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#### Biden has PC for infrastructure but it needs to maintained in the face of impatient democrats.

**Sullivan and Kane 6/11** [Sean and Paul. Sean Sullivan covers national politics, with a focus on the 2020 presidential campaign. Paul Kane. Washington, D.C.Senior congressional correspondent and columnist. Education: University of Delaware, BA. “‘Time is running out’: Democrats split over Biden’s relentless focus on infrastructure”. 6-9-2021. . https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/democrats-split-biden-infrastructure/2021/06/10/f1f95a8e-c91f-11eb-afd0-9726f7ec0ba6\_story.html.] SJ//VM

“The infrastructure bill — its status is up in the air, but its long-term prognosis is okay,” said Brian Fallon, a former Senate Democratic aide who heads the liberal group Demand Justice. “You have another patient that’s dying on the table, and that’s the one you need to triage.” As pressure built in the party, Attorney General Merrick Garland signaled Friday that the Justice Department not only would scrutinize voting laws for signs of discrimination, but also would apply oversight to post-election audits. Supporters of former president Donald Trump have spearheaded audits in various states despite no evidence of fraud. “Where we see violations, we will not hesitate to act,” Garland said. Story continues below advertisement NAACP President Derrick Johnson said his group was “encouraged by the new tone on voting rights set by the Biden-Harris administration” but warned that the battle “is far from over.” As Garland spoke, the infrastructure talks remained fluid. Many Senate Democrats think that a bipartisan deal will never be reached, and that the prolonged bipartisan talks are only delaying the inevitable fallback to party-line legislation. White House press secretary Jen Psaki said Biden remains committed to pushing a bill through Congress this summer. Other Democrats strongly doubt that timetable can be achieved, however, and they worry that it will be even harder to pass anything next year, with congressional elections looming in November. Story continues below advertisement Many liberals initially accepted Biden’s push for a big infrastructure package as a follow-up to his covid-19 relief bill. But now they are alarmed at the plan’s slow progress, combined with aggressive moves by Republicans in Florida, Georgia, Arizona and Texas to pass restrictive voting laws, and they want the White House to redirect the power of the presidency to combat those efforts. [*After blocking voting bill, Texas Democrats call on Congress to do more*](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/texas-voting-rights-congress/2021/05/31/a3ff5f6a-c229-11eb-93f5-ee9558eecf4b_story.html?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_32) Fallon said Biden’s priorities are evident in his trips around the country to tout his infrastructure plan, punctuated by colorful activities such as [driving an electric vehicle in Michigan](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/biden-electric-truck/2021/05/18/168abee0-b815-11eb-a6b1-81296da0339b_story.html?itid=lk_inline_manual_33). “He’s test-driving Ford F-150s. He’s not going to Selma to talk about voting rights,” Fallon said. “That needs to happen.” Republicans see it differently, contending that Biden is trying to have it both ways by cramming his infrastructure bill with unrelated Democratic priorities. Story continues below advertisement “From the day the White House rolled out its first infrastructure plan in March, it’s been clear that the left’s definition of the word is evolving faster than even some Democrats can keep track,” Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said on the Senate floor this week. “Medicaid expansion as infrastructure. Paid leave as infrastructure. And job-killing tax increases to hold the assortment together.” On the other hand, some liberal Democrats say they will oppose a deal with Republicans if it fails to address issues such as climate change, illustrating how hard a bipartisan deal will be in the evenly divided Senate. “From my perspective — no climate, no deal,” said Sen. Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.). “I’m not voting for an infrastructure bill that does not have climate.” He also rejected the idea of passing a more traditional bill that focuses on roads and bridges with the promise that a climate-centered bill would come later. Story continues below advertisement Markey recalled a climate bill passed by the House in 2009 that died in the Senate due to Republican opposition. “We now have a second chance at passing a piece of climate legislation that matches the scope and the scale of the problem,” Markey said. “We can’t allow Republican dilatory tactics to block consideration of a climate bill.” The prospects for a voting rights bill are if anything even more dire. All but one Democratic senator has signed on to the For the People Act, which has passed the House. The legislation, which Biden supports, would [set standards](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/manchin-voting-rights/2021/06/02/103db892-c320-11eb-93f5-ee9558eecf4b_story.html?itid=lk_inline_manual_43) for early voting and vote-by-mail that could override some state Republican voting laws. But Sen. Joe Manchin III (D-W.Va.), the lone holdout, said definitively this week that he would not vote for the plan, nor would he support changing the Senate filibuster rules to enable Democrats to pass it with a simple majority rather than 60 votes. White House officials have refrained from public criticism of Manchin, a reflection of his pivotal role in the Washington landscape. In a Senate that is divided 50-50, Manchin could single-handedly torpedo the infrastructure bill, prompting many in the White House to carefully mind what they say about him. White House officials said they are not taking voting rights any less seriously than infrastructure, pointing to recent remarks Biden made on the matter in Tulsa, his decision to [tap Vice President Harris to work on the issue](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/ahead-of-tulsa-trip-biden-to-unveil-new-plans-to-reduce-black-white-wealth-gap/2021/05/31/b80c9c4e-c269-11eb-8c18-fd53a628b992_story.html?itid=lk_inline_manual_47) and his executive order expanding ballot access. But voting rights activists note that those moves haven’t prevented the GOP voting laws from taking effect. The White House official working on voting rights expressed strong support for the For the People Act, even though the official thought it was not a panacea. The official said there are other means of fighting the Republican voting laws, through the courts or the executive branch. But the official said such efforts would be cumbersome and acknowledged that none would be as effective as the legislation. When it comes to infrastructure, in contrast, the president’s urgency has been in plain sight. Biden has traveled the country to promote his proposal. He’s enlisted Cabinet secretaries to help sell it. He’s holding Oval Office meetings where he negotiates directly on it. And he is expending significant political capital to get it across the finish line. In the eyes of Biden’s allies, this is a good recipe for success in the midterms and beyond. “The White House is right to make infrastructure a priority,” said Sen. Richard Blumenthal (D-Conn.), who is up for reelection. “It’s urgently time-sensitive because it’s so key to jobs and economic recovery, not to mention faith in the basic capacity of government to build bridges and roads.” Infrastructure is also an appealing goal for the White House because its passage may not require a long-shot effort to end the filibuster. If all 50 Democratic senators stick together, they could pass it with no Republican support using a special budgetary maneuver. That is not true for measures such as the voting rights bill, which has no connection to the budget, making it much more difficult to shepherd into law. Even if the bipartisan talks do not result in a deal, they are important to Manchin, who might not join a Democratic-only bill unless he thinks a real effort has been made to court Republicans, Democrats close to the process said. Underlying Democrats’ anxieties are painful memories of the early months of the Obama administration, when they passed a stimulus bill that many now think was too small, and talks on the Affordable Care Act dragged on without resulting in any GOP support. Now, some fear that if the party doesn’t move more swiftly, it could miss its chance to get an infrastructure bill passed. With no margin for error in the Senate, circumstances could shift at any moment, they say, noting that in 2010, Democrats unexpectedly lost a special Senate election, costing them a filibuster-proof majority and nearly dooming the ACA. “During the Obama admin, folks thought we’d have a 60 Dem majority for a while. It lasted 4 months. Dems are burning precious time & impact,” Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-N.Y.) tweeted. “It’s a hustle. We need to move now.” Others warn that even if Biden is ultimately successful on infrastructure, his victory could be short-lived without action on voting rights, given next year’s midterm elections. “You can win a round, but it doesn’t mean you win the fight,” said the Rev. Al Sharpton.

