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

#### 1] Only pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable – all other frameworks collapse.

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] Weighability – only consequentialism can explain the ethical difference in breaking a promise to take someone to the hospital and breaking a promise to take someone to lunch – that outweighs –

#### A] Resolvability – there’s no way to weigh between competing offense under their fw which means their fw can’t guide action – outweighs cuz it’s a pre req to deciding the debate

#### 3] Tradeoffs are inevitable -- governments are forced to make decide between tradeoffs ie welfare for the rich and welfare for the poor which means they’re forced to aggregate

#### 4] Preserving life is a pre requisite to the ideal conditions their theory assumes -- all value stems from experienced wellbeing.

## 1

#### Historically, police unions protect police, empowering violent misconduct

Scheiber 20, Noam Scheiber, Farah Stockman and J. David Goodman, 6-6-2020, "How Police Unions Became Such Powerful Opponents to Reform Efforts (Published 2020)," No Publication, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/06/us/police-unions-minneapolis-kroll.html // tw

Over the past five years, as demands for reform have mounted in the aftermath of police violence in cities like Ferguson, Mo., Baltimore and now Minneapolis, police unions have emerged as one of the most significant roadblocks to change. The greater the political pressure for reform, the more defiant the unions often are in resisting it — with few city officials, including liberal leaders, able to overcome their opposition. They aggressively protect the rights of members accused of misconduct, often in arbitration hearings that they have battled to keep behind closed doors. And they have also been remarkably effective at fending off broader change, using their political clout and influence to derail efforts to increase accountability. A few days after prosecutors in Minneapolis charged an officer with murder in the death of George Floyd, the president of the city’s police union denounced political leaders, accusing them of selling out his members and firing four officers without due process. “It is despicable behavior,” the union president, Lt. Bob Kroll, wrote in a letter to union members obtained by a local reporter. He also referred to protesters as a “terrorist movement.” In other instances, unions have not resisted reforms outright, but have made [reforms] them difficult to put in place. Federal intervention is often one of the few reliable ways of reforming police departments. But in Cleveland, the union helped slow the adoption of reforms mandated by a federal consent decree, according to Jonathan Smith, a former U.S. Justice Department official who oversaw the government’s investigation of policing practices there. “A major role for police unions is basically as an insurance policy,” said Dale Belman, a labor relations professor at Michigan State University who has consulted for police unions. “The feeling of a lot of officers is that it’s very easy to sacrifice them. Something goes wrong and boom.” Unions can be so effective at defending their members that cops with a pattern of abuse can be left untouched, with fatal consequences. In Chicago, after the killing of 17-year-old Laquan McDonald by officer Jason Van Dyke, it emerged that Mr. Van Dyke had been the subject of multiple complaints already. But a “code of silence” about misconduct was effectively “baked into” the labor agreements between police unions and the city, according to a report conducted by task force. When liberal politicians do try to advance reform proposals, union officials have resorted to highly provocative rhetoric and hard-boiled campaign tactics to lash out at them. This past week, the head of the sergeants’ union in New York posted a police report on Twitter revealing personal information about the daughter of Mr. de Blasio, who had been arrested during a protest. While statistics compiled by the group Campaign Zero show that police killings and shootings in Chicago have fallen following a set of reforms enacted after a federal investigation, advocates worry that the union will undermine them in contract negotiations. Police unions have traditionally used their bargaining agreements to create obstacles to disciplining officers. One paper by researchers at the University of Chicago found that incidents of violent misconduct in Florida sheriff’s offices increased by about 40 percent after deputies gained collective bargaining rights.

#### Allowing more strikes only cedes more power to unions

Grim 20, Andrew Grim, 7-1-2020, "Perspective," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/07/01/what-is-blue-flu-how-has-it-increased-police-power/ tw

This weekend, officers from the New York City Police Department are rumored to be planning a walkout to protest calls to defund the police. This builds on a similar tactic used by police in Atlanta less than a month ago. On June 16, Fulton County District Attorney, Paul L. Howard Jr. announced that Garrett Rolfe, the Atlanta police officer who fatally shot Rayshard Brooks, would face charges of felony murder and aggravated assault. That night, scores of Atlanta Police Department officers caught the “blue flu,” calling out sick en masse to protest the charges against Rolfe. Such walkouts constitute, in effect, illegal strikes — laws in all 50 states prohibit police strikes. Yet, there is nothing new about the blue flu. It is a strategy long employed by police unions and rank-and-file officers during contract negotiations, disputes over reforms and, like in Atlanta, in response to disciplinary action against individual officers. The intent is to dramatize police disputes with municipal government and rally the citizenry to their side. But the result of such protests matter deeply as we consider police reform today. Historically, blue flu strikes have helped expand police power, ultimately limiting the ability of city governments to reform, constrain or conduct oversight over the police. They allow the police to leverage public fear of crime to extract concessions from municipalities. This became clear in Detroit more than 50 years ago. In June 1967, tensions arose between Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanagh and the Detroit Police Officers Association (DPOA), which represented the city’s 3,300 patrol officers. The two were at odds primarily over police demands for a pay increase. Cavanagh showed no signs of caving to the DPOA’s demands and had, in fact, proposed to cut the police department’s budget. On June 15, the DPOA escalated the dispute with a walkout: 323 officers called in sick. The number grew over the next several days as the blue flu spread, reaching a height of 800 absences on June 17. In tandem with the walkout, the DPOA launched a fearmongering media campaign to win over the public. They took out ads in local newspapers warning Detroit residents, “How does it feel to be held up? Stick around and find out!” This campaign took place at a time of rising urban crime rates and uprisings, and only a month before the 1967 Detroit riot, making it especially potent. The DPOA understood this climate and used it to its advantage. With locals already afraid of crime and displeased at Cavanagh’s failure to rein it in, they would be more likely to demand the return of the police than to demand retribution against officers for an illegal strike. This was far from the end of the fight between Cavanagh and the DPOA. In the ensuing months and years, they continued to tussle over wages, pensions, the budget, the integration of squad cars and the hiring of black officers. The threat of another blue flu loomed over all these disputes, helping the union to win many of them. Throughout the 1960s, ’70s and ’80s, the blue flu was a ubiquitous and highly effective tactic in Baltimore, Memphis, New Orleans, Chicago, Newark, New York and many other cities. In most cases, as author Kristian Williams writes, “When faced with a walkout or slowdown, the authorities usually decided that the pragmatic need to get the cops back to work trumped the city government’s long term interest in diminishing the rank and file’s power.” But each time a city relented to this pressure, they ceded more and more power to police unions, which would turn to the strategy repeatedly to defend officers’ interests — particularly when it came to efforts to address systemic racism in police policies and practices.

