties might be jettisoned, at least for a time—particularly when people realized that the fuel for the bomb that had done such damage would easily have fit in a suitcase. Old rules limiting search and surveillance could be among the first to go. The government might well impose martial law as it sought to control the situation, hunt for the perpetrators, and find any additional weapons or nuclear materials they might have. Even the far smaller attacks of 9/11 saw the US government authorizing torture of prisoners and mass electronic surveillance. And what standards of international order and law would still hold sway? The country attacked might well lash out militarily at whatever countries it thought might bear a portion of responsibility. (A terrifying description of the kinds of discussions that might occur appeared in Brian Jenkins’ book, Will Terrorists Go Nuclear?) With the nuclear threshold already crossed in this scenario—at least by terrorists—it is conceivable that some of the resulting conflicts might escalate to nuclear use. International politics could become more brutish and violent, with powerful states taking unilateral action, by force if necessary, in an effort to ensure their security. After 9/11, the United States led the invasions of two sovereign nations, in wars that have since cost hundreds of thousands of lives and trillions of dollars, while plunging a region into chaos. Would the reaction after a far more devastating nuclear attack be any less? In particular, the idea that each state can decide for itself how much security to provide for nuclear weapons and their essential ingredients would likely be seen as totally unacceptable following such an attack. Powerful states would likely demand that others surrender their nuclear material or accept foreign troops (or other imposed security measures) to guard it. That could well be the first step toward a more profound transformation of the international system. After such a catastrophe, major powers may feel compelled to more freely engage in preventive war, seizing territories they worry might otherwise be terrorist safe havens, and taking other steps they see as brutal but necessary to preserve their security. For this reason, foreign policy analyst Stephen Krasner has argued that “conventional rules of sovereignty would be abandoned overnight.” Confidence in both the national security institutions of the country attacked and international institutions such as the International Atomic Energy Agency and the United Nations, which had so manifestly failed to prevent the devastation, might erode. The effect on nuclear weapons policies is hard to predict: One can imagine new nuclear terror driving a new push for nuclear disarmament, but one could also imagine states feeling more certain than ever before that they needed nuclear weapons.

#### Nuke war causes extinction

PND 16. internally citing Zbigniew Brzezinski, Council of Foreign Relations and former national security adviser to President Carter, Toon and Robock’s 2012 study on nuclear winter in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Gareth Evans’ International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament Report, Congressional EMP studies, studies on nuclear winter by Seth Baum of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute and Martin Hellman of Stanford University, and U.S. and Russian former Defense Secretaries and former heads of nuclear missile forces, brief submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, Open-Ended Working Group on nuclear risks. A/AC.286/NGO/13. 05-03-2016. <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/OEWG/2016/Documents/NGO13.pdf> //Re-cut by Elmer

Consequences human survival 12. Even if the 'other' side does NOT launch in response the smoke from 'their' burning cities (incinerated by 'us') will still make 'our' country (and the rest of the world) uninhabitable, potentially inducing global famine lasting up to decades. Toon and Robock note in ‘Self Assured Destruction’, in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists 68/5, 2012, that: 13. “A nuclear war between Russia and the United States, even after the arsenal reductions planned under New START, could produce a nuclear winter. Hence, an attack by either side could be suicidal, resulting in self assured destruction. Even a 'small' nuclear war between India and Pakistan, with each country detonating 50 Hiroshima-size atom bombs--only about 0.03 percent of the global nuclear arsenal's explosive power--as air bursts in urban areas, could produce so much smoke that temperatures would fall below those of the Little Ice Age of the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, shortening the growing season around the world and threatening the global food supply. Furthermore, there would be massive ozone depletion, allowing more ultraviolet radiation to reach Earth's surface. Recent studies predict that agricultural production in parts of the United States and China would decline by about **20 percent** for four years, and by 10 percent for a decade.” 14. A conflagration involving USA/NATO forces and those of Russian federation would most likely cause the deaths of most/nearly all/all humans (and severely impact/extinguish other species) as well as destroying the delicate interwoven techno-structure on which latter-day 'civilization' has come to depend. Temperatures would drop to below those of the last ice-age for up to 30 years as a result of the lofting of up to 180 million tonnes of very black soot into the stratosphere where it would remain for decades. 15. Though human ingenuity and resilience shouldn't be underestimated, human survival itself is arguably problematic, to put it mildly, under a 2000+ warhead USA/Russian federation scenario. 16. The Joint Statement on Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences signed October 2013 by 146 governments mentioned 'Human Survival' no less than 5 times. The most recent (December 2014) one gives it a highly prominent place. Gareth Evans’ ICNND (International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament) Report made it clear that it saw the threat posed by nuclear weapons use as one that at least threatens what we now call 'civilization' and that potentially threatens human survival with an immediacy that even climate change does not, though we can see the results of climate change here and now and of course the immediate post-nuclear results for Hiroshima and Nagasaki as well.

