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### Inherency

#### Despite mild progress, Biden’s policies fail to adequately empower workers toward a green economy. A green jobs guarantee is necessary

Markovčič & French 7/19/23
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Bidenomics” is a far cry from the type of expanded role for the state in the green transition that socialists have advocated in the form of a Bernie Sanders or Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez–style Green New Deal. Its limitations, however, ultimately stem from the political climate out of which it has emerged. The alternative vision, put forward by Sanders, AOC, and the few other left-wing elected officials in Congress, was to rapidly decarbonize the economy via a massive expansion of public ownership of industry and infrastructure, aimed at achieving full employment and increasing unionization. A Green New Deal of that sort would empower workers, reduce economic inequality, and make major steps toward democratizing the economy. If you squint, Bidenism appears to offer something that bears resemblance to the more radical aims of the US left. The role of socialists must be to point out the difference between the militaristic corporate handout that is the IRA, CHIPS Act, and associated policies, and the vision of redistribution and economic planning we need to confront climate change and inequality. This moment has shown publicly, for the first time in decades, the massive influence the state can have in managing the economy. The ultimate aims of socialists are for an end to great power conflict, the reconstruction of the global order in the interests of the international working class, and the democratization of the economy so that decisions around investment and workers’ conditions are made by the public. Biden’s agenda clearly does not seek to address these issues. Democrats are unwilling to base their proposals on anything that might smell like socialist principles or suggest insufficient reverence for the sanctity of private enterprise, so they are forced to justify exceptions to free-market dogma by the presence of the supposed threat of China. The point is not that socialists should advocate for “free trade” or oppose attempts to increase semiconductor production in the United States, but we must be careful not to get sucked into supporting Democrats’ increasingly militaristic posturing. This will be easier said than done. Absent a stronger social base and independent political voice, it will be difficult for socialists to explain how our support for investments in domestic industry differs from that of the anti-China hawks. This is not to say that there’s nothing for socialists to like in the Inflation Reduction Act and other Biden administration policies. At least in part due to the various subsidies provided, we are in the middle of a factory construction boom, with investment at a thirty-year high. In a relatively tight labor market like the one we have now, this could make it easier for workers to unionize, even in the traditionally nonunion South — like the 1,400 workers at a bus manufacturer in Fort Valley, Georgia, who just voted to unionize. And in New York, the Democratic Socialists of America (DSA) and allies recently pushed through a bill that makes use of federal IRA funds to direct the state to build public renewable energy, with strong labor protections for new green jobs. Yet these victories did not happen automatically, and neither will the many more larger wins we’ll need for a just transition. Even as legislation has included some modest labor provisions, it’s no accident that so much funding is flowing to right-to-work states. Prevailing wage requirements are restricted to a narrow set of jobs, and real employer neutrality or union labor mandates were left out of recent bills. It was not even a year ago that Biden and Congress denied railworkers the right to strike; we saw there how paper thin pro-union sentiment can be when profits are on the line. Socialists should be clear-eyed about the fact that government policy toward unions will remain ambivalent at best. When it comes to legislation, the Left cannot be content with being “junior partners” to a militaristic and corporate-friendly Democratic establishment. Socialists can’t be afraid to openly criticize Biden and the Democrats; we must build our own public identity and political organization, as groups like DSA are continuing to do, and agitate for ambitious pro-worker demands like a green jobs guarantee and public ownership of the energy system.

### Plan

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase fiscal redistribution in the United States by adopting a green jobs guarantee

### Solvency

#### Conditions for transitioning to green jobs are ripe now – a green jobs guarantee ensures this transition is equitable
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Climate action and economic prosperity are often put at odds. Shortly after the Green New Deal resolution was introduced to Congress by Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Senator Edward J. Markey, the narrative rapidly shifted away from discussing the details of the first proposed solution to climate change on the scale of the crisis, to discussing the economic feasibility of implementing such a plan. In reality, the Green New Deal addresses both concerns—addressing the climate crisis will grow our economy in addition to preventing immense economic losses that would result from inaction. When asking how much it would cost to address the climate emergency, the next question must be what is the cost of doing nothing? Aside from the immeasurable human suffering and invaluable human lives lost to the impacts of climate change, annual losses of hundreds of billions of dollars in some U.S. economic sectors are projected by the end of the century. To put this into perspective, the United States could experience yearly losses greater than the current GDP of many U.S. states. Still, the impact of climate action on our economy and jobs is a concern to many. And these questions are important ones. Addressing the climate emergency, namely achieving net-zero greenhouse gas emissions, requires large changes in almost all sectors of our economy. Decarbonizing our economy will mean job losses in some sectors, like natural gas and coal, and gains in others, renewable energy and green construction. But do these jobs exist and do they pay well? One of the key first steps in building a sustainable economy is the clean energy transition, i.e. obtaining our energy from non-fossil fuel sources. This transition has never been more feasible. In many regions of the U.S., solar and wind are beating natural gas and becoming the cheapest electricity generation technologies. E2’s 2018 Clean Jobs America report found that clean jobs in the U.S. already outnumbered fossil fuel jobs 3-to-1. And just in solar, jobs have increased by 167% over the last decade. Not only are clean jobs thriving, but their wages are comparable—the Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the mean hourly wage for the fossil fuel electric power generation sector is $41 compared to $43 for solar and $39 for wind. But these numbers are just averages, and when you look closer there is a shift in availability and wages of the most common jobs. Power plant operators receiving $40 an hour will be far and few compared to solar installers and wind technicians, currently receiving $21 and $28 an hour respectively. This is a big difference, and one that should not be ignored as the policy details of the Green New Deal are written. Globally, the International Labour Organization estimates a net 18 million jobs will be created by a clean energy transition that meets the Paris Agreement’s 2°C goal. A UMass Amherst study found that every $1 million dollars shifted from fossil fuels to clean energy results in a net increase of five jobs. And these are just clean energy jobs. Green jobs expand across more sectors than just energy, including zero-emission vehicles and charging infrastructure, building retrofits, agriculture, forestry, and also care work including health care workers and teachers. Although there will be a net increase in jobs, this will not come without losses—the International Labour Organization predicts 6 million lost jobs from a clean energy transition. This is why the Green New Deal’s just transition is crucial. A just transition means ensuring that displaced workers are protected with income support and a federal jobs guarantee—providing the necessary education, experience, and job training to perform low-carbon work with high wages in their communities. It’s great that addressing the climate crisis and ensuring a livable future means creating new jobs, however having these jobs in the right places is just as important as the total number of jobs created. Green jobs must be available in communities where fracking or coal industries are the main employer. These jobs should also be available to frontline and vulnerable communities, those that will be disproportionately affected by climate change. The Green New Deal aims to protect these communities, which include “indigenous peoples, communities of color, migrant communities, deindustrialized communities, depopulated rural communities, the poor, low-income workers, women, the elderly, the unhoused, people with disabilities, and youth.” Investing in these communities is not only just, but pivotal for the widespread support necessary to adopt the Green New Deal’s plan for a livable future. The Green New Deal is the solution to the jobs issue. We can mitigate and adapt to climate change, create millions of good jobs, and ensure no one is left behind.

#### Green jobs works, is feasible, and is necessary to transition from fossil fuels
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By now everyone has heard about the Green New Deal; from the Sunrise Movement protesting on Capitol Hill, to the many threads discussing it on social media, the “GND” is a policy the world is eager to talk about. However, it has not always been like this. About two and a half years ago I wrote a piece trying to introduce the general public to the Job Guarantee (JG). Back then, the topic seemed restricted to the circles of lefty publications, Keynesian economists, and a handful of Economic Departments across the world. Now, however, the Job Guarantee has been catapulted into mainstream discourse, thanks to increased popular interest on the GND and MMT. Nevertheless, even two years ago, there was some precautionary excitement about the Job Guarantee among some advocates of Keynesian spending and proponents of Modern Money Theory (MMT), who have been working on this concept for a long time. Their perspective is amicable to this idea because they are unafraid of a government deficit, and in favor of direct job creation. They understand that deficit-spending is not inherently bad and that the US government will never have to default on its debt. When the economy is not at full employment, increasing the deficit would actually be helpful, not harmful. However, financial feasibility should not be the only concern when implementing the Job Guarantee. One of the most important dichotomies in Economics lies between growth and environmental sustainability. It is believed that economic growth is damaging to the planet but eco-friendly policies are bound to stun the economy. This, however, is not necessarily the case. It is possible to have both economic flourishing and care for the planet – if we implement a Green Job Guarantee. If we’re going to be at full employment, we have to do it in a way the planet can handle it. A fiscal stimulus aimed at reducing unemployment is timely and necessary. Despite the confidence expressed by the Fed about the latest employment numbers, the situation for those who are jobless is not looking good. One of the reasons for the latest rate hike by the Fed was their positive outlook on unemployment numbers. Chairman Yellen had gone as far as saying that at 4.6% unemployment rate we were close to full employment and fiscal stimulus is not necessary to reach that goal. However, the US economy keeps adding thousands of jobs every month despite official unemployment dipping below 4%. The low official joblessness rate hides the fact that an increasing number of Americans have left the labor force altogether. For example, there are currently over 5 million Americans who are not in the labor force but have reported that they want a job. This is where a Job Guarantee program could come in handy. In short, the government would act as an Employer of Last Resort, effectively guaranteeing a job to all of those willing and able to work. The current structure of the economy relies too heavily on fossil fuels, wasteful production methods and non-renewable resources. Unless we change this, sustaining full-employment would result in increasing production, consumption, and waste. This reminds me of my favorite Keynes’ quote, “In the long run we are all dead.” If we’re talking about a long run of increasing pollution, he would surely be right. As we know, too much of a good thing can be a bad thing. This applies to jobs too. Unless the jobs created are green jobs, too much employment will bring us to environmental destruction. How do we do it? The issue of the environmental sustainability of a Job Guarantee program has been on my mind since I first heard of the revolutionary employment policy. Mathew Forstater’s Green Jobs proposal has been inspirational to my work. In my Master’s thesis, I tweaked its existing framework to target environmentally sustainable outcomes. I find that we can transform the Job Guarantee program to ensure its sustainability without increasing its cost. Here’s how: I set up the program in a way that promotes social enterprise and community development, following the work of Pavlina Tcherneva and colleagues. With the help of social entrepreneurs, NGOs, and Nonprofit Organizations, local communities should decide what projects will be undertaken. For example, communities along the Hudson River could support a program where workers dealt with invasive species such as the zebra mussel and water chestnut. Other localities could handle neighborhood farming, recycling centers, flood containment structures, bike paths, etc. It’s been found that if the community is involved in determining what projects are taken on, participation levels are higher. A more detailed account of my proposal and calculations is available upon request, but this is the gist of it: I used an Input-Output model to establish what would be the cost of employing the official U-3 unemployed population into “green” Job Guarantee jobs. That framework accounts for indirect job creation related to the proposal, but not induced employment. What I find is that the US government can, under conservative assumptions, employ all of those who are officially unemployed for around 1.1% of GDP while paying them a $15hr wage. That is about 17% of the annual military budget. The Green Job Guarantee program is projected to cost just under 200 billion dollars per year in order to ensure employment for 7.8 million people. As the world economy quickly transitions into a more sustainable state, a shift in the productive structure will occur, rendering some current occupations useless. Workers who are employed in areas like fossil fuel energy generation (the fabled coal workers of the American Midwest for example) will be left without a job and unlikely to find a new one right away. There is no way to predict how quickly this transition will occur: it could be a gradual–albeit fast–process if led by government initiative, a slower and insufficient movement if guided by profit motives, or even a sudden transition caused by a widespread popular response to natural disasters. Given current trends, I don’t believe it’s too optimistic to think the transition to a renewable energy generation and a sustainable economy will occur before the fossil reserves are depleted. As such, fossil fuel workers (and those who depend on their consumption) are at risk of losing their jobs in the near future. A Job Guarantee program would allow those workers to not only find employment readily but also to acquire on-the-job skills that will allow them an easier transition into the Green economy. As we continue to criticize and investigate the policy ideas being put out there, let’s look beyond the government deficit, and consider the planet too. Whether you’re afraid of government debt or not, you should be concerned with the destruction of the earth. If we are going to have a public program that aims at generating new jobs and bringing people back into the workforce, then that program should be a Job Guarantee. But, if we’re going to guarantee jobs, they will have to be green. And we have all the tools we need to make that happen.\*

