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### Advantage 1: Nukes

#### Strikes are key to safety of nuclear weapons facilities, Williams 10-18

[Martin Williams, 10-18-2021, "Clyde nuclear base emergency staff to strike from tomorrow over safety fears", https://www.heraldscotland.com/news/homenews/19655524.clyde-nuclear-base-emergency-staff-strike-tomorrow-safety-fears/, date accessed 10-24-2021] //Lex AT

EMERGENCY workers at the home of Britain's nuclear weapons on the Clyde are set to strike over "major safety concerns" after managers slashed firefighter numbers. Action has been previously been given the go-ahead following a ballot of workers after managers proceeded with cuts to eight posts from the specialist fire safety crew at HM Naval Base Clyde, a reduction in strength of 15 percent, with the a union describing it as an "an accident waiting to happen". Unite members working for outsourcing services firm Capita [Business](https://www.heraldscotland.com/business_hq/) Services will now start strike action from Tuesday in a dispute over cuts to fire and rescue crew levels, and a lack of consultation. The Unite members on the Clyde employed by Capita, who provide onsite fire cover for both Faslane and Coulport naval bases, have been involved in an overtime ban since September 16 but are now stepping up their action to include discontinuous strike action. The six-hour strike action will take place on Tuesday and Thursday and on October,26 and 28. The cuts were confirmed to staff earlier this year by Capita which won the contract in 2020 for fire response services from the Ministry of Defence and insists the cuts would actually improve safety. The union Unite [Scotland](https://www.heraldscotland.com/news/homenews/) hasslammed the decision taken by Capita management in consultation with the Ministry of Defence to press ahead with cuts to fire crews alongside the lack of promised new fire vehicles and updated equipment. The trade union representing around 45 fire safety crew workers has made repeated representations to Capita management which have raised ‘more concerns’, in addition to those around staffing levels. Debbie Hutchings, Unite industrial officer, said: “Unite’s members are stepping up their industrial action this week at Coulport and Faslane due to the ongoing concerns around safety. This dispute is about our members not being given the assurances and guarantees over their [health](https://www.heraldscotland.com/news/health/) and safety in fire response situations, and the training which has been promised to cover such responses.” “We have been in dialogue with Capita since their decision to press ahead with cutting the fire response services at the bases, but more concerns have been raised throughout this process. Unite remains open to dialogue with Capita but our members have simply had enough and feel that their employer has not yet done enough. The workers will be taking strike action in the interests of their safety, and the safety of the public.” Her Majesty's Naval Base, Clyde is the navy's headquarters in Scotland and is best known as Britain's nuclear weapons base, in the form of a fleet of four Vanguard-class submarines equipped with Trident nuclear missiles and five other Astute and Trafalgar-class nuclear-powered attack submarines. Workers believe the cuts impair the abilities of the onsite fire crews to do their jobs properly, particularly, in relation to incidents that would involve wearing breathing apparatus. Capita has previously stated that they intend to mitigate safety risks due to the cuts through an investment in new technology to reduce fire risk". But workers have said they are not aware of any new technology which would address ongoing safety concerns.

#### Fires are a huge threat to nuclear explosions—UK is on the brink, Ritchie 14

[Dr Nick Ritchie, 2014, "Nuclear risk: the British case", University of York, https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/78773/1/Nuclear\_risk\_paper.pdf, date accessed 10-24-2021] //Lex AT

Nuclear deterrence is a risky business: it is fallible, its effects are contingent on context, and escalation of a conflict to the actual use of nuclear weapons cannot be ruled out. In fact, the successful practice of nuclear deterrence between states requires the perceived probability of the use of nuclear weapons to be high. This form of nuclear risk is compounded by the routine safety problems of running a national nuclear weapons enterprise. The data on such safety risks is striking. In the UK context alone we outline 16 submarine collisions since 1979, 266 submarine fires in the past 25 years, numerous safety shortfalls with nuclear-armed submarines and at the Atomic Weapons Establishment, 158 fires at the Atomic Weapons Establishment between 2000-2011, and serious unresolved safety concerns with the Trident warhead. These two dimensions of nuclear risk – deterrence and safety – are outlined below. Considering the very harmful and potentially catastrophic consequences of a nuclear weapon explosion, the existence of nuclear weapons generates an unacceptable risk. The international community has worked hard over the past century to regulate and constrain the means of violence at the disposal of states, most recently through further regulation of the arms trade. Yet nuclear violence remains unencumbered despite the very severe risks nuclear weapons pose. This risk can be eliminated through rapid progress to a world free of nuclear weapons. The early negotiation of an international treaty prohibiting nuclear weapons, even without the participation of nuclear-armed states, would be an important contribution towards this goal.

#### One explosion escalates,

Roth and Burn 17, 9-28-2017, Matthew Bunn is a professor of practice at the Harvard Kennedy School. A former advisor in the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy, Nickolas Roth is a research associate at the Belfer Center’s Project on Managing the Atom at Harvard University."The effects of a single terrorist nuclear bomb," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, <https://thebulletin.org/2017/09/the-effects-of-a-single-terrorist-nuclear-bomb/>, 3/29/20)//ww BJ

