

1: BUSINESS AS USUAL AT THE WHO | The Norwich Radical

*Radical Praise It's Not Business As Usual [V. Michele Jackson, Dr. Judson Cronwall] on www.enganchecubano.com
FREE shipping on qualifying offers. Paperback.*

The report shows that warming must be held to no more than 1. This requires emissions of CO2 to be limited to an amount that, at the current rate, will be breached in 10 to 15 years. The report outlines four broad pathways to stay within that limit, all of which include large-scale deployment of various technological fixes to climate change. These include not just the sensible pursuit of solar energy and wind power but also of unproven technologies, such as bioenergy with carbon capture and storage, which has not been demonstrated to work at scale. Why bioenergy with carbon capture and storage? Therefore, modelers assume large-scale CO2 removal to reduce the amount of gas in the atmosphere. What could justify such an approach? The belief that technology will save us. These technologies would have to be deployed at massive scales. The amount of carbon dioxide that would have to be captured and stored is. So, within 80 years, an amount that is more than half of all the CO2 emitted over two and a half centuries will have to be captured and stored using a technology that has not been demonstrated. Along with these futuristic technologies, a more familiar savior also comes to the rescue: Wishful thinking about unproven technologies is easier to understand than the continued faith in the failed project of nuclear energy. Nuclear energy has been generating electricity since the 1950s, with more than 400 nuclear power plants operating in the world today—long enough for us to evaluate its ecological and economic costs, risks, and benefits. Nuclear energy has been declining, not growing, as a share of the electricity market during the period that climate change has become recognized as an important problem. This included a period when the nuclear industry was heralding a renaissance. The downward trend is expected to continue. One cannot resolve the climate problem under capitalism, which cannot survive without endless growth. Despite governments subsidizing the technology in various ways over the decades, the economics of nuclear energy is a major problem: Nuclear reactors are expensive to construct, and prone to costing more than budgeted and taking longer to build than projected. What they have in common is unexpected cost increases: Summer went up so high that the utility constructing the plant abandoned it after spending billions. One would think that these trends would lead policymakers to abandon nuclear power, but faith that these failures can be resolved is fueling government and private investments in a new generation of reactor designs—advanced reactors, small modular reactors, and Generation IV reactors. But there is no reason to believe these new designs will prove cheaper than current reactors—unless the designers, constructors, and regulators emphasize lowered costs over safety, which increases the risk of future Chernobyls and Fukushimas. The models it uses do not deal with these problems of nuclear energy. They simply assume that nuclear reactors will be built. This Panglossian approach allows modelers to state the climate problem can be contained without giving up a social and political system that is founded on continued and endless economic growth. This belief also allows for the idea that the business-as-usual approach can continue, and the solution is replacing coal, gas, and nuclear plants with solar panels, wind turbines, and batteries or other storage technologies. As supporters of the fossil fuel and nuclear industries like to point out, even these technologies have environmental and social impacts. The alternative is obvious. The starting point of any serious discussion of climate change must be to recognize that it is not possible to limit global warming to either 1. To put it more bluntly, one cannot resolve the climate problem under capitalism, which cannot survive without endless growth. Arguments against capitalism are at least as old as capitalism itself. If one is honest about the implications of the latest report, climate change is providing another compelling argument for fundamental economic change. Just Readers Like You. You can help fund powerful stories to light the way forward. He is the author of *The Power of Promise: Examining Nuclear Energy in India*. He is the author of *The End of Patriarchy: Radical Feminism for Men*.

2: Monthly Review | Facing the Anthropocene: Fossil Capitalism and the Crisis of the Earth System

quotes from David Platt: 'Radical obedience to Christ is not easy It's not comfort, not health, not wealth, and not prosperity in this world. Radical obedience to Christ risks losing all these things.

