## AC

The standard is **maximizing happiness**.

First, respect for human worth would justify util. **Cummiskey 90** writes[[1]](#footnote-1)

We must not obscure the issue by characterizing this type of case as the sacrifice of individuals for some abstract “social entity.” It is not a question of some persons having to bear the cost for some elusive “overall social good.” Instead, the question is whether some persons must bear the inescapable cost for the sake of other persons. Robert Nozick, for example, argues that “to use a person in this way does not sufficiently respect and take account of the fact that he is a separate person, that his is the only life he has.” But why is this not equally true of all those whom we do not save through our failure to act? **By emphasizing solely the one who must bear the cost if we act, we fail to** sufficiently **respect** and take account of **the many other** separate **persons**, each with only one life, **who will bear the cost of our inaction**. In such a situation, what would a conscientious Kantian agent, an agent motivated by the unconditional value of rational beings, choose? A morally good agent recognizes that the basis of all particular duties is the principle that “rational nature exists as an end in itself”. Rational nature as such is the supreme objective end of all conduct. If one truly believes that all rational beings have an equal value, then the rational solution to such a dilemma involves maximally promoting the lives and liberties of as many rational beings as possible. In order to avoid this conclusion, the non-consequentialist Kantian needs to justify agent-centered constraints. As we saw in chapter 1, however, even most Kantian deontologists recognize that agent-centered constraints require a non- value-based rationale. But we have seen that Kant’s normative theory is based on an unconditionally valuable end. How can a concern for the value of rational beings lead to a refusal to sacrifice rational beings even when this would prevent other more extensive losses of rational beings? If the moral law is based on the value of rational beings and their ends, then what is the rationale for prohibiting a moral agent from maximally promoting these two tiers of value? If I sacrifice some for the sake of others, I do not use them arbitrarily, and I do not deny the unconditional value of rational beings. **Persons** may **have “dignity**, that is, an unconditional and incomparable worth” **that transcends any market value, but persons also have** a fundamental **equality that dictates that some must** sometimes **give way for the sake of others.** The concept of the end-in-itself does not support the view that we may never force another to bear some cost in order to benefit others.

Second, util is epistemologically necessary. Everyone values happiness whether they want to or not. Even a skeptic wouldn’t shoot themselves in the foot.

Third, personal identity is indeterminate because a brain could be split into two future people which proves only end states can be the object of evaluation.

And fourth, policy makers cant evaluate side constraints because they have to consider trade offs between multiple people.

**Plan**: The United States ought to require employers pay a living wage adjusted to local cost of living differences.

**Contention 1** is Warming

Scenario 1 is Inequality

Income inequality kills business compliance with international environmental agreements—those are uniquely key to solve warming

**Wilkinson and Pickett 10** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

**More Equal Societies are Greener** As well as helping to reduce consumerism, strengthening community life and enabling societies to respond more cohesively to crises, evidence shows that greater equality also leads people to treat environmental issues more seriously. **Because community life is stronger and people trust each other more** in more equal societies, they also seem to be more public spirited and more willing to work together towards shared objectives. The conflict between self and society is perhaps less stark and **people are more likely to do things** they feel are **for** the **public benefit**. Support for environmental policies is a sensitive indicator of the balance between feeling that life is about the pursuit of self-interests in opposition to the wider society, and the pursuit of common interests. Based on **data from the World Economic Forum**, Figure 25 **shows that business leaders in more equal countries regard complying with international environmental agreements as more important** than do their counterparts in less equal societies. **Believing that it is important to comply with international** environmental **agreements is** of course **essential if the world is to respond adequately to** the challenge of **climate change**.

Empirics prove inequality kills social cohesion. This undermines peoples’ willingness to act in the common interest

**Wilkinson and Pickett 10** writes[[3]](#footnote-3)

The development of internationally comparable measures of income inequality in different countries means that it is now possible to compare more and less equal societies and identify the effects of inequality on social life. It is not simply that greater equality reduces the intensity of status competition and the pressure to consume. The **statistical evidence** also **shows that** the **quality of social relations is better in more equal societies. People are more likely to feel they can trust others, community life is stronger, and levels of violence are lower**. Figure 8 shows that there are very big differences in the proportion of people who feel they can trust others. **In** the **more unequal countries** only **10 or 15 percent say they trust others, where**as **in** the **more equal societies this rises to 60-70 percent**. This relationship between greater trust and greater equality has been shown a number of times in different settings including among the 50 states of the USA.13 14 in Britain the richest 20 per cent are over 7 times as rich as the poorest 20 per cent Figure 8. People Are More Likely To Trust Each Other In More Equal Societies Concern has grown over recent years at the apparent decline in community life in many societies. Researchers such as Robert Putnam, a political scientist at Harvard, have combined different indicators of people’s involvement in local community life to make up indexes of ‘social capital’. Typically they have included variables such as the proportion of the population who are members of voluntary associations of any kind (such as gardening clubs, sports clubs, charities or choirs), whether people read a local newspaper or vote in local elections. They usually show a strong tendency for community life to be weaker both in more deprived areas and in more unequal societies. **In a study of Italy, Putnam mentions** a **close association between** his measures of **social capital and income inequality across 20 regions**.15 **In the United States, similarly, he shows a close association** between income inequality and social capital across the 50 states.16 In both cases, social capital is substantially weaker where inequality is greater. In his study of the USA he also draws attention to how trends in social capital follow trends in income inequality. He says: “Social capital and economic inequality moved in tandem through most of the twentieth century. In terms of the distribution of wealth and income, America in the 1950s and 1960s was more egalitarian than it had been in more than a century. ...those same decades were also the high point of social connectedness and civic engagement. Record highs in equality and social capital coincided. “Conversely, the last third of the twentieth century was a time of growing inequality and eroding social capital. By the end of the twentieth century the gap between rich and poor in the US had been increasing for nearly three decades, the longest sustained increase in inequality for at least a century. The timing of the two trends is striking: somewhere around 1965-70 America reversed course and started becoming both less just economically and less well connected socially and politically.” (Putnam RD (2000), Bowling Alone: the collapse and revival of American community. NY: Simon and Schuster. p.359.) Although the deteriorating quality of social relations associated with widening income differences is central to the effects of inequality on social functioning, it is doubly relevant here because **social divisions reduce** a **society’s ability to act in the common interest**. Putnam first developed his measures of social capital as part of the research he was doing in Italy to find out why there were such big differences in how well regional governments functioned. Some were very much more efficient and better organised than others despite all having been set up in 1970 with the same level of funding per head of population. What Putnam found was that local governments did best (on a number of objective assessments of performance) in regions where there were high levels of involvement in community life and badly in regions with low levels.

Inequality-induced decline in social cohesion makes it harder to solve environmental issues. Even small changes can make a big difference

**Stiglitz 13** writes[[4]](#footnote-4)

Partha **Dasgupta**, whom I’ve worked with a great deal, has **emphasized the environment-inequality nexus** in the context of development. It is the destitute who turn to the forest for their energy, but in doing so, they destroy their own future wellbeing. This behavior is individually rational, perhaps, but collectively irrational. The interesting thing is that in societies with a reasonable degree of social cohesion, social-control mechanisms may, and often do, actually work. But **inequality tends to undermine social cohesion**. The importance of social cohesion was evident **in** a recent visit to **Bhutan**, the Himalayan country that has made its national objective Gross National Happiness (GNH), rather than the more traditional GDP. At the start, **everybody was allowed to cut** down **three trees a year. I asked, “How do you enforce this?” The Bhutanese answered, “Nobody would disobey.”** A few years later, the limit was reduced to two trees, and the Bhutanese people adapted to that. The point is that **in societies with** a **high** degree of social **cohesion, people can work together and solve** some of these **problems** better than they can in societies with less social cohesion and more inequality. **When** the tide of **inequality becomes too great,** what economists call **“social capital” tends to break down**. Let me make a few observations about this. First, it turns out that small interventions can have very big effects. That’s important for those of us who are involved in policy because, quite often, we can’t solve the big problems. **We can’t persuade our government to adopt a carbon price, but we can make a big difference even with** some **small interventions**. An example on a national scale that is relevant in many developing countries is the adoption of more efficient cook stoves. These are cook stoves that use less energy, so that the people who use them have to cut down fewer forests. It also means they are exposed to less indoor air pollution, which is a major source of health problems in developing countries, for lungs and eyes.

