

Use QR code to access  
editable doc

**Only edit during class.**

**Only edit the white cells  
of the table.**



### DEBATE DAY SCHEDULE

1. **1:00** 4 groups prepare for debate--judges,  
follow your link and see instructions there
2. **1:10** First round of debate
3. **1:20** Second round groups prep a bit more.
4. **1:25** Second round of debate
5. **1:35** Judges decide
6. **1:40** Judges declare winner and give  
feedback



April 30 -- Green choices

- No class today, so any debating will be just “virtual.”
- If you don’t have the second debate speaker point, you should add an argument to the table.
- Anyone else is also welcome to add arguments.
- Please finish adding arguments by April 30, 2 pm.

| Should you reduce your carbon footprint?   |  |
|--|--|
| A. YES, I should reduce my carbon footprint because even if I’m <b>just one person</b> , my footprint <b>makes a difference</b> to climate change. Chyler, Vaughn  | B. YES, because even though my individual footprint <b>makes no difference</b> , there are reasons of <b>character and virtue</b> for me to reduce it. (Jamieson says this, as does Hourdequin) Jackson, Carla, Julianna                     |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| C. YES WE SHOULD. We should <b>think of the self collectively</b> , not atomistically. “What should I do” really means “what should we do.” We should reduce our footprints because that <b>collective effort will prevent climate change</b> . (Hourdequin, drawing on Confucius) Marco, Hailey, Derik, Kamila, Sofie, Lucas, Liam, Cooper, Clayton, Victor | D. NO, climate change is <b>not the kind of problem</b> that can be solved through individual “carbon dieting”. The solutions have to come from governments, industries, and the development of new technologies. Olivia, Hannah, Drew Reece |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   |   |
| <p>I agree with this side because it is a good compromise of the past few readings we have done. Although our individual efforts to reduce our carbon footprint may not have much of an impact alone, collectively if everyone decided to reduce their footprint some progress would be seen. I also like the idea of hypocrisy that Hourdequin brought up in his reading and I think it is unfair just to push all of the climate change problems created by us onto elected officials and say that we are completing our moral obligation like Sinnot-Armstrong says. <b>WHO?</b>.-cooper</p> | <p>I believe that a collective effort will create a bit of a difference in the effect of climate change, however, a collective of individuals can only reduce the effects of climate change to a certain extent without actual policies and new technology. There's also the question of if you can get a large enough collective of people to change their lifestyle without incentives. It seems like the climate situation would have to be truly dire in order to get people to make a change, but this doesn't mean individuals shouldn't do anything, I believe it means that further technologies and policies will make a greater change that could lead/incentivise people to choosing a sustainable lifestyle. - Reece</p>  |
|   | <p>While individual efforts like using more sustainable objects or driving less are meaningful and in big collective efforts, might be impactful, they are not sufficient to address the giant scale of climate change. A majority of global emissions are coming from industries such as energy, oil, transportation (SpaceX, Bezos' space stuff, Tesla, air travel, etc.), and more. That is beyond common citizens like ourselves. And I would argue, as Jamieson does, that although it is nice to make an effort, our individual actions don't make that much of an impact compared to say the government could. The government has the power to enforce and shape policies. To head-on address this issue, policy needs to change on top of peoples' lifestyle choices. -olivia</p> |
|   |   |
|   |   |

