### Climate Change Adv

#### Lack of a “*right to strike*” means the UK makes it near *impossible* for workers to climate strike.

Aspinall ’19 [Georgia, acting features editor at Grazia UK, formerly at The Debrief, “How Do You Strike For A Social Issue Without Getting In Trouble At Work?”, 09-02-2019, https://graziadaily.co.uk/life/in-the-news/how-to-strike-climate-crisis/]//pranav

But for many of us, striking for the climate crisis seems unthinkable. Not because it’s not a gravely important issue, but because we have no idea how to strike for a social issue. It’s complicated enough striking for industrial action (that is, when the majority of employees have a grievance with their employer) but to strike for something outside of that – many of us wouldn’t even know where to start without getting in trouble at work. Because, thanks to Margaret Thatcher, laws around strike action in the UK are extreme. According to Employment Law Watch, ‘there is no right to strike’ in the UK and calling one is ‘in principle unlawful as it amounts to inducing employees to breach their contracts of employment’. It is therefore described as a ‘privilege’, not a right. However, there are a bunch of rules strike action must follow to be legally immune. For industrial action, it must be about a trade dispute between the workers and employers, the result of a properly organised ballot and can only occur if the employer has been given detailed notice seven days prior. Typically, this means strikes are organised by trade unions that actually understand all of the rules that must be followed for a strike to be legal. But, non-union members have the same rights as union members as long as they take part in legal, official industrial action. Which is useful to know given that only 26% of UK employees are union members. This strike however, is not industrial action at all – it’s a social strike. So what rights do workers have to even take part? Well, none – which is unsurprising given that we don’t even have the legal right to strike against industrial action. What it does mean though, is that striking for climate change would involve taking some all-important holiday time. ‘Someone wanting to take part in the Climate Strike would have to request this as holiday, as it wouldn’t constitute a workplace dispute,’ says HR Advisor Kyle Taylor. ‘Otherwise, they would be classed as Absent Without Leave (AWOL)’ Going AWOL can be grounds for disciplinary action, however it is at the discretion of your employer how serious they take the incident. For example, you may simply not be paid for the day’s work or it could go on your record – it’s not typically grounds for dismissal.

**Collective action incentivizes policy change, but status quo sustains science as usual which embraces climate skep.**

**Green ’19** [Matthew, Reuters Journalist, “Scientists endorse mass civil disobedience to force climate action”, 10-12-2019, Reuters, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-climate-change-scientists/scientists-endorse-mass-civil-disobedience-to-force-climate-action-idUSKBN1WS01K]//pranav

In a joint declaration, **climate scientists, physicists, biologists, engineers and others from at least 20 countries broke with the caution traditionally associated with academia to side with peaceful protesters** courting arrest from Amsterdam to Melbourne. **Wearing white laboratory coats to symbolize their research credentials, a group of about 20 of the signatories gathered on Saturday to read out the text outside London’s century-old Science Museum in the city’s upmarket Kensington district**. “**We believe that the continued governmental inaction over the climate and ecological crisis now justifies peaceful and non-violent protest and direct action**, even if this goes beyond the bounds of the current law,” said Emily Grossman, a science broadcaster with a PhD in molecular biology. She read the declaration on behalf of the group. “**We therefore support those who are rising up peacefully against governments around the world that are failing to act proportionately to the scale of the crisis**,” she said. The declaration was coordinated by a group of scientists who support Extinction Rebellion, a civil disobedience campaign that formed in Britain a year ago and has since sparked offshoots in dozens of countries. **The group launched a fresh wave of international actions on Monday, aiming to get governments to address an ecological crisis caused by climate change and accelerating extinctions of plant and animal species**. **A total of 1,307 volunteers had since been arrested at various protests in London by 2030 GMT on Saturday, Extinction Rebellion said. A further 1,463 volunteers have been arrested in the past week in another 20 cities**, including Brussels, Amsterdam, New York, Sydney and Toronto, according to the group’s tally. More protests in this latest wave are due in the coming days. While many scientists have shunned overt political debate, fearing that being perceived as activists might undermine their claims to objectivity, the 395 academics who had signed the declaration by 1100 GMT on Sunday chose to defy convention. “**The urgency of the crisis is now so great that many scientists feel, as humans, that we now have a moral duty to take radical action**,” Grossman told Reuters. **Other signatories included several scientists who contributed to the U.N.-backed Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC),** which has produced a series of reports underscoring the urgency of dramatic cuts in carbon emissions. “**We can’t allow the role of scientists to be to just write papers and publish them in obscure journals and hope somehow that somebody out there will pay attention**,” Julia Steinberger, an ecological economist at the University of Leeds and a lead IPCC author, told Reuters. “**We need to be rethinking the role of the scientist and engage with how social change happens at a massive and urgent scale,”** she said. “**We can’t allow science as usual.”**

**Climate strikes spill over and cause corporate policy change – empirically proven in tech – that bypasses politicians & avoids legal disputes.**

**Ghaffary ’19** [Shirin Ghaffary, 9-20-2019, "Here’s why the Amazon climate walkout is a big deal," Vox, https://www.vox.com/recode/2019/9/20/20874497/amazon-climate-change-walkout-google-microsoft-strike-tech-activism]//pranav

On Friday, over 1,500 Amazon workers plan to walk out of work to protest their company’s environmental impact. It will be the first time in Amazon’s 25-year history that its corporate employees have participated in a walkout demonstration. **Employees are calling on Amazon to reduce its carbon footprint as part of a larger**, youth-led global **climate strike that has planned hundreds of events around the world**. **Even ahead of their walkout, protesters have already seen results.** On Thursday morning, Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos announced in Washington, DC, **that the company is making a pact to follow the Paris climate agreement — a cross-country pledge for nations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions — and it is also pledging to be carbon neutral by 2040.** But Amazon employees who plan to walk out of work say it’s not enough. Organizers told Recode they want to see Amazon set a more aggressive plan for the company to reduce its carbon emissions to zero; they want it to stop selling its cloud services to the oil and gas industry; and they want it to stop donating to politicians who deny climate change’s existence. (**Bezos said he would “take a hard look” at whether donations are going toward climate-change deniers** but made no promises.) Amazon declined to comment directly on the strike. “I would love to be in a meeting where one of the criteria or goals around the design that I’m proposing is, ‘How much carbon does this remove from our footprint?’” Weston Fribley, a software engineer at Amazon and one of the organizers of Amazon Employees for Climate Justice, the group organizing the walkout, told Recode. “Our work is interesting and challenging, and it’s tough to see the company not prioritizing things that are so important.” **Employees from several other major tech companies have joined Amazon’s lead, calling on their companies to change business practices to reduce climate change**. So far, 700 **Google** employees have pledged to walk out, along with others at several other major tech companies including **Microsoft, Facebook, and Twitter**. **(Google announced a day ahead of the walkout that it’s making a major investment in wind and solar energy.)** These employees’ **coordinated involvement is a sign of how far the growing tech labor movement has come since rank-and-file workers began organizing over the past several years**. In 2019, as public and political scrutiny of their companies increases, **these employees have mobilized to pressure their companies on political issues ranging from selling AI tech military use, providing products to oppressive governments, and discrimination and harassment in the workplace**. Several leaders of the Amazon protest say they were inspired by last year’s Google walkout in which 20,000 employees left work to protest the company’s payout of high-powered executives accused of sexually harassing employees. The walkout was a historic moment for tech activism and the largest-ever company protest by workers in the industry. **It’s remarkable that employees at Amazon, known for a grueling work culture in which employees put on a unified public front and are sworn to secrecy, are now leading a protest in their sector.** “**The tech climate strike is proof that tech workers across the industry are becoming more confident in our power to shape the future,”** the organizing group Tech Workers Coalition (TWC) said in a statement to Recode. TWC helped coordinate employees at major companies who planned to join Amazon workers in participating in the strike. “This is a historic milestone for our industry and shows that we will only continue getting stronger until tech treats everyone equitably.” **The walkout is indeed a sign of a growing, cross-industry movement by employees to move the needle on their employer’s business practices on social and political issues**. A few months ago, employees at e-commerce home decor giant Wayfair walked out of work to demand their employer stop providing beds to children in US immigration detention facilities. Similarly, employees at the advertising firm Ogilvy protested their company’s contract with US Border Patrol, prompting the CEO to hold a lengthy meeting addressing concerns to a room full of angry employees. (Neither Ogilvy nor Wayfair have said they will cancel their contracts.) And at Amazon, workers have also formed a “We Won’t Build It” organizing group to protest the company’s Amazon Web Services contracts with companies like Palantir, which provide a technological infrastructure that helps US immigration agencies enforce deportation policies. **At a time when many of these workers are feeling doubtful about politicians’ ability to pass laws enforcing changes they want to see, they’re increasingly calling on their employers to set the ethical standard**. “**It goes beyond climate change**,” one Amazon employee who plans to walk out and who requested anonymity told Recode. “It demonstrates that, ‘Hey, you guys can organize on something together that you feel strongly about that maybe your managers don’t like but that you think is the right thing to do.’

**Warming causes extinction & turns every impact – no adaptation & each degree is worse**

**Krosofsky ’21** [Andrew, Green Matters Journalist, “How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction”, Green Matters, 03-11-2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction]//pranav

Eventually, yes. **Global warming will invariably result in the mass extinction of millions of different species,** humankind included. In fact, **the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet**. **Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won’t be able to handle long-term**. Extreme weather patterns are shifting climates across the globe, eliminating habitats and altering the landscape. **As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced**. Then, of course, **there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with**. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, **these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions**. The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, **unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak.** **The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming.** Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. **Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to ocean acidification**. **This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia’s Great Barrier Reef**, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that more than 30 percent of Earth’s plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050. By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent. We won’t try and sugarcoat things, humanity’s own prospects aren’t looking that great either. According to The Conversation, **our species has just under a decade left to get our CO₂ emissions under control. If we don’t cut those emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to potentially catastrophic levels. It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense.** The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, **but it will mean less food, less water, and increased hardship across the world — especially in low-income areas and developing countries. This increase will also mean more pandemics, devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires**.

