## **FW**

The standard is maximizing pleasure.

#### Utilitarianism shows a broader view of morals beyond one person.

Robert Cavalier 96 (Robert Cavalier, Director of CMU’s Center for Advancement of Applied Ethics and Political Philosophy, President of the International Association for Computing and Philosophy, Chair of the APA Committee on Philosophy and Computers) Online Guide to Ethics and Moral Philosophy 1996No Publication http://caae.phil.cmu.edu/cavalier/80130/part2/sect9.html#Top%20of%20Page //DebateDrills TJ

**Utilitarianism is a normative ethical theory that places the locus of right and wrong solely on the outcomes (consequences) of choosing one action/policy over other actions/policies. As such, it moves beyond the scope of one's own interests and takes into account the interests of others.** [John Stuart Mill](http://caae.phil.cmu.edu/cavalier/80130/part1/sect4/BenandMill.html) adjusted the more hedonistic tendencies in Bentham's philosophy by emphasizing (1) **It is not the quantity of pleasure, but the quality of happiness that is central to utilitarianism**, (2) the calculus is unreasonable -- **qualities cannot be quantified (there is a distinction between 'higher' and 'lower' pleasures)**, and (3) utilitarianism refers to "the Greatest Happiness Principle" -- **it seeks to promote the capability of achieving happiness** (higher pleasures) **for the most amount of people** (this is its "extent").

## Disclosure Theory

#### A] Interpretation: Debaters must, on the page with their name and the school they attend, disclose all taglines, full citations, and the first and last three words of the pieces of evidence read in their cases on the NDCA wiki at least 30 minutes before the round

#### B] Violation: My opponent hasn’t posted cites: I can provide screen shots if necessary.

#### C] Net Benefits:

**1] Research** – disclosure increases research and gets rid of anti-educational arguments because debaters are forced to prepare cases knowing that people will have answers AND people get the opportunity to research answers to disclosed cases.

**Nails 13** - (Jacob [I am a policy debater at Georgia State University. I debated LD for 4 years for Starr's Mill High School (GA) and graduated in 2012.] "A Defense of Disclosure (Including Third-Party Disclosure)" http://nsdupdate.com/2013/a-defense-of-disclosure-including-third-party-disclosure-by-jacob-nails/)

I fall squarely on the side of disclosure. I find that **the largest advantage of widespread disclosure is the educational value it provides.** First, **disclosure streamlines research. Rather than every team and every lone wolf researching completely in the dark, the wiki provides a public body of knowledge that everyone can contribute to and build off of.** Students can look through the different studies on the topic and choose the best ones on an informed basis without the prohibitively large burden of personally surveying all of the literature. **The best arguments are identified and replicated, which is a natural result of an open marketplace of ideas. Quality of evidence increases across the board. In theory,** the increased quality of information **[this] could trade off with quantity**. If debaters could just look to the wiki for evidence, it might remove the competitive incentive to do one’s own research. **Empirically**, however**, the opposite has been true.** In fact, a second advantage of **disclosure is that it motivates research. Debaters cannot expect to make it a whole topic with the same stock AC – that is, unless they are continually updating and frontlining it.** Likewise, **debaters with access to their opponents’ cases can do more targeted and specific research. Students can go to a new level of depth, researching not just the pros and cons of the topic but the specific authors, arguments, and adovcacies employed by other debaters.** The incentive to cut author-specific indicts is low if there’s little guarantee that the author will ever be cited in a round but high if one knows that specific schools are using that author in rounds. In this way, disclosure increases incentive to research by altering a student’s cost-benefit analysis so that the time spent researching is more valuable, i.e. more likely to produce useful evidence because it is more directed. In any case, if publicly accessible evidence jeopardized research, backfiles and briefs would have done LD in a long time ago. Lastly, and to my mind most significantly, **disclosure weeds out anti-educational arguments. I have in mind the sort of theory spikes and underdeveloped analytics whose strategic value comes only from the fact that the time to think of and enunciate responses to them takes longer than the time spent making the arguments themselves. If [theory spikes] these arguments were made on a level playing field where each side had equal time to craft answers, they would seldom win rounds, which is a testimony to the real world applicability (or lack thereof) of such strategies.** A model in which arguments have to withstand close scrutiny to win rounds creates incentive to find the best arguments on the topic rather than the shadiest. Having transitioned from LD to policy where disclosure is more universal, I can say that **debates are more substantive, developed, and responsive when both sides know what they’re getting into prior to the round**. The educational benefits of disclosure alone aren’t likely to convince the fairness-outweighs-education crowd, but I’ve learned over the course of many theory debates that most of that crowd has a very warped and confusing conception of fairness. **Debaters who produce better research are more deserving of a win. Debaters who can make smart arguments and defend them from criticism should win out over debaters who hide behind obfuscation.** That so many rounds these days are resolved on frivolous theory and dropped, single-sentence blips suggests that wins are not going to the “better debaters” in any meaningful sense of the term. The structure of LD in the status quo doesn’t incentivize better debating.

**2] Clash** – Disclosure is the best method for increasing clash in debates because it allows debaters to substantively engage positions rather than relying on sketchy tricks to avoid the discussion. It also allows for more specific clash because debaters can see specific arguments disclosed instead of trying to link generic arguments in.

## Business fear

#### Businesses will fear any new power grasps

**ACIP 09**, (American Council on International Personnel, “Examining Proposals to Create a New Commission on Employment-Based Immigration,” 6-18-2009, [http://www.immigrationworksusa.org/uploaded/file/ACIP Commission Paper Final.pdf](http://www.immigrationworksusa.org/uploaded/file/ACIP%20Commission%20Paper%20Final.pdf))//AK

**Employers would see the most glaring flaw** in these proposals as the empowerment of a small group of people to overrule the hiring decisions of thousands of employers. Any attempt to micromanage which foreign-born professionals can be hired is likely to be problematic, since employers do not hire people in the aggregate, in general or economy wide. Businesses engage in ongoing recruitment that identifies individuals who will enable a company to compete better in the domestic or global economy. No small group of people, regardless of their backgrounds, could know how many of such individuals, or which qualifications, U.S. companies as a whole require in a given year.