The scale of death and suffering. How many would die in such an event, and how many would be terribly wounded, would depend on where and when the bomb was detonated, what the weather conditions were at the time, how successful the response was in helping the wounded survivors, and more. Many estimates of casualties are based on census data, which reflect where people sleep at night; if the attack occurred in the middle of a workday, the numbers of people crowded into the office towers at the heart of many modern cities would be far higher. The daytime population of Manhattan, for example, is roughly twice its nighttime population; in Midtown on a typical workday, there are an estimated 980,000 people per square mile. A 10-kiloton weapon detonated there might well kill half a million people—not counting those who might die of radiation sickness from the fallout. (These effects were analyzed in great detail in the Rand Corporation’s Considering the Effects of a Catastrophic Terrorist Attack and the British Medical Journal’s “Nuclear terrorism.”) On a typical day, the wind would blow the fallout north, seriously contaminating virtually all of Manhattan above Gramercy Park; people living as far away as Stamford, Connecticut would likely have to evacuate. Seriously injured survivors would greatly outnumber the dead, their suffering magnified by the complete inadequacy of available help. The psychological and social effects—overwhelming sadness, depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, myriad forms of anxiety—would be profound and long-lasting. The scenario we have been describing is a groundburst. An airburst—such as might occur, for example, if terrorists put their bomb in a small aircraft they had purchased or rented—would extend the blast and fire effects over a wider area, killing and injuring even larger numbers of people immediately. But an airburst would not have the same lingering effects from fallout as a groundburst, because the rock and dirt would not be sucked up into the fireball and contaminated. The 10-kiloton blast we have been discussing is likely toward the high end of what terrorists could plausibly achieve with a crude, improvised bomb, but even a 1-kiloton blast would be a catastrophic event, having a deadly radius between one-third and one-half that of a 10-kiloton blast. These hundreds of thousands of people would not be mere statistics, but countless individual stories of loss—parents, children, entire families; all religions; rich and poor alike—killed or horribly mutilated. Human suffering and tragedy on this scale does not have to be imagined; it can be remembered through the stories of the survivors of the US atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the only times in history when nuclear weapons have been used intentionally against human beings. The pain and suffering caused by those bombings are almost beyond human comprehension; the eloquent testimony of the Hibakusha—the survivors who passed through the atomic fire—should stand as an eternal reminder of the need to prevent nuclear weapons from ever being used in anger again. Global economic disaster. The economic impact of such an attack would be enormous. The effects would reverberate for so far and so long that they are difficult to estimate in all their complexity. Hundreds of thousands of people would be too injured or sick to work for weeks or months. Hundreds of thousands more would evacuate to locations far from their jobs. Many places of employment would have to be abandoned because of the radioactive fallout. Insurance companies would reel under the losses; but at the same time, many insurance policies exclude the effects of nuclear attacks—an item insurers considered beyond their ability to cover—so the owners of thousands of buildings would not have the insurance payments needed to cover the cost of fixing them, thousands of companies would go bankrupt, and banks would be left holding an immense number of mortgages that would never be repaid. Consumer and investor confidence would likely be dramatically affected, as worried people slowed their spending. Enormous new homeland security and military investments would be very likely. If the bomb had come in a shipping container, the targeted country—and possibly others—might stop all containers from entering until it could devise a system for ensuring they could never again be used for such a purpose, throwing a wrench into the gears of global trade for an extended period. (And this might well occur even if a shipping container had not been the means of delivery.) Even the far smaller 9/11 attacks are estimated to have caused economic aftershocks costing almost $1 trillion even excluding the multi-trillion-dollar costs of the wars that ensued. The cost of a terrorist nuclear attack in a major city would likely be many times higher. The most severe effects would be local, but the effects of trade disruptions, reduced economic activity, and more would reverberate around the world. Consequently, while some countries may feel that nuclear terrorism is only a concern for the countries most likely to be targeted—such as the United States—in reality it is a threat to everyone, everywhere. In 2005, then-UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan warned that these global effects would push “tens of millions of people into dire poverty,” creating “a second death toll throughout the developing world.” One recent estimate suggested that a nuclear attack in an urban area would cause a global recession, cutting global Gross Domestic Product by some two percent, and pushing an additional 30 million people in the developing world into extreme poverty. Desperate dilemmas. In short, an act of nuclear terrorism could rip the heart out of a major city, and cause ripple effects throughout the world. The government of the country attacked would face desperate decisions: How to help the city attacked? How to prevent further attacks? How to respond or retaliate? Terrorists—either those who committed the attack or others—would probably claim they had more bombs already hidden in other cities (whether they did or not), and threaten to detonate them unless their demands were met. The fear that this might be true could lead people to flee major cities in a large-scale, uncontrolled evacuation. There is very little ability to support the population of major cities in the surrounding countryside. The potential for widespread havoc and economic chaos is very real. If the detonation took place in the capital of the nation attacked, much of the government might be destroyed. A bomb in Washington, D.C., for example, might kill the President, the Vice President, and many of the members of Congress and the Supreme Court. (Having some plausible national leader survive is a key reason why one cabinet member is always elsewhere on the night of the State of the Union address.) Elaborate, classified plans for “continuity of government” have already been drawn up in a number of countries, but the potential for chaos and confusion—if almost all of a country’s top leaders were killed—would still be enormous. Who, for example, could address the public on what the government would do, and what the public should do, to respond? Could anyone honestly assure the public there would be no further attacks? If they did, who would believe them? In the United States, given the practical impossibility of passing major legislation with Congress in ruins and most of its members dead or seriously injured, some have argued for passing legislation in advance giving the government emergency powers to act—and creating procedures, for example, for legitimately replacing most of the House of Representatives. But to date, no such legislative preparations have been made. In what would inevitably be a desperate effort to prevent further attacks, traditional standards of civil liberties might be jettisoned, at least for a time—particularly when people realized that the fuel for the bomb that had done such damage would easily have fit in a suitcase. Old rules limiting search and surveillance could be among the first to go. The government might well impose martial law as it sought to control the situation, hunt for the perpetrators, and find any additional weapons or nuclear materials they might have. Even the far smaller attacks of 9/11 saw the US government authorizing torture of prisoners and mass electronic surveillance. And what standards of international order and law would still hold sway? The country attacked might well lash out militarily at whatever countries it thought might bear a portion of responsibility. (A terrifying description of the kinds of discussions that might occur appeared in Brian Jenkins’ book, Will Terrorists Go Nuclear?) With the nuclear threshold already crossed in this scenario—at least by terrorists—it is conceivable that some of the resulting conflicts might escalate to nuclear use. International politics could become more brutish and violent, with powerful states taking unilateral action, by force if necessary, in an effort to ensure their security. After 9/11, the United States led the invasions of two sovereign nations, in wars that have since cost hundreds of thousands of lives and trillions of dollars, while plunging a region into chaos. Would the reaction after a far more devastating nuclear attack be any less? In particular, the idea that each state can decide for itself how much security to provide for nuclear weapons and their essential ingredients would likely be seen as totally unacceptable following such an attack. Powerful states would likely demand that others surrender their nuclear material or accept foreign troops (or other imposed security measures) to guard it. That could well be the first step toward a more profound transformation of the international system. After such a catastrophe, major powers may feel compelled to more freely engage in preventive war, seizing territories they worry might otherwise be terrorist safe havens, and taking other steps they see as brutal but necessary to preserve their security. For this reason, foreign policy analyst Stephen Krasner has argued that “conventional rules of sovereignty would be abandoned overnight.” Confidence in both the national security institutions of the country attacked and international institutions such as the International Atomic Energy Agency and the United Nations, which had so manifestly failed to prevent the devastation, might erode. The effect on nuclear weapons policies is hard to predict: One can imagine new nuclear terror driving a new push for nuclear disarmament, but one could also imagine states feeling more certain than ever before that they needed nuclear weapons.

#### Nuke war causes extinction

PND 16. internally citing Zbigniew Brzezinski, Council of Foreign Relations and former national security adviser to President Carter, Toon and Robock’s 2012 study on nuclear winter in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, Gareth Evans’ International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament Report, Congressional EMP studies, studies on nuclear winter by Seth Baum of the Global Catastrophic Risk Institute and Martin Hellman of Stanford University, and U.S. and Russian former Defense Secretaries and former heads of nuclear missile forces, brief submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, Open-Ended Working Group on nuclear risks. A/AC.286/NGO/13. 05-03-2016. <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/OEWG/2016/Documents/NGO13.pdf> //Re-cut by Elmer

Consequences human survival 12. Even if the 'other' side does NOT launch in response the smoke from 'their' burning cities (incinerated by 'us') will still make 'our' country (and the rest of the world) uninhabitable, potentially inducing global famine lasting up to decades. Toon and Robock note in ‘Self Assured Destruction’, in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists 68/5, 2012, that: 13. “A nuclear war between Russia and the United States, even after the arsenal reductions planned under New START, could produce a nuclear winter. Hence, an attack by either side could be suicidal, resulting in self assured destruction. Even a 'small' nuclear war between India and Pakistan, with each country detonating 50 Hiroshima-size atom bombs--only about 0.03 percent of the global nuclear arsenal's explosive power--as air bursts in urban areas, could produce so much smoke that temperatures would fall below those of the Little Ice Age of the fourteenth to nineteenth centuries, shortening the growing season around the world and threatening the global food supply. Furthermore, there would be massive ozone depletion, allowing more ultraviolet radiation to reach Earth's surface. Recent studies predict that agricultural production in parts of the United States and China would decline by about **20 percent** for four years, and by 10 percent for a decade.” 14. A conflagration involving USA/NATO forces and those of Russian federation would most likely cause the deaths of most/nearly all/all humans (and severely impact/extinguish other species) as well as destroying the delicate interwoven techno-structure on which latter-day 'civilization' has come to depend. Temperatures would drop to below those of the last ice-age for up to 30 years as a result of the lofting of up to 180 million tonnes of very black soot into the stratosphere where it would remain for decades. 15. Though human ingenuity and resilience shouldn't be underestimated, human survival itself is arguably problematic, to put it mildly, under a 2000+ warhead USA/Russian federation scenario. 16. The Joint Statement on Catastrophic Humanitarian Consequences signed October 2013 by 146 governments mentioned 'Human Survival' no less than 5 times. The most recent (December 2014) one gives it a highly prominent place. Gareth Evans’ ICNND (International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament) Report made it clear that it saw the threat posed by nuclear weapons use as one that at least threatens what we now call 'civilization' and that potentially threatens human survival with an immediacy that even climate change does not, though we can see the results of climate change here and now and of course the immediate post-nuclear results for Hiroshima and Nagasaki as well.