#### Preserving comfortable union relations maintains PC.

**Kerrissey and Schofer 13** [Kerrissey, Jasmine, and Evan Schofer. Jasmine Kerrissey Department of Sociology University of California, Irvine Evan Schofer Department of Sociology University of California, Irvine. “Union Membership and Political Participation in the United States.” *Social Forces*, vol. 91, no. 3, 2013, pp. 895–928. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/23361125] SJ//VM

Discussion and Conclusion We observe consistent evidence that union members are more politically engaged than non-members. The effect of union membership is broad, spanning most types of political and civic involvement, including voting, protesting, signing petitions, association membership, and so on, and holds up with a large range of control variables. 36 The prior literature looks mainly at voting outcomes – and often finds weak results when many variables are controlled – so even these basic findings represent a step forward. The magnitude of the union membership effect varies across outcomes, but is generally substantial. For instance, union members have 20% greater odds of voting than comparable non-members. The odds of participating in a protest were 73% to 100% higher among union members, according to the Roper and Verba datasets, respectively. Many of the large and highly significant effects are in areas of social protest and electoral participation. In the case of volunteering and charitable donations, for instance, we see substantially larger effects in political forms of those activities – whereas general measures of volunteering and donations show smaller effects. We observe weaker or non-significant effects of union membership on activities that are far removed from union agendas, such as general civic membership, volunteering, or blood donation. It appears that unions build ‘political capital’ more than generalized ‘social capital’.8 These patterns are broadly consistent with our structural arguments, discussed above, that contemporary American labor unions face strong pressures to mobilize members to prepare for collective action with employers and to maintain political capital with the Democratic party.

