# 1AC—lay

#### I affirm the resolution resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### For clarification, I offer the following definitions:

#### A just government:

Flynn 21 Alexis Flynn [Consent Manager at Greystone], 4-3-2021, "Do we have a just government? – Greedhead.net," No Publication, <https://greedhead.net/do-we-have-a-just-government/#What_is_the_basis_of_just_government> // EH

What is the basis of just government? By this definition, a just government is a government that acts for the good of the people and is morally upright. A just government is one that follows and applies its own laws consistently for all participants. If this definition was valid, the government created by the Constitution of the United States is not just.

## Framing

#### The value is Quality of Life since just governments intrinsically serve the purpose of improving and maintaining the lives of their constituents.

#### The value criterion is maximizing expected well-being. Also known as hedonistic act utilitarianism.

#### Prefer our value criterion:

#### 1] Bindingness—Neuroscience proves that pleasure is intrinsically good and binds our decision-making calculus
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**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be bettear at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even produce **the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### 2] Actor spec—governments must inherently use util because they don’t have intentions and constantly deal with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations

#### 3] Consequential ethics are best for specific scenarios and evaluating impacts of a probabilistic nature, other frameworks devolve into using blanket claims which obscure particular moral circumstances.

## Contention One:

#### The industrial base is on the brink of collapse due to offshoring and outsourcing, that threatens the integrity of the defense sector
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Ending offshoring and bringing jobs back home will take more than tweets, press releases, and op-eds Posted May 20, 2020 at 12:08 am by Owen E. Herrnstadt (Professor Herrnstadt currently is the Chief of Staff to the International President and Director of Trade and Globalization, at the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers. As Chief of Staff, he assists in running one of the largest manufacturing and transportation unions in the world. As Director of Trade and Globalization, he develops policy for international trade, economic investment, international labor standards, and human rights matters. In addition to the Law Center, he teaches as an adjunct professor at the American University’s Washington College of Law. ) https://www.epi.org/blog/ending-offshoring-and-bringing-jobs-back-home-will-take-more-than-tweets-press-releases-and-op-eds///(\*ak)

Despite repeated warnings, America’s industrial base has been whittled away by corporations offshoring work to Mexico, China, and other countries. The offshoring of much-needed medical equipment in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic heightens the urgency to bring these supply chains home.While U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer’s recent op-ed heralding an end to “the era of reflexive offshoring” highlights some positive steps forward by the USTR, much more needs to be done to bring supply chains home. It is not enough to—as the administration has done—set tariff policy by tweet, negotiate trade agreements that do not directly take on outsourcing across manufacturing and service sectors, and hope that corporations finally “see the light” and bring jobs home. Rather, returning jobs to America requires a robust, comprehensive strategy that coordinates policies in trade, currency valuation, investment, financing, energy, technology, tax, education, training, government procurement, and labor. To start, this strategy would include the following: Insist that the Defense Department and other U.S. agencies cease their reflexive support for continued use of outside supply chains in Mexico and elsewhere and instead push for bringing work home. Ensure that “Made in the U.S.” in government procurement programs actually means that a product is manufactured by U.S. workers with U.S. supplies and materials. Require employment impact statements in government contract and award determinations in order to maximize U.S. job creation. Create a U.S. Manufacturing Investment Bank. Address currency misalignment. Eliminate tax incentives that encourage corporations to outsource production. Insist that the Defense Department and other U.S. agencies push for bringing work home The Trump administration could start to bring work home by scrutinizing its own departments, starting with the Pentagon. Several days ago, Pentagon officials acknowledged the dangers of relying on supply chains in other countries for defense products, especially in aviation and shipbuilding. But their response to that danger missed the point. Citing how the COVID-19 crisis has led to the closures of factories in Mexico that are critical to the defense industry, Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment Ellen Lord said she would be asking the Mexican Foreign Affairs Minister to help reopen international suppliers there that provide parts for U.S. airframe production. What is wrong with this picture? Instead of demanding that Mexico open its factories in the midst of COVID-19 to produce items for the United States, Pentagon officials should be demanding that U.S. companies move work back home. How can some officials reinforce the use of supply chains outside of the U.S. when over 36 million U.S. workers, many of them in manufacturing, are unemployed? Also extremely troubling is the simple fact that many factories in Mexico cannot provide proper personal protective equipment for workers and forcing them back to work without needed safety measures jeopardizes lives. It’s bad enough that U.S. workers in certain industries are being asked to return to work without proper personal protective equipment, reliable testing and strict adherence to the Centers for Disease Control guidelines. U.S. government officials’ demands that Mexico reopen factories and subject unprotected workers to the dangers of COVID-19 are unconscionable. It is no secret that U.S. companies have flocked to Mexico over the past 30 years. As I have previously written, Mexico now employs between 30,000 and 40,000 workers in just one industry alone, aerospace. Aerospace manufacturers promote Mexico’s low wages to draw business across the border. Analysts have commented that “Mexico’s proximity to the U.S. and its lower labor cost structure have drawn approximately 300 foreign manufacturers to areas in five Mexican states.” As one review of the aerospace industry noted, “The downside of this is that the country may be used increasingly for its cheap labor by profit-hungry companies from more established markets.” Mexico’s aerospace industry is now a major exporter to the U.S., as highlighted by the Pentagon’s announcement. And it is not just aerospace manufacturing that has shifted supply chains to Mexico. In addition to medical supplies, other essential sectors are greatly impacted by supply chains in Mexico, including all sorts of manufacturing, electronics, communications (especially call centers), and food products. Now is the time for all federal departments—starting with Defense—to insist that U.S. companies bring work home, especially work that is essential to our economy and national defense. The administration can start by using the Defense Production Act to ensure that the U.S. immediately step up production of essential items like desperately needed personal protection equipment and ventilators. There are hundreds of factories that have closed across the country that could be used for this important mission. Ensure that “Made in the U.S.” in government procurement programs actually means that a product is manufactured by U.S. workers with U.S. supplies and materials For most consumers, a U.S. product is one that is domestically manufactured at home with U.S. materials and supplies. They would be shocked to learn that our federal government considers a product to be domestically made even when a significant number of parts and components were produced in other countries. Although the government has adopted domestic content requirements in certain procurement programs, these content requirements can be as low as 51%. Moreover, methods for calculating domestic content are a mess. What factors do agencies include in determining content? Is the calculation limited to raw materials, production, assembly, and maintenance? Or can the calculation include intangible items that can be used to inflate domestic content—like the value of marketing, research, development, and intellectual property rights? How is the origin of components and subcomponents considered? The administration should move quickly to make domestic content calculations effective and transparent. Domestic sourcing requirements for all government procurement programs (e.g., “Buy American” laws) and programs that support U.S. exports (e.g., the U.S. Export-Import Bank) should also be reviewed to ensure that the requirements are strong, taken seriously, and effectively implemented. Further, waivers that allow exemptions from domestic procurement requirements should be greatly narrowed, including when exemptions are granted for the use of foreign-sourced goods that are in the “public interest,” not reasonably available in sufficient commercial quantities, or not available at a reasonable cost. The Buy American requirements should also be equally rigorous with sectors like food products. Government commissaries and cafeterias should be using products made here at home. This includes items from sugar and flour to baked goods. Require employment impact statements in government contract and award determinations in order to maximize U.S. job creation The administration should adopt a simple, common-sense policy that directly links domestic employment with certain government activities. One way to accomplish this is to require detailed employment impact statements (EIS) as part of the decision-making process for government procurement contracts, assistance, grants, and awards. The results reflected by the EIS would be a significant factor in the final determination concerning the project or transaction under consideration. The EIS would contain information pertaining to employment that would be maintained, created, or lost if the program in question were approved. To assure that employment impact statements and reliance upon them are fully and effectively implemented, federal agencies would need to submit annual reports summarizing the procedures used and the results. The reports would furnish the administration and Congress with valuable information about how government programs are supporting the creation and maintenance of jobs. Create a U.S. Manufacturing Investment Bank Similar to the concept of the U.S. Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im Bank), a new U.S. Manufacturing Investment Bank would provide financial support for the revitalization of the U.S. manufacturing sector. The U.S. Manufacturing Investment Bank would target large, medium, and small manufacturers that cannot obtain affordable credit on commercial terms. Financing would be in the form of loans at or below commercial rates or of a federal guarantee of a commercial loan. These loans would be paid back directly to the U.S. Treasury, similar to the procedures implemented by the Ex-Im Bank. In order to receive financing, eligible companies would need to demonstrate a reasonable assurance of repayment within the terms of the agreement and agree to the following requirements: Loans will be used to domestically manufacture, assemble, and/or service goods, equipment, parts, and components. Materials used for manufacturing will be domestically produced or mined. Work will not be outsourced to other countries. Also, companies that receive loans must not be found in violation of any federal labor and employment laws for one year prior to the inception of the loan and through its term. Address currency misalignment As detailed in EPI’s Policy Agenda, policymakers must focus their attention on making the dollar competitive. Cheap imports achieved through [foreign] currency undervaluation continue to make production in China and elsewhere attractive. Combined with addressing the effects of the strong dollar on trade imbalances, bringing supply chains home will require that policymakers take actions outlined in the EPI Policy Agenda: Engage in international negotiation to lead to a competitive dollar, as the U.S. did with the 1985 Plaza Accord. If negotiations fail, rely on the U.S. Treasury and the Federal Reserve to sell dollars in global markets to realign the dollar’s value against other currencies. Impose a tax on the purchases of dollar-denominated assets by foreign governments and investors. Eliminate tax incentives that encourage corporations to outsource production If the administration is serious about bringing jobs back home, it should support legislation that would remove tax incentives for corporations to create and maintain production overseas. Introduced last year by Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse and Rep. Lloyd Doggett, The No Tax Breaks for Outsourcing Act would go a long way toward removing these incentives. According to Whitehouse’s office, the measure would, among other things: Tax income from overseas subsidiaries at the same rate that applies to domestic income. Treat “foreign” corporations that are managed and controlled in the U.S. as domestic companies. Crack down on so called “inversions” by maintaining the U.S. tax treatment of merged companies that retain a majority of U.S. ownership. While strong statements from some administration officials, like the USTR, about bringing jobs home are laudable, current policies will not achieve these much-needed results. With over 36 million people out of work and an unemployment rate which has reached Depression-era levels, Americans are in desperate need of a well-coordinated, comprehensive policy to stop the erosion of our nation’s industrial base. Of course, changing the flow of supply chains back to the U.S. will not occur overnight. But we need to start somewhere and we need to start now. Never again should our highest officials in the Defense Department have to plead for help from another country to produce the essential equipment that should be produced here at home. Nor should our officials demand that another country force its workers to produce goods for the U.S. under unsafe conditions.