### Climate

#### Climate change is already creating irrevocable damage to communities and ecosystems, immediate transition from
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The world is likely to pass a dangerous temperature threshold within the next 10 years, pushing the planet past the point of catastrophic warming — unless nations drastically transform their economies and immediately transition away from fossil fuels, according to one of the most definitive reports ever published about climate change. Want to know how your actions can help make a difference for our planet? Sign up for the Climate Coach newsletter, in your inbox every Tuesday and Thursday. The report released Monday by the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) found that the world is likely to surpass its most ambitious climate target — limiting warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius (2.7 degrees Fahrenheit) above preindustrial temperatures — by the early 2030s. Beyond that threshold, scientists have found, climate disasters will become so extreme that people will not be able to adapt. Basic components of the Earth system will be fundamentally, irrevocably altered. Heat waves, famines and infectious diseases could claim millions of additional lives by century’s end. At our current global pace of carbon emissions, the world will burn through its remaining “carbon budget” by 2030. Doing so would put the long-term goal of keeping global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius (2.7 degrees Fahrenheit) irrevocably out of reach. Why the goal of 1.5 degrees Celsius? Keeping warming below this threshold would help save the world’s coral reefs and preserve the Arctic’s protective sea ice layer. It could also stave off dramatic sea level rise by avoiding further destabilization in Antarctica and Greenland. So where do we stand now? The world has already warmed more than 1.1 degrees Celsius (2 degrees Fahrenheit) above preindustrial temperatures. We charted over 1,200 different scenarios for climate change over the coming century; of those, 230 pathways achieve the warming goal — although only 112 may be realistic. What can be done? Not all hope is lost. Tackling global warming is an enormous feat, but there are many people, organizations and activists making bold strides. We’re tracking their stories in our Climate Solutions section. Human activities have already transformed the planet at a pace and scale unmatched in recorded history, the IPCC said, causing irreversible damage to communities and ecosystems. Yet global emissions continue to rise, and current carbon-cutting efforts are wildly insufficient to ward off climate catastrophe. Monday’s assessment synthesizes years of studies on the causes and consequences of rising temperatures, leading U.N. Secretary General António Guterres to demand that developed countries such as the United States eliminate carbon emissions by 2040 — a decade earlier than the rest of the world. With few nations on track to fulfill their climate commitments and with the developing world already suffering disproportionately from climate disasters, he said, rich countries have a responsibility to act faster than their low-income counterparts. The IPCC report shows humanity has reached a “critical moment in history,” IPCC Chair Hoesung Lee said. The world has all the knowledge, tools and financial resources needed to achieve its climate goals, but after decades of disregarding scientific warnings and delaying climate efforts, the window for action is rapidly closing. Calling the report a “how-to guide to defuse the climate time-bomb,” Guterres announced on Monday an “acceleration agenda” that would speed up global actions on climate. Emerging economies including China and India — which plan to reach net zero in 2060 and 2070, respectively — must hasten their emissions-cutting efforts alongside developed nations, Guterres said. Both the U.N. chief and the IPCC also called for the world to phase out coal, oil and gas, which are responsible for more than three-quarters of global greenhouse gas emissions. “This report offers hope, and it provides a warning,” Lee told reporters Monday. “The choices we make now and in the next few years will reverberate around the world for hundreds, even thousands, of years.” A stark scientific outlook Already, the IPCC’s synthesis report shows, humanity has fundamentally and irreversibly transformed the Earth system. Emissions from burning fossil fuels and other planet-warming activities have increased global average temperatures by at least 1.1 degrees Celsius (2 degrees Fahrenheit) since the start of the industrial era. The amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere hasn’t been this high since archaic humans carved the first stone tools. These changes have caused irrevocable damage to communities and ecosystems, evidence shows: Fish populations are dwindling, farms are less productive, infectious diseases have multiplied, and weather disasters are escalating to unheard-of extremes. The risks from this relatively low level of warming are turning out to be greater than scientists anticipated — not because of any flaw in their research, but because human-built infrastructure, social networks and economic systems have proved exceptionally vulnerable to even small amounts of climate change, the report said. The suffering is worst in the world’s poorest countries and low-lying island nations, which are home to roughly 1 billion people yet account for less than 1 percent of humanity’s total planet-warming pollution, the report says. But as climate disruption increases with rising temperatures, not even the wealthiest and most well-protected places will be immune. Homes in Pakistan's southwestern Baluchistan province were inundated in August. (Zahid Hussain/AP) In 2018, the IPCC found that a 1.5C world would be overwhelmingly safer than one that is 2 degrees Celsius (3.6 degrees Fahrenheit) warmer than the preindustrial era. At the time, scientists said humanity would have to zero out carbon emissions by 2050 to meet the 1.5-degree target and by 2070 to avoid warming beyond 2 degrees. Five years later, humanity isn’t anywhere close to reaching either goal. Unless nations adopt new environmental policies — and follow through on the ones already in place — global average temperatures could warm by 3.2 degrees Celsius (5.8 degrees Fahrenheit) by the end of the century, the synthesis report says. In that scenario, a child born today would live to see several feet of sea level rise, the extinction of hundreds of species and the migration of millions of people from places where they can no longer survive. “We are not doing enough, and the poor and vulnerable are bearing the brunt of our collective failure to act,” said Madeleine Diouf Sarr, Senegal’s top climate official and the chair for a group of least-developed countries that negotiate together at the United Nations. She pointed to the damage wrought by Cyclone Freddy, the longest-lasting and most energetic tropical storm on record, which has killed hundreds of people and displaced thousands more after bombarding southern Africa and Madagascar for more than a month. The report shows that higher temperatures make storms more powerful and sea level rise makes flooding from these storms more intense. Meanwhile, the report says, the death toll from these kinds of disasters is 15 times as high in vulnerable nations as it is in wealthier parts of the world. If the world stays on its current warming track, the IPCC says, global flood damage will be as much as four times as high as it will be if people limit temperature rise to 1.5 degrees. “The world cannot ignore the human cost of inaction,” Sarr said. The price of delay Though much of the synthesis report echoes warnings scientists have issued for decades, the assessment is notable for the blunt certainty of its rhetoric. The phrase “high confidence” appears nearly 200 times in the 36-page summary chapter. Humanity’s responsibility for all of the warming of the global climate system is described as an unassailable “fact.” Yet the report also details how public officials, private investors and other powerful groups have repeatedly failed to heed those warnings. More than 40 percent of cumulative carbon emissions have occurred since 1990 — when the IPCC published its first study on the dangerous consequences of unchecked warming. Governments continue to subsidize fossil fuel use; banks and businesses invest far more in polluting industries than they do in climate solutions. The consumption habits of the wealthiest 10 percent of people generate three times as much pollution as those of the poorest 50 percent, the report said. Decades of delay have denied the world any hope of an easy and gradual transition to a more sustainable economy, the panel says. Now, only “deep, rapid and … immediate” efforts across all aspects of society — combined with still-unproven technologies to pull carbon from the atmosphere — will be able to stave off catastrophe.

#### A green job guarantee is necessary to avert climate change and spills over into more sustainable and equitable development
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As a framework for climate legislation, the Green New Deal arose in response to the environmental wreckage and growing inequality that are a direct product of fossil-fuelled capitalism. The only way to meet our climate obligations is to transform our economy—not just away from fossil fuels, but also to be more equitable and inclusive. The GND therefore combines financial help for transitioning energy workers with secure universal pensions for all, good quality housing, highwage job creation, expanded public services (health care, child care, elder care and transit), restored public and natural spaces, and a new internationalism based on solidarity and true development. Absolutely central to the Canadian Green New Deal movement is decolonization and Indigenous rights. “We will not achieve climate justice without Indigenous human rights. UNDRIP and the right to free and informed prior consent are central to our struggle,” says Leah Gazan, newly elected NDP MP for Winnipeg Centre, and one of Our Time’s Green New Deal champions. The social policy piece of the GND is crucial for two reasons. First, making a job guarantee and expansion of public services part of our demands is how we build support for the mass movement we need to make this happen. Second, an economy centered on care work, along with sustainable food production, housing, and transportation, is what a low-carbon economy looks like.

#### Combining social and environmental policy through a GJG builds support and spills over into further climate action
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The impacts of climate change are already being felt around the world (IPCC 2014, USGCRP 2018). Yet, governments have struggled to enact climate policies at the scale of the crisis and are not on track to keep warming below 2 ◦ C (Raftery et al 2017). As the world’s largest economy, the United States plays a pivotal role in the global effort to reduce emissions. But the U.S. has thus far failed to enact federal climate policy, and even state-level efforts to address climate change are being rolled back in some cases (Mildenberger 2020, Stokes 2020). Global efforts to combat climate change require the emergence of domestic US political coalitions in favor of ambitious climate reforms. And yet, despite apparently strong public support for action to address climate change (Bergquist and Warshaw 2019, Mildenberger et al 2017), a bipartisan support coalition has proven elusive. To break policy gridlock, US climate advocates have begun to champion a new strategy: linking climate policy to social and economic reforms. These advocates view climate change as one of several inter-linked crises that amplify poverty, inequality, and social vulnerability (Brulle and Pellow 2006, Mohai et al 2009). Some federal, state, and local politicians have embraced this policy bundling approach. Federal politicians have proposed a ‘Green New Deal’ that combines investments to transition carbon-intensive sectors—such as electricity, transportation, and industry—with reforms to economic and social policies—including healthcare, the minimum wage, and housing. New York’s Climate Leadership and Community Protection Act, passed in June 2019, combined aggressive climate policies with targeted investments in disadvantaged communities. The two largest cities in the United States— Los Angeles and New York City—have also adopted policies that would dramatically reduce carbon emissions while creating new jobs. These debates have also found new relevance in the context of the COVID19 health and economic crisis. Governments around the world are debating whether and how to leverage stimulus packages to simultaneously manage climate risks and support economic recovery. This bundling effort represents a fundamental shift in political strategy. Instead of building an elite bipartisan coalition as prior federal efforts did (Skocpol 2013), these advocates seek to mobilize massive public support, including constituencies who may not consider themselves ‘environmentalists’. As such, bundling climate policy with progressive social and economic programs reflects an effort to expand the scope of political conflict (Schattschneider 1975) to engage new voters. These efforts view social movements as central to enactment. Conversely, this strategy moves away away from bipartisanship as the central feature of federal climate policymaking (Layzer 2012, Mildenberger 2020) and could even alienate centrists or conservatives. Will combining climate, economic, and social policy increase public support for climate action relative to previous climate advocacy strategies? Prior research suggests that emphasizing co-benefits such as economic development and public health can expand support for climate policy (Rabe 2004, Myers et al 2012, Stokes and Warshaw 2017). The policy bundling strategy exemplified in the Green New Deal goes a step further, by synthesizing across seemingly distinct policy areas. To date, we have lacked empirical evidence to assess advocates’ claims that bundling climate policy with economic and social programs can deliver broader support coalitions. Here, we offer a rigorous empirical test of this new coalition-building strategy. First, we use a conjoint survey experiment to evaluate whether integrating climate policy with economic and social policy reforms expands or shrinks public support for climate action. Next, we use a second conjoint experiment to examine how specific climate policies—including carbon pricing, clean energy standards, technology investments, and transportation policies—change the size of support coalitions. This analysis builds on work assessing variation in support for different policy instruments (e.g. Lachapelle et al (2012)). Our conjoint design allows us to examine public preferences in a choice setting that mirrors the tradeoffs inherent to real policy debates. Finally, we explore the composition of a potential coalition by analyzing differences in support by partisanship, race, and income. Overall, we find climate policy bundles that include social and economic reforms such as affordable housing, a $15 minimum wage, or a job guarantee increase US public support for climate mitigation. Clean energy standards, regardless of what technologies are included, also make climate policies more popular. Linking climate policy to economic and social issues is particularly effective at expanding support among people of color. This is notable, since these are the communities most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and to the costs of climate policy (Harlan et al 2015).

