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**A just government ought to recognize the right of workers to strike except for police officers.**

**Police Strikes are used to combat racial progress and attempts to limit police power. Making them legal and easier only make progress much harder.**

Andrew **Grim 2020** What is the ‘blue flu’ and how has it increased police power? <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/07/01/what-is-blue-flu-how-has-it-increased-police-power/>

But the result of such protests matter deeply as we consider police reform today. Historically, **blue flu strikes have helped expand police power, ultimately limiting the ability of city governments to reform, constrain or conduct oversight over the police**. They **allow the police to leverage public fear of crime to extract concessions from municipalities.** This became clear in Detroit more than 50 years ago. In June 1967, tensions arose between Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanagh and the Detroit Police Officers Association (DPOA), which represented the city’s 3,300 patrol officers. The two were at odds primarily over police demands for a pay increase. Cavanagh showed no signs of caving to the DPOA’s demands and had, in fact, proposed to cut the police department’s budget. On June 15, the DPOA escalated the dispute with a walkout: 323 officers called in sick. The number grew over the next several days as the blue flu spread, reaching a height of 800 absences on June 17. In tandem with the walkout, the DPOA launched a fearmongering media campaign to win over the public. They took out ads in local newspapers warning Detroit residents, “How does it feel to be held up? Stick around and find out!” This campaign took place at a time of rising urban crime rates and uprisings, and only a month before the 1967 Detroit riot, making it especially potent. The DPOA understood this climate and used it to its advantage. **With locals already afraid of crime and displeased at Cavanagh’s failure to rein it in, they would be more likely to demand the return of the police than to demand retribution against officer**s for an illegal strike. The DPOA’s strategy paid off. The walkout left Detroit Police Commissioner Ray Girardin feeling “practically helpless.” “I couldn’t force them to work,” he later told The Washington Post. Rather than risk public ire by allowing the blue flu to continue, Cavanagh relented. Ultimately, the DPOA got the raises it sought, making Detroit officers the highest paid in the nation. This was far from the end of the fight between Cavanagh and the DPOA. In the ensuing months and years, **they continued to tussle over wages, pensions, the budget, the integration of squad cars and the hiring of black officers.**The threat of another blue flu loomed over all these disputes, helping the union to win many of them. And Detroit was not an outlier. Throughout the 1960s, ’70s and ’80s, the blue flu was a [ubiquitous and highly effective](https://www.akpress.org/our-enemies-in-blue.html) tactic in Baltimore, Memphis, New Orleans, Chicago, Newark, New York and many other cities. In most cases, as author Kristian Williams writes, “When faced with a walkout or slowdown, the authorities usually decided that the pragmatic need to get the cops back to work trumped the city government’s long term interest in diminishing the rank and file’s power.” But each time a city relented to this pressure, they ceded more and more power to police unions, which would turn to the strategy repeatedly to defend officers’ interests — **particularly when it came to efforts to address systemic racism in police policies and practices.** In 1970, black residents of Pittsburgh’s North Side neighborhood raised an outcry over the “hostile sadistic treatment” they experienced at the hands of white police officers. They lobbied Mayor Peter F. Flaherty to assign more black officers to their neighborhood. The mayor agreed, transferring several white officers out of the North Side and replacing them with black officers. While residents cheered this decision, white officers and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), which represented them, were furious. They slammed the transfer as “discrimination” against whites. About 425 of the Pittsburgh Police Department’s 1,600 police officers called out sick in protest. Notably, black police officers broke with their white colleagues and refused to join the walkout. They praised the transfer as a “long overdue action” and viewed the walkout as a betrayal of officers’ oath to protect the public. Nonetheless, the tactic paid off. After several days, Flaherty caved to the “open revolt” of white officers, agreeing to halt the transfers and instead submit the dispute to binding arbitration between the city and the police union. Black officers, though, continued to speak out against their union’s support of racist practices, and many of them later resigned from the union in protest. Similar scenarios played out in Detroit, Chicago and other cities in the 1960s and ’70s, as **white officers continually staged walkouts to preserve the segregated status quo in their departments**. These blue flu **strikes amounted to an authoritarian power grab by police officers bent on avoiding oversight, rejecting reforms and shoring up their own authority**. In the aftermath of the 1967 Detroit walkout, a police commissioner’s aide strongly criticized the police union’s strong-arm tactics, saying “it smacks of a police state.” The clash left one newspaper editor wondering, “Who’s the Boss of the Detroit Police?” But in the “law and order” climate of the late 1960s, such criticism did not resonate enough to stir a groundswell of public opinion against the blue flu. And police unions dismissed critics by arguing that officers had “no alternative” but to engage in walkouts to get city officials to make concessions. Crucially, the very effectiveness of the blue flu may be premised on a myth**. While police unions use public fear of crime skyrocketing without police on duty**, in many cases,**the absence of police did not lead to a rise in crime**. In New York City in 1971, [for example](https://untappedcities.com/2020/06/12/the-week-without-police-what-we-can-learn-from-the-1971-police-strike/), 20,000 officers called out sick for five days over a pay dispute without any apparent increase in crime. The most striking aspect of the walkout, as one observer noted, “might be just how unimportant it seemed.” Today, municipalities are under immense pressure from activists who have taken to the streets to protest the police killings of black men and women. Some have already responded by enacting new policies and cutting police budgets. As it continues, **more** blue flus **are likely to follow as officers seek to wrest back control of the public debate on policing and reassert their independence.**

**Those strikes cement a police culture which leads to endless amounts of racist violence and the bolstering of the prison industrial complex.**

**Chaney and Ray 13**, Cassandra (Has a PhD and is a professor at LSU. Also has a strong focus in the structure of Black families) , and Ray V. Robertson (Also has a PhD and is a criminal justice professor at LSU). "Racism and police brutality in America." *Journal of African American Studies* 17.4 (2013): 480-505. SM//do I really need a card for this

