

HCW NC

1. FW

I negate resolved: a just government out to recognize the unconditional right to strike.

The value criterion is Maximising well being:

Prefer this for two reasons:

1. Governments and policymakers default to utilitarian calculus.

Gary Woller (BYU Professor). "An Overview by Gary Woller." A Forum on the Role of Environmental Ethics. June 1997. pp. 10.

Moreover, **virtually all public policies entail some redistribution of economic or political resources, such that one group's gains must come at another group's expense. Consequently, public policies in a democracy must be justified to the public, and especially to those who pay the costs of those policies. Such justification cannot simply be assumed a priori by invoking some higher-order moral principle.** Appeals to a priori moral principles, such as environmental preservation, also often fail to acknowledge that public policies inevitably entail trade-offs among competing values. **Thus since policymakers cannot justify inherent value conflicts to the public in any philosophical sense, and since public policies inherently imply winners and losers, the policymakers' duty [is] to the public interest requires them to demonstrate that the redistributive effects and value trade-offs implied by their policies are somehow to the overall advantage of society.** At the same time, **deontologically based ethical systems have severe practical limitations as a basis for public policy. At best, a priori moral principles provide only general guidance to ethical dilemmas in public affairs and do not themselves suggest appropriate public policies, and at worst, they create a regimen of regulatory unreasonableness while failing to adequately address the problem or actually making it worse.** For example, a moral obligation to preserve the environment by no means implies the best way, or any way for that matter, to do so, just as there is no a priori reason to believe that any policy that claims to preserve the environment will actually do so. Any number of policies might work, and others, although seemingly consistent with the moral principle, will fail utterly. That deontological principles are an inadequate basis for environmental policy is evident in the rather significant irony that most forms of deontologically based environmental laws and regulations tend to be implemented in a very utilitarian manner by street-level enforcement officials. Moreover, ignoring the relevant costs and benefits of environmental policy and their attendant incentive structures can, as alluded to above, actually work at cross purposes to environmental preservation. (There exists an extensive literature on this aspect of regulatory enforcement and the often perverse outcomes of regulatory policy. See, for example, Ackerman, 1981; Bartrip and Fenn, 1983; Hawkins, 1983, 1984; Hawkins and Thomas, 1984.) Even the most die-hard preservationist/deontologist would, I believe, be troubled by this outcome. The above points are perhaps best expressed by Richard Flathman, **The number of values typically involved in public policy decisions, the broad categories which must be employed and above all, the scope and complexity of the consequences to be anticipated militate against reasoning so conclusively that they generate an imperative to institute a specific policy. It is seldom the case that only one policy will meet the criteria of the public interest (1958, p. 12). It therefore follows that in a democracy, policymakers have an ethical duty to establish a plausible link between policy alternatives and the problems they address, and the public must be reasonably assured that a policy will actually do something about an existing problem; this requires the means-end language and methodology of utilitarian ethics.** Good intentions, lofty rhetoric, and moral piety are an insufficient.

2. The Consequentialist Nature of Moral Value

All questions of value depend upon consequentialist experiences.

Sam **Harris** (CEO Project Reason; PHD UCLA Neuroscience; BA Stanford Philosophy). "The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values." 20**10**.

Here is my (consequentialist) starting point: **all questions of value (right and wrong, good and evil, etc.) depend upon the possibility of experiencing such value. Without potential consequences at the level of experience—happiness, suffering, joy, despair, etc.—all talk of value is empty.** Therefore, **to say that an act is morally necessary**, or evil, or blameless, **is to make (tacit) claims about its consequences in the lives of conscious creatures** (whether actual or potential). I am unaware of any interesting exception to this rule. Needless to say, [For example,] if one is worried about pleasing God or His angels, this assumes that such invisible entities are conscious (in some sense) and cognizant of human behavior. It also generally assumes [and] that it is possible to suffer their [his] wrath or enjoy their approval, either in this world or the world to come. Even within religion, therefore, consequences and conscious states remain the foundation of all values.

