

UBI CP [2:50]

CP Text: A just government ought to provide universal basic income

Striking can't solve layoffs when the employer doesn't need their workers anymore – UBI would give workers a cushion to survive unemployment AND increase their ability to strike by providing a strike fund. Shahriari-Parsa 21.

Tascha **Shahriari-Parsa, 21** [Tascha Shahriari-Parsa is a student at Harvard Law School.] ("Why Universal Basic Income is a Labor Issue," OnLabor, 4-30-2021, <https://onlabor.org/why-universal-basic-income-is-a-labor-issue/>)/va

For both Stern and Yang, **UBI is**, at least in large part, **a solution to** growing concerns over the role that **automation** will play in creating mass unemployment. As Yang pointed out on his campaign trail, self-driving truck technology could easily render millions of Americans without a job in the blink of an eye. And it's not just truck drivers: a **2016 federal report** found that **83% of jobs making less than \$20 per hour could be lost** due to automation. This doesn't mean that labor will become obsolete—jobs displaced by technology will eventually be replaced by jobs in other areas. But what are you supposed to do if you've been driving trucks your whole life? Learn how to code? How would you survive in the interim? Perhaps unions can mitigate the 'side-effects' of technology. In 1812, the Luddites famously smashed textile machinery, giving rise to the modern usage of the term "luddite" to refer to a person opposed to technological progress. But contrary to the common myth, the Luddites **were not** against machinery. They were against their terrible labor conditions, demanding that whoever runs the machines should receive sufficient training and be paid a fair wage. In that sense, the Luddites' demands were comparable to those of **UNITE HERE** hotel workers who went on strike throughout the country in 2018, **winning** mandated training for workers affected by new technology as well as a say over how new technology would be implemented. ¶ Collective bargaining over the implementation of technology is an important part of the solution. But **even if we organized the entire U.S. workforce into unions** with enough power to negotiate such agreements, **we wouldn't stop mass layoffs. The key source of workers' leverage** over their employer—**the ability to withhold labor—is predicated on the employer's need for their labor in the first place.** **UBI** isn't a replacement for a union, but it **can help fill a gap** where labor otherwise has very little power. And it's not just about technology. **When Marriot workers were negotiating their agreements in 2018**, what **they** likely **weren't expecting** was **that 98% of their members would be out of work** not **as a consequence of** automation, but rather, **a global pandemic**. Moreover, mass unemployment has always been endemic to capitalism. Even in the absence of crisis, **there will always be millions** of Americans **without a job**. In a society as rich as ours, **UBI is a declaration that everyone is entitled to an income**, whether they work or not. UBI is also **a proclamation that** the poor should have the right to use their money as they see fit—that **poverty is itself the issue, rather than a symptom of a lack of character** or a **'poor gene'**. And given how wealth and power go hand in hand, **UBI gives the working class a fighting chance to counter the power of the elite**. Moreover, a UBI would substantially alter the landscape of labor. **If everyone is guaranteed a paycheck** whether they show up to work or not, **workers will have far more bargaining power** than they do in the present. **A \$1,000/month UBI is** not a living wage, but it's **a cushion that would give workers more power to leave a bad job—and thus more power to** negotiate to **make that job better**. **Serving the function of a strike fund**, a UBI would also make it easier for workers to go on strike. Additionally, **UBI would raise minimum standards on top of prevailing wages, allowing workers to save** more of their **bargaining leverage for everything else** that matters.

A Universal Basic Income solves poverty. Wright 17.

Erik Olin Wright, American analytical Marxist sociologist, author, and educator 2-14-2017, "Can the universal basic income solve global inequalities?," UNESCO Inclusive Policy Lab,

<https://en.unesco.org/inclusivepolicylab/news/can-universal-basic-income-solve-global-inequalities/> JRG

The universal basic income (UBI) is spreading and becoming front and centre in the public discussion. What if this idea, suggesting a flat income given to every citizen regardless of employment or social status, was part of the solution to today's inequalities? In his contribution to the World

