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#### Restraining strikes is key to CCP stability- history proves

Griffiths, 16 – CNN International senior producer

[James Griffiths, "China on Strike,” CNN, 3-29-2016, https://www.cnn.com/2016/03/28/asia/china-strike-worker-protest-trade-union/index.html, accessed 10-10-2021]

While unrest in Xinjiang, Tibet and Hong Kong gains the most attention overseas, "in terms of actual number of disputes, labor is almost certainly the biggest source of conflict," Freidman adds.

"The authorities are concerned that this could cohere into a political force."

Signs of such resistance were on view in March, as coal workers in Heilongjiang province took to the streets to protest plans by state-run Longmay Mining Group to lay off more than 100,000 employees.

The protests forced an embarrassing reversal by governor Lu Hao, who had previously held Longmay up as an example of how Xi Jinping's push for restructuring of the state sector could be carried out.

Following the protests, Lu issued a statement vowing to "financially support" the firm to ensure that workers received unpaid wages, blaming managers at the company for withholding information.

"I had known that above ground workers had wages in arrears, but it's also true that workers down shafts are also in arrears, and I spoke wrongly about that," Lu told state media, which did not mention the protests.

Longmay Mining Group did not immediately respond to a request for comment.

Beijing is worried that any kind of greater political consciousness among workers "would lead to a bigger movement" that could threaten their hold on power, Wang says.

"If you look at the crackdown, it is specifically aimed at the pillars of civil society that have been most effective in pushing the government to do things."

This thinking is heavily influenced by the experiences of other Communist regimes, says Friedman.

The decision by the Polish government to allow workers greater freedoms after a series of huge strikes in 1980 led to the rise of the Solidarity Union -- the first non-Communist controlled labor organization in a Warsaw Pact country -- and the eventual end of one-party rule.

"Solidarity played an absolutely decisive role in ending Communist Party rule in Poland," Friedman says.

#### Loss of CCP legitimacy spurs diversionary wars

**Norris, 17** -- Texas A&M Chinese foreign and security policy professor

[William, he teaches graduate-level courses in Chinese domestic politics, East Asian security, and Chinese foreign policy, he is also a nonresident associate with the nuclear policy program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, "Geostrategic Implications of China’s Twin Economic Challenges," June 2017, https://www.cfr.org/sites/default/files/report\_pdf/Discussion\_Paper\_Norris\_China\_OR.pdf, accessed 9-4-19, footnote 23 included]

Populist pressures might tempt the party leadership to encourage diversionary nationalism. The logic of this concern is straightforward: the Communist Party might seek to distract a restless domestic population with adventurism abroad.19 The Xi administration wants to appear tough in its defense of foreign encroachments against China’s interests. This need stems from a long-running narrative about how a weak Qing dynasty was unable to defend China in the face of European imperial expansion, epitomized by the Opium Wars and the subsequent treaties imposed on China in the nineteenth century. The party is particularly sensitive to perceptions of weakness because much of its claim to legitimacy—manifested in Xi’s Chinese Dream campaign today—stems from the party’s claims of leading the restoration of Chinese greatness. For example, the May Fourth Movement, a popular protest in 1919 that helped catalyze the CPC, called into question the legitimacy of the Republic of China government running the country at that time because the regime was seen as not having effectively defended China’s territorial and sovereignty interests at the Versailles Peace Conference.

Diversionary nationalist frictions would likely occur if the Chinese leadership portrayed a foreign adversary' as having made the first move, thus forcing Xi to stand up for China’s interests. An example is the 2012 attempt by the nationalist governor of Tokyo, Shintaro Ishihara, to buy the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands from a private owner.20 Although the Japanese central government sought to avert a crisis by stepping in to purchase the islands—having them bought and administered by Ishihara’s Tokyo metropolitan government would have dragged Japan into a confrontation with China—China saw this move as part of a deliberate orchestration by Japan to nationalize the islands. Xi seemingly had no choice but to defend China’s claims against an attempt by Japan to consolidate its position on the dispute.21 This issue touched off a period of heated tensions between China and Japan, lasting more than two years.22 Such dynamics are not limited to Japan. Other possible areas of conflict include, but are not necessarily limited to, Taiwan, India, and the South China Sea (especially with the Philippines and Vietnam).

The Chinese government will use such tactics if it believes that the costs are relatively low. Ideally, China would like to appear tough while avoiding material repercussions or a serious diplomatic breakdown. Standing up against foreign encroachment—without facing much blowback—could provide Xi’s administration with a tempting source of noneconomic legitimacy'. However, over the next few years, Xi will probably not be actively looking to get embroiled abroad. Cushioning the fallout from slower growth while managing a structural economic transition will be difficult enough. Courting potential international crises that distract the central leadership would make this task even more daunting.

Even if the top leadership did not wish to provoke conflict, a smaller budgetary allotment for security could cause military interests in China to deliberately instigate trouble to justify their claims over increasingly scarce resources. For example, an air force interested in ensuring its funding for a midair tanker program might find the existence of far-flung territorial disputes to be useful in making its case. Such a case would be made even stronger by a pattern of recent frictions that highlights the necessity of greater air power projection. Budgetary pressures may be partly behind a recent People’s Liberation Army reorganization and headcount reduction. A slowing economy might cause a further deceleration in China’s military spending, thus increasing such pressures as budgetary belts tighten.

CHALLENGES TO XI’S LEADERSHIP

Xi Jinping’s efforts to address economic challenges could fail, unleashing consequences that extend well beyond China’s economic health. For example, an economic collapse could give rise to a Vladimir Putin-like redemption figure in China. Xi’s approach of centralizing authority over a diverse, complex, and massive social, political, and economic system is a recipe for brittleness. Rather than designing a resilient, decentralized governance structure that can gracefully cope with localized failures at particular nodes in a network, a highly centralized architecture risks catastrophic, system-level failure. Although centralized authority offers the tantalizing chimera of stronger control from the center, it also puts all the responsibility squarely on Xi’s shoulders.

With China’s ascension to great power status, the consequences of internecine domestic political battles are increasingly playing out on the world stage. The international significance of China’s domestic politics is a new paradigm for the Chinese leadership, and one can expect an adjustment period during which the outcome of what had previously been relatively insulated domestic political frictions will likely generate unintended international repercussions. Such dynamics will influence Chinese foreign policy and security behavior. Domestic arguments over ideology, bureaucratic power struggles, and strategic direction could all have ripple effects abroad. Many of China’s party heavyweights still employ a narrow and exclusively domestic political calculus. Such behavior increases the possibility of international implications that are not fully anticipated, raising the risks of strategic miscalculation on the world stage. For example, the factional power struggles that animated the Cultural Revolution were largely driven by domestic concerns, yet manifested themselves in Chinese foreign policy for more than a decade. During this period, China was not the world’s second largest economy and, for much of this time, did not even have formal representation at the United Nations. If today’s globally interconnected China became engulfed in similar domestic chaos, the effects would be felt worldwide.23

23. This outcome is only one of several potentially dangerous consequences. Others include a rebellious military, destabilizing foreign policy, outright civil war, renewed military conflict with Taiwan, virulent anti-Americanism, and financial collapse and contagion.

#### Draws in the US and escalates- goes nuclear

Chang, 18 -- CNN contributor

[Gordon, "China and Russia Have Set a Nuclear Collision Course With the United States," Daily Beast, 9-4-18, https://www.thedailybeast.com/china-and-russia-have-set-a-nuclear-collision-course-with-the-united-states?ref=scroll, accessed 9-8-19]

Moreover, any conflict between China and the United States in the Pacific could quickly escalate to nuclear war.

China, surpassing the U.S. last year, now boasts the world’s largest navy, and it is adding to its fleet “at a stunning rate,” according to the Times. Even last year, the count was lopsided with China claiming 317 surface vessels and subs in active service and the U.S. 283.

Of course, it’s not clear how capable the People’s Liberation Army Navy is. The PLAN, as it is known, has never participated in a large-scale wartime engagement at sea, and its fleet is not, on the whole, as modern as America’s.

Nonetheless, China has a few critical advantages. Its naval assets are concentrated along its shores and U.S. forces are spread around the globe; areas of likely conflict are near China and far from America; and the PLAN has some crucial weapons that are better than those of the United States, especially anti-ship missiles. Beijing has also gone big into “asymmetric” warfare, for instance militarizing fishing fleets, enlisting the “little blue men” of what has become a maritime militia.

The Chinese also have one other advantage: the will to use force to take what is in the possession of others. In their peripheral seas, they grabbed control of the Paracel Islands, in the northern portion of the South China Sea, from South Vietnam in 1974 after a short battle. The Chinese also seized Mischief Reef from the Philippines in a series of actions from late 1994 to early 1995, and they snatched Scarborough Shoal, also from Manila, in early 2012. Now, China is, among other things, pressuring other Philippine features in the South China Sea and using menacing tactics to take over a chain of uninhabited islets currently under Japanese control in the East China Sea.

Moreover, Beijing has clearly relished challenging the U.S. Navy and Air Force in the global commons, threatening and on occasion harassing American ships, planes, and drones. The seizure of an American drone in international waters in December 2016, in sight of the USNS Bowditch and in defiance of radio commands, was brazen and nothing short of an act of war.

Moreover, Beijing’s harassment of the USNS Impeccable in March 2009 in the South China Sea, using its maritime militia, was so severe that it constituted an attack on the United States.

“The key point is that China accepts the risk of escalation to a greater extent than does the U.S., because China uses confrontation to alter the status quo in its favor,” Anders Corr, editor of Great Powers, Grand Strategies: The New Game in the South China Sea, told the National Interest at the beginning of this year.

China is apparently willing to escalate all the way. But the New York Times, in its reporting last month, did not mention one Chinese threat to American forces in the region: nuclear attack.

“For regional warfare, especially in Asia, the People’s Liberation Army is equipped for nuclear operations both offensive and defensive,” Richard Fisher of the International Assessment and Strategy Center told The Daily Beast. “If China can conjure a ‘defensive’ political moral high ground to justify offensive military campaigns to retrieve ‘lost’ territory, we should be prepared for China’s very early use of nuclear weapons to support its theater campaign. We can, for example, expect China to ‘demonstrate’ nuclear weapons at sea to deter American or Japanese military support for Taiwan in the event of a Chinese attack, or even outright Chinese use of nuclear weapons against Japanese bases supporting U.S. forces coming to the defense of Taiwan.”
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#### Healthcare systems are ready for the next pandemic BUT frontline workers are key

Nundy, 21 -- Accolade chief medical officer and primary care physician

[Dr. Shantanu, interview with John Henning Schumann, "How Health Care In The U.S. May Change After COVID: An Optimist's Outlook," NPR, 5-13-2021, https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2021/05/13/996233365/how-health-care-in-the-u-s-may-change-after-covid-an-optimists-outlook, accessed 10-18-2021]

With more than one-third of U.S. adults now fully vaccinated against COVID-19, there's growing optimism on many fronts. A majority of states have either lifted health-related restrictions or have announced target dates for doing so.

