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#### Current strike protection is weak, leads to inequality, but policy would work to restore union integrity

HRW 21 April 29, 2021 6:00AM EDT Why the US PRO Act Matters for the Right to Unionize: Questions and Answers | <https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/04/29/why-us-pro-act-matters-right-unionize-questions-and-answers> HRW (Human Rights Watch investigates and reports on abuses happening in all corners of the world. We are roughly 450 people of 70-plus nationalities who are country experts, lawyers, journalists, and others who work to protect the most at risk, from vulnerable minorities and civilians in wartime, to refugees and children in need.)///(\*ak)

The Covid-19 pandemic has exposed the [difficult economic and social realities](https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/03/02/united-states-pandemic-impact-people-poverty) for many working people in the United States and has exacerbated pre-existing inequalities. Low-wage workers, who are disproportionately women, migrants, and Black, Indigenous, and other people of color, have largely borne the brunt of the pandemic’s economic fallout. Weaknesses and deficiencies in US labor law have made the situation worse. Workers face major obstacles to organize, unionize, and collectively bargain for [fair wages](https://www.ilo.org/legacy/english/inwork/cb-policy-guide/declarationofPhiladelphia1944.pdf), decent benefits, and safe working conditions. On numerous fronts, US laws fall far short of international standards on freedom of association and collective bargaining. Now there is an opportunity to strengthen US labor laws. The Protecting the Right to Organize Act (the PRO Act), H.R. 842, S. 420 passed the US House of Representatives on March 9, 2021 with a bipartisan vote. If approved by the Senate, it would significantly strengthen the ability of workers in the private sector to form unions and engage in collective bargaining for better working conditions and fair wages. If enacted into law, the PRO Act would be the most comprehensive worker empowerment legislation since the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of 1935. This question-and-answer document addresses the PRO Act through a human rights lens, with a focus on the right to freedom of association and collective bargaining. It examines the challenges of unionizing in the US and explains how the PRO Act would be a corrective. Current US law excludes certain categories of workers, makes it difficult for workers to join unions, hampers the fight for better working conditions, and has failed to keep up with the disruptive role of workplace technologies in organizing efforts. Addressing these shortcomings could help to bring US law closer to international human rights standards, and slow or reverse decades of rising economic inequality.

#### Best evidence concludes AFF---decreasing worker power causes inequality AND slow growth

Bivens & Shierholz 18, Josh Bivens is the director of research at the Economic Policy Institute (EPI). Heidi Shierholz leads EPI’s policy team, which monitors wage and employment policies coming out of Congress and the administration and advances a worker-first policy agenda. EPI (2018) “What labor market changes have generated inequality and wage suppression?” <https://files.epi.org/pdf/148880.pdf> brett

At the macroeconomic level, this claim that stripping away bulwarks to workers’ power has failed to lead to efficiency gains seems extremely well supported by the evidence. While many of the policy changes that have limited workers’ market power since the 1970s were done explicitly in the name of efficiency-seeking, the rate of productivity growth (a measure of how much income is generated in an hour of work—the most common macroeconomic measure of economic efficiency) slowed radically in the years after the mid-1970s, as seen in Figure B.13 This slowdown was briefly reversed in the late 1990s by the large investment in information and communications technologies associated with the widespread adoption of the internet and by a period of tighter labor markets (Bivens 2017b). But this brief surge soon failed and productivity continued growing much more slowly than in previous periods—when policy had consciously supported the leverage of typical workers. In short, the policy movement to disempower workers not only led to less equal growth, but was also associated with significantly slower growth.

When we assert that most of the policy change that led to inequality and slower growth was focused on disempowering workers—and that policy going forward needs to work to reempower workers—we certainly do not mean to imply one should ignore potential policy opportunities that could erode employer power (e.g., through more robust antitrust enforcement). But the larger opportunities are likely those that lead to more labor market balance in the power between employers and workers by increasing worker power—not trying to move the labor market toward a competitive ideal that is not attainable.

#### Empirics prove lack of striking capacity leads to vast socioeconomic inequality and economic decline

Bivens et al, 17 (Josh, director of research at the Economic Policy Institute (EPI), “How today’s unions help working people,” 8/24/17, Economic Policy Institute, https://www.epi.org/publication/how-todays-unions-help-working-people-giving-workers-the-power-to-improve-their-jobs-and-unrig-the-economy/)

As union coverage has declined and the voice of workers has correspondingly diminished, many of the key workplace standards past generations counted on have been eroded. For instance, there has been an erosion of overtime pay protection, slashing of workers’ compensation programs, and a decline in the real value of the minimum wage, which is lower now than it was in 1968.