Social Science Report 2016, renowned sociology Professor Erik Olin Wright explored the concept for us: The idea of an unconditional basic income (UBI) is quite simple: every legal resident in a country receives a monthly stipend sufficient to live above the poverty line. Let's call this the 'no frills culturally respectable standard of living'. The grant is unconditional on the performance of any labour or other form of contribution, and it is universal – everyone receives the grant, rich and poor alike. Grants go to individuals, not families. Parents are the custodians of under-age children's grants, which may be smaller than the grants for adults. Universalistic programmes such as public education and healthcare, that provide services to people rather than cash, continue alongside UBI, but most other redistributive transfers are eliminated since the UBI provides everyone with a decent subsistence. This means that in welfare systems that already provide generous anti-poverty income support through a patchwork of specialized programmes, the net increase in cost represented by UBI is not large. Special needs subsidies of various sorts continue – for example, for people with disabilities – but they are also smaller than now since the basic cost of living is covered by UBI. Minimum wage rules are relaxed, since there is little need to prohibit below-subsistence wages if all earnings in effect generate discretionary income. While everyone receives the grant, most people at any given point in time are probably net contributors since their taxes rise by more than the basic income they receive. UBI has potentially profound ramifications for inequality. Poverty is eliminated, the labour contract becomes more nearly voluntary, and the power relations between workers and employers become less unequal since workers have the option of exit. The possibility of people forming cooperative associations to produce goods and services to serve human need outside the market increases since such activity no longer needs to provide the basic standard of living for participants. Sceptics of basic income typically raise two main objections: that UBI would reduce incentives to work and reduce the supply of labour, and that the tax rates needed to fund UBI would be prohibitively high. Two things can be said about the incentive issue. First, means-tested income support programmes are plagued by poverty traps in which people lose their benefits when their earned income crosses some threshold. By contrast, a UBI creates no disincentive to work. Paid work always increases the discretionary income of people with a UBI. Second, while no country has adopted a full basic income, there have been a few limited experiments in various places in the world which enable us to examine the effects of UBI on labour force participation. In the United States and Canada in the 1970s there were a number of randomized controlled trials, most notably in Seattle and Denver, in which randomly selected low-income individuals received a UBI. More recently, in India in 2011, eight villages were selected in which all residents were given a basic income. In all of these experiments, receiving a UBI significantly improved the lives of people while having at most a modest effect on labour force participation. The level of taxation needed to pay for a basic income is, of course, an important issue. But the sustainable level of taxation in any country is not mainly an economic issue. It is a political issue that depends on the administrative capacity to extract taxes and the political will to do so.

Solves the aff

Aff justifies an unconditional right to strike on the basis that it leads to higher wages and thus solves income inequality. However, there are better ways to solve economic inequality. A just government should raise the minimum wage to a level sufficient to raise workers out of poverty, and implement a universal basic income.

UBI solves economic inequality and improves the economy Hinh 20.

Ken Hinh is a sophomore undergraduate student at UC Berkeley. "Poverty in a crisis: Why we need UBI during Covid-19."

Published by the Daily Californian on May 12, 2020.

(<https://www.dailycal.org/2020/05/12/poverty-in-a-crisis-why-we-need-ubi-during-covid-19/>) - AP

The economic repercussions of the COVID-19 pandemic are far-reaching, ravaging families, businesses and communities across the country. Almost every business, charity and nonprofit nationwide has been affected by the pandemic, and millions of individuals and families have been left in financial ruin. In my eyes, the present remedies provided by the government will do nothing for the millions of Americans who are living paycheck to paycheck. The most effective way to provide immediate relief to the people most impacted by COVID-19 is to put money directly into their hands. Before the COVID-19 pandemic ravaged our communities, there was support of a universal basic income, or UBI, by prominent figures and organizations — such as professor Robert Reich, Andrew Yang and 293 members of UC Berkeley's Forward club — to combat job losses due to automation. But instead of automation, it is a global disaster that has inarguably destroyed our economy on a massive scale. However, we must not forget that smaller-scale "disasters" occur every moment of our lives: someone could lose their job, get evicted, come down with an illness or receive an unexpected bill that they can't afford. We live in a society in which 59% of Americans cannot pay an unexpected \$400 bill. In addition, every single citizen struggles with time, empathy or money in some form or another; these struggles are the most pervasive problems of our era. Notably, we live in a time in which many of our social safety nets should solve these problems. Instead, our mental health as a society is declining, suicides and drug overdoses are increasing and income inequality is at an all-time high. A UBI would provide the financial safety net that so many people desperately need to guard against these issues. Furthermore, as the coronavirus continues to wreak havoc on the very fabric of our society, our unemployment infrastructure is being overwhelmed. More than 30 million Americans have filed for unemployment since March, and the April unemployment rate skyrocketed to 14.7%. How much aid will all of these people really receive? Even before COVID-19, our welfare system was not effective — the pandemic has simply revealed the inadequacies of our political and economic infrastructure. There are more than 38.1 million Americans who live in poverty. Current social safety nets, such as Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, or TANF, do an extremely poor job of reducing poverty. Poverty is killing people every day. And after the coronavirus pandemic, we will no longer be able to ignore it. Moreover, in no single state does TANF provide the benefits of even half the poverty level. What's more, the racial inequities with all states' use of funds account for 15% of the Black-white child poverty gap. In no way do our current safety nets protect our most vulnerable populations. But why should our society choose UBI over our current welfare system? In my eyes, it comes down to speed, universality and security. First, a UBI would allow our government to put money directly into people's hands with the utmost speed. There would be no time whatsoever being wasted on bureaucracy — individuals would already have the necessary funds in their pockets. Second, universality — or doing away with means testing — would ensure that everyone is included and no one is excluded. Currently, the Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security Act does not provide payments to undocumented immigrants, international students and families of mixed immigration status. We need to ensure that everyone who needs help will get help without having to jump over any additional hurdles. With universality, determining who is eligible is simpler and the cost of administering is reduced. Lastly,

