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#### Biden’s policies are continuing the US-Chinese trade war; however, agreements and deals are being made to end it.

Bradsher 21 Bradsher, Keith. “A Temporary U.S.-China Trade Truce Starts to Look Durable.” *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 27 May 2021, www.nytimes.com/2021/05/27/business/us-china-trade-deal.html. SJEP

SHANGHAI — Just days before the coronavirus shut down the [Chinese](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/05/29/health/us-china-mask-production.html) city of Wuhan and changed the world, the Trump administration and China [signed](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/15/business/economy/china-trade-deal.html) what both sides said would be only a temporary truce in their 18-month trade war. Since then, the pandemic has scrambled global priorities, international commerce has stalled and surged again and President Biden has taken office. But the truce endures — and now appears to be setting new, lasting ground rules for global trade. The agreement didn’t stop many of the same practices that sparked the trade war, the biggest in history. It does nothing to prevent China from throwing huge subsidies at a range of industries — from electric cars to jetliners to computer chips — that could shape the future, but for which the country often relies heavily on American technology. In return, the truce left in place most of the tariffs that the Trump administration imposed on $360 billion a year in Chinese-made goods, many of them subsidized. Such unilateral moves run counter to the spirit of the rules of global trade, which were set up to stop nations from starting economic conflicts on their own and to keep them from spiraling out of control. But the new model seems to be catching on. The European Union announced on May 5 that it was drafting legislation that would allow it to [broadly penalize imports and investments](https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/QANDA_21_1984) from subsidized industries overseas. E.U. officials, who had initially [looked askance at the U.S.-China truce](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/23/business/economy/china-us-trade-deal-allies.html), said their policy was not aimed specifically at China. But trade experts were quick to note that no other exporter has the scale of manufacturing and breadth of subsidies that China has. “You see a real appetite in the U.S. but also in the E.U. for unilateral measures,” said Timothy Meyer, a former State Department lawyer who is now a professor at Vanderbilt Law School. The truce, known as the Phase 1 agreement, could still be supplanted by a new deal. The agreement requires that the two sides conduct a high-level review of it this summer. On Wednesday in Washington, Katherine Tai, the United States trade representative, held an introductory call with a senior Chinese official, Vice Premier Liu He — a signal that Mr. Liu, the same top negotiator who squared off against the Trump administration, will be kept in place by China. But prospects for a far-reaching new deal this year are slim. The Biden administration is drafting a comprehensive strategy toward China, a complex interagency procedure that could last into early next year. It has also shown little appetite for easing up on China’s trade practices, and it has publicly discussed smoothing ties with European and other allies that were ruffled by other disputes during the Trump administration. “We welcome the competition,” Ms. Tai [told lawmakers](https://www.finance.senate.gov/hearings/the-presidents-2021-trade-policy-agenda) earlier this month. “But the competition must be fair, and if China cannot or will not adapt to international rules and norms, we must be bold and creative in taking steps to level the playing field and enhance our own capabilities and partnerships.”

#### The plan will cause an increase in jobs outsourced to China. South Africa proves.

Maré 17 Maré, Arnoux. “How Staff Outsourcing Can Help Avoid Wage Strikes.” *Innovative Staffing Solutions*, 12 Sept. 2017, innovativestaff.net/staff-outsourcing-can-help-avoid-wage-strikes/. SJEP

Strike action is so destructive to a business’ operations, it comes as no surprise that organisations are willing to go to extremes to avoid such devastation. It was recently announced that government and labour and business agreed to a package of labour market reform which will see R20/hour as the minimum wage. This arguably provides more benefits to the labour movement than it does to business. However, this is the price business is willing to pay to reduce labour market tension. The South African government, business, community sector and the labour federations represented at Nedlac signed the agreement earlier this year in Cape Town. The agreement came in the wake of years of destructive labour unrest, particularly in the mining industry, which wreaked untold damage on the economy and on job creation. Faced with the option of paying a wage that many businesses really cannot afford, or alternatively risking their entire business destroyed by prolonged strike activity, Nedlac opted for the former. Nonetheless, individual companies may feel they cannot afford that leap in their wage bill. However, strikes at a local level could be avoided in other ways. Strike action typically doesn’t happen from any principled stance by either labour or business, but because the situation is not anticipated or managed and simply drifts out of control. A viable solution to eliminating the strike factor is by outsourcing your staff. We employ more than 6,000 staff whom we contract out to various clients, and in our experience, if you take care of your staff they will take care of you. It also makes the commitment that should there ever be a strike, alternative staff are put on site at the client to ensure its operations are not affected. South Africa’s economy has become an extremely competitive one, and losing business through a strike is a serious blow. While some companies are strong enough to survive the damage, they may still lose market share. Weaker businesses could go under as a result of industrial action. It is not just its client companies that benefit, but also the workers who often in the past found themselves embroiled in strike action against their will due to union pressure. This takes as great a financial toll on the lives of staff as it does on the company, as employees are not paid for the days they are on strike. In fact, a prolonged strike may also mean striking workers never truly recover financially. The labour agreement also introduces secret strike balloting, advisory arbitration and agreed standards of conduct during industrial action (including by the police and private security companies) and this is a step in the right direction which should reduce the propensity for violence and the length of strikes. This is going to become the higher priority, if the Nedlac deal achieves its aim of reducing strike activity. The price tag for securing labour’s co-operation was steep: it is estimated that R20/hour (R3,500/month for a 40-hour week) national minimum wage will raise wages across nearly half of South Africa’s businesses. Many small businesses are panicking that it will put them out of business. Staff outsourcing is an option they should consider as it can save a business up to 60% in operational costs instead of letting things drift until they inevitably are forced to close their doors.

