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

#### Pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable. people consistently regard pleasure and pain as good reasons for action, despite the fact that pleasure doesn’t seem to be instrumentally valuable for anything.

Moen 16 [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281]

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes: “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.

#### 2. existential threats outweigh-

#### a. Extinction outweighs.

--- must preserve infinite lives and generations.

--- question of intergenerational equity.

--- existential threats are underestimated: global public good, intergenerational, unprecedented, scope neglect.

GPP 17 (Global Priorities Project, Future of Humanity Institute at the University of Oxford, Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland, “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance,” Global Priorities Project, 2017, <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>, Accessed 7/22/2017, Kent Denver-jKIM)

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

#### b. prereq to their offense- it forecloses all future value and causes massive structural violence

#### 3. only it can explain degrees of wrongness- it is worse to kill thousands than to lie to a friend- either ethical theories cannot explain comparative badness, or it collapses
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#### Plan: A just government ought to provide a federal jobs guarantee.

Tcherneva 18 [Pavlina R. Tcherneva is an American economist, of Bulgarian descent, working as associate professor and director of the Economics program at Bard College. She is also a research associate at the Levy Economics Institute and expert at the Institute for New Economic Thinking. “The Job Guarantee: Design, Jobs, and Implementation.” April 2018. http://www.levyinstitute.org/pubs/wp\_902.pdf]

The job guarantee (JG) is a public option for jobs. It is a permanent, federally funded, and locally administered program that supplies voluntary employment opportunities on demand for all who are ready and willing to work at a living wage. While it is first and foremost a jobs program, it has the potential to be transformative by advancing the public purpose and improving working conditions, people’s everyday lives, and the economy as a whole. This working paper provides a blueprint for operationalizing the proposal. It addresses frequently asked questions and common concerns. It begins by outlining some of the core propositions in the existing literature that have motivated the JG proposal. These propositions suggest specific design and implementation features. (Some questions are answered in greater detail in appendix III). The paper presents the core objectives and expected benefits of the program, and suggests an institutional structure, funding mechanism, and project design and administration. I. CONCEPTUAL UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT For the purposes of this paper full employment is defined as a situation where any person of legal working age who wants to work is able to obtain employment at a living wage and decent working conditions. This includes but is not limited to new entrants in the labor market, people in “hidden unemployment” who are not normally counted in the official statistics, and individuals who are employed involuntarily in part-time working arrangements or other forms of precarious work. At the macroeconomic level, unemployment is understood as: · A monetary problem: It is a consequence of business cycles dynamics and profitseeking firms behavior, as well as the State’s inadequate management of the currency and the monetary system. · A situation that cannot be remedied by private firms: The private sector is unable to produce and maintain tight full employment over the long run. 3 · A problem that is best understood as a silent epidemic: There is a distinct and discernable geographical pattern and propagation mechanism of unemployment, which mimics the behavior of a virus or mass contagion (Tcherneva 2017). Joblessness behaves like a disease and generates large social, health, and economic costs. · A problem that is already “paid for”: The costs of these social and economic ills— both in real and financial terms—are already “paid for” by the economy and society at large. · A problem by design and a public sector failure: Unemployment is a problem created by concrete policy measures (targeting a non-accelerating rate of unemployment [NAIRU], austerity policies). The government has chosen an explicit policy of keeping a percentage of the population in involuntary unemployment (the NAIRU is a policy benchmark). The government is also responsible for supporting the unemployed, i.e., the unemployed are already in the public sector. Government, public institutions, and civil society are not only paying the direct cost of unemployment, but more importantly are already bearing the large associated real costs of unemployment. · A moral failure: Unemployment has been used as the main bulwark against inflation and economic instability and is considered a “necessary evil.” The idea that some people will necessarily lose their jobs and livelihoods in the fight against other economic ills is a profound moral failure of the economics profession. Unemployment is the failure and responsibility of the public sector and it is already “paid for.” By contrast, the JG offers a superior policy option to the current approach, and one that is macroeconomically sound and humane. It pays to employ the unemployed, preventing and reducing the outsized costs of unemployment, supporting the production of valuable public goods, and investing in and empowering people, planet, and community. 4 II. OBJECTIVES OF THE JOB GUARANTEE Core Policy Objective of the Job Guarantee · To provide decent jobs at decent pay on demand to all individuals of legal working age who want to work, irrespective of labor market status, race, sex, color, or creed. Additional Objectives · To guarantee a basic human right, as outlined in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and Franklin D. Roosevelt’s call for an Economic Bill of Rights. · To institute a public option for work, i.e., an employment safety net. · To create job opportunities in close proximity to the unemployed. · To create suitable work opportunities for people of varied skill levels. · To serve the public purpose. · To establish an effective minimum wage for the economy as a whole. · To operate as an “employment buffer stock” in stabilizing the business cycle. · To enhance price stability by using the JG’s buffer stock mechanism and minimum wage feature. · To serve as a preventative policy that inoculates against the vast economic, social and political costs of unemployment. · To be used as an institution vehicle for addressing other social ills—e.g., environmental concerns, care needs, urban blight, etc. · To put people and their needs at the forefront of public policy, in order to empower and support them. III. KEY PROGRAM FEATURES · Permanent but voluntary: The program is permanent. It offers employment opportunities in the community to perform socially useful work. · A living wage: It offers a wage-benefit package, establishing a floor to living incomes. The wage in this proposal is $15 per hour plus benefits. 5 · Local: The program takes the contract to the worker, creating jobs where the unemployed live. · Targeted: By design, the program creates the greatest number of jobs in communities with the greatest number of unemployed people, who are facing multiple other social deprivations. · Federally funded, locally administered: Since it is an employment safety net, and for financial sustainability reasons, the program is funded by the federal government, but primarily administered by local and municipal governments, nonprofits and/or social enterprises, and cooperatives. · An “add on” program: This is a new program that serves as an option to (but does not displace) existing programs. For example, people would have a choice between continuing to receive unemployment insurance (UI) or enrolling in the program. If they choose the former but still have trouble finding conventional private or public sector work once UI benefits have been exhausted, they will still have the option of enrolling in the JG program. · Not a workfare program: The program does not require people to work for their existing benefits (e.g., Medicare, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program [SNAP], Head Start, etc.). · Community Jobs Banks: The program serves as a repository of various employment opportunities. It does not displace existing public sector work. It is authorized as a separate program under the Department of Labor (DOL) and provides employment opportunities on standby. · A safety net and a transitional jobs program: As a safety net, it gives opportunities to anyone who wishes to work at the base wage-benefit package, irrespective of their labor market status or situation. As a transitional program, it serves as a stepping stone to paid work—from unemployment to employment or from JG employment to other forms of private, public, and nonprofit employment. · Fits JG jobs to people: It meets people where they are in terms of ability. It provides suitable, useful work opportunities, designed to be appropriate for the education or skill level of the applicant. 6 · Provides working day options: The JG offers part-time and flexible work arrangements, as needed, for caregivers, students, etc. · Jobs for all: The program does not exclude any individual or group of people who want to work. The design must be sensitive to the needs of special groups such as veterans, atrisk youth, ex-convicts, or people with disabilities. · Invests in people: It offers training, education, and apprenticeship opportunities. · Invests in communities: The JG aims to match unfilled community needs with unemployed or underemployed people who could work to meet them. · Invests in the public good: It separates the offer of employment from the profitability of employment. Projects are created to serve community needs, rather than prioritizing whether the projects are deemed “profitable” in the narrow sense. · Invests in the environment: The program focuses on addressing environmental concerns.