Income inequality contributes to AIDS spread. Living wage solves.

**Varela 14** writes[[5]](#footnote-5)

But treatment can also lead to complacency and, ultimately, more pills. **Cuomo’s** laudable **plan**, the first in the nation to set the stage for HIV eradication, risks failure, if it **doesn’t** also **address HIV’s most virulent precursor**, catalyst, and enabler**: Poverty**. As it happens, the maps of poverty in the United States—where officially 14.5 percent of the population is poor and another 5 percent are nearly poor—overlay quite seamlessly onto the maps of HIV. That should come as no surprise to anyone who studies or treats chronic conditions, most of which—diabetes, heart disease, kidney disease, etc.—correlate with poverty. **Not only does poverty prevent us from accessing** the **stuff** of life **that buffers us from poor health, it** also **creates hospitable environments for disease. People living at or near poverty have greater** levels of **stress hormones**, like cortisol, running through their bodies. And stress has a direct effect on each of the ten leading causes of death in the United States. This isn’t the “good” stress that saves us from dangerous situations (“fight or flight”) or even the “medium” stress that causes panic before public speaking, as a work deadline looms, or on the way to the birth of your first child. The stress of poverty is a chronic stress that kills by hastening the wear and tear of processes and organs that are necessary for our survival. In fact, **chronic stress** is akin to untreated HIV: it **assaults the immune system and quickens** the **transition to AIDS**. Poverty doesn’t only manifest internally. People struggling to make ends meet are more likely to be perpetrators of violence and to be its victims. They are more likely to drown their sorrows and to inject drugs. They are more likely to fall into homelessness. They are less likely to have healthy nutrition options. And they are also less likely to access and adhere to prevention or treatment regimens for all of their ailments, not just HIV. The situation may get worse before it gets better. **Research recently found that countries** in recession and **with growing income inequality experienced jumps in HIV** incidence. It isn’t only our elevated poverty levels that put us at risk. A comparison of 141 countries ranks the United States 100th in income equality. Lesotho, which has an adult HIV prevalence of 23 percent, is in last place. **The country with the most equal distribution of income is Sweden; its HIV prevalence is** 0**.2 percent**. Being poor is a more accurate predictor of HIV than being male, female, Black or Hispanic is. A 2010 study of poor urban areas found that race and gender were not significant predictors of HIV prevalence. Why then are our proposed solutions for a problem with economic roots overwhelmingly clinical? Cuomo and our other leaders would do well to focus on progressive fiscal policies such as **a living wage**, universal health care, and a basic income. These measures **would lift Americans out of poverty**, save money on health costs, **and**, most importantly, **save lives.**

**AIDS Is The Worst Disaster Ever**

**Hunter, 2005:**

(Susan Hunter, Independent Consultant who has worked at the highest policy level with world health organizations (UNAIDS, UNICEF, USAID) in Africa over the last 20 years. 2005. AIDS In Asia: A Continent In Peril. Palgrave Macmillan Publishers.)

**HIV/AIDS is** fast becoming **the worst disaster the world has ever known**. Even if a cure is found tomorrow, **the toll of death and suffering will far exceed any other recorded human catastrophe, any other previous epidemic, natural disaster, war, or incident of genocidal violence.** On a timeline extending from A.D. 0 to 2010, three huge spikes of death loom. Two are just past the middle of the Black Death, which killed 93 million people worldwide by the early 1500s, and the decimation of Native Americans by waves of multiple diseases brought by their European conquerors in the 1500s, which killed about 90 million people. At the other end of the timeline looms the impending disaster of **AIDS, which will have killed or infected at least 130 million people by 2010. Everything** in between **is dwarfed by these gigantic disease disasters, including World War I, which killed 10 million people, the 1918-1919 influenza epidemic, which killed 20 million, and World War II,** which killed 50 million people. **Other events we commonly think of as catastrophic look relatively small next to these giants. The Vietnam War,** for example, took 5 million lives on both sides; **the U.S. Civil War,** only 600,000. **The huge death tolls in Russia under Stalin (20 million) and China under Mao (40 million) are dwarfed by AIDS, SARS, which has killed several hundred people, and other emerging diseases like Ebola do not even register on the time scale of major disasters**.

**Living wage solves—2 reasons**

**A. Purchasing power**

**Decline in purchasing power causes massive income inequality.**

**Boushey 14**

\*citing MIT economist David Autor, London School of Economics economist Alan Manning, and Federal Reserve Board economist Christopher Smith

Heather Boushey (Executive Director and Chief Economist, Washington Center for Equitable Growth). “Understanding how raising the federal minimum wage affects income inequality and economic growth.” Testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. March 12th, 2014. http://equitablegrowth.org/research/understanding-the-minimum-wage-and-income-inequality-and-economic-growth/

Finally, the level of the minimum wage has a considerable effect on the distribution of wages in the United States. As mentioned above, the minimum wage used to be much closer to the average wage. But since 1968, the average wage grew as the purchasing power of the minimum wage declined by 23 percent. At the same time, the distance between wage earner at the 10th percentile and median wage earner, or the earner at the 50th percentile, grew by 18 percent from 1979 to 2009. Economists have found that the declining inflation-adjusted value of the minimum wage **had a considerable effect on wage inequality** for those workers in the bottom half of the wage distribution. A 1996 paper by economists John DiNardo, of the University of Michigan, Nicole Fortin, of the University of British Columbia, and Thomas Lemieux, also of the University of British Columbia, found that the decrease in the minimum wage from 1979 to 1988 had a considerable effect on the wage distribution. They found the decline over that time could explain up to 25 percent of the change in the standard deviation in the logarithm of male wages and up to 30 percent for female wages. In plain English, this means the decline in the minimum wage explained up to a fourth of increasing wage inequality for men and up to three-tenths of increase wage inequality for women. In more recent work, MIT economist David Autor, London School of Economics economist Alan Manning, and Federal Reserve Board economist Christopher Smith find that about 75 percent of the increase in low-end inequality from 1979 to 1991 is due to the decline in the value of the minimum wage, but the decline only explains 45 percent of the increase from 1979 to 2009. While the literature has not come to an agreement on the exact size of the effect, the decline of the minimum wage was a significant factor in the increase in inequality for lower half of the income distribution.

**Living wage solves. It increases demand and job growth and doesn’t cause outsourcing or automation.**

**Hanauer 13**

Nick Hanauer (billionaire). “The Capitalist’s Case for a $15 Minimum Wage.” Bloomberg View. June 19th, 2013. http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2013-06-19/the-capitalist-s-case-for-a-15-minimum-wage