### Advantage 2: Teachers

#### Education is on the decline—STEM is hit hardest, Signal 20

[The Signal, 8-20-2020, "A Closer Look at the Current UK Teacher Shortage", Santa Clarita Valley Signal, https://signalscv.com/2020/08/a-closer-look-at-the-current-uk-teacher-shortage/, date accessed 10-24-2021] //Lex AT

Let’s take a closer look at the current state of the British education system, and the shortages that have been plaguing it. We’ll then discuss some of the factors contributing to the [teacher shortfall before we share a number of potential solutions](https://epi.org.uk/publications-and-research/teacher-shortages-in-england-analysis-and-pay-options/) suggested by the data. We’ll also look at how the coronavirus crisis has affected the teacher shortage. The State of the British Education System While the number of students in the UK has remained constant over the years, the number of teachers in the UK fell by 7%. Matters will only be made worse by the population bulge hitting secondary schools. The number of secondary students is expected to rise by 10% between now and 2023. Not only that, but it has been estimated that roughly 1 in 5 teachers leave within two years, and 40% within 5 years. This means that we are losing many of the new teachers that are coming in. Teacher exit rates are also higher in shortage areas. This includes maths, science and foreign languages. Up to half of these teachers leave within 5 years, but we’re also seeing shortages in normally popular subjects like English and Geography. Teachers Need Better Pay Studies show that many teachers leaving are heading to non-teaching jobs that pay more. This suggests that we could reduce turnover by increasing pay. This is especially true for maths and science teachers who can earn much more in professional jobs. Schools filled with disadvantaged students have trouble recruiting and keeping teachers. This issue is more severe for maths and science teachers. One solution is [taking advantage of the Pupil Premium](https://www.theschoolrun.com/the-parents-guide-to-the-pupil-premium). London schools take advantage of that program, paying teachers in shortage subjects about £1500 more. This has helped them to secure more teachers, and more importantly, more qualified teachers in shortage subjects. This will also reduce the risk of early career teachers leaving. Support New Applicants Eager to Gain a Steady Job The coronavirus crisis and related government-mandated shutdowns have left millions out of work, while millions more are afraid of losing their jobs. However, one of the unexpected effects of the recent global pandemic is that it seems to have revived interest in the profession. As a matter of fact, we saw the number of teacher training applications rise during the lockdowns, and it has been estimated that the coronavirus may reduce shortages by as much as 40%. Places like Wales have seen rises of up to 6.8% in applications compared to the same date last year, which is encouraging as it is one of the regions most affected by shortages. Online degrees also offer a glimmer of hope to meet demand. Students can now earn a [master’s in education distance learning](https://online.exeter.ac.uk/programmes/masters/ma-education) without having to visit campus and get a degree from a globally recognised program. This is essential because many schools are pulling out of offers to teach future teachers because of the coronavirus itself. The virus has put incredible pressure on faculty, who now have to deal with the very real reality of teaching staff falling ill and sick students falling behind. Other programs are dropping trainees because they’re afraid that those who enter the profession during times of uncertainty are much more likely than average to leave when the economy turns around. Fortunately, the same economic uncertainty is improving teacher retention for the time being. However, we still need to take steps to keep them in the classroom after the crisis is over. Protect Teachers Teachers don’t just leave because they can earn more money elsewhere. Teachers may leave because of violence in the classroom or an excessive workload. Schools, however, are taking steps to ensure that a teacher’s workload is manageable when schools reopen. This has been an ongoing issue since the teacher shortage contributes to an increasing student-teacher ratio. Furthermore, schools are also taking steps to protect the health of teachers in the classroom. While there is some hope, teacher shortages should not only continue to be an issue in the UK but most countries in the G7. This should definitely serve as a warning to everyone, and push societies to re-evaluate how they treat and train the teachers of tomorrow.

