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## 1NC – Off

### Framing

#### Pleasure and pain are the starting point for moral reasoning—they’re our most baseline desires and the only things that explain the intrinsic value of objects or actions

Moen 16, Ole Martin (PhD, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo). "An Argument for Hedonism." Journal of Value Inquiry 50.2 (2016): 267.

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative. 2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good. 3 As Aristotle observes: “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value. Although pleasure and pain thus seem to be good candidates for intrinsic value and disvalue, several objections have been raised against this suggestion: (1) that pleasure and pain have instrumental but not intrinsic value/disvalue; (2) that pleasure and pain gain their value/disvalue derivatively, in virtue of satisfying/frustrating our desires; (3) that there is a subset of pleasures that are not intrinsically valuable (so-called “evil pleasures”) and a subset of pains that are not intrinsically disvaluable (so-called “noble pains”), and (4) that pain asymbolia, masochism, and practices such as wiggling a loose tooth render it implausible that pain is intrinsically disvaluable. I shall argue that these objections fail. Though it is, of course, an open question whether other objections to P1 might be more successful, I shall assume that if (1)–(4) fail, we are justified in believing that P1 is true itself a paragon of freedom—there will always be some agents able to interfere substantially with one’s choices. The effective level of protection one enjoys, and hence one’s actual degree of freedom, will vary according to multiple factors: how powerful one is, how powerful individuals in one’s vicinity are, how frequent police patrols are, and so on. Now, we saw above that what makes a slave unfree on Pettit’s view is the fact that his master has the power to interfere arbitrarily with his choices; in other words, what makes the slave unfree is the power relation that obtains between his master and him. The difﬁculty is that, in light of the facts I just mentioned, there is no reason to think that this power relation will be unique. A similar relation could obtain between the master and someone other than the slave: absent perfect state control, the master may very well have enough power to interfere in the lives of countless individuals. Yet it would be wrong to infer that these individuals lack freedom in the way the slave does; if they lack anything, it seems to be security. A problematic power relation can also obtain between the slave and someone other than the master, since there may be citizens who are more powerful than the master and who can therefore interfere with the slave’s choices at their discretion. Once again, it would be wrong to infer that these individuals make the slave unfree in the same way that the master does. Something appears to be missing from Pettit’s view. If I live in a particularly nasty part of town, then it may turn out that, when all the relevant factors are taken into account, I am just as vulnerable to outside interference as are the slaves in the royal palace, yet it does not follow that our conditions are equivalent from the point of view of freedom. As a matter of fact, we may be equally vulnerable to outside interference, but as a matter of right, our standings could not be more different. I have legal recourse against anyone who interferes with my freedom; the recourse may not be very effective—presumably it is not, if my overall vulnerability to outside interference is comparable to that of a slave— but I still have full legal standing.68 By contrast, the slave lacks legal recourse against the interventions of one speciﬁc individual: his master. It is that fact, on a Kantian view—a fact about the legal relation in which a slave stands to his master—that sets slaves apart from freemen. The point may appear trivial, but it does get something right: whereas one cannot identify a power relation that obtains uniquely between a slave and his master, the legal relation between them is undeniably unique. A master’s right to interfere with respect to his slave does not extend to freemen, regardless of how vulnerable they might be as a matter of fact, and citizens other than the master do not have the right to order the slave around, regardless of how powerful they might be. This suggests that Kant is correct in thinking that the ideal of freedom is essentially linked to a person’s having full legal standing. More speciﬁcally, he is correct in holding that the importance of rights is not exhausted by their contribution to the level of protection that an individual enjoys, as it must be on an instrumental view like Pettit’s. Although it does matter that rights be enforced with reasonable effectiveness, the sheer fact that one has adequate legal rights is essential to one’s standing as a free citizen. In this respect, Kant stays faithful to the idea that freedom is primarily a matter of standing—a standing that the freeman has and that the slave lacks. Pettit himself frequently insists on the idea, but he fails to do it justice when he claims that freedom is simply a matter of being adequately (and reliably) shielded against the strength of others. As Kant recognizes, the standing of a free citizen is a more complex matter than that. One could perhaps worry that the idea of legal standing is something of a red herring here—that it must ultimately be reducible to a complex network of power relations and, hence, that the position I attribute to Kant differs only nominally from Pettit’s. That seems to me doubtful. Viewing legal standing as essential to freedom makes sense only if our conception of the former includes conceptions of what constitutes a fully adequate scheme of legal rights, appropriate legal recourse, justiﬁed punishment, and so on. Only if one believes that these notions all boil down to power relations will Kant’s position appear similar to Pettit’s. On any other view—and certainly that includes most views recently defended by philosophers—the notion of legal standing will outstrip the power relations that ground Pettit’s theory.

#### That justifies util – we must aggregate in order to determine how behaviors will be conducted based on what is most pleasurable. Anything else is arbitrary and always allows for exclusions, but aggregation solves because it allows us to determine what behaviors are most likely given relative evaluations of pleasure and pain.

#### Thus, the standard is maximizing expected well-being – prefer:

#### 1] Actor specificity

#### A] Governments must aggregate since every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### B] States lack wills or intentions since policies are collective actions. Actor-specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings. Link turns calc indites because the alt would be *no* action.

#### 2] **No act-omission distinction—governments are responsible for everything in the public sphere so inaction is implicit authorization of action: they have to yes/no bills, which means everything collapse to aggregation.**

#### 3] Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet up for lunch, that is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital via intuitions. Intuitions outweigh—they’re the foundational basis for any argument and theories that contradict our intuitions are most likely false even if we can’t deductively determine why.

#### 4] Existential threats independently outweigh – all life has infinite value and extinction eliminates the possibility for future generations

GPP 17 (Global Priorities Project, Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” Global Priorities Project, 2017, <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>,

