## 1NC

#### Interp: Affirmatives must only defend the implementation of a law that a just government recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike

#### This does not require the use of any particular style, type of evidence, or assumption about the role of the judge — only that the *topic* should determine the debate’s subject matter.

#### “Resolved” means enactment of a law.

Words and Phrases 64 Words and Phrases Permanent Edition (Multi-volume set of judicial definitions). “Resolved”. 1964.

Definition of the word **“resolve,”** given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It **is** of **similar** force **to the word “enact,”** which is defined by Bouvier as **meaning “to establish by law”.**

#### Government refers to a group of officials with authority over a political unit – not “the multitude”

Merriam Webster nd — (Merriam Webster, “government”, Available Online at <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/government#:~:text=1%20%3A%20the%20act%20or%20process,for%20a%20political%20unit%20%3A%20rule>, accessed 11-21-21, HKR-AM)

1: the body of persons that constitutes the governing authority of a political unit or organization: such as

a: the officials comprising the governing body of a political unit and constituting the organization as an active agency

The government was slow to react to the crisis.

#### Right to strike is legally established and refers to actively withdrawing labor, not just “unproductivity”

EurWork 10 — (European Observatory of Working Life, “Right to strike”, 11-29-10, Available Online at <https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/observatories/eurwork/industrial-relations-dictionary/right-to-strike>, accessed 11-21-21, HKR-AM)

Although Article 151 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) states that ‘[t]he Union and the Member States (…) shall have as their objectives the promotion of employment, improved living and working conditions, so as to make possible their harmonisation while the improvement is being maintained (…)’, Article 153(5) TFEU explicitly excludes the right to strike from the provisions over which the Union has competence to legislate. Yet strike action is one of the fundamental means available to workers and their organisations to promote their economic and social interests. It is the most visible and controversial form of collective action in the event of industrial dispute and is often seen as the last resort of workers’ organisations in pursuit of their demands. The right to strike is explicitly recognised in the constitutions and/or laws of many countries. It can take many forms, from the complete withdrawal of labour for an indefinite period to more restricted forms of protest.

#### Violation – they reinterpret \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ – that’s distinct from legally establishing a right to strike

#### TVA- defend queer people’s right to strike and justify that by saying work as an ideology is bad – that still lets you discuss your topic matter but requires the aff to materially defend strikes as a stasis point. Disads to the TVA prove neg ground and no right to a perfect 1ac. Materially defending implentation is also important for limits – key for the DA’s that we’re reading and the fact they will say “no link” in the 1AR proves our claim of negative contestment and engagement.

#### Switch side debate – critiques of liberalism and performance can be read on the neg – solves dogmatism by testing different viewpoints

#### Debate doesn’t have any effect on the political and the individual arguments we read have no effect on our subjectivity, even if they spur immediate reflection, those insights aren’t integrated into deep-stored memory—this means you can vote negative on presumption. Encouraging focused, nuanced research and clash is the only chance to change attitudes long term—which means they can’t solve their impact turns but our model can.

**Vote Neg – The resolution is the only common stasis point that anchors negative preparation. Allowing any aff deviation from the resolution is a moral hazard which justifies an infinite number of unpredictable arguments with thin ties to the resolution. Because debate is a competitive game, their interpretation incentivizes affirmatives to run further towards fringes and revert to truisms which are exceedingly difficult to negate—this asymmetry is compounded by their monopoly on preparation**

#### That outweighs – The competitive incentive from debate creates pressures for research and focused clash which generates important skills and makes debate a training ground for future work. The impact Successful movement organizing is analogous to mainstream politics – it requires skilled organization, negotiating relationships, strategic leadership, and proto-institutionalism – sacrificing debate as training ensures we never translate opinion into political power, but requiring the aff defend contestable positions linearly increases debate’s capacity for movement advocacy as they get more predictable

Han and Barnett-Loro 18 [Hahrie Han, Department of Political Science, University of California, Santa Barbara. Carina Barnett-Loro, Climate Advocacy Lab, San Francisco. To Support a Stronger Climate Movement, Focus Research on Building Collective Power. December 19, 2018. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fcomm.2018.00055/full]