### Advantage 2: Teachers

#### Education is on the decline—STEM is hit hardest, Signal 20

[The Signal, 8-20-2020, "A Closer Look at the Current UK Teacher Shortage", Santa Clarita Valley Signal, https://signalscv.com/2020/08/a-closer-look-at-the-current-uk-teacher-shortage/, date accessed 10-24-2021] //Lex AT

Let’s take a closer look at the current state of the British education system, and the shortages that have been plaguing it. We’ll then discuss some of the factors contributing to the [teacher shortfall before we share a number of potential solutions](https://epi.org.uk/publications-and-research/teacher-shortages-in-england-analysis-and-pay-options/) suggested by the data. We’ll also look at how the coronavirus crisis has affected the teacher shortage. The State of the British Education System While the number of students in the UK has remained constant over the years, the number of teachers in the UK fell by 7%. Matters will only be made worse by the population bulge hitting secondary schools. The number of secondary students is expected to rise by 10% between now and 2023. Not only that, but it has been estimated that roughly 1 in 5 teachers leave within two years, and 40% within 5 years. This means that we are losing many of the new teachers that are coming in. Teacher exit rates are also higher in shortage areas. This includes maths, science and foreign languages. Up to half of these teachers leave within 5 years, but we’re also seeing shortages in normally popular subjects like English and Geography. Teachers Need Better Pay Studies show that many teachers leaving are heading to non-teaching jobs that pay more. This suggests that we could reduce turnover by increasing pay. This is especially true for maths and science teachers who can earn much more in professional jobs. Schools filled with disadvantaged students have trouble recruiting and keeping teachers. This issue is more severe for maths and science teachers. One solution is [taking advantage of the Pupil Premium](https://www.theschoolrun.com/the-parents-guide-to-the-pupil-premium). London schools take advantage of that program, paying teachers in shortage subjects about £1500 more. This has helped them to secure more teachers, and more importantly, more qualified teachers in shortage subjects. This will also reduce the risk of early career teachers leaving. Support New Applicants Eager to Gain a Steady Job The coronavirus crisis and related government-mandated shutdowns have left millions out of work, while millions more are afraid of losing their jobs. However, one of the unexpected effects of the recent global pandemic is that it seems to have revived interest in the profession. As a matter of fact, we saw the number of teacher training applications rise during the lockdowns, and it has been estimated that the coronavirus may reduce shortages by as much as 40%. Places like Wales have seen rises of up to 6.8% in applications compared to the same date last year, which is encouraging as it is one of the regions most affected by shortages. Online degrees also offer a glimmer of hope to meet demand. Students can now earn a [master’s in education distance learning](https://online.exeter.ac.uk/programmes/masters/ma-education) without having to visit campus and get a degree from a globally recognised program. This is essential because many schools are pulling out of offers to teach future teachers because of the coronavirus itself. The virus has put incredible pressure on faculty, who now have to deal with the very real reality of teaching staff falling ill and sick students falling behind. Other programs are dropping trainees because they’re afraid that those who enter the profession during times of uncertainty are much more likely than average to leave when the economy turns around. Fortunately, the same economic uncertainty is improving teacher retention for the time being. However, we still need to take steps to keep them in the classroom after the crisis is over. Protect Teachers Teachers don’t just leave because they can earn more money elsewhere. Teachers may leave because of violence in the classroom or an excessive workload. Schools, however, are taking steps to ensure that a teacher’s workload is manageable when schools reopen. This has been an ongoing issue since the teacher shortage contributes to an increasing student-teacher ratio. Furthermore, schools are also taking steps to protect the health of teachers in the classroom. While there is some hope, teacher shortages should not only continue to be an issue in the UK but most countries in the G7. This should definitely serve as a warning to everyone, and push societies to re-evaluate how they treat and train the teachers of tomorrow.

#### Recognition from strikes is key to teacher satisfaction, Weale 21

[[Sally Weale](https://www.theguardian.com/profile/sallyweale), 4-8-2021, "One in three teachers plan to quit, says National Education Union survey", Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2021/apr/08/one-in-three-uk-teachers-plan-to-quit-says-national-education-union-survey, date accessed 10-24-2021] //Lex AT

One in three [teachers](https://www.theguardian.com/education/teaching) plan to quit the classroom within five years because of increased workload and diminishing respect for the profession, according to a major union survey. The poll by the National Education Union, which was conducted among teachers, [school](https://www.theguardian.com/education/schools) leaders and support staff in schools in England, Wales and Northern Ireland, revealed an education workforce [exhausted after a year of Covid](https://www.theguardian.com/education/2021/apr/03/work-pressure-in-covid-lockdown-was-shattering-say-teachers) disruption, with 70% reporting increased workload over the last 12 months and 95% worried about the impact on their wellbeing. Out of a poll of 10,000 members, 35% said they would “definitely” not be working in education by 2026, while two-thirds (66%) said the status of the profession has got worse and blamed government for [failing to listen to or value teachers](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2021/jan/03/the-guardian-view-on-schools-ministers-outclassed-by-teachers). As one respondent put it: “The pandemic has highlighted a high expectation on teachers whilst a total lack of respect from government.” Among those who said they intended to leave education, the most common reason given was that the profession was not valued or trusted by government or media (53%), closely followed by workload (51%), accountability (34%) and pay (24%). Kevin Courtney, the NEU joint general secretary, said it should come as no surprise that so many teachers are thinking of leaving the profession. “These findings come after a year in which the education profession – as key workers – have been provided few safety protections, had to improvise solutions where government had simply left a void, and were met with a pay freeze for their troubles,” he said. “To create an environment in which so many are overworked and looking for an exit, it is a scandal that so little effort has been made by government to value the profession. Instead, they feel insulted, and for many there comes a point where enough is enough.” The survey also found that more than half (55%) believe their work-life balance is now worse than before the first lockdown. Lockdown has however had a positive impact on staff relationships with their pupils’ families with 30% reporting improved contacts with parents, many of whom have been intimately involved with their child’s education this year, home-schooling while schools have been closed to all but vulnerable pupils and children of key workers. The survey was published to coincide with the NEU’s annual conference – held virtually this year due to the pandemic – where members voted on Monday for a motion which called for GCSEs and A-levels to be scrapped and replaced with more flexible assessments. After two years without [exams](https://www.theguardian.com/education/exams) because of Covid, Duncan Morrison, from Lewisham, south-east London, told conference: “We have a golden opportunity to win our agenda to stop toxic testing. Parents can see we don’t need tests. They can see there is an alternative. Everyone can see there is no case for going back.” Amid anger over the government’s pay freeze for public sector workers, the NEU called for a 7% pay rise for teachers this year and agreed to survey members to build towards a ballot for national strikes if ministers fail to meet their pay demands.