Already, many clinicians and health policy experts are thinking about what the post-pandemic world will look like.

COVID-19 demonstrated that even in a behemoth industry like health care, change can come quickly when it's necessary. Patients understandably avoided hospitals and clinics because of the risk of viral exposure — leading to quick opportunities for innovation.

For example, the use of telemedicine skyrocketed, and many think it's an innovation that's here to stay. Patients like the convenience — and for many conditions, it's an effective alternative to an in-person visit.

Dr. Shantanu Nundy, for one, is optimistic about the future of health care in the U.S. He is a primary care physician practicing just outside Washington, D.C., and the chief medical officer at Accolade, a company that helps people navigate the health care system.

Nundy has bold views, based on his current roles as well as prior positions with the Human Diagnosis Project, a crowd-sourcing platform for collaboration on challenging medical cases, and as a senior health specialist for the World Bank, where his work took him to Africa, Asia and South America.

He spoke with Shots about his new book, Care After Covid: What the Pandemic Revealed Is Broken in Healthcare and How to Reinvent It.

This interview has been edited for length and clarity.

You seem pretty optimistic about changes to U.S. health care because of the pandemic. What changes or new practices do you think are most likely to stick around?

I am optimistic. Health care has changed more in the past year than during any similar period in modern U.S. history. And it changed for the better.

Doctors and other front-line workers finally started meeting patients where they are: in the community (e.g., at drive-through testing and mass vaccination sites), at home (e.g., with house calls and even hospital-level care at home), and on their devices. Doctors and patients connected in new ways: In my clinic, which serves low-income patients in the Washington, D.C., area, I was given an iPhone for the first time for video and audio visits and found myself messaging with patients between visits to refill medications or follow up on their symptoms.

Some of these changes will reverse as things get back to normal, but what won't change is the fundamental culture shifts. The pandemic magnified long-standing cracks in the foundation of the U.S. health care system and exposed those cracks to populations that had never witnessed them before. All of us — not just patients with chronic diseases or patients who live at the margin — have the shared experience of trying to find a test or vaccine, of navigating the byzantine healthcare system on our own.

The crisis also exposed just how inequitable the health care system is for Black and brown communities. The numbers don't lie — these populations died of COVID-19 at a rate much higher than their white counterparts. I'm hopeful these shared experiences and revelations have created the empathy and impetus to demand change.

Your book envisions a care framework that will be "distributed, digitally enabled, and decentralized." Let's take them one at a time. What do you mean by "distributed care?"

"Distributed care" refers to the notion that care should happen where health happens, at home and in the community. We need to redistribute care from clinics and hospitals to homes, pharmacies and grocery stores, barbershops and churches, workplaces and online, where patients are on-the-go. This doesn't mean we should eliminate traditional health care settings. Hospitals and clinics will continue to play a major role in health care delivery, but for most people, these will become secondary, rather than primary, sources of care.

The most obvious upside to distributed care is that it's more affordable. Without the overhead costs of expensive medical facilities, costs decrease. It also has the potential to be more effective and equitable. Our health is largely driven by our behaviors and our environment. By delivering it where we live and work, care can better address the root causes of poor health, including social isolation, poor nutrition, physical inactivity, and mental and emotional distress. Distributed care can also reach communities too far from the nearest clinic or hospital — or who are too distrustful to even step foot in one.

We already have digitally enabled care to some extent: We use apps, our medical records are electronic, and many of us have now used telemedicine to connect with clinicians. What is your vision of the future of "digitally enabled care?"

"Digitally enabled" refers to the idea that the right role of technology in health care is simply to increase the care in healthcare. ... For a glimpse of what's possible, I'll share my mom's experience during the pandemic. For 25 years, she struggled with Type 2 diabetes (and for the past 10 years, has been on insulin). But faced with all the reports of patients with diabetes having higher rates of COVID-19 complications, she signed up for a virtual diabetes service that was completely different than anything she had tried in the past two decades.

She was shipped a free glucose meter and weighing scale to send her data to her new diabetes care team. She downloaded a mobile app where she did video visits with her doctor — more frequently than she ever had in person — and 24/7 access to a health coach that she sometimes messaged with multiple times per day in the first few weeks of the program. She also was connected with another patient — a gentleman in Chicago who, like my mom, followed an Indian vegetarian diet — to exchange recipes with. The result: Within weeks, my mom lost over 10 pounds and safely got off of insulin. Nearly a year later, she still is.

How do you envision future care that is decentralized? Will U.S. health care become more of a do-it-yourself industry?

"Decentralized care" refers to a model where decisions about care are in the hands of those closest to it, including doctors and patients.

But health care is highly centralized and heavily regulated, and what doctors can do often comes down to what we can charge insurance companies for.

One example: I had a patient who was in and out of the hospital for heart failure. After one of these hospitalizations, I saw her in-clinic and learned that she didn't have a scale and couldn't afford one. Daily weigh-ins are critical for patients like her, as a few pounds gained can be an indicator of impending heart failure. So, I handed her a $20 bill from my pocket for a scale, and she was never admitted to the hospital again. If our health care system was decentralized, I would be able to get my patients the $20 piece of equipment they need instead of racking up thousands of dollars in expensive medical tests and hospitalizations.

With all of the innovation you foresee, will there be actual market-based competitive pricing reform, or will all of the whistles and bells just drive health care costs inexorably upward?

The type of innovation we need most is true "disruptive innovation." This is a term that gets thrown around liberally, but the real definition refers to products or services that dramatically lower prices and increase quality, much more so than those currently available.

I see two steps we must take to get there: First, we need to stop nibbling around the edges. Often, our solution to, say, Type 2 diabetes, is training doctors in better management or approving a drug that is 1% better (and 200 times more expensive) than what we have now. A truly disruptive innovation is what my mom used: a digitally enabled service that reversed her diabetes and got her off of insulin completely.

Second, we need to get out of our own way. Early on in the pandemic, when we finally allowed patients to test themselves for COVID-19, we still required a doctor to sign off on the test. Patients filled out a questionnaire and a doctor then needed to scan through dozens of forms an hour to approve or reject the test applications (these were almost always approved). That's crazy! Now, we've finally let doctors off the hook, and patients can walk into a CVS or Walgreens to pick up a rapid COVID-19 test over the counter.

What are some ways that your future vision could go off the rails and lead us toward a care system that is less open, less transparent or less patient-centered?

The biggest threat is the continued monopolization of health care. In many parts of the country, there are only one or two large health systems and a few options for health insurance. This drives up prices with little to no benefit for patients or doctors.

Will the lessons of COVID-19 make us more prepared, and our health care system more adept for the next global challenge?

Absolutely. The pandemic has created medicine's greatest generation. By shepherding this country through the crisis, an entire generation of doctors, nurses, pharmacists and administrators learned an entirely new set of skills: public communication, front-line innovation, data-driven decision-making.

An outside force — a new virus — accelerated much-needed change in health care, but the work is just beginning. The future of care is now on us.

#### Strikes spur closures and collapse healthcare- empirics prove

Essien, 18 -- University of Uyo economics professor

[Madara, University of Uyo Department of Microbiology head & Vice Dean of Science, International Centre for Energy and Environmental Sustainability Research research fellow, "The Socio-Economic Effects of Medical Unions Strikes on the Health Sector of Akwa Ibom State of Nigeria," Asia Business Review, 8.2, May/August 2018, https://doi.org/10.18034/abr.v8i2.157, accessed 10-16-21, modified for ableist language]

The Nigerian economy has been disturbed and its economic activities disrupted from time to time due to labour union strike actions. Its first recorded labour strike was on June 21,1945 where about 150,000 clerical and nonclerical workers in the Nigerian Civil Service were demanding for better wages due to the rising cost of living brought about by the Second World War. This was possible because workers formed themselves into a labour union. The essence of the union amongst others was negotiation of wages, work rules, complaint procedures, rules governing hiring, firing and promotion of workers, workplace safety and policies to enforce strikes.

Despite the fact that the Trade Dispute Act of 1976 declared strike illegal; and the institutionalization of "no work, no pay" rule strike actions in Nigeria has no abated. The Nigerian health system has experienced exponential increase in industrial conflict. It appears that no part of public service in Nigeria has experienced more strikes than the health sector. In recent times there are many incidences of health workers strike; but the most interesting is the case of the Federal Medical Centre in Owerri. The health workers came to work every day but spend their time singing and praying on the hospital grounds, while ignoring their patients in the wards, protesting against the privatization of some of the hospital services. In many other parts of the country public sector hospitals were closed for about half of the year due strikes by doctors. But as soon as they returned, other health sector workers under the aegis of the Joint Health Sector Unions (JOHESU) proceeded to strike from November 2014 to February, 2015. Several patients including those in critical conditions were forced to discharge themselves following paralysis of medical and clinical services. It also made children to be abandoned in the children ward. All accident and emergency (A & E) department were under lock and key. Wards were deserted. This has impacted on the health care system, leading to several avoidable deaths, complication and outgoing medical tourism, as the wealthy seek health services abroad.

It can be seen so far that strikes in the health sector have assumed an astronomical proportion. This is occasioned by the inability of the government to settle her health workers duly and at the right time. Also, for harmony to exist in any productive sector of a country, there need to be an efficient interplay of both individuals (workers) and the country (employer). Perhaps, strikes are sustained because this interplay is not efficient enough and so disharmony becomes the order of the day in the sector. The impact of these different strikes on the health sector tends to place more negative values on local and national economy. Thus, this work aimed at analyzing the socio-economic dynamics of these strikes and how it impacts on the health sector of Nigeria - focusing on the health sector of Akwa Ibom State.

Statement of the Problem

Nigeria as a country has suffered from several health workers' strikes involving different categories of health workers. Frequent health workers' strikes result in the closure of public health care institutions preventing Nigerians access to quality health services. Health care workers are specialized in different areas; an optician does a different work from a surgeon and so on. It is the integration of all their works as well as the interrelationship that exists in these different medical services that makes the health system, as a whole function effectively. Thus, if any of these categories withholds services due to strikes, the health sector will definitely not function efficiently. This posed serious hardship to the relations of patients as they complained they had no money to go to private hospitals. Strikes [freeze]~~paralyze~~ healthcare delivery services at the detriment of people's lives. It has so far sent many people to their untimely graves. Incessant strikes do not only create animosity, acrimony and supremacy tussle among various units and departments in the public health institutions but it also ~~cripple~~[destroys] the health system economic-wise. On the account of this observation, the study aim to highlights the economic consequences of the strike actions. It set out to analyze the positive and negative socio-economic effect of medical union strike on health sector of Akwa Ibom State. In other words, the work aims to show how medical union strike impact on the State's economic indices.

