### T

#### Our interpretation is that a Just Government is confined to legal boundaries

Merriam Webster [Merriam Webster, No Date. “Just” [https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/just Accessed 10/24](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/just%20Accessed%2010/24) //gord0]

Definitions of Just 1a **:** having a basis in or conforming to fact or reason **:** [reasonable](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reasonable) had just reason to believe he was in danger b **:** conforming to a standard of correctness **:** [proper](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/proper) just proportions c archaic **:** faithful to an original 2a (1) **:** acting or being in conformity with what is morally upright or good **:** [righteous](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/righteous) a just war (2) **:** being what is merited **:** [deserved](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/deserved) a just punishment b **:** legally correct **:** [lawful](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/lawful) just title to an estate

#### The US violates – they are extra topical.

Patterson 16 [Margot Patterson is a writer who lives in Kansas City, Mo. October 12, 2016. “How the U.S. violates international law in plain sight” [https://www.americamagazine.org/politics-society/2016/10/12/how-us-violates-international-law-plain-sight Accessed 10/24](https://www.americamagazine.org/politics-society/2016/10/12/how-us-violates-international-law-plain-sight%20Accessed%2010/24) //gord0]

Americans used to be big supporters of international law. It was President Woodrow Wilson who proposed the League of Nations after World War I. Politics kept the United States from joining, but after World War II the United States played a leading role in creating the United Nations as well as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and a host of other international organizations. Because of  new international trade and investment agreements, intellectual property accords and treaties on the environment, international law has grown; yet when it comes to waging war, a cornerstone principle, more and more the United States acts as if international law applies to other countries but not to itself.

The law of war prohibits force unless force has been approved by the U.N. Security Council or unless a country has been attacked and is acting in self-defense. Even under those conditions, force is regarded as a last resort, permissible only if it is likely to be successful.

Diminishing respect for international law can be linked to the rise of the United States as a military power after World War II, to the domination of U.S. foreign policy by realists who emphasize U.S. military might and our willingness to use it, and even to the civil rights and feminist movements of the 1960s. As interest in the Constitution was renewed, Americans turned inward and perceived the struggle for justice almost exclusively through their own legal system.

According to Mary Ellen O’Connell, a professor of international law at the University of Notre Dame, there has been a decline in the knowledge of international law at every level of our society, from our highest government officials to the person on the street. Along with that some key misconceptions have taken hold—among them that international law is ineffective and unenforceable. Such views are “factually incorrect,” said O’Connell, author of the book *The Power and Purpose of International. Law.*

#### Vote neg – their interpretation crushes negative ground premised on stable generics which don’t exist when you switch governments – the inflation DA is a good generic but can’t apply to all affirmatives since each nation’s economy is distinct.

#### No RVI’s – they incentivize abusive affs to bait T

#### Competing interpretations – Reasonability is arbitrary and leads to a race to the bottom

### PIC

#### The United States ought to:

#### Recognize a right of workers to strike, except for workers who are essential to a country’s food supply

#### Provide those workers with a unconditional right to impartial conciliation followed by arbitration procedures

#### **Workers right to strike can be conditional in the context of food supply---exceptions are limited to avoid abuses, AND enable alternatives that channel worker demands**

Brudney 21, James J., Joseph Crowley Chair in Labor and Employment Law, Fordham Law School. Yale Journal of International Law, 2021. “The Right to Strike as Customary International Law” <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1710&context=yjil> brett

The international right to strike is far from absolute. It may be restricted in exceptional circumstances, or even prohibited, pursuant to national regulation. For a start, Convention 87 provides that members of the armed forces and the police may be excluded from the scope of the Convention in general, including the right to strike.57 In addition, applications by the CFA and CEACR have concluded that three distinct forms of substantive restriction on the right to strike are compatible with Convention 87.

1. Substantive Limitations

One important restriction applies to certain categories of public servants. The CEACR and CFA have made clear that public employees generally enjoy the same right to strike as their counterparts in the private sector; at the same time, in order to ensure continuity of functions in the three branches of government, this right may be restricted for public servants exercising authority in the name of the State.58 Examples include officials performing tasks that involve the administration of necessary executive branch functions or that relate to the administration of justice.

Each country hasits own approach to classifying public servants exercising authority in the name of the State. When considering the international right under Convention 87, some public servant exceptions seem clearly applicable, such as officials auditing or collecting internal revenues, customs officers, or judges and their close judicial assistants. 59 Some public servant exceptions seem inapplicable, such as teachers, or public servants in State-owned commercial enterprises.60 Whether public servants are exercising authority in the name of the State can be a close question under particular national law, one on which the CEACR and CFA have offered encouragement and guidance,61 as has the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR).62

A second equally important restriction on the right to strike involves essential services in the strict sense of the term. This is an area in which both the CEACR and CFA have developed a detailed set of applications and guidelines. 63 The two committees consider that essential services, for the purposes of restricting or prohibiting the right to strike, are only those “the interruption of which would endanger the life, personal safety or health of the whole or part of the population.”64

This definition of essential services “in the strict sense of the term” stems from the idea that “essential services” as a limitation on the right to strike would lose its meaning if statutes or judicial decisions defined those services in too broad a manner. 65 The interruption of services that cause or have the potential to cause economic hardships—even serious economic hardships—is not ordinarily sufficient to qualify the interrupted service as essential. Indeed, the very purpose of a strike is to interrupt services or production and thereby cause a degree of economic hardship. That is the leverage workers can exercise; it is what allows a strike to be effective in bringing the parties to the table and securing a negotiated settlement.

The two ILO supervisory committees also have made clear that the essential services concept is not static in nature. Thus, a non-essential service may become essential if the strike exceeds a certain duration or extent, or as a function of the special characteristics of a country. 66 One example is that of an island State where at some point ferry transportation services become essential to bring food and medical supplies to the population.67

When examining concrete cases, the supervisory bodies have considered a range of services, both public and private, too broad to summarize here. As illustrative, the two bodies have determined that essential services in the strict sense of the term include air traffic control services, 68 telephone services, 69 prison services, firefighting services, and water and electricity services. 70 The CEACR and CFA also have identified a range of services that presumptively are deemed not to be essential in the strict sense of the term.71

In addition, in circumstances where a total prohibition on the right to strike is not appropriate, the magnitude of impact on the basic needs of consumers or the general public, or the need for safe operation of facilities, may justify introduction of a negotiated minimum service.72 Such a service, however, must truly be a minimum service, that is one limited to meeting the basic needs of the population or the minimum requirements of the service, while maintaining the effectiveness of the pressure brought to bear through the strike by a majority of workers.73

The third substantive restriction on the right to strike under Convention 87 relates to situations of acute national or local crisis, although only for a limited period and only to the extent necessary to meet the requirements of the situation.74

With respect to all three forms of substantive restriction, the CFA and CEACR have indicated that certain alternative options should be guaranteed for workers who are deprived of the right to strike. These options include impartial conciliation followed by arbitration procedures in which any awards are binding on both parties and are to be implemented in full and rapid terms.75

#### PIC solves – exceptions are allowed under CIL

1AC Brudney 21 [James; 2/8/21; Joseph Crowley Chair in Labor and Employment Law, Fordham Law School; “The Right to Strike as Customary International Law,” THE YALE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, Vol 46, <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1710&context=yjil>] Justin \*\* Brackets in original