#### An FJG solves discrimination in the job market

Wray et. al. 18 [Larry Randall Wray is a professor of Economics at Bard College and Senior Scholar at the Levy Economics Institute. Flavia Dantas is a professor of economics at SUNY, Cortland. Scott Fullwiler is a Research Scholar at the Global Institute for Sustainable Prosperity and Associate Professor of economics at the University of Missouri – Kansas City. Pavlina Tcherneva is an associate professor of economics and director of the economics program at Bard College. Stephanie Kelton is an American economist and academic. She is currently a professor at Stony Brook University and a Senior Fellow at the Schwartz Center for Economic Policy Analysis at the New School for Social Research. “Public Service Employment: A Path to Full Employment.” April 2018. <http://www.levyinstitute.org/pubs/rpr_4_18.pdf>]

\*\*\*Note --- PSE = FJG\*\*\*

The PSE program would play a progressive role in addressing certain racial, ethnic, and gender inequalities in labor markets. Blacks and Hispanics tend to face labor market conditions that are more uncertain, difficult, or unstable. These groups tend to face higher unemployment and underemployment rates, as well as a longer duration of unemployment. They are also less likely to work in the highest paying occupations (management, professional, and related), receive considerably lower median weekly earnings in nearly all occupational groups,22 and are twice as likely to be among the working poor. Not surprisingly, these groups stand to benefit more than proportionally from the PSE program. Using demographic data for the segments of the CNIP 16+ discussed above, we find that the share of racial and ethnic minorities participating in the program would be greater than their respective shares of both the CNIP 16+ and the labor force. This section breaks down the demographic composition of the program’s potential workforce23 for the subsections of the CNIP 16+ selected above. Demographics of the unemployed24 In 2017Q3, the overall unemployment rate was at 4.4 percent. Youths, blacks, and Latinos experienced the highest unemployment rates. In fact, blacks were twice as likely to be unemployed as whites—they faced an unemployment rate of 7.5 percent, compared to 3.8 percent for whites and 5.1 percent for Hispanics and Latinos. Blacks were also subject to longer average and median durations of unemployment (28 and 12.5 weeks, respectively), while black male teenagers (18–19 years of age) experienced a jobless rate of 33.9 percent—much higher than any other demographic group. Demographics of the underemployed and underpaid The demographics of the program’s projected participants will mirror the demographics of the unemployed, underemployed, and marginally attached—with greater than proportional participation by women, blacks, and Hispanics. In proportion to their shares of the CNIP 16+ and the labor force, blacks and Hispanics are also more likely to be employed part time for economic reasons. These groups are also more likely to be paid hourly for full-time employment at or below the minimum wage. Meanwhile, whites, especially women, are proportionally more likely to be working part time for noneconomic reasons. All of these groups will benefit from the introduction of the PSE program. Demographics of the population out of the labor force Women of all races were more likely to fall out of the labor force even though they wanted a job. Men were more likely to cite discouragement as a reason for wanting a job but not searching in the previous month. Meanwhile, women were likely to cite “other reasons” for wanting a job, while being classified as only marginally attached to the labor force (note that “other reasons” include childcare problems and other family responsibilities, which are seen as traditionally female responsibilities). Further, blacks and Hispanics were more likely to be out of the labor force, even though they wanted work, than whites. Again, the program will benefit all these groups. Demographics of the program’s potential participants Table 2.5 shows the breakdown of the racial, ethnic, and gender composition of the potential program participants based on the assumptions described above. Consistent with our findings above, blacks and Hispanics will benefit more than proportionately— relative to their respective shares of the CNIP 16+ and the labor force—from the creation of the program. Poverty Reduction and PSE Sustained, tight full employment through a universal job guarantee program is the most effective policy tool for fighting poverty in the United States. Poverty in this country is largely a matter of income distribution, inadequate pay, and insufficient hours of work. The PSE program tackles all three problems simultaneously by providing jobs on demand at a living wage to all who are willing and ready to work. Further, full employment at a living wage increases the bargaining power of workers in low-paying jobs and thus reduces wage disparities across industries and occupations. Poverty in the United States In 2016, there were 40.6 million people and 27.8 million families living in poverty in the United States. Blacks and Hispanics experienced the highest poverty rates. Women were more likely to be below the poverty line than men, and teenagers and children were far more likely to be below the poverty line than those aged 18 and older. Poverty rates among the elderly were the lowest—thanks to Social Security. Families with a single female householder were almost twice as likely to experience poverty as families where the single householder was male. Also, families with related children under the age of 18 experienced poverty rates much higher than did families with no children. The availability of jobs that pay a living wage reduces the likelihood that individuals and their families will fall into poverty. Families with no employed workers, or with only one part-time worker, were far more likely to fall under the poverty threshold (26.4 percent and 29.6 percent, respectively) than families with a full-time worker. Only 3 percent of families with at least one full-time, year-round worker fell below 100 percent of the poverty threshold. In other words, lack of access to a full-time job increases the probability of falling into poverty nearly tenfold. The pattern is similar for individuals between ages 18 and 64. Those who worked for at least one week