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**CP Text: Just governments ought to recognize the right of workers to strike except for healthcare workers during a public health emergency.**

**The counterplan is key to pandemic containment**

**Damery et al 10** S Damery, H Draper, S Wilson, S Greenfield, J Ives, J Parry, J Petts and T Sorell, Journal of Medical Ethics Vol. 36, No. 1 (January 2010), pp. 12-18 (7 pages), "Healthcare workers' perceptions of the duty to work during an influenza pandemic on JSTOR," <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20696709#metadata_info_tab_contents>

The duty to work is presently under scrutiny because of the current swine flu pandemic. Pandemic influenza is, according to the National Risk Register, the potential emergency that is likely to have the greatest impact in the UK,6 and the serious nature of the threat is widely recognised internationally.710 Health services in the UK are already strained, and the situation is set to worsen as winter?the traditional influenza season? approaches. HCWs are at the forefront of both pandemic response and exposure to infection. An effective public health response that ensures that appropriate standards of conventional and critical patient care can be maintained depends on the majority of uninfected HCWs continuing to attend work, despite the risks they might face in doing so. We recently published research suggesting that absenteeism during an influenza pandemic may be significant, depending on the severity of the pandemic and the combination of adverse circum stances that arise as a result.11 In common with others, we have found that there are barriers to both the willingness and the ability to work.11-15 Pandemic preparedness plans typically focus on reducing barriers to ability (such as employers providing HCWs with transport to and from work if they are redeployed to an alternative site, or allowing greater flexibility of working hours).16 These plans assume that ability and willingness are discrete and complementary, such that addressing barriers to ability to work will have a corresponding positive influence on will ingness to do so. However, willingness may not necessarily be increased by the implementation of practical or pragmatic solutions but may be instead more deeply rooted in a number of factors, such as the extent to which HCWs feel included in preparedness planning, or various sociodemo graphic and family issues. These are likely to influence HCWs; willingness to work during a pandemic or other emergency.15 1718 The main findings of a large-scale survey of professional and non-professional HCWs in the West Midlands, which aimed to investigate the factors associated with willingness to work during an influenza pandemic, have been published elsewhere.11

#### Pandemics cause extinction

**Millet and Snyder-Beattie 17** Piers Millett and Andrew Snyder-Beattie, Health Security Volume 15, Number 4, 2017, https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/hs.2017.0028

How worthwhile is it spending resources to study and mitigate the chance of human extinction from biological risks? The risks of such a catastrophe are presumably low, so a skeptic might argue that addressing such risks would be a waste of scarce resources. In this article, we investigate this position using a cost-effectiveness approach and ultimately conclude that the expected value of reducing these risks is large, especially since such risks jeopardize the existence of all future human lives. Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world's population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization. A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to remote populations, overcome rare genetic resistances, and evade detection, cures, and countermeasures. Even evolution itself may work in humanity's favor: Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off, and so evolutionary pressures could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6 While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they do not rule the possibility out entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of species going extinct due to disease—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include native American tribes exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and the Western Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population).9 In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But many diseases are proof of principle that each worst-case attribute can be realized independently. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, natural evolution would be an unlikely source for pathogens with the highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach. But advances in biotechnology might allow the creation of diseases that combine such traits. Recent controversy has already emerged over a number of scientific experiments that resulted in viruses with enhanced transmissibility, lethality, and/or the ability to overcome therapeutics.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-21 Although these experiments had scientific merit and were not conducted with malicious intent, their implications are still worrying. This is especially true given that there is also a long historical track record of state-run bioweapon research applying cutting-edge science and technology to design agents not previously seen in nature. The Soviet bioweapons program developed agents with traits such as enhanced virulence, resistance to therapies, greater environmental resilience, increased difficulty to diagnose or treat, and which caused unexpected disease presentations and outcomes.22 Delivery capabilities have also been subject to the cutting edge of technical development, with Canadian, US, and UK bioweapon efforts playing a critical role in developing the discipline of aerobiology.23,24 While there is no evidence of state-run bioweapons programs directly attempting to develop or deploy bioweapons that would pose an existential risk, the logic of deterrence and mutually assured destruction could create such incentives in more unstable political environments or following a breakdown of the Biological Weapons Convention.25The possibility of a war between great powers could also increase the pressure to use such weapons—during the World Wars, bioweapons were used across multiple continents, with Germany targeting animals in WWI,26 and Japan using plague to cause an epidemic in China during WWII.27 Non-state actors may also pose a risk, especially those with explicitly omnicidal aims. While rare, there are examples. The Aum Shinrikyo cult in Japan sought biological weapons for the express purpose of causing extinction.28 Environmental groups, such as the Gaia Liberation Front, have argued that “we can ensure Gaia's survival only through the extinction of the Humans as a species … we now have the specific technology for doing the job … several different [genetically engineered] viruses could be released”(quoted in ref. 29). Groups such as R.I.S.E. also sought to protect nature by destroying most of humanity with bioweapons.30 Fortunately, to date, non-state actors have lacked the capabilities needed to pose a catastrophic bioweapons threat, but this could change in future decades as biotechnology becomes more accessible and the pool of experienced users grows.31,32 What is the appropriate response to these speculative extinction threats? A balanced biosecurity portfolio might include investments that reduce a mix of proven and speculative risks, but striking this balance is still difficult given the massive uncertainties around the low-probability, high-consequence risks. In this article, we examine the traditional spectrum of biosecurity risks (ie, biocrimes, bioterrorism, and biowarfare) to categorize biothreats by likelihood and impact, expanding the historical analysis to consider even lower-probability, higher-consequence events (catastrophic risks and existential risks). In order to produce reasoned estimates of the likelihood of different categories of biothreats, we bring together relevant data and theory and produce some first-guess estimates of the likelihood of different categories of biothreat, and we use these initial estimates to compare the cost-effectiveness of reducing existential risks with more traditional biosecurity measures. We emphasize that these models are highly uncertain, and their utility lies more in enabling order-of-magnitude comparisons rather than as a precise measure of the true risk. However, even with the most conservative models, we find that reduction of low-probability, high-consequence risks can be more cost-effective, as measured by quality-adjusted life year per dollar, especially when we account for the lives of future generations. This suggests that despite the low probability of such events, society still ought to invest more in preventing the most extreme possible biosecurity catastrophes.