April 14 -- Returning the parks to the tribes

| <p><b>Should US National Parks be returned to the tribes?</b><br/> <a href="#">Treuer's article</a>   <a href="#">Summary of his article</a></p>   |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>YES</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Treuer's position</li> <li>• Parks would be returned to a consortium of Native Americans</li> <li>• Covenant would require conservation and continued access for all</li> <li>• Native Americans would have "unfettered access"</li> </ul>  | <p><b>NO</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• US would continue to own the parks</li> <li>• Park service would continue managing</li> <li>• There may be increased access for Native Americans</li> </ul>  |
| <p><b>Front--make the case for YES</b><br/> <b>Marco, Kamila, Sofie</b></p>  | <p><b>Front--make the case for NO</b><br/> <b>Priya, Corinne, Vaughn, Matthew</b></p>  |
| <p>Reparations: National parks were historically established on lands that were forcibly/deceitfully taken away from the Native American communities, and allowing them stewardship of these spaces would be a means of rectifying the injustices that occurred.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the displacement of the indigenous communities</li> <li>- allowing them access to the land would be an effort in recognizing their rights had been violated prior (kamila)</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Give special privileges as a stepping stone to giving natives control of the parks. If they are given special privileges, then they can learn how to properly conserve the parks but they are still able to fulfill their cultural and spiritual needs</li> </ul> |
| <p>Spirituality/Conservation: Not granting ownership to Native Americans, even if they are given increased access, restricts their spirituality and connection with the land. This spirituality and relationship they have is extremely significant. Their beliefs aid in the conservation of the lands they own. CSKT bison range owned by Native American tribes and displays evidence of bison population and preservation of land being maintained. Other organizations such as the IFAD in the UN have advocated for adapting Native American methods, displaying the capability of Native Americans in conserving National Parks if granted ownership.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- National parks are visited by people from all over the world so having it in the hands of the government rather than a smaller tribe would give us more control over the preservation of the park because the federal government has more resources</li> </ul>    |
| <p>ACContinued access to their land is able to maintain and repair the relationship between them and the land.</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We find that there would be a fundamental issue in who/which tribes would be able to govern certain national parks. One tribe may have owned a park at one</li> </ul>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>They have a special relationship with the land that they have taken care of well for thousands of years.</p> <p>They should own the land and should absolutely be able to practice their rituals and traditions in the parks as they have done for thousands of years</p> <p>They would be able to fix the ecological problems of the land as they believe in taking care of the environment</p>  | <p>point, and another could have owned it at another point. We think that it would become very difficult to feasibly just give all of the land back fairly and equitably. There could be some sort of middle ground, but it may be hard to absolutely provide the land back to Native Americans when the claim to land may be mixed. (Priya)</p>   |
| <p style="text-align: center;"><b>YES</b></p> <p><b>Back--strengthen the case for YES, respond to NO</b></p> <p><b>Lucas, Derik</b></p>  | <p style="text-align: center;"><b>NO</b></p> <p><b>Back--strengthen the case for NO, respond to YES</b></p> <p><b>Carla, Drew, Hannah</b></p>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The stepping stones argument is like a transition plan, control of the land would not be an immediate transition but there would be a phasing out of the Parks dept. As to which tribe would actually get control of the parks make a council of tribes, control for the land in the past may be mixed but care for the land shouldn't be.</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More of a feasibility critique, it is very unrealistic to hand over a bunch of land to a foreign nation. How do they pay for the upkeep? How are we going to ensure the park's health and freedom of access?</li> </ul>   |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Subject to conservation rules, tribes have prior experience administering reservations so would be well equipped.</li> <li>- Treuer also argues for continued financial support from the government</li> <li>-</li> </ul> <p>the transfer should be subject to <b>binding covenants</b> guaranteeing a standard of conservation that is at least as stringent as what the park system forces today, so that the parks' ecological health would be preserved--and improved--long into the future."</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- How can we ensure they do not have selfish motives with the park?</li> </ul> <p>Counsel would not work because they would disagree, tribes would have various motives.</p>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The government currently does not do that great of a job of managing the parks, plus removing the parks from the hands of the government to a bipartisan group whom is concerned only with maintaining the conservation of the land would be beneficial</li> </ul> <p>The federal government allows <b>overcrowding</b> and habitat loss and some administrations reduce park staff and allow development on public land (2021) (p. 43)</p>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If their relationship with land matters so much then why do they not develop a relationship with the land they already have? Instead it is usually developed for profit (casinos and entertainment) before it is treated with the reciprocity and serviceberry attitude that is suggested.</li> </ul> <p>Seems like the "spirituality and reparations" narrative relies on some element of false pathos that's evident in the lack of mass land conservation. Although there is evidence of native americans doing good things that is not evidence that "they" as a race of people are any more capable of maintaining land then</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>another race. It seems like reliance on some sort of positive stereotype of native americans. It seems almost racist.</p> <p>The argument presented is "Some of these types of people do action A, therefore all of these people will do A".</p> <p>Native americans are the same as any other race of people and the narrative just does not work.</p> |
| <p>Judges: <b>Chyler, Hailey, Olivia, Liam</b> &amp; Victor<br/> Judges instructions are <a href="#">here</a>.</p> |  |

March 25 Future Ethics Debate/Discussion

- 10 minutes prep
- 5 minutes for each group to present

#### DEBATE DAY SCHEDULE

7. **1:00** Clarify question
8. Break into four groups--see names in table below.
9. **1:05** Prepare for first round (use table below)--decide who will speak and what arguments they will make
10. **1:15** Have first round of debate
11. **1:25** Prepare for second round (table)--decide who will speak and what arguments they will make
12. **1:30** Have second round of debate
13. **1:40** Discuss, choose MVPs

