

ND21 – NC – LARP

Economy DA: 2:10, 1:50

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 kill the economy – Engineering News 18

Reporter, Creamer Media. "Strikes And Their Economic Consequences." Engineering News, 2018, www.engineeringnews.co.za/article/strikes-and-their-economic-consequences-2018-10-01/rep_id:4136#:~:text=Strike%20action%20results%20in%20less,or%20to%20lost%20producti on%20time. // LHP PS

After conducting intensive research* into the topic of strikes and labour unrest, the Mandela Initiative came to several conclusions. One of these was that the right to strike is made up of a delicate balance between the power of firms and the rights of

employees, and is considered a sign of a healthy democracy "Whilst there are potential benefits from strikes (e.g. better work morale, lower absenteeism, or improved labour productivity), strike action also brings about numerous direct and indirect economic costs that can be high, depending on duration, number of workers involved and divisions affected," the Initiative confirmed. According to labour expert Suleyman Alley, there are seven key causes of labour unrest: health hazards in the workplace; excessive working hours; low wages; demand for leave with pay; discrimination; inadequate working tools; and aggressive behaviour of managers towards employees. While several activities can be taken in an effort to prevent strikes from occurring or escalating, in the South

African context, the tendency towards violent outbursts seems to outweigh reasonable action. "Strikes and labour unrest have marked negative impacts on the employees themselves, the employers and their stakeholders, the government, consumers, and the economy," advises Jacki Condon, Managing Director of Apache Security Services. "The negative effects on international trade include the hinderance of economic development, creating great economic uncertainty – especially as the global media continues to share details, images and videos of violence, damage to property and ferocious clashes between strikers and security." Strike action results in less productivity, which in turn means less profits. Labour Law expert, Ivan Israelstam confirms that; "The employer is likely to lose money due to delayed service to clients or to lost production time. The employees will lose their pay due to the no work, no pay principle. If the strikers are dismissed they will lose their livelihoods altogether." This year alone, Eskom, Prasa, various manufacturing plants, Sasol and the Post Office have faced crippling strikes – to name but a few. Condon argues that

there are more immediate consequences to consider than loss of income. As the socio-economic issues continue to affect South

Africans across the board, tensions are constantly rising," states Condon. "Businesses must protect themselves, their assets, business property, and their non-striking employees from violence and intimidation." Condon believes that this requires the deft hand of well-trained and highly qualified close protection operatives. These operatives provide not only protection, but video evidence as well, ensuring those responsible for damage can be held to account. "The key is to create a strategic partnership with a reliable security provider. Plans must be put into place to protect businesses against vandalism, physical assault, property invasion and intimidation during labour unrest," concludes Condon.

Strikes skyrockets unemployment rates – kills the economy – empirically proven – Tenza 20

Tenza, Mlungisi. “The Effects of Violent Strikes on the Economy of a Developing Country: a Case of South Africa.” Obiter, Nelson Mandela University, 2020, www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004.

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 South Africa's primary source of income is through employment; the state relies heavily on the income taxes it collects from employed people. **The implication is that unemployment has a negative effect on the state while if more people are employed, their income tax will add to the government's coffers. Unemployment means that people are unable to support themselves and their families, conversely the state has an obligation of ensuring that such people sustainable means in the form of social assistance.**³³ **The state, together with the private sector, bears the responsibility of alleviating poverty in society.** Unemployment is a real contributor to poverty. Other factors that contribute to poverty include a general lack of education, lack of relevant skills in certain areas such as science, inequality, inherited past practices and structural problems such as low wages supporting big families, low domestic savings, the ongoing electricity shortage from 2013 to 2015 threatening investors, low levels of business confidence, severe drought, reduced fiscal capacity, and the growing risk of stagflation. In **addition, a lengthy strike comes with a threat of job losses in vulnerable sectors such as mining, metals and agriculture.** It is also believed that protracted strikes contribute towards weakening the country's local currency (the South African rand). All these factors put a strain on the already struggling economy of South Africa.

