## Util

#### Extinction outweighs

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

**Advantage 1 is Pandemics**

**The aff lets critical medical workers strike in all situations without consequences.**

**This is problematic because hospitals are the critical internal link for pandemic preparedness.**

**Al Thobaity 20**, Abdullelah, and Farhan Alshammari. "Nurses on the frontline against the COVID-19 pandemic: an Integrative review." Dubai Medical Journal 3.3 (2020): 87-92. (Associate Professor of Nursing at Taif University)

The majority of infected or symptomatic people seek medical treatment in medical facilities, particularly hospitals, as a high number of cases, especially those in critical condition, will have an impact on hospitals [4]. The concept of hospital resilience in disaster situations is defined as the ability to recover from the damage caused by huge disturbances quickly [2]. The resilience of hospitals to pandemic cases depends on the preparedness of the institutions, and not all hospitals have the same resilience. A lower resilience will affect the **sustainability of the health services**. This also affects healthcare providers such as doctors, nurses, and allied health professionals [5, 6]. Despite the impact on healthcare providers, excellent management of a pandemic depends on the level of **preparedness of healthcare providers, including nurses**. This means that if it was impossible to be ready before a crisis or disaster, responsible people will do all but the impossible to save lives.

**Future pandemics will cause extinction – it only takes one “super-spreader” to kill us all.**

**Bar-Yam 16** [[Yaneer Bar-Yam](https://twitter.com/YaneerBarYam), Transition to extinction: Pandemics in a connected world, New England Complex Systems Institute (July 3, 2016), https://necsi.edu/transition-to-extinction] //DD PT

Watch as one of the more aggressive—brighter red — strains rapidly expands. After a time it goes extinct leaving a black region. Why does it go extinct? The answer is that it spreads so rapidly that it kills the hosts around it. Without new hosts to infect it then dies out itself. That the rapidly spreading pathogens die out has important implications for evolutionary research which we have talked about elsewhere [1–7]. In the research I want to discuss here, **what we were interested in is the effect of adding long range transportation** [8]. **This includes natural**means of dispersal **as well as unintentional dispersal by humans**, like adding airplane routes, which is being done by real world airlines (Figure 2). **When we introduce long range transportation** into the model, **the success of more aggressive strains changes**. **They** can **use the** long range **transportation to find new hosts and escape local extinction**. Figure 3 shows that **the more transportation routes** introduced into the model, **the more higher aggressive pathogens are able to survive and spread**. As we add more long range transportation, **there is a critical point at which pathogens become so aggressive that the entire host population dies**. **The pathogens die at the same time, but that is not exactly a consolation to the hosts**. **We call this the phase transition to extinction** (Figure 4). **With increasing levels of global transportation, human civilization may be approaching such a critical threshold**. In the paper we wrote in 2006 about **the dangers of global transportation for pathogen evolution and pandemics** [8], we mentioned the risk from Ebola. Ebola is a horrendous disease that was present only in isolated villages in Africa. It was far away from the rest of the world only because of that isolation. Since Africa was developing, it was only a matter of time before it reached population centers and airports. While the model is about evolution, it is really about which pathogens will be found in a system that is highly connected, and Ebola can spread in a highly connected world. The traditional approach to public health uses historical evidence analyzed statistically to assess the potential impacts of a disease. As a result, many were surprised by the spread of Ebola through West Africa in 2014. **As the connectivity of the world increases, past experience is not a good guide to future events**. **A key point about the phase transition to extinction is its suddenness. Even a system that seems stable**, **can be destabilized by a few** more **long-range connections**, and **connectivity is continuing to increase**. So **how close are we to the tipping point? We don’t know but it would be good to find out before it happens**. While Ebola ravaged three countries in West Africa, it only resulted in a handful of cases outside that region. One possible reason is that many of the airlines that fly to west Africa stopped or reduced flights during the epidemic [9]. In the absence of a clear connection, public health authorities who downplayed the dangers of the epidemic spreading to the West might seem to be vindicated. As with the choice of airlines to stop flying to west Africa, our analysis didn’t take into consideration how people respond to epidemics. It does tell us what the outcome will be unless we respond fast enough and well enough to stop the spread of future diseases, which may not be the same as the ones we saw in the past. **As the world becomes more connected, the dangers increase**. Are people in western countries safe because of higher quality health systems? **Countries like the U.S. have highly skewed networks of social interactions with some very highly connected individuals that can be “superspreaders.”** The chances of such an individual becoming infected may be low but **events like a mass outbreak pose a much greater risk if they do happen**. If a sick food service worker in an airport infects 100 passengers, or a contagion event happens in mass transportation, **an outbreak could very well prove unstoppable.**