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>DISCOUNTING</b><br><a href="#">Blog post</a><br><a href="#">Broome reading</a>  | <b>LONGTERMISM</b><br><a href="#">MacAskill reading</a>  |
| <b>PRO</b><br>Priya, <b>Matthew, Marco</b> , Hannah, Hailey, <b>Derik</b><br>You will explain some of the arguments for discounting.<br>1. Prioritarianism | <b>PRO</b><br><b>Carla</b> , Liam, <b>Cooper, Victor</b> , Chyler, <b>Angie</b><br>You will explain some of the arguments for longtermism. |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pure temporal distance</li> <li>Investment</li> <li>Others we discussed on Mar 14</li> </ol>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The hiker argument (p. 10)</li> <li>The future plague argument (p. 10)</li> <li>The imagining future people argument (p. 10)</li> <li>The time vs. distance argument (p. 10)</li> <li>The sheer number argument (p.15-19)</li> <li>Other arguments</li> </ol>   |
| <p>3. Investment in other options could negate the need for future projects and lead to more immediate results. Additionally, the opportunity cost of investing in a long-term project is immense. - Matthew Dallao</p>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The hiker argument explains a scenario in which a hiker drops a glass bottle and it shatters over the path. In the future, a child walking on the path steps on the glass and hurts herself because the hiker did not clean up the glass. The main point of this argument is that harm is still harm, no matter when it happens. So people in the present have an obligation to at least not purposefully harm anyone in the future. The argument itself makes sense because it is not necessarily telling people to take action for future people, but just to not cause harm to people on purpose like in the example. -Cooper</li> </ol> |
| <p>Marco - Pure temporal distance argues that people in the future should be given less consideration due to existing in the distant future. Ex. Child 100 years from now dying shouldn't be given as much importance as one now. While cruel initially, epistemic justification should be considered due to this large distance in time. Unpredictable nature of our world in the future as well as misallocation of resources can be prevalent. While pure discounting advocates for a high discounting rate, it doesn't argue that we should completely turn our backs on the future generations and the issues that plague the world.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If there is a plague that is about to happen and someone has the opportunity to stop it they should. The time or the outcome of the catastrophic event does not matter when making this decision. However, preventing events like a plague or a pandemic should be a priority because it can determine whether or not the future people/generations would be affected (by cutting the future short or alter humanity's future). Anything that is able to cause pain or death is worthy of our concern. (Angie)</li> </ol>   |
| <p>Derik - We should consider Prioritarianism as the effect of the money spent, as well as the time and energy spent now can be far more beneficial to people now. As time goes on, technology and life will get better, overall happiness and living conditions improve, making the future people better off or more "rich" compared to us. We are worse off therefore we should take priority<br/>It's saying they will be richer in the future and we are poorer. The poor don't have to help the rich!</p>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Time vs. distance argues that a person who lives across the world matters, even if we cannot see them, they still matter, and they exist. This applies to future people. Even though they still do not exist, they still matter. It is important to take future people into consideration just as we do with people who live across the globe. (Carla)</li> </ol>   |
|   | <p>(Victor) 5. The Sheer Number Argument explains the amount of future people that could exist in the next 500 million years. The diagram displays each person as approximately 10 billion people, with only 3 pages in the reading, compared to the actual size of twenty thousand of these pages.</p> <div> <p>The diagram displays the importance and role of all of the currently existing</p> </div>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | people, as well as the responsibilities each of our actions today have that could either increase or reduce the number of people that get to live in the future.   |
| <b>CON</b><br><b>Jackson, Olivia, Corinne, Sofie, Reece, Brooklyn</b><br>You will critique discounting. Some focus should be on the PRO arguments but you may want to make other critical points.<br><br>Was Corinne the third speaker?   | <b>CON</b><br><b>Vaughn, Lucas, Julianna, Clayton, Drew, Kamila</b><br>You will critique longtermism. Some focus should be on the PRO arguments but you may want to make other critical points.<br><br>Who was the third speaker?  |
| The Injustice of Discounting- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Broome argues that discounting the future involves treating the welfare of future generations as less valuable than the welfare of people alive today.</li> <li>2. Discounting is ethically problematic because it leads to a kind of injustice where the interests of future people are systematically undervalued</li> <li>3. People have the same moral worth and value as people from the future</li> <li>4. "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice anywhere" - MLK jr</li> <li>5. In response to second point made—Discrimination is not justified or ethical simply because there is a large time gap/jump between generations <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The value of life in the future is equal as the value now</li> </ol> </li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The main problem is speculation, if it may not happen then you cannot weigh it equally against something that is actually happening. Discount rates account for two things, opportunity cost and risk. Mainly this is about the risk or the chance of the event not actually happening <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Lottery example: A ticket that might win \$10,000 is not actually worth \$10,000</li> <li>b. Response to plague: Would you rather prevent a plague now that's killing many people or a plague that could possibly happen, say 50/50 chance in 30 years</li> </ol> </li> </ol> |
| Affects of climate change are increasing at an increasing rate because of population growth. In the 70s it was 3.7 billion vs. now it is 8 billion, a 121% increase in 50 years. Also with life spans getting longer the decisions we make now will affect us as well as future generations because people are most likely going to live to see two maybe three future generations. It makes more sense to view our generation as equal to future ones because we will also be affected by the decisions made.  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7. We cannot be sure that our current actions/changes will have the intended effect for the future population. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is more probable that any issues that can arise in the future are better handled during that period of time, as opposed to current people basing solutions on future expectations.</li> </ul> </li> </ol><br>kamila m  |
| We can not predict the future with absolute certainty, and with changes in climate changes going the way they are now, along with resource depletion, pandemics, and inequality could make the future worse than it is now. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More people and technology doesn't equate to the actions of people morally will act in the future.</li> <li>- Also, finite resources like fresh water, arable land, and rare earth minerals are being consumed at unsustainable rates.</li> </ul>  | Sheer number is again about the amount of people that <i>could</i> exist, they very well may not.<br><br>Time vs. distance also doesn't work because the people far away still actually exist while the ones far away in time do not.  |
|   | Response to hiker argument:  |