II. THE INTERNATIONAL RIGHT TO STRIKE AS CIL That an international right to strike is widely recognized by governments does not mean the right has assumed the status of CIL. This Part seeks to forge that link, to show how the international right to strike qualifies as CIL. It begins (II.A) by identifying the two basic elements of CIL and explaining why the right to strike is an integral textual and conceptual component of FOA. It then establishes (II.B and C) that FOA and the right to strike satisfy both elements of CIL—a general practice accepted by States, stemming from a sense of legal obligation. While there are variations and qualifiers at the national level, the contours of CIL status are clear: a basic right subject to three substantive restrictions; a recognition that strikers retain their employment relationship during the strike itself; and certain procedural prerequisites or limitations. 105 This Part next demonstrates (II.D) that the two U.S. practices discussed earlier as deviating from the international right to strike—denying all public employees the right and authorizing permanent replacement of lawful strikers— contravene core aspects of the right to strike as CIL. Finally (II.E), this Part introduces the complexities of the U.S. position on FOA and the right to strike as international rights, reflected in the failure to ratify Convention 87 while both Congress and the executive branch embrace Convention 87 principles including the right to strike. A. Initial Definitions and Considerations 1. CIL Standards The two basic elements that determine the existence and content of a rule of CIL are first, the requirement of a general practice by States, and second, the requirement that the general practice be undertaken from a sense of legal right or obligation (opinio juris).106 The first element is objective: whether there is a sufficiently widespread and consistent practice of States endorsing and adhering to the rule. Evidence of such a general practice may include governmental conduct in connection with treaties; legislative or administrative acts; decisions of national courts; conduct in relation to resolutions adopted by an international organization; diplomatic acts and correspondence; and executive operational conduct on the ground.107 The second element, opinio juris, is more subjective: the general practice must be undertaken based on its acceptance as law, rather than being accepted based on mere usage or habit or some pragmatic motive. As is true for general practice, evidence of acceptance as law may come in a range of forms. These include public statements made on behalf of States; government legal opinions; decisions of national courts; treaty provisions; diplomatic correspondence; and conduct related to resolutions adopted by an international organization.108 2. The Right to Strike as Integral to FOA Freedom of association is one of the core principles on which the ILO was founded and continues to exist. 109 As set forth under Convention 87, FOA includes a series of integral elements, of which the right to strike is one. The two ILO supervisory mechanisms that have regularly applied or interpreted Convention 87 have understood it to include the right to strike from the early days of the Convention’s existence.110 Leading U.N. human rights covenants also recognize FOA as a basic right, including the right to strike as a component. 111 And the labor provisions of the 2019 U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement include the following statement: “For greater certainty, the right to strike is linked to the right to freedom of association, which cannot be realized without protecting the right to strike.”112 Accordingly, if FOA is seen as Customary International Law (CIL), and the right to strike is an essential component of FOA, then the right to strike should also be understood to be part of CIL. Consider in this regard the following integral elements of Convention 87. The fact that as part of FOA, workers and employers “shall have the right to establish and . . . to join organizations of their own choosing without previous authorization”113 means the State may not impose unreasonably high membership requirements that hinder the establishment of organizations, or require that members may not join several different organizations. 114 Similarly, the fact that under FOA, workers and employers “shall have the right to . . . elect their representatives in full freedom [and that] public authorities shall refrain from any interference which would restrict this right or impede the lawful exercise thereof,”115 means the State may not impose limits on candidates due to their nationality, literacy, political opinions, moral standing, or for workers, their non-employment in the employer’s occupation or enterprise. 116 And the fact that as part of FOA, workers “shall have the right . . . to organize their. . . activities and to formulate their programs” free “from any interference [by the public authorities]”117 means that worker organizations, in order to defend the occupational interests of their members, have the right to hold trade union meetings, the right to have access to places of work and to communicate with management, and the right to organize nonviolent protest action including strikes. 118 B. FOA and the Right to Strike as General Practice There is ample support that FOA is widely accepted in objective terms. Convention 87 has been ratified by 155 countries, or 83 percent of the 187 ILO Member States. 119 In addition, the ILO Constitution, endorsed by all members, specifies the critical role of FOA both in its 1919 founding document and the 1944 Declaration of Philadelphia as a constitutional addition.120 More recently, ILO Declarations issued in 1998 and 2008, again embraced by all members, make clear that even Member States that have not ratified Convention 87 are obligated to act in good faith to respect and effectuate FOA principles.121 Beyond the ILO realm, workers’ freedom of association, including the right to form and join trade unions and expressly the right to strike, is recognized in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly to be effective 1976.122 The Covenant has been ratified by 171 countries, including two of the four large-population countries that have not ratified Convention 87.123 Another major UN Human Rightstreaty, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), also adopted by the U.N. General Assembly to be effective in 1976, recognizes FOA including the right to form and join trade unions. 124 The ICCPR has been ratified by 173 countries, including three of the four largepopulation countries that have not ratified Convention 87; its human rights committee has consistently recognized the right to strike as part of FOA under the Covenant. 125 Indeed, of the 187 ILO Member States, only 11 relatively smallpopulation countries have not ratified at least one of Convention 87, the ICESCR, or the ICCPR.126 FOA is also expressly recognized in a labor setting in the European Convention on Human Rights, which has been ratified by all 48 countries in the Council of Europe. 127 At a national level, the vast majority of constitutions provide for freedom of association, although some use general language that (unlike the international instruments just mentioned) does not specify workers or trade unions. 128 Apart from States’ nearly-universal embrace of FOA as a general matter, the right to strike itself has been broadly accepted by governments. As noted earlier, more than 90 countries have made a public commitment to the right to strike in their constitutions. 129 These commitments have translated to actual practice when national courts have relied on guidance from the CEACR and CFA in assuring compliance with their constitutional right to strike. Judicial interpretation of the international right as part of applying a domestic constitution often involves assuring compliance by governments or employers,130 though it also may require compliance by unions. 131 And compliance with the international right to strike may even emanate from application of a national constitution that endorses FOA without being explicit about the right to strike.132 Among the many national courts that have invoked the CEACR and/or CFA in support of a right to strike,133 two other cases worth noting involve Brazil and Kenya because neither country has ratified Convention 87. In 2012, the Labour Court in Brazil ordered reinstatement of workers terminated for participating in a work stoppage. 134 Under Brazil’s Constitution, “norms that define fundamental rights and guarantees are directly applicable.”135 Given that the Court found that the employer’s conduct had violated the principle of freedom of association and the free exercise of the right to strike, it seems that the “principle of freedom of association” was being directly applied as a matter of customary international law rather than through a ratified treaty or convention.136 In 2013, the Industrial Court of Kenya ordered the reinstatement of five workers dismissed for participating in a strike and strike-related activities. The Court’s reasoning derived from Kenya’s general participation in the ILO, including “respect for International Labour Standards,” rather than direct application of fundamental norms as in the Brazil case.137 The Industrial Court invoked a report by the CEACR and decisions by the CFA to support its decision; its recognition of FOA as an accepted international standard suggests that reports from the ILO supervisory bodies served as evidence of CIL.138 Finally, states’ widespread practice is reflected in the negotiation of trade agreements over the past two decades that recognize both FOA and the right to strike. Since 2003, labor provisions in U.S. trade agreements have regularly featured linkages to FOA as one of the fundamental ILO norms. 139 The commitment by signatory states to FOA as understood under the 1998 ILO Declaration has been progressively strengthened during this period—from providing that parties “shall strive to ensure” protection of FOA under domestic laws140 to specifying that parties shall “adopt and maintain [FOA rights] in [their] statutes and regulations, and practices thereunder.”141 The latest trade agreement, involving the United States, Mexico, and Canada (approved as a successor to NAFTA) expressly provides that the right to FOA necessarily includes protection for the right to strike.142 Trade agreements involving EU countries also feature commitments to respect and implement under domestic law the principles of FOA as understood in the ILO context. 143 This wide network of similarly worded, mostly bilateral trade agreements addressing the subject of FOA constitutes additional evidence of general practice for CIL purposes. 144 The pervasive nature of actual practice regarding FOA and the right to strike does not mean that the right’s content is static or fixed. To be sure, there is broad acceptance of the two previously discussed features on which U.S. law is out of step: the prohibition on permanent replacements145 and public employees’ right to strike with certain exceptions. 146 And although particular limits on the right may vary from one country to another, there is an international consensus that the right exists and that any limits should be reasonable.147 The International Court of Justice (ICJ) does not require uniformity in practice in order to establish CIL, and indeed, it has countenanced some degree of variation: The Court does not consider that, for a rule to be established as customary, the corresponding practice must be in absolutely rigorous conformity with the rule. In order to deduce the existence of customary rules, the Court deems it sufficient that the conduct of States should, in general be consistent with such rules.148 C. FOA and the Right to Strike as Opinio Juris There is also considerable support for the proposition that the general practice of states on FOA and the right to strike stems from acceptance as a matter of legal obligation. Admittedly, while the existence of opinio juris may be inferred from a general practice, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) has at times noted the insufficiency or inconclusiveness of such practice, instead seeking confirmation that “[states’] conduct is ‘evidence of a belief that this practice is rendered obligatory by the existence of a rule of law requiring it.’”149 Trade agreements, for instance, may represent treaty law and may qualify as evidence of general practice, but they are typically entered into by States that have specific economic or political objectives rather than from a desire to embrace obligations arising under international law.150 Further, it is possible that even with respect to ILO conventions, widespread ratification is in part a function of acculturation, insofar as endorsements across a region contribute to socialized acceptance of norms on FOA, reassuring peer countries that protecting rights to association including the right to strike will not place them in an inferior competitive position.151 That said, the ICJ often does infer the existence of opinio juris from a general practice and/or from determinations by national or international tribunals.152 And there are ample reasons to draw such an inference here. To start, FOA is consciously accepted as an obligation by ILO member states not simply through ratification of Convention 87 (covering more than 80 percent of them) but by virtue of membership itself. The ILO Constitution expressly requires support for FOA principles, and these principles are further imbedded through a tripartite governance structure that allocates power-sharing roles to worker organizations alongside governments and employers.153 Thus, ILO members understand there is an underlying obligation to respect FOA in law and practice.154 A second reason is that domestic law can provide relevant evidence regarding the presence of opinio juris among states. Commitments to FOA expressed in national constitutions, statutes, and court decisions are not necessarily evidence of a state’s belief that the principle is international as opposed to domestic law. Nonetheless, the International Law Commission has made clear that evidence of acceptance as law (opinio juris) “may take a wide range of forms,” including but not limited to “official publications; government legal opinions; [and] decisions of national courts.”155 In this regard, the CEACR in 2012 identified 92 countries where “the right to strike is explicitly recognized, including at the constitutional level”; the list includes six countries that have not ratified Convention 87.156 Recognition in domestic law of a right to strike alongside a conscious decision not to ratify Convention 87 could give rise to an inference that these six countries are rejecting the right as a principle of international law. However, as explained earlier, national courts for two of the six non-ratifying countries (Brazil and Kenya) expressly invoke ILO membership and/or principles as guidance in their domestic law decisions. 157 In addition, Canada—a country not listed among the 92 endorsing the right to strike in the 2012 General Survey— has since recognized a constitutional right to strike under national law, relying in part on international law principles including CEACR and CFA determinations. 158 The Canadian Supreme Court had previously been explicit in invoking Convention 87, ICESCR, and ICCPR as “documents [that] reflect not only international consensus but also principles that Canada has committed itself to uphold.”159 Further, a third country in the group of six—South Korea—has affirmed in its trade agreements with the United States and the EU its obligation to “adopt and maintain in its statutes and regulations, and practices” FOA in accordance with the ILO Declaration.160 And in various CFA complaints against South Korea for violating FOA principles, including the right to strike, the Government has disputed the facts of the complaints while at the same time recognizing that such rights are embedded in international law.161 Accordingly, a more relevant reference point in this setting may be that “when States act in conformity with a treaty provision by which they are not bound . . . this may evidence the existence of acceptance as law (opinio juris) in the absence of any explanation to the contrary.”162 Stepping back, domestic law on FOA and the right to strike, which for many countries developed after Convention 87 and its initial applications by the CEACR and CFA, may be viewed in part as a window into countries’ sense of obligation in law and practice. A state may at times adopt labor provisions of a trade agreement for reasons of comity or relative competitive advantage. These reasons may play a more modest role with respect to adoption of certain human rights treaties or ILO conventions. 163 But evidence of practice and obligation in the domestic law sphere—especially when informed by regard for international instruments—seems almost by definition to be a function of acceptance as law rather than susceptibility to strategic motivations. In this regard, there are numerous instances in recent years where governments have expanded their legislative protections for the right to strike following a period of dialogue with the CEACR, and that committee has recognized and applauded the changes in law.164 Of particular relevance to the U.S. setting, these expansions have included assuring the right to strike for public sector employees and prohibiting the hiring of replacements for strikers.165 A third reason to infer opinio juris (in addition to the centrality of FOA principles within the ILO Constitution and the strong evidence of FOA and rightto-strike practice and obligation under domestic law) involves recent statements from high officials in the United Nations indicating that the right to strike is understood by its leaders as CIL. In his 2016 report to the U.N. General Assembly, the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and association explained, “The right to strike has been established in international law for decades, in global and regional instruments, and is also enshrined in the constitutions of at least 90 countries. The right to strike has, in fact, become customary international law.”166 In 2018, responding to a press briefing on a strike by U.N. employees following announced pay cuts, the Deputy Spokesman for the U.N. SecretaryGeneral reiterated the U.N. view that the right to strike is indeed CIL and did so in the context of the right being asserted by public employees not involved in the administration of the state: Question: Does the Secretary-General believe that U.N. staff have a right to take part in industrial action? Deputy Spokesman: We believe the right to strike is part of customary international law.167 These statements did not simply materialize in recent times. Two major U.N. Human Rights treaties—the ICESCR and the ICCPR—have been interpreted by their relevant treaty bodies to include a right to strike; these bodies have reaffirmed their joint commitment to the right to strike as part of FOA, and they regularly monitor governments’ record of compliance with this right. 168 And as noted earlier, the two treaties—each ratified by over 80 percent of U.N members—include a clause explicitly identifying respect for ILO Convention 87. In sum, the principles of FOA including the right to strike would appear to satisfy both prongs of the CIL test. The widely recognized general practice on strikes has sufficient shape and contours: a basic right, three substantive exceptions (public servants involved in administration of the state, essential services in the strict sense of the term, and acute national emergencies), a recognition that strikers retain their employment relationship during the strike itself, and certain procedural prerequisites or attached conditions. 169 There are variations in national practice and also disagreements at the margins about what the right to strike protects, but these aspects are not different in kind from diversity and contests regarding international rights prohibiting child labor, or for that matter domestic constitutional rights involving freedom of expression or the right to bear arms. As for opinio juris, a broad range of sources combine to establish that the general practice stems from a sense of acceptance and obligation: ILO foundation and structure; two widely endorsed United Nations human rights treaties; national constitutions; government representations; domestic legislative and judicial decisions that expressly refer to or impliedly accept international standards and practices; and contemporary U.N. leadership.

