#### **1-DA**

#### **Economy is good now but future demands upon a steady stream of labor and continued efforts against inflation**

**Foster 10-14** Sarah Foster, 10-14-2021, "How Is The U.S. Economy Doing? 4 Key Areas To Watch As Delta Variant Holds Back Recovery," Bankrate, <https://www.bankrate.com/banking/federal-reserve/how-us-economy-is-doing/>

Sarah previously worked for Bloomberg News, the Chicago Tribune and the Chicago Daily Herald and has been quoted in several national and regional media outlets, including Yahoo! News, NBC, the Toronto Star, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and more.//RD Debatedrills

That’s because **the financial system has made significant progress at rebounding from the coronavirus pandemic-induced plunge in March 2020. Not only that, but the U.S. economy by sheer size is bigger today than before the outbreak began, with economists expecting the fastest rate of growth in decades — a clear green light for the financial system**. **The question, however, is how long that pace can be sustained.** **The International Monetary Fund in October** [**downgraded its global growth forecasts**](https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2021/10/12/world-economic-outlook-october-2021)**, referencing supply chain disruptions, waning fiscal stimulus and threats from the Delta variant**. That comes nearly three weeks after the Fed, too, waved a yellow caution flag by [revising their own forecasts lower](https://www.bankrate.com/banking/federal-reserve/fomc-meeting-recap-september-2021/). Meanwhile, fears are also growing that [inflation could burn red hot](https://www.bankrate.com/investing/winners-and-losers-rising-inflation/), as Americans pay higher prices on everything from airfares and hotels to rents, housing, groceries and vehicles. **Americans are greatly impacted by the U.S. economy because it influences their employment outcomes and how much they pay for goods and services.** Here’s four key measures that are worth paying attention to right now and how it could impact your wallet. 1. **Job market: Employers are showing record demand for hiring, but not enough people are taking the bait** At first glance, the job market should be booming: **Employers in August had a near record number of jobs to fill (10.1 million), and those outnumbered the jobless (7.7 million), according to the Department of Labor. The quits rate — the share of workers who voluntarily separated from their positions, a measure generally seen as a sign of economic confidence – soared to new heights in August (2.9 percent)**. But take a look at other measures, and the story changes. Unemployment in September was still at elevated levels (4.8 percent) compared to before the outbreak, and close to 5 million positions are still missing from the economy. **That’s after the pandemic leveled the job market, costing 22.3 million positions and causing joblessness to skyrocket to its highest level since the Great Depression (14.8 percent).** **Economists reference changing worker priorities, leading to supply challenges rather than low demand for workers**. Virus fears could be keeping workers on the sidelines. Remote learning, schools with quarantine protocols and child care restraints are weighing on Americans’ job prospects. Some workers may have retired, while [elevated business formation in 2021](https://www.census.gov/econ/bfs/pdf/bfs_current.pdf) suggests others could be going into business for themselves. The Delta variant could also be inspiring workers to stay out of work. Workers who are on the job hunt might not have the skills that match up with available positions. Illustrating those factors is a shrinking labor pool, with 3.1 million fewer people working today than in February 2020**. Labor force participation in September also declined by 183,000 workers. Another primary factor: Individuals are reevaluating what they want out of work. The industries most fragile to the pandemic have the highest quit rates, starting with food service and accommodation (6.8 percent) — part of the leisure and hospitality industry, which has a quits rate of 6.4 percent** — while retail trade (4.7 percent) trails closely behind. “That plays into the reassessment side of the story,” says Rhea Thomas, senior economist at Wilmington Trust. “The risks are higher in terms of contracting a virus [in those industries], and it’s part of the reason why people with those skills may not necessarily be able to easily into other industries, creating some of this friction in terms of being unable to match employees up with where employers are seeking more **help.” Meanwhile, the highest percentage of job openings are also in leisure and hospitality (16.4 percent), accommodation and food services (14.3 percent), and retail (11.4 percent), suggesting difficulties in replacing the workers who’ve left. A** [**Bankrate poll from August**](https://www.bankrate.com/personal-finance/job-seekers-survey-august-2021/) **found that more than half (55 percent) of the labor force plan to look for new employment at some point over the next 12 month**s, with workers **prioritizing flexible work arrangements such as remote work or adjustable hours, as well as higher pay and job security**. **Companies are already having to hike worker pay, among them retailers and restaurants such as Target, McDonald’s, Under Armour and Chipotle. Average hourly earnings in September rose 4.6 percent from a year ago, according to the Department of Labor.