### Democracy Adv

#### UK democracy is declining right now – Johnson’s levelling up agenda is a disguise for masking dissent

Macfarlane 5/12 [Laurie is a Research Associate at IIPP. Prior to this Laurie was a Senior Economist at the New Economics Foundation. Open Democracy “The UK government is using ‘levelling up’ to hide a crackdown on political dissent” <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/oureconomy/the-uk-government-is-using-levelling-up-to-hide-a-crackdown-on-political-dissent/> ] //aaditg

What about Boris Johnson? For many, the answer is obvious: Brexit. But when it comes to domestic policy, the prime minister has yet to leave his mark on the country. After a year spent fighting the COVID-19 pandemic, the closest thing his government has to a flagship policy is the much-trumpeted “levelling-up” agenda. Officially the aim is to tackle the UK’s stark regional inequalities and “rebalance opportunities” across the country. Unofficially it’s about cementing Conservative support in traditional Labour strongholds in northern England and the Midlands. But while the broad objectives may sound sensible, in recent weeks frustration with the policy has been growing. Some have denounced the agenda for being vague and ill-defined, while others have accused the flagship Levelling Up Fund and Towns Fund of being convenient conduits for pork barrel politics. In an attempt to fend off critics and put the agenda back on track, the government promised that this week’s Queen’s Speech would be “jam-packed with measures to 'level up' the UK”. So how did it measure up to this promise? The Queen’s Speech included a total of 28 new bills covering a broad range of issues, from healthcare and criminal justice to online safety and professional qualifications. Bizarrely, almost every area of policy is presented as contributing to the levelling-up agenda in some way ­– from the launch of a new anti-smoking strategy to the recruitment of more police officers. But simply repeating a term over and over again doesn’t make it more convincing. In reality, precious little of the government’s legislative agenda will have any bearing on regional inequalities. Where legislative proposals are relevant, the solutions presented are far from convincing. Precious little of the government’s legislative agenda will have any bearing on regional inequalities A new Skills and Post-16 Education Bill will introduce a Lifelong Loan Entitlement, which will expand the student loan system to cover four years of education at any time in life. While the prime minister said the scheme will be "rocket fuel" for the levelling-up agenda, it’s unclear how burdening struggling families – many of whom are already drowning in debt – with even more loans will help to narrow the UK’s economic divides. A new Planning Bill will allegedly create a “simpler, faster and more modern planning system” that will promote homeownership and tackle the housing crisis. But by undermining local authorities and handing over more power to private developers, many housing experts believe the government’s reforms will make the housing crisis worse, not better. The government will also deliver on its commitment to establish eight freeports, which we are told will “drive regeneration by bringing investment, trade and jobs”. However, experts say there is little evidence that freeports create additional jobs or boost economic growth, while others have warned they could lead to increased tax evasion and money laundering. Meanwhile, legislation that would genuinely help to level up the country, such the long-awaited bills on workers’ rights and private renting reform, both of which were first promised in 2019, have once again been neglected or kicked into the long grass. So despite the government’s best efforts to convince us otherwise, ‘levelling up’ remains a slogan without substance. But if the government’s legislative programme isn’t going to level up the country, what is it going to deliver? The answer is: something else entirely. In the UK’s political system, a government can continue winning elections by suppressing critics and rigging democracy in its favour Under the proposed Electoral Integrity Bill, it will no longer be possible to simply walk into a polling station, give your name and address, and cast a vote. Instead voters will be forced to show photographic ID at polling stations. While the government claims the measure is being introduced to “protect the integrity of elections”, critics say the move is a naked attempt at voter suppression. In 2015 it was estimated that 3.5 million UK citizens do not have access to photo ID, while 11 million don’t own a passport or a driver’s licence. Unsurprisingly, those voters are disproportionately poor, disadvantaged and non-white. Groups including the Electoral Reform Society, the Runnymede Trust and the Traveller Movement have warned that requiring voter ID could cause widespread disenfranchisement among minority communities (who, as it happens, tend not to vote Conservative). This isn’t the only attack on democracy. After Labour dominated last week’s mayoral elections, the home secretary, Priti Patel, unveiled plans to change the electoral system. The reform involves switching all future English mayoral elections from the existing supplementary vote system – in which the public ranks their two favourite candidates – to the first-past-the-post system used in elections to the House of Commons. Political analysts say the move will make it easier for Conservatives to win future elections. It’s not just elections that are in the government’s sights. The proposed Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts bill has been described by the human rights organisation Liberty as “an assault on basic civil liberties”. As well as dramatically curtailing the right to protest against government policies, the bill creates new stop-and-search powers and criminalises trespass – measures that could licence state harassment, ramp up racial profiling and threaten the way of life of Gypsy and Traveller communities. Academics have also expressed concern about the proposed Higher Education (Freedom of Speech) Bill, which will enable speakers who are ‘no-platformed’ to sue universities for compensation. While the government claims the bill will “strengthen academic freedom and free speech in universities in England”, critics say it’s an attempt to impose a right-wing agenda on university campuses. So while the government claims its main focus is levelling up, its legislative agenda suggests the priority is something rather different: cracking down on political dissent. After years spent dealing with Brexit and COVID-19, Johnson’s domestic priorities are finally becoming clear: reward those who vote Conservative, and suppress those who don’t. Is this really a sustainable strategy? In most democracies, where coalitions and consensus building are the norm, the answer would be ‘no’. But in the UK’s winner-takes-all political system, it’s perfectly possible for a government to continue winning elections by suppressing critics and rigging the rules of democracy in its favour. Can it be stopped? That depends on whether progressives are up to the task of defending our democracy and civil liberties from a creeping new authoritarianism.

#### **Status quo democracies response to climate *misses* the boat – they have to *unlock* the local level**

Farmer 10-7 [Paul Farmer is co-founder and chief strategist of Partners in Health The New York Times, 10-7-2021, accessed on 10-27-2021, The New York Times, "Seeking Solutions to Global Challenges", <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/07/world/global-challenge-solutions.html>] //aaditg