### 2

#### CP Text: A just government should –

#### - Eliminate the use of fossil fuels.

#### - Eliminate their production subsidies for fossil fuels

#### - Establish an incentive program for artificial tree carbon capture

#### That reduces foreign energy dependence and kickstarts a renewable revolution.

**Monasterolo 19** Irene Monasterolo [Irene Monasterolo is a development economist with experience in policy monitoring and evaluation; institutional capacity building; governance of evidence-based sustainability policies; complex system thinking for modelling the resource-climate nexus; green fiscal and monetary policies for financing the green economy; and adaptation tools for building agricultural resilience to climate change, focusing on food risk and climate adaptation. She has worked as a scientist in academia, as an economist for consulting companies, as a consultant for the World Bank. She is currently Assistant Professor of Climate Economics and Finance at the Vienna University of Economics and Business and a Visiting Scholar with Stanford Energy's Sustainable Finance Initiative. She holds a PhD in Agri-food economics and statistics from the University of Bologna (IT) and held a post-doc at the Global Sustainability Institute in Cambridge (UK) focused on modelling the impact of resource constraints on global growth and political instability.] & Marco Raberto [Associate Professor of Business and Management Engineering, University of Genoa, Italy] (2019). The impact of phasing out fossil fuel subsidies on the low-carbon transition. Energy Policy, 124, 355–370. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2018.08.051 // ash

The phasing out of fossil fuel subsidies contributes to improve the performance of the production factors, represented by unemployment (top panel) and firms’ capital (bottom panel). In the case of full fossil fuel subsidies (black line), the economy experiences the highest unemployment and the lowest firm's capital accumulation because the subsidies are fully financed via general taxation, thus depressing other investments (bottom panel) and consumption. In addition, since the country needs to import raw materials and fossil fuels from ROW, a carbon-intense economy means an outflow of liquidity to the foreign country. In contrast, the phasing in of green subsidies contributes to increase capital accumulation and employment (see Fig. 8 for details).

Fig. 7a: Production factors conditioned to green subsidies. Fig. 7a shows the effects on the production factors (y axis) of increasing levels of green fiscal policy and green sovereign bonds issuance (x axis). Higher levels of green subsidies lead to positive economic outcomes in terms of lower unemployment (top panel) and higher speed of capital accumulation in the production sectors (bottom panel), thus supporting the development of the green economy. Nevertheless, the trend in the fiscal and green bonds’ policy scenarios is slightly different. Our explanation is that the higher share of renewable energy production in the green subsidies scenarios implies lower fossil fuels extraction, thus lower revenues and profits for the mining company, and consequently lower money outflow to the ROW. In this way, the domestic economy displays higher purchasing power and domestic demand, with positive effects on unemployment rate and capital accumulation. This positive effect also emerges in BA's balance sheet (Fig. 3).

