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**Counterplan text:** A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike with the condition that healthcare workers do not join the strike

**Competition:**It competes: The counterplan recognizes the fundamental rights of workers but acknowledges that the right to life outweighs privacy concerns.

Health care professionals are unable to strike without endangering their patients. Their strikes necessitate that people are harmed in order to be effective

**Bengu et Mula ‘02**

Muula As, Phiri A., 2002, "Is it ethical for health workers to strike? Issues from the 2001 QECH general hospital strike," PubMed Central (PMC), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3346014/> // LH

In the context of a strike,one should ensure not undertake anything that could result incausing harm directly or indirectly to the patient. A**ny struggle undertaken by medical personnel that violates patient right to health is unethica**l. The struggle should be centered at improving overall working conditions and environment in the hospital. The problem with this understanding is that it is almost**impossible to stage a strike which is not painful and does not hurt the patient** as such would in essence defeat the whole effect of the strike. One could rightly argue that, **the only ones who could better defend the plight of the patient are the health workers**. If they forsake their patient who can then defend them? Therefore if the health workers want to improve their working conditions let them also fight for the living and care conditions of their patients. For the working condition of a health worker is the living condition of the patient, both are **two sides of one coin.** A health worker and a patient are not the same and yet they cannot be separated; one cannot be, without the other. Thereforegovernment cannot improve the living conditions of patients without improving the working conditions of the health personnel. **The duty and responsibility to protect life is among the first in hierarchy of values.**

**More people die when healthcare workers strike. This disproportionately affects those who need intensive care**. The net benefit of doing the counterplan is that less people would die.

 Wright 10 Sarah H. Wright July 2010 "Evidence on the Effects of Nurses' Strikes" <https://www.nber.org/digest/jul10/evidence-effects-nurses-strikes> (Researcher at National Bureau of Economic Research)

U.S. hospitals were excluded from collective bargaining laws for three decades longer than other sectors because of fears **that strikes by nurses might imperil patients' health**. Today, while unionization has been declining in general, it is growing rapidly in hospitals, with the number of unionized workers rising from 679,000 in 1990 to nearly one million in 2008. In Do Strikes Kill? Evidence from New York State (NBER Working Paper No. 15855), co-authors Jonathan Gruber and Samuel Kleiner carefully examine the effects of nursing strikes on patient care and outcomes. The researchers match data on nurses' strikes in New York State from 1984 to 2004 to data on hospital discharges, including information on treatment intensity, patient mortality, and hospital readmission. They conclude that nurses' strikes were **costly to hospital patients**: in-hospital mortality **increased by 19.4 percent** and hospital readmissions **increased by 6.5 percen**t for patients admitted during a strike. Among their sample of 38,228 such patients, an estimated **138 more individuals died than would have without a stri**ke, and 344 more patients were readmitted to the hospital than if there had been no strike. "Hospitals functioning during nurses' strikes **do so at a lower quality of patient care,"** they write. Still, at hospitals experiencing strikes, the measures of treatment intensity -- that is, the length of hospital stay and the number of procedures performed during the patient's stay -- show no significant differences between striking and non-striking periods. Patients appear to receive the same intensity of care during union work stoppages as during normal hospital operations. Thus, the poor outcomes associated with strikes suggest that they might reduce hospital productivity. These poor health outcomes increased for both emergency and non-emergency hospital patients, even as admissions of both groups decreased by about 28 percent at hospitals with strikes. The poor health outcomes were not apparent either before or after the strike in the striking hospitals, suggesting that they are attributable to the strike itself. And, the poor health outcomes do not appear to do be due to different types of patients being admitted during strike periods, because patients admitted during a strike are very similar to those admitted during other periods. Hiring replacement workers apparently does not help: hospitals that hired replacement workers **performed no better** during strikes than those that did not hire substitute employees. In each case, patients with conditions that required intensive nursing were more likely to fare worse in the presence of nurses' strikes.