1.2. THE ETHICS OF EXISTENTIAL RISK In his book Reasons and Persons, Oxford philosopher Derek Parfit advanced an influential argument about the importance of avoiding extinction: I believe that if we destroy mankind, as we now can, this outcome will be much worse than most people think. Compare three outcomes: (1) Peace. (2) A nuclear war that kills 99% of the world’s existing population. (3) A nuclear war that kills 100%. (2) would be worse than (1), and (3) would be worse than (2). Which is the greater of these two differences? Most people believe that the greater difference is between (1) and (2). I believe that the difference between (2) and (3) is very much greater. ... The Earth will remain habitable for at least another billion years. Civilization began only a few thousand years ago. If we do not destroy mankind, these few thousand years may be only a tiny fraction of the whole of civilized human history. The difference between (2) and (3) may thus be the difference between this tiny fraction and all of the rest of this history. If we compare this possible history to a day, what has occurred so far is only a fraction of a second.65 In this argument, it seems that Parfit is assuming that the survivors of a nuclear war that kills 99% of the population would eventually be able to recover civilisation without long-term effect. As we have seen, this may not be a safe assumption – but for the purposes of this thought experiment, the point stands. What makes existential catastrophes especially bad is that they would “destroy the future,” as another Oxford philosopher, Nick Bostrom, puts it.66 This future could potentially be extremely long and full of flourishing, and would therefore have extremely large value. In standard risk analysis, when working out how to respond to risk, we work out the expected value of risk reduction, by weighing the probability that an action will prevent an adverse event against the severity of the event. Because the value of preventing existential catastrophe is so vast, even a tiny probability of prevention has huge expected value.67 Of course, there is persisting reasonable disagreement about ethics and there are a number of ways one might resist this conclusion.68 Therefore, it would be unjustified to be overconfident in Parfit and Bostrom’s argument. In some areas, government policy does give significant weight to future generations. For example, in assessing the risks of nuclear waste storage, governments have considered timeframes of thousands, hundreds of thousands, and even a million years.69 Justifications for this policy usually appeal to principles of intergenerational equity according to which future generations ought to get as much protection as current generations.70 Similarly, widely accepted norms of sustainable development require development that meets the needs of the current generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.71 However, when it comes to existential risk, it would seem that we fail to live up to principles of intergenerational equity. Existential catastrophe would not only give future generations less than the current generations; it would give them nothing. Indeed, reducing existential risk plausibly has a quite low cost for us in comparison with the huge expected value it has for future generations. In spite of this, relatively little is done to reduce existential risk. Unless we give up on norms of intergenerational equity, they give us a strong case for significantly increasing our efforts to reduce existential risks. 1.3. WHY EXISTENTIAL RISKS MAY BE SYSTEMATICALLY UNDERINVESTED IN, AND THE ROLE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY In spite of the importance of existential risk reduction, it probably receives less attention than is warranted. As a result, concerted international cooperation is required if we are to receive adequate protection from existential risks. 1.3.1. Why existential risks are likely to be underinvested in There are several reasons why existential risk reduction is likely to be underinvested in. Firstly, it is a global public good. Economic theory predicts that such goods tend to be underprovided. The benefits of existential risk reduction are widely and indivisibly dispersed around the globe from the countries responsible for taking action. Consequently, a country which reduces existential risk gains only a small portion of the benefits but bears the full brunt of the costs. Countries thus have strong incentives to free ride, receiving the benefits of risk reduction without contributing. As a result, too few do what is in the common interest. Secondly, as already suggested above, existential risk reduction is an intergenerational public good: most of the benefits are enjoyed by future generations who have no say in the political process. For these goods, the problem is temporal free riding: the current generation enjoys the benefits of inaction while future generations bear the costs. Thirdly, many existential risks, such as machine superintelligence, engineered pandemics, and solar geoengineering, pose an unprecedented and uncertain future threat. Consequently, it is hard to develop a satisfactory governance regime for them: there are few existing governance instruments which can be applied to these risks, and it is unclear what shape new instruments should take. In this way, our position with regard to these emerging risks is comparable to the one we faced when nuclear weapons first became available. Cognitive biases also lead people to underestimate existential risks. Since there have not been any catastrophes of this magnitude, these risks are not salient to politicians and the public.72 This is an example of the misapplication of the availability heuristic, a mental shortcut which assumes that something is important only if it can be readily recalled. Another cognitive bias affecting perceptions of existential risk is scope neglect. In a seminal 1992 study, three groups were asked how much they would be willing to pay to save 2,000, 20,000 or 200,000 birds from drowning in uncovered oil ponds. The groups answered $80, $78, and $88, respectively.73 In this case, the size of the benefits had little effect on the scale of the preferred response. People become numbed to the effect of saving lives when the numbers get too large. 74 Scope neglect is a particularly acute problem for existential risk because the numbers at stake are so large. Due to scope neglect, decision-makers are prone to treat existential risks in a similar way to problems which are less severe by many orders of magnitude. A wide range of other cognitive biases are likely to affect the evaluation of existential risks.75
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### DA – Infrastructure

#### Infrastructure will pass – Biden gets it done and it is enough for climate

Clayton 11/4 [Ag Policy Editor Chris Clayton has been writing and editing for DTN/The Progressive Farmer since 2005 after working more than seven years as a reporter for the Omaha World-Herald. Chris has been recognized as writer of the year by the American Agricultural Editors' Association and won story of the year multiple times from the organization. He also has won the Glenn Cunningham Agricultural Journalist of the Year Award from the North American Agricultural Journalists and served as the group's president in 2012-13. The National Farmers Union and American Coalition for Ethanol also each have named Chris communicator of the year. November 4, 2021. “Democrats move to vote on Policy agenda” [https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/news/article/2021/11/04/biden-reflects-urgency-get-things Accessed 11/4](https://www.dtnpf.com/agriculture/web/ag/news/article/2021/11/04/biden-reflects-urgency-get-things%20Accessed%2011/4) //gord0]

OMAHA (DTN) -- After key election losses such as the Virginia governor's race, House Democrats are seeking to move ahead on President Joe Biden's domestic policies with an expected vote on the $1.75 trillion "Build Back Better Act."

The newest version of the bill was sent to the House Rules Committee on Wednesday afternoon with the committee holding a marathon late-night hearing to detail rules for debate if the bill gets to a floor vote this week.

Speaking at the White House on Wednesday, Biden said he understands people want to see Democrats "get things done." The president said he's pushing members of his party to give final passage to the $1.2 trillion infrastructure bill, as well as the mix of social programs and tax changes in the Build Back Better Act.

"People are upset and uncertain about a lot of things -- from COVID, to school, to jobs, to a whole range of things, and the cost of a gallon of gasoline," Biden said. "And so, if I'm able to pass -- sign into law my Build Back Better initiative, I'm in a position where you're going to see a lot of those things ameliorated quickly and swiftly. And so that has to be done."

Still, Biden's agenda remains caught between moderates and liberals in his own party, leaving open questions of whether House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., can schedule a floor vote on the bill.

The House Agriculture Committee released details highlighting $87.4 billion in spending on agriculture, including $28 billion for conservation programs, $27 billion for forestry, $18 billion for rural development, $12 billion for farmer debt relief and $2 billion for agricultural research.

On taxes, the bill changes the current 21% rate and provides a tax cut to 18% for corporations with taxable income below $400,000. The tax is increased to 26.5% for corporations with incomes higher than $5 million. The bill also sets a minimum 15% corporate tax for companies that zero out their tax liability.

The bill also boosts the valuation benefit of Section 2032 A for farmland, raising the land value deduction from $750,000 to $11.7 million.

The bill also increases taxes on higher-income people and limits deductions of qualified business income (Section 199A) for married couples with more than $500,000 in taxable income on a joint return.

For families, the bill extends the $3,600 Child Tax Credit and expands the Earned Income Credit for low-wage workers without children.

A provision drawing criticism is an agreement to expand the State and Local Taxes (SALT) deduction from $10,000 to $72,500. Republicans pointed out the provision largely helps wealthier people because most people now take advantage of the $24,000 standard deduction.

More Recommended for You

"The people left in the poor rural areas of my district are going to get left out," said Rep. Tom Rice, R-S.C., pointing to the changes on SALT.

The bill also includes a provision allowing Health and Human Services officials to negotiate certain prescription drug prices for Medicare.

Despite earlier objections from the Senate parliamentarian, the House bill also includes immigration provisions, including granting permanent residency status for farmworkers and other undocumented immigrations who were considered essential workers early in the pandemic. The bill also includes legal immigration status for children who came into the U.S. with their parents, known as "Dreamers." The White House stated the bill also will reform the immigration system to reduce the visa backlog.

The White House released a fact sheet on rural communities, championing the "landmark new program," the Rural Partnership Program, which will provide $970 million for states and tribes to use for competitive rural economic grant programs.

Kelliann Blazek, special assistant to the president for agriculture and rural policy, highlighted the Rural Partnership Program in an interview with DTN. Blazek noted that eight out of 10 counties with high levels of poverty are in rural areas of the country and have fewer resources for local development.

"So, we're taking a bottom-up approach and putting rural communities in the driver's seat so they have the tools and resources to evaluate their goals and then we'll help them get there," Blazek said.