security. People need to feel secure in their financial positions before they can thrive, and a UBI would provide that economic foundation. In addition, a Finnish basic income experiment found that recipients experienced improved mental health, confidence and life satisfaction. Although it is not an end-all-be-all solution to all of our country's problems, it's a start — a start toward leveling the playing field among the haves and the have-nots. Policymakers in Spain, Canada and the United States are acknowledging the importance of emergency UBI in this crisis. On Friday, Senators, Kamala Harris, D-California, Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., and Ed Markey, D-Mass., proposed legislation that would send a \$2,000 monthly check to everyone who makes less than \$120,000. However, they're ignoring the impact that a UBI would have during more normal times. In addition to protecting those left behind by our welfare system, a UBI would produce economic growth by putting money into people's pockets to spend. Personally, I know an extra \$2,000 a month would help my mom, who lost her job as a result of COVID-19. According to a study by the Roosevelt Institute, a UBI would expand the United States' GDP by \$2.5 trillion. When people are given direct cash, they will inject that money directly into their communities, spending it on food, groceries, utility bills and auto repairs. A temporary UBI will be essential during this pandemic to combat the looming recession, but a permanent one will be needed to ensure that every single American can have the chance to thrive. The fight for UBI will live on. The pandemic has opened a door, however, giving us a glimpse into the vast inequities of our current safety net system. We need a UBI to ensure that everyone has financial security no matter what and to provide an economic foundation for all. Hopefully, one day, we will be able to say with confidence that we've eradicated poverty.

UBI solves better -- covers workers and also those who are unable to work. Farrell 20.

Julie Farrell is a disabled writer and accessibility consultant based in Edinburgh. "Dying from Inequality - Why Universal Basic Income is the Solution." Published by Disability Arts Online on June 22, 2020. Available here:

(<https://disabilityarts.online/magazine/opinion/dying-from-inequality-why-universal-basic-income-is-the-solution/>) - AP

'It is the peculiar lowness of poverty that you discover first.' Wrote George Orwell in his memoir, *Down and Out in Paris and London* (1933). The peculiar lowness. These words powerfully convey the ever-present sinking feeling of poverty. It doesn't level out. It doesn't go away. You go fathoms deep but you keep on sinking. If anything can wake us up to our own inequality crisis, it's a global pandemic which threatens the very foundations of a capitalist economy that we are built on. The systemic injustices faced by the poor, disabled and elderly are now being faced collectively by the nation in the face of Covid-19 – and we're waking up to the possibility of something better. 'People living in the poorest, most disadvantaged communities face the highest risk of dying by suicide', the Samaritans cited in their 2017 report, *Dying from Inequality*. They found that 'financial instability and poverty can increase suicide risk.' And that 'Suicide is a major inequality issue.' It comes as no surprise that unmanageable debt, unemployment, poor housing conditions, and other socioeconomic factors all contribute to high suicide rates. 'Tackling inequality should be central to suicide prevention' reads the report summary. So how do we do that? In a world of systemic inequality, where poverty and homelessness have never been eradicated, the welfare state has become increasingly punitive – and workers are still punished for sickness – is equality even possible? In a world where the UK has seen suicide rates increase by 10.9% in the last year alone. Where thousands of low-skilled, but equally – if not more so – valuable workers are struggling to make ends meet, thanks to low wages and flimsy worker protections. The report addresses the factors which lead to poverty on a societal, community and individual level; with much emphasis

