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### Economy Disadvantage

Global Economy rising now due to stabilizing effects but COVID still means that it’s on the brink. Strikes hurt the economy since 1] they hurt core business industries like automobiles which can have cascading effects and 2] unstable labor relations can deter investment opportunities which wrecks growth.

#### The Global Economy is stabilizing and set for increases in 2021 but is still vulnerable to shocks

**World Bank 6-8** 6-8-2021 "The Global Economy: on Track for Strong but Uneven Growth as COVID-19 Still Weighs" <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/06/08/the-global-economy-on-track-for-strong-but-uneven-growth-as-covid-19-still-weighs>

A year and a half since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the global economy is poised to stage its most **robust post-recession recovery** in 80 years in 2021. But the rebound is expected to be **uneven across countries**, as major economies look set to register strong growth even as many developing economies lag. Global growth is expected to accelerate to 5.6% this year, largely on the strength in major economies such as the United States and China. And while growth for almost every region of the world has been revised upward for 2021, many continue to grapple with COVID-19 and what is likely to be its long shadow. Despite this year’s pickup, the level of global GDP in 2021 is expected to be **3.2% below** pre-pandemic projections, and per capita GDP among many emerging market and developing economies is anticipated to remain below pre-COVID-19 peaks for an extended period. As the **pandemic continues to flare**, it will shape the path of global economic activity.

#### Strikes hurt the Economy – two warrants:

#### 1] They hurt critical core industries that is necessary for economic growth

**McElroy 19** John McElroy 10-25-2019 "Strikes Hurt Everybody" <https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody> (MPA at McCombs school of Business)

This creates a **poisonous relationship** between the company and its workforce. Many GM hourly workers don’t identify as GM employees. They identify as UAW members. And they see the union as the source of their jobs, not the company. It’s an unhealthy dynamic that puts GM at a disadvantage to non-union automakers in the U.S. like Honda and Toyota, where workers take pride in the company they work for and the products they make. Attacking the company in the media also **drives away customers**. Who wants to buy a shiny new car from a company that’s accused of underpaying its workers and treating them unfairly? Data from the Center for Automotive Research (CAR) in Ann Arbor, MI, show that **GM loses market share during strikes and never gets it back**. GM lost two percentage points during the 1998 strike, which in today’s market would represent **a loss of 340,000 sales**. Because GM reports sales on a quarterly basis we’ll only find out at the end of December if it lost market share from this strike. UAW members say one of their greatest concerns is job security. But causing a company to lose market share is a sure-fire path to **more plant closings and layoffs**. Even so, unions are incredibly important for boosting wages and benefits for working-class people. GM’s UAW-represented workers earn considerably more than their non-union counterparts, about $26,000 more per worker, per year, in total compensation. Without a union they never would have achieved that. Strikes are a powerful weapon for unions. They usually are the only way they can get management to accede to their demands. If not for the power of collective bargaining and the threat of a strike, management would largely ignore union demands. If you took away that threat, management would pay its workers peanuts. Just ask the Mexican line workers who are paid $1.50 an hour to make $50,000 BMWs. But strikes don’t just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they’re striking against. They hurt **suppliers, car dealers and the communities located near the plants.** The Anderson Economic Group estimates that 75,000 workers at supplier companies were temporarily laid off because of the GM strike. Unlike UAW picketers, those supplier workers won’t get any strike pay or an $11,000 contract signing bonus. No, most of them lost close to a month’s worth of wages, which must be financially devastating for them. GM’s suppliers also lost a lot of money. So now they’re cutting budgets and delaying capital investments to make up for the lost revenue, which is a further drag on the economy. According to CAR, the communities and states where GM’s plants are located collectively lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenue. Some economists warn that if the strike were prolonged it could knock the state of Michigan – home to GM and the UAW – **into a recession.** That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible. So, while the UAW managed to get a nice raise for its members, the strike left a path of destruction in its wake. That’s not fair to the innocent bystanders who will never regain what they lost. John McElroyI’m not sure how this will ever be resolved. I understand the need for collective bargaining and the threat of a strike. But there’s got to be a better way to get workers a raise without torching the countryside.

#### 2] Strikes create a stigmatization effect over labor and consumption that devastates the Economy

**Tenza 20**, Mlungisi. "The effects of violent strikes on the economy of a developing country: a case of South Africa." Obiter 41.3 (2020): 519-537. (Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal)