This is an article from World Review: The State of Democracy, a special section that examines global policy and affairs, and is published in conjunction with the annual Athens Democracy Forum. For three days last week, global leaders met in Athens to discuss the challenges democratic governments face around the world — from climate change to social inequality to polarized politics, fraying economic systems and a fraught relationship with technology. In its ninth year, the Athens Democracy Forum, with a theme of “Resilience and Renewal” this time, explored the lessons learned from the overlapping crises and considered ways to manage the economic and social fallout and accomplish the formidable tasks ahead. Here are excerpts from some of the panel discussions, all of which have been edited and condensed. Health care as a human right Dr. Paul Farmer is co-founder and chief strategist of Partners in Health, dedicated to community-based health care and treatment, especially focused on resource-stretched and starved areas and countries; chairman of the department of global health and social medicine at Harvard Medical School; and chief of the division of global health equity at Brigham and Women’s Hospital in Boston. He talked to Patrick Healy of The New York Times. MR. HEALY Paul, you’ve been working to expand and improve health care across the globe for nearly 40 years. I’m wondering, how much closer are we to global acceptance of health as a human right compared with when you really started this work in the 1980s? MR. FARMER I would say we’re closer now than we’ve ever been before in my lifetime, in any case. And that’s including in the United States, where health care has not been traditionally considered a right. We’re seeing it across Asia, in parts of Latin America, in Europe. And a lot of this has spurred by the dramatic events of the last 18 months, I think. Seeing what it’s like to get through a pandemic when you don’t have a strong safety net has been an object lesson for many. MR. HEALY In terms of the pandemic — take the United States, for instance — there is still, to some degree, a difference of opinion in terms of responsibilities for what the federal government should do, what states should do, what localities should do, what kind of rules should even be in place. And it feels like health care as a human right sometimes isn’t enough of that conversation. Why do you think that is still the case in the United States and some other countries? MR. FARMER I think it’s just one of many paradigms that can be use to promote health equity. The others — for example, public health as a public good — are important as well. The idea that there are certain things that a federal government takes responsibility for. And many of the places where I’ve worked, for example in Rwanda, where the real impetus for investing in a national health insurance system and the rollout of a care delivery system, has also been premised on the notion that this is the best way to break the cycle of poverty and disease. So whether you’re looking at health as a human right or public health as a public good, or as health safety nets as a way to break the cycle of poverty and disease, they’re all leading in the right direction. MR. HEALY Does it surprise you that there has not been over the last 18 months more of a consensus in the United States and some countries of how to approach not just the treatment of Covid but the cost and expense of health care, especially for people who have faced inequities in the health care system before? Or is that lack of consensus just part of, in some ways, a functioning democracy? How do you see that? MR. FARMER Our struggle between federalism and local rule has been going on for some time. And what we have to reckon with as a nation is, why have we done so uniquely poorly in responding to Covid? After all, we have more resources than most places in the world. And part of that has to do with our patchwork health delivery system, our patchwork health insurance systems, which are also a reflection of this longstanding tension. Yes, there are some cultural issues about notions of libertarianism, a history of hostility to government efforts to intrude in people’s lives. MR. HEALY Paul, you’ve been involved for years in partnerships — public, private, the donor community, governments — to bring health care resources, clinical support, to countries around the world. What do you think President Biden and the Biden administration need to do to deal with the global vaccine need and campaign? Because there is a real debate in the United States about whether more people who’ve had the shot need boosters, or whether more can be done for other countries. MR. FARMER First of all, I do want to say on many scores I think the Biden administration is off to a pretty robust start. Obviously, our criterion for defining success is the high rate of vaccination. And we don’t have that. Some of the specific issues are around technology transfer so that there can be manufacturing of vaccines, particularly on the continent of Africa, I would say. There, you have a setting where there is a total reliance on imports of vaccine — 99 percent of the vaccines used in Africa are imported — and also a very low level of uptake of vaccination that cannot be blamed on hesitancy unless we’re talking about elite hesitancy to put in place mechanisms that would roll out the vaccine. So there’s an area of manufacturing tech transfer where the Biden administration could do more. Donations are still not working as a means of vaccinating large parts of Africa. The multilateral mechanisms haven’t functioned well enough. So there are lots of areas, I believe, where the administration can make vaccine equity and vaccine diplomacy central. I also think that there are places nearby the United States, like Haiti, which has been struggling with political disruption, natural disasters and now a wave of refugees being returned to the middle of a crisis. These are also settings in which we should do a better job making sure we can help on the Covid front, but also on the many other challenges that are facing Haiti. And it varies from place to place. The will to confront climate change It’s far more dangerous than the coronavirus and more permanent. So why is it so hard for governments and individuals to adopt a sense of urgency about climate change? What alliances need to be built among philanthropists, corporations, activists and policymakers to change course? Panelists: Ivan Tse, president, Tse Foundation; Matt Brittin, president, EMEA Business & Operations, Google; and Philip Glanville, mayor of Hackney borough of London. Moderated by Liz Alderman, chief European business correspondent, The New York Times. MS. ALDERMAN Obviously, climate change is one of the No. 1 issues that governments are tackling. We’ve got COP26 [United Nations Climate Change Conference] coming up very shortly in Glasgow. Local and national governments in countries around the world have been making commitments, but there’s much more to do. Mayor Glanville, one of the questions is what more is it that governments can do to press this forward? You’re helping lead a new green deal. Tell us what has gone right in the initiatives that you have taken, and what isn’t going right, what more it is that you need to do that could also be a model for other cities. MR. GLANVILLE I firmly believe that it is the local level you have to unlock to ensure that we get not just the action on climate change that we want to see, but the change in our communities, the nature-led recovery that we want, and that also we involve the citizen level in that work. Failure to do that, we will miss the opportunity for social justice, green recovery and green jobs. And what we’ve been doing in London is to think about how we can reimagine the city away from the private car. And there are obviously people who are involved in electric-vehicle transition, and that is an absolutely important act. The problem is, if we just do that we’re transitioning a society based around the private car. Already in Britain, land-transport emissions have overtaken energy contribution to climate change. And there’s some really stark statistics at a national level. Before Covid every morning 36 million seats in cars were unfilled. So people are driving all around the country, and there are 36 million cars. The average occupancy of a car is 1.2 people. So if we simply take that old model and apply it to a new model, we’re going to invest far too much in E.V.s. So we have been taking the steps in the city to invest in active travel. So it’s thinking about how we restrict private car use and the most polluting vehicles. London-wide that’s represented by the Ultra Low Emission Zone, which is the mayor of London’s plan to effectively charge the most polluting vehicles to come into the center. But my borough in Hackney sits just outside the city center, and it has some of the lowest car ownership anywhere in Britain. Some of the highest number, if not the highest number, of trips taken by walking, cycling and public transport. But it also has some of the worst air. So we’ve been introducing low-traffic neighborhoods, which is where you don’t close roads permanently, but you restrict through-traffic access. And we’re seeing the impact on air quality, the taking up of walking and cycling. And you also start to get the chance to reimagine what roads can be, so you can de-pave, you can create parklets, you can do urban tree planting, changing what the city is, but also improving its resilience. We’re seeing increased flooding in Europe, fires here in Greece, we’ve seen the impact of heat. The solutions to that are not concrete and car-based. We need to reimagine what our streets can be and make sure that they’re ready for that transition. It is about being more ambitious than just transitioning existing ways of the transport economy into something far more better and sustainable. We were in a session this morning that was looking for the big idea. And then you have the practical role of elected politicians who have to take their communities with them, and to be frank, we have to win elections to show that leadership. I think it’s absolutely important though that we show that leadership, but we also invest in the coproduction. So there’s platforms like Commonplace in the U.K., where you’re allowed to go out there and talk about what you like about an area, what you would like to change, how are the different ways of travel impacting on individual lives? There’s also that sense — and I have it all the time talking as a politician-citizen — I’m not asking everyone to get on a bike. Not everyone can, not everyone is able to, there are issues of disability and equality. What I’m saying is if you are driving around in a private car you should be considering a bike. That frees road space. The bus is an incredibly important tool here. We need bus prioritization in cities. We need the affordability of public transportation to be invested in. And I think that’s what we’re doing in London is having a holistic approach. It’s walking, it’s cycling, it’s scooting, it’s personal mobility. All of that has a part to play. And if it just becomes a sort of young-people-on-bikes debate vs. people who might have disability or large families in cars, we can’t allow that to happen. MS. ALDERMAN Let me pivot off that to Matt. Matt, Google has taken huge strides as a company to reduce its carbon footprint. But besides that in terms of searches — the searches that you all see with regard to climate change — can you talk to us about what the top issues seem to be on people’s minds based on what you are observing? Is there any sort of, backlash or resistance among citizens who recognize that really the only way to deal with climate change is on an individual basis through their own actions, but whose lives would have to be changed fairly dramatically by no longer driving their cars if they’re the only person in them. MR. BRITTIN I think it’s very clear governments, companies and communities have to work together to tackle these challenges. What we see in consumers searching over the last five years, we’ve seen nearly five times the volume of searches for sustainable goods. If you look at the Edelman Trust Barometer, you see that over 70 percent of people are concerned or fearful about the consequences of the climate crisis. So we definitely see people turning to information sources to try to make smarter choices. That’s one thing we’re trying to do is help people to be better informed about smarter choices. Second thing for us is the tools that we build. So obviously there are the consumer tools that you know about, like how to insulate your home, or how to find a healthier way to get to work. So working with cities like Hackney, or I was looking at a project yesterday in Kampala [Uganda] where we’re supporting local engineers to collect data via air sensors about where pollution sits. And I think there’s a big piece here around getting data that allows local decision makers, communities and families to manage their situations better. MS. ALDERMAN Ivan, as head of the TSE Foundation, talk to us about the role of culture in the overall climate change, not only the debate, but the role that culture is playing and can play in raising the level of consciousness not only among individuals, but among our leaders about tackling climate change in a better, more purposeful way. MR. TSE I think that there is greater alignment now between governments and consumers. And some of the questions that we look at is how does the cultural sector help move the conversation forward from here? I think we’re ready to focus more on the adaptation side because we realize that climate change is already happening. And I think that we need to develop a lifestyle that helps us adapt to it. The example that we have in the past is the quit smoking/nonsmoking movement, which was a multipronged effort that fundamentally changed the definition of smoking. It strikes me that it’s not that we don’t really know what to do about climate. What we lack is a collective sense of ethics and the political will to get there. And that’s not something that, perhaps, our minds can fix by themselves. And so what we need to do is essentially amplify the human spirit so that we can address climate change from a different perspective and according to a different logic. Astronauts who’ve come back have called this the “overview effect.” And so we may have to design a gateway so that climate change triggers a fundamental immune response. The danger of deep fakes As deep fakes and other manipulated media become more sophisticated and cheaper to produce, people outside the world of tech are experimenting with them. For some creators, they can be powerful tools for expression. But they can also be used to influence people and sway opinions. Does the mere fact of calling something “art” give people creative license to toy with reality? How do we prepare and protect ourselves, our institutions and our democracies when seeing is no longer believing? Panelists: Toomas Hendrik Ilves, former president, Estonia; Barnaby Francis (Bill Posters), artist, researcher, author and facilitator; and Ashley Tolbert, senior security engineer, Netflix. Moderator: Farah Nayeri, a culture reporter for The New York Times. MS. NAYERI I think deep fakes first came to the general public’s attention in 2017 when there were a huge number of videos of celebrities and actors engaging in pornographic acts, which they actually never did in real life, going viral. And so this whole conversation, this whole debate, started getting inflamed right around that time. And nowadays, from what I understand, just about anybody can create a deep fake. Barnaby, let me turn to you. I know that your artist name is Bill Posters. I wanted to get you to talk about the concept of deep fakes. Because for you, it’s a way of making art, it’s an art form, and I understand that art is about artifice and art is about representing people in a kind of make-believe way. But do you understand the democratic implications or the political implications of the art that you make? MR. FRANCIS So I created a series of artworks called “Big Data Public Faces” with a collaborator, Daniel Howe. They included a fake video of Mark Zuckerberg of Facebook and various celebrities. The artworks were picked up, went viral and created a furor around the issues that our artwork is connected with, right? Which is about disinformation and misinformation and the way that truth is distributed online, or how our perceptions can be altered by various forms of technologies that are using new media like this. We use the deep fake as a form of that. MS. NAYERI But then, you can get someone who watches a snippet of your Zuckerberg video in which he’s saying some very ominous things and really believe that Mark said that, run with it and run it on other platforms. MR. FRANCIS Yeah, of course it’s possible, absolutely. MS. NAYERI That you’re making art, and art in the artistic context is fine, but then when taken out of the artistic context there are all kinds of dangers. MR. FRANCIS Absolutely. And that is true for any form of information that’s shared in any forum or information ecosystem online, right? Whether that’s misquoted, whether that’s misrepresented, etc. So the real kind of key component here is literacy and context. So anything that I share online is contextualized as pieces of contemporary art, you know conceptual art pieces. So there’s always that kind of transparency in relation to the media that’s being shared, right? Unfortunately, we don’t get that in many of the forums or contexts of information that’s shared online as well. MS. NAYERI Toomas Hendrik Ilves, you’re the former president of Estonia. And Forbes magazine said that while you were running things, Estonia was the most digitally savvy country on earth. You led a digital revolution in your country, and my understanding is that nowadays it’s possible in Estonia to be identified through facial-recognition technology — or not really? I mean, how digital is Estonia? MR. ILVES In Estonia, all public services, or all interactions between the citizen and the state, can be done digitally, except for getting married, getting divorced, and selling or buying physical property, which is not a bad idea given that two Russian Mafiosi bought apartments in Trump Tower in the U.S. through anonymous [shell] companies. Everything else you can do online. Last year, when in January I read an article in your newspaper about basically there was a backlog of 3.5 million passport applications after two months of Covid, I said, why a backlog? Well, it was because the offices were closed. Whereas when I go to Estonia I had to renew my passport, I just go online. I had to upload a new picture because, you know, less hair and more gray, but other than that it was the same. And everything else has stayed the same. I didn’t have to fill anything out. That’s what we do. But in terms of facial recognition, no, not much. But on deep fakes I’m much more worried. MS. NAYERI If your country is working with facial-recognition technology, let’s say somebody pretends they’re me and they make a video of me doing something criminal, do you know what I mean? MR. ILVES I think it’s worse than that. I think basically the rise of deep fakes, unlike photography, Photoshopping, because of the movement involved and because you can do it with voice and video, is that it really strikes at the empiricist basis of democracy. MS. NAYERI Why do you think that’s a threat to democracy? MR. ILVES Because you can undermine basically anything. You make a fake video of a politician taking a bribe, you can completely discredit people who have been legitimately elected by creating deep fakes. And the problem is the technological solutions to fighting that are fairly limited. So we’re going to have to actually school people to not believe what they see. MS. TOLBERT I share the belief that deep fakes are worrisome. Although I do stand in the middle of this line that deep fakes are artful, right? So synthesized media, it is a form of art, and it’s been around since the 19th century. But when you step outside of the bounds of that art there are catastrophic risks to deep fakes. A well-timed deep fake can have real impact on an election, on someone’s reputation. So you’re essentially borrowing influence for a momentary motive. And then, once that seed is planted, it’s almost irreversible to basically go back and revert this spread of instant knowledge. So for me it’s the virality, it’s the fact that this line of disinformation and deep fakes, is just too powerful. The economy the pandemic broke The ravages of the pandemic have profoundly changed how we work, buy and sell. As we rebuild our economies, should we be focused on a “great reset” to economic models responsible for obscene gaps between rich and poor, or should we use this opportunity to build back better? What could a new economic model actually look like? What kinds of partnerships are needed between the public and private sectors to actually make it happen? Paanelists: Loukas Tsoukalis, president of the board,Eliamep; Azeem Azhar, founder, Exponential View; and Hervé Berville, member of French Parliament. Moderator: Liz Alderman, chief European business correspondent, The New York Times. MS. ALDERMAN One of the things we’ve heard frequently since the pandemic broke out was talk about how countries would steer not only through the health crisis, but also grow back from the massive economic crisis. So this mantra of “building back better” has become a new, in many ways, political catchphrase for an agenda that basically aims to better protect public services, tackle inequality and create a more shockproof economy while tackling climate change. Loukis, since we’re here in Greece, you know this is a country like many others in Europe and around the world that has been recovering from an economic crisis, only to be hit by Covid. But now we are seeing a kind of major effort in this country to build back better. For example, you’ve got the digitalization of public services, building investments for a green economy and a major E.U. recovery plan. But is it possible to shockproof Greece or really any other country against future calamities? MR. TSOUKALIS Surely not. I mean, first of all, let us remember that Greece went through a hellish decade, an economic crisis that led to a reduction of Greek G.D.P. by 25 percent — unprecedented for any developed country in the (postwar period. And then hit by a pandemic. Greece has been recovering and it’s now in the process of not only recovering, but also accelerating the digital and the green transformation of the economy, with the help of the European recovery program. And this is one factor that makes a huge difference with the way Europe and the European Union in particular try to tackle, or not tackle, the two crises. With the euro crisis, Europe took a long time and basically did very little, insisting on the economics of austerity, which worsened the problem in virtually the whole of Europe. Now with the pandemic, European political leaders luckily realized that if they repeated the same experience they had with the euro crisis the risk of the European Union splitting apart would be very high. So that’s why we ended up with an extremely ambitious recovery program, which also leads to the first mutualization of European debt, which is not exactly the (Hamiltonian) moment for Europe, but it’s just an important first step. MS. ALDERMAN Azeem, obviously one of the major elements in helping to sustain any kind of recovery from the pandemic has to do with the quality of jobs and basically the way companies are operating in society. We’ve seen divisions in society open up, with inequalities becoming even greater since the pandemic started. And you had a column in Wired magazine recently titled “The Exponential Age Will Transform Economics Forever,” which talked about how our inability to understand that we’re living in a moment of exponential change could tear apart economics and society. Can you just explain to us what you mean by that and what are the implications of it at a time when countries are looking for ways to reset their economies from the impact of the pandemic? MR. AZHAR Where we found ourselves just before the pandemic was still an uncomfortable position in the sense that even though employment levels were very high in most of the richer economies in the world, there were certainly significant questions about the quality of that employment. As we move to apply these exponential technologies and we build platforms like Uber and many others, we see a bifurcation in not necessarily the quantity of workers, but the quality of that work. And when we look at what’s happened during the pandemic, the winners in industry have been those digital network platforms. Amazon added 800,000 workers globally since the pandemic started. And at one high level that’s a great number, that is 800,000 more families with employment. But one of the things that we have noticed, it’s something I write about in my book, is that the relative power between the corporation and the worker has shifted dramatically in favor of the corporation over the last 40 or 50 years as we’ve implemented these advanced technologies. We see that in measures like the labor share of national income, which has been declining in pretty much all over the rich world. And so we sit at a moment where we have to ask whether the traditional orthodoxies of our economics still make sense. Do they serve us? And they perhaps may serve a