The interest rate set by the central bank could explain why the scenarios characterized by green subsidies financed with the issuance of green sovereign bonds are slightly less performing in terms of capital investments than the ones characterized by green fiscal policies. Indeed, the central bank's interest rate increases the most in the green bonds’ scenarios, thus counteracting the inflationary trend created by the green bonds’ issuance on the real economy. These results provide useful insights in the current discussion on what role, if any, central banks could play in the low-carbon transition by greening monetary policies.

7. Conclusion and policy implications

By applying an expanded version of the EIRIN SFC behavioral model, we find that reforming fossil fuel subsidies in high-income countries could create the conditions to foster a stable low-carbon energy transition, with positive socio-economic effects. Indeed, a gradual phasing out of fossil fuel subsidies contributes to shift investments to low-carbon energy production. In addition, it contributes to improve the real economy performance through higher capital accumulation in the domestic economy and the creation of green jobs and capital investments, supported by a dynamic credit market. Table 3 shows the impact of each policy and scenario to the real economy, green capital investments and the credit market.

#### Super trees are sufficient to solve international warming.

Vince 12 [Gaia Vince, BBC News, 4 October 2012, Sucking CO2 from the Skies With Artificial Trees, <http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20121004-fake-trees-to-clean-the-skies>] TR

Scientists are looking at ways to modulate the global temperature by removing some of this greenhouse gas from the air. If it works, it would be one of the few ways of geoengineering the planet with multiple benefits, beyond simply cooling the atmosphere. Every time we breathe out, we emit carbon dioxide just like all other metabolic life forms. Meanwhile, photosynthetic organisms like plants and algae take in carbon dioxide and emit oxygen. This balance has kept the planet at a comfortably warm average temperature of 14C (57F), compared with a chilly -18C (0F) if there were [no carbon dioxide in the atmosphere](http://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/cmb-faq/globalwarming.html). In the [Anthropocene](http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20120209-welcome-to-the-age-of-modern-man) (the Age of Man), we have shifted this balance by releasing more carbon dioxide than plants can absorb. Since the industrial revolution, humans have been burning increasing amounts of fossil fuels, releasing stored carbon from millions of years ago. Eventually the atmosphere will reach a new balance at a hotter temperature as a result of the additional carbon dioxide, but getting there is going to be difficult. The carbon dioxide we are releasing is changing the climate, the wind and precipitation patterns, acidifying the oceans, warming the habitats for plants and animals, melting glaciers and ice sheets, increasing the frequency of wildfires and raising sea levels. And we are doing this at such a rapid pace that animals and plants may not have time to evolve to the new conditions. Humans won't have to rely on evolution, but we will have to spend hundreds of billions of dollars on adapting or moving our cities and other infrastructure, and finding ways to grow our food crops under these unfamiliar conditions. Even if we stopped burning fossil fuels today, there is enough carbon dioxide in the atmosphere - and it is such [a persistent, lasting gas](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/jan/16/greenhouse-gases-remain-air) – that temperatures will continue to rise for a few hundred years. We won't stop emitting carbon dioxide today, of course, and it is now very likely that within the lifetime of people born today we will increase the temperature of the planet [by at least 3C more](http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-17488450) than the average temperature before the industrial revolution. Seek and capture Hence, the idea of finding ways of removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. One way to do this is to grow plants that absorb a lot of carbon dioxide and store it. But although we can certainly improve tree-planting, we also need [land to grow food](http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20120828-enriching-the-soil) for an [increasing global population](http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20120725-population-overload), so there's a limit to how much forestry we can fit on the planet. In recent years there have been attempts to remove the carbon dioxide from its source in power plants. [Scrubber devices](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scrubber)have been fitted to the chimneys in different pilot projects around the world so that the greenhouse gas produced during fossil fuel burning can be removed from the exhaust emissions. The carbon dioxide can then be cooled and pumped for storage in deep underground rock chambers, for example, replacing the fluid in saline aquifers. Another storage option is to use the collected gas to replace crude oil deposits, helping drilling companies to pump out oil from hard to reach places, in a process known as advanced oil recovery. Removing this pollution from power plants – called [carbon capture and storage](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/interactive/2008/jun/12/carbon.capture) – is a useful way of preventing additional carbon dioxide from entering the atmosphere as we continue to burn fossil fuels. But what about the gas that is already out there? The problem with removing carbon dioxide from the atmosphere is that it’s present at such a low concentration. In a power plant chimney, for instance, carbon dioxide is present at concentrations of 4-12% within a relatively small amount of exhaust air. Removing the gas takes a lot of energy, so it is expensive, but it’s feasible. To extract the 0.04% of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere would require enormous volumes of air to be processed. As a result, most scientists have baulked at the idea. Fake plastic trees [Klaus Lackner](http://www.columbia.edu/~kl2010/members_lackner.htm), director of the Lenfest Center for Sustainable Energy at Columbia University, has come up with a technique that he thinks could solve the problem. Lackner has designed an artificial tree that passively soaks up carbon dioxide from the air using “leaves” that are 1,000 times more efficient than true leaves that use photosynthesis. "We don't need to expose the leaves to sunlight for photosynthesis like a real tree does," Lackner explains. "So our leaves can be much more closely spaced and overlapped – even configured in a honeycomb formation to make them more efficient." The leaves look like sheets of papery plastic and are coated in a resin that contains sodium carbonate, which pulls carbon dioxide out of the air and stores it as a bicarbonate (baking soda) on the leaf. To remove the carbon dioxide, the leaves are rinsed in water vapour and can dry naturally in the wind, soaking up more carbon dioxide. Lackner calculates that his tree can remove one tonne of carbon dioxide a day. Ten million of these trees could remove 3.6 billion tonnes of carbon dioxide a year – equivalent to about 10% of our global annual carbon dioxide emissions. "Our total emissions could be removed with 100 million trees," he says, "whereas we would need 1,000 times that in real trees to have the same effect." If the trees were mass produced they would each initially cost around $20,000 (then falling as production takes over), just below the price of the average family car in the United States, he says, pointing out that 70 million cars are produced each year. And each would fit on a truck to be positioned at sites around the world. "The great thing about the atmosphere is it's a good mixer, so carbon dioxide produced in an American city can be removed in Oman," he says.