When South Africa obtained democracy in 1994, there was a dream of a better country with a new vision for industrial relations.5 However, the number of violent strikes that have bedevilled this country in recent years seems to have shattered-down the aspirations of a better South Africa. South Africa recorded 114 strikes in 2013 and 88 strikes in 2014, which cost the country about **R6.1 billion** according to the Department of Labour.6 The impact of these strikes has been hugely felt by the mining sector, particularly the platinum industry. The biggest strike took place in the platinum sector where about 70 000 mineworkers’ downed tools for better wages. Three major platinum producers (Impala, Anglo American and Lonmin Platinum Mines) were affected. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 25 June 2014. Business Day reported that “the five-month-long strike in the platinum sector pushed the economy to the brink of recession”. 7 This strike was closely followed by a four-week strike in the metal and engineering sector. All these strikes (and those not mentioned here) were characterised with violence accompanied by damage to property, intimidation, assault and sometimes the killing of people. Statistics from the metal and engineering sector showed that about 246 cases of intimidation were reported, 50 violent incidents occurred, and 85 cases of vandalism were recorded.8 Large-scale unemployment, soaring poverty levels and the dramatic income inequality that characterise the South African labour market provide a broad explanation for strike violence.9 While participating in a strike, workers’ stress levels leave them feeling frustrated at their seeming powerlessness, which in turn provokes further violent behaviour.10 These strikes are not only violent but **take long to resolve.** Generally, a lengthy strike has a **negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation**. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty. One of the measures that may boost the country’s economic growth is by attracting potential investors to invest in the country. However, this might be difficult as investors would want to invest in a country where there is a likelihood of getting returns for their investments. The wish of getting returns for investment may not materialise if the labour environment **is not fertile** for such investments as a result of, for example, unstable labour relations. Therefore, investors may be reluctant to invest where there is an unstable or fragile labour relations environment. 3 THE COMMISSION OF VIOLENCE DURING A STRIKE AND CONSEQUENCES The Constitution guarantees every worker the right to join a trade union, participate in the activities and programmes of a trade union, and to strike. 11 The Constitution grants these rights to a “worker” as an individual.12 However, the right to strike and any other conduct in contemplation or furtherance of a strike such as a picket13 can only be exercised by workers acting collectively.14 The right to strike and participation in the activities of a trade union were given more effect through the enactment of the Labour Relations Act 66 of 199515 (LRA). The main purpose of the LRA is to “advance economic development, social justice, labour peace and the democratisation of the workplace”. 16 The advancement of social justice means that the exercise of the right to strike must advance the interests of workers and at the same time workers must refrain from any conduct that can affect those who are not on strike as well members of society. Even though the right to strike and the right to participate in the activities of a trade union that often flow from a strike17 are guaranteed in the Constitution and specifically regulated by the LRA, it sometimes happens that the right to strike is exercised for purposes not intended by the Constitution and the LRA, generally. 18 For example, it was not the intention of the Constitutional Assembly and the legislature that violence should be used during strikes or pickets. As the Constitution provides, pickets are meant to be peaceful. 19 Contrary to section 17 of the Constitution, the conduct of workers participating in a strike or picket has changed in recent years with workers trying to emphasise their grievances by causing disharmony and chaos in public. A media report by the South African Institute of Race Relations pointed out that between the years 1999 and 2012 there were 181 strike-related deaths, 313 injuries and 3,058 people were arrested for public violence associated with strikes.20 The question is whether employers succumb easily to workers’ demands if a strike is accompanied by violence? In response to this question, one worker remarked as follows: “[T]here is no sweet strike, there is no Christian strike … A strike is a strike. [Y]ou want to get back what belongs to you ... you won’t win a strike with a Bible. You do not wear high heels and carry an umbrella and say ‘1992 was under apartheid, 2007 is under ANC’. You won’t win a strike like that.” 21 The use of violence during industrial action affects not only the strikers or picketers, the employer and his or her business but it also affects innocent members of the public, non-striking employees, the environment and the economy at large. In addition, striking workers visit non-striking workers’ homes, often at night, threaten them and in some cases, assault or even murder workers who are acting as replacement labour. 22 This points to the fact that for many workers and their families’ living conditions remain unsafe and vulnerable to damage due to violence. In Security Services Employers Organisation v SA Transport & Allied Workers Union (SATAWU),23 it was reported that about 20 people were thrown out of moving trains in the Gauteng province; most of them were security guards who were not on strike and who were believed to be targeted by their striking colleagues. Two of them died, while others were admitted to hospitals with serious injuries.24 In SA Chemical Catering & Allied Workers Union v Check One (Pty) Ltd,25 striking employees were carrying various weapons ranging from sticks, pipes, planks and bottles. One of the strikers Mr Nqoko was alleged to have threatened to cut the throats of those employees who had been brought from other branches of the employer’s business to help in the branch where employees were on strike. Such conduct was held not to be in line with good conduct of striking.26 These examples from case law show that South Africa is facing a problem that is affecting not only the industrial relations’ sector but also the economy at large. For example, in 2012, during a strike by workers employed by Lonmin in Marikana, the then-new union Association of Mine & Construction Workers Union (AMCU) wanted to exert its presence after it appeared that many workers were not happy with the way the majority union, National Union of Mine Workers (NUM), handled negotiations with the employer (Lonmin Mine). AMCU went on an unprotected strike which was violent and resulted in the loss of lives, damage to property and negative economic consequences including a weakened currency, reduced global investment, declining productivity, and increase unemployment in the affected sectors.27 Further, the unreasonably long time it takes for strikes to get resolved in the Republic has a negative effect on the business of the employer, the economy and employment. 3 1 Effects of violent and long strikes on the economy Generally, South Africa’s economy is on a downward scale. First, it fails to create employment opportunities for its people. The recent statistics on unemployment levels indicate that unemployment has increased from 26.5% to 27.2%. 28 The most prominent strike which nearly brought the platinum industries to its knees was the strike convened by AMCU in 2014. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 24 June 2014. It affected the three big platinum producers in the Republic, which are the Anglo American Platinum, Lonmin Plc and Impala Platinum. It was the longest strike since the dawn of democracy in 1994. As a result of this strike, the platinum industries lost billions of rands.29 According to the report by Economic Research Southern Africa, the platinum group metals industry is South Africa’s second-largest export earner behind gold and contributes just over 2% of the country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP).30 The overall metal ores in the mining industry which include platinum sells about 70% of its output to the export market while sales to local manufacturers of basic metals, fabricated metal products and various other metal equipment and machinery make up to 20%. 31 The research indicates that the overall impact of the strike in 2014 was driven by a reduction in productive capital in the mining sector, accompanied by a decrease in labour available to the economy. This resulted in a sharp increase in the price of the output by 5.8% with a **GDP declined by 0.72 and 0.78%**.32

#### Err Negative – over-estimate the effect on Strikes on the economy since traditional economic measures underestimate the damage.

**Babb No Date** Katrina Babb "Chapter 11: The Economic Impact of Unions" <http://isu.indstate.edu/conant/ecn351/ch11/chapter11.htm> (Professor of Economic at Indiana State)

Strikes ­ Simple statistics on strike activity suggest that strikes are relatively rare and the associated aggregate economic losses are relatively minimal. Table 11-3 provides data on major work stoppages, defined as those involving 1000 or more workers and lasting at least one full day or one work shift. But these data **can be misleading** **as a measure of the costliness of a strike.** On the one hand, employers in the struck industry may have anticipated the strike and worked their labor force overtime to accumulate inventories to supply customers during the strike period, so that the work lost data overstates the actual loss. On the other hand, the amount lost **can be understated** by the data if production in associated industries ( those that buy inputs from the struck industry or sell products to it) **is disrupted**. As a broad generalization, the adverse effects of a strike on nonstriking firms and customers are likely to be greater **when services are involved** and less when products are involved. Remember, that strikes are the result of the failure of both parties to the negotiation, so it is inaccurate to attribute all of the costs associated with a strike to labor alone.

#### Economic Collapse falls out into an all-out international conflict.

**Tønnesson 15**, Stein. "Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace." International Area Studies Review 18.3 (2015): 297-311. (the Department of Peace and Conflict, Uppsala University, Sweden, and Peace research Institute Oslo (PRIO), Norway)

Several **recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to** the **current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers**. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, **those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are righ**t. **Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but** asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict(Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the **risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners**. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, **decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations**. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. **If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame** this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, **contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly**, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. **The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious**. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then **a trade war could** result, **interrupt**ing **transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions.** **This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining** the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and **unreliably** so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two **great powers might gamble that the other** **yield in a cyber-war or** conventional **limited war,** **or third party countries might engage** in conflict with each other, **with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene**.

### Hospital DA

#### Hospital Strikes are devastating to public health infrastructure and patient care and sky-rocket costs – hospital strikes are relatively low now but the Plan green-lights more aggressive Strike actions.