during 2016 experienced poverty rates much lower than those who did not work for at least one week: 5.9 percent compared to 30.5 percent. Families with children under the age of 18 were more likely to be at or below the poverty line, and while families with no workers faced the highest poverty rates, families where members of the household worked only part time also experienced poverty rates well above national averages.25 The working poor The opportunity to work full time greatly reduces the incidence of poverty. In 2016, 8.75 million individuals between the ages of 18 and 64 who worked during the year lived in poverty. The poverty rate for individuals in the same age group who worked full time was only 2.2 percent, while those who worked less than full time or did not work at all faced much higher poverty rates: 14.7 percent and 30.5 percent, respectively. The BLS (2017a) identifies three major labor market problems that prevent working people from escaping poverty: low earnings, unemployment, and involuntary part-time employment. In 2015, 82 percent of the working poor experienced at least one of these three problems. Around 40.3 percent of workers who participated in the labor market for at least 27 weeks, and experienced all three problems above, lived below the poverty threshold. Those who experienced low pay and some period of unemployment had a 41.4 percent chance of falling below the poverty line. Low earnings was by far the most common single problem for the working poor—25 percent of those who worked at least 27 weeks in low-paying jobs lived below the poverty line. 20 Public Service Employment The PSE program described above tackles all three problems at once, providing full-time work at a living wage. And because the program sets an effective national minimum wage of $15 per hour, with benefits that include childcare and healthcare, we expect the implementation of the program to also benefit private sector workers who are paid less than the minimum wage or who do not receive adequate benefits from their employers.26 A study by the Economic Policy Institute (Cooper 2017) estimates that over 40 million workers would be affected by an increase of the minimum wage to $15 per hour. Even if the legal minimum wage were not raised, the existence of a PSE program that pays $15 would ensure that anyone ready and willing to work would be able to receive at least that wage. Also, we expect that many of those employed part time for economic reasons, and noneconomic reasons related to childcare, will join the program. Even if they continue to work part time, they will receive the program’s wage. This will allow many families to have an additional worker to provide supplemental income. Childhood poverty Children under the age of 18 experience the highest poverty rates in the United States. In 2016, 80.3 percent of families with no working member and with related children under the age of 18 lived in poverty. By contrast, only 4.9 percent of families where at least one member of the household worked full time, year round were poor. If more than one member of the family worked full time, year round, the likelihood that families with children would fall below the poverty threshold is much lower: 0.7 percent. The impact of the PSE program on poverty As discussed above, the program sets the effective minimum wage. Today, an individual who works 40 hours a week for 52 weeks (i.e., full time) at the current federal minimum wage will earn only $15,080 a year. As can be seen in Table 2.6, families with only one member of the household working full time at the minimum wage (assuming wages and salaries are the only source of family income) would fall below the poverty threshold. By contrast, at the PSE wage of $15 per hour, a program participant employed full time, year round would earn an annual income of $31,200,27 which is well above the poverty threshold for a typical family of four. In fact, it would take only one member of the family working full time in the PSE program to lift a family of five (with or without children under the age of 18) out of poverty. With the program in place, families composed of up to five individuals could be lifted out of poverty if one member participated in the program full time. If a second member of the household were to work part time, year round (i.e., 20 hours per week for 52 weeks) in the program, the family income would be sufficient to lift family units containing up to eight individuals out of poverty. Finally, poverty would be eradicated if at least two members of the household in families of eight or more worked full time in the program. Levy Economics Institute of Bard College 21 The number of adults and children in different family units who could be lifted out of poverty with implementation of the program will depend on the number of individuals in poor families that would be willing and able to take a program job. We do not know how many members of poor families would join the program, but we can estimate the number of adults and children who live below the poverty thresholds according to the family unit size (see Table 2.7). 28 According to our calculations, 9.5 million children under 18 could be raised above current poverty thresholds if one member of their household were employed full time, year round in the program. Another 2.9 million children in families composed of six to eight individuals could be raised out of poverty if two members of the household were employed in the program, with one full-time and one part-time worker, both year round. For families with more than eight members, it would take two full-time workers to raise their families above the poverty threshold. Clearly, families could still fall below the poverty threshold if, for any reason (including disability, illness, or age), full-time work in the program is not a possibility. A generous safety net should be in place to support or supplement incomes for families whose members cannot or should not work. The program would greatly reduce the number of families and individuals receiving such transfer payments. Further, the net size of income transfers necessary for these families would be smaller if these families could be directly and indirectly benefited by the in-kind output generated by their local PSE program. The demands on the social safety net would be far smaller if all those who wanted to work could obtain jobs at a living wage.