#### **Strikes divide the union.**

Israelstam 17 [Ivan. Ivan Israelstam is the *Chief Executive of Labour Law Management Consulting*. “What is the impact of strikes for employers and employees?”. 11-22-2017. Skills Portal. https://www.skillsportal.co.za/content/what-impact-strikes-employers-and-employees.] SJ//VM

The loss of production and of customers is usually the first consequence of a strike. However, indirect strike costs incurred later can be just as serious. In the case of *NUM and others vs Chrober Slate (Pty) Ltd* (2008, 3 BLLR 287) the mine dismissed its quarry workers and factory staff due to an unprocedural strike by the quarry workers. The employer admitted that the factory staff were not to blame for the work stoppage as it had been the quarry workers who had refused to work. The dismissals of the factory staff were found to be unfair and the Labour Court ordered the mine to reinstate the 42 dismissed employees with back pay. In order to avoid the snowballing costs and loss of business that strikes can cause the employer needs to understand: What constitutes a strike in legal terms, The economic effects of a strike for both parties, The effects of a strike on the employment relationship, How to resolve constructively the conflict that causes industrial action, How to minimise the damage caused by a strike, and How to bring a strike to a speedy end. WHAT CONSTITUTES A STRIKE? A strike is any concerted withholding of labour by a group of employees in support of a demand made by them to the employer. Examples of this are work stoppages, go-slows, overtime bans and work-to-rule. THE ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF A STRIKE FOR BOTH PARTIES. The employer is likely to lose money due to delayed service to clients or to lost production time. The employees will lose their pay due to the no work, no pay principle. If the strikers are dismissed they will lose their livelihoods altogether. THE EFFECTS OF A STRIKE ON THE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP. Once the strike is over, even if the business has not been closed down by it, the feelings of hostility resulting from the strike can severely damage teamwork, productivity and profitability. HOW TO RESOLVE CONSTRUCTIVELY THE CONFLICT THAT CAUSES INDUSTRIAL ACTION. Before the conflict gets to the stage of impasse that results in a strike the parties need to utilise the services of an expert in conflict resolution. The CCMA was set up with the purpose of helping the parties to resolve conflict peacefully. However, in practice, the warring parties too often go to the CCMA because the law says they must rather than in a sincere attempt to sort out their differences. In other words, by the time the parties end up at the CCMA the conflict is often beyond the point of no return. For this reason, during times of industrial peace, employers and employees should identify and agree upon the use of a trained and reputable conflict resolution expert to be called in when the parties are unable to solve the problem themselves. HOW TO MINIMISE THE DAMAGE CAUSED BY A STRIKE. Employees should allow the business to continue to run in order to avert the likelihood of a closure that could result in job losses. Employers should use the services of a reputable labour broker who can provide alternative labour during the strike. Both parties should behave in a civil and professional manner towards each other. HOW TO BRING A STRIKE TO A SPEEDY END. Where the parties are unable to find common ground they should not delay in bringing in the services of their mutually agreed strike resolution expert. An expert in this field will not only have techniques of bringing the parties together but will also be able to see solutions that the emotions of the parties have prevented them from seeing. The expert should also be able to help the parties rebuild their relationship once the strike is over.

#### Infrastructure bill is necessary to tackle emission reduction goals.

**Newburger 3/29** [Emma. Emma Newburger is a Climate policy reporter at [@CNBC](https://twitter.com/CNBC). [@Cornell](https://twitter.com/Cornell) grad. “Here’s how Biden’s infrastructure package will likely tackle climate change”. 1-27-2021. CNBC. https://www.cnbc.com/2021/03/29/biden-infrastructure-bill-what-to-expect-on-climate-change.html.] SJ//VM