Masterson 17 Les Masterson 8-15-2017 "Nursing strikes can cause harm well beyond labor relations" <https://www.healthcaredive.com/news/nursing-strikes-can-cause-harm-well-beyond-labor-relations/447627/> (Senior Managing Editor at Quinstreet)//Elmer

Officials said the lockout was required because they needed to give at least five-day contracts to 320 temporary nurses brought in to fill the gap. The nurses are back on the job now without a new contract, but the strike and subsequent lockout got the public’s attention. **Hospital strikes aren't** that **common** — usually, the sides agree to a new contract. Strikes or threatened strikes in recent years have typically involved conflicts over pay, benefits and staff workloads. **When strikes do happen**, however, **they can hurt a hospital’s reputation, finances and patient care**. Strike’s effect on patient safety A **study** on nurses’ strikes in New York **found** that labor actions have a temporary **negative effect on** a hospital’s **patient safety**. Study authors Jonathan Gruber and Samuel A. Kleiner found that nurses’ strikes **increased** **in-patient mortality by 18.3%** **and 30-day readmission by 5.7%** for patients admitted during the strike. **Patients admitted during a strike got a lower quality of care, they wrote.** “We show that this deterioration in outcomes occurs only for those patients admitted during a strike, and not for those admitted to the same hospitals before or after a strike. And we find that these changes in outcomes are not associated with any meaningful change in the composition of, or the treatment intensity for, patients admitted during a strike,” they said. They said a possible reason for the lower quality is fewer major procedures performed during a strike, which could lead partially to diminished outcomes. The study authors found that **patients that need the most** nursing **care** **are** **the ones who make out worst during strikes.** “We find that patients with particularly nursing-intensive conditions are more susceptible to these strike effects, and that hospitals hiring replacement workers perform no better during these strikes than those that do not hire substitute employees,” they wrote. Allina Health’s Abbott Northwestern Hospital in Minneapolis faced a patient safety issue during a strike last year that resulted in the CMS placing the hospital in “immediate jeopardy” status after a medication error. A replacement nurse administered adrenaline to an asthmatic patient through an IV rather than into the patient’s muscle. The patient, who was in the emergency room (ER), wound up in intensive care for three days because of the error. Allina said the error was not the nurse’s fault, but was the result of a communication problem. The CMS accepted the hospital plan of correction, which included having a nurse observer when needed and retraining ER staff to repeat back verbal orders. A strike’s financial impact **Hospitals** also **take** a **financial hit during strikes.** **Even the threat of** a **one- or two-day nurse strike** **can cost a hospital millions.** **Bringing in** hundreds or **thousands of temporary nurses** from across the country **is costly** for hospitals. They need to advertise the positions, pay for travel and often give bonuses to lure temporary nurses. The most expensive recent nurse strike was when about 4,800 nurses went on strike at Allina Health in Minnesota two times last year. **The two strikes of seven days and 41 days cost the health system $104 million.** The hospital also saw a $67.74 million operating loss during the quarter of those strikes. To find temporary replacements, Allina needed to include enticing offers, such as free travel and a $400 bonus to temporary nurses. Even the threat of a strike can cost millions. Brigham and Women’s **Hospital** in Boston spent more than $8 million and **lost $16 million** in revenue **preparing for a strike** in 2016. The 3,300-nurse union threatened to walk out for a day and much like Tufts Medical Center, Brigham & Women’s said the hospital would lock out nurses for four additional days if nurses took action. At that time, Dr. Ron Walls, executive vice president and chief operating officer at Brigham and Women’s Hospital, said the hospital spent more than $5 million on contracting with the U.S. Nursing Corp. to bring on 700 temporary nurses licensed in Massachusetts. The hospital also planned to cut capacity to 60% during the possible strike and moved hundreds of patients to other hospitals. They also canceled procedures and appointments in preparation of a strike. The Massachusetts Nurses Association and Brigham & Women’s were able to reach a three-year agreement before a strike, but the damage was already done to the hospital’s finances. Richard L. Gundling, senior vice president of healthcare financial practices at Healthcare Financial Management Association, told Healthcare Dive that healthcare organizations need to plan for business continuity in case of an event, such as a labor strike, natural disaster or cyberattack. “Business continuity is directly related to the CFO’s responsibility for maintaining business functions. The plan should include having business continuity insurance in place to replace the loss associated with diminished revenue and increased expenses during the event,” Gundling said. These plans should provide adequate staffing, training, materials, supplies, equipment and communications in case of a strike. Hospitals should also keep payers, financial agencies and other important stakeholders informed of potential issues. “It’s also key to keep financial stakeholders well informed; this includes insurance companies, bond rating agencies, banks, other investors, suppliers and Medicare/Medicaid contractors,” he said. “Business continuity is directly related to the CFO’s responsibility for maintaining business functions. The plan should include having business continuity insurance in place to replace the loss associated with diminished revenue and increased expenses during the event." Richard Gundling Senior vice president of healthcare financial practices, Healthcare Financial Management Association Impact to a hospital’s reputation Hospital strikes, particularly nurses’ strikes, can also wreak havoc on a hospital’s reputation. Nurses are a beloved profession. They work hard, often long hours and don’t make a fortune doing it. The median registered nurses’ salary is about $70,000, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

#### Strikes endanger patients and violates moral duties to others AND hurts trust between patients and doctors

**Campbell 16** Denis Campbell 4-9-2016 "All-out junior doctors’ strike unethical and reckless, says NHS chief"<https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/apr/09/doctors-strike-nhs-chief-england> (Denis Campbell is health policy editor for the Guardian and the Observer. He has written about the NHS, public health and medicine since 2007 and shares health-writing duties with Sarah Boseley, the health editor) JG

**A total withdrawal of labour, scheduled for later this** **month,** will threaten hospitals’ ability to deliver safe care **in areas such as A&E, childbirth and intensive care,** **according to Prof Sir Bruce Keogh, the national medical director of NHS England. In a strongly worded article** **in the Observer, Keogh writes that such an escalation of the dispute with the government would be** reckless, unethical**, a breach of the medical profession’s** fundamental duty to “do no harm**” and a move that will destroy the public’s trust in doctors. “Despite the fact that** **consultants will do their best to cover, the fact is that junior doctors are** **key to the safe and effective running of our NHS. So this new action will put additional, significant** **strain on A&E, intensive care and maternity services, particularly in** **smaller hospital,” Keogh explains. “I worry that withdrawal of emergency cover will put our sickest and most vulnerable patients at greater risk. This challenges the** **ethical framework on which our profession is founded and runs against the grain of our NHS and our personal and** professional values**”,** he adds. Junior doctors are due to refuse to work in any medical setting at all between 8am and 5pm on 26 and 27 April as part of their campaign of industrial action in the bitter and long-running row with Jeremy Hunt, the health secretary, over the new contract he intends to impose on them from August. The British Medical Association reacted angrily to Keogh’s intervention. Johann Malawana, the BMA’s junior doctor chair, said: “No junior doctor wants to take this action but we have been left with no choice. They have already done everything else in their power to make their voices heard - protests, marches, petitions, emergency care only strikes. By continuing to ignore them, the government has left them left with no choice. “We regret any disruption caused to patients and have given trusts enough notice for them to plan ahead, and to ensure that senior hospital doctors, GPs and other NHS staff will continue to provide excellent care for patients. Please be assured that should someone need emergency care on a day of action, they will receive it. “It is disappointing that Bruce Keogh is attacking frontline doctors rather than echoing calls, from patients’ groups to senior NHS managers, for the government to get back around the table and end this dispute through talks. In his article, Keogh argues that the continuing series of strikes have caused too much “distress, anxiety and confusion” to patients already through the cancellation of almost 25,000 operations, as a result of four walkouts since January. He says an all-out strike would be “a watershed moment for the NHS”. Keogh is the first senior doctor to articulate in public the warnings that many leaders of the profession have recently given the BMA privately about the danger of patients dying because too few doctors were on duty. Many of the medical royal colleges, which represent different types of doctors professionally, are torn between support for their striking trainees and fear that doctors’ high standing with the public could be ruined if a total withdrawal of cover is seen as a step too far.