placed on “weak social protection (especially inadequate employment benefits); poor (or non-existent) active labour market programmes; weak (or non-existent) employment protection; austerity measures; cuts in mental healthcare spending”. A mixed race woman and two white women stand among packed shelves of food at a foodbank Three women at a foodbank in Vauxhall. Photograph: Newfrontiers [licensed under CC BY-NC-ND 2.0] Disabled people who find themselves reliant on government support to live have seen a drastic decrease in access to this support, and if they do receive it, bureaucratic processes cause months of delays, reduced payments and expedient recoup of payments with little to no warning. Just this year, Errol Graham died from starvation after his benefits were cut – his body was found by bailiff’s coming to evict him. His needs were not understood nor adequately supported, Assistant Coroner Dr Elizabeth Didcock said: “The sudden loss of all income, and the threat of eviction that followed from it, will have caused huge distress and worry, and significant financial hardship... Likely, this loss of income, and housing, were the final and devastating stressors, that had a significant effect on his mental health... The safety net that should surround vulnerable people like Errol in our society has holes in it.” Tougher ‘fit to work’ assessments have now been linked to 590 additional suicides by the University of Liverpool. An average of 9,700 deaths are caused every year by living in a cold house, as Errol Graham did. Homeless deaths have been steadily rising over the last couple of decades as have deaths from malnourishment. The causes are intersectional. Living with chronic illness might make it harder for someone to work enough hours to pay the bills, but the government may deem them as ‘fit to work’ – with a huge impact on their mental health when they don’t receive support from the state. Older people may find their pensions aren’t sufficient to afford the cost of additional fuel to heat their homes through the winter. Disturbingly, 22% of the UK population are now living in poverty – 34% are children. The Trussell Trust is the largest food bank network in the UK – it handed out around 41,000 food packs in 2010 compared to 1.2 million in 2017. One in three premature deaths in the UK is attributable to socioeconomic inequality. There is one simple solution or at least a very good attempt at the beginnings of it – pay every individual a basic living wage. No matter what their situation. Lift the poor out of poverty. It’s not difficult to understand. It’s much cheaper to do this than to continue with the welfare state we currently have. No more bureaucracy, or administrative costs, or untrained and non-specialist staff assessing the medical needs of applicants.

These steps would solve AC impacts but would not link to the disadvantages of an unconditional right to strike. Gives workers bargaining power, they can leave jobs.

Supply Chain Inflation DA [2:10]

Supply chain is on the brink now because of increased demand – the plan causes widespread collapse of global supply chains because it creates an unprecedented worker shortage – that causes societal collapse because the global supply is key to delivering food, medicine, and tech

Global supply chain is on the brink of collapse – drives inflation

Jun 21 [He Jun, Mr. He Jun is Partner, Director of China Macro-Economic Research Team and Senior Researcher. His research field covers China's macro-economy, energy industry and public policy., 7-3-2021, "What's Causing the Global Supply Crunch?," Supply Chain Digital, <https://supplychaindigital.com/procurement/whats-causing-global-supply-crunch>, accessed 11-14-2021] BCortez