#### Higher wages leads to economic recovery, Roberts and Olinsky 21

[Lily Roberts and Ben Olinsky, 1-27-2021, "Raising the Minimum Wage Would Boost an Economic Recovery—and Reduce Taxpayer Subsidization of Low-Wage Work", Center for American Progress, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/news/2021/01/27/495163/raising-minimum-wage-boost-economic-recovery-reduce-taxpayer-subsidization-low-wage-work/, date accessed 10-26-2021] //Lex AT

As Congress works on coronavirus rescue legislation and a subsequent package to rebuild the economy, the minimum wage should not be dismissed. Raising the wages of low-income workers will stimulate the economy; substantially lower the amount the country spends on social safety net programs such as SNAP; and reduce economic inequality, thereby unleashing additional economic growth in a period of recovery. Stimulate the economy by putting more money in workers’ wallets Phasing in a minimum wage increase between 2021 and 2025 would boost consumer spending and economic growth as the country recovers from the public health and economic crises. Different methodological approaches predict varying aggregate effects of minimum wage increases. However, calculations uniformly point toward wage increases begetting stimulus, especially wage increases for low-wage workers: The [Federal Reserve of Chicago determined](http://www.chicagofed.org/digital_assets/publications/working_papers/2007/wp2007_23.pdf) that low-wage worker households spent an additional $2,800 in the year after a $1-per-hour increase to the minimum wage. The [most recent analysis](https://www.epi.org/publication/why-america-needs-a-15-minimum-wage/) from the Economic Policy Institute found that increasing the minimum wage to $15 by 2025 would generate $107 billion in higher wages. Their [earlier analysis indicates](https://www.epi.org/publication/ib341-raising-federal-minimum-wage/) that an increase from $7.25 to $9.80 per hour between 2012 and 2014 would have generated “approximately 100,000 new jobs.” The [Institute for Policy Studies calculates](https://ips-dc.org/wall_street_bonuses_and_the_minimum_wage/) that for every extra dollar going into the wallet of a low-wage worker, about $1.21 is added to the overall economy. Broad consensus in the academic research over the past 30 years has debunked the idea that raising the minimum wage causes employers to employ fewer people. Economists found that a $15 minimum wage would not reduce employment even [in areas that currently have the lowest wages](https://irle.berkeley.edu/minimum-wage-effects-in-low-wage-areas/). Dozens of careful studies have explored how minimum wage laws affect earnings and employment, influenced by the [seminal 1994 work of David Card and Alan Krueger](https://www.jstor.org/stable/2118030?seq=1). In **spring 2019, prominent economists in the US and the UK published** [**an analysis of 138 state-level minimum wage changes since 1979**](https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjz014)**, finding that the overall number of low-wage jobs remained unchanged** after the increase and that low-wage workers who were already earning above the minimum also saw modest wage increases. In fact, in 2014, the 13 states that raised their minimum wages [added jobs at a faster rate](https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2014/07/19/332879409/states-that-raised-minimum-wage-see-faster-job-growth-report-says) than the states that did not, according to the U.S. Department of Labor. [New analysis](https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0047272720301754) from CAP Distinguished Senior Fellow Austan Goolsbee shows that individual consumer choices driven by fear of COVID-19 infection—not legal closures or stay-at-home orders—largely drove changes in consumer traffic and spending. This indicates that once vaccination rates increase and fear of exposure decreases, consumer spending patterns will readjust if consumers have sufficient funds to spend. The post-pandemic economy will provide a strategic moment to ensure that those in low-income households (who are more likely to spend each additional dollar they receive in pay than higher-income people) will be able to increase their consumption as needed. [New research](https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w25761/w25761.pdf?utm_campaign=PANTHEON_STRIPPED&amp%3Butm_medium=PANTHEON_STRIPPED&amp%3Butm_source=PANTHEON_STRIPPED) demonstrates that minimum wage increases have a particularly strong effect on households’ real spending on food, particularly food prepared away from home. This category of increased spending would be particularly beneficial to a recovering restaurant sector.

#### Strong STEM education solves climate change, SITU 10-4

[StudyUSA, 10-4-2021, "Why Is STEM Important? The Impact of STEM Education on Society", Study in the USA, https://www.studyusa.com/en/a/2157/why-is-stem-important-the-impact-of-stem-education-on-society, date accessed 10-25-2021] //Lex AT

Preparation of STEM Experts Who Can Make a Difference STEM education gives people skills that make them more employable and ready to meet the current labor demand. It encompasses the whole range of experiences and skills. Each STEM component brings a valuable contribution to a well-rounded education. Science gives learners an in-depth understanding of the world around us. It helps them to become better at research and critical thinking. Technology prepares young people to work in an environment full of high-tech innovations. Engineering allows students to enhance problem-solving skills and apply knowledge in new projects. Mathematics enables people to analyze information, eliminate errors, and make conscious decisions when designing solutions. STEM education links these disciplines into a cohesive system. Thus, it prepares professionals who can transform society with innovation and sustainable solutions. The STEM approach to education fosters creativity and divergent thinking alongside fundamental disciplines. It motivates and inspires young people to generate new technologies and ideas. With a focus on practice and innovation, students get to learn from [inquiry-based assignments](https://www.prodigygame.com/main-en/blog/inquiry-based-learning-definition-benefits-strategies). STEM education gives an understanding of concepts and encourages knowledge application. To keep it short, its aim can be formulated in two simple actions: explore and experience. Students are free to exercise what they learn and embrace mistakes in a risk-free environment. Project-based learning and problem-solving help learners to form a special mindset. Its core is in flexibility and curiosity, which equips learners to respond to real-world challenges. STEM-Enhanced Teamwork and Communication STEM education prepares the world for the future. It is based on teamwork and collaboration of professionals from different disciplines. As a STEM student, you do not need to be an expert in each particular subject. You rather acquire a mindset that enables you to become a part of the highly qualified workforce, which functions in collaboration. Teamwork brings a significant increase in productivity, work satisfaction, and profitability. Bottom of Form Active engagement of experts from diverse fields will drive change in our society. STEM education exposes students to effective interdisciplinary communication. Scientists research and experiment, offering the team discoveries. Technology experts provide gadgets that can make the work of the team more effective. Engineers help to solve challenges by designing and running platforms that enable change. Mathematicians analyze information to eliminate mistakes and provide precise calculations. Our world is continuously changing. The only way we can be ready for its challenges is through communication and collaboration. Collaborative experience also helps to broaden the impact of STEM education. Working with local experts and our international colleagues, we can promote our values and move towards a single purpose. This way, we improve communities, offering new educational and employment opportunities. Such open access to world-class experience is possible only when we combine our knowledge and capabilities. Social Awareness There is a high demand for STEM skills in society. STEM education enables people to make informed decisions within the discussed subject areas. Moreover, STEM awareness is necessary for any job as most industries are more or less connected to science and technology: from an [essay writing service](https://essayservice.com/) and college to a paper company. Thus, such education will allow children to grow into active citizens who can speak up in STEM discussions with sound knowledge of the subject. STEM awareness promotes interest in a range of exciting careers. Currently, some STEM occupations are understaffed. For example, according to the projections, the U.S. will need [1 million more STEM experts](https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2015/article/stem-crisis-or-stem-surplus-yes-and-yes.htm) in the near future. Besides, one of the goals of STEM initiatives is to encourage broader participation of women and minorities in the STEM workforce. This allows us to bridge ethnic and gender gaps. We need the engagement and participation of schools, policymakers, parents, students, and educators. This is the only way to continue technological and scientific progress. Sustainable Solutions to Challenges STEM subjects are focused on providing solutions to the concerns society has today. Human history had seen years of thoughtless exhaustion of natural resources. Such a lack of environmental education led to numerous challenges. These issues affect the health and well-being of all living organisms on our planet. Our environment needs protection. Thus, sustainability became one of the most urgent aspects studied by STEM disciplines. The youth is more worried about climate change than the older generation. As statistics shows, [70% of young people](https://news.gallup.com/poll/234314/global-warming-age-gap-younger-americans-worried.aspx) aged 18 to 34 worry about global warming. STEM education can answer their questions. It can teach them how to find the necessary solutions for sustainable development. Education is a powerful tool that ensures the rise of STEM literate society. Well-educated community members can find ways to work in a competitive world. They will use sustainable practices that do not harm nature. In the bigger picture, economic and social progress is tightly connected to the environment. We need to work our way to a sustainable future. Yet, it is possible to accomplish only with STEM skills, experiences, and a multi-disciplinary approach.