#### Outsourcing decks domestic innovation and manufacturing—has long term effects

Mohr 19

Angie Mohr is an economist with extensive personal finance experince of over 18 years. She’s a writer for Forbes, MSNBC money, the motley fool, CBS moneywatch, yahoo finance, and others. She’s also an investment and economic author. “4 eays outsourcing damages industry” Investopedia. https://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/0312/4-ways-outsourcing-damages-industry.aspx June 25, 2019. [leg up changed to advantage for potential ableist connotations]

The outsourcing of human capital to countries in the developing world is a cost-saving measure employed by an increasing number of companies across the United States. It is estimated that the number of jobs outsourced offshoreby 2015 could be as high as 3.3 million. While the practice has preserved capital for many national and international companies, it could be damaging to American industry as a whole, in the long term. The draining of jobs, knowledge and innovation may eventually give other countries a technological [advantage] on the United States, and depress the American economy further. These are four major threats to U.S industry caused by outsourcing. Higher Semi-Permanent Unemployment Jobs that move offshore often do not come back. The lower wages and operating costs, plus the simpler administrative requirements in countries such as India and Russia, make operating in those countries cheaper and easier. Without new jobs being created in America, unemployment rises and a higher base unemployment rate becomes the norm. It could be decades before developing countries reach their saturation point and wages are driven higher. In the meantime, more American workers are out of work with few prospects of landing a job. Loss of Intellectual Capital In the beginning, the outsourcing movement was meant to transfer low-skill jobs out and retain highly-skilled jobs as an important asset for the advancement of the country's economy. However, as emerging economies work hard to build their own intellectual capital, American companies are increasingly contracting accountants, engineers and IT specialists at a rate far lower than it would cost them in the U.S. This "brain drain" has long-term repercussions for American industry. Once a skill has been largely moved offshore, it is difficult to regain. For example, if most publishers outsource book design and layout work to Chinese firms, over time there will be fewer designers in the U.S. who have that skill. It also means that there are fewer students of the craft, due to lack of opportunities. Loss of Manufacturing Capacity When industry moves offshore, not only do we lose the knowledge, we also lose the manufacturing capacity. For example, the U.S. was once the leader in solar cell manufacturing, but most American solar technology companies have set up new plants in countries that offer significant incentives, such as Germany. The manufacturing capacity is gone and, if the U.S. ever wanted to repatriate these types of industries, it would take years to re-develop the manufacturing equipment and train engineers. Reliance on Foreign RelationsAnother risk that outsourcing companies face is the potential for relations with other countries to change. For example if the U.S. were to engage in a trade war with China, the Chinese government may levy tariffs against foreign companies operating within its borders or on goods crossing the border. In 1996, the Helms-Burton Act restricted U.S. companies from doing business in and with Cuba, forcing many companies to totally redesign their operations outside of the country.Investors in international markets can also suffer losses to their portfolios if relations between two countries break down or if a foreign country falls into economic duress, which negatively affects the activities of companies operating in that region. The Bottom Line, The short term gain derived by companies that outsource operations offshore is eclipsed by the long term damage to the U.S. economy. Over time, the loss of jobs and expertise will make innovation in the U.S. difficult, while, at the same time, building the brain trust of other countries.

#### US manufacturing and innovation lag gives China/Russia hypersonic dominance in the new arms race—Hypersonics are destructive missiles which are too fast to be deterred
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Russia, China, the U.S.: Who Will Win the Hypersonic Arms Race? When missiles fly beyond Mach 5, materials melt, airflow turns turbulent, and budgets enter the stratosphere | [Philip E. Ross](https://spectrum.ieee.org/author/ross-philip-e) (Philip E. Ross became a senior editor at IEEE Spectrum in June 2006. His interests include transportation, energy storage, artificial intelligence, natural-language processing, and the economic aspects of technology. He has reported on solar towers in Spain, cloud seeding in Nevada, telescopes atop a mountain in the Canaries, and robotic cars in California and Germany. He blogs mainly for [Cars That Think](https://spectrum.ieee.org/blog/cars-that-think), which won a 2015 Neal Award. Earlier in his career he worked for Red Herring, Forbes, Scientific American, and The New York Times. He has a master’s degree in international affairs from Columbia University and another, in journalism, from the University of Michigan.), 17 Nov 2020 | 16:00 GMT, https://spectrum.ieee.org/aerospace/aviation/russia-china-the-us-who-will-win-the-hypersonic-arms-race///(\*ak)

