## 1AC

### 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.

#### 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

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] Death is bad and outweighs – it destroys the subject itself – kills any ability to achieve value in ethics since life is a prerequisite.

#### 2] Extinction outweighs –

#### 1 – Paternalism – taking everyones lives without their consent is actively violent and takes away people’s autonomy.

#### 2 – Suffering – mass death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities

#### 3 – Moral uncertainty – if we’re unsure about which interpretation of the world is true – we ought to preserve the world to keep debating about it

#### 3] Util forces you to justify why actions are good and bad – intuitions fail in the real world.

Hare 79, R.M. What Is Wrong with Slavery. Philosophy and Public Affairs, 1979, links,jstor.org/sici?sici=0048-3915%28197924%298%3A2%3C103%3AWIWWS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-6. // TG

Utilitarianism therefore, unlike some other theories, is exposed to the facts. The utilitarian cannot reason a priori that whatever the facts about the world and human nature, slavery is wrong. He has to show that it is wrong by showing, through a study of history and other factual observation, that slavery does have the effects (namely the production of misery) which make it wrong. This, though it may at first sight appear a weakness in the doctrine, is in fact its strength. A doctrine, like some kinds of intuitionism, according to which we can think up examples as fantastic as we please and the doctrine will still come up with the same old answers, is really showing that it has lost contact with the actual world with which the intuitions it relies on were designed to cope. Intuitionists think they can face the world armed with nothing but their inbred intuitions; utilitarians know that they have to look at what actually goes on in the world and see if the intuitions are really the best ones to have in that sort of world. I come now to the second horn of the dilemma, on which the utili- tarian is allowed to say, 'Your example won't do: it would never happen that way. He may admit that Waterloo and the Congress of Vienna could have turned out differently-after all it was a damned nice thing, and high commanders were in those days often killed on the battlefield (it was really a miracle that Wellington was not), and there were liberal movements in both countries. But when we come to the Caribbean, things begin to look shakier. Is it really likely that there would have been such a contrast between the economies of Juba and Camaica? I do not believe that the influence of particular national leaders is ever so powerful, or that such perfectly wise leaders are ever forthcoming. And I do not believe that in the Caribbean or anywhere else a system of nationalized slavery could be made to run so smoothly. I should, rather, expect the system to deteriorate very rapidly. I base these expectations on general beliefs about human nature, and in particular upon the belief that people in the power of other people will be exploited, whatever the good intentions of those who founded the system. Alternatively, if there really had been leaders of such amazing statesmanship, could they not have done better by abolishing slavery and substituting a free but disciplined society? In the example, they gave the slaves some legal rights; what was to prevent them giving others, such as the right to change residences and jobs, subject of course to an overall system of land-use and economic planning such as exists in many free countries? Did the retention of slavery in par- ticular contribute very much to the prosperity of Juba that could not have been achieved by other means? And likewise, need the govern- ment of Camaica have been so incompetent? Could it not, without reintroducing slavery, have kept the economy on the rails by such controls as are compatible with a free society? In short, did not the optimum solution lie somewhere between the systems adopted in Juba and Camaica, but on the free side of the boundary between slav- ery and liberty? These factual speculations, however, are rather more superficial than I can be content with. The facts that it is really important to draw attention to are rather deep facts about human nature which must always, or nearly always, make slavery an intolerable condition. I have mentioned already a fact about slave ownership: that ordinary, man haine du noorly luovo evrloit those vor utham they have absolute power. We have only to read the actual history of slavery in all centuries and cultures to see that. There is also the effect on the characters of the exploiters themselves. I had this brought home to me recently when, staying in Jamaica, I happened to pick up a history book15 written there at the very beginning of the nineteenth century, before abolition, whose writer had added at the end an appendix giving his views on the abolition controversy, which was then at its height. Although obviously a kindly man with liberal leanings, he argues against abolition; and one of his arguments struck me very forcibly. He argues that although slavery can be a cruel fate, things are much better in Jamaica now: there is actually a law that a slave on a plantation may not be given more than thirty-six lashes by the foreman without running him up in front of the overseer. The contrast between the niceness of the man and what he says here does perhaps more than any philosophical argument to make the point that our moral principles have to be designed for human nature as it is. The most fundamental point is one about the human nature of the slave which makes ownership by another more intolerable for him than for, say, a horse (not that we should condone cruelty to horses). Men are different from other animals in that they can look a long way ahead, and therefore can become an object of deterrent punishment. Other animals, we may suppose, can only be the object of Skinnerian reinforcement and Pavlovian conditioning. These methods carry with them, no doubt, their own possibilities of cruelty; but they fall short of the peculiar cruelty of human slavery. One can utter to a man threats of punishment in the quite distant future which he can under- stand. A piece of human property, therefore, unlike a piece of inani- mate property or even a brute animal in a man's possession, can be subjected to a sort of terror from which other kinds of property are immune; and, human owners being what they are, many will inevi- tably take advantage of this fact. That is the reason for the atrocious punishments that have usually been inflicted on slaves; there would have been no point in inflicting them on animals. A slave is the only being that is both able to be held responsible in this way, and has no escape from, or even redress against, the power that this ability to threaten confers upon his oppressor. If he were a free citizen, he would have rights which would restrain the exercise of the threat; if he were a horse or a piece of furniture, the threat would be valueless to his owner because it would not be understood. By being subjected to the threat of legal and other punishment, but at the same time deprived of legal defences against its abuse (since he has no say in what the laws are to be, nor much ability to avail himself of such laws as there are) the slave becomes, or is likely to become if his master is an ordinary human, the most miserable of all creatures. No doubt there are other facts I could have adduced. But I will end by reiterating the general point I have been trying to illustrate. The wrongness of slavery, like the wrongness of anything else, has to be shown in the world as it actually is. We can do this by first reaching an understanding of the meaning of this and the other moral words, which brings with it certain rules of moral reasoning, as I have tried to show in other places. 16 One of the most important of these rules is a formal requirement reflected in the Golden Rule: the requirement that what we say we ought to do to others we have to be able to say ought to be done to ourselves were we in precisely their situation with their interests. And this leads to a way of moral reasoning (utilitarian- ism) which treats the equal interests of all as having equal weight. Then we have to apply this reasoning to the world as it actually is, which will mean ascertaining what will actually be the result of adopting certain principles and policies, and how this will actually impinge upon the interests of ourselves and others. Only so can we achieve a morality suited for use in real life; and nobody who goes through this reasoning in real life will adopt principles which permit slavery, be- cause of the miseries which in real life it causes. Utilitarianism can thus show what is wrong with slavery; and so far as I can see it is the kind of moral reasoning best able to show this, as opposed to merely protesting that slavery is wrong.