#### Medical strikes collapse access which spurs disease and turns the case- healthcare is a prereq to fix inequality and poverty

Essien, 18 -- University of Uyo economics professor

[Madara, University of Uyo Department of Microbiology head & Vice Dean of Science, International Centre for Energy and Environmental Sustainability Research research fellow, "The Socio-Economic Effects of Medical Unions Strikes on the Health Sector of Akwa Ibom State of Nigeria," Asia Business Review, 8.2, May/August 2018, https://doi.org/10.18034/abr.v8i2.157, accessed 10-16-21]

The result of this study has serious social and economic implications for the society in terms of its effects on micro-economic and macro-economic indices of the country. The impact is usually higher in developing economies. In other words, in less developed economies, medical unions' strikes further worsens already worse socioeconomic circumstances to the extent that citizens lack or have little options to turn to. From the study, 20% of the respondents reported that medical union strike worsen patients' health conditions, 14.7% reported that it leads to spreading of disease, and 6.7% indicated that medical union strike increases social inequality (Figure 1).

In Nigeria about 70% of the population is reported to live below poverty line, this means that the little money individuals and household have is used to purchase essential services such as food, shelter, clothing and healthcare. Yet, healthcare is cheaper in government-managed facilities. However, when the health workers within such facilities down tools, this decreases the ability of many individuals and households to obtain healthcare because they usually lack the wherewithal to finance such alternatives. This leads to worsening of the conditions of both inpatients and outpatients and also leads to spreading of diseases in the case of contagious diseases. This also means that the affected population would be less productive in terms of their involvement in pursuit of economic productive ends achieve through exerting labour. At the macro-economic level, the aggregate productivity of the national economy will be negatively affected.

From the study, it was reported that medical Union strike leads to increased social inequality. This means that during strike the gap between the poor and the rich as well as between the male and female gender becomes increasingly obvious. Many rich people could obtain medical services at private clinics during which fewer poor could do same. In the same vein, fewer female than their male counterparts could obtain medical services at private healthcare facility. The impact of worsening social inequality implies that, most of the disadvantaged group could not contribute to economic growth at per capita level. This would also have negative effects on national aggregates. 12.7% of respondents indicated that medical union strike increases mortality rate (Figure 1); particularly that of children who are known to be more vulnerable to disease (Todaro and Smith 2012).

Studies have indicated that healthier people earn higher wages. In Cote d' Ivoire it was reported that unhealthy people, that is people who were likely to lose a day of work per month due to illness earned 19% lower than healthy people (Todaro and Smith 2012).This further means that, a healthy population is a prerequisite for successful economic development. This study indicates that medical unions' strike worsens outpatients' health and reduces the opportunity of the population to obtain healthcare services (Figure 1). Good health standard in a population is unimportant to achieve goals of poverty reduction. As Todaro and Smith (2012) note, "if parents are two weak, unhealthy, and unskilled to be productive enough to support their family, the children have to work. But if the children work, they cannot get the education they need, so when they grow up, they will have to send their own children to work "(p.403). Thus, the cycle of poverty and low productivity extend across generations. Health and education are pivotal to economic development (Todaro and Smith 2012).

Strike itself is based on microeconomic self-interest. Umo (1993) noted that "the economic world draws its dynamism from the self-interest motivation of individuals, firms and governments in response to some desirable incentives" (p.3). Umo (1993) also noted that every economic activity is a response to a reward or loss system. The existence of appropriate incentives elicits appropriate (correct) economic behavior. The level of efficiency in public institutions depends on the structure of positive and or negative incentives facing the operators (Umo 1993). People work to earn a living. Health workers also work to earn a living. Their motivation to work is the reward that they get. However, when the incentive is distorted, they are bound to react. A restoration of these incentives means restoration of efficiency to the system. We can say that strike is an economic corrective mechanism necessary for the effective functioning of the work environment in terms of protecting the reward system of the economy thereby, ensuring efficiency and productivity.

Conclusion and Recommendations

From the findings of the study, it can be concluded that strikes interrupt the smooth flow of medical services to citizens and it is slowly and irredeemably destroying the public health system. This is a result of incompatible demand of the employers and her employees. Also, the study also reveal that denial of salary review and accumulated salary arrears were identified as major causes of medical union strikes. It is noteworthy that the impact of industrial conflict is felt in the productive sector of the economy, both at microeconomic and macroeconomic levels. When people's health conditions get worsened or there is high mortality rate due to strikes, they become unable to shoulder their responsibilities effectively and hence cannot make progress that will contribute to the growth of the society. This will also reduce labour force drastically both currently and in the future and will in turn affect aggregate production and income negatively. Poor health and negative economic growth are inextricably linked. Improving the health of a nation's citizens can directly result in economic growth. When human capital is deteriorated, economic productivity is at stake. Health workers have been seen as valuable assets to the society. Their intrinsic value, in terms of human capital, should be respected rather than focusing on economic productivity that may be derived from it. Whenever that is ignored, labour unions utilize the threat of strike (Owoye, 1994).

#### Strikes collapse healthcare worker morale even if they succeed- spurs brain drain and severe healthcare disruption

Chima, 13 -- University of Kwazulu-Natal public health professor

[Sylvester, Programme of Bio & Research Ethics and Medical Law head, former Professor of Pathology and Medical Law at the International American Medical University, "Global medicine: Is it ethical or morally justifiable for doctors and other healthcare workers to go on strike?," BMC Medical Ethics, 12-19-2013, https://bmcmedethics.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1472-6939-14-S1-S5, accessed 10-16-2021]

*NOTE: HCWs = health care workers*

Impact of strikes on doctors and HCWs

It would appear that strikes may have a disproportionate deleterious impact on doctors and other HCWs when compared to patients. Striking HCWs frequently face a loss of income, job insecurity, and emotional distress, plus long hours of work for those who choose not to participate in the strike action. Further, there could be derangement of working relationships as well as loss of established leadership [11, 41]. Whether or not their demands are eventually met, doctors who have been involved in strikes usually end up disillusioned and demotivated and many end-up emigrating overseas or relocating within the country thereby leading to either internal or external brain drain. For example, striking doctors in Timaru, New Zealand reported an "overwhelming feeling of complete lack of confidence and trust in the hospital management team" [11, 16, 25, 55, 66]. The impact of such movements could be as severe as occurred in Malta, where the Maltese medical school lost its GMC accreditation due to a prolonged doctor's strike [9]. It could also lead to a situation where close to 25% of a national doctors threatened to quit their jobs and leave the country unless they received wage increases, as reported recently from the Czech Republic [16]. The brain drain which occurred in Malta, New Zealand and Israel following doctors strikes led to major disruptions in healthcare service delivery in the centers and regions affected [9, 14].

#### Next pandemic causes extinction- strong public health is key to solve

Bhadelia, 21 -- Center for Emerging Infectious Diseases Policy & Research founding director

[Nahid, MD, MALD, "What do we need to build resilience against the next pandemic?," Center for Emerging Infectious Diseases Policy & Research, 5-18-2021, https://www.bu.edu/ceid/2021/05/18/placeholder-blog-post/, accessed 10-18-2021]

What do we need to build resilience against the next pandemic?

We have lost close to 3.4 million souls to COVID-19 globally over the last year. By some estimates, the real number may be much higher than that because the excess deaths this year are closer to between 7 and 13 million, after accounting for those who died without a diagnosis and those who died because they could not receive timely care for another medical condition. And the pandemic, despite the receding cases in high-resource countries, is nowhere near its end.

Lives lost are the tip of iceberg. We cannot quantify the pain felt by family members remaining behind. Livelihoods and businesses have been devastated. The pandemic’s impact reaches into all recesses of our personal and public lives. It has and will continue to undo decades of work globally on reducing poverty, improving education and health, and empowering women. An IMF study last year showed how, in the five years after major epidemics, income inequality continues to increase in affected countries. Similar trends are already being seen in five countries with the heaviest death tolls from COVID-19. As communities around the world deal with the wreckage of their economies, 95 million more people have been pushed into extreme poverty, with another 200 million predicted to be at risk between now and the year 2030. And this does not even cover the multidimensional impact of poverty. How long will it take for us to recover from this pandemic? How do we take stock and pandemic-proof our communities?

More urgently, COVID-19 may not be the last pandemic we face in our lifetimes. The existential threat of pandemics doesn’t decrease because we are already facing one. In fact, this pandemic worsens the risk for new threats because our effort and resources are depleted, and our surveillance and healthcare systems are overstretched. And because the risk of new infectious diseases seeping into the human population from animal reservoirs is going to continue to grow as we see grow in numbers, require more land, raise more animals, put down more roads, use up more wetlands, and close the gap between us and natural habitats where yet undiscovered viruses lurk. How can we ensure that economically devastated communities coming out of this pandemic recover without worsening the tenuous balance we have with the world around us?

Within our own lifetimes, we have seen the impact of climate change, another existential crisis, transition from something we heard about in news reports to something we experience in our personal lives in the form of changing weather patterns, health effects, increased risk of natural disasters, and rising sea levels. Over the next decades, these factors will exponentially increase the incidence of many infections and change the distribution of others.

And as we tackle these complex problems, new challenges are arising: despite becoming ever more globally connected, our perceptions of reality continue to be disparate. In the deluge of digital data, many among us are falling prey to misinformation and disinformation. The urgency of outbreaks, the shifting scientific knowledge base that comes from tackling emerging pathogens, and political interference have all contributed to the signal getting lost in the noise. The role of disinformation is only going to expand in future emergencies. How do we share timely information in crisis? How do we, in government, science, and public health, earn and build the trust of our communities so ours is the voice they listen to during the fray? How do we listen more carefully to them? How do we involve them in making us all safer?

We can no longer ignore infectious threats on the other side of the world, and we can no longer practice isolationist policies. Because COVID-19 painfully instructed us that outbreaks aren’t just something that happen on the news in distant communities, but instead, they can reach into our homes and rip away our loved ones.

There are moments in history when our actions require collective metacognition and urgency. This has to be one of those moments.

The Center for Emerging Infectious Diseases (CEID) Policy & Research was founded because the time is now for collective transdisciplinary research and response. Every step of the way in this pandemic, the questions haven’t been just scientific, they have also been legal, economic, cultural, and ethical. CEID’s mission is to tug at the threads of all the complex systems that leave us vulnerable to new epidemics and help us answer some of the questions posed above. Through research, collaborative action, community engagement, and training, we hope to find ways to secure us against future global threats. I hope you will reach out with ideas, collaborate with us, and check back often to see where our work is taking us.

We are not rudderless as we head into this future. The COVID-19 pandemic, like recent Ebola virus disease outbreaks and other recent emergencies, has shown that investment in sciences, global collaboration, public health, and health-systems readiness can decrease our vulnerability. We need not only to invest in diagnostics, vaccines, and therapeutics but also find a new way of approaching the problems. My own experience serving as an outbreak responder in multiple emergencies has underscored for me again and again that epidemics fracture us along lines of existing weakness. Because at the terminus of all international surveillance for outbreaks are many communities that do not have access to care. When families can’t access care, we can’t stop cases from becoming clusters, which then become outbreaks. When communities can’t equitably access vaccines, it makes it harder for them to recover, and we continue to suffer collectively from the global economic impact and through the appearance of new variants. When structural racism keeps parts of our communities from being protected, diagnosed, and cared for, all of us are at risk. When it comes to infectious diseases outbreaks, health inequity is a threat to all our survival.