Racism and Discrimination According to Marger (2012), “racism is an ideology, or belief system, designed to justify and rationalize racial and ethnic inequality” (p. 25) and “discrimination, most basically, is behavior aimed at denying members of particular ethnic groups’ equal access to societal rewards” (p. 57). Defining both of these concepts from the onset is important for they provide the lens through which our focus on the racist and discriminatory practices of law enforcement can occur. Since the time that Africans [African Americans] were forcibly brought to America, they have been the victims of racist and discriminatory practices that have been spurred and/or substantiated by those who create and enforce the law. For example, The Watts Riots of 1965, the widespread assaults against Blacks in Harlem during the 1920s (King 2011), law enforcement violence against Black women (i.e., Malaika Brooks, Jaisha Akins, Frankie Perkins, Dr. Mae Jemison, Linda Billups, Clementine Applewhite) and other ethnic women of color (Ritchie 2006), the beating of Rodney King, and the deaths of Amadou Diallo in the 1990s and Trayvon Martin more recently are just a few public examples of the historical and contemporaneous ways in which Blacks in America have been assaulted by members of the police system (King 2011; Loyd 2012; Murch 2012; Rafail et al. 2012). In Punishing Race (2011), law professor Michael Tonry’s research findings point to the fact that Whites tend to excuse police brutality against Blacks because of the racial animus that they hold against Blacks. Thus, to Whites, Blacks are viewed as deserving of harsh treatment in the criminal justice system (Peffley and Hurwitz 2013). At first glance, such an assertion may seem to be unfathomable, buy that there is an extensive body of literature which suggests that Black males are viewed as the “prototypical criminal,” and this notion is buttressed in the media, by the general public, and via disparate sentencing outcomes (Blair et al. 2004; Eberhardt et al. 2006; Gabiddon 2010; Maddox and Gray 2004; Oliver and Fonash 2002; Staples 2011). For instance, Blair et al. (2004) revealed that Black males with more Afrocentric features (e.g., dark skin, broad noses, full lips) may receive longer sentences than Blacks with less Afrocentric features, i.e., lighter skin and straighter hair (Eberhardt et al. 2006). Shaun Gabiddon in Criminological Theories on Race and Crime (2010) discussed the concept of “Negrophobia” which was more extensively examined by Armour (1997). Negrophobia can be surmised as an irrational of Blacks, which includes a fear of being victimized by Black, that can result in Whites shooting or harming an AfricanAmerican based on criminal/racial stereotypes (Armour 1997). The aforementioned racialized stereotypical assumptions can be deleterious because they can be used by Whites to justify shooting a Black person

~~on the slightest of pretense (Gabiddon 2010). Finally, African-American males represent a group that has been much maligned in the larger society (Tonry 2011). Further, as victims of the burgeoning prison industrial complex, mass incarceration, and enduring racism, the barriers to truly independent Black male agency are ubiquitous and firmly entrenched (Alexander 2010; Chaney 2009; Baker 1996; Blackmon 2008; Dottolo and Stewart 2008; Karenga 2010; Martin et al. 2001; Smith and Hattery 2009). Thus, racism and discrimination heightens the psychological distress experienced by Blacks (Robertson 2011; Pieterse et al. 2012), as well as their decreased mortality in the USA (Muennig and Murphy 2011). Police Brutality Against Black Males According to Walker (2011), police brutality is defined as “the use of excessive physical force or verbal assault and psychological intimidation” (p. 579). Although one recent study suggests that the NYPD has become better behaved due to greater race and gender diversity (Kane and White 2009), Blacks are more likely to be the victims of police brutality. A growing body of scholarly research related to police brutality has revealed that Blacks are more likely than Whites to make complaints regarding police brutality (Smith and Holmes 2003), to be accosted while operating [driving] a motorized vehicle (“Driving While Black”), and to underreport how often they are stopped due to higher social desirability factors (TomaskovicDevey et al. 2006). Interestingly, data obtained from the General Social Survey (GSS), a representative sample conducted biennially by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago for the years 1994 through 2004, provide further proof regarding the acceptance of force against Blacks. In particular, the GSS found Whites to be significantly (29.5 %) more accepting of police use of force when a citizen was attempting to escape custody than Blacks when analyzed using the chi-squared statistical test (p The average Southern policeman is a promoted poor White with a legal sanction to use a weapon. His social heritage has taught him to despise the Negroes, and he has had little education which could have changed him….The result is that probably no group of Whites in America have a lower opinion of the Negro people and are more fixed in their views than Southern policeman. (Myrdal 1944, pp. 540–541) Myrdal (1944) was writing on results from a massive study that he undertook in the late 1930s. He was writing at a time that even the most conservative among us would have to admit was not a colorblind society (if one even believes in such things). But current research does corroborate his observations that less educated police officers tend to be the most aggressive and have the most formal complaints filed against them when compared to their more educated counterparts (Hassell and Archbold 2010; Jefferis et al. 2011). Tonry (2011) delineates some interesting findings from the 2001 Race, Crime, and Public Opinion Survey that can be applied to understanding why the larger society tolerates police misconduct when it comes to Black males. The survey, which involved approximately 978 non-Hispanic Whites and 1,010 Blacks, revealed a divergence in attitudes between Blacks and Whites concerning the criminal justice system (Tonry 2011). For instance, 38 % of Whites and 89 % of Blacks viewed the criminal justice system as biased against Blacks (Tonry 2011). Additionally, 8 % of Blacks and 56 % of Whites saw the criminal justice system as treating Blacks fairly (Tonry 2011). Perhaps most revealing when it comes to facilitating an environment ripe for police brutality against Black males, 68 % of Whites and only 18 % of Whites expressed confidence in law enforcement (Tonry 2011). Is a society wherein the dominant group overwhelming approves of police performance willing to do anything substantive to curtail police brutality against Black males? Police brutality is not a new phenomenon. The Department of Justice (DOJ) office of Civil Rights (OCR) has investigated more than a dozen police departments in major cities across the USA on allegations of either racial discrimination or police brutality (Gabbidon and Greene 2013). To make the aforementioned even more clear, according to Gabbidon and Greene (2013), “In 2010, the OCR was investigating 17 police departments across the country and monitoring five settlements regarding four police agencies” (pp. 119–120). Plant and Peruche (2005) provide some useful information into why police officers view Black males as potential perpetrators and could lead to acts of brutality. In their research, the authors suggest that since Black people in general, and Black males in particular, are caricatured as aggressive and criminal, police are more likely to view Black men as a threat which justifies the disproportionate use of deadly force. Therefore, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that police officers’ decisions to act aggressively may, to some extent, be influenced by race (Jefferis et al. 2011). The media’s portrayals of Black men are often less than sanguine. Bryson’s (1998) work in this area provides empirical evidence that the mass media that has been instrumental in portraying Black men as studs, super detectives, or imitation White men and has a general negative effect on how these men are regarded by others. Such characterizations can be so visceral in nature that “prototypes” of criminal suspects are more likely to be African-American (Oliver et al. 2004). Not surprisingly, the more Afrocentric the African-American’s facial features, the more prone he or she is expected to be deviant (Eberhardt et al. 2006). Interestingly, it is probable that less than flattering depictions of Black males on television and in news stories are activating pre-existing stereotypes possessed by Whites as opposed to facilitating their creation. According to Oliver et al. (2004), “it is important to keep in mind that media consumption is an active process, with viewers’ existing attitudes and beliefs playing a larger role in how images are attended to, interpreted, and remembered” (p. 89). Moreover, it is reductionist to presuppose that individual is powerless in constructing a palatable version of reality and is solely under the control of the media and exercises no agency. Lastly, Peffley and Hurwitz (2013) describe what can be perceived as one of the more deleterious results of negative media caricatures of Black males. More specifically, the authors posit that most Whites believe that Blacks are disproportionately inclined to engage in criminal behavior and are the deserving on harsh treatment by the criminal justice system. On the other hand, such an observation is curious because most urban areas are moderate to highly segregated residentially which would preclude the frequent and significant interaction needed to make such scathing indictments (Bonilla-Silva 2009). Consequently, the aforementioned racial animus has the effect of increased White support for capital punishment if questions regarding its legitimacy around if capital punishment is too frequently applied to Blacks (Peffley and Hurwitz 2013; Tonry 2011). Ultimately, erroneous (negative) portrayals of crime and community, community race and class identities, and concerns over neighborhood change all contribute to place-specific framing of “the crime problem.” These frames, in turn, shape both intergroup dynamics and support for criminal justice policy (Leverentz 2012).~~

#### Also – the police have historically have been incredibly anti-queer, take

Lambda "Protected and Served?,"] SM

Police officers are charged with serving and protecting the public—all of the public. Yet lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people and people living with HIV have often been given good reason to be wary of whether that responsibility includes them. Police have targeted LGBT people and the places they congregate and socialize, including certain bars and parks, for unwarranted searches, arrests and raids. Some police officers have also demonstrated prejudice and hostility based on actual or perceived sexual orientation, gender identity or HIV status.