## Feb 26 PCBB Debate

- The principle of commensurate burdens and benefits (PCBB): **"Other things being equal, those who derive benefits should sustain commensurate burdens."** (Wenz, "Just Gargage" p. 446)
- You might need material from the [post on Wenz](#).
- You might want to look at [Wenz's article "Just Garbage"](#)

|   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>If you respond to another argument, please write “Re: ____”.</p> <p>The speaker should orally recap the argument they’re responding to.</p> <p>We’ll hear from groups 1, 2, (break)3, and (break) 4 in that order.</p> |  |   |
| WINDOW  | FOR-PCBB   | AGAINST-PCBB  |
| FRONT   | <p><b>1) Make basic case for PCBB</b></p> <p>Chyler, Jackson, Carla, Sofie, Reece, Victor</p>  | <p><b>2) Make case against PCBB</b></p> <p>Brooklyn, Jake, Vaughn, Hannah, Kamila, Lucas, Priya</p>   |
| BACK  | <p>1. If you make a lot of money and live in a big house, you generate more waste. If you are generating more waste, you should not be able to ship that waste off to a different place.</p>   | <p>A. A third party can't dictate what is a burden or a benefit because everyone's personal values, experiences, and circumstances are different. What helps one person might hurt another. Forcing one view ignores personal experiences and choices, making it unfair to label something as good or bad for everyone.</p>                                       |
|   | <p>2. It's unethical to reap the benefits and not have any of the burden. There is no good reason why other people should bear the burden while not receiving any benefits at all. Only having burdens/benefits is unethical.</p>  | <p>B. Concerning the residential aspect, the burden of spending more money on housing comes with the benefit of having a better overall community. Part of spending that money is so that wealthier people do not have to deal with less environmental burden around them. People spending less on housing are content with taking on more of the burden too.</p> |
|   | <p>3. In the context of Env. Issues, PCBB is a good guiding line b/c accounts for injustice as a unique burden. Environmental injustice often exploits communities who don't have much of a choice in the matter. Certain burdens should not be allowed to be passed on.</p> | <p>C. Often, the individuals who bear the costs do so willingly because the benefits they receive, such as compensation, outweigh the costs within their circumstances.</p>   |

**Defend PCBB, respond to other side**  
Ane, Derik, Julianna, Clayton, Marco, Liam

The underlying moral principle remains true. You ought to reap what you sow. There is no way to disprove this moral argument through any viable ethical theory. The argument we are making is a moral argument.

Counter to A: That's how every institution that exists works: legal system, economies, governments, etc.