#### The trade war has already weakened China’s economy.

Wallace 19 Wallace, Charles. “Trade War Hurting China's Economy.” *Forbes*, Forbes Magazine, 9 Aug. 2019, www.forbes.com/sites/charleswallace1/2019/08/09/trade-war-hurting-chinas-economy/?sh=1528d6694035. SJEP

New signs emerged Friday that President Trump’s tariffs on Chinese exports are beginning to seriously impact the overall Chinese economy. [The Chinese government reported that exports to the U.S. in July fell by 6.5%.](https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3022013/chinas-us-trade-slumps-again-exports-rise-due-higher-demand)It was the second month after Trump increased tariffs on $250 billion worth of Chinese goods to 25%. Imports from the U.S.. Also fell by 19.1%. Perhaps more alarming, the[country’s producer price index turned negative, falling 0.3% from flat levels in the previous month. It was the first time the PPI has been negative in three years.](https://www.scmp.com/economy/china-economy/article/3022075/us-trade-war-drives-chinas-producer-prices-deflation-pork) Analysts say that the trade war with the U.S. Is forcing Chinese factories to sell their wares to wholesalers at a discount. Another key indicator, the manufacturing purchasing managers’ index (PMI) – which measures factory owner sentiment, registered 49.7 in July. Although this was slightly above June’s levels, a reading below 50 is a sign that the industrial sector is still contracting. The country’s National Bureau of Statistics reported Friday that the means of production – capital goods like machinery – fell by 0.7 % in the month. Trump has expressed hope that the declines in the Chinese economy will force the Beijing government to agree to terms of a new trade agreement when the two sides next meet in September. But the Chinese have accused the U.S. of instigating unrest in Hong Kong and allowed their currency, the renminbi, to fall in value against the U.S. dollar, signs that relations are worsening rather than improving.

#### A greater outsourcing of jobs to China will levy additional tariffs crippling China’s economy.

Gereffi 21 Gereffi, Gary, and Joonkoo Lee and [Hyun-Chin Lim](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#auth-Hyun_Chin-Lim) . “Trade Policies, Firm Strategies, and Adaptive Reconfigurations of Global Value Chains.” Journal of International Business Policy, Palgrave Macmillan UK, 16 Mar. 2021, link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z. SJEP