#### **Strikes cause food insecurity---empirics**

Lopes et al 19, Mariana Souza Lopes--Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Research Group on Nutrition Interventions, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil. Melissa Luciana de Araújo--Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Research Group on Urban Agriculture, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil. Aline Cristine Souza Lopes--Nutrition Department, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Research Group on Nutrition Interventions. PHN, (2019) <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/public-health-nutrition/article/national-general-truck-drivers-strike-and-food-security-in-a-brazilian-metropolis/90C14AC48923A17597DED720365E810B> brett

Food security exists when people have, at all times, a guaranteed and adequate food supply. Food security involves access to sufficient, safe and nutritious food that meets individual dietary requirements and food preferences for a healthy life without restricting access to other fundamental needs( 1 ) and sovereignty( 2 ). Therefore, the risk of food insecurity is influenced by the availability, price, access and quality of the food supply to the consumer, especially in a crisis situation( 3 ). Studies that have explored the global food crisis and market instability indicate that there is an independent association between crisis situations and food security( 4 , 5 ). For example, a recent Brazilian study showed that there was a marked increase in the prevalence of food insecurity during the Brazilian economic crisis( 4 ).

In Brazil, the Centrais de Abastecimento de Minas Gerais S.A. (CEASA-MINAS) distributes produce. The aims of the CEASA-MINAS are to: (i) improve the process of marketing and distribution of products; and (ii) connect producers and consumers in urban centres. The CEASA-MINAS is supported by mixed-capital (public and private) resources and operates under governmental supervision. Consequently, the CEASA-MINAS plays an important role in guaranteeing food security and the human right to food( 6 ).

The state of Minas Gerais is the third-largest economy in Brazil and has one of the best transport networks in the country. The CEASA-MINAS has six units in this state and its headquarters is in the city of Contagem, in the metropolitan region of Belo Horizonte. The headquarters is the principal unit and is named CEASA-Minas Grande BH( 7 ). In 2018, the CEASA-Minas Grande BH traded about 2000 tonnes of food, which corresponded to 80 % of the total market in the state( 8 ). Therefore, this business unit is the subject of the present study.

The supply of unprocessed or minimally processed foods\* in the CEASA-MINAS is self-supplied by the state of Minas Gerais. In spite of this, food is transported via long routes in the state due to its large territory (586 528 km2). The distribution network is more complex for fruit. The supply of fruit at the CEASA-Minas Grande BH has multiple origins and the fruits are carried by trucks over long distances. Some leafy vegetables are produced near the food supply centre( 10 ). In general, the food supply of the CEASA-Minas Grande BH covers a radius of 200 km, but there are items that originate from distances of up to 2000 km away( 11 ). The 1081 municipality suppliers of the CEASA-Minas Grande BH move, on average, 25 700 trucks per month via Brazilian roadways( 8 ).

Consequently, a national general truck drivers’ strike may have important consequences for the economy and food supply chain of a country that is dependent on road networks. Such an event occurred on 21–30 May 2018. During this 10 d strike, Brazilians experienced an extreme event characterized by roadblocks and the unavailability of fuel, medicine, food, and the inputs for food production processes. The disruption of the supply of animal feed had a devastating impact: millions of chickens and pigs were slaughtered because producers had no food for them( 12 ). The drivers were on strike in order to make diesel oil tax-free and to obtain better working conditions( 13 ).

Despite the drivers’ important claims, in a crisis situation, 200 km can be as long as 2000 km and the repercussions may result in negative impacts for food security. Given the importance of transport conditions for the food security of the Brazilian population, the present paper aimed to analyse the impact of the national general truck drivers’ strike on the availability, variety and price of unprocessed foods sold by a food supply centre in a Brazilian metropolis.

#### Food insecurity goes nuclear

Hartley et al 12 (Major General John Hartley AO (Retd), CEO and Institute, Director Future Directions International, Roundtable Chairman. Alyson Clarke, FDI Executive Officer Gary Kleyn, Manager, FDI Global Food and Water Crises Research Programme, “International Conflict Triggers and Potential Conflict Points Resulting from Food and Water Insecurity” 25 May 2012 http://futuredirections.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/Workshop\_Report\_-\_Intl\_Conflict\_Triggers\_-\_May\_25.pdf) brett

There is little dispute that conflict can lead to food and water crises. This paper will consider parts of the world, however, where food and water insecurity can be the cause of conflict and, at worst, result in war. While dealing predominately with food and water issues, the paper also recognises the nexus that exists between food and water and energy security. There is a growing appreciation that the conflicts in the next century will most likely be fought over a lack of resources. Yet, in a sense, this is not new. Researchers point to the French and Russian revolutions as conflicts induced by a lack of food. More recently, Germany’s World War Two efforts are said to have been inspired, at least in part, by its perceived need to gain access to more food. Yet the general sense among those that attended FDI’s recent workshops, was that the scale of the problem in the future could be significantly greater as a result of population pressures, changing weather, urbanisation, migration, loss of arable land and other farm inputs, and increased affluence in the developing world. In his book, Small Farmers Secure Food, Lindsay Falvey, a participant in FDI’s March 2012 workshop on the issue of food and conflict, clearly expresses the problem and why countries across the globe are starting to take note. He writes (p.36), “…if people are hungry, especially in cities, the state is not stable – riots, violence, breakdown of law and order and migration result.” “Hunger feeds anarchy.” This view is also shared by Julian Cribb, who in his book, The Coming Famine, writes that if “large regions of the world run short of food, land or water in the decades that lie ahead, then wholesale, bloody wars are liable to follow.” He continues: “An increasingly credible scenario for World War 3 is not so much a confrontation of super powers and their allies, as a festering, self-perpetuating chain of resource conflicts.” He also says: “The wars of the 21st Century are less likely to be global conflicts with sharply defined sides and huge armies, than a scrappy mass of failed states, rebellions, civil strife, insurgencies, terrorism and genocides, sparked by bloody competition over dwindling resources.” As another workshop participant put it, people do not go to war to kill; they go to war over resources, either to protect or to gain the resources for themselves. Another observed that hunger results in passivity not conflict. Conflict is over resources, not because people are going hungry. A study by the International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict. Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkans experienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon. The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA, the US Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Oslo Peace Research Institute, all identify famine as a potential trigger for conflicts and possibly even nuclear war.