Building public will to address the climate crisis requires more than shifting climate change opinion or engaging more people in activism (Raile et al., 2014). By many measures, the climate movement today is stronger than ever: more people taking actions, more financial resources, and deeper concern. Nonetheless, despite increasingly widespread popular demand for sensible climate solutions (Leiserowitz et al., 2017; Hestres and Nisbet, 2018) and broad organizational infrastructure to support climate activism across most Westernized democracies (Brulle, 2014), public will that translates into the political power needed to effect meaningful change has been elusive (McAdam, 2017). Even the 2014 and 2017 People's Climate Marches that drew hundreds of thousands to the streets, demonstrations in support of the Paris Climate Accords, and large-scale acts of civil disobedience in opposition to the Keystone XL and Dakota Access pipelines have resulted in only short-lived campaign victories. Nearly 10 years after the failure to pass comprehensive climate and clean energy legislation at the federal level, experts largely agree there is “little hope” existing policies are sufficient to address the scale of the crisis (Keohane and Victor, 2011).

How can research help bridge the gap not only between opinion and action, but also between action and power? Many articles in this special edition examine the question of the conditions that make it more likely individuals will take action around climate issues. Indeed, the gap between opinion and action is well-known (Kahan and Carpenter, 2017), and burgeoning research in many fields of social science seeks to bridge it (Rickard et al., 2016; Doherty and Webler, 2016; Feldman and Hart, 2018). One of us works for the Climate Advocacy Lab, which supports field experimentation through direct funding and in-kind research assistance to build our collective understanding of the most effective strategies for moving people into action.

There is less attention, however, to the question of how those actions might translate into political influence. The challenge is this: in most cases, the null assumption is that activism becomes power at scale: that collective action is merely the sum of its parts, and the more people who take action, the more likely a movement is to achieve its goals. All things being equal, it is true that more is better (Madestam et al., 2013). Additional research, however, shows that for our stickiest social problems (like climate change), simply having more activists, money, or other resources is not sufficient to create and sustain the kind of large-scale change needed (Baumgartner et al., 2009; Canes-Wrone, 2015). Instead, we need a social movement that translates our actions into power. Social movements are a set of “actors and organizations seeking to alter power deficits and to effect transformations through the state by mobilizing regular citizens for sustained political action” (Amenta et al., 2010). Instead of focusing only on resources, movements focus on power. Instead of focusing only on individual action, they focus on collective action. To become a source of power, collective action must be transformative.

How, then, do we build the kind of movements that generate the collective action necessary to shift existing power dynamics? For scholars, what research can help advocates understand how to translate individual actions into the powerful, and transformative collective action necessary to create change? To examine this question, we co-hosted a conference that brought social scientists together with climate advocates in the United States. At this convening, movement leaders argued that to better support building a robust climate movement, research should move beyond traditional public opinion, communications, messaging, and activism studies toward a greater focus on the strategic leadership and collective contexts that translate opinion and action into political power. This paper thus offers a framework, described in Table 1, for synthesizing existing research on movement-building and highlighting the places where additional research is needed. We hope this framework can help focus more future research on the collective, relational contexts and strategic leadership choices necessary to generate collective action that translates into power. In describing the framework, we draw on Slater and Gleason's (2012) typology to show what we know and do not know about supporting movement actors seeking to make more impactful choices.

Assessing the State of Research on Climate Movement Building

How do movement leaders translate supportive public opinion and grassroots activism into political influence? Answering this question rests on first understanding a few key points about social movements. First, movements operate in an environment of uncertainty. For the climate movement, everything from oil spills to hurricanes, domestic elections to international treaties, legal decisions, and market forces can affect the terrain they must navigate. Movement leaders cannot directly control many of these things. Second, policy change is not power. A given policy change will not automatically effect change in the world consistent with movement interests (Hacker, 2004). Moreover, policies can be easily overturned, as exemplified by the transition from Obama to Trump, and immediate rollback of key policies including the Clean Power Plan, restrictions on drilling and mining on public lands, and coal ash protections. To create lasting power, movements need broad constituencies that persist through the ups and downs and whims of different administrations. Third, there is no direct line from activism to power, because power is a dynamic relationship between movements and their targets. To wield power, movements use their resources to act on the interests of political decision-makers (Hansen, 1991). In fact, some research suggests the advocacy group resources most predictive of large-scale policy change are relationships with decision-makers—more so than lobbying money, campaign contributions, or the number of grassroots members (Baumgartner et al., 2009). Some argue that the climate movement's failure to build and sustain the kind of constituency that would pressure decision-makers contributed to the failure of cap-and-trade legislation in 2010 (Skocpol, 2013).