#### FJG would raise the wage floor to a living wage

Tcherneva 20 [Pavlina Tcherneva is an associate professor of economics and director of the economics program at Bard College. “GUARANTEEING EMPLOYMENT DURING THE PANDEMIC AND BEYOND.” 2020. http://www.levyinstitute.org/pubs/pn\_20\_4.pdf]

Critically, the JG raises the wage floor by establishing a labor standard for minimum pay and working conditions for all jobs in the economy. It is a policy that ensures that precarious and poorly paid work is extinguished along with the coronavirus by increasing competition in the labor market— competition for workers. Why toil away at $7.25/hour if the local green JG project offers $15/hour and Medicare? As an alternative to the most precarious private sector work, the JG pressures firms to improve their pay and benefits if they wish to retain and attract employees. Many private sector workers will get a pay raise, which in turn will boost spending, growth, and firm profits. Businesses that can only survive by paying poverty wages will no longer be viable; nor will those that use the “threat of the sack” to create the most difficult working conditions (wage theft, discrimination, harassment) for the lowest-wage and most vulnerable workers. The JG will give workers the power to say “no” to abusive employers. It will also act as a stepping-stone for young people entering the labor market, an employment opportunity for caregivers who wish to return to paid work, and a bridge to civilian employment for former inmates and veterans.

#### Living wages drive innovation

Popelka 14 [Larry Popelka Founder and CEO of GameChanger.  He also writes a regular innovation column for Bloomberg BusinessWeek.  Prior to GameChanger Larry was VP of Marketing, Global Development and New Ventures at Clorox. Larry led corporate innovation, strategy and acquisitions for Clorox. He also wrote Moneyball Marketing and GameChanger Manifesto. “The Case for a Higher Minimum Wage to Drive Innovation.” May 13, 2014. https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2014-05-13/the-case-for-a-higher-minimum-wage-to-drive-innovation]

The [minimum wage debate](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/terminal/N0ZWCT3HBS3K) is missing one important point: Higher minimum wages spur innovation. A lot of companies sell products and services to help streamline operations and lower costs. Cheap labor is a barrier to innovation because it means that any investment in new equipment will take that much longer to pay off for the customer. As U.S. minimum wage labor got cheaper in real dollar terms over the past decade, it has become harder for these companies to innovate. A great example is Ecolab, a company that sells cleaning products and equipment to hotels, restaurants, and other businesses that employ minimum wage workers. Ecolab’s business model is to provide advanced, automated cleaning equipment and supplies (such as self-dosing washing machines and automated cleaning devices) that get the job done with less labor, thus reducing costs. As labor costs stay flat or go down, it becomes harder for Ecolab to demonstrate economic value through labor savings to its customers. Ecolab and companies like it are probably sitting on innovations that don’t yet pay out but might become viable if the minimum wage were to increase to $9 or $10 per hour. A February [report from the Congressional Budget Office](http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/44995-MinimumWage.pdf) report estimates that a minimum wage at $10 per hour would cost the economy 500,000 jobs. But this analysis fails to take into account the secondary and tertiary benefits of “innovation stimulus” from a minimum wage hike that would probably add higher-skilled jobs to the economy. McDonald’s, one of the largest employers of minimum wage workers, owes much of its historic success to rising minimum wages. Ray Kroc’s original business model at McDonald’s when he founded it in 1955 was to develop more efficient ways to cook and serve hamburgers; he used automated equipment and more standardized ways of working so his shops could produce more food per employee. So went the invention of “fast food.” McDonald’s was able to undercut local hamburger shops on cost. Its success was fueled by a rapidly rising federal minimum wage, which grew from 75¢ per hour, when McDonald’s was founded, to $1.40 per hour just 12 years later, making it harder for local hamburger joints with higher labor costs to compete. McDonald’s success also created a variety of new jobs. A new set of companies was formed to supply high-tech fast food equipment; one was llinois-based Prince Castle, which was founded in 1955 to service McDonald’s and now sells fast food equipment globally. The UPC barcode is another example of an innovation made feasible by higher minimum wages. Prior to the invention of barcodes, grocery stock clerks manually attached price stickers to every package in a supermarket. Printed barcodes on packages eventually eliminated that task, saving grocery retailers millions of dollars in labor. But in 1973, even though IBM had developed a working barcode system, none of the grocery chains wanted to adopt it. They couldn’t justify the investment because minimum wage labor cost only $1.60 per hour, making it cheaper for them to keep manually applying price stickers. By 1980, the minimum wage had jumped to $3.10 per hour, drastically changing the economics and leading almost every store to convert to a UPC system by 1985. While many stock clerks lost their jobs, several new industries were created. IBM, NCR, and additional computing companies benefited by selling scanner systems that later went global. And AC Nielsen created a new business selling the available scanner data and sales analytics to manufacturers to help them better understand how their products were selling and how well their marketing worked. Today, Nielsen employs 40,000 people in jobs that pay a lot more than stock clerks earn. RFID tags represent the next generation of product scanning, but the technology still sits on the sidelines because it hasn’t crossed that cost-benefit threshold. The tags use radio frequency signals to allow products to be scanned and inventory to be managed in bulk from a distance, eliminating the need for workers to scan individual items. The cost has come down to 7¢ per tag, making them close to affordable, so it is possible that a minimum wage change would make this technology widely viable. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of such innovations might become commonplace via a simple change in the minimum wage. Smart, innovative companies should be pushing for a minimum wage increase because it represents an opportunity to create disruptive products and services that will move companies, industries, and the U.S. economy forward.