The fundamental law of capitalism is that if workers have no money, businesses have no customers. That’s why the extreme, and widening, wealth gap in our economy presents not just a moral challenge, but an economic one, too. In a capitalist system, rising inequality creates a **death spiral of falling demand** that ultimately takes everyone down. Low-wage jobs are fast replacing middle-class ones in the U.S. economy. Sixty percent of the jobs lost in the last recession were middle-income, while 59 percent of the new positions during the past two years of recovery were in low-wage industries that continue to expand such as retail, food services, cleaning and health-care support. By 2020, 48 percent of jobs will be in those service sectors. Policy makers debate incremental changes for arresting this vicious cycle. But perhaps the most powerful and elegant antidote is sitting right before us: a spike in the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour. True, that sounds like a lot. When President Barack Obama called in February for an increase to $9 an hour from $7.25, he was accused of being a dangerous redistributionist. Yet consider this: If the minimum wage had simply tracked U.S. productivity gains since 1968, it would be $21.72 an hour -- three times what it is now. CULTIVATING CONSUMERS Traditionally, arguments for big minimum-wage increases come from labor unions and advocates for the poor. I make the case as a businessman and entrepreneur who sees our millions of low-paid workers as customers to be cultivated and not as costs to be cut. Here’s a bottom-line example: My investment portfolio includes Pacific Coast Feather Co., one of the largest U.S. manufacturers of bed pillows. Like many other manufacturers, pillow-makers are struggling because of weak demand. The problem comes down to this: My annual earnings equal about 1,000 times the U.S. median wage, but I don’t consume 1,000 times more pillows than the average American. Even the richest among us only need one or two to rest their heads at night. An economy such as ours that increasingly concentrates wealth in the top 1 percent, and where most workers must rely on stagnant or falling wages, isn’t a place to build much of a pillow business, or any other business for that matter. Raising the minimum wage to $15 an hour would inject about $450 billion into the economy each year. That would give more purchasing power to millions of poor and lower-middle-class Americans, and would stimulate buying, production and hiring. Studies by the Economic Policy Institute show that a $15 minimum wage would directly affect 51 million workers and indirectly benefit an additional 30 million. That’s 81 million people, or about 64 percent of the workforce, and their families who would be more able to buy cars, clothing and food from our nation’s businesses. This virtuous cycle effect is described in the research of economists David Card and Alan Krueger (the current chairman of the White House Council of Economic Advisers) showing that, contrary to conventional economic orthodoxy, increases in the minimum wage increase employment. In 60 percent of the states that raised the minimum wage during periods of high unemployment, **job growth was faster than the national average**. Some business people oppose an increase in the minimum wage as needless government interference in the workings of the market. In fact, a big increase would substantially reduce government intervention and dependency on public assistance programs. FEDERAL BENEFITS No one earning the current minimum wage of about $15,000 per year can aspire to live decently, much less raise a family. As a result, almost all workers subsisting on those low earnings need panoply of taxpayer-supported benefits, including the earned income tax credit, food stamps, Medicaid or housing subsidies. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the federal government spent $316 billion on programs designed to help the poor in 2012. That means the current $7.25 minimum wage forces taxpayers to subsidize Wal-Mart Stores Inc. and other large employers, effectively socializing their labor costs. This is great for Wal-Mart and its shareholders, but terrible for America. It is both unjust and inefficient. A higher minimum wage would also make low-income families less dependent on government programs: The CBO report shows that the federal government gives about $8,800 in annual assistance to the lowest-income households but only $4,000 to households earning $35,500, which would be about the level of earnings of a worker making $15 an hour. An objection to a significant wage increase is that it would force employers to shed workers. Yet the evidence points the other way: Workers earn more and spend more, increasing demand and helping businesses grow. Critics of raising the minimum wage also say it will lead to more outsourcing and job loss. Yet virtually all of these low-wage jobs are service jobs that can neither be outsourced nor automated. Raising the earnings of all American workers would provide all businesses with more customers with more to spend. Seeing the economy as Henry Ford did would redirect our country toward a high-growth future that works for all.

**B. Bargaining power**

**Living wage solves bargaining power.**

**Konczal 14**

Mike Konczal (fellow at the Roosevelt Institute). “7 Bipartisan Reasons to Raise the Minimum Wage.” Boston Review. March 3rd, 2014. http://www.bostonreview.net/us/mike-konczal-seven-reasons-raise-minimum-wage

When low-wage workers protest at fast food restaurants, low wages are not necessarily their sole concern. The working conditions may be equally important. Between a lack of sick days, random shift scheduling, and working without pay, there is a host of problems and humiliations from which workers seek redress. Civic republicanism presses against these practices. Philip Pettit, the philosopher most associated with this strain of thinking, defines its goal in terms of “freedom as non-domination,” freedom “as a condition under which a person is more or less immune to interference on an arbitrary basis.” In what sense can people be considered free if their means of survival places them at the mercy of an erratic schedule, thereby preventing the formation of civic and communal ties? Surveys of New York City’s low-wage workers find that 84 percent of them are not paid for their entire workday. When bosses can flout labor contracts and arbitrarily impose working conditions in this way, workers lack the kind of freedom that civic republicans celebrate. **By making the labor market tighter through lower turnover and vacancies,** a higher minimum wage creates bargaining power for workers and will help to eliminate these kinds of domination.

**Counterplans can’t solve. Living wage is key.**

**NYT 14**

New York Times Editorial Board. “The Case for a Higher Minimum Wage.” February 8th, 2014. http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/09/opinion/sunday/the-case-for-a-higher-minimum-wage.html

WHAT’S THE POINT OF THE MINIMUM WAGE? Most people think of the minimum wage as the lowest legal hourly pay. That’s true, but it is really much more than that. As defined in the name of the law that established it — the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 — the minimum wage is a fundamental labor standard designed to protect workers, just as child labor laws and overtime pay rules do. Labor standards, like environmental standards and investor protections, are essential to a functional economy. Properly set and enforced, these standards check exploitation, pollution and speculation. In the process, they promote broad and rising prosperity, as well as public confidence. The minimum wage is specifically intended to take aim at the inherent imbalance in power between employers and low-wage workers that can push wages down to poverty levels. An appropriate wage floor set by Congress effectively substitutes for the bargaining power that low-wage workers lack. When low-end wages rise, poverty and inequality are reduced. But that doesn’t mean the minimum wage is a government program to provide welfare, as critics sometimes imply in an attempt to link it to unpopular policies. An hourly minimum of $10.10, for example, as Democrats have proposed, would reduce the number of people living in poverty by 4.6 million, according to widely accepted research, without requiring the government to tax, borrow or spend. IS THERE AN ALTERNATIVE? No. Other programs, including food stamps, Medicaid and the **e**arned-**i**ncome **t**ax **c**redit, also increase the meager resources of low-wage workers, but **they do not provide bargaining power to claim a better wage.** In fact, they can drive wages down, because employers who pay poorly factor the government assistance into their wage scales. This is especially true of the earned-income tax credit, a taxpayer-provided wage subsidy that helps lift the income of working families above the poverty line. Conservatives often call for increases to the E.I.T.C. instead of a higher minimum wage, saying that a higher minimum acts as an unfair and unwise tax on low-wage employers. That’s a stretch, especially in light of rising corporate profits even as pay has dwindled. It also ignores how the tax credit increases the supply of low-wage labor by encouraging more people to work, holding down the cost of labor for employers. By one estimate, increasing the tax credit by 10 percent reduces the wages of high-school educated workers by 2 percent. There are good reasons to expand the tax credit for childless workers, as President Obama recently proposed. It is a successful antipoverty program and a capstone in the conservative agenda to emphasize work over welfare. But an expanded E.I.T.C. is no reason to stint on raising the minimum wage — just the opposite. A higher minimum wage could help offset the wage-depressing effect of a bolstered E.I.T.C., and would ensure that both taxpayers and employers do their part to make work pay.

**Bargaining power is key to solve income inequality**

**Gupta 15**

Sarita Gupta (executive director of Jobs with Justice). “Protect and Expand Workers’ Ability to Bargain.” Moyers and Company. January 20th, 2015. http://billmoyers.com/2015/01/20/protect-expand-workers-ability-bargain/

Greedy corporations have been on a decades-long bender to take advantage of working people — depressing wages, benefits and job standards, which has led to record inequality and poverty. At Jobs With Justice, we believe that **fighting poverty requires expanding** and protecting **the ability of workers to bargain with their employers** to demand higher wages, better working conditions and better living standards. As the nature of work changes, we look at collective bargaining through the union workplace campaign lens, but also through nontraditional forms, including legislative, policy, rulemaking and industry-wide interventions that put more money in workers’ pockets and improve standards and conditions for workers. Only through bargaining do workers have the power to directly confront the corporate actors behind poverty and inequality. Video From Jobs With Justice San Francisco: Fight for $15 and Just Hours Protest One example of this effort is our Retail Workers Bill of Rights campaign – led by Jobs With Justice San Francisco. Retail jobs are well understood to be some of the fastest growing and most poorly paid jobs in our economy, and an increasing number of people employed in this industry aren’t able to get the hours they need to earn enough to support their families. Working with the city’s Board of Supervisors, we pushed legislation to offer workers access to fairer, more predictable schedules. And in response to growing outrage over the turbulence families are experiencing due to a rise in inflexible and erratic schedules, community and labor advocates in a half dozen cities are planning to move similar reforms in 2015. Beyond winning better scheduling practices from employers, these campaigns – and others like them – have the potential to set workers up for more transformational fights, making bolder demands that increase onramps to collective bargaining and ultimately confront corporate power and fight poverty and inequality. Sign up now to join the fight for fair schedules and expanded bargaining for workers.