## 2

#### Climate tech innovation is high now and set to improve. That’s necessary to solve warming.

Winkler 11/4 Amanda is the managing editor at Freethink. Prior to joining Freethink, she was a freelance filmmaker focused on issues related to foreign policy and the U.S. military. Her work has been featured on PBS and in film festivals. Before that, she was a video producer for Reason Magazine. November 4, 2021. “Climate tech is booming — and this is better news than COP26” [https://www.freethink.com/environment/climate-tech-is-booming-and-this-is-better-news-than-cop26 Accessed 11/6](https://www.freethink.com/environment/climate-tech-is-booming-and-this-is-better-news-than-cop26%20Accessed%2011/6) //gord0]

Climate technology is *in* again.As world leaders gather in Glasgow this week for COP26, a common refrain is emerging: policy and pledges alone aren’t going to get us to [net zero by 2050](https://www.iea.org/reports/net-zero-by-2050). We need more innovation. And fast.

**Policy shmolicy:** This year’s UN climate conference has so far proven to be no different than the other 25 summits that have been held in the past: policymakers make voluntary pledges to cut carbon emissions to prevent rising global temperatures.

However, there’s no way to hold the pledge-makers accountable, so these summits tend to be mostly hot (*warm?*) air. Six years after the major Paris climate agreement, the world isn’t anywhere close to achieving the accord’s goal of limiting global warming to below 2° C this century. (To have a shot of reaching that goal, we’d need to hit [net zero by 2050](https://www.fastcompany.com/90243693/the-future-of-the-world-is-on-the-line-and-our-chance-to-fix-it-is-now)).

Climate change is complex so there’s not going to be one technology that solves it — we’ll need to develop and deploy a range of technologies.

But a [new report](https://www.unep.org/resources/emissions-gap-report-2021) shows that even if countries simply fulfilled their current climate pledges, we’ll still see at least a 2.7° C rise this century. This could [still cause](https://www.economist.com/briefing/2021/07/24/three-degrees-of-global-warming-is-quite-plausible-and-truly-disastrous) an increase in extreme and deadly weather events like rising sea levels and heatwaves.

**Many solutions:** Solving climate change is incredibly difficult: to decarbonize the world’s economy, we need to rethink how *every industry* generates energy. Agriculture, manufacturing, shipping, construction, fashion — all of these industries will need to modernize their equipment to use energy more sustainably. This takes time and billions of dollars. Meanwhile, the industries still need to make a profit.

Given the complexity of the problem, there’s likely not going to be one technology that solves climate change; instead, we’ll need to develop and deploy a range of technologies.

**Bring in the tech:** To achieve net zero by 2050, [it’s estimated](https://pitchbook.com/news/articles/cop26-2021-climate-change-finance-bubble) that 65% of emissions reductions can be achieved by existing technologies and policy changes. The other 35% will need to come from new technologies.

Varun Sivaram, a senior advisor to John Kerry, told *MIT Tech Review* that the most important role the U.S. can play in leading global emissions reduction is to develop cheaper, better low-carbon technologies.

“The number one tool the U.S. has to speed the energy transition around the world is innovation,” he [said](https://www.technologyreview.com/2021/10/28/1038845/cop26-glasgow-un-climate-change-conference-emissions-gap/). By funding R&D efforts, he notes, the U.S. could make it easier for other countries — especially emerging countries — to decarbonize.

**Rise of the green economy:** The good news is that [a green energy economy](https://www.iea.org/reports/world-energy-outlook-2021/a-new-energy-economy-is-emerging#abstract) is emerging — and VCs have noticed. According to the Morning Brew, in 2021 over $30 billion has already been poured into climate technology startups, up 30% from last year.

Svenja Telle, Pitchbook analyst, [told](https://www.morningbrew.com/emerging-tech/stories/2021/11/01/in-record-breaking-year-for-vc-funding-climate-tech-is-no-exception) the Morning Brew that clean-industry technology is the fastest-growing sector of climate tech. This sector includes alternative energy and manufacturing innovation.

There’s a [big boom](https://www.forbes.com/sites/mergermarket/2021/11/03/demand-for-metals-charges-up-lithium-ion-battery-recycling/?sh=1b433d106f43) in lithium battery recycling. As more things are electrified, especially vehicles, we’ll need a way to recycle those batteries.

[Redwood Materials](https://techcrunch.com/2021/07/28/redwood-materials-raises-700m-to-expand-its-battery-recycling-operation/) is among the startups leading the recycling charge. The company extracts materials that are usually mined — like cobalt, nickel, and lithium — from recycled consumer electronics and then sells those materials to its customers, like Panasonic.

Green hydrogen is also [on the rise](https://www.forbes.com/sites/arielcohen/2020/10/19/the-green-hydrogen-revolution-is-now-underway/?sh=6e78a4f5232c) — this is a hydrogen fuel that can be made from renewable energy sources. It’s only byproduct is water. Right now, it’s too expensive to produce, but it may become cost-competitive in the near future. There are already a few [massive hydrogen projects](https://www.freethink.com/environment/green-hydrogen) underway.

Another fast growing area is built-environment companies, [said](https://www.morningbrew.com/emerging-tech/stories/2021/11/01/in-record-breaking-year-for-vc-funding-climate-tech-is-no-exception?utm_campaign=etb&utm_medium=newsletter&utm_source=morning_brew) Telle. This includes building construction and operations, which are responsible for about 39% of global emissions.

The *New York Times* [reports](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/26/business/climate-change-sustainable-real-estate.html) that more investors are looking at *sustainable real estate*, now that new technology and stricter standards enable better tracking of a development’s carbon footprint.”

“Five to 10 years ago, there was a lot of debate about sustainability, that, ‘It’s nice, but I don’t want to pay for it,’” Stephen Tross, chief investment officer at a Dutch investment firm, told the NYT. “Today, you don’t sacrifice returns for sustainability, you create returns with sustainability.”

Turntide Technologies [recently raised $225 million](https://techcrunch.com/2021/06/30/sustainable-tech-developer-turntide-technologies-raises-225m/) to continue developing their [“smart motor](https://www.freethink.com/technology/turntide-technologies)” which makes motors much more efficient, reducing energy consumption by about 64%.

“Today, half of the world’s energy is used by electric motors and nearly half of that energy consumption is being wasted due to inefficiency and lack of intelligent controls,”  Ryan Morris, CEO, told TechCrunch.