### CP

#### The United States should

#### Recognize a right of workers to strike, except for healthcare workers

#### ban healthcare worker strikes.

#### COVID-19 has increased healthcare worker strikes risking health care effectiveness

Ryan Essex, Ph.D., and Sharon M. Weldon, Ph.D. 6/17/21, “Health Care Worker Strikes and the Covid Pandemic,” NEJM, www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMp2103327//lhs-ap

While the heroics of health care workers have been celebrated and we’ve gained a renewed appreciation of the risks that many frontline workers face while providing fundamental services, less attention has been paid to those who have refused to work under such dangerous conditions and those who have pointed out that no health care workers needed to be placed at such high risk. Many have rightly argued that heroics were required only because of government neglect, underfunding, and lack of preparation for a pandemic that we knew was coming. Many workers are justifiably angry. Although there are no official figures, Covid-19 appears to have led to a substantial uptick in strike actions by health care workers.

In February 2020, facing an unknown “pneumonia,” experts in Hong Kong called for closing the borders in an effort to mitigate its spread until more could be ascertained about the nature of the virus (which would be labeled Covid-19 on February 11 and deemed a pandemic roughly a month later). The Hong Kong government failed to act, despite calls from experts and health care workers, with support from the general public. In late January, labor unions repeatedly called for dialogue with the government regarding border closure. When that effort failed, a vote was held on strike action, for which there was overwhelming support. From February 3 through 7, 2020, health care workers in Hong Kong went on strike, making a number of demands, including the closure of borders and a sufficient supply of PPE and facilities to manage the potential spread of the virus.

Such action has not been restricted to Hong Kong. Amid multiplying cases of Covid-19, health care workers in Zimbabwe went on strike in June 2020 because of a lack of PPE and low salaries. Indeed, strike action by health care workers has been a global phenomenon. In the United States, nurses have gone on strike, and in the United Kingdom pharmacists and nurses have threatened strike action. Doctors in South Korea launched a nationwide strike in August, and health care workers in Kenya, Spain, Bosnia, and Peru have all gone on strike at some point during the pandemic.

Health care workers even went on strike after the military coup in Myanmar in February 2021, with a spokesperson noting that they “simply [did] not want to work for the regime that staged the military coup.”1 Such action must be understood in the context of broader unrest. In Venezuela, for example, many health care workers have had no option to stop working during the pandemic. In what has been described as a crisis within a crisis, Covid-19 has exacerbated many of the problems of Venezuela’s ailing health care system. Though there has been unrest, the Venezuelan government has attempted to silence critics, deny PPE shortages, and blame health care workers. The government also denies that an estimated 200 health care workers have died, contending that there have been only 12 deaths attributable to Covid-19.2

Though these situations are distinct in multiple ways and health care workers have gone on strike (or protested) for myriad reasons, common demands underlying nearly all these actions relate to inadequate responses to Covid-19 and inadequate protections for frontline workers; every group taking action has explicitly demanded more PPE.

Experts in law, ethics, and medicine have long debated whether and when strike action by health care personnel can be justified. Although these debates have centered on the risks that strikes carry for patients, these actions also pose risks for health care workers — they may damage morale and team cohesion, for example, and in many countries strikes have been repressed violently. Other risks relate to public perceptions and to potentially broader harms for both society and the health care community as a whole.3 Perhaps most fundamentally, however, strikes raise questions about what health care workers owe society and what society owes them.

#### Strikes negatively affect healthcare. Gruber & Kleiner 10

Do Strikes Kill? Evidence from New York State Jonathan Gruber and Samuel A. Kleiner NBER Working Paper No. 15855 March 2010 JEL No. I12,I23,J52,J62 <https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w15855/w15855.pdf>

We have gathered data on every hospital strike over the 1984 to 2004 period in New York State. We carefully match each striking hospital over this period with a set of control hospitals in their area, and examine the evolution of outcomes before, during, and after the strike in the striking versus control hospitals. Our results are striking: there is a meaningful increase in both hospital mortality and hospital readmission among patients admitted during a hospital strike. Our central estimates suggest that the rate of hospital mortality is 19.4% higher, and rates of hospital readmission are 6.5% higher, among those admitted during a strike than among patients in nearby hospitals at the same time. We show that this deterioration in outcomes occurs only for those patients admitted during the strike, and not for those admitted before or after to the same hospitals. And we find that these changes are not associated with any meaningful change in the composition of patients admitted during the strike or the treatment intensity for patients admitted during these strikes. We also find evidence of a more severe impact of these strikes on patients whose conditions require more intensive nursing inputs, and that outcomes are no better for patients admitted to striking hospitals who employ replacement workers. Overall, our findings suggest that strikes lead to lower quality of medical care in hospitals.

#### Lack of Health Care Leads to Disease

**Stoto et. al ’90** (Michael A., PhD + Professor of Health Systems Administration and Population Health at Georgetown University, “Healthy People 2000: Citizens Chart the Course,” https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK235764/

Many, if not all, of the priorities of positive health activity on the national agenda can be substantially influenced by access to professional health care. To cite just a few examples, the detection of and intervention against hypertension and cancer, immunization against preventable infectious diseases, control of obesity, or the preventive management of depression require the services of physicians or other skilled health personnel. Yet some 35 to 40 million Americans do not have economic access to doctors through voluntary health insurance, Medicare, or Medicaid. A larger number lack economic and physical access to primary health care, although they may have insurance for hospitalization.

#### Extinction – defense is wrong

Piers Millett 17, Consultant for the World Health Organization, PhD in International Relations and Affairs, University of Bradford, Andrew Snyder-Beattie, “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity”, Health Security, Vol 15(4), http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/hs.2017.0028

Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3 while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world’s population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization.

A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to remote populations, overcome rare genetic resistances, and evade detection, cures, and countermeasures. Even evolution itself may work in humanity’s favor: Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off, and so evolutionary pressures could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6

While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they do not rule the possibility out entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of species going extinct due to disease—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include native American tribes exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and theWestern Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population).

In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But many diseases are proof of principle that each worst-case attribute can be realized independently. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, natural evolution would be an unlikely source for pathogens with the highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach. But advances in biotechnology might allow the creation of diseases that combine such traits. Recent controversy has already emerged over a number of scientific experiments that resulted in viruses with enhanced transmissibility, lethality, and/or the ability to overcome therapeutics.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-2

### DA

#### Strikes increase prices, deck productivity, no econ recovery – unique to covid inflation

Jesse Newman, 10-17, 2021. Jesse Newman is a reporter covering food and agriculture from The Wall Street Journal's corporate bureau in Chicago. “Unions Push Companies as Workers Stay Scarce” *WSJ*, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/from-film-sets-to-manufacturing-plants-unions-push-companies-as-workers-stay-scarce-11634488473> \\loyola\\

Union leaders are pressing to increase their ranks and secure gains for their members as workers demand more from their employers and companies struggle with labor shortages and snarled supply chains.

A [walkout by production workers](https://www.wsj.com/articles/john-deere-workers-go-on-strike-after-voting-down-tentative-deal-11634220536?mod=article_inline) for farm and construction machinery company [Deere](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/DE) [DE -0.28%](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/DE?mod=chiclets)& Co. that began Thursday followed [recent stoppages](https://www.wsj.com/articles/grocers-prepare-for-possible-snack-shortages-as-mondelez-workers-strike-11630586597?mod=article_inline) at snack producer [Mondelez International](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/MDLZ) Inc., [commercial truck](https://www.wsj.com/articles/volvo-trucks-aims-to-reopen-factory-after-third-contract-rejection-11626112152?mod=article_inline) maker Volvo and breakfast-cereal giant [Kellogg](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/K) Co. [Labor leaders elsewhere](https://www.wsj.com/articles/starbucks-faces-rare-union-test-in-upstate-new-york-11632488098?mod=article_inline) this year have worked to unionize [Starbucks](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/SBUX) Corp. [SBUX 1.72%](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/SBUX?mod=chiclets)baristas and [Amazon.com](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/AMZN) Inc. [AMZN 1.11%](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/AMZN?mod=chiclets)warehouse workers, so far [with mixed success](https://www.wsj.com/articles/amazon-warehouse-workers-set-to-vote-on-unionizing-what-we-know-11612785600?mod=article_inline).