Given these three factors—persistent uncertainty, the need to focus on power not policy, and the complex interests of movement targets—what are the questions movement leaders need to answer to build a more effective climate movement? We argue that most research has focused either on documenting trends in the political environment in which movements work or on questions of how the movement can focus on building more of its resources (such as more supportive public opinion or more activists). Those questions are important. Particularly in today's uncertain, dynamic political environment, however, we also need research on strategy: how do movements create the leadership capacities and organizational (or “meso-level”) conditions needed to navigate uncertain political situations and shifting relationships, and thus translate resources to power?

Organizations that have successfully wielded power in other issue areas can be instructive in showing why understanding strategic leadership and meso-level, collective contexts matters. Consider the gun debate in the United States. Polls show strong public support for stricter regulation of guns, advocates like Michael Bloomberg have poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the fight, and protests have brought millions of people into the streets for gun control. Nonetheless, the National Rifle Association (NRA) has been more effective in translating its activists and resources into political power. Why? First, leaders within the NRA undertook an intentional campaign to build an ardent constituency of gun owners that was willing to stand together, again and again, through ups and downs of any political fight, to support gun rights. As recently as the early 1970s, the NRA supported sensible gun regulations. Beginning in the 1970s, however, a group of hardline conservatives took control of leadership of the organization (Melzer, 2009). To build constituency, they used three key tactics: widespread benefits provided to gun owners from the national organization, strong appeals to identity, and a complex latticework of interpersonal relationships sustained at the local level (LaCombe, forthcoming). Second, leaders strategically leveraged this constituency to negotiate relationships with the Republican Party. The recurrent ability of leaders to deliver support from this constituency for policymakers became the basis through which the NRA built high-level relationships with elected officials and the Republican Party, thus cementing its hold over gun policy in the United States. By linking base-building with elite politics, the NRA transformed the political dynamics around gun rights.

#### filter their impacts through predictable testability ---debate inherently judges relative truth value by whether or not it gets answered---a combination of a less predictable case neg, the burden of rejoinder, and them starting a speech ahead will always inflate the value of their impacts, which makes non-arbitrarily weighing whether they should have read the 1ac in the first place impossible within the structure of a debate round so even if we lose framework, vote neg on presumption.

No RVIs – this includes impact turns and independent voting issues –

1 – exclusions are inevitable – we only have 45 minutes to discuss things – doesn’t prove harmful intent

2 – T is an aff burden – doesn’t justify them winning

3 – forces unreasonable standard of epistemic perfection – bad arguments should be rejected, but that doesn’t implicate the team

### NC

#### Our interpretation is that the topic should determine the division of affirmative and negative ground – it was negotiated and determined in advance. This does not require a specific type of evidence or style of debate but rather that they just defend [the resolution].

#### Vote negative for balanced ground – picking an aff outside of the predictable limits of the topic allows the aff to have a de facto prep advantage because they can scoop from the same bucket of literature for four years and frontline the same few positions while the negative is forced onto concessionary ground at the margins of the literature because they’re invested research into only the topic.

#### Independently, lack of ground eradicates negative clash and turns all their impacts – only funneling inevitable competitive incentives creates engagement with scholarship promotes the third and fourth line testing necessary for argument refinement

#### Procedural fairness first:

#### 1 - It’s inevitable – debate is a game proven by coin flips, speech times, set sides, and competition for the ballot – if neither fairness nor the ballot mattered then vote neg on presumption because you don’t have to reward the better debater

#### TVA solves their offense –

#### Disads to the TVA are the entire point – proves there’s negative ground and in-depth topical discussion of your literature base on both sides

#### They don’t get to weigh their aff – T is a procedural and proving our violation means we couldn’t contest their offense

#### Exclusions inevitable – we all have personal attachments and opinions on topics that can conflict with the positions we run like protestors negating versus defund the police affs – however, the debating the topic doesn’t mandate that we agree with our positions but rather take a stance for 1 round

#### Use competing interpretations – this debate is a question of competing models and what their model justifies

## DA- Inflatation

#### Strikes increase prices, deck productivity, no econ recovery – unique to covid inflation

Jesse Newman, 10-17, 2021. Jesse Newman is a reporter covering food and agriculture from The Wall Street Journal's corporate bureau in Chicago. “Unions Push Companies as Workers Stay Scarce” *WSJ*, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/from-film-sets-to-manufacturing-plants-unions-push-companies-as-workers-stay-scarce-11634488473> \\loyola\\

Union leaders are pressing to increase their ranks and secure gains for their members as workers demand more from their employers and companies struggle with labor shortages and snarled supply chains.