Over $30 billion has already been poured into climate technology this year, up 30% from last year.

**Deja vu:** From 2006 to 2011, we also saw a  “clean tech” boom that ended up being a disastrous bust — more than 90% of the cleantech startups funded during this time [did not](https://energy.mit.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/MITEI-WP-2016-06.pdf) return the money invested in them. (Hey, [Solyndra](https://fortune.com/2015/08/27/remember-solyndra-mistake/)!)

However, this time [appears to be different](https://www.forbes.com/sites/robtoews/2021/10/31/will-this-generation-of-climate-tech-be-different/?sh=78b53b094a62). One major reason is that renewable energy is now [price-competitive](https://www.irena.org/newsroom/pressreleases/2020/Jun/Renewables-Increasingly-Beat-Even-Cheapest-Coal-Competitors-on-Cost#:~:text=%E2%80%9CRenewable%20energy%20is%20increasingly%20the,benefits%20to%20the%20wider%20economy.) with fossil fuels. That wasn’t the case in 2009, when solar power was [*over four times*](https://ourworldindata.org/cheap-renewables-growth) more expensive than fossil fuels. The price has fallen fast and is [expected](https://about.bnef.com/new-energy-outlook/) to get even cheaper. This has made a global transition to clean energy systems possible.

Another reason is that most of today’s climate technology startups are powered by software and machine learning. That means today’s startups are more likely to scale, compared to yesterday’s technology which leaned heavily on hard assets.

“Investors were scared after what happened with Clean Tech 1.0, but it’s different this time. Back then everything was focused on really R&D-heavy technologies in clean energy. This time it’s about decarbonizing the entire economy,” Telle told Morning Brew.

“Something that is relevant for every single sector. And it’s the only way forward.”

**Violent strike efforts are increasing – they slow innovation, specifically in the tech sector.**

**Hanasoge 16** [Chaithra; Senior Research Analyst, Market Researcher, Consumer Insights, Strategy Consulting; “The Union Strikes: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly,” Supply Wisdom; April/June 2016 (Doesn’t specifically say but this is the most recent event is cites); https://www.supplywisdom.com/resources/the-union-strikes-the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly/]//SJWen

The result: Verizon conceded to several of the workers’ demands including hiring union workers, protection against outsourcing of call-center jobs, and employee benefits such as salary hikes and higher pension contributions, among others and thus bringing an end to the strike in June.

The repercussion: The strike witnessed **several instances** of **social disorder**, **violence** and **clashes**, ultimately calling for third party intervention (Secretary of Labor – Thomas Perez) to initiate negotiations between the parties. Also, as a result of the strike, Verizon reported **lower** than **expected revenues** in the **second quarter of 2016**.

Trade unions/ labor unions aren’t just this millennia’s product and has been in vogue since times immemorial. **Unions**, to **ensure fairness** to the working class, have **gone on strike for better working conditions** and employee benefits since the **industrial revolution** and are as strong today as they were last century. With the **advent of technology and advancement in artificial intelligence**, machines are grabbing the jobs which were once the bastion of the humans. So, questions that arise here are, what relevance do unions have in today’s work scenario? And, are the strikes organized by them avoidable?

As long as the concept of labor exists and employees feel that they are not receiving their fair share of dues, unions will exist and thrive. Union protests in most cases cause work stoppages, and in certain cases, disruption of law and order. Like in March 2016, public servants at Federal Government **departments across Australia** went on a series of **strikes** over failed pay negotiations, **disrupting operations** of many **government departments** for a few days.  Besides such direct effects, there are many **indirect effects** as well such as **strained employee relations**, **slower work processes**, **lesser productivity** and **unnecessary legal hassles**.

Also, union strikes can **never be taken too lightly** as they have prompted major overturn of decisions, on a few occasions. Besides the **Verizon incident** that was a **crucial example** of this, nationwide strikes were witnessed in India in March and April this year when the national government introduced reforms related to the withdrawal regulations and interest rate of employee provident fund, terming it as ‘anti-working class’. This compelled the government to withhold the reform for further review. In France, strike against labor law reforms in May turned violent, resulting in riots and significant damage to property. The incident prompted the government to consider modifications to the proposed reforms.

However, aside from employee concerns, such incidents are also determined by a number of other factors such as the country’s political scenario, economy, size of the overall workforce and the unions, history of unionization, labor laws, and culture. For example, it is a popular saying that the French are always on strike as per tradition (although recent statistics indicate a decline in frequency). In a communist government like China, strikes have steadily risen in number. In 2015, China Labor Bulletin (CLB), a Hong Kong-based workers’ rights group recorded 2,700 incidents of strikes and protests, compared to 1,300 incidents in 2014. Most of them have stemmed out of failure by the government to respect the basic rights of employees and address labor concerns.

Interestingly, unions have **not been able to gain a strong foothold** in the **IT-BPO industry**. While many countries do have a separate union to represent workers from the sector, incidents of strikes like Verizon **have been relatively lo**w.  However, workplace regulations, in addition to other factors mentioned could be a trigger for such incidents, even if on a smaller scale. For example, a recent survey that **interviewed several BPO employees** in India revealed that while **forming a union** in the BPO sector was **difficult**, irksome workplace regulations such as constant surveillance, irregular timings and incentives have prompted employees to express their resentment in smaller ways such as corruption of internal servers and so on.  Such risks are further enhanced in a city like Kolkata, which carries a strong trade union culture.

#### Technology is rapidly shifting towards climate change prevention – NASA proves

Smith 10/19 [Hayley Smith. October 19, 2021. “NASA turns technology back toward Earth to focus on climate change” [https://phys.org/news/2021-10-nasa-technology-earth-focus-climate.html Accessed 11/6](https://phys.org/news/2021-10-nasa-technology-earth-focus-climate.html%20Accessed%2011/6) //gord0]

After decades of gazing into space, NASA is turning its technology back toward Earth to study the effects of drought, fire and climate change on the Blue Planet.

At the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in La Cañada Flintridge last Thursday, scientists and [state officials](https://phys.org/tags/state+officials/) gathered to discuss how [satellite data](https://phys.org/tags/satellite+data/), 3D imaging and new radar and laser technologies can provide invaluable insights into Earth's rapidly changing systems.

Some said the meeting marked a sea change for previously siloed agencies, and underscored the need to work together to solve the climate crisis.

"I don't want to be overly dramatic, but in truth, this discussion is about saving our planet," NASA Administrator Bill Nelson told the group of attendees, which included Earth and space scientists from NASA and JPL, local congressional representatives and California environmental secretaries Wade Crowfoot and Jared Blumenfeld.

Upcoming Earth-centric missions will provide a more precise look at "everything that's happening" with the oceans, the land and the atmosphere than ever before, Nelson said. Among the big-ticket items were new tools to measure snowpack and groundwater, satellites to monitor methane emissions and remote sensing assets to assess the impact of hazards such as wildfires, earthquakes and mudslides.

"We're facing an existential crisis on this planet," said Crowfoot, the state's natural resources secretary. "These challenges are intense. ... But there's no better place than California to do this work, because we understand the gravity of the threat."