Unions reduce inequality and are essential for low- and middle-wage workers’ ability to obtain a fair share of economic growth

The spread of collective bargaining that followed the passage of the National Labor Relations Act in 1935 led to decades of faster and fairer economic growth that persisted until the late 1970s. But since the 1970s, declining unionization has fueled rising inequality and stalled economic progress for the broad American middle class. Figures A and B show that when unions are weak, the highest incomes go up even more, but when unions are strong, middle incomes go up.

Research by EPI and other institutions shows this correlation is no accident. First, unions have strong positive effects not only on the wages of union workers but also on the wages of comparable nonunion workers, as unions set standards for entire industries and occupations (these union and nonunion wage boosts are explored in detail in the next section of this report). Second, unions make wages among occupations more equal because they give a larger wage boost to low- and middle-wage occupations than to high-wage occupations. Third, unions make wages of workers with similar characteristics more equal because of the standards unions set. Fourth, unions have historically been more likely to organize middle-wage than high-wage workers, which lowers inequality by closing gaps between, say, blue-collar and white-collar workers. Finally, the union wage boost is largest for low-wage workers and larger at the middle than at the highest wage levels, larger for black and Hispanic workers than for white workers, and larger for those with lower levels of education—wage increases for these groups help narrow wage inequalities.[16](https://www.epi.org/publication/how-todays-unions-help-working-people-giving-workers-the-power-to-improve-their-jobs-and-unrig-the-economy/#_note16) We know how big a force for equality unions are by looking at how much their decline has contributed to inequality between middle- and high-wage workers: union decline can explain one-third of the rise in wage inequality among men and one-fifth of the rise in wage inequality among women from 1973 to 2007. Among men, the erosion of collective bargaining has been the largest single factor driving a wedge between middle- and high-wage workers.[17](https://www.epi.org/publication/how-todays-unions-help-working-people-giving-workers-the-power-to-improve-their-jobs-and-unrig-the-economy/#_note17)

#### Inequality causes global nuke war

Solt 11 – Frederick Solt, Ph.D. in Political Science from University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, currently Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Iowa, Assistant Professor, Departments of Political Science and Sociology, Southern Illinois at the time of publication, “Diversionary Nationalism: Economic Inequality and the Formation of National Pride,” *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 73, No. 3, pgs. 821-830, July 2011, Available to Subscribing Institutions)

One of the oldest theories of nationalism is that states instill the nationalist myth in their citizens to divert their attention from great economic inequality and so forestall pervasive unrest. Because the very concept of nationalism obscures the extent of inequality and is a potent tool for delegitimizing calls for redistribution, it is a perfect diversion, and states should be expected to engage in more nationalist mythmaking when inequality increases. The evidence presented by this study supports this theory: across the countries and over time, where economic inequality is greater, nationalist sentiments are substantially more widespread. This result adds considerably to our understanding of nationalism. To date, many scholars have focused on the international environment as the principal source of threats that prompt states to generate nationalism; the importance of the domestic threat posed by economic inequality has been largely overlooked. However, at least in recent years, domestic inequality is a far more important stimulus for the generation of nationalist sentiments than the international context. Given that nuclear weapons—either their own or their allies’—rather than the mass army now serve as the primary defense of many countries against being overrun by their enemies, perhaps this is not surprising: nationalism-inspired mass mobilization is simply no longer as necessary for protection as it once was (see Mearsheimer 1990, 21; Posen 1993, 122–24). Another important implication of the analyses presented above is that growing economic inequality may increase ethnic conflict. States may foment national pride to stem discontent with increasing inequality, but this pride can also lead to more hostility towards immigrants and minorities. Though pride in the nation is distinct from chauvinism and outgroup hostility, it is nevertheless closely related to these phenomena, and recent experimental research has shown that members of majority groups who express high levels of national pride can be nudged into intolerant and xenophobic responses quite easily (Li and Brewer 2004). This finding suggests that, by leading to the creation of more national pride, higher levels of inequality produce environments favorable to those who would inflame ethnic animosities. Another and perhaps even more worrisome implication regards the likelihood of war. Nationalism is frequently suggested as a cause of war, and more national pride has been found to result in a much greater demand for national security even at the expense of civil liberties (Davis and Silver 2004, 36–37) as well as preferences for “a more militaristic foreign affairs posture and a more interventionist role in world politics” (Conover and Feldman 1987, 3). To the extent that these preferences influence policymaking, the growth in economic inequality over the last quarter century should be expected to lead to more aggressive foreign policies and more international conflict. If economic inequality prompts states to generate diversionary nationalism as the results presented above suggest, then rising inequality could make for a more dangerous world. The results of this work also contribute to our still limited knowledge of the relationship between economic inequality and democratic politics. In particular, it helps explain the fact that, contrary to median-voter models of redistribution (e.g., Meltzer and Richard 1981), democracies with higher levels of inequality do not consistently respond with more redistribution (e.g., Bénabou 1996). Rather than allowing redistribution to be decided through the democratic process suggested by such models, this work suggests that states often respond to higher levels of inequality with more nationalism. Nationalism then works to divert attention from inequality, so many citizens neither realize the extent of inequality nor demand redistributive policies. By prompting states to promote nationalism, greater economic inequality removes the issue of redistribution from debate and therefore narrows the scope of democratic politics.