#### Hospitals are the critical internal link for pandemic preparedness.

**Al Thobaity 20**, Abdullelah, and Farhan Alshammari. "Nurses on the frontline against the COVID-19 pandemic: an Integrative review." Dubai Medical Journal 3.3 (2020): 87-92. (Associate Professor of Nursing at Taif University)

**The majority of infected or symptomatic people seek medical treatment in medical facilities, particularly hospitals, as a high number of cases, especially those in critical condition, will have an impact on hospitals [4]. The concept of hospital resilience in disaster situations is defined as the ability to recover from the damage caused by huge disturbances quickly [2]. The resilience of hospitals to pandemic cases depends on the preparedness of the institutions, and not all hospitals have the same resilience. A lower resilience will affect the sustainability of the health services. This also affects healthcare providers such as doctors, nurses, and allied health professionals [5, 6]. Despite the impact on healthcare providers, excellent management of a pandemic depends on the level of preparedness of healthcare providers, including nurses. This means that if it was impossible to be ready before a crisis or disaster, responsible people will do all but the impossible to save lives.**

#### New Pandemics are deadlier and faster are coming – COVID is just the beginning

**Antonelli 20** Ashley Fuoco Antonelli 5-15-2020<https://www.advisory.com/daily-briefing/2020/05/15/weekly-line> "Weekly line: Why deadly disease outbreaks could become more common—even after Covid-19" (Associate Editor — American Health Line)

Contagious during the so-called "incubation period"—the time when people are infected with a pathogen but are not yet showing symptoms of the infection or are showing only mild symptoms; and Resistant to any known prevention or treatment methods. The researchers also concluded that such a pathogen would have a "low but significant" fatality rate, meaning the pathogen wouldn't kill human hosts fast enough to inhibit its spread. As **Amesh Adalja**—a senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, who led the report—told Live Science's Rachael Rettner at the time, "**It just has to make a lot of people sick" to disrupt society**. The researchers said RNA viruses—which include the common cold, influenza, and severe acute respiratory syndrome (or SARS, which is caused by a type of coronavirus)—fit that bill. And even though we had a good bit of experience dealing with common RNA viruses like the flu, Adalja at the time told Rettner that there were "a whole host of viral families that get very little attention when it comes to pandemic preparedness." Not even two years later, the new coronavirus, which causes Covid-19, emerged and quickly spread throughout the world, reaching pandemic status in just a few months. To date, officials have reported more than 4.4 million cases of Covid-19 and 302,160 deaths tied to the new coronavirus globally. In the United States, the number of reported Covid-19 cases has reached more than 1.4 million and the number of reported deaths tied to the new coronavirus has risen to nearly 86,000 in just over three months. Although public health experts had warned about the likelihood of a respiratory-borne RNA virus causing the next global pandemic, many say the world was largely unprepared to handle this type of infectious disease outbreak. And as concerning as that revelation may be on its own, **perhaps even more worrisome is that public health experts predict life-threatening infectious disease outbreaks are likely to become more common—meaning we could be susceptible to another pandemic in the future**. Why experts think deadly infectious disease outbreaks could become more common As the Los Angeles Times's Joshua Emerson Smith notes, infectious disease experts for more than ten years now have noted that "[o]utbreaks of dangerous new diseases with the potential to become pandemics have been on the rise—from HIV to swine flu to SARS to Ebola." For instance, a report published in Nature in 2008 found that **the number of emerging infectious disease events that occurred in the 1990s was more than three times higher than it was in the 1940s**. Many experts believe the recent increase in infectious disease outbreaks is tied to human behaviors that disrupt the environment, "such as **deforestation and poaching**," which have led "to increased contact between highly mobile, urbanized human populations and wild animals," Emerson Smith writes. In the 2008 report, for example, researchers noted that about 60% of 355 emerging infectious disease events that occurred over a 50-year period could be largely linked to wild animals, livestock, and, to a lesser extent, pets. Now, researchers believe the new coronavirus first jumped to humans from animals at a wildlife market in Wuhan, China. Along those same lines, some experts have argued that global climate change has driven an increase in infectious diseases—and could continue to do so. A federally mandated report released by the U.S. Global Change Research Program in 2018 warned that warmer temperatures could expand the geographic range covered by disease-carrying insects and pests, which could result in more Americans being exposed to ticks carrying Lyme disease and mosquitos carrying the dengue, West Nile, and Zika viruses. And experts now say continued warming in global temperatures, deforestation, and other environmentally disruptive behaviors have broadened that risk by bringing more people into contact with disease-carrying animals. Further, experts note that infectious diseases today are able to spread much faster and farther than they could decades ago because of increasing globalization and travel. While some have suggested the Covid-19 pandemic could stifle that trend, others argue globalization is likely to continue—meaning so could infectious diseases' far spread.
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### Indopak

#### **The India-Pakistan conflict will never escalate to nuke war despite their brutal past** Kadir 19 Jawad Kadir, UK-based Pakistani PhD Scholar. Area of research includes Pakistan-India relations, “India and Pakistan Won’t Fight to Death Because They Need Each Other Alive”, The Globe Post, 6/3/19, https://theglobepost.com/2019/03/06/india-pakistan-conflict/, DOA: 1/25/20//TT