#### Police violence disproportionately targets communities of color and upholds white supremacy – the access to legal intervention creates a cycle of oppression

DeVylder et al 20, Jordan DeVylder PhD, Lisa Fedina PhD, and Bruce Link PhD, 7-9-2020, "The American Journal of Public Health (AJPH) from the American Public Health Association (APHA) publications," American Journal of Public Health, https://ajph.aphapublications.org/doi/10.2105/AJPH.2020.305874

For the purposes of this article, we refer generally to “police violence” and “mental health” because there is not yet sufficient research to confidently link specific subtypes of police violence to specific mental health outcomes. We therefore define police violence as acute events of physical, sexual, psychological, or neglectful violence, following the World Health Organization’s guidelines on defining violence and earlier work on the phenomenology of police violence exposure.7 Mental health is intended to be inclusive of behaviors and psychological symptoms that would be considered indicators of clinical psychopathology, including but not limited to general psychological distress, posttraumatic stress symptoms, suicidal ideation and behavior, psychosis like experiences, and depression. These definitions may need to be expanded as this literature develops, as currently it typically focuses on acute violent events (rather than chronic or vicarious exposures) and a psychopathology oriented view of mental health (rather than a focus on functioning or quality of life), but they are being used here as a reflection of the variables typically employed in the literature at this point in time. Recent public attention directed toward police violence has spurred an emerging literature on the health significance of police violence exposure,1,8,9 addressing a long-unheeded call to conceptualize police violence as a public health issue in the United States.7 Cross-sectional studies have consistently found clinically and statistically significant associations between police violence exposure and a range of mental health outcomes,10-16 and community-level data have likewise demonstrated higher rates of mental health symptoms in neighborhoods or cities in which police abuse (e.g., “stop and frisk” practices, which are primarily used in neighborhoods predominantly composed of people of color) and killings of unarmed civilians are more common.17,18 These associations have generally been found to remain statistically significant (and of sufficient effect sizes to support public health significance) even with adjustment for closely related forms of violence exposure, such as interpersonal violence or lifetime abuse exposure.10,14 For example, exposure to assaultive forms of police violence (i.e., physical or sexual) has been found to be associated with 4- to 11-fold greater odds for a suicide attempt among adults across racial/ethnic groups, even with conservative adjustments.12,14 Although most of this research has been conducted with adults, recent analyses suggest that this problem extends into adolescence as well.19 A selective overview of recent work on this topic is provided in Table 1, and has recently been reviewed elsewhere.21 A long tradition in social science theory suggests that the police play a critical role in disciplining the public, not just in terms of offenses and punishments but in the construction and maintenance of an established social order favoring dominant groups. In light of the use of the police in this regard, it follows that exposure to violence emanating from their actions would have distinct and pernicious features.22,23 Police organizations in the United States are thus authoritative institutions legitimized to apply force—and potentially fatal force—to maintain a particular social and political order.24 In interactions with civilians, police officers are in positions of relatively greater power because of both the symbolic and state-sanctioned status of their profession, and their immediate legal availability of means (e.g., guns, batons, tasers) to wield force, threat of force, and coercion, at their discretion. This distinguishes police violence from interpersonal forms of violence that are perpetrated by people who are not sanctioned to enact violence, such as caregivers, peers, or intimate partners. This distinction is made not to downplay the seriousness of other forms of violence—such as child abuse, intimate partner violence, or sexual assault—but to assert that modern-day police violence is embedded in historical state-enforced practices that permitted cruel, unusual, and dehumanizing punishment of individuals deemed to be from threatening or “dangerous classes,”25 particularly Blacks. Communities of color and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) communities have been historically subjected to racially motivated, discriminatory state-sponsored laws (e.g., Jim Crow laws, sodomy laws) enforced by police that permitted harassment, discrimination, and excessive and fatal force against individuals from these communities. As such, the processes and contexts in which police violence has been historically perpetuated are uniquely distinct from the perpetuation of interpersonal forms of violence by others. Furthermore, police violence is sanctioned not only by institutions in the United States but also by the American public, and is intentionally designed to uphold White supremacy.26 Members of the dominant society thus contribute to police violence and the lack of police accountability Victims of police violence have little legal recourse or opportunities for seeking help in the criminal justice system. The police have legal sanction to intervene in other crimes of violence (e.g., sexual assault, physical assault), making it much more difficult to prove that the violence was unjustly or excessively delivered. Additionally, the people reviewing disputed cases are often also police officers, and indicted police officers are tried by prosecutors who must otherwise work with police officers. These and other circumstances make contesting the perpetration of violence extremely difficult. Victims of other forms of violence, particularly intimate partner violence, indeed face enormous barriers in seeking help and legal recourse, including stigma in reporting intimate partner violence, poverty and other economic barriers, and other sociocultural and contextual factors.27 Victims of police violence face many of these same barriers; because they have few if any options for reporting an incident, for legal recourse, or for advocacy services and referrals to mental health treatment, any mental health symptoms they have may worsen over time.28 People feel more secure if they feel safe and protected in their day-to-day activities. Assumptive World Theory proposes that people’s deeply held beliefs about the world and themselves can be shaken by an event that forcefully disconfirms such beliefs.31 Police violence is particularly likely to provide such disconfirming evidence in that the police represent a societal institution that many, though not all, have come to rely on deeply and implicitly for help when a threat emerges. When police perpetrate violence, this belief is shattered as the police are no longer protectors but rather the central threat that needs to be addressed. Additionally, police violence is normative, rather than an acute or singular event, which has led to the erosion of public trust in the police and favorable views of police seen as protective. Because police violence is disproportionately directed toward people of color, many of whom are poor, it can underscore a sense of diminished value within the US racial and class hierarchies. Accordingly, the media narrative around police violence has focused on incidents directed toward Black people, and has at times framed these incidents within the context of the legacy of racism and White supremacy in the United States. Data from the first and second Survey of Police–Public Encounters studies have confirmed that—at least in Baltimore, Maryland; New York City; the District of Columbia; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania—police violence is more likely to be directed toward people of color, although it is notable that these studies have found Latinx groups to be at approximately the same level of risk as non-Latinx Blacks.11,14 Although White respondents were also at some risk of exposure to police violence, the racial disparities were significant, even after adjustment for crime involvement and income. Similarly, the prevalence of police-inflicted shootings is approximately 3.5-fold greater among non-Latinx Black than non-Latinx White residents of the United States. Notably, there is insufficient prior data to allow a thorough discussion of police violence and mental health among indigenous populations, although the rate of police killings is extremely high among this group. Other potentially high-risk groups likely include people who identify as sexual or gender minorities, people who are homeless, or those who have a severe mental illness diagnosis, among others. Future research should focus on understudied sociodemographic groups that are disproportionately subject to police violence (e.g., indigenous populations, trans individuals), and the conceptual framework presented in this article will require modification as more data become available. Further, when there are major social movements or protests following prominent incidents of police violence, many in the public, particularly those who benefit from the dominant social order that the police help to maintain, take a “blaming the victim” mentality and highlight infractions by the victim that may have justified their injury or death (e.g., the alleged theft of cigarillos by Michael Brown cited as justification for excessive and fatal force). On a broader societal level, protests in Ferguson, Missouri were blamed for a subsequent supposed “war on cops” in which the rate of civilians killing police officers purportedly increased, although there is no actual evidence for any such increase.38