B&D: In the majority of cases people do not CHOOSE to spend less on housing, they are forced to because of their socioeconomic situation that in many cases they were born into. They are not choosing to live in an area knowing they will bear the burden of pollution or waste because it is cheap. This is just another

3

**Add to case against PCBB, rebut other side**  
Angie, Cooper, Matthew, Olivia, Hailey, Drew

**C.**

Quantity of biodegradable waste (kg/c/d)

| Socioeconomic group | Quantity of biodegradable waste (kg/c/d) |
|---------------------|--|
| HSEG                | 0.16                                     |
| UMSEG               | 0.18                                     |
| MSEG                | 0.19                                     |
| LMSEG               | 0.21                                     |

**D.**

Quantity of Non-biodegradable waste (kg/c/d)

| Socioeconomic group | Quantity of Non-biodegradable waste (kg/c/d) |
|---------------------|--|
| HSEG                | 0.22   |
| UMSEG               | 0.21   |
| MSEG                | 0.22   |
| LMSEG               | 0.27   |

In the most direct way, paying for what you generate occurs - property taxes etc. The direct implementation with trash would mean composts and waste disposal on individual's own property. We all pass off this burden to varying degrees. There is also no clear way to quantify equity via the PCBB per Wenz's case. The same issue / case will impose a different level of burden or benefit on each individual person. Quantifying this is really money. The system currently works more or less.

Even if PCBB were true...

E. They bear the burden in the higher property tax cost.

Paying less = benefit / more trash near your house

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
|  | burden that they have to bare on top of possibly not having an adequate liveable wage. (think of relative wage)   | <p>-----</p> <p>Less trash in your community = benefit / Greater monetary contribution = burden</p> <p>Not arguing that it is always a choice, but rather that it is a system of counterweights that still balances burden and benefit.</p> <p>Also, if a dump was placed in Highland Park/ extremely high income neighborhood, home values would decrease and some people would move, displacing the uber-welathy to another area. Their consumption would theoretically follow them to this new area, meaning that per Wenz's idea of PCBB, we would need to move the dump to this area. Then, these people would once again leave, and the cycle would repeat. There is no realistic system in which this could clearly and consistently work, aside from (in the most extreme and unrealistic sense) backyard composts and disposal sites. (Hailey)</p> |
|  | 6. Welfare, taxes, etc exist in service of the greater community, of which everyone benefits. You are entitled to the money you earn, but you owe some to the community in which you live, to ensure your neighbors can live a fulfilling and happy life. The exchange of goods and services between consenting parties does not disprove the argument for PCBB within the proposed framework. This does not change the fact, you must reap what you sow. | F. There are many examples of non-PCBB practices in society, while it's a guideline it is not a hard rule. For example, welfare, tax brackets, the acceptable practice of having your parents pay for your college, hiring a cleaning lady in your house or a janitor for your building. Should I be allowed to hire a cleaning lady or a waste management company to take my trash out once a week?  |

| <b>Debate 1: Is overpopulation a problem for the world today?</b><br><b>Links you might need: <a href="#">Our World in Data</a> <a href="#">Ord's Arguments</a> <a href="#">The overpopulation project</a></b> |  |
|--|--|
| Yes, overpopulation is a problem for the world today   | No, overpopulation is not a problem for the world today  |
| <b>First round</b><br><small>WINDOW FRONT</small><br>Chyler, Matthew, Corinne, Marco, Jackson, Reece*  | <b>First round</b><br><small>DOOR FRONT</small><br>Sofie, Priya, Brooklyn, Vaughn, Hannah, Kamila, Derik |