#### Businesses fear: strikes cause uncertainty

Davis 50 (Davis, Richard G. “Governmental Employees and the Right to Strike.” *Social Forces*, vol. 28, no. 3, Oxford University Press, 1950, pp. 322–29, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2572018>.)//AK

The labor problem of government employees is different from that of the workers in private in- dustry, for it involves a contest between a specific group of citizens on the one hand and all of the people, acting through the instrumentality of gov- ernment, on the other.4 There is no substantial body of reference material on the question of employee organization in government, chiefly because the comparative quiescence of government workers in respect to labor conflict has never served to bring the question sharply to the attention of the public. There have been occasional strikes by public employees ever since 1836, and the dramatic police strike in Boston in 1919 is an outstanding example; but in general it is fair to say that "few government walkouts have approximated in se- verity, extent, length and social impact various strikeson the railroads,in coal mines, in automobile and rubberplants, and others in private industry."5 It is thus a very apt statement of Fisher's that "most of the antagonists of employee organization have in the main been concerned over the possible threatof strike or sabotage contained in the ex- istence of organizations of workers in govern- ment,"'6 rather than basing their opposition on historical evidence.

#### Business confidence key to the economy- cycle

**Braithwaite 4** (John, Fellow @ Australian Research Council Federation, March, 592 Annals 79, lexis)

The challenge of designing institutions that simultaneously engender emancipation and hope is addressed within the assumption of economic institutions that are fundamentally capitalist. This contemporary global context gives more force to the hope nexus because we know capitalism thrives on hope. **When business confidence collapses, capitalist economies head for recession**. This dependence on hope is of quite general import; business leaders must have hope for the future before they will build new factories; consumers need confidence before they will buy what the factories make; investors need confidence before they will buy shares in the company that builds the factory; bankers need confidence to lend money to build the factory; scientists need confidence to innovate with new technologies in the hope that a capitalist will come along and market their invention. Keynes's ([1936]1981) *General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money* lamented the theoretical neglect of "animal spirits" of hope ("spontaneous optimism rather than . . . mathematical expectation" (p. 161) in the discipline of economics, a neglect that continues to this day (see also Barbalet 1993).

## Offshoring

#### Unionization turns jobs – offshoring

**Gaston 2** (Noel Gaston, School of Business, Bond University, June, 2002. Gold Coast, “The Effects of Globalisation on Unions and the Nature of Collective Bargaining”. 377-396 Vol. 17 No.2)//AK

Most importantly, for present purposes, Proposition 1 also states that **the domestic union** is adversely affected by a higher value of the firm’s disagreement outcome. Mezzetti and Dinopoulos (1991) interpret as the value of the option to switch production abroad. That is, varies positively with **a credible outsourcing alternative** for the firm.13 It is **a credible threat** in the case of a multinational enterprise because of the lack of coordination between domestic and foreign unions or workers. As Caves (1996) notes, multinational enterprises enjoy bargaining ploys that national firms simply do not possess. Further, “[i]f the MNE maintains capacity to produce the same goods in different national markets, output curtailed by a strike in one market can be replaced from another subsidiary’s plant. ... the MNE can credibly threaten to close down a given plant, or shelve any expansion plans there, and choose another market for any additions to capacity.” Caves (1996, p.125). The ability to outsource shifts the domestic collective bargaining outcome in favour of the firm. That is, when it bargains with a domestic union, the firm can threaten to close the domestic plant and switch production to the foreign country. During any dispute, the domestic firm supplies the market from abroad. The threat point of the firm is therefore its reservation profit when its production facilities are moved offshore.14 A pertinent issue is how unions might respond to the possibility of outsourcing production and employment by firms. If foreign direct investment and outsourcing production facilities overseas by firms are features of the new global environment, then it is simply unrealistic to assume that unions and workers sit idly by. Unions adapt to the new global environment or risk extinction. Labour market institutions evolve

#### Offshoring hurts salaries, jobs, and innovation

**The Economist 03** (The Economist, 2003 (“Stolen Jobs?,” Leaders, December 11th, Available Online at <https://www.economist.com/leaders/2003/12/11/stolen-jobs>,))//AK