Union officials said workers are motivated by lingering frustration over their hours, pay and concerns for their health as some have held front-line jobs through the Covid-19 pandemic. Employees this year have pushed for higher wages, expanded benefits, safer workplaces and added staffing.

“There is a new militancy out there,” said James P. Hoffa, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters labor union, which represents 1.4 million workers, from Detroit auto workers to package-delivery drivers. “I do think it’s an opportunity for labor.”

Many companies in recent months, responding to the tight labor market for lower-wage workers, [have been raising pay](https://www.wsj.com/articles/labor-shortage-missing-workers-jobs-pay-raises-economy-11634224519?mod=article_inline), offering signing bonuses and improving benefits to stay competitive. Critics of unions have warned that the work stoppages and efforts to influence labor policy could push up prices for consumers and slow production, potentially stifling the U.S. economic recovery.

“Businesses and unions should be working together to get the economy back on track,” said Kristen Swearingen, chairwoman of the Coalition for a Democratic Workplace, an organization of industry groups including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Work stoppages could wind up costing jobs and hurting small businesses, the coalition said.

Earlier this month on the company’s earnings call, the chief executive officer of food giant [Conagra Brands](https://www.wsj.com/market-data/quotes/CAG) Inc. was asked by analysts about concerns over strikes.

“It’s a tight labor market, and it takes a lot of ingenuity and creativity and effort to attract and retain employees,” Sean Connolly, the CEO, responded, adding, “So we’re, obviously, always trying to cultivate the strongest possible relationships with our employees…And I feel good about where we sit right now, but it’s—there’s no denying, it’s a daily grind.”

arcel Debruge, a labor-relations attorney for companies, said companies are dealing with heightened frustration among employees. But he feels many companies are increasing efforts to be responsive and that employees might not turn to unions partly because workers now have other avenues, such as social media, to express grievances and secure gains. “I don’t believe a new day has dawned in organized labor,” he said.

Union membership, particularly in the private sector, [has been in a decade slong decline](https://www.wsj.com/articles/u-s-union-membership-hits-another-record-low-11579715320?mod=article_inline). Job growth has slowed in industries such as manufacturing, transportation and utilities, which are typically more unionized compared with healthcare and other services. Some manufacturers have placed new plants in Southern states where unions typically are less common.

Union members made up 10.8% of the U.S. workforce last year, a higher proportion than in 2019, but down from a peak of 20.1% in 1983, the earliest year for which the Labor Department has comparable data.

Labor leaders said now is a time to build their ranks due to worker shortages, the pandemic struggles and because a pro-labor president is in the White House. Rob Hill, vice president and organizing director of the Service Employees International Union 32BJ, which represents janitors and airport workers, said he expects the roughly 175,000-member union this year to sign up double the number of new members than it did in 2020, which was around 4,000. Concerns over compensation, healthcare coverage and paid time off are drawing more workers’ interest in the union, he said.

The Teamsters union said it is fielding an unprecedented volume of requests to form unions at workplaces around the country, and Mr. Hoffa cited organizing efforts or first-time contracts within Illinois cannabis dispensaries, food-distribution warehouses and Las Vegas casinos.

Jonas Loeb, communications director for the 150,000-member International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, said that union is actively recruiting live-events workers across the country. A rush of concerts and other events being scheduled as pandemic restrictions ease is putting greater strains on employees, Mr. Loeb said.

This weekend, the film and television industry narrowly avoided a shutdown of production after the stage workers’ union [reached a tentative agreement](https://www.wsj.com/articles/hollywood-workers-reach-agreement-with-studios-averting-strike-11634434300?mod=hp_lead_pos2&mod=article_inline) with studios and streaming services over worker demands.

Not all workers’ efforts have been successful. Amazon.com employees at an Alabama warehouse in April voted not to unionize, and a separate 2018 effort to organize workers at Amazon’s Whole Foods Market also failed.

Pro-union workers at the Alabama warehouse this year said organizing could help boost wages and provide a more reasonable pace on the job. Amazon pushed back, promoting its $15-an-hour pay and benefits and highlighting the cost of paying union dues. [About 71% of the warehouse’s workers](https://www.wsj.com/articles/amazon-is-ahead-in-union-vote-as-tallying-set-to-resume-11617960604?mod=article_inline) who cast ballots voted against unionizing, [citing worries](https://www.wsj.com/articles/why-amazon-workers-in-alabama-voted-against-union-11618066800) over job security, the cost of paying dues and the concern that unionizing wouldn’t do much to improve pay and benefits. The union leading the effort is [seeking a second vote](https://www.wsj.com/articles/union-appeals-amazon-election-in-alabama-says-company-violated-laws-11618839996).

Unions have argued that their membership ranks would be boosted if current labor laws were revised to more severely punish employers who unlawfully thwart organizing efforts. Republicans and business groups have said such changes would limit workers’ ability to freely choose whether to join a union.

Some union officials and labor researchers said there is an emotional component wrapped up in current union actions. Frustration remains among some workers over being required to work long hours through the pandemic, they said, and a sense of injustice as some companies reap big profits from a rebounding economy.

Robert Bruno, professor of labor and employment relations at the University of Illinois, said this past week’s strike against Deere came despite the equipment company’s contract proposal that included higher wages, bonuses and enhanced pension benefits, suggesting that workers’ frustrations extend beyond money.

“Workers are angry,” Mr. Bruno said.

Deere has said it is working to resolve its striking workers’ concerns and aims to keep its operations running.

Michelle Back worked throughout the pandemic at a pharmacy for Kaiser Permanente in California and often left her young, autistic son at home. She said she is committed to pushing back against what she sees as insufficient proposals for wage increases and benefits in contract negotiations by Kaiser.

“We were healthcare heroes just months ago,” said Ms. Back, who is representing pharmacy workers in negotiations and for decades has served as a liaison between employees and management. When given the chance to vote to authorize a strike later this month, she said, she will vote yes.

Arlene Peasnall, senior vice president of human resources at Kaiser Permanente, said it has always tried to work cooperatively with unions representing its employees, and that Kaiser’s proposal aims to slow “over-market” wage growth in some areas while increasing wages for all current employees.

“We recognize what a monumental effort it has been for our employees to deliver such excellent care and service to our members and patients during the last 20 months of the pandemic,” Ms. Peasnall said. “We believe we will come together and find a mutually beneficial solution.”

—Amara Omeokwe, Lauren Weber and Bob Tita contributed to this article.

#### Inflation is contained now, but rising prices cause the Federal Reserve to hike interest rates – that quickly destroys the economy

Cox 21 – Jeff Cox, finance editor for CNBC.com where he manages coverage of the financial markets and Wall Street, “The Fed can fight inflation, but it may come at the cost of future growth,” 3/20/21, https://www.cnbc.com/2021/03/20/the-fed-can-fight-inflation-but-it-may-come-at-a-cost.html

One of the main reasons Federal Reserve officials don’t fear inflation these days is the belief that they have tools to deploy should it become a problem.

Those tools, however, come with a cost, and can be deadly to the kinds of economic growth periods the U.S. is experiencing.

Hiking interest rates is the most common way the Fed controls inflation. It’s not the only weapon in the central bank’s arsenal, with adjustments to asset purchases and strong policy guidance also at its disposal, but it is the most potent.

It’s also a very effective way of stopping a growing economy in its tracks.

The late Rudi Dornbusch, a noted MIT economist, once said that none of the expansions in the second half of the 20th century “died in bed of old age. Every one was murdered by the Federal Reserve.”

In the first part of the 21st century, worries are growing that the central bank might become the culprit again, particularly if the Fed’s easy policy approach spurs the kind of inflation that might force it to step on the brake abruptly in the future.

“The Fed made clear this week that it still has no plans to raise interest rates within the next three years. But that apparently rests on the belief that the strongest economic growth in nearly 40 years will generate almost no lasting inflationary pressure, which we suspect is a view that will eventually be proven wrong,” Andrew Hunter, senior U.S. economist at Capital Economics, said in a note Friday.

As it pledged to keep short-term borrowing rates anchored near zero and its monthly bond purchases humming at a minimum $120 billion a month, the Fed also raised its gross domestic product outlook for 2021 to 6.5%, which would be the highest yearly growth rate since 1984.

The Fed also ratcheted up its inflation projection to a still rather mundane 2.2%, but higher than the economy has seen since the central bank started targeting a specific rate a decade ago.

Competing factors

Most economists and market experts think the Fed’s low-inflation bet is a safe one – for now.

A litany of factors is keeping inflation in check. Among them are the inherently disinflationary pressures of a technology-led economy, a jobs market that continues to see nearly 10 million fewer employed Americans than a decade ago, and demographic trends that suggest a longer-term limit to productivity and price pressures.