#### Strikes are the internal link to uphold democracy – empirics prove

Pope 18 [ Before joining Rutgers in 1986, James Gray Pope worked in a shipyard and represented labor unions at the Boston law firm of Segal, Roitman & Coleman. He has a doctorate in politics from Princeton and specializes in constitutional law, constitutional theory, and labor law. “Labor’s right to strike is essential” Sept 2018 <https://www.psc-cuny.org/clarion/september-2018/labor%E2%80%99s-right-strike-essential>] //aaditg

What provoked Cuomo and de Blasio to close ranks and launch a simultaneous attack on workers’ rights? Gubernatorial candidate Cynthia Nixon had the audacity to include in her platform a plank endorsing public workers’ right to strike. No wonder Cuomo and de Blasio struck back: Like Bernie Sanders, Nixon threatened the grip of Wall Street-backed politicians on what was once the party of working people. The right to strike should be a no-brainer for any self-respecting candidate who claims to care about working people. It isn’t some transitory policy fix; it’s a fundamental human right, recognized in international law. Without the right to strike, workers have no effective recourse against unhealthy conditions, inadequate wages, or employer tyranny. Before the American labor movement began its long decline, unions made the right to strike a litmus test for supporting candidates. Labor leaders held that anti-strike laws imposed “involuntary servitude” in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Corporate interests ridiculed this claim, arguing that the Amendment guaranteed only the individual right to quit and go elsewhere. But workers and unions held their ground. “The simple fact is that the right of individual workers to quit their jobs has meaning only when they may quit in concert, so that in their quitting or in their threat to quit they have a real bargaining strength,” Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) General Counsel Lee Pressman explained. “It is thus hypocritical to suggest that a prohibition on the right to strike is not in practical effect a prohibition on the right to quit individually.” Labor leaders quoted the Supreme Court’s statement that the Amendment was intended “to make labor free, by prohibiting that control by which the personal service of one man is disposed of or coerced for another’s benefit which is the essence of involuntary servitude.” Although they never convinced the Supreme Court that this principle covered the right to strike, Congress did embrace the core of their claim when it protected the right to strike in two historic statutes, the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932 and the Wagner National Labor Relations Act of 1935. The “individual unorganized worker,” explained Congress, “is helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and to protect his freedom of labor.” A DEMOCRATIC NEED The recent teacher strikes underscore another, equally vital function of the strike: political democracy. It is no accident that strikers often serve as midwives of democracy. Examples include Poland in the 1970s, where shipyard strikers brought down the dictatorship, and South Africa in the 1970s and 1980s, where strikers were central to the defeat of apartheid. Even in relatively democratic countries like the United States, workers often find it necessary to withhold their labor in order to offset the disproportionate power of wealthy interests and racial elites. During the 1930s, for example, it took mass strikes to overcome judicial resistance to progressive economic regulation. Today, workers confront a political system that has been warped by voter suppression, gerrymandering and the judicial protection of corporate political expenditures as “freedom of speech.” With corporate lackeys holding a majority of seats on the Supreme Court, workers may soon need strikes to clear the way for progressive legislation just as they did in the 1930s. But if the right to strike is a no-brainer, then how did Cuomo and de Blasio justify attacking it? “The premise of the Taylor Law,” said Cuomo, “is you would have chaos if certain services were not provided,” namely police, firefighters and prison guards. If that’s the premise, then why not endorse Nixon’s proposal as to teachers and most public workers, and propose exceptions for truly essential services? That’s the approach of international law, and that’s what Nixon clarified she supports. But Cuomo couldn’t explain why teachers and other non-essential personnel should be denied this basic human right. As for de Blasio, he claimed that the Taylor Law accomplishes “an important public purpose” and that “there are lots of ways for workers’ rights to be acknowledged and their voices to be heard.” What public purpose? Forcing workers to accept inadequate wages and unsafe conditions? What ways to be heard? Groveling to politicians for a raise in exchange for votes? The ban forces once-proud unions to serve as cogs in the political machines of Wall Street politicians. No sooner did Nixon endorse the right to strike than two prominent union leaders rushed to provide cover for Cuomo. Danny Donohue, president of the Civil Service Employees Association, called her “incredibly naive” and charged that “clearly, she does not have the experience needed to be governor of New York.” Evidently Cuomo, who was elected governor on a program of attacking unions and followed through with cuts to public workers’ pensions and wages, does have the requisite experience. John Samuelsen of the Transport Workers Union, which represents more than 40,000 New York City transit workers, also lashed out, saying, “I believe that she will cut and run when we shut the subway down…. As soon as her hipster Williamsburg supporters can’t take public transit to non-union Wegmans to buy their kale chips, she will call in the National Guard and the Pinkertons.”