IN AMERICA, in Britain, in Australia, an awful thought has gripped employees in the past six months or so: India may do for services what China already does for manufacturing. Any product can be made in China less expensively than in the rich countries. Is it merely a matter of time before any service that can be electronically transmitted is produced in India more cheaply too? As “offshoring”—a hideous word to describe work sent overseas, often outsourced—has spread from manufacturing to white-collar services, so the pressure on legislators to step in has increased (see article). Manufacturers have used overseas suppliers for years. But now, cheaper communications allow companies to move back-office tasks such as data entry, call centres and payroll processing to poorer countries. India has three huge attractions for companies: a large pool of well-educated young workers, low wages and the English language. But plenty of other industrialising countries also handle back-office work. Moreover, given the pressure on costs in rich countries, offshore sourcing of services will grow: a much-quoted study by Forrester, a consultancy, last year predicted that 3.3m American jobs (500,000 of them in IT) would move abroad by 2015. And the quality of outsourcing will improve. Many of the jibes at Indian outsourcing today—about thick accents and unreliable technology—sound like the jeers at unreliable and ugly Japanese cars 30 years ago. No wonder politicians are under pressure to discourage companies (and public agencies) from sending service work abroad. To do so, though, would be as self-defeating as stopping the purchase of goods or components abroad. For, although the jobs killed by outsourcing abroad are easy to spot, the benefits are less visible but even greater. Like trade in goods, trade in services forces painful redistributions of employment. A study for the Institute for International Economics found that, in 1979-99, 69% of people who lost jobs as a result of cheap imports in sectors other than manufacturing found new work. But those figures are only for America, with its flexible job market, and leave a large minority who did not find new employment. Moreover, 55% of those who found new jobs did so at lower pay, and 25% took pay cuts of 30% or more. Some of the gains from free trade need to be used to ease the transition of workers into new jobs. But those gains are substantial. Some arise simply from organising work in more effective ways. A fair part of the work that moves abroad represents an attempt by companies to provide a round-the-clock service, by making use of time zones. To that extent, offshoring directly improves efficiency. In addition, a recent report on offshoring from McKinsey estimates that every dollar of costs the United States moves offshore brings America a net benefit of $1.12 to $1.14 (the additional benefit to the country receiving the investment comes on top). Part of this arises because, as low value-added jobs go abroad, labour and investment can switch to jobs that generate more economic value. This is what has happened with manufacturing: employment has dwindled, but workers have moved into educational and health services where pay is higher (and conditions often more agreeable). The thirst for the new What of innovation, though? At present, most new products and services are developed in the rich world—and, indeed, predominantly in the United States. Many Americans fear that all those bright young Chinese and Indians will steal not just jobs but the rich world's most precious skills. One of the uglier side-effects of the growing hostility to exporting service jobs has been a move to reduce the availability of visas for temporary workers in skilled jobs and especially in IT, on the grounds that they transfer knowledge and skills back home, taking jobs and innovation with them.

#### Offshoring bad for employement, spending and leadership- discount any studies that say offshoring is good because they are one sided

Roberts 16 (Paul Craig Roberts, American economist, journalist, blogger, and former civil servant, former Assistant Secretary of the US Treasury, former Associate Editor of the Wall Street Journal, frequent contributor to Global Research, BA in Economics from the Georgia Institute of Technology, PhD in Economics from the University of Virginia, Fellow in Economics at the University of Oxford, 2016 (“The Offshore Outsourcing of American Jobs: A Greater Threat Than Terrorism,” Global Research, March 13th, Available Online at <https://www.globalresearch.ca/the-offshore-outsourcing-of-american-jobs-a-greater-threat-than-terrorism/18725>, Accessed 7-03-08))//AK

Is offshore outsourcing good or harmful for America? To convince Americans of outsourcing’s benefits, corporate outsourcers sponsor misleading one-sided “studies.” Only a small handful of people have looked objectively at the issue. These few and the large number of Americans whose careers have been destroyed by outsourcing have a different view of outsourcing’s impact. But so far there has been no debate, just a shouting down of skeptics as “protectionists.” Now comes an important new book, Outsourcing America, published by the American Management Association. The authors, two brothers, Ron and Anil Hira, are experts on the subject. One is a professor at the Rochester Institute of Technology, and the other is professor at Simon Fraser University. The authors note that despite the enormity of the stakes for all Americans, a state of denial exists among policymakers and outsourcing’s corporate champions about the adverse effects on the US. The Hira brothers succeed in their task of interjecting harsh reality where delusion has ruled. In what might be an underestimate, a University of California study concludes that 14 million white-collar jobs are vulnerable to being outsourced offshore. These are not only call-center operators, customer service and back-office jobs, but also information technology, accounting, architecture, advanced engineering design, news reporting, stock analysis, and medical and legal services. The authors note that these are the jobs of the American Dream, the jobs of upward mobility that generate the bulk of the tax revenues that fund our education, health, infrastructure, and social security systems. The loss of these jobs “is fool’s gold for companies.” Corporate America’s short-term mentality, stemming from bonuses tied to quarterly results, is causing US companies to lose not only their best employees-their human capital-but also the consumers who buy their products. Employees displaced by foreigners and left unemployed or in lower paid work have a reduced presence in the consumer market. They provide fewer retirement savings for new investment. Nothink economists assume that new, better jobs are on the way for displaced Americans, but no economists can identify these jobs. The authors point out that “the track record for the re-employment of displaced US workers is abysmal: “The Department of Labor reports that more than one in three workers who are displaced remains unemployed, and many of those who are lucky enough to find jobs take major pay cuts. Many former manufacturing workers who were displaced a decade ago because of manufacturing that went offshore took training courses and found jobs in the information technology sector. They are now facing the unenviable situation of having their second career disappear overseas.” The “New Economy” Is The No Jobs Economy American economists are so inattentive to outsourcing’s perils that they fail to realize that the same incentive that leads to the outsourcing of one tradable good or service holds for all tradable goods and services. In the 21st century the US economy has only been able to create jobs in nontradable domestic services-the hallmark of a third world labor force. Prior to the advent of offshore outsourcing, US employees were shielded against low wage foreign labor. Americans worked with more capital and better technology, and their higher productivity protected their higher wages. Outsourcing forces Americans to “compete head-to-head with foreign workers” by “undermining US workers’ primary competitive advantage over foreign workers: their physical presence in the US” and “by providing those overseas workers with the same technologies.” The result is a lose-lose situation for American employees, American businesses, and the American government. Outsourcing has brought about record unemployment in engineering fields and a major drop in university enrollments in technical and scientific disciplines. Even many of the remaining jobs are being filled by lower paid foreigners brought in on H-1b and L-1 visas. American employees are discharged after being forced to train their foreign replacements. US corporations justify their offshore operations as essential to gain a foothold in emerging Asian markets. The Hira brothers believe this is self-delusion. “There is no evidence that they will be able to outcompete local Chinese and Indian companies, who are very rapidly assimilating the technology and know-how from the local US plants. In fact, studies show that Indian IT companies have been consistently outcompeting their US counterparts, even in US markets. Thus, it is time for CEOs to start thinking about whether they are fine with their own jobs being outsourced as well.” The authors note that the national security implications of outsourcing “have been largely ignored.” Outsourcing is rapidly eroding America’s superpower status. Beginning in 2002 the US began running trade deficits in advanced technology products with Asia, Mexico and Ireland. As these countries are not leaders in advanced technology, the deficits obviously stem from US offshore manufacturing. In effect, the US is giving away its technology, which is rapidly being captured, while US firms reduce themselves to a brand name with a sales force.