#### Allowing the climate to continue warming only a few points of a degree will create significant habitat loss, further heating will create a mass extinction event

Santos & Lane 23

Vicky Santos is the News Content Manager for the University of Buffalo, She has 15 years of experience as a communicator in higher education having served as the director of news and media services for the College of Liberal Arts at Auburn University, in Auburn, AL. Chris Lane is a writer for UBNow, the University of Buffalo newspaper. "Climate change to push species, reduce their habitats." Published by UBNow on May 30, 2023. Available here: (https://www.buffalo.edu/ubnow/stories/2023/05/wilson-climate-change.html) - AP

A new study led by a team of researchers, including UB geographer Adam Wilson, found that climate change will expose species to temperatures above those they have experienced over the past 150 years and may drastically reduce their available habitat. Even a small environmental variation can lead to a large and abrupt change in the area that a species can persist, researchers found. For example, if the temperature of a species’ habitat rises too high, the species may only survive by moving to a new location, which can be impossible. The study, published in Nature Ecology & Evolution, predicts when and where climate change is likely to expose species across the globe to potentially dangerous temperatures. The authors — Wilson; Alex L. Pigot, University College London; Cory Merow, University of Connecticut; and Christopher H. Trisos, University of Cape Town — analyzed data from more than 35,000 species of animals (including mammals, amphibians, reptiles, birds, corals, fish, whales and plankton) and seagrasses from every continent and ocean basin, alongside climate projections running up to 2100. They investigated when areas within each species’ geographical range will cross a threshold of thermal exposure, defined as the first five consecutive years where temperatures consistently exceed the most extreme monthly temperature experienced by a species across its geographic range over recent history — 1850-2014. Once the thermal exposure threshold is crossed, the animal is not necessarily going to die out, but there is also no evidence that it can survive the higher temperatures due to climate change. “The loss of biodiversity is concerning because it threatens the stability of ecosystems, disrupts essential ecological processes, and undermines the well-being of both human societies and the planet as a whole,” says Wilson, associate professor in the Department of Geography. The researchers found a consistent trend that for many animals, the thermal exposure threshold will be crossed for much of their geographic range within the same decade. “Our findings suggest that once we start to notice that a species is suffering under unfamiliar conditions, there may be very little time before most of its range becomes inhospitable, so it’s important that we identify in advance which species may be at risk in coming decades,” says Pigot, the study’s lead author. While some animals may be able to survive these higher temperatures, many other animals will need to move to cooler regions or evolve to adapt, which they likely cannot do in such short timeframes. “To minimize biodiversity loss due to climate change, it is crucial to implement effective conservation strategies, promote sustainable land and resource management practices, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions to mitigate the impacts of climate change on ecosystems,” Wilson says. The researchers found that the extent of global warming makes a big difference: If the planet warms by 1.5°C, 15% of the species they studied would be at risk of experiencing unfamiliarly hot temperatures across at least 30% of their existing geographic range in a single decade; this doubles to 30% of species at 2.5°C of warming. “Our study is yet another example of why we need to urgently reduce carbon emissions to mitigate the harmful effects climate change is having on animals and plants, and avoid a massive extinction crisis,” Pigot says.

### Worker Protections

#### Green Job Guarantees are necessary to decarbonize the economy and alleviate the need for year-round work
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A second, related mechanism to help insulate the economy against extreme heat would be the adoption of a job guarantee via a permanent public works program. Echoing climate activists, Pavlina R. Tcherneva, an economist at the Levy Institute, proposes a job guarantee “can be designed as a ‘National Care Act’ that addresses the environmental and care needs of communities.” It would cover a range “of ‘invisible’ environmental work that is labor-intensive and can be done by people of various skill levels”— more routine upkeep of municipal infrastructure, for instance, but also an array of projects that can amplify efforts by less wealthy cities and towns to achieve decarbonization. This permanent program would have a degree of elasticity to accommodate labor market fluctuations that are likely to be directly influenced by the climate. Of course, public works projects involve significant amounts of outdoor labor, which would have to pause in the event of extreme heat, just as analogous activity in the private sector would. Supplemented by more generous and automated unemployment insurance, a “climate corps”-driven job guarantee could, however, lubricate voluntary transitions from employment in the private sector to the public one and back. If increasing numbers of firms begin to organize fiscal and operational calendars that account for major, climate-based periods of inactivity, workers that need or want additional income during these forced lulls can arrange to temporarily participate in a job guarantee program. Because public works do not need to meet customer demand the way most private enterprises do, nonhazardous, purposeful duties can be assigned and modulated during the cooling intervals of an extended heatwave. As with private sector occupations that would become nocturnal during riskier parts of the year, some job guarantee programs should include bonuses or overtime pay for highly unconventional schedules. The base pay should also exceed the $15 per hour that job guarantee advocates originally recommended before the pandemic. “Unless governments design regulatory frameworks that are applicable at the international level, heat stress will have exponential ramifications for human development.” There are other potential social and political benefits to a job guarantee. It could rebuild confidence in the public sector that transcends political polarization between major cities and less urban areas, which has exacerbated the anti-majoritarian features of the U.S. political system. By alleviating pressures to sustain year-round operations, it may also temper greatly the aversion to socialized employment that a large faction of capitalists has historically held. Expanded care work, meanwhile, would relieve parents who are able to work from home or are otherwise employed in more “climate-proof” fields from having to attend to children or other vulnerable family members. Alongside far more robust public investments in the training required to sustain a green economy — think not only of jobs in the advanced sciences, but of electricians and other trades overlooked by the “knowledge economy” — a job guarantee could help underpin a “just transition” for workers and regions that are most dependent on carbon-intensive industries. Combined with this new, more egalitarian division of labor, a job guarantee would help keep more firms afloat in the long run by facilitating “track switching” — shifting workers between the public and private sectors in a way that would allow them to more flexibly plan their lives without loss of income. This would ensure a modicum of output when other forms of economic activity, particularly those that are services-based, are compelled to radically slacken or halt. At the same time, the political onus to achieve full employment would finally hinge on public entities instead of markets, whose innate volatility and jealously-guarded centers of power have always kept true full employment an elusive target. The nature of the guarantee would thus inject a certain level of stability into macroeconomic conditions that a neoliberal approach to climate adaptation and labor flexibility would most certainly not. Indeed, the record of neoliberal labor markets suggests only chaos would prevail as extreme heat becomes virtually ubiquitous. In the 40-plus years of increased employment in low-wage services, much of the American workforce has experienced the petty anarchy of “just-in-time” scheduling or on-call labor, the deceptive exploitation of “wearing multiple hats,” and the ordeal of having to juggle multiple, ever-varying income streams. The walkouts and strikes that have occurred during the pandemic are a mere hint of the collapse that awaits employment based on maximally extractive flexibility. By contrast, a job guarantee will likely introduce a qualitatively different form of discipline into markets, especially as companies are forced to reckon with extreme heat. Transparent and increasingly democratic firm-level planning might finally take precedence over practices meant to obtain short-term efficiencies from employees, which are often at the expense of their wages and mental and physical health. Alongside indicative planning and more direct forms of state-driven development, a job guarantee may also hasten the exit of firms whose business model cannot be reasonably adapted to climate change. As the economist J.W. Mason has suggested with regard to the relative increase in worker power that tight labor markets yield, the elimination of businesses that cannot improve employee welfare is ultimately good for the health and productivity of the national economy. This phenomenon will be far more pronounced when extended heatwaves reveal which businesses refuse to meet the most elemental of employee demands for better pay and safer work conditions. “If there were ever a moment that called for a positive, humanistic interpretation of biopolitics, it is now.” Of course, measures to reduce working hours and, in some cases, radically change our relationship to productive labor will need to be undergirded by an expanded welfare state. That will require much more political will than was glimpsed at the peak of the 2020-2021 crisis, when enhanced unemployment insurance, extended Medicaid coverage, and what amounted to an experiment in monthly cash transfers for families with children previewed the social rights that the American state is amply capable of providing. Some will dismiss these proposals as impractical and utopian. Setting aside the obvious political challenges that a climate-based labor policy will face, there are reasons to believe millions are anxious for government to fully recognize that economic security and climate adaptation are mutually reinforcing. Young people know that the alternative, at minimum, is spiraling underdevelopment. Skeptics should consider that since the 1990-91 recession, “jobless” recoveries have been the underlying fact of continued but largely anemic economic growth in the U.S. Due to asset inflation and increasing amounts of wealth tied up in globalized financial markets (as well as more regressive taxation and redistribution), each rebound has primarily benefitted the top 10% while eliminating the kind of steady jobs that once underpinned upward mobility and a family wage for blue-collar workers. This dynamic deferred the fixed investment in renewable energy production and related technology needed to adapt our entire social infrastructure to climate change — investment that would have generated more decent jobs and curtailed the rise of staggering inequality. As supporters of a green developmental agenda have recognized, the result of myopic governance and short-term profit-seeking has been decades of lost growth in the real economy. The advent of life-threatening extreme heat that is dispersed in rough cycles with immense geographic variability will dwarf these socioeconomic consequences. Growth that could have built sustainability for the present moment is now being desperately sought just as climate change introduces more and more contingency in the maintenance of everyday economic life. More than extreme heat, the increase in wet-bulb globe temperatures will expose the folly of failing to devise new regulations and systems to reallocate labor toward greater social and environmental utility. Where the “urban heat island effect” is most serious, the logic of disposability that propels gig worker platforms could turn deadly. If there were ever a moment that called for a positive, humanistic interpretation of biopolitics — in which a planning apparatus was implemented to avert regular, mass exposure to atmospheric conditions that can trigger organ failure — it is now. If we are to secure a more holistic form of development and avert permanent decline, we must not only unyoke our economy from fossil fuels, but plan, with ingenuity and courage, for the limits that the sovereign force of extreme heat will impose. By redefining how labor markets should function and the state’s role in determining them, we can create a bridge to an economy that can endure at least some of the climate shocks on the horizon.

#### Green jobs solves – they span a variety of industries, skills, and functions creating flexibility and promoting sustainable development
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Green jobs have only been a subject of economic research for the past fifteen years. Notable reports began appearing in peer reviewed journals since roughly 2004, when economist Mathew Forstater proposed a green public service employment program.20 In 2008, the Political Economy Research Institute published a report proposing a two-year, $100 billion recovery program to create 2 million energy efficiency jobs.21 But until the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) launched its green jobs study in 2010, there was no comprehensive, unified way to track green jobs in the economy. Since then, the definition of green jobs most frequently used in reports studying the green economy comes from the BLS (which, from here on, this report will refer to as the standard definition).22 The BLS project was conceived during the implementation of the 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), which, under Van Jones’ advisorship, included policies to boost renewable energy production. To fund the project, the 2010 Consolidated Appropriations Act—which made appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies—included $8 million for the BLS to measure green jobs in order to “to develop information on (1) the number of and trend over time in green jobs, (2) the industrial, occupational, and geographic distribution of the jobs, and (3) the wages of the workers in these jobs.”23 The program unfortunately was defunded in 2013, leaving researchers to study the patchwork sector without a consistent source of data. The standard definition of green jobs used by the BLS in their study captures ideas from all three waves of environmentalism described above, including work in conservation, regulation, and all major sectors targeted for decarbonization. According to the BLS, “Green jobs are either a) Jobs in businesses that produce goods or provide services that benefit the environment or conserve natural resources; or b) Jobs in which workers’ duties involve making their establishment’s production processes more environmentally friendly or use fewer natural resources.”24 The definition classifies green jobs into three major categories: renewable energy production, energy efficiency, and environmental management. Renewable energy jobs include all occupations throughout the wind, solar, hydro, biomass, geothermal, and nuclear energy supply chain, including but not limited to those engaged with surveying and mapping, technical consulting, geological services, lawyers, accountants and financial services, electrical, mechanical, and project engineers, construction, marketing, sales, transportation, permitting, installation, quality assurance, and maintenance. Energy efficiency jobs include jobs related to reducing energy intensity in buildings, appliances, and transportation. Occupations related to energy efficiency include, but are not limited to, heating and air conditioning mechanics and installers, plumbers and pipefitters, roofers, and manufacturers of energy efficient products, including household Energy Star appliances, manufacturers that use recycled products as inputs, public transportation workers, workers making and selling electric and hybrid cars or car parts, and workers building and maintaining a more resilient energy grid. Environmental management jobs are those that directly relate to the environmental health, including but not limited to recycling material collectors, septic and sewer pipe cleaners and remediation, conservation scientists, environmental engineers, water and wastewater treatment operators, forest management and park workers, environmental educators, regulators, compliance workers, and legislators. The Green Goods and Services (GGS) survey that the BLS administered in 2010 and 2011 tracked workers in firms engaged in the provisioning of goods and services in these categories. According to the survey, which identified over 300 detailed industries (out of more than 1,000 industries identified in the Census’ North American Industry Classification System) involved in the production of green goods and services, sectors with the largest number of green jobs are construction, manufacturing, and professional, scientific, and technical services.25 These job classifications align heavily with the more recent eras of environmental work in sustainability and regulation.