A [walkout by production workers](https://www.wsj.com/articles/john-deere-workers-go-on-strike-after-voting-down-tentative-deal-11634220536?mod=article_inline) for farm and construction machinery company [Deere](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/DE) [DE -0.28%](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/DE?mod=chiclets)& Co. that began Thursday followed [recent stoppages](https://www.wsj.com/articles/grocers-prepare-for-possible-snack-shortages-as-mondelez-workers-strike-11630586597?mod=article_inline) at snack producer [Mondelez International](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/MDLZ) Inc., [commercial truck](https://www.wsj.com/articles/volvo-trucks-aims-to-reopen-factory-after-third-contract-rejection-11626112152?mod=article_inline) maker Volvo and breakfast-cereal giant [Kellogg](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/K) Co. [Labor leaders elsewhere](https://www.wsj.com/articles/starbucks-faces-rare-union-test-in-upstate-new-york-11632488098?mod=article_inline) this year have worked to unionize [Starbucks](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/SBUX) Corp. [SBUX 1.72%](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/SBUX?mod=chiclets)baristas and [Amazon.com](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/AMZN) Inc. [AMZN 1.11%](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/AMZN?mod=chiclets)warehouse workers, so far [with mixed success](https://www.wsj.com/articles/amazon-warehouse-workers-set-to-vote-on-unionizing-what-we-know-11612785600?mod=article_inline).

Union officials said workers are motivated by lingering frustration over their hours, pay and concerns for their health as some have held front-line jobs through the Covid-19 pandemic. Employees this year have pushed for higher wages, expanded benefits, safer workplaces and added staffing.

“There is a new militancy out there,” said James P. Hoffa, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters labor union, which represents 1.4 million workers, from Detroit auto workers to package-delivery drivers. “I do think it’s an opportunity for labor.”

Many companies in recent months, responding to the tight labor market for lower-wage workers, [have been raising pay](https://www.wsj.com/articles/labor-shortage-missing-workers-jobs-pay-raises-economy-11634224519?mod=article_inline), offering signing bonuses and improving benefits to stay competitive. Critics of unions have warned that the work stoppages and efforts to influence labor policy could push up prices for consumers and slow production, potentially stifling the U.S. economic recovery.

“Businesses and unions should be working together to get the economy back on track,” said Kristen Swearingen, chairwoman of the Coalition for a Democratic Workplace, an organization of industry groups including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Work stoppages could wind up costing jobs and hurting small businesses, the coalition said.

Earlier this month on the company’s earnings call, the chief executive officer of food giant [Conagra Brands](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/CAG) Inc. was asked by analysts about concerns over strikes.

“It’s a tight labor market, and it takes a lot of ingenuity and creativity and effort to attract and retain employees,” Sean Connolly, the CEO, responded, adding, “So we’re, obviously, always trying to cultivate the strongest possible relationships with our employees…And I feel good about where we sit right now, but it’s—there’s no denying, it’s a daily grind.”

arcel Debruge, a labor-relations attorney for companies, said companies are dealing with heightened frustration among employees. But he feels many companies are increasing efforts to be responsive and that employees might not turn to unions partly because workers now have other avenues, such as social media, to express grievances and secure gains. “I don’t believe a new day has dawned in organized labor,” he said.

Union membership, particularly in the private sector, [has been in a decade slong decline](https://www.wsj.com/articles/u-s-union-membership-hits-another-record-low-11579715320?mod=article_inline). Job growth has slowed in industries such as manufacturing, transportation and utilities, which are typically more unionized compared with healthcare and other services. Some manufacturers have placed new plants in Southern states where unions typically are less common.

Union members made up 10.8% of the U.S. workforce last year, a higher proportion than in 2019, but down from a peak of 20.1% in 1983, the earliest year for which the Labor Department has comparable data.