## HCW PIC

#### Text: A Just government ought to recognize a conditional right of workers to strike whereby Healthcare Workers are not permitted to strike during a pandemic.

#### Strikes During a Pandemic decks preparedness – responsivity is slowed, faith is deterred, and resources are overstretched. Its try or die for medical preparedness to mitigate the next pandemic.

Jamaluddin et al. 21 [Jamaluddin, J., Baharum, N. N., Jamil, S. N., & Kamel, M. A. M. (2021). Doctors Strike During COVID-19 Pandemic in Malaysia: Between Right and Wrong. *Voices in Bioethics*, *7*. <https://doi.org/10.52214/vib.v7i.8586>] DD HJ

Although doctor strikes do not seem to increase patient mortality, they can disrupt delivery of healthcare.[32] Disruptions in delivery of service from prolonged strikes can result in decline of in-patient admissions and outpatient service utilization, as suggested during strikes in the UK in 2016.[33] When emergency services were affected during the last strike in April, regular service was also significantly affected. Additionally, people might need to seek alternative sources of care from the private sector and face increased costs of care. HCWs themselves may feel guilty and demotivated because of the strikes. The public health system may also lose trust as a result of service disruption caused by high recurrence of strikes. During the COVID-19 pandemic, as the healthcare system remains stretched, the potential adverse effects resulting from doctor strikes remain uncertain and potentially disruptive. In the UK, it is an offence to “willfully and maliciously…endanger human life or cause serious bodily injury.”[34] Likewise, the General Medical Council (GMC) also requires doctors to ensure that patients are not harmed or put at risk by industrial action. In the US, the American Medical Association code of ethics prohibits strikes by physicians as a bargaining tactic, while allowing some other forms of collective bargaining.[35] However, the American College of Physicians prohibits all forms of work stoppages, even when undertaken for necessary changes to the healthcare system. Similarly, the Delhi Medical Council in India issued a statement that “under no circumstances doctors should resort to strike as the same puts patient care in serious jeopardy.”[36] On the other hand, the positions taken by the Malaysian Medical Council (MMC) and Malaysian Medical Association (MMA) on doctors’ strikes are less clear when compared to their Western counterparts. The MMC, in their recently updated Code of Professional Conduct 2019, states that “the public reputation of the medical profession requires that every member should observe proper standards of personal behavior, not only in his professional activities but at all times.” Strikes may lead to imprisonment and disciplinary actions by MMC for those involved. Similarly, the MMA Code of Medical Ethics published in 2002 states that doctors must “make sure that your personal beliefs do not prejudice your patients' care.”[37] The MMA which is traditionally meant to represent the voices of doctors in Malaysia, may hold a more moderate position on strikes. Although HCW strikes are not explicitly mentioned in either professional body’s code of conduct and ethics, the consensus is that doctors should not do anything that will harm patients and they must maintain the proper standard of behaviors. These statements seem too general and do not represent the complexity of why and how a strike could take place. Therefore, it has been suggested that doctors and medical organizations should develop a new consensus on issues pertaining to medical professional’s social contract with society while considering the need to uphold the integrity of the profession. Experts in law, ethics, and medicine have long debated whether and when HCW strikes can be justified. If a strike is not expected to result in patient harm it is perhaps acceptable.[38] Although these debates have centered on the potential risks that strikes carry for patients, these actions also pose risks for HCWs as they may damage morale and reputation.[39] Most fundamentally, strikes raise questions about what healthcare workers owe society and what society owes them. For strikes to be morally permissible and ethical, it is suggested that they must fulfil these three criteria:[40] a. Strikes should be proportionate, e., they ‘should not inflict disproportionate harm on patients’, and hospitals should as a minimum ‘continue to provide at least such critical services as emergency care.’ b. Strikes should have a reasonable hope of success, at least not totally futile however tough the political rhetoric is. c. Strikes should be treated as a last resort: ‘all less disruptive alternatives to a strike action must have been tried and failed’, including where appropriate ‘advocacy, dissent and even disobedience’. The current strike does not fulfil the criteria mentioned. As Malaysia is still burdened with a high number of COVID-19 cases, a considerable absence of doctors from work will disrupt health services across the country. Second, since the strike organizer is not unionized, it would be difficult to negotiate better terms of contract and career paths. Third, there are ongoing talks with MMA representing the fraternity and the current government, but the time is running out for the government to establish a proper long-term solution for these contract doctors. One may argue that since the doctors’ contracts will end in a few months with no proper pathways for specialization, now is the time to strike. However, the HCW right to strike should be invoked only legally and appropriately after all other options have failed. CONCLUSION The strike in Malaysia has begun since the drafting of this paper. Doctors involved assure that there will not be any risk to patients, arguing that the strike is “symbolic”.[41] Although an organized strike remains a legal form of industrial action, a strike by HCWs in Malaysia poses various unprecedented challenges and ethical dilemmas, especially during the pandemic. The anonymous and uncoordinated strike without support from the appropriate labor unions may only spark futile discussions without affirmative actions. It should not have taken a pandemic or a strike to force the government to confront the issues at hand. It is imperative that active measures be taken to urgently address the underlying issues relating to contract physicians. As COVID-19 continues to affect thousands of people, a prompt reassessment is warranted regarding the treatment of HCWs, and the value placed on health care.