Since his inauguration in January 2017, U.S. President Donald Trump and his administration have imposed various trade restrictions against a host of countries, including its allies.1 The protectionist moves culminated in a U.S. trade conflict with China, which started in early 2018 and featured U.S. tariff hikes on imports from China and an American trade ban against Huawei, the Chinese electronics and telecom giant, over national security concerns and China’s retaliatory counter-tariffs. Despite a first-phase deal in January 2020, many contentious issues are largely unresolved (Swanson & Rapperport, [2020](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR83)), and the stand-off between the two countries has intensified amid the COVID-19 pandemic (Rudd, [2020](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR74)). The trade war is notable not only because it involves the world’s two largest economies tightly connected through GVCs, but also because GVCs continued to expand in recent decades amidst lowered trade barriers and a rules-based regime under the World Trade Organization (WTO), which provided predictability in trade and investment (Azmeh, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR2); Fajgelbaum, Goldberg, Kennedy & Khandelwal, [2020](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR26)). Now, the tide is apparently turning in the opposite direction, raising the specter of the shrinkage, if not demise, of GVCs (Chor, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR17)). However, given the prevalence of GVCs nowadays, the impacts of trade restrictions can be different from those in the pre-GVC world, and some measures can have unintended consequences (Bellora & Fontagné, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR7); Blanchard, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR9)). In the GVC world, diverse trade patterns other than a simple bilateral exchange of final goods exist, and trade is intertwined with foreign direct investment (FDI) and outsourcing (UNCTAD, [2013](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR86); Head & Mayer, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR50)). As a result, the effect of trade restrictions can be amplified beyond the two disputing partners or the targeted final products. For instance, when U.S. or third-country firms outsource to or invest in China in order to export to the U.S., they are immediately exposed to the U.S. restrictions against China. Thus, higher U.S. import tariffs penalize many non-Chinese firms (including American ones) that use China as a sourcing location where imported inputs are assembled for export to the U.S, as in the case of Apple’s iPhone.2 At the same time, higher tariffs on imported intermediate goods from China can hurt U.S. domestic firms using these inputs. Tesla, an American electric vehicle company, uses imported parts from China, and higher U.S. tariffs will drive up its U.S. production costs (Matousek, [2018](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR63)). Furthermore, because “not all imports are equal” (Gereffi, [2018b](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR39): 436), the impact and magnitude of trade restrictions are highly specific and vary not only by sector (Erken, Giesbergen & Nauta, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR25)) as well as over time, but also by the type of GVC linkages a country or firm is involved in (Gereffi, Humphrey & Sturgeon, [2005](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR43); Van Assche & Gangnes, [2019](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s42214-021-00102-z#ref-CR89)). Thus, it is increasingly difficult to pinpoint the winners and losers of trade policies because they are not always straightforward in a GVC world. The gains and losses depend not only on a country’s or firm’s engagement with its target market, but also the way it is involved in GVCs through third countries and the time period involved.

#### An economically weak China leads to diversionary war– it escalates.

Hassid, PhD, 19

(Jonathan, PoliSci@Berkeley, AssistProfPoliSci@IowaState, A Poor China Might Be More Dangerous Than a Rich China, in Foreign Policy Issues for America, ed. Richard Mansbach DPhil and James McCormick PhD, Routledge)

China has a number of political differences and potential conflicts with the United States, some of which are summarized in Chapter 4. From China’s vast maritime territorial claims, the anomalous status of Taiwan to America’s alliances with Japan and South Korea, its treatment of Tibetans and Islamic minorities like the Uighurs, and its reluctance to implement UN-sponsored sanctions to force North Korea to abandon nuclear weapons, there are many potential flash points in the Sino-U.S. relationship. Many analysts noted that at the 19th Party Congress Xi Jinping promoted a more aggressive and muscular foreign policy, promising that China would become a world superpower by 2050. This fact alone could presage eventual conflict with the current reigning superpower, the United States. Indeed, many in China and across Asia feel that President Trump’s pullout from the U.S.-led Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) have already signaled US retreat from the region, opening the way for a more assertive Chinese foreign policy. Some analysts go further, arguing that China is even now trying to build its own world order and muscle out U.S. trade influence by signing new bilateral trade agreements with historical U.S. allies like Canada. These signs may point to potential conflict in the future. However there is also reason to be hopeful; relations between the two giants were normalized in the 1970s, and thus far China and the United States have avoided serious conflict. In part this has been a result of U.S. policies in the region and because China has been able to increase its global status peacefully. But perhaps the most important reason conflict has been avoided is because Beijing has looked inwardly, concentrating on generating economic growth within its borders rather than making trouble beyond them. President Donald Trump has repeatedly argued that the United States must be more assertive in foreign affairs and in realizing its national interest regardless of the impact on others. His rhetoric has been highly combative. From vowing to declare China a “currency manipulator” on his first day in office – a claim he has since abandoned – to arguing that China has been cheating America in trade deals and denouncing the U.S. trade deficit with China, Trump has appeared to prefer confronting Beijing rather in engaging and cooperating with China. But this appearance of confrontation may belie a different reality. Many have noted that Trump and his family have personal business ties with China, including large investments and numerous pending trademark applications. Actions like Trump’s 2018 public support for state-owned Chinese tech company ZTE – coming just two days after the Chinese government announced a US $500m investment in a Trump-branded property in Indonesiaiii – further suggest to some that Beijing might be directly manipulating the US president to benefit Chinese foreign policy. Combined with the perception, common in Chinese official circles, that the United States under Trump is actually retreating from its commitments in Asia, the result might be additional areas of potential conflict with China and misperception and misunderstanding between the two. What might happen if there were an unintended Sino-American military confrontation in the South China Sea or the Sea of Japan, just as the Chinese economy slumps and triggers spreading labor unrest and disturbances at home? What might happen if Xi Jinping’s goal of having “no poverty in China by 2020” proves impossible, and China’s middle class becomes alienated from the regime and political dissent spreads owing to acute economic and/or environmental distress? Under such circumstances, China’s history suggests that Xi and other leaders might decide a “minor” foreign conflict would be a way to divert the attention of Chinese citizens from their domestic concerns. In China’s past, as we have seen, such “domestically-influenced” conflicts have been contained, but the very success of these previously limited conflicts might make Chinese leaders overconfident about their ability to avoid military escalation. Mistakes are easy to make, especially if the potential foe has a leader who tweets militant threats. If Beijing sought to distract an unhappy population by stirring up Chinese nationalism toward the United States, Taiwan, or Japan regarding maritime territorial claims, for example, and believes the Trump administration will not intervene, the two might careen toward a war that neither wants. An incident caused by a trigger-happy U.S. pilot or Chinese naval officer might escalate into a war that neither Washington nor Beijing sought. In the end, then, it may arguably better for the Trump administration that China continues to flourish economically. A prosperous China means that the United States has a valuable trading partner and – in certain issues – even a strategic partner. An impoverished China, however, might be bad news for everyone.