At the launch of our center, we asked public health experts and scientists, “What do we need to do to build resilience against the next pandemic?” Over the next few months, we will continue asking this question to different disciplines, covering those working on health and economic equity, lawmakers, the business community, artists and musicians, and those in media and journalism. Because the solutions, like the questions, require all of us.

# ON

## Framework

### Consequences Good

#### Debates about oppression should center on consequences.

Christopher A. Bracey 6, Associate Professor of Law, Associate Professor of African & African American Studies, Washington University in St. Louis, September, Southern California Law Review, 79 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1231, p. 1318

Second, **reducing conversation** on race matters **to an ideological contest allows opponents to elide inquiry into whether the results of a particular** preference **policy are desirable. Policy positions masquerading as** principled **ideological stances create the impression that a racial policy is not simply a choice among available alternatives, but the embodiment of some higher moral principle**. Thus, **the "principle" becomes an end in itself, without reference to outcomes. Consider the prevailing view of colorblindness in constitutional discourse. Colorblindness has come to be understood as the embodiment of what is morally just,** independent of its actual effect upon the lives of racial minorities. This explains Justice Thomas's belief in the "moral and constitutional equivalence" between Jim Crow laws and race preferences, and his tragic assertion that "Government cannot make us equal [but] can only recognize, respect, and protect us as equal before the law." [281](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=cd9713b340d60abd42c2b34c36d8ef95&_docnum=9&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkVA&_md5=9645fa92f5740655bdc1c9ae7c82b328#n281) For Thomas, there is no meaningful difference between laws designed to entrench racial subordination and those designed to alleviate conditions of oppression. **Critics may point out that colorblindness in practice has the effect of entrenching existing racial disparities in** health, wealth, and society. **But in framing the debate in purely ideological terms, opponents are able to avoid the contentious issue of outcomes and make viability determinations based exclusively on whether racially progressive measures exude fidelity to the ideological principle of colorblindness. Meaningful policy debate is replaced by ideological exchange, which further exacerbates hostilities and deepens the cycle of resentment.**

### Extinction Outweighs

#### Preventing Extinction is important – it’s key to value to life and is a prereq to social progress

Cerutti 14 - Professor of Political Philosophy emeritus at the University of Florence and Adjunct Professor at the Scuola superiore Sant’Anna, Pisa. In the last fifteen years, Cerutti has been aVisiting Professor at Harvard, the Universit´e de Paris 8, the Humboldt Universit ¨at zu Berlin, the London School of Economics and Political Science,(China Foreign Affairs University), Beijing, and Stanford University in Florence. Beyond the publications quoted in this article, Cerutti has written widely on the political identity of the Europeans and the legitimacy of the European Union (last publication: Debating Political Identity and Legitimacy in the European Union, ed. with S. Lucarelli and V. Schmidt, Routledge: London 2011). Also, his MOOC ‘Political Philosophy: An Introduction’ is accessible on the platform <iversity.org>.

(Furio “Humankind’s First Fundamental Right: Survival,” Constellations)