#### Disease causes extinction – weakening health care preparedness is the death knell

Ord ‘20 (Toby Ord is a moral philosopher, Oxford University, Future of Life Institute. Ord has advised the World Health Organization, the World Bank, the World Economic Forum, the US National Intelligence Council, the UK Prime Minister’s Office, Cabinet Office, and Government Office for Science; “Why we need worst-case thinking to prevent pandemics”; The Guardian; D.A. April 18th 2020, [Published March 6th 2020]; <https://www.theguardian.com/science/2020/mar/06/worst-case-thinking-prevent-pandemics-coronavirus-existential-risk>)

[TITLE]: Why we need worst-case thinking to prevent pandemics The world is in the early stages of what may be the most deadly pandemic of the past 100 years. In China, thousands of people have already died; large outbreaks have begun in South Korea, Iran and Italy; and the rest of the world is bracing for impact. We do not yet know whether the final toll will be measured in thousands or hundreds of thousands. For all our advances in medicine, humanity remains much more vulnerable to pandemics than we would like to believe. To understand our vulnerability, and to determine what steps must be taken to end it, it is useful to ask about the very worst-case scenarios. Just how bad could a pandemic be? In science fiction, we sometimes encounter the idea of a pandemic so severe that it could cause the end of civilisation, or even of humanity itself. Such a risk to humanity’s entire future is known as an existential risk. We can say with certainty that the novel coronavirus, named Covid-19, does not pose such a risk. But could the next pandemic? To find out, and to put the current outbreak into greater context, let us turn to the past. In 1347, death came to Europe. It entered through the Crimean town of Caffa, brought by the besieging Mongol army. Fleeing merchants unwittingly carried it back to Italy. From there, it spread to France, Spain and England. Then up as far as Norway and across the rest of Europe – all the way to Moscow. Within six years, the Black Death had taken the continent. Tens of millions fell gravely ill, their bodies succumbing to the disease in different ways. Some bore swollen buboes on their necks, armpits and thighs; some had their flesh turn black from haemorrhaging beneath the skin; some coughed blood from the necrotic inflammation of their throats and lungs. All forms involved fever, exhaustion and an intolerable stench from the material that exuded from the body. There were so many dead that mass graves needed to be dug and, even then, cemeteries ran out of room for the bodies. The Black Death devastated Europe. In those six years, between a quarter and half of all Europeans were killed. The Middle East was ravaged, too, with the plague killing about one in three Egyptians and Syrians. And it may have also laid waste to parts of central Asia, India and China. Due to the scant records of the 14th century, we will never know the true toll, but our best estimates are that somewhere between 5% and 14% of all the world’s people were killed, in what may have been the greatest catastrophe humanity has seen. The Black Death was not the only biological disaster to scar human history. It was not even the only great bubonic plague. In AD541 the plague of Justinian struck the Byzantine empire. Over three years, it took the lives of roughly 3% of the world’s people. When Europeans reached the Americas in 1492, the two populations exposed each other to completely novel diseases. Over thousands of years, each population had built up resistance to their own set of diseases, but were extremely susceptible to the others. The American peoples got by far the worse end of the exchange, through diseases such as measles, influenza and, especially, smallpox. During the next 100 years, a combination of invasion and disease took an immense toll – one whose scale may never be known, due to great uncertainty about the size of the pre-existing population. We can’t rule out the loss of more than 90% of the population of the Americas during that century, though the number could also be much lower. And it is very difficult to tease out how much of this should be attributed to war and occupation, rather than disease. At a rough estimate, as many as 10% of the world’s people may have been killed. Centuries later, the world had become so interconnected that a truly global pandemic was possible. Towards the end of the first world war, a devastating strain of influenza, known as the 1918 flu or [Spanish flu](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/sep/09/spanish-flu-pandemic-centenary-first-world-war), spread to six continents, and even remote Pacific islands. About a third of the world’s population were infected and between 3% and 6% were killed. This death toll outstripped that of the first world war. Yet even events like these fall short of being a threat to humanity’s long-term potential. In the great bubonic plagues we saw civilisation in the affected areas falter, but recover. The regional 25%-50% death rate was not enough to precipitate a continent-wide collapse. It changed the relative fortunes of empires, and may have substantially altered the course of history, but if anything, it gives us reason to believe that human civilisation is likely to make it through future events with similar death rates, even if they were global in scale. The Spanish flu pandemic was remarkable in having very little apparent effect on the world’s development, despite its global reach. It looks as if it was lost in the wake of the first world war, which, despite a smaller death toll, seems to have had a much larger effect on the course of history. The full history of humanity covers at least 200,000 years. While we have scarce records for most of these 2,000 centuries, there is a key lesson we can draw from the sheer length of our past. The chance of human extinction from natural catastrophes of any kind must have been very low for most of this time – or we would not have made it so far. But could these risks have changed? Might the past provide false comfort? Our population now is a thousand times greater than it was for most of human history, so there are vastly more opportunities for new human diseases to originate. And our farming practices have created vast numbers of animals living in unhealthy conditions within close proximity to humans. This increases the risk, as many major diseases originate in animals before crossing over to humans. Examples include HIV (chimpanzees), Ebola (bats), Sars (probably civets or bats) and influenza (usually pigs or birds). We do not yet know where Covid-19 came from, though it is very similar to coronaviruses found in bats and pangolins. Evidence suggests that diseases are crossing over into human populations from animals at an increasing rate. Modern civilisation may also make it much easier for a pandemic to spread. The higher density of people living together in cities increases the number of people each of us may