### 3

#### Global tech innovation high now.

Mercury News et al 6/4 [Mercury News and East Bay Times Editorial Boards, June 4, 2021, “Editorial: How America can Win the Global Tech War” <https://www.mercurynews.com/2021/06/04/editorial-why-silicon-valley-needs-endless-frontier-bill/> //gord0]

The nation that wins the global tech race will dominate the 21st century. This has been true since the 1800s. Given the rapid pace of innovation and tech’s impact on our economy and defense capabilities in the last decade, there is ample evidence to suggest that the need for investment in tech research and development has never been greater. China has been closing the tech gap in recent years by making bold investments in tech with the intent of overtaking the United States. This is a tech war we cannot afford to lose. It’s imperative that Congress pass the Endless Frontier Act and authorize the biggest R&D tech investment in the United States since the Apollo years. Rep. Ro Khanna, D-Santa Clara, made a massive increase in science and technology investment a major part of his platform while campaigning for a seat in Congress in 2016. Now the co-author of the 600-page legislation is on the cusp of pushing through a bipartisan effort that has been years in the making. Khanna and his co-authors, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., Sen. Todd Young, R-Ind., and Rep. Mike Gallagher, R-Wisc., are shepherding the bill through the Senate, which is expected to approve it sometime later this month. That would set up a reconciliation debate between the House and Senate that would determine the bill’s final language. The ultimate size of the investment is still very much up in the air. Khanna would like Congress to authorize $100 billion over a five-year period for critical advancements in artificial intelligence, biotechnology, cybersecurity, semiconductors and other cutting-edge technologies. The Senate is talking of knocking that number down to $50 billion or $75 billion. They should be reminded of China Premier Li Keqiang’s March announcement that China would increase its research and development spending by an additional 7% per year between 2021 and 2025. The United States still outspends China in R&D, spending $612 billion on research and development in 2019, compared to China’s $514 billion. But the gap is narrowing. At the turn of the century, China was only spending $33 billion a year on R&D, while the United States was spending nearly 10 times that amount. The bill would authorize 10 technology hubs throughout the nation designed to help build the infrastructure, manufacturing facilities and workforce needed to help meet the nation’s tech goals. Building tech centers throughout the United States should also create more support for the industry across the country. Tech’s image has taken a beating in recent years — the emergence of the term “Big Tech” is hardly a positive development — and the industry will need all the support it can muster in Congress. The United States continues to have a crucial tech edge over its competitors, most notably China. The only way we can hope to win the 21st century is to make significant investments in research and development that will spark the next wave of innovation.

#### 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/>] Justin

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 low.  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.

#### Victories like the aff mobilizes unions in the IT sector.

Vynck et al 21 [Gerrit De; Carleton University, BA in Journalism and Global Politics, tech reporter for The Washington Post. He writes about Google and the algorithms that increasingly shape society. He previously covered tech for seven years at Bloomberg News; Nitashu Tiku; Columbia University, BA in English, New York University, MA in Journalism, Washington Post's tech culture reporter based in San Francisco; Macalester College, BA in English, Columbia University, MS in Journalism, reporter for The Washington Post who is focused on technology coverage in the Pacific Northwest; “Six things to know about the latest efforts to bring unions to Big Tech,” The Washington Post; <https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/01/26/tech-unions-explainer/>] Justin

In response to tech company crackdowns and lobbying, gig workers have shifted their strategy to emphasize building worker-led movements and increasing their ranks, rather than focusing on employment status as the primary goal, says Veena Dubal, a law professor at the University of California Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco. The hope is that with President Biden in the White House and an even split in the Senate, legislators will mobilize at the federal level, through the NLRA or bills such as the PRO Act, to recognize gig worker collectives as real unions.