C1. HCW

Hospitals were excluded from collective bargaining which meant strikes were relatively low. Nurse strikes cause disruption in hospital preparedness and quality of care. This wrecks pandemic preparedness for the next wave of pandemics which will be even deadlier than COVID which causes Extinction.

Nurse strikes devastates hospitals

Wright 10 Sarah H. Wright July 2010 "Evidence on the Effects of Nurses' Strikes"

<https://www.nber.org/digest/jul10/evidence-effects-nurses-strikes> (Researcher at National Bureau of Economic Research)

U.S. hospitals were excluded from collective bargaining laws for three decades longer than other sectors because of fears that strikes by nurses might imperil patients' health. Today, while unionization has been declining in general, it is growing rapidly in hospitals, with the number of unionized workers rising from 679,000 in 1990 to nearly one million in 2008. In Do Strikes Kill? Evidence from New York State (NBER Working Paper No. 15855), co-authors Jonathan Gruber and Samuel Kleiner carefully examine the effects of nursing strikes on patient care and outcomes. The researchers match data on nurses' strikes in New York State from 1984 to 2004 to data on hospital discharges, including information on treatment intensity, patient mortality, and hospital readmission. They conclude that nurses' strikes were costly to hospital patients: in-hospital mortality increased by 19.4 percent and hospital readmissions increased by 6.5 percent for patients admitted during a strike. Among their sample of 38,228 such patients, an estimated 138 more individuals died than would have without a strike, and 344 more patients were readmitted to the hospital than if there had been no strike. "Hospitals functioning during nurses' strikes do so at a lower quality of patient care," they write.

Still, at hospitals experiencing strikes, the measures of treatment intensity -- that is, the length of hospital stay and the number of procedures performed during the patient's stay -- show no significant differences between striking and non-striking periods. Patients appear to receive the same intensity of care during union work stoppages as during normal hospital operations. Thus, the poor outcomes associated with strikes

suggest that they might reduce hospital productivity. These poor health outcomes increased for both emergency and non-emergency hospital patients, even as admissions of both groups decreased by about 28 percent at hospitals with strikes. The poor health outcomes were not apparent either before or after the strike in the striking hospitals, suggesting that they are attributable to the strike itself. And, the poor health outcomes do not appear to be due to different types of patients being admitted during strike periods, because patients admitted during a strike are very similar to those admitted during other periods. Hiring replacement workers apparently does not help: hospitals that hired replacement workers performed no better during strikes than those that did not hire substitute employees. In each case, patients with conditions that required intensive nursing were more likely to fare worse in the presence of nurses' strikes.

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.

New Pandemics are deadlier and faster are coming – COVID is just the beginning

Antonelli 20 Ashley Fuoco Antonelli 5-15-2020 <https://www.advisory.com/daily-briefing/2020/05/15/weekly-line> "Weekly line: Why deadly disease outbreaks could become more common—even after Covid-19" (Associate Editor — American Health Line)

While the new coronavirus pandemic suddenly took the world by storm, the truth is public health experts for years have warned that a virus similar to the new coronavirus would cause the next pandemic—and they say deadly infectious disease outbreaks could become more common. Infectious disease experts are always on the lookout for the next pandemic, and in a report published two years ago, researchers from the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health predicted that the pathogen most likely to cause the next pandemic would be a virus similar to the common cold. Specifically, the researchers predicted that the pathogen at fault for the next pandemic would be: A microbe for which people have not yet developed immunities, meaning that a large portion of the human population would be susceptible to infection; Contagious during the so-called "incubation period"—the time when people are infected with a pathogen but are not yet showing symptoms of the infection or are showing only mild symptoms; and Resistant to any known prevention or treatment methods. The researchers also concluded that such a pathogen would have a "low but significant" fatality rate, meaning the pathogen wouldn't kill human hosts fast enough to inhibit its spread. As Amesh Adalja—a senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security, who led the report—told Live Science's Rachael Rettner at the time, "It just has to make a lot of people sick" to disrupt society. The researchers said RNA viruses—which include the common cold, influenza, and severe acute respiratory syndrome (or