#### Heat deaths tear through climate impacted jobs, ripple out to local communities, disrupting critical supply chains
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We are going to feel the economic impacts of extreme and protracted heat long before we might experience the fallout from many other climate tipping points — the consequences, for example, of failing to contain global warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius by 2030. Projections that outdoor workers in the U.S. could suffer at least one week of unbearable heat by 2050 may understate its growing severity and mounting consequences, particularly for developing countries. When it becomes too hot to work for significant parts of the year, the recessionary effects could be akin to those experienced by regions and populations that have struggled with decades of disinvestment. Trade and industrial policies in the U.S. that promise to re-shore or “friend”-shore supply chains in order to promote national economic resilience will consequently be undermined, creating the potential for a new type of stagflation that postpones investment in critical industries at the worst possible juncture.

In the near-term, extreme heat may not result in the scale of death and illness wrought by the COVID-19 pandemic. But unlike a global pandemic, it will not be a once-in-a-century event, which required extraordinary fiscal support to restore the basics of economic activity. Rather, it will be a regular yet fluctuating aspect of each passing year. The failure of public policy to meet that challenge will ensure that global inflation for certain necessities does not abate, while contracting overall capacity to produce and consume the things that make modern society cohere. Purchasing power among workers and much of the middle class will erode substantially, shrinking demand for skilled work, which will stunt the life chances of younger generations amid an aging, increasingly care-dependent population.

“Failing to plan for the problem of extreme heat and labor could grind the energy transition to an agonizing crawl and limit our ability to avoid catastrophe.”

Lethal heat is, of course, just one example of the extreme weather events already afflicting the globe. From massive, uncontrollable wildfires to hurricanes that shut down entire energy grids to the catastrophic monsoon that Pakistan experienced this past summer, devastating climate events are now a fact of life. Yet persistent, dangerous heat is uniquely insidious. Unless governments design regulatory frameworks with standards and enforcement that are applicable at the international level, heat stress will have exponential ramifications for human development.

Numerous organizations have sounded the alarm about its effects on working conditions, labor productivity and public health. The Union of Concerned Scientists has warned that the United States’ roughly 32 million outdoor workers “have up to 35 times the risk of dying from heat exposure than does the general population,” and that “$39.3 to $55.4 billion in outdoor workers’ earnings would be at risk annually by midcentury.” At around one fifth of the country’s total labor force, outdoor workers’ projected income drop will tear through local economies and municipal budgets while also drying up foreign remittances sent by immigrant laborers, who make up roughly between a fifth and a third of this group.

Globally, the crisis posed by heat stress is even more dire. The International Labour Organization (ILO) has warned that in 2030, an estimated “2.2% of total working hours worldwide will be lost to high temperatures — a productivity loss equivalent to 80 million full time jobs.” This conservative estimate assumes there will be a certain percentage of days with reduced sun exposure, which is essential for construction and agricultural work — but if those days conducive to outdoor labor become dramatically fewer, the loss in productivity would increase to an equivalent of 136 million lost jobs.

These numbers, however, don’t fully convey how potentially tens of millions of people being unable to work may effectively suspend major parts of the global economy during future heatwaves. According to a 2020 report by Somini Sengupta for The New York Times, under a moderate warming scenario, significant portions of the Global South will suffer annually between 100 and 200 days of temperatures above 95 degrees Fahrenheit over the next two decades. Beyond leading to crop failures and a diminished capacity to harvest and process foodstuffs, such conditions could dramatically interrupt the mining of minerals that are critical to the production of renewables.

#### Its try or die for decarbonizing the economy – each year worsening heat will cascade into the workforce halting developments toward a sustainable society
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Nearly every country and economic sector is heading for a tipping point that could derail efforts to decarbonize the economy: A time when it will be too hot to work for weeks every year, not just isolated days. Farm and outdoor workers, low-income people dependent on public transit and those who work indoors without adequate cooling would face potential dire health effects, leading to massive productivity loss with significant negative feedback loops for development. Our food, sanitation and energy grid systems would all become more precarious as a result.

While the problem of heat and labor is often overshadowed by other apocalyptic climate scenarios and tipping points, it is an urgent one nonetheless — failing to plan for it could grind the energy transition to an agonizing crawl and limit our ability to avoid catastrophe. To address this problem, we will have to reorganize everyday economic life around what the human body can bear.

Neither warnings about the loss of growth and purchasing power nor decreased life expectancy fully capture what’s at stake. Permanent health damage arising from recurrent exposure to extreme heat will result in higher rates of effective disability and force early exits from the labor market. In the U.S., in particular, it will overwhelm a health care system rife with underpaid labor, private bureaucratic inefficiencies and predatory billing practices. Like other components of the country’s patchwork welfare state, Supplemental Security Income is not designed to meet a ballooning demand for government assistance. Particularly among immigrant communities, participation in the informal economy may only increase among younger generations to cover family budgets stretched thin by chronically ill former breadwinners. Those who are dependent on Medicaid or the Affordable Care Act’s health insurance marketplace may likewise slide into the informal economy if employment conditions in lower-end services, retail and manufacturing become too onerous.

New labor market interventions are thus needed not only to undergird the energy transition but to preserve the social objectives historically ascribed to economic development and full employment — a goal long championed by labor unions, left Keynesians, civil rights activists and the “paleo” left more broadly. As understood by these groups, full employment has always meant economic policies that guarantee a job with a living wage to everyone who wants to work; in theory, this requires investment by the public sector in programs that ensure employment keeps pace with innovation. While a universal basic income could be part of the solution, it does not provide a means to plan for extended shortfalls in productivity and the most socially necessary forms of labor.

Instead, full employment should be redefined in both practical and radical ways. Climate change will undoubtedly sharpen the difference between purposeful, desirable jobs and their opposite while also reducing most people’s threshold for daily productivity. If the labor pool shrinks for ill-compensated formal employment at the same time that both higher-income professionals and manual laborers demand fewer working hours, public policy will have to move in a direction that guarantees work and distributes production in a manner that compresses differentials in hours and wages. In fact, there are already ideas in progressive policy circles that governments can adapt to preempt or offset the economic risks of extreme heat and introduce a “pro-social,” as opposed to “pro-market,” spectrum of labor flexibility.

# Extensions

## Inherency

#### The lack of social welfare policies in the status quo is a matter of political will
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In late March, as COVID-19 spread, Congress passed the largest federal bailout in modern American history. Despite adding $2 trillion to the already $25 trillion national debt, the bill received unanimous support--even from well-known deficit hawks like Mitt Romney and Nancy Pelosi. But how is it that, after decades of warnings about the dangers of running up a deficit, by conservatives and liberals alike, it became possible to conjure trillions of dollars overnight? Here's the thing: The panic over deficits is a hoax. The federal government could fund a massive social welfare program like universal health care tomorrow without a hitch, no matter what the politicians say. Or at least that's how Stephanie Kelt-on, the former chief economist to the U.S. Senate Committee on the Budget, sees it. In her new book, The Deficit Myth, Kelt-on methodically debunks one of the most pervasive and ingrained truisms in the American consciousness: the belief that the national debt is a problem and that it is always a good thing to try to pay it off. Kelton, who served as Bernie Sanders's economic adviser during his 2016 and 2020 presidential campaigns, is a proponent of Modern Monetary Theory (MMT), a macroeconomic framework for understanding how governments produce, spend, and trade money now that currencies are no longer tied to the gold standard. Using MMT as a "diagnostic toolkit," Kelton argues that abandoning a shiny metal-backed currency has had enormous--but deeply misunderstood--consequences. "For the currency issuer, money is no object," she writes. "It doesn't exist in some scarce physical form--like gold--that the government needs to 'find' in order to spend. It is conjured into existence from a computer keyboard each time the Federal Reserve carries out a payment to the Treasury." In other words, the government's budget is not the same as your household ledger, because it--unlike average schlubs like you and me--will never go broke. The political debate about debt arises, Kelton writes, because most Americans, elected representatives included, are convinced this couldn't possibly be true, that there must be some limit to the amount of money the government can produce. After all, doesn't the government rely on taxes to stay afloat? Even if the Federal Reserve is a bottomless ATM, wouldn't we end up footing the bill for overzealous money printing? The short answer, according to Kelton, is no. As strange as it sounds, taxpayers are not propping up the government. In the MMT view of money, the federal government does not use taxes to fund anything, as it could always create funding to supply its needs. Taxes, instead, are levied as an incentive to earn money in whatever currency a government issues and to spur economic activity. Of course, while a currency-issuing government can never by definition run out of money, that does not mean there is no limit on spending. Kelton does set an end-point, but it isn't the ever-shifting debt ceiling. In her view--one once shared by former Federal Reserve Chair Alan Greenspan--overspending is only a problem when there's more cash floating around than goods or services to spend it on. And we, as Kelton highlights, are nowhere near that tipping point. Throughout The Deficit Myth, Kelton argues that the fear of adding to the U.S. national debt should not be an excuse to avoid creating a more humane economy. For instance, since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, more than thirty million people have filed for unemployment, amounting to the largest spike in joblessness since the Great Depression. While the federal stimulus bill expanded unemployment insurance, a much surer way to address joblessness would be for the government to simply offer a job to anyone who needs one. Now that we know that Congress has been sitting on a magic money pot this whole time, it becomes clear that the failure to fix problems like unemployment (through a federal jobs guarantee policy), a lack of health care (Medicare for All), and climate change (the Green New Deal) has always been a matter of political will, not whether or not we can afford it.

## Solvency

#### Green Job Guarantees work, pay for themselves, avoid inflation, and lead to positive social outcomes
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One of the main arguments raised against the introduction of forms of Job Guarantees lays on the assumption that a certain degree of unemployment is functional to the control of inflation: governments control unemployment by changing spending and taxation levels in order to be able to manage inflation and keep it at a reasonable level. To this extent, the NAIRU (NonAccelerating Inflation Rate of Unemployment) concept has been widely adopted as a parameter that represents the lowest rate of unemployment that can be sustained without causing wages growth and inflation to rise. It is a concept that helps us gauge how much ‘spare capacity’ there is in the economy. (Reserve Bank of Australia) However, several studies (Wray et. al., 2018; Parrique, 2019) found that employment guarantee programs could play an important role in achieving full employment without having repercussions on inflation and wage levels. For instance, the Public Service Employment (PSE) solution proposed by Wray in the U.S.A. has the potential to address and partially solve several social and employment issues that are widely spread and significantly costly for U.S. countries. The authors’ proposal consists in the introduction of a form of Job Guarantee that is funded by 22 the federal government and managed by local institutions at the extent of providing social/environmental-care related occupations to unemployed, mostly low-skilled, people. The main advantages and features reported are the following: • Increase in the minimum wage levels: setting a fixed hourly rate (15$/h) for people who would be employed under PSE activities, would force the private sector to adapt to the (decent and living) wage established by the program, reducing income inequality; • The PSE would not create competition in the private sector’s labour market since it would not attract regular workers who work at a higher wage level; • The PSE would not create competition in the private sector profitable activities since it would not address markets already served by private firms; • The PSE would target social and environmental problems by creating work opportunities specifically aimed at serving local communities’ needs, therefore creating double advantages for communities; • The PSE would contribute in reducing gender inequality by providing more work opportunities for unemployed women; • The PSE would possibly pay itself over time by reducing public expenditures that are due/related to unemployment conditions (reduction of crime, better health, greater social and economic stability) and to environmental change (mitigation of local ecological problems and improvement of environmental conservation activities in communities). The Public Service Employment plan has great potential in dealing with social problems and improving overall working and living conditions for people living in poverty and for local communities. However, although these objectives are in line with the Sustainable Development Goals and therefore are part of a system where, as seen before, environmental protection plays a crucial role, within the scope of this thesis we mainly focus on the ecological implications of policies implementation and their effects on employment. In these regards, the authors state that care for the environment would be one of the main cores of the proposal and the created jobs would tackle: soil erosion, flood control, environmental surveys, species monitoring, parks maintenance and renewal, removal of invasive species, sustainable agricultural practices, support for local fisheries, tree planting, disasters’ prevention measures, weatherization of homes in poor overlooked communities, composting. Unfortunately, though, the study does not provide figures specifically concerning green employment increase and green jobs creation. A breakdown by type of job of the total number of occupations created – ranging from 10 to 15mln 23 over all U.S.A. countries with peaks after 3-4 years of implementation, according to authors’ estimates – would be useful to measure the effective impact of PSE on green employment. A practical implementation of a universal Job Guarantee program was started in October 2020 in Marienthal, Austria, as a response to the worsening of unemployment conditions over the last years, which is particularly due to the Covid-19 pandemic (Universal Job Guarantee Experiment, 2020). Designed by Oxford University researchers Lukas Lehner and Maximillian Kasy, the program aims at providing unconditional job opportunities for all people who have been unemployed for 12 or more months within the Marienthal area and pays a collectively bargained minimum wage (1,500€/month), taken from a €7.4mln total budget. The planned duration of this experiment is set to 3 years and foresees two waves of employment. Preliminary results published in 2021 (Lehner L., Kays M., 2021) promise a general improvement in several social areas, particularly incomes, mental health, wellbeing and social inclusion. Although this project does not specifically target green employment and environmental preservation activities, positive outcomes witnessed at the end of the implementation (2024) could lead the way to the proposal and institution of similar forms of Job Guarantee centred on the creation and promotion of green work opportunities that could both benefit social and ecological conditions. Furthermore, it would provide social and financial support to workers who could be displaced from brown sectors as a result of the Green Transition (Mastini et. al., 2021). A possible indirect environmental downside of employment guarantee programs that should be considered is the possible increase in consumption, and therefore production and resource usage levels. Income provision to previously unemployed people, raise of minimum wages and general improvement of living conditions would probably lead to increases in products and services demand with consequential impacts on resource depletion due to rises in production of goods and services provision if not accompanied by other interventions to mitigate environmental impacts of such activities. Economics studies should be carried out to assess whether Green Jobs Guarantee proposals’ ecological benefits could be offset by these implications or not.