President Joe Biden delivers remarks on tackling climate change prior to signing executive actions as White House climate envoy John Kerry and Vice President Kamala Harris listen in the State Dining Room at the White House in Washington, U.S., January 27, 2021. President [Joe Biden](https://www.cnbc.com/joe-biden/) this week is set to unveil details of a major infrastructure package that’s expected to include record spending on mitigating [climate change](https://www.cnbc.com/environment/) and accelerating a nationwide transition to clean energy. The president is expected to introduce up to $3 trillion in spending on efforts to boost the economy, including rebuilding aging infrastructure like highways, bridges and rail lines, and investing in technologies to reduce planet-warming greenhouse gas emissions. Some of the policies on the table include:

Installing thousands of new electric vehicle charging stations

Funds to build energy-efficient homes

Constructing new electric power lines

The package may be split between two bills, starting with legislation that incorporates Biden’s [Build Back Better agenda](https://joebiden.com/build-back-better/) and supports his goal to achieve carbon-free power generation by 2035 and net-zero emissions by 2050. The recovery plan will potentially involve installing thousands of electric vehicle charging stations and providing incentives to encourage Americans to purchase electric vehicles. As a candidate, Biden vowed to establish ambitious fuel economy standards for gasoline cars to encourage a shift to electric vehicles. The transportation sector accounts for the [largest share of U.S. emissions](https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/sources-greenhouse-gas-emissions#:~:text=Transportation%20(28.2%20percent%20of%202018,ships%2C%20trains%2C%20and%20planes.), according to the Environmental Protection Agency, and could be the most difficult to decarbonize. The package also is primed to include funding to build millions of new energy-efficient homes and retrofit existing buildings to increase efficiency. There’s money to construct electric power lines that provide renewable energy and expand electricity storage. Paul Bledsoe, a former Clinton White House climate advisor now with the Progressive Policy Institute, said Biden’s goal is to jumpstart the economy and create new jobs during the transition away from fossil fuels. “Electrifying America’s cars and trucks, creating a nationwide smart grid, expanding electricity storage to allow more renewable energy, establishing universal high speed internet — all of these are intended to boost the productivity and competitiveness of the economy, while also cutting emissions,” Bledsoe said. Loading low-carbon energy initiatives into an infrastructure bill will likely be more divisive in Congress than previous Covid stimulus legislation. The last major push to pass climate legislation through the Senate was in 2009, when congressional Democrats failed to pass a carbon-pricing system. Some Democrats and climate activists fear that another failure to pass meaningful climate legislation amid concerns that a clean energy transition will cost jobs. Some Republicans who opposed Biden’s pandemic relief package have also condemned the president’s goal to incorporate climate policy into infrastructure legislation. Rep. Sam Graves, R-Mo., the top Republican on the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, said he’ll work with Democrats on infrastructure but that prioritizing climate issues would not receive GOP support. “A transportation bill needs to be a transportation bill, not a Green New Deal,” Graves said during a hearing Thursday. “It needs to be about roads and bridges.” House Speaker [Nancy Pelosi](https://www.cnbc.com/nancy-pelosi/) said Thursday she’ll support a bipartisan bill but will not eliminate components addressing climate change due to Republican objections. “We cannot just settle for what we can agree on without recognizing that this has to be a bill for the future, that we have to recognize the climate crisis,” Pelosi [told reporters.](https://www.speaker.gov/newsroom/32521-0) Biden has argued that his actions on climate will create millions of jobs. The president has already issued a series of climate executive orders, including suspending new oil and gas leasing on federal lands and [rejoining the U.S. into the Paris climate accord](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/01/20/biden-inauguration-us-rejoins-paris-climate-accord.html). The administration is leaning toward pursuing the bipartisan infrastructure legislation and passing other components through budget reconciliation, which would require only Senate Democrats to vote. “To gain the broadest support in Congress, Biden must emphasize the economic and jobs benefits of these investments first and foremost, not simply the climate benefits,” Bledsoe said. Stephanie Gidigbi Jenkins, director for policy and partnerships at the Natural Resources Defense Council, said the administration’s infrastructure proposal so far is “clearly focused on the right problems.” “Making these investments will create millions of good, American jobs and help us address the legacy of racial injustice,” Jenkins said. “Given the ambitions from the Biden administration and the commitment from key congressional leaders, we now have a historic opportunity to rebuild our economy for a cleaner, brighter future,” Jenkins added. “We are confident that Congress can achieve these goals.”