### Underview

#### 1] Aff gets 1AR theory to prevent infinite abuse it’s DTD since the 1AR needs it to make the time investment worth, no RVIs because you can dump on a 30 sec shell for 6 minutes, and competing interps since the 2n can’t dump on a reasonability bright-line that excludes only what they did wrong – 1AR theory comes first the 1AR is too short to be able to rectify abuse and adequately cover substance.

#### 2] Procedural fairness first a) probability – one round cant alter subjectivity, but it can rectify fairness skews, b) link turns their role of the ballot since it proves we couldn’t engage in it and it is exclusionary, c) answers are self-defeating since they presuppose the judge evals them fairly.

### Method

#### Strikes expand disabled peoples rights, Bagenstos 17

(Samuel R. Bagenstos, 6-1-2017, "Disability Rights and Labor: Is This Conflict Really Necessary?," University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository, <https://repository.law.umich.edu/articles/1852/> ))

Having read up to this point, you might agree that there are important interests on both sides here. But, you might say, all that shows is that there is a conflict; it doesn’t show how that conflict ought to be resolved. After all, regardless of which side we favor in any particular policy choice, we may well be, at the margins, favoring one legitimate interest over another perfectly legitimate interest. And that’s particularly true in our fallen world, where we are quite far from implementing the ideal set of arrangements that could in fact accommodate the legitimate interests of both warring sides here. In this last Part, I will move from the idealistic register of normative analysis to a more hard-headed pragmatism. I will argue that, for two pragmatic reasons, disability rights advocates will better serve the interests of the disability rights movement by advocating for employment-law protections for personal-assistance workers. One reason has to do with labor markets; employment-law protections can be crucial to attracting and retaining high-quality attendant-services workers. The other reason has to do with politics. The disability rights movement needs allies, and the labor movement can be a very helpful ally in arguing for the expansion of the services on which disabled people rely to promote full inclusion in the community. Start with labor markets. We know that consumer-controlled personal-assistance services are a key tool for achieving independence and integration for disabled people. But adequate personal-assistance services depend on having a stable labor force of people willing to serve as personal assistants. And individuals with disabilities have often found it difficult to attract and retain workers for those positions. One set of researchers found that “[c]onsumers of PAS [personal-assistance services] consistently report difficulty in recruiting and retaining personal assistants.”86 Others have described attendant-services positions as marked by “unacceptably high rates of vacancies and turnover.” 87 As a result of this labor-market “churning,” many disabled individuals are unable to find people willing to provide personal-assistance services.88 Even when disabled individuals can find workers, frequent turnover means frequently facing the burden of identifying, hiring, and training new attendant-services workers.89 High vacancy and turnover rates thus have what one set of researchers calls “a profoundly negative effect on consumers’ ability to achieve full community integration.”90 And they place many individuals with disabilities at risk of reinstitutionalization.91 And why are there such high vacancy and turnover rates for personal-assistance positions? Because too few workers are willing to do these jobs at the rates they are paid.92 Attendant-services work is stressful and grueling, and many people will choose not to do it if they can find better-paying alternative jobs. An array of studies finds that low wages and poor benefits are the most significant reason for the churning in this part of the labor market.93 **Increased wage protections and unionization can therefore serve the interests of people with disabilities by stemming the turnover among personal assistants.** Reduced turnover is exactly what we have seen in states that have provided collective bargaining rights and wage increases to attendant-care workers.94 At least this is true when they have not sought to comply on the cheap. When states have imposed strict hourly caps on personal-assistance work, as Illinois has recently, they have actually harmed the interests of both workers and disabled people.95 But when states have taken increased wages as an occasion for increased investment in community services, the result has been a win-win. As a purely pragmatic matter, then, disability rights advocates should favor worker protections—not just to serve the interest of the workers, but to serve their own interests. But there is more to the pragmatic argument than just policy wonkism. As some of my discussion to this point suggests, the political landscape facing disability rights advocates these days is a particularly challenging one. **As the disability rights movement has recognized that public services, along with civil rights, are crucial to promoting integration and empowerment for people with disabilities, it has repeatedly confronted the incredibly harsh budget politics of our current era.** We live in an era of austerity, particularly at the state level.96 **Medicaid, which finances personal-assistance services for disabled persons, is one of those entitlement programs, and it is perpetually threatened by cuts at the state and federal level**. Indeed, the political pressures on Medicaid have only increased with the adoption of the Affordable Care Act97—which dramatically expanded the program—and the Supreme Court’s National Federation of Independent Business decision98—which made the expansion optional for each state.99 Many states with Republican-controlled legislatures refused to participate in the expansion, and the entire controversy highlighted the political pressures on the Medicaid program as a whole.100 In a world like this, disability rights advocates need allies. **And unions can be important allies in the effort to defend and enhance spending on programs like Medicaid.** When disability rights advocates defend the rights of workers in Medicaid programs, that cements an alliance with the representatives of those workers to defend and expand those programs. In the end, the answer to the problem of limited resources is not for disability rights activists and labor to fight increasingly pitched battles over allocation of a smaller and smaller pie. The only answer is to engage in political activism that will increase the resources that the state devotes to community based services for people with disabilities. Increased resources will promote the independence and full citizenship of disabled Americans at the same time it provides stable and well-paying jobs for personal-assistance workers. And the only way to engage in successful advocacy on this front is for people with disabilities and the labor movement—the interests that gain the most from expanded investments—to work together.