As the global economy gradually recovers from the impact of COVID-19 pandemic, **worldwide supply crunch is intensifying, spreading not only from one country to another, but also from one industry to another.**^a A year ago, when the pandemic continued to spread, economies around the world were severely hit and there was panic buying among consumers. Today, **it is companies that are trying to go on a stockpiling, buying more raw materials than they need to keep up with rapidly recovering demand.** The panic buying is fuelling more shortages of **raw materials, including copper, iron ore, steel, corn, coffee, wheat, soybeans, wood, semiconductors, plastics, cardboard, etc.** As a result, **inventories of seemingly every raw material around the world are running low.** "You name it, and we have a shortage on it," Tom Linebarger, chairman and chief executive of engine and generator manufacturer Cummins Inc., said earlier, and he noted that his clients are "trying to get everything they can because they see high demand".^a **Supply shortages have driven prices up significantly, with the impact of rising prices for some key raw materials being significant. The** prices of various industrial raw materials such as crude oil, plastics, and chemicals are rising. Some of the impacts of higher raw material prices have already begun to be reflected in consumer goods. Reynolds Consumer Products Inc., the maker of the namesake aluminium foil and Hefty trash bags, is planning another round of price hike, and this will be the third for the increase this year alone. Food prices are also climbing. The price of palm oil, the world's most consumed edible oil, has risen more than 135% over the past year to record levels; soybeans have topped USD 16 a bushel for the first time since 2012; corn futures prices have touched an eight-year high, and wheat futures prices have risen to the highest level since 2013.^a **Changes in factory orders due to the impact of the pandemic have also tightened supply in some markets and pushed up prices for raw materials.** Some knitting enterprises in Dongguan, Guangdong, said that affected by the pandemic, about 40% of the orders have come back to China from countries such as India and Southeast Asian countries, while the factory utilisation rate has increased by about 30% to 40%, and now it has reached 100%. In Jiangyin, Jiangsu, a bedsheet enterprise adjusted its production capacity to accommodate a USD 20 million order from Southeast Asia. Increased demand from the textile industry has led to tight supplies of raw materials. In Wujiang, Jiangsu, where polyester filament yarn is the most in demand, the shortage of raw materials this year has been unexpected, especially in the current off-season, when there is not much stock. In Suzhou, also in Jiangsu, the export of polyester filament yarn increased by nearly 60% from January to April, while the price increased by 40% to 60%. Compared with the same period last year, the price of filament yarn increased by RMB 2000-3000/ton.^a Remarkably, this **hoarding frenzy is pushing global supply chains to the brink of collapse. Inventory shortages, transportation bottlenecks, and price increases are nearing critical levels, raising concerns that strong global growth could fuel inflation.** The supply disruptions in the past are simply incomparable compared to the severe inventory crunch of 2021. Industry insiders predict that both large and small enterprises will be affected by this supply shortage.^a Why are current supply shortages so acute? ^a Researchers at ANBOUND believe that instead of having one single factor, **there are multiple reasons for the emergence of complex systemic problems.**^a First of all, **there is the recovery in demand as the pandemic is brought under control.** This year, as vaccination rollout efforts have brought the pandemic significantly under control in the United States and some European countries, the economy has begun to show significant momentum for recovery. This **trend prompted a near-simultaneous recovery in**

most markets around the world. The collective recovery of global markets has led to a near-simultaneous increase in demand, exacerbating the mismatch between supply and demand. In the case of commodity futures, the capital was collectively bullish on commodities under such expectations, significantly driving up the prices of commodities (mostly upstream commodities) and spreading to midstream and downstream commodities. It should be noted in particular that the surge in demand for certain specific commodities under the pandemic has also exacerbated the supply-demand mismatch in some industrial chains. For example, the increase in the need of remote, online working and studying has increased the demand for all kinds of electronic products, leading to a surge in global demand for semiconductor chips, which affects several chip-requiring industries.^a Another reason is that the pandemic has disrupted the global supply chain system, causing distortions in supply and demand in certain industries, which are transmitted along the supply chain, causing a wider supply crunch. As ANBOUND previously pointed out, the spread of the pandemic has dealt multiple blows to global supply chains. During the pandemic, China, as the "world's factory", was affected by the pandemic and its production side was disrupted. Then, the demand side of developed countries was suppressed by the impact of the pandemic. This is followed by the fact that the malfunctioning of the global supply chain system has exacerbated global supply distortions. To cite an example, the severe shortage of containers due to disruption of the supply chain has exacerbated the global supply distortions.^a In addition, enterprises began to collectively increase their inventories, leading to the increase of inventories in the industrial chain and supply chain, amplifying the demand for all kinds of raw materials, intermediate products, and supporting products. In the past, in order to save costs and improve efficiency, many enterprises advocated zero-inventory production and tried to reduce the inventory in the production link, thereby reducing the capital occupation. However, the smooth operation of zero inventory production depends on the efficient global supply chain system. Once a problem occurs in the global supply chain system, it can lead to chaos in the whole supply chain system. The 2011 earthquake in Tōhoku, Japan has caused the shutdown of some key auto parts plants, which once led to the global auto supply chain being affected. Likewise, the global spread of the COVID-19 pandemic since last year has damaged, distorted, and even disrupted global supply chains.^a Finally, geopolitical factors have also contributed to the tight supply of global commodities, resulting in the artificial disruption of part of the industrial chain and supply chain. For example, the U.S.-driven crackdown on chip supply to Chinese enterprises and related sanctions have seriously disrupted the global semiconductor industry chain.