SARS, which is caused by a type of coronavirus)—fit that bill. And even though we had a good bit of experience dealing with common RNA viruses like the flu, Adalja at the time told Rettner that there were "a whole host of viral families that get very little attention when it comes to pandemic preparedness." **Not even two years later, the new coronavirus, which causes Covid-19, emerged and quickly spread throughout the world, reaching pandemic status in just a few months.** To date, officials have reported more than 4.4 million cases of Covid-19 and 302,160 deaths tied to the new coronavirus globally. In the United States, the number of reported Covid-19 cases has reached more than 1.4 million and the number of reported deaths tied to the new coronavirus has risen to nearly 86,000 in just over three months. Although public health experts had warned about the likelihood of a respiratory-borne RNA virus causing the next global pandemic, many say the world was largely unprepared to handle this type of infectious disease outbreak. **And as concerning as that revelation may be on its own, perhaps even more worrisome is that public health experts predict life-threatening infectious disease outbreaks are likely to become more common—meaning we could be susceptible to another pandemic in the future.** Why experts think deadly infectious disease outbreaks could become more common As the Los Angeles Times's Joshua Emerson Smith notes, infectious disease experts for more than ten years now have noted that "[o]utbreaks of dangerous new diseases with the potential to become pandemics have been on the rise—from HIV to swine flu to SARS to Ebola." For instance, a report published in Nature in 2008 found that the number of emerging infectious disease events that occurred in the 1990s was more than three times higher than it was in the 1940s. Many experts believe the recent increase in infectious disease outbreaks is tied to human behaviors that disrupt the environment, "such as deforestation and poaching," which have led "to increased contact between highly mobile, urbanized human populations and wild animals," Emerson Smith writes. **In the 2008 report, for example, researchers noted that about 60% of 355 emerging infectious disease events that occurred over a 50-year period could be largely linked to wild animals, livestock, and, to a lesser extent, pets.** Now, researchers believe the new coronavirus first jumped to humans from animals at a wildlife market in Wuhan, China. Along those same lines, some experts have argued that global climate change has driven an increase in infectious diseases—and could continue to do so. A federally mandated report released by the U.S. Global Change Research Program in 2018 warned that **warmer temperatures could expand the geographic range covered by disease-carrying insects and pests, which could result in more Americans being exposed to ticks carrying Lyme disease and mosquitos carrying the dengue, West Nile, and Zika viruses.** And experts now say continued warming in global temperatures, deforestation, and other environmentally disruptive behaviors have broadened that risk by bringing more people into contact with disease-carrying animals. **Further, experts note that infectious diseases today are able to spread much faster and farther than they could decades ago because of increasing globalization and travel.** While some have suggested the Covid-19 pandemic could stifle that trend, others argue globalization is likely to continue—meaning so could infectious diseases' far spread.

Future pandemics will cause extinction – it only takes one ‘super-spreader’ – US prevention is key’

Bar-Yam 16 Yaneer Bar-Yam 7-3-2016 “Transition to extinction: Pandemics in a connected world”
<http://necsi.edu/research/social/pandemics/transition> (Professor and President, New England Complex System Institute; PhD in Physics, MIT)

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.**

C2 Econ

Strikes do not create

CM '18: Media statement from Creamer Media's Engineering News. "Strikes and their economic consequences". October 1st, 2018. <https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/article/strikes-and-their-economic-consequences-2018-10-01>. FD.

After conducting intensive research* into the topic of strikes and labour unrest, the Mandela Initiative came to several conclusions. One of these was that the right to strike is made up of a delicate balance between the **power** of firms and the rights of employees, and is considered a sign of a healthy democracy. "Whilst there are potential benefits from strikes (e.g. better work morale, lower absenteeism, or improved labour productivity), **strike action also brings about numerous direct and indirect economic costs that can be high, depending on duration, number of workers involved and divisions affected.**" the Initiative confirmed. According to labour expert Suleyman Alley, there are seven key causes of labour unrest: **health** hazards in the workplace; excessive working hours; low wages; demand for leave with pay; discrimination; inadequate working tools; and aggressive behaviour of managers towards employees. "**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 Services. "**The negative effects on international trade include the hindrance 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.**" 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 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 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** property, and their non-striking employees from violence and intimidation." Condon believes that this requires the deft hand of well-trained and highly qualified close protection operatives. These operatives provide not only protection, but video evidence as well, ensuring those responsible for damage can be held to account. "The key is to create a strategic partnership with a reliable **security** provider. Plans must be put into place to protect businesses against vandalism, physical assault, property invasion and intimidation during labour unrest," concludes Condon.