** **2. Inflation: Prices are heating up across the board, and experts aren’t sure when that pace will abate**It’s no secret that consumers have been paying higher prices this year. Almost nine in 10 Americans (or 89 percent) said they’ve paid more for goods and services this year, while two-thirds (66 percent) say it’s negatively impacted their finances, according to a separate Bankrate survey from August**. Year-over-year consumer price increases have been at 13-year highs for six straight months**, rising by 5.4 percent in September. But what’s noteworthy is where the inflationary pressures are coming from. Prices aren’t just increasing on things like hotels (24.1 percent, on a 12-month basis), apparel (1.9 percent), meals at restaurants (4.7 percent), or concert and sporting event tickets (6.3 percent) — areas that would be more closely linked to the reopening of the economy. Americans are also having to pay more for meat (16.7 percent), gasoline (41.8 percent), rent (3.3 percent) and used cars and trucks (21 percent). Home values: Prices are soaring for both owners and renters Even more high-frequency measures tell the same story. The median one-bedroom rent is up 10.7 percent since March 2020, according to data from apartment rental site Zumper. Meanwhile, the median sale price of U.S. houses has soared for five straight months and reached a new record in the second quarter of 2021, rising by 16.2 percent from a year ago, according to the Census Bureau. Economists say that once shelter prices are up, **they tend to stay that way — and considering that housing is the biggest line in most Americans’ budgets, that could come as a detriment to consumers’ wallets if wage gains don’t compensate.** “**We certainly see an environment where inflation could run above 3 percent through 2022,”** says Jordan Jackson, global market strategist at J.P. Morgan Asset Management. **“The shelter piece and wage pressures are probably going to be the primary drivers of what causes inflation to settle down at a higher run rate.” T**hat highlights the ultimate question when it comes to inflation: **How long it will last. Consumers theoretically will work through all their pent-up demand and eventually spend all of the extra money that Congress a**warded them through stimulus checks and fiscal stimulus. Yet, supply chain bottlenecks are lingering longer than expected, as virus cases continue to shut down factories across the globe and worker shortages reduce production. “There’s a global traffic jam of goods affecting cargo ships, shipping containers, trucks and railroads. That’s leading to price increases,” says Mark Hamrick, Bankrate senior economic analyst. “Resolution of these complicated supply traffic jams doesn’t seem to be in the cards any time soon.” 3. What else to watch: Economic growth, consumer spending and inequality Make no mistake: 2021 is going to be a record year for growth. Officials at the Federal Reserve are expecting that the financial system will grow 5.9 percent this year. That would be the fastest pace of growth since 1984. Even in 2022, the economy is geared up for above-trend growth, surging 3.8 percent in the year according to Fed forecasts, which would be the fastest since 2004. By sheer dollar amount, the U.S. economy is now bigger than it was before the pandemic despite ongoing labor market troubles, rising by an annualized pace of 6.7 percent in the second quarter of 2021. That was in part thanks to record demand. Spending surged 12 percent, as consumers dined out, traveled and shopped again thanks to reopened businesses, vaccinations and leftover stimulus money. **Record federal spending has also helped prop up growth this year, rising by an annualized pace of 4.2 percent in the first quarter of 2021. But that growth pace is expected to slow by the third quarter of 2021,** with the Atlanta Fed’s GDPNow tool putting growth at 1.3 percent in the quarter, with waning fiscal stimulus, production shortages and the Delta variant to blame. **Fed officials have already downgraded their forecasts for the year to 5.9 percent from 7 percent growth, referencing those restraints in records of their September meeting.** “Growth here in the U.S. is still overall solid, but you did have Delta throwing a temporary wrench into the recovery and slowing some momentum that might have otherwise been there,” Thomas says. “Even without Delta, you would’ve expected that slowing pace of growth moving into next year. That fiscal boost is not expected to be here next year.” Even as the economy heals, the recovery is feeling uneven for some of the country’s most vulnerable. Black unemployment is nearly twice that of whites (7.9 percent versus 4.2 percent), while 6.3 percent of Hispanic workers are jobless. Meanwhile, low-wage jobs declined more rapidly during the pandemic than middle- and higher-income positions, with employment in the lowest-paying jobs about 20 percent below pre-pandemic levels, according to the Fed’s May 2021 monetary policy report. “The pandemic-related downturn exacerbated income and wealth inequality,” Hamrick says. “Even with a relatively rapid decline in the headline unemployment rate, now below 5 percent, the jobless rates for Blacks, Hispanics and teens remain elevated.” 4. **The Fed: Officials are gearing up to back away from extraordinary accommodation That tale of two economies could make the Fed’s job even harder, as officials want to avoid overheating the economy while also giving the labor market plenty of time to run.** Officials, however, are judging that it’s time to start backing away from stimulus. That will come in two parts — first by slowing its bond buying and second by eventually hiking interest rates. The Fed’s asset purchase slowdown — a process known as taper — appears all but locked in, with officials in records of their September meeting judging that tapering could begin sometime in mid-November or mid-December and finish by the middle of next year. **The Fed looks like it could reduce how many Treasury securities it’s buying each month by $10 billion and how many mortgage-backed securities it’s purchasing each month by $5 billion.** That matters for consumers because the Fed’s asset purchases have kept a lid on record-low mortgage rates. To be sure, the Fed would still be in a stimulative stance, just not as much as it was at the onset of the pandemic. When it comes to rate hikes, the Fed is also growing less patient, with officials in September divided on a rate hike as soon as 2022. **Investors are already bracing for them, with the majority of market participants betting on at least one rate hike by September 2022, according to CME Group’s FedWatch.**