#### Decline cascades---nuclear war

Dr. Mathew Maavak 21, PhD in Risk Foresight from the Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, External Researcher (PLATBIDAFO) at the Kazimieras Simonavicius University, Expert and Regular Commentator on Risk-Related Geostrategic Issues at the Russian International Affairs Council, “Horizon 2030: Will Emerging Risks Unravel Our Global Systems?”, Salus Journal – The Australian Journal for Law Enforcement, Security and Intelligence Professionals, Volume 9, Number 1, p. 2-8

Various scholars and institutions regard global social instability as the greatest threat facing this decade. The catalyst has been postulated to be a Second Great Depression which, in turn, will have profound implications for global security and national integrity. This paper, written from a broad systems perspective, illustrates how emerging risks are getting more complex and intertwined; blurring boundaries between the economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological taxonomy used by the World Economic Forum for its annual global risk forecasts. Tight couplings in our global systems have also enabled risks accrued in one area to snowball into a full-blown crisis elsewhere. The COVID-19 pandemic and its socioeconomic fallouts exemplify this systemic chain-reaction. Onceinexorable forces of globalization are rupturing as the current global system can no longer be sustained due to poor governance and runaway wealth fractionation. The coronavirus pandemic is also enabling Big Tech to expropriate the levers of governments and mass communications worldwide. This paper concludes by highlighting how this development poses a dilemma for security professionals. Key Words: Global Systems, Emergence, VUCA, COVID-9, Social Instability, Big Tech, Great Reset INTRODUCTION The new decade is witnessing rising volatility across global systems. Pick any random “system” today and chart out its trajectory: Are our education systems becoming more robust and affordable? What about food security? Are our healthcare systems improving? Are our pension systems sound? Wherever one looks, there are dark clouds gathering on a global horizon marked by volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity (VUCA). But what exactly is a global system? Our planet itself is an autonomous and selfsustaining mega-system, marked by periodic cycles and elemental vagaries. Human activities within however are not system isolates as our banking, utility, farming, healthcare and retail sectors etc. are increasingly entwined. Risks accrued in one system may cascade into an unforeseen crisis within and/or without (Choo, Smith & McCusker, 2007). Scholars call this phenomenon “emergence”; one where the behaviour of intersecting systems is determined by complex and largely invisible interactions at the substratum (Goldstein, 1999; Holland, 1998). The ongoing COVID-19 pandemic is a case in point. While experts remain divided over the source and morphology of the virus, the contagion has ramified into a global health crisis and supply chain nightmare. It is also tilting the geopolitical balance. China is the largest exporter of intermediate products, and had generated nearly 20% of global imports in 2015 alone (Cousin, 2020). The pharmaceutical sector is particularly vulnerable. Nearly “85% of medicines in the U.S. strategic national stockpile” sources components from China (Owens, 2020). An initial run on respiratory masks has now been eclipsed by rowdy queues at supermarkets and the bankruptcy of small businesses. The entire global population – save for major pockets such as Sweden, Belarus, Taiwan and Japan – have been subjected to cyclical lockdowns and quarantines. Never before in history have humans faced such a systemic, borderless calamity. COVID-19 represents a classic emergent crisis that necessitates real-time response and adaptivity in a real-time world, particularly since the global Just-in-Time (JIT) production and delivery system serves as both an enabler and vector for transboundary risks. From a systems thinking perspective, emerging risk management should therefore address a whole spectrum of activity across the economic, environmental, geopolitical, societal and technological (EEGST) taxonomy. Every emerging threat can be slotted into this taxonomy – a reason why it is used by the World Economic Forum (WEF) for its annual global risk exercises (Maavak, 2019a). As traditional forces of globalization unravel, security professionals should take cognizance of emerging threats through a systems thinking approach. METHODOLOGY An EEGST sectional breakdown was adopted to illustrate a sampling of extreme risks facing the world for the 2020-2030 decade. The transcendental quality of emerging risks, as outlined on Figure 1, below, was primarily informed by the following pillars of systems thinking (Rickards, 2020): • Diminishing diversity (or increasing homogeneity) of actors in the global system (Boli & Thomas, 1997; Meyer, 2000; Young et al, 2006); • Interconnections in the global system (Homer-Dixon et al, 2015; Lee & Preston, 2012); • Interactions of actors, events and components in the global system (Buldyrev et