#### Police unions are anti-labor- means the aff can never solve without getting rid of them AND turns case.

Modak 20. Ria Modak [Student Coordinator, Muslim American Studies Working Group, Harvard Student Labor Action Movement and the Harvard Graduate Students Union] 20 - ("Police Unions Are Anti-Labor," Ria Modak, Harvard Political Review, 9-9-2020, 10-27-2021 https://harvardpolitics.com/police-unions-are-anti-labor/)//AW

My own experiences with HUPD are reflective of a long history fraught with violence. For two centuries, **the police have been used to suppress labor action** and promote corporate interests. **The police**, the National Guard and the U.S. Army **played an integral role in suppressing the Great Strike of 1877**, the Homestead Strike of 1892 **and** the **Lawrence Strike** of 1912, to name a few examples. **In** each of **these incidents,** the **police resorted to extreme violence**, acquiring new legal powers and protections as they terrorized working class communities. By the middle of the 20th century, **the police had become** **a**n autocratic, **militarized force whose** primary **role was to challenge organized labor through union-busting and strike-breaking.** They continue to occupy this role. For evidence, we have to look no further than the ongoing protests for racial justice in which the police have been called to attend to instances of rioting. Their brutal treatment of protesters, including the use of teargas and rubber bullets, is further proof of their commitment to property over people. It is no coincidence that cops interfere with labor action; the fundamental objective of the police is to protect property. Modern day police forces in urban cities like Boston were founded to safeguard trade and protect commercial property, and in the South, policing evolved from slave patrols tasked with chasing down runaway slaves. **Policing** was, and **continues to** be, a way to protect and **serve capitalism, not people**. By attending to private property, which itself depends on the extraction of labor from the working class, the police align themselves with capitalists, rather than with workers**. The** material **interests of** the **police are antithetical to the very ethos of organized labor, which seeks to protect workers from capitalist exploitation.** It is impossible to build a working class movement while supporting an institution that was founded to oppress working class and Black communities. Police unions are also complicit in anti-labor action in the federal political arena. The Fraternal Order of Police and **the International Union of Police Associations**, the two largest police unions in the country, endorsed President Trump in 2016 and recently endorsed his reelection campaign. By funneling money into President Trump’s campaign, **the IUPA is** directly **responsible for** hisblatantly **anti-labor policies, which have restricted the freedom to join unions, silenced workers, and gutted health and safety protections.** Furthermore, much of the power **of** policing lies in **police unions,** which **enable racist, anti-labor action by making it** nearly **impossible for** police **officers to be held accountable** for their actions. Collective bargaining agreements allow officers to evade the consequences of innumerable wrongs — including the violent killing of Black people, sexual assault, lying to investigators and falsifying documents — by limiting independent oversight and expunging misconduct records. In addition, unions spend millions of dollars lobbying against police reform on the local, state and federal levels. By shielding officers from consequences and blocking reform, **police unions embolden violence against the Black and Brown communities** that are the most vulnerable to police brutality. One way to put an end to racialized police violence is to put an end to police unions. **Dismantling police unions is a** crucial **step in taking power away from the police and giving it back to** working class communities and **communities of color.** Although not all police departments are unionized or affiliated with a larger labor federation like the AFL-CIO, those that are must be expelled. However, disaffiliation must be only the first step in a broader struggle to dismantle the police in its entirety. Police abolition means building a world that does not rely on capitalism and racism to structure society. Although some critics of abolition argue that disaffiliating police unions would threaten other public sector unions, many trade unionists disagree with this position, indicating support from public sector workers themselves. Union members represented by the Service Employees International Union and United Auto Workers have demanded the disaffiliation of police unions from the larger labor movement. In addition, a coalition of labor organizers called “No Cop Unions” have called on the AFL-CIO to expel IUPA and urged AFL-CIO affiliates with partial law enforcement membership to terminate their relationships with unionized police and correctional officers. Ultimately, the call to separate **police unions** from the labor movement is a recognition that they **have no role in a society that truly values workers**. The **goals of the police**, which are maintained and facilitated by police unions, **are incompatible with pro-labor ideology**. The labor movement must take a firm stance against police unions and work to develop an anti-racist praxis. There can be no labor justice while police unions continue to protect anti-worker interests.

## 2

#### **False worker confidence is fueling strikes but in reality, workers are getting replaced**

Marks 21, Gene Marks,, 10-26-2021, "Employees are not showing up to work — employers are replacing them with robots," TheHill, https://thehill.com/opinion/technology/578484-employees-are-not-showing-up-to-work-employers-are-replacing-them-with