#### Climate strikes are a form of environmental, civil *mobilization* that creates the emergence of a democratic impetus *legitimizing* democracy and reform

Szolucha 20 [ Anna Szolucha works at Department of Social Sciences, Faculty of Arts, Design and Social Sciences, Northumbria University, Newcastle, UK Sage Pub “Why is everyone talking about climate change ... again?” Feb 19, 2020 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0791603520908188> ] // aaditg

And yet, as U Thant’s quote would seem to confirm, there is a justified feeling that we have been here before; we have already made those arguments; we have appealed to global solidarity and cried out for urgent action to tackle global warming and stop causing irreparable damage to the Earth’s ecosystems. However, at least from a European perspective, there is also a sense that things are changing. The recent popular mobilisations in the form of climate strikes, various national movements and, importantly, community-based campaigns have raised the profile of climate action and brought it to the fore of national and international debate in a way that we have not seen for years. Importantly, this seems to be the case in both the core as well as on the periphery of Europe where the environment has suddenly become a topic of electoral debates. So how do we make sense of the current moment in, what seems to be, a very long march toward tackling climate change? What is the same? What is different? How to define success and failure? And what has climate change to do with democracy? A view from the fracking front I remember that I first heard of fracking1 when I lived in Ireland, about nine years ago. I did not think for a moment that I would end up living in the vicinity of fracking pads in England, conducting ethnographic research about the impacts of gas developments on local communities. I think that it is important that I say where my observations are coming from because climate change looks a little bit differently from the perspective of a rural Lancashire or North Yorkshire 2 Irish Journal of Sociology 0(0) community split by their views on shale gas than from the perspective of capitalbased social movement organisations or policy makers. What I found early on, when I came to live in the communities facing the prospect of fracking, was the profound sense of democratic and social injustice that was fuelled by the distrust toward the authorities, police and the gas industry (Szolucha, 2016, 2018). Regardless of their individual views on hydraulic fracturing, local residents felt alienated from the conditions of their physical environments as well as from their rights as democratic subjects. This experience stemmed from their interactions with one another as well as with the industry and various state agencies that were tasked with safeguarding the environment and people’s health. The distrust settled in the communities quite quickly, at least partially prompted by the increasing corporatisation of the state and the hollowing out of its democratic function. Although fracking can have an impact on all local residents, it is important to note that the majority of gas developments that I have researched have taken place in areas that are overall traditionally Conservative-voting, predominantly white and middle-class. These characteristics can influence the way in which people make sense of decisions and actions that affect their lives, but I think that the popular democratic and anti-authoritarian tone of the claims made by community-based campaigns does not derive simply from their sociological characteristics but is also symptomatic of the current moment in the global struggle to tackle climate change. In outlining the similarities and differences between the current and past waves of social protest around environmental issues, I want to highlight the role that popular democratic demands play in mobilising for climate action – why are they important and why are they the only thing that really moves things forward? Have we really been here before? Yes, which means that, hopefully, we will have learnt something. And we did. In the 1970s and 1980s, environmentalism won much wider public support and, in the US, where it became overtly political and radical, it facilitated the creation of the Earth Day – a now-annual and global event that promotes environmental protection. It was initially modelled on anti-war teach-ins, but their antiestablishment orientation soon gave way to environmental management which conceived of problems as technical and scientific rather than social, democratic or transformative (Gottlieb, 1995). The echoes of this approach can still be heard today in the way in which climate science is often elevated to the status of the “truth” that alone should be sufficient to mobilise populations and political leaders to take decisive and rapid action on climate change. Forty and 50 years ago, the heightened environmental awareness led to the emergence of professional organisations in which experts dealt with specific problems, often applying a conservationist lens. This relatively unthreatening form of activism helped introduce some legislative and administrative changes such as the National Environmental Protection Act of 1970 in the United States and the Szolucha 3 Control of Pollution Act 1974 in Britain. The Environmental Protection Agency was set up in the US and the Department of the Environment was established in the UK around that time as well (Sandbach, 1978). Although these developments contained popular fears, they by no means put an end to local, issue- and community-based campaigns. The Irish environmental movement was also born around this time in the context of Wood Quay and the Carnsore Point protests (Leonard, 2008). What dominated the wave of mainstream environmentalism in the 1970s was a distinct approach – epitomised in The Club of Rome’s conclusions and organisational principles – that was largely top-down, technical, expert-led and global rather than local (Eastin et al., 2011). A view from below was lacking, and the democratic and anti-authoritarian impulse that undoubtedly drove a lot of environmental activism of the time was domesticated by the promises of regulatory and expert oversight. The transformational potential that was required to make substantive changes in the way people treated the environment was spent on the creation of recycling programmes and environmental curricula in schools (Ogrodnik and Staggenborg, 2016). Isn’t this exactly where we are heading today? The top-down and expert-led approach to tackling climate change is still dominant in intergovernmental negotiations and has even been adopted by some of its critics in social movements who use it to address the powers that be and receive massive media resonance. Emission targets often remain the main reference point for the formal mitigation pledges and efforts. Even the distinctly global approach to the problem and the popularisation of climate change by the mass media are exactly what scholars were hailing as a new quality of the 1970s environmentalism: “What is new” they wrote “is, on the one hand, the global approach to the problem – both figuratively and literally – and, on the other hand, the popularisation of the issues by the mass media” (Kimber and Richardson, 1974: 3). The rhetoric of ecological catastrophe propagated by such figures as Greta Thunberg or Sir David Attenborough also bears an uncanny resemblance to the “eco-doom” literature that was popular in the 1970s. The tactics and methods used by some of the contemporary environmental movements and grassroots campaigns, that employ high-visibility direct action rather than discrete lobbying, were also characterised as novel ... 50 years ago. At the time, such environmental groups as Friends of the Earth and Greenpeace distinguished themselves from the Conservation Society or the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England by undertaking more militant actions that addressed concerns pertaining to the general environmental crisis rather than single issues (Herring, 2001). Today, new social movement organisations and local groups seem to be taking up the mantle of more confrontational environmentalism. Notwithstanding these historical similarities, it would be wrong to conclude that nothing has changed in the last 50 years. Popular environmental protest can teach us a lesson about why popular democratic demands are important for effecting change in many aspects of politics 4 Irish Journal of Sociology 0(0) and society. But first, how should we think about these new, old developments in the environmental movements and popular ecological awareness? What we are witnessing is perhaps less of a “new” type of environmentalism and more of an important moment in the evolution of the environmental movement and the history of climate action. These moments happen maybe once in a generation, roughly. In the 1970s, the new global environmentalism was part of an age of protest and was instrumental in the emergence of the environmental justice movement which highlighted the social bias and racism of siting decisions. Twenty years after that, anti-nuclear mobilisations in various countries in Europe and anti-road protests in Britain again led to the emergence of new ecological groups and renewed public interest in environmental problems. The 2000s in Ireland were definitely marked by the protest against the Corrib gas project in County Mayo and the jailing of the Rossport Five, which have indirectly contributed to anti-fracking resistance and a ban on the method in 2017 (Darcy and Cox, 2019). Elsewhere, global warming became one of the targets of alter-globalisation struggles that linked capitalist globalisation with international inequalities perpetuated by the extractive activities. In 2020, we are again at a historical juncture when the cultural environmental critique has merged with scientific concerns. The expanding extraction of fossil fuels in evermore unconventional ways and places is mobilising community-based campaigns that find themselves discovering a growing environmental movement that echoes and amplifies their causes. The “new” movement is itself often informed by the recent wave of pro-democratic and anti-austerity protests such as Occupy. The ideas about direct action and direct democracy that animated those mobilisations are being creatively rediscovered as a distinctive form of anti-authoritarianism in a new reality increasingly defined by the far right. Democracy and climate action From the point of view of a community-based campaign in Britain – whether opposed to or in favour of fossil fuel extraction – the scope for popular democratic action has been contracting rather than expanding. When local residents decide to get involved in community activism – the majority of them for the first time in their lives – they enter a technocratic, political and social landscape that is largely not amenable to hearing or engaging with their concerns. The UK planning system, for example, often considers the old vocabularies of local amenity and aesthetics to be more materially significant than issues of climate change and social acceptance. The central government is happy to facilitate fracking at times when it finds it expedient and suspends the controversial practice in the runup to elections. This gives rise to popular dissatisfaction which facilitates and sustains environmental networks that people organise under to address their particular and more general concerns around climate change. Popular discontent is instrumental in the emergence of a democratic impetus – a social and cultural force that appeals to egalitarianism and “the people” as the source and value of important political changes and actions. Popular democratic impulse embodied in community-based environmental campaigns delegitimises certain political decisions and challenges them from the position of grassroots experience and civic subjectivity. Every “new” era of environmental protest seems to be driven by this democratic impetus. It stems from outside the state and its only claim to power is that it is portrayed to articulate the democratic will of a community or society. If today, climate change is competing with other major issues on the national and international agenda, this is not because of an IPCC report or the most recent climate science; rather, it is because of the potent merging of environmental, democratic and anti-authoritarian feelings that have brought global warming to the fore again. Over 50 years ago, Rachel Carson – the author of “Silent Spring,” a seminal book about the environmental impacts of pesticides – recognised that some of the pressing environmental issues of the day were indicative of “an era dominated by industry, in which the right to make a dollar at whatever cost is seldom challenged” (2002: 13). A similar sentiment is also the mobilising force behind environmental movements and campaigns today. Although they have had 50 years to develop articulate understandings of social inequality, it is striking to read that some scholars still think about European environmentalism as “privileged fear” of those who will not have to bear the full weight of the climate crisis. And it is hard to blame them for this view because there is much more that could be done to give social inequality its proper place in the climate change debate. The current environmental moment is therefore susceptible to the same pitfalls and the same fate as its 1970s iteration. The social and economic dimensions of climate change may be lost again because they are not being put centre stage. The environmental and climate change protests today may not signify a beginning of an entirely new environmentalism or even a culmination of five decades of ecological struggles. Everyone is speaking about climate change again because we are at a particular moment in the complex history of climate action – when environmental, democratic and anti-authoritarian concerns have come together drawing on as well as forgetting some lessons of the previous waves of popular mobilisations around environmental issues. Part of this predicament stems from the diverse roots and organisational principles of the plethora of campaigns and actors involved in tackling the climate crisis. So, as we are all learning about the possibilities of contemporary climate action, is the history of the environmental movement “a litany of small, ephemeral, and qualified victories, many of which have been further undermined in recent years” (Boime, 2008: 298)? It is true that, in hindsight, the last 50 years of environmentalism that I sketched above can leave one with a nagging sense of disappointment at the incremental nature of climate action. On the other hand, as many local campaigners and activists would tell you, this is not how they experience their actions in real time. Is this “movement amnesia” a failure to learn within movements as well as between different waves of protest? Not necessarily. In fact, a sense of 6 Irish Journal of Sociology 0(0) transgressing old boundaries and established ways of organising are essential parts of the democratic impulse that drives social mobilisation. If arguments or strategies seem novel to some of those who undertake climate action, it may simply mean that those strategies are reaching out to broader social groups. So what are the lessons that we can draw from the last 50 years of environmental mobilisations? It seems that neither massive media interest, symbolic figures nor spectacular direct actions are a proved recipe for tackling global warming in an effective way. They are important, but I would advise caution to those who think that they indicate a real social and political change. In fact, the lesson that I take from history is this: climate change, democracy and anti-authoritarianism constitute a potent formula for environmental mobilisation as long as they remain grounded in everyday life concerns and activity of social groups regardless of individual income or identity. This is why environmental justice and democracy are so important in tackling the climate crisis; they should be a way, rather than only an effect of addressing global warming. The experience of the last 50 years shows that environmental movements come and go and, although they are instrumental in effecting socio-political change, it is the democratic agency of society that gives them their impetus and legitimacy. And it seems that, in some parts of contemporary Europe, fighting for a liveable climate may need to go hand in hand with fighting for democracy.