al, 2010; Bashan et al, 2013; Homer-Dixon et al, 2015); and • Adaptive qualities in particular systems (Bodin & Norberg, 2005; Scheffer et al, 2012) Since scholastic material on this topic remains somewhat inchoate, this paper buttresses many of its contentions through secondary (i.e. news/institutional) sources. ECONOMY According to Professor Stanislaw Drozdz (2018) of the Polish Academy of Sciences, “a global financial crash of a previously unprecedented scale is highly probable” by the mid- 2020s. This will lead to a trickle-down meltdown, impacting all areas of human activity. The economist John Mauldin (2018) similarly warns that the “2020s might be the worst decade in US history” and may lead to a Second Great Depression. Other forecasts are equally alarming. According to the International Institute of Finance, global debt may have surpassed $255 trillion by 2020 (IIF, 2019). Yet another study revealed that global debts and liabilities amounted to a staggering $2.5 quadrillion (Ausman, 2018). The reader should note that these figures were tabulated before the COVID-19 outbreak. The IMF singles out widening income inequality as the trigger for the next Great Depression (Georgieva, 2020). The wealthiest 1% now own more than twice as much wealth as 6.9 billion people (Coffey et al, 2020) and this chasm is widening with each passing month. COVID-19 had, in fact, boosted global billionaire wealth to an unprecedented $10.2 trillion by July 2020 (UBS-PWC, 2020). Global GDP, worth $88 trillion in 2019, may have contracted by 5.2% in 2020 (World Bank, 2020). As the Greek historian Plutarch warned in the 1st century AD: “An imbalance between rich and poor is the oldest and most fatal ailment of all republics” (Mauldin, 2014). The stability of a society, as Aristotle argued even earlier, depends on a robust middle element or middle class. At the rate the global middle class is facing catastrophic debt and unemployment levels, widespread social disaffection may morph into outright anarchy (Maavak, 2012; DCDC, 2007). Economic stressors, in transcendent VUCA fashion, may also induce radical geopolitical realignments. Bullions now carry more weight than NATO’s security guarantees in Eastern Europe. After Poland repatriated 100 tons of gold from the Bank of England in 2019, Slovakia, Serbia and Hungary quickly followed suit. According to former Slovak Premier Robert Fico, this erosion in regional trust was based on historical precedents – in particular the 1938 Munich Agreement which ceded Czechoslovakia’s Sudetenland to Nazi Germany. As Fico reiterated (Dudik & Tomek, 2019): “You can hardly trust even the closest allies after the Munich Agreement… I guarantee that if something happens, we won’t see a single gram of this (offshore-held) gold. Let’s do it (repatriation) as quickly as possible.” (Parenthesis added by author). President Aleksandar Vucic of Serbia (a non-NATO nation) justified his central bank’s gold-repatriation program by hinting at economic headwinds ahead: “We see in which direction the crisis in the world is moving” (Dudik & Tomek, 2019). Indeed, with two global Titanics – the United States and China – set on a collision course with a quadrillions-denominated iceberg in the middle, and a viral outbreak on its tip, the seismic ripples will be felt far, wide and for a considerable period. A reality check is nonetheless needed here: Can additional bullions realistically circumvallate the economies of 80 million plus peoples in these Eastern European nations, worth a collective $1.8 trillion by purchasing power parity? Gold however is a potent psychological symbol as it represents national sovereignty and economic reassurance in a potentially hyperinflationary world. The portents are clear: The current global economic system will be weakened by rising nationalism and autarkic demands. Much uncertainty remains ahead. Mauldin (2018) proposes the introduction of Old Testament-style debt jubilees to facilitate gradual national recoveries. The World Economic Forum, on the other hand, has long proposed a “Great Reset” by 2030; a socialist utopia where “you’ll own nothing and you’ll be happy” (WEF, 2016). In the final analysis, COVID-19 is not the root cause of the current global economic turmoil; it is merely an accelerant to a burning house of cards that was left smouldering since the 2008 Great Recession (Maavak, 2020a). We also see how the four main pillars of systems thinking (diversity, interconnectivity, interactivity and “adaptivity”) form the mise en scene in a VUCA decade. ENVIRONMENTAL What happens to the environment when our economies implode? Think of a debt-laden workforce at sensitive nuclear and chemical plants, along with a concomitant surge in industrial accidents? Economic stressors, workforce demoralization and rampant profiteering – rather than manmade climate change – arguably pose the biggest threats to the environment. In a WEF report, Buehler et al (2017) made the following pre-COVID-19 observation: The ILO estimates that the annual cost to the global economy from accidents and work-related diseases alone is a staggering $3 trillion. Moreover, a recent report suggests the world’s 3.2 billion workers