**Advantage 2 is Economics**

**Worker strikes negatively affect economic productivity to a great extent.**

**Mariesa A. Herrmann of Columbia University & Jonah E. Rockoff of Columbia Business School wrote in 2012:**

**Herrmann and Rockoff 12** (Mariesa A. Herrmann and Jonah E. Rockoff (2012), Mariesa Herrmann specializes in designing and conducting education evaluations. Her research has focused on interventions intended to improve educator effectiveness such as teacher and principal evaluation, professional development, and pay for performance. Since joining Mathematica in 2012, Herrmann has worked on a range of projects in the education area. Currently, she is deputy project director for the U.S. Department of Education’s national evaluation of teacher residency programs. Past projects include a synthesis of research evidence on assistant principals, the national evaluation of Race to the Top and School Improvement grants, and research-practice partnerships with the School District of Philadelphia and New Jersey Department of Education.) Worker Absence and Productivity: Evidence from Teaching. Journal of Labor Economics, 30(4), 749–782. doi:10.1086/666537 // TK

A significant amount of work time is lost each year due to worker absence, but evidence on the productivity losses from absenteeism remains scant due to difficulties with identification. We use uniquely detailed data on the timing, duration, and cause of absences among teachers to address many of the potential biases from the endogeneity of worker absence. Our analysis indicates that worker absences have large negative impacts: the expected loss in daily productivity from employing a temporary substitute is on par with replacing a regular worker of average productivity with one at the 10th–20th percentile of productivity. There is scant evidence on the productivity losses from worker absence, despite the fact that absenteeism results in an annual loss of 2% of work time in the United States (US Department of Labor 2008). Several highly regarded studies in economics have documented drops in productivity

**Hermann and Rockoff 12 proves that Worker strikes lead to absenteeism, which greatly leads to productivity loss as supported by other credible sources**

AND

**Economic productivity is key to global economic growth, it is urgently needed as in the status quo growth is already slowing down. Dany Bahar of the Brookings Institute writes in 2017 that:**

**Bahar 17,** (Dany Bahar is a nonresident senior fellow in the Global Economy and Development program at the Brookings Institution and an associate professor of practice of international and public affairs at Brown University's Watson Institute. He was previously a Senior Fellow and David M. Rubenstein Fellow at Brookings. An Israeli and Venezuelan economist, he is also an associate at the Harvard Center for International Development (Growth Lab), and a research affiliate at both CESifo Group Munich and IZA Institute of Labor Economics), “Productivity is key to economic growth: Why is it slowing down in advanced economies?” September 25, 2017,  <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/up-front/2017/09/25/productivity-is-key-to-economic-growth-why-is-it-slowing-down-in-advanced-economies/> // TK

A few months before leaving office [President Barack Obama wrote](http://www.economist.com/news/briefing/21708216-americas-president-writes-us-about-four-crucial-areas-unfinished-business-economic) about the challenges that his successor would have to tackle. Recent innovations, he claimed, “have not yet substantially boosted measured productivity growth.” In fact, since 2004, productivity growth slowed across nearly all advanced economies. Productivity being the most important determinant of economic growth, Obama concluded, “Without a faster-growing economy, we will not be able to generate the wage gains people want, regardless of how we divide up the pie.” President Obama was right: Productivity is the key to economic growth. In fact, over 60 percent of cross-country differences in income can be explained by productivity.