#### **[SKO{]The very threat of a strike would strengthen unions significantly.**

**Kim 14** [Lanu Kim, 2014, " What Makes Unions Strong? A Network Perspective on Union Bargaining Power", Washington University Press, https://digital.lib.washington.edu/researchworks/bitstream/handle/1773/25433/Kim\_washington\_0250O\_12844.pdf?sequence=1] //DD PT

**Collective bargaining is a crucial tool** in a union’s arsenal, **but sometimes negotiations break down**. **This may lead unions to employ** the second means at their disposal: **a strike**. During a strike, **workers refuse to perform their expected duties. Strikes can severely damage a company’s productivity if unionized workers refuse to work for substantial periods of time**, **or if other workers join** the strike **in solidarity**. **By threatening a company with decreasing productivity**, **strikes** can **enhance a union’s power at the bargaining table**. In addition, **strikes help unions gain support from the broader public by publicizing poor working conditions** and stagnant wages. Building **political pressure** outside the company may **force employers to pay more attention to workers’ demands**. While strikes can enhance a union’s power, **strikes are quite a rare occurrence**. In 2012, **there were only 19 work stoppages that involved 1,000 or more workers**, and less than .005% of working time was idled by strikes (Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics). **In past decades, strikes were somewhat more common**, but still rare relative to the working population of the US: in the 1970s, the average number of strikes per year was 287.9 compared to 20.1 in 2000s (Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics). Though strikes are a powerful means by which workers can express their grievances and broaden support for their positions, their infrequency suggests that they are very difficult to conduct.