#### Democracy *solves* climate change but we need an *increase* in pace of action

Casas-Zamora 21 [Dr. Kevin Casas-Zamora is the Secretary-General of the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), with over 25 years of experience in democratic governance as a researcher, analyst, educator, consultant and public official. Here he discusses the role that democracy plays in mitigating climate change. 06/29/2021 Why democracy is the key ingredient to battling climate change” <https://www.euronews.com/green/2021/06/29/why-democracy-is-the-key-ingredient-to-battling-climate-change> ] //aaditg

The recent court rulings tell us a lot, not just about the powerful assets that democracy can deploy in the struggle against climate change, but also the long-term robustness of the case for democracy as a political system. Democracies are under pressure from populism, disinformation, inequality and voter frustration, according to the Global State of Democracy report from the intergovernmental organisation International (IDEA). They are also afflicted by a crisis of self-confidence. Fairly or not, the current pandemic has helped cement a narrative portraying liberal democracies as lumbering and too divided to cope with big challenges, while extolling the presumed ability of authoritarian systems to act decisively. Andre Penner/AP2011 Deforestation in the Brazilian AmazonAndre Penner/AP2011 ‘Extremists and populists on the rise’: Why the EU needs a green prosecutor What are the vices to democracy? This narrative is not concocted out of thin air. Democracies do suffer from vices when it comes to slow-burning crises like global warming. Voters and politicians have short attention spans. Balances of power mean reforms can be held hostage to obstinate US Senators or oil lobbyists. Science can play second fiddle to voters if it entails higher taxes - France’s yellow vest protests, sparked by fuel price rises, are a case in point. And yet, despite all this, the facts are clear - 9 out of the 10 top performers in the 2021 Climate Change Performance Index are democracies. Sweden tops the list of 57 countries. China is 30th. The reasons for this are not hard to fathom. Democracies allow for the free flow of information that enables policy makers to debate and find solutions, and for civil society to mobilise. It is no coincidence that youth campaigner Greta Thunberg helped spark a global movement from a lone street demonstration in Sweden, one of the world’s top performing democracies. It is no coincidence that youth campaigner Greta Thunberg helped spark a global movement from a lone street demonstration in Sweden, one of the world’s top performing democracies. Democracies are more effective against climate change for the same reasons that they don’t experience famines, as Nobel Laureate Indian economist Amartya Sen suggested long ago - because in allowing freedom of expression, a vibrant civil society, regular elections and the workings of checks and balances, they increase the likelihood that crises will be met and destructive policies corrected. Democracy is not simply elections - it is the often chaotic workings of myriad institutions and groups as well as a culture of open debate, where climate reform is nudged along by courts, free media, parliaments, and public protests. Democracy’s most powerful weapon against the challenges of this century is its ability to self-correct. And then there is the capacity of democratic systems to forge the social consensus required for long-term transformations to be sustainable. We know this story - participatory decision-making may be slower than executive decrees, but almost always yields outcomes that are more legitimate and accepted by society, and hence more durable. Canva Democracy is a key ingredient to fighting climate changeCanva This is vital for climate change. Decarbonisation is not something governments do by fiat, though act they must - it is something societies as a whole must do by conviction. Consumer habits will need to change, from reducing air travel to adjusting diets. Trillions of dollars will have to be invested in transforming the sources of energy that fuel economies. New social contracts will have to be devised so that the burden of these fiscal bills can be equitably shared. There is no guarantee that democracies will succeed in building the consensus needed to save our species, but their odds are better than those of any other political arrangement. Could decarbonising our cities be the answer to climate change? Kids are disappointed in grownups’ ‘un-green’ ways: Here are their plans for a cleaner future Democratic governance could slow down climate change This is, however, the key question – while it is clear that the attributes of democracy are potentially superior to deal with climate change, it is much less clear that they will be actually deployed with the celerity required. This is, precisely, what courts are doing in Germany and elsewhere - they are moving forward the deadlines that political systems and societies must meet if our species is to avoid disaster. Those deadlines are tight – a few decades, at most. But courts alone won’t do the trick. Democratic governments, parliaments, and political leaders must also dramatically increase the pace of their actions. This is why it is so vital to connect the discussion of climate change with debates on the quality of democratic governance. We must distill, disseminate, and design the institutions and practices that are more likely to allow democracies to build consensus, distribute burdens and make decisions effectively to meet the climate crisis. Experimenting with new forms of political deliberation, like citizens’ assemblies, enlarging the representation of young people by lowering the voting age and adopting some of the bargaining practices between industries, workers and governments that have been so instrumental in building consensus in Northern Europe - this is the stuff democratic governance agendas should be made of in the climate crisis era.

### Plan

#### Thus the plan – The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland should recognize an unconditional right for workers to climate strike.

Clarion 19 [ The Clarion is a magazine for labor activitists. 9/09/2019 “Workers need the right to strike for climate justice” https://theclarionmag.org/2019/09/09/workers-need-the-right-to-strike-for-climate-justice/ ] // aaditg

Workers need the right to strike for climate justice – repeal the anti-union laws In 2019, school students’ strikes internationally have shifted the debate about the climate crisis. Now more and more school student activists recognise that they alone cannot tackle the crisis and win a fundamental transformation of society. A just transition to a new economic system run in the interests of people and planet, not profit, must have workers at its core. For more than thirty years, workers in the UK have been fenced in by laws which make quick and effective strike action difficult, and action over political issues like climate change more difficult still. Workers do take radical action despite the law; but over the years the anti-union laws have helped weaken the culture of workplace organisation and workers’ direct action. The urgency of the climate crisis demands both bending and defiance of these laws – as groups of workers will undertake on 20 September – and a renewed campaign for them to be scrapped completely. In the context of climate chaos, workers urgently need freedom to take quick and effective industrial action to defend themselves against dangerous and unstable working conditions. They urgently need freedom to take solidarity action to support other workers in their communities, across the UK and – crucially in an interconnected world where the global poor are on the frontline – in other countries. And they urgently need freedom to take industrial action for political issues, most importantly a just solution to the climate crisis. We therefore call on all organisations who seriously want to fight climate change to call for the abolition of all anti-union laws and their replacement with strong legal rights for workers and unions, including the right to strike quickly and effectively, in solidarity with others and for political demands. We congratulate the Greens for taking a strong stand on these issues. We call on Labour to carry out the policy passed by its conference in 2017 and 2015. We welcome the motion to the TUC Congress submitted by the Fire Brigades Union.

#### Coordinated civic engagement and strikes is key to comprehensive climate action globally.

Fisher and Nasrin 20 [Dana R; Professor of Sociology and the Director of the Program for Society and the Environment at the University of Maryland. Her research focuses on questions related to democracy, activism, and environmentalism — most recently studying climate activism, protests, and the American Resistance. Her research employs a mixed-methods approach that integrates data collected through open-ended semi-structured interviews and participant observation with various forms of survey data; Sohana; University of Maryland, College Park, UMD, UMCP, University of Maryland College Park · Philip Merrill College of Journalism Master of Arts; “Climate activism and its effects,” Wiley Interdisciplinary Review; October 2020; https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345455893\_Climate\_activism\_and\_its\_effects]