Scenario 2 is Work Hours

Minimum wage hikes force employers to reduce hours—the Law of Demand predicts that with more certainty than unemployment

**Perry 14** writes[[6]](#footnote-6)

Posts on CD about the minimum wage always generate a higher than average number of comments, and Friday’s CD post (“Do Demand Curves Slope Down or Not?”) was no exception – there have been 46 comments so far. Most of the minimum wage debate centers on the issue of whether minimum wage increases have any effects on employment levels. Specifically, does the empirical evidence point to any significantly negative effects on employment levels following minimum wage hikes, as clearly predicted by economy theory? Some empirical evidence like the much-cited 1994 study by Card and Krueger found “no indication that the rise in the minimum wage reduced employment” at fast-food restaurants in New Jersey following a minimum wage increase to $5.05 per hour compared to nearby fast-food restaurants in Pennsylvania where the minimum wage remained constant at $4.25. **Let me** attempt to **reconcile** the apparent **inconsistency between**: a) **economic theory**, which clearly predicts a negative relationship between the minimum wage and the quantity of unskilled workers demanded by employers, **and** b) some of the **empirical evidence that finds no negative employment effects** following minimum wage hikes. Here’s the key point: **The negative relationship** predicted by economic theory **is not**: a) **between** minimum **wage hikes and** the number of **unskilled workers employed, but** b) between minimum **wage hikes and** the number of **unskilled work hours** demanded by employers. The two charts above help to illustrate that difference: In the top chart, we see a negative relationship between an increase in the minimum wage and the number of hours of unskilled work demanded by employers in the 12-month period following the increase in the hourly price of unskilled labor (to capture the effects on future hiring). Like an increase in the cost of any other labor input or other input like food, energy, raw materials, machinery, equipment rental, or building rent, **employers facing** a 39% **increase in the cost of unskilled labor** (from $7.25 to $10.10 an hour) **would** have no other choice than to **reduce** the number of **unskilled work hours – it would** simply **be** a **necessary** strategy **for survival**. As I pointed out recently, a minimum wage increase to $10.10 per hour would be the equivalent to an annual tax of more than $6,000 per full-time worker earning the minimum wage. The various strategies employers might use to reduce their demand for unskilled work hours over the 12-month period following a 39% minimum wage hike might include: a) reducing the number of hours worked per week by entry-level unskilled workers, e.g. cutting their hours from 40 to 30 per week, or from 30 to 20, etc., b) reducing the number of unskilled workers currently employed through layoffs, c) reducing the number of unskilled workers that employers might have previously been planning on adding to staffing levels in the future, d) substituting skilled workers for the now relatively more expensive unskilled workers, and e) investing in technologies that would substitute automation, mechanization, robotics, and self-serve options for unskilled workers. **Although the effect** of a 39% minimum wage hike **on employment** levels **might be uncertain, the negative effect on** the number of **hours** of unskilled labor demanded by employers **would be** much **more certain** and predictable **according to the Law of Demand**. The bottom chart shows graphically how it would be possible that an increase in the minimum wage might not adversely affect the number of unskilled workers employed by looking at the relationship between the average weekly compensation for unskilled workers (and not the hourly monetary wage) and the number of unskilled workers.

Reductions in work hours reduce warming and unemployment; they also improve quality of life

**Schor 11** writes[[7]](#footnote-7)

So what's the alternative to slashing government programmes, budget, and more concentrated wealth at the top? The centerpiece of a new approach is to re-structure the labour market by reducing hours of work. That may seem counter-intuitive in a period when the mainstream message is that we are poorer than ever and have to work harder. But the historical record suggests it's a smart move that will create what economists call a triple dividend: three positive outcomes from one policy innovation. **The first benefit** of hours reductions **is** a **significant reduction in unemployment**. Maintaining balance in the labour market has always been through reduction in hours of work. **Without** the advances of **a shorter workweek**, vacation time, earlier retirement and later labour force entrance, the **economies of the OECD would never have attained the "golden age" of high employment** that prevailed **after the** 1930s **depression**. Between 1870 and 1970, hours of work fell roughly in half. These countries have re-balanced the labour market by re-distributing work to make its allocation fairer. **We need shorter hours because it is unrealistic to count on** growth in **GDP to absorb** all this current and future **"surplus" labour. Rich countries never grow that rapidly**. So the austerity economics that says work longer and retire later has it exactly wrong. But even if GDP growth could solve the unemployment problem, it shouldn't, because the cost in GHG emissions is prohibitive. North America and Europe have already blown their carbon budgets and until we re-structure energy systems, growth isn't reconcilable with responsible emissions levels. Here too **shorter hours** of work provide a dividend. They **are associated with lower** ecological and **carbon footprints. Countries that work more pollute more**. That both **because their scale of production is larger** (the GDP effect) **and** because **time-stressed** households and **societies do things in more carbon intensive ways** than societies in which time is more abundant. Longer hours of work lead people to travel, eat, and live faster-paced lives, which in turn require more energy. **The third benefit** of shorter hours **is** the **time itself**. As a growing movement of "downshifters" attests, **short hour lifestyles allow people to** build stronger social connections, **maintain** their **physical and mental health, and engage in activities that are creative and meaningful**. Time is especially valuable in rich countries where material needs can be met for everyone, and deprivation is caused by mal-distribution of income and wealth. So that's the triple dividend: reduce unemployment, cut carbon emissions, and give people quality of life. Austerity economics says we can't afford to work less. A serious reading of our economic history suggests we can't afford not to.

The US’s lengthy work hours will get modeled globally—this causes warming

**Rosnick and Weisbrot 6** writes[[8]](#footnote-8)

**Longer Work Hours Means More Energy Use Countries where people work fewer hours use** much **less energy than the U**nited **S**tates. If we assume constant energy efficiency (energy per unit of GDP) and a constant productivity (GDP per hour of work), then energy use per hour of work must be constant. Table 4 shows that, under this simplifying assumption, if workers in “Old Europe” had worked as many hours in 2003 as had workers in the United States, the EU-15 would have consumed 18 percent more energy. 6 [Table 3] Table 3 represents a simplified estimation of how energy consumption per country would increase if work hours increased. However, the relationship between energy consumption and work hours could be more complicated. For example, workers (or families) with less leisure time may dry their laundry by machine rather than drying it on a clothesline. They may not take the time to walk or bicycle to work, but rather drive. These behavioral changes in response to increased work hours would cause energy efficiency to decline as work hours increased. On the other hand, they may have their clothes professionally laundered, or take a cab. While these decisions would increase energy consumption, they would also increase hours worked in the economy, so the effect on this measure of energy efficiency is indeterminate. Finally, they may pay professionals to paint their homes rather than do it themselves. While this would consume the same amount of much energy, it would increase hours worked, thereby increasing this measure of energy efficiency. Of course, as people leave their homes to work, energy savings at home might balance the extra energy consumed at work. Any net effect of work hours on energy consumption is not easy to predict. We therefore try to estimate this relationship between energy efficiency (as measured per hours worked) and an increase in hours. The appendix explains how this is done. Based on this estimation, we can delineate a range of possible relationships between an increase in work hours and energy consumed. Table 4 takes the low estimate of this range: that **every one percent increase in work hours** per worker **results in** a 0**.32 percent increase in energy consumed per work hour**. In other words, energy use per work hour increases as work hours increase, but here we are using the lowest (most conservative) estimate of the amount by which it increases. 8 [Table 4 and Table 5] Collectively, these three scenarios cover a range of possible energy responses to changes in work hours. If, in 2003, other developed country workers worked as many hours as Americans, by these estimates they would have consumed anywhere from 12 to 41 percent more energy. Similarly, if Americans traded work for leisure, they could reduce their energy needs by 9 to 26 percent. Conclusion If Americans chose to take advantage of their high level of productivity by shortening the workweek or taking longer vacations rather than producing more, there would follow a number of benefits. Specifically, if the U.S. followed the EU-15 in terms of work hours, then: • Employed workers would find themselves with seven additional weeks of time off. • The United States would consume some 20 percent less energy. • If a 20 percent energy savings had been directly translated into lower carbon emissions, then the U.S. would have emitted 3 percent less carbon dioxide in 2002 than it did in 1990.9 This level of emissions is only 4 percent above the negotiated target of the Kyoto Protocol. On the flip side, **there is political pressure within European countries to adopt a more American labor model. If Europeans did** in fact **give up** their **shorter workweeks** and longer vacations**, they would consume** some additional **25 percent more energy**. Translated into carbon emissions, this would have enormous consequences for those countries that have signed and ratified the Kyoto Protocol. Over 1990 levels,10 the EU-15 emitted 8 percent more carbon dioxide in 2002, despite a clear commitment to reduce emissions to 8 percent below 1990 levels by 2008-12. Thus, the EU-15 must cut emissions by 14 percent from 2002 levels. However, if EU-15 workers had consumed 25 percent more energy and consequently emitted 25 percent more carbon dioxide in 2002, they would have had to cut emissions by more than one-third from that level to meet their commitment to Kyoto. According to the IPCC Third Assessment Report,11 the amount of global **warming is tied to the speed by which emissions are cut. If by 2050 the world is emitting** 10Gt (**10 billion metric tons**) of carbon, **we may be on a path to 2.5 degrees Celsius** of warming. On the other hand, if the level of emissions is **14Gt** of carbon dioxide **in 2050 may mean 4.5 degrees** of warming. **A worldwide choice of American work hours** over European levels **could result in 1 to 2 degrees Celsius of additional warming**, in addition to higher fuel prices. Finally, the debate over the European and American models, depending on the extent to which either side prevails, will have economic and environmental implications for a number of middle-income countries. These countries – especially the fast-growing economies of Asia – will most likely choose between these two models of labor market institutions and consumption. South Korea and Taiwan are already at European levels of GDP per capita. China (at $8,004 per person) is still far behind but is growing rapidly and is the second largest economy in the world in absolute size,12 and at current growth rates will pass the United States in less than a decade. **The American model is** still **portrayed throughout the international** business **press as the one to emulate. The environmental consequences of developing countries’ choices could be** very **serious.**