#### Recognition from strikes is key to teacher satisfaction, Weale 21

[[Sally Weale](https://www.theguardian.com/profile/sallyweale), 4-8-2021, "One in three teachers plan to quit, says National Education Union survey", Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2021/apr/08/one-in-three-uk-teachers-plan-to-quit-says-national-education-union-survey, date accessed 10-24-2021] //Lex AT

One in three [teachers](https://www.theguardian.com/education/teaching) plan to quit the classroom within five years because of increased workload and diminishing respect for the profession, according to a major union survey. The poll by the National Education Union, which was conducted among teachers, [school](https://www.theguardian.com/education/schools) leaders and support staff in schools in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, revealed an education workforce [exhausted after a year of Covid](https://www.theguardian.com/education/2021/apr/03/work-pressure-in-covid-lockdown-was-shattering-say-teachers) disruption, with 70% reporting increased workload over the last 12 months and 95% worried about the impact on their wellbeing. Out of a poll of 10,000 members, 35% said they would “definitely” not be working in education by 2026, while two-thirds (66%) said the status of the profession has got worse and blamed government for [failing to listen to or value teachers](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/jan/03/the-guardian-view-on-schools-ministers-outclassed-by-teachers). As one respondent put it: “The pandemic has highlighted a high expectation on teachers whilst a total lack of respect from government.” Among those who said they intended to leave education, the most common reason given was that the profession was not valued or trusted by government or media (53%), closely followed by workload (51%), accountability (34%) and pay (24%). Kevin Courtney, the NEU joint general secretary, said it should come as no surprise that so many teachers are thinking of leaving the profession. “These findings come after a year in which the education profession – as key workers – have been provided few safety protections, had to improvise solutions where government had simply left a void, and were met with a pay freeze for their troubles,” he said. “To create an environment in which so many are overworked and looking for an exit, it is a scandal that so little effort has been made by government to value the profession. Instead, they feel insulted, and for many there comes a point where enough is enough.” The survey also found that more than half (55%) believe their work-life balance is now worse than before the first lockdown. Lockdown has however had a positive impact on staff relationships with their pupils’ families with 30% reporting improved contacts with parents, many of whom have been intimately involved with their child’s education this year, home-schooling while schools have been closed to all but vulnerable pupils and children of key workers. The survey was published to coincide with the NEU’s annual conference – held virtually this year due to the pandemic – where members voted on Monday for a motion which called for GCSEs and A-levels to be scrapped and replaced with more flexible assessments. After two years without [exams](https://www.theguardian.com/education/exams) because of Covid, Duncan Morrison, from Lewisham, south-east London, told conference: “We have a golden opportunity to win our agenda to stop toxic testing. Parents can see we don’t need tests. They can see there is an alternative. Everyone can see there is no case for going back.” Amid anger over the government’s pay freeze for public sector workers, the NEU called for a 7% pay rise for teachers this year and agreed to survey members to build towards a ballot for national strikes if ministers fail to meet their pay demands.

#### Higher wages leads to economic recovery, Roberts and Olinsky 21

[Lily Roberts and Ben Olinsky, 1-27-2021, "Raising the Minimum Wage Would Boost an Economic Recovery—and Reduce Taxpayer Subsidization of Low-Wage Work", Center for American Progress, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/news/2021/01/27/495163/raising-minimum-wage-boost-economic-recovery-reduce-taxpayer-subsidization-low-wage-work/, date accessed 10-26-2021] //Lex AT

As Congress works on coronavirus rescue legislation and a subsequent package to rebuild the economy, the minimum wage should not be dismissed. Raising the wages of low-income workers will stimulate the economy; substantially lower the amount the country spends on social safety net programs such as SNAP; and reduce economic inequality, thereby unleashing additional economic growth in a period of recovery. Stimulate the economy by putting more money in workers’ wallets Phasing in a minimum wage increase between 2021 and 2025 would boost consumer spending and economic growth as the country recovers from the public health and economic crises. Different methodological approaches predict varying aggregate effects of minimum wage increases. However, calculations uniformly point toward wage increases begetting stimulus, especially wage increases for low-wage workers: The [Federal Reserve of Chicago determined](http://www.chicagofed.org/digital_assets/publications/working_papers/2007/wp2007_23.pdf) that low-wage worker households spent an additional $2,800 in the year after a $1-per-hour increase to the minimum wage. The [most recent analysis](https://www.epi.org/publication/why-america-needs-a-15-minimum-wage/) from the Economic Policy Institute found that increasing the minimum wage to $15 by 2025 would generate $107 billion in higher wages. Their [earlier analysis indicates](https://www.epi.org/publication/ib341-raising-federal-minimum-wage/) that an increase from $7.25 to $9.80 per hour between 2012 and 2014 would have generated “approximately 100,000 new jobs.” The [Institute for Policy Studies calculates](https://ips-dc.org/wall_street_bonuses_and_the_minimum_wage/) that for every extra dollar going into the wallet of a low-wage worker, about $1.21 is added to the overall economy. Broad consensus in the academic research over the past 30 years has debunked the idea that raising the minimum wage causes employers to employ fewer people. Economists found that a $15 minimum wage would not reduce employment even [in areas that currently have the lowest wages](https://irle.berkeley.edu/minimum-wage-effects-in-low-wage-areas/). Dozens of careful studies have explored how minimum wage laws affect earnings and employment, influenced by the [seminal 1994 work of David Card and Alan Krueger](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2118030?seq=1). In **spring 2019, prominent economists in the US and the UK published** [**an analysis of 138 state-level minimum wage changes since 1979**](https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjz014)**, finding that the overall number of low-wage jobs remained unchanged** after the increase and that low-wage workers who were already earning above the minimum also saw modest wage increases. In fact, in 2014, the 13 states that raised their minimum wages [added jobs at a faster rate](https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2014/07/19/332879409/states-that-raised-minimum-wage-see-faster-job-growth-report-says) than the states that did not, according to the U.S. Department of Labor. [New analysis](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0047272720301754) from CAP Distinguished Senior Fellow Austan Goolsbee shows that individual consumer choices driven by fear of COVID-19 infection—not legal closures or stay-at-home orders—largely drove changes in consumer traffic and spending. This indicates that once vaccination rates increase and fear of exposure decreases, consumer spending patterns will readjust if consumers have sufficient funds to spend. The post-pandemic economy will provide a strategic moment to ensure that those in low-income households (who are more likely to spend each additional dollar they receive in pay than higher-income people) will be able to increase their consumption as needed. [New research](https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w25761/w25761.pdf?utm_campaign=PANTHEON_STRIPPED&amp%3Butm_medium=PANTHEON_STRIPPED&amp%3Butm_source=PANTHEON_STRIPPED) demonstrates that minimum wage increases have a particularly strong effect on households’ real spending on food, particularly food prepared away from home. This category of increased spending would be particularly beneficial to a recovering restaurant sector.