These developments have the international community worried about the possibility of an all-out conflict, which would seriously challenge security in the Asian subcontinent. However, there also prevails a popular narrative that the elites in both countries use the flare-ups to serve their political agenda. A recent book, written by the former intelligence chiefs of India and Pakistan, goes further and claims that the governments sometimes accommodate each other. At times Pakistan has even allowed India to drop a couple of bombs at harmless places in Pakistan, just to satisfy the Indian public’s opinion. Since the violent 1947 partition of British India in India and Pakistan, both countries have pursued policies that diametrically oppose each other. Pakistan’s military even owes its powerful role in politics to the popular “desire” for competing/defeating India at any cost. The majority of Pakistanis see the military as the only powerful institution that can compete with India. To secure the popular votes, all the political parties in Pakistan currently seem to be on the same anti-Indian page. The scenario is not much different in India, where Prime Minister Narendra Modi is said to have ignited anti-Pakistani sentiments in light of the upcoming elections. Prestige Competition In India and Pakistan, it is the popular sentiment to undermine the other that determines policies. After the recent incident in Kashmir, one can easily notice an ongoing prestige competition on social media, engaging people in all classes from both countries. Even during times of peace, the nations are electronically belittling each other; be it during a sports event or because of a victory in the technological field. A recent visit of the Saudi Crown prince to both countries started a debate about which of the states was more respected by the visitor. This prestige factor has always been present in India-Pakistan relations. After India conducted five nuclear tests in 1998, Pakistan responded with six tests to satisfy the nation psychologically and to prove to the world that “we are no less than India.” This act was in line with the local idiom “Pagg Uchi ho jaye” (the turban must stay high) and implies that Pakistan’s policies revolve around acquiring prestige, with India as a reference point. Humiliation over Elimination It is also worthy to mention that it is humiliation and not elimination that matters in India-Pakistan relations. The two each need their counterpart alive, just to let the other down again and again, and to prove their superiority to the international community. For this reason, the obvious numerical and military might of India is persistently challenged by Pakistan in spite of having lesser capabilities, which always hurts India’s prestigious stance. India suffers from an “I am not respected” syndrome, while Pakistan feels it is not given a proper status. Naturally, when both countries feel they have proven their prestige, tension starts to de-escalate. This appears to be the current stage the states are at after Pakistan returned the Indian pilot the country captured. This is why clashes never lead to the point of no return, **despite having had three major wars and several armed conflicts.** Even during the Indo-Pakistani War of 1971, India captured over 93,000 Pakistani prisoners of war only to return them safely after India’s prestige had been satisfied. Both nations will continue to compete with the purpose of maximizing their prestige against each other, but it is not likely they will eliminate each other. India and Pakistan need each other as a part of their psychological integrity. Because an all-out conflict would endanger the other’s existence, this is a questionable scenario.

### Nuke War

#### Small arsenals and tests prove no extinction from nuke war

Frankel et al. 15 [Dr. Michael J. Frankel is a senior scientist at Penn State University’s Applied Research Laboratory, where he focuses on nuclear treaty verification technologies, is one of the nation’s leading experts on the effects of nuclear weapons, executive director of the Congressional Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack, led development of fifteen-year global nuclear threat technology projections and infrastructure vulnerability assessments; Dr. James Scouras is a national security studies fellow at the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory and the former chief scientist of DTRA’s Advanced Systems and Concepts Office; Dr. George W. Ullrich is chief technology officer at Schafer Corporation and formerly senior vice president at Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), currently serves as a special advisor to the USSTRATCOM Strategic Advisory Group’s Science and Technology Panel and is a member of the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board. 04-15-15. “The Uncertain Consequences of Nuclear Weapons Use.” The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory. DTIC. <https://apps.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a618999.pdf>] Justin

Scientific work based on real data, rather than models, also cast additional doubt on the basic premise. Interestingly, publication of several contradictory papers describing experimental observations actually predated Schell’s work. In 1973, nine years before publication of The Fate of the Earth, a published report failed to find any ozone depletion during the peak period of atmospheric nuclear testing.26 In another work published in 1976, attempts to measure the actual ozone depletion associated with Russian megaton-class detonations and Chinese nuclear tests were also unable to detect any significant effect.27 At present, with the reduced arsenals and a perceived low likelihood of a large-scale exchange on the scale of Cold War planning scenarios, official concern over nuclear ozone depletion has essentially fallen off the table. Yet continuing scientific studies by a small dedicated community of researchers suggest the potential for dire consequences, even for relatively small regional nuclear wars involving Hiroshimasize bombs. Nuclear Winter The possibility of catastrophic climate changes came as yet another surprise to Department of Defense scientists. In 1982, Crutzen and Birks highlighted the potential effects of high-altitude smoke on climate,29 and in 1983, a research team consisting of Turco, Toon, Ackerman, Pollack, and Sagan (referred to as TTAPS) suggested that a five-thousand-megaton strategic exchange of weapons between the United States and the Soviet Union could effectively spell national suicide for both belligerents.30 They argued that a massive nuclear exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union would inject copious amounts of soot, generated by massive firestorms such as those witnessed in Hiroshima, into the stratosphere where it might reside indefinitely. Additionally, the soot would be accompanied by dust swept up in the rising thermal column of the nuclear fireball. The combination of dust and soot could scatter and absorb sunlight to such an extent that much of Earth would be engulfed in darkness sufficient to cease photosynthesis. Unable to sustain agriculture for an extended period of time, much of the planet’s population would be doomed to perish, and—in its most extreme rendition—humanity would follow the dinosaurs into extinction and by much the same mechanism.31 Subsequent refinements by the TTAPS authors, such as an extension of computational efforts to three-dimensional models, continued to produce qualitatively similar results. The TTAPS results were severely criticized, and a lively debate ensued between passionate critics of and defenders of the analysis. Some of the technical objections critics raised included the TTAPS team’s neglect of the potentially significant role of clouds;32 lack of an accurate model of coagulation and rainout;33 inaccurate capture of feedback mechanisms;34 “fudge factor” fits of micrometer-scale physical processes assumed to hold constant for changed atmospheric chemistry conditions and uniformly averaged on a grid scale of hundreds of kilometers;35 the dynamics of firestorm formation, rise, and smoke injection;36 and estimates of the optical properties and total amount of fuel available to generate the assumed smoke loading. In particular, more careful analysis of the range of uncertainties associated with the widely varying published estimates of fuel quantities and properties suggested a possible range of outcomes encompassing much milder impacts than anything predicted by TTAPS.37 Aside from the technical issues critics raised, the five-thousand-megaton baseline exchange scenario TTAPS envisioned was rendered obsolete when the major powers decreased both their nuclear arsenals and the average yield of the remaining weapons. With the demise of the Soviet Union, the nuclear winter issue essentially fell off the radar screen for Department of Defense scientists, which is not to say that it completely disappeared from the scientific literature. In the last few years, a number of analysts, including some of the original TTAPS authors, suggested that even a “modest” regional exchange of nuclear weapons—one hundred explosions of fifteenkiloton devices in an Indian–Pakistani exchange scenario—might yet produce significant worldwide climate effects, if not the full-blown “winter.”38 However, such concerns have failed to gain much traction in Department of Defense circles.