It’s obvious why the militaries of the world want missiles that can follow erratic paths at low altitude while flying at five times the speed of sound, eluding any chance at detection or interception. “Think of it as delivering a pizza, except it’s not a pizza,” says [Bradley Wheaton](https://www.facebook.com/afosr/posts/dr-brad-wheaton-and-his-team-at-jhu-applied-physics-laboratory-apl-are-working-t/10156523149046425/), a specialist in hypersonics at the Johns Hopkins University [Applied Physics Laboratory](https://www.jhuapl.edu/) (APL), in Maryland. “In the United States, just 15 minutes can cover the East Coast; a really fast missile takes 20 minutes to get to the West Coast. At these speeds, you have a factor of 50 increase in the area covered per unit of time.” So the question isn’t why the great powers are pursuing hypersonic arms, but why they are doing so now. Quick answer: They are once again locked in an arms race. The wider world first heard of this type of weaponry in March 2018, when Russian president Vladimir Putin [gave a speech](https://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2018/03/01/590014611/experts-aghast-over-russian-claim-of-nuclear-powered-missile-with-unlimited-rang) describing his country’s plans for a nuclear-powered cruise missile that could fly around the world at blinding speed, then snake around hills and dales to a target. His bold assertions have been questioned, particularly the part about nuclear power. Even so, a year later [a nuclear accident killed seven people](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/12/world/europe/russia-nuclear-accident-putin.html) near a testing range off the northern coast of Russia, and U.S. intelligence officials speculated that it involved hypersonic experiments. The nature of that accident is still shrouded in mystery, but it’s clear there’s been a huge increase in the research effort in hypersonics. Here’s a roundup of what the superpowers of the 21st century are doing to pursue what is, in fact, an old concept. The hypersonic missiles in use or in testing in China and Russia can apparently carry either conventional warheads, aimed at ships and other small military targets, or nuclear ones, aimed at cities and government centers. These ship killers could deprive the United States of its preeminence at sea, which is more than enough reason for China, for instance, to develop hypersonics. But a nuclear-armed version that leaves the defender too little time to launch a retaliatory strike would do even more to shift the balance of power, because it would dismantle the painstakingly constructed system of deterrence known as mutually assured destruction, or by the jocular acronym MAD. “The nuclear side is very destabilizing, which is why the Russians are going after it,” says [Christopher Combs](https://engineering.utsa.edu/mechanical/team/combs/), a professor of mechanical engineering at the University of Texas at San Antonio. “But on the U.S. side we see no need for that, so we’re going conventional.” That is indeed the official U.S. policy. But in August, some months after Combs spoke with IEEE Spectrum, an Aviation Week article [pointed out](https://aviationweek.com/defense-space/missile-defense-weapons/usaf-errantly-reveals-research-icbm-range-hypersonic-glide) that an Air Force agency charged with nuclear weapons requested that companies submit ideas for a “thermal protection system that can support [a] hypersonic glide to ICBM ranges.” Soon after that, the request was hastily taken down, and the U.S. Air Force felt compelled to restate its policy not to pursue nuclear-capable hypersonic weapons. Today’s forays into hypersonic research have deep roots, [reaching back](https://www.nasa.gov/centers/dryden/history/milestones/50.html) to the late 1950s, in both the United States and the Soviet Union. Although this work continued for decades, in 1994, a few years after the Cold War ended with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the United States pulled the plug on research into hypersonic flight, including its last and biggest program, the [Rockwell X-30](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rockwell_X-30). Nicknamed the “Orient Express,” the X-30 was to have been a crewed transport that would top out at 25 times the speed of sound, Mach 25—enough to take off from Washington, D.C., and land in Tokyo 2 hours later. Russia also discontinued research in this area during the 1990s, when its economy was in tatters. Today’s test vehicles just pick up where the old ones left off, explains [Alexander Fedorov](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Alexander_Fedorov2), a professor at Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology and an expert on hypersonic flow at the boundary layer, which is right next to the vehicle’s skin. “What’s flying now is just a demonstration of technology—the science is 30 years old,” he says. Fedorov has lectured in the United States; he even helps U.S. graduate students with their research. He laments how the arms race has stifled international cooperation, adding that he himself has “zero knowledge” about the military project Putin touted two years ago. “But I know that people are working on it,” he adds. In the new race, Fedorov says, Russia has experience without much money, China has money without much experience, and the United States has both, although it revived its efforts later than did Russia or China and is now playing catch-up. For fiscal 2021, U.S. research agencies have budgeted US [$3.2 billion](https://fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R45811.pdf)[PDF] for all hypersonic weapons research, up from $2.6 billion in the previous year. Other programs are under way in India and Australia; even Israel and Iran are in the game, if on the sidelines. But Fedorov suggests that the Chinese are the ones to watch: They used to talk at international meetings, he says, but now they mostly just listen, which is what you’d expect if they had started working on truly new ideas—of which, he reiterates, there are very few on display. All the competing powers have shown vehicles that are “very conservative,” he says. One good reason for the rarity of radical designs is the enormous expense of the research. Engineers can learn only so much by running tests on the ground, using computational fluid-flow models and hypersonic wind tunnels, which themselves cost a pretty penny (and simulate only some limited aspects of hypersonic flight). Engineers really need to fly their creations, and usually when they do, they use up the test vehicle. That makes design iteration very costly. It’s no wonder hypersonic prototypes fail so often. In mere supersonic flight, passing Mach 1 is a clear-cut thing: The plane outdistances the sound waves that it imparts to the air to produce a shock wave, which forms the familiar [two-beat sonic boom](https://www.nasa.gov/centers/armstrong/news/FactSheets/FS-016-DFRC.html). But as the vehicle exceeds Mach 5, the density of the air just behind the shock wave diminishes, allowing the wave to [nestle along the surface](http://www.aerospaceweb.org/design/waverider/flow.shtml) of the vehicle. That in-your-face layer poses no aerodynamic problems, and it could even be an advantage, when it’s smooth. But it can become turbulent in a heartbeat. “Predicting when it’s going turbulent is hard,” says Wheaton, of Johns Hopkins APL. “And it’s important because when it does, heating goes up, and it affects how control surfaces can steer. Also, there’s more drag.” The pioneers of hypersonic flight learned about turbulence the hard way. On one of its many flights, in 1967, the U.S. Air Force’s X-15 experimental hypersonic plane went into a spin, killing the pilot, [Michael J. Adams](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_J._Adams). The right stuff, indeed. Hypersonic missiles come in two varieties. The first kind, launched into space on the tip of a ballistic missile, punches down into the atmosphere, then uses momentum to maneuver. Such “boost-glide” missiles have no jet engines and thus need no air inlets, so it’s easy to make them symmetrical, typically a tube with a cone-shape tip. Every part of the skin gets equal exposure to the air, which at these speeds breaks down into a plume of plasma, like the one that puts astronauts in radio silence during reentry. Boost-glide missiles are now operational. China appears to have deployed the first one, called the Dongfeng-17, a ballistic missile that carries glide vehicles. Some of those gliders are [billed as capable of knocking out U.S. Navy supercarriers](https://www.globaltimes.cn/content/1193485.shtml). For such a mission it need not pack a nuclear or even a conventional warhead, instead relying on its enormous kinetic energy to destroy its target. And there’s nothing that any country can now do to defend against it. “Those things are going so fast, you’re not going to get it,” General Mark Milley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in March, in [testimony](https://www.armed-services.