#### Extinction

Specktor 19 [Brandon writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years] 6-4-2019, "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html> Justin

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes**; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of** [**lethal heat conditions**](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly **one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert**. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations**, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in **nuclear war, are likely**. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

## 2

#### Pleasure and pain *are* intrinsic value and disvalue.

Blum et al. 18 Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>, R.S.

**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even produce **the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being. Prefer:

#### 1] Actor specificity: util is the best for governments, which is the actor in the rez – multiple warrants – a] Governments must aggregate since every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action b] No intent-foresight distinction – the actions we take are inevitably informed by predictions from certain mental states, meaning consequences are a collective part of the will c] No act omission distinction – governments are responsible for everything in the public sphere so inaction is an implicit authorization of action d] Actor-specificity comes first since different agents have different ethical standings. Takes out util calc indicts since they’re empirically denied and link turns them because the alt would be no action.

#### 2] No calc indicts – a] no philosophy actually says that consequences don’t matter at all since otherwise it would indict every theory since they use causal events for ethics b] winning hedonism proves we’re the only one with impacts to it so a risk of offense is sufficient c] they’re blippy nibs that set us at a disadvantage since they only have to win one while we have to beat them all – kills fairness

#### 3] Extinction outweighs under any framework

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

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

## 3

#### Kantian philosophy is anti-gay - this is not an ad hominem - this is a conclusion of his ethics and the formula of humanity. SOBLE[[1]](#footnote-1) quotes Kant:

Kant immediately continues by completing his sparse inventory of three objectionable, sexually unnatural, practices [quote begins here] “A second crimen carnis contra naturam is intercourse between sexus homogenii, in which the object of sexual impulse is a human being but there is homogeneity instead of heterogeneity of sex. . . . This practice too is contrary to the ends of humanity; for the end of humanity in respect of sexuality is to preserve the species without debasing the person; but in this instance the species is not being preserved (as it can be by a crimen carnis secundum naturam), but the person is set aside, the self is degraded below the level of the animals, and humanity is dishonoured. The third crimen carnis contra naturam occurs when the object of the desire is in fact of the opposite sex but is not human. Such is sodomy, or intercourse with animals. This, too, is contrary to the ends of humanity and against our natural instinct. It degrades mankind below the level of animals, for no animal turns in this way from its own species.75

#### This is not “Kant believed some other bad thing.” The argument follows from the necessity of avoiding contradiction in conception by willing the perpetuation of the species. Kant thought the homosexual maxim of sex without reproduction had no such function, so it constituted sacrificing your rational agency for the subordinate end of pleasure.

#### Means that gay people cannot operate under the assumptions of the 1ac - you have made the round unsafe for them by deploying philosophy that openly condones homophobia and thus attempts to exclude them from the discussion. Discussions in a classroom have profound impacts in academic settings. SOBLE (2):

What was it like to listen to the distinguished Kant lecture on sexual perversion, to sit in Kant's classroom in 1780, hearing his emotional, weakly-argued condemnation of masturbation and homosexuality, and copying it into a notebook?96 Did his students titter? Was tittering tolerated in the German classroom? Did they at least roll their eyes? Were they disgusted, along with Kant, at homosexuality, or were they disgusted by his disgust? (Are my students disgusted, along with me, by homophobia, or are they disgusted by my being disgusted?) And those in his classes who masturbated or were homosexual, how did they respond? Consider the pain of hearing oneself accused in the strongest terms of being lower than a beast, and being accused by no less an authority than Professor Kant. His diatribe against homosexuality is little more than intellectual gay-bashing. Thus I imagine the profound fear felt by his targets who attended his lectures. I wonder if I would have had the courage to confront Kant in class, if I would have had the manly balls of my rational autonomy to do what the lesbian sadomasochist Pat Califia does: If I am going to be called all those bad names anyway, I might as well be the first one to spread the good news. When you come out, you make yourself vulnerable to disapproval, criticism, and discrimination. But you also get to define your own terms. You get to go first and be the one to say who you are and what that means. And after you've already admitted in public that you're a hopelessly twisted slut, what are your detractors going to do?97 I don't know if I would have been able to confess my own 'pervy' sexuality in Kant's auditorium. Maybe it is only from the comfortable, far away position of the early 21st-century that I feel safe calling Kant's account of sexual perversion a clunker concocted by a kisöreg.

## Case

1. Alan Soble, The Monist 86:1 (Jan. 2003), pp. 55-89. Kant and Sexual Perversion [↑](#footnote-ref-1)