are increasingly unwell, with the vast majority facing significant economic insecurity: 77% work in part-time, temporary, “vulnerable” or unpaid jobs. Shouldn’t this phenomenon be better categorized as a societal or economic risk rather than an environmental one? In line with the systems thinking approach, however, global risks can no longer be boxed into a taxonomical silo. Frazzled workforces may precipitate another Bhopal (1984), Chernobyl (1986), Deepwater Horizon (2010) or Flint water crisis (2014). These disasters were notably not the result of manmade climate change. Neither was the Fukushima nuclear disaster (2011) nor the Indian Ocean tsunami (2004). Indeed, the combustion of a long-overlooked cargo of 2,750 tonnes of ammonium nitrate had nearly levelled the city of Beirut, Lebanon, on Aug 4 2020. The explosion left 204 dead; 7,500 injured; US$15 billion in property damages; and an estimated 300,000 people homeless (Urbina, 2020). The environmental costs have yet to be adequately tabulated. Environmental disasters are more attributable to Black Swan events, systems breakdowns and corporate greed rather than to mundane human activity. Our JIT world aggravates the cascading potential of risks (Korowicz, 2012). Production and delivery delays, caused by the COVID-19 outbreak, will eventually require industrial overcompensation. This will further stress senior executives, workers, machines and a variety of computerized systems. The trickle-down effects will likely include substandard products, contaminated food and a general lowering in health and safety standards (Maavak, 2019a). Unpaid or demoralized sanitation workers may also resort to indiscriminate waste dumping. Many cities across the United States (and elsewhere in the world) are no longer recycling wastes due to prohibitive costs in the global corona-economy (Liacko, 2021). Even in good times, strict protocols on waste disposals were routinely ignored. While Sweden championed the global climate change narrative, its clothing flagship H&M was busy covering up toxic effluences disgorged by vendors along the Citarum River in Java, Indonesia. As a result, countless children among 14 million Indonesians straddling the “world’s most polluted river” began to suffer from dermatitis, intestinal problems, developmental disorders, renal failure, chronic bronchitis and cancer (DW, 2020). It is also in cauldrons like the Citarum River where pathogens may mutate with emergent ramifications. On an equally alarming note, depressed economic conditions have traditionally provided a waste disposal boon for organized crime elements. Throughout 1980s, the Calabriabased ‘Ndrangheta mafia – in collusion with governments in Europe and North America – began to dump radioactive wastes along the coast of Somalia. Reeling from pollution and revenue loss, Somali fisherman eventually resorted to mass piracy (Knaup, 2008). The coast of Somalia is now a maritime hotspot, and exemplifies an entwined form of economic-environmental-geopolitical-societal emergence. In a VUCA world, indiscriminate waste dumping can unexpectedly morph into a Black Hawk Down incident. The laws of unintended consequences are governed by actors, interconnections, interactions and adaptations in a system under study – as outlined in the methodology section. Environmentally-devastating industrial sabotages – whether by disgruntled workers, industrial competitors, ideological maniacs or terrorist groups – cannot be discounted in a VUCA world. Immiserated societies, in stark defiance of climate change diktats, may resort to dirty coal plants and wood stoves for survival. Interlinked ecosystems, particularly water resources, may be hijacked by nationalist sentiments. The environmental fallouts of critical infrastructure (CI) breakdowns loom like a Sword of Damocles over this decade. GEOPOLITICAL The primary catalyst behind WWII was the Great Depression. Since history often repeats itself, expect familiar bogeymen to reappear in societies roiling with impoverishment and ideological clefts. Anti-Semitism – a societal risk on its own – may reach alarming proportions in the West (Reuters, 2019), possibly forcing Israel to undertake reprisal operations inside allied nations. If that happens, how will affected nations react? Will security resources be reallocated to protect certain minorities (or the Top 1%) while larger segments of society are exposed to restive forces? Balloon effects like these present a classic VUCA problematic. Contemporary geopolitical risks include a possible Iran-Israel war; US-China military confrontation over Taiwan or the South China Sea; North Korean proliferation of nuclear and missile technologies; an India-Pakistan nuclear war; an Iranian closure of the Straits of Hormuz; fundamentalist-driven implosion in the Islamic world; or a nuclear confrontation between NATO and Russia. Fears that the Jan 3 2020 assassination of Iranian Maj. Gen. Qasem Soleimani might lead to WWIII were grossly overblown. From a systems perspective, the killing of Soleimani did not fundamentally change the actor-interconnection-interaction adaptivity equation in the Middle East. Soleimani was simply a cog who got replaced.