#### Climate change destroys the world.

Specktor 19 [Brandon; writes about the science of everyday life for Live Science, and previously for Reader's Digest magazine, where he served as an editor for five years; "Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don't Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims," livescience, 6/4/19; <https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html>] Justin

[Article references this study: https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/148cb0\_b2c0c79dc4344b279bcf2365336ff23b.pdf,

David Spratt David Spratt is a Research Director for Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, Melbourne, and co-author of Climate Code Red: The case for emergency action,

Ian Dunlop Ian T. Dunlop is a member of the Club of Rome. Formerly an international oil, gas and coal industry executive, chairman of the Australian Coal Association, chief executive of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and chair of the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading 1998-2000.]

The current climate crisis, they say, is larger and more complex than any humans have ever dealt with before. General climate models — like the one that the [United Nations' Panel on Climate Change](https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/) (IPCC) used in 2018 to predict that a global temperature increase of 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit (2 degrees Celsius) could put hundreds of millions of people at risk — fail to account for the **sheer complexity of Earth's many interlinked geological processes**; as such, they fail to adequately predict the scale of the potential consequences. The truth, the authors wrote, is probably far worse than any models can fathom. How the world ends What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions. "Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and **55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of** [**lethal heat conditions**](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized. Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly **one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert**. Entire **ecosystems collapse**, beginning with the **planet's coral reefs**, the **rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets.** The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees. This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to **stress the fabric of the world's largest nations**, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in **nuclear war, are likely**. The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

#### Current opposition against strikes increases spread of covid in schools, Stevens 10-6

[[Robert Stevens](https://www.wsws.org/en/authors/Robert-Stevens), 10-6-2021, "UK: National Education Union leader opposes school strikes in Twitter exchange with parents and teachers", https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2021/10/06/cour-o06.html, date accessed 10-25-2021] //Lex AT

The National Education Union (NEU) has doubled down on its support for the Conservative government’s homicidal “stay in school” policy. NEU joint leader Kevin Courtney engaged in a Twitter exchange with parents, including Lisa Diaz—who instigated the October 1 global school strike opposing sending children into unsafe schools—and members of his own union. The exchange took place in an October 2 thread in which Courtney arrogantly dismissed calls for a ballot for industrial action against children’s and school workers’ lack of safety in schools during the ongoing pandemic. Schools reopened in Britain from mid-August in Scotland, the end of August in Northern Ireland and from the start of September in England and Wales, with the full backing of the NEU. Getting children back in classrooms was critical to Prime Minister Boris Johnson’s reopening of the economy in July, with schools acting as holding pens for children so that their parents can go to work churning out profits for the corporations. Reopening schools went ahead even though the Conservative government’s own advisers warned that schools would become vectors of transmission and contribute to a surge of COVID-19. The virus is now infecting children at a more rapid rate than at any point in the pandemic. Figures from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) for September show that 10 children lost their lives to COVID that month. Eleven children have died since the start of the school term in Britain. The deaths include 15-year-old [J](https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2021/10/04/jorj-o04.html)orja Halliday and a girl aged under 14 in Wales, the youngest ever victim in that country. Courtney posted a graph based on the weekly ONS Coronavirus Infection Survey. It showed infections rates rocketing among the School Year 2 to School Year 6 and School Year 7 to Year 11 groups of children. Courtney commented, “Covid cases in secondary schools in England are shooting up. So is education disruption.” The last of his six tweets asks, “Why doesn't the DfE [Department for Education] act to reduce disruption?” A concern with “education disruption”, i.e., anything that cuts across economic activity, places Courtney and the NEU among the most determined opponents of all those demanding that children and teachers not suffer and die as COVID is allowed to become endemic. Among those responding to Courtney’s thread and demanding that the NEU act immediately were members of the SafeEdforAll (Safe Education for All) campaigning Group. Responding to Courtney’s initial post, Tariq asked, “Why are the unions not demanding industrial action? Inaction is not neutral.” Courtney dismissively replied, “Well this is difficult. Strike action for how long? with what aim? What’s the leverage that will persuade the Govt to act? What proportion of members would support unpaid strike action for that long?” Lisa Diaz responded: “How long? Until schools are safe. “What aim? Stop children and teachers dying and get sick (long term - both)

#### That escalates security threats—extinction.

RECNA et al. 21 [Research Center for Nuclear Weapon Abolition; Nagasaki, Japan; “Pandemic Futures and Nuclear Weapon Risks: The Nagasaki 75th Anniversary pandemic-nuclear nexus scenarios final report,” Journal for Peace and Nuclear Disarmament; 5/28/21; <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/25751654.2021.1890867>] Justin

The Challenge: Multiple Existential Threats The relationship between pandemics and war is as long as human history. Past pandemics have set the scene for wars by weakening societies, undermining resilience, and exacerbating civil and inter-state conflict. Other disease outbreaks have erupted during wars, in part due to the appalling public health and battlefield conditions resulting from war, in turn sowing the seeds for new conflicts. In the post-Cold War era, pandemics have spread with unprecedented speed due to increased mobility created by globalization, especially between urbanized areas. Although there are positive signs that scientific advances and rapid innovation can help us manage pandemics, it is likely that deadly infectious viruses will be a challenge for years to come. The COVID-19 is the most demonic pandemic threat in modern history. It has erupted at a juncture of other existential global threats, most importantly, accelerating climate change and resurgent nuclear threat-making. The most important issue, therefore, is how the coronavirus (and future pandemics) will increase or decrease the risks associated with these twin threats, climate change effects, and the next use of nuclear weapons in war.5 Today, the nine nuclear weapons arsenals not only can annihilate hundreds of cities, but also cause nuclear winter and mass starvation of a billion or more people, if not the entire human species. Concurrently, climate change is enveloping the planet with more frequent and intense storms, accelerating sea level rise, and advancing rapid ecological change, expressed in unprecedented forest fires across the world. Already stretched to a breaking point in many countries, the current pandemic may overcome resilience to the point of near or actual collapse of social, economic, and political order. In this extraordinary moment, it is timely to reflect on the existence and possible uses of weapons of mass destruction under pandemic conditions – most importantly, nuclear weapons, but also chemical and biological weapons. Moments of extreme crisis and vulnerability can prompt aggressive and counterintuitive actions that in turn may destabilize already precariously balanced threat systems, underpinned by conventional and nuclear weapons, as well as the threat of weaponized chemical and biological technologies. Consequently, the risk of the use of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), especially nuclear weapons, increases at such times, possibly sharply. The COVID-19 pandemic is clearly driving massive, rapid, and unpredictable changes that will redefine every aspect of the human condition, including WMD – just as the world wars of the first half of the 20th century led to a revolution in international affairs and entirely new ways of organizing societies, economies, and international relations, in part based on nuclear weapons and their threatened use. In a world reshaped by pandemics, nuclear weapons – as well as correlated non-nuclear WMD, nuclear alliances, “deterrence” doctrines, operational and declaratory policies, nuclear extended deterrence, organizational practices, and the **existential risks** posed by retaining these capabilities – are all up for redefinition. A pandemic has potential to destabilize a nuclear-prone conflict by incapacitating the supreme nuclear commander or commanders who have to issue nuclear strike orders, creating uncertainty as to who is in charge, how to handle nuclear mistakes (such as errors, accidents, technological failures, and entanglement with conventional operations gone awry), and opening a brief opportunity for a first strike at a time when the COVID-infected state may not be able to retaliate efficiently – or at all – due to leadership confusion. In some nuclear-laden conflicts, a state might use a pandemic as a cover for political or military provocations in the belief that the adversary is distracted and partly disabled by the pandemic, increasing the risk of war in a nuclear-prone conflict. At the same time, a pandemic may lead nuclear armed states to increase the isolation and sanctions against a nuclear adversary, making it even harder to stop the spread of the disease, in turn creating a pandemic reservoir and transmission risk back to the nuclear armed state or its allies. In principle, the common threat of the pandemic might induce nuclear-armed states to reduce the tension in a nuclear-prone conflict and thereby the risk of nuclear war. It may cause nuclear adversaries or their umbrella states to seek to resolve conflicts in a cooperative and collaborative manner by creating habits of communication, engagement, and mutual learning that come into play in the nuclear-military sphere. For example, militaries may cooperate to control pandemic transmission, including by working together against criminal-terrorist non-state actors that are trafficking people or by joining forces to ensure that a new pathogen is not developed as a bioweapon. To date, however, the COVID-19 pandemic has increased the isolation of some nuclear-armed states and provided a textbook case of the failure of states to cooperate to overcome the pandemic. Borders have slammed shut, trade shut down, and budgets blown out, creating enormous pressure to focus on immediate domestic priorities. Foreign policies have become markedly more nationalistic. Dependence on nuclear weapons may increase as states seek to buttress a global re-spatialization6 of all dimensions of human interaction at all levels to manage pandemics. The effect of nuclear threats on leaders may make it less likely – or even impossible – to achieve the kind of concert at a global level needed to respond to and administer an effective vaccine, making it harder and even impossible to revert to pre-pandemic international relations. The result is that some states may proliferate their own nuclear weapons, further reinforcing the spiral of conflicts contained by nuclear threat, with cascading effects on the risk of nuclear war.