The meeting between California and [federal officials](https://phys.org/tags/federal+officials/) was a far cry from 2018, when—frustrated by the Trump administration's efforts to scuttle climate research—then-Gov. Jerry Brown insisted that California would launch "our own damn satellite, to figure out where the pollution is and how are we going to end it."

Now, three years later, Californians need only look out their windows to get a sense of what scientists can observe from above. Wildfires are burning record acreage across the West, while worsening drought is draining the region's water supplies to unseen levels. The state also recorded its hottest summer ever in 2021.

Many at the meeting hoped NASA and JPL's findings would help combat global warming by informing decision-makers as they determine the best paths forward.

"It's really a game changer to be able to have this data," NASA Deputy Administrator Pam Melroy said, noting that the U.S. can also lead the rest of the world in utilizing the same tools. "Because we'll never solve climate until everybody is a participant."

Many of the projects have been in development for years, but a recent memorandum of understanding between the state and JPL helped get additional projects off the ground, Crowfoot said—including critical items focused on water resiliency. The Western U.S. in recent months has seen such severe drought conditions that officials closed Lake Oroville's hydroelectric power plant for the first time and declared the first-ever water shortage on the Colorado River, among other actions.

One new web-based platform, OpenET, will provide satellite-based information on evapotranspiration, the process through which water leaves plants, soils and other surfaces, which could help state officials understand water usage in agricultural areas and assist farmers with precision irrigation.

"As states, we do our best to manage this resource of water, but we're never going to do it with the sophistication we need to without partners like NASA," Crowfoot said, adding that the agency could be the "tip of the spear" when it comes to combating climate change.

Other water-related items include surface water and ocean topography tools known as SWOT that will contribute to NASA's first-ever global survey of the Earth's surface water. Every 21 days, SWOT will survey almost 600,000 miles of global rivers at least twice, aiding drought forecasters and hazardous-flood preparations, officials said. It is set to launch in 2022.

JPL interim Director Larry James said the next generation of water-measuring spacecraft will also allow scientists to measure freshwater body heights and flows for the first time, while laser-imaging spectrometers will help study snowmelt and snow volume.

But scientists aren't just studying water. Methane was also a focus of discussion, with a new satellite due to launch in 2023 that will help monitor concentrations of the harmful emission, the second-largest contributor to greenhouse warming after carbon dioxide.

Blumenfeld, California's secretary for environmental protection, said the three largest producers of methane in the state are the oil and gas industry, landfills and agriculture (particularly, large animal operations and dairies). The new tool will enable anyone to see whether an oil refinery, for example, is leaking methane.

"It gives accountability, which is a critical element we need to get to in order to deal with the climate crisis, and it would not happen without NASA and JPL," Blumenfeld said. "Globally, and living in California, this is a really big deal."

But space missions have also come under scrutiny for their own environmental impact, as propellants required to launch rockets into space can expel carbon dioxide, liquid hydrogen, kerosene or other chemicals into the atmosphere.

The launch of a Falcon Heavy rocket from SpaceX, Elon Musk's privately owned space transportation company, burned about 400 metric tons of kerosene and emitted more [carbon dioxide](https://phys.org/tags/carbon+dioxide/) in a few minutes than an average car would in more than two centuries, reports found—and the number of commercial spaceflights is expected to increase tenfold in the coming years.

But NASA administrators say that the scale of their projects is getting "smaller and smarter," with one official noting that the methane satellite is "the size of a shoebox."

"It's an absolutely minuscule part, but it is a real concern," Melroy said of rocket emissions, noting that the agency is working on developing more sustainable fuels.

And while many of the [new tools](https://phys.org/tags/new+tools/) provide big-picture views of massive global challenges, some are much more local. Nelson said people don't have to be scientists to understand the impact of wildfires, drought, sinkholes or floods.

"There are places in the country, and represented in the halls of government, that are going to be very resistant, so we have to tell the story," he said. "We've got to educate the people, and unfortunately, increasingly, all of these disasters are helping us to do that."

Nearly 2.5 million acres have burned in California's wildfires so far this year—a number second only to 2020, the state's worst wildfire season on record. Entire towns have been leveled by flames.

Some of NASA's tools can help identify where wildfires are spotting, or shooting out embers that could potentially endanger firefighters and ignite new blazes, officials said. Others can employ sophisticated radar systems over disaster areas to assess damage and assist first responders.

JPL Earth science and technology director Jim Graf said they can also fly over the 1,100-mile levee system in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta to quickly identify sinking or weaknesses. That information could help officials make decisions on critical infrastructure, such as roads, bridges and aqueducts.

Officials on Thursday also showed off their NASA-ISRO Synthetic Aperture Radar satellite, or NISAR, which is still under construction and will "provide an unprecedented view of Earth" when it launches in 2023, they said. The satellite will monitor the entire globe as it scans for disturbances in glaciers, volcanoes and other systems.

"Basically, it's going to use two radar instruments that will look at changes in the Earth's surface," said Susan Owen McCollum, deputy project scientist for NISAR. "That actually can tell you a lot: how fast the ice sheets are melting, how fast the ground is moving."

Another aspect of the radar will enable officials to monitor how forest biomass is changing through carbon containment or other processes, McCollum said, which could be essential for studying places like the Amazon.

"Radar is a very powerful imaging tool—it sees the Earth in way that's different," she said.

But NASA and JPL also haven't lost sight of the final frontier, and officials on Thursday offered a tour of the control room for the Mars Perseverance rover. The rover, which landed on Mars in February, is collecting rock samples that will be returned to Earth for closer study.

The Ingenuity helicopter that arrived with the rover has also completed more than a dozen flights, they said, demonstrating for the first time that powered, controlled flight on another planet is possible.

Yet while the challenges of space exploration may seem a world away from those here on Earth, Perseverance project scientist Ken Farley said much can be learned from the red planet. Some of the rocks his team is studying are 3.5 billion years old and come from a time when liquid water flowed on the surface of Mars.

There is no liquid water on the Martian surface today, he said, and there is essentially no atmosphere.

"It is an example of massive [climate change](https://phys.org/tags/climate+change/)—from a planet that we believe would have been inhabitable to a planet that, at least on the surface, is not," Farley said. "It is a clear example that climate changes, and it can change enormously."

Nelson, the NASA administrator, echoed those sentiments when he addressed the rover's control team.

"That's one of the profound things that I think happens to every person that's had the privilege of looking out the window of a spacecraft when you orbit the Earth," he said. "You see how beautiful it is, but how fragile."