Econ decline results in nuclear war through diplomacy decline. Tønnesson 15

Tønnesson Tønnesson, Stein [Tønnesson is a research professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in Norway and the leader of the East Asia Peace program at Uppsala University in Sweden.] “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino-US peace.” *International Area Studies Review*, Vol. 18, pgs. 297-311, 2015

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.

Extinction – nuke war fallout creates Ice Age and mass starvation. Starr 15

Starr, Steven [Steven Starr is the director of the University of Missouri's Clinical Laboratory Science Program, as well as a senior scientist at the Physicians for Social Responsibility. He has been published in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and the Strategic Arms Reduction (STAR) website of the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology] "Nuclear War: An Unrecognized Mass Extinction Event Waiting To Happen." March 2015 AA

A war fought with 21st century strategic nuclear weapons would be more than just a great catastrophe in human history. If we allow it to happen, such a war would be a mass extinction event that ends human history. There is a profound difference between extinction and "an unprecedented disaster," or even "the end of civilization," because even after such an immense catastrophe, human life would go on. But extinction, by definition, is an event of utter finality, and a nuclear war that could cause human extinction should really be considered as the ultimate criminal act. It certainly would be the crime to end all crimes. The world's leading climatologists now tell us that nuclear war threatens our continued existence as a species. Their studies predict that a large nuclear war, especially one fought with strategic nuclear weapons, would create a post-war environment in which for many years it would be too cold and dark to even grow food. Their findings make it clear that not only humans, but most large animals and many other forms of complex life would likely vanish forever in a nuclear darkness. of our own making. The environmental consequences of nuclear war would attack the ecological support systems of life at every level. Radioactive fallout produced not only by nuclear bombs, but also by the destruction of nuclear power plants and their spent fuel pools, would poison the biosphere. Millions of tons of smoke would act to destroy Earth's protective ozone layer and block most sunlight from reaching Earth's surface, creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last for decades. Yet the political and military leaders who control nuclear weapons strictly avoid any direct public discussion of the consequences of nuclear war. They do so by arguing that nuclear weapons are not intended to be used, but only to deter. Remarkably, the leaders of the Nuclear Weapon States have chosen to ignore the authoritative, long-standing scientific research done by the climatologists, research that predicts virtually any nuclear war, fought with even a fraction of the operational and deployed nuclear arsenals, will leave the Earth essentially uninhabitable.

Tech DA: 1:24, 1:10

Innovation is high now – Tannen 21

Tannen, Janette. "Pandemic Spurs a Burst of Technology Innovation." University of Miami News and Events, 7 Nov. 2021, <https://news.miami.edu/stories/2020/08/pandemic-spurs-a-burst-of-technology-innovation.html>. // LHP SV

But COVID-19 has been a boom for technology and, according to University of Miami experts, these innovations are destined to transform how we do business and almost every other facet of life—from how we communicate, educate, recreate, and entertain to how we seek medical care, design new

homes, and perhaps even choose who we live with. **"Tech companies are enabling digital productivity," said Ernie Fernandez, vice president of information technology and the University's chief information officer. "And this is not just a temporary COVID-19 response—these companies will continue to provide value in a world where digital technology is going to persist"** Geoff Sutcliffe, a computer science professor, added that amid the unfortunate misery and death, the pandemic has some silver

linings. **"We are privileged to be living through an industrial revolution, with computing at the core of it,"** he said. "Suddenly, this is how we do life and it will change our economic lives completely."

Violent strike efforts are increasing – they slow innovation, specifically in the tech sector.

Hanasoge 16 [Chaithra; Senior Research Analyst, Market Researcher, Consumer Insights, Strategy Consulting; "The Union Strikes: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly," Supply Wisdom; April/June 2016 (Doesn't specifically say but this is the most recent event is cites); <https://www.supplywisdom.com/resources/the-union-strikes-the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly/>]/SJWen

The result: Verizon conceded to several of the workers' demands including hiring union workers, protection against outsourcing of call-center jobs, and employee benefits such as salary hikes and higher pension contributions, among others and thus bringing an end to the strike in June.