#### Racial Capitalism thesis is incorrect – connection between Race and Cap is circumstantial not necessary

Walzer 20 Michael Walzer 7-29-2020 "A Note on Racial Capitalism" <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online_articles/a-note-on-racial-capitalism> (a prominent American political theorist and public intellectual. A professor emeritus at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey)//Elmer

I have been puzzled for many months by the appearance of the phrase “racial capitalism” in the left press (see, for example, the article by K. Sabeel Rahman in the Summer 2020 issue of Dissent). What does it mean? Perhaps the adjective “racial” is simply an ordinary qualifying adjective. Racial capitalism is one kind of capitalism, and then there must be other kinds, requiring other adjectives. Here in the United States we have a kind of capitalism where the majority of exploited workers or a majority of the most exploited workers are people of color. The underclass and the reserve army are defined both racially and economically. Of course, no leftist writer would be indifferent to the exploitation of white workers, who might still make up the majority of the American workforce—and who are certainly the majority of exploited workers in Europe. The point of the adjective, then, is simply to focus our attention, for good reasons, on non-white workers. But is the exploitation of these workers a necessary feature of American capitalism? The phrase “racial capitalism” leaves us unclear about whether the hierarchical location of non-white workers is determined by race or by capitalism or by the two somehow working together. To begin to answer that question, we need to look at some examples of non-racial capitalism. The form of capitalism sponsored by the **Chinese communists** is obviously non-racial. Though the exploited workers are, in Western terminology, people of color, Western terminology is out of place here. If the Chinese imported white workers to take on the most menial jobs, that might make Chinese capitalism “racial,” **but no such importations have been reported**. The predatory version of capitalism that prevails in Putin’s Russia is also non-racial. It may be that Muslims are among the most exploited workers in Russia, but they are mostly Caucasian (some of them the original Caucasians), so we would have to talk about religious capitalism—where Orthodox Christians, not white people, are the privileged group. But no one is doing that. I have no statistics, but from what I read about China and Russia, I doubt that the rate of exploitation is higher in the United States, in racial capitalism, than it is in those two countries, **where capitalism is non-racial**. **Capitalism “works” with and without a racialized underclass** and reserve army. But is that right? The adjective “racial” sometimes makes a much stronger claim: it isn’t a qualifying but rather a definitional adjective. Capitalism is necessarily, inherently, racist. Forget about China and Russia, which are capitalist latecomers. Western capitalism is the prototypical version, and it has been racist from day one (if we can agree on day one)—always and forever racist. Does this mean that Manchester in 1844, as Engels described it, where all the exploited workers were white, wasn’t capitalist? No, for those workers were producing fabrics from cotton raised and harvested by Black slaves in the American South. That’s true enough, but I am not sure it is sufficient for an argument about necessity. Consider a counterfactual possibility: had no Black slaves been available, the recruitment of Irish workers would have started much earlier than it did. The rise of capitalism would not have been halted had the slave trade never begun. But the Manchester/Southern plantation example suggests what we all now know: capitalism is a global economic system, and it depends on the exploitation of people of color around the world. Here, however, it seems clear that the key **issue is exploitation, not racism**.

Given global demography, the majority of workers in any global economy will be people of color. Even in a democratically or social democratically regulated global system, the majority of workers and the majority of managers—the underclass and the overclass—will be non-white. Indeed, it would be the refusal of any transnational corporation to hire people of color that would rightly be called racist. (In the Pennsylvania town where I grew up, the local steel company did not hire, and therefore did not exploit, Jews or Black people. I suppose that this is also an example of racial capitalism.) All this suggests that capitalism and racism **have to be analyzed separately**. They overlap sometimes, as they do today in the United States. But the overlap is **circumstantial, not necessary**. **The two phenomena are distinct. They don’t rise and fall together. Each one, for different reasons, requires severe criticism and sustained opposition.** Many years ago, socialist writers argued that the triumph of the working class would liberate women, Jews, Black people, and everyone else. Separate political struggles against sexism, anti-Semitism, or racism were unnecessary—indeed they were a distraction from the all-important class war. Today some people on the left seem to believe that the end of racism will bring with it the downfall of capitalism. Both these theories are wrong. Overthrowing racism will still leave us with capitalism; overthrowing capitalism will still leave us with racism. Putting the adjective and noun together gives us a false sense of the **relationship** between the two phenomena. It might make sense, then, to ban the phrase from the pages of left newspapers and magazines. But since I am opposed to bans of that sort, I would only suggest that the phrase should always be queried by the editors. Do the writers who use it have some idea about what it means? Or are they just against racial capitalism, whatever it means?