#### Strong STEM education solves climate change, SITU 10-4

[StudyUSA, 10-4-2021, "Why Is STEM Important? The Impact of STEM Education on Society", Study in the USA, https://www.studyusa.com/en/a/2157/why-is-stem-important-the-impact-of-stem-education-on-society, date accessed 10-25-2021] //Lex AT

Preparation of STEM Experts Who Can Make a Difference STEM education gives people skills that make them more employable and ready to meet the current labor demand. It encompasses the whole range of experiences and skills. Each STEM component brings a valuable contribution to a well-rounded education. Science gives learners an in-depth understanding of the world around us. It helps them to become better at research and critical thinking. Technology prepares young people to work in an environment full of high-tech innovations. Engineering allows students to enhance problem-solving skills and apply knowledge in new projects. Mathematics enables people to analyze information, eliminate errors, and make conscious decisions when designing solutions. STEM education links these disciplines into a cohesive system. Thus, it prepares professionals who can transform society with innovation and sustainable solutions. The STEM approach to education fosters creativity and divergent thinking alongside fundamental disciplines. It motivates and inspires young people to generate new technologies and ideas. With a focus on practice and innovation, students get to learn from [inquiry-based assignments](https://www.prodigygame.com/main-en/blog/inquiry-based-learning-definition-benefits-strategies). STEM education gives an understanding of concepts and encourages knowledge application. To keep it short, its aim can be formulated in two simple actions: explore and experience. Students are free to exercise what they learn and embrace mistakes in a risk-free environment. Project-based learning and problem-solving help learners to form a special mindset. Its core is in flexibility and curiosity, which equips learners to respond to real-world challenges. STEM-Enhanced Teamwork and Communication STEM education prepares the world for the future. It is based on teamwork and collaboration of professionals from different disciplines. As a STEM student, you do not need to be an expert in each particular subject. You rather acquire a mindset that enables you to become a part of the highly qualified workforce, which functions in collaboration. Teamwork brings a significant increase in productivity, work satisfaction, and profitability. Bottom of Form Active engagement of experts from diverse fields will drive change in our society. STEM education exposes students to effective interdisciplinary communication. Scientists research and experiment, offering the team discoveries. Technology experts provide gadgets that can make the work of the team more effective. Engineers help to solve challenges by designing and running platforms that enable change. Mathematicians analyze information to eliminate mistakes and provide precise calculations. Our world is continuously changing. The only way we can be ready for its challenges is through communication and collaboration. Collaborative experience also helps to broaden the impact of STEM education. Working with local experts and our international colleagues, we can promote our values and move towards a single purpose. This way, we improve communities, offering new educational and employment opportunities. Such open access to world-class experience is possible only when we combine our knowledge and capabilities. Social Awareness There is a high demand for STEM skills in society. STEM education enables people to make informed decisions within the discussed subject areas. Moreover, STEM awareness is necessary for any job as most industries are more or less connected to science and technology: from an [essay writing service](https://essayservice.com/) and college to a paper company. Thus, such education will allow children to grow into active citizens who can speak up in STEM discussions with sound knowledge of the subject. STEM awareness promotes interest in a range of exciting careers. Currently, some STEM occupations are understaffed. For example, according to the projections, the U.S. will need [1 million more STEM experts](https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2015/article/stem-crisis-or-stem-surplus-yes-and-yes.htm) in the near future. Besides, one of the goals of STEM initiatives is to encourage broader participation of women and minorities in the STEM workforce. This allows us to bridge ethnic and gender gaps. We need the engagement and participation of schools, policymakers, parents, students, and educators. This is the only way to continue technological and scientific progress. Sustainable Solutions to Challenges STEM subjects are focused on providing solutions to the concerns society has today. Human history had seen years of thoughtless exhaustion of natural resources. Such a lack of environmental education led to numerous challenges. These issues affect the health and well-being of all living organisms on our planet. Our environment needs protection. Thus, sustainability became one of the most urgent aspects studied by STEM disciplines. The youth is more worried about climate change than the older generation. As statistics shows, [70% of young people](https://news.gallup.com/poll/234314/global-warming-age-gap-younger-americans-worried.aspx) aged 18 to 34 worry about global warming. STEM education can answer their questions. It can teach them how to find the necessary solutions for sustainable development. Education is a powerful tool that ensures the rise of STEM literate society. Well-educated community members can find ways to work in a competitive world. They will use sustainable practices that do not harm nature. In the bigger picture, economic and social progress is tightly connected to the environment. We need to work our way to a sustainable future. Yet, it is possible to accomplish only with STEM skills, experiences, and a multi-disciplinary approach.