#### Job guarantees historically work and centering the environment is key for sustainability
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Just as climate decommodifcation is a transition tool that is likely to be implemented by states, an employment guarantee is another state-driven program with similar efects: Employment guarantees have a long tradition and worldwide application. In the Philippines, for example, a green works program was introduced to provide people with income and rebuild infrastructure in the aftermath of a natural disaster (International Labor Organisation 2017). In India, rural low-income households are guaranteed one hundred days of paid employment (Dutta et al. 2012). Recently, job guarantee programs have experienced a revival that is mainly led by indicators of joblessness among the young and long-term unemployed (Tcherneva 2020). Also, with the economic consequences of Covid19, the calls for job guarantees have increased (Dhingra 2020). In 2020 for example, Austria started a pilot project “Marienthal reversed” offering a paid job to every long-term unemployed in the municipality of Gramatneusiedl (programme description (Arbeitsmarktservice Österreich 2020), more context on job guarantees options in Austria (Tamesberger and Theurl 2019) (Picek 2020)). Usually, job guarantees cover tasks that would not be paid on the frst labor market, jobs that support the community or social institutions. So far, the environmental consequences have been of little importance for the programs. Many activities in the social, care, and cultural sector, however, are resource-light services (Jackson and Victor 2011). Hence, with a fixed environmental budget more hours of work are environmentally “affordable” in these sectors compared to other sectors. Indeed, a job guarantee could be seen as a subsidy for socially and ecologically beneficial initiatives in the form of labor free of charge for the initiative (Parrique 2019). A job guarantee is therefore a key element in socio-economic scenarios for carbon neutrality (D’Alessandro et al. 2020) and policy strategies for a green recovery (Mastini et al. 2021). From a Post-work perspective, the conditionality of income on paid work could be seen critically because it reinforces a work fetishism instead of liberating people from employment (Hofmann and Paulsen 2020). If a job guarantee replaces the right to unemployment benefits, it can be stigmatizing and even worsen environmental impacts because many unnecessary—resource-consuming—tasks would be invented for the program just to keep people occupied. Including environmental considerations in job guarantee programs would be a crucial improvement for sustainable employment. Furthermore, granting universal access to the program is an important feature. So far, many job-guarantees only target long-term unemployed. Extending the eligibility to employees in brown jobs could further reduce the environmental impact because it enables workers in these sectors to switch to greener (job-guarantee) jobs. The same holds for the amount of work time and remuneration backing up the job guarantee—too-low or too-high incomes, or long work-hours inhibit sustainable lifestyles. The main contribution of a job guarantee rests on its contribution to the outcome efficiency dimension because it supports sectors with low energy consumption per hour worked and work-intensive outputs. The job guarantee is likely to take place in sectors that serve human needs in an environmentally generalizable way.

#### Green jobs explanation
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First, it is necessary to describe exactly how the Green Job Guarantee is intended to work, at least in a general sense. To do so, it may be most helpful to first understand the intent of a general Jobs Guarantee/ELR proposal. In general, a Federal Jobs Guarantee program could be defined as: “…a public option for jobs. It is a permanent, federally funded, and locally administered program that supplies voluntary employment opportunities on demand for all who are ready and willing to work at a living wage. While it is first and foremost a jobs program, it has the potential to be transformative by advancing the public purpose and improving working conditions, people’s everyday lives, and the economy as a whole (Tcherneva, 2018).” 3 The general idea is that these types of jobs would generally be lower-skilled and require little training, which helps to both widen access to individuals of all skill levels and allow for people to be quickly put to work within the program. The main goal of the program is, of course, to solve the problem of less-than-full employment. Doing so would provide a boost to the economy by stimulating effective demand, and assisting in evening out the downturns of the business cycle. It is a counter-cyclical policy, very much in the Keynesian vein of thought. In addition to the practical economic goal of full employment, the policy has other expected benefits, including the establishment of a “labor standard” for the economy, inflation stabilization, a living income, and improved income distribution (Tcherneva, 2018). These benefits extend beyond the economic to improve social and general well-being among those employed by the policy and society at large. Whereas a general Job Guarantee addresses mainly the social and economic aspect of life, a Green Job Guarantee incorporates a third dimension – the ecological. In a very general sense, the Green Job Guarantee program is merely a Job Guarantee program that is specifically designed with the promotion of environmental sustainability in mind. There are two key ways in which a program can be designed to achieve this goal. First, since these jobs are provided by the public sector, they are not designed to make a profit; therefore, they do not have to be set up to maximize cost-related efficiencies in the same way that a private, profit-driven firm (Forstater, 2004). Cost concerns are typically the reason that environmental impact is not a chief concern of many private firms – regulations on things such as emissions or processing of waste materials impose a burden on a company that essentially eat into profits. Combined with the classic “tragedy of the commons” property problems, it is difficult to set up market incentives for private companies to promote environmental improvement. However, since profit is not a concern in the Green Job program, environmental goals can be place first and 4 foremost. This means that the program can utilize more “green” production processes and focus on using fewer natural resources, even if the costs of doing so are greater. Forstater noted that this fact means that “Even if the activities performed no positive environmental tasks, the outcome will be more sustainable than if the private sector were stimulated to full employment (2004).” However, the second way in which the program can improve the environment is just this – these jobs given can be specifically designated to perform environmental services. For example, Godin briefly discusses the construction of energy efficient, “green” buildings, which yields natural resource and air quality benefits (2012). Forstater provides the example of widespread recycling programs (2004). Such jobs clearly support economic, social, and environmental improvement. In any case, there are a multitude of potential employment opportunities that tackle environmental problems which could be addressed by a Green Job Guarantee. The ongoing Coronavirus Pandemic provides a specific and timely context in which to contextualize how a Green Jobs program could be utilized to help support our three key goal areas (economic, social, environmental/ecological) in a time in which these areas are particularly affected.

#### A green jobs guarantee is feasible, will stimulate local economies, and ensures just transition from climate change

Ahola 22

Micke Ahola is a writer for Green New Deal Rising. "Why we need green jobs for everyone." Published by Green New Deal Rising on December 9, 2022. Available here: (https://www.gndrising.org/updates/why-we-need-green-jobs-for-everyone/) - AP

In order to address the existential risk posed by climate change, we need to rapidly transform our economy. This means winding down high-carbon industries like fossil fuels and industrial agriculture, and investing in the growth of new ones like renewable energy and nature-friendly farming. As a transformation to a low-carbon economy will require fundamental changes across industries, it is all the more important that the transformation is just. Any change in the economy has the potential to benefit or harm certain groups of people or individuals. This means care must be taken to make the green transition one that empowers people in precarious and low-paid jobs in existing industries, rather than imposing further hardship on them. To carry out a just transition to a low-carbon economy, a Green Jobs Guarantee is needed to make the transformation both rapid and fair to the impacted people and communities. But what does it really involve - and is a Green Jobs Guarantee actually realistic? What is the Green Jobs Guarantee? The Green Jobs Guarantee means that every single person who wants a job in the green economy will be able to get one. To rapidly reduce emissions, increase production of renewables, and create a more just and caring economy, a vast amount of work is required. The NEF’s Green New Deal Declaration has identified a number of jobs that would be generated in this transition. Upgrading every home in the UK to a good energy efficiency standard by 2030 Building boulevards, linear parks and new public and green spaces Upgrading social infrastructure, such as care workers, nursing assistants and teaching assistants A new fund should be set up to train workers while they are working, rather than waiting to support them while they are unemployed Green jobs aren’t just jobs involved with the generation of wind energy or re-building nature areas, but all the jobs required to build a just, caring and green economy from social care work to insulating every home. A social care working helping an older man with his balance. How every job can be a little greener While the Green Jobs Guarantee would make sure that every person will have access to secure, well-paid work in the low-carbon economy, the changes proposed by the Green New Deal don’t end there. By rebalancing our work and leisure time, we can share out the work and live happier, healthier lives. A 4-day work week would reduce the UK’s carbon footprint by over 20% - the equivalent of taking over 20 million cars off the road - while at the same time giving us back time to spend with our families, hobbies and looking after ourselves. With the extra day off, we would be able to spend time reconnecting with nature and learning how to live more sustainably. It would also give us a better chance to live a slower and more well-balanced life rather than resorting to carbon-intensive fast food, fast fashion and other forms of consumer culture that are easy to fall into in the little spare time we are provided by a five-day work week. Is a Green Jobs Guarantee a realistic policy? The New Economics Foundation estimates that to achieve a Green New Deal, the government would need to spend 2% of GDP in the short term, rising to 5% of GDP to deliver change at pace. The UK government currently spends over 50% of GDP in public spending, so a Green New Deal could absolutely be made to fit into the government budget - there just needs to be the political willpower for it. Funding a Green New Deal could also be achieved partly by the government by winding down subsidies for high-carbon industries, and instituting charges such as a frequent-flyer tax on carbon-intensive activities like domestic flights. A Green New Jobs guarantee will also provide a stimulus to the economy by boosting economic activity in deprived regions through the provisioning of well-paid and secure jobs. These jobs providing a secure paycheck will allow people to support their local businesses, helping rekindle a sense of community, and provide increased tax revenue to the government to fund more green investment. How you can get involved We need a Green New Deal and a Green Jobs Guarantee - but it’s going to take some work to get there. So get involved via a Green New Deal welcome call, reach out to your friends and family and talk to them about the Green New Deal, and keep an eye on here and your social media feeds for more upcoming events and opportunities.

## Climate

#### Green job guarantees are essential for a just-transition from extractive industries, include training and transition, and challenges our undervaluing of particular jobs

Novello & Carlock 19

Amanda Novello is a former senior policy associate at The Century Foundation. She is currently an economic policy consultant providing research on labor markets, family policies, and the green economy. Greg Carlock was a manager in the Climate Change & Sustainability practice at ICF, a world leading environmental and management consultancy. "Redefining Green Jobs for a Sustainable Economy." Published by the Century Foundation on December 2, 2019. Available here: (https://production-tcf.imgix.net/app/uploads/2019/11/02131209/Green-Jobs\_Final\_PDF31.pdf) – AP

Policy makers and practitioners, from federal agencies down to community groups, should seriously reconsider what activities are considered green. Just as energy efficiency workers help make society more environmentally sustainable, our nation’s health care and education workers help make society more socially and economically sustainable. All of these workers can help lead the nation toward a more prosperous future, so long as they are accounted for in all green economy policies and programs. In order to track progress on the path toward a sustainable economy, one crucial federal action is to measure green jobs. It’s hard to measure them without standardized survey data because the range of activities one does in a job can include both sustainable/low-carbon and unsustainable/ high-carbon inputs and outputs. In order to understand how market and policy changes are affecting the labor market for green jobs, Congress should reauthorize funding for BLS’s Green Goods and Services survey. The BLS should clarify and expand upon the criteria for defining green jobs as discussed under this framework, identify and track new dimensions about jobs that could support additional analyses about equity and geography, and streamline the processes for collecting this information from employers. In addition, there must be opportunities for all workers to access robust job training pathways toward jobs that have, at least, the same salary that they have now, in order to encourage workers to move into sustainable green jobs. The green job guarantee component of the Green New Deal69 aims to address issues of precarity, low wages, and pervasive unemployment in some communities, by providing training and good jobs to all who are willing and able. A federally funded and locally administered job guarantee program70 would allow localities to address systemic inequalities both in the labor market and in green infrastructure for resilience and adaptation to climate change. The job guarantee should also be grounded in a framework of green jobs for a sustainable economy—a framework that aims to improve the working conditions in jobs that have been undervalued, including traditionally womens’ roles in the care and education sectors. Then those sectors would be more economically sustainable, but also environmentally sustainable, as they would offer good low-carbon alternatives to jobs in the extractive economy. Until we get there, though, the government should play an active role in mandating sustainability requirements in all policy, and in measuring progress. We don’t have much more time to wait.