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/20-13_03-04-2020.pdf)[PDF] before Congress. You might think that you give up the element of surprise by starting with a ballistic trajectory. But not completely. Once the hypersonic missile comes out of its dive to fly horizontally, it becomes invisible to sparsely spaced radars, particularly the handful based in the Pacific Ocean. And that flat flight path can swerve a lot. That’s not because of any AI-managed magic—the vehicle just follows a randomized, preprogrammed set of turns. But the effect on those playing defense is the same: The pizza arrives before they can find their wallets. The second kind of hypersonic missile gets the bulk of its impulse from a jet engine that inhales air really fast, whirls it together with fuel, and burns the mixture in the instant that it tarries in the combustion chamber before blowing out the back as exhaust. Because these engines don’t need compressors but simply use the force of forward movement to ram air inside, and because that combustion proceeds supersonically, they are called supersonic ram jets—scramjets, for short. One advantage the scramjet has over the boost-glide missile is its ability to stay below radar and continue to maneuver over great distances, all the way to its target. And because it never enters outer space, it doesn’t need to ride a rocket booster, although it does need some powerful helper to get it up to the speed at which first a ramjet, and then a scramjet, can work. Another advantage of the scramjet is that it can, in principle, be applied for civilian purposes, moving people or packages that absolutely, positively have to be there quickly. The Europeans have such [a project](https://www.nbcnews.com/mach/science/hypersonic-airliner-would-take-you-los-angeles-tokyo-under-two-ncna1045986). So do the [Chinese](https://www.bbc.com/news/business-43151175), and Boeing has shown a [concept](https://www.space.com/41042-boeing-hypersonic-passenger-plane-concept.html). Everyone talks up this possibility because, frankly, it’s the only peaceable talking point there is for hypersonics. Don’t forget, though, that supersonic commercial flight happened long ago, made no money, and ended—and supersonic flight is way easier. The scramjet has one big disadvantage: It’s a lot harder technically. Any hypersonic vehicle must fend off the rapidly moving air outside, which can heat the leading edges to as high as [3,000 °C](https://www.asme.org/topics-resources/content/ceramics-make-hypersonic-flight-possibility#:~:text=Temperatures%20at%20the%20surface%20of,cones%20and%20leading%20edges%20intact.). But that heat and stress is nothing like the hellfire inside a scramjet engine. There, the heat cannot radiate away, it’s hard to keep the flame lit, and the insides can come apart second by second, affecting airflow and stability. Five minutes is a long time in this business. That’s why scramjets, though conceived in the 1950s, still remain a work in progress. In the early 2000s, NASA’s [X-43](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NASA_X-43) used scramjets for about 10 seconds in flight. In 2013, [Boeing’s X-51 Waverider](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boeing_X-51_Waverider) flew at hypersonic speed for [210 seconds](https://www.flightglobal.com/pictures-and-animation-x-51a-waverider-reaches-mach-5-in-140s-scramjet-flight/93720.article) while under scramjet power. Tests on the ground have fared better. In May, workers at the Beijing Academy of Sciences ran a scramjet for 10 minutes, according to a [report](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/science/article/3086804/report-chinese-scramjet-test-challenge-most-advanced-missile) in the South China Morning Post. Two years earlier, the leader of the project, Fan Xuejun, [told the same newspaper](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/CASI/Display/Article/1604494/chinas-opening-a-factory-to-build-engines-for-hypersonic-missiles-and-spaceplan/) that a factory was being built to construct a variety of scramjets, some supposedly for civilian application. One engine would use a combined cycle, with a turbojet to get off the ground, a ramjet to accelerate to near-hypersonic speed, a scramjet to blow past Mach 5, and maybe even a rocket to top off the thrust. That’s a lot of moving parts—and an ambition worthy of Elon Musk. But even Musk might hesitate to follow Putin’s proposal to use a nuclear reactor for energy. The cost of developing a scramjet capability is only one part of the economic challenge. The other is making the engine cheap enough to deploy and use in a routine way. To do that, you need fuel you can rely on. Early researchers worked with a class of highly energetic fuels that would react on contact with air, like triethylaluminum. “It’s a fantastic scramjet engine fuel, but very toxic, a bit like the hydrazine fuels used in rockets nowadays, and this became an inhibitor,” says [David Van Wie](https://www.linkedin.com/in/dave-vanwie-a8030a29), of Johns Hopkins APL, explaining why triethylaluminum was dropped from serious consideration. Next up was liquid hydrogen, which is also very reactive. But it needs elaborate cooling. Worse, it packs a rather low amount of energy into a given volume, and as a cryogenic fuel it is inconvenient to store and transport. It has been and still is used in experimental missiles, such as the X-43. Today’s choice for practical missiles is hydrocarbons, of the same ilk as jet fuel, but fancier. The Chinese scramjet that burned for 10 minutes—like others on the drawing board around the world—burns hydrocarbons. Here the problem lies in breaking down the hydrocarbon’s long molecular chains fast so the shards can bind with oxygen in the split second when the substances meet and mate. And a split second isn’t enough—you have to do it continuously, one split second after another, “like keeping a match lit in a hurricane,” in the [oft-quoted words](https://www.nasa.gov/missions/research/X-43_overview.html) of NASA spokesman Gary Creech, back in 2004. Scramjet designs try to protect the flame by shaping the inflow geometry to create an eddy, forming a calm zone not unlike the eye of a hurricane. Flameouts are particularly worrisome when the missile starts jinking about, thus disrupting the airflow. “It’s the ‘unstart’ phenomenon, where the shock wave at the air inlets stops the engine, and the vehicle will be lost,” says [John D. Schmisseur](https://www.utsi.edu/dr-john-schmisseur/), a researcher at the University of Tennessee Space Institute, in Tullahoma. And you really only get to meet such gremlins in actual flight, he adds. There are other problems besides flameout that arise when you’re inhaling a tornado. One expert, who requested anonymity, puts it this way: “If you’re ingesting air, it’s no longer air; it’s a complex mix of ionized atmosphere,” he says. “There’s no water anymore; it’s all hydrogen and oxygen, and the nitrogen is to some fraction elemental, not molecular. So combustion isn’t air and fuel—it’s whatever you’re taking in, whatever junk—which means chemistry at the inlet matters.” Simulating the chemistry is what makes hypersonic wind-tunnel tests problematic. It’s fairly simple to see how an airfoil responds aerodynamically to Mach 5—just cool the air so that the speed of sound drops, giving a higher Mach number for a given airspeed. But blowing cold air tells you only a small part of the story because it heads off all the chemistry you want to study. True, you can instead run your wind tunnel fast, hot, and dense—at “high enthalpy,” to use the term of art—but it’s hard to keep that maelstrom going for more than a few milliseconds. “Get the airspeed high enough to start up the chemistry and the reactions sap the energy,” says [Mark Gragston](https://mabe.utk.edu/people/mark-gragston/), an aerospace expert who’s also at the UT Space Institute. Getting access to such monster machines isn’t easy, either. “At Arnold Air Force Base, across the street from me, the Air Force does high-enthalpy wind-tunnel experiments,” he says. “They’re booked up three years in advance.” Other countries have more of the necessary wind tunnels; even India has [about a dozen](https://fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R45811.pdf)[PDF]. Right now, the United States is spending loads of money building these machines in an effort to catch up with Russia and China. You could say there is a wind-tunnel gap—one more reason U.S. researchers are keen for test flights. Another thing about cooling the air: It does wonders for any combustion engine, even the kind that pushes pistons. [Reaction Engines](https://www.reactionengines.co.uk/about/about-us), in Abingdon, England, appears to be the first to try to apply this phenomenon in flight, with a special precooling unit. In its less-ambitious scheme, the precooler sits in front of the air inlet of a standard turbojet, adding power and efficiency. In its more-ambitious concept, called [SABRE](https://www.reactionengines.co.uk/beyond-possible/sabre) (Synergetic Air Breathing Rocket Engine), the engine operates in combined mode: It takes off as a turbojet assisted by the precooler and accelerates until a ramjet can switch on, adding enough thrust to reach (but not exceed) Mach 5. Then, as the vehicle climbs and the atmosphere thins out, the engine switches to pure rocket mode, finally launching a payload into orbit. In principle, a precooler could work in a scramjet. But if anyone’s trying that, they’re not talking about it. Fast forward five years and boost-glide missiles will no doubt be deployed in the service of multiple countries. Jump ahead another 15 or 20 years, and the world’s superpowers will have scramjet missiles. So what? Won’t these things always play second fiddle to ballistic missiles? And won’t the defense also have its say, by unveiling superfast antimissiles and Buck Rogers–style directed-energy weapons? Perhaps not. The defense always has the harder job. As President John F. Kennedy [noted in an interview](https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/television-and-radio-interview-after-two-years-conversation-with-the-president) way back in 1962, when talking about antiballistic missile defense, what you are trying to do is shoot a bullet with a bullet. And, he added, you have to shoot down not just one but many, including a bodyguard of decoys. Today there are indeed antimissile defenses that can protect particular targets against ballistic missiles, at least when they’re not being fired in massive salvos. But you can’t defend everything, which is why the great powers still count on deterrence through mutually assured destruction. By that logic, if you can detect cruise missiles soon enough, you can at least make those who launched them wish they hadn’t. For that to work, we’ll need better eyes in the skies. In the United States, the military wants around $100 million for research on low-orbit space sensors to detect low-flying hypersonic missiles, Aviation Week [reported](https://aviationweek.com/defense-space/mda-seeking-108m-more-hypersonic-defense-sensors) in 2019. Hardly any of the recent advances in hypersonic flight result from new scientific discoveries; almost all of it stems from changes in political will. Powers that challenge the international status quo—China and Russia—have found the resources and the will to shape the arms race to their benefit. Powers that benefit from the status quo—the United States, above all—are responding in kind. Politicians fired the starting pistol, and the technologists are gamely leaping forward. And the point? There is no point. It’s an arms race.