#### Climate change destroys the world.

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>] Justin

[Article references this study: https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/148cb0\_b2c0c79dc4344b279bcf2365336ff23b.pdf,

David Spratt David Spratt is a Research Director for Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, Melbourne, and co-author of Climate Code Red: The case for emergency action,

Ian Dunlop Ian T. Dunlop is a member of the Club of Rome. Formerly an international oil, gas and coal industry executive, chairman of the Australian Coal Association, chief executive of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and chair of the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading 1998-2000.]

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."

### Solvency

#### Plan - The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### I’ll defend enforcement through modelling the NLRA, Bondi 95

Victor Bondi , 1995, "American Decades: 1940-1949," No Publication, <https://www.cengage.com/search/productOverview.do?N=197+4294921854+4294916915+4294904579&amp;Ntk=P_EPI&amp;Ntt=15051676421114137871909840985170930831&amp;Ntx=mode%2Bmatchallpartial>

Durin g the 1930s and World War II, organized labor made progress on many fronts. Various labor unions also formed an alliance with the Democratic Party, then in control, and promoted legislation and government regulation to cement these gains. However, in the 1946 election the Republican Party won control of Congress and set about to eliminate or roll back what they perceived to be the excessive power of labor unions. The Republican controlled Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act over the veto of President Harry S Truman, reducing or eliminating many labor union advantages provided for in the **National Labor Relations Act of 1935**. These **included** the unconditional closed shop; the checkoff system, which enabled unions to collect dues from all employed members; the **unconditional right to strike at any time;** and immunity from employer lawsuits over breaches of contract and strike damages.

#### The Unconditional Right to Strike is defined in the NLRA as,

[National Labor Relations Board](https://www.nlrb.gov/), [The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) is comprised of a team of professionals who work to assure fair labor practices and workplace democracy nationwide. Since its creation by Congress in 1935, this small, highly respected, independent Federal agency has had daily impact on the way America's companies, industries and unions conduct business. Agency staff members investigate and remedy unfair labor practices by unions and employers.], xx-xx-xxxx, "NLRA and the Right to Strike," No Publication, https://www.nlrb.gov/about-nlrb/rights-we-protect/your-rights/nlra-and-the-right-to-strike