#### Prefer our ev—your stats don’t evaluate long term consequences.

Ide 21 [Tobias; April 2021; School of Geography, The University of Melbourne, 221 Bouverie St, Carlton, VIC 3053, Australia Institute of International Relations, Brunswick University of Technology, Bienroder Weg 97, 38106 Brunswick, Germany; “COVID-19 and armed conflict,” Elsevier Public Health Emergency Collection, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7833329/>] Justin

4. Discussion and conclusion Besides its immediate health and economic effects, COVID-19 can also impact armed conflict risks, with these conflicts themselves being an important obstacle in dealing with the pandemic. This article provided an assessment of the impact of COVID-19 on armed conflict based on data from the first six months of 2020. Theoretically, the pandemic could affect conflict risks through increased grievances, possibilities to demonstrate solidarity, or modified opportunity structures for armed groups. Results show that in four of the nine countries under study, the number of armed conflict events declined after the onset of the COVID-19 crisis. These declines are mostly related to strategic decisions and less favourable opportunity structures for armed groups, such as logistical difficulties and attempts to increase popular support. They offer few prospects for health diplomacy and sustainable peacebuilding. In places like Afghanistan, where the Taliban restrained their military activities to gain local support, the initial decline might even set the stage for a later escalation of the armed conflict. Similar concerns exist regarding recruitment in Colombia and India. In five of the nine countries analysed, armed conflict prevalence increased in the face of the pandemic. This is further evidence that health diplomacy approaches demonstrating goodwill and reducing grievances have little impact during the pandemic (Polo, 2020). COVID-19 did not change the root causes or principal dynamics of the armed conflicts in any of these five countries, but it accelerated existing trends and provided strategic opportunities for armed groups to exploit. Two factors are particularly relevant here: The weakening of state institutions (providing incentives for rebels to intensify military pressure) and a lack of (international) public attention (allowing to extend military operations without backlashes). While short-term rises in armed conflict risks related to the pandemic are mostly driven by changed opportunity structures, grievances could play a more prominent role when longer time horizons are considered. The economic repercussions associated with the current global spike in infections could exceed the coping capacities of households that did relatively well during the first COVID-19 wave. In coincidence with ethnic or religious cleavages, this could raise discontent to a level at which armed conflicts erupt. However, grievances usually take time to translate into organised armed activities. Declining levels of democracy as states claim emergency powers to combat COVID-19 are also a risk factor. Countries with a medium level of democracy and highly repressive regimes are empirically much more likely to experience civil wars than consolidated democracies (Cederman & Vogt, 2017). Armed conflict can have tremendous negative effects on human security and health governance. It is therefore of crucial importance to monitor the impact of COVID-19 on armed conflict risks and to develop adequate policy responses, such as sanctioning armed groups trying to exploit the pandemic.

### Solvency

#### Plan - The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### I’ll defend enforcement through modelling the NLRA, Bondi 95

Victor Bondi , 1995, "American Decades: 1940-1949," No Publication, <https://www.cengage.com/search/productOverview.do?N=197+4294921854+4294916915+4294904579&amp;Ntk=P_EPI&amp;Ntt=15051676421114137871909840985170930831&amp;Ntx=mode%2Bmatchallpartial>

Durin g the 1930s and World War II, organized labor made progress on many fronts. Various labor unions also formed an alliance with the Democratic Party, then in control, and promoted legislation and government regulation to cement these gains. However, in the 1946 election the Republican Party won control of Congress and set about to eliminate or roll back what they perceived to be the excessive power of labor unions. The Republican controlled Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act over the veto of President Harry S Truman, reducing or eliminating many labor union advantages provided for in the **National Labor Relations Act of 1935**. These **included** the unconditional closed shop; the checkoff system, which enabled unions to collect dues from all employed members; the **unconditional right to strike at any time;** and immunity from employer lawsuits over breaches of contract and strike damages.

#### The Unconditional Right to Strike is defined in the NLRA as,

[National Labor Relations Board](https://www.nlrb.gov/), [The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) is comprised of a team of professionals who work to assure fair labor practices and workplace democracy nationwide. Since its creation by Congress in 1935, this small, highly respected, independent Federal agency has had daily impact on the way America's companies, industries and unions conduct business. Agency staff members investigate and remedy unfair labor practices by unions and employers.], xx-xx-xxxx, "NLRA and the Right to Strike," No Publication, https://www.nlrb.gov/about-nlrb/rights-we-protect/your-rights/nlra-and-the-right-to-strike