#### 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.

#### Future pandemics will cause extinction – it only takes one ‘super-spreader’ –prevention is key

Bar-Yam 16 Yaneer Bar-Yam 7-3-2016 “Transition to extinction: Pandemics in a connected world” <http://necsi.edu/research/social/pandemics/transition> (Professor and President, New England Complex System Institute; PhD in Physics, MIT)

Watch as one of the more aggressive—brighter red — strains rapidly expands. After a time it goes extinct leaving a black region. Why does it go extinct? The answer is that it spreads so rapidly that it kills the hosts around it. Without new hosts to infect it then dies out itself. That the rapidly spreading pathogens die out has important implications for evolutionary research which we have talked about elsewhere [1–7]. In the research I want to discuss here, what we were interested in is the effect of adding long range transportation [8]. This includes natural means of dispersal as well as unintentional dispersal by humans, like adding airplane routes, which is being done by real world airlines (Figure 2). When we introduce long range transportation into the model, the success of more aggressive strains changes. They can use the long range transportation to find new hosts and escape local extinction. Figure 3 shows that the more transportation routes introduced into the model, the more higher aggressive pathogens are able to survive and spread. As we add more long range transportation, there is a critical point at which pathogens become so aggressive that the entire host population dies. The pathogens die at the same time, but that is not exactly a consolation to the hosts. We call this the phase transition to extinction (Figure 4). With increasing levels of global transportation, human civilization may be approaching such a critical threshold. In the paper we wrote in 2006 about the dangers of global transportation for pathogen evolution and pandemics [8], we mentioned the risk from Ebola. Ebola is a horrendous disease that was present only in isolated villages in Africa. It was far away from the rest of the world only because of that isolation. Since Africa was developing, it was only a matter of time before it reached population centers and airports. While the model is about evolution, it is really about which pathogens will be found in a system that is highly connected, and Ebola can spread in a highly connected world. The traditional approach to public health uses historical evidence analyzed statistically to assess the potential impacts of a disease. As a result, many were surprised by the spread of Ebola through West Africa in 2014. As the connectivity of the world increases, past experience is not a good guide to future events. A key point about the phase transition to extinction is its suddenness. Even a system that seems stable, can be destabilized by a few more long-range connections, and connectivity is continuing to increase. So how close are we to the tipping point? We don’t know but it would be good to find out before it happens. While Ebola ravaged three countries in West Africa, it only resulted in a handful of cases outside that region. One possible reason is that many of the airlines that fly to west Africa stopped or reduced flights during the epidemic [9]. In the absence of a clear connection, public health authorities who downplayed the dangers of the epidemic spreading to the West might seem to be vindicated. As with the choice of airlines to stop flying to west Africa, our analysis didn’t take into consideration how people respond to epidemics. It does tell us what the outcome will be unless we respond fast enough and well enough to stop the spread of future diseases, which may not be the same as the ones we saw in the past. As the world becomes more connected, the dangers increase. Are people in western countries safe because of higher quality health systems? Countries like the U.S. have highly skewed networks of social interactions with some very highly connected individuals that can be “superspreaders.” The chances of such an individual becoming infected may be low but events like a mass outbreak pose a much greater risk if they do happen. If a sick food service worker in an airport infects 100 passengers, or a contagion event happens in mass transportation, an outbreak could very well prove unstoppable

**Chima ‘13**

BMJ, 10-4-2010, "Chibuzo Odigwe: How healthy is the giant at 50?," <https://blogs.bmj.com/bmj/2010/10/04/chibuzo-odigwe-how-healthy-is-the-giant-at-50/>

**A more proactive and progressive policy of motivating providers of health care would ensure we reduce our losses of skilled manpower to other countries.** The situation where many Nigerians are left without access to public health services for months on end in some instances **as a result of strikes by demotivated health workers is most distastefu**l, and does not help our already depressing vital statistics" [[66](https://bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6939-14-S1-S5#ref-CR66)]. Further, a report by the working group on human resources for health in Africa has indicated that interventions to stem the migration of health professionals is probably the single most important measure that needs to be undertaken to maintain healthcare workforce in African countries. According this report, "a key action is a significant upward revision of the **total compensation package to a level that reflects the value placed on the work they do, is likely to discourage staff from wanting to leave public sector services**" [[25](https://bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6939-14-S1-S5#ref-CR25)]. Finally it has been observed that power dynamics existing between employers and employees may provide an impetus to strikes, "an inflexible powerful employer who is unwilling to negotiate on issues considered important by employees, and is more likely to experience job action by employees" [[31](https://bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6939-14-S1-S5#ref-CR31)].