Warming cause multiple scenarios for extinction

**Sharp and Kennedy 14** writes[[9]](#footnote-9)

Our planet is 4.5 billion years old. If that whole time was to be reflected on a single one-year calendar then the dinosaurs died off sometime late in the afternoon of December 27th and modern humans emerged 200,000 years ago, or at around lunchtime on December 28th. Therefore, human life on earth is very recent. Sometime on December 28th humans made the first fires – wood fires – neutral in the carbon balance. Now reflect on those most recent 200,000 years again on a single one-year calendar and you might be surprised to learn that the industrial revolution began only a few hours ago during the middle of the afternoon on December 31st, 250 years ago, coinciding with the discovery of underground carbon fuels. Over the 250 years carbon fuels have enabled tremendous technological advances including a population growth from about 800 million then to 7.5 billion today and the consequent demand to extract even more carbon. This has occurred during a handful of generations, which is hardly noticeable on our imaginary one-year calendar. The release of this carbon – however – is changing our climate at such a rapid rate that it threatens our survival and presence on earth. It defies imagination that so much damage has been done in such a relatively short time. The implications of **climate change** are **the single most significant threat to life on earth** and, put simply, we are not doing enough to rectify the damage. This relatively very recent ability to change our climate is an inconvenient truth; the science is sound. We know of the complex set of interrelated national and global security risks that are a result of global warming and the velocity at which climate change is occurring. We worry it may already be too late. Climate change writ large has informed few, interested some, confused many, and polarized politics. It has already led to an increase in natural disasters including but not limited to droughts, storms, floods, fires etc. The year 2012 was among the 10 warmest years on record according to an American Meteorological Society (AMS) report. Research suggests that climate change is already affecting human displacement; reportedly 36 million people were displaced in 2008 alone because of sudden natural disasters. Figures for 2010 and 2011 paint a grimmer picture of people displaced because of rising sea levels, heat and storms. Climate change affects all natural systems. It impacts temperature and consequently it affects water and weather patterns. It contributes to desertification, **deforestation** **and acidification of the oceans**. Changes in weather patterns may mean droughts in one area and floods in another. Counter-intuitively, perhaps, sea levels rise but perennial river water supplies are reduced because glaciers are retreating. As glaciers and polar ice caps melt, there is an albedo effect, which is a double whammy of less temperature regulation because of less surface area of ice present. This means that less absorption occurs and also there is less reflection of the sun’s light. A potentially critical wild card could be runaway climate change due to the release of methane from melting tundra. Worldwide permafrost soils contain about 1,700 Giga Tons of carbon, which is about four times more than all the carbon released through human activity thus far. The planet has already adapted itself to dramatic climate change including a wide range of distinct geologic periods and multiple extinctions, and at a pace that it can be managed. It is human intervention that has accelerated the pace dramatically: An increased surface temperature, coupled with more severe weather and changes in water distribution will create uneven **threats to our** **ag**ricultural systems and will foster **and** support the **spread** of insect borne **diseases** like Malaria, Dengue and the West Nile virus. **Rising sea levels** will increasingly **threaten** our coastal population and infrastructure centers and with more than 3.5 billion people – **half** **the planet** – depending on the ocean for their primary source of food, ocean acidification may dangerously undercut critical natural food systems which would result in reduced rations. Climate change also carries significant inertia. Even if emissions were completely halted today, temperature increases would continue for some time. Thus the impact is not only to the environment, water, coastal homes, agriculture and fisheries as mentioned, but also would lead to conflict and thus impact national security. **Resource wars** are inevitable **as countries** respond, adapt and **compete for** the shrinking set of those available **resources**. These wars have arguably already started and will continue in the future because climate change will force countries to act for national survival; the so-called Climate Wars. As early as 2003 Greenpeace alluded to a report which it claimed was commissioned by the Pentagon titled: An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and Its Implications for U.S. National Security. It painted a picture of a world in turmoil because global warming had accelerated. The scenario outlined was both abrupt and alarming. The report offered recommendations but backed away from declaring climate change an immediate problem, concluding that it would actually be more incremental and measured; as such it would be an irritant, not a shock for national security systems. In 2006 the Center for Naval Analyses (CNA) – Institute of Public Research – convened a board of 11 senior retired generals and admirals to assess National Security and the Threat to Climate Change. Their initial report was published in April 2007 and made no mention of the potential acceleration of climate change. The team found that climate change was a serious threat to national security and that it was: “most likely to happen in regions of the world that are already fertile ground for extremism.” The team made recommendations from their analysis of regional impacts which suggested the following. **Europe would** experience some **fractur**ing because of border migration. **Africa** **would need** more **stability** and humanitarian operations provided by the United States. **The Middle East would** **experience a “loss of** food and water **security** (which) will increase pressure to emigrate across borders.” **Asia would suffer from “threats to** **water** **and** the **spread of** infectious **disease**.” In 2009 the CIA opened a Center on Climate Change and National Security to coordinate across the intelligence community and to focus policy. In May 2014, CNA again convened a Military Advisory Board but this time to assess National Security and the Accelerating Risk of Climate Change. The report concludes that climate change is no longer a future threat but occurring right now and the authors appeal to the security community, the entire government and the American people to not only build resilience against projected climate change impacts but to form agreements to stabilize climate change and also to integrate climate change across all strategy and planning. The calm of the 2007 report is replaced by a tone of anxiety concerning the future coupled with calls for public discourse and debate because “time and tide wait for no man.” The report notes a key distinction between resilience (mitigating the impact of climate change) and agreements (ways to stabilize climate change) and states that: Actions by the United States and the international community have been insufficient to adapt to the challenges associated with projected climate change. Strengthening resilience to climate impacts already locked into the system is critical, but this will reduce long-term risk only if improvements in resilience are accompanied by actionable agreements on ways to stabilize climate change. The 9/11 Report framed the terrorist attacks as less of a failure of intelligence than a failure of imagination. Greenpeace’s 2003 account of the **Pentagon**’s alleged report **describes a coming climate Armageddon** which to readers was unimaginable and hence the report was not really taken seriously. It described: A world thrown into turmoil by drought, floods, typhoons. Whole countries rendered uninhabitable. The capital of the Netherlands submerged. The borders of the U.S. and Australia patrolled by armies firing into waves of starving boat people desperate to find a new home. Fishing boats armed with cannon to drive off competitors. Demands for access to water and farmland **backed up with nuclear weapons**. The CNA and Greenpeace/Pentagon reports are both mirrored by similar analysis by the World Bank which highlighted not only the physical manifestations of climate change, but also the significant human **impacts that threaten to unravel decades of economic development, which will** ultimately **foster conflict**. Climate change is the quintessential “Tragedy of the Commons,” where the cumulative impact of many individual actions (carbon emission in this case) is not seen as linked to the marginal gains available to each individual action and not seen as cause and effect. It is simultaneously huge, yet amorphous and nearly invisible from day to day. It is occurring very fast in geologic time terms, but in human time it is (was) slow and incremental. Among environmental problems, it is uniquely global. With our planet and culture figuratively and literally honeycombed with a reliance on fossil fuels, we face systemic challenges in changing the reliance across multiple layers of consumption, investment patterns, and political decisions; it will be hard to fix!

