Main article 1 (op-ed)
Agency: Deutsche Welle (DW)
Committee: HRC
Sakithma Iddawela

A gig or a rigged economy?

An economy, rising in its significance, prevalence, and accidence. But to what extent does this capitalist-oriented market have in stabilizing a nation’s GDP while safeguarding the rights of its people? The gig economy, while hailed for its flexibility and innovation, can also be our worst enemy in this dynamic moving world. It is a movement viewed as a potentially lethal affair for workers, given the prevalence of job insecurity, lack of legal protections, and the exploitative nature of certain employment practices.

On the charts of adopting and adapting the gig economy system, Germany is found to be on the winning charts. A conflict arose between capitalism and human rights, balancing a devil and an angel on the shoulder. Although the gig economy is comprised of immense exploitation and relationship hindering, the German province has barricaded the effects of gig economies on social aspects by implementing the principle of equal pay and extending it to include the principle of equal treatment. Equal treatment encompasses overtime, breaks, rest periods, remuneration for night work, holidays, and days off.

A crisis erupted, adding pressure on Lebanon’s shoulders, a nation known for its zomato's delivery operations, equally contributing to the gig economy slowly fabricating its way into the service industry. Throughout the voyage of seeking power, happiness, and unity, the delegate of Lebanon was on the riot of questioning every other nation on the panel, based on their stance on economic workers failed to take into account their own economic, financial, and social crisis, affecting Palestinian, Syrian and Lebanese citizens. Pretty absurd how straight after accusing everyone of mass refuge, they were unable to answer nor explain their cause of liquidity issues. The so-called “multi-prolonged crisis” was stated, by the delegate of Lebanon to be due to the need to provide Syrian refugees into the domains of Lebanon, willing to accept and take care of them, yet claim to be a burden on their shoulders. Why should a country, facing immense debt, and economic uncertainty, be given the upper hand and responsibility to look after those vulnerable?

The delegate of Lebanon begged for sympathy, to which a form of asking for financial aid was brought about, yet failed to answer the main basis of why and how Lebanon questioned other nations' economic stances when they were under severe lucrative affairs. Being financially stable to prioritizing Syrian refugees and providing healthcare, immunizations, education, and social services, through the support of USA’s financial aid, equally means that Lebanon is capable and competent enough to look after its own citizens. Yet the residents of Lebanon face the depreciation horrors of the Lebanese lira and the growing trend among landlords to request rent payments in dollars. With 80% of the Lebanese population living in poverty and 36% experiencing extreme poverty, coupled with 90% of Syrian refugees struggling to meet their basic requirements, Lebanon currently bears the highest per capita refugee burden globally. A back-and-forth babbling about “refugees being our main priority” was made, with Lebanon’s only argument of degrading Gemany’s high GDP for not taking in any refugees, examining it to be a “selfish move”.

As per the representative from Germany, in response to inquiries regarding the protective measures for enabling gig workers to seek legal remedies, it was asserted that Germany has fundamentally adjusted existing policies to accommodate the gig economy and safeguard the rights of individuals. This adaptation includes the implementation of policies promoting equal treatment, laws specifically addressing temporary employment contracts, and the government actively enforcing violations of such regulations.

Lebanon's aspiration to condemn a worldwide range of self-centeredness while simultaneously seeking empathy is remarkably audacious. Yet, the question remains: is this appeal truly warranted? Should assistance be extended to those who endeavor to undermine a financial supporter?