#### Must weigh the consequences of plan versus the alt – its key to contesting ableism – their FW cant negotiate between the multitude of opportunity costs

Linda Barclay 11, Professor in the Philosophy Department at Monash University, 9/19/2011, Justice and Disability: What Kind of Theorizing Is Needed?, Journal of Social Philosophy Vol 42(3), http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9833.2011.01533.x/full

Some people with disabilities have criticized this view for failing to give proper weight to the disadvantages of impairments themselves. Some impairments are the source of significant pain and frustration, quite irrespective of social organization (Morris 1991; Wendell 1996; Shakespeare 2006). However, my discussion will focus on those disadvantages to which social organization makes a clear contribution. I will argue that it is implausible to attribute all disadvantage with a clear social contribution to injustice. As I shall show, virtually no theory of social or distributive justice would support the claim that any social contribution to disadvantage can be deemed to be an injustice. If the social contribution to disability is not an injustice, then nor does it necessarily require changing. Thus, merely identifying some social arrangement as contributing to disadvantage, as the social model does, does not entail that social change is demanded as a matter of justice.¶ There are two significant reasons for why it is implausible to characterize all social contribution to disadvantage as an injustice. First, it is doubtful that we can design a society so that no one is disadvantaged due to social arrangement. Despite the aspirations of the movement for universal design, it is not possible to design a society without features that impact differentially on some people because of their physical or mental traits. From whose perspective should the justice of social design be judged? We can do so through the “interests of the nondisabled, of the blind, of the deaf, of the walking-impaired, of persons with Down syndrome or of any of an indefinite number of other groups. In many, many ways, what is better for some is worse for others” (Pogge 2000, 39–40; Barclay 2010). The following examples are by no means unusual:¶ People with mobility issues who do not use wheelchairs may find that steps are safer and easier for them than ramps. Blind people may find that kerb cuts which liberate wheelchair users make it difficult for them to differentiate pavement from road, and leave them vulnerable to walking into the path of a vehicle. Wheelchair users may have problems with tactile paving which gives locational cues to visually impaired people . . . Partially sighted people may request large text on white background: people with dyslexia may prefer black print on yellow paper. Some people will prefer rooms to be dim, others will prefer them to be brightly lit. (Shakespeare 2006, 46)¶ It has been noted by others that proponents of the social model often rely heavily on examples where rectifying institutional biases against some people with impairments does not impose any disadvantages on others (Pogge 2000, 51). But if the physical and mental differences between people are taken seriously, then this involves recognition that a society shaped to be equally advantageous to all people irrespective of those differences is not possible. People with severe cognitive impairments are usually absent from the raft of examples used by proponents of the social model, even though typical references to people with “sensory, physical, or cognitive impairments” would suggest they are intended to be included within its reach.3 But how should society have evolved if it was to avoid imposing disadvantages on people with cognitive impairments (Wasserman 1998, 187)? The very nature of political debate, research and technological achievement, of very many forms of social engagement, and so on, are by their nature incommodious for people with severe cognitive impairments (which is by no means to suggest that all institutions or practices need to be: see, e.g., Wikler 1977; Kittay and Carlson 2010). In no way do I wish to undermine the significant advances in research and social practice that have made possible more inclusive social practices—in education, architecture, employment, and other key areas. There are very, many ways that society can be more inclusive. The theoretical point is simply that such gains can never extend to the point where no one is differentially impacted upon by social arrangements.¶ These claims are compatible with a concept of disability that “relativizes” disadvantage, including limitations to functioning or personal abilities, to social organization. Just because it is not possible to design a social environment that is equally hospitable to all people irrespective of their physical and mental differences, it does not follow that one cannot coherently define disability as flowing from a poor fit between the person and her social context, thereby highlighting the social contribution. What is disputed here is the claim that any social contribution to disability is an injustice which thereby demands social redress. If it is not possible to create an equally commodious “fit” between all individuals and their shared social environment, then it is not reasonable to accuse society of an injustice when it fails to do so. Second, we cannot assume injustice even in cases where it is possible to design a society that does not impose any disadvantages on any particular group of people, but where a decision is made not to opt for that design. If it is extremely costly to design an equally or at least maximally amenable society, it is not obvious that a society that chooses not to bear this cost is morally at fault (Kahane and Savulescu 2009, 41–42). Suppose for example that it proves prohibitively expensive to design public transportation that is equally accessible to all people, irrespective of the physical and mental differences between them. Would it necessarily be a dereliction of social justice to design a cheaper system not altogether accessible to everyone? Or if it proves too expensive to insist that every book or document written also be automatically released in a form equally accessible to the blind, or to people who can't read, or only read poorly, would it really be unacceptable to instead opt for some less accessible system? There is no compelling reason to assume without further argument that such decisions are unjust. The point has been made many times that deaf people would not experience any disadvantage in a social environment where everyone signed when they spoke. For that reason, Anita Silvers suggests that because we do not do so, we unjustly discriminate against the deaf (Silvers 1998, 258). I think most people would consider this an extraordinarily implausible claim, for the reason that equal accessibility does not always trump other considerations that must be weighed in determining just outcomes.