Adapted from A Finer Future: The neoliberal narrative holds that a company exists solely to make money for its owners. If owners use their profits for philanthropy, that is noble. But it is not the job of the corporate sector, so the story goes, to worry about the woes of the world. Access to these has historically been, and today remains, heavily subsidized. The neoliberal worldview, in which such fraud is celebrated as cleverness, has long believed that companies should "externalize" costs as much as possible. Indeed, companies spend a lot of money to lobby or corrupt regulators to ensure that only weak controls are ever imposed on them, arguing that if industry is unduly shackled, it will be unable to deliver the good life its customers want. Activists, in contrast, argue that only by punishing business and imposing draconian regulations can we save nature and our families. And so business and activists have remained in a standoff, the Earth roasts and collapse looms. It is perhaps time to recognize that neither narrative is a useful one, and increasingly, neither is true. No one better proved this than industrialist Ray Anderson, who baldly stated, "In the future, industrialists like me will be in jail. The radical industrialist Ray was a South Georgia high-school football star. After taking his engineering degree at Georgia Tech, he went into the local business: When he was passed over for a promotion he felt he deserved, Ray, always intensely competitive, founded his own company, Interface. He proceeded to grow it into one of the largest carpet companies in the world. In , Ray added a European carpet company to his family of brands. Ray responded, "Do we have one? Quick, someone get me a book on the environment. Ray created what he called his Dream Team, some of the best minds in sustainability, to advise him. Together they remade Interface into the poster child of corporate sustainability. Ray named the adventure of becoming a regenerative company, the task to which he set Interface, "climbing Mount Sustainability": When Oakey reported on his success at a Dream Team meeting, his eyes were big as saucers. Net GHG emissions down 82 percent in absolute tonnage, 92 percent per pound of product; Renewable energy up 84 percent; six of seven manufacturing sites are percent renewable; energy usage down 45 percent per pound of product; Waste from facilities reduced 91 percent. Interface reckons that it is halfway to its Mission Zero goal of zero impact, zero footprint by And it remains committed to achieving it. Some at Interface are nervous, acutely aware that is near. Some say it will take a miracle. Hartzfelt dismissed such concerns: He believed that greater sustainability would earn him goodwill and customer loyalty, and it did, but he expected to have to pay for those attributes. His commitment to behave in more sustainable ways enhanced every aspect of shareholder value. It kept his company alive as several competitors went out of business. It created unprecedented employee engagement and customer loyalty. It also drove his innovation. Savings from sustainability paid for all of the costs of the transformation and became an enduring source of profit. The business case for sustainability began to emerge in the mids. In , Lovins coined the term "Integrated Bottom Line," arguing that a corporate commitment to sustainability enhances 13 aspects of shareholder value, including better financial performance, higher stock value, faster-growing stock value, lower risks, better ability to attract and retain employees, better brand equity, better relations with stakeholders and lower cost of distrust. By the mid-aughts, reports from the big management consulting houses confirmed each aspect of the ways in which companies that led in efficiency, social responsibility, good governance and other aspects of corporate sustainability outperformed less sustainable peers. Its "Climate Action and Profitability" study showed that companies that integrate sustainability into their business strategies outperform those who fail to show such leadership. Every three years, Accenture surveys 1, CEOs from more than countries. The report found that while a strong majority believed that a corporate commitment to sustainability is a path to growth and innovation 78 percent , conferring competitive advantage in their industry 79 percent , only 38 percent felt that they could quantify the business value of such programs to their company. Only 15 percent felt that they had made sufficient progress in the prior three years in making their sustainability commitment a must-have asset for customers, and 82 percent saw this as crucial to enabling greater sustainability to transform the economy.

Analysts concluded that corporate sustainability had plateaued. By , attitudes had shifted. Almost 60 percent of CEOs surveyed said that they could accurately quantify the business value of their sustainability program to their company. Ninety-seven percent believed that sustainability is important to the future success of their business, and 53 percent felt that business is making sufficient efforts to address global challenges. Transparency was seen as a critical factor, with 79 percent seeing brand, trust and reputation as driving action on sustainability. Corporate social responsibility has come a long way from the days when most companies were what sustainability analyst Bob Willard calls "pre-compliant," getting away with as much as they could and only reluctantly obeying the law. Smart companies discovered that implementing efficiency saved money. Some then moved on to integrating sustainability throughout their operations. It moves a company from one focused on serving Wall Street analysts by delivering ever-increasing quarterly profits to one in which enhanced shareholder value is recognized as an outcome of behaving responsibly to people and to planet. When well-managed, a commitment to sustainability creates savings that compound essentially infinitely. One problem is that after a few years these savings are forgotten, new accounting baselines reset the bar and normal corporate life goes on.

3: David Platt Quotes (Author of Radical)

by Stu Lucy. What with the circulation of fake news becoming increasingly more prevalent, sometimes you read an article and feel the need to double check its authenticity.