#### US domestic manufacturing competitivity is vital to deterring hypersonics-- The risk is existential

Polsgrove 8-20

OCTOBER 20, 2020 [Nuclear War Makes a Comeback](https://www.counterpunch.org/2020/10/20/nuclear-war-makes-a-comeback/) BY [CAROL POLSGROVE](https://www.counterpunch.org/author/carolpolsgrove/) (She holds Ph. D. and M.A. degrees in English from the University of Louisville and an M.A.) | <https://www.counterpunch.org/2020/10/20/nuclear-war-makes-a-comeback/>//(\*ak)

On websites where policy makers, scholars, and military leaders gather, concern about the possibility of nuclear war has been rising sharply in recent months as China, the United States, and Russia develop new weapons and new ways of using old ones. On [War on the Rocks](https://warontherocks.com/2020/08/managing-the-sino-american-dispute-over-missile-defense/), an online platform for national security articles and podcasts, Tong Zhao, a senior fellow at the Carnegie-Tsinghua Center for Global Policy, reported August 11 on public calls in China “to quickly and massively build up its nuclear forces” on the theory that only a “more robust nuclear posture” would prevent war with the United States. The biggest nuclear arms budget ever is nearing approval in the US Congress, and the Trump administration has raised the possibility of resuming nuclear tests. President Trump has pulled the United States out of the1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty with Russia, while the New Start Treaty capping Russian and U.S. nuclear warheads and delivery systems is set to expire next February if the two countries don’t agree to extend it. For its part, Russia appears poised to equip its navy with hypersonic nuclear strike weapons, and according to the British newspaper [The Independent](https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/russia-nuclear-weapons-hypersonic-vladimir-putin-poseidon-drone-tsirkon-a9638921.html), “The Russian premier has repeatedly spoken of his wish to develop a new generation of nuclear weapons that can be targeted anywhere on the planet.” Meanwhile, momentum to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons has faltered. Nine nations now hold nuclear arms in an increasingly unsettled international scene. [Recent research](https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/5/10/eaay5478) has shown that a nuclear exchange between just two of those with lesser arsenals—India and Pakistan— “could directly kill about 2.5 times as many as died worldwide in WWII, and in this nuclear war, the fatalities could occur in a single week.” Burning cities would throw so much soot into the upper atmosphere that temperatures and precipitation levels would fall across much of the earth—bringing widespread drought, famine, and death. Clashes between India, Pakistan, and other nuclear armed states have become frequent enough that the International Red Cross marked the 75th anniversary of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki with [a warning](https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/press-release/international-red-cross-red-crescent-movement-urges-nations-end-nuclear-era): “[T]he risk of use of nuclear weapons has risen to levels not seen since the end of the Cold War.” For 75 years, the nuclear Sword of Damocles has dangled over the earth. There is widespread agreement among analysts that the long lull may soon be over—due in part, to the end of the Cold War. During those decades, the United States and the USSR cooperated not only to avoid bombing each other into oblivion but also to discourage other nations from gaining their own nuclear arms, in part by spreading their nuclear umbrellas over their allies. That international system has dissolved. In addition to the United States, Russia, and China, other nations have nuclear weapons and more are likely to acquire them. And a new possibility has appeared on the horizon: the increased likelihood that nuclear weapons could be introduced into conventional warfare in regional wars. In [a monograph](https://cgsr.llnl.gov/content/assets/docs/CGSR_LP4-FINAL.pdf) published by Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, US defense policy and strategy analyst John K. Warden writes that “in the capitals of potential adversary countries,” the idea is taking hold “that nuclear wars can be won because they can be kept limited, and thus can be fought—even against the United States.” What can the United States do to convince adversaries not to introduce nuclear weapons into a conventional war—to make clear, in advance, that taking such a step would lead to fatal consequences for the country that took it? The answer from the US national security establishment, as the fiscal 2021 defense budget suggests, is a readiness to fight fire with fire: If the “adversaries” of the United States hold out the threat of introducing nuclear weapons in a conventional war, then (the argument goes) they should expect that the United States will respond in kind. How many weapons and delivery systems would that require? A lot, according to the nuclear budget for the Departments of Defense and Energy now going through Congress. At a time when Covid-19 has shaken the foundations of the federal budget, Congress is close to [approving $44.5 billion](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2020-03/news/us-nuclear-budget-skyrockets) for fiscal 2121 to modernize nuclear warheads, delivery systems, and the infrastructure that supports them. Sierra Club Nuclear Policy Director John Coequyt has [called on Congress](https://www.sierraclub.org/press-releases/2020/08/75th-anniversary-japan-nuclear-bombings-sierra-club-continues-calls-for#:~:text=In%20response%2C%20Sierra%20Club%20Nuclear,of%20all%20nuclear%20weapons%20worldwide) “to resist the current renewal of the nuclear arms race and to ban the use of nuclear weapons,” and Sierra Club members have mobilized to try to stop funding for nuclear war projects in their neighborhoods. In South Carolina, for instance, Tom Clements, Sierra Club member and director of Savannah River Site Watch, has joined other groups in [challenging plans](file:///\\users\carolpolsgrove\Downloads\%5bhttps:\srswatch.org\wp-content\uploads\2020\06\SRS-Watch-news-on-pit-plant-petition-to-DOE-June-24-2020.pdf) for expanded plutonium pit production at the Savannah River Site. And the Ohio Sierra Club’s Nuclear Free Committee has [opposed production](https://content.sierraclub.org/grassrootsnetwork/sites/content.sierraclub.org.activistnetwork/files/teams/documents/Ohio%2C%20Centrus%2C%20Saudi%20Nuclear%20Bomb%20Sierra%201-2020.pdf) at the Portsmouth Nuclear Site in Piketon of “high-assay low-enriched uranium” that could be upgraded for weapons use, in the United States or elsewhere. While such efforts often focus on local effects of nuclear weapons production, they also manifest a larger concern. Says the Club’s Nuclear Free Core Team’s Mark Muhich, the renewed nuclear arms race is “an existential threat both to human civilization and to the earth.”

#### Other methods fail, having the ability to unconditionally strike is key to securing protections against outsourcing and bad conditions

Poydock et al 21

Downturn in strike activity reflects COVID-19 recession but fails to capture many walkouts for worker safety Report • By Margaret Poydock (Margaret Poydock joined EPI in 2016. As the policy analyst, she assists the policy team in managing EPI’s legislative and policy initiatives to build a more just economy. Previously, Poydock was EPI’s communications assistant. In that position, she provided support for the media relations, publications, and web departments.), Celine McNicholas (Celine McNicholas is the director of policy and government affairs/general counsel at the Economic Policy Institute, a nonprofit, nonpartisan think tank that uses the power of its research on economic trends and the impact of economic policies to advance reforms that serve working people, deliver racial justice, and guarantee gender equity. McNicholas assumed the policy director position in October 2021. She has served as EPI’s director of government affairs and labor counsel since 2017.), and Heidi Shierholz (Heidi Shierholz is the president of the Economic Policy Institute, a nonprofit, nonpartisan think tank that uses the power of its research on economic trends and on the impact of economic policies to advance reforms that serve working people, deliver racial justice, and guarantee gender equity. In 2021 she became the fourth president EPI has had since its founding in 1986.) • February 19, 2021 https://www.epi.org/publication/2020-work-stoppage-report////(\*ak)

University of Illinois at Chicago workers strike for pay raises and safety protections On September 14, 2020, more than 4,000 workers at the University of Illinois at Chicago went on strike.[11](https://www.epi.org/publication/2020-work-stoppage-report/#_note11) The workers, represented by the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 73, authorized the strike after a year’s worth of failed contract negotiations to address fair pay and working conditions. The striking workers called for minimum wage increases, adequate staffing levels, and safer working conditions during the coronavirus pandemic. The strike also served as a solidarity action with nurses at the University of Illinois Hospital, who had just begun a strike of their own to call for adequate staffing levels and protective equipment.[12](https://www.epi.org/publication/2020-work-stoppage-report/#_note12) After ten days, the UIC strike concluded when SEIU Local 73 and the university agreed to a four-year contract that provided across-the-board raises and back pay for all workers, safe staffing levels to limit exposure to the coronavirus, personal protective equipment, protections against outsourcing, and for establishing a $15 minimum wage for building service workers.{{13}

## Contention Two: Worker power

#### Current strike protection is weak, that leads to inequality, but the aff would restore union integrity

HRW 21 April 29, 2021 6:00AM EDT Why the US PRO Act Matters for the Right to Unionize: Questions and Answers | <https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/04/29/why-us-pro-act-matters-right-unionize-questions-and-answers> HRW (Human Rights Watch investigates and reports on abuses happening in all corners of the world. We are roughly 450 people of 70-plus nationalities who are country experts, lawyers, journalists, and others who work to protect the most at risk, from vulnerable minorities and civilians in wartime, to refugees and children in need.)///(\*ak)

The Covid-19 pandemic has exposed the [difficult economic and social realities](https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/03/02/united-states-pandemic-impact-people-poverty) for many working people in the United States and has exacerbated pre-existing inequalities. Low-wage workers, who are disproportionately women, migrants, and Black, Indigenous, and other people of color, have largely borne the brunt of the pandemic’s economic fallout. Weaknesses and deficiencies in US labor law have made the situation worse. Workers face major obstacles to organize, unionize, and collectively bargain for [fair wages](https://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/inwork/cb-policy-guide/declarationofPhiladelphia1944.pdf), decent benefits, and safe working conditions. On numerous fronts, US laws fall far short of international standards on freedom of association and collective bargaining. Now there is an opportunity to strengthen US labor laws. The Protecting the Right to Organize Act (the PRO Act), H.R. 842, S. 420 passed the US House of Representatives on March 9, 2021 with a bipartisan vote. If approved by the Senate, it would significantly strengthen the ability of workers in the private sector to form unions and engage in collective bargaining for better working conditions and fair wages. If enacted into law, the PRO Act would be the most comprehensive worker empowerment legislation since the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of 1935. This question-and-answer document addresses the PRO Act through a human rights lens, with a focus on the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining. It examines the challenges of unionizing in the US and explains how the PRO Act would be a corrective. Current US law excludes certain categories of workers, makes it difficult for workers to join unions, hampers the fight for better working conditions, and has failed to keep up with the disruptive role of workplace technologies in organizing efforts. Addressing these shortcomings could help to bring US law closer to international human rights standards, and slow or reverse decades of rising economic inequality.