#### Technological innovation solves every existential threat – which outweighs.

Matthews 18 Dylan. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the future. It’s reasonable to suggest that those quadrillions of future people have, accordingly, hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here today do. That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future.” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most literal thing it could mean is preventing human extinction, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly part of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address specific threats to humanity (which he calls “targeted” approaches to the far future) have to complement “broad” approaches, where instead of trying to predict what’s going to kill us all, you just generally try to keep civilization running as best it can, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with potential extinction events in the future, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation; it also means acting on pressing needs now. For example: We’re going to be better prepared to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or global warming if society as a whole makes a lot of scientific progress. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of the best things we can do for the far future is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls “lost Einsteins” (potential innovators who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: improve incentives and norms in academic work to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X ”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.” Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.

### 4

#### The US economy is bound to bounce back stronger than ever --- COVID wasn’t a normal recession, this card answers thumpers

Bachman 6-14 [Danny Bachman is responsible for Deloitte’s quarterly U.S. Economic Forecast. Prior to coming to Deloitte, Dr. Bachman worked as a forecaster, economic analyst, and model expert at the US Commerce Department and for several economic consulting companies. He also taught economics at Temple University. “United States Economic Forecast: 2nd Quarter 2021.” June 14, 2021. https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/economy/us-economic-forecast/united-states-outlook-analysis.html]

“Normal” recessions permanently damage the economy. Investment suffers, leaving the economy with less capital than it might have had with no downturn. While unemployed, workers lose skills and hence productivity. Spending on R&D, a key driver of innovation, falls off as businesses focus on their current balance sheets. But this time may well be different. In fact, some forecasters, such as the IMF, have already assumed that US GDP is likely to actually rise above the level expected before the pandemic, at least temporarily. Our new Deloitte US forecast also assumes that the economy in 2022 will outperform our prepandemic assumption. But we’re even more optimistic: It’s beginning to look as though we’ve not only avoided the “scarring” that many economists feared at the beginning of the pandemic—we’ve also accelerated technological change, meaning that productivity growth, and GDP, are likely to remain above prepandemic levels. How does it happen that, after suffering a steep decline in production and income, a historic jump in the unemployment rate, and the trauma of a completely different type of shock that required substantial changes in behavior, the American economy might actually return even stronger? Some reasons why the economy is poised for strong growth: 1. Business finances are healthy. Most recessions in the past had financial causes,1 and businesses (especially financial businesses) had to take time to rebuild their balance sheets. That left many business leaders leery of taking on debt or making risky investments. As a result, investment spending remained muted, people remained unemployed for a long time, and growth was limited. The current recession, by contrast, was met with firm government action that bolstered the financial system and most businesses’ balance sheets. That leaves businesses ready, willing, and able to spend once they get the signal that they can do so safely. 2. Households—particularly higher-income households—are sitting on a large pile of savings—about US$2.8 trillion more in Q1 2021 than we had expected them to want under “normal” circumstances before the pandemic.2 Since consumers in aggregate didn’t take on more debt, balance sheets are healthy and consumers quite literally have money to spend. The reopening of the consumer service sector is therefore likely to result in a burst of pent-up spending as people return to restaurants, theaters, sports events, and travel. That’s very different from the normally conservative post-recession behavior of consumers who, even as employment recovers, tend to remain cautious about spending. 3. The pandemic accelerated productivity trends—telecommuting and e-commerce in particular—that were already underway, forcing managers and consumers to adopt new technology with little notice. This may not be the first time that businesses innovated only once they felt severe outside pressure: Economist Robert Gordon argues that the post-World War II economic boom in the United States owes a lot to the financial pressures of the Great Depression and the supply chain pressures of World War II, which forced US businesses to adopt previously existing innovative technologies.3 The future technological revolution may similarly owe much to COVID-19.