NLRA and the Right to Strike The Right to Strike. Section 7 of the Act states in part, “Employees shall have the right. . . to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.” Strikes are included among the concerted activities protected for employees by this section. Section 13 also concerns the right to strike. It reads as follows: Nothing in this Act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right. It is clear from a reading of these two **provisions** that: the law not only guarantees the right of employees to strike, but also **places limitations** and qualifications **on** the exercise of **that right**. **Lawful** and unlawful strikes. The lawfulness of a **strike** may **depend on the object, or purpose, of the strike, on its timing, or on the conduct of the strikers.** The object, or objects, of a strike and whether the objects are lawful are matters that are not always easy to determine. Such issues often have to be decided by the National Labor Relations Board. The consequences can be severe to striking employees and struck employers, involving as they do questions of reinstatement and backpay. Strikes for a lawful object. Employees who strike for a lawful object fall into two classes: economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers. Both classes continue as employees, but unfair labor practice strikers have greater rights of reinstatement to their jobs. Economic strikers defined. If the object of a strike is to obtain from the employer some economic concession such as higher wages, shorter hours, or better working conditions, the striking employees are called economic strikers. They retain their status as employees and cannot be discharged, but they can be replaced by their employer. If the employer has hired bona fide permanent replacements who are filling the jobs of the economic strikers when the strikers apply unconditionally to go back to work, the strikers are not entitled to reinstatement at that time. However, if the strikers do not obtain regular and substantially equivalent employment, they are entitled to be recalled to jobs for which they are qualified when openings in such jobs occur if they, or their bargaining representative, have made an unconditional request for their reinstatement. Unfair labor practice strikers defined. Employees who strike to protest an unfair labor practice committed by their employer are called unfair labor practice strikers. Such strikers can be neither discharged nor permanently replaced. When the strike ends, unfair labor practice strikers, absent serious misconduct on their part, are entitled to have their jobs back even if employees hired to do their work have to be discharged. If the Board finds that economic strikers or unfair labor practice strikers who have made an unconditional request for reinstatement have been unlawfully denied reinstatement by their employer, the Board may award such strikers backpay starting at the time they should have been reinstated. **Strikes unlawful because of purpose**. A strike may be unlawful because an object, or purpose, of the strike is unlawful. **A strike in support of** a union **unfair labor practice**, or one that would cause an employer to commit an unfair labor practice, may be a strike for an unlawful object. For example, it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge an employee for failure to make certain lawful payments to the union when there is no union security agreement in effect (Section 8(a)(3)). A strike to compel an employer to do this would be a strike for an unlawful object and, therefore, an unlawful strike. Furthermore, Section 8(b)(4) of the Act prohibits strikes for certain objects even though the objects are not necessarily unlawful if achieved by other means. An example of this would be a strike to compel Employer A to cease doing business with Employer B. It is not unlawful for Employer A voluntarily to stop doing business with Employer B, nor is it unlawful for a union merely to request that it do so. It is, however, unlawful for the union to strike with an object of forcing the employer to do so. In any event, employees who participate in an unlawful strike may be discharged and are not entitled to reinstatement. Strikes unlawful because of timing—Effect of no-strike contract. A strike that violates a no-strike provision of a contract is not protected by the Act, and the striking employees can be discharged or otherwise disciplined, unless the strike is called to protest certain kinds of unfair labor practices committed by the employer. It should be noted that not all refusals to work are considered strikes and thus violations of no-strike provisions. A walkout because of conditions abnormally dangerous to health, such as a defective ventilation system in a spray-painting shop, has been held not to violate a no-strike provision. Same—Strikes at end of contract period. Section 8(d) provides that when either party desires to terminate or change an existing contract, it must comply with certain conditions. If these requirements are not met, a strike to terminate or change a contract is unlawful and participating strikers lose their status as employees of the employer engaged in the labor dispute. If the strike was caused by the unfair labor practice of the employer, however, the strikers are classified as unfair labor practice strikers and their status is not affected by failure to follow the required procedure. Strikes unlawful because of misconduct of strikers. Strikers who engage in serious misconduct in the course of a strike may be refused reinstatement to their former jobs. This applies to both economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers. Serious misconduct has been held to include, among other things, violence and threats of violence. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that a “sitdown” strike, when employees simply stay in the plant and refuse to work, thus depriving the owner of property, is not protected by the law. Examples of serious misconduct that could cause the employees involved to lose their right to reinstatement are: • Strikers physically blocking persons from entering or leaving a struck plant. • Strikers threatening violence against nonstriking employees. • Strikers attacking management representatives.

#### Covid makes organized strikes impossible--status quo efforts are doomed to fail, Gall 20

[Gregor Gall, 4-16-2020, "Right Now in the UK, Strikes Are Effectively Illegal", Tribune Magazine, https://tribunemag.co.uk/2020/04/right-now-in-the-uk-strikes-are-effectively-illegal, date accessed 10-24-2021] //Lex AT