More strikes compound supply problems

The Editorial Board 21 [The Editorial Board, 10-17-2021, "Big Labor and the Supply Shortage," archive.md, <https://archive.md/dLU48#selection-3997.0-3997.19>, accessed 11-14-2021]
BCortez

Forget what you've heard about the downfall of organized labor. A spate of strikes across the country is highlighting the power of unions amid today's national worker shortage, with potentially damaging consequences for the continuing nationwide supply problems.^a The biggest strike came after midnight Thursday when more than 10,000 Deere & Co. employees walked off the job. Workers on Oct. 10 overwhelmingly rejected a deal for wage and benefit increases negotiated by their United Auto Workers reps.^a In a different year employees might have leapt at the terms they turned down. By 2027 the deal would have lifted the typical production worker's annual wages to \$72,000 from \$60,000, according to the company. Employees also stood to gain one-time bonuses and better retirement benefits.^a But several factors are strengthening worker demands. Inflation has climbed to 5.4% in the past year, eating up current wages and driving employees to hold out for bigger raises. This is likely to spread to other companies and industries as inflation persists. A shortage of labor has also increased wage demands and union leverage, as employers are discovering.^a These circumstances have spurred thousands of other workers to the picket line in recent months. Frito-Lay employees in July won a steeper raise and an end to certain tight shift schedules. Carpenters in Washington state accelerated their proposed 21% pay raise this month after holding out for three weeks. More than 1,400 Kellogg employees left their posts last week at four plants across the country.^a **Unions**

planned these strikes at a tense moment in the economy. Supply chains are squeezed between restored demand and scarce labor, creating output shortages in countless industries. In retail alone, Salesforce estimates that roughly 350,000 missing workers will cost companies \$223 billion by the holiday season. Work stoppages are compounding that pain for businesses and consumers. The Des Moines Register reports that farmers fear delayed repairs and deliveries as Deere manages its strike. Kellogg, whose CEO said in May that he was holding back price increases, saw its share price drop when workers walked out. This display of labor muscle upends the victim narrative of unions and their political allies. Union membership as a share of the private workforce has dropped through the years for a variety of reasons, not least the example of auto and steel companies burdened by bad union contracts and legacy costs. Thousands of union auto workers lost jobs while non-union workers prospered at auto makers in right-to-work states in the South. Yet unions still hold significant leverage in organized industries. The self-portrayal as victims is convenient for unions in their pursuit of bargaining advantages from their political allies. The AFL-CIO, Big Labor's leading lobby, has led the campaign to pass the PRO Act, which would give unions the upper hand against management. Despite workers' demonstrated success at the picket line, union advocates and Democrats want to ban right-to-work laws in the states and limit how employers can make a case against union bargaining demands. The recent strikes aren't without irony for President Biden, a professed labor advocate now facing political damage from rising inflation and severe supply shortages. The President on Wednesday announced deals with retailers to speed up deliveries and unclog busy ports. We wonder what he promised the longshoremen at the Port of Long Beach in return. Our view is that unions and managers can work out their own problems, and wage gains in a tight labor market are welcome when they reflect gains in productivity. The problem arises when wage demands undermine a business's ability to compete in the marketplace, which ultimately hurts the workers who will lose their jobs in the future. Meantime, the reality in today's economy is that the more workers go on strike, the longer it will take for supply to catch up with demand.

Inflation collapses the global economy

Kinsley 10 [Michael Kinsley, Kinsley graduated from Harvard, went to Oxford on a Rhodes Scholarship, and came back to study at Harvard Law, 4-1-2010, "My Inflation Nightmare," Atlantic,

<https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2010/04/my-inflation-nightmare/307995/>, accessed 11-14-2021] BCortez

Another way to say "collapse of the currency" is to say "hyperinflation." Hyperinflation is when inflation feeds on itself and takes off beyond control. You can have stable 2 to 3 percent inflation. But you can't have stable 10 percent inflation. When everybody assumes 10 percent, all the forces that produced 10 percent push it to 20 percent, and then 40 percent, and soon people are lugging currency in a wheelbarrow, as in the famous photos from Weimar Germany. Thirty years ago, we peered into this abyss and pulled back just in time. As inflation neared its peak of more than 13 percent, Jimmy Carter appointed Paul Volcker as chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. Using his control over the money supply, Volcker purposely plunged us into a deep recession, which is the only certain remedy. Carter got blamed for both the inflation and the recession that cured it. The columnist Robert Samuelson tells the story in his book, just out in paperback, *The Great Inflation and Its Aftermath*. Even 13 percent inflation was a nightmare. A stable currency is firm ground on which you can build a life. Inflation turns life into *Through the Looking-Glass*: you have to run faster and faster to stay in the same place. Saving is for suckers, and money needs to be spent sooner rather than later. Planning even a year or two ahead becomes nearly impossible. Worst of all, economically, the hard knocks and lucky breaks of life, which people generally accept when they are distributed by fate, become politicized, and therefore embittering. Stop fighting, and you start losing.