infect. Rapid long-distance transport greatly increases the distance pathogens can spread, reducing the degrees of separation between any two people. Moreover, we are no longer divided into isolated populations as we were for most of the past 10,000 years. Together these effects suggest that we might expect more new pandemics, for them to spread more quickly, and to reach a higher percentage of the world’s people. But we have also changed the world in ways that offer protection. We have a healthier population; improved sanitation and hygiene; preventative and curative medicine; and a scientific understanding of disease. Perhaps most importantly, we have public health bodies to facilitate global communication and coordination in the face of new outbreaks. We have seen the benefits of this protection through the dramatic decline of endemic infectious disease over the past century (though we can’t be sure pandemics will obey the same trend). Finally, we have spread to a range of locations and environments unprecedented for any mammalian species. This offers special protection from extinction events, because it requires the pathogen to be able to flourish in a vast range of environments and to reach exceptionally isolated populations such as uncontacted tribes, Antarctic researchers and nuclear submarine crews. It is hard to know whether these combined effects have increased or decreased the existential risk from pandemics. This uncertainty is ultimately bad news: we were previously sitting on a powerful argument that the risk was tiny; now we are not. We have seen the indirect ways that our actions aid and abet the origination and spread of pandemics. But what about cases where we have a much more direct hand in the process – where we deliberately use, improve or create the pathogens? Our understanding and control of pathogens is very recent. Just 200 years ago, we didn’t even understand the basic cause of pandemics – a leading theory in the west claimed that disease was produced by a kind of gas. In just two centuries, we discovered it was caused by a diverse variety of microscopic agents and we worked out how to grow them in the lab, to breed them for different traits, to sequence their genomes, to implant new genes and to create entire functional viruses from their written code. This progress is continuing at a rapid pace. The past 10 years have seen major qualitative breakthroughs, such as the use of the gene editing tool Crispr to efficiently insert new genetic sequences into a genome, and the use of gene drives to efficiently replace populations of natural organisms in the wild with genetically modified versions. This progress in biotechnology seems unlikely to fizzle out anytime soon: there are no insurmountable challenges looming; no fundamental laws blocking further developments. But it would be optimistic to assume that this uncharted new terrain holds only familiar dangers. To start with, let’s set aside the risks from malicious intent, and consider only the risks that can arise from well-intentioned research. Most scientific and medical research poses a negligible risk of harms at the scale we are considering. But there is a small fraction that uses live pathogens of kinds that are known to threaten global harm. These include the agents that cause the Spanish flu, smallpox, Sars and H5N1 or avian flu. And a small part of this research involves making strains of these pathogens that pose even more danger than the natural types, increasing their transmissibility, lethality or resistance to vaccination or treatment. In 2012, a Dutch virologist, Ron Fouchier, published details of an experiment on the recent H5N1 strain of bird flu. This strain was extremely deadly, killing an estimated 60% of humans it infected – far beyond even the Spanish flu. Yet its inability to pass from human to human had so far prevented a pandemic. Fouchier wanted to find out whether (and how) H5N1 could naturally develop this ability. He passed the disease through a series of 10 ferrets, which are commonly used as a model for how influenza affects humans. By the time it passed to the final ferret, his strain of H5N1 had become directly transmissible between mammals. The work caused fierce controversy. Much of this was focused on the information contained in his work. The US National Science Advisory Board for Biosecurity ruled that his paper had to be stripped of some of its technical details before publication, to limit the ability of bad actors to cause a pandemic. And the Dutch government claimed that the research broke EU law on exporting information useful for bioweapons. But it is not the possibility of misuse that concerns me here. Fouchier’s research provides a clear example of well-intentioned scientists enhancing the destructive capabilities of pathogens known to threaten global catastrophe. Of course, such experiments are done in secure labs, with stringent safety standards. It is highly unlikely that in any particular case the enhanced pathogens would escape into the wild. But just how unlikely? Unfortunately, we don’t have good data, due to a lack of transparency about incident and escape rates. This prevents society from making well-informed decisions balancing the risks and benefits of this research, and it limits the ability of labs to learn from each other’s incidents. Security for highly dangerous pathogens has been deeply flawed, and remains insufficient. In 2001, Britain was struck by a devastating outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in livestock. Six million animals were killed in an attempt to halt its spread, and the economic damages totalled £8bn. Then, in 2007, there was another outbreak, which was traced to a lab working on the disease. Foot-and-mouth was considered a highest-category pathogen, and required the highest level of biosecurity. Yet the virus escaped from a badly maintained pipe, leaking into the groundwater at the facility. After an investigation, the lab’s licence was renewed – only for another leak to occur two weeks later. In my view, this track record of escapes shows that even the highest biosafety level (BSL-4) is insufficient for working on pathogens that pose a risk of global pandemics on the scale of the Spanish flu or worse. Thirteen years since the last publicly acknowledged outbreak from a BSL-4 facility is not good enough. It doesn’t matter whether this is from insufficient standards, inspections, operations or penalties. What matters is the poor track record in the field, made worse by a lack of transparency and accountability. With current BSL-4 labs, an escape of a pandemic pathogen is only a matter of time. One of the most exciting trends in biotechnology is its rapid democratisation – the speed at which cutting-edge techniques can be adopted by students and amateurs. When a new breakthrough is achieved, the pool of people with the talent, training, resources and patience to reproduce it rapidly expands: from a handful of the world’s top biologists, to people with PhDs in the field, to millions of