## Adv-2

#### The industrial base is on the brink of collapse due to offshoring and outsourcing, that threatens the integrity of the defense sector

Herrnstadt 20

Ending offshoring and bringing jobs back home will take more than tweets, press releases, and op-eds Posted May 20, 2020 at 12:08 am by Owen E. Herrnstadt (Professor Herrnstadt currently is the Chief of Staff to the International President and Director of Trade and Globalization, at the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers. As Chief of Staff, he assists in running one of the largest manufacturing and transportation unions in the world. As Director of Trade and Globalization, he develops policy for international trade, economic investment, international labor standards, and human rights matters. In addition to the Law Center, he teaches as an adjunct professor at the American University’s Washington College of Law. ) https://www.epi.org/blog/ending-offshoring-and-bringing-jobs-back-home-will-take-more-than-tweets-press-releases-and-op-eds///(\*ak)

Despite repeated warnings, America’s industrial base has been whittled away by corporations offshoring work to Mexico, China, and other countries. The offshoring of much-needed medical equipment in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic heightens the urgency to bring these supply chains home.While U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer’s recent op-ed heralding an end to “the era of reflexive offshoring” highlights some positive steps forward by the USTR, much more needs to be done to bring supply chains home. It is not enough to—as the administration has done—set tariff policy by tweet, negotiate trade agreements that do not directly take on outsourcing across manufacturing and service sectors, and hope that corporations finally “see the light” and bring jobs home. Rather, returning jobs to America requires a robust, comprehensive strategy that coordinates policies in trade, currency valuation, investment, financing, energy, technology, tax, education, training, government procurement, and labor. To start, this strategy would include the following: Insist that the Defense Department and other U.S. agencies cease their reflexive support for continued use of outside supply chains in Mexico and elsewhere and instead push for bringing work home. Ensure that “Made in the U.S.” in government procurement programs actually means that a product is manufactured by U.S. workers with U.S. supplies and materials. Require employment impact statements in government contract and award determinations in order to maximize U.S. job creation. Create a U.S. Manufacturing Investment Bank. Address currency misalignment. Eliminate tax incentives that encourage corporations to outsource production. Insist that the Defense Department and other U.S. agencies push for bringing work home The Trump administration could start to bring work home by scrutinizing its own departments, starting with the Pentagon. Several days ago, Pentagon officials acknowledged the dangers of relying on supply chains in other countries for defense products, especially in aviation and shipbuilding. But their response to that danger missed the point. Citing how the COVID-19 crisis has led to the closures of factories in Mexico that are critical to the defense industry, Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment Ellen Lord said she would be asking the Mexican Foreign Affairs Minister to help reopen international suppliers there that provide parts for U.S. airframe production. What is wrong with this picture? Instead of demanding that Mexico open its factories in the midst of COVID-19 to produce items for the United States, Pentagon officials should be demanding that U.S. companies move work back home. How can some officials reinforce the use of supply chains outside of the U.S. when over 36 million U.S. workers, many of them in manufacturing, are unemployed? Also extremely troubling is the simple fact that many factories in Mexico cannot provide proper personal protective equipment for workers and forcing them back to work without needed safety measures jeopardizes lives. It’s bad enough that U.S. workers in certain industries are being asked to return to work without proper personal protective equipment, reliable testing and strict adherence to the Centers for Disease Control guidelines. U.S. government officials’ demands that Mexico reopen factories and subject unprotected workers to the dangers of COVID-19 are unconscionable. It is no secret that U.S. companies have flocked to Mexico over the past 30 years. As I have previously written, Mexico now employs between 30,000 and 40,000 workers in just one industry alone, aerospace. Aerospace manufacturers promote Mexico’s low wages to draw business across the border. Analysts have commented that “Mexico’s proximity to the U.S. and its lower labor cost structure have drawn approximately 300 foreign manufacturers to areas in five Mexican states.” As one review of the aerospace industry noted, “The downside of this is that the country may be used increasingly for its cheap labor by profit-hungry companies from more established markets.” Mexico’s aerospace industry is now a major exporter to the U.S., as highlighted by the Pentagon’s announcement. And it is not just aerospace manufacturing that has shifted supply chains to Mexico. In addition to medical supplies, other essential sectors are greatly impacted by supply chains in Mexico, including all sorts of manufacturing, electronics, communications (especially call centers), and food products. Now is the time for all federal departments—starting with Defense—to insist that U.S. companies bring work home, especially work that is essential to our economy and national defense. The administration can start by using the Defense Production Act to ensure that the U.S. immediately step up production of essential items like desperately needed personal protection equipment and ventilators. There are hundreds of factories that have closed across the country that could be used for this important mission. Ensure that “Made in the U.S.” in government procurement programs actually means that a product is manufactured by U.S. workers with U.S. supplies and materials For most consumers, a U.S. product is one that is domestically manufactured at home with U.S. materials and supplies. They would be shocked to learn that our federal government considers a product to be domestically made even when a significant