This article’s main thesis1 is that, **given the existence of** at least two **global threats**, nuclear weapons and climate change, **which endanger the life of humankind as a civ- ilized species**, its **right to survive should be asserted as its first** human or rather **fundamental right.** The sense of **this** assertion **is not just philosophical but legal as** **well**.¶ To substantiate this thesis, I shall go through six argumentative steps:¶ 1. Why begin with global threats.¶ 2. Why survival is the leading category in this field, and¶ how it interplays with justice.¶ 3. What interest humankind has in its survival, and why¶ it should be protected as a right.¶ 4. Why regard “humankind” rather than “all indi-¶ viduals” as a possible actor.¶ 5. Why speak of a fundamental rather than human¶ right, and how to constitutionalize this right.¶ 6. How two developments in international law after 1945 can contribute to support the argument I have¶ been sketching.¶ \*\*¶ 1. If philosophical thinking starts with being amazed at something in the world (Plato’s θαυμα ́ζειν), my in- terest in the present matter2 was first stimulated by the pre-philosophical amazement I always felt in seeing that in the now enormous human rights discourse (both in politics and academia) so much care is dedicated to the single individuals, and so wide-ranging designs of a cos- mopolis to come are based on their rights. Yet **nobody seems to take note that the life of all present and future individuals could be annihilated** by a nuclear war or up- set by catastrophic developments of climate change. **It is like insisting on first debating the rights of a ship’s** third- class **passengers** 3 **instead of taking action in the light of the fact that the ship is already taking in seawater from a leak** (climate change is already happening) and also risks to hit a mine that is floating around and would send it along with all passengers and crew straight to the ocean depths (by thinking and acting timely, leaks can be filled, mines detected and swept away, all ac- tions that would put the care for third-class passengers¶ on a firmer ground). **These dangers are philosophically significant because they tell something about human beings**, the only ones who have become able to destroy their own race, as well as about modernity: the possibil- ity of self-destruction sets an end to this era, opens a new one, which can only vaguely be termed post-modern,4 and requires an updated rewriting of the Dialectics of the Enlightenment. It is also politically significant as it challenges present politics to restructure itself by ex- tending its attention to the far future, something which is not possible within the boundaries of modern politics because of its narrow time structure.5 In a more precise language, I term **challenges like nuclear weapons** (con- sidered in themselves, while nuclear proliferation is but a subphenomenon) **and climate change** global (in a very specific sense) because they are lethal and planet-wide, **can hit** approximately **everybody on earth and** can be reasonably addressed only by the near totality of coun- tries and peoples. They would not wipe out biologically humankind, although this cannot be excluded in case of an all-out nuclear war; but **they would destroy human civilization**:6 not a set of values, but the set of material and cultural tools (agriculture, communications, trans- portation and trade) that allow unspecialized animals like the humans to survive and to thrive.¶ It is clear that my thesis presupposes a revised scale of relevance among the issues requiring and stimulat- ing theoretical investigations: in my philosophical view global threats have a greater relevance and are intellec- tually more challenging than the issues suggested by the media’s headlines (present wars, terrorism, group and minority rights in the US, multiculturalism in Canada or Australia, immigrants in Europe, or, more recently, the crisis of the global economic system). As a reflection upon the deeper longue dure ́e determinants of hu[hu]man- ity’s fate, political philosophy should not necessarily espouse the agenda suggested by current politics and journalism and, instead, seek its own independent as- sessment of the state of the world as part of its business; this is a critical attitude that cannot be implemented without a philosophical view on history (not to be con- fused with a revival of the “grand narratives”). Besides, **the shifting of** most of Critical **Theory to pure normativity has favored** the emergence not just of worldviews based on the predominance of Sollen, but also of **an exclusive attention on intersubjectivity** and its troubles; **as if challenges to politics and civilization caused by systemic imperatives** (**such as the nuclear threat and**¶ **climate change)** **were beyond the grasp of critical inquiry**. What I am attempting in this article is to address an issue such as human rights that is typical of **the self- centered normative approach** mentioned and to show how it **should be restructured to address the challenges for humankind’s survival**.¶ In this attempt I am driven by the intent to debunk the layer of denial (or repression in pshychoanalyti- cal sense) that, more intensely after the end of the Cold War, has removed the nuclear threat from the philosoph- ical reflection on modernity and has later prevented cli- mate change from entering the main agenda of Critical Theory. There is also an epistemological aspect in this: a critical Zeitdiagnose, or an informed assessment of where history has taken us to in our post-modern times is not possible without first taking what hard science has to say about the threats for humankind very seriously.7 With rare exceptions, **critical theorists seem to be reluctant to address the philosophical issues raised by global challenges, not to mention their** **complete denial** beginning with Horkheimer and Adorno in the Fifties and Sixties (when Mutual Assured Destruction became a real possibility) **of the meaning of nuclear weapons. It is as if Critical Theory**, despite its claim to be a gen- eral assessment of our civilization, **had accepted a tacit division of labor in which its competence is restricted to social justice** (in continuation of its original being rooted in the Marxian critique of political economy) **and the “damaged”**8 **subjectivity**. The rest of the real world is left to a purely Hobbesian (and later Luhmannian) reading, or to the perception of side-figures such as Karl Jaspers or Gu ̈nther Anders.¶ A last epistemological remark: **starting from problems and threats that**, however socially generated, **come up as physical events and are accounted for by hard science has the advantage that philosophy can work on them without first engaging in a complicate and doubt- ful theorizing about how the world should be reshaped** according to a general normative theory. This ad hoc theorizing shows the ability or inability of a philosoph- ical view to come to terms with problems that are of paramount importance to everybody, not just to the prac- titioners of Schulphilosophie.¶ 2. I have explained elsewhere9why survival rather than justice is the leading category of a philosophy of global threats. **The** now thriving **literature on justice and climate change misses the point** that before we look for ways to establish justice between generations, **we have to motivate our interest in** their **existence** and wellbeing, or rath er in the existence and wellbeing of humankind.10 While survival of humankind is what best defines our problematic situation, when it comes to the normative aspect I believe that **we should assume responsibility for future generations** rather than do justice to them; talking responsibility I move from its most elementary¶ manifestation, the responsibility parents take on for their children. Justice as fairness comes in when we have to fight back “generational nepotism:” it is wrong for any generation to spoil the environment without regard to the consequences in the future, far that it may be, that is not just out of respect for those that may harm our children and children’s children. Out of elementary fairness, as expressed in the Golden Rule, we cannot deny parents of the, say, twenty-fifth century the chance to bear and educate their children in decent conditions.¶ Now, survival is a Hobbesian category, as such it sounds like an anathema to critical thinking, just as most categories stemming from the tradition of politi- cal realism do. Since under global threats present and future humankind is really endangered in its survival, it is however hard to see the rationale of denying the fact because the name comes from the enemy’s vocabu- lary. More importantly, there is an essential difference: Hobbes’ survival regards the individual and is there- fore self-centered and adversarial (in common parlance, mors tua vita mea), while humankind’s survival as a moral and political goal is by its own definition an uni- versalistic feature. More on this later.¶ A much talked-about issue in this context is the so- called identity problem, which I am however inclined to dismiss. If it means the doubtfulness of any engagement in favor of future generations because we do not know if they will exist (we could decide to stop procreating), the problem is surrounded by an air of futility: there is no imaginable decision process that could effectively lead to a total procreation stop. On the other hand, if only a few humans were alive in the far future, this would be enough of a reason for our engagement. Of course future humanity could never be born because meanwhile the planet may have been burnt out by an asteroid (natural precariousness of human life) or an all-out nuclear war ([hu]man-made precariousness). Neither type of precarious- ness can however be a reason not to endorse the interest of future generations in survival, because reducing that precariousness is exactly the engagement’s telos. The other aspect of the identity problem — the non-identity of posterity’s values and preferences with our own, or their indeterminacy — is not relevant to our case, be- cause the goal for whose attainment we are called to save or sacrifice something for their survival has to do with their sheer survival (in an indispensably civilized framework, as explained above) rather than with our own and the posterity’s moral configuration; in other words, there is no paternalistic attitude in it.¶ In a fairly different meaning, closer to social rather than moral (analytical) theory, identity comes up in an- other sense. Assuming responsibility for (or, for that matter, being fair to) future generations is not just an altruistic attitude. Not in the sense that we can do as well do so by acting on egoistic grounds: were this the¶ main reason to take action, we were justified to limit our effort to the less costly adaptation policies instead of funding the restructuring of the economy necessary for mitigation, the only way-out from global warming for generations of the far future. To be true, addressing the limitation of global warming or the neutralization of nuclear weapons requires wide-ranging undertakings that can be justified only on grounds of a moral attitude towards future generations rather than of our enlight- ened self-interest. But **doing what we can for the survival of humankind can give ourselves reassurance that our individual life** (also seen in the context of our gen- eration’s) **is meaningful** beyond the limits of our own existence on earth, **because doing so helps us shed our isolation as single individuals or single generation and become partners in a wider transgenerational covenant of solidarity**.¶ 3. That the interest to live and to raise children in de- cent conditions we attribute to future generations ought to be translated into a right is not self-evident. It is not simply that we should abstain from transforming every reasonable claim into a right, and instead reserve this category for the essentials that make the associated life of individuals in the polity possible and acceptable ac- cording to each evolutionary stage.11 More importantly, doubts may also arise as to whether it is wise to translate any goal of social and political struggles into a right, that is to “juridify” it instead of focusing on the underlying conflict dynamics and the participation of the conflict- ing parties. In general I share this preoccupation, and have misgivings at any inflationary expansion of the hu- man rights catalogue. On the other hand, moral rights that do not translate into legal rights12 are politically pointless or at least much less significant than the rights enshrined in a legal order. Also, our case is different, and the issues we are confronted with are more radi- cal than the worries with ‘juridification;’ this is all the truer, since the establishment of a right to survival for humankind would require a long and fierce political and intellectual battle in the first place.¶ First of all, does the right of humanity to survival qualify as a (basic or human) right? Before we proceed, let us note that humankind’s survival is not a good like civil liberties, which is completely at the disposal of human beings; instead, it can depend on the orbits of asteroids and other NEOs.13 The “right of humankind to survival” should therefore be read as a short for “the right of humankind, including future people, to have all previous generations doing their best to ensure their sur- vival and protect them from [hu]man-made threats.” In this version, we are clearly afar from the confusion between rights and goals criticized by Dworkin14 (§3.1 in the chapter on Difficult cases), the causation of the good at stake (survival) being elusive, or not completely nor (in the case of climate change) undoubtedly human; also¶ the content of the right is not a physical state, but rather the behavior influencing it. In a manifest way, this also identifies the right’s indispensable correlate, that is the duty of the relevant actors (individuals and institutions) to refrain from behaviors that are likely to cause harm to that good.¶ Whether or not this claim can translate into a right should be investigated from two points of view, those of its structure (a) and its bearer (b).¶ a. As for structure, three of Feinberg’s15 four crite- ria for being a right are already met (to have a content, a holder and an addressee). The fourth, the ‘source of validation,’ gradually emerges from the argument I am unfolding. Frydman and Haarscher also list four condi- tions, of which three are already present (titulaire, objet, opposabilite ́) – even if more remains to be said about the first one; while the fourth condition (sanction) shall be discussed below in the framework of the constitu- tionalization problem.16 Finally, let us look at the stan- dard distinction of negative and positive rights, which Shue rightly believes to be substantially untenable. This is also true in our case, because the ‘behavior’ of in- dividuals and institutions, which humanity is entitled to expect, according to the new right, can be imple- mented either by abstaining in single cases from using or possessing nuclear weapons and emitting excessive GHGs or by establishing new institutions (a global En- vironmental Protection Agency, say) and strategies (for example, technology transfer from advanced to develop- ing countries to help the latter rein in global warming). What would be acknowledged would be the right, not the policies that according to time and circumstances are devised for its realization.¶ Does this new right share with the other fundamental or human rights the need to be founded in a conception of the human, such as those focused by Donnelly on dignity, by Meyers on moral agency and by Frydman and Haarscher on autonomy?17 Not properly, or not di- rectly. Humanity’s right to survival is a meta-right rather than being the first right and sharing the same founda- tion with the others.18 Therefore, its foundation is for- mal rather than rooted in a substantive view of what is human: **acknowledging this right is the pre-condition for making all other rights possible**. It is their Bedingung der Mo ̈glichkeit, to put it as Kant might have done. Not only in the trivial but sturdy physical sense that **human rights can only apply to a living humankind, but not to a ”republic of insects and grass”** (Jonathan Schell on the state of the earth after a large nuclear war19). **The meta-right as a pre-condition has** rather **to be un- derstood in the moral sense: no foundation of morality** or legality (except in a totally positivistic view of the latter) **makes sense if it cannot rely on the respect of the fundamental rights of those** (poor populations al- ready affected by global warming, future generations¶ as victims of nuclear war or extreme climate change) **harmed by our acts and omissions**. Here I mean moral- ity at large, regardless of its being based on a conception of the right or the good. In other words, the two **global challenges, which have received so little attention in the mainstream philosophy of the last decades, have indeed philosophical implications capable of undermining the** business-as-**usual attitude in moral and political theory**; I mean the attitude to think of the foundations of moral- ity and polity as if the [hu]man-made (modern) world in which they operate had not been substantially altered by humankind’s newly achieved capability to destroy itself and/or the planet.¶ Let us make a further step on the road that leads to uncouple, as far as it goes, the foundation of a new right of paramount importance from a substantive conception of the human – an effort aimed at protecting it from the uncertain or frail fate of such conceptions. On the one hand, as a meta-right to individual-only human rights, the right to survival does not imply a choice among substantive values; this right does not refer to a partic- ular conception of what is good for future generations, as it only wants to ensure for them existential condi- tions that are an indispensable basis for their members to pursue whatever idea of the good, of liberty and self- realization they may choose. On the other hand, survival is indeed referred not to the mere biological fact, but to the survival of humankind in decent, civilized condi- tions, taking civilization in the meaning explained in §1. Alone, as I explained above, this qualification is not an added axiological component (civilization as a sys- tem of values), as it rather relies on the analytical view that some technical and cultural features of civilization are essential to the life of the human species.¶ There is a last aspect to be examined with regard to the structure or nature of this right: its emergence not from a shift in the doctrine of human rights, but as a response to a new situation in world history, in which survival goods (a livable atmosphere in the first place) that were so far tacitly taken for granted turn out to be no longer guaranteed, but more and more endangered. As such, this new right reconnects to what we know about individual human rights, that is that they come up as a response to “perceived threats” and build an “evolving whole”.20¶ b. Let us now come to the question of the right’s bearer. It is humankind, defined as the generality of the living individuals along with those who will be born. There are three possible objections to this proposition.¶ First, it seems to be self-evident that the notion of a human right for the so defined humankind cannot be subject to the classical liberal objection that bearers of such rights are individuals, not groups.21 Humankind is not an exclusive and self-contained group opposed to others (at least until we do not have our first contact with¶ dwellers of other regions of the universe), nor is it meant here to represent particular sets of values. Between the two meanings of “humanity” — as species (Artbegriff) and as regulative notion of a community cemented by shared values and goals (Zielbegriff)22 — I am referring to the first one; it is now becoming philosophically sig- nificant because not even its biological existence can be taken for granted under [hu]man-made threats. Humankind is not a hypostasis detached from the individuals, as in the case of ‘the community’ or ‘das Volk,’ as it rather means the totality of the living individuals of any given generation including (a) their potential to generate fur- ther human beings and generations and (b) their knowl- edge that the latter will exist and probably suffer. This reflexive notion of humankind raises a problem, but remains open to different ethical choices: indifference towards future generations, responsibility for them, and obligations assumed in their favor.