NLRA and the Right to Strike The Right to Strike. Section 7 of the Act states in part, “Employees shall have the right. . . to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.” Strikes are included among the concerted activities protected for employees by this section. Section 13 also concerns the right to strike. It reads as follows: Nothing in this Act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right. It is clear from a reading of these two **provisions** that: the law not only guarantees the right of employees to strike, but also **places limitations** and qualifications **on** the exercise of **that right**. **Lawful** and unlawful strikes. The lawfulness of a **strike** may **depend on the object, or purpose, of the strike, on its timing, or on the conduct of the strikers.** The object, or objects, of a strike and whether the objects are lawful are matters that are not always easy to determine. Such issues often have to be decided by the National Labor Relations Board. The consequences can be severe to striking employees and struck employers, involving as they do questions of reinstatement and backpay. Strikes for a lawful object. Employees who strike for a lawful object fall into two classes: economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers. Both classes continue as employees, but unfair labor practice strikers have greater rights of reinstatement to their jobs. Economic strikers defined. If the object of a strike is to obtain from the employer some economic concession such as higher wages, shorter hours, or better working conditions, the striking employees are called economic strikers. They retain their status as employees and cannot be discharged, but they can be replaced by their employer. If the employer has hired bona fide permanent replacements who are filling the jobs of the economic strikers when the strikers apply unconditionally to go back to work, the strikers are not entitled to reinstatement at that time. However, if the strikers do not obtain regular and substantially equivalent employment, they are entitled to be recalled to jobs for which they are qualified when openings in such jobs occur if they, or their bargaining representative, have made an unconditional request for their reinstatement. Unfair labor practice strikers defined. Employees who strike to protest an unfair labor practice committed by their employer are called unfair labor practice strikers. Such strikers can be neither discharged nor permanently replaced. When the strike ends, unfair labor practice strikers, absent serious misconduct on their part, are entitled to have their jobs back even if employees hired to do their work have to be discharged. If the Board finds that economic strikers or unfair labor practice strikers who have made an unconditional request for reinstatement have been unlawfully denied reinstatement by their employer, the Board may award such strikers backpay starting at the time they should have been reinstated. **Strikes unlawful because of purpose**. A strike may be unlawful because an object, or purpose, of the strike is unlawful. **A strike in support of** a union **unfair labor practice**, or one that would cause an employer to commit an unfair labor practice, may be a strike for an unlawful object. For example, it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge an employee for failure to make certain lawful payments to the union when there is no union security agreement in effect (Section 8(a)(3)). A strike to compel an employer to do this would be a strike for an unlawful object and, therefore, an unlawful strike. Furthermore, Section 8(b)(4) of the Act prohibits strikes for certain objects even though the objects are not necessarily unlawful if achieved by other means. An example of this would be a strike to compel Employer A to cease doing business with Employer B. It is not unlawful for Employer A voluntarily to stop doing business with Employer B, nor is it unlawful for a union merely to request that it do so. It is, however, unlawful for the union to strike with an object of forcing the employer to do so. In any event, employees who participate in an unlawful strike may be discharged and are not entitled to reinstatement. Strikes unlawful because of timing—Effect of no-strike contract. A strike that violates a no-strike provision of a contract is not protected by the Act, and the striking employees can be discharged or otherwise disciplined, unless the strike is called to protest certain kinds of unfair labor practices committed by the employer. It should be noted that not all refusals to work are considered strikes and thus violations of no-strike provisions. A walkout because of conditions abnormally dangerous to health, such as a defective ventilation system in a spray-painting shop, has been held not to violate a no-strike provision. Same—Strikes at end of contract period. Section 8(d) provides that when either party desires to terminate or change an existing contract, it must comply with certain conditions. If these requirements are not met, a strike to terminate or change a contract is unlawful and participating strikers lose their status as employees of the employer engaged in the labor dispute. If the strike was caused by the unfair labor practice of the employer, however, the strikers are classified as unfair labor practice strikers and their status is not affected by failure to follow the required procedure. Strikes unlawful because of misconduct of strikers. Strikers who engage in serious misconduct in the course of a strike may be refused reinstatement to their former jobs. This applies to both economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers. Serious misconduct has been held to include, among other things, violence and threats of violence. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that a “sitdown” strike, when employees simply stay in the plant and refuse to work, thus depriving the owner of property, is not protected by the law. Examples of serious misconduct that could cause the employees involved to lose their right to reinstatement are: • Strikers physically blocking persons from entering or leaving a struck plant. • Strikers threatening violence against nonstriking employees. • Strikers attacking management representatives.

#### Covid makes organized strikes impossible--status quo efforts are doomed to fail, Gall 20

[Gregor Gall, 4-16-2020, "Right Now in the UK, Strikes Are Effectively Illegal", Tribune Magazine, https://tribunemag.co.uk/2020/04/right-now-in-the-uk-strikes-are-effectively-illegal, date accessed 10-24-2021] //Lex AT

At the moment in Britain, there is no lawful right to strike or take industrial action. This is not because of a new anti-union law (which the Tories promised in their 2019 general election manifesto) or even because of an existing anti-union law (of which they are many). Instead, it is because in the midst of the coronavirus crisis, the government designated balloting organisations like Civica Election Services (formerly Electoral Reform Services) are no longer able to take and process requests from unions for ballots to be organised. This is because the ballots are postal ballots. They are mandatory under the Trade Union Act 1984 and the only form they can take is the postal form. The ballot papers have to be despatched to home addresses of union members, filled in, posted back, opened, counted and then the result verified. But at this moment, those balloting organisations are following government advice on the safety for employees in terms of social distancing and public safety. This situation has gone on for a number of weeks. This bizarre situation is entirely unnecessary. When the last round of trade union laws were being drawn up, trade unions specifically requested that [provisions for electronic voting](https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2015/oct/03/len-mcluskey-unite-deal-david-cameron-trade-union-bill) be included in the bill. In the years since, those calls have continued – but without success. Electronic voting would still involve some element of risk to the employees of the balloting organisations (given that they would still have to work together to some degree), but the level of contact would be much lower. A small number of employees could work at distance from each other to send out and collate the returns. Organisations like Civica conduct electronic balloting and have done so for nearly twenty years for a variety of organisations. But even though the government commissioned its own review in 2017 into the feasibility of using electronic balloting for strikes and industrial action ballots, the recommendation from the review to conduct a pilot study to test feasibility has not been taken up. Consequently, this means that all of the fifty or strikes so far in response to coronavirus issues in the workplace (over social distancing, personal protective equipment, washing facilities and so on) have been unofficial strikes and have probably also been unlawful. There is a little bit of ambiguity here. Workers can invoke the safe work protocol if they believe, under the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations 1999, that their work situation represents a threat of ‘serious or imminent danger’ to their safety. This entitles workers to remove themselves to a place of safety. But in the cases of these walkouts, employers have, of course, protested that their employees were not unsafe. Unions like the Communication Workers Union (CWU) and the Rail, Maritime and Transport (RMT) union have not only pledged support for their members walking out in these situations, but issued guidance to say that their members should pursue that course of action in a number of circumstances. However, that does not mean that any of the walkouts have been declared as official disputes because to do so could mean unions being found in contempt of court and fined if employers won injunctions against them for taking action without a ballot. And the fines can be steep. But even if balloting for industrial action was to take place electronically at the moment, this would not resolve the legal grey area. The process of balloting also requires that, for example, advance notice (14 days) is given to employers about when the action will take place, who will take it and where it will be held. In situations of critical health and safety concerns – like those faced by many workers during the current coronavirus crisis – workers need to be able to walkout immediately and with the full protection of the law. At present, they enjoy no such rights. But what about union members wanting to take strike or industrial action to defend and advance their terms and conditions of employment? The month of April is the traditional date for the settlement of annual pay awards determined by collective bargaining. This has serious and immediate implications. Due to the ongoing lockdown, union members subject to these collective bargaining agreements have effectively no recourse to take lawful industrial action to create the leverage needed to win their demands in pay negotiations. That is the reality of Britain’s draconian anti-union laws. All this points towards the need for the repeal of the anti-union laws. This means not just the Trade Union Act 2016, which increased the thresholds of support needed in a ballot, but much broader changes which must include a positive right to strike codified in law for workers.

### Framework

#### The standard is maximizing expected well being or saving lives.

#### 1] Pleasure and pain are intrinsic value and disvalue – everything else regresses – robust neuroscience.

Blum et al. 18

Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>, R.S.

**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10]. Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14]. Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals. Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it. It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring. Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health. Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage. Finding happiness is different between apes and humans As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure. Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even **produce the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered. Desire and reward centers It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation. In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41]. Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42]. Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans. In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45]. Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations. Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50] In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders. In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS. Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### 2] Death is bad and outweighs – it destroys the subject itself – kills any ability to achieve value in ethics since life is a prerequisite.