“Those are pretty powerful forces, and I’d bet they win,” said Jim Paulsen, chief investment strategist at the Leuthold Group. “It may work out, but it’s a risk, because if it doesn’t work and inflation does get going, the bigger question is, what are you going to do to shut it down. You say you’ve got policy. What exactly is that going to be?”

The inflationary forces are pretty powerful in their own right.

An economy that the Atlanta Fed is tracking to grow 5.7% in the first quarter has just gotten a $1.9 trillion stimulus jolt from Congress.

Another package could be coming later this year in the form of an infrastructure bill that Goldman Sachs estimates could run to $4 trillion. Combine that with everything the Fed is doing plus substantial global supply chain issues causing a shortage of some goods and it becomes a recipe for inflation that, while delayed, could still pack a punch in 2022 and beyond.

The most daunting example of what happens when the Fed has to step in to stop inflation comes from the 1980s.

Runaway inflation began in the U.S. in the mid ’70s, with the pace of consumer price increases topping out at 13.5% in 1980. Then-Fed Chairman Paul Volcker was tasked with taming the inflation beast, and did so through a series of interest rate hikes that dragged the economy into a recession and made him one of the most unpopular public figures in America.

Of course, the U.S. came out pretty good on the other side, with a powerful growth spurt that lasted from late -1982 through the decade.

But the dynamics of the current landscape, in which the economic damage from the Covid-19 pandemic has been felt most acutely by lower earners and minorities, make this dance with inflation an especially dangerous one.

“If you have to prematurely abort this recovery because we’re going to have a kneejerk stop, we’re going to end up hurting most of the people that these policies were enacted to help the most,” Paulsen said. “It will be those same disenfranchised lower-comp less-skilled areas that get hit hardest in the next recession.”

The bond market has been flashing warning signs about possible inflation for much of 2021. Treasury yields, particularly at the longer maturities, have surged to pre-pandemic levels.

That action in turn has raised the question of whether the Fed again could become a victim of its own forecasting errors. The Jerome Powell-led Fed already has had to backtrack twice on sweeping proclamations about long-term policy intentions.

“Is it really going to be all temporary?”

In late-2018, Powell’s statements that the Fed would continue raising rates and shrinking its balance sheet with no end in sight was met with a history-making Christmas Eve stock market selloff. In late 2019, Powell said the Fed was done cutting rates for the foreseeable future, only to have to backtrack a few months later when the Covid crisis hit.

“What happens if the healing of the economy is more robust than even the revised projections from the Fed?” said Quincy Krosby, chief market strategist at Prudential Financial. “The question for the market is always, is it really going to be all temporary?’”

Krosby compared the Powell Fed to the Alan Greenspan version. Greenspan steered the U.S. through the “Great Moderation” of the 1990s and became known as “The Maestro.” However, that reputation became tarnished the following decade when the excesses of the subprime mortgage boom triggered wild risk-taking on Wall Street that led to the Great Recession.

Powell is staking his reputation on a staunch position that the Fed will not raise rates until inflation rises at least above 2% and the economy achieves full, inclusive employment, and will not use a timeline for when it will tighten.

“They called Alan Greenspan ‘The Maestro’ until he wasn’t,” Krosby said. Powell “is telling you there’s no timeline. The market is telling you it does not believe it.”

To be sure, the market has been through what Krosby described as “squalls” before. Bond investors can be fickle, and if they sense rates rising, they’ll sell first and ask questions later.

Michael Hartnett, the chief market strategist at Bank of America, pointed to multiple other bond market jolts through the decades, with only the 1987 episode in the weeks before the Oct. 19 Black Monday stock market crash having “major negative spillover effects.”

He doesn’t expect the 2021 selling to have a major impact either, though he cautions that things could change when the Fed finally does pivot.

#### Extended COVID economic decline causes multilateral meltdown – causes nuclear war, climate change, Arctic and space war.

McLennan 21 – Strategic Partners Marsh McLennan SK Group Zurich Insurance Group, Academic Advisers National University of Singapore Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford Wharton Risk Management and Decision Processes Center, University of Pennsylvania, “The Global Risks Report 2021 16th Edition” “http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF\_The\_Global\_Risks\_Report\_2021.pdf

Forced to choose sides, governments may face economic or diplomatic consequences, as proxy disputes play out in control over economic or geographic resources. The deepening of geopolitical fault lines and the lack of viable middle power alternatives make it harder for countries to cultivate connective tissue with a diverse set of partner countries based on mutual values and maximizing efficiencies. Instead, networks will become thick in some directions and non-existent in others. The COVID-19 crisis has amplified this dynamic, as digital interactions represent a “huge loss in efficiency for diplomacy” compared with face-to-face discussions.23 With some alliances weakening, diplomatic relationships will become more unstable at points where superpower tectonic plates meet or withdraw.

At the same time, without superpower referees or middle power enforcement, global norms may no longer govern state behaviour. Some governments will thus see the solidification of rival blocs as an opportunity to engage in regional posturing, which will have destabilizing effects.24 Across societies, domestic discord and economic crises will increase the risk of autocracy, with corresponding censorship, surveillance, restriction of movement and abrogation of rights.25 Economic crises will also amplify the challenges for middle powers as they navigate geopolitical competition. ASEAN countries, for example, had offered a potential new manufacturing base as the United States and China decouple, but the pandemic has left these countries strapped for cash to invest in the necessary infrastructure and productive capacity.26 Economic fallout is pushing many countries to debt distress (see Chapter 1, Global Risks 2021). While G20 countries are supporting debt restructure for poorer nations,27 larger economies too may be at risk of default in the longer term;28 this would leave them further stranded—and unable to exercise leadership—on the global stage.

Multilateral meltdown Middle power weaknesses will be reinforced in weakened institutions, which may translate to more uncertainty and lagging progress on shared global challenges such as climate change, health, poverty reduction and technology governance. In the absence of strong regulating institutions, the Arctic and space represent new realms for potential conflict as the superpowers and middle powers alike compete to extract resources and secure strategic advantage.29 If the global superpowers continue to accumulate economic, military and technological power in a zero-sum playing field, some middle powers could increasingly fall behind. Without cooperation nor access to important innovations, middle powers will struggle to define solutions to the world’s problems. In the long term, GRPS respondents forecasted “weapons of mass destruction” and “state collapse” as the two top critical threats: in the absence of strong institutions or clear rules, clashes— such as those in Nagorno-Karabakh or the Galwan Valley—may more frequently flare into full-fledged interstate conflicts,30 which is particularly worrisome where unresolved tensions among nuclear powers are concerned. These conflicts may lead to state collapse, with weakened middle powers less willing or less able to step in to find a peaceful solution.

### Case

#### 1AR theory shouldn’t have predetermined paradigm issues---A] punishment should be contextual to abuse – don’t give the death penalty for shoplifting and key to substance B] Incentivizes lots of friv shells that trade off with substance and skew the 2nr time allocation

#### No solvency –

#### Aff perception is restricted to labor law

1AC Brudney 21 [James; 2/8/21; Joseph Crowley Chair in Labor and Employment Law, Fordham Law School; “The Right to Strike as Customary International Law,” THE YALE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, Vol 46, <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1710&context=yjil>] Justin