#### Innovation is key to fighting climate change

Fayolle 19 [Ambroise Fayolle is the vice president of the European Investment Bank. “How Techonological Innovation Can Disrupt Climate Change.” November, 2019. https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2019/11/how-technological-innovation-can-disrupt-climate-change]

The only way to get ahead of a crisis as large as climate change is through groundbreaking technological innovation in clean energy and low-carbon technologies. And that, in turn, will require efforts to mitigate investment risks for private-sector actors, who cannot be expected to ignore their own bottom lines. Because it poses an existential threat to humanity, climate change represents the bad kind of disruption. But it can – and must – be fought with the good kind of disruption: innovation. Since the Industrial Revolution, disruptive innovation has generated growth, created jobs, and opened new avenues for investment. And in the case of climate change, it could save humanity, by accelerating global efforts to reduce greenhouse-gas (GHG) emissions. In fact, innovation will be absolutely necessary for a successful transition to a green economy that leaves no one behind. Without it, we have less chance of achieving genuine sustainability. The alternative, of course, is unthinkable. To understand the extent of the threat posed by climate change in the event that we do nothing, consider where we are today. Average global temperatures have [already risen](https://visibleearth.nasa.gov/images/47628/global-warming-mapped) by almost 1°C above pre-industrial levels, owing to the accumulation of GHGs in the atmosphere; and two-thirds of that increase has occurred since 1975. If the trend continues, global average temperatures could rise by 4°C by the end of this century. If that doesn’t sound like much, remember that our climate is fragile. Small changes in surface temperatures will cause big problems. When average temperatures were 4°C below pre-industrial levels, much of Europe was buried beneath several kilometers of ice. Just imagine what a world that is 3°C warmer than today might look like. Nonetheless, I am confident that effective, disruptive ideas are out there. Floating windfarms, for example, can unlock clean wind power for the dozens of countries whose coastal waters are too deep for traditional offshore facilities. And advances in technologies based on waste-eating bioluminescent bacteria promise to illuminate our streets and factories. To bring these solutions to scale, we need to put more financing into the right hands. We also need to encourage industries to be more creative, and to pursue more breakthrough technologies. For example, the European Investment Bank (EIB), the European Commission, and Breakthrough Energy Ventures [established](https://www.eib.org/en/press/all/2019-141-the-european-commission-european-investment-bank-and-breakthrough-energy-ventures-establish-a-new-eur-100-million-fund-to-support-clean-energy-investments) a €100 million ($110 million) fund in 2019 to support disruptive investments in clean energy. Innovative disruption needs to happen fast. According to the International Energy Agency, only seven of the 45 energy technologies and sectors assessed in its most recent [Tracking Clean Energy Progress](https://www.iea.org/tcep/) report are on target to meet its Sustainable Development Scenario, which is aligned with the global commitments enshrined in the 2015 Paris climate agreement. Hence, for the policymakers, technologists, executives, and entrepreneurs, the question is: Where do we go from here?

#### Extinction -- contrary models are wrong.

Ng 19 [Yew-Kwang; May 2019; Professor of Economics at Nanyang Technology University, Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and Member of the Advisory Board at the Global Priorities Institute at Oxford University, Ph.D. in Economics from Sydney University; Global Policy, “Keynote: Global Extinction and Animal Welfare: Two Priorities for Effective Altruism,” vol. 10, no. 2, p. 258-266; RP]

Catastrophic climate change

Though by no means certain, CCC causing global extinction is possible due to interrelated factors of non‐linearity, cascading effects, positive feedbacks, multiplicative factors, critical thresholds and tipping points (e.g. Barnosky and Hadly, [2016](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0005); Belaia et al., [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0008); Buldyrev et al., [2010](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0016); Grainger, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0027); Hansen and Sato, [2012](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0029); IPCC [2014](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0031); Kareiva and Carranza, [2018](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0033); Osmond and Klausmeier, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0056); Rothman, [2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0066); Schuur et al., [2015](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0069); Sims and Finnoff, [2016](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0072); Van Aalst, [2006](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0079)).[7](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-note-1009_67)

A possibly imminent tipping point could be in the form of ‘an abrupt ice sheet collapse [that] could cause a rapid sea level rise’ (Baum et al., [2011](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0006), p. 399). There are many avenues for positive feedback in global warming, including:

* the replacement of an ice sea by a liquid ocean surface from melting reduces the reflection and increases the absorption of sunlight, leading to faster warming;
* the drying of forests from warming increases forest fires and the release of more carbon; and
* higher ocean temperatures may lead to the release of methane trapped under the ocean floor, producing runaway global warming.