#### Best evidence concludes AFF---decreasing worker power causes inequality AND slow growth

Bivens & Shierholz 18, Josh Bivens is the director of research at the Economic Policy Institute (EPI). Heidi Shierholz leads EPI’s policy team, which monitors wage and employment policies coming out of Congress and the administration and advances a worker-first policy agenda. EPI (2018) “What labor market changes have generated inequality and wage suppression?” <https://files.epi.org/pdf/148880.pdf> brett

At the macroeconomic level, this claim that stripping away bulwarks to workers’ power has failed to lead to efficiency gains seems extremely well supported by the evidence. While many of the policy changes that have limited workers’ market power since the 1970s were done explicitly in the name of efficiency-seeking, the rate of productivity growth (a measure of how much income is generated in an hour of work—the most common macroeconomic measure of economic efficiency) slowed radically in the years after the mid-1970s, as seen in Figure B.13 This slowdown was briefly reversed in the late 1990s by the large investment in information and communications technologies associated with the widespread adoption of the internet and by a period of tighter labor markets (Bivens 2017b). But this brief surge soon failed and productivity continued growing much more slowly than in previous periods—when policy had consciously supported the leverage of typical workers. In short, the policy movement to disempower workers not only led to less equal growth, but was also associated with significantly slower growth.

When we assert that most of the policy change that led to inequality and slower growth was focused on disempowering workers—and that policy going forward needs to work to reempower workers—we certainly do not mean to imply one should ignore potential policy opportunities that could erode employer power (e.g., through more robust antitrust enforcement). But the larger opportunities are likely those that lead to more labor market balance in the power between employers and workers by increasing worker power—not trying to move the labor market toward a competitive ideal that is not attainable.

#### Inequality causes immense global conflict

Solt 11 – Frederick Solt, Ph.D. in Political Science from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, currently Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Iowa, Assistant Professor, Departments of Political Science and Sociology, Southern Illinois at the time of publication, “Diversionary Nationalism: Economic Inequality and the Formation of National Pride,” *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 73, No. 3, pgs. 821-830, July 2011, Available to Subscribing Institutions)

One of the oldest theories of nationalism is that states instill the nationalist myth in their citizens to divert their attention from great economic inequality and so forestall pervasive unrest. Because the very concept of nationalism obscures the extent of inequality and is a potent tool for delegitimizing calls for redistribution, it is a perfect diversion, and states should be expected to engage in more nationalist mythmaking when inequality increases. The evidence presented by this study supports this theory: across the countries and over time, where economic inequality is greater, nationalist sentiments are substantially more widespread. This result adds considerably to our understanding of nationalism. To date, many scholars have focused on the international environment as the principal source of threats that prompt states to generate nationalism; the importance of the domestic threat posed by economic inequality has been largely overlooked. However, at least in recent years, domestic inequality is a far more important stimulus for the generation of nationalist sentiments than the international context. Given that nuclear weapons—either their own or their allies’—rather than the mass army now serve as the primary defense of many countries against being overrun by their enemies, perhaps this is not surprising: nationalism-inspired mass mobilization is simply no longer as necessary for protection as it once was (see Mearsheimer 1990, 21; Posen 1993, 122–24). Another important implication of the analyses presented above is that growing economic inequality may increase ethnic conflict. States may foment national pride to stem discontent with increasing inequality, but this pride can also lead to more hostility towards immigrants and minorities. Though pride in the nation is distinct from chauvinism and outgroup hostility, it is nevertheless closely related to these phenomena, and recent experimental research has shown that members of majority groups who express high levels of national pride can be nudged into intolerant and xenophobic responses quite easily (Li and Brewer 2004). This finding suggests that, by leading to the creation of more national pride, higher levels of inequality produce environments favorable to those who would inflame ethnic animosities. Another and perhaps even more worrisome implication regards the likelihood of war. Nationalism is frequently suggested as a cause of war, and more national pride has been found to result in a much greater demand for national security even at the expense of civil liberties (Davis and Silver 2004, 36–37) as well as preferences for “a more militaristic foreign affairs posture and a more interventionist role in world politics” (Conover and Feldman 1987, 3). To the extent that these preferences influence policymaking, the growth in economic inequality over the last quarter century should be expected to lead to more aggressive foreign policies and more international conflict. If economic inequality prompts states to generate diversionary nationalism as the results presented above suggest, then rising inequality could make for a more dangerous world. The results of this work also contribute to our still limited knowledge of the relationship between economic inequality and democratic politics. In particular, it helps explain the fact that, contrary to median-voter models of redistribution (e.g., Meltzer and Richard 1981), democracies with higher levels of inequality do not consistently respond with more redistribution (e.g., Bénabou 1996). Rather than allowing redistribution to be decided through the democratic process suggested by such models, this work suggests that states often respond to higher levels of inequality with more nationalism. Nationalism then works to divert attention from inequality, so many citizens neither realize the extent of inequality nor demand redistributive policies. By prompting states to promote nationalism, greater economic inequality removes the issue of redistribution from debate and therefore narrows the scope of democratic politics.

#### Slow growth and economic decline cascades into several geopolitical struggles—best post-covid evidence

Dr. Mathew Maavak 21, PhD in Risk Foresight from the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, External Researcher (PLATBIDAFO) at the Kazimieras Simonavicius University, Expert and Regular Commentator on Risk-Related Geostrategic Issues at the Russian International Affairs Council, “Horizon 2030: Will Emerging Risks Unravel Our Global Systems?”, Salus Journal – The Australian Journal for Law Enforcement, Security and Intelligence Professionals, Volume 9, Number 1, p. 2-8