## 2

#### The standard is maximizing ex[ected well being. Prefer it:

#### [1] Actor spec: util is the best for governments, which is the actor in the rez – multiple warrants:

#### [a] Governments must aggregate since every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### [b] No intent-foresight distinction – the actions we take are inevitably informed by predictions from certain mental states, meaning consequences are a collective part of the will.

#### [c] No act omission distinction – governments are responsible for everything in the public sphere and have yes/no bills so inaction is an implicit authorization of action.

#### Extinction outweighs under any framework

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)

## 3

#### CP Text: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike for all purposes except against vaccine mandates.

#### Hospital workers protest against vaccine mandate.

**Villegas and Diamond 6/8** [Paulina and Dan. Paulina Villegas is a General Assignment reporter covering breaking news and national enterprise stories for The Washington Post. Dan Diamond is a national health reporter for The Washington Post. “178 hospital workers suspended for not complying with coronavirus vaccination policy”. 6-8-2021. . https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2021/06/08/houston-hospital-workers-suspended-vaccine/.] SJ//VM

A Houston-based hospital system suspended more than 170 health-care workers who did not comply with the organization’s vaccine mandate, the system’s CEO said Tuesday, a day after employees protested the requirement outside a medical center. While 24,947 of Houston Methodist’s employees were fully vaccinated against the novel coronavirus by Monday’s deadline, 178 employees did not get fully vaccinated and were suspended without pay for two weeks, Houston Methodist CEO Marc Boom wrote in an internal message that the system [shared with The Washington Post](https://www.washingtonpost.com/context/hospital-suspends-workers-for-not-complying-with-coronavirus-vaccination-policy/28c8534d-a479-4ebe-8152-5e9fbcf1c21a/?itid=lk_inline_manual_4). “Of these employees, 27 have received one dose of vaccine, so I am hopeful they will get their second doses soon,” Boom wrote. “I know that today may be difficult for some who are sad about losing a colleague who’s decided to not get vaccinated,” he added. “We only wish them well and thank them for their past service to our community, and we must respect the decision they made.” Story continues below advertisement Meanwhile, 285 employees received a medical or religious exemption from the vaccine, and 332 employees were granted deferrals for pregnancy or other reasons, Boom said. The CEO in March called on Houston Methodist staffers to [get vaccinated](https://www.washingtonpost.com/health/2021/05/21/employers-colleges-vaccine-mandates/?itid=lk_inline_manual_9) against the novel [coronavirus](https://www.washingtonpost.com/coronavirus/?itid=lk_inline_manual_9), saying the health system needed to set an example and protect patients. The policy drew attacks from conservative media and prompted legal threats, including a [lawsuit](https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2021/05/29/texas-hospital-vaccine-lawsuit/?itid=lk_inline_manual_9) from more than 100 of the system’s staffers, led by a nurse who worked in the coronavirus unit and insisted that vaccines needed further study. On Monday, dozens of medical workers gathered outside a Texas hospital to protest the policy. Story continues below advertisement “Vaxx is Venom,” read one of the signs. “Don’t Lose Sight of Our Rights,” read another sign held by one among dozens of supporters who rallied at Houston Methodist Baytown Hospital in Baytown, Tex. Starting in April, the system began requiring vaccination for all its employees in more than a dozen of its locations across Texas, saying it wasthe first in the nation to take such a step. Those who did not provide proof of vaccination by June 7 — or who had not applied by early April for an exemption based on “medical condition (including pregnancy deferment) or sincerely held religious belief” — were to face suspension without pay for two weeks, according to a [hospital memo.](https://hrportal.ehr.com/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=WbwcMj8SRPg%3d&portalid=78) If the employees do not prove vaccination or have an exemption by June 21, they will be subject to “employment termination,” the memo said. Story continues below advertisement Some of the employees have said the order is an infringement on their rights. “No one should be forced to put something into their body if they’re not comfortable with it,” said Jennifer Bridges, a nurse who has worked for Houston Methodist for more than six years and has protested mandatory vaccination policies for months. Bridges was one of those who had been suspended, [the Texan](https://thetexan.news/houston-hospital-nurses-stage-walkout-over-vaccine-mandate/) reported. “We fully support the right of our employees to peacefully gather on their own time,” Gale Smith, a Houston Methodist spokesperson, said in an statement sent to The Washington Post this week. Bridges had refused to comply, objecting because the vaccines authorized for emergency use in the United States have not been “fully” approved by the Food and Drug Administration — a process that generally involves two years of clinical trials to assess side effects. Story continues below advertisement “I’m not anti-vaccine. I’ve