## Worker Protections

#### Green jobs pay better

Novello & Carlock 19

Amanda Novello is a former senior policy associate at The Century Foundation. She is currently an economic policy consultant providing research on labor markets, family policies, and the green economy. Greg Carlock was a manager in the Climate Change & Sustainability practice at ICF, a world leading environmental and management consultancy. "Redefining Green Jobs for a Sustainable Economy." Published by the Century Foundation on December 2, 2019. Available here: (https://production-tcf.imgix.net/app/uploads/2019/11/02131209/Green-Jobs\_Final\_PDF31.pdf) – AP

Wages and Inclusiveness of Green Jobs As Americans continue to struggle to find decent pay in a country with the highest share of workers earning low pay than all similarly rich nations,32 some sectors break this trend. Green jobs under the standard definition, for example, are more likely to be middle-class jobs than non-green jobs, and are less likely to be low-paying than non-green jobs (“lowwage” workers in green jobs earn $5–$7 more per hour than low-wage workers nationally).33 Using 2016 data, Brookings found that the mean hourly wages in each major category of green jobs (clean energy production, energy efficiency, and environmental management), were above the national average by at least $2 per hour (see Figure 1).34 Wages in each category were also at or above $15 per hour for the lowest decile of earners, at least $4 per hour above earnings at the low-end for all workers nationally. Out of all occupations nationally, over 30 percent of workers earn under $15 per hour, whereas that figure is around only 4 percent of green workers. Notably, in effect, there is less income inequality within green jobs than the national average, despite there being lower educational requirements, on average, than jobs nationally.35

# Answers

## Disad Answers

### Politics

#### Link Turn: Green job guarantees are popular and mobilize support for broader political platforms

Data For Progress 6/13/23

Data for Progress is a multidisciplinary group of exports using state-of-the-art techniques in data science to support progressive activists and causes. "Green Jobs." Published by the Data for Progress on June 13, 2023. Available here: (https://www.dataforprogress.org/green-jobs) - AP

A green jobs guarantee is more popular than a jobs guarantee without green framing. Among Trump voters, a job guarantee has net -15 support, while a green job guarantee has -1 support. Green job creation performs well across a range of geographies. Young people report being more likely to support a candidate supportive of a candidate who supports a green job guarantee and clean energy. Low enthusiasm voters report that they would be more supportive of candidates in favor of green jobs and clean energy. Green Jobs Can Help Progressives Win Traditionally Unsupportive Voters We asked two policy questions about a job guarantee. Respondents were asked: Would you support or oppose giving every American who wants one a job scaling up renewable energy, weatherizing homes and office buildings, developing mass transit projects, and maintaining green community spaces? Would you support or oppose the federal funding of community job creation for any person who can't find a job? We find that both questions elicited the same level of support, with fifty-five percent in support. However, the green jobs framing elicited less opposition: 23 percent opposed the non-green framing, while 18 percent opposed the green framing. Digging in, we find that the green framing elicited far less opposition from Donald Trump voters. Thirty-five percent of Trump voters supported green jobs and 36 percent opposed, while 30 percent supported the community job creation compared with 45 percent opposed. In addition, the green jobs creation question garnered net support among non-voters. Across geographies, environmental jobs garnered consistently high support. It performed better than community jobs among suburban and urban voters. Green Jobs Can Mobilize Voters In addition, we asked respondents whether they would be more supportive or less supportive of candidates who support green policies. Would you be more or less likely to support a candidate for office who supports moving the United States to 100% renewable energy by 2030? Would you be more or less likely to support a candidate for office who supports a jobs guarantee to address the economy, inequality, and climate change by offering every American who wants one a job expanding renewable energy, mass transit, efficient buildings, community green spaces, and resilient infrastructure? Notably, we find that voters are more likely to support candidates running on these issues than be less likely to support them. Fifty-one percent of voting eligible adults said they would be more likely to support a candidate running on a green job guarantee (with only 20 percent opposed). Forty-eight percent of voting eligible adults said they would be more likely to support a candidate who was running on 100% renewable energy by 2030. Notably, this is significantly faster than even the most progressive legislation currently in Congress. Young people are far more likely to support a candidate running on 100% renewable energy and green jobs. More than half of individuals under 30 said they would be more supportive of a candidate running on clean energy or green jobs with only 15 percent saying 100% renewables would make them less likely and 10 percent saying the same about green jobs. Among Democrats, 66 percent of “somewhat enthusiastic” individuals said a 100% clean energy candidate would make them more likely to vote for them (only 8 percent said “less” likely). For a green job candidate, those shares were 65 percent and 6 percent respectively. Among all voting eligible adults, 46 percent of somewhat enthusiastic voters said they would be more likely to support a clean energy candidate (17 percent said less likely). Among all voting eligible adults, 53 percent said they would be more likely to support a green jobs candidate, with only 15 saying they would be less likely. Analyze the data yourself! You can analyze our data yourself using the tool below. To create cross-tabulations, simply click the “by” in the top right corner. All question wordings appear below the data analysis tool. You can toggle whether the data appears as a chart or a cross-tabulation and the decimal points displayed. All data are weighted to be nationally representative of American adults. Methodology: Data for Progress commissioned polling on major progressive policies with YouGov Blue. The survey, fielded between July 13 and 16, included 1,515 eligible voters and is weighted to be nationally representative. The survey included a series of questions on green jobs. The chart below shows whether respondents would support or oppose a proposal to "Require a minimum amount of renewable fuels (wind, solar, and hydroelectric) in the generation of electricity even if electricity prices increase somewhat." The tabulations are based on Data for Progress analysis of Cooperative Congressional Election Studies (2016) survey data.

#### Just-transition policies like green jobs guarantees are popular

Marshall & Burgess 22

Ranae Marshall has a B.A. from the Department of Environmental Studeis at the University of Colorado Boulder and works with the Cooperative Institue for Research in Environmental Sciences at the University of Colorado Boulder. Matthew G. Burgess is an Assistant professor at the University of Colorado Boulder who reearches economic growth and its environmental impacts, natural resoruce management and conservation, mathematical modeling of human-environment systems, and political polarization of environmental issues. "Advancing bipartisan decarbonization policies: lessons from state-level successes and failures." Published by the acadmic journal Climate Change, vol 171(17) in 2022. Available here: (https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10584-022-03335-w#citeas) - AP

A recent study of 2476 Americans by Bergquist et al. (2020) evaluated the marginal impact of 40 climate, social, and economic policies on the overall support for climate action and reform. Interestingly, they found that a coalition building approach that couples certain economic and social policies including affordable housing, a $15 minimum wage, or a job guarantee with climate policy makes climate action more popular especially among people of color (Bergquist et al. 2020). The policies evaluated by Bergquist et al. (2020) are similar to our economic justice indicators classification of environmental justice components in decarbonization legislation. Indeed, we found economic justice bills passed in a bipartisan way significantly disproportionately, compared to no justice, in our logit models. However, environmental justice policies with social justice indicators (i.e., invoking academic jargon or non-neutral with respect to immutable characteristics) were not evaluated by Bergquist et al. (2020). These findings raise the question of how voters might respond to different combinations of economic justice indicators, social justice indicators, and other kinds of climate-mitigation policy. More broadly, future research should assess how combining various climate and non-climate policies affect support. Another important future research objective is comparing the effectiveness of climate-mitigation policies, especially in combination with assessment of political feasibility. A particularly important question is whether and to what extent there is a tradeoff between political feasibility and ambition. RPS is arguably the policy type that has been researched the most in terms of its effectiveness (e.g., see Barbose et al. (2016), Greenstone and Nath (2020), Wiser et al. (2016), and refs. therein), though newer programs like PACE (one recent study on PACE program impacts on California’s economy—Rose and Wei 2020), shared renewable projects, and an assortment of financial incentives have not been heavily studied from a state or national level relating to estimated emissions reductions. Additionally, future research on this topic could gauge whether preliminary policies such as task forces, studies, and pilot programs are developed into long-lasting policies and programs.

## K Answers

### Cap

#### Link Turn: Green jobs guarantees are part of the history of working-class struggle to command production in favor of their material needs

Medwell 22

Jamie Medwell is an journalist and magazine editor working in New Zealand trade union comms. "The Lucas Plan was a Workers' Alternative to Neoliberalism." Published by the Tribune Magazine on July 3, 2022. Available here: (https://tribunemag.co.uk/2022/03/lucas-aerospace-plan-1976-socially-useful-work-green-new-deal-manufacturing) - AP

In the second half of the twentieth century, the favoured slogan of global capital—‘cuts, job losses, money for the bosses’—met a new threat. It came in the form of an alliance between the workers at the UK-based military contractor Lucas Aerospace and then firebrand Labour Minister for Industry Tony Benn. The Lucas workforce, more than 11,000 strong, faced mass redundancy after Harold Wilson’s dream of reorienting British industry around ‘the white heat of high technology’ ushered in a period of Labour government cuts to military spending. On approaching Benn to discuss the potential nationalisation of Lucas Aerospace, workers were urged to challenge their supposed redundancy by coming up with an alternative corporate strategy—one independent from the need for military spending, and based on the workers’ ‘knowledge of their company, its equipment, the market and the skills they had at their disposal.’ The result was the Lucas Plan. Published in 1976, the plan argued for the redeployment of the government funds previously spent on Lucas Aerospace’s military contracts to combat the ‘illogical growth of the dole queue’ by redirecting Lucas workers’ capacity toward production ‘useful to the community at large.’ In Benn’s words, the plan amounted to ‘one of the most remarkable exercises that has ever occurred in British industrial history.’ Lucas workers socialised their extensive industry knowledge. The Combine they formed pulled organisers from all levels of the company, both ‘skilled’ and ‘unskilled’, to oppose the segregation of its workforce into classes—a tactic that remains relevant in the era of worker atomisation ushered in by the likes of Amazon and Uber—and carried its egalitarian principles forward, posing questions usually reserved for management to workers on the shop floor. The first, ‘what socially-useful products should we make?’, was answered by a list of 150 items, each with its own social or environmental utility, based on the workforce, equipment, and skills available in each of the country’s seventeen Lucas Aerospace factories. Ideas ranged from alternative energy sources based on solar and wind power to medical devices like kidney dialysis machines, and even a ‘road to rail vehicle’ able to move between road and railway networks. Many ideas were ahead of their time: wind turbines, hybrid car engines, and telechiric machines were suggested, as was a ‘combined heat and power system for use on social housing estates’. Whether their products were intended for use in social housing, public transport, or the NHS, the aim of the Lucas Combine was to serve the public using public funds, or as the Plan put it, to close the ‘gap between what technology could provide, and actually does provide, to address a wide range of human problems.’ Not only did the plan anticipate the need for wide-reaching state-funded intervention to tackle the nascent climate crisis—described in the Plan as the ‘pollution of the environment’ by ‘anti-social corporations’—but it engaged in the kind of bottom-up organisation necessary to counter attempts by managers to weaken labour power and shut down the attack on capitalism’s sacred cow, the profit motive. Lucas Combine member Mike Cooley summed up the plan’s spirit as a refusal to be ‘reduced to a sort of beelike behaviour,’ in which workers reacted without thought to the demands of the free market; instead, Lucas workers chose a future in which ‘masses of people, conscious of their skills and abilities in both a political and technical sense, chose to become the architects of a new form of technological development.’ The plan’s impact was enormous. In 1977, the New Statesman noted that the ‘philosophical and technical implications of the plan are now being discussed on average twenty-five times a week in international media’; two years later, it was nominated for a Nobel Peace Prize. Even the Financial Times wrote in the year of its formulation that the Lucas Plan was ‘one of the most radical alternative plans ever drawn up by workers for their company’. Ahead of its time it might have been, but the Lucas Plan was also brought to a halt by the political forces of its present. Neoliberalism was in its ascendency, and free-marketeers were rattling their sabres. By the time the plan was finalised, Tony Benn had been moved from the Department of Trade and Industry to a more obscure role in government; tensions between the Labour government and the trade union movement were flaring, and it wouldn’t be long before Thatcher came to Number 10 with intent to break the power of the labour movement for good. Mike Cooley and his comrades were duly punished, fired from Lucas Aerospace for their activism. Some Combine members found a new home at the Greater London Council (GLC), which voted the Left into power in 1981. Cooley was appointed director of technology at the GLC’s newly created Greater London Enterprise Board, which went on to create hundreds of union jobs throughout the city in the 1980s. A Lucas Plan Today In the last couple of years, many economists claim to have heard the death knell of neoliberalism as a result of the pandemic and the newfound interventionism of right-wing governments, and have tried to plot what might come next. Whether or not those claims were premature, it does now seem that the Lucas Plan’s moment may have finally arrived. Questions about the viability of ‘socially useful’ manufacturing were reignited when, weeks after the pandemic began, firms including Brewdog, Lamborghini, and arms manufacturers pivoted to churn out hand sanitiser, face masks, and medical equipment. This was a temporary response to a crisis carried out by private companies, rather than a long-term attempt to transition to socially-useful manufacturing backed by public funds—but future pivots don’t have to be. With calls for socially-useful production sounded ever more loudly on the Left, this recent bout of private philanthropy serves an important role: to remind us that manufacturing could and should be first and foremost a social instrument used for the public good, not a means to accumulate an ever-growing pile of private profit. For Amelia Horgan, author of Lost In Work: Escaping Capitalism, the Lucas Plan offers the modern Left a revolutionary opportunity to ‘reorient(e) production away from arms and environmental degradation and towards socially-valuable life-sustaining activity.’ By extension, revisiting the plan can play a role in uniting environmentalist and labour movement groups by offering a solution to climate catastrophe based on workers’ material interests, rather than self-sacrifice. And in some industries, the idea of converting manufacturing away from environmental degradation has started to take root. When aerospace manufacturer Airbus suffered a fifty-five percent drop in profit and the predicted loss of 15,000 jobs during the first three months of the pandemic, a collective of more than 100 local scientists and researchers from the French city of Toulouse, where Airbus is based, presented company bosses with an alternative corporate plan. The plan demanded the company recognise the ‘lack of certainty about the aviation industry’s recovery,’ coupled with ‘the damage it inflicts on the environment,’ arguing for a ‘clear-headed debate on the reconversion of the sector and (its) companies.’ A similar debate is taking place in the automotive industry, the only American industry that underwent complete conversion to supply the World War II effort, which some automotive workers claim makes it uniquely positioned as a ‘flexible machine’ that society can use to do almost anything—even fight climate change. The most significant legacy of the Lucas Plan, however, might be its relevance to contemporary discussions around a Green New Deal—in particular, the idea of a ‘green jobs guarantee’, which would guarantee workers from polluting industries are offered green jobs, thereby ensuring their work is redirected toward socially useful ends without the need for redundancies. Reimagined today, the inspiration of the Lucas Plan could transform workplaces across the country into battlegrounds against climate change—and in fact, with corporate bodies unwilling to address the climate question and spending big to avoid it, nothing less will do. But it also proves that this kind of transformative change can only be achieved from the ground up, and with the backing of a strong trade union movement whose members are empowered and unafraid to challenge precarious, unproductive, and socially and environmentally destructive work.