There are several explanations addressing the productivity slowdown that go from [mismeasurement](http://marginalrevolution.com/marginalrevolution/2016/03/productivity-slowdown-or-measurement-problem.html) to the [“drying out” of productivity-enhancing innovations](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2014/02/24/qa-why-robert-gordon-thinks-growth-is-over-and-what-we-can-do-about-it/?utm_term=.95f1b491efde), but consensus hasn’t been reached. What is clear is that in order to understand productivity it is important to look at the behavior of the smallest possible economic unit driving changes in aggregate productivity: the firm (individual businesses and corporations).

In my most recent [working paper](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/bahar_workingpaper_productivity.pdf), I look at millions of firms concentrated in more than 40 countries trying to answer a simple question: Is there convergence? Convergence, originally, is the name given by economists to the process through which poor countries grow at faster rates than rich countries, generating catching-up (a process for which there is little to no evidence of actually occurring without certain conditions). So, taking this question to the firm level and with a focus on productivity, I ask: Are the very low-productivity firms improving their productivity at a faster rate than the high-productivity firms?

Intuition would say the answer is yes. Why? Imagine the life of a newly established small firm producing footballs. In its beginning, it is likely that the firm is very “unproductive,” with each football produced requiring more worker-hours than an already established, large football firm. But the small firm can improve relatively quickly by simply copying some best practices from the larger firms, by, for example, hiring one manager that used to work at a larger firm or by buying a football making machine that was invented and developed by others. Therefore, these small firms can be expected to improve their productivity quite fast. However, for the already highly productive firms to improve their productivity requires more effort than simply copying best practices. Instead, it requires innovating, which in itself is very risky and costly. Yet, if they want to stay at the top, the large firms must keep innovating, even while knowing it is likely that the smaller firms will eventually benefit from those innovations.

My paper finds evidence of convergence, but also of divergence. That is, fast productivity growth is concentrated at the bottom and at the top of the productivity distribution. The very small, low-productivity firms grow fast, but so do the large high-productivity ones. This result is consistent with what the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development documents in their report [The Future of Productivity](https://www.oecd.org/eco/OECD-2015-The-future-of-productivity-book.pdf).

But the result is salient because it implies that there is a “middle productivity trap,” where firms, once they reach average levels of productivity, will lag behind those at the very top. This trap could point to existing market frictions that hinder the spread of innovations from the top to the bottom. Moreover, it is consistent with two important facts: First, the widening productivity dispersion—[a phenomenon that has been happening in the U.S. since the mid-1990s](https://www.brookings.edu/research/declining-business-dynamism-implications-for-productivity/)—and, second, the [increasing market share of “superstar” firms](https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2017/02/labors-share/515211/). These both could very well be related to the slowdown in total productivity.

Productivity is the most important determinant of economic growth, and in turn, of living standards more generally. As Paul Krugman—Nobel Laureate in economics—once put it, “Productivity isn’t everything, but, in the long run, it is almost everything.” The challenge for policymakers is to focus on the long run and to identify the market frictions that are causing most firms to lag behind.

Bahar 17 proves that the loss of productivity is important since productivity is necessary to increase economic growth and also increase living standards, which is directly tied to the quality of life. In addition to this, since innovation is already faltering in the status quo, voting for the aff will only make things worse and send the global situation to the brink.

**Innovation is key to preventing global recessions. Angela Hausman of Harvard University writes in 2013:**

**Hausman and Johnston 13**, (Hausman, Angela; Johnston, Wesley (2013)), . “The role of innovation in driving the economy: Lessons from the global financial crisis”. Journal of Business Research, 67(1), 2720–2726.         doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.03.021     // TK

2. Background 2.1. The impact of innovation on the economy “Innovation is critically important in contemporary economies. A key driver of the improvement in consumers' living standards is the growth and success of firms, and the wealth of nations. Investment in research and development (R&D) is essential for firms and nations to produce innovations and compete for the future”. (Tellis, Eisingerich, Chandy, & Prabhu, 2008) Getting government agencies, scholarly associations, think tanks, academics, business writers, and business leaders to agree on anything about the global financial crisis defies conventional logic, but that happened. Independently, these organizations and individuals accept the centrality of innovation for fueling a strong economy. Although not directly tied to the financial meltdown, their studies contend the lack of innovation compounds an otherwise difficult situation and, according to some, is a significant symptom of a more generalized problem resulting in this crisis. These groups commonly study discontinuous innovations that bring new technologies, new solutions, and new ways of doing things, rather than product enhancements. Where consensus breaks down is, as we will see later, when determining how best to stimulate innovations. Innovation contributes to a strong economy in several ways.