Two additional impacts.

A. Phytoplankton

#### Global warming destroys phytoplankton

**Spotts, 2010:**

(Pete Spotts, Staff Writer For The Christian Science Monitor. July 28, 2010. *Vital Ocean Phytoplankton A Casualty Of Global Warming?*. http://www.csmonitor.com/Science/2010/0728/Vital-ocean-phytoplankton-a-casualty-of-global-warming)

**The foundation of the ocean food chain is eroding, and global warming is partly to blame.** That's the broad conclusion from **a newly released study** **[found that]** of a century's worth of measurements of the abundance of phytoplankton in the world's oceans. **Between 1899 and 2008, phytoplankton – microscopic, plant-like organisms in ocean surface waters – declined by roughly 1 percent of the global average per year, the study estimates. That works out to a 40 percent drop in amount of phytoplankton between 1950 and 2008**, according to the study, which appears in tomorrow's issue of the [journal Nature](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/Nature+Publishing+Group). **Beyond disruptions to the ocean food chain, such a decline would undercut the ocean's ability to take up the carbon dioxide humans have pumped into the atmosphere through increased burning of coal, oil, and gas**, as well as through land-use changes, say scientists. If the findings hold up to additional scrutiny, "that's quite remarkable," says [Peter Franks](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/Peter+Franks), a phytoplankton ecologist at the [Scripps Institution of Oceanography](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/Scripps+Institution+of+Oceanography) in [La Jolla](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/La+Jolla), [Calif.](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/California) "If it's true, there's a lot of bad stuff going on." Phytoplankton use sunlight to convert carbon dioxide into oxygen and into the sugars that keep the plankton alive long enough to become another creature's meal. By some estimates ocean phytoplankton are responsible for half of all the photosynthetic activity on the planet. The trend noted in the study becomes most pronounced near the poles and in the tropics since 1950, the researchers say. **Of the factors the team considered to explain the decline, the most influential appeared to be rising sea-surface temperatures – a trend many other scientists have traced to global warming.**

**Phytoplankton destruction causes extinction**

**The New Republic, 2007:**

**(The Greatest Dying. Jerry Coyne And Hopi E. Hoekstra. September 24, 2007.** <http://www.oilempire.us/omnicide.html>**)**

**In many ways, oceans are the most vulnerable areas of all. As overfishing eliminates major predators, while polluted and warming waters kill off phytoplankton, the intricate aquatic food web could collapse from both sides. Fish, on which so many humans depend, will be a fond memory. As phytoplankton vanish, so does the ability of the oceans to absorb carbon dioxide and produce oxygen. (Half of the oxygen we breathe is made by phytoplankton, with the rest coming from land plants.) Species extinction is also imperiling coral reefs - a major problem since these reefs have far more than recreational value: They provide tremendous amounts of food for human populations and buffer coastlines against erosion.**

B. Meridional overturning circulation

**Global warming disrupts meridional overturning circulation**

**Marzeion et al., 2010:**

(Marzeion, Ben, Anders Levermann, and Juliette Mignot. "Sensitivity Of North Atlantic Subpolar Gyre And Overturning To Stratification-Dependent Mixing: Response To Global Warming." *Climate Dynamics* 34.5 (2010): 661-668. *Academic Search Complete*. Web. 14 June 2012. Assistant Professor At The Institute Of Meteorology And Geophysics At The University Of Innsbruck.)

**The state of the climate system in the North Atlantic depends on the states of a number of coupled sub-systems**, e.g. the subpolar gyre (SPG), the overflows over the Greenland–Scotland Ridge (GSR), and the AMOC (Drange et al. 2005). **In particular, the AMOC is thought to contribute to the relatively warm European climate by transporting \*1 PW of heat from the tropics northward** (Hall and Bryden 1982; Ganachaud and Wunsch 2000; Trenberth and Caron 2001). While the strength of the AMOC is likely to influence global climate, e.g. by modulating the El Nin˜o/Southern Oscillation phenomenom (Timmermann et al. 2005), the position of the Intertropical Convergence Zone (Vellinga and Wood 2002), and by changing North Atlantic surface elevation (Levermann et al. 2005), the strongest effects can be found in the northern North Atlantic. Changes in the North Atlantic flow patterns are important factors for the heat transport into the Nordic region (Ha´tu´n et al. 2005), and economically relevant for fisheries (Ha´tu´n et al. 2007). **Model results suggest that the influence of increased greenhousegas concentrations will weaken the future AMOC, by causing decreased heat loss and increased freshwater input in the high latitudes, thus lowering the density of the surface water in the northern sinking regions** (e.g. Manabe and Stouffer 1994; Rahmstorf and Ganopolski 1999; Gregory et al. 2005).

**That causes extinction**

**Kiehl and Shields, 2005:**

(Jeffrey T. Kiehl. Christine A. Shields. Members Of The Climate Change Research Section At The National Center For Atmospheric Research. Climate Simulation Of The Latest Permian: Implications For Mass Extinction. http://www.cgd.ucar.edu/ccr/aboutus/staff/kiehl/Kiehl-Shields.pdf)

**The fundamental conclusion of this study is that, given elevated CO2 levels with realistic latest Permian paleoclimatic boundary conditions, a fully coupled comprehensive climate system model can simulate terrestrial and ocean conditions in concert with latest Permian paleodata. The implication of our study is that elevated CO2 is sufficient to lead to inhospitable conditions for marine life and excessively high temperatures over land would contribute to the demise of terrestrial life (Ward et al., 2005). The isotopic data indicate that through the latest Permian the climate was slowly warming and d13C was decreasing, and that these changes accelerated considerably at the Permian-Triassic boundary. Given the sensitivity of ocean circulation to highlatitude warming, it is hypothesized that some critical level of high-latitude warming was reached where connection of surface waters to the deep ocean was dramatically reduced, thus leading to a shutdown of marine biologic activity, which in turn would have led to increased atmospheric CO2 and accelerated warming.**

**Technology and politics won’t solve---only individual consumption changes can effectively mitigate climate change---new sources of information are necessary**

**Lenzen 97** – PhD, Professor of Applied Physics

(Manfred, “Individual responsibility and climate change,” Individual responsibility and climate change, Environmental Justice Conference, The University of Melbourne)

From the previous sections, two conclusions can be drawn, which are (1) that **personal consumption** in∂ industrialised countries like Australia **is the main constituent in** both total **global emissions** and their∂ growth rate, and (2) that **it is unlikely** that **emissions in industrialised countries will be reduced to a**n∂ equitable and **sustainable level by technological and political measures**.∂ In view of political inertia and **the limited technical potential** of curbing greenhouse gas emissions, these∂ conclusions **point to an** alternative, **individual response**. This is to change the pattern as well as to∂ reduce the amount of personal consumption. The motivation for such an individual response emerges∂ from the recognition of the individual's entanglement in the global crisis and hence personal∂ responsibility. **Adjusting to an environmentally sustainable** and globally equitable **level of consumption∂ can be** an **ethical** option for people in industrialised countries who are concerned about global∂ unfairness and environmental degradation, but disappointed about adequate political movement.∂ Moreover, comparing personal consumption with the previously mentioned sustainable level of 3.5 t∂ CO2-e per year can be quite enlightening and it questions, who is actually willing to make the sacrifices∂ that an environmentally rigorous policy would entail.30 Finally, **changes in** consumer **behaviour can∂ gradually become** more **widespread,** and then **have a significant influence on global** greenhouse gas∂ **emissions, and** effectively **supplement** **political and technological measures**.∂ **Individual awareness** and concern about global unfairness and environmental degradation **is a∂ prerequisite for behavioural changes towards** equity and **sustainability**. In fact, a growing number of∂ people regard environmental issues as important. In Australia, for example, about 70% of the∂ population older than 18 years consider environmental protection as important as economic growth.∂ The people most concerned about the environment are aged between 25 and 34 years, preferentially∂ female, with tertiary education and working in professional occupations.31 There are, however, two∂ inhibiting factors.∂ Firstly, in industrialised countries, concerns about climate change bear little relation to personal∂ greenhouse gas emissions. This paradox was, for example, one of the results of a survey of households∂ in Melbourne, Australia, undertaken in order to determine people's understanding of, and attitude∂ towards climate change as well as their actions in response to their concerns.32 It was found that people∂ who had a clear understanding of the greenhouse effect produced as much CO2 in their households as∂ others. Furthermore, respondents who regarded climate change as a serious issue caused only slightly∂ lower CO2 household emissions (associated with lower electricity use) than those who did not share this∂ concern. A significant reduction in CO2 emissions was only observed in conjunction with lifestyle∂ changes such as the reduction of car use and household heating. Another example is an Australian∂ study on initiatives to promote sustainable consumption, which revealed that information and education∂ as well as economic incentives exhibited only a low level of success in initiating changes in∂ consumption patterns. However, the analysis of obligatory and coercive initiatives (especially those∂ where avoidance was difficult) showed that consumers complied with the initiative program where they∂ had no choice to act but in an environmentally responsible way.33 These findings suggest that the∂ provision of information to the general public alone does not motivate behavioural changes. It seems∂ that only under certain circumstances is the mere desire for an intact environment turned into∂ corresponding action. **One** **prerequisite** for voluntary individual action **was found to be** the individual∂ **belief in the efficacy of pro-environmental behaviour**.34 Moreover, it is argued that a sense of **confusion∂ and uncertainty arising from conflicting information** from different sources35 **as well as** a publicly∂ perceived **mistrust in** the governmental **institutions providing this information**36 **are key obstacles for∂ consistent action**. In summary, it appears that feelings of lack of agency as well as political disaffection∂ are the most significant inhibitors of environmentally conscious behaviour.37