The repercussion: The **strike witnessed several instances of social disorder, violence and clashes**, ultimately calling for third party intervention (Secretary of Labor – Thomas Perez) to initiate negotiations between the parties. Also, **as a result of the strike, Verizon reported lower than expected revenues in the second quarter of 2016.**

Trade unions/ labor unions aren't just this millennia's product and has been in vogue since times immemorial. **Unions, to ensure fairness to the working class, have gone on strike for better working conditions and employee benefits since the industrial revolution and are as strong today as they were last century. With the advent of technology and advancement in artificial intelligence**, machines are grabbing the jobs which were once the bastion of the humans. So, questions that arise here are, what relevance do unions have in today's work scenario? And, are the strikes organized by them avoidable?

As long as the concept of labor exists and employees feel that they are not receiving their fair share of dues, unions will exist and thrive. Union protests in most cases cause work stoppages,

and in certain cases, disruption of law and order. Like in March 2016, public servants at Federal Government departments across Australia went on a series of strikes over failed pay negotiations, disrupting operations of many government departments for a few days. Besides such direct effects, there are many indirect effects as well such as strained employee relations, slower work processes, lesser productivity and unnecessary legal hassles.

Also, union strikes can never be taken too lightly as they have prompted major overturn of decisions, on a few occasions. Besides the Verizon incident that was a crucial example of this, nationwide strikes were witnessed in India in March and April this year when the national government introduced reforms related to the withdrawal regulations and interest rate of employee provident fund, terming it as 'anti-working class'. This compelled the government to withhold the reform for further review. In France, strike against labor law reforms in May turned violent, resulting in riots and significant damage to property. The incident prompted the government to consider modifications to the proposed reforms.

However, aside from employee concerns, such incidents are also determined by a number of other factors such as the country's political scenario, economy, size of the overall workforce and the unions, history of unionization, labor laws, and culture. For example, it is a popular saying that the French are always on strike as per tradition (although recent statistics indicate a decline in frequency). In a communist government like China, strikes have steadily risen in number. In 2015, China Labor Bulletin (CLB), a Hong Kong-based workers' rights group recorded 2,700 incidents of strikes and protests, compared to 1,300 incidents in 2014. Most of them have stemmed out of failure by the government to respect the basic rights of employees and address labor concerns.

Interestingly, unions have not been able to gain a strong foothold in the IT-BPO industry. While many countries do have a separate union to represent workers from the sector, incidents of strikes like Verizon have been relatively low. However, workplace regulations, in addition to other factors mentioned could be a trigger for such incidents, even if on a smaller scale. For example, a recent survey that interviewed several BPO employees in India revealed that while forming a union in the BPO sector was difficult, irksome workplace regulations such as constant surveillance, irregular timings and incentives have prompted employees to express their resentment in smaller ways such as corruption of internal servers and so on. Such risks are further enhanced in a city like Kolkata, which carries a strong trade union culture.

Victories like the aff mobilizes unions in the IT sector.

Vynck et al 21 [Gerrit De; Carleton University, BA in Journalism and Global Politics, tech reporter for The Washington Post. He writes about Google and the algorithms that increasingly shape society. He previously covered tech for seven years at Bloomberg News; Nitashu Tiku; Columbia University, BA in English, New York University, MA in Journalism, Washington Post's tech culture reporter based in San Francisco; Macalester College, BA in English, Columbia University, MS in Journalism, reporter for The Washington Post who is focused on technology coverage in the Pacific Northwest; "Six things to know about the latest efforts to bring unions to

Big Tech,” The Washington Post;

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/01/26/tech-unions-explainer/>]/[SJWen

In response to **tech** company crackdowns and lobbying, **gig workers have shifted their strategy to emphasize building worker-led movements** and increasing their ranks, rather than focusing on employment status as the primary goal, says Veena Dubal, a law professor at the University of California Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco. **The hope is that with President Biden in the White House and an even split in the Senate, legislators will mobilize** at the federal level, **through the NLRA or bills such as the PRO Act, to recognize gig worker collectives as real unions.**

Technological innovation solves every existential threat – which outweighs we cannot solve extinction without innovation.