#### Link turn: Socialist policies like a green jobs guarantee builds support and popular movement against capitalism

Diamond 23

Melissa Diamond has a Masters of Education in Social and Cultural Foundations from the University of Washington. "The Environmental Education Crisis: On the Limitations of Liberal Education in the Climate Crisis. Thesis published by the University of Wawshington in 2023. Pp. 42-44. Available here: (https://www-proquest-com.ezproxy.lib.utah.edu/docview/2836737471?accountid=14677&fromopenview=true&parentSessionId=9h0fUDexhEWnSATmbStBEdH%2BnF9YWPSK0Imw3s%2FNnv8%3D&parentSessionId=JJ4SdqvNG8iizm%2FJpPdri44Py9ZOu%2F8YLJllfAiYbos%3D&pq-origsite=gscholar) - AP

A second but related potential objection is that ending capitalism is just not pragmatic. According to the IPCC, we only have until 2030 to cut global emissions in half to avoid far worse climate catastrophe (2022). Even if market-based solutions may not fully end the climate crisis, we should still focus on them for the time being. We do not have time to end capitalism 43 and fix all of our social justice issues worldwide in the next seven or so years. This position is also reflected by the Washington Post Editorial Board, who write that “the goal is so fundamental that policymakers should focus above all else on quickly and efficiently decarbonizing. They should not muddle this aspiration with other social policy, such as creating a federal jobs guarantee, no matter how desirable that policy might be.” This objection rests on the premise that market-based solutions are more politically viable than far-reaching, expensive socialist policies, like those outlined in the Green New Deal (at least in the original version proposed by Sen. Edward J. Markey and Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez) (H.Res.318, 2023; S.Res.173, 2023). However, there are various reasons to believe this is not actually the case. As I highlighted in the previous section, Stokes and Mildenberger argue that any politically viable carbon pricing strategy will not work fast enough because of the political power that fossil fuel companies have in the current system. Furthermore, Stokes and Mildenberger highlight the case of the Yellow Vest movement in France, which arose in response to a proposed carbon tax that was subsequently abandoned. The participants in the Yellow Vest movement opposed the carbon tax because it was leading to an increase in oil prices for regular people; rather than eating the cost of the carbon tax themselves, fossil fuel companies simply offset the cost onto consumers. Even the Post Editorial Board acknowledges the fact that carbon taxes can hurt the poor, but respond with the idea that “the revenue from carbon pricing could be recycled back to Americans in a progressive way, and most people would end up whole or better off.” At this point, they undermine their own initial point that we should not “muddle” decarbonization efforts “with other social policy.” Indeed, it appears that even they believe that in order to have a politically viable carbon tax program, we need to consider questions of social justice as well. 44 On the other hand, socialist, Green New Deal policies like a federal green jobs guarantee can serve to benefit the vast majority of people. As argued by Aronoff et. al. (2019) in the book A Planet to Win: Why We Need a Green New Deal, tying green investments to broadly socialist policies like jobs guarantees and housing rescue can make such investments “viscerally popular” (p. 10). In a section called “The Case for Practical Radicalism,” Aronoff et. al. argue that in contrast to the “faux Green New Deal” position (essentially the pro-market stance of the Post Editorial Board), they see the “broadening of climate policy as a political asset: it’s an opportunity to build majority support for big change and mobilize political energies to change the status quo” (p. 17). Furthermore, the authors of A Planet to Win do not see carbon taxes as mutually exclusive with broader climate policy. In fact, they endorse a progressive carbon tax as a “secondary tool,” or a complement to other policies aimed at “raising the general standard of living” (p. 20). This leads to a similar conclusion to that of the previous objection: while marketbased reforms have the potential to help, they alone are not enough. Therefore, I maintain that we must end capitalism to have a chance at ending the climate crisis.

### Ecocriticism

#### Perm: Changing our relationship with nature requires a diversity of tactics – a green jobs guarantee is not mutually exclusive and solves better than the alt alone

Strome 23
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Ecological collapse, climate catastrophe, and social inequality are arguably the most pressing concerns for the continued survival of the human species and complex life generally. Special attention to ecological collapse was validated in October of 2022 with the release of the UN’s Emissions Gap Report acknowledging that, “climate crisis calls for rapid transformation of societies” (UNEP 2022). “Inadequate action”, “very limited progress”, and “closing window” are phrases used throughout the report (UNEP 2022). Similarly, UN Secretary General António Guterres, in regard to climate crises, suggests that, “We have a choice. Collective action or collective suicide. It is in our hands.” (Harvey 2022). Calls for “societal transformation” that do not explicitly include the leveling of social inequality will necessarily miss the intended mark. While the above quotes specifically address the existential threats of climate catastrophe, there is little detailing of what “societal transformation” actually entails beyond minimizing fossil fuel extraction and carbon emissions. Social transformation–if taken to literally suggest rearranging and reimagining how societies are organized–would entail reevaluating the ways in which egalitarianism and direct democracy can foster more equitable social institutions. Research has shown that imagining a better world can increase real-world motivation towards taking concrete actions to change society (Fernando et al. 2018). Just as an egalitarian ethos is only a blueprint for desired values and morals (there are no 60 guarantees for social equity), utopian ideals are similarly products of a collective imagination reflecting on equitable societies. Egalitarianism weaves foresight with pragmatic action. This is the space between order and disorder. Elite social values such as privatization, monopolization, over-production, and over-consumption, dominate the industrialized western world, and have been effectively globalized. These values threaten bio-cultural diversity with standardization: a socialecological monoculture that threatens the survival of complex life. Graeber & Wengrow (2021) conclude their book Dawn of Everything with what might feel like a disappointing prescription: There are no panaceas to strict hierarchy and ecological collapse. Implicit to this suggestion, however, is that there are many solutions to be developed to meet the needs and circumstances of unique societies in particular and rapidly changing ecological circumstances. Complex problems are best dealt with by complex solutions (Ostrom 1990). The egalitarian methodology examined in this thesis suggests a “diversity of tactics” to ensure long-term reversal of detrimental hierarchies. These organizing principles alongside extant ethnography, archaeology, and paleoanthropology, offer triedand-true, real-world strategies to build upon and incorporate into egalitarian projects at various scales and in various contexts. Consider the following two tactics as examples of egalitarian methodology, each of which share similar imaginative social-ecological aspirations with Bookchin, but are perhaps more realistic and grounded. Polycentricity: Similar to Crumley’s heterarchy, Elinor Ostrom proposes that polycentricity (“many centers”) allows ranks within hierarchies to freely associate and 61 encourages bottom-up self-organization (Crumley 2015, Ostrom 1990). Polycentricity intends to strengthen interaction and dialogue between local-regional communities, and national governments and corporations that dominate the production of social-ecological policies. Ostrom won the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences in 2009 for her work that demonstrated both theoretically and ethnographically (such as Maasai pastoralists) that many societies have effectively organized around common-pool resources. Ostrom thoroughly dispels Garrett Hardin’s (1968) neo-Hobbesian “Tragedy of the Commons” which suggests that individuals' self-interest will necessarily lead to overexploitation of finite resources (Ostrom 1990). Degrowth: Degrowth is an emerging set of theories which critique private ownership’s “grow or die” imperative and is similarly focused on both social inequality and unsustainable economic development (Hickel et al. 2022). Degrowth critiques GDP (gross domestic product) as a primary indicator of prosperity. Based on an economic dogma of perpetual growth, GDP is expected to increase at a steady rate annually, which recalls outdated theories of linear social development. Loss of biodiversity and climate catastrophe are both visceral reminders that infinite growth on a planet of finite resources threatens mass extinction. Degrowth is a diverse body of unfolding ideas, among them; reduce less-necessary production (i.e., fossil fuels, animal agriculture, car culture, advertising, demilitarization), improve public services, introduce green jobs guarantee, reduce working time, enable sustainable development, etc. (Hickel et al. 2022). 62 There are a number of additional developing fields of theoretical-praxis that hold valuable social-ecological potential; bioregionalism, adaptation of social organizations to naturally defined zones; permaculture, habitat management and community design which emulates arrangements observed in thriving natural ecosystems; agroecology, study of ecological processes applied to agricultural production; Earth Jurisprudence, a philosophy of law and system of governance that suggests the wellbeing of communities of complex life are dependent on the holistic wellbeing of the biosphere; and traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) and the “Land Back” movement are important focuses originating from Indigenous communities. These tactics and more represent tangible theoreticalpraxis that Social Ecology can incorporate and adopt.