## 1AR

## Spec

**I meet. The aff is federal.**

**A. “United States” means the federal government; that’s Ballentine 95**

Ballentine's Legal Dictionary and Thesaurus, "United States," 1995, p. 689

**United States 1. The federal government. 2. A sovereign nation or sovereign state called the "United States." 3. Territory over which this sovereign nation called the "United States" exercises sovereign power.**

**B. “Living wage” is federal.**

**Stevens 15**

Rachel Stevens (Top 8 National NFA LD Debater 2011; supervisor of Debate Central). “LD January/February 2015 Analysis.” Debate Central. 2015. http://debate-central.ncpa.org/januaryfebruary-2015-ld-topic-analysis-is-published/

“Living wage” is related, but not identical, to “minimum wage.” The United Sates has a federal minimum wage, which is $7.25/hour. However, it may be higher in certain states or cities which have chosen to pass legislation to raise their own minimum wage. “Living wage,” on the other hand, does not legally refer to any specific dollar amount. Some areas may have living wage ordinances, which require its businesses to pay a wage indexed to the current cost of living in that area. However, because cost of living differs depending on where one is, the living wage could be dramatically different in one area to the next. So, **if we are discussing things on a national scale (which most debates on this topic** probably **will),** it is important to recognize that the living wage would not be a consistent number of dollars per hour throughout an entire country, but rather would be set at different amounts depending on the cost of living in various areas. (Another area of ambiguity in the topic: how much discrepancy is appropriate? Should the wage be set by county? City? Neighborhood? Block?) To determine what a living wage might be in a particular location, check out this living wage calculator. Technically, a living wage *IS* a minimum wage, in the sense that both establish the smallest amount of money a business can legally pay an employee. They are both what can be called a “wage floor” in economic literature. So, while the federal minimum wage is not necessarily a living wage (data shows that, in many cities, the cost of living dramatically outpaces the federal minimum wage), a legally-required **living wage *would become the new minimum wage*** *in its corresponding area*. In other words, theoretical arguments about how wage floors affect economies would apply to debates about both the federal minimum wage and any given living wage. But, arguments specific to the federal minimum wage generally will not be directly 4 applicable to discussions of a living wage, and vice versa. This is because living wages are tied to the cost of living in a specific area, while the same is not always true of the legal minimum wage.

Counter-interpretation: the aff does not need to specify beyond a particular country.

I meet.

1. It’s infinitely regressive. There’s always more I could spec, which means he’ll always have a link to frivolous theory, which outweighs and turns his offense because it has zero topic relevance.

2. US Spec solves. It gives a specific lit base. He has tons of counterplans: UBI, wage subsidies, EITC, and unions. Any more overburdens the aff because the 1AR is too short to start over against hyper-specific counterplans that steal most of the aff.

3. Spec kills clash and education because I could break a new mechanism to get out of generic neg prep.

4. Not predictable; theres no rez basis.

5. It’s the TOC. Stop whining and cut cards.

## Whiteness

**Anti-blackness isn’t ontological – policy’s the best venue to combat it**

**Bouie 13**, staff writer at The American Prospect, Making and Dismantling Racism, http://prospect.org/article/making-and-dismantling-racism

Over at The Atlantic, Ta-Nehisi Coates has been exploring the intersection of race and public policy, with a focus on white supremacy as a driving force in political decisions at all levels of government. This has led him to two conclusions: First, that anti-black racism as we understand it is a creation of explicit policy choices—the decision to exclude, marginalize, and stigmatize Africans and their descendants has as much to do with racial prejudice as does any intrinsic tribalism. And second, that it's possible to dismantle this prejudice using public policy. Here is Coates in his own words: Last night I had the luxury of sitting and talking with the brilliant historian Barbara Fields. One point she makes that very few Americans understand is that racism is a creation. You read Edmund Morgan’s work and actually see racism being inscribed in the law and the country changing as a result. If we accept that racism is a creation, then we must then accept that it can be destroyed. And if we accept that it can be destroyed, we must then accept that it can be destroyed by us and that it likely must be destroyed by methods kin to creation. **Racism was created by policy. It will** likely **only be** ultimately **destroyed by policy.** Over at his blog, Andrew Sullivan offers a reply: I don’t believe the law created racism any more than it can create lust or greed or envy or hatred. It can encourage or mitigate these profound aspects of human psychology – it can create racist structures as in the Jim Crow South or Greater Israel. But it can no more end these things that it can create them. A complementary strategy is finding ways for the targets of such hatred to become inured to them, to let the slurs sting less until they sting not at all. Not easy. But a more manageable goal than TNC’s utopianism. I can appreciate the point Sullivan is making, but I'm not sure it's relevant to Coates' argument. It is absolutely true that "Group loyalty is deep in our DNA," as Sullivan writes. And if you define racism as an overly aggressive form of group loyalty—basically just prejudice—then Sullivan is right to throw water on the idea that the law can "create racism any more than it can create lust or greed or envy or hatred." But Coates is making a more precise claim: That **there's nothing natural about the black/white divide** that has defined American history. White Europeans had contact with black Africans well before the trans-Atlantic slave trade **without** the emergence of an **anti-black racism**. It took **particular choices** made by particular people—in this case, plantation owners in colonial Virginia—to make black skin a stigma, to make the "one drop rule" a defining feature of American life for more than a hundred years. By enslaving African indentured servants and allowing their white counterparts a chance for upward mobility, colonial landowners began the process that would make white supremacy the ideology of America. The position of slavery generated a stigma that then justified continued enslavement—blacks are lowly, therefore we must keep them as slaves. Slavery (and later, Jim Crow) wasn't built to reflect racism as much as it was built in tandem with it. And later policy, in the late 19th and 20th centuries, further entrenched white supremacist attitudes. Block black people from owning homes, and they're forced to reside in crowded slums. Onlookers then use the reality of slums to deny homeownership to blacks, under the view that they're unfit for suburbs. In other words, create a prohibition preventing a marginalized group from engaging in socially sanctioned behavior—owning a home, getting married—and then blame them for the adverse consequences. Indeed, in arguing for gay marriage and responding to conservative critics, Sullivan has taken note of this exact dynamic. Here he is twelve years ago, in a column for The New Republic that builds on earlier ideas: Gay men--not because they're gay but because they are men in an all-male subculture--are almost certainly more sexually active with more partners than most straight men. (Straight men would be far more promiscuous, I think, if they could get away with it the way gay guys can.) Many gay men value this sexual freedom more than the stresses and strains of monogamous marriage (and I don't blame them). But this is not true of all gay men. Many actually yearn for social stability, for anchors for their relationships, for the family support and financial security that come with marriage. To deny this is surely to engage in the "soft bigotry of low expectations." They may be a minority at the moment. But with legal marriage, their numbers would surely grow. And they would function as emblems in gay culture of a sexual life linked to stability and love. [Emphasis added] What else is this but a variation on Coates' core argument, that society can create stigmas by using law to force particular kinds of behavior? Insofar as gay men were viewed as unusually promiscuous, it almost certainly had something to do with the fact that society refused to recognize their humanity and sanction their relationships. The absence of any institution to mediate love and desire encouraged behavior that led this same culture to say "these people are too degenerate to participate in this institution." If the prohibition against gay marriage helped create an anti-gay stigma, then lifting it—as we've seen over the last decade—has helped destroy it. There's no reason racism can't work the same way.