#### Empirics – we’ve nuked ourselves 2,000 times and the largest event was only 1/1000th as powerful as natural disasters

Eken 17 [Mattias Eken - PhD student in Modern History at the University of St Andrews. “The understandable fear of nuclear weapons doesn’t match reality”. 3/14/17. <https://theconversation.com/the-understandable-fear-of-nuclear-weapons-doesnt-match-reality-73563>] // Re-Cut Justin

Nuclear weapons are unambiguously the most destructive weapons on the planet. Pound for pound, they are the most lethal weapons ever created, capable of killing millions. Millions live in fear that these weapons will be used again, with all the potential consequences. However, the destructive power of these weapons **has been vastly exaggerated**, albeit for good reasons. Public fear of nuclear weapons being used in anger, whether by terrorists or nuclear-armed nations, has risen once again in recent years. **This is** in no small part **thanks to the current political climate** between states such as the US and Russia and the various nuclear tests conducted by North Korea. But whenever we talk about nuclear weapons, it’s easy to get carried away with doomsday scenarios and apocalyptic language. As the historian Spencer Weart once argued: “**You say ‘nuclear bomb’ and everybody immediately thinks of the end of the world.**” Yet the means necessary to produce a nuclear bomb, let alone set one off, remain incredibly complex – and while the damage that would be done if someone did in fact detonate one might be very serious indeed, **the chances that it would mean “the end of the world” are vanishingly small**. In his 2013 book Command and Control, the author Eric Schlosser tried to scare us into perpetual fear of nuclear weapons by recounting stories of near misses and accidents involving nuclear weapons. One such event, the 1980 Damascus incident, saw a Titan II intercontinental ballistic missile explode at its remote Arkansas launch facility after a maintenance crew accidentally ruptured its fuel tank. Although the warhead involved in the incident didn’t detonate, Schlosser claims that “if it had, much of Arkansas would be gone”. But that’s not quite the case. The nine-megaton thermonuclear warhead on the **Titan II** missile had a blast radius of 10km, or an area of about 315km². The state of Arkansas spreads over 133,733km², meaning the weapon **would have caused destruction across 0.2% of the state.** That would naturally have been a terrible outcome, but certainly not the catastrophe that Schlosser evokes. Claims exaggerating the effects of nuclear weapons have become commonplace, especially after the September 11 terrorist attacks in 2001. In the early War on Terror years, Richard Lugar, a former US senator and chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, argued that terrorists armed with nuclear weapons pose an existential threat to the Western way of life. What he failed to explain is how. It is by no means certain that a single nuclear detonation **(or even several)** would do away with our current way of life. Indeed, **we’re still here despite having nuked our own planet more than 2,000 times** – a tally expressed beautifully in this video by Japanese artist Isao Hashimoto). While the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty forced nuclear tests underground, **around 500 of** all **the nuclear weapons detonated were unleashed in the Earth’s atmosphere**. This includes the world’s largest ever nuclear detonation, the 57-megaton bomb known as **Tsar Bomba**, detonated by the Soviet Union on October 30 1961. Tsar Bomba was more than 3,000 times more powerful than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. That is immense destructive power – but as one physicist explained, **it’s only “one-thousandth the force of an earthquake, one-thousandth the force of a hurricane”.** The Damascus incident proved how incredibly hard it is to set off a nuclear bomb and the limited effect that would have come from just one warhead detonating. Despite this, some scientists have controversially argued that an even limited all-out nuclear war might lead to a so-called nuclear winter, since the smoke and debris created by very large bombs could block out the sun’s rays for a considerable amount of time. To inflict such ecological societal annihilation with weapons alone, we would have to detonate hundreds if not thousands of thermonuclear devices in a short time. Even in such extreme conditions, the area actually devastated by the bombs would be limited: for example, **2,000 one-megaton explosions with a destructive radius of five miles each would directly destroy less than 5% of the territory of the US**. Of course, if the effects of nuclear weapons have been greatly exaggerated, there is a very good reason: since these weapons are indeed extremely dangerous, any posturing and exaggerating which intensifies our fear of them makes us less likely to use them. But it’s important, however, to understand why people have come to fear these weapons the way we do. After all, nuclear weapons are here to stay; they can’t be “un-invented”. If we want to live with them and mitigate the very real risks they pose, we must be honest about what those risks really are. Overegging them to frighten ourselves more than we need to keeps nobody safe.

#### Analysis of historical volcano activity disproves nuclear winter – an eruption 5 times the size of a regional nuclear exchange dissipated in just 2 years

Reisner et al. 18 [Jon Reisner, atmospheric researcher at LANL Climate and Atmospheric Sciences; Gennaro D'Angelo, UKAFF Fellow and member of the Astrophysics Group at the School of Physics of the University of Exeter, Research Scientist with the Carl Sagan Center at the SETI Institute, currently works for the Los Alamos National Laboratory Theoretical Division; Eunmo Koo, scientist in the Computational Earth Science Group at LANL, recipient of the NNSA Defense Program Stockpile Stewardship Program award of excellence; Wesley Even, R&D Scientist at CCS-2, LANL, specialist in computational physics and astrophysics; Matthew Hecht is a member of the Computational Physics and Methods Group in the Climate, Ocean and Sea Ice Modelling program (COSIM) at LANL, who works on modeling high-latitude atmospheric effects in climate models as part of the HiLAT project; Elizabeth Hunke, Lead developer for the Los Alamos Sea Ice Model, Deputy Group Leader of the T-3 Fluid Dynamics and Solid Mechanics Group at LANL; Darin Comeau, Scientist at the CCS-2 COSIM program, specializes in high dimensional data analysis, statistical and predictive modeling, and uncertainty quantification, with particular applications to climate science; Randall Bos is a research scientist at LANL specializing in urban EMP simulations; James Cooley is a Group Leader within CCS-2. 03/16/2018. “Climate Impact of a Regional Nuclear Weapons Exchange: An Improved Assessment Based On Detailed Source Calculations.” Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres, vol. 123, no. 5, pp. 2752–2772] // Re-Cut Justin

To quantitatively account for natural and forced variability in the climate system, we created two ensembles, one for the natural, unforced system and a second ensemble using a range of realistic vertical profiles for the BC aerosol forcing, consistent with our detailed fire simulation. The control ensemble was generated using small atmospheric temperature perturbations (Kay et al., 2015). Notably, the overall spread of anomalies in both ensembles is very similar. These ensembles were then used to create “super ensembles” using a statistical emulator, which allows a robust statistical comparison of our simulated results with and without the carbon forcing. Our primary result is the **decreased impact on global climate indices**, such as global average surface temperature and precipitation, relative to standard scenarios considered in previous work (e.g., Robock et al., 2007a; Stenke et al., 2013; Mills et al., 2014; Pausata et al., 2016). With our finding of **substantially less BC aerosol being lofted to stratospheric heights** (e.g., over a factor of four less than in most of the scenarios considered by previous studies), these globally averaged anomalies drop to **statistically insignificant levels** after the first several years (Figures 14 and 16). Our results are generally comparable to those predicted by other studies that considered exchange scenarios in which only about 1 Tg of soot is emitted in the upper troposphere (Robock et al., 2007a; Mills et al., 2008; Stenke et al., 2013). There are more subtle suggestions of regional effects, notably in the extent of the region over which sea surface temperature differences between ensembles remain significant in the final years of simulation (Figure 17). Further work is required to adequately analyze these and other potential regional effects. Historical analysis of several large volcanic eruptions and a recent large fire also supports this result. For example, Timmreck et al. (2010) claim that nonlinear aerosol effects of the Toba Tuff eruption 74,000 years ago helped **limit significant global cooling** impacts to a **two-year time period** and that any cooling beyond this time period could be due to other effects. It should be noted that this eruption was estimated to have produced **106 Tg** of ash and comparable amounts of other gases, such as sulfur dioxide (SO2), while the estimated amount of soot produced by a regional exchange is on the order of **10 Tg**, or **5 orders of magnitude smaller than the ash** (not including gases) **produced by the Toba eruption**. Noting that a nuclear exchange is not identical to volcanic events, it has been asserted that BC particles produced by fires should have a **greater impact on absorbing solar radiation** than even has the significantly larger amounts of ash and various gases produced by large eruptions (e.g., Robock and Toon 2010). Likewise, recent work in analyzing BC emissions from large fires suggests that in such fires, similar to large volcanic eruptions, **coating of soot particles with other particles** in convective eddies **tends to increase their size and hence increase their subsequent rainout** (China et al., 2013) before they can reach the stratosphere. In fact, the recent study of Pausata et al. (2016) found that growth of BC aerosol via coagulation with organic carbon significantly reduce the particles’ lifetime in the atmosphere