¶ At this point a proponent of the social model might suggest that even if society cannot always be charged with injustice when its design is not fully accessible, society still has a duty to ameliorate the disadvantageous impacts of incommodious design. I agree. There are many concrete ways that a just society should act so as to reduce the poverty and social exclusion typically experienced by people whose physical and mental traits fit poorly in some respects with their social environment. For example, the fact that the overwhelming majority of people do not sign presents clear disadvantages to the deaf. I have rejected Silvers's suggestion that our failure to simultaneously sign is an injustice. However, society can nonetheless mitigate at least some of these disadvantages by funding translators and various other services. Society can also ameliorate some of the disadvantages of not being able to read, or to read the printed word, by promoting and funding alternative communication formats. Most people with very profound disabilities cannot afford to buy accommodation with the level of extensive care they need to live decently. Society can contribute to these costs. Many disabilities and the political, social, and economic disadvantages associated with them have their cause in a failure to fairly distribute shared social resources.¶ Even in these cases, however, one cannot assume that whenever society fails to make available resources of various kinds to ameliorate disadvantage it acts unjustly. Resources are often scarce: a theory of distributive justice is again needed to determine how limited resources should be distributed in the face of potentially infinite demand for those resources. It is highly doubtful that any theory of justice, given limited resources, will automatically favor whatever expenditure of resources is needed to address any disadvantage connected to impairment (Arneson 2000; Buchanan et al. 2000).¶ At this point it is worth considering more carefully the factors that would be relevant in determining a just social response to disadvantage from a more theoretical standpoint. Some theories of distributive justice demand no particular redress for disadvantage not brought about by force, or fraud or theft. Theories widely known as “libertarian” deny that society has a duty to address even severe material inequality. Indeed, libertarians charge that measures to redistribute wealth and other forms of advantage are an immoral violation of individual liberty (cf. Nozick 1974). Fortunately, libertarian theory of this nature is of minimal influence in political philosophy. Overwhelmingly, political philosophers are persuaded by the numerous good reasons for believing that society has a duty to consider and often redress current distributive arrangements. Of the many theories that have been developed, each has different views about two core aspects of distributive justice: the currency and the rule of distribution.¶ First, the currency of distributive justice refers to what it is whose distribution is of relevance. When we make interpersonal comparisons in order to determine whether current distributions are just or fair, with respect to what do we make such comparisons? The answer to this question is one of the key issues that divides different theories of justice. The views debated include: resources like income and wealth (cf. Dworkin 2000); welfare (understood both subjectively and objectively) (cf. Arneson 1989); capabilities (the capacity to do and be certain things) (Anderson 1999; Nussbaum 2000); and so on. In short, any comparative claim that someone is worse off, will have to specify with respect to what. Second, the rule of distributive justice refers to how the currency should be distributed. Should everyone have an equal share of the relevant currency (e.g., income and wealth, welfare, capabilities, and so on)? Or is it only imperative that everyone has a sufficient amount of the currency? Others have argued that what justice demands is that the position of the worst off should receive priority. Again, different views about the rule of distributive justice divide the various political theories of social justice.¶ Even with this very brief overview of the shape of current theorizing about distributive justice, it should be apparent that no straightforward conclusions can be drawn about the justice or otherwise of any social arrangement that differentially affects people. To take a very simple example, differential wealth and income might be considered entirely irrelevant for justice from many theoretical perspectives. First, it might be denied that income and wealth—as opposed to social standing, or welfare, or capabilities—is the appropriate currency of justice. As long as everyone enjoys good social standing, or the ability to do and be what they consider valuable (and so on), then issues of differential income may be largely irrelevant. Second, income and wealth might be accepted as the currency of justice, but it might be denied that an equal measure of income and wealth is the appropriate rule of distribution. On this view, as long as everyone has sufficient income, or the income of the worst off is maximized, then inequality may not be considered an injustice.¶ When disability theorists assume that any social arrangement that has a negative impact on a person with an impairment thereby demands social remedy, all manner of unargued assumptions are made both about the currency and the rule of distributive justice. It is fair to say that it is often assumed that inequality with respect to any measure of comparison is unjust. Such an assumption presupposes an incredibly strong position on distributive justice. It is strong both because it assumes any conceivable point of comparison should command social concern, and because it demands strict equality with respect to whatever currency is under consideration. Strict equality, as opposed to sufficiency or priority to the worst off, is very contentious for a number of reasons, especially if one considers equality beyond income or wealth. As I have already indicated in my criticisms of the social model, achieving strict equality in any particular domain may sometimes be impossible, or achievable only at considerable cost to other valuable outcomes, including equality in other areas. These are core reasons why many philosophers have favored focusing on ensuring everyone has enough, or that the interests of the worst off are prioritized, when not everyone can be made equally well-off without unacceptable cost.