had every vaccine known to man, except this one,” Bridges told The Post in May, adding that she and like-minded colleagues wanted to be able to decline care. “As nurses and medical staff, everybody feels like you should have a right to choose what you put in your body.” Boom and outside experts have countered that the vaccines are safe and effective, citing the growing body of data on their protective effects. Although the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has [said](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/recommendations/essentialworker.html) the federal government does not mandate vaccination, it has also stated that “for some healthcare workers or essential employees, a state or local government or employer, for example, may require or mandate that workers be vaccinated as a matter of state or other law.” Story continues below advertisement Last week, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the agency that enforces work discrimination laws, [said](https://www.natlawreview.com/article/equal-employment-opportunity-commission-eeoc-says-employers-can-mandate-covid-19) employers can require the vaccines. Bridges and 116 other Houston Methodist employees [sued](https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2021/05/29/texas-hospital-vaccine-lawsuit/?itid=lk_inline_manual_31) the hospital system last month, after it made vaccination a condition of employment. The lawsuit, filed in a state court, has moved to a federal court. “We will fight this all the way to the Supreme Court,” Bridges told the Texan on Monday. “This is wrongful termination and a violation of our rights.” Jennifer Bridges, a nurse at Houston Methodist, in Houston on May 19. (Mark Felix for The Washington Post) The lawsuit says Houston Methodist’s vaccine requirement violates medical ethics standards known as the Nuremberg Code, which was designed to prevent experimentation on humans who do not consent to it. Story continues below advertisement It also states that Methodist is forcing its employees to be human “guinea pigs” as a condition for continued employment,” arguing that the mandate “requires the employee to subject themselves to medical experimentation as a prerequisite to feeding their families.” Bridges, like many other nurses and health workers refusing vaccines, has denied being an anti-vaxxer in interviews with several media outlets, and says she has received vaccinations for other diseases. She is among the millions of Americans refusing vaccinations, citing a range of concerns and motives including what they say was a rushed process for authorizing the vaccine, a lack of comprehensive data of potential side effects, and an affront to individual freedoms. Some say government officials have concealed information about severe cases of negative reaction to the vaccine, though there is no evidence to support such allegations. Such concern was echoed by Angelina Farella — a pediatrician and member of America’s Frontline Doctors, a conservative group that has opposed mandating the experimental coronavirus vaccines — who joined the protesters Monday. Story continues below advertisement In comments to [local media covering the protest,](https://thetexan.news/houston-hospital-nurses-stage-walkout-over-vaccine-mandate/) Farella said vaccine promoters are minimizing data of cases of serious adverse reactions to the inoculation, which she said have in some cases led to death. Health officials have repeatedly stated that cases of severe reactions to the vaccine are rare. According to the [CDC,](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/vaccines/safety/adverse-events.html) more than 285 million doses of vaccines against the novel coronavirus, which causes the illness covid-19, were administered from Dec. 14 through May 24. During that span, the federal Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting Systems (VAERS) received 4,863 reports of death (0.0017 percent) among people who received a coronavirus vaccine, which does not necessarily mean the vaccine was a direct cause of death. Vaccination reluctance among health workers has remained high in Texas and across the nation. Story continues below advertisement A [Gallup poll](https://news.gallup.com/poll/350720/covid-vaccine-reluctant-likely-stay.aspx) conducted in May found that 24 percent of U.S. adults do not plan to be vaccinated for various reasons, including worry that the vaccines were not safe. In Texas, the issue led the legislature to draft a bill to penalize businesses or government entities that require proof of vaccination from their customers. The measure, signed into law Monday by Gov. Greg Abbott (R), also established that businesses requiring customers to be vaccinated will be denied state contracts and could lose their licenses or operating permits. Joseph Varon, chief of staff at United Memorial Medical Center in Houston, said he has seen vaccination reluctance among his staff, especially at the beginning of the rollout when, he said, almost 40 percent of the hospital’s nurses refused to get vaccinated because of political reasons or fears of side effects. “It is a serious issue that health professionals have this attitude,” Varon said. “You would expect it from other conservative groups, not from health workers.” Although he wants all front-line workers to be vaccinated, Varon said, forcing them to do so may backfire. “It is not a question of whether they should be vaccinated or not,” he said. “The tricky part is how you get people to do it.”