Labor leaders said now is a time to build their ranks due to worker shortages, the pandemic struggles and because a pro-labor president is in the White House. Rob Hill, vice president and organizing director of the Service Employees International Union 32BJ, which represents janitors and airport workers, said he expects the roughly 175,000-member union this year to sign up double the number of new members than it did in 2020, which was around 4,000. Concerns over compensation, healthcare coverage and paid time off are drawing more workers’ interest in the union, he said.

The Teamsters union said it is fielding an unprecedented volume of requests to form unions at workplaces around the country, and Mr. Hoffa cited organizing efforts or first-time contracts within Illinois cannabis dispensaries, food-distribution warehouses and Las Vegas casinos.

Jonas Loeb, communications director for the 150,000-member International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, said that union is actively recruiting live-events workers across the country. A rush of concerts and other events being scheduled as pandemic restrictions ease is putting greater strains on employees, Mr. Loeb said.

This weekend, the film and television industry narrowly avoided a shutdown of production after the stage workers’ union [reached a tentative agreement](https://www.wsj.com/articles/hollywood-workers-reach-agreement-with-studios-averting-strike-11634434300?mod=hp_lead_pos2&mod=article_inline) with studios and streaming services over worker demands.

Not all workers’ efforts have been successful. Amazon.com employees at an Alabama warehouse in April voted not to unionize, and a separate 2018 effort to organize workers at Amazon’s Whole Foods Market also failed.

Pro-union workers at the Alabama warehouse this year said organizing could help boost wages and provide a more reasonable pace on the job. Amazon pushed back, promoting its $15-an-hour pay and benefits and highlighting the cost of paying union dues. [About 71% of the warehouse’s workers](https://www.wsj.com/articles/amazon-is-ahead-in-union-vote-as-tallying-set-to-resume-11617960604?mod=article_inline) who cast ballots voted against unionizing, [citing worries](https://www.wsj.com/articles/why-amazon-workers-in-alabama-voted-against-union-11618066800) over job security, the cost of paying dues and the concern that unionizing wouldn’t do much to improve pay and benefits. The union leading the effort is [seeking a second vote](https://www.wsj.com/articles/union-appeals-amazon-election-in-alabama-says-company-violated-laws-11618839996).

Unions have argued that their membership ranks would be boosted if current labor laws were revised to more severely punish employers who unlawfully thwart organizing efforts. Republicans and business groups have said such changes would limit workers’ ability to freely choose whether to join a union.

Some union officials and labor researchers said there is an emotional component wrapped up in current union actions. Frustration remains among some workers over being required to work long hours through the pandemic, they said, and a sense of injustice as some companies reap big profits from a rebounding economy.

Robert Bruno, professor of labor and employment relations at the University of Illinois, said this past week’s strike against Deere came despite the equipment company’s contract proposal that included higher wages, bonuses and enhanced pension benefits, suggesting that workers’ frustrations extend beyond money.

“Workers are angry,” Mr. Bruno said.

Deere has said it is working to resolve its striking workers’ concerns and aims to keep its operations running.

Michelle Back worked throughout the pandemic at a pharmacy for Kaiser Permanente in California and often left her young, autistic son at home. She said she is committed to pushing back against what she sees as insufficient proposals for wage increases and benefits in contract negotiations by Kaiser.

“We were healthcare heroes just months ago,” said Ms. Back, who is representing pharmacy workers in negotiations and for decades has served as a liaison between employees and management. When given the chance to vote to authorize a strike later this month, she said, she will vote yes.

Arlene Peasnall, senior vice president of human resources at Kaiser Permanente, said it has always tried to work cooperatively with unions representing its employees, and that Kaiser’s proposal aims to slow “over-market” wage growth in some areas while increasing wages for all current employees.

“We recognize what a monumental effort it has been for our employees to deliver such excellent care and service to our members and patients during the last 20 months of the pandemic,” Ms. Peasnall said. “We believe we will come together and find a mutually beneficial solution.”

—Amara Omeokwe, Lauren Weber and Bob Tita contributed to this article.

#### Inflation is contained now, but rising prices cause the Federal Reserve to hike interest rates – that quickly destroys the economy

Cox 21 – Jeff Cox, finance editor for CNBC.com where he manages coverage of the financial markets and Wall Street, “The Fed can fight inflation, but it may come at the cost of future growth,” 3/20/21, https://www.cnbc.com/2021/03/20/the-fed-can-fight-inflation-but-it-may-come-at-a-cost.html

One of the main reasons Federal Reserve officials don’t fear inflation these days is the belief that they have tools to deploy should it become a problem.