It is worth emphasizing this series of developments. United States political diplomacy and input from executive branch experts has helped the transnational legal process to strengthen the international right to strike. The U.S. has been a leading advocate on the international stage promoting both FOA principles and the right to strike—in its trade legislation, bilateral and regional trade agreements, and official positions at the ILO Governing Body. That the U.S. has not ratified Convention 87 does not mean it is somehow undemocratic or improper for U.S. officials to be bound by rules that U.S. influence helped create. To be sure, Sosa recognizes that Congress may “shut the door to the law of nations” explicitly or implicitly by treaties or statutes that occupy the field.271 And there is some domestic law that is inconsistent with the right to strike set forth in CIL. As discussed in Part I.C, this law notably includes a 1935 statutory provision exempting states as “employers” under the NLRA, thereby relegating public employees to state-by-state regulation of FOA and the right to strike; and a 1938 Supreme Court decision allowing private employers to hire permanent replacements for strikers.272 But these expressions of domestic law do not appear to be “controlling” in the relevant sense of addressing or responding to the CIL that is asserted here. The 1935 statutory provision and 1938 Supreme Court decision predate the promulgation of Convention 87 by a decade or more—hence they are not in any way responsive to the existence of FOA or the right to strike at an international level.273 The Court has relied on its 1938 statutory interpretation decision approving of permanent replacements in more recent decades.274 And there were legislative efforts in the early 1990s to overturn the permanent replacement doctrine that did not succeed. 275 It is possible to contend that despite the absence of legislative approval for permanent replacements, the Court’s continuing endorsement of its jurisprudence, and Congress’s failure to override those decisions, are sufficiently controlling in this context. On the other hand, there is a respectable and perhaps persuasive argument that these judicial decisions and instances of congressional inaction do not amount to a sufficiently comprehensive scheme of statutes and regulations addressing the precise issue.276 Relatedly, there is no indication that either the Court or Congress acted with a purpose to preclude the application of CIL in the right-to-strike setting, or even with an awareness that relevant CIL existed.277 In this regard, it is noteworthy that the international right to strike assumed increased visibility and importance beginning in the mid to late 1990s, following elevation of FOA as one of the eight fundamental ILO conventions and the promulgation of the 1998 Declaration. The Supreme Court in the context of admiralty law—relying on the law of nations—has applied recent CIL to overrule its own precedents, or to bypass or distinguish earlier statutory provisions. 278 In doing so, the Court has recognized the primacy of evolving developments in CIL so long as these changes in the law of nations are not directly contradicted by earlier federal statutory text. 279 Violations of CIL, like violations of international law generally, can produce friction between nations that hinders the accomplishment of foreign relations goals.280 As noted earlier, government officials and scholars have expressed concern in recent decades that failure to ratify Convention 87 and other fundamental ILO conventions can undermine U.S. standing on matters of international labor and human rights law.281 At the same time, the U.S. has been a leading advocate on the international stage promoting both FOA principles and the right to strike—in its trade legislation, bilateral and regional trade agreements, and official positions at the ILO Governing Body. And again, while CIL can give way when there is genuinely controlling positive law, such law must be meant to control an otherwise applicable CIL. The mere presence of a relevant statutory provision or judicial decision, without evidence that Congress or the court was aware the CIL existed, is unlikely to qualify. Moreover, if there is a potential conflict between established CIL and sufficiently clear federal statutes, the relative timing of these two sources of law becomes important. The Court has made clear that Congress can override CIL based on subsequent clear legislation.282 It is also well-settled that federal statutes and treaties are equal in authority such that “if a treaty and a federal statute conflict, ‘the one last in date will control the other.’”283 Given the status accorded to CIL as federal law comparable to treaties, it should follow that the last-in-time rule also applies to resolve any differences between an earlierenacted federal statute and a later CIL norm, at least one that meets the Sosa standard of definiteness, specificity, and widespread acceptance.284 Applying the last-in-time rule in our setting, the two most prominent divergences between CIL and existing federal statutory law would be resolved in favor of CIL. The NLRA doctrine allowing employers to permanently replace lawful strikers is not addressed at all in the text. It was derived from the 1935 law as part of a 1938 Supreme Court interpretation that has been relied upon in subsequent Court decisions through the late 1980s. The exemption of state and local government workers from federal law was itself part of the 1935 statute. Both the Court decisions establishing a permanent replacement doctrine and the text exempting state and local governments arose well before—and with no evident awareness of—the establishment and evolution of CIL on FOA and the right to strike. This CIL began emerging in the late 1960s and became fully developed from the late 1990s, continuing to the present.

#### The spillover card is only about labor-related SDG’s not all of them – They don’t access extinction

1AC ILO 15 [International Labor Organization; The International Labour Organization is a United Nations agency whose mandate is to advance social and economic justice through setting international labour standards. Founded in October 1919 under the League of Nations, it is the first and oldest specialised agency of the UN; “The benefits of International Labour Standards,” No date stated but most recent event cited is 2015, <https://www.ilo.org/global/standards/introduction-to-international-labour-standards/the-benefits-of-international-labour-standards/lang--en/index.htm>] Justin

International labour standards are first and foremost about the development of people as human beings. In the Declaration of Philadelphia (1944), the international community recognized that “labour is not a commodity”. Labour is not an inanimate product, like an apple or a television set, that can be negotiated for the highest profit or the lowest price. Work is part of everyone’s daily life and is crucial to a person’s dignity, well-being and development as a human being. Economic development should include the creation of jobs and working conditions in which people can work in freedom, safety and dignity. In short, economic development is not undertaken for its own sake, but to improve the lives of human beings. International labour standards are there to ensure that it remains focused on improving the life and dignity of men and women. Decent work resumes the aspirations of humans in relation to work. It brings together access to productive and suitably remunerated work, safety at the workplace and social protection for families, better prospects for personal development and social integration, freedom for individuals to set out their claims, to organize and to participate in decisions that affect their lives, and equality of opportunity and treatment for all men and women. Decent work is not merely an objective, it is a means of achieving the specific targets of the new international programme of sustainable development. At the United Nations General Assembly in September 2015, decent work and the four pillars of the Decent Work Agenda – employment creation, social protection, rights at work and social dialogue – became the central elements of the new Sustainable Development Agenda 2030 . Goal 8 of the 2030 Agenda calls for the promotion of sustained, inclusive and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment and decent work for all. Moreover, the principal elements of decent work are broadly incorporated into the targets of a large number of the 16 Goals of the United Nations new vision of development. An international legal framework for fair and stable globalization Achieving the goal of decent work in the globalized economy requires action at the international level. The world community is responding to this challenge in part by developing international legal instruments on trade, finance, the environment, human rights and labour. The ILO contributes to this legal framework by elaborating and promoting international labour standards aimed at making sure that economic growth and development go hand-in-hand with the creation of decent work. The ILO’s unique tripartite structure ensures that these standards are backed by governments, employers and workers alike. International labour standards therefore lay down the basic minimum social standards agreed upon by all the players in the global economy. A level playing field An international legal framework on social standards ensures a level playing field in the global economy. It helps governments and employers to avoid the temptation of lowering labour standards in the hope that this could give them a greater comparative advantage in inter- national trade. In the long run, such practices do not benefit anyone. Lowering labour standards can encourage the spread of low-wage, low-skill and high-turnover industries and prevent a country from developing more stable high-skilled employment, while at the same time slowing the economic growth of trade partners. Because international labour standards are minimum standards adopted by governments and the social partners, it is in everyone’s interest to see these rules applied across the board, so that those who do not put them into practice do not undermine the efforts of those who do. A means of improving economic performance International labour standards have been sometimes perceived as being costly and therefore hindering economic development. However, a growing body of research has indicated that compliance with international labour standards is often accompanied by improvements in productivity and economic performance. Minimum wage and working-time standards, and respect for equality, can translate into greater satisfaction and improved performance for workers and reduced staff turnover. Investment in vocational training can result in a better trained workforce and higher employment levels. Safety standards can reduce costly accidents and expenditure on health care. Employment protection can encourage workers to take risks and to innovate. Social protection, such as unemployment schemes, and active labour market policies can facilitate labour market flexibility, and make economic liberalization and privatization sustainable and more acceptable to the public. Freedom of association and collective bargaining can lead to better labour–management consultation and cooperation, thereby improving working conditions, reducing the number of costly labour conflicts and enhancing social stability. The beneficial effects of labour standards do not go unnoticed by foreign investors. Studies have shown that in their criteria for choosing countries in which to invest, foreign investors rank workforce quality and political and social stability above low labour costs. At the same time, there is little evidence that countries which do not respect labour standards are more competitive in the global economy. International labour standards not only respond to changes in the world of work for the protection of workers, but also take into account the needs of sustainable enterprises. A safety net in times of economic crisis Even fast-growing economies with high-skilled workers can experience unforeseen economic downturns. The Asian financial crisis of 1997, the 2000 dot-com bubble burst and the 2008 financial and economic crisis showed how decades of economic growth can be undone by dramatic currency devaluations or falling market prices. For instance, during the 1997 Asian crisis, as well as the 2008 crisis, unemployment increased significantly in many of the countries affected. The disastrous effects of these crises on workers were compounded by the fact that in many of these countries social protection systems, notably unemployment and health insurance, active labour market policies and social dialogue were barely developed. The adoption of an approach that balances macroeconomic and employment goals, while at the same time taking social impacts into account, can help to address these challenges. A strategy for reducing poverty Economic development has always depended on the acceptance of rules. Legislation and functioning legal institutions ensure property rights, the enforcement of contracts, respect for procedure and protection from crime – all legal elements of good governance without which no economy can operate. A market governed by a fair set of rules and institutions is more efficient and brings benefit to everyone. The labour market is no different. Fair labour practices set out in international labour standards and applied through a national legal system ensure an efficient and stable labour market for workers and employers alike. In many developing and transition economies, a large part of the work- force is engaged in the informal economy. Moreover, such countries often lack the capacity to provide effective social justice. Yet international labour standards can also be effective tools in these situations. Most ILO standards apply to all workers, not just those working under formal employment arrangements. Some standards, such as those dealing with homeworkers, migrant and rural workers, and indigenous and tribal peoples, deal specifically with certain areas of the informal economy. The reinforcement of freedom of association, the extension of social protection, the improvement of occupational safety and health, the development of vocational training, and other measures required by international labour standards have proved to be effective strategies in reducing poverty and bringing workers into the formal economy. Furthermore, international labour standards call for the creation of institutions and mechanisms which can enforce labour rights. In combination with a set of defined rights and rules, functioning legal institutions can help formalize the economy and create a climate of trust and order which is essential for economic growth and development. (Note 1 ) The sum of international experience and knowledge International labour standards are the result of discussions among governments, employers and workers, in consultation with experts from around the world. They represent the international consensus on how a particular labour problem could be addressed at the global level and reflect knowledge and experience from all corners of the world. Governments, employers’ and workers’ organizations, international institutions, multinational enterprises and non-governmental organizations can benefit from this knowledge by incorporating the standards in their policies, operational objectives and day-to-day action. The legal nature of the standards means that they can be used in legal systems and administrations at the national level, and as part of the corpus of international law which can bring about greater integration of the international community.