Economic decline causes global nuclear war

Tønnesson 15 [(Stein, Research Professor, Peace Research Institute Oslo; Leader of East Asia Peace program, Uppsala University) “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace,” International Area Studies Review, Vol. 18, No. 3, p. 297-311, 2015]

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

This leads to extinction. Starr 15. [Steven, Senior Scientist for Physicians for Social Responsibility (www.psr.org) and Director of the Clinical Laboratory Science Program at the University of Missouri. Starr has published in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and the Strategic Arms Reduction (STAR) website of the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology] “Nuclear Wa: An Unrecognized Mass Extinction Event Waiting To Happen.” Ratical. March 2015.

<https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StevenStarr022815.html> TG

A war fought with 21st century strategic nuclear weapons would be more than just a great catastrophe in human history. If we allow it to happen, such a war would be a mass extinction event that ends human history. There is a profound difference between extinction and “an unprecedented disaster,” or even “the end of civilization,” because even after such an immense catastrophe, human life would go on. But extinction, by definition, is an event of utter finality, and a nuclear war that could cause human extinction should really be considered as the ultimate criminal act. It certainly would be the crime to end all crimes. The world’s leading

climatologists now tell us that nuclear war threatens our continued existence as a species. Their studies predict that a large nuclear war, especially one fought with strategic nuclear weapons, would create a post-war environment in which for many years it would be too cold and dark to even grow food. Their findings make it clear that not only humans, but most large animals and many other forms of complex life would likely vanish forever in a nuclear darkness of our own making. The environmental consequences of nuclear war would attack the ecological support systems of life at every level. Radioactive fallout produced not only by nuclear bombs, but also by the destruction of nuclear power plants and their spent fuel pools, would poison the biosphere. Millions of tons of smoke would act to destroy Earth's protective ozone layer and block most sunlight from reaching Earth's surface, creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last for decades. Yet the political and military leaders who control nuclear weapons strictly avoid any direct public discussion of the consequences of nuclear war. They do so by arguing that nuclear weapons are not intended to be used, but only to deter. Remarkably, the leaders of the Nuclear Weapon States have chosen to ignore the authoritative, long-standing scientific research done by the climatologists, research that predicts virtually any nuclear war, fought with even a fraction of the operational and deployed nuclear arsenals, will leave the Earth essentially uninhabitable.

Supply chain collapse causes total societal collapse

Stoller 11 [Matt Stoller, Matt Stoller is a fellow at the Open Markets program of New America., 7-27-2011, "How America Could Collapse," Nation, <https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/how-america-could-collapse/>, accessed 11-14-2021] BCortez

Worryingly, there's been very little consideration of how systemic collapses can happen in another, perhaps more dangerous realm—the industrial supply system that keeps us in everything from medicine to food to cars to, yes, videotape. In 2004, for instance, England closed one single factory, which caused the United States to lose half of its flu vaccine supply.^a Barry Lynn of the New America Foundation has been studying industrial supply shocks since 1999, when he noticed that global computer chip production was concentrated in Taiwan. After a severe earthquake in that country, the global computer industry nearly shut down, crashing the stocks of large computer makers. This level of concentration of the production of key components in a globalized economy is a new phenomenon. Lynn's work points to the highly dangerous side of globalization, the flip side of a hyper-efficient global supply chain. When one link in that chain is broken, there is no fallback.^a Lynn has continued to study industrial supply shocks and says, "What I have found most interesting recently is the apparent role supply chain shocks played in triggering a synchronized slowdown of industrial economies in April—production down (in USA, China, Europe, Southeast Asia), jobs down, demand down, GDP numbers down—due almost entirely to the loss of a single factory that makes microcontroller chips for cars."^a Today, the problem manifests as shortages of videotape or auto parts, but the global supply chain is so tangled and fragile that next time it could be electronics, weaponry, or even food or medicine. As Lynn noted in an interview with Dylan Ratigan, China controls 100 percent of the national supply of ascorbic acid, which is a basic food preservative. Leading oncologists are already warning that we are experiencing severe shortages of generic yet pivotal cancer drugs, because there's no incentive for corporations to make them.^a According to Lynn's groundbreaking book *End of the Line*, the essential problem is a basic shift in the way that American multinationals operate. In the 1980s, the competitive manufacturing threat from Japan led most large companies to eliminate waste in their production facilities. As a result, they stopped keeping spare parts on hand. Eventually, companies began outsourcing production itself, as profits came increasingly from extractive monopolistic power over an economic system. Walmart is an important example; its profits come from the power it can exert on its suppliers, telling them what to make and how to make it, while the company itself functions as a giant autocratic marketplace and trading operation. Increasingly, this is the model of success in our global economy. Boeing, Cisco, Apple—all of them rely on their power over an ecosystem of production facilities halfway around the world. They have become rent extractive profit-machines, which is a relatively new phenomenon.^a It was in the 1990s that American multinationals, spurred by government policy, began outsourcing operations to China. At the same time, the Clinton administration steadily