#### Strikes create structural weaknesses in the economy --- new study finds they decrease productivity, create market vulnerability, and weaken capital --- that’s a death knell for the economy

Wisniewski et. al. 19 [Tomasz Wisniewski, the Open University. Brendan Lambe, De Montfort University. Alexandra Dias, New York University. “The Influence of General Strikes against Government on Stock Market Behavior. 2019. Scottish Journal of Political Economy. https://sci-hub.se/10.1111/sjpe.12224]

While some clarity may have emerged with respect to the outcomes encountered by workers and governments, the literature remains silent with regards to the ramifications faced by employers. It is this void in the body of knowledge that our paper intends to fill. Even if the general strikes are not strictly directed against companies, their value may be adversely affected for several reasons. First, the unproductive periods impose costs in terms of lower levels of output and profits. Although general strikes are typically short in duration, the large number of employees involved has a bearing on the total number of days not worked (Gall, 2013). Second, such manifestations of popular dissent signal to the market the workforce’s frustration with the government and its policies. In the case where policy-makers are responsive to the demands being made, a general strike may also signal the weakening position of capital providers and other sources of power within the productive process. Corporations may also be forced into a position of carrying the burden of government concessions and the costs of social pacts that are agreed in the aftermath of a general strike. Third, in instances where the future response of the government is not known with certainty, additional investment risk is created. Such risk will raise the time-varying discount rates leading to lower stock valuations and increased market volatility. Fourth, conceding to workers’ demands may lead to a deterioration in a government’s financial position, which will exert upward pressure on bond yields and discount rates. This, in turn, would further aggravate the falls in stock prices. Our findings in this study reflect the abovementioned considerations. Through investigating a large sample spanning an array of countries, we demonstrate a valuation impact that is both statistically and economically significant. Since the magnitude of the fall in stock prices coinciding with the occurrence of a general strike is substantial, investors should pay particular attention to this type of event. Furthermore, we record significant increases in stock index return volatility and Value-at-Risk1 in the year of the event, which could be indicative of the policy uncertainty that arises alongside mass strike action. Such findings should be brought into consideration by those on both sides of the divide who are engaged in the collective bargaining process. Market vulnerability around times of mass strike action could be particularly distressing to shareholders who are not internationally diversified. The problem is of concern not only to frontline investors but extends to a wider swathe of the population invested in the market through pension funds. It is neither in the interest of trade unions nor governments to adversely affect the value of retirement portfolios. For this reason, both parties should seek alternative resolutions that do not involve walkouts. This means that in order to avoid costly economic frictions, governments should be wary of situations which may inflame worker indignation. Similarly, trade unions should consider the full welfare implications for their members before staging a mass protest.

#### Structural problems mean the next recession will cause global conflict, inequality, terrorism, and war

Lu 18 [Qian Lu, Managing Director, Greater China, The Economist Group. “The next economic crisis could cause global conflict. Here’s why.” November 13, 2018. https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why]

The response to the 2008 economic crisis has relied far too much on monetary stimulus, in the form of quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates, and included far too little structural reform. This means that the next crisis could come soon – and pave the way for a large-scale military conflict. The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social, political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a major global military conflict. The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates. But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies. Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment. The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929. As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy. If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war. For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun. To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict. According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels. This is all the more worrying in view of the numerous other factors stoking social unrest and diplomatic tension, including technological disruption, a record-breaking migration crisis, anxiety over globalization, political polarization, and rising nationalism. All are symptoms of failed policies that could turn out to be trigger points for a future crisis. Voters have good reason to be frustrated, but the emotionally appealing populists to whom they are increasingly giving their support are offering ill-advised solutions that will only make matters worse. For example, despite the world’s unprecedented interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed, as countries – most notably, Donald Trump’s US – pursue unilateral, isolationist policies. Meanwhile, proxy wars are raging in Syria and Yemen. Against this background, we must take seriously the possibility that the next economic crisis could lead to a large-scale military confrontation. By the logic of the political scientist Samuel Huntington , considering such a scenario could help us avoid it, because it would force us to take action. In this case, the key will be for policymakers to pursue the structural reforms that they have long promised, while replacing finger-pointing and antagonism with a sensible and respectful global dialogue. The alternative may well be global conflagration.

#### Extinction – nuke war fallout creates Ice Age and mass starvation

Steven Starr 15. “Nuclear War: An Unrecognized Mass Extinction Event Waiting To Happen.” Ratical. March 2015. <https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StevenStarr022815.html> TG

A war fought with 21st century strategic nuclear weapons would be more than just a great catastrophe in human history. If we allow it to happen, such a war would be a mass extinction event that [ends human history](https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StarrNuclearWinterOct09.pdf). There is a profound difference between extinction and “an unprecedented disaster,” or even “the end of civilization,” because even after such an immense catastrophe, human life would go on.

But extinction, by definition, is an event of utter finality, and a nuclear war that could cause human extinction should really be considered as the ultimate criminal act. It certainly would be the crime to end all crimes.