So what should Democrats do? When the president nominated the radical rightwing jurist Brett Kavanaugh to replace him, those threats became real and Democrats were put in a bind. How strongly should they oppose him? Should they go all out, or lick their wounds and move on? If Kavanaugh is confirmed, the radical right will have a stranglehold on the Court for the next 15 years at least. Wade will be overturned, but Roe is just one vulnerability. The Roberts Court has done great damage already – from Citizens United to Heller , which created an constitutional right to be armed, to Clapper v. Amnesty International , a catch denial of the right to fight secret wiretapping, to restrictions on voting , joining lawsuits , forming unions , and on and on. Future decisions by a radical-majority Court may be terrifying to contemplate, but the right has considered them already. These are just the tip of the iceberg though. Those earlier rulings, though they are never cited, still stand. To pick just one, in Schechter Poultry the Court held that Congress could not delegate its regulatory power to the Executive Branch. If the next Court starts citing Schechter, as Neil Gorsuch did from the bench just two years ago , the regulatory state itself – hated by the Koch brothers and all other rightwing ideologues – could be pulled completely apart. Bipartisan anger since then has only increased. What response might even more radical changes, crafted by a small but arrogant minority, enforced from a captured, unelected bench, cause in this country? Would it not light a fuse to that powder? Should they block this nomination with every power they have? Brian Schatz, referring to the lost Merrick Garland fight and the subsequent Gorsuch nomination Yet just as before, Democratic leaders are again reluctant to be bold , even refusing to rein in their pro-Kavanaugh colleagues. Just recently, in fact, Senate minority leader Chuck Schumer allowed seven Federalist Society-approved lower-court nominees to be fast-tracked to the bench. The problem for Democratic leaders is clear. If Democratic votes put Kavanaugh on the Court, the nation will be harmed irreparably, and Democrats will not only be complicit, they will be seen to be complicit, risking even further abandonment by the young and first-time voters they must inspire. Yet even if they act with strength, is there a way to win? The answer is yes. The tactic that put Gorsuch on the Court was extreme but constitutional. The tactic that blocks Brett Kavanaugh is no more extreme, and no less constitutional. Then the one remaining Democrat, a rotating position, will rise to deny unanimous consent on every matter the Senate tries to take up, including each quorum call. This means all 50 Republicans with the passing of John McCain must be in or near the chamber on any day Republicans wish to do business. They could still win every vote they want to win – 50 Republicans and one Democrat does constitute a quorum – but the price would be high. No single Republican senator could stray far from the chamber on days the Senate was in session – she could not go home, fundraise outside of DC or lunch with lobbyists away from the Capitol. Business as usual would end, and only votes Republicans deemed crucial could pass. The life of a Republican senator would drastically change. If Democrats do only that, they will lose. This is a threat to disrupt the Senate itself, and the life of each Republican senator, for the rest of the year – unless Republicans table the nomination until the next Senate is seated. Would they take it just to confirm Brett Kavanaugh? Republicans may well balk if Democrats hold strong. That will pay Democrats dividends down the road, in the same way that being complicit could cost them dearly. Despite protests to the contrary , the path is available. This is the world we cover. Because of people like you, another world is possible. There are many battles to be won, but we will battle them together – all of us. Common Dreams is not your normal news site. We want the world to be a better place. If you can help today – because every gift of every size matters – please do.

4: Shooting at Robert Lavoy Finicum and Lying About It is Business as Usual for the Feds - www.enganche.com

Roper's Radical Racers is an upscale company that sells cars primarily to racecar drivers and movie producers. In the past, Roper's Radical Racers marketed itself to the fun-loving driverlong dash"the driver who wanted to "race with life."