The White House also spotlighted $9.7 billion in loans for rural electric providers and a separate $2.88 billion for electric loans to boost renewable energy. The investment is the largest since the Rural Electrification Act for providing energy to rural America, the White House stated.

On the $28 billion in conservation spending, the bill increases funds for USDA's major conservation programs to focus on climate-smart agricultural practices. That includes $9 billion for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), $7.45 billion for the Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP), $4.1 billion for the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP), and $1.7 billion for the Agricultural Conservation Easement Program. The White House stated that "at its peak," the climate-smart programs could reach as many as 130 million crop acres.

"The president believes farmers and ranchers are part of the solution when it comes to climate change, and from the very start of this administration, we've been seeking input from and listening to farmers and ranchers and rural communities to inform our climate agenda," Blazek said.

Republicans testifying before the Rules Committee challenged the $1.75 trillion costs of the bill, arguing the actual costs were higher. They added that the costs of the bill would add "further fuel for the fire" on inflation. Pointing to the creation of the Civilian Conservation Corps that would operate out of USDA, Rep. Bruce Westerman, R-Ark., said the recreation of a 1930s New Deal program would compete for workers.

"Why create a government jobs program when every employer I run across tells me they can't find people to work," Westerman said.

Rep. Jim McGovern, D-Mass., chairman of the House Rules Committee, pointed to the benefit of the reconciliation package and the $1.2 trillion Senate-passed infrastructure bill, which is tied up because House Democrats will not pass it until they vote on the Build Back Better Act. McGovern noted Republicans could not get an infrastructure bill passed when President Donald Trump was in charge and Republicans controlled Congress.

"Every week was infrastructure week," McGovern said. He added, "The reason I am anxious to get both of these bills done is people want us to deliver. They are tired of talk and no action. And, you know, they are tired of the polarization. And so, you know, people are talking about these bills as a political calculation, but at the end of the day, you know, if we can get this done, it's going to be meaningful in people's lives," McGovern said.

#### Strengthening unions requires Biden’s political capital – PRO act proves

Birenbaum 21 [Charles S. Birenbaum serves as the firm’s Chair of Northern California and Co-Chair of the firm’s Labor & Employment Practice’s Labor-Management Relations group. Chuck is an experienced labor and employment attorney who focuses his practice on traditional labor and employment law matters, and has wide-ranging experience litigating in state and federal courts as well as various administrative agencies. March 12, 2021. “The New New Deal? U.S. House Of Representatives Passes Sweeping Labor Reform With Significant but Uncertain Future” [https://www.natlawreview.com/article/new-new-deal-us-house-representatives-passes-sweeping-labor-reform-significant Accessed 10/27](https://www.natlawreview.com/article/new-new-deal-us-house-representatives-passes-sweeping-labor-reform-significant%20Accessed%2010/27) //gord0]

Unions are back in the news. On March 9, 2021, the U.S. House of Representatives successfully passed the Protect the Right to Organize Act (the PRO Act), legislation designed to overhaul the current labor relations framework—touching on issues including independent contractors, joint employers, employee arbitration agreements, and new union organizing rules. While Senate passage may not happen, President Biden’s insistence on being the “most pro-union president” could make the PRO Act a legislative priority later in his term.

**I.  Expanding the Class of Covered Employees**

The PRO Act contains a host of laws and definitional revisions that significantly expand the class of employees covered by the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| a. |  | Independent Contractor Classifications |

The PRO Act redefines “employees” under the NLRA, by codifying the “ABC Test” for independent contractors used by certain states (such as California and Massachusetts). In practice, this new definition will significantly expand the class of eligible “employees” entitled to unionization and collective bargaining rights by making it more difficult for employers to categorize workers as independent contractors.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| b. |  | Joint-Employer Classifications |

The PRO Act redefines “employers” under the NLRA, by codifying the liberal joint-employer standard announced in Browning-Ferris Industries, (2015) 362 NLRB No. 186. The new standard looks to the “right-to-control” any terms and conditions of employment of a workforce, even if indirectly and even if never exercised in fact. This test will create labor liability for businesses that traditionally have not had that liability.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| c. |  | State Right-To-Work Laws |

The PRO Act overturns all state “right-to-work” laws. States would no longer be able to prohibit union security and dues check-off clauses if placed in collective bargaining agreements. Mandatory union dues deduction for virtually all employees covered by a collective bargaining agreement could provide unions with financial incentives to bolster their efforts in the 27 states currently with right-to-work laws.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| d. |  | Employee Arbitration Agreements |

The PRO Act outlaws class, collective, and joint-action employment arbitration agreements—rending them illegal. The change would circumvent the recent U.S. Supreme Court decision, Epic Systems Corp v. Lewis (2018) 138 S. Ct. 1612, upholding the use of these types of agreements under the Federal Arbitration Act.

**II.  Employer and Union Economic Pressure Tactics**

Hard bargaining is often an inescapable reality of unions relations, and one that has been finely tuned through legislation, litigation, and judicial precedent over the last 90 years. The PRO Act disrupts that balance by changing the rules of engagement for unions and employers alike—with preferential treatment of union rights. For unions, the PRO Act lifts the ban on previously prohibited tactics like recurrent and intermittent strikes, as well as secondary boycotts and related pressure tactics against neutral third parties, like the protest or picketing of an employer’s clients, customers, or vendors. For employers, the PRO Act goes the other direction by imposing new bans on previously common and currently lawful tactics, such as pre-strike lockouts and the hiring of permanent replacement workers for striking employees—a significant blow to employers’ bargaining leverage and ability to operate during a strike.

**III.  Employer, Union, and Employee Communication Rights**

Communication during election campaigns and collective bargaining is integral for all sides—providing a platform to air grievances and novel perspectives on the relative pros and cons of unionization or contracted terms. The PRO Act alters these rights in several ways. For employers, the PRO Act prohibits the holding of mandatory employment meetings where they can educate employees on the employer’s historic experiences and perspectives. In contrast, the bill forces employers to allow employees to use company devices and email systems for any union organizing or concerted, protected activity—even though not work-related. And in advance of the elections themselves, employers are obligated to turn over employees’ personal contact information to unions.

**IV.  Union Election and Collective Bargaining Practices**

Elections and collective bargaining lie at the heart of modern labor law. The PRO Act disrupts longstanding practices in these critical areas. On the elections side, the Act gives unions substantial control of the appropriate bargaining unit, as well as the method and location of elections, while depriving employers of standing to intervene in the decision-making process regarding those issues. When determining the results of an election, the Act imposes harsh penalties for the commission of unfair labor practices by the employer, including bargaining orders irrespective of employee votes against unionization. And once bargaining begins, in certain cases the parties are required to reach agreement within 90 days or become subject to mandatory mediation and interest arbitration—all of which stands as an overhaul to current practices.

**V.  Increase in Employer Exposure**

Employer exposure for NLRA violations is also increased under the PRO Act. Liability would include: (a) backpay; (b) front pay; (c) consequential damages; (d) liquidated damages; (e) civil penalties; and (f) punitive damages. Depending on the violation and circumstances, civil penalties can range as high as $100,000 per violation and be imposed against employers, officers, and directors. The Act also gives employees a private right of action to pursue certain remedies in federal court—a break from the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) prior jurisdictional exclusivity.