Though there are also avenues for negative feedback, the scientific consensus is for an overall net positive feedback (Roe and Baker, [2007](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0065)). Thus, the Global Challenges Foundation ([2017](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0026), p. 25) concludes, ‘The world is currently completely unprepared to envisage, and even less deal with, the consequences of CCC’.

The threat of sea‐level rising from global warming is well known, but there are also other likely and more imminent threats to the survivability of mankind and other living things. For example, Sherwood and Huber ([2010](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0071)) emphasize the adaptability limit to climate change due to heat stress from high environmental wet‐bulb temperature. They show that ‘even modest global warming could … expose large fractions of the [world] population to unprecedented heat stress’ p. 9552 and that with substantial global warming, ‘the area of land rendered uninhabitable by heat stress would dwarf that affected by rising sea level’ p. 9555, making extinction much more likely and the relatively moderate damages estimated by most integrated assessment models unreliably low.

While imminent extinction is very unlikely and may not come for a long time even under business as usual, the main point is that we cannot rule it out. Annan and Hargreaves ([2011](https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/full/10.1111/1758-5899.12647#gpol12647-bib-0004), pp. 434–435) may be right that there is ‘an upper 95 per cent probability limit for S [temperature increase] … to lie close to 4°C, and certainly well below 6°C’. However, probabilities of 5 per cent, 0.5 per cent, 0.05 per cent or even 0.005 per cent of excessive warming and the resulting extinction probabilities cannot be ruled out and are unacceptable. Even if there is only a 1 per cent probability that there is a time bomb in the airplane, you probably want to change your flight. Extinction of the whole world is more important to avoid by literally a trillion times.
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#### Tech can solve infrastructure concerns but needs to be integrated – operators are key.

Jacobs 5/31 [Lionel; Senior Security Architect in the Palo Alto Networks ICS and SCADA solutions team. Coming from the asset-owner side , Lionel has spent more than 20 years working in the IT/OT environment, with a focus on ICS systems design, controls, and implementation. He was a pioneer in bridging the IT-OT security gap and implementing next-generation security into performance and safety critical process control areas. During his tenure, he successfully deployed a large scale ICS/SCADA security architecture composed of over 100 next-generation firewalls, hundreds of advanced endpoint protection clients and SIEM, distributed over dozens of remote plants and a centralized core, all based on a "Zero Trust" philosophy. Lionel graduated from Houston Baptist University with a double degree in Physics and Mathematics and has held certifications as a MCSE, CCA, CCNP, CCIP, CCNA, CSSA, and GICSP; “Critical Infrastructure Protection: Physical and Cyber Security Both Matter,” eSecurity Planet; 5/31/21; https://www.esecurityplanet.com/networks/critical-infrastructure-protection-physical-cybersecurity/]//SJWen

Segmentation based on business criteria

Segmentation is not just breaking apart the network based on the IP-Address space. True segmentation requires identifying and grouping devices into Zones or Enclaves based on meaningful business criteria to protect better vulnerable devices found within the address space. Access to devices in the zone needs to be restricted by users, groups, protocols, networks, and devices. In some instances, you may even consider restricting access by time of day.

IoT/IIoT is beginning to take hold in the energy industry, which means there are going to be more devices attached to these networks gathering information and possibly running on a vendor’s proprietary software and hardware, which more than likely will not be managed or patchable by the operator of the system. So O&G needs to have a definite plan on how they will address this growing trend, and a zero trust-based strategy offers the best means of doing this integration in a safe, secure, and, most important, reversible manner.

Camera and sensor security

Segmentation will also include the zoning of radio frequency (RF) technologies like Wi-Fi, Microwave, satellite, and cellular. ICS and SCADA systems operators must remain mindful of the possibility of an upstream attack by threat actors who have managed to compromise their RF facilities. Remote facilities and devices often have cameras and sensors to alert when a door has been opened. Still, because they are remote, attackers have time to enter the facilities and plant a device that can go completely unnoticed.

Another option physical access affords them is the opportunity to compromise the runtime operating systems and/or OS of the devices they find. The only way you will find these would be to do a physical search of the facility or cabinet and run an audit of the OS to ensure nothing has been tainted.

Zoning limits damage

So the reason why the zone trust segmentation (zoning) is so important is if you don’t have the time to perform these acts to confirm that the site is not compromised. With proper zoning enforcement, you can limit and isolate the damage to a region or just that location.

Zones in a Zero Trust network also serve as an inspection point for traffic entering and exiting the enclave. The enabling of IPS, IDS, and virtual sandboxing technology can be applied on a per-zone basis, allowing for customized protection for the vulnerable devices contained within. Implementing these security measures is a best practice even on zones where devices can receive updates and have some form of endpoint protection.

With proper design and device consideration, zoning with the different inspection technologies enabled can also be a remediating factor for those devices in your network that cannot be patched, updated, and even those that are end-of-life. In short, zoning with inspection technology enabled helps to ensure IT and OT network systems’ safe operations. In even the most secure environments, it is never safe to assume that data traffic transversing the network is free of a potential threat.