It’s the “Great Resignation,” and many workers seem to prefer not coming in to work. Employers are increasingly obliging them. How? By eliminating their jobs altogether. A recent survey from Verizon of more than 600 U.S. small businesses found that 30 percent [of small businesses] have already adopted digital tools to help compensate for a shortage of workers during the COVID-19 pandemic. Think this is short term? It’s not. As the cost of these technologies rapidly decline, both big and small companies are making significant investments in software and hardware that is helping to eliminate what is for many their biggest headache: people. For obvious reasons, businesses don’t like to talk about how they’re eliminating employees with automation. But it’s happening. Yes, it’s happening. In retail, for example, supermarket chain Hy-Vee announced that it is testing shelf-scanning inventory management robots in its stores, while ShopRite is piloting robotic delivery. Amazon is quietly rolling out thousands of self-service grocery stores manned by a skeleton staff of workers to restock shelves — until they’re eventually replaced by robots. Airport retailer Hudson is using Amazon’s technology to automate its locations. In the United Kingdom, supermarket giant Tesco has come up with its own “walkout store” to compete against Amazon. Pennsylvania convenience store chain Wawa has added self-checkouts to dozens of its stores with plans to make this permanent across all locations. Make no mistake: These self-service technologies eliminate workers. That’s why retailers are jumping on this trend. The same goes for the restaurant industry. Owners there are finding themselves at ground zero of the Great Resignation. So, they’re also doing their part to help their employees find employment, somewhere else. According to a recent New York Times report, many are turning to robots to “make French fries, mixed drinks and even clean toilets, and they never ask for a raise”  (or complain about Dave Chappelle). A Connecticut seafood chain says it will soon have as many as five robotic “servers” programmed to “bring food out to tables and dirty dishes back to the dishwasher station.” A California eatery now offers robot-served Japanese food. A robot that makes pizzas is replacing workers while another company prospers as it sells robotic arms that make everything from burgers to salads to sushi. These companies know one thing for sure: Robotic servers and robotic arms show up for work every day. Dave & Buster's recently announced  that its locations are using contactless ordering, a move that has allowed them to “expand the size of server sections and reduce staffing levels to be more efficient” (translation: fewer workers). McDonalds is testing an automated, voice-recognition based drive-thru ordering system at 10 of its Chicago locations that will reduce to one in five the number of orders that workers have to complete. And reduce the number of people taking orders too, of course. (Shhhh.) On the factory floor, robots are doing all the work at Nissan's “intelligent plant,” with an executive from the company gushing how "up to now, people had to make production adjustments through experience, but now robots with artificial intelligence, analyzing collected data, are able to do it.” Transportation and warehouse workers as well as truck drivers better double-check their savings too. That’s because Ford, Argo and Walmart are bringing robo-delivery to Miami, Austin and Washington, D.C., and Walgreens and Google are teaming up to offer drone deliveries in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. Delivery service Grubhub is rolling out robots to deliver pizza across 250 colleges in the U.S. For the companies still actually employing people, many are doing so by using artificial intelligence-powered virtual recruiting tools and offering mental health benefits powered by chat bots. According to a recent report, 75 percent of U.S. employers (rising to 99 percent of Fortune 500 companies) are using interviewing and other recruiting technology “in response to a rise in digital job applications from the ‘90s onwards. Technology has made it easier for people to apply for jobs, but also easier for companies to reject [people] them.” Do you get it, people? Your “ghosting,” quitting and unreliable behavior is now paying off. Your demands for higher pay, more time off, increased benefits and a greater say in how your employers conduct their businesses are being answered. Your complaints, whistleblowing and public shaming of your employer (deserved or not) is now having its effect.

#### The aff accelerates automation via an increase in strikes which causes mass unemployment and greater wage inequality

Casselman 21, Ben Casselman, 7-3-2021, "Pandemic Wave of Automation May Be Bad News for Workers," No Publication, https://www.nytimes.com/2021/07/03/business/economy/automation-workers-robots-pandemic.html

An increase in automation, especially in service industries, may prove to be an economic legacy of the pandemic. Businesses from factories to fast-food outlets to hotels turned to technology last year to keep operations running amid social distancing requirements and contagion fears. Now the outbreak is ebbing in the United States, but the difficulty in hiring workers — at least at the wages that employers are used to paying — is providing new momentum for automation. Technological investments that were made in response to the crisis may contribute to a post-pandemic productivity boom, allowing for higher wages and faster growth. But some economists say the latest wave of automation could eliminate jobs and erode bargaining power, particularly for the lowest-paid workers, in a lasting way. “Once a job is automated, it’s pretty hard to turn back,” said Casey Warman, an economist at Dalhousie University in Nova Scotia who has studied automation in the pandemic. The trend toward automation predates the pandemic, but it has accelerated at what is proving to be a critical moment. The rapid reopening of the economy has led to a surge in demand for waiters, hotel maids, retail sales clerks and other workers in service industries that had cut their staffs. At the same time, government benefits have allowed many people to be selective in the jobs they take. Together, those forces have given low-wage workers a rare moment of leverage, leading to higher pay, more generous benefits and other perks. Automation threatens to tip the advantage back toward employers, potentially eroding those gains. A working paper published by the International Monetary Fund this year predicted that pandemic-induced automation would increase inequality in coming years, not just in the United States but around the world. Checkers, like many fast-food restaurants, experienced a jump in sales when the pandemic shut down most in-person dining. But finding workers to meet that demand proved difficult — so much so that Shana Gonzales, a Checkers franchisee in the Atlanta area, found herself back behind the cash register three decades after she started working part time at Taco Bell while in high school. The push toward automation goes far beyond the restaurant sector. Hotels, retailers, manufacturers and other businesses have all accelerated technological investments. In a survey of nearly 300 global companies by the World Economic Forum last year, 43 percent of businesses said they expected to reduce their work forces through new uses of technology. In a recent working paper, Professor Acemoglu and a colleague concluded that “a significant portion of the rise in U.S. wage inequality over the last four decades has been driven by automation” — and he said that trend had almost certainly accelerated in the pandemic. At some businesses, automation is already affecting the number and type of jobs available. Meltwich, a restaurant chain that started in Canada and is expanding into the United States, has embraced a range of technologies to cut back on labor costs. Its grills no longer require someone to flip burgers — they grill both sides at once, and need little more than the press of a button. The grocery business has long been a source of steady, often unionized jobs for people without a college degree. But technology is changing the sector. Self-checkout lanes have reduced the number of cashiers; many stores have simple robots to patrol aisles for spills and check inventory; and warehouses have become increasingly automated. Kroger in April opened a 375,000-square-foot warehouse with more than 1,000 robots that bag groceries for delivery customers. The company is even experimenting with delivering groceries by drone.