Matthews 18 Dylan. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. <https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good>

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the future. It's reasonable to suggest that those quadrillions of future people have, accordingly, hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here today do. That's the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead's 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, "On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future." It's a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It's not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned "long-termism" into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most literal thing it could mean is preventing human extinction, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity's continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that's certainly part of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address specific threats to humanity (which he calls "targeted" approaches to the far future) have to complement "broad" approaches, where instead of trying to predict what's going to kill us all, you just generally try to keep civilization running as best it can, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with potential extinction events in the future, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future doesn't mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation; it also means acting on pressing needs now. For example: We're going to be better prepared to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or global warming if society as a whole makes a lot of scientific progress. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn't get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a

civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of **the best things** we can do for the far future **is to** improve school systems — here and now — to **harness** the group economist Raj Chetty calls “lost Einsteins” (potential **innovators** who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: **improve incentives and norms in academic work** to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X “If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.” Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery

BLOCKS

They can't solve in countries that already have high voter participation. And unions are subject to corruption – this destroys democracy, multiple warrants. Prefer my evidence because it controls the internal link to why civic participation even matters because it is corrupt- PETRO

Petro, Sylvester. "The Corruption of Union Leadership: Sylvester Petro." FEE Freeman Article, Foundation for Economic Education, 1 May 1959, <https://fee.org/articles/the-corruption-of-union-leadership/>. // LHP HL

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 wor

Id. 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 workmen 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. The Welfare State Philosophy The same thinking which is producing the Welfare State has also been largely responsible for the special privileges accorded trade unions. Furthermore, the welfare-state ideology has given the State so many diverse jobs to perform that it can no longer properly perform the basic job for which it was designed. That job was to insure domestic tranquility by protecting honest citizens against thugs and criminals. Proper performance of that basic function requires, obviously, a primary and predominant preoccupation by the government with the police force and the administration of justice. While we expend our substance in granting special privileges and subsidies to the strong pressure groups, encouraging idleness and unproductiveness, we under man our police forces and pay them poorly, so that they have neither the numbers nor the quality of men necessary to do what is, after all, the basic job of civilization: keeping the peace. While recognizing, then, that Senator Ives had hold of a piece of the truth in observing that the crime disclosed in the McClellan Record is a part of the larger problem of law enforcement created by the welfare-state distortion of the role of government, his view is not on the whole accurate. At least it is not the whole truth if he means to say that there are no independent causes for the prevalence of crime and

corruption in trade unions. **It is not the whole truth because it fails to explain why, among all the other private associations of society—the business firms, the bar associations, the medical associations, and the thousands of other private associations in this country—violence, crime, and corruption do not prevail as they do among trade unions.** Violence, crime, and corruption

prevail among trade unions to a degree unmatched in any other private association because trade unions have acquired from society and the law special privileges allowed to no other private association. There is every reason to believe that any other private association accorded the same privileges would manifest the same characteristics which the McClellan Record discloses in trade unions. If, for example, businessmen were allowed to compel the purchases of their customers, to assault them when they showed any intention of removing their patronage, and to block access to competitors—there is very little reason to believe that such conduct would not become common business practice, **leading to more and more of**

the same as the selective process wore on in business in the way that it has in trade unions : with the productive and the ingenious giving ground before the thugs, the bullies, and the master strategists of large-scale organized violence. Businesses compete in a civilized way partly because the