## PTX

Fiat means the aff happens immediately, so there’s no debate in Congress and no loss of polcap.

Living wage is bottom of the docket. The \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ bill will pass before living wage is even considered by Congress.

No polcap. Obama is a cactus. **Onion 10** writes[[10]](#footnote-10)

WASHINGTON—According to a poll released Tuesday, nearly **20 percent** of U.S. citizens now **believe** Barack **Obama is a** cactus, the most Americans to identify the president as a water-retaining **desert plant** since he took office. A growing segment of the population believes the president is **pollinated by moths and hummingbirds.** The poll, conducted by the Pew Research Center, found a sharp rise in the number of Americans who say they firmly believe Obama was either born a cactus, [or] became a cactus during his youth, or has questionable links to the *Cactaceae* family. "We asked people of varying races, ages, and backgrounds the same question: 'What is President Barack Obama?'" Pew spokeswoman Jodi Miller told reporters. "And a fifth of them responded, 'A cactus.'" According to the poll, Obama has lost favor among many voters who supported his candidacy in 2008 but have since come to doubt he is a mammal. While these Americans concede Obama may not specifically be a cactus, most believe he is a plant of some kind, with 18 percent saying the president is a ficus, 37 percent believing him to be a grain such as wheat or millet, and 12 percent convinced he is an old-growth forest in Northern California. When asked why they agreed with the statement "President Obama is a large succulent plant composed of specialized cells designed for water retention in arid climates," many responded that they "just know," claiming **the pres**ident **only acts like a human** being **for political purposes and is truly a cactus at heart.** A number of polled Americans identified the above as a photo of President Obama. White House officials have asserted that the nation's 44th president is a person. "You can't go a day without hearing how Obama's a radical cactus sympathizer who wants to sap America of all its drinking water, or how he was actually born in the Kalahari Desert," said media critic Lynn Pelmont, referring to cable news outlets that suggest the president has prickly spines he uses to protect himself from thirsty animals. "For a man who prides himself on delivering a coherent message, **there's a**n awful **lot of confusion** out there **about whether he's a Harvard** Law **grad**uate **or a leafless** flowering **shrub."** "He must speak frankly to the American people about his mammalian background," Pelmont added. "If not, it's only a matter of time before people start believing those fringe bloggers who claim the president of the United States is actually an old washing machine." Some Beltway observers have accused Republicans of tacitly encouraging the cactus rumor, pointing out that if millions of voters believe Obama produces buds through spirally arranged areoles situated along his stem, the GOP has a much better chance of retaking Congress in November. "If the president says he is a human being, I'll take him at his word," Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell said Sunday on *Meet the Press*. "Though I've never heard him complain about being thirsty. Not once. That could be a coincidence, I suppose, but it's really not my place to say."

TURN – Raising the minimum wage is popular

**Swanson 2-6** writes[[11]](#footnote-11)

**Raising the minimum wage is** about as **popular** an economic policy position as any in America. In fact, more people want to increase the minimum wage than have a positive view of the capitalist system that underpins the nation's economy. A new HuffPost/YouGov poll found that 62 percent of Americans support raising the minimum wage from $7.25 to $10.10 an hour, while 26 percent are opposed. Meanwhile, 53 percent have a positive opinion of capitalism, while 19 percent have a negative view. Democratic lawmakers and President Barack Obama support increasing the minimum wage to $10.10 an hour. Obama announced during his State of the Union address last week that he would use an executive order to raise pay for federal contractors. Although most Americans surveyed said they favor raising the minimum wage, responses were divided along party lines. Eighty-five percent of Democrats and 60 percent of independents think the minimum wage should be increased, but only 31 percent of Republicans agree. **A majority of Americans in all income groups said they support an increase**, including 67 percent of those whose families make less than $40,000 a year and 55 percent of those whose families make more than $100,000 a year. Fans of capitalism were more likely than not to support a wage hike for low-income workers, with 51 percent backing an increase. Six hundred economists have signed on to an Economic Policy Institute letter urging Congress to raise the minimum wage. Though the question of whether an increase would help or hurt workers is the subject of some debate, the poll finds **Americans are mostly unswayed by arguments that an increase might hurt workers** because businesses would respond by hiring fewer people. Only 30 percent said they thought a minimum wage hike would hurt workers, while **52 percent said it would help them**. Fifty-five percent of those with a family income of less than $40,000 and 50 percent of those making more than $100,000 agreed. On this question, too, respondents were split along party lines, with 76 percent of Democrats saying that a minimum wage increase would help workers and 60 percent of Republicans saying it would hurt them. Independents were more likely to say it would help them, by a 49 percent to 33 percent margin.

## Fism

Federalism kills natural disaster preparedness

**Governing Magazine 5** writes[[12]](#footnote-12)

After Hurricane Frances ripped through Florida about a year ago, the Federal Emergency Management Agency wrote checks worth $31 million to residents of Miami-Dade County. There was a big problem with the payouts, though: The storm had actually hit about 200 miles to the north. Frances gave Miami a good soaking but didn't really do much damage there. It's an ironic tale, in light of all the finger-pointing wrought by the catastrophe of Hurricane Katrina. To be sure, state and local officials never relish having to work with FEMA's bureaucracy when disaster strikes. That's been abundantly clear this past month. But there's usually a silver--or green--lining. It's not too hard to shake millions, even billions, out of Washington after a calamity, or even a rainstorm in Miami's case. In fact, it's much easier than winning federal aid for workaday priorities such as education or public housing. This is one of **federalism**'s little quirks--one that some argue **makes natural disasters** even **more disastrous. If the feds always pick up the tab,** then **there's no incentive for states or localities to halt** risky development in areas prone to **flooding, mudslides or wildfires.** It's an example of what economists call a "moral hazard" problem. **"The signal that's gone out** over many years **is that no matter what type of natural disaster** it is**, FEMA** comes in and **bails you out**," says Pietro Nivola, a senior fellow with the Brookings Institution. **"State and local governments become complacent."**

Natural disasters cause extinction. **Sid Ahmed 5** writes[[13]](#footnote-13)

The human species has never been exposed to a natural upheaval of this magnitude within living memory. What happened in South Asia is the ecological equivalent of 9/11. Ecological problems like global warming and climatic disturbances in general threaten to make our natural habitat unfit for human life. The **extinction** of the species **has become a** very **real possibility**, whether by our own hand or **as a result of natural disasters** of a much greater magnitude than the Indian Ocean earthquake and the killer waves it spawned. Human civilisation has developed in the hope that Man will be able to reach welfare and prosperity on earth for everybody. But now things seem to be moving in the opposite direction, exposing planet Earth to the end of its role as a nurturing place for human life. Today, **human conflicts have become less of a threat than** the **confrontation between Man and Nature. At least they are less likely to bring about the end of the human species.** The reactions of Nature as a result of its exposure to the onslaughts of human societies have become more important in determining the fate of the human species than any harm it can inflict on itself. Until recently, the threat Nature represented was perceived as likely to arise only in the long run, related for instance to how global warming would affect life on our planet. Such a threat could take decades, even centuries, to reach a critical level. This perception has changed following the devastating **earthquake and tsunamis** that hit the coastal regions of South Asia and, less violently, of East Africa, on 26 December. This cataclysmic event has **underscore**d **the vulnerability of our world before the wrath of Nature** and shaken the sanguine belief that the end of the world is a long way away. Gone are the days when we could comfort ourselves with the notion that the extinction of the human race will not occur before a long-term future that will only materialise after millions of years and not affect us directly in any way. **We are now forced to live with the possibility of** an **imminent demise of humankind.**
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