#### Warming causes extinction — leads to severe weather conditions, ecosystem collapse and armed conflict.

Sprat and Dunlop 19 — Spratt is Research Director for Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, Melbourne, and co-author of Climate Code Red: The case for emergency action. Dunlop is a member of the Club of Rome. Formerly an international oil, gas and coal industry executive, chairman of the Australian Coal Association, chief executive of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and chair of the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading 1998-2000. (David and Ian; Published: May 2019; “Existential climate-related security risk: A scenario approach”; Breakthrough Policy Paper; Accessed: April 9, 2021; http://mycoasts.org/commons/library/2019\_Spratt\_Dunlop.pdf)//CYang

2050: By 2050, there is broad scientific acceptance that system tipping-points for the West Antarctic Ice Sheet and a sea-ice-free Arctic summer were passed well before 1.5°C of warming, for the Greenland Ice Sheet well before 2°C, and for widespread permafrost loss and large-scale Amazon drought and dieback by 2.5°C. The “hothouse Earth” scenario has been realised, and Earth is headed for another degree or more of warming, especially since human greenhouse emissions are still significant. 20

While sea levels have risen 0.5 metres by 2050, the increase may be 2-3 metres by 2100, and it is understood from historical analogues that seas may eventually rise by more than 25 metres. Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of lethal heat conditions, beyond the threshold of human survivability.

The destabilisation of the Jet Stream has very significantly affected the intensity and geographical distribution of the Asian and West African monsoons and, together with the further slowing of the Gulf Stream, is impinging on life support systems in Europe. North America suffers from devastating weather extremes including wildfires, heatwaves, drought and inundation. The summer monsoons in China have failed, and water flows into the great rivers of Asia are severely reduced by the loss of more than one-third of the Himalayan ice sheet. Glacial loss reaches 70 percent in the Andes, and rainfall in Mexico and central America falls by half. Semi-permanent El Nino conditions prevail. Aridification emerges over more than 30 percent of the world’s land surface. Desertification is severe in southern Africa, the southern Mediterranean, west Asia, the Middle East, inland Australia and across the south-western United States.

Impacts: A number of ecosystems collapse, including coral reef systems, the Amazon rainforest and in the Arctic.

Some poorer nations and regions, which lack capacity to provide artificially-cooled environments for their populations, become unviable. Deadly heat conditions persist for more than 100 days per year in West Africa, tropical South America, the Middle East and South-East Asia, contributing to more than a billion people being displaced from the tropical zone.

Water availability decreases sharply in the most affected regions at lower latitudes (dry tropics and subtropics), affecting about two billion people worldwide. Agriculture becomes nonviable in the dry subtropics.

Most regions in the world see a significant drop in food production and increasing numbers of extreme weather events, including heat waves, floods and storms. Food production is inadequate to feed the global population and food prices skyrocket, as a consequence of a one-fifth decline in crop yields, a decline in the nutrition content of food crops, a catastrophic decline in insect populations, desertification, monsoon failure and chronic water shortages, and conditions too hot for human habitation in significant food-growing regions.

The lower reaches of the agriculturally-important river deltas such as the Mekong, Ganges and Nile are inundated, and significant sectors of some of the world’s most populous cities — including Chennai, Mumbai, Jakarta, Guangzhou, Tianjin, Hong Kong, Ho Chi Minh City, Shanghai, Lagos, Bangkok and Manila — are abandoned. Some small islands become uninhabitable. Ten percent of Bangladesh is inundated, displacing 15 million people.

Even for 2°C of warming, more than a billion people may need to be relocated and In high-end scenarios, the scale of destruction is beyond our capacity to model, with a high likelihood of human civilisation coming to an end. National security consequences: For pragmatic reasons associated with providing only a sketch of this scenario, we take the conclusion of the Age of Consequences ‘Severe’ 3°C scenario developed by a group of senior US national-security figures in 2007 as appropriate for our scenario too:

Massive nonlinear events in the global environment give rise to massive nonlinear societal events. In this scenario, nations around the world will be overwhelmed by the scale of change and pernicious challenges, such as pandemic disease. The internal cohesion of nations will be under great stress, including in the United States, both as a result of a dramatic rise in migration and changes in agricultural patterns and water availability. The flooding of coastal communities around the world, especially in the Netherlands, the United States, South Asia, and China, has the potential to challenge regional and even national identities. Armed conflict between nations over resources, such as the Nile and its tributaries, is likely and nuclear war is possible. The social consequences range from increased religious fervor to outright chaos. In this scenario, climate change provokes a permanent shift in the relationship of humankind to nature’. (emphasis added)

# Case

## FW

#### 1] Extinction comes first under any framework—it’s the ultimate form of oppression and violence.

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

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

#### 2] Defer to consequentialist utilitarianism---risk-analysis should be centered on preventing extinction.

Baum & Barrett ’18 (Seth D. Baum & Anthony M. Barrett. Global Catastrophic Risk Institute. 2018. “Global Catastrophes: The Most Extreme Risks.” Risk in Extreme Environments: Preparing, Avoiding, Mitigating, and Managing, edited by Vicki Bier, Routledge, pp. 174–184)

2. What Is GCR And Why Is It Important? Taken literally, a global catastrophe can be any event that is in some way catastrophic across the globe. This suggests a rather low threshold for what counts as a global catastrophe. An event causing just one death on each continent (say, from a jet-setting assassin) could rate as a global catastrophe, because surely these deaths would be catastrophic for the deceased and their loved ones. However, in common usage, a global catastrophe would be catastrophic for a significant portion of the globe. Minimum thresholds have variously been set around ten thousand to ten million deaths or $10 billion to $10 trillion in damages (Bostrom and Ćirković 2008), or death of one quarter of the human population (Atkinson 1999; Hempsell 2004). Others have emphasized catastrophes that cause long-term declines in the trajectory of human civilization (Beckstead 2013), that human civilization does not recover from (Maher and Baum 2013), that drastically reduce humanity’s potential for future achievements (Bostrom 2002, using the term “existential risk”), or that result in human extinction (Matheny 2007; Posner 2004). A common theme across all these treatments of GCR is that some catastrophes are vastly more important th