As coordinated school strikes have taken place around the world to draw attention to the climate crisis, they have mobi-lized an increasing number of participants in a growing number of locations. This type of activism involves particularforms of civic engagement that specifically aim to pressure governments to take action that addresses the issue of cli-mate change. Civic engagement is the term used to describe the manifold ways that citizens participate in their societieswith the intention of influencing communities, politics, and the economy. Forms of engagement range from tactics thatinvolve citizens working directly to change their individual behaviors, along with those that involve indirect efforts tobring about change through the political and economic systems (like school strikes). Tactics run the gamut and rangefrom those that work within these systems to those that work outside of them (Meyer & Tarrow, 1997). Collectiveefforts are mediated by various organizational forms (Anheier & Themudo, 2002), which can either create or remove obstacles to participation (Fisher & Green, 2004; for more general discussion, see Gamson, 1975; McAdam, 1983). Ashas been noted by numerous studies, civic engagement is much higher in democratic countries where citizens areafforded rights to participate and to voice their opinions (DeBardeleben & Pammett, 2009; see also Putnam, Leonardi, &Nanetti, 1994; Schofer & Longhofer, 2011; Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999; de Tocqueville, 2002; see particularly Verba,Schlozman, & Brady, 1995). At the same time, digital technologies have been found to facilitate the spread of variousforms of activism while they connect countries and cultures (Bennett, 2013; Theocharis, Vitoratou, & Sajuria, 2017) This paper reviews the specific ways that citizens have engaged civically around the issue of climate change, paying particular attention to the documented effects of these efforts on climate change itself. Our discussion provides a review of the range of direct and indirect forms of climate activism (for a general overview of the direct and indirect effects of social movements, see Snow & Soule, 2010). After this review, we present the case of school strikes as a specific tactic that has gained attention in recent years. In this section, we review the limited research that presents data collected from participants of climate strikes in 2019 to understand trends in the expansion of this popular tactic. As the world responds to the COVID-19 outbreak and activism (including climate strikes) move increasingly online, we discuss the potential implications of the pandemic on climate activism and engagement. The conclusion of this paper emphasizes that future research must pay more attention to the relationship between climate-related civic engagement and measurable environmental outcomes. It highlights the methodological challenges facing scholars who take on the difficult analytical task of assessing the outcomes of climate activism in a way that is scalable for a global movement aiming to stop a global crisis. 2 | ACTIVISM WITH DIRECT EFFECTS ON CLIMATE CHANGE There are limited forms of civic engagement that involve efforts to have a direct effect on individual greenhouse gas emissions. For example, some environmental movements and environmental groups encourage their members to make lifestyle changes that reduce their individual carbon footprints. These efforts focus on changing consumer behaviors, such as reducing car-use, flying, shifting to nonfossil fuel-based sources of electricity, and eating less dairy or meat (Büchs, Saunders, Wallbridge, Smith, & Bardsley, 2015; Cherry, 2006; Cronin, McCarthy, & Collins, 2014; Ergas, 2010; Haenfler, Johnson, & Jones, 2012; Middlemiss, 2011; Salt & Layzell, 1985; Saunders, Büchs, Papafragkou, Wallbridge, & Smith, 2014; Stuart, Thomas, Donaghue, & Russell, 2013; Wynes, Nicholas, Zhao, & Donner, 2018; for an overview on these measures, see Wynes & Nicholas, 2017). So far, there are only a limited number of case studies that measure the direct effect of participation in these types of movements as it relates to climate outcomes. In their study of the electricity use of 72 households in southern England, for example, Saunders and colleagues find an association between low levels of electricity use and contact with environmental organizations (Saunders et al., 2014). Similarly, in a longitudinal ethnographic study of a small number of participants in an environmental campaign in Sweden, Vestergren and colleagues conclude that participants in an environmental campaign sustained reductions in plastic use and meat consumption over the period of their study (Vestergren, Drury, & Chiriac, 2018, 2019). There is a clear need for research on the material outcomes of these movements that aim to have direct effects on consumption patterns that goes beyond single case studies. At the same time, measuring direct effects of these efforts in a way that scales up is extremely challenging, especially when crossing cultural and institutional contexts. 3 | ACTIVISM WITH INDIRECT EFFECTS ON CLIMATE CHANGE Most types of activism, however, do not aim to have direct effects on greenhouse gas emissions. Instead, they work to pressure economic and political actors to change policies and behaviors in a way that will lead to reductions in emissions. In other words, their goals are indirect: these forms of engagement target nodes of power—policymakers, regulators, and businesses—to change their behaviors and/or accelerate their efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. These forms of civic engagement involve providing the labor and political will needed to pressure political and economic actors to enact the kinds of emission-reducing policies recommended by scientists working with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change & Edenhofer, 2014, pt. IV). Much of the research in this area looks at the role of internationally focused environmental Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), which tend to target international environmental negotiation processes (Betsill & Corell, 2008; Boli & Thomas, 1999; Fox & Brown, 1998). Within this research area, there are numerous studies that analyze 2 of 11 FISHER AND NASRIN quantitative data sets to understand the relationship between NGOs and a country's environmental impact comparatively (see also Frank, Hironaka, & Schofer, 2000; Grant, Jorgenson, & Longhofer, 2018; Jorgenson, Dick, & Shandra, 2011; Longhofer & Jorgenson, 2017; Schofer & Hironaka, 2005). Other studies focus specifically on the relationship between NGOs and environmental impact within nations (Dietz, Frank, Whitley, Kelly, & Kelly, 2015; Grant & Vasi, 2017; Shwom, 2011). In their quantitative analysis of the effects of world society on environmental protection outcomes in countries around the world, Schofer and Hironaka find clear evidence that the rise of an “international environmental regime,” which includes environmental NGOs, is associated with lower levels of environmental degradation, including reduced carbon dioxide emissions (Schofer & Hironaka, 2005). More recently, scholars have worked to understand this relationship within the context of development. For example, Longhofer and Jorgenson conclude that nations with the highest levels of membership in international environmental NGOs experience a moderate “decoupling” in the assocaition between economic development and carbon emissions (Grant et al., 2018; see also Jorgenson et al., 2011; Longhofer & Jorgenson, 2017) Although these studies provide a good first step in understanding this connection, more research is needed about how exactly the existence of NGOs bring about lower emissions. Beyond these studies that explicitly analyze the relationship between NGOs and carbon emissions, there is a small but growing literature that assesses the broader consequences of activism, which aims to pressure policymakers to take action across a range of issues (Amenta, Caren, Chiarello, & Su, 2010; Giugni, McAdam, & Tilly, 1999; Soule & Olzak, 2004). This research focuses specifically on the outcome of specific forms of engagement, or tactics (for an overview, see Caren, Ghoshal, & Ribas, 2011). Some of the most common tactics that activists are employing to reduce greenhouse gas emissions indirectly are summarized in the sections that follow. 3.1 | Activism through litigation Litigation is one of the tactics that citizens, local governments, NGOs, and even corporations are using to pressure governments. This tactic aims to work through the judicial system to take action or enforce existing legislation (McCormick et al., 2017; Peel & Lin, 2019; Peel & Osofsky, 2015; Setzer & Vanhala, 2019; see also Pfrommer et al., 2019). In May 2017, UN Environment reported that climate change-related cases had been filed in 24 countries plus the European Union (UN Environment, 2017). In some cases, this tactic is being used to pressure businesses and governments to meet their policy commitments (Setzer & Vanhala, 2019; UN Environment, 2017). So far, however, there remains insufficient evidence regarding what effect these judicial efforts are having on greenhouse gas emissions. 3.2 | Activism targeting business actors At the same time, some groups focus their attention on targeting the economic sector and specific businesses. These efforts employ shareholder activism and cooperative board stewardship, as well as protest (King & Soule, 2007; M.-D. P. Lee & Lounsbury, 2011; McDonnell, King, & Soule, 2015; Szulecki, 2018; Yildiz et al., 2015). Shareholder activism focuses on investors' response to corporate activities and performances (Gillan & Starks, 2007). It involves investors who are dissatisfied with the company's management or operation taking advantage of their role as shareholders to pressure the company to change (Bratton & Mccahery, 2015; Gillan & Starks, 2007). Cooperative board stewardship, in contrast, involves “jointly owned and democratically controlled businesses” that support renewable energy (Viardot, 2013, p. 757; see also Yildiz et al., 2015). Some of this business-focused activism involves working through transnational advocacy networks, which have been documented to target governments and corporations (Hadden & Jasny, 2017; Keck & Sikkink, 2014; McAteer & Pulver, 2009). In their comparative study of shareholder activism in the Amazon region, McAteer and Pulver come to mixed conclusions, finding that one of the shareholder advocacy networks in Ecuador was successful in limiting oil development, while the other was not (McAteer & Pulver, 2009). Other types of activism that target business practices involve environmental groups working as part of a campaign to pressure institutional investors and universities to divest from fossil fuels. Groups employ “a range of strategies to shame, pressure, facilitate, and encourage investors in general, and large institutional investors in particular, to relinquish their holdings of fossil fuel stocks in favour of climate-friendly alternatives” (Ayling & Gunningham, 2017, p. 131; Franta, 2017; Grady-Benson & Sarathy, 2016; Hestres & Hopke, 2019). Although research has yet to conclude FISHER AND NASRIN 3 of 11 that these efforts have a substantial effect on fossil fuel funding or greenhouse gas emissions (Tollefson, 2015; but see Bergman, 2018), a recent study of fossil fuel divestment and green bonds provides some evidence of success. In it, Glomsrød and Wei model green investment scenarios that include funding allocation constraints due to divestment around the world. The authors find that these efforts yield notable emissions reductions (Glomsrød & Wei, 2018, p. 7). 3.3 | Activism working within the political system Activism also frequently involves citizens working individually or in groups to take advantage of opportunities to pressure governmental actors from within the political system. These tactics involve lobbying elected officials or working to change political representation through democratic elections of candidates (for an overview, see Clemens, 1997; Schlozman, Verba, & Brady, 2012). Turning first to lobbying, there is some evidence that these efforts by civic groups have a positive effect on environmental outcomes. In their 2016 study, Olzak and colleagues find that the number of environmental lobbyist organizations has a positive effect on the enactment of environmental legislation (Olzak, Soule, Coddou, & Muñoz, 2016). Although the authors do not specifically document the effects of the legislation on material outcomes, more recent research has found climate laws to reduce carbon emissions (Eskander & Fankhauser, 2020). Even though groups representing both the general public and businesses engage in lobbying, research has found business groups have (and spend) more financial and human resources, which affords them “privileged access” to policymakers and policymaking (Freudenburg, 2005). In his study of the “climate lobby,” Brulle compares the amounts spent by different groups for lobbying around the climate issue in the U.S. Congress. He finds that the “major sectors involved in lobbying were fossil fuel and transportation corporations, utilities, and affiliated trade associations. Expenditures by these sectors dwarf those of environmental organizations and renewable energy corporations” (Brulle, 2018, p. 289; see also Farrell, 2016). In some cases, representatives from business interests that have been lobbying against environmental policies are given opportunities to join the government. This process leads to “Regulatory Capture” by the specific business interest and is found to be associated with substantial negative public and environmental health consequences (for a recent example, see Dillon et al., 2018). Activism within the political system also involves citizens working through the electoral process to affect all sorts of social change (for a discussion of engagement in electoral politics as activism, see Fisher, 2012, 2019a). In some cases, elections focus on the differences between candidates who are supportive of policies that include more aggressive climate change mitigation strategies. Although research has yet to analyze extensively the relationship between this type of election-related civic engagement and climate outcomes, there is already some evidence. For example, a 2019 study finds that individuals in the United States who installed solar panels participate more in elections (Mildenberger, Howe, & Miljanich, 2019). At the same time, other research has documented various forms of electoral backlash against climate policies, both individually (Stokes, 2016, 2020), as well as in combination with other progressive agenda items (Muradian & Pascual, 2020). In their study of the success of “far-right movements” around the world and the concurrent election of “far-right” candidates, Muradian and Pascual note that far-right-leaning elected officials tend to have low concern for environmental issues and to deny climate change and disregard scientific evidence (Muradian & Pascual, 2020). Although they do not specifically look at the environmental outcomes of these officials holding office, given their common values and the empirical evidence coming out of the early years of the Trump Administration (Bomberg, 2017; Fisher & Jorgenson, 2019), it is likely that these officials will contribute to the passage of policies that limit the effectiveness of climate-related plans, reduce enforcement of these plans, or block them outright. 3.4 | Activism outside the economic and political system At the same time, there is expansive research on the ways citizens with less access to resources and power participate by challenging the economic and political system from outside it (for an overview, see Meyer & Tarrow, 1997). These efforts include a range of more confrontational tactics, such as boycotting, striking, protesting, and direct action that target politics, policymakers, and businesses. Many studies have explained this type of activism using climate change as a case (Fisher, 2010; Hadden, 2015; Saunders, Grasso, Olcese, Rainsford, & Rootes, 2012; Swim, Geiger, & Lengieza, 2019; Wahlström, Wennerhag, & Rootes, 2013; see also Fisher, Stanley, Berman, & Neff, 2005; Walgrave, 4 of 11 FISHER AND NASRIN Wouters, Van Laer, Verhulst, & Ketelaars, 2012). So far, however, only a handful of studies have explored the effect of these tactics on climate-related outcomes (but see Muñoz, Olzak, & Soule, 2018; Olzak et al., 2016). In their research on the success of environmental legislation in the U.S. Congress, Olzak and colleagues find that some civic tactics have a more positive effect than others: while they conclude that the number of environmental lobbyist organizations is positively associated with the enactment of environmental legislation, which can lead to carbon emissions reductions, they also find that protest by constituents has no effect (Olzak et al., 2016; see also Olzak & Soule, 2009). In a 2018 piece, which uses more recent data to analyze the relationship between protest, policy, and greenhouse gas emissions across states in the United States, the authors come to different conclusions. They find that emissions in states decline when there is more pro-environmental protest (Muñoz et al., 2018). A good deal of research has concluded that activism, including tactics such as protests or strikes played a large role in pressuring governments to create environmental laws and environmental agencies tasked with enforcing those laws around the world (Brulle, 2000; see also Longhofer, Schofer, Miric, & Frank, 2016; McCloskey, 1991; Rucht, 1999; Schreurs, 1997; Steinhardt & Wu, 2016; Wong, 2018). Moreover, research has documented how coalitions of activists achieved a degree of success when they protested environmentally damaging projects, including the Narmada Dam development in India (Khagram, 2004), and environmentally harmful nuclear power plants, dams, and airports in Japan (Aldrich, 2010). In her study of the campaign against coal mining and burning in South Africa, Cock finds that the campaign challenged inequality and generated solidarity (Cock, 2019). 4 | CLIMATE STRIKES AS A GROWING TACTIC Climate strikes are a particular outsider tactic that aims to pressure both the political and economic system. On August 20, 2018, Greta Thunberg decided not to attend school and sit on the steps of the Swedish parliament to demand that the government take steps to address climate change (Gessen, 2018). Inspired by the national school walkout against gun violence in the United States that was organized after the Parkland School Shooting in Florida, the 15-year-old has spent her Fridays sitting with a hand-written sign protesting ever since. Fridays for Future—the name of the group coordinating this tactic of skipping school on Fridays to protest inaction on climate change—flourished due to its usage of digital technologies to engage young people and the tactic has spread. In March 2019, the first global climate strike took place, turning out more than 1 million people around the world. Six months later in September 2019, young people and adults responded to a call by young activists to participate in climate strikes as part of the “Global Week for Future” surrounding the UN Climate Action Summit.1 The number of participants in this event globally jumped to an estimated 7.6 million people (Rosane, 2019). Figure 1 presents the growth in the tactic of climate strikes in terms of the numbers of nations where strikes have taken place and the total number of participants involved. Even before this movement had mobilized millions to strike, a narrative synthesis of studies that focused on youth perceptions of climate change from 1993 to 2018 documented how youth voices on climate change had become much more prominent and more widely publicized (K. Lee, Gjersoe, O'Neill, & Barnett, 2020). Specific research on this movement and its consequences has yet to be published in peer-reviewed publications (but see Evensen, 2019; Fisher, 2019b; Wahlström et al., 2013). However, in a series of pieces published in the Washington Post, Fisher presents analyses of data collected from participants in climate strikes during 2019 to understand how this tactic and the movement have grown in the United States (Fisher, 2019c, 2019d). As an outsider tactic by school-aged children that aims to pressure governments to implement more radical climate policies that will lead to emissions reductions, school strikes are a popular example of activism with the goal of having an indirect effect on climate change. Measuring the outcomes of these efforts, in terms of political outcomes and emissions reductions is extremely challenging given the indirect nature of this activism. Such calculations are made even more challenging given the scale and scope of the activism, which has mobilized millions of people to act locally to pressure governments at the local, national, and international levels. Although the overall numbers are large, most of these strikes involve relatively small proportions of overall populations.