Shaun King March 20 , 7: Democratic nominee Larry Krasner takes the stage after winning the election to be the next Philadelphia district attorney on Nov. Anything less than a complete revolution that tore down the bigoted and patently unfair systems of mass incarceration would be a severe disappointment. Across the country, talking the talk of criminal justice reform has gotten many people elected as DA. Once in office, their reforms have often been painfully slow and disappointing. Krasner was the first candidate elected who publicly committed not just to intermittent changes, but a radical overhaul. So far, having been in office less than three months, he has exceeded expectations. Among the offenses, according to the Philadelphia Inquirer , the police officers had lied to their fellow investigators, filed false reports, used excessive force, driven drunk, and burgled. Mill is in jail for minor probation violations. All of that is big, but nothing is as essential and revolutionary as the internal five-page guiding document of new policies that Krasner sent to his staff. I study prosecutors for fun and for a living. Check out the document for yourself. The first sentence says it all: Furthermore, he instructed prosecutors to stop charging those with marijuana with any paraphernalia crimes. Next, Krasner instructed his prosecutors to stop charging sex workers that have fewer than three convictions with any crime and drop all current cases against sex workers who also fit that description. All sex workers with three or more convictions are to be referred to Dawn Court " a special diversionary program created in specifically for sex workers with repeat offenses, the first of its kind in the nation. First, Krasner instructed prosecutors to stop the wide-ranging practice of beginning plea deals with the highest possible sentencing and instead, begin those plea deals at the bottom end of the available range of time that can be served. And when less than 24 months is available as a sentence for a crime, house arrest or diversion programs should be used instead of incarceration. The annual cost of incarceration, Krasner reminded his prosecutors, was currently more per year than the beginning salary of teachers, police officers, firefighters, social workers, addiction counselors, and even prosecutors in his office. First, Krasner requested that people either be given no probation after incarceration or no more than a month probationary period. Mill has spent an outrageous 10 years on probation " a five-year term was extended several times due to various violations " dating all the way back to when he was a teenager. Now, as a grown man, nearly 10 years later, he is being held in jail for violating that probation. Other policies aimed at drastically reducing the length of the probationary periods focused on the fact that, according to Krasner, Philadelphia currently has over 44, people on probation. More serious cases end up being harder to track and follow. From time to time, transformational leaders take office. They show everyone else exactly what can be done and how to do it. We depend on the support of readers like you to help keep our nonprofit newsroom strong and independent.

5: Nuclear Power Will Not Save Us From Climate Change by M.V. Ramana and Robert Jensen "YES! M

Articles published in strategy+business do not necessarily represent the views of the member firms of the PwC network. Reviews and mentions of publications, products, or services do not constitute endorsement or recommendation for purchase.

Athletes train and compete, and train further to enhance capacities for future events. Armies fight battles deploying whatever materiel and personnel they have at their disposal, and in more peaceful times develop new military capabilities in anticipation of battles still unfought. More generally speaking, we "consume" and "invest"; and as the old proverb warns to remind us that there is a downside also: Running the business and changing it are not sequential but parallel pursuits. Even armies are seldom on full alert all the time, at least not for limitless periods. War and peace are punctuated -- providing the breathing space to build and regroup. Managers enjoy no such luxury, competing today and preparing for tomorrow with no letup on either front. Because the two activities go on continuously and in parallel, we tend to forget that they are in fact very different in character. Running a successful business requires a clear strategy in terms of defining target markets and lavishing attention on those factors which are critical to success; changing a business in anticipation of the future requires a vision of how the future will look and a strategy for how the organization will have to adapt to meet future challenges. Until recently, most organizations have successfully managed to run and change their businesses under the umbrella of a single strategy. As long as neither present competition was too demanding, nor change too severe, this approach proved to be quite adequate. This did, in fact, characterize most business activity in the long period of expansion following the Second World War and lasting until the early s. In spite of a few nasty jolts in which management was rudely reminded of the necessity for change, and in spite of a few outbursts of intense competitive activity when supply and demand were temporarily out of balance, or a competitor made a radical breakthrough, a "business as usual" philosophy prevailed. Singular strategies encompassing present and future did the job. As competition for current markets has heated up and as change has become increasingly pervasive, a single strategy encompassing the near to medium term runs the risk of providing neither the basis for effectively running the existing business, nor the basis for managing change. The idea of duality is not entirely new. In , a far-sighted publication of the Boston Consulting Group revealed that the planning practices of a sample of their large client companies were of two distinct types: Curiously, this distinction, articulated nearly twenty-five years ago, has not been given a great deal of further attention. One reason may indeed be that times were less demanding and the need to distinguish between present and future strategies was less evident; another may be that it was an insight ahead of its time; strategic planning was then in a very experimental stage and innovative approaches and insights -- good and bad -- were used and discarded with some rapidity. Critics of current planning approaches which are built primarily on "fitting" existing distinctive competences to market opportunities have, in fact, argued that articulating such strategies and making them explicit can actually limit flexibility, and "block out peripheral vision! But there is nothing wrong at all with making present strategy explicit if this is combined with a parallel undertaking to determine the direction of future change. As the old proverb has it: Present planning also requires vision -- a vision of how the firm has to operate now given its unique competences and choice of target markets. The long-term plan, by contrast, is built on a vision of the future -- and even more importantly on how to get there. Planning for today requires a clear definition of the business -- a precise delineation of target customer segments, customer functions, and the business approach to be used; planning for tomorrow is much more concerned with how the business should be redefined for the future. Planning for today is focused on shaping up the business to meet the needs of customers today with excellence. This means identifying those factors that are critical to success and smothering them with attention; planning for tomorrow is often focused on reshaping the business to compete more effectively in the future. Planning for today is focused on achieving compliance in the various functional activities of the firm with whatever definition of the business has been chosen; planning for tomorrow is much more likely to involve bold moves away from existing ways of conducting the business. And, while planning for today