#### Automation causes widespread job loss and inequality which turns case

Aratani 20, Lauren Aratani, 11-27-2020, "Robots on the rise as Americans experience record job losses amid pandemic," Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2020/nov/27/robots-replacing-jobs-automation-unemployment-us

The Covid-19 pandemic has left millions of Americans unemployed – disproportionately those in the service industries where women and people of color make up the largest share of the labor force. In October, 11 million people were unemployed in the US, compared with about 6 million people who were without a job during the same time last year. A recent report from the World Economic Forum predicted that by 2025 the next wave of automation – turbocharged by the pandemic – will disrupt 85m jobs globally. New jobs will be created but “businesses, governments and workers must plan to urgently work together to implement a new vision for the global workforce”. The impact of a recession on the growth of automation has been well-documented by economists and has shown that automation does not grow steadily, but rather happens in bursts. Businesses are more likely to automate after experiencing economic shocks, when they have strong incentives to save on labor. While an increase in automation can be good for educated workers and help to stimulate the economy, studies have also shown that new technology tends to leave low-wage workers behind. “Automation has been a major driver in the increase in inequality,” said Daron Acemoglu, an economist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Acemoglu co-authored a study published in May that showed automation creates a “prosperity gap” that benefits high-skilled workers at the sake of lower-skilled workers. Low-wage workers are not only more susceptible to job loss and wage depression due to automation, but they also experienced the most job losses due to shutdowns. Higher-wage workers are more likely to be able to work from home during the pandemic, while lower-wage workers – a disproportionate number of whom are Black or Hispanic – were more susceptible to layoffs due to shutdown orders.

# Case

## Adv 1

#### 1] Gourevitch ev identifies cap as the root cause of oppression but there’s nothing in the 1ac in it of it self that is a direct resistance or combat to capitalism

#### 2] Lim 19 and Pope 18 just say strikes are good, not that an unconditional r2s is key or necessary – means the aff links to the squo bc there’s strikes right now and they’re not proving then necessity of the resolution or why the aff is key – they make the huge jump that their ev preaching strikes is ab an uncondo r2s – that’s just not true

#### 3] that means zero inherency: strikes exist rn

Greenhouse 11/5 - Steven Greenhouse [American labor and workplace journalist and writer], “Op-Ed: Why unions are striking — and winning more public support than in 50 years,” *Los Angeles Times* (Web). Nov. 4, 2021. Accessed Nov. 5, 2021. <https://www.latimes.com/opinion/story/2021-11-04/unions-strikes-economic-justice-agenda-public-approval> AT

The U.S. is experiencing an unusual surge of strikes — 10,000 John Deere workers went on strike in October, and so did 1,400 Kellogg workers, and now 35,000 Kaiser Permanente healthcare workers are threatening to walk out.¶ Workplace experts generally point to two reasons for this surge. First, after working so hard and often risking their lives during the pandemic, many workers believe that they deserve better pay and treatment. Second, American workers — especially long-underappreciated essential and low-wage workers — are suddenly feeling empowered because of today’s labor shortage.¶ These factors have certainly helped cause the wave of walkouts, but there’s another

#### 4] Framing strikes as a “right” to be granted instead of a “freedom” cements state power over the working class and destroys class solidarity.

Dimick 19

Matthew Dimick, Professor @ University at Buffalo School of Law, 12-13-2019, "Labor Rights Will Not Save the Labor Movement," Jacobin, <https://jacobinmag.com/2019/12/labor-rights-movement-freedom-nlra-nlrb-mass-picketing> //MLT

Everyone agrees that labor law is broken. Under the auspices of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) — which was passed in 1935 at the height of the New Deal and laid the foundation for our current regime of collective bargaining — union membership rates have declined to existentially low levels. Though the weaknesses in labor law have been glaringly apparent for some time, and intermittent attempts have been made to reform it, discussion about labor law reform is now reaching a critical mass. Labor law reform has been central to the campaign promises of both Bernie Sanders and Elizabeth Warren. There is much in common between the Sanders and Warren plans, though the level of detail in the Warren plan burnishes her reputation as a technocrat. Liberal think tanks have jumped on board. Left-leaning publications have also directed their attention to labor law reform. What unites most of these proposals is the idea of strengthening labor rights. I wrote an essay recently in Catalyst arguing that this approach is wrong. The labor movement should be wary of labor rights and instead seek to expand labor freedoms. A right is some legally enforceable claim, backed through the coercive machinery of the state (fines, injunctions, imprisonment, etc.), that one legal subject has against another because of some interference caused or threatened by that other. A freedom, in contrast, is the absence of a legally enforceable duty to refrain from some action. A “right to strike,” for example, means that workers are protected from any interference an employer might take against an employee for engaging in a strike. During a strike, hiring permanent replacement workers counts as the most obvious form of interference, and indeed such replacements have had a devastating impact on the effectiveness of strikes. A fully recognized right to strike would prohibit the hiring of permanent replacements and legally compel employers to discharge their replacements when striking workers decide to call off the strike and return to work. All well and good, except that this rights approach overlooks the most important reason employers get away with hiring permanent replacements: labor law effectively bans mass picketing, the picketing of large numbers of workers near the struck business. Before mass picketing was banned, it was the most potent weapon in labor’s arsenal in the 1940s, and its repeated use established an “unofficial norm” against hiring permanent replacements, a norm that lasted until employers started defying it in the 1980s. Elimination of the ban on mass picketing would give workers a labor freedom rather than a labor right. With the labor freedom, it is workers themselves, through mass picketing, who enforce their strike power; with the labor right, it is the state, through the ban on permanent replacements, that does the enforcement. One might ask, “What’s the difference, if workers win the strike in the end?” Part of the answer comes from asking yourself, “Which of the two will build stronger and longer-term working-class solidarity?” The other part of the answer is that in numerous other cases, the effect of labor rights has been far more insidious. Labor rights, unfortunately, have been frequently used by judges, politicians, and bureaucrats as reasons for prohibiting or eliminating protection for strikes and other forms of collective activity. One example of this is the NLRA’s ban on organization and recognition picketing. Labor law prohibits any picketing (or even threats of picketing) “where an object thereof is forcing or requiring an employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees.” This provision exists not because of some cynical, ideologically motivated, anti-union impulse. Rather, it exists because the NLRA already provides workers with a “fair” and “neutral” administrative method for choosing a bargaining representative and establishing a bargaining relationship: the National Labor Relations Board’s election procedure. In practice, however, these provisions virtually compel workers to make use of the board’s election procedure, which is characterized by legal-bureaucratic delay and employer intimidation.