number of parts and components were produced in other countries. Although the government has adopted domestic content requirements in certain procurement programs, these content requirements can be as low as 51%. Moreover, methods for calculating domestic content are a mess. What factors do agencies include in determining content? Is the calculation limited to raw materials, production, assembly, and maintenance? Or can the calculation include intangible items that can be used to inflate domestic content—like the value of marketing, research, development, and intellectual property rights? How is the origin of components and subcomponents considered? The administration should move quickly to make domestic content calculations effective and transparent. Domestic sourcing requirements for all government procurement programs (e.g., “Buy American” laws) and programs that support U.S. exports (e.g., the U.S. Export-Import Bank) should also be reviewed to ensure that the requirements are strong, taken seriously, and effectively implemented. Further, waivers that allow exemptions from domestic procurement requirements should be greatly narrowed, including when exemptions are granted for the use of foreign-sourced goods that are in the “public interest,” not reasonably available in sufficient commercial quantities, or not available at a reasonable cost. The Buy American requirements should also be equally rigorous with sectors like food products. Government commissaries and cafeterias should be using products made here at home. This includes items from sugar and flour to baked goods. Require employment impact statements in government contract and award determinations in order to maximize U.S. job creation The administration should adopt a simple, common-sense policy that directly links domestic employment with certain government activities. One way to accomplish this is to require detailed employment impact statements (EIS) as part of the decision-making process for government procurement contracts, assistance, grants, and awards. The results reflected by the EIS would be a significant factor in the final determination concerning the project or transaction under consideration. The EIS would contain information pertaining to employment that would be maintained, created, or lost if the program in question were approved. To assure that employment impact statements and reliance upon them are fully and effectively implemented, federal agencies would need to submit annual reports summarizing the procedures used and the results. The reports would furnish the administration and Congress with valuable information about how government programs are supporting the creation and maintenance of jobs. Create a U.S. Manufacturing Investment Bank Similar to the concept of the U.S. Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im Bank), a new U.S. Manufacturing Investment Bank would provide financial support for the revitalization of the U.S. manufacturing sector. The U.S. Manufacturing Investment Bank would target large, medium, and small manufacturers that cannot obtain affordable credit on commercial terms. Financing would be in the form of loans at or below commercial rates or of a federal guarantee of a commercial loan. These loans would be paid back directly to the U.S. Treasury, similar to the procedures implemented by the Ex-Im Bank. In order to receive financing, eligible companies would need to demonstrate a reasonable assurance of repayment within the terms of the agreement and agree to the following requirements: Loans will be used to domestically manufacture, assemble, and/or service goods, equipment, parts, and components. Materials used for manufacturing will be domestically produced or mined. Work will not be outsourced to other countries. Also, companies that receive loans must not be found in violation of any federal labor and employment laws for one year prior to the inception of the loan and through its term. Address currency misalignment As detailed in EPI’s Policy Agenda, policymakers must focus their attention on making the dollar competitive. Cheap imports achieved through [foreign] currency undervaluation continue to make production in China and elsewhere attractive. Combined with addressing the effects of the strong dollar on trade imbalances, bringing supply chains home will require that policymakers take actions outlined in the EPI Policy Agenda: Engage in international negotiation to lead to a competitive dollar, as the U.S. did with the 1985 Plaza Accord. If negotiations fail, rely on the U.S. Treasury and the Federal Reserve to sell dollars in global markets to realign the dollar’s value against other currencies. Impose a tax on the purchases of dollar-denominated assets by foreign governments and investors. Eliminate tax incentives that encourage corporations to outsource production If the administration is serious about bringing jobs back home, it should support legislation that would remove tax incentives for corporations to create and maintain production overseas. Introduced last year by Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse and Rep. Lloyd Doggett, The No Tax Breaks for Outsourcing Act would go a long way toward removing these incentives. According to Whitehouse’s office, the measure would, among other things: Tax income from overseas subsidiaries at the same rate that applies to domestic income. Treat “foreign” corporations that are managed and controlled in the U.S. as domestic companies. Crack down on so called “inversions” by maintaining the U.S. tax treatment of merged companies that retain a majority of U.S. ownership. While strong statements from some administration officials, like the USTR, about bringing jobs home are laudable, current policies will not achieve these much-needed results. With over 36 million people out of work and an unemployment rate which has reached Depression-era levels, Americans are in desperate need of a well-coordinated, comprehensive policy to stop the erosion of our nation’s industrial base. Of course, changing the flow of supply chains back to the U.S. will not occur overnight. But we need to start somewhere and we need to start now. Never again should our highest officials in the Defense Department have to plead for help from another country to produce the essential equipment that should be produced here at home. Nor should our officials demand that another country force its workers to produce goods for the U.S. under unsafe conditions.