2] Strikes critical core industries that is necessary for economic growth

McElroy 19 John McElroy 10-25-2019 "**Strikes Hurt Everybody**" <https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody> (MPA at McCombs school of Business)

This **creates a poisonous relationship between the company and its workforce.** Many GM hourly workers don't identify as GM employees. They identify as UAW members. And they see the union as the source of their jobs, not the company. It's an unhealthy dynamic that puts GM at a disadvantage to non-union automakers in the U.S. like Honda and Toyota, where workers take pride in the company they work for and the products they make. **Attacking the company in the media also drives away customers.** Who wants to buy a shiny new car from a company that's accused of underpaying its workers and treating them unfairly? Data from the Center for Automotive Research (CAR) in Ann Arbor, MI, show that **GM loses market share during strikes and never gets it back.** GM **lost two percentage points** during the 1998 strike, which in today's market **would represent a loss of 340,000 sales.** Because GM reports sales on a quarterly basis we'll only find out at the end of December if it lost market share from this strike. UAW members say one of their greatest concerns is job security. **But causing a company to lose market share is a sure-fire path to more plant closings and layoffs.** Even so, unions are incredibly important for boosting wages and benefits for working-class people. GM's UAW-represented workers earn considerably more than their non-union counterparts, about \$26,000 more per worker, per year, in total compensation. Without a union they never would have achieved that. Strikes are a powerful weapon for unions. They usually are the only way they can get management to accede to their demands. If not for the power of collective bargaining and the threat of a strike, management would largely ignore union demands. If you took away that threat, management would pay its workers peanuts. Just ask the Mexican line workers who are paid \$1.50 an hour to make \$50,000 BMWs. **But strikes don't just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they're striking against. They hurt suppliers, car dealers and the communities located near the plants.** The Anderson Economic Group estimates that 75,000 workers at supplier companies were temporarily laid off because of the GM strike. Unlike UAW picketers, those supplier workers won't get any strike pay or an \$11,000 contract signing bonus. No, most of them lost close to a month's worth of wages, which must be financially devastating for them. GM's suppliers also lost a lot of money. **So now they're cutting budgets and delaying capital investments to make up for the lost revenue, which is a further drag on the economy.** According to CAR, the communities and states where GM's plants are located collectively lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenue. **Some economists warn that if the strike were prolonged it could knock the state of Michigan – home to GM and the UAW – into a recession.** That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible. So, while the UAW managed to get a nice raise for its members, the strike left a path of destruction in its wake. That's not fair to the innocent bystanders who will never regain what they lost. John McElroy I'm not sure how this will ever be resolved. I understand the need for collective bargaining and the threat of a strike. But there's got to be a better way to get workers a raise without torching the countryside.

There are two links into extinction

1. Economic Collapse goes Nuclear – at worst this causes extinction, economic collapse will hurt vulnerable communities the worst

Tønnesson 15, Stein. "Deterrence, interdependence and Sino-US peace." *International Area Studies Review* 18.3 (2015): 297-311. (the Department of Peace and Conflict, Uppsala University, Sweden, and Peace research Institute Oslo (PRIO), Norway)

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.