#### **5] turn: unions are uniquely susceptible to right-wing populism which erodes necessary material policymaking**

Gruenberg 21, Mark Gruenberg, 3-30-2021, "Worldwide, union leaders grapple with members backing right-wing ‘populists’," People's World, https://peoplesworld.org/article/worldwide-union-leaders-grapple-with-members-backing-right-wing-populists/

WASHINGTON—For years, union leaders on both sides of “The Pond”—also known as the Atlantic Ocean—have faced a problem: Right-wing ideologues’ “populist” rhetoric sways millions of their members to vote against their own interests. And then once those putative plutocrats achieve public office, they show their true colors, by enacting and enforcing repressive pro-corporate anti-worker laws. The problem is visible in the U.S., where 40% of union members and their families backed former GOP Oval Office occupant Donald Trump in 2020. But it’s not just Trump. Over the years, millions supported other right-wing Republicans such as Sens. Mitch McConnell (Ky.),  Ted Cruz (Texas), various U.S. representatives, Gov. Greg Abbott (Texas), and former Govs. Bruce Rauner (Ill.) and Scott Walker (Wis.). All of them, especially Trump and Cruz, spout populist bombast and claim to represent workers—and then enact edicts benefiting the corporate class. “Trump’s policies favored the rich and the well-connected. But four in ten union voters wanted to give him a second term” last November, said Knut Pankin, moderator of a late-March panel discussion on Right-Wing Populism As An Anti-Worker Agenda. “Why?” The dilemma exists in other democracies, too. Some unionists heeded anti-immigrant screeds from Germany’s extreme right Alternative for Deutschland, Marine LePen’s French National Rally (formerly the National Front), Norbert Hofer’s Austrian Freedom Party, Hungarian Prime Minister/strongman Viktor Orban of Fidesz, and Poland’s Law and Justice Party, panelists said. Once those blocs won power in Austria, Poland, and Hungary, or influenced elections in France, mainstream politicians followed their lead, cracking down on workers as well as targeting migrants. The pols feared they would otherwise lose more votes to the right. All those parties, including the GOP, “started as bourgeois, middle-class, shopkeeper-oriented” organizations, but have since pivoted to right-wing populism, Greven explained. “But one common denominator” is the GOP and the other right-wing parties, plus the workers they appeal to, “have a radicalized response” that “is nationalist, protectionist and nativist…to all facets of globalization,” he said. Those facets include corporate export of workers’ jobs to low-wage nations and resentment of refugees and migrants, often people of color whom white nativists in Europe and the U.S. view as a threat. “’Us versus them’ is much easier to sell to working-class constituents. Union status doesn’t inoculate people versus right-wing populism,” Greven said. While populists’ pro-worker rhetoric is “a charade,” and progressives’ answer, “tax the rich,” is not enough, he added. “There used to be good-paying union jobs that people are yearning for,” Kaptur said. They’re gone, so reindustrialization “is necessary because, without it, our people will continue to radicalize,” just like the Trumpites who staged the Jan. 6 invasion of the U.S. Capitol. The right-wing charade fools workers, including union workers in the U.S., said McDaniel, and in Europe, said Finchelstein. Ethnocentrism is part of it, said McDaniel.

#### 6] do not let them make the wild claim that they dismantle capitalism and get rid of the worker/employer relationsion – theres no ev in the 1ac that supports that and all their ev is contingent on the fact that this relationship needs to exist in order to demand change, not abolition

## Adv 2

#### 1] no link – the people striking are mainly school kids who aren’t workers which means you err neg to give them some strike leverage without creating more harms via disads

#### 2] turn: climate strikes aren’t enough and deter material solutions

Chung 19, Cadence Chung, 5-17-2019, "Climate change is a real problem, but strikes won't change anything," Stuff, https://www.stuff.co.nz/environment/climate-news/112807046/how-not-to-solve-the-issue-why-climate-change-strikes-wont-do-anything

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

#### 3] Capitalism solves extinction through environmental collapse – reject evidence that ignores synergistic deployment of adaptative tech – the public won’t transition to socialism but WILL channel political energies into innovative solutions that turn case.

Bailey ’18 [Ronald; March 12; B.A. in Economics from the University of Virginia, member of the Society of Environmental Journalists and the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, citing a compilation of interdisciplinary research; Reason, “Climate Change Problems Will Be Solved Through Economic Growth,” <https://reason.com/2018/03/12/climate-change-problems-will-be-solved-t>; RP]

"It is, I promise, worse than you think," David Wallace-Wells wrote in an infamously apocalyptic 2017 New York Magazine article. "Indeed, absent a significant adjustment to how billions of humans conduct their lives, parts of the Earth will likely become close to uninhabitable, and other parts horrifically inhospitable, as soon as the end of this century." The "it" is man-made climate change. Temperatures will become scalding, crops will wither, and rising seas will inundate coastal cities, Wallace-Wells warns. But toward the end of his screed, he somewhat dismissively observes that "by and large, the scientists have an enormous confidence in the ingenuity of humans….Now we've found a way to engineer our own doomsday, and surely we will find a way to engineer our way out of it, one way or another." Over at Scientific American, John Horgan considers some eco-modernist views on how humanity will indeed go about engineering our way out of the problems that climate change may pose. In an essay called "Should We Chill Out About Global Warming?," Horgan reports the more dynamic and positive analyses of two eco-modernist thinkers, Harvard psychologist Steven Pinker and science journalist Will Boisvert. In an essay for The Breakthrough Journal, Pinker notes that such optimism "is commonly dismissed as the 'faith that technology will save us.' In fact, it is a skepticism that the status quo will doom us—that knowledge and behavior will remain frozen in their current state for perpetuity. Indeed, a naive faith in stasis has repeatedly led to prophecies of environmental doomsdays that never happened." In his new book, Enlightenment Now, Pinker points out that "as the world gets richer and more tech-savvy, it dematerializes, decarbonizes, and densifies, sparing land and species." Economic growth and technological progress are the solutions not only to climate change but to most of the problems that bedevil humanity. Boisvert, meanwhile, tackles and rebuts the apocalyptic prophecies made by eco-pessimists like Wallace-Wells, specifically with regard to food production and availabilty, water supplies, heat waves, and rising seas. "No, this isn't a denialist screed," Boisvert writes. "Human greenhouse emissions will warm the planet, raise the seas and derange the weather, and the resulting heat, flood and drought will be cataclysmic. Cataclysmic—but not apocalyptic. While the climate upheaval will be large, the consequences for human well-being will be small. Looked at in the broader context of economic development, climate change will barely slow our progress in the effort to raise living standards." Boisvert proceeds to show how a series of technologies—drought-resistant crops, cheap desalination, widespread adoption of air-conditioning, modern construction techniques—will ameliorate and overcome the problems caused by rising temperatures. He is entirely correct when he notes, "The most inexorable feature of climate-change modeling isn't the advance of the sea but the steady economic growth that will make life better despite global warming." Horgan, Pinker, and Boisvert are all essentially endorsing what I have called "the progress solution" to climate change. As I wrote in 2009, "It is surely not unreasonable to argue that if one wants to help future generations deal with climate change, the best policies would be those that encourage rapid economic growth. This would endow future generations with the wealth and superior technologies that could be used to handle whatever comes at them including climate change." Six years later I added that that "richer is more climate-friendly, especially for developing countries. Why? Because faster growth means higher incomes, which correlate with lower population growth. Greater wealth also means higher agricultural productivity, freeing up land for forests to grow as well as speedier progress toward developing and deploying cheaper non–fossil fuel energy technologies. These trends can act synergistically to ameliorate man-made climate change." Horgan concludes, "Greens fear that optimism will foster complacency and hence undermine activism. But I find the essays of Pinker and Boisvert inspiring, not enervating….These days, despair is a bigger problem than optimism." Counseling despair has always been wrong when human ingenuity is left free to solve problems, and that will prove to be the case with climate change as well.