#### Increased strikes send a clear signal to terrorists that critical US infrastructure is vulnerable by weakening organizations.

Davies 6 [Ross; George Mason University - Antonin Scalia Law School, Faculty, The Green Bag; “Strike Season: Protecting Labor-Management Conflict in the Age of Terror,” SSRN; 4/12/06; https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=896185]//SJWen

Strikes (and, to a lesser extent, lockouts) are painful but necessary parts of private-sector American labor-management relations. Even if they weren't - even if sound public policy called for their eradication - we couldn't stop them. They are an inevitable byproduct of the conflicting interests and limited resources of organized workers and their employers. History shows that this is true even in times of warfare overseas or crisis at home: labor-management strife lessens at the beginning of a conflict and then bounces back. Now, however, we are confronted with warfare at home, a phenomenon that the United States has not had to deal with since the Civil War - before the rise of today's unprecedentedly large, complex, and interdependent economy and government.

And history is repeating itself again. After a lull at the beginning of the war with terrorists, work stoppages have returned to their pre-war levels. The overall rate of strike activity is substantially lower than it was during previous wars (it has been slowly declining, along with overall union membership in the private sector, for decades). Today's war, however, is being fought in part on American soil, and against enemies who operate worldwide, but whose attacks tend to be small and local, seeking advantage from the unpredictability and brutality of the damage they inflict rather than from its scale. Thus, even small, localized, and occasional work stoppages - not just the large-scale strikes that arguably affected the military-industrial complex and thus the war efforts in the past - have the potential to increase risks to critical infrastructure and public safety during the war on terror. In other words, persistent strike activity at current levels poses risks of public harm, albeit risks that are difficult to anticipate with specificity in the absence of much experience or available data. This justifies taking some reasonable precautions, including the proposal made in this Article.

By its very nature, a labor strike increases the vulnerability of that employer's operations to a terrorist attack. A strike is an act specifically designed to disrupt and weaken an employer's operations, for the (usually) perfectly lawful purpose of pressing for resolution of a dispute with management. A weakened organization or other entity is, of course, less capable of resisting and surviving exogenous shocks, whether they be commercial competition or terrorist attacks. In the United States, with its fully extended and endlessly interconnected critical infrastructure that touches everything from food processing to energy distribution to water quality, a strike in the wrong place at the wrong time that disrupts and weakens some part of that infrastructure could be decisive in the success or failure of a terrorist attack of the small, local sort described above, on such a weakened link in some infrastructural chain. Of course, none of this is to suggest that any union or its members (or any employer or its managers) would knowingly expose their fellow citizens or their property to a terrorist attack. To the contrary, experience to date suggests that union members are at least as patriotic and conscientious as Americans in general. In fact, the effectiveness of the proposal made in this Article is predicated in part on the assumption that neither workers nor their employers will knowingly contribute to the incidence or effectiveness of terrorist attacks. The concern addressed here is, rather, that innocent instigators or perpetuators of a work stoppage might unwittingly facilitate a successful terrorist attack or aggravate its effects.

#### Attacks on critical infrastructure collapses the economy through multiple avenues.

FAS 6 [DCSINT Handbook No. 1.02; Info directly from US army and Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence; “Critical Infrastructure Threats and Terrorism,” DCSINT/FAS; 8/10/6; https://fas.org/irp/threat/terrorism/sup2.pdf]//SJWen

Agriculture

In 1984, a cult group poisoned salad bars at several Oregon restaurants with Salmonella bacteria as the first recorded event of bioterrorism in the United States. This resulted in 750 people becoming sick.24 A review of the agriculture infrastructure results in vulnerable areas such as the high concentration of the livestock industry and the centralized nature of the food processing industry. The farm-to table chain contains various points into which an attack could be launched. The threat of attack would seriously damage consumer confidence and undermine export markets. Understanding the goal of the threat points to the area most likely attacked. If the intent was economic disruption the target would be livestock and crops, but if the intent was mass casualties the point of attack would be contamination of finished food products. Damage to livestock could be very swift, the USDA calculated that foot-and mouth disease could spread to 25 states in 5 days.25 CDC is presently tracking and developing scenarios for the arrival of Avian Flu.

Banking

Prior to the destruction of the Twin Towers, physical attacks against the banking industry, such as the destruction of facilities, were rare. Unfortunately, evidence indicates that may change, in March 2005 three British al-Qa’ida operatives were indicted by a U.S. federal court on charges of conducting detailed reconnaissance of financial targets in lower Manhattan, Newark, New Jersey, and Washington, D.C. In addition to video taping the Citigroup Center and the New York Stock Exchange in New York City, the Prudential Financial building in Newark, and the headquarters of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in Washington D.C., the men amassed more than 500 photographs of the sites.26 The Banking infrastructures primary weakness is along its cyber axis of attack. Through phishing and banking Trojan targeting specific financial institutions, attackers reduce confidence among consumers. Recently American Express posted an alert online, including a screenshot of a pop-up that appeared when users log in to its secure site.27

The attack not only attempts to obtain personal information that can be used for various operations, but also launches a virus into the user’s computer. CitiBank, and Chase Manhattan Bank have both been victim during 2005 and 2006 to phishing schemes misrepresenting their services to their clients.