an others. Carl Sagan was perhaps the first to recognize this, in his commentary on nuclear winter (Sagan 1983). Without nuclear winter, a global nuclear war might kill several hundred million people. This is obviously a major catastrophe, but humanity would presumably carry on. However, with nuclear winter, per Sagan, humanity could go extinct. The loss would be not just an additional four billion or so deaths, but the loss of all future generations. To paraphrase Sagan, the loss would be billions and billions of lives, or even more. Sagan estimated 500 trillion lives, assuming humanity would continue for ten million more years, which he cited as typical for a successful species. Sagan’s 500 trillion number may even be an underestimate. The analysis here takes an adventurous turn, hinging on the evolution of the human species and the long-term fate of the universe. On these long time scales, the descendants of contemporary humans may no longer be recognizably “human”. The issue then is whether the descendants are still worth caring about, whatever they are. If they are, then it begs the question of how many of them there will be. Barring major global catastrophe, Earth will remain habitable for about one billion more years 2 until the Sun gets too warm and large. The rest of the Solar System, Milky Way galaxy, universe, and (if it exists) the multiverse will remain habitable for a lot longer than that (Adams and Laughlin 1997), should our descendants gain the capacity to migrate there. An open question in astronomy is whether it is possible for the descendants of humanity to continue living for an infinite length of time or instead merely an astronomically large but finite length of time (see e.g. Ćirković 2002; Kaku 2005). Either way, the stakes with global catastrophes could be much larger than the loss of 500 trillion lives. Debates about the infinite vs. the merely astronomical are of theoretical interest (Ng 1991; Bossert et al. 2007), but they have limited practical significance. This can be seen when evaluating GCRs from a standard risk-equals-probability-times-magnitude framework. Using Sagan’s 500 trillion lives estimate, it follows that reducing the probability of global catastrophe by a mere one-in-500-trillion chance is of the same significance as saving one human life. Phrased differently, society should try 500 trillion times harder to prevent a global catastrophe than it should to save a person’s life. Or, preventing one million deaths is equivalent to a one-in500-million reduction in the probability of global catastrophe. This suggests society should make extremely large investment in GCR reduction, at the expense of virtually all other objectives. Judge and legal scholar Richard Posner made a similar point in monetary terms (Posner 2004). Posner used $50,000 as the value of a statistical human life (VSL) and 12 billion humans as the total loss of life (double the 2004 world population); he describes both figures as significant underestimates. Multiplying them gives $600 trillion as an underestimate of the value of preventing global catastrophe. For comparison, the United States government typically uses a VSL of around one to ten million dollars (Robinson 2007). Multiplying a $10 million VSL with 500 trillion lives gives $5x1021 as the value of preventing global catastrophe. But even using “just" $600 trillion, society should be willing to spend at least that much to prevent a global catastrophe, which converts to being willing to spend at least $1 million for a one-in-500-million reduction in the probability of global catastrophe. Thus while reasonable disagreement exists on how large of a VSL to use and how much to count future generations, even low-end positions suggest vast resource allocations should be redirected to reducing GCR. This conclusion is only strengthened when considering the astronomical size of the stakes, but the same point holds either way. The bottom line is that, as long as something along the lines of the standard riskequals-probability-times-magnitude framework is being used, then even tiny GCR reductions merit significant effort. This point holds especially strongly for risks of catastrophes that would cause permanent harm to global human civilization. The discussion thus far has assumed that all human lives are valued equally. This assumption is not universally held. People often value some people more than others, favoring themselves, their family and friends, their compatriots, their generation, or others whom they identify with. Great debates rage on across moral philosophy, economics, and other fields about how much people should value others who are distant in space, time, or social relation, as well as the unborn members of future generations. This debate is crucial for all valuations of risk, including GCR. Indeed, if each of us only cares about our immediate selves, then global catastrophes may not be especially important, and we probably have better things to do with our time than worry about them. While everyone has the right to their own views and feelings, we find that the strongest arguments are for the widely held position that all human lives should be valued equally. This position is succinctly stated in the United States Declaration of Independence, updated in the 1848 Declaration of Sentiments: “We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and 3 women are created equal”. Philosophers speak of an agent-neutral, objective “view from nowhere” (Nagel 1986) or a “veil of ignorance” (Rawls 1971) in which each person considers what is best for society irrespective of which member of society they happen to be. Such a perspective suggests valuing everyone equally, regardless of who they are or where or when they live. This in turn suggests a very high value for reducing GCR, or a high degree of priority for GCR reduction efforts. 3. Challenges To Analyzing GCR Given the goal of reducing GCR, one must know what the risks are and how they can be reduced. This requires diving into the details of the risks themselves—details that we largely skip in this paper—but it also requires attention to a few analytical challenges. The first challenge is the largely unprecedented nature of global catastrophes. Simply put, modern human civilization has never before ended. There have been several recent global catastrophes of some significance, the World Wars and the 1918 flu among them, but these clearly did not knock civilization out. Earlier catastrophes, including the prehistoric mass extinction events, the Toba volcanic eruption, and even the Black Death plague, all occurred before modern civilization existed. The GCR analyst is thus left to study risks of events that are in some way untested or unproven. But the lack of historical precedent does not necessarily imply a lack of ongoing risk. Indeed, the biggest mistake of naïve GCR analysis is to posit that, because no global catastrophe has previously occurred, therefore none will occur. This mistake comes in at least three forms. The first and most obviously false form is to claim that unprecedented events never occur. In our world of social and technological innovation, it is easy to see that this claim is false. But accounting for it in risk analysis still requires some care. One approach is to use what is known in probability theory as zero-failure data (Hanley 1983; Bailey 1997; Quigley and Revie 2011). Suppose that no catastrophe has occurred over n prior time periods—for example, there has been no nuclear war in the 65 years since two countries have had nuclear weapons. (The second country to build nuclear weapons was the Soviet Union, in 1949.) It can thus be said that there have been zero failures of nuclear deterrence in 65 cases. An approximate upper bound can then be estimated for the probability p of nuclear deterrence failure, i.e. the probability of nuclear war, occurring within an upcoming year. Specifically, p lies within the interval [0, u] with (1---α) confidence, where u = 1---α(1/n) gives the upper limit of the confidence interval. Thus for 95% confidence (α = 0.05), u = 1-0.05(1/65) = 0.05, meaning that there is a 95% chance that the probability of nuclear war within an upcoming year is somewhere between 0 and 0.05. Note that this calculation assumes (perhaps erroneously) that the 65 non-failures are independent random trials and that p is approximately constant over time, but it nonetheless provides a starting point for estimating the probability of unprecedented events. Barrett et al. (2013) uses a similar approach as part of a validation check of a broader risk analysis of U.S.-Russia nuclear war. The second form of the mistake is to posit that the ongoing existence of human civilization proves that global catastrophes will not occur. It is true that civilization’s continued existence despite some past threats should provide some comfort, but it should only provide some comfort. Consider this: if a global catastrophe had previously occurred, nobody would still be around to ponder the matter (at least for catastrophes causing human extinction). The fact of being able to observe one’s continued survival is contingent upon having survived. While it is easy to see that this is a mistake, it is harder to correct for it. Again, it requires careful application of probability theory, correcting for what is known as an observation selection effect (Bostrom 2002b, Ćirković 4 et al. 2010). The basic idea is to build the existence of the observer into probability estimates for catastrophes that would eliminate future observers. The result is probability estimates unbiased by the observer’s existence, with global catastrophe probability estimates typically revised upwards. The third form of the mistake is to posit that, because humanity has survived previous catastrophes, or risks of catastrophes, therefore it will survive future ones. This mistake is especially pervasive in discussions of nuclear war. ~~People sometimes observe that no nuclear war has ever occurred and cite this as evidence to conclude that therefore nuclear deterrence and the fear of mutually assured destruction will indefinitely continue to keep the world safe (for discussion see Sagan and Waltz 2013). But there have been several near misses, from the 1962 Cuban missile crisis to the 1995 Norwegian rocket incident, and there is no guarantee that nuclear war will be avoided into the distant future. Similarly, just because no pandemic has ever killed the majority of people (Black Death killed about 22%), or just because early predictions about the rise of artificial intelligence proved false (they expected human-level AI within decades that have long since come and gone; see Crevier 1993; McCorduck 2004), it does not necessarily follow that no pandemics would be so lethal, or that AI cannot reach the lofty heights of the early predictions. Careful risk analysis can correct for the third form by looking at the full sequences of events that would lead to particular global catastrophes. For example, nuclear weapons in the United States are launched following a sequence of decisions by increasingly high ranking officials, ultimately including the President. This decision sequence can be built into a risk model, with model parameters estimated from historical data on how often each step in the decision sequence has been reached (Barrett et al. 2013). The more often near misses have occurred, and the nearer the misses were, the higher the probability of an eventual “hit” in the form of a nuclear war. The same analytic structure can be applied to other GCRs.~~

#### 3] Government actions will inevitably lead to trade-offs because they benefit some and harm others – aggregation is the only way to resolve these conflicts since A] anything else would unjustifiably prioritize one group over another and B] side constraints would freeze action in the face of tradeoffs.