**VI.  Moving Forward**

The PRO Act’s passage in the Senate appears a challenge. Despite sweeping approval by the House and even modest bipartisan support, Senate passage remains a significant hurdle. Under current Senate rules, to avoid filibuster, the Act would require all 50 Democratic votes and 10 Republican votes—neither of which appears likely based on recent history. And legislative alternatives to gridlock, such as budget reconciliation or abolishing the filibuster, may also encounter significant resistance. Given President Biden’s public and oft-repeated support for labor unions, it remains to be seen whether the PRO Act, and political capital necessary for its passage, ultimately become a larger priority for President Biden further into his term.

#### Bidens PC is what got infrastructure through the senate, and its key now.

Smith and Gambino 10/1 [David Smith is the Guardian's Washington DC bureau chief. Lauren Gambino is political correspondent for Guardian US, based in Washington DC. October 1, 2021. “Biden upbeat on rare Capitol Hill visit but domestic agenda hangs in jeopardy” [https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/oct/01/democrats-congress-biden-infrastructure-talks Accessed 10/25](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/oct/01/democrats-congress-biden-infrastructure-talks%20Accessed%2010/25) //gord0]

Democrats returned to the Capitol on Friday deeply divided but determined to make progress on Joe Biden’s ambitious economic vision, after an embarrassing setback delayed a planned vote on a related $1tn measure to improve the nation’s infrastructure.

Biden on Friday made a rare visit to Capitol Hill to meet privately with House Democrats amid a stalemate that has put his sprawling domestic agenda in jeopardy. The visit comes after after the House speaker, Nancy Pelosi, [delayed a vote on part of his economic agenda,](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/sep/30/biden-nancy-pelosi-infrastructure-bill) a bipartisan $1tn public works measure, on Thursday night after a frantic day of negotiations failed to produce a deal.

“We’re going to get this thing done,” Biden said, as he exited the caucus room. “It doesn’t matter when – it doesn’t matter whether it’s in six minutes, six days, or six weeks – we’re going to get it done.”

Earlier in the day, Pelosi promised that there would be a “vote today” on the measure, an ambitious timeline that would require Democrats first reaching a compromise on the broader piece of Biden’s agenda that virtually every member of the party in both the House and Senate could support. But a resolution before the weekend appeared unlikely as Democrats remained deeply at odds over the scale and structure of a more expansive package containing containing a host of progressive priorities, provisions to expand health care access, establish paid leave, combat climate change and reduce poverty – all underwritten by tax increases on wealthy Americans and corporations.

Democrats are trying to score a major legislative victory with razor-thin majorities in both chambers. Failure would deny Biden much of his domestic agenda, leaving the party with little to show for their time controlling the White House, the Senate and House – a governing trifecta they last enjoyed in 2010.

Senator Joe Manchin of West Virginia has proposed a spending package of about $1.5tn – less than half the size of the proposal put forward by the president and Democratic leaders. Another Democratic centrist, Senator Kyrsten Sinema, declined to say whether she agreed with Manchin’s proposal.

The wrangling resumed in the House on Friday morning, which, due to a quirk of process, [remained](https://twitter.com/HouseDailyPress/status/1443770307903475712) in the legislative day of 30 September even as the calendar turned to October.

Huddled together in an hours-long caucus meeting, Pelosi tried to steer the feuding factions within her party toward common ground after Thursday’s marathon negotiating session generated deepening acrimony and no deal.

Congresswoman Pramila Jayapal, chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, emerged from the morning gathering optimistic that Democrats would eventually pass both bills. But she remained firm in her position – and confident in her members – that there the infrastructure bill would not move forward without assurances that the Senate would pass Biden’s larger bill.

“We’ve seen more progress in the last 48 hours than we’ve seen in a long time on reconciliation,” she said, crediting progressives’ infrastructure revolt for forcing Manchin and Sinema to the negotiating table.

The decision to postpone the infrastructure vote was seen as a victory for progressives who were unwavering in their resolve to “hold the line” and vote against the bill unless they received “ironclad” commitments that Biden’s proposed $3.5tn social and environmental package would also pass.

Many progressives also say they will withhold support for the infrastructure bill until the Senate passes the second piece of Biden’s economic agenda, legislation that has yet to be written. Jayapal made clear this was her preference, but later left the door open to the possibility that the party could reach an agreement without a vote.

“If there’s something else that’s short of a vote … that gives me those same assurances, I want to listen to that,” she told reporters.

The stalemate also laid bare deep ideological fractures within the party. Unlike the debate over Barack Obama’s healthcare legislation a decade ago, progressives appear to be more closely aligned with the president and able to flex their political muscles. On Thursday they were united in making the case that centrists are now in the minority.

Varshini Prakash, executive director of Sunrise Movement, a youth group fighting the climate crisis, [said:](https://mailchi.mp/sunrisemovement/sunrise-movement-responds-to-delay-of-bif-sinema-and-manchin-are-to-blame?e=18cba0fd52) “Tonight, we are so proud of progressives for holding the line. But let’s be clear, progressives are not the ones delaying the vote – Joe Manchin and Kyrsten Sinema are.”

Thursday’s delay could anger moderates and cause further infighting that puts Biden’s agenda at risk. Earlier this week Stephanie Murphy, a congresswoman from Florida, warned: “If the vote were to fail or be delayed, there would be a significant breach of trust.”

Republicans who had supported the infrastructure bill in the Senate also acknowledged the setback. Senators Rob Portman, Bill Cassidy, Susan Collins, Lisa Murkowski and Mitt Romney said in a joint statement: “While we are disappointed the [House of Representatives](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/house-of-representatives) did not meet its deadline to vote on the bipartisan infrastructure bill, we remain hopeful the House will come together in a spirit of bipartisanship just as the Senate did and pass this important piece of legislation.

“This bill is critically important to modernizing and upgrading everything from our roads and bridges to broadband and increasing the resiliency of the nation’s electrical grid.”

Both pieces of legislation are critical to Biden’s economic vision. While he has staked his domestic agenda – and his legacy – on a $3.5tn social policy package, he invested precious political capital in courting Republicans to support the infrastructure bill, part of a campaign promise to usher in a new era of bipartisanship in Congress. The bill passed the Senate in August, with 19 Republican votes and great fanfare.

#### Infrastructure reform solves Climate Change, extinction!

USA Today 7-20 7-20-2021 "Climate change is at 'code red' status for the planet, and inaction is no longer an option" <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/todaysdebate/2021/07/20/climate-change-biden-infrastructure-bill-good-start/7877118002/> //Elmer