requires organization, planning for tomorrow quite often requires reorganization. In a nutshell, planning for today is about managing for results; planning for tomorrow is about managing change. All of the usual human ailments with respect to vision are reproduced in companies. Myopia can extend well beyond the "marketing myopia," that Theodore Levitt identified three decades ago. Companies can, in fact, be so consumed with the present that they fail completely to prepare themselves for the future. When change comes, it is unexpected and unprepared for -- and these companies are left high and dry, the victims of their short-term focus. But just as dangerous is to focus most of the attention on the future, overlooking the needs for excellent performance today. Change should be a management preoccupation, but in addition to, not instead of, present performance. As we shall see subsequently, the appropriate balance between a present and future orientation is related to the situation at hand. But whatever the situation, both components must always be attended to in parallel. Underlying the failure of companies to achieve the proper balance between present and future is usually the inability of individual managers to wear these two hats simultaneously. Some managers, especially at lower levels, do of course spend most of their time on current operations as opposed to the requirements for future change. And the reverse is true at the top of the corporate hierarchy. But the more organizations flatten and responsibilities are pushed down, the more every manager has to have a sharp eye on both horizons. Different companies are adjusting their practices in different ways in recognition of the dual nature of managerial work. While some continue with a "catchall" process which lumps together present and future into a two-, three-, or five-year business plan, others are making a clearer distinction between the long-term framework and shorter-term plans, reserving the former more for corporate headquarters while delegating the latter more to business unit management. Only a few are making a more fundamental distinction between present and future, and between the roles of corporate and business unit management in attending to each. It is to current managerial practice that we now turn to see how some leading companies are responding to the dual challenge of present and future in increasingly competitive and changing markets.

6: Philadelphia DA Larry Krasner Is Following Through on Criminal Justice Reform

Beverly's Burgers came under fire recently when allegations were made that its veggie burgers were actually made with beef. To counter the claims, the restaurant called in a company to test not only its veggie burgers but also the rest of its vegetarian options to prove they lacked meat.

7: How Interface realized that the carpet business as usual wasn't sustainable | GreenBiz

Business as usual has been built on cheap access to the world's resources, especially fossil energy. Access to these has historically been, and today remains, heavily subsidized. The \$10 billion a minute the world spends in energy subsidies is only the tip of the iceberg of ways that we make resource depletion look cheaper than it really is.

8: Review: Praise In The House: Urban Praise - Radical For Christ | Cross Rhythms

The headline should be enough to expose this - "Business as Usual for the Feds" - since, in this case, it was "the feds" who indicted one of their own, and the criminal behavior was isolated.

9: Managing with Dual Strategies eBook by Derek F. Abell | Official Publisher Page | Simon & Schuster

So if there is going to be a Green Tea Party, it will have to emerge from a different place -- the radical center, a center committed to a radical departure from business as usual.

Piano notes for new hindi songs 2015 Augmenting the design: design options and logical formulas He who writes the dispatches Planning for the private interest Reviving the English Revolution The Mystery of Brookside School Introduction to mixed-signal IC test and measurement Particle physics in a historical perspective Managerial Accounting 1e with Xanadu Password Set The Metalwork of Albert Paley Modeling a mobile cell Romeo juliet full text The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia [EasyRead Comfort Edition] Color worksheets for preschool and kindergarten Titanic voices from the disaster ebook Endangered language varieties Gregory R. Guy and Ana M.S. Zilles Political elites and the new Russia Before Anne After The Winning Helix Rainbow wings (Sunshine) Tacos recipes and provocations Best practices : an analysis of teacher diversity in eleven New York City independent schools Kate Knopp Creative airbrushing Magnetic particle inspection report Redhat 6 certification guide Intonation of colloquial English The internal organisation of the Merchant Adventurers of England Principles of numerical control What is the nature of science The Philadelphia Orchestra : The Stokowski years, 1915-1940 A History Of Simony In The Christian Church Star Trek Technology Black magic sanction Business Cycles and Macroeconomic Stability Martin heidegger saved my life Trusting your senses : selective perception and 9/11 Takeover of LIFFE (Holdings plc by Euronext UK plc Seat ibiza 2012 user manual Criminal Procedure (Law in a Flash) Acs general chemistry ii study guide