#### States have no act-omission distinction – they’re responsible for everything in the public domain so every omission is an active implicit authorization. States lack intentions since policies are collective actions.

#### Actor-specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings.

#### ~~Takes out util calc indicts since they’re empirically denied – they just prove util is hard, not wrong - and link turns them because the alt would be no action~~

#### 4] Util is a lexical pre-requisite to any other framework: Threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis – that inhibits the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose.

#### Thus, the standard is maximizing expected well-being.

#### 1] We can discuss critical queer issues under a util standard – we don’t need a self-serving, unpredictable framework to engage in political LGBTQ discussions

#### 2] Their critiques of pedagogy are talking about banking-models of education – debate is explicitly the opposite, their critiquing things like schools and universities, not debate

## Case

#### 1] Anti-queer teachers… my gov teacher goes very dangerously close.

#### 2] Why do teacher protests solve – literally no reason it would spill over

#### 3] Teachers strike regardless of the illegality – there’s no RTS key, its just strikes generally good

#### 4] Rehighlighting of the rest of the article of Will 20:

Some of the statewide strikes, walkouts, and mass demonstrations in the last couple years were sanctioned by the teachers’ unions, but others were grassroots actions, driven by social media. In some of those states—including West Virginia, where the movement began with a nine-day strike in 2018—striking is illegal.

In 2018, “what it boiled down to was a community of teachers saying, ‘If we’re going to have a seat at the table, if anybody’s going to hear our voices and our concerns, this is the way we can be heard,’” said Karla Hilliard, a West Virginia teacher. “I feel like there is similar momentum nationwide right now.”

If a critical mass of teachers refuses to work, the laws against striking won’t matter, Shelton said—it will be impossible to punish that many teachers. But if a national or state movement is spotty, with only a handful of teachers from certain districts protesting, then participating teachers could be in legal trouble.

#### 5] Teachers are striking now – either squo solves or the plan doesn’t do anything bc teachers don’t do anything

Rohlinger 18 Deana Rohlinger, Professor of Sociology @ FSU. April 26, 2018. “3 reasons why teachers are striking right now” [3 reasons why teachers are striking right now (theconversation.com)](https://theconversation.com/3-reasons-why-teachers-are-striking-right-now-95582) Accessed 12-3 // gord0

Teachers from [Arizona](https://www.npr.org/2018/04/22/604702008/arizona-teachers-plan-to-strike-on-thursday) and [Colorado](https://chalkbeat.org/posts/co/2018/04/23/these-col%20orado-school-districts-are-canceling-classes-for-teacher-protests/) are joining teachers in Oklahoma and Kentucky on the picket line.

These teacher strikes will likely intensify the debate among elected officials over where education fits in state budget priorities. They may also prompt Americans to consider whether they are willing to pay more tax dollars to educate the country’s youth.

As a [scholar](https://scholar.google.com/citations?user=Pg36S-AAAAAJ&hl=en&authuser=1) who studies [protest](http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/2056305117706786) and [politics](http://www.cambridge.org/us/academic/subjects/sociology/political-sociology/abortion-politics-mass-media-and-social-movements-america) in the U.S., I’m often asked why teachers are striking now.

These are the three main reasons:

1. Money matters

First, teachers are tired of trying to educate students without enough money or adequate resources. This shared grievance goes well beyond low [teacher pay](https://theconversation.com/5-things-to-know-about-the-teacher-strike-in-oklahoma-94277).

Teachers are rebelling against [aging facilities](https://www.weareteachers.com/why-are-teachers-and-kids-working-in-buildings-that-are-falling-apart/), outdated teaching materials and four-day weeks – all of which are a result of reduced amounts of state and federal money flowing into public schools. In particular, funding greatly varies by [school district](https://www.npr.org/2016/04/18/474256366/why-americas-schools-have-a-money-problem) ~~and is often thinly spread in many states.~~

~~Take~~[~~Texas~~](https://www.npr.org/2016/04/18/474256366/why-americas-schools-have-a-money-problem)~~, for example. School districts on the state’s east coast, especially around Houston, spend 33 percent less per student, per year, than the country’s national average of US$11,841. Compare this to school districts on Texas’s western border, which spend 33 percent more per student, per year, than the national average.~~

~~In places like West Virginia and Oklahoma, where~~[~~teachers are~~](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/06/us/west-virginia-teachers-strike-deal.html)[~~pushing back~~](https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2018/4/24/17274808/teacher-strikes-public-opinion-poll)~~against a poorly funded education system, most of the school districts fall anywhere from 10 to 33 percent below the national average.~~

~~Experts agree that public education has fallen on hard times in the last decade. The liberal~~[~~Center on Budget and Policy Priorities~~](https://www.cbpp.org/research/state-budget-and-tax/a-punishing-decade-for-school-funding)~~notes that most schools in the U.S. took a hit after the Great Recession in 2008, and that, in 2015, 29 states in the U.S. were still spending less per student than they did in 2008.~~

~~Financial resources are particularly stretched in states that champion charter schools, which often are entitled to a piece of a state’s school dollars. According to the~~[~~Education Commission of the States~~](https://www.ecs.org/charter-school-policies/)~~, 44 states and the District of Columbia permit charter schools. Of those,~~[~~25 states~~](http://ecs.force.com/mbdata/mbquestNB2C?rep=CS1703)~~do not have caps on the number of charter schools that can exist. This means that the number of charter schools can increase dramatically over a relatively short period of time.~~

[~~Florida~~](http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7696/urlt/Charter_Sept_2017_rev.pdf)~~, for example, added almost 100 charter schools between 2012 and 2017 – increasing the total number of charter schools in the state from 578 to 654. Education dollars in the state of Florida are attached to students rather than schools, and charter schools attract students away from the public school system. This means most public schools saw a decline in dollars received over this same period of time.~~

~~This, in turn, meant Florida schools found it more difficult to~~[~~cover the costs~~](http://www.jacksonville.com/article/20160407/NEWS/801246143)~~associated with hiring teachers and support staff, as well as paying for educational materials and building upkeep. In short,~~[~~less money~~](https://theconversation.com/states-are-favoring-school-choice-at-a-steep-cost-to-public-education-95395)~~goes to public schools in states where charter schools proliferate. The strikes are the teachers’ way of saying they have had enough.~~

#### ~~6] No evidence that teachers are actually trying to improve queer ppl’s rights – no good answer to this in CX, there’s literally no evidence in the 1AC implicating why teachers would [a] be able to and [b] want to strike against antiqueer legislation.~~