¶ 4. A second question is: why should we speak of humankind instead of limiting ourselves to the more sober expression “all present and future individuals?” There is first a lexicological advantage, in as much as we thus use one word instead of connecting two by an “and.” This better conveys the sense that the bond of solidarity based on the responsibility for the elementary living conditions of posterity makes present and future individuals one community – in this sole, thin sense in- deed, which does not try to conceal the deep fractures existing between contemporaries within the present and the successive generations of this community. The very inclusion of future people into humankind is not an act of inclusive kindness towards them, but is rather made compelling by the lethal threats that past and present people have projected into the life of posterity, in an amount unprecedented in history. Lastly, introducing humankind as a bearer of rights highlights that the right of the individuals to be alive and free can be enjoyed only in the middle of a larger community, which makes the claim of human rights possible and helps to im- plement them. In times of economic globalization and global threats, we have come to know that this com- munity is the whole humankind, not just nations. All this however does not alter the truth that who is entitled to vindicate the right to survival is not humanity as a hypostasis, but every individual either living or not yet born – very much like what happens with individual human rights, whose constitutional formulation makes them enjoyable for every citizen who will in the future be born under the same Constitution.¶ Third comes the standard objection: it does not make sense to endorse obligation towards future people, since, if men and women agree to stop reproduction, those people might never be born. I have already dismissed this as a futile mental experiment. It could further be argued, though, that future generations might turn out¶ to have moral standards totally different from ours. Yet, the possibility that posterity will be not amenable to our moral world is not huge enough to release us from any responsibility towards them. We can still under- stand, and to an extent share, the moral problems raised by the Bible or the Greek classical tragedy of millen- nia ago and should not easily assume that our fellow humans of the year 3000, dwellers of a planet spoiled by global warming, will be morally so hugely different from us.¶ Finally, let me anticipate here one of the legal con- siderations that will be developed later on. Any right- establishing text (but I am now referring to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, UDHR 1948) works with the basic formula “everyone has the right to etc.”23 The validity of the claims is limited only by the spatial ex- tension of the law: a right established by the French Constitution may be thought to be valid universally, but is legally protected only on French territory, while the rights mentioned in the UDHR apply by definition to the entire world where humans live. This can be dubbed spa- tial universalism, while establishing a right of present and future humanity to survive is tantamount to adding a time universalism. In other words, this makes explicit that the right of everyone to a just international order (UDHR 1948, Art. 28; more below) also holds for the ‘everyones’ of the year 3000. This may have always been tacitly intended by the law, the only time limit ly- ing in the possibility that the law is at some point in the future dismissed by another law canceling or expand- ing those rights. In a present like ours, in which it has become known that the future is no longer guaranteed to be essentially homogeneous (with no radical change in the physical and anthropological life conditions) to the present and the past, it has become necessary to openly establish a linkage between our obligations and the rights of future generations, as far as existential issues are concerned; a link that will likewise apply to them as soon as they become the present generation.¶ So far, I have clarified the moral and, to a lesser extent, legal reasons for introducing the notion of hu- mankind as right bearer. I will now stress that the hu- mankind discourse in this article remains political rather than moral.¶ It is not necessary here to rerun the history of the humankind/humanity notion; it is enough to remember that its denial has been a stronghold in the battle of value nihilists (Nietzsche) and realist thinkers (Oswald Spen- gler, who dismissed it as a “zoological notion,” and more extensively Carl Schmitt in Schmitt 1976, particularly §6). As self-contained units (such as the Westphalian system states) were deemed to be the only sustainable and legitimate polities, any reference to humanity was seen as toothless or manipulative, as a noble universalis- tic alibi for particularistic interests.24 Setting aside this¶ sort of criticism, which mistakes the ideological use of the term for its very substance, we know that humanity, as a good-will aspiration of philosophers, poets and re- ligious men, could not be regarded as a political notion because only non-voluntaristic communities can be re- garded as political. They alone allow for binding and effective decisions, whereas any partner can at any time and according to its convenience withdraw from mem- bership in “humanity” or other large associations based on just good will.¶ This can now be expected to change, because **planetary lethal threats such as nuclear war or disastrous climate change have the potential strength to forge all relevant political actors into one community**, not unlike Hobbes’ individuals, **who received the push to unite from the threats to their life and limbs**: first **because they are all put in danger, and** second **because they have to act jointly** if they really want to fight back those dangers. **This is a possibility, not an** actual and **inevitable process**, as there are enough counter-forces that impede those ‘Hobbesian’ threats to fully make hu- mankind one political community: fear, the protecting passion, does no longer work as smoothly as in Hobbes’ model of Leviathan.25 Nor is the potential contained in global challenges supposed to generate a world state as its only outcome: practicing survival policies, who- ever the actors may be, is more important than a uni- fied state-like structure in charge of doing so. Nonethe- less **all this is enough to use ‘humankind’ in a political sense**, as something that is a potential constituency rather than a fragmented multiplicity of individuals and states.¶ 5. Why a fundamental rather than a human right? The distinction between human and fundamental is not univocally worked out in the literature.26 In the vocab- ulary I am using here, human rights are seen as a philo- sophical concept and a moral (deontological) precept, while fundamental rights are those positively acknowl- edged in a legal order, entrusted to political and institu- tional processes for their implementation, and claimable in courts – this last feature being more problematic. Putting on humankind’s survival the label of a funda- mental right avoids leaving it in a philosophical limbo as a regulative idea,27 and gives it a better defined political and legal nature; this is more adequate to the character- istic of survival as something endangered by political decisions (or the lack thereof) and requesting a political solution by a given deadline (the next few years if we want to try to keep the temperature increase expected by 2100 under two degrees).¶ If humankind’s survival is acknowledged as a funda- mental right, it follows that it should be constitutional- ized, that is inserted in new and old (and aptly modified) Constitutions as well as in a new version of the Univer- sal Declaration of Human Rights; as such, it could be referred to as highest guidance in international treaties aimed at implementing it – rather than being enshrined in a specific ‘survival’ treaty. In constitutional law, a development in this sense is already taking place, in as much as either the rights of future generations to a safe environment or our responsibility towards them in this regard or the imperative to preserve the environ- ment (without mention of the future generations, but implicitly to their benefit) have been affirmed in consti- tutional amendments of the last two decades in countries such as Germany, France, Switzerland, but also Burkina Faso and Burundi. Having rights or being protected by the legally defined responsibility of the previous gener- ations is however not the same thing, and with regard to humankind’s survival I would point at its stronger formulation as a right: it is more binding, while the ob- jections against endowing future generations with rights can be easily argued against. Just because it is conceived in favor of those who cannot yet uphold their interest, this right should be protected against cancellation by a sort of Ewigkeitsklausel as in Art. 79.3 of the German Grundgesetz.28 A right to survival is more specific and more stringent than the right to a safe environment be- cause it derives from lethal and global challenges that affect the very core of the polity, protection, rather than from a generic care for a balanced relationship to na- ture or from a diffuse feeling of benevolence for the posterity.¶ In national or regional Constitutions, the acknowl- edgment of this right could be accompanied by the establishment of corresponding institutions, promoting the implementation of the new right; it could be for example an ombudsman29 for future generation as a (countermajoritarian)30 authority protecting their inter- ests against damages resulting from new legislation, and endowed with the power to send it back to the legislative rather than to veto it straight away.31 Not to be underes- timated are the difficulties that would arise in striking a very delicate balance on two levels: in general between the interests of present and future generations,32 but also between parliaments or executives, which act under the pressure of their constituencies, and the members of the ombudsman authority, who remain nonetheless contem- poraries of the former rather than being appointed by the latter – for all too natural reasons.¶ The same difficulty would affect the national courts in which the new fundamental right, as jus cogens principle, should be made claimable at the initiative of institutions such as the ombudsman or of advocacy groups representing a significative number of citizens in a referendum-like counting procedure. In international courts,33 the interest of future generations should be represented by an ombudsman to be established at the UN as well as at regional associations of states such as the EU or Mercosur. A point however that remains¶ open to further discussion has been raised in the de- bate on socio-economic or solidarity rights, which may have some affinity with the right to survival: theoreti- cally, Frank Michelman has made clear that the status of a norm as constitutional law ought not to be con- flated with the question of its availability for judicial enforcement.34 In practice, conflicts are easily possi- ble between the courts sentencing on the states’ failure to implement those rights and “the vain or overbearing nature of these sentences” on a matter that is political rather than judicial. 35 This is true in our case as well: the attainment of a new international order without national possession of nuclear arms or a carbon-free reordering of the world economy are goals for policy-making, not something that can be attained in courts. In this frame- work, however, courts are not jobless: sentencing the nuclear-armed states for their failure in implementing art.VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT),36 or the US of the Bush years for withdrawing from the Kyoto Protocol and failing to cut emissions is a typical judicial matter, as the two cases would regard the break of treaty obligations or the failure to cease doing some- thing harmful, not to bring about something good.37¶ Finally, two more fundamental objections could be raised against the idea of a legal protection of the inter- est of future generations. It could be argued that what would be represented (in a time-universalistic mode) is not the interest of future generations, but rather the interest of a particular fraction of the present ones, dis- guising itself as standard bearer of those people to come. On the one hand this should be taken into account as critical point of view in the public debate on those inter- ests. On the other hand, this criticism, strictly speaking, would also delegitimize such an ancient principle of Roman and Western law as the protection of the child. In morality it would affirm a radical skepticism that denies the possibility of slipping into another person’s clothes and acting from a non-egoistic stance. This can be obviously upheld, but at the price of the disappear- ance of morality as well as of the polity, which is – in any case and among other things – a solidaristic association.¶ A second problem, which is more difficult to deal with, is that we do not know as a general piece of knowl- edge what the interest of future generations is; whereas in the case of legal protection of the child we share a generally accepted knowledge of his or her future in- terest (to remain healthy, to get sufficient education, to be free to make the best of him/herself). What the real life conditions and the presumable vital interests of fu- ture generations will be can only be tentatively argued from what the several branches of natural and economic (e.g. demography) science are able to tell us about what is likely to remain constant in physical and cultural anthropology and what is likely to be most endangered.¶ As such, it is important that moral and political theory renew their relationship to the natural sciences after a time of reciprocal disdain between the two. While sci- ence cannot by itself draw an encompassing picture of future life under global threats, philosophy should learn from science what those future problems are likely to be and elaborate on them, instead of reflecting on the future of humanity by just moving from the doctrines of past philosophers or relying on the hearsay about it based on media reports or the philosopher’s personal divinations.¶ 6. My philosophical proposal to fill a hole in human rights discourse and legislation by introducing a first or meta-fundamental right of humankind to survival and positivizing it in national, international and world law38 resonates with two legal developments. The first related to ‘humanity’, the second to ‘human rights.’ The latter resonates with the novelties in constitutional law men- tioned in §5.¶ The first one began in 1970 as the UN General As- sembly adopted Resolution 2749, the Declaration of Principles Governing the Seabed and Ocean Floor, con- taining the notion of a “common heritage of mankind”; it was originally introduced to protect the seabed and ocean floor and later the “moon and other celestial bod- ies” from exploitation by powerful countries against the interest of the developing ones.39 In the 1990s, the competing and “thinner” concept of “common concern of mankind” emerged, as in the Convention on Bio- diversity of 1992; nonetheless it can be said that hu- mankind has become a notion contained in binding in- ternational law and referred to indivisible (climate) and divisible (seabed, ocean floor, moon) objects, and that this has happened as an answer to problems and chances generated by huge technological advancement.¶ In another corner of legal development, it could be argued that the logical structure, so to speak the norma- tive algorithm of the UDHR norms — the aforemen- tioned ‘everyone has the right . . . ’ — implies that hu- mankind, not just single individuals, is to be the bearer of those rights, even if the collective singular is not used. Turning to a more substantive level, we could go as far as to say that the legal protection of humankind’s survival was implicitly enshrined as early as 1948 in the UDHR and later in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) as well as the In- ternational Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), both of 1966. Art. 28 UDHR (“ev- eryone has the right to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Decla- ration can be fully realized”) could be rethought in the direction of institutions bound to implement for every- one, now and in the future, the right to life (Art.3 UDHR, Art. 6 ICCPR), the right to an adequate standard of liv- ing incl. adequate food (Art.11 ICESRC)40 as well as¶ the right of the family to be protected (Art.10 ICESRC), a right that would be denied to families of the posterity bound to live under insufferable environmental condi- tions (cf. above the notion of a transgenerational chain of parents). While the different binding strength of the several **legal formulations** (treaty, covenant, convention, declaration) **cannot be ignored**, it remains clear that le- gal documents do not advance by themselves the cause of humankind’s survival, except if they can be effec- tively referred to in a court of justice; but **they create an appropriate and stable environment for what can really bring about a change, that is educational and political struggles,** the former aiming at a change in the political culture.¶ To sum up, (**humankind has thus ceased to be just a concept used by philosophers** and theologians, whose presence in international law was merely philo- sophical, if not rhetorical, as in the Preamble to the UN Charter of 1945. Though not explicitly endowed with rights in the documents quoted above, the humankind of the “common heritage” doctrine is an important prece- dent in the direction, suggested by this article, of in- troducing this new legal actor. When looking at the implementation of the rights that can be attributed to it, the other legal novelty of the “common but dif- ferentiated responsibility”41 of individual actors, such as countries, should also be brought to bear. This is important when it comes to distributing the burden of the duties corresponding to those rights – which is in- deed one of the major issues in the debate following the Copenhagen Accord on Climate Change of 2009. In any case, the legal acknowledgment of a “common responsibility” for the global commons is a further step in designing humankind as a juridical notion.¶ This article is policy-oriented in the peculiar sense of a constitutional policy that will require decades, if ever, to become the subject of debate and even longer to be legally implemented. Impulses in this direction are cer- tainly not be expected from the world of politics, but rather from the scientific community (provided a now utopian sounding collaboration of physics, philosophy and legal theory materializes) or from scattered sen- tences of national and international courts, particularly in environmental matter.42 **Support from civil society would help**.¶ Finally, the author’s suggestion as to how to read this proposal: it has a clearly cosmopolitan (or better: cosmopolitical) character, not however in the sense of cosmopolitanism as a general doctrine of government/ governance. It is rather generated by tools coming from realist thought: new threats as source of new rights, and lethal and planetary threats to the survival of hu- mankind’s civilization as drivers towards a new level of legal protection.