Those tools, however, come with a cost, and can be deadly to the kinds of economic growth periods the U.S. is experiencing.

Hiking interest rates is the most common way the Fed controls inflation. It’s not the only weapon in the central bank’s arsenal, with adjustments to asset purchases and strong policy guidance also at its disposal, but it is the most potent.

It’s also a very effective way of stopping a growing economy in its tracks.

The late Rudi Dornbusch, a noted MIT economist, once said that none of the expansions in the second half of the 20th century “died in bed of old age. Every one was murdered by the Federal Reserve.”

In the first part of the 21st century, worries are growing that the central bank might become the culprit again, particularly if the Fed’s easy policy approach spurs the kind of inflation that might force it to step on the brake abruptly in the future.

“The Fed made clear this week that it still has no plans to raise interest rates within the next three years. But that apparently rests on the belief that the strongest economic growth in nearly 40 years will generate almost no lasting inflationary pressure, which we suspect is a view that will eventually be proven wrong,” Andrew Hunter, senior U.S. economist at Capital Economics, said in a note Friday.

As it pledged to keep short-term borrowing rates anchored near zero and its monthly bond purchases humming at a minimum $120 billion a month, the Fed also raised its gross domestic product outlook for 2021 to 6.5%, which would be the highest yearly growth rate since 1984.

The Fed also ratcheted up its inflation projection to a still rather mundane 2.2%, but higher than the economy has seen since the central bank started targeting a specific rate a decade ago.

Competing factors

Most economists and market experts think the Fed’s low-inflation bet is a safe one – for now.

A litany of factors is keeping inflation in check. Among them are the inherently disinflationary pressures of a technology-led economy, a jobs market that continues to see nearly 10 million fewer employed Americans than a decade ago, and demographic trends that suggest a longer-term limit to productivity and price pressures.

“Those are pretty powerful forces, and I’d bet they win,” said Jim Paulsen, chief investment strategist at the Leuthold Group. “It may work out, but it’s a risk, because if it doesn’t work and inflation does get going, the bigger question is, what are you going to do to shut it down. You say you’ve got policy. What exactly is that going to be?”

The inflationary forces are pretty powerful in their own right.

An economy that the Atlanta Fed is tracking to grow 5.7% in the first quarter has just gotten a $1.9 trillion stimulus jolt from Congress.

Another package could be coming later this year in the form of an infrastructure bill that Goldman Sachs estimates could run to $4 trillion. Combine that with everything the Fed is doing plus substantial global supply chain issues causing a shortage of some goods and it becomes a recipe for inflation that, while delayed, could still pack a punch in 2022 and beyond.

The most daunting example of what happens when the Fed has to step in to stop inflation comes from the 1980s.

Runaway inflation began in the U.S. in the mid ’70s, with the pace of consumer price increases topping out at 13.5% in 1980. Then-Fed Chairman Paul Volcker was tasked with taming the inflation beast, and did so through a series of interest rate hikes that dragged the economy into a recession and made him one of the most unpopular public figures in America.

Of course, the U.S. came out pretty good on the other side, with a powerful growth spurt that lasted from late -1982 through the decade.

But the dynamics of the current landscape, in which the economic damage from the Covid-19 pandemic has been felt most acutely by lower earners and minorities, make this dance with inflation an especially dangerous one.

“If you have to prematurely abort this recovery because we’re going to have a kneejerk stop, we’re going to end up hurting most of the people that these policies were enacted to help the most,” Paulsen said. “It will be those same disenfranchised lower-comp less-skilled areas that get hit hardest in the next recession.”

The bond market has been flashing warning signs about possible inflation for much of 2021. Treasury yields, particularly at the longer maturities, have surged to pre-pandemic levels.

That action in turn has raised the question of whether the Fed again could become a victim of its own forecasting errors. The Jerome Powell-led Fed already has had to backtrack twice on sweeping proclamations about long-term policy intentions.

“Is it really going to be all temporary?”

In late-2018, Powell’s statements that the Fed would continue raising rates and shrinking its balance sheet with no end in sight was met with a history-making Christmas Eve stock market selloff. In late 2019, Powell said the Fed was done cutting rates for the foreseeable future, only to have to backtrack a few months later when the Covid crisis hit.