#### 3] Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations—takes out calc indicts since they are empirically denied.

#### 4] Extinction outweighs –

#### 1 – Paternalism – taking everyones lives without their consent is actively violent and takes away people’s autonomy.

#### 2 – Suffering – mass death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities

#### 3 – Objectivity – body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical

#### 4 – Moral uncertainty – if we’re unsure about which interpretation of the world is true – we ought to preserve the world to keep debating about it

### Underview

#### 1] Aff gets 1AR theory to prevent infinite abuse it’s DTD since the 1AR needs it to make the time investment worth, no RVIs because you can dump on a 30 sec shell for 6 minutes, and competing interps since the 2n can’t dump on a reasonability bright-line that excludes only what they did wrong – 1AR theory comes first the 1AR is too short to be able to rectify abuse and adequately cover substance.

#### 2] Procedural fairness first a) probability – one round cant alter subjectivity, but it can rectify fairness skews, b) link turns their role of the ballot since it proves we couldn’t engage in it and it is exclusionary, c) answers are self-defeating since they presuppose the judge evals them fairly.

#### 3] “A” implies singular,

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/a

used as a function word before singular nouns when the referent is unspecified

#### 4] A implies specific when put before a modifier like “Just”

CCC (“Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles, Capital Community College Foundation, a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation) LHSLA JC/SJ

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. **Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already**," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class

#### 5] The UK is a just government, several democracy indexes agree, DA 18

[Democratic Audit, 10-31-2018, "In comparative league tables of liberal democracies the UK’s democracy is judged to be First Division, but not Premier League", https://www.democraticaudit.com/2018/10/31/in-comparative-league-tables-of-liberal-democracies-the-uks-democracy-is-judged-to-be-first-division-but-not-premier-league/, date accessed 10-26-2021] //Lex AT

What picture do these scorings give about UK democracy? Essentially, despite its long evolutionary history and claims to iconic status (for example, as the home to the ‘mother of parliaments’), the UK remains ‘first division’ but not ‘premier league’. All the rankings agree that the UK is one of the world’s broad top group of democracies, but none of them put it within the top ten positions. However, the top-scoring countries tend to be small or very small countries, especially the Scandinavian countries with some tiny additions (like Estonia). Arguably it is much easier to run a liberal democracy with (say) six million people than with the UK’s current 66 million. And, of course, it is harder still to run a democracy with 300 million people (as in the USA), and very hard to do so with 1.2 billion people (as in India). Smaller states are more straightforward to operate, and organising public participation and consultation there is simpler. So perhaps this explains the UK’s absence from the top ten. Five of the six rankings also score participation-related aspects as the UK’s weakest area. However, the EIU index instead scores Britain lowest on how well government operates.

#### 6] Here are some counter solvency advocates links are in the doc

<https://apnews.com/article/coronavirus-pandemic-economy-4f0b6285a57c8b2929e2aceb864e7675>

<https://www.cnbc.com/2011/06/06/strike-and-well-change-the-law-uk-warns-unions.html>

https://www.cnn.com/2021/10/22/economy/uk-inflation-5-bank-of-england/index.html

#### 7] Imagining extinction is good

Jessica Hurley 17, Assistant Professor in the Humanities at the University of Chicago, “Impossible Futures: Fictions of Risk in the Longue Durée”, Duke University Press, https://read.dukeupress.edu/american-literature/article/89/4/761/132823/Impossible-Futures-Fictions-of-Risk-in-the-Longue

If contemporary ecocriticism has a shared premise about environmental risk it is that genre is the key to both perceiving and, possibly, correcting ecological crisis. Frederick Buell’s 2003 From Apocalypse to Way of Life: Environmental Crisis in the American Century has established one of the most central oppositions of this paradigm. As his title suggests, Buell tells the story of a discourse that began in the apocalyptic mode in the 1960s and 70s, when discussions of “the immanent end of nature” most commonly took the form of “prophecy, revelation, climax, and extermination” before turning away from apocalypse when the prophesied ends failed to arrive (112, 78). Buell offers his suggestion for the appropriate literary mode for life lived within a crisis that is both unceasing and inescapable: new voices, “if wise enough….will abandon apocalypse for a sadder realism that looks closely at social and environmental changes in process and recognizes crisis as a place where people dwell” (202-3). In a world of threat, Buell demands a realism that might help us see risks more clearly and aid our survival.¶ Buell’s argument has become a broadly held view in contemporary risk theory and ecocriticism, overlapping fields in the social sciences and humanities that address the foundational question of second modernity: “how do you live when you are at such risk?” (Woodward 2009, 205).1 Such an assertion, however, assumes both that realism is a neutral descriptive practice and that apocalypse is not something that is happening now in places that we might not see, or cannot hear. This essay argues for the continuing importance of apocalyptic narrative forms in representations of environmental risk to disrupt conservative realisms that maintain the status quo. Taking the ecological disaster of nuclear waste as my case study, I examine two fictional treatments of nuclear waste dumps that create different temporal structures within which the colonial history of the United States plays out. The first, a set of Department of Energy documents that use statistical modeling and fictional description to predict a set of realistic futures for the site of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico (1991), creates a present that is fully knowable and a future that is fully predictable. Such an approach, I suggest, perpetuates the state logics of implausibility that have long undergirded settler colonialism in the United States. In contrast, Leslie Marmon Silko’s contemporaneous novel Almanac of the Dead (1991) uses its apocalyptic form to deconstruct the claims to verisimilitude that undergird state realism, transforming nuclear waste into a prophecy of the end of the United States rather than a means for imagining its continuation. In Almanac of the Dead, the presence of nuclear waste introjects a deep-time perspective into contemporary America, transforming the present into a speculative space where environmental catastrophe produces not only unevenly distributed damage but also revolutionary forms of social justice that insist on a truth that probability modeling cannot contain: that the future will be unimaginably different from the present, while the present, too, might yet be utterly different from the real that we think we know.¶ Nuclear waste is rarely treated in ecocriticism or risk theory, for several reasons: it is too manmade to be ecological; its catastrophes are ongoing, intentionally produced situations rather than sudden disasters; and it does not support the narrative that subtends ecocritical accounts of risk perception in which the nuclear threat gives rise to an awareness of other kinds of threat before reaching the end of its relevance at the end of the Cold War.2 In what follows, I argue that the failure of nuclear waste to fit into the critical frames created by ecocriticism and risk theory to date offers an opportunity to expand those frames and overcome some of their limitations, especially the impulse towards a paranoid, totalizing realism that Peter van Wyck (2005) has described as central to ecocriticism in the risk society. Nuclear waste has durational forms that dwarf the human. It therefore dwells less in the economy of risk as it is currently conceptualized and more in the blown-out realm of deep time. Inhabiting the temporal scale that has recently been christened the Anthropocene, the geological era defined by the impact of human activities on the world’s geology and climate, nuclear waste unsettles any attempt at realist description, unveiling the limits of human imagination at every turn.3 By analyzing risk society through a heuristic of nuclear waste, this essay offers a critique of nuclear colonialism and environmental racism. At the same time, it shows how the apocalyptic mode in deep time allows narratives of environmental harm and danger to move beyond the paranoid logic of risk. In the world of deep time, all that might come to pass will come to pass, sooner or later. The endless maybes of risk become certainties. The impossibilities of our own deaths and the deaths of everything else will come. But so too will other impossibilities: talking macaws and alien visitors, the end of the colonial occupation of North America, or a sudden human determination to let the world live. The end of capitalism may yet become more thinkable than the end of the world. Just wait long enough. Stranger things will happen.