**Not long ago**, **climate change** for many Americans **was** like **a distant bell**. News of starving polar bears or melting glaciers was tragic and disturbing, but other worldly. Not any more. **Top climate scientists** from around the world **warned of a "code red for humanity**" in a report issued Monday that says severe, human-caused global warming is become unassailable. Proof of the findings by the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is a now a factor of daily life. Due to **intense heat waves and drought**, 107 wildfires – including the largest ever in California – are now raging across the West, consuming 2.3 million acres. Earlier this summer, hundreds of people died in unprecedented triple-digit heat in Oregon, Washington and western Canada, when a "heat dome" of enormous proportions settled over the region for days. Some victims brought by stretcher into crowded hospital wards had body temperatures so high, their nervous systems had shut down. People collapsed trying to make their way to cooling shelters. Heat-trapping greenhouse gases Scientists say the event was almost **certainly made worse and more intransigent by human-caused climate change**. They attribute it to a combination of warming Arctic temperatures and a growing accumulation of heat-trapping greenhouse gases caused by the burning of fossil fuels. The **consequences of** what mankind has done to the atmo**sphere are now inescapable**. Periods of **extreme heat** are projected to **double** in the lower 48 states by 2100. **Heat deaths** are far **outpacing every other form of weather killer** in a 30-year average. A **persistent megadrought** in America's West continues to create tinder-dry conditions that augur another devastating wildfire season. And scientists say **warming oceans** are **fueling** ever **more powerful storms**, evidenced by Elsa and the early arrival of hurricane season this year. Increasingly severe weather is causing an estimated $100 billion in damage to the United States every year. "It is honestly surreal to see your projections manifesting themselves in real time, with all the suffering that accompanies them. It is heartbreaking," said climate scientist Katharine Hayhoe. **Rising seas** from global warming Investigators are still trying to determine what led to the collapse of a Miami-area condominium that left more than 100 dead or missing. But one concerning factor is the corrosive effect on reinforced steel structures of encroaching saltwater, made worse in Florida by a foot of rising seas from global warming since the 1900s. The clock is ticking for planet Earth. While the U.N. report concludes some level of severe climate change is now unavoidable, there is still a window of time when far more catastrophic events can be mitigated. But mankind must act soon to curb the release of heat-trapping gases. Global **temperature** has **risen** nearly **2 degrees** Fahrenheit since the pre-industrial era of the late 19th century. Scientists warn that in a decade, it could surpass a **2.7**-degree increase. That's **enough** warming **to cause catastrophic climate changes**. After a brief decline in global greenhouse gas emissions during the pandemic, pollution is on the rise. Years that could have been devoted to addressing the crisis were wasted during a feckless period of inaction by the Trump administration. Congress must act Joe Biden won the presidency promising broad new policies to cut America's greenhouse gas emissions. But Congress needs to act on those ideas this year. Democrats cannot risk losing narrow control of one or both chambers of Congress in the 2022 elections to a Republican Party too long resistant to meaningful action on the climate. So what's at issue? A trillion dollar **infrastructure bill** negotiated between Biden and a group of centrist senators (including 10 Republicans) is a start. In addition to repairing bridges, roads and rails, it would **improve access** by the nation's power infrastructure **to renewable energy sources,** **cap millions of abandoned oil and gas wells spewing greenhouse gases**, **and harden structures against climate change**. It also **offers tax credits for** the **purchase of electric vehicles** and funds the construction of charging stations. (**The nation's largest source of climate pollution are gas-powered vehicles**.) Senate approval could come very soon. Much **more is needed** if the nation is going to reach Biden's necessary goal of cutting U.S. climate pollution in half from 2005 levels by 2030. His ideas worth considering include a federal clean electricity standard for utilities, federal investments and tax credits to promote renewable energy, and tens of billions of dollars in clean energy research and development, including into ways of extracting greenhouse gases from the skies. Another idea worth considering is a fully refundable carbon tax. **The vehicle** for these additional proposals **would be a second infrastructure bill**. And if Republicans balk at the cost of such vital investment, Biden is rightly proposing to pass this package through a process known as budget reconciliation, which allows bills to clear the Senate with a simple majority vote. These are drastic legislative steps. But drastic times call for them. And when Biden attends a U.N. climate conference in November, he can use American progress on climate change as a mean of persuading others to follow our lead. Further delay is not an option.

## 1NC – Framework

### Kant

#### Indifference – Even if there are apriori moral truths, I can choose to ignore them. Cognition is binding – if I put my hand on a hot stove, I can’t turn off my natural aversion to it.

#### A priori truth:

#### Uncertainty – sharing experiences solves and universal principles of pleasure and pain can be applied to everyone

#### Naturalistic Fallacy – Its wrong. Past experiences can guide future action – if I throw a baseball upward and it hits the ground I can reasonably assume that will happen again.

#### Practical Reason – doesn’t solve regress, reason can also be regressive because you can always reason about reason which answers the aggregation indicts.

#### Induction not circular – it’s a scientifically sound principle of causality – we know the sun will rise tomorrow because we understand celestial bodies not because it rose yesterday

#### Action theory – it’s a bad form of viewing ethics, deosn’t mean anything – also aggregation solves

#### Universality: Knowledge is based on experience – I wouldn’t know 2+2=4 without experience of objects nor the color red without some experience of color. We can’t obtain evidence of goodness without experience.

#### Farr:

#### 1] Extinction is the most exclusive because everyone dies, and the worst off are disproportionately affected by warming since low income neighborhoods are the first to feel the effects.

#### 2] You don’t solve oppression – exclusion can still happen given intrinsic understandings of morality.

#### AFC:

#### Counter interpretation – we can contest the aff framework

#### A] Topic lit – most articles are written through the lens of util because they’re crafted for policymakers and the general public who take consequences to be important, not philosophy majors. Key to fairness and education – the lit is where we do research and determines how we engage in the round.

#### B] Ground – every impact functions under util whereas other ethics flow to one side exclusively. Kills fairness since we both need arguments to win

#### Performativity is wrong – supporting a moral theory doesn’t necessitate Kant, thousands of years of other theories proves. Also doesn’t prove Kant – simply proves that we at some level for some reason enjoy some sort of freedom

#### No strat skew— a] don’t need to know all frameworks pre-round they can just extemp answers b] prep is part of the game if you defend Kant you should have to beat back other NCs.

#### Their contention ed standard wrong-- Standards debate is part of the topic debate—there’s no benefit to discussing the topic without discussing which impacts are relevant AND framework debates gives us a larger variety of topical arguments like Ks

## CASE

#### 1] Strikes violate individual autonomy by exercising coercion.

Gourevitch 18 [Alex; Brown University; “The Right to Strike: A Radical View,” American Political Science Review; 2018; [https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321]](https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321%5d//SJWen) Justin

\*\*Edited for ableist language

Every liberal democracy recognizes that workers have a right to strike. That right is protected in law, sometimes in the constitution itself. Yet strikes pose serious problems for liberal societies. They involve violence and coercion, they often violate some basic liberal liberties, they appear to involve group rights having priority over individual ones, and they can threaten public order itself. Strikes are also one of the most common forms of disruptive collective protest in modern history. Even given the dramatic decline in strike activity since its peak in the 1970s, they can play significant roles in our lives. For instance, just over the past few years in the United States, large illegal strikes by teachers ~~paralyzed~~ froze major school districts in Chicago and Seattle, as well as statewide in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and Colorado; a strike by taxi drivers played a major role in debates and court decisions regarding immigration; and strikes by retail and foodservice workers were instrumental in getting new minimum wage and other legislation passed in states like California, New York, and North Carolina. Yet, despite their significance, there is almost no political philosophy written about strikes.1 This despite the enormous literature on neighboring forms of protest like nonviolence, civil disobedience, conscientious refusal, and social movements.

The right to strike raises far more issues than a single essay can handle. In what follows, I address a particularly significant problem regarding the right to strike and its relation to coercive strike tactics. I argue that strikes present a dilemma for liberal societies because for most workers to have a reasonable chance of success they need to use some coercive strike tactics. But these coercive strike tactics both violate the law and infringe upon what are widely held to be basic liberal rights. To resolve this dilemma, we have to know why workers have the right to strike in the first place. I argue that the best way of understanding the right to strike is as a right to resist the oppression that workers face in the standard liberal capitalist economy. This way of understanding the right explains why the use of coercive strike tactics is not morally constrained by the requirement to respect the basic liberties nor the related laws that strikers violate when using certain coercive tactics.

#### 2] Means to an end: employees ignore their duty to help their patients in favor of higher wages which treats them as a means to an end.