At the moment in Britain, there is no lawful right to strike or take industrial action. This is not because of a new anti-union law (which the Tories promised in their 2019 general election manifesto) or even because of an existing anti-union law (of which they are many). Instead, it is because in the midst of the coronavirus crisis, the government designated balloting organisations like Civica Election Services (formerly Electoral Reform Services) are no longer able to take and process requests from unions for ballots to be organised. This is because the ballots are postal ballots. They are mandatory under the Trade Union Act 1984 and the only form they can take is the postal form. The ballot papers have to be despatched to home addresses of union members, filled in, posted back, opened, counted and then the result verified. But at this moment, those balloting organisations are following government advice on the safety for employees in terms of social distancing and public safety. This situation has gone on for a number of weeks. This bizarre situation is entirely unnecessary. When the last round of trade union laws were being drawn up, trade unions specifically requested that [provisions for electronic voting](https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2015/oct/03/len-mcluskey-unite-deal-david-cameron-trade-union-bill) be included in the bill. In the years since, those calls have continued – but without success. Electronic voting would still involve some element of risk to the employees of the balloting organisations (given that they would still have to work together to some degree), but the level of contact would be much lower. A small number of employees could work at distance from each other to send out and collate the returns. Organisations like Civica conduct electronic balloting and have done so for nearly twenty years for a variety of organisations. But even though the government commissioned its own review in 2017 into the feasibility of using electronic balloting for strikes and industrial action ballots, the recommendation from the review to conduct a pilot study to test feasibility has not been taken up. Consequently, this means that all of the fifty or strikes so far in response to coronavirus issues in the workplace (over social distancing, personal protective equipment, washing facilities and so on) have been unofficial strikes and have probably also been unlawful. There is a little bit of ambiguity here. Workers can invoke the safe work protocol if they believe, under the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999, that their work situation represents a threat of ‘serious or imminent danger’ to their safety. This entitles workers to remove themselves to a place of safety. But in the cases of these walkouts, employers have, of course, protested that their employees were not unsafe. Unions like the Communication Workers Union (CWU) and the Rail, Maritime and Transport (RMT) union have not only pledged support for their members walking out in these situations, but issued guidance to say that their members should pursue that course of action in a number of circumstances. However, that does not mean that any of the walkouts have been declared as official disputes because to do so could mean unions being found in contempt of court and fined if employers won injunctions against them for taking action without a ballot. And the fines can be steep. But even if balloting for industrial action was to take place electronically at the moment, this would not resolve the legal grey area. The process of balloting also requires that, for example, advance notice (14 days) is given to employers about when the action will take place, who will take it and where it will be held. In situations of critical health and safety concerns – like those faced by many workers during the current coronavirus crisis – workers need to be able to walkout immediately and with the full protection of the law. At present, they enjoy no such rights. But what about union members wanting to take strike or industrial action to defend and advance their terms and conditions of employment? The month of April is the traditional date for the settlement of annual pay awards determined by collective bargaining. This has serious and immediate implications. Due to the ongoing lockdown, union members subject to these collective bargaining agreements have effectively no recourse to take lawful industrial action to create the leverage needed to win their demands in pay negotiations. That is the reality of Britain’s draconian anti-union laws. All this points towards the need for the repeal of the anti-union laws. This means not just the Trade Union Act 2016, which increased the thresholds of support needed in a ballot, but much broader changes which must include a positive right to strike codified in law for workers.

### Framework

#### The standard is maximizing expected well being or saving lives.

#### 1] The standard is maximizing expected foreseen well-being.

#### Pleasure is both unconditionally and intrinsically valuable.

Goldstein 89 [Irwin Goldstein, “Pleasure and Pain: Unconditional, Intrinsic Values”, Philosophy and Phenomenological Research , Dec., 1989, Vol. 50, No. 2 (Dec., 1989), pp. 255-276, International Phenomenological Society, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2107959?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents>, Irvin Goldstein was a philosophy professor at Davidson College for 31 years] //Lex AKu