# Neg Stuff

## Cap

#### As just-transition models get mobilized by the state they reinforce the status quo, kill off genuine grassroots movement, and create exclusion

Mertins-Kirkwood et al., 23
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To the labour movement, just transition includes policies such as income supports and retraining programs to ensure workers’ livelihoods are protected as they transition to new jobs in other industries. In 2015, the International Labour Organization (ILO) encapsulated the movement’s priorities in its Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all, which emphasized social dialogue, decent work and labour rights.22 The labour movement has been key to winning recognition for the principles of a just transition in international law, including in the Paris Agreement. More recently, the concept has been interpreted by a range of progressive actors, including in environmental and social justice movements, to capture a broader agenda of societal change in response to the climate emergency. 13 Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives Under this more expansive definition, just transition includes foregrounding the voices and demands of historically marginalized communities, expansive universal public services, an emphasis on the low-carbon care economy, public spending on economic alternatives, and a green industrial strategy to fast track new industries and make good on a green jobs guarantee. Advocates move beyond instrumental employment concerns to embrace issues of energy democracy and public power.23 While there is overlap with the ILO priorities, groups like the Climate Justice Alliance emphasize selfdetermination, redistribution, and economic transformation in their definition of a just transition.24 Some Indigenous communities have also adopted just transition language to centre issues of reconciliation and historical justice in the climate discourse.25 As just transition has moved from the advocacy space into the policy space, it has taken on new meanings. Governments that employ the term have occasionally used it to rebrand traditional and inadequate workforce transition programs, which has led to significant worker distrust of the term—from coal workers in Appalachia and New Brunswick to oil workers in Alberta to forestry workers in British Columbia.26 The U.S.-based Just Transition Listening Project, which engages with communities that are undergoing or have undergone economic transitions, has found that these communities are, in general, deeply skeptical of just transition policies.27 Where just transition policies are more genuine, critics argue that the term nevertheless risks being used as a “disciplining device that steers local activists towards approaches that are compatible with government policy directions.”28 For its part, the Canadian government has watered down the concept to mean a focus on community consultations and “inclusive economic opportunities” in place of the more radical concepts of self-determination and direct job creation.29 Many Canadian workers and communities have understandably come to view just transition as an exercise in government greenwashing.30 That may explain, at least in part, the federal government’s recent preference for the phrase “sustainable jobs,” which has fewer pre-existing connotations. The Just Transition Research Collaborative, a group of international academics and experts, has attempted to map these various understandings of a just transition along two axes. First, on a spectrum from “exclusive” (i.e., benefiting a specific group) to “inclusive” (i.e., benefiting society as a whole). Second, on a spectrum from “no harm done” (i.e., preserving the status quo) to “new vision” (i.e., transforming the existing political and economic system).31 They find that most just transition advocates—including labour unions—define the term in more-or-less inclusive and transformative terms. Don’t wait for the state 14 However, where governments have pursued “just transition” policies, they have generally been exclusive in scope and more protective of the status quo. There is both a need and an opportunity, then, to re-radicalize the political narrative around a just transition to achieve its transformative potential. Given the “failure of elected officials to deliver just transition policies,” as the Just Transition Listening Project concludes, it falls to organizers to recapture the promise of a just transition and advance a concrete, progressive alternative.32 What does that look like in practice? For the purposes of this paper, we recognize two parallel and complementary trajectories: (1) labour organizing toward a just transition, which is fundamentally focused on the dignity and well-being of affected workers, especially in the energy industry, and (2) the broader array of climate justice movements that are inspired by the idea of a just transition (whether or not they use the exact term) and are fighting for societal transformation, prioritizing the demands and voices of Indigenous and other historically marginalized communities, and connecting the dots among many connected crises and ambitious solutions. The two tracks are grounded in the same principles of justice and social power, compounding their effectiveness when coalitions are pulling in the same direction.33 Nevertheless, there are practical distinctions. The ongoing dialogue between unions, governments and industry that constitutes the just transition (or “sustainable jobs”) policy space today is generally focused on fossil fuel workers in fossil fuel communities. When we use the term “just transition”, we are referring to these sorts of worker-focused efforts. Climate justice organizing, on the other hand, considers a more diverse set of individuals and communities who are impacted by the climate transition in different ways. We refer to this umbrella of initiatives as “community-led climate transitions” or “grassroots climate organizing”. This paper is primarily concerned with the latter group, for whom the just transition framework may be used as inspiration for a new kind of organizing, though the lessons from previous just transition efforts are applicable across the labour and social movement space. In the next section we look at a number of cases where this kind of community-level climate transition planning has already occurred

## Solvency

#### Federal jobs guarantees will incite backlash from corporations, empirics prove

Rector 22
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So, too, would a universal health care program like Medicare for All. Although the Affordable Care Act reduced the uninsured rate in Detroit from 22.5 percent to 17.1 percent in 2013–2014, it remained the highest in the region, and an estimated 44 percent of the uninsured were eligible for Medicaid. As the legal scholar Dorothy E. Roberts has argued, “To achieve the Beloved Community Dr. King worked for, we must recognize health care as a human right by guaranteeing universal, state-supported, high-quality healthcare.” At the same time, Roberts has stressed that “ending health inequities requires eliminating the living conditions that unjustly damage the health of socially disadvantaged communities,” from ending residential lead contamination to decriminalizing addiction, mental illness, and ending restrictions on women’s reproductive rights. It also requires ensuring that medical education no longer “perpetuates biological concepts of race, the racial concept of disease, and stereotypes about racial difference that contribute to inferior treatment of black patients.”34 While private health insurers oppose Medicare for All, a federal jobs guarantee is likely to incite aggressive opposition from employers, for reasons that the Polish economist Michal Kalecki famously identified in 1943, and Barry Commoner noted at Black Lake in 1976. Full employment legislation would increase workers’ bargaining power and threaten the primacy of private investment in key sectors of the economy.35 Even if such opposition is overcome, and such legislation is linked to a just transition in Detroit, the private sector will still provide the bulk of jobs for the city’s workers for the foreseeable future. Still, Detroit’s private sector can also support more democratic economic models, such as worker-owned enterprises and consumer cooperatives. While the UAW and other unions were able to wrest wage increases and a “private welfare state” from corporations such as GM after World War II, their members had no say in the investment decisions that reduced the number of manufacturing jobs in Detroit from 349,000 in 1950 to 23,000 in 2007.36 The history of deindustrialization in Detroit and elsewhere provides a long and painful cautionary tale about the dangers of relying on conventionally structured capitalist firms, accountable to private shareholders but not to their workers or the larger community, to provide an employment base.

#### No Solvency: Federal job guarantees cannot successfully sort people into jobs that correspond to their skills, severing project efficacy

Gulker 19
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Economist John Miller of Wheaton College wrote a sharp critique this week of my work on the job guarantee. I was pleased to see it. In nearly five months, Miller is the first economist on the left to respond on the basis of economics rather than retreating to blanket declarations that job-guarantee opponents are either nefarious or uninformed. Miller’s piece is also a reminder that those with whom we disagree are never monolithic. While criticizing my arguments against the job guarantee as proposed by economists at the Levy Economics Institute and the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP), he quickly pivots to the virtues of government hiring programs in general. In the process, he especially exposes the excesses of the Levy proposal. Miller, like many on the left, also casts his policy goals for the labor market as an essential response to the challenge of climate change. Here he could contribute more to the debate by unpacking what exactly he means by the “environmental crisis” we face and whether large-scale government hiring is the best or most direct way to address that crisis. The Central Planner’s Problem Miller and I are in full agreement that “the prospect of a federal job guarantee must have spooked Max Gulker.” His understanding of why I am spooked is more problematic. To Miller, the labor market is defined by powerful firms profiting from exploitive relationships that workers are forced to accept as their least-bad option. Nobody should minimize the struggles of the working poor and chronically unemployed. But Miller ignores the troublesome details of how a job-guarantee program would work and the economic interdependencies among all of us that would cause its consequences to be well beyond what its proponents intend. Suppose that instead of driving your own job search, you were assigned a job by a government agency. A competent and well-meaning staff would process millions of resumes and job descriptions and match each worker to a job. Think about where you would end up if the decision-makers’ knowledge of your skills, preferences, and goals were limited to a sheet of paper, a volume of information that would already challenge decision-makers. Your current work situation may be far from perfect, but the vast majority of people would inevitably wind up with inferior matches because of the fundamental limits to the information held by the planning agency. This is the system at the heart of the job-guarantee proposals laid out by both the Levy and CBPP authors. In fact, any true guarantee must take agency regarding who gets what job out of the hands of workers and employers, who can only opt in or out. As the number of bad matches reaches millions, the individual losses in productivity don’t just add up, they spill over. Some who are chronically unemployed or underemployed would earn more, and in isolation that is of course a good thing. But they would do so without necessarily building any skills, and only at the pleasure of a democratic electorate that Miller must recognize is rather unpredictable. Given Miller’s awareness of the balance of power between workers and employers, he must account for the fact that the job guarantee as proposed by the Levy and CBPP economists would create a locus of financial and decision-making power far greater than even the largest corporations. Many on the left think such power is sanctified if part of a government of their design, but in my view these relationships could easily become just as exploitative as anything in the private sector. How do we truly empower the chronically unemployed and underemployed? We engage with them as individuals with their own skills, preferences, and goals. We help them to build their networks and seek training as they desire. And we do it on the local, even neighborhood, level, even though this will lead to short-term differences in outcomes, because this variation can teach us what actually works far better than anything Miller or I can write down. From One Flawed Proposal to Another Miller implies that I am wrong to worry about the job guarantee leading to “economic disaster.” By peeling away millions from the private sector into a system that is necessarily inferior in assigning jobs, disaster could indeed ensue. Miller accurately summarizes concerns expressed by economist Dean Baker and me that the program would attract millions more than the authors intend. But before he has a chance to explain why we’re wrong or why this wouldn’t be a bad thing, he suddenly pivots. “The goal of a job guarantee could be accomplished by public-sector spending large enough to bring about genuine full employment,” writes Miller, shifting his focus for the remainder of the article to a more traditional government stimulus-and-employment program. Many of the potential government jobs Miller highlights, such as infrastructure, healthcare, and clean-energy technology, are expressly excluded from the Levy job-guarantee proposal. The Levy economists’ “human buffer stock” must be kept busy with tasks that do not require special skills and do not directly compete with specific private sector industries. Miller’s choice of government jobs underscores the problematic trade-offs inherent in any large government employment program cleverly termed the “impossible quadrilateral” by Hugh Sturgess. The jobs Miller proposes promise more value to society than the chores favored by the Levy Institute, but necessarily raise issues of skill requirements and nationalizing entire industries. Unskilled workers might be able to help out with large infrastructure or clean-energy projects, but these require skilled contractors, workers, and even scientists. How will Miller’s plan attract these workers from the private sector? How much will the government pay? And as resources are diverted from the private sector, those issues of the inferior allocation of resources rear their head again.

## Worker Safety

#### Federal jobs fails to increase worker conditions across the board

Holden & Dixon 22
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We agree, and it is a central plank of democratic liberalism, that a dignified social minimum needs to be afforded to everyone; and this means guaranteeing a minimum wage that allows for a dignified life for full-time workers. But raising the minimum wage needs to be done openly and based on evidence and debate, not via the backdoor of a large increase in the minimum wage for public sector rather than private sector workers. It also needs to be done with a view to avoiding a harsh tradeoff between decent wages and access to employment. Many advocates of a jobs guarantee implicitly claim that there is no tradeoff between minimum wages and employment, but this begs the question of why they need a jobs guarantee at all. Why not simply require the private sector to pay $25 an hour plus benefits? Or $30. Or $40. As a matter of logic, the answer is that the private sector would not provide a sufficient number of jobs at those rates of pay. But even if one believes that there is no tradeoff between minimum wages and unemployment, the forces of automation and globalization would leave a significant “jobs gap.” Our jobs guarantee seeks to fill that gap, but not in a way that makes the gap larger by reducing private sector employment. The key point to understand is that there are two problems to be solved: (i) there are not enough private sector jobs; and (ii) at the current minimum wage in the United States, many of those jobs that do exist do not provide a sufficient social minimum. And, solving those problems requires two different instruments—a jobs guarantee that provides work to those who need it, and a boost to private sector conditions through the universal leave and other programs discussed earlier. Trying to use a jobs guarantee with generous terms and conditions to solve both the amount and nature of work problems is a mistake. It makes the jobs gap larger, and it puts the government in direct competition with the private sector not out of necessity (in employing people to provide essential government services) but by design (as a way of forcing the hand of the private sector). This may be justified in some circumstances: for instance, in India there is a national “workfare” or jobs guarantee program that is deliberately designed to put competitive pressure on private sector employers to adhere to the law and actually pay the minimum wage to private sector workers.16 But absent this kind of compliance or rule of law concern, democratic liberalism favors a more direct approach to raising both the minimum wage and guaranteeing residual public sector employment for those who need it.

#### Transitioning too quickly to green jobs leads to workplace hazard
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Decarbonisation policies can lead to shifts away of employment from these sectors or introduce new business models and practices, potentially offering workers better working conditions. At the same time, it should not be assumed that that all “green” jobs guarantee improved physical working conditions. New activities could expose workers to other hazardous substances or environments in a way that is not yet well understood. For instance, workers producing photovoltaic panels are exposed to toxic substances (Poschen and Renner, 2015[39]) and solar panel installers could suffer of great heat stress (EU-OSHA, 2014[40]) (eu osha 2014). New and fast-moving, innovative businesses and business practices (including remote work) could translate into insufficient awareness and culture of occupational safety and health (EUOSHA, 2013[41]; EU-OSHA, 2014[40]).