| <b>Arguments</b><br>You'll make the initial arguments for your side. Everyone should help come up with arguments. You'll need 3 speakers.  | <b>Arguments</b><br>You'll make the initial arguments for your side. Everyone should help come up with arguments. You'll need 3 speakers.  |
|--|--|
| 1. Preserve earth for future generations, better to deal with issue now since <b>resources are finite</b>  | 1. <b>Overconsumption is the issue</b> , and specifically, resource allocation.<br>2. -Carbon footprint diff<br>3. -Waste  |
| 2. <b>Pollution is present at a higher level in growing countries due to a lack of technology</b> and infrastructure to support the large/growing populations. Slowing the rate of growth would allow the governments to create a more stable infrastructure that could support the population without the high levels of pollution. | 2. <b>Food is not scarce</b><br><b>Plenty of land to grow food</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amount of arable land globally is increasing</li> <li>There is enough food on earth to feed everyone</li> </ul> <p>The current problem can be fixed w \$</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a price tag on fixing food insecurity</li> <li>It's 40 billion a year to fix world hunger</li> <li>This is a man-made problem that people profit from it</li> <li>Jeff has 241.9 Bil, He could feed everyone for 6.0475 years</li> <li>This could easily come from the federal budget we spend 200 billion on police</li> <li></li> </ul> <p>The current problem can be fixed with sustainable practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>40% of food is wasted in America fix that with policy</li> <li>Incentivising green diets like vegetarian</li> </ul> |
| 3. Because utilities (social and environmental) will become less available-- <b>fewer doctors etc.</b>   | 3. In the current economic situation, there is less of a need to have kids - so there is less of a desire to do so.<br><b>Women are more empowered to be independent and not have children as the focal point in their lives.</b>  |
| <b>YES</b><br><b>Second round</b><br><small>WINDOW BACK</small><br>Angie, Clayton, Victor, Liam, Cooper*, Jake*  | <b>NO</b><br><b>Second round</b><br><small>DOOR BACK</small><br>Olivia, Julianna, Hailey, Carla, Lucas, Drew   |
| <b>Arguments</b><br>Your job is to strengthen your side's case and rebut the other side. Everyone should help come up with arguments. You'll need 3 speakers.  | <b>Arguments</b><br>Your job is to strengthen your side's case and rebut the other side. Everyone should help come up with arguments. You'll need 3 speakers.  |
| 1. Consumption vs Population<br>a. Overconsumption stems from the bigger problem of Overpopulation, the bigger the   | 1. <b>Earth's resources are not a "hard stop" finite</b><br>a. Stagnant energy consumption per capita  |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>population, the higher the carbon footprint and bigger amount of waste created</p> <p>b. In terms of resource allocation, we have been progressively getting worse at it as the population has increased over time. Take <b>Earth's Overshoot Day</b>, when humanity consumes more resources than the Earth can regenerate in a given year. In 1968, the date was December 25th with a population of around 4 billion, whereas for today it is <b>July 24th</b> with a population of 8.2 billion.</p> | <p>i. If we use energy for so much more (we have phones, TVs, larger refrigerators, more tech) then we used to, then we are clearly becoming more efficient</p> <p>2. Societal advancement is a function of population growth. It makes our lives better., it expands markets and creates more opportunities to drive innovation. Our entire lives depend on the population growing, to drive innovation, create jobs.</p> <p>3. Overshoot day is a hallucination. If we had 8 billion people living as hunter gatherers the earth could obviously no support this. <b>Our society advances as population expands</b> and we are able to bend the finitude of earths resources. The earth cannot naturally support New york city</p> <div> </div>  |
| <p>2. <b>Food solutions would not be practical</b> within the current global economic framework and cultures.</p> <p>3. We cannot seize 240 billion from Bezos :, since overconsumption is an obvious issue, better solution would be only having one kid.</p>   | <p>2. Population isn't the problem today, numerically speaking -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Global fertility rate is current 2.2 and on the decline</li> <li>- Requirement for maintaining our current population sitting around 2.1</li> <li>- In Europe this rate is now below 1.5; in the US it is around 1.66 (indicating a shrinking population with development)</li> <li>- 1960's this was around 5.0 globally</li> </ul> <p><b>The issue today isn't the total number of people globally, but rather the impact of each member of it</b> (lifestyle, culture, etc) - environmental footprint / consumption varies greatly from individual to individual - one child solution is major cultural problem and issue for human rights (this will also shrink the population majorly - two parents to one child)</p> <div> </div> <p>(Hailey)</p> |
| <p>4. <b>Increased population leads to increased inequality:</b> Saturated labor pool, migration crises,</p>   | <p>3. Fallacy of false cause. <b>Population growth does not necessarily lead to increased inequality.</b> It's a correlation,</p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>labor exploitation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>5. Oversupply of labor leads to declining wages</li><li>6. More pressure for labor, bargaining power decreases</li><li>7. This is seen in the global south, high fertility, high exploitation from the consumption of the western world</li><li>8. You don't need infinite growth (its impossible)</li></ol> | <p>we have seen the population grow through time and inequality grow through time. Destruction of feudalism as population grows disproves this. We can also look at points in US history when inequality was declining and the population was increasing.</p> <p>Utilities are an issue of incentivizing those professions, lack of teachers, doctors, etc. is because of poor working conditions and low pay (Olivia)</p> |
|---|--|