The world’s leading climatologists now tell us that nuclear war threatens our continued existence as a species. Their studies predict that a large nuclear war, especially one fought with strategic nuclear weapons, would create a post-war environment in which for many years it would be too cold and dark to even grow food. Their findings make it clear that not only humans, but most large animals and many other forms of complex life would likely vanish forever in a nuclear darkness of our own making.

The environmental consequences of nuclear war would attack the ecological support systems of life at every level. Radioactive fallout produced not only by nuclear bombs, but also by the destruction of nuclear power plants and their spent fuel pools, would poison the biosphere. Millions of tons of smoke would act to [destroy Earth’s protective ozone layer](https://www2.ucar.edu/atmosnews/just-published/3995/nuclear-war-and-ultraviolet-radiation) and block most sunlight from reaching Earth’s surface, creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last for decades.

Yet the political and military leaders who control nuclear weapons strictly avoid any direct public discussion of the consequences of nuclear war. They do so by arguing that nuclear weapons are not intended to be used, but only to deter.

Remarkably, the leaders of the Nuclear Weapon States have chosen to ignore the authoritative, long-standing scientific research done by the climatologists, research that predicts virtually any nuclear war, fought with even a fraction of the operational and deployed nuclear arsenals, will leave the Earth essentially uninhabitable.

### Case

#### Climate strikes aren’t sufficient to reduce reliance on fuels.

Hayes 19 [Jason; Contributor to The Hill, director of environmental policy at the Mackinac Center for Public Policy, a research and education institute in Midland, Mich; “A global climate strike isn't enough,” The Hill; 9/19/19; <https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/461809-a-global-climate-strike-isnt-enough>] Justin

A collective of influential green groups and corporations is supporting a campaign for a global climate strike from Sept. 20-27. The strike pushes young people to walk out of schools and workplaces to protest the energy sources that keep us alive and thriving. That many people are concerned about the global climate is obvious, but how will encouraging them to abandon their jobs or schools for a day or two, or seven, reduce greenhouse gas emissions?

The campaign website — globalclimatestrike.net — tells people they must “demand an end to the age of fossil fuels.” But, in the United States, we rely on these fuels for over 80 percent of the energy we use to provide basic necessities such as food, clean water, heating and air conditioning, medicine, transportation and so much more.

To make things worse, the energy sources offered up as replacements for fossil fuels — typically wind and solar — couldn’t even exist without fossil fuels. Natural gas, oil and coal are needed to mine, refine, process and ship the metals, rare earth minerals, silicone, plastics and various chemicals that go into renewables. Without steel, there are no towers to hold up wind turbines. Without rare earths, there are no solar panels. Adding to this conundrum is the fact that wind and solar cannot provide reliable power. They are intermittent, meaning they must be propped up by more reliable energy sources, such as natural gas.

A group of environmental policy experts has put together MyClimatePledge.com as our response, because we’d like to challenge climate strikers and to help them appreciate that striking won’t be enough.

#### Climate strikers don’t have enough leverage.

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>] Justin

But strikers must have the leverage to accomplish their goals

Strikers represent the demand for climate action. But who will supply these policies and what leverage do strikers have over these policymakers? This is where climate strikes could run into a problem.

Strikers have leverage when their absence from work disrupts activities that are valuable to policymakers. If railway workers go on strike, trains cannot run and the public is upset. When airline pilots go on strike, people cannot fly, and airlines lose revenue. By some accounts, the 48-hour strike of British Airways pilots (regarding a pay dispute) in September 2019 will cost the company about £100 million.

What leverage do the climate strikers have? Assuming most of the strikers are students, what costs might their strikes impose on the actors that need to change their climate policies (namely, governments and fossil fuel firms)?

Student strikes probably do not disrupt the government or fossil fuel firms. The main bearer of these costs are the conscientious teachers who need to figure out how they are going to make up for the lost teaching time.

#### Strikes cause us to be taken less seriously – that prevents material solutions.

Chung 19 [Climate change is a real problem, but strikes won't change anything, <https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/climate-news/112807046/how-not-to-solve-the-issue-why-climate-change-strikes-wont-do-anything>, May 17 2019, Cadence Chung] [SS] // Re-Cut Justin