## 4

#### Interp: The aff must define what a just government is

#### Violation: they didn’t

#### [1] Stable advocacy – 1AR clarification delinks neg positions that prove why strikes in a certain instance are harmful by saying those aren’t under just government – wrecks neg ballot access and kills in depth clash – CX doesn’t check since it kills 1NC construction pre-round

#### [2] Prep skew – I don’t know what they will be willing to clarify until CX which means I could go 6 minutes planning to read a disad and then get screwed over in CX when they spec something else. This means that CX can’t check because the time in between is when I should be formulating my strat and waiting until then is the abuse. Key fairness because I won’t be able to use the strat I formulated if you skewed my prep and will have a time disadvantage

#### D. Voter

**Fairness is a voter—debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation. Education is a voter – it is the terminal impact of debate. Drop the debater—the abuse has already occurred and my time allocation has shifted—also the shell indicts your whole aff—justifies severance which skews my strat. Use competing interps—leads to a race to the top since we figure out the best possible norm and avoids judge intervention since there’s a clear brightline.**

**No RVIs—**

**a. Baiting—they’ll just bait theory and prep it out—justifies maximal abuse and results in a chilling effect**

**b. its not logical—you don’t reward them for meeting the burden of being fair. Logic is a meta constraint on all args because it definitionally determines whether an argument is valid.**

## 5

#### Tech can solve infrastructure concerns but needs to be integrated – operators are key.

Jacobs 5/31 [Lionel; Senior Security Architect in the Palo Alto Networks ICS and SCADA solutions team. Coming from the asset-owner side , Lionel has spent more than 20 years working in the IT/OT environment, with a focus on ICS systems design, controls, and implementation. He was a pioneer in bridging the IT-OT security gap and implementing next-generation security into performance and safety critical process control areas. During his tenure, he successfully deployed a large scale ICS/SCADA security architecture composed of over 100 next-generation firewalls, hundreds of advanced endpoint protection clients and SIEM, distributed over dozens of remote plants and a centralized core, all based on a "Zero Trust" philosophy. Lionel graduated from Houston Baptist University with a double degree in Physics and Mathematics and has held certifications as a MCSE, CCA, CCNP, CCIP, CCNA, CSSA, and GICSP; “Critical Infrastructure Protection: Physical and Cyber Security Both Matter,” eSecurity Planet; 5/31/21; <https://www.esecurityplanet.com/networks/critical-infrastructure-protection-physical-cybersecurity/>] Justin

Segmentation based on business criteria

Segmentation is not just breaking apart the network based on the IP-Address space. True segmentation requires identifying and grouping devices into Zones or Enclaves based on meaningful business criteria to protect better vulnerable devices found within the address space. Access to devices in the zone needs to be restricted by users, groups, protocols, networks, and devices. In some instances, you may even consider restricting access by time of day.

IoT/IIoT is beginning to take hold in the energy industry, which means there are going to be more devices attached to these networks gathering information and possibly running on a vendor’s proprietary software and hardware, which more than likely will not be managed or patchable by the operator of the system. So O&G needs to have a definite plan on how they will address this growing trend, and a zero trust-based strategy offers the best means of doing this integration in a safe, secure, and, most important, reversible manner.

Camera and sensor security

Segmentation will also include the zoning of radio frequency (RF) technologies like Wi-Fi, Microwave, satellite, and cellular. ICS and SCADA systems operators must remain mindful of the possibility of an upstream attack by threat actors who have managed to compromise their RF facilities. Remote facilities and devices often have cameras and sensors to alert when a door has been opened. Still, because they are remote, attackers have time to enter the facilities and plant a device that can go completely unnoticed.

Another option physical access affords them is the opportunity to compromise the runtime operating systems and/or OS of the devices they find. The only way you will find these would be to do a physical search of the facility or cabinet and run an audit of the OS to ensure nothing has been tainted.