#### 3] The aff homogenizes all strikes as an unconditional right which is unethical.

Loewy 2K, Erich H. "Of healthcare professionals, ethics, and strikes." Cambridge Q. Healthcare Ethics 9 (2000): 513. (Erich H. Loewy M.D., F.A.C.P., was born in Vienna, Austria in 1927 and was able to escape first to England and then to the U.S. in late 1938. He was initially trained as a cardiologist. He taught at Case Western Reserve and practiced in Cleveland, Ohio. After 14 years he devoted himself fully to Bioethics and taught at the University of Illinois for 12 years. In 1996 he was selected as the first endowed Alumni Association Chair of Bioethics at the University of California Davis School of Medicine and has taught there since.) JG

It would seem then that the ethical considerations for workers striking in an industry such as a shoe factory or a chain grocery store are quite different from the ethical considerations for workers in sanitation, police, or fire departments, or for professionals such as teachers or those involved directly in healthcare. Even in the latter “professional” category, there are subtle but distinct differences of “rights” and obligations. However, one cannot conclude that for workers in essential industries strikes are simply ethically not permissible, whereas they are permissible for workers in less essential industries. Strikes, by necessity, injure another, and injuring another cannot be ethically neutral. Injuring others is prima facie ethically problematic—that is, unless a good and weighty argument for doing so can be made, injuring another is not ethically proper. Striking by a worker, in as much as doing so injures another or others, is only a conditional right. A compelling ethical argument in favor of striking is needed as well as an ethical argument in favor of striking at the time and in the way planned. It remains to delineate the conditions under which strikes, especially strikes by workers in essential industries and even more so by persons who consider themselves to be “professionals,” may legitimately proceed and yet fulfill their basic purpose.

#### ~~4] Free-riding: strikes are a form of free-riding since those who don’t participate still reap the benefits.~~

~~Dolsak and Prakash 19 [Nives and Aseem; We write on environmental issues, climate politics and NGOs; “Climate Strikes: What They Accomplish And How They Could Have More Impact,” 9/14/19; Forbes;~~ [~~https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/09/14/climate-strikes-what-they-accomplish-and-how-they-could-have-more-impact/?sh=2244a9bd5eed~~](https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/09/14/climate-strikes-what-they-accomplish-and-how-they-could-have-more-impact/?sh=2244a9bd5eed)~~] Justin~~

~~While strikes and protests build solidarity among their supporters, they are susceptible to collective action problems. This is because~~ **~~the goals that strikers pursue tend to create non-excludable benefits~~**~~. That is, benefits such as climate protection can be enjoyed by both strikers and non-strikers. Thus, large participation in climate strikes will reveal that in spite of free-riding problems, a large number of people have a strong preference for climate action.~~

### Advantage

#### ~~Zero impact to warming~~

~~Hart 15 (Michael, he’s the Simon Reisman chair at the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University in Ottawa, former Fulbright-Woodrow Wilson Center Visiting Research, he was also a Scholar-in-Residence in the School of International Service and a Senior Fellow in the Center for North American Studies at American University in Washington, a former official in Canada’s Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, where he specialized in trade policy and trade negotiations, MA from the University of Toronto and is the author, editor, or co-editor of more than a dozen books, “Hubris: The Troubling Science, Economics, and Politics of Climate Change”, google books)~~

~~As already noted, the IPCC scenarios themselves are wildly alarmist, not only on the basic science but also on the underlying economic assumptions, which in turn drive the alarmist impacts. The result cannot withstand critical analysis. Economists Ian Castles and David Henderson, for example, show the extent to which the analysis is driven by the desire to reach predetermined outcomes.50 Other economists have similarly wondered what purpose was served by pursuing such unrealistic scenarios. It is hard to credit the defense put forward by Mike Hulme, one of the creators of the scenarios, that the IPCC is not engaged in forecasting the future but in creating “plausible” story lines of what might happen under various scenarios.51 Each scare scenario is based on linear projections without any reference to technological developments or adaptation. If, on a similar linear basis, our Victorian ancestors in the UK, worried about rapid urbanization and population growth in London, had made similar projections, they would have pointed to the looming crisis arising from reliance on horse-drawn carriages and omnibuses; they would have concluded that by the middle of the 20th century, London would be knee-deep in horse manure, and all of the southern counties would be required to grow the oats and hay to feed and bed the required number of horses. Technology progressed and London adapted. Why should the rest of humanity not be able to do likewise in the face of a trivial rise in temperature over the course of more than a century? The work on physical impacts is equally over the top. All the scenarios assume only negative impacts, ignore the reality of adaptation, and attribute any and all things bad to global warming. Assuming the GHG theory to be correct means that its impact would be most evident at night and during the winter in reducing atmospheric heat loss to outer space.52 It would have greater impact in increasing minimum temperatures than in increasing maximum temperatures. Secondary studies, however, generally ignore this facet of the hypothesis. The IPCC believes that a warmer world will harm human health due, for example, to increased disease, malnutrition, heat-waves, floods, storms, and cardiovascular incidents. As already noted there is no basis for the claim about severe-weather-related threats or malnutrition. The claim about heat-related deaths gained a boost during the summer of 2003 because of the tragedy of some 15,000 alleged heat-related deaths in France as elderly people stayed behind in city apartments without air conditioning while their children enjoyed the heat at the sea shore during the August vacation. Epidemiological studies of so-called "excess" deaths resulting from heat waves are abused to get the desired results. Similar studies of the impact of cold spells show that they are far more lethal than heat waves and that it is much easier to adapt to heat than to cold.53 More fundamentally, this, like most of the alarmist literature, ignores the basics of the AGW hypothesis: the world will not see an exponential increase in summer, daytime heat (and thus more heat waves), but a decrease in night-time and winter cooling, particularly at higher latitudes and altitudes. Based on the AGW hypothesis, Canada, China, Korea, Northern Europe, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Chile, and Argentina will see warmer winters and warmer nights. There are clear benefits to such a development, even if there may also be problems, but the AGW industry tends to ignore the positive aspects of their alarmist scenarios. The feared spread of malaria, a much repeated claim, is largely unrelated to climate. Malaria’s worst recorded outbreak was in Siberia long before there was any discussion of AGW. Similarly, the building of the Rideau Canal in Ottawa in the 1820s was severely hampered by outbreaks of malaria due to the proximity of mosquito-infested wetlands in the area. Malaria remains widespread in tropical countries today in part because of the UN’s lengthy embargo on the use of DDT, the legacy of an earlier alarmist disaster. Temperature is but one factor, and a minor one at that, in the multiple factors that affect the rise or decline in the presence of disease-spreading mosquitoes. Wealthier western countries have pursued public health strategies that have reduced the incidence of the dis- ease in their countries. Entomologist Paul Reiter, widely recognized as the leading specialist on malaria vectors and a contributor to some of the early work of the IPCC, was aghast to learn how his careful and systematic analysis of the potential impacts had been twisted in ways that he could not endorse. In a recent paper, he concludes: “Simplistic reasoning on the future prevalence of malaria is ill-founded; malaria is not limited by climate in most temperate regions, nor in the tropics, and in nearly all cases, ’new' malaria at high altitudes is well below the maximum altitudinal limits for transmission. Future changes in climate may alter the prevalence and incidence of the disease, but obsessive emphasis on ’global warming' as a dominant parameter is indefensible; the principal determinants are linked to ecological and societal change, politics and economics.”54 Catastrophic species loss similarly has little foundation in past experience.55 Even if the GHG hypothesis were to be correct, its impact would be slow, providing significant scope and opportunity for adaptation, including by ﬂora and fauna. One of the more irresponsible claims was made by a group of UK modelers who fed wildly improbable scenarios and data into their computers and produced the much-touted claim of massive species loss by the end of the century. There are literally thousands of websites devoted to spreading alarm about species loss and biodiversity. Global warming is but one of many claimed human threats to the planet’s biodiversity. The claims, fortunately, are largely hype, based on computer models and the estimate by Harvard naturalist Edward O. Wilson that 27,000 to 100,000 species are lost annually - a figure he advanced purely hypothetically but which has become one of the most persistent of environmental urban myths. The fact is that scientists have no idea of the extent of the world's ﬂora and fauna, with estimates ranging from five million to 100 million species, and that there are no reliable data about the rate of loss. By some estimates, 95 per cent of the species that ever existed have been lost over the eons, most before humans became major players in altering their environment. A much more credible estimate of recent species loss comes from a surprising source, the UN Environmental Program. It reports that known species loss is slowing reaching its lowest level in 500 years in the last three decades of the 20th century, with some 20 reported extinctions despite increasing pressure on the biosphere from growing human population and industrialization.57 The alarmist community has also introduced the scientifically unknown concept of "locally extinct,” often meaning little more than that a species of plant or animal has responded to adverse conditions by moving to more hospitable circumstances, e.g., birds or butterflies becoming more numerous north of their range and disappearing at its extreme southern extent. Idso et al. conclude: “Many species have shown the ability to adapt rapidly to changes in climate. Claims that global warming threatens large numbers of species with extinction typically rest on a false definition of extinction (the loss of a particular population rather than en- tire species) and speculation rather than real-world evidence. The world’s species have proven very resilient, having survived past natural climate cycles that involved much greater warming and higher C02 concentrations than exist today or are likely to exist in the coming centuries?“~~