Hundreds of students stand outside Parliament, the fervour of do-goodery tainting the air with its saccharine scent. They proclaim their heart’s desires, their bottled-up pleas for change. For action. They all yell up at those pristine steps, yelling…for what? As a high school student, it has been very difficult to ignore the constant mentions of the climate change strikes. Feel-good phrases have been hammered into us for weeks ‒ that by striking, we could change the world. We can convince the government that things need to change. We can actively reverse climate change and environmental havoc. To which I say...no? The world is at a strange point when it comes to the environment. **We are all aware of the issue, but unsure of what to do next.** The media feeds us scary facts ‒ that by 2020 the ocean will be filled with more plastic than fish, that the global sea level has risen 6.7 inches in the last century, that we only have 12 years to reverse what we have done to the environment. So I get it. I totally understand feeling the antsy need to do something, anything to help combat our environmental crisis. But **yelling about climate change isn’t going to do anything**. ADVERTISING First of all, as I previously stated, nobody knows what to do next about our environmental crisis. So we all respond by being extremely vague. Just ‘climate change’ is such a broad topic to protest about. **We are not going to get anywhere by being** so **vague**. READ MORE: \* You'll do anything for your kids? How about saving the planet?! \* We need to act on climate change for the sake of our children \* What you need to know about the previously withheld climate report **A problem isn’t solved by preaching emptily about the fact that it exists, and then expecting the government to magically come up with a solution for it.** To solve the climate change issue, we need to get specific. We need to get intelligent. Yes, there is power in numbers, but not when those numbers are all yelling about a problem without any semblance of how to solve it. How about this ‒ New Zealand mostly recycles plastic type 1 (PET), type 2 (HPDE), and type 4 (LPDE). Most other types of plastic and packaging is sent to third world countries where they are unprofessionally burned or otherwise dealt with, thus releasing countless toxins into the atmosphere. Or, if they aren’t sent to these places, they simply sit in landfill, secreting greenhouse gases and oozing leachate. Sure, recycling is not the ultimate solution, but it is still so much better than letting this waste sit around further contributing to global warming. Why don’t we use our collective passion to propose that the government sets up more recycling facilities in NZ ‒ a plausible action that could actually be implemented? Or, while we’re on a waste tangent, why don’t we mention that food waste is one of the biggest contributors to climate change, producing methane which is 28 times more potent than your regular carbon dioxide. How are you adapting for climate change? What are you doing to save our planet? Contribute How about we propose to the government or the council that a composting scheme is set up around neighbourhoods, in order to harness our food waste for good and not let it further wreck our ozone? We cannot afford to just rant about the general problem anymore, people. By proposing specific aspects that would majorly reduce the climate change problem, the government would have something clear to latch onto and would thus be more likely to implement these solutions. Secondly, **striking is not the best way to gain likeability** in the public eye. Perhaps this is just my opinion as a reserved person, but I just don’t see the point in getting needlessly fired up about something. Yes, absolutely, you should feel free to express your emotions and feel outraged at the government’s lack of action ‒ as a human who intends to live on this earth in the future, I am absolutely disgusted with how the world’s powers aren’t changing things. But we shouldn’t let this anger simply come out as...anger. **Problems are not solved by yelling in a fit of rage, letting emotions override logic**. We are students. We are intelligent, opinionated people. Let’s make speeches. Let’s write letters. Let’s plan protests that are thought-out, impactful, and effective in not only acknowledging the problem, but also suggesting and encouraging solutions. **Holding our signs and yelling ourselves hoarse at the government steps isn’t going to help our problem at all, and our anger will honestly just cause us to be taken less seriously.** "Why don’t we use our collective passion to propose that the government sets up more recycling facilities in NZ ‒ a plausible action that could actually be implemented?" DUSTAN WOODHOUSE/UNSPLASH "Why don’t we use our collective passion to propose that the government sets up more recycling facilities in NZ ‒ a plausible action that could actually be implemented?" Lastly, the whole awareness thing. **People constantly say that this protest will make** government and general **society more aware** of climate change. But here’s the thing...**they are aware**. Us regular people have the media constantly reminding **us** of our environmental turmoil, and undoubtedly **the government are aware** too, judging by Labour’s policies at the time of election and **all of the environmental conferences** they are attending. **They know. Everyone knows. We don’t need to remind people anymore**. To truly get on top of this problem, **we need to stop being aware and start taking action**. The two ideas for action that I mentioned previously are two of countless options. We are all so passionate about our planet, and that is amazing, so why don’t we harness that passion and put it into a tangible form, instead of making ourselves more uncomfortably aware of a problem without ever solving it? All in all, I’m not against the strike. If it makes you feel good, then sure. Do it. Go up with your signs and do something good that you believe in ‒ I’ll never try to stop you from doing that. But in order to solve this problem, we can’t be vague anymore. We can’t just be aware anymore. We can’t just be angry about the problem. Things are only going to change if we implement tactics. If we express our ideas intelligently. If we think of actual, attainable solutions. The world has never been changed through acknowledgement of a problem ‒ it is what comes after the acknowledgement that makes all the difference.
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