Zoning limits damage

So the reason why the zone trust segmentation (zoning) is so important is if you don’t have the time to perform these acts to confirm that the site is not compromised. With proper zoning enforcement, you can limit and isolate the damage to a region or just that location.

Zones in a Zero Trust network also serve as an inspection point for traffic entering and exiting the enclave. The enabling of IPS, IDS, and virtual sandboxing technology can be applied on a per-zone basis, allowing for customized protection for the vulnerable devices contained within. Implementing these security measures is a best practice even on zones where devices can receive updates and have some form of endpoint protection.

With proper design and device consideration, zoning with the different inspection technologies enabled can also be a remediating factor for those devices in your network that cannot be patched, updated, and even those that are end-of-life. In short, zoning with inspection technology enabled helps to ensure IT and OT network systems’ safe operations. In even the most secure environments, it is never safe to assume that data traffic transversing the network is free of a potential threat.

#### Increased strikes send a clear signal to terrorists that critical US infrastructure is vulnerable by weakening organizations.

Davies 6 [Ross; George Mason University - Antonin Scalia Law School, Faculty, The Green Bag; “Strike Season: Protecting Labor-Management Conflict in the Age of Terror,” SSRN; 4/12/06; <https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=896185>] Justin

Strikes (and, to a lesser extent, lockouts) are painful but necessary parts of private-sector American labor-management relations. Even if they weren't - even if sound public policy called for their eradication - we couldn't stop them. They are an inevitable byproduct of the conflicting interests and limited resources of organized workers and their employers. History shows that this is true even in times of warfare overseas or crisis at home: labor-management strife lessens at the beginning of a conflict and then bounces back. Now, however, we are confronted with warfare at home, a phenomenon that the United States has not had to deal with since the Civil War - before the rise of today's unprecedentedly large, complex, and interdependent economy and government.

And history is repeating itself again. After a lull at the beginning of the war with terrorists, work stoppages have returned to their pre-war levels. The overall rate of strike activity is substantially lower than it was during previous wars (it has been slowly declining, along with overall union membership in the private sector, for decades). Today's war, however, is being fought in part on American soil, and against enemies who operate worldwide, but whose attacks tend to be small and local, seeking advantage from the unpredictability and brutality of the damage they inflict rather than from its scale. Thus, even small, localized, and occasional work stoppages - not just the large-scale strikes that arguably affected the military-industrial complex and thus the war efforts in the past - have the potential to increase risks to critical infrastructure and public safety during the war on terror. In other words, persistent strike activity at current levels poses risks of public harm, albeit risks that are difficult to anticipate with specificity in the absence of much experience or available data. This justifies taking some reasonable precautions, including the proposal made in this Article.

By its very nature, a labor strike increases the vulnerability of that employer's operations to a terrorist attack. A strike is an act specifically designed to disrupt and weaken an employer's operations, for the (usually) perfectly lawful purpose of pressing for resolution of a dispute with management. A weakened organization or other entity is, of course, less capable of resisting and surviving exogenous shocks, whether they be commercial competition or terrorist attacks. In the United States, with its fully extended and endlessly interconnected critical infrastructure that touches everything from food processing to energy distribution to water quality, a strike in the wrong place at the wrong time that disrupts and weakens some part of that infrastructure could be decisive in the success or failure of a terrorist attack of the small, local sort described above, on such a weakened link in some infrastructural chain. Of course, none of this is to suggest that any union or its members (or any employer or its managers) would knowingly expose their fellow citizens or their property to a terrorist attack. To the contrary, experience to date suggests that union members are at least as patriotic and conscientious as Americans in general. In fact, the effectiveness of the proposal made in this Article is predicated in part on the assumption that neither workers nor their employers will knowingly contribute to the incidence or effectiveness of terrorist attacks. The concern addressed here is, rather, that innocent instigators or perpetuators of a work stoppage might unwittingly facilitate a successful terrorist attack or aggravate its effects.

#### Attacks on critical infrastructure collapses the economy through multiple avenues.

FAS 6 [DCSINT Handbook No. 1.02; Info directly from US army and Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence; “Critical Infrastructure Threats and Terrorism,” DCSINT/FAS; 8/10/6; <https://fas.org/irp/threat/terrorism/sup2.pdf>] Justin

Agriculture

In 1984, a cult group poisoned salad bars at several Oregon restaurants with Salmonella bacteria as the first recorded event of bioterrorism in the United States. This resulted in 750 people becoming sick.24 A review of the agriculture infrastructure results in vulnerable areas such as the high concentration of the livestock industry and the centralized nature of the food processing industry. The farm-to table chain contains various points into which an attack could be launched. The threat of attack would seriously damage consumer confidence and undermine export markets. Understanding the goal of the threat points to the area most likely attacked. If the intent was economic disruption the target would be livestock and crops, but if the intent was mass casualties the point of attack would be contamination of finished food products. Damage to livestock could be very swift, the USDA calculated that foot-and mouth disease could spread to 25 states in 5 days.25 CDC is presently tracking and developing scenarios for the arrival of Avian Flu.