¶ In short, no theory of justice can underpin the assumption that any differential impact of social decisions is an injustice. One would have to develop the core aspects of a theory of justice to argue that any given situation counts as an injustice. However, despite arguing that no theory of social justice would favor whatever expenditure of resources is needed to eliminate any comparative disadvantage experienced by a person with an impairment, I wish to reiterate the point made earlier that in fact much existing and severe disadvantage would be widely condemned by most theories of justice. Whatever the metric of justice is taken to be—income and wealth, welfare, capabilities—people with disabilities are often among those who fare most poorly. Not only are they usually unequal with respect to these metrics, most societies fail to make any serious attempt even to ensure they have a sufficient or decent amount. And despite often being among the worst off with respect to the relevant metrics, it would be laughable if not so serious to claim that the interests of people with disabilities were prioritized in any society. Therefore, much of the disadvantage routinely endured by people with disabilities would in fact be roundly condemned by most social justice theories if applied to current social arrangements. Sources of disadvantage to one's income, or welfare or social standing that can be removed without imposing unacceptable cost on others, would clearly count as injustices. Undoubtedly, much of the disadvantage experienced by people with impairments is of this kind. There may be no good reason why stairs rather than ramps became dominant within the built environment: in the overwhelming majority of cases ramps provide equal and cost-effective access, so the failure to provide them as standard would count as an injustice, given that access issues have such a profound impact on people's income and wealth, welfare, capabilities, and general social standing. People with disability are denied access to employment which they are well qualified to execute, which is clearly also an injustice for the same reasons. In many cases, fully accessible transport could have been designed without any compromise to function or cost, so failure to do so is also an injustice. Even when social institutions can't be designed to be fully accessible, fairly modest expenditure of social resources can mitigate many of the disadvantageous impacts of inaccessibility. A person with profound disabilities only lives in squalid and undignified accommodation because society fails to provide resources for proper accommodation and care; a deaf person is only excluded from university because society fails to fund translators; a person with intellectual disability may only be excluded from political participation, or from participating in making important decisions about her own health or social engagements because society fails to fund services that translate information into easy-to-read formats, or that assist her to make her own choices.¶ In most of these cases, irrespective of either the metric or the rule of justice, one can plausibly conclude that failure to distribute resources in the relevant manner would count as an injustice, and injustice by its very nature demands social redress. This way of accounting for a person's disadvantage attributes the source of the disadvantage, or at least its degree, to unjust social decisions rather than to “natural facts” about a person and her traits or abilities, and this obviously demands social remedy. But importantly, these core commitments of the social model follow from a determination of what justice for people with impairments demands. It is only after we have established that social institutions and resources should be designed or distributed in a certain way that we can make full sense of the social model's claims that the social factors that contribute to disability should be changed. Merely highlighting the social contribution to disability does not get us to the normative conclusion that social remedy is required. If the social contribution to disadvantage is unavoidable, or only overcome at unacceptable cost, including opportunity cost, then it is incorrect to assume that it is a source of injustice. And if it is incorrect to characterize a social arrangement as a source of injustice, even when we fully recognize the way it contributes to disability and disadvantage, then no normative conclusions about the need to change it will necessarily follow. Rather than justifying the social changes that would deliver justice for the disabled, the social model of disability already assumes the social justice perspective needed to underpin its conclusions about social remedy. This means that effective theoretical challenge to injustice with respect to disability must place theories of social justice at the centre. The demands for social redress that are rightly pressed by disability activists are grounded not merely in conceptual claims about the social contribution to disability, but in rarely articulated, let alone defended, normative claims about the entitlements of people with disability. The suggestion is that the defense of such claims, which is basic political philosophy work, should be the focus of those concerned with ongoing injustice.¶ One might agree that we cannot assume any particular social or policy response follows from the mere recognition of the role that social arrangements play in causing disadvantage. It might still be claimed, in defense of the social model, that it makes a crucial contribution in identifying the correct cause of disability in social rather than natural conditions.4 Even if no conclusions about social justice follow from this alone, it is a significant victory in other respects to correctly identify the causes of disability and disadvantage. Adam Samaha, for example, embraces the social model's claim that disadvantage is caused by social factors, even though he also defends a version of the argument that no particular normative conclusions concerning how society should respond to disability follow from it (Samaha 2007). As I have already stated in the introduction, I am simply skeptical of attempts to identify a singular cause, or type of cause, of disability and disadvantage. I agree with Wasserman's definitive analysis that attempting to identify the causes of disability in either social factors, or natural features of the person, is inevitably normatively loaded in the ways he suggests (Wasserman 2001, 225–29).5 Indeed, here too a case can be made that the social model probably assumes a certain normative view to make sense of even its more modest claims about the cause of disability. Although it is beyond the scope of this paper to develop this argument in any detail, I would suggest that if it seems intuitively compelling to identify a particular social arrangement or practice as “the” cause of functional limitation or social disadvantage this will be because the social feature is believed to be obviously unjust. It is intuitively compelling to say that the cause of a wheelchair user's inability to do her job is her employer's decision to remove the elevator and put in a new staircase for purely aesthetic reasons. It is less intuitively compelling to say that the cause of reduced mobility of a person who must lie in a bed is that society fails to ensure that all modes of transport are equally commodious for bed users. Tremendous improvements have been made in law, social policy and practice, and academic research, because disability scholars and activists have highlighted the role of social environments in creating disability and disadvantage. New, more respectful, and more efficacious ways of dealing with disability and social exclusion have occurred as a direct result of recognizing that neither functional limitation nor social and political disadvantage follow from impairment without an incommodious social environment playing a significant, sometimes decisive, part. This has been a real achievement but it shouldn't be confused with the implausible idea that social features have been identified as the sole cause of disability as some proponents of the social model claim.