What is good overall, right, or obligatory varies according to effects. Each is context-dependent and may vary across cultures. Evaluations of what is so universally are hazardous; such high level principles seem inevitably to meet expectations. We need not expect exertion to be good overall univer- sally: its value hinges on effects, which vary. What is right may vary with context and so cross-culturally. Even stealing and killing are sometimes right (Noddings, i984: 93). If he is using 'moral demands' to designate duties (actual, not prima facie) and to exclude intrinsic badness, Gilbert Harman may be correct in saying "there are no basic moral demands that apply to everyone" (I984: 27). Though calling all members in a class good is risky, intrinsic universal evaluations can be less precarious than other universal evaluations. Pleasure's intrinsic worth is not context-dependent and so not subject to con- textual fluctuations. When in pain, I can immediately recognize bad even if I am oblivious to the sensation's context and indifferent to moral considerations; pain's intrinsic badness is not founded in and so potentially undermined by pain's surroundings. Because we direct so many evalua- tions to what is good overall or morally good, much of what we justly call 'good' simpliciter is good only in some circumstances. This helps camouflage the fact that pleasure and other value-conferring ends are good in themselves unconditionally. Pleasure is good as such, because of its pleasurableness, not because of some further good quality which colors pleasure and may or may not be present. The foundation of pleasure's goodness, its pleasurableness, marks every pleasure. How could pleasure fail to be intrinsically good? G. E. Moore's reasoning resembles mine when he writes that a judgment of intrinsic goodness "if true of one instance of the thing in question, is necessarily true of all" (1903: 27). Since at least some pleasure is good intrinsically simply because of its pleasurableness, pleasure should always be good intrinsically, whatever the society, and so be an unconditional value. Pleasure's standing as an intrinsic value is founded in pleasure's nature. Appreciating its value and understanding what pleasure is are not inde- pendent projects. Intrinsic goodness is not merely incidental to pleasure; I suggest it is fundamental to what makes an experience pleasure. As hot and cold are opposites in temperature and north and south in direction, so pleasure and pain, both physical and emotional, are opposites in intrinsic agreeability. Heat is ipso facto, and thus always, linked to high tempera- ture; so, achieved in a virtuous or vicious activity, pleasure in itself is ipso facto and so always agreeable and pain ipso facto and so always disagree- able. I propose that pleasure's goodness - which for me is, in part, its char- acter of affording valid, intrinsic grounds for desire - fixes pleasure's agreeableness, and pain's badness dictates its disagreeableness.' Plea- sure and pain, then, contrast with experiences of warmth or coldness, which are linked to value only incidentally: pleasure and pain are oppo- sites through their opposing intrinsic worth. For every pleasure, intrinsic goodness is fundamental to what marks a psychological occurrence, localized or nonlocalized, as pleasure. Grounding dislike, having dis- value, is a defining feature of the unpleasant and so common to all unpleasantness. This view of pleasure answers pluralists, who detect no property shared by all pleasure which unites the diverse phenomena we label 'pleasure' into a single class.'6 The interrelated properties of pleasure's agreeable- ness, its natural tendency to attract sentient beings and, more fundamen- tally, its intrinsic nonmoral goodness and intrinsic grounding of desire unify the psychological occurrences, localized and nonlocalized, we label 'pleasure'. Pain, physical and emotional, forms a single class opposite to pleasure through its disagreeableness, its tendency to repel, its intrinsic badness and grounding of aversion."

#### 2] Util is a lexical pre-requisite to any other framework: Threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose. That precludes the ability to have agency and have the value conferring status that their framework says is valuable

#### 3] Actor specificity: A] Governments must aggregate since every policy benefit some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action. B] States lack wills or intentions since policies are collective actions. C] No act omission distinction---choosing to omit is an act itself – people psychologically decide not to act. Actor-specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings. Takes out util calc indicts since they’re empirically denied, and link turns them because the alt would be *no* action. AND No intent foresight distinction – if I forsee

#### 4] Ground – every impact function under util whereas other ethics can flow to one side exclusively. Util ensures equal playing field since affirmatives have different advantage areas and negs can read different pics, cps and disads. Kills fairness since we both need equal playing field.

#### 5] Extinction is the biggest impact.

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 s’o 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 ndermined 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)

#### That means prefer consequentialism – its best suited to prevent extinction since looking into the intrinsic nature of stuff will never be able to prevent catastrophic consequences that lead to extinction but looking at foreseen consequences can.

#### 6] AFC – Interpretation: the neg must not contest the aff framework, read arguments that contest the ethical validity of the aff standard, or read an alternative framework provided that: the aff standard is act utilitarianism and the aff has been disclosed open source

#### A] Clash – AFC is key to force substantive engagement – util doesn’t exclude impacts and forces debaters to do advocacy comparison and engage in meaningful rebuttal clash. The disclosure plank means no prep skew and that you should be ready to debate the aff which is key to topic clash – topic ed o/w on timeframe since we can learn phil over 4 years but only have the topic for a few months

#### B] Strat skew – neg is reactive and can up-layer the aff on moral frameworks, procedurals, and discursive arguments – AFC levels the playing field by forcing the neg to commit to the aff on substance, which ensures the AC matters.

#### C] Drop the debater, no rvi on 1ac theory—they have the opportunity to meet my interp and my interp gives them plenty of ground—means that the benefits of drop the arg and rvi are non-unique and only I rectify the skew. They can also spend 13 min dumping on a 30 second aff shell which means they have a huge timeskew on the interp.

#### 7] Interpretation—the neg must fairly prove the truth of the statement “The United kingdom ought not recognize an unconditional right to strike” To clarify, other than t or theory, all negative arguments must prove the truth of the statement.

#### A] Research – proving the converse means they have to actively search out reasons the plan is a bad idea--their model ensures that they never have to research different topics or do prep since it gives them an infinite number of objections

#### B] Strat skew—2 warrants – 1, you get variable ground if not bound by the rez--means you have access to more layers since I have a truth burden and you don’t, 2, you can moot 6 minutes of the 1ac by shifting the debate to a separate layer that the aff doesn’t interact with