## 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 goes Nuclear.

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 right. 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, interrupting 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.
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#### **Moen 16** [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] SJDI // RCT by JPark

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes: “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.

#### 1] Util is a lexical pre-requisite to any other framework: Threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose – so, util comes first and my offense outweighs theirs under their own framework.

#### 2] actor-specificity: side constraints freeze action because government policies always require trade-offs—the only justifiable way to resolve those conflicts is by benefiting everyone. Actor-specificity comes first because different agents have different ethical obligations.

#### 3] Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet up for lunch, that is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital. Only the consequences explain why the second one is much worse than the first.

#### 4] Reversibility- we can’t improve society if we are all dead – it can’t be reversed (sequence of timeframe and magnitude)

#### 5] Suffering- death causes suffering when people can’t get access to basic resources and necessities

#### 6] Extinction outweighs

MacAskill 14 [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.

### Case

### AT – corruption

#### TURN – unions are super corrupt.

Shannon ‘18

[Report shows corruption continues to plague labor unions, <https://www.washingtonpolicy.org/publications/detail/report-shows-corruption-continues-to-plague-labor-unions>, Jan 22 2018, Erin Shannon, Director at the Center for Worker Rights] [SS]

Many in the public perceive labor unions to be synonymous with corruption. For decades, the labor bosses running unions have been caricatured as morally bankrupt, mobster-like thugs who care more about power and money than serving their hard-working, dues-paying members. It’s a perception that some union officials like to perpetuate. One Teamsters official would introduce himself as “Jimmy the Bull” before threatening businesses and non-profits if they didn’t hire his workers for jobs that didn’t even exist (because they weren’t needed). Ironically, the jobs he strong-armed were for friends and family members, some of whom weren’t even union members. He and his union gang (they referred to themselves as the “Perry Crew”) would shake down employers and pocket the payments that were supposed to go to the union benefit fund. Jimmy the Bull and the Perry Crew also assaulted and intimidated rank and file union members who were critical of union leadership and physically blocked them from the union hall to keep them from voting on a contract proposal with a major employer. Jimmy the Bull and the Perry Crew were ultimately found guilty of extortion and racketeering, joining the ranks of hundreds of union leaders who have been found guilty of a myriad of crimes against their union brothers and sisters. According to an investigation by the Detroit Free Press, federal records reveal embezzling from union offices is “endemic” around the country. The Detroit Free Press reports that documents obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) show embezzlement took place in hundreds of union offices across the nation over the past ten years. In just the last two years alone, more than 300 union offices were found to have a union official or employee stealing from union members. The article highlights some examples, but a more extensive list can be found on the Labor Racket Weekly, a recurring and regularly updated list of the union officials around the country who have been charged, or found guilty, of stealing from the hard-working members who pay dues. Or you can peruse the Office of Labor-Management Standards (OLMS) Annual Report, which highlights the most significant enforcement actions against union officers and employees each year. The Detroit Free Press report said individual cases compiled by the OLMS last year cite theft and fraud ranging from $1,051 to a staggering $6.5 million. The stolen dues are used to buy everything from luxury goods and lavish vacations to everyday items like gas and food. OLMS has investigated and prosecuted union leaders for embezzling more than $100 million in union dues since 2001. Like Jimmy the Bull, the crimes don’t stop with embezzlement. Hundreds of union officials have been indicted for other crimes that victimize union members, such as filing false reports, keeping false records, destruction of records, extortionate picketing and deprivation of rights by violence. The OLMS notes: “As part of its effort to protect and safeguard union funds and assets, OLMS investigates possible embezzlement from unions and other violations of criminal laws. Over the past 10 years, restitution of $102,625,236 has been paid or ordered to be paid to defrauded unions and other parties.” Just to clarify, that is restitution of more than $102 million. In addition to those crimes, the DOL’s Office of Inspector General (OIG) has investigated numerous cases of labor racketeering and organized crime’s influence within the labor movement. Since 2001, there have been more than 2,000 union racketeering indictments and $3 billion levied in fines and restitutions. Of course, the shocking data from the Department of Labor only includes the cases where the theft, racketeering and other criminal activity were caught. One can’t help but wonder how high the incidence of theft, fraud and other criminal activity by union officials might really be. Regardless, it is clear that union corruption is alive and well across the country.