### Climate Change

#### Link turn – strikes hurt the economy which affects all industries: including the green energy sector which is key to solving climate change

#### 1] Strikes hurt the economy which also affects the green energy sector

**Tenza 20**, Mlungisi. "The effects of violent strikes on the economy of a developing country: a case of South Africa." Obiter 41.3 (2020): 519-537. (Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal)

When South Africa obtained democracy in 1994, there was a dream of a better country with a new vision for industrial relations.5 However, the number of violent strikes that have bedevilled this country in recent years seems to have shattered-down the aspirations of a better South Africa. South Africa recorded 114 strikes in 2013 and 88 strikes in 2014, which cost the country about **R6.1 billion** according to the Department of Labour.6 The impact of these strikes has been hugely felt by the mining sector, particularly the platinum industry. The biggest strike took place in the platinum sector where about 70 000 mineworkers’ downed tools for better wages. Three major platinum producers (Impala, Anglo American and Lonmin Platinum Mines) were affected. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 25 June 2014. Business Day reported that “the five-month-long strike in the platinum sector pushed the economy to the brink of recession”. 7 This strike was closely followed by a four-week strike in the metal and engineering sector. All these strikes (and those not mentioned here) were characterised with violence accompanied by damage to property, intimidation, assault and sometimes the killing of people. Statistics from the metal and engineering sector showed that about 246 cases of intimidation were reported, 50 violent incidents occurred, and 85 cases of vandalism were recorded.8 Large-scale unemployment, soaring poverty levels and the dramatic income inequality that characterise the South African labour market provide a broad explanation for strike violence.9 While participating in a strike, workers’ stress levels leave them feeling frustrated at their seeming powerlessness, which in turn provokes further violent behaviour.10 These strikes are not only violent but **take long to resolve.** Generally, a lengthy strike has a **negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation**. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty. One of the measures that may boost the country’s economic growth is by attracting potential investors to invest in the country. However, this might be difficult as investors would want to invest in a country where there is a likelihood of getting returns for their investments. The wish of getting returns for investment may not materialise if the labour environment **is not fertile** for such investments as a result of, for example, unstable labour relations. Therefore, investors may be reluctant to invest where there is an unstable or fragile labour relations environment. 3 THE COMMISSION OF VIOLENCE DURING A STRIKE AND CONSEQUENCES The Constitution guarantees every worker the right to join a trade union, participate in the activities and programmes of a trade union, and to strike. 11 The Constitution grants these rights to a “worker” as an individual.12 However, the right to strike and any other conduct in contemplation or furtherance of a strike such as a picket13 can only be exercised by workers acting collectively.14 The right to strike and participation in the activities of a trade union were given more effect through the enactment of the Labour Relations Act 66 of 199515 (LRA). The main purpose of the LRA is to “advance economic development, social justice, labour peace and the democratisation of the workplace”. 16 The advancement of social justice means that the exercise of the right to strike must advance the interests of workers and at the same time workers must refrain from any conduct that can affect those who are not on strike as well members of society. Even though the right to strike and the right to participate in the activities of a trade union that often flow from a strike17 are guaranteed in the Constitution and specifically regulated by the LRA, it sometimes happens that the right to strike is exercised for purposes not intended by the Constitution and the LRA, generally. 18 For example, it was not the intention of the Constitutional Assembly and the legislature that violence should be used during strikes or pickets. As the Constitution provides, pickets are meant to be peaceful. 19 Contrary to section 17 of the Constitution, the conduct of workers participating in a strike or picket has changed in recent years with workers trying to emphasise their grievances by causing disharmony and chaos in public. A media report by the South African Institute of Race Relations pointed out that between the years 1999 and 2012 there were 181 strike-related deaths, 313 injuries and 3,058 people were arrested for public violence associated with strikes.20 The question is whether employers succumb easily to workers’ demands if a strike is accompanied by violence? In response to this question, one worker remarked as follows: “[T]here is no sweet strike, there is no Christian strike … A strike is a strike. [Y]ou want to get back what belongs to you ... you won’t win a strike with a Bible. You do not wear high heels and carry an umbrella and say ‘1992 was under apartheid, 2007 is under ANC’. You won’t win a strike like that.” 21 The use of violence during industrial action affects not only the strikers or picketers, the employer and his or her business but it also affects innocent members of the public, non-striking employees, the environment and the economy at large. In addition, striking workers visit non-striking workers’ homes, often at night, threaten them and in some cases, assault or even murder workers who are acting as replacement labour. 22 This points to the fact that for many workers and their families’ living conditions remain unsafe and vulnerable to damage due to violence. In Security Services Employers Organisation v SA Transport & Allied Workers Union (SATAWU),23 it was reported that about 20 people were thrown out of moving trains in the Gauteng province; most of them were security guards who were not on strike and who were believed to be targeted by their striking colleagues. Two of them died, while others were admitted to hospitals with serious injuries.24 In SA Chemical Catering & Allied Workers Union v Check One (Pty) Ltd,25 striking employees were carrying various weapons ranging from sticks, pipes, planks and bottles. One of the strikers Mr Nqoko was alleged to have threatened to cut the throats of those employees who had been brought from other branches of the employer’s business to help in the branch where employees were on strike. Such conduct was held not to be in line with good conduct of striking.26 These examples from case law show that South Africa is facing a problem that is affecting not only the industrial relations’ sector but also the economy at large. For example, in 2012, during a strike by workers employed by Lonmin in Marikana, the then-new union Association of Mine & Construction Workers Union (AMCU) wanted to exert its presence after it appeared that many workers were not happy with the way the majority union, National Union of Mine Workers (NUM), handled negotiations with the employer (Lonmin Mine). AMCU went on an unprotected strike which was violent and resulted in the loss of lives, damage to property and negative economic consequences including a weakened currency, reduced global investment, declining productivity, and increase unemployment in the affected sectors.27 Further, the unreasonably long time it takes for strikes to get resolved in the Republic has a negative effect on the business of the employer, the economy and employment. 3 1 Effects of violent and long strikes on the economy Generally, South Africa’s economy is on a downward scale. First, it fails to create employment opportunities for its people. The recent statistics on unemployment levels indicate that unemployment has increased from 26.5% to 27.2%. 28 The most prominent strike which nearly brought the platinum industries to its knees was the strike convened by AMCU in 2014. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 24 June 2014. It affected the three big platinum producers in the Republic, which are the Anglo American Platinum, Lonmin Plc and Impala Platinum. It was the longest strike since the dawn of democracy in 1994. As a result of this strike, the platinum industries lost billions of rands.29 According to the report by Economic Research Southern Africa, the platinum group metals industry is South Africa’s second-largest export earner behind gold and contributes just over 2% of the country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP).30 The overall metal ores in the mining industry which include platinum sells about 70% of its output to the export market while sales to local manufacturers of basic metals, fabricated metal products and various other metal equipment and machinery make up to 20%. 31 The research indicates that the overall impact of the strike in 2014 was driven by a reduction in productive capital in the mining sector, accompanied by a decrease in labour available to the economy. This resulted in a sharp increase in the price of the output by 5.8% with a **GDP declined by 0.72 and 0.78%**.32