Hausman and Johnston 13 proves that since innovation is key to a strong economy, it shows how the affirmative’s unconditional worker strikes will result in another global recession.

FINALLY,

**Global Recessions negatively harm the quality of life for all involved long term, particularly workers and the bottom line. The Economic Policy Institute writes in 2009 that:**

**EPI 09,** (About EPI. The Economic Policy Institute (EPI) is a nonprofit, nonpartisan think tank created in 1986 to include the needs of low- and middle-income workers in economic policy discussions. EPI believes every working person deserves a good job with fair pay, affordable health care, and retirement security.To achieve this goal, EPI conducts research and analysis on the economic status of working America. EPI proposes public policies that protect and improve the economic conditions of low- and middle-income workers and assesses policies with respect to how they affect those workers.), Economic Scarring, the long-term impacts of the recession, Sept. 30 2009, <https://www.epi.org/publication/bp243/>>

Economic recessions are often portrayed as short-term events. However, as a substantial body of economic literature shows, the consequences of high unemployment, falling incomes, and reduced economic activity can have lasting consequences. For example, job loss and falling incomes can force families to delay or forgo a college education for their children. Frozen credit markets and depressed consumer spending can stop the creation of otherwise vibrant small businesses. Larger companies may delay or reduce spending on R&D.

In each of these cases, an economic recession can lead to “scarring”—that is, long-lasting damage to individuals’ economic situations and the economy more broadly. This report examines some of the evidence demonstrating the long-run consequences of recessions. Findings include:

Educational achievement: Unemployment and income losses can reduce educational achievement by threatening early childhood nutrition; reducing families’ abilities to provide a supportive learning environment (including adequate health care, summer activities, and stable housing); and by forcing a delay or abandonment of college plans.

Opportunity: Recession-induced job and income losses can have lasting consequences on individuals and families. The increase in poverty that will occur as a result of the recession, for example, will have lasting consequences for kids, and will impose long-lasting costs on the economy.

Private investment: Total non-residential investment is down by 20% from peak levels through the second quarter of 2009. The reduction in investment will lead to reduced production capacity for years to come. Furthermore, since technology is often embedded in new capital equipment, the investment slowdown can also be expected to reduce the adoption of new innovations.

Entrepreneurial activity and business formation: New and small businesses are often at the forefront of technological advancement. With the credit crunch and the reduction in consumer demand, small businesses are seeing a double squeeze. For example, in 2008, 43,500 businesses filed for bankruptcy, up from 28,300 businesses in 2007 and more than double the 19,700 filings in 2006. Only 21 active firms had an initial public offering in 2008, down from an average of 163 in the four years prior.

There is also substantial evidence that economic outcomes are passed across generations. As such, economic hardships for parents will mean more economic hurdles for their children. While it is often said that deficits can cause transfers of wealth from future generations of taxpayers to the present, this cost must also be compared with the economic consequences of recessions that are also passed to future generations.

This analysis also suggests that efforts to stimulate the economy can be very effective over both the short- and long-run. Using a simple illustrative accounting framework, it is shown that an economic stimulus can lead to a short-run boost in output that outweighs the additional interest costs of the associated debt increase. This is especially true over a short horizon.

A recession, therefore, should not be thought of as a one-time event that stresses individuals and families for a couple of years. Rather, economic downturns will impact the future prospects of all family members, including children, and will have consequences for years to come.