#### **Recognizing the right to strike strengthens the power that unions have by creating unconditional leverage against companies.**

**Hennebert et al. 20** [Hennebert, Marc-Antonin, and Marcel Faulkner. “Are Strikes Still a Tool for Union Action? A Qualitative Investigation into the Private Sector in Quebec, Canada.” Economic and Industrial Democracy, vol. 41, no. 1, Feb. 2020, pp. 73–97, doi:10.1177/0143831X16684963.] //DD PT

Economic and structural factors. Many **respondents** first **recognized that the decision to go on strike was** a ‘**strategic** choice’ dictated by several variables including the particularly important variable of their economic environment. Thus, for these respondents, **it was important to analyse the** economic conditions and, in particular, the **conditions of the industry sector** involved, and to thoroughly understand the state of the labour market before even considering going on strike as a rational choice of action. At this stage, **the company’s financial situation** **appears to have been the most important variable** to consider in making an informed decision. However, the **respondents’ comments revealed a paradoxical argument**. In fact, **in order for a strike to be effective, it must have ‘serious financial consequences for the employer’, that is**, **it must ‘hurt the company’, but without undermining its survival**. One union representative underlined the importance of seeking such a balance: … if I want to go on strike, or even if I want to put pressure on the employer, if I undermine the work of my members and the company, I have nothing to gain by it. So, **the decision to go on strike must be taken in light of the company’s situation** … **I will be in a better position if the economic situation of the company is positive**. Although the analysis of the company’s financial situation is not a new step in the decisional process leading to a strike, according to our interviewees, it nevertheless appears to be more complex than in the past because of the changing corporate structures of companies and the increasing blurring of their organizational boundaries. **Identifying ‘the real corporate entity’ involved in the negotiation**, **knowing who ‘the real employer’ is, or ‘simply determining the real corporate profitability level’, have become increasingly difficult tasks**. These tasks become even more complex when management teams refuse to be transparent about their financial information. One of our interlocutors summed up these difficulties as follows:

#### **An influx of union power forces widespread wage hikes.- basically turns contention 2**

**McNicholas et al. 20** [[Celine McNicholas](https://www.epi.org/people/celine-mcnicholas/), [Lynn Rhinehart](https://www.epi.org/people/lynn-rhinehart/), [Margaret Poydock](https://www.epi.org/people/margaret-poydock/), [Heidi Shierholz](https://www.epi.org/people/heidi-shierholz/), and [Daniel Perez](https://www.epi.org/people/daniel-perez/), 8-25-2020, "Why unions are good for workers—especially in a crisis like COVID-19: 12 policies that would boost worker rights, safety, and wages," Economic Policy Institute, <https://www.epi.org/publication/why-unions-are-good-for-workers-especially-in-a-crisis-like-covid-19-12-policies-that-would-boost-worker-rights-safety-and-wages/>] //DDPT

On average, **a worker covered by a union contract earns 11.2% more in wages than a peer with similar education, occupation, and experience in a nonunionized workplace in the same industry**; **this** wage advantage **is known as the “union wage premium.”**[16](https://www.epi.org/publication/why-unions-are-good-for-workers-especially-in-a-crisis-like-covid-19-12-policies-that-would-boost-worker-rights-safety-and-wages/#_note16) And unions don’t just help union workers—they help all of us. When union density is high, nonunion workers benefit, because **unions effectively set broader standards**—**including higher wages**, as noted by Rosenfeld, Denice, and Laird (2016)—**that nonunion employers must meet in order to attract and retain the workers they need** (and to avoid facing a union organizing drive themselves). **The combination of the direct effect** of unions on union members **and this “spillover” effect** to nonunion workers **means unions are crucial in raising wages** for working people and reducing income inequality. Research shows that deunionization accounts for a sizable share of the growth in inequality between typical (median) workers and workers at the high end of the wage distribution in recent decades—on the order of 13–20% for women and 33–37% for men.[17](https://www.epi.org/publication/why-unions-are-good-for-workers-especially-in-a-crisis-like-covid-19-12-policies-that-would-boost-worker-rights-safety-and-wages/#_note17)

#### **A sudden increase in wages causes a rapid rise in inflation.**

**Rockeman and Pickert 21** [Olivia Rockeman and Reade Pickert, 06-09-21, "Surprise Jump in U.S. Wages Gives Inflation Debate a New Twist," BloombergQuint, <https://www.bloombergquint.com/global-economics/surprise-jump-in-u-s-wages-gives-inflation-debate-a-new-twist>] //DDPT