#### 4] It’s key to CCS – link-turns every impact.

Graciela ‘16 (/16 – Professor of Economics and of Statistics at Columbia University and Visiting Professor at Stanford University, and was the architect of the Kyoto Protocol carbon market (being interviewed by Marcus Rolle, freelance journalist specializing in environmental issues and global affairs, “Reversing Climate Change: Interview with Graciela Chichilnisky,” http://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/01/09/2016/reversing-climate-change-interview-graciela-chichilnisky)//cmr

GC: Green capitalism is a new economic system that values the natural resources on which human survival depends. It fosters a harmonious relationship with our planet, its resources and the many species it harbors. It is a new type of market economics that addresses both equity and efficiency. Using carbon negative technology™ it helps reduce carbon in the atmosphere while fostering economic development in rich and developing nations, for example in the U S., EU, China and India. How does this work? In a nutshell Green Capitalism requires the creation of global limits or property rights nation by nation for the use of the atmosphere, the bodies of water and the planet’s biodiversity, and the creation of new markets to trade these rights from which new economic values and a new concept of economic progress emerges updating GDP as is now generally agreed is needed. Green Capitalism is needed now to help avert climate change and achieve the goals of the 2015 UN Paris Agreement, which are very ambitious and universally supported but have no way to be realized within the Agreement itself. The Carbon Market and its CDM play critical roles in the foundation of Green Capitalism, creating values to redefine GDP. These are needed to remain within the world’s “CO2 budget” and avoid catastrophic climate change. As I see it, the building blocks for Green Capitalism are then as follows; (1) Global limits nation by nation in the use of the planet’s atmosphere, its water bodies and biodiversity - these are global public goods. (2) New global markets to trade these limits, based on equity and efficiency. These markets are relatives of the Carbon Market and the SO2 market. The new market create new measures of economic values and update the concept of GDP. (3) Efficient use of Carbon Negative Technologies to avert catastrophic climate change by providing a smooth transition to clean energy and ensuring economic prosperity in rich and poor nations. These building blocks have immediate practical implications in reversing climate change and can assist the ambitious aims of Paris COP21 become a reality. MR: What is the greatest advantage of the new generation technologies that can capture CO2 from the air? GC: These technologies build carbon negative power plants, such as Global Thermostat, that clean the atmosphere of CO2 while producing electricity. Global Thermostat is a firm that is commercializing a technology that takes CO2 out of air and uses mostly low cost residual heat rather than electricity to drive the capture process, making the entire process of capturing CO2 from the atmosphere very inexpensive. There is enough residua heat in a coal power plant that it can be used to capture twice as much CO2 as the plant emits, thus transforming the power plant into a “carbon sink.” For example, a 400 MW coal plant that emits 1 million tons of CO2 per year can become a carbon sink absorbing a net amount of 1 million tons of CO2 instead. Carbon capture from air can be done anywhere and at any time, and so inexpensively that the CO2 can be sold for industrial or commercial uses such as plastics, food and beverages, greenhouses, bio-fertilizers, building materials and even enhanced oil recovery, all examples of large global markets and profitable opportunities. Carbon capture is powered mostly by low (85°C) residual heat that is inexpensive, and any source will do. In particular, renewable (solar) technology can power the process of carbon capture. This can help advance solar technology and make it more cost-efficient. This means more energy, more jobs, and it also means economic growth in developing nations, all of this while cleaning the CO2 in the atmosphere. Carbon negative technologies can literally transform the world economy. MR: One final question. You distinguish between long-run and short-run strategies in the effort to reverse climate change. Would carbon negative technologies be part of a short-run strategy? GC: Long-run strategies are quite different from strategies for the short-run. Often long-run strategies do not work in the short run and different policies and economic incentives are needed. In the long run the best climate change policy is to replace fossil fuel sources of energy that by themselves cause 45% of the global emissions, and to plant trees to restore if possible the natural sources and sinks of CO2. But the fossil fuel power plant infrastructure is about 87% of the power plant infrastructure and about $45-55 trillion globally. This infrastructure cannot be replaced quickly, certainly not in the short time period in which we need to take action to avert catastrophic climate change. The issue is that CO2 once emitted remains hundreds of years in the atmosphere and we have emitted so much that unless we actually remove the CO2 that is already there, we cannot remain long within the carbon budget, which is the concentration of CO2 beyond which we fear catastrophic climate change. In the short run, therefore, we face significant time pressure. The IPCC indicates in its 2014 5th Assessment Report that we must actually remove the carbon that is already in the atmosphere and do so in massive quantities, this century (p. 191 of 5th Assessment Report). This is what I called a carbon negative approach, which works for the short run. Renewable energy is the long run solution. Renewable energy is too slow for a short run resolution since replacing a $45-55 trillion power plant infrastructure with renewable plants could take decades. We need action sooner than that. For the short run we need carbon negative technologies that capture more carbon than what is emitted. Trees do that and they must be conserved to help preserve biodiversity. Biochar does that. But trees and other natural sinks are too slow for what we need today. Therefore, negative carbon is needed now as part of a blueprint for transformation. It must be part of the blueprint for Sustainable Development and its short term manifestation that I call Green Capitalism, while in the long run renewable sources of energy suffice, including Wind, Biofuels, Nuclear, Geothermal, and Hydroelectric energy. These are in limited supply and cannot replace fossil fuels. Global energy today is roughly divided as follows: 87% is fossil, namely natural gas, coal, oil; 10% is nuclear, geothermal, and hydroelectric, and less than 1% is solar power — photovoltaic and solar thermal. Nuclear fuel is scarce and nuclear technology is generally considered dangerous as tragically experienced by the Fukushima Daichi nuclear disaster in Japan, and it seems unrealistic to seek a solution in the nuclear direction. Only solar energy can be a long term solution: Less than 1% of the solar energy we receive on earth can be transformed into 10 times the fossil fuel energy used in the world today. Yet we need a short-term strategy that accelerates long run renewable energy, or we will defeat long-term goals. In the short term as the IPCC validates, we need carbon negative technology, carbon removals. The short run is the next 20 or 30 years. There is no time in this period of time to transform the entire fossil infrastructure — it costs $45-55 trillion (IEA) to replace and it is slow to build. We need to directly reduce carbon in the atmosphere now. We cannot use traditional methods to remove CO2 from smokestacks (called often Carbon Capture and Sequestration, CSS) because they are not carbon negative as is required. CSS works but does not suffice because it only captures what power plants currently emit. Any level of emissions adds to the stable and high concentration we have today and CO2 remains in the atmosphere for years. We need to remove the CO2 that is already in the atmosphere, namely air capture of CO2 also called carbon removals. The solution is to combine air capture of CO2 with storage of CO2 into stable materials such as biochar, cement, polymers, and carbon fibers that replace a number of other construction materials such as metals. The most recent BMW automobile model uses only carbon fibers rather than metals. It is also possible to combine CO2 to produce renewable gasoline, namely gasoline produced from air and water. CO2 can be separated from air and hydrogen separated from water, and their combination is a well-known industrial process to produce gasoline. Is this therefore too expensive? There are new technologies using algae that make synthetic fuel commercially feasible at competitive rates. Other policies would involve combining air capture with solar thermal electricity using the residual solar thermal heat to drive the carbon capture process. This can make a solar plant more productive and efficient so it can out-compete coal as a source of energy. In summary, the blueprint offered here is a private/public approach, based on new industrial technology and financial markets, self-funded and using profitable greenmarkets, with securities that utilize carbon credits as the “underlying” asset, based on the KP CDM, as well as new markets for biodiversity and water providing abundant clean energy to stave off impending and actual energy crisis in developing nations, fostering mutually beneficial cooperation for industrial and developing nations. The blueprint proposed provides the two sides of the coin, equity and efficiency, and can assign a critical role for women as stewards for human survival and sustainable development. My vision is a carbon negative economy that represents green capitalism in resolving the Global Climate negotiations and the North–South Divide. Carbon negative power plants and capture of CO2 from air and ensure a clean atmosphere together innovation and more jobs and exports: the more you produce and create jobs the cleaner becomes the atmosphere. In practice, Green Capitalism means economic growth that is harmonious with the Earth resources.