#### No SDG uniqueness – their ev says CIL is a prerequisite and they’re important not that action is happening now and non-compliance ruins it

#### Cop26 proves no UN climate action

**Mathiesen ’10-27-21** [Karl and Zack Coleman; POLITICO, “Why the COP26 climate summit won’t save the planet,” https://www.politico.eu/article/why-the-cop26-climate-summit-wont-save-the-planet/]

James Hansen, the former NASA scientist whose evidence to Congress in 1988 was considered a landmark in the public awareness that greenhouse gas emissions were dangerously heating up the Earth, said the slowness of governments and the greenhouse gases already in the atmosphere make stopping warming at 1.5℃ “unachievable.”

The latest sweeping review of studies by the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) — the top scientific authority on the subject — charted just one scenario in which 1.5 is possible. Under that, global CO2 emissions plummet this decade and reach net-zero by around the middle of the century. But even then, the world exceeds the 1.5-degree threshold before dipping below again with the help of large-scale efforts to suck carbon from the atmosphere. Other researchers, including IPCC author Piers Forster, point to that and say “temperature rise can STILL be limited to 1.5 degrees.” But there is currently no indication such a rescue plan is being developed.

Slow slog

The gloomy prospect for the COP26 summit is largely due to the result being baked in well before delegates show up in Glasgow. Most countries have already indicated how much — or how little — they are willing to do ahead of the talks — and current promises entail warming of about 2.7 degrees Celsius.

While the talks formally last only two weeks, it’s better to think of the COP as a one-year process — extended to two years by the pandemic — during which the world’s biggest polluters were lobbied to enact policies that cut emissions, commit to phasing out coal and align their targets to 1.5 degrees Celsius. These economy-defining pledges are not the type of commitments leaders can pull out of a hat in the final hours of talks.

More than half the world's countries have submitted enhanced plans — the key breakthrough of the Paris deal which asked each country to make a climate promise and then to gradually increase those pledges. Roughly three-quarters of the global economy — including the biggest polluter by far China — is now covered by a target to reach net-zero around the middle of the century or just after.

But many of those pledges are not supported by plans to cut emissions in this decade, and added together they fall well short of 1.5 degrees. The political will to do more is lacking — even in the world's richest countries which talk a good game on tackling global warming.

There's been a lot of pressure on China to change the date it has promised its emissions will peak from “before 2030” to something more like 2025. It hasn’t budged, although it has promised to stop financing foreign coal projects.

#### SDG was never going to be met in the first place, but even if it was their data collection is flawed- so meeting them doesn’t even solve your impacts

**Hickel**, J. (**2020**, September 30). The World's Sustainable Development Goals aren't sustainable. Foreign Policy. Retrieved October 31, 2021, from https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/09/30/the-worlds-sustainable-development-goals-arent-sustainable/. // sosa

In 2015, the world’s governments signed on to the U.N. Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) with a commitment to bring the global economy back into balance with the living world. Now, five years later, as the U.N. General Assembly convenes online to discuss the global ecological crisis, everyone wants to know how countries are performing.

To answer this question, delegates and policymakers have referred to a metric called the [SDG Index](https://dashboards.sdgindex.org/rankings), which was developed by Jeffrey Sachs “to assess where each country stands with regard to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.” The metric tells a very clear story. Sweden, Denmark, Finland, France, and Germany—along with most other rich Western nations—rise to the top of the rankings, giving casual observers the impression that these countries are real leaders in achieving sustainable development.

There’s only one problem. Despite its name, the SDG Index has very little to do with sustainable development all. In fact, oddly enough, the countries with the highest scores on this index are some of the most environmentally unsustainable countries in the world.

Take Sweden, for example. Sweden scores an impressive 84.7 on the index, topping the pack. But ecologists have long pointed out that Sweden’s “material footprint”—the quantity of natural resources that the country consumes each year—is one of the biggest in the world, right up there with the United States, at [32 metric tons per person](http://www.resourcepanel.org/global-material-flows-database). To put this in perspective, the global average is about 12 tons per person, and the sustainable level is about [7 tons per person](https://www.mdpi.com/2079-9276/4/1/25). In other words, Sweden is consuming nearly five times over the boundary.

There is nothing sustainable about this kind of consumption. If everyone on the planet were to consume as Sweden does, global resource use would exceed 230 billion tons of stuff per year. To get a sense for what this would look like, consider all the resources that we presently extract, produce, transport, and consume around the world each year—and all of the ecological damage that this causes—and triple it.

Or take Finland, for example, which is No. 3 on the SDG Index. Finland’s carbon footprint is about [13 metric tons](http://www.sustainabledevelopmentindex.org/) of carbon dioxide per person per year, similar to that of Saudi Arabia. This makes it one of the most polluting countries in the world, in per capita terms, and a major contributor to climate breakdown. For comparison, China’s carbon footprint is about 7 tons per person. India’s is less than 2. If the whole world were to consume as much fossil fuels as Finland does, the planet would be literally uninhabitable.

This isn’t just a matter of a few odd results. Data published by scientists at the University of Leeds shows that all of the top-ranked countries in the SDG Index have [significantly overshot](https://goodlife.leeds.ac.uk/countries/) their fair share of planetary boundaries, in consumption-based terms—not only when it comes to resource use and emissions but also in terms of land use and chemical flows like nitrogen and phosphorous. It is physically impossible for all nations to consume and pollute at the level of the SDG top performers without destroying our planet’s biosphere.

In other words, the SDG Index is, from the perspective of ecology, incoherent. It creates the illusion that rich countries have high levels of sustainability when in fact they do not.

So what’s going on here? Well, the SDG Index is directly linked to the Sustainable Development Goals. There are 17 goals, each of which include a number of targets. The SDG Index takes indicators for each of these targets (where data is available), indexes them, and then averages them together to arrive at a score for each goal. Then the 17 goals are averaged together in turn to come up with the final figure. All of this seems reasonable enough, on the face of it. But taking this approach means introducing a number of analytical problems.

First, there is a weighting problem. The SDGs include three different kinds of indicators: Some focus on ecological impact (like deforestation and biodiversity loss), some focus on social development (like education and hunger), and some focus on infrastructure development (like transportation and electricity). Most of the SDGs contain a mix of these, but the ecological indicators are almost always swamped, as it were, by the development indicators. For example, the SDG Index has [four indicators](https://sdsna.github.io/SDR2020/SDR2020IndicatorProfiles.pdf) for Goal 11 (on “sustainable cities and communities”); three of them are development indicators, while only one of them has to do with ecological impact. This means that if a country performs well on the development indicators, its score for that goal will look good even if it fails in terms of sustainability.

This issue is compounded by a second problem, namely, that only four of the 17 SDGs deal mostly or wholly with ecological sustainability (Goals 12 through 15). The other 13 are mostly focused on development. Once again, this means that good performance on the development goals outweighs poor performance on the sustainability goals, so countries like Sweden, Germany, and Finland can rise to the top of the index (with the United States ranking in the top 20 percent) even though they have highly unsustainable levels of ecological impact.

The final problem is that the vast majority of the ecological indicators are territorial metrics that do not account for impacts related to international trade. For instance, take the air pollution indicator in Goal 11. Rich countries come out looking clean—but this is largely because they have offshored most of their polluting industries to countries in the global south since the 1980s, thus shifting the problem abroad.

So too with the indicators on deforestation, overfishing, and so on: most of this damage happens in poorer countries, but it is disproportionately caused by overconsumption in richer countries, and quite often perpetrated by corporations or investors headquartered there. As a result, poorer countries get punished in the SDG Index for being harmed and polluted by richer countries. Of course, in many cases territorial metrics are appropriate; but there are a number of indicators in the SDG Index that should be reckoned as well in consumption-based terms and yet are not.

In effect, the SDG Index celebrates rich countries while turning a blind eye to the damage they are causing. Ecological economists have long warned against this approach. It violates the principle of “strong sustainability,” which holds that good performance on development indicators cannot legitimately substitute for destructive levels of ecological impact. The SDG Index team are aware of this problem. It’s even mentioned (briefly) in their methodological notes—but then it’s swept under the rug in favor of a final metric that has little grounding in ecological principles.

Ultimately, metrics of sustainable development need to be universalizable. In other words, the top performers on the index should represent a standard that all nations could aspire to achieve without this leading to a collapse of global ecosystems. That’s not the case with the SDG Index, where rich countries are held up as models when in reality, as the Leeds research [shows](https://goodlife.leeds.ac.uk/countries/), they are a big part of the problem.

The United Nations needs to redesign the index to correct these issues. This can be done by rendering the ecological indicators in consumption-based terms wherever relevant and possible, to take account of international trade, and by indexing the ecological indicators separately from the development indicators so that we can see clearly what’s happening on each front. This way we can celebrate what countries like Denmark and Germany have achieved in terms of development while also recognizing that they are major drivers of ecological breakdown and need urgently to change course, with rapid reductions in emissions and resource use.

Until then, we should avoid using the SDG Index as a metric of progress in sustainable development, because it’s not. Given the stakes of the crisis we face, we need to tell more honest, accurate stories about what’s happening to our planet and who is responsible for it.

#### No weak states offense – No reason it’s related to labor or uniqueness about weak states experiencing labor problems