people with undergraduate-level biology. The Human Genome Project was the largest ever scientific collaboration in biology. It took 13 years and $500m to produce the full DNA sequence of the human genome. Just 15 years later, a genome can be sequenced for under $1,000, and within a single hour. The reverse process has become much easier, too: online DNA synthesis services allow anyone to upload a DNA sequence of their choice then have it constructed and shipped to their address. While still expensive, the price of synthesis has fallen by a factor of 1,000 in the past two decades, and continues to drop. The first ever uses of Crispr and gene drives were the biotechnology achievements of the decade. But within just two years, each of these technologies were used successfully by bright students participating in science competitions. Such democratisation promises to fuel a boom of entrepreneurial biotechnology. But since biotechnology can be misused to lethal effect, democratisation also means proliferation. As the pool of people with access to a technique grows, so does the chance it contains someone with malign intent. People with the motivation to wreak global destruction are mercifully rare. But they exist. Perhaps the best example is the Aum Shinrikyo cult in Japan, active between 1984 and 1995, which sought to bring about the destruction of humanity. It attracted several thousand members, including people with advanced skills in chemistry and biology. And it demonstrated that it was not mere misanthropic ideation. It launched multiple lethal attacks using VX gas and sarin gas, killing more than 20 people and injuring thousands. It attempted to weaponise anthrax, but did not succeed. What happens when the circle of people able to create a global pandemic becomes wide enough to include members of such a group? Or members of a terrorist organisation or rogue state that could try to build an omnicidal weapon for the purposes of extortion or deterrence? The main candidate for biological existential risk in the coming decades thus stems from technology – particularly the risk of misuse by states or small groups. But this is not a case in which the world is blissfully unaware of the risks. Bertrand Russell wrote of the danger of extinction from biowarfare to Einstein in 1955. And, in 1969, the possibility was raised by the American Nobel laureate for medicine, Joshua Lederberg: “As a scientist I am profoundly concerned about the continued involvement of the United States and other nations in the development of biological warfare. This process puts the very future of human life on earth in serious peril.” In response to such warnings, we have already begun national and international efforts to protect humanity. There is action through public health and international conventions, and self-regulation by biotechnology companies and the scientific community. Are they adequate? National and international work in public health offers some protection from engineered pandemics, and its existing infrastructure could be adapted to better address them. Yet even for existing dangers this protection is uneven and under-provided. Despite its importance, public health is underfunded worldwide, and poorer countries remain vulnerable to being overwhelmed by outbreaks. Biotechnology companies are working to limit the dark side of the democratisation of their field. For example, unrestricted DNA synthesis would help bad actors overcome a major hurdle in creating extremely deadly pathogens. It would allow them to get access to the DNA of controlled pathogens such as smallpox (whose genome is readily available online) and to create DNA with modifications to make the pathogen more dangerous. Therefore, many synthesis companies make voluntary efforts to manage this risk, screening their orders for dangerous sequences. But the screening methods are imperfect, and they only cover about 80% of orders. There is significant room for improving this process, and a strong case for making screening mandatory. We might also look to the scientific community for careful management of biological risks. Many of the dangerous advances usable by states and small groups have come from open science. And we’ve seen that science produces substantial accident risk. The scientific community has tried to regulate its dangerous research, but with limited success. There are a variety of reasons why this is extremely hard, including difficulty in knowing where to draw the line, lack of central authorities to unify practice, a culture of openness and freedom to pursue whatever is of interest, and the rapid pace of science outpacing that of governance. It may be possible for the scientific community to overcome these challenges and provide strong management of global risks, but it would require a willingness to accept serious changes to its culture and governance – such as treating the security around biotechnology more like that around nuclear power. And the scientific community would need to find this willingness before catastrophe strikes. Threats to humanity, and how we address them, define our time. The advent of nuclear weapons posed a real risk of human extinction in the 20th century. There is strong reason to believe the risk will be higher this century, and increasing with each century that technological progress continues. Because these anthropogenic risks outstrip all natural risks combined, they set the clock on how long humanity has left to pull back from the brink. I am not claiming that extinction is the inevitable conclusion of scientific progress, or even the most likely outcome. What I am claiming is that there has been a robust trend towards increases in the power of humanity, which has reached a point where we pose a serious risk to our own existence. How we react to this risk is up to us. Nor am I arguing against technology. Technology has proved itself immensely valuable in improving the human condition. The problem is not so much an excess of technology as a lack of wisdom. Carl Sagan put this especially well: “Many of the dangers we face indeed arise from science and technology – but, more fundamentally, because we have become powerful without becoming commensurately wise. The world-altering powers that technology has delivered into our hands now require a degree of consideration and foresight that has never before been asked of us.” Because we cannot come back from extinction, we cannot wait until a threat strikes before acting – we must be proactive. And because gaining wisdom takes time, we need to start now. I think that we are likely to make it through this period. Not because the challenges are small, but because we will rise to them. The very fact that these risks stem from human action shows us that human action can address them. Defeatism would be both unwarranted and counterproductive – a self-fulfilling prophecy. Instead, we must address these challenges head-on with clear and rigorous thinking, guided by a positive vision of the longterm future we are trying to protect.