#### The only reason why unions are politically active is to forward their own, corrupt goals using tactics like bribery, coercion, and harassment – policies like the aff are the root cause of abusive union power.

Petro ‘59

[The Corruption of Union Leadership, <https://fee.org/articles/the-corruption-of-union-leadership/>, Sylvester Petro, May 1 1959, Sylvester Petro (1917–2007) was a professor of law and the author of several books on the history of labor policy in the United States, including The Labor Policy of a Free Society, The Kohler Strike, and The Kingsport Press Strike. As professsor and director of the Wake Forest University Institute of Law and Policy Analysis, he taught generations of students about the history of labor unions, while defending free association and free contract as essential to the free and prosperous commonwealth.] [SS]

Coercion marks the beginning and corruption the conclusion of the march of union power observ­able in the McClellan Record. The process begins with the use of compulsion to secure members. Thereafter new and different coer­cive devices are used to bind the unwilling employees to the union. After a union has learned the use­fulness of coercion in increasing membership, it falls into the habit of using even more in disputes with employers. Some trade union leaders hold that any employer who resists their demands is an “enemy of the labor movement” who must be taught a lesson, and, if he con­tinues to resist, must be exter­minated. If employees themselves refuse to acquiesce in strikes, if, instead, they exercise their right to continue working during strikes, they are considered trai­tors, against whom brutal reprisals are not only permissible but praiseworthy. Law-enforcement officials some­times stand in the way, however, and it, therefore, becomes necessary to take care of them, too. Pure bribery is not always the appropriate method here, and often a generous campaign contribution will do as well. If the laws of the land pose an obstacle to the use of union power against traitorous employers and employees, then the laws must be changed, and full-scale political action, largely financed by membership dues con­tributed in a substantial degree by workers of differing political views, is the appropriate vehicle for change. Candidates who sup­port the unions’ claims of special privileges to coerce and compel get extensive, expensive, and en­thusiastic political support; those who insist that the laws of the land should apply to trade unions are marked for extinction. Too often the unions have their way, although a startling exception here and there indicates that the black night has not yet fallen. Meanwhile, alongside the struc­ture of traditional unionism, there begins to grow in its shadow a murky pseudo-unionism. A two-stage process is at work. Frequent use of coercion and violence by traditional unions induces their leaders to include on their staffs—alongside college-trained econ­omists—men with criminal rec­ords and backgrounds of brutality; if dirty work is to be done, it is just as well to have a person around who has had some experi­ence with it. And the practical privilege to coerce, to extort, to shake down, to compel (such as has accrued to the unions) is pre­cisely what the denizens of the underworld, the professionals of organized crime, have been search­ing for most avidly, ever since the rich pickings under Prohibition dried up. If a single picket will harm a business badly enough to make the owner sign up with the union, maybe it will also serve to shake loose some immediate money. In either case, the picket line is coer­cive, and if it is a specially privi­leged form of coercion in the one case, why not in the other? Thus the professional extortionist dis­covers a new tool for his trade, and thus to are born “racket-picketing” and its associated shakedown techniques. Convicted criminals are in the unions then with both feet—as adjuncts to traditional unions, and on their own, cynically using the form of unionism as a cover for their age-old methods of getting ahead in the world. The one thing they have never learned is how to work for a living. As union agents and leaders they live very well off the product of those who have learned how to make a living through socially useful work—the businessmen and workingmen of the country. Although society at large may know very little about all this, it pays the bill—an overwhelming, extortionate, and destructive bill. A shakedown induced by “stran­ger-picketing” has to be made up by the businessman somehow. The situation is not made any better by the shrill accusations of the union leaders against business­men about the high cost of living and unemployment. The plain fact is that no businessman ever likes to cut back production. He does so only when he has to. More often than not the union leader has been responsible for pricing union members out of the market. For that, he ought to be fired, or law and law enforcement ought to be rigorous enough to keep him from abusing workers, union members, businessmen, and the public. Special Privilege—Unlimited Power The point cannot be emphasized enough. The harm done by crimi­nals masquerading as union offi­cials is enormous and filled with the most ominous signs for the future of society. But it is still less than that produced by the power of the traditional unions. They daily coerce and brutally at­tack workers who decline to join or refuse to participate in strikes. They throw out of work hundreds of thousands of men because of their artificially inflated wage costs. They create irresistible in­flationary pressures and compound the evil by encouraging costly and destructive deficit-spending by governments. Through the use of legal and political special privi­leges, they tie up entire industries into tight monopolies and cartels which abuse the public and threaten the destruction of the free and competitive economy which has always been the Ameri­can ideal. This is the panorama of union power. Traditional unions have secured for themselves special privileges which vest in them un­limited power. This power, like any other unlimited power, can only be abused, and it is abused. Violence and economic coercion by themselves create socially harm­ful conditions, the consequences of which are infinite and unpredicta­ble. Besides, they exert a magnetic force, drawing to the trade unions some of the worst types of crimi­nals, who find there an environ­ment which suits them. The combination is a destructive force which no society can long survive: on the one hand, abuse of the citizenry and impair­ment of peaceful, progressive, pro­ductive activity; on the other hand, dissolution of the moral and political structure. In the spe­cial privileges of coercion and compulsion which unions have gained, there breeds a rotten growth which corrupts the whole moral and political structure of society.