relaxed antitrust enforcement, leading to massive corporate consolidation and the creation of the virtual firm. By the early parts of the last decade, the ideal American multinational made its profits by using its market power to gut labor and supply prices and by using its political power to eliminate taxation. All of this turned giant American institutions against making things. This is why we rely on a British factory to make our flu vaccine, why global videotape production was knocked offline by a tsunami and why that same event slowed the gigantic auto industry. US corporate leaders now see the idea of making things as a cost of doing business, one best left to others. What has happened as a result is that much of the production for critical products and services that make our economy run is constructed by a patchwork global network of suppliers all over the world in unstable regions, over which we have very little control. An accident or political problem in any number of countries may deny us not just iPhones but food, medicine or critical machinery.^a Andy Grove, co-founder of Intel, has made the case that America needs to be building things here, investing here and manufacturing here. We need the know-how and the ecosystem of innovation. The more corporate America seeks to push production risk off the balance sheet onto an increasingly fragile global supply chain, the more it seeks to wound the state so there is no body that can constrain its worst impulses, the more likely we will see a truly devastating Lehman-style industrial supply shock.^a There's a good amount of grumbling about the state of American infrastructure—collapsing bridges, high-speed rail, etc. But American infrastructure is not just about public goods, it's about how the corporations that enforce, inform and organize economic activity are themselves organized. Are they doing productive research? Are they spreading knowledge and know-how to people who will use it responsibly? Are they creating prosperity or extracting wealth using raw power? And most importantly, are they contributing to the robustness of our society, such that we can survive and thrive in the normal course of emergencies?^a The answer to all of these questions right now is “no.” And while this may not be hitting the elite segments of the economy right now, there will be no escape from a flu pandemic or significant food shortage. The re-engineering of our global supply chain needs to happen—and it will happen, either through good leadership or through collapse. This means that our government and our society needs to reorient our economy toward manufacturing and rededicate our corporations to productive uses. This will require a new conception of antitrust laws to ensure that monopolistic or oligopolistic practices in pivotal industries aren't placing our culture at risk. It means understanding the networks of suppliers and sub-suppliers. And it means ending the race to the bottom that pushes deflationary pressures on labor and the social safety net. All of this can insure a more robust culture and economy, one which can withstand national security or environmental challenges. The sooner our leaders, both in public and private institutions, recognize how highly vulnerable we are to a societal collapse, the better chance we have of avoiding collapse.

<https://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1434&context=tcl>

Ironically enough, the Sinclair decision will also add to the woes of many harassed union leaders. It is unfortunate but true that those labor organizations which are most democratic in their internal affairs are often most guilty of illegal strike activities; either the leaders cannot control dissident elements in the ranks or, facing re-election difficulties, must cater to the desire of the members for dramatic action to protest real or imagined grievance. In the past, the threat of an imminent injunction has been urged when necessary by union officials, without losing face, as a compelling reason for re-sorting to arbitration rather than a work stoppage for satisfaction of the grievance. It is quite likely that in the next few years, Congress will avoid the effect of the Sinclair decision by either amending the venerable Norris-LaGuardia Act or, more likely, by amending the NLRA to make an unjustified breach of a no strike clause an unfair labor practice, enjoined at the discretion of the NLRB. In certain vital industries or occupations, compulsory arbitration may be the necessary alternative to strikes of any kind. Teachers and hospital workers, for example, who in effect are denied the right to strike under all circumstances, should not be forced to rely solely on the generosity or political sensibilities of public officials for redress.