Banking

Prior to the destruction of the Twin Towers, physical attacks against the banking industry, such as the destruction of facilities, were rare. Unfortunately, evidence indicates that may change, in March 2005 three British al-Qa’ida operatives were indicted by a U.S. federal court on charges of conducting detailed reconnaissance of financial targets in lower Manhattan, Newark, New Jersey, and Washington, D.C. In addition to video taping the Citigroup Center and the New York Stock Exchange in New York City, the Prudential Financial building in Newark, and the headquarters of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in Washington D.C., the men amassed more than 500 photographs of the sites.26 The Banking infrastructures primary weakness is along its cyber axis of attack. Through phishing and banking Trojan targeting specific financial institutions, attackers reduce confidence among consumers. Recently American Express posted an alert online, including a screenshot of a pop-up that appeared when users log in to its secure site.27

The attack not only attempts to obtain personal information that can be used for various operations, but also launches a virus into the user’s computer. CitiBank, and Chase Manhattan Bank have both been victim during 2005 and 2006 to phishing schemes misrepresenting their services to their clients.

Energy

Recently the oil industry occupied the headlines, and the criticality of this infrastructure is not lost on terrorists. In mid-December 2004, Arab television aired an alleged audiotape message by Usama bin Laden in which he called upon his followers to wreak havoc on the U.S. and world economy by disrupting oil supplies from the Persian Gulf to the United States.28 The U.S. uses over 20.7 million barrels a day of crude oil and products and imports 58.4% of that requirement.29 On 19 January 2006 al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden announced in a video release that, “The war against America and its allies will not be confined to Iraq…..”, and since June of 2003 there have been 298 recorded attacks against Iraqi oil facilities.30 Terrorists conduct research as to the easiest point to damage the flow of oil or to the point where the most damage can be done. Scenarios involving the oil fields themselves, a jetliner crashing into the Ras Tanura facility in Saudi Arabia could remove 10 percent of the world’s energy imports in one act.31 Maritime attacks are also option for terrorists; on October 6, 2002 a French tanker carrying 397,000 barrels of crude oil from Iran to Malaysia was rammed by an explosive laden boat off of the port of Ash Shihr, 353 miles east of Aden. The double-hulled tanker was breached, and maritime insurers tripled the rates.32 Energy most travel often long distances from the site where it is obtained to the point where it is converted into energy for use, a catastrophic event at any of the sites or along its route can adversely impact the energy infrastructure and cause ripples in other infrastructures. The security of the pipeline in Alaska increases in importance as efforts are made to make America more independent on energy use.

Economy

The U.S. economy is the end-state target of several terrorist groups as identified in the introduction quote. The means by which terrorists and other threats attempt to impact the economic infrastructure is through it’s linkage to the other infrastructures. Attacks are launched at other infrastructures, such as energy or the Defense Industrial Base in an effort to achieve a “cascading” result that impacts the economy. Cyber attacks on Banking and Finance are another effort to indirectly impact the economy. The short term impacts of the 9/11 attacks on Lower Manhattan resulted in the loss of 30% of office space and a number of businesses simply ceased to exist. Close to 200,000 jobs were destroyed or relocated out of New York City. The destruction of physical assets was estimated in the national accounts to amount to $14 billion for private businesses, $1.5 billion for state and local government enterprises and $0.7 billion for federal enterprises. Rescue, cleanup and related costs are estimated to at least $11 billion for a total direct cost of $27.2 billion.33 The medium and long term effects cannot be accurately estimated but demonstrate the idea of cascading effects. The five main areas affected over a longer period were Insurance, Airlines, Tourism and other Service Industries, Shipping and Security and military spending. At various times terrorist rhetoric has mentioned attacks against Wall Street proper, but the more realistic damage to the economy will come through the indirect approach of cascading effects.

Transportation

The attack on commuter trains in Madrid in March of 2004 and the London bombings in July of 2005, which together killed 243 people, clearly indicated the threat to the transportation infrastructure. Statistics provided by the Brookings Institute in Washington DC show that between 1991 and 2001 42% of worldwide terrorist attacks were directed against mass transit. Transportation is viewed by terrorists as a “soft target” and one that will impact the people of a country. Mass Service