#### Debate must center existential risks – it’s key to civic engagement and academic research to develop risk mitigation strategies, but any alternative impact calc ensures complacency – we can win on this alone

Javorsky 18 [Emilia Javorsky is a Boston-based physician-scientist focused on the invention, development and commercialization of new medical therapies. She also leads an Artificial Intelligence in Medicine initiative with The Future Society at the Harvard Kennedy School of Government. Why Human Extinction Needs a Marketing Department. January 15, 2018. <https://www.xconomy.com/boston/2018/01/15/why-human-extinction-needs-a-marketing-department/>]

Experts at Oxford University and elsewhere have estimated that the risk of a global human extinction event this century—or at least of an event that wipes out 10 percent or more of the world’s population— is around **1 in 10**. The most probable culprits sending us the way of the dinosaur are mostly **anthropogenic risks**, meaning those created by humans. These include climate change, **nuclear disaster**, and more emerging risks such as artificial intelligence gone wrong (by accident or nefarious intent) and bioterrorism. A recent search of the scientific literature through ScienceDirect for “human extinction” returned a demoralizing 157 results, compared to the 1,627 for “dung beetle.” I don’t know about you, but this concerns me. Why is there so little research and action on existential risks (risks capable of rendering humanity extinct)? A big part of the problem is a **lack of awareness** about the **real threats** we face and what can be done about them. When asked to estimate the chance of an extinction event in the next 50 years, U.S. adults in surveys reported chances ranging from **1 in 10 million** to 1 in 100, certainly not 10 percent. The **awareness** and **engagement issues** extend to the **academic community** as well, where **a key bottleneck** is a lack of talented people **studying existential risks**. Developing viable **risk mitigation strategies** will require widespread **civic engagement** and **concerted research** efforts. Consequently, there is an **urgent need** to improve the **communication** of the **magnitude** and importance of **existential risks**. The first step is getting an audience to pay attention to this issue.

#### That is the only egalitarian metric---anything else collapses cooperation on collective action crises and makes extinction inevitable

Khan 18 (Risalat, activist and entrepreneur from Bangladesh passionate about addressing climate change, biodiversity loss, and other existential challenges. He was featured by The Guardian as one of the “young climate campaigners to watch” (2015). As a campaigner with the global civic movement Avaaz (2014-17), Risalat was part of a small core team that spearheaded the largest climate marches in history with a turnout of over 800,000 across 2,000 cities. After fighting for the Paris Agreement, Risalat led a campaign joined by over a million people to stop the Rampal coal plant in Bangladesh to protect the Sundarbans World Heritage forest, and elicited criticism of the plant from Crédit Agricolé through targeted advocacy. Currently, Risalat is pursuing an MPA in Environmental Science and Policy at Columbia University as a SIPA Environmental Fellow, “5 reasons why we need to start talking about existential risks,” <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/01/5-reasons-start-talking-existential-risks-extinction-moriori/>)

Infinite future possibilities I find the story of the Moriori profound. It teaches me two lessons. Firstly, that human culture is far from immutable. That we can struggle against our baser instincts. That we can master them and rise to unprecedented challenges. Secondly, that even this does not make us masters of our own destiny. We can make visionary choices, but the future can still surprise us. This is a humbling realization. Because faced with an uncertain future, the only wise thing we can do is prepare for possibilities. Standing at the launch pad of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, the possibilities seem endless. They range from an era of abundance to the end of humanity, and everything in between. How do we navigate such a wide and divergent spectrum? I am an optimist. From my bubble of privilege, life feels like a rollercoaster ride full of ever more impressive wonders, even as I try to fight the many social injustices that still blight us. However, the accelerating pace of change amid uncertainty elicits one fundamental observation. Among the infinite future possibilities, only one outcome is truly irreversible: extinction. Concerns about extinction are often dismissed as apocalyptic alarmism. Sometimes, they are. But repeating that mankind is still here after 70 years of existential warning about nuclear warfare is a straw man argument. The fact that a 1000-year flood has not happened does not negate its possibility. And there have been far too many nuclear near-misses to rest easy. As the World Economic Forum’s Annual Meeting in Davos discusses how to create a shared future in a fractured world, here are five reasons why the possibility of existential risks should raise the stakes of conversation: 1. Extinction is the rule, not the exception More than 99.9% of all the species that ever existed are gone. Deep time is unfathomable to the human brain. But if one cares to take a tour of the billions of years of life’s history, we find a litany of forgotten species. And we have only discovered a mere fraction of the extinct species that once roamed the planet. In the speck of time since the first humans evolved, more than 99.9% of all the distinct human cultures that have ever existed are extinct. Each hunter-gatherer tribe had its own mythologies, traditions and norms. They wiped each other out, or coalesced into larger formations following the agricultural revolution. However, as major civilizations emerged, even those that reached incredible heights, such as the Egyptians and the Romans, eventually collapsed. It is only in the very recent past that we became a truly global civilization. Our interconnectedness continues to grow rapidly. “Stand or fall, we are the last civilization”, as Ricken Patel, the founder of the global civic movement Avaaz, put it. 2. Environmental pressures can drive extinction More than 15,000 scientists just issued a ‘warning to humanity’. They called on us to reduce our impact on the biosphere, 25 years after their first such appeal. The warning notes that we are far outstripping the capacity of our planet in all but one measure of ozone depletion, including emissions, biodiversity, freshwater availability and more. The scientists, not a crowd known to overstate facts, conclude: “soon it will be too late to shift course away from our failing trajectory, and time is running out”. In his 2005 book Collapse, Jared Diamond charts the history of past societies. He makes the case that overpopulation and resource use beyond the carrying capacity have often been important, if not the only, drivers of collapse. Even though we are making important incremental progress in battles such as climate change, we must still achieve tremendous step changes in our response to several major environmental crises. We must do this even while the world’s population continues to grow. These pressures are bound to exert great stress on our global civilization. 3. Superintelligence: unplanned obsolescence? Imagine a monkey society that foresaw the ascendance of humans. Fearing a loss of status and power, it decided to kill the proverbial Adam and Eve. It crafted the most ingenious plan it could: starve the humans by taking away all their bananas. Foolproof plan, right? This story describes the fundamental difficulty with superintelligence. A superintelligent being may always do something entirely different from what we, with our mere mortal intelligence, can foresee. In his 2014 book Superintelligence, Swedish philosopher Nick Bostrom presents the challenge in thought-provoking detail, and advises caution. Bostrom cites a survey of industry experts that projected a 50% chance of the development of artificial superintelligence by 2050, and a 90% chance by 2075. The latter date is within the life expectancy of many alive today. Visionaries like Stephen Hawking and Elon Musk have warned of the existential risks from artificial superintelligence. Their opposite camp includes Larry Page and Mark Zuckerberg. But on an issue that concerns the future of humanity, is it really wise to ignore the guy who explained the nature of space to us and another guy who just put a reusable rocket in it? 4. Technology: known knowns and unknown unknowns Many fundamentally disruptive technologies are coming of age, from bioengineering to quantum computing, 3-D printing, robotics, nanotechnology and more. Lord Martin Rees describes potential existential challenges from some of these technologies, such as a bioengineered pandemic, in his book Our Final Century. Imagine if North Korea, feeling secure in its isolation, could release a virulent strain of Ebola, engineered to be airborne. Would it do it? Would ISIS? Projecting decades forward, we will likely develop capabilities that are unthinkable even now. The unknown unknowns of our technological path are profoundly humbling. 5. 'The Trump Factor' Despite our scientific ingenuity, we are still a confused and confusing species. Think back to two years ago, and how you thought the world worked then. Has that not been upended by the election of Donald Trump as US President, and everything that has happened since? The mix of billions of messy humans will forever be unpredictable. When the combustible forces described above are added to this melee, we find ourselves on a tightrope. What choices must we now make now to create a shared future, in which we are not at perpetual risk of destroying ourselves? Common enemy to common cause Throughout history, we have rallied against the ‘other’. Tribes have overpowered tribes, empires have conquered rivals. Even today, our fiercest displays of unity typically happen at wartime We give our lives for our motherland and defend nationalistic pride like a wounded lion. But like the early Morioris, we 21st-century citizens find ourselves on an increasingly unstable island. We may have a violent past, but we have no more dangerous enemy than ourselves. Our task is to find our own Nunuku’s Law. Our own shared contract, based on equity, would help us navigate safely. It would ensure a future that unleashes the full potential of our still-budding human civilization, in all its diversity. We cannot do this unless we are humbly grounded in the possibility of our own destruction. Survival is life’s primal instinct. In the absence of a common enemy, we must find common cause in survival. Our future may depend on whether we realize this.

### Ethics

1. **The notion of freedom only exists in a space where we don’t have to worry about our basic need for survival. Ethics and freedom only exist in conjunction when people don’t have to worry about their healthcare system collapsing or complete nuclear war. Freedom substantively collapses into caring about our lives and preventing our destruction. That is why we have certain freedoms in the first place. They say that ethics must begin from freedom, but then they provide no definitions of what freedom is or how it exists within the context of this debate. Freedom is vague, and it is not a good standard to base a debate around. Make them provide a definition before they start espousing that freedom is the only metric for debate.**

**2.(a) You should be responsible for all of the consequences of your advocacy, because how people respond to your idea affects people and their livelihoods. The road to hell is paved with good intentions. You assign moral violence; this is net bad.**

**(b) My DA’s still win the debate in this framework. For example, healthcare workers striking is what causes the healthcare system to be undermined.**

**3. Ethics are inherently subjective. You say that we shouldn’t prescribed moral obligation from experience, but this makes no sense. It is the consequences and understanding of our actions that dictates what is ethical. If we can’t base ethics on our experiences and our perception, then nothing could ever be considered to be ethical or unethical.**

**4 & 5. Non-interference isn’t inherently bad. Many strikes are occurring now in the squo. Kellogs, John Deer, and Harvard are some to name a few. People obviously aren’t adapting to their current situations, and they are actively rebelling against the institutions that are being upheld.**

#### And: Slavery analogies are morally abhorrent- they mask the actual slavery experienced in the past and present.

Wolverton, 13 ["Slavery is Abhorrent," Daily Kos, 11-27-13, https://www.dailykos.com/stories/2013/11/27/1258476/-Slavery-is-Abhorrent, accessed 1-21-21]

Why people can't get it is beyond me. We live in a world that still has slavery. It's reprehensible. It's offensive. If you've never been enslaved, then you don't know what slavery means. If you don't have an ancestor who was a slave, you don't know what slavery means. If you haven't bothered to look at the horrific documentation from the 18th and 19th centuries (or today!) referencing slavery; you don't know the brutality of slavery. You don't know the callous indifference of how slavery was and is implemented. So, stop with the slavery analogies. Slavery exists today in this country and others. Slavery analogies are grating in that they are the epitome of false equivalencies. The slavery that up to 30 million people in the world currently live under is real. The enslavement of millions of people in North America prior to abolition was real. Slavery analogies trivialize the horrible experiences slaves endure.