#### Imagining extinction is good

Jessica Hurley 17, Assistant Professor in the Humanities at the University of Chicago, “Impossible Futures: Fictions of Risk in the Longue Durée”, Duke University Press, https://read.dukeupress.edu/american-literature/article/89/4/761/132823/Impossible-Futures-Fictions-of-Risk-in-the-Longue

If contemporary ecocriticism has a shared premise about environmental risk it is that genre is the key to both perceiving and, possibly, correcting ecological crisis. Frederick Buell’s 2003 From Apocalypse to Way of Life: Environmental Crisis in the American Century has established one of the most central oppositions of this paradigm. As his title suggests, Buell tells the story of a discourse that began in the apocalyptic mode in the 1960s and 70s, when discussions of “the immanent end of nature” most commonly took the form of “prophecy, revelation, climax, and extermination” before turning away from apocalypse when the prophesied ends failed to arrive (112, 78). Buell offers his suggestion for the appropriate literary mode for life lived within a crisis that is both unceasing and inescapable: new voices, “if wise enough….will abandon apocalypse for a sadder realism that looks closely at social and environmental changes in process and recognizes crisis as a place where people dwell” (202-3). In a world of threat, Buell demands a realism that might help us see risks more clearly and aid our survival.¶ Buell’s argument has become a broadly held view in contemporary risk theory and ecocriticism, overlapping fields in the social sciences and humanities that address the foundational question of second modernity: “how do you live when you are at such risk?” (Woodward 2009, 205).1 Such an assertion, however, assumes both that realism is a neutral descriptive practice and that apocalypse is not something that is happening now in places that we might not see, or cannot hear. This essay argues for the continuing importance of apocalyptic narrative forms in representations of environmental risk to disrupt conservative realisms that maintain the status quo. Taking the ecological disaster of nuclear waste as my case study, I examine two fictional treatments of nuclear waste dumps that create different temporal structures within which the colonial history of the United States plays out. The first, a set of Department of Energy documents that use statistical modeling and fictional description to predict a set of realistic futures for the site of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico (1991), creates a present that is fully knowable and a future that is fully predictable. Such an approach, I suggest, perpetuates the state logics of implausibility that have long undergirded settler colonialism in the United States. In contrast, Leslie Marmon Silko’s contemporaneous novel Almanac of the Dead (1991) uses its apocalyptic form to deconstruct the claims to verisimilitude that undergird state realism, transforming nuclear waste into a prophecy of the end of the United States rather than a means for imagining its continuation. In Almanac of the Dead, the presence of nuclear waste introjects a deep-time perspective into contemporary America, transforming the present into a speculative space where environmental catastrophe produces not only unevenly distributed damage but also revolutionary forms of social justice that insist on a truth that probability modeling cannot contain: that the future will be unimaginably different from the present, while the present, too, might yet be utterly different from the real that we think we know.¶ Nuclear waste is rarely treated in ecocriticism or risk theory, for several reasons: it is too manmade to be ecological; its catastrophes are ongoing, intentionally produced situations rather than sudden disasters; and it does not support the narrative that subtends ecocritical accounts of risk perception in which the nuclear threat gives rise to an awareness of other kinds of threat before reaching the end of its relevance at the end of the Cold War.2 In what follows, I argue that the failure of nuclear waste to fit into the critical frames created by ecocriticism and risk theory to date offers an opportunity to expand those frames and overcome some of their limitations, especially the impulse towards a paranoid, totalizing realism that Peter van Wyck (2005) has described as central to ecocriticism in the risk society. Nuclear waste has durational forms that dwarf the human. It therefore dwells less in the economy of risk as it is currently conceptualized and more in the blown-out realm of deep time. Inhabiting the temporal scale that has recently been christened the Anthropocene, the geological era defined by the impact of human activities on the world’s geology and climate, nuclear waste unsettles any attempt at realist description, unveiling the limits of human imagination at every turn.3 By analyzing risk society through a heuristic of nuclear waste, this essay offers a critique of nuclear colonialism and environmental racism. At the same time, it shows how the apocalyptic mode in deep time allows narratives of environmental harm and danger to move beyond the paranoid logic of risk. In the world of deep time, all that might come to pass will come to pass, sooner or later. The endless maybes of risk become certainties. The impossibilities of our own deaths and the deaths of everything else will come. But so too will other impossibilities: talking macaws and alien visitors, the end of the colonial occupation of North America, or a sudden human determination to let the world live. The end of capitalism may yet become more thinkable than the end of the world. Just wait long enough. Stranger things will happen.

#### Capitalism is self-correcting and sustainable.

Kaletsky ’11 (Anatole, editor-at-large of *The Times* of London, where he writes weekly columns on economics, politics, and international relationsand on the governing board of the New York-based Institute for New Economic Theory (INET), a nonprofit created after the 2007-2009 crisis to promote and finance academic research in economics, Capitalism 4.0: The Birth of a New Economy in the Aftermath of Crisis, p. 19-21)

Democratic capitalism is a system built for survival. It has adapted successfully to shocks of every kind, to upheavals in technology and economics, to political revolutions and world wars. Capitalism has been able to do this because, unlike communism or socialism or feudalism, it has an inner dynamic akin to a living thing. It can adapt and refine itself in response to the changing environment. And it will evolve into a new species of the same capitalist genus if that is what it takes to survive. In the panic of 2008—09, many politicians, businesses, and pundits forgot about the astonishing adaptability of the capitalist system. Predictions of global collapse were based on static views of the world that extrapolated a few months of admittedly terrifying financial chaos into the indefinite future. The self-correcting mechanisms that market economies and democratic societies have evolved over several centuries were either forgotten or assumed defunct. The language of biology has been applied to politics and economics, but rarely to the way they interact. Democratic capitalism’s equivalent of the biological survival instinct is a built-in capacity for solving social problems and meeting material needs. This capacity stems from the principle of competition, which drives both democratic politics and capitalist markets. Because market forces generally reward the creation of wealth rather than its destruction, they direct the independent efforts and ambitions of millions of individuals toward satisfying material demands, even if these demands sometimes create unwelcome by-products. Because voters generally reward politicians for making their lives better and safer, rather than worse and more dangerous, democratic competition directs political institutions toward solving rather than aggravating society’s problems, even if these solutions sometimes create new problems of their own. Political competition is slower and less decisive than market competition, so its self-stabilizing qualities play out over decades or even generations, not months or years. But regardless of the difference in timescale, capitalism and democracy have one crucial feature in common: Both are mechanisms that encourage individuals to channel their creativity, efforts, and competitive spirit into finding solutions for material and social problems. And in the long run, these mechanisms work very well. If we consider democratic capitalism as a successful problem-solving machine, the implications of this view are very relevant to the 2007-09 economic crisis, but diametrically opposed to the conventional wisdom that prevailed in its aftermath. Governments all over the world were ridiculed for trying to resolve a crisis caused by too much borrowing by borrowing even more. Alan Greenspan was accused of trying to delay an inevitable "day of reckoning” by creating ever-bigger financial bubbles. Regulators were attacked for letting half-dead, “zombie” banks stagger on instead of putting them to death. But these charges missed the point of what the democratic capitalist system is designed to achieve. In a capitalist democracy whose raison d’etre is to devise new solutions to long-standing social and material demands, a problem postponed is effectively a problem solved. To be more exact, a problem whose solution can be deferred long enough is a problem that is likely to be solved in ways that are hardly imaginable today. Once the self-healing nature of the capitalist system is recognized, the charge of “passing on our problems to our grand-children”—whether made about budget deficits by conservatives or about global warming by liberals—becomes morally unconvincing. Our grand-children will almost certainly be much richer than we are and will have more powerful technologies at their disposal. It is far from obvious, therefore, why we should make economic sacrifices on their behalf. Sounder morality, as well as economics, than the Victorians ever imagined is in the wistful refrain of the proverbially optimistic Mr. Micawber: "Something will turn up."