## EMT PIC

#### CP Text- A just government ought to provide an unconditional right to strike except for Ambulance and Paramedic workers

#### There are large paramedic Shortages right now, this is exacerbated in rural areas where health services are most needed

Kate Rogers, FEB 1 2019, “The need for EMTs and paramedics is growing, but finding people to fill the jobs isn’t easy,” CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2019/02/01/the-need-for-paramedics-is-growing-but-strong-labor-market-makes-hiring-hard.html> | DD JH

On any given day, Eric Mailman may transport a baby born into a neonatal intensive care unit from one hospital to another, or he could answer a call for an elderly person in cardiac arrest. The paramedic and operations coordinator at Northern Light Health’s medical transport and emergency care in Bangor, Maine, can answer anywhere between four and 17 calls in a day, on shifts that can stretch from 12 to 24 hours. The only guarantee is that work will be busy and unpredictable. “The positive is that you get to step in on the chaos of the worst day of someone’s life and bring some calm and peace — to me that is priceless,” Mailman said. “But there are days when you can’t intervene, where things are out of your control. It’s impossible to help everybody, and those days are the hardest.” At Northern Light, some 170 people work in emergency medical services and transport, but the system is currently about 10 percent understaffed. Challenges are many in hiring — the community is rural, and while the pay and benefits can be competitive, the job itself is a big commitment, requiring sometimes up to two years of training, recertification and continuing education. Roughly five years ago, there were 15 to 20 applicants per open position, says Joe Kellner, vice president of emergency services and community programs at Northern Light. Today, however, it’s not uncommon to post a job and have zero applicants respond, he said. The tight labor market is particularly weighing on the health sector. The health-care industry added 42,000 new jobs in January, with more than 22,000 in ambulatory health-care services and another 19,000 in hospitals, [according to Friday’s closely watched Labor Department report](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/02/01/nonfarm-payrolls-january-2019.html). The health-care sector has added 368,000 jobs over the past year, while unemployment continues to hover near historic lows. “Fewer people are entering the profession, unemployment is low, and this is also a job that many people used to get into through volunteerism and in local communities — there is a lot less of that,” Kellner says. “The pathway in is harder and harder, but we try to create solutions for that.” Northern Light’s system is run in partnership with a larger nine-hospital system throughout the state, allowing for more reliable funding and options for those using emergency medical services as a stepping stone to other areas of health care. The company also reimburses for tuition, offers competitive paid time off and a retirement plan with a matching employer contribution. Highly trained paramedics are paid about $27 an hour. Emergency medical technicians and paramedics like Mailman are in demand, not just in Bangor but around the country. Challenges persist beyond just finding people to fill jobs in more rural areas, however — [2017 median nationwide pay](https://www.bls.gov/ooh/healthcare/emts-and-paramedics.htm) was just more than $33,000, or about $16 an hour. Funding can also be an issue in some communities, as reimbursements from insurers, patients, and Medicare and Medicaid are outpaced by wage pressures and costs to operate. This is especially common in volunteer programs, funded in large part by community donations and local taxpayer dollars. “If people really want to feel confident that they can call 911 and someone will come, they need to support their community so it will provide that kind of service,” says Kathy Robinson, program manager for the National Association of State EMS Officials. Health-care hiring boom The need for EMT and paramedic workers comes as the health-care sector continues to boom. “The strong economy definitely has an impact,” says Ani Turner, co-director of sustainable health spending strategies at nonprofit research organization Altarum. “We are at full employment, so along with expanded insurance coverage in the Affordable Care Act that started to take effect part way through 2014, we have a lot of people that now have health insurance coverage. More people with health benefits, more people with insurance increases the demand for health care and therefore health jobs.” Much of this growth came from the ambulatory sector, with an emphasis on outpatient care, which added 37,800 jobs in December 2018. What’s more, out of the 30 fastest-growing occupations through 2026, per BLS, [nearly half fall under the health-care category](https://www.bls.gov/ooh/fastest-growing.htm), and analysts say there’s likely no slowing down ahead. The workforce continues to age, as does the population in need of care, the opioid epidemic persists, and the pool of skilled labor remains tight. With all that growth, there’s no doubt demand will continue within systems like Northern Light, where trained professionals like Mailman are ready to answer the call. “I love my job. I can’t imagine doing anything different than what I do,” Mailman said.

#### Ambulance strikes in countries lead to increased mortality rates and massively delayed response time.

The Times ,3-27-2012, "Pensioner’s death linked to ambulance strike," No Publication, <https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/pensioners-death-linked-to-ambulance-strike-m89w3tkcx3t> | DD JH

An elderly patient died in London while waiting for a delayed ambulance during autumn’s mass strike, in which more than half of the capital’s ambulance workers walked out. An official NHS report will today claim the death could be linked to the industrial action on November 30, revealing how it led to major delays in the 999 emergency service. Some patients in “life-threatened” situations were forced to wait for more than two hours for a response, while many others were left in “distress and pain”, it finds. The study, seen by The Times, claims that the death - at 4.35pm - was “potentially linked to a delayed response”. A further investigation is expected to confirm that the patient was waiting too long for the ambulance but cannot conclusively blame that for the patient’s death. The NHS London report says the death occurred over three hours after the London Ambulance Service declared an “Internal Major Incident” and called on the unions to repudiate the strike. Services were so clogged up by then that dozens of emergency cases were being held with many patients forced to wait an hour or longer for a response. However, the strike continued and very few members of staff returned to work, the study says. Hundreds of people who needed urgent medical attention received delays in their care. Some 875 patients in “potential immediately life-threatened” situations - classified as category A - were forced to wait longer than the eight-minute target for an urgent response. Of those, 318 waited longer than 19 minutes. By the evening some patients whose lives were at the highest level of risk classified had to wait more than two hours. The NHS London report concludes that the action had a “significant effect” on the operational capability of the ambulance service. It fears that “timely, consistent, effective and safe clinical care” was not delivered. “Undoubtedly some patients waited too long for an ambulance, in particular those patients with non life-threatening conditions and it is recognised that these patients were often in distress and pain,” it concludes. The report finds that the majority of patients had to wait longer than nationally mandated standards. The expectation was that 30 per cent of staff would walk out but over half actually did and the service was not able to handle it. In some parts of the capital staffing levels fell to just 10 per cent. ADVERTISEMENT The report reveals how 117 calls were being held by 1pm, with over 50 waiting more than an hour. By 4pm four category A patients were being held for more than an hour. By the evening dozens of emergency cases were not responded to for between one or two hours. The ambulance service has a target of responding to three quarters of category A calls within 8 minutes. On November 30, that fell to below one quarter. It insists that future strikes must be better dealt with.