#### ~~Alarmists have hijacked the global warming debate by cutting off funding for skeptical scientists~~

~~The Telegraph 07 (Tom Harper, Novermber 3,~~ [~~http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1545134/Scientists-threatened-for-%27climate-denial%27.html#continue~~](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1545134/Scientists-threatened-for-'climate-denial'.html#continue)~~)~~

~~Scientists who questioned mankind's impact on climate change have received death threats and claim to have been shunned by the scientific community. They say the debate on global warming has been "hijacked" by a powerful alliance of politicians, scientists and environmentalists who have stifled all questioning about the true environmental impact of carbon dioxide emissions. Timothy Ball, a former climatology professor at the University of Winnipeg in Canada, has received five deaths threats by email since raising concerns about the degree to which man was affecting climate change. One of the emails warned that, if he continued to speak out, he would not live to see further global warming. "Western governments have pumped billions of dollars into careers and institutes and they feel threatened," said the professor. "I can tolerate being called a sceptic because all scientists should be sceptics, but then they started calling us deniers, with all the connotations of the Holocaust. That is an obscenity. It has got really nasty and personal." Last week, Professor Ball appeared in The Great Global Warming Swindle, a Channel 4 documentary in which several scientists claimed the theory of man-made global warming had become a "religion", forcing alternative explanations to be ignored. Richard Lindzen, the professor of Atmospheric Science at Massachusetts Institute of Technology - who also appeared on the documentary - recently claimed: "Scientists who dissent from the alarmism have seen their funds disappear, their work derided, and themselves labelled as industry stooges. "Consequently, lies about climate change gain credence even when they fly in the face of the science." Dr Myles Allen, from Oxford University, agreed. He said: "The Green movement has hijacked the issue of climate change. It is ludicrous to suggest the only way to deal with the problem is to start micro managing everyone, which is what environmentalists seem to want to do." Nigel Calder, a former editor of New Scientist, said: "Governments are trying to achieve unanimity by stifling any scientist who disagrees. Einstein could not have got funding under the present system."~~

#### ~~CO2’s key to agriculture -- extinction~~

~~Ferrara 14 (Peter, J.D. Harvard Law, contributor to Forbes on climate and public policy, Director of Entitlement and Budget Policy for the Heartland Institute, Senior Advisor for Entitlement Reform and Budget Policy at the National Tax Limitation Foundation, General Counsel for the American Civil Rights Union, and Senior Fellow at the National Center for Policy Analysis, served in the White House Office of Policy Development under President Reagan, and as Associate Deputy Attorney General of the United States under President George H.W. Bush, “The Period Of No Global Warming Will Soon Be Longer Than the Period of Actual Global Warming”, http://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2014/02/24/the-period-of-no-global-warming-will-soon-be-longer-than-the-period-of-actual-global-warming/#42cc9ebf8bf0)~~

~~In addition, CO2 is actually essential to all life on the planet. Plants need CO2 to grow and conduct photosynthesis, which is the natural process that creates food for animals and fish at the bottom of the food chain. The increase of CO2 in the atmosphere that has occurred due to human emissions has actually increased agricultural growth and output as a result, causing actually an increased greening of the planet. So has any warming caused by such human emissions, as minor warming increases agricultural growth. The report states, “CO2 is a vital nutrient used by plants in photosynthesis. Increasing CO2 in the atmosphere ‘greens’ the planet and helps feed the growing human population.”~~

#### ~~\*\*Elevated CO2 is key to cotton~~

~~Kakani et al 04 -- Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, Mississippi State University, Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, Mississippi State University, Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, Mississippi State University, and USDA UV-B Monitoring and Research Program, Natural Resource Ecology Laboratory, Colorado State University, Fort Collins (Vijaya Gopal Kakani, Kambham Raja Reddy, Duli Zhao and Wei Gao, 2004, “Senescence and hyperspectral reflectance of cotton leaves exposed to~~

~~ultraviolet-B radiation and carbon dioxide”, PHYSIOLOGIA PLANTARUM 121: 250–257. 2004, pubmed.gov | JJ)~~

~~Considerable growth and developmental variations occur in plants exposed to UV-B radiation and atmospheric [CO2 ]. Selection of leaves from a plant at different node positions provided us with leaves that differed in age, and the leaves at same node in different treatments enabled us to study the effect of different intensities of UV-B radiation and [CO2 ] on leaves of the same age. In cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L. cv. DES119), Sassenrath-Cole et al. (1996) found that changes in leaf photosynthetic responses to light environment during leaf ageing were solely as a result of physiological changes within the senescing leaf and not the result of photon flux density environment or shading. Decline in photosynthesis and chlorophyll are early symptoms of senescence, with chloroplasts as one of the primary targets for degradation (Thomas and Stoddart 1980, Grove and Mohanty 1992). In cotton, remobilization of leaf N to reproductive organs appears to be the principle component leading to photosynthetic decline (Pettigrew et al. 2000) and the data also suggest that environmental factors can play a role in causing the photosynthetic decline. In our study, atmospheric [CO2 ] did not alter the senescence as indicated by Pn and chlorophyll pigments. Elevated [CO2 ], however, increased Pn by 35% similar to that recorded in earlier studies in well-watered and well fertilized conditions (Reddy et al. 1997, 2000). In this study, at 0 kJ of UV-B and with increase in leafage, a decrease in Pn was recorded with no change in chlorophyll pigments indicating that decline in Pn is a stimulant for leaf senescence in cotton. The photosynthesis activity below a certain threshold level is known to induce leaf senescence (Smart 1994, Dai et al. 1999). Hensel et al. (1993) postulated that a decrease in photosynthesis efficiency reduces sugar levels that may be an early signal for induction of senescence. In the current study, near ambient UV-B radiation (7.7 kJ) reduced the Pn of30day-old leaves by 50% compared with that at 0 kJ UV-B radiation. In detached maize leaves, senescence induced loss of chlorophyll and photosynthesis was significantly enhanced by UV-B radiation (Biswal et al. 1997). Under high UV-B of15.1 kJ, the 12-day-old leaves had Pn on par with the 30-day-old leaves in the control treatment. The 21-day-old leaves exposed to high UV-B were on par with the 30-day-old leaves exposed to ambient and high UV-B, suggesting that these leaves were in a similar senescence phase as a result of their exposure to UV-B radiation. Thus, the UV-B radiation resulted in accelerated leaf ageing.~~