Various scholars and institutions regard global social instability as the greatest threat facing this decade. The catalyst has been postulated to be a Second Great Depression which, in turn, will have profound implications for global security and national integrity. This paper, written from a broad systems perspective, illustrates how emerging risks are getting more complex and intertwined; blurring boundaries between the economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological taxonomy used by the World Economic Forum for its annual global risk forecasts. Tight couplings in our global systems have also enabled risks accrued in one area to snowball into a full-blown crisis elsewhere. The COVID-19 pandemic and its socioeconomic fallouts exemplify this systemic chain-reaction. Onceinexorable forces of globalization are rupturing as the current global system can no longer be sustained due to poor governance and runaway wealth fractionation. The coronavirus pandemic is also enabling Big Tech to expropriate the levers of governments and mass communications worldwide. This paper concludes by highlighting how this development poses a dilemma for security professionals. Key Words: Global Systems, Emergence, VUCA, COVID-9, Social Instability, Big Tech, Great Reset INTRODUCTION The new decade is witnessing rising volatility across global systems. Pick any random “system” today and chart out its trajectory: Are our education systems becoming more robust and affordable? What about food security? Are our healthcare systems improving? Are our pension systems sound? Wherever one looks, there are dark clouds gathering on a global horizon marked by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA). But what exactly is a global system? Our planet itself is an autonomous and selfsustaining mega-system, marked by periodic cycles and elemental vagaries. Human activities within however are not system isolates as our banking, utility, farming, healthcare and retail sectors etc. are increasingly entwined. Risks accrued in one system may cascade into an unforeseen crisis within and/or without (Choo, Smith & McCusker, 2007). Scholars call this phenomenon “emergence”; one where the behaviour of intersecting systems is determined by complex and largely invisible interactions at the substratum (Goldstein, 1999; Holland, 1998). The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic is a case in point. While experts remain divided over the source and morphology of the virus, the contagion has ramified into a global health crisis and supply chain nightmare. It is also tilting the geopolitical balance. China is the largest exporter of intermediate products, and had generated nearly 20% of global imports in 2015 alone (Cousin, 2020). The pharmaceutical sector is particularly vulnerable. Nearly “85% of medicines in the U.S. strategic national stockpile” sources components from China (Owens, 2020). An initial run on respiratory masks has now been eclipsed by rowdy queues at supermarkets and the bankruptcy of small businesses. The entire global population – save for major pockets such as Sweden, Belarus, Taiwan and Japan – have been subjected to cyclical lockdowns and quarantines. Never before in history have humans faced such a systemic, borderless calamity. COVID-19 represents a classic emergent crisis that necessitates real-time response and adaptivity in a real-time world, particularly since the global Just-in-Time (JIT) production and delivery system serves as both an enabler and vector for transboundary risks. From a systems thinking perspective, emerging risk management should therefore address a whole spectrum of activity across the economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological (EEGST) taxonomy. Every emerging threat can be slotted into this taxonomy – a reason why it is used by the World Economic Forum (WEF) for its annual global risk exercises (Maavak, 2019a). As traditional forces of globalization unravel, security professionals should take cognizance of emerging threats through a systems thinking approach. METHODOLOGY An EEGST sectional breakdown was adopted to illustrate a sampling of extreme risks facing the world for the 2020-2030 decade. The transcendental quality of emerging risks, as outlined on Figure 1, below, was primarily informed by the following pillars of systems thinking (Rickards, 2020): • Diminishing diversity (or increasing homogeneity) of actors in the global system (Boli & Thomas, 1997; Meyer, 2000; Young et al, 2006); • Interconnections in the global system (Homer-Dixon et al, 2015; Lee & Preston, 2012); • Interactions of actors, events and components in the global system (Buldyrev et al, 2010; Bashan et al, 2013; Homer-Dixon et al, 2015); and • Adaptive qualities in particular systems (Bodin & Norberg, 2005; Scheffer et al, 2012) Since scholastic material on this topic remains somewhat inchoate, this paper buttresses many of its contentions through secondary (i.e. news/institutional) sources. ECONOMY According to Professor Stanislaw Drozdz (2018) of the Polish Academy of Sciences, “a global financial crash of a previously unprecedented scale is highly probable” by the mid- 2020s. This will lead to a trickle-down meltdown, impacting all areas of human activity. The economist John Mauldin (2018) similarly warns that the “2020s might be the worst decade in US history” and may lead to a Second Great Depression. Other forecasts are equally alarming. According to the International Institute of Finance, global debt may have surpassed $255 trillion by 2020 (IIF, 2019). Yet another study revealed that global debts and liabilities amounted to a staggering $2.5 quadrillion (Ausman, 2018). The reader should note that these figures were tabulated before the COVID-19 outbreak. The IMF singles out widening income inequality as the trigger for the next Great Depression (Georgieva, 2020). The wealthiest 1% now own more than twice as much wealth as 6.9 billion people (Coffey et al, 2020) and this chasm is widening with each passing month. COVID-19 had, in fact, boosted global billionaire wealth to an unprecedented $10.2 trillion by July 2020 (UBS-PWC, 2020). Global GDP, worth $88 trillion in 2019, may have contracted by 5.2% in 2020 (World Bank, 2020). As the Greek historian Plutarch warned in the 1st century AD: “An imbalance between rich and poor is the oldest and most fatal ailment of all republics” (Mauldin, 2014). The stability of a society, as Aristotle argued even earlier, depends on a robust middle element or middle class. At the rate the global middle class is facing catastrophic debt and unemployment levels, widespread social disaffection may morph into outright anarchy (Maavak, 2012; DCDC, 2007). Economic stressors, in transcendent VUCA fashion, may also induce radical geopolitical realignments. Bullions now carry more weight than NATO’s security guarantees in Eastern Europe. After Poland repatriated 100 tons of gold from the Bank of England in 2019, Slovakia, Serbia and Hungary quickly followed suit. According to former Slovak Premier Robert Fico, this erosion in regional trust was based on historical precedents – in particular the 1938 Munich Agreement which ceded Czechoslovakia’s Sudetenland to Nazi Germany. As Fico reiterated (Dudik & Tomek, 2019): “You can hardly trust even the closest allies after the Munich Agreement… I guarantee that if something happens, we won’t see a single gram of this (offshore-held) gold. Let’s do it (repatriation) as quickly as possible.” (Parenthesis added by author). President Aleksandar Vucic of Serbia (a non-NATO nation) justified his central bank’s gold-repatriation program by hinting at economic headwinds ahead: “We see in which direction the crisis in the world is moving” (Dudik & Tomek, 2019). Indeed, with two global Titanics – the United States and China – set on a collision course with a quadrillions-denominated iceberg in the middle, and a viral outbreak on its tip, the seismic ripples will be felt far, wide and for a considerable period. A reality check is nonetheless needed here: Can additional bullions realistically circumvallate the economies of 80 million plus peoples in these Eastern European nations, worth a collective $1.8 trillion by purchasing power parity? Gold however is a potent psychological symbol as it represents national sovereignty and economic reassurance in a potentially hyperinflationary world. The portents are clear: The current global economic system will be weakened by rising nationalism and autarkic demands. Much uncertainty remains ahead. Mauldin (2018) proposes the introduction of Old Testament-style debt jubilees to facilitate gradual national recoveries. The World Economic Forum, on the other hand, has long proposed a “Great Reset” by 2030; a socialist utopia where “you’ll own nothing and you’ll be happy” (WEF, 2016). In the final analysis, COVID-19 is not the root cause of the current global economic turmoil; it is merely an accelerant to a burning house of cards that was left smouldering since the 2008 Great Recession (Maavak, 2020a). We also see how the four main pillars of systems thinking (diversity, interconnectivity, interactivity and “adaptivity”) form the mise en scene in a VUCA decade. ENVIRONMENTAL What happens to the environment when our economies implode? Think of a debt-laden workforce at sensitive nuclear and chemical plants, along with a concomitant surge in industrial accidents? Economic stressors, workforce demoralization and rampant profiteering – rather than manmade climate change – arguably pose the biggest threats to the environment. In a WEF report, Buehler et al (2017) made the following pre-COVID-19 observation: The ILO estimates that the annual cost to the global economy from accidents and work-related diseases alone is a staggering $3 trillion. Moreover, a recent report suggests the world’s 3.2 billion workers are increasingly unwell, with the vast majority facing significant economic insecurity: 77% work in part-time, temporary, “vulnerable” or unpaid jobs. Shouldn’t this phenomenon be better categorized as a societal or economic risk rather than an environmental one? In line with the systems thinking approach, however, global risks can no longer be boxed into a taxonomical silo. Frazzled workforces may precipitate another Bhopal (1984), Chernobyl (1986), Deepwater Horizon (2010) or Flint water crisis (2014). These disasters were notably not the result of manmade climate change. Neither was the Fukushima nuclear disaster (2011) nor the Indian Ocean tsunami (2004). Indeed, the combustion of a long-overlooked cargo of 2,750 tonnes of ammonium nitrate had nearly levelled the city of Beirut, Lebanon, on Aug 4 2020. The explosion left 204 dead; 7,500 injured; US$15 billion in property damages; and an estimated 300,000 people homeless (Urbina, 2020). The environmental costs have yet to be adequately tabulated. Environmental disasters are more attributable to Black Swan events, systems breakdowns and corporate greed rather than to mundane human activity. Our JIT world aggravates the cascading potential of risks (Korowicz, 2012). Production and delivery delays, caused by the COVID-19 outbreak, will eventually require industrial overcompensation. This will further stress senior executives, workers, machines and a variety of computerized systems. The trickle-down effects will likely include substandard products, contaminated food and a general lowering in health and safety standards (Maavak, 2019a). Unpaid or demoralized sanitation workers may also resort to indiscriminate waste dumping. Many cities across the United States (and elsewhere in the world) are no longer recycling wastes due to prohibitive costs in the global corona-economy (Liacko, 2021). Even in good times, strict protocols on waste disposals were routinely ignored. While Sweden championed the global climate change narrative, its clothing flagship H&M was busy covering up toxic effluences disgorged by vendors along the Citarum River in Java, Indonesia. As a result, countless children among 14 million Indonesians straddling the “world’s most polluted river” began to suffer from dermatitis, intestinal problems, developmental disorders, renal failure, chronic bronchitis and cancer (DW, 2020). It is also in cauldrons like the Citarum River where pathogens may mutate with emergent ramifications. On an equally alarming note, depressed economic conditions have traditionally provided a waste disposal boon for organized crime elements. Throughout 1980s, the Calabriabased ‘Ndrangheta mafia – in collusion with governments in Europe and North America – began to dump radioactive wastes along the coast of Somalia. Reeling from pollution and revenue loss, Somali fisherman eventually resorted to mass piracy (Knaup, 2008). The coast of Somalia is now a maritime hotspot, and exemplifies an entwined form of economic-environmental-geopolitical-societal emergence. In a VUCA world, indiscriminate waste dumping can unexpectedly morph into a Black Hawk Down incident. The laws of unintended consequences are governed by actors, interconnections, interactions and adaptations in a system under study – as outlined in the methodology section. Environmentally-devastating industrial sabotages – whether by disgruntled workers, industrial competitors, ideological maniacs or terrorist groups – cannot be discounted in a VUCA world. Immiserated societies, in stark defiance of climate change diktats, may resort to dirty coal plants and wood stoves for survival. Interlinked ecosystems, particularly water resources, may be hijacked by nationalist sentiments. The environmental fallouts of critical infrastructure (CI) breakdowns loom like a Sword of Damocles over this decade. GEOPOLITICAL The primary catalyst behind WWII was the Great Depression. Since history often repeats itself, expect familiar bogeymen to reappear in societies roiling with impoverishment and ideological clefts. Anti-Semitism – a societal risk on its own – may reach alarming proportions in the West (Reuters, 2019), possibly forcing Israel to undertake reprisal operations inside allied nations. If that happens, how will affected nations react? Will security resources be reallocated to protect certain minorities (or the Top 1%) while larger segments of society are exposed to restive forces? Balloon effects like these present a classic VUCA problematic. Contemporary geopolitical risks include a possible Iran-Israel war; US-China military confrontation over Taiwan or the South China Sea; North Korean proliferation of nuclear and missile technologies; an India-Pakistan nuclear war; an Iranian closure of the Straits of Hormuz; fundamentalist-driven implosion in the Islamic world; or a nuclear confrontation between NATO and Russia. Fears that the Jan 3 2020 assassination of Iranian Maj. Gen. Qasem Soleimani might lead to WWIII were grossly overblown. From a systems perspective, the killing of Soleimani did not fundamentally change the actor-interconnection-interaction adaptivity equation in the Middle East. Soleimani was simply a cog who got replaced.