#### 5] Growth solves war AND root causes their impacts – throw out non-empirical analyses.

Cortright ’16 (David; 5/18/16; Ph.D. in Political Science from the Union Graduate School, M.A. in History from New York University, B.A. in History from the University of Notre Dame, Director of Policy Studies at the Kroc Institute for International Peace Studies, former research associate at the Center for National Security Studies; Kroc Institute, “Linking Development and Peace: The Empirical Evidence,” <https://peacepolicy.nd.edu/2016/05/18/linking-development-and-peace-the-empirical-evidence/)>

The connections between **development and peace** are firmly supported by social science research. All the standard indicators of economic development, including per capita income, economic growth rates, levels of trade and investment, and degree of market openness, are **significantly correlated** with peace. Virtually every study on the causes of war finds a strong connection between low income and the likelihood of armed conflict. Economist Edward Miguel describes this link as “one of the most **robust empirical relationships** in the economic literature.” Irrespective of all other variables and indicators, poverty as measured by low income bears a strong and **statistically significant** relationship to increased risk of civil conflict. No one has made this point more convincingly over the years than Paul Collier. He and his colleagues have shown that civil conflict is heavily concentrated in the poorest countries. The risk of civil war is strongly associated with joblessness, poverty and a general lack of development. They famously conclude, “The **key root cause** of conflict is the failure of economic **development**.” They also make the reverse point. Raising economic **growth rates** and levels of per capita income may be “the single **most important step** that can be taken” to reduce the likelihood of armed conflict. War is reverse development. It undermines economic well-being and reduces income levels. War may bring profit for the few, those ‘masters of war’ as Bob Dylan called them, but it creates economic misery for many. Once started, war becomes a self-sustaining system, an “economy of war” Mary Kaldor calls it in New and Old Wars, a feeding trough for profiteers, warlords and mobsters that becomes exceedingly difficult to stop. War reduces life expectancy and destroys education and public health systems. It tears apart the social fabric. The World Development Report 2011 calculates the cost of a major civil war as equivalent to more than **30 years of typical growth** for a medium-size developing country. Trade levels take 20 years to recover. The negative economic impact of conflict helps to explain why countries at war are often caught in a deadly conflict trap, why the chief legacy of a civil war is another war. The linkage between **poverty and war** has a human face. We can see it the hallowed out stare and angry glare of the mostly young men who fight in these wars. Surveys of insurgents and militia fighters confirm that many are driven by poverty and unemployment. The majority of child soldiers “are drawn from the poorest, least educated and most marginalized sections of society.” The link between low income and conflict risk does not mean that poverty causes war, however. There is no automatic connection. Some poor countries, such as Zambia or Bangladesh, have not experienced recent major civil conflict. Other mid-level income countries, such as Croatia and Serbia, have fought bitter wars. It is not poverty per se but a general lack of **economic development** that is most strongly associated with armed conflict. Poverty and a lack of opportunity are **most disruptive** when communities experience a decline in social and economic status, and when they perceive an unjust discrepancy between what they have and what they expect or feel they deserve.

#### Elites react with war – if goods don’t cross borders, then soldiers will.

Liu ’18 [Qian; November 2; Economist, Managing Director at Greater China, citing the economist Thomas Piketty and political scientist Samuel Huntington; Project Syndicate, “From economic crisis to World War III,” p. 1-2; RP]

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 labour 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. 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 stabilise 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 characterised 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 globalisation, political polarisation, 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 J. 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.