#### 2] If there is any change at solving climate change, we need green energy to be able to replace fossil fuel electricity generation but strikes hurt those industries

Conca 7/21 [What’s Happening? Global Emissions Are Still Rising / https://www.forbes.com/sites/jamesconca/2021/07/23/whats-happening-global-emissions-are-still-rising/?sh=f498d4b77ec8 / been a scientist in the field of the earth and environmental sciences for 33 years, specializing in geologic disposal of nuclear waste, energy-related research, planetary surface processes, radiobiology and shielding for space colonies, subsurface transport and environmental clean-up of heavy metals. ]

After the world has spent a few trillion dollars over the last ten years trying to decarbonize, $503 billion in 2020 alone, carbon emissions are still increasing. Even as the pandemic slowed that growth for a bit during 2020-2021, emissions in 2022-2023 will break all records and exceed 55 billion tons/year by more than a little. According to the International Energy Agency, global electricity demand will increase by 5% in 2021 and 4% in 2022, and half of this increase will be from fossil fuels, particularly new coal in the developing world. CO2 emissions from the power sector will rise to record levels in 2022, exceeding 34 billion tons. After dropping 4% in 2020, nuclear power generation is forecast to grow, but only by 1% in 2021. This is one important reason why carbon emissions will grow so much during this period. PROMOTED Renewable electricity generation, which grew 7% in 2020, will continue to rise, but cannot keep up with increasing demand, not by half. Until growth in renewables and nuclear exceeds that of fossil fuels, and by a lot, we will make no headway against the environmental problems we need to solve in the next three decades. Renewables and fully electric vehicles aside, all fossil fuels are increasing worldwide primarily because of economic growth in the developing world. Even coal is increasing worldwide, producing more power than hydro, nuclear and renewables combined. This not because coal is cheapest – it’s not. Of all energy sources, coal is merely the easiest to set up in a poor or developing country that has little existing infrastructure. It is the easiest to transport – by ship, rail or truck. It is straightforward to build a coal-fired power plant. And to operate it. Thus, fossil fuel will keep increasing. "Our analyses show that the short-term trend in global electricity markets is not consistent with a zero emissions pathway," the IEA said. While emissions go down a bit in the developed world, they keep increasing in the developing world. EIA While there plenty of Roadmaps to Net Zero by 2050, there are no actual projections that this will happen. No serious projections even have global emissions much lower than 30 billion tons/year by 2050. That’s because the use of oil and natural gas keep increasing and only flatten by about 2040 They don’t ever decrease until the second half of this century. And coal decreases by only 15% or so. This is not the trend that’s going to get us to a low-carbon future. In fact, the only things that will get us to net-zero must include some form of the following , although other issues like infrastructure needs will also be essential: - stop building any new fossil fuel plants as soon as possible; once built you’re locked into that fossil fuel for at least 40 years - stop closing perfectly performing and safe nuclear plants that have already been relicensed for another 20 or 40 years - install 3,500,000 of new MW of wind turbines (12 trillion kWhs/year) - install 1,400,000 MW of new nuclear reactors, particularly SMRs that are especially ideal for load-following renewables (11 trillion kWhs/year) - install 2,100,000 MW of new solar (7 trillion kWhs/year) - install 1,200,000 new MW of hydro w/80,000 MW existing (7 trillion kWhs/yr) - secure sources of Li, Co, Nd, Fe and other metals needed to build these alternatives, especially to build the batteries for enough fully electric vehicles to replace oil. - build a fleet of 3 billion fully electric vehicles by 2050, much fewer will not sufficiently drop our consumption of oil. It turns out that the cost of this new low-carbon energy mix is about the same as business-as-usual, $65 trillion versus $63 trillion, over about 30 years. It’s just that more of the total cost is in up-front capital costs instead of fuel costs - $28 trillion versus $11 trillion. It will take over 12 billion tons of steel alone for that much renewables (annual global output of steel is presently 1.6 billion tons). Cost estimates by the International Renewable Energy Agency for decarbonizing the world, all sectors not just energy, top $100 trillion by 2050. In a recent McKinsey report, the estimated cost of decarbonizing just the industrial sector would be about $21 trillion between now and 2050, although both could be significantly lower if technologies and efficiencies continue to advance. But it’s the lack of nuclear that really puts the stake in the heart of the decarbonization dream. The Mochovce 3 nuclear unit in the Slovak Republic is expected to start commercial operation this year, but the retirement of the Fessenheim nuclear plant in France and Ringhals in Sweden in 2020 negates that. With the retirement of 4.3 GW of nuclear in Germany, 2 GW in the U.K. and 1 GW in Belgium before the end of 2022, nuclear electricity generation is likely to drop again in 2022, by 3%, even if the Olkiluoto 3 EPR in Finland starts commercial operation. Aerial view of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Like many nuclear power plants in America and a few other developed countries, Diablo Canyon in San ... [+] MARK RALSTON/AFP/GETTY IMAGES In the U.S., EIA predicts that 9.1 GW of nuclear capacity will be added by 2050, as well as another 4.7 GW of added nuclear capacity resulting from uprates - operational changes that allow existing plants to produce more electricity. However, more than offsetting this additional capacity, are projected retirements of 29.9 GW of nuclear capacity through 2050, especially those expected to close by 2026. Indian Point’s foolish closing recently has erased most of New York’s progress in lowering their carbon footprint with renewables. China is planning 180 GW of new nuclear plants, big ones, by 2035. If the rest of the world followed suit in proportion, we would have a chance. So, if you think we’ve been doing a reasonable job of curbing fossil fuel use, even after spending some trillions of dollars, you are sadly mistaken. It’s nice to have a plan, but if it’s not based in reality, it’s not going to happen.

The chances of a robust shift to green energy is unlikely by ~~~, but strikes exacerbate these concerns