An **unexpected jump in U.S. wages has given financial markets a new reason to worry that higher inflation may be here to stay**. Consumer prices are rising quickly as the economy reopens after the pandemic. A closely watched data release on Thursday is expected to show prices rose another 0.4% in May -- pushing annual inflation above April’s 4.2%, already the highest in more than a decade. Many policy makers and economists see the price spike as temporary –- partly because they haven’t been anticipating much in the way of wage growth, which has been relatively stagnant for years at the lower end of the pay scale. **Employment is still way down** from pre-pandemic levels, suggesting an ample pool of workers from which to draw, and most jobs being created right now are in low-wage industries like restaurants and tourism. But last week’s jobs report showed a larger-than-forecast pickup in average hourly wages for a second straight month. It turns out that whatever the unemployment numbers say, there’s a shortage of people ready to work at the going rate of compensation -- prompting many employers to boost pay or offer bonuses in order to staff up. Dreaded Spiral **That raises the prospect of what’s known and dreaded in economics as a wage-price spiral**. The idea is that **higher wages spur more spending growth that strains production capacity and drives up business costs**. In turn, **companies raise prices and workers demand even larger pay increases to stay ahead of a rising cost of living**. **Those dynamics contributed to persistently high U.S. inflation in the 1970s** –- a period often invoked by those who fear a lasting wave of post-Covid inflation. **Federal Reserve officials aren’t in that camp**. They acknowledge that pandemic policies like stimulus checks and enhanced unemployment benefits could push wages up, and noted last week that firms are boosting starting pay. But they also say the increases are concentrated in lower-paid service industries –- where faster wage growth is exactly what the Fed and the Biden administration want to see -- and haven’t spread up through the pay scale. More broadly, Fed Chair Jerome Powell has repeatedly argued that the once-close link between wages and inflation has broken down in recent years. ‘Full Denial’ **Some economists say the central bank is understating a significant risk.** “**Fed officials do not believe that wage pressures can exist in a world with 6% unemployment, so they are in full denial**,” Stephen Stanley, chief economist at Amherst Pierpont Securities LLC, said in a note. “**A substantial pickup in wage gains would be the quickest path to turning a ‘transitory’ inflation blip into a persistent upturn**.” Across the **U.S., job openings grew to a record-high 9.3 million in April**, and **some analysts say that’s increased workers’ bargaining power**. **Other economists cite** entrenched trends like **declining union membership**, **and argue that they leave workers lacking the clout to make the pay increases stick in the longer term**.

#### **Rapid inflation triggers an economic crisis.**

**Cox 21** [Jeff Cox, 06-07-2021, “Deutsche Bank warns of global ‘time bomb’ coming due to rising inflation,” CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/06/07/deutsche-bank-warns-of-global-time-bomb-coming-due-to-rising-inflation.html>] //DDPT

The Deutsche team said **the coming inflation could resemble the 1970s experience**, **a decade during which inflation averaged nearly 7% and was well into double digits at various times**. Soaring food and energy prices along with the end of price controls helped push that era’s soaring inflation. Then-Fed Chairman **Paul Volcker led the effort to squash inflation then**, **but needed to use dramatic interest rate hikes that triggered a recession**. The Deutsche team worries that **such a scenario could play out again.** “Already, **many sources of rising prices are filtering through into the US economy**. Even if they are transitory on paper, they may feed into expectations just as they did in the 1970s,” they said. “The risk then, is that even if they are only embedded for a few months they may be difficult to contain, especially with stimulus so high.” **The firm said interest rate hikes could** “**cause havoc in a debt-heavy world**,” **with financial crises likely particularly in emerging economies where growth won’t be able to overcome higher financing costs.**

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

#### **Extinction**

**Edwards 17** [Paul N. Edwards, CISAC’s William J. Perry Fellow in International Security at Stanford’s Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies. Being interviewed by EarthSky. How nuclear war would affect Earth’s climate. September 8, 2017. earthsky.org/human-world/how-nuclear-war-would-affect-earths-climate] Note, we are only reading parts of the interview that are directly from Paul Edwards --

In the nuclear conversation, what are we not talking about that we should be?