2. Resource scarcity from a bad Econ causes global war and genocide

Klare, professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, 2006

(Michael, Mar 6 2006, "The coming resource wars" <http://www.energybulletin.net/node/13605>)

It's official: the era of resource wars is upon us. In a major London address, British Defense Secretary John Reid warned that global climate change and dwindling natural resources are combining to increase the likelihood of violent conflict over land, water and energy. Climate change, he indicated, "will make scarce resources, clean water, viable agricultural land even scarcer"—and this will "make the emergence of violent conflict more rather than less likely." Although not unprecedented, Reid's prediction of an upsurge in resource conflict is significant both because of his senior rank and the vehemence of his remarks. "The blunt truth is that the lack of water and agricultural land is a significant contributory factor to the tragic conflict we see unfolding in Darfur," he declared. "We should see this as a warning sign." Resource conflicts of this type are most likely to arise in the developing world, Reid indicated, but the more advanced and affluent countries are not likely to be spared the damaging and destabilizing effects of global climate change. With sea levels rising, water and energy becoming increasingly scarce and prime agricultural lands turning into deserts, internecine warfare over access to vital resources will become a global phenomenon. Reid's speech, delivered at the prestigious Chatham House in London (Britain's equivalent of the Council on Foreign Relations), is but the most recent expression of a growing trend in strategic circles to view environmental and resource effects—rather than political orientation and ideology—as the most potent source of armed conflict in the decades to come. With the world population rising, global consumption rates soaring, energy supplies rapidly disappearing and climate change eradicating valuable farmland, the stage is being set for persistent and worldwide struggles over vital resources. Religious and political strife will

not disappear in this scenario, but rather will be channeled into contests over valuable sources of water, food and energy.

Resource wars lead to extinction

Moore, member of many ornithological organizations, 20**08**

(Stan, March 29, "Peak Oil and Economic Growth: Where Do We Go From Here?" <http://www.theoil Drum.com/node/3759>)

The other consideration that is NEVER mentioned in this regard is the highly disproportionate DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH amongst all of humanity among and between nations. **There is plenty** of wealth to **go around if there was equitable distribution** of wealth. **If mankind does not change its perception of greed as ecologically and economically unhealthy then not only will the earth's planetary life support system ultimately fail**, but violence, wars, (especially **resource wars**) **threaten all of humanity, but the end result** is tragedy or even **extinction of the human species itself as an unsustainable disruptive species with infinite resource "needs" on a finite planet.**

4. Teachers DA

The Long-run Effects of Teacher Strikes:

David **Jaume** and Alexander **Willén** September 20**17**

dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164417071001

This suggests that **ten days of exposure to teacher strikes during primary school increases the number of people that do not graduate from high school by 28 out of every 1,000 and increases the number of people that do not finish tertiary education by 15 out of every 1,000. These effects represent declines of 0.48 percent, 0.68 percent and 0.21 percent relative to the respective means**, which is shown directly below the estimates in the table. A comparison of Panel B and Panel C [The study] reveals that males are more affected by teacher strikes, though the effects are statistically and economically significant among individuals of both genders. That the effects are stronger for men is consistent with the large literature that shows boys to be more sensitive than girls to educational interventions and adverse shocks during childhood (Krueger 1999; Autor and Wasserman 2013; Bertrand and Pan 2013; Fan et al. 2015; Lovenheim and Willén 2016; Autor et al. 2016). The average individual in our sample experienced a total of 88 days of teacher strikes during primary school. Scaling the point estimates to account for the mean level of exposure (multiplying the point estimates by 8.8) suggests that the average cohort in our sample suffered adverse educational attainment effects with respect to the proportion of people obtaining a high school diploma, a college degree and years of education equivalent to 4.18, 6.38 and 1.84 percent respectively, relative to the means.

Taken together, the results in Table 5 **suggest that exposure to teacher strikes not only has adverse short-term educational attainment effects (as measured by the reduction in the proportion that obtain a high school diploma), but that these effects persist as individuals move through the various stages of the education system** (as measured by the proportion that obtain a college degree and the average number of years of education). ²⁶ This is an important finding that has not been documented before. **The results show that a teacher's decision to strike results in permanent harm to his or her students' average educational outcomes.**

On their case

TURN: Right to strike breaks down societal norms and results in societal chaos – proven in South-Africa.

TURN: Strikes are ineffective– they can't overcome the power imbalance and have a net negative impact on workers due to increasingly harsh relations in the office.