law compels them to do so and partly because the law's compulsion has created a selection process which grinds out the thugs and the lawless and advances the able and the industrious. Among trade unions, precisely the contrary process of selection has been going on, with, as might be expected, precisely the contrary results. Errors in Government The sources of the special privileges which trade unions enjoy are to be found in the policies and conduct of the federal government over the past thirty years, beginning in 1930 and continuing to this date. The responsibility is nonpartisan, with Republicans and Democrats sharing it, although not in equal proportions. It is distributed in another way. Rather than being confined to one or another of the three branches of the federal government, it is shared, instead, by all three: the legislative branch, the executive branch, and the judicial branch. Unwise laws have been made worse by the administration and interpretation they have had, while socially beneficial laws have been reduced to impotency by a reluctant administration, on the one hand, and dubious interpretation, on the other. Without exonerating Congress from its share of the responsibility, one still must acknowledge in the interests of accuracy that its record is not as defective as that of the other parties: the National Labor Relations Board, representing the executive branch; and the United States Supreme Court, representing the judicial branch. Accuracy calls for further qualification. There have at all times been on the Supreme Court some justices who resisted valiantly and with great legal ability the errors and excesses of that Court. Again, some of the justices who earlier participated in the most dubious decisions of the Court have shown since then that theirs were good-faith errors; and, as all good and learned men will do upon finding themselves in error, they have taken steps toward correction. It should also be noted that at frequent intervals between 1935 and 1953 there were some members of the NLRB who recognized and dissented from improper decisions of the Board. Moreover, the majority of the Board since 1953 has been guilty of nothing comparable to the outrageous misinterpretations of the Taft-Hartley Act handed down by the majority which prevailed from 1949 to 1953, although the more recent majority has been very slow to correct some and has failed completely to reverse the most serious of its predecessor's misinterpretations. Whereas the NLRB and the Supreme Court have preponderantly contributed decisions heightening the abusive powers of trade unions and negating the efforts of Congress to reduce such powers, the record of the Federal Circuit Courts of Appeals has been one, preponderantly, of the kind of excellence in legal scholarship, fair-mindedness, and fidelity to law and precedent which is to be expected of all judges. The Circuit Judges, with some exceptions, have neither tried to give trade unions and their officials more privileges than the laws of Congress intended nor have they negated, except by direct mandate of the Supreme Court, the laws of Congress which

were intended to limit abusive and monopolistic trade-union conduct. **Little need be added at this point on the kind of corruption at all levels which we have witnessed in the preceding chapters.... But we must bear in mind that moral and political corruption of the varieties recounted their rot integrity at all levels and thus weaken the fiber of society, making it prone to further corruption of a million kinds in a million ways, every day. Nonunion men treated brutally as outlaws and union members as serfs, the infiltration of unions by professional gangsters, extortion from businessmen, bribery and corruption of public officials, the theory that trade unions are entitled to special privileges from government—no society can survive much of that for very long.** Destructive Monopoly Powers All these put together, however, probably do not equal and certainly do not exceed the

danger inherent in the necessary course of monopolistic unionism. As much as trade unions may protest their virtue and distort the truth, it is the opinion of the most competent economists in this country, and of the greatest economists in the world, that monopolistic trade unionism will destroy any free enterprise system if it is allowed to proceed unchecked. Many of America's ranking economists have come to more or less this same conclusion—Fritz Machlup, Milton Friedman, David McCord Wright, Edward H. Chamberlin, Philip Bradley, Henry C. Simons, and many others of equal ability and disinterested devotion to truth.1 Their conclusions are shared by economists of unsurpassed international reputation, including Friedrich A. Hayek and Wilhelm Roepke, as well as the man who has in our time achieved the greatest stature of all in the social sciences, in my opinion, Professor Ludwig von Mises.2 Steps in the Process All these men agree, not only as to the fact but as to the process by means of which trade unions will, if unchecked,

bring about the destruction of the free society. **First, compulsory membership leading to dictatorial control of all workers; second, through the ensuing monopolistic regimentation of all industry, the securing of wage structures higher than the market will bear; third, in inevitable consequence, drastic and severe unemployment of great numbers of workers; fourth, clamorous insistence that government, through deficit spending, create jobs and other subsidies for the men thrown into unemployment by the union monopolies; fifth, loose money policies by the monetary arm of a government politically committed to “full employment” policies; sixth, a crackup inflation; seventh, consequent mangling of the lives of all those who have attempted to save; eighth, increasing chaos and dislocation; ninth, the rise of vicious demagogues playing upon the confusion, chaos, and dissatisfaction of the populace to secure for themselves dictatorial powers which permit them to apply totalitarian remedies which the Constitution of the United States inhabits; tenth, dissolution into the jungle.** The McClellan Record demonstrates the fundamental culpability of the federal government for the intolerable

conditions which exist in labor relations. Attacks on thugs, racketeers, and power-hungry union leaders miss the real point. The real problem, the real fault, lies in a theory of government which ensures an awful paradox: a virtual anarchy within a plethora of laws. We have thousands upon thousands of rules and statutes, millions upon millions of government employees. Yet we have no law.