#### Transition wars cause extinction

Harris 03. Lee, Analyst – Hoover Institution and Author of The Suicide of Reason, “The Intellectual Origins of America-Bashing”, Policy Review, January, http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3458371.html

This is the immiserization thesis of Marx. And it is central to revolutionary Marxism, since if capitalism produces no widespread misery, then it also produces no fatal internal contradiction: If everyone is getting better off through capitalism, who will dream of struggling to overthrow it? Only genuine misery on the part of the workers would be sufficient to overturn the whole apparatus of the capitalist state, simply because, as Marx insisted, the capitalist class could not be realistically expected to relinquish control of the state apparatus and, with it, the monopoly of force. In this, Marx was absolutely correct. No capitalist society has ever willingly liquidated itself, and it is utopian to think that any ever will. Therefore, in order to achieve the goal of socialism, nothing short of a complete revolution would do; and this means, in point of fact, a full-fledged civil war not just within one society, but across the globe. Without this catastrophic upheaval, capitalism would remain completely in control of the social order and all socialist schemes would be reduced to pipe dreams.

#### Cap is inevitable – the alt fails

Wilson 2k (Wilson, 2000  Editor and Publisher of Illinois Academe of many books including ‘The Myth of Political Correctness’ – 2000 (John K. Wilson, “How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People” p. 123)//Lex AKu

The left often finds itself stuck in a debate between revolution and reform. To self-described revolutionaries, any attempt to reform the system is a liberal compromise that only delays the creation of a socialist utopia. The vision of workers casting off their chains and embracing the overthrow of capitalism is pure fantasy. No one actually knows what it means to overthrow capitalism, and it clearly isn't going to happen, anyway. Reforming American capitalism is not a halfhearted effort at modest change; it is a fundamental attack on the reigning ideology of "free market" capitalism. Progressive reforms, taken seriously, are revolutionary in every important sense. Reforms such as the New Deal were truly revolutionary for their time, and American capitalism has been saved from its own flaws by these progressive reforms. The problem is that these progressive reforms have not been carried far enough, in part because the revolutionary left has too often failed to support the progressives’ reformist agenda. The only leftist revolution in America will come from an accumulation of progressive policies, and so the question of revolution versus reform is irrelevant.

#### Cap key to the environment – assumes any possible neg warrant.

**Bilgili, Koçak, & Bulut 16**—Faik Bilgili PhD in Economics from The City University of New York and Istanbul University; professor of Economics at Erciyes University, Turkey // Emrah Koçak research at Evran University // Ümit Bulut PhD in Economics from Gazi University and Professor of Economics at Ahi Evran University [“The dynamic impact of renewable energy consumption on CO2 emissions: A revisited Environmental Kuznets Curve approach,” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, Vol. 54, Feb. 2016, p. 838-839]

Some seminal papers reveal that, **within the process of economic growth, environmental pollution level first scales up and later scales down**. This is **an inverted U-shaped relationship between GDP** per capita **and pollution level** (Grossman and Krueger [3,4], Panayotou [5], Shafik [6], Selden and Song [7]). Since this relationship resembles the relationship between GDP per capita and income inequality produced by Kuznets [8], Panayotou [5] calls it Environmental **Kuznets Curve (EKC)**. According to the EKC hypothesis, **the level of environmental pollution** initially intensifies because of economic growth, later **tampers after GDP per capita reaches a threshold value** (Panayotou [5], Suri and Chapman [9]; Stern [10]). Therefore, this hypothesis implies a dynamic process in which **structural change occurs together with economic growth** (Dinda [2]). Grossman and Krueger [3] first clarify how the EKC arises. They explore that **economic growth affects environmental quality through three channels:** (i) **scale effect,** (ii) **structural effect, and** (iii) **technological effect**. Fig. 1 presents the EKC within the periods of (i), (ii) and (iii). According to the scale effect, given the level of technology, more resources and inputs are employed to produce more commodities at the beginning of economic growth path. Hence, more energy resources and production will induce more waste and pollutant emissions, and the level of environmental quality will get worse (Torras and Boyce [11], Dinda [2], Prieur [12]). **The structural effect states that the economy will have a structural transformation, and economic growth will affect environment positively along with continuation of growth**. In other words, **as national production grows the structure of economy changes**, and **the share of less polluting economic activities increases gradually**. Besides, **an economy experiences a transition from capital-intensive industrial sectors to service sector and reaches technology-intensive knowledge economy** (the final stage of the structural change). Due to the fact **that technology-intensive sectors utilize fewer natural sources, the impact of these sectors on environmental pollution will be less**. The last channel of the growth process is the technological effect channel. **Since a high-income economy can allocate more resources for research and development expenditures, the new technological processes will emerge**. Thus, **the country will replace old and dirty tech**nologies **with new and clean tech**nologies, **and environmental quality will deepen**