Waldersee '17: Victoria Waldersee. "We asked economists whether strikes really work". Our Economy. Thursday September 7th, 2017. <https://www.ecnmy.org/engage/we-asked-economists-whether-strikes-really-work/>. FD

Strikes are always the last resort. Everyone from unions to HR managers pretty much agrees on that," says Simms. "You only do it if you've tried everything to get the other side to understand, and they either can't, or they just won't. Obviously there's an imbalance of power, so unions are always in a weaker position, and individual employees even more so." Often, strikers just feel they're being expected to do more than they're being paid for. But recently, says Professor Crossman, it's been about more than that – people's pay isn't rising, but inflation is, and executive salaries are going up too. So people end up feeling like they're being unfairly treated, and the money they're earning is buying them less because prices are going up. Another big issue is flexible working. It's good for some, but others feel like it's been imposed on them by big companies making it the norm. Not knowing how many hours work you'll have means your income stream is unpredictable, and that's a real problem for people. "Most of us have regular bills – we know what the outflows of cash from our account are looking like," Crossman points out. "We want to make sure the inflows match." "The basic 'economics' idea is that we have the right to decide how we use our labour," says Simms. "If we didn't, we'd be slaves, literally. But if we're freely making the choice to exchange our work for pay, and other benefits, then in principle we have the right to withdraw it, too." It depends on a few things: One, how much it's going to affect the employer's business in the short term; two, how replaceable the workers are; and three, to what extent the strikers have the public and the government on their side. "I work at a university," says Simms. "If I decide not to work today, not much happens to my employer's business. But if I were a train driver, and I decided not to do my job, it would obviously have an immediate effect." **If workers can easily be replaced by other workers, their 'bargaining power' is pretty low.** If there is what economists call 'surplus labour' – i.e., people available and willing to do the job in the current conditions – then companies can just fire unhappy staff and call on a bank of new workers. When public sector workers go on strike, there are often private companies happy to do the work instead. And then there's technology What's this? "Advances in technology are really reducing the power of workers to fight their corner," says Crossman. In low-wage, manufacturing jobs, people can just be replaced by obedient robots, and that's the end of that. If the government and the public take a stand against the way workers are being treated – regardless of whether they could be replaced by other workers, or by robots – all this changes. Customers could simply boycott a product or service, and governments could launch official inquiries as to whether people's rights are being breached. That puts companies in a vulnerable place, which workers can't do. "Trade unions would say customers are secondary," says Simms. "The workers have decided it's necessary, because someone isn't listening to them." According to Crossman, it's a matter of opinion. "If you look at the train strike [in the UK], customers were angry about the fact they couldn't get to work, but they knew the service was bad before. So they tend to blame government and management, not unions. But there's only so much they'll take before they start turning on staff." Governments have got to try and help the parties reach an agreement – a bit like a marriage counselor," says Simms. Whether they've got an obligation to get involved varies country to country – in the UK, it's optional, but in other places, it's mandatory. The other option is setting rules to avoid the things that cause strikes to kick off in the first place from happening. But, as Crossman points out, companies tend to find a way around them." When companies were supposed to regulate how much they could increase executive pay in the 1970s, they just started handing out company cars. It's like a computer virus: the virus comes after the computer has been created, so you're always playing catch up." Governments can do the opposite, too: make it harder for unions to go on strike, by doing things like requiring a minimum vote among union members to allow industrial action. You can also make votes secret, to avoid any kind of peer pressure. How else could workers express their dissatisfaction with the way they're being treated? Simms suggests some simple things: "Pull a sickie! It's definitely not legal for your union to ask you to do that, but..." Another simple act of protest, especially in hospitality, is just getting really grumpy. "There was a smile strike at Disneyland about 20 years ago," says Simms. "Which at Disneyland is obviously a seriously huge thing" You can also only agree to do things strictly outlined in your contract – that's called a Work To Rule, and is often really annoying for employers. Plus, as Crossman pointed out, you still get paid. **But there's not much you can do.** "It feels like these days, the power is just really imbalanced," says Crossman. "Because no-one in their right mind is going to put their house in jeopardy, or not be able to pay rent, so they'll ultimately go back, because they need to, economically. Employers suffer financial damage, but evidence suggests it doesn't take too long to recoup the losses. But once an employee has lost their wage, they can't get that back without working overtime."