**Case**

**Strikes are ineffective because they are dependent on the economy, unlike alternatives, which proves that the cp is key and economic collapse is inevitable in their world.**

**Malin 13** [Martin H. Malin, Professor of Law Emeritus at Chicago-Kent College of Law, 1/14/13, “Two Models of Interest Arbitration,” Ohio State Journal on Dispute Resolution, [https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1741&context=fac\_schol]//DD](https://scholarship.kentlaw.iit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1741&context=fac_schol%5d//DD) AS

One of the strikes in 2009-2010 was in higher education (at the University of Illinois) and two of the strikes is 2011-2012 were in higher education (at the University of Illinois at Chicago and Southern Illinois University at Carbondale). Four strike notices that were not followed by strikes in 2011-2012 were also in higher education (University of Illinois- Springfield, Kennedy-King College, City Colleges of Chicago and Rock Valley Community College) and four strike notices in 2010-2011 were in higher education for different bargaining units at Southern Illinois University - Carbondale, one of which led to the strike in 2011-2012. Strikes in K-12 education are likely to be much more politically sensitive than strikes in higher education. A strike at a state university or local community college does not attract the attention of hundreds to tens of thousands of parents, depending on the size of the school district, who suddenly have to make alternate arrangements for their children. The data makes clear· that **when the economy crashed, unions of educational employees stopped striking.** In the four school years since the economy crashed, public K-12 education in Illinois has seen one strike in 2008-2009, three in 2009-2010, two in 2010-2011 and three strikes in 2011-2012. Moreover, as Table One makes clear, **there has also been a dramatic decrease in the number of strike notices**. Except for an outlier year of 2006-2007 when there were only twenty-four strike notices filed,the pre-2008 strike notices ranged from thirty-two to fifty each year. In 2008-2009 there were only eleven strike notices and there were only thirteen the following year. Although the number increased in the following year, several of those were in higher education; the number ofK-12 strike notices dropped back the next year and the numbers remained at least 50% below the· number of notices in the years prior to 2008. In other words, **educational employees'** unions were not only refraining from striking, they **weren't even threatening to strike. Strike duration also changed markedly as the economy crashed**. Table Two presents data on strike duration obtained from the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Board. While strikes lasting a week or longer were common before the economy crashed, strikes thereafter were generally settled in a matter of days with two outliers (Ottawa Township High School and Illini Bluffs Community Unit School District) as the only exceptions. This record is even more remarkable considering the environment for K-12 negotiations. Although decreases in government revenue generally lag the drop in the economy and the lag was probably extended by the availability of federal stimulus money, **it is likely that by 2009-2010 and certainly by 2010- 2011 that the parties were negotiating in a concessionary environment.**

**Turn-Striking leads to worse conditions.**

**Condon 18** [Jacki, 1 October 2018, “Strikes and their Economic Consequences”, Engineering News, <https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/article/strikes-and-their-economic-consequences-2018-10-01>] //DebateDrills LC

While several activities can be taken in an effort to prevent strikes from occurring or escalating, in the South African context, **the tendency towards violent outbursts seems to outweigh reasonable action.**

“**Strikes and labour unrest have marked negative impacts on the employees themselves, the employers and their stakeholders, the government, consumers, and the economy**,” advises Jacki Condon, Managing Director of Apache [Security](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/security) [Services](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/services). “**The negative effects on international trade include the hinderance of economic development, creating great economic uncertainty**– especially as the global media continues to share details, images and videos of violence, damage to property and ferocious clashes between strikers and [security](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/security).”

**Strike action results in less productivity, which in turn means less profits**. Labour Law expert, Ivan Israelstam confirms that; “The employer is likely to lose money due to delayed [service](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/service) to clients or to lost production time. **The employees will lose their pay due to the no work, no pay principle. If the strikers are dismissed they will lose their livelihoods altogether**.”

This year alone, Eskom, Prasa, various [manufacturing](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/manufacturing) plants, Sasol and the Post Office have faced crippling strikes – to name but a few. **Condon argues that there are more immediate consequences to consider than loss of income.**

“**As the socio-economic issues continue to affect South Africans across the board, tensions are constantly rising**,” states Condon. “**Businesses must protect themselves, their assets,**[**business**](https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/topic/business)**property, and their non-striking employees from violence and intimidation**.”