**We are not talking enough about the climatic effects of nuclear war**. The “nuclear winter” theory of the mid-1980s played a significant role in the arms reductions of that period. But with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the reduction of U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals, **this aspect of nuclear war has faded from view. That’s not good. In the mid-2000s, climate scientists** such as Alan Robock (Rutgers**) took another look at nuclear winter theory. This time around, they used much-improved and much more detailed climate models than those available 20 years earlier.** They also tested the potential effects of smaller nuclear exchanges. The result: an exchange involving just 50 nuclear weapons — the kind of thing we might see in an India-Pakistan war, for example — could loft 5 billion kilograms of smoke, soot and dust high into the stratosphere. That’s enough to cool the entire planet by about 2 degrees Fahrenheit (1.25 degrees Celsius) — about where we were during the Little Ice Age of the 17th century. Growing seasons could be shortened enough to create really significant food shortages. So the climatic effects of even a relatively small nuclear war would be planet-wide. What about a larger-scale conflict? A **U.S.-Russia war currently seems unlikely, but if it were to occur, hundreds or even thousands of nuclear weapons might be launched. The climatic consequences would be catastrophic: global average temperatures would drop as much as 12 degrees Fahrenheit (7 degrees Celsius) for up to several years — temperatures last seen during the great ice ages. Meanwhile, smoke and dust circulating in the stratosphere would darken the atmosphere enough to inhibit photosynthesis, causing disastrous crop failures, widespread famine and massive ecological disruption. The effect would be similar to that of the giant meteor believed to be responsible for the extinction of the dinosaurs. This time, we would be the dinosaurs**. Many people are concerned about North Korea’s advancing missile capabilities. Is nuclear war likely in your opinion? At this writing, **I think we are closer to a nuclear war than we have been since the early 1960s.** In the North Korea case, both Kim Jong-un and President Trump are bullies inclined to escalate confrontations. President **Trump lacks impulse control, and there are precious few checks on his ability to initiate a nuclear strike**. We have to hope that our generals, both inside and outside the White House, can rein him in. North Korea would most certainly “lose” a nuclear war with the United States. But many millions would die, including hundreds of thousands of Americans currently living in South Korea and Japan (probable North Korean targets). Such vast damage would be wrought in Korea, Japan and Pacific island territories (such as Guam) that any “victory” wouldn’t deserve the name. Not only would that region be left with horrible suffering amongst the survivors; it would also immediately face famine and rampant disease. Radioactive fallout from such a war would spread around the world, including to the U.S. It has been more than 70 years since the last time a nuclear bomb was used in warfare. What would be the effects on the environment and on human health today? To my knowledge, most of the changes in nuclear weapons technology since the 1950s have focused on making them smaller and lighter, and making delivery systems more accurate, rather than on changing their effects on the environment or on human health. So-called “battlefield” weapons with lower explosive yields are part of some arsenals now — **but it’s quite unlikely that any exchange between two nuclear powers would stay limited to these smaller, less destructive bombs.**

**Case**

**Framing:**

**1] Having a good econ is a preq to being able to distribute econ and have econ equality**

**2] Definition- flawed- cant just allow some workers to strike, must defend all workers to strike- the right to strike is not subject to any condtions, so it’s universal. Also unfair, means subjectively allowing some to resist worker domination whiles other still have to suffer.**

#### **3] 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** goodor 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 theThe 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.