#### Restoring union ability to strike solves for these issues

Shierholz 20 January 27, 2020 at 3:18 pm by [Heidi Shierholz](https://www.epi.org/people/heidi-shierholz/) (Ph.D., Economics, University of Michigan M.A., Economics, University of Michigan M.S., Statistics, Iowa State University B.A., Mathematics, Grinnell College, Senior Economist and Director of Policy ) Weakened labor movement leads to rising economic inequality https://www.epi.org/blog/weakened-labor-movement-leads-to-rising-economic-inequality///(\*ak)

The basic facts about inequality in the United States—that for most of the last 40 years, pay has stagnated for all but the highest paid workers and inequality has risen dramatically—are widely understood. What is less well-known is the role the decline of unionization has played in those trends. The share of workers covered by a collective bargaining agreement dropped from [27 percent to 11.6 percent between 1979 and 2019](https://www.epi.org/data/#?subject=unioncov), meaning the union coverage rate is now less than half where it was 40 years ago. Research shows that this de-unionization accounts for a sizable share of the growth in inequality over that period—[around 13–20 percent for women and 33–37 percent for men](https://www.epi.org/publication/labor-day-2019-collective-bargaining/). Applying these shares to annual earnings data reveals that working people are now losing on the order of $200 billion per year as a result of the erosion of union coverage over the last four decades—with that money being redistributed upward, to the rich. The good news is that restoring union coverage—and strengthening workers’ abilities to join together to improve their wages and working conditions in other ways—is therefore likely to put at least $200 billion per year into the pockets of working people. These changes could happen through organizing and policy reform. Policymakers have introduced legislation, the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act, that would significantly reform current labor law. Building on the reforms in the PRO Act, the [Clean Slate for Worker Power Project](https://lwp.law.harvard.edu/clean-slate-project) proposes further transformation of labor law, with innovative ideas to create balance in our economy. How is it that de-unionization has played such a large role in wage stagnation for working people and the rise of inequality? When workers are able to join together, form a union and collectively bargain, their pay goes up. On average, a worker covered by a union contract earns [13.2 percent](https://www.epi.org/publication/how-todays-unions-help-working-people-giving-workers-the-power-to-improve-their-jobs-and-unrig-the-economy/) more than a peer with similar education, occupation and experience in a non-unionized workplace in the same sector. Furthermore, the benefits of collective bargaining extend well beyond union workers. Where unions are strong, they essentially set broader standards that non-union employers must match in order to attract and retain the workers they need and to avoid facing an organizing drive. The combination of the direct effect of unions on their members and this “spillover” effect to non-union workers means unions are crucial in fostering a vibrant middle class—and has also meant that as unionization has eroded, pay for working people has stagnated and inequality has skyrocketed. Unions also help shrink racial wage gaps. For example, black workers are more likely than white workers to be represented by a union, and black workers who are in unions get a larger boost to wages from being in a union than white workers do. This means that the decline of unionization has played a significant role in the [expansion of the black–white wage gap](https://www.epi.org/publication/black-white-wage-gaps-expand-with-rising-wage-inequality/#epi-toc-16). But isn’t the erosion of unionization because workers don’t want unions anymore? No—survey data show that in fact, a [higher](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0019793918806250) share of non-union workers say they would vote for a union in their workplace today than did 40 years ago. Isn’t the erosion of unionization due to the shifts in employment from manufacturing to service-producing industries? No again—changing industry composition [explains only a small share](https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-shift-in-private-sector-union-participation-explanations-and-effects/) of the erosion of union coverage. What has caused declining unionization? One key factor is fierce corporate opposition that has smothered workers’ freedom to form unions. Aggressive anti-union campaigns—once confined to the most anti-union employers—have become widespread. For example, it is now standard, when workers seek to organize, for their employers to hire union avoidance consultants to coordinate fierce anti-union campaigns. We estimate that employers spend nearly [$340 million per year](https://www.epi.org/publication/unlawful-employer-opposition-to-union-election-campaigns/) hiring union avoidance advisers to help them prevent employees from organizing. And though the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) makes it illegal for employers to intimidate, coerce or fire workers in retaliation for participating in union-organizing campaigns, the penalties are grossly insufficient to provide a meaningful disincentive for such behavior. This means employers often engage in illegal activities, such as threatening to close the worksite, cutting union activists’ hours or pay, or reporting workers to immigration enforcement authorities if employees unionize. In [at least 1 in 5](https://www.epi.org/publication/unlawful-employer-opposition-to-union-election-campaigns/) union elections, employers are charged with illegally firing workers involved in organizing. In the face of these attacks on union organizing, policymakers have egregiously failed to update labor laws to balance the system. Fundamental reform is necessary to build worker power and guarantee all workers the right to come together and have a real voice in their workplace. Restoring the right to representation on the job will likely put at least $200 billion in the pockets of working families each year, reducing income inequality and racial wage gaps, building a vibrant middle class and creating an economy that works for all, not just the privileged few.
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#### Non-Unique and no linear da, healthcare workers inevitably strike now

#### Link turn—healthcare improves with strikes

Jaffe 21 Sarah Jaffe, C.M. Lewis 21, 5-6-2021, "Nurses Are Striking Across the Country Over Patient Safety," Nation, https://www.thenation.com/article/activism/nursing-strike-massachusetts-covid/ EH

WORCESTER, MASS.—On May Day outside of St. Vincent Hospital here, there was a sing-along going on. It was the 55th day that the nurses, members of the Massachusetts Nurses Association, had been on strike at the hospital, and the sunny weather and blooming flowers meant morale was high. Supporters, from local City Council member Khrystian King to the Worcester branch of the Democratic Socialists of America, as well as members of other unions like the Teamsters and IATSE, joined the nurses to celebrate the worker’s holiday and to demand that the hospital, as the thematically rewritten lyrics to one song went, “bring in more nurses to care in there!” “Patient safety in that building has been lacking for some time now,” explained nurse and vice president of MNA Marie Ritacco. “We have been at the negotiating table with the hospital for about two years, and once the pandemic hit, of course we had to take a pause and take care of business inside.” They hadn’t thought that conditions could get worse, but during the pandemic, they did, and the nurses made the difficult choice to take a strike vote. “I think [Tenet] thought that we were so broken down that we weren’t going to continue fighting for what we know is safe and appropriate,” Ritacco said. The St. Vincent nurses strike may be the longest nursing strike in the country for nearly 30 years; nursing strikes typically last only a few days or weeks. They’re also striking against a massive for-profit company—Dallas-based Tenet Healthcare Corporation—which owns St. Vincent, and which the nurses say puts profits over patient care. But around the country, the pandemic has pushed nurses and hospital workers, already squeezed by a patchwork health care system and private ownership, into a position where many of them feel that they have no choice but to use the strike weapon to demand change to the way health care is provided. The MNA set up its strike headquarters in a former bank around the corner from St. Vincent, and it was bustling with nurses and supporters in blue and red strike gear at all times of day. A long table overflowed with much-used wearable strike signs—“ON STRIKE for safe patient care,” as well as several health care inside jokes like “Don’t lie, we can spot A-Fib” and “no more bare-bones staffing” and of course the ubiquitous “Healthcare Not Profits”—just inside the door, across from a table laden with snacks. Further down the hall there’s a room filled with toys for picketers’ kids to play with. The week before the May Day festivities, Marlena Pellegrino and two of her colleagues were walking the line, back and forth in front of one of the hospital’s multiple entrances, keeping an eye out for CEO Carolyn Jackson to pass them on her way home from work. It was cold and windy but Pellegrino and the others wore MNA blue knit hats and matching masks; Pellegrino’s red coat and her red fleece-lined boots also matched. Everyone calls Pellegrino “Mother Marlena,” an MNA staffer told The Nation, because she’s been there since the nurses at St Vincent first unionized 20 years ago—the issue then was staffing levels, too. She’s cochair of the bargaining unit, and she exudes warmth even when she talks about the things that make her angry. “Our patients were suffering. We’re the experts at the bedside. We don’t lie. We haven’t given up our livelihood and our health insurance and time with our family and part of our emotional health for the last seven weeks just because.”