### EXTRAS (AT UNIONS GOOD)

#### Unions are unnecessary, increase unemployment, and decrease production – right to leave solves all their impacts. Prefer evidence from real union workers.

Thompson ‘12

['Unnecessary' and 'Political': Why Unions Are Bad For America, <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/06/unnecessary-and-political-why-unions-are-bad-for-america/258405/>, June 12 2012, Derek Thompson, staff writer at The Atlantic, where he writes about economics, technology, and the media. He is the author of Hit Makers and the host of the podcast Crazy/Genius] [SS]

I was in a union and **'unions are unnecessary'** I worked in a unionized refinery and my personal experience has been that unions are unnecessary. As an engineer, **I was unable to** touch any tools, **provide** any **assistance** to our technicians and operators **for "taking work away from a union employee**." While not always the case, **the union gave protection to the laborer to be** extremely **la**zy **and unproductive because** as long as he showed up to work on time, **there was no way he could get fired**. The **technicians** and operators **started at $28**.00 an hour, **which was more than** I made as **an engineer**. Obviously they have a much lower ceiling and top out pretty quickly, but that is an enormous amount of money for someone who can get away with being lazy as he wants. Also, during lead ups to labor negotiations (there were two big ones while I was there), **there was ample evidence of sabotage to the plant** while engineers were being trained to operate the refinery in the event of a strike. I cannot for the life of me understand why one would put people at risk in order to protect their job. There were several unionized technicians and operators that were very pleasant and worked hard when asked to do so, but this was not the norm. Additionally, often the best unionized workers were promoted to management and were no longer protected by the union. I understand that there was a time in the nation when we had fourteen year old kids working 18 hours a day, but we have long since moved past those days. I'm all for finding ways to close the income inequality gap (higher taxes, more efficient tax code), but I assure you that **unionizing labor will not solve our problem**. 'The right to leave' With all this discussion of power, people seem to be missing **the biggest bargaining chip of all - the right to leave. An employee has the nearly unfettered right to walk away** from a job. Even with noncompete clauses and other employment contracts, there are very, very few cases in which an employee can be forced to work. Conversely, a company has numerous restrictions on when, how, and who they can terminate. MAKE YOUR INBOX MORE INTERESTING Each weekday evening, get an overview of the day’s biggest news, along with fascinating ideas, images, and people. Email Address (required) Enter your email Sign Up THANKS FOR SIGNING UP! WHY **UNIONS COULD INCREASE UNEMPLOYMENT** Consumers will naturally gravitate toward the best value, which is why Wal-Mart has been successful by imparting downward pressure on prices and the cost of living. That you don't like them because it hurts your profit margin selling whatever it is you're selling doesn't change the fact that basic laws of supply and demand have led to consumers getting the goods they want at lower cost. Subsidies impede creative destruction (though maybe you'd rather still be a peasant in the Dark Ages?), and tariffs force up prices for everyone, decrease choice, and increase the cost of living -- which particularly hurts the poor. I guess you just don't care about poor people, huh? By the same token, **employees will work for the employer offering the best terms of employment**. Right now **there are more job-seekers than jobs, so the leverage lies with employers. The opposite is true in a good economy. Making it more difficult for businesses to hire and adapt may mean some people get better terms, but a larger percentage get no job at all.**