“What happens if the healing of the economy is more robust than even the revised projections from the Fed?” said Quincy Krosby, chief market strategist at Prudential Financial. “The question for the market is always, is it really going to be all temporary?’”

Krosby compared the Powell Fed to the Alan Greenspan version. Greenspan steered the U.S. through the “Great Moderation” of the 1990s and became known as “The Maestro.” However, that reputation became tarnished the following decade when the excesses of the subprime mortgage boom triggered wild risk-taking on Wall Street that led to the Great Recession.

Powell is staking his reputation on a staunch position that the Fed will not raise rates until inflation rises at least above 2% and the economy achieves full, inclusive employment, and will not use a timeline for when it will tighten.

“They called Alan Greenspan ‘The Maestro’ until he wasn’t,” Krosby said. Powell “is telling you there’s no timeline. The market is telling you it does not believe it.”

To be sure, the market has been through what Krosby described as “squalls” before. Bond investors can be fickle, and if they sense rates rising, they’ll sell first and ask questions later.

Michael Hartnett, the chief market strategist at Bank of America, pointed to multiple other bond market jolts through the decades, with only the 1987 episode in the weeks before the Oct. 19 Black Monday stock market crash having “major negative spillover effects.”

He doesn’t expect the 2021 selling to have a major impact either, though he cautions that things could change when the Fed finally does pivot.

#### Extended COVID economic decline causes multilateral meltdown – causes nuclear war, climate change, Arctic and space war.

McLennan 21 – Strategic Partners Marsh McLennan SK Group Zurich Insurance Group, Academic Advisers National University of Singapore Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford Wharton Risk Management and Decision Processes Center, University of Pennsylvania, “The Global Risks Report 2021 16th Edition” “http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\_The\_Global\_Risks\_Report\_2021.pdf

Forced to choose sides, governments may face economic or diplomatic consequences, as proxy disputes play out in control over economic or geographic resources. The deepening of geopolitical fault lines and the lack of viable middle power alternatives make it harder for countries to cultivate connective tissue with a diverse set of partner countries based on mutual values and maximizing efficiencies. Instead, networks will become thick in some directions and non-existent in others. The COVID-19 crisis has amplified this dynamic, as digital interactions represent a “huge loss in efficiency for diplomacy” compared with face-to-face discussions.23 With some alliances weakening, diplomatic relationships will become more unstable at points where superpower tectonic plates meet or withdraw.

At the same time, without superpower referees or middle power enforcement, global norms may no longer govern state behaviour. Some governments will thus see the solidification of rival blocs as an opportunity to engage in regional posturing, which will have destabilizing effects.24 Across societies, domestic discord and economic crises will increase the risk of autocracy, with corresponding censorship, surveillance, restriction of movement and abrogation of rights.25 Economic crises will also amplify the challenges for middle powers as they navigate geopolitical competition. ASEAN countries, for example, had offered a potential new manufacturing base as the United States and China decouple, but the pandemic has left these countries strapped for cash to invest in the necessary infrastructure and productive capacity.26 Economic fallout is pushing many countries to debt distress (see Chapter 1, Global Risks 2021). While G20 countries are supporting debt restructure for poorer nations,27 larger economies too may be at risk of default in the longer term;28 this would leave them further stranded—and unable to exercise leadership—on the global stage.

Multilateral meltdown Middle power weaknesses will be reinforced in weakened institutions, which may translate to more uncertainty and lagging progress on shared global challenges such as climate change, health, poverty reduction and technology governance. In the absence of strong regulating institutions, the Arctic and space represent new realms for potential conflict as the superpowers and middle powers alike compete to extract resources and secure strategic advantage.29 If the global superpowers continue to accumulate economic, military and technological power in a zero-sum playing field, some middle powers could increasingly fall behind. Without cooperation nor access to important innovations, middle powers will struggle to define solutions to the world’s problems. In the long term, GRPS respondents forecasted “weapons of mass destruction” and “state collapse” as the two top critical threats: in the absence of strong institutions or clear rules, clashes— such as those in Nagorno-Karabakh or the Galwan Valley—may more frequently flare into full-fledged interstate conflicts,30 which is particularly worrisome where unresolved tensions among nuclear powers are concerned. These conflicts may lead to state collapse, with weakened middle powers less willing or less able to step in to find a peaceful solution.

## Case

FW

#### 4] Extinction comes first under any framework

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

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