4] Climate strike pushes no policy, actually causes harms – SMALL 2

Small, Diane. "Why the Climate Strike Is a Useless Act." Eluxe Magazine, 3 Apr. 2020, <https://eluxemagazine.com/culture/articles/why-the-climate-strike-is-a-useless-act/>. // LHP HL

Protests can play an important role in our society – but only when the objective is clear. Stop the War protests mean just that, for example. But the **climate strike' has no clear, realistic goals whatsoever. It's easy to complain, but it's much harder to come up with – let alone demand – serious, viable solutions.** Green energy is a noble goal, but so far, it's not viable for fuelling most countries – far from it. And even when it works, it often comes with its own issues: for example, **China's 'green energy' Three Gorges Hydroelectric Dam displaced 1.2 million people, killed countless numbers of animals and plants, and flooded pristine forests.** The Climate Strike is a caprice; a feel-good event that seems to be at least partly designed to give totally un-eco-friendly companies like Vivienne Westwood a bit of a greenwashing boost, while acting as something of an excuse for workers and students to bunk off and join a huge street party. **They may feel that they're doing something positive for the environment, but in the end, they will accomplish nothing.** There's no doubt the planet needs saving, but gathering a bunch of impassioned protestors (many of whom are too young to vote, even) with zero feasible demands for change is a waste of energy. If people really want to 'strike' in an effective way, real sacrifice is necessary. **We must lower our energy use. Reduce our consumption. Boycott some of the biggest corporations on the planet. But it seems too few are willing to make those sacrifices.**

5] No impact -- Extinction from warming requires 12 degrees, far greater than their internal link, and intervening actors will solve before then

Sebastian Farquhar 17, leads the Global Priorities Project (GPP) at the Centre for Effective Altruism, et al., 2017, "Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance," <https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf>

The most likely levels of global warming are very unlikely to cause human extinction.¹⁵ The **existential risks of climate change** instead **stem from tail risk** climate change – **the low probability of extreme levels of warming – and interaction with other sources of risk.** It is impossible to say with confidence at what point global warming would become severe enough to pose an existential threat. Research has suggested that **warming of 11-12°C would render most of the planet uninhabitable**,¹⁶ and would completely devastate agriculture.¹⁷ This would pose an extreme threat to human civilisation as we know it.¹⁸ Warming of around 7°C or more could potentially produce conflict and instability on such a scale that the indirect effects could be an existential risk, although it is extremely uncertain how likely such scenarios are.¹⁹ Moreover, **the timescales over which such changes might happen could mean that humanity is able to adapt enough to avoid extinction in even very extreme scenarios.** The probability of these levels of warming depends on eventual greenhouse gas concentrations. According to some experts, **unless strong action is taken soon by major emitters**, it is likely that **we will pursue a medium-high emissions pathway**.²⁰ If we do, the chance of extreme warming is highly uncertain but appears non-negligible. Current concentrations of greenhouse gases are higher than they have been for hundreds of thousands of years,²¹ which means that there are significant unknown unknowns about how the climate system will respond. Particularly concerning is the risk of positive feedback loops, such as the release of vast amounts of methane from melting of the arctic permafrost, which would cause rapid and disastrous warming.²² The economists Gernot Wagner and Martin Weitzman have used IPCC figures

(which do not include modelling of feedback loops such as those from melting permafrost) to estimate that if we continue to pursue a medium-high emissions pathway, the probability of eventual warming of 6°C is around 10%,²³ and of 10°C is around 3%.²⁴ These estimates are of course highly uncertain. It is likely that the world will take action against climate change once it begins to impose large costs on human society, long before there is warming of 10°C. Unfortunately, there is significant inertia in the climate system: there is a 25 to 50 year lag between CO₂ emissions and eventual warming,²⁵ and it is expected that 40% of the peak concentration of CO₂ will remain in the atmosphere 1,000 years after the peak is reached.²⁶ Consequently, it is impossible to reduce temperatures quickly by reducing CO₂ emissions. If the world does start to face costly warming, the international community will therefore face strong incentives to find other ways to reduce global temperatures.