#### Unions have a history of racism– prefer evidence from real union employees.

Watson 6/14

[Union Construction’s Racial Equity and Inclusion Charade, <https://ssir.org/articles/entry/union_constructions_racial_equity_and_inclusion_charade>, ravis Watson, June 14 2021 Travis Watson is the creator of ADOSConstruction.org and chair of the Boston Employment Commission (BEC). Appointed by former Boston mayor and current US Department of Labor Secretary Martin J. Walsh, the BEC oversees the Boston Residents Jobs Policy, which sets employment standards on city-assisted construction projects. Travis also is a board member of YouthBuild Boston and NEI General Contracting’s Workforce Opportunity Resource Center.] [SS]

Union construction jobs are not just good jobs, they are great jobs. They have a relatively low entry barrier and offer world-class training, great pay, and benefits that allow members to retire with dignity. However, what’s often overlooked is union construction’s racism, and that those great jobs, particularly leadership positions, are designed to remain filled by white men. Thanks to construction workers, activists, and journalists, there are countless documented examples of the widespread racism that Black people face in interactions with construction unions. From being called racist names to being administered tests designed to ensure their failure, a gamut of discriminatory practices make it difficult for Black workers to enter, remain, and grow in the industry. This Is What Racism Looks Like This Is What Racism Looks Like This series aims to explain how racism operates within organizations and create conversation about racial justice, dignity, and belonging.Follow this seriesFOLLOW THIS SERIES In an effort to understand the barriers to racial equity and inclusion in Boston union construction, I’ve spoken to dozens ofunion and non-union workers and activists about the industry’s racism. Some respondents rehearsed revisionist histories and pretended that racism within the trades has never existed. But others fully acknowledged the industry’s history of racism and wanted to collaborate on solutions towards equity and inclusion. “The building trades unions are committed to access to wages and benefits,” says Brian Doherty, secretary-treasurer/general agent for the Building & Construction Trades Council of Boston’s Metropolitan District, “but for a hundred years, it was for very few people, it wasn’t for everyone. The past is shameful.” In order to create a more diverse and inclusive industry, and to avoid the same mistakes in the future, we first need to learn from this shameful past. Referencing historical examples—primarily found in researchers David A. Goldberg and Trevor Griffey’s Black Power at Work: Community Control, Affirmative Action, and the Construction Industry—I describe the six strategies that have made the process of joining a construction union as frustrating as possible for Black people. So frustrating and exhausting, in fact, that many Black people would rather give up trying, or not try at all. And, when a particular strategy fails to dissuade Black applicants, white union members resort to intimidation and erecting other barriers for entry, such as devising a racially biased entrance exam that projects racism as a kind of failure onto Black people. Other times it’s openly calling Black workers the “N-word” and explicitly telling them that they aren’t welcome into a construction union. I then turn to the case study of union construction in the Boston area to examine how racism manifests today.