#### UK seeking climate leadership now, and climate reform gets modeled by other T15 fossel fuel financiers

LaFortune 10/29 [Rachel, Researcher, Environment and Human Rights, “UK Needs to Provide Genuine Leadership on Fossil Fuel Financing”, 10-29-2021, https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/10/30/uk-needs-provide-genuine-leadership-fossil-fuel-financing]//pranav

In the leadup to the United Nations climate summit in Glasgow, COP26, the United Kingdom has sought to position itself as a leader in global efforts to end government support for fossil fuels. The UK’s Special Envoy to COP26, John Murton, announced earlier in October the United Kingdom’s intention to forge an alliance of governments and public-finance institutions to phase out international public finance for fossil fuels and increase support for renewables. There is no question that leadership on this critical issue is desperately needed to avert the worst climate outcomes. The question is whether the United Kingdom will do what’s necessary to deliver on this promise, and whether other top fossil fuel financers will likewise rise to the occasion. Governments should urgently be taking every possible measure to stop the flow of financial support to fossil fuels. Such support – through subsidies and public finance – artificially reduces the cost of fossil fuel exploration, production, and consumption, incentivizing further production and wasteful energy use. The International Energy Agency made clear in a 2021 report that all governments need to eliminate fossil fuel subsidies in the next few years and completely halt investment in new fossil fuel production this year to meet world climate targets. Ultimately, phasing out support for fossil fuels is a matter of governments meeting their human rights obligation to address the climate crisis. This move is key to reducing emissions and ensuring that governments can tap into their full resources to support communities bearing the brunt of climate impacts. Yet governments continue to provide billions of dollars in support for fossil fuels. From 2018 to 2020, G20 countries and the multilateral development banks they govern provided at least US$63 billion per year in international public finance for oil, gas, and coal projects, 2.5 times as much as for renewable energy. Looking at public finance along with domestic subsidies and other supports, G20 governments provided US$584 billion a year to support fossil fuels between 2017 and 2019. Positively, there is a growing movement to end international financing for coal, including a G7 commitment in June to phase out most public international finance for coal-fired power generation. The Chinese government – by far the world’s largest international public financer of coal – pledged several months later to stop building coal-fired power plants overseas, potentially signaling a significant shift. Now, with COP26 and the G20 summit just around the corner, the United Kingdom’s climate team has set the ambitious goal of eliminating not only public financing for coal, but for all fossil fuels. This is an important step, and everyone should join in. In particular, countries such as Canada – the top fossil fuel public financer – and Italy, Germany, and France – among the top 15 G20 fossil fuel financers – should embrace this commitment. But more is needed. International public finance is key, but governments should also end the billions more they provide in domestic subsidies and broader government support for fossil fuels, while protecting low-income households from associated price increases. And while joint commitments are a positive first step, they must be followed by concrete, timely action. Past commitments to phase out fossil fuel subsidies have stagnated. Despite repeated pledges, G20 governments have collectively achieved just a nine percent reduction in the billions in fossil fuel subsidies provided from the period of 2014-2016 to 2017-2019. The United Kingdom itself exhibits how commitments to eliminate government support for fossil fuels can fall short in important ways. On international public finance, the United Kingdom announced the immediate end to support for the fossil fuel sector overseas starting this year. But the plan has loopholes that will allow continued support for fossil fuels, particularly for gas. The United Kingdom is in fact continuing support for a massive gas project in Mozambique that it agreed to fund just months before its commitment to end support for fossil fuels abroad. As governments from around the world gather in Glasgow in November to chart a course forward on climate, with so much hanging in the balance, the United Kingdom and other big emitters need to break from the past and lead a new type of international collaboration to phase out support for fossil fuels. It should be marked by timely action, broad support, and clear commitments to prevent the worst climate outcomes and their impact on human rights the world over.

## Framework

**I value morality.**

**The standard is minimizing material violence. [To clarify I defend utilitarianism].**

**Actor Spec— States must use util. Any other standard dooms the moral theory**

**Goodin 90.** Robert Goodin 90, [professor of philosophy at the Australian National University college of arts and social sciences], “The Utilitarian Response,” pgs 141-142 //RS

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first, the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices – public and private alike – are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices, but that is all. That is enough to allow public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to choose general rules or conduct.

**Extinction comes first under any framework.**

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

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