On contention 1:

#### **Unions are exclusive—increases monopoly over representation**

**Vernuccio 14** F. Vincent Vernuccio, senior fellow at the Mackinac Center for Public Policy. He served as the Mackinac Center's director of labor policy between 2012 and 2017, 11-11-2014, "Choice vs. Compulsion: Unions’ Monopoly Privilege," Mackinac Center, [https://www.mackinac.org/20701 //](https://www.mackinac.org/20701%20//) EH

The **NLRA gives unions exclusive representation or monopoly bargaining power** if they have been selected by a majority of the employees in a collective bargaining unit: **Representatives** designated or selected for the purposes of collective bargaining by the majority of the employees in a unit appropriate for such purposes, shall be the exclusive representatives of all the employees in such unit for the purposes of collective bargaining in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours of employment, or other conditions of employment.[6] **If unions choose to be the exclusive representative of workers, they automatically receive a legal monopoly over negotiation and representation**. The cost of maintaining this monopoly is that unions cannot discriminate against nonunion members and are legally required to represent all workers equally. Likewise, workers who do not want this representation must accept the union contract and cannot negotiate on their own behalf or represent themselves. In a 1997 Mackinac Center study, Robert P. Hunter, a former regional director of the Federal Labor Relations Authority, defines the problem with exclusive representation: When a union is selected to represent employees in an "appropriate" unit of workers, the union alone has the legal authority to speak for all employees, including those who neither voted for nor joined the labor organization. No other union, individual or representative may negotiate terms and conditions of employment, and the individual employee is effectively deprived of the opportunity to represent his or her own interests.[7] Almost all union contracts include exclusive representation because of the legal privileges and protections that come along with it. Besides the monopoly bargaining and forced negotiations, private sector unions also receive the ability to limit other unions from organizing the workers into a different union, a practice sometimes referred to as “raiding.”[8]

#### **Unions are essentially labor cartels, which have a worse effect on the the WOKER.**

**Sherk 2009** [James (Research Fellow, Labor Economics at the Heritage Foundation), 21 May 2009, “What Unions Do: How Labor Unions Affect Jobs and the Economy”, The Heritage Foundation, <https://www.heritage.org/jobs-and-labor/report/what-unions-do-how-labor-unions-affect-jobs-and-the-economy>] //DebateDrills LC

**Unions function as labor cartels. A labor cartel restricts the number of workers in a company or industry to drive up the remaining workers' wages**, just as the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) attempts to cut the supply of oil to raise its price. **Companies pass on those higher wages to consumers through higher prices, and often they also earn lower profits. Economic research finds that unions benefit their members but hurt consumers generally, and especially workers who are denied job opportunities.**

**The average union member earns more than the average non-union worker. However, that does not mean that expanding union membership will raise wages: Few workers who join a union today get a pay raise.** What explains these apparently contradictory findings? The economy has become more competitive over the past generation. Companies have less power to pass price increases on to consumers without going out of business. Consequently, **unions do not negotiate higher wages for many newly organized workers. These days, unions win higher wages for employees only at companies with competitive advantages that allow them to pay higher wages, such as successful research and development (R&D) projects or capital investments.**

**Unions effectively tax these investments by negotiating higher wages for their members, thus lowering profits**. Unionized companies respond to this union tax by reducing investment. Less investment makes unionized companies less competitive.

**This, along with the fact that unions function as labor cartels that seek to reduce job opportunities, causes unionized companies to lose jobs.** Economists consistently find that unions decrease the number of jobs available in the economy. **The vast majority of manufacturing jobs lost over the past three decades have been among union members**--non-union manufacturing employment has risen. Research also shows that **widespread unionization delays recovery from economic downturns.**

Some unions win higher wages for their members, though many do not. But with these higher wages, **unions bring less investment, fewer jobs, higher prices, and smaller 401(k) plans for everyone else**. On balance, labor cartels harm the economy, and enacting policies designed to force workers into unions will only prolong the recession.

On contention 2:

Cross Apply disad

### **Strikes 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

On contention 3:

### **They dont get a fighting chance**

#### **A massive influx of union power would cause mass unemployment.**

**Thompson 12** [Derek Thompson, 6-12-2012, "'Unnecessary' and 'Political': Why Unions Are Bad For America," Atlantic, <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/06/unnecessary-and-political-why-unions-are-bad-for-america/258405/>] //DD PT

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.**

**Turns their contention bc income inequality would only be exacerbated- leading to worse health condtions and lay ability to pay.**