**Freedom shouldn’t be considered to be a power structure. There is no such this as absolute freedom, and the application of freedom in society is arbitrary. Freedom has always remained as a contingent outcome because it exists in response to our views as a society. Also, this argument of domination and non-domination is based in analogies to slavery – reject the team.**

**6. Defer to specificity- they need to prove a specific reason our disad is flawed, don’t prioritize generic args. This measure of specificity is better for debate. Once again, cross apply non-domination argument from previous point.**

**7. Freedom is not inherent to argumentation – we still have restrictions in debate. This doesn’t automatically flow aff . They aren’t even advocates for their own cause. This argument that debate exists as a community is only being used to win a round. If you really value non-domination in debate, you would be proactive and focus on equity across schools and ways to make debate more accessible instead of running arguments that are only applicable for a month or two before the topic changes.**

**8. Link turn: I am able to beat larger schools despite being from literally the smallest school in this tournament. I am able to hold my own in debate not because of coaches or any fellow debaters, but because I research. Research is something that debaters can do on their own and be sufficient at. I just beat Peninsula, a school that has more debaters than my entire town of Saratoga, Wyoming, because of research and because I put in the effort.**

**9.Impact turn: winning without prep. The fact that they said that you can fight their framework without prep or research is bad. This is an Independent DA to their framework. Research is the most valuable skill debate offers. Debating without prep destroys the entire value of debate. The best skill that debate offers is research. It is vital to advocate for our causes - this link turns freedom at a pre-fiat level. If you care about freedom, you should prioritize a framework that incentivizes research. They have admitted that their framework doesn’t.**

**10.Pascal’s Wager – Even a 1% risk that their framing leads to extinction should justify a neg ballot, the harm is too great**

## Solvency

**Strikes fail because of public backlash and replacement- that turns the case- a failed strike leaves workers worse off and unions decimated**

**Houlihan, 21** – University of Wyoming master’s student

[Glenn, "The Legacy of the Crushed 1981 PATCO Strike; Forty years ago today, 13,000 air traffic controllers went on strike. President Ronald Reagan would soon crush that strike — leading to **devastating consequences** for organized labor and all workers that we’re still dealing with today.," Jacobin, 8-3-2021, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2021/08/reagan-patco-1981-strike-legacy-air-traffic-controllers-union-public-sector-strikebreaking, accessed 10-14-2021]

Following the failed strike, PATCO was **decertified as a union**. As an organization, it was **annihilated**. Many of the former controllers suffered **immense hardships**, including struggles to replace their income and the subsequent breakdown of relationships and marriages, after losing their highly specialized job. Some fired members and their partners even killed themselves.

Roots of a Failed Strike

The PATCO leadership were blindsided by the firings — especially since the union had, unwisely, endorsed Reagan’s 1980 presidential campaign over Carter’s. PATCO president Poli was persuaded by a letter he received from Reagan in October 1980 that stated:

You can rest assured that if I am elected President, I will take whatever steps are necessary to provide our air traffic controllers with the most modern equipment available and to adjust staff levels and work days so that they are commensurate with achieving a maximum degree of public safety.

Once Reagan took office, however, it soon became apparent that whatever ally PATCO thought they had in the White House was in fact a pro-business zealot who savored the opportunity to crush organized labor. Andrew Tillett-Saks underlines PATCO’s political misjudgment: “Unions that give their imprimatur to an anti-union president will soon find that president destroying them and the rest of the labor movement anyway.”

Another factor that pushed the PATCO strike toward catastrophe was public opinion. As research from the Pew Research Center shows, the fired controllers won little sympathy from the public. A Gallup poll conducted a few days after the firings showed that 59 percent of Americans approved of the way Reagan was handling the issue, compared to just 30 percent who disapproved. The Gallup poll also found that a whopping 68 percent of the public thought that air traffic controllers shouldn’t be allowed to strike. As David Macaray states, “The PATCO strike of 1981 will undoubtedly go down in history as a monument to overplaying one’s hand.”

This lack of popularity **isn’t inherent to illegal strikes**. If strikers demonstrate they are using their militancy to fight not just for themselves but for the entire working class, they can build a broad coalition of sustained community support. Teachers have done this in recent years, waging strikes both legal and illegal in cities like Chicago and red states like West Virginia that have proven widely popular. Unfortunately, PATCO strikers failed to frame their demands in ways that appealed to the public, and Reagan’s narrative that the union was greedy — “the union demands are seventeen times what had [previously] been agreed to,” the president insisted publicly — gained traction, portraying the strikers as selfish and unreasonable.

In addition, the strikers drastically underestimated Reagan’s willingness to replace them. It isn’t illegal for US companies or the government to hire **strikebreakers**. A notorious 1936 Supreme Court ruling, NLRB v. Mackay Radio & Telegraph Co., described by Paul C. Weiler as “the worst contribution that the U.S. Supreme Court has made to the current shape of labor law in this country,” legally defends the act of strikebreaking. Reagan’s intervention during the PATCO strike, however, “normalized the aggressive strike-breaking and union-busting agenda that had already become common in the private sector” and accelerated the use of strikebreaking as an anti-union tactic.

Seth Ackerman points out that permanent replacement became a “critical weapon” that allowed employers to go on the offensive against organized workers, and **management** even “**actively sought to provoke strikes**, with the intention of keeping production running and permanently **replacing the workers**, thereby **getting rid of a union** once and for all.” Indeed, “the probability of a union activist being illegally fired during a union organizing campaign rose from about 10 percent in the 1970s to 27 percent over the first half of the 1980s.” The strike rate collapsed soon after.

In the case of PATCO, two thousand non-striking controllers **crossed the picket line** to join roughly three thousand supervisors and nine hundred military controllers to **effectively circumvent** the firings. In the long-term, the cost of training new replacements far exceeded PATCO’s contract demands. Yet in the short-term, the government was able to quickly restore 80 percent of flights to normal operations — **crushing the strikers’ leverage** in the process.

#### Even if they used to work, in the current moment they’ll fail and leave labor worse off

Medearis, 20 – UC Riverside political science professor

[John, "On the Strike and Democratic Protest," in Protest and Dissent, ed. by Melissa Schwartzberg, 2020, University Press Scholarship Online, accessed 11-3-21]

First, organized labor is rightly seen as having been “the core equalization institution” in the United States in the middle of the twentieth century, at exactly the time when strike activity was (p.240) most robust.4 Effective unions can improve the earnings of their own members, as well as those of non-members in sectors of the economy that have strong union representation. The equalizing power of unions and union activity can thus be seen in wage benefits to unionized workers, and in the effect that a higher degree of union organization has on wages across an industry, even for the sector’s non-unionized workers.5 The precise role of strikes in raising wages is a complicated question, and one whose answer has probably changed over time. In the golden age of organized labor in the United States, workers often won considerable wage benefits through striking. But since the 1980s, many strikes have ended badly for labor. This is likely because of broad forces that have weakened the position of workers and reduced the effectiveness and incidence of strikes. The decline of the strike may represent in part a calculation by workers and unions that the potency of this form of action has diminished.6

#### The right to strike isn’t sufficient- the largest labor union already has it but chooses not to strike anyway

Schuhrke, 20 -- University of Illinois at Chicago labor historian

[Jeff, "Why Won’t the US’s Largest Labor Federation Talk About a General Strike?," Jacobin, 9-18-2020, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/09/general-strike-afl-cio, accessed 10-14-2021]

Why Won’t the US’s Largest Labor Federation Talk About a General Strike?

The barriers to organizing a general strike in the United States in response to the myriad miseries American workers are facing are massive. But we can’t move toward such a strike without at least putting the possibility on the table and discussing it — something the AFL-CIO has shown no interest in doing.

Every so often over the past few years, the hashtag #GeneralStrike goes viral, with everyone from obscure Twitter users to celebrities like Cher and Britney Spears calling for a nationwide work stoppage to demand systemic change. It’s much easier to get a hashtag to take off than to actually pull off a general strike, of course. But since the pandemic began, calls for a general strike have become louder and more frequent, with even the New York Times getting on board.

US union density is at its lowest point in a century, and workers’ power is incredibly low. Still, the number of US workers going on strike is at a thirty-year high. Workers like teachers have pulled off successful work stoppages in the last few years, and the pandemic has shown that strikes or strike threats can be essential tools for defending workers’ health and safety. Such successes have no doubt helped grow the popularity of the idea that the most powerful and effective way workers can fight back against the domination of capital and the willful indifference of neoliberal institutions is by collectively withholding our labor.

It seems like everyone is talking about a general strike these days. Everyone, that is, except the one organization best positioned to not just raise the issue of a general strike, but to go beyond mere talk to actually organize one: the AFL-CIO.

Representing 12.5 million workers from fifty-five affiliated unions linked together not only through the national federation, but also through a robust network of statewide federations and local labor councils all over the country, the AFL-CIO is the single largest workers’ organization in the United States. If any entity has the requisite infrastructure and relationships in place to realize a national, cross-industry strike, it is the AFL-CIO.

#### Strikes will support populism- turns the case

Medearis, 20 – UC Riverside political science professor

[John, "On the Strike and Democratic Protest," in Protest and Dissent, ed. by Melissa Schwartzberg, 2020, University Press Scholarship Online, accessed 11-3-21]

This is an even more disheartening conclusion than it may seem. Because it is unlikely that it is enough simply to declare that there are too few strikes, hoping workers will respond with greater efforts. The problem is not just that we do not have the kind of robust strike activity that could effectively check corporate policies that produce income and wealth inequality—and so, in turn, reduce the undemocratic power of money in politics. Nor is it just that we lack a labor movement sufficiently visible and activist to turn voters from right-wing populism toward democratic alternatives. Nor is it simply that we do not have the tactical repertoire to resist autonomy-threatening forms of labor organization—from familiar workplace domination to new practices found in the gig economy.80 The problem is not even just that episodes in which workers connect with each other to experience democratic life, as in the teachers’ strikes in 2018, while inspiring, are now too rare. The difficulty is that it is by no means clear how, in the contemporary political economy, to reclaim the benefits of vibrant strike activity. There is no reason to believe that the reduction in strikes is simply due to oversight or choice—that workers simply forgot or lost the courage to strike. The long decline of the strike is likely due to structural changes that have made striking a less attractive option for workers and have also directly acted on and through some of the other phenomena discussed here, such as greater economic disparities and the power of money in politics.