#### ~~Cotton’s key to the Pakistani economy~~

~~Nadeem et al 10 -- Department o f Agronomy, University o f Agriculture, Faisalabad , Pakistan, 1 = University College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences , Islamia University, Bahawalpur , Pakistan (Muhammad Ather Nadeem, Asghar Ali, Muhammad Tahir , Muhammad Naeem 1 , Asim Raza Chadhar and Sagheer Ahmad, 2010, “Effect of Nitrogen Levels and Plant Spacing on Growth and Yield of Cotton”, Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences, Vol. 8 No. 2,~~ [~~http://www.pjlss.edu.pk/sites/default/files/121-124%20(dr.%20Athar%202).pdf~~](http://www.pjlss.edu.pk/sites/default/files/121-124%20(dr.%20Athar%202).pdf) ~~| JJ)~~

~~Cotton (Gossypium hirsutum L.) is considered as mainstay of Pakistan’s economy. It is an important cash crop, major source of foreign exchange and plays an important role in agriculture, industry and economic development of the country. In Pakistan cotton is grown on an area is 3.22 million hectares with total production of 12417 thousand bales and average seed cotton yield of 732 kg ha -1 (Anonymous, 2007). Despite of concerted efforts of breeders and agronomists, yield per unit area is still far below from many other cotton producing countries of the world. Low yield of cotton in Pakistan is attributed to some production as well as economic constraints. Poor quality seed, low seed rate, low plant population, poor management or agronomic practices, conventional sowing methods, imbalanced fertilizer application, weed infestation and insect attack are main causes of its low yield. In cotton plant, spacing has effects on the growth and yield characteristics of the plant. Plant population (density) is very important for attaining optimum crop growth and yield under irrigated conditions. Mostly, farmers maintain plant spacing and density according to their traditional methods of planting rather than variety requirement and hence do not obtain the high crop yield. Hussain et al. (2000) reported that 30 cm spacing between cotton plants increased plant height, number of bolls per plant and boll weight as compared to 10 cm and 20 cm. However, plant spacing did not affect ginning out turn or fiber quality. On the other hand Muhammad et al. (2002) found that boll weight decreased by increasing plant population. The field conditions that produce short stature plants can generally tolerate higher plant density without incurring significant yield reduction (Hake et al., 1991). Adequate plant population facilitates the efficient use of applied fertilizers and irrigation (Abbas, 2000). When density is low, fruiting branches are longer and a greater percentage of bolls are produced on outer position of fruiting branches but first position bolls produced by high density are the biggest and best resulting in high yield. Fruit initiation was influenced by plant density in upland cotton (Buxton et al., 1977).~~

#### ~~Pakistan economic decline sparks nuclear war~~

~~Guthrie 2k~~ **~~--~~** ~~(Grant, J.D. candidate, 2000, University of California, Hastings College of the Law., Hastings International and Comparative Law Review “Nuclear Testing Rocks the Sub-Continent: Can International Law Halt the Impending Nuclear Conflict Between India and Pakistan?” Spring/Summer 2000, pg lexis wyo-ef)~~

~~Nuclear testing creates political instability because it requires a substantial economic investment. One, small fission device typically costs five million U.S. dollars to manufacture. 84 Pakistan's economy is fragile already. 85 Pakistan's total budget for 1996-1997 was $ 12.5 [\*503] billion, out of which 45 percent was spent on debt service and 24 percent on defense. 86 If Pakistan begins increasing its defense budget there will be nothing left for its people. 87 The spending effects of continued nuclear tests might bankrupt the Pakistani economy. One day, the Pakistani government might be forced to sell nuclear fuel, nuclear weapons or nuclear technology to generate capital. Uncontrollable nuclear proliferation could ensue and the world political regime might become destabilized. There are strong political forces contending for control of Pakistan. 88 Pakistan has been ruled on and off by the military for half of its history. 89 In October of 1999, Pakistan's democratically elected government was overthrown and traded for a military regime. 90 If Pakistan's political climate does not eventually stabilize, Pakistan may become divided and compartmentalized, like a warlord-ridden, nuclear Somalia. Each faction would control nuclear weapons and a nuclear civil war could ensue. The world could be at the mercy of a rogue nuclear state. The effect on the world could be incredibly destabilizing.~~

#### ~~This turns their warming impact~~

~~Duncan Clark 9, editorial environmental consultant to the London Guardian, co-director of GreenProfile, January 2, 2009, “The carbon footprint of nuclear war,” online: http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/blog/2009/jan/02/nuclear-war-emissions~~

~~Almost 700m [million] tonnes of CO2 would be released into the Earth's atmosphere by even the smallest nuclear conflict, according to a US study that compares the environmental costs of developing various power sources Just when you might have thought it was ethically sound to unleash a nuclear attack on a nearby city, along comes a pesky scientist and points out that atomic warfare is bad for the climate. According to a new paper in the journal Energy & Environmental Science, even a very limited nuclear exchange, using just a thousandth of the weaponry of a full-scale nuclear war, would cause up to 690m tonnes of CO2 to enter the atmosphere -- more than UK's annual total. The upside (kind of) is that the conflict would also generate as much as 313m tonnes of soot. This would stop a great deal of sunlight reaching the earth, creating a significant regional cooling effect in the short and medium terms -- just like when a major volcano erupts. Ultimately, though,~~ **~~the CO2 would win out and crank up global temperatures~~** ~~an extra few notches. The paper's author, Mark Z Jacobson, a professor of civil and environmental engineering at Stanford University, calculated the emissions of such a conflict by totting up the burn rate and carbon content of the fabric of our cities. "Materials have the following carbon contents: plastics, 38–92%; tyres and other rubbers, 59–91%; synthetic fibres, 63–86%; woody biomass, 41–45%; charcoal, 71%; asphalt, 80%; steel, 0.05–2%. We approximate roughly the carbon content of all combustible material in a city as 40–60%." But why would a Stanford engineer bother calculating such a thing? Given that the nuclear exchange would also kill up to 17 million people, who's going to be thinking about the impact on global warming? The purpose of the paper is to compare the total human and environmental costs of a wide range of different power sources, from solar and wind to nuclear and biofuels. One of the side-effects of nuclear power, the report argues, is an increased risk of nuclear war: "Because the production of nuclear weapons material is occurring only in countries that have developed civilian nuclear energy programs, the risk of a limited nuclear exchange between countries or the detonation of a nuclear device by terrorists has increased due to the dissemination of nuclear energy facilities worldwide." "As such," Jacobson continues, "it is a valid exercise to estimate the potential number of immediate deaths and carbon emissions due to the burning of buildings and infrastructure associated with the proliferation of nuclear energy facilities and the resulting proliferation of nuclear weapons … Although concern at the time of an explosion will be the deaths and not carbon emissions, policy makers today must weigh all the potential future risks of mortality and carbon emissions when comparing energy sources."~~