Energy

Recently the oil industry occupied the headlines, and the criticality of this infrastructure is not lost on terrorists. In mid-December 2004, Arab television aired an alleged audiotape message by Usama bin Laden in which he called upon his followers to wreak havoc on the U.S. and world economy by disrupting oil supplies from the Persian Gulf to the United States.28 The U.S. uses over 20.7 million barrels a day of crude oil and products and imports 58.4% of that requirement.29 On 19 January 2006 al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden announced in a video release that, “The war against America and its allies will not be confined to Iraq…..”, and since June of 2003 there have been 298 recorded attacks against Iraqi oil facilities.30 Terrorists conduct research as to the easiest point to damage the flow of oil or to the point where the most damage can be done. Scenarios involving the oil fields themselves, a jetliner crashing into the Ras Tanura facility in Saudi Arabia could remove 10 percent of the world’s energy imports in one act.31 Maritime attacks are also option for terrorists; on October 6, 2002 a French tanker carrying 397,000 barrels of crude oil from Iran to Malaysia was rammed by an explosive laden boat off of the port of Ash Shihr, 353 miles east of Aden. The double-hulled tanker was breached, and maritime insurers tripled the rates.32 Energy most travel often long distances from the site where it is obtained to the point where it is converted into energy for use, a catastrophic event at any of the sites or along its route can adversely impact the energy infrastructure and cause ripples in other infrastructures. The security of the pipeline in Alaska increases in importance as efforts are made to make America more independent on energy use.

Economy

The U.S. economy is the end-state target of several terrorist groups as identified in the introduction quote. The means by which terrorists and other threats attempt to impact the economic infrastructure is through it’s linkage to the other infrastructures. Attacks are launched at other infrastructures, such as energy or the Defense Industrial Base in an effort to achieve a “cascading” result that impacts the economy. Cyber attacks on Banking and Finance are another effort to indirectly impact the economy. The short term impacts of the 9/11 attacks on Lower Manhattan resulted in the loss of 30% of office space and a number of businesses simply ceased to exist. Close to 200,000 jobs were destroyed or relocated out of New York City. The destruction of physical assets was estimated in the national accounts to amount to $14 billion for private businesses, $1.5 billion for state and local government enterprises and $0.7 billion for federal enterprises. Rescue, cleanup and related costs are estimated to at least $11 billion for a total direct cost of $27.2 billion.33 The medium and long term effects cannot be accurately estimated but demonstrate the idea of cascading effects. The five main areas affected over a longer period were Insurance, Airlines, Tourism and other Service Industries, Shipping and Security and military spending. At various times terrorist rhetoric has mentioned attacks against Wall Street proper, but the more realistic damage to the economy will come through the indirect approach of cascading effects.

Transportation

The attack on commuter trains in Madrid in March of 2004 and the London bombings in July of 2005, which together killed 243 people, clearly indicated the threat to the transportation infrastructure. Statistics provided by the Brookings Institute in Washington DC show that between 1991 and 2001 42% of worldwide terrorist attacks were directed against mass transit. Transportation is viewed by terrorists as a “soft target” and one that will impact the people of a country. Mass Service Transportation (MST) is the likely target of a terrorist attack.

MST caters to large volumes of people, crammed into narrow confined spaces

MST is designed to move large numbers of people quickly and efficiently, which is often counter to protective measure

MST assets are enclosed, serving to amplify explosions

MST attacks can result in “cascading effects” because communications and power conduits are usually collocated in proximity to their routes

The Department of Homeland Security sent a “public sector notice” in May of 2006 based on two incidents of “suspicious videotaping” of European mass-transit systems.34 The individual had several tapes besides the one in his camera, none of which showed any tourist sites. The tapes focused on the insides of subway cars, the inside and outside of several stations and exit routes from the stations. In June of 2003 the FBI arrested Iyman Faris, a 34 year old naturalized American citizen who had been in contact with Al Qaeda conducting research and reconnaissance in an effort to destroy the Brooklyn Bridge.35 Mr. Faris had traveled to Afghanistan and Pakistan in 2000, meeting with Osama bin Laden, he returned to the U.S. and began gathering information concerning the Brooklyn Bridge and communicating via coded messages with Al Qaeda leaders. An attack on the bridge would have not only damaged the transportation infrastructure, but also a known American landmark. On 24 May 2006, a Pakistani immigrant was convicted on charges of plotting to blow up one of Manhattan’s busiest subway stations in retaliation for the U.S. actions at the Abu Ghraib prison.36

Terrorist threats to the transportation infrastructure extend beyond land to the sea. Vice Admiral Jonathan Greenert, commander of the U.S. Seventh Fleet, said “one of my nightmares would be a maritime terrorism attack in the Strait of Malacca”.37 “There is a strain of al-Qaida in Southeast Asia, called Jemaah Islamiya. They are actively pursuing a maritime terrorism capability that includes diving and mining training.”38 As how this might impact on the economy, $220 billion in trade comes through the Seventh Fleet area of responsibility and 98% of the commerce is moved by sea. Just as ports can be viewed a SPOF within the maritime transport system, there are certain waterway chokepoints or heavily trafficked areas that can be viewed as a high payoff target to a terrorist or result in catastrophic damage from a natural disaster.

#### Extinction.

Liu '18 [Qian; 11/13/18; Managing Director of Greater China for The Economist Group, previously director of the global economics unit and director of Access China for the Economist Intelligence Unit, PhD in economics from Uppsala University; "The next economic crisis could cause a global conflict. Here's why," <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why/>] // Re-Cut SJWen

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.