#### Outsourcing decks domestic innovation and manufacturing—has long term effects
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Angie Mohr is an economist with extensive personal finance experince of over 18 years. She’s a writer for Forbes, MSNBC money, the motley fool, CBS moneywatch, yahoo finance, and others. She’s also an investment and economic author. “4 eays outsourcing damages industry” Investopedia. https://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/0312/4-ways-outsourcing-damages-industry.aspx June 25, 2019. [leg up changed to advantage for potential ableist connotations]

The outsourcing of human capital to countries in the developing world is a cost-saving measure employed by an increasing number of companies across the United States. It is estimated that the number of jobs outsourced offshoreby 2015 could be as high as 3.3 million. While the practice has preserved capital for many national and international companies, it could be damaging to American industry as a whole, in the long term. The draining of jobs, knowledge and innovation may eventually give other countries a technological [advantage] on the United States, and depress the American economy further. These are four major threats to U.S industry caused by outsourcing. Higher Semi-Permanent Unemployment Jobs that move offshore often do not come back. The lower wages and operating costs, plus the simpler administrative requirements in countries such as India and Russia, make operating in those countries cheaper and easier. Without new jobs being created in America, unemployment rises and a higher base unemployment rate becomes the norm. It could be decades before developing countries reach their saturation point and wages are driven higher. In the meantime, more American workers are out of work with few prospects of landing a job. Loss of Intellectual Capital In the beginning, the outsourcing movement was meant to transfer low-skill jobs out and retain highly-skilled jobs as an important asset for the advancement of the country's economy. However, as emerging economies work hard to build their own intellectual capital, American companies are increasingly contracting accountants, engineers and IT specialists at a rate far lower than it would cost them in the U.S. This "brain drain" has long-term repercussions for American industry. Once a skill has been largely moved offshore, it is difficult to regain. For example, if most publishers outsource book design and layout work to Chinese firms, over time there will be fewer designers in the U.S. who have that skill. It also means that there are fewer students of the craft, due to lack of opportunities. Loss of Manufacturing Capacity When industry moves offshore, not only do we lose the knowledge, we also lose the manufacturing capacity. For example, the U.S. was once the leader in solar cell manufacturing, but most American solar technology companies have set up new plants in countries that offer significant incentives, such as Germany. The manufacturing capacity is gone and, if the U.S. ever wanted to repatriate these types of industries, it would take years to re-develop the manufacturing equipment and train engineers. Reliance on Foreign RelationsAnother risk that outsourcing companies face is the potential for relations with other countries to change. For example if the U.S. were to engage in a trade war with China, the Chinese government may levy tariffs against foreign companies operating within its borders or on goods crossing the border. In 1996, the Helms-Burton Act restricted U.S. companies from doing business in and with Cuba, forcing many companies to totally redesign their operations outside of the country.Investors in international markets can also suffer losses to their portfolios if relations between two countries break down or if a foreign country falls into economic duress, which negatively affects the activities of companies operating in that region. The Bottom Line, The short term gain derived by companies that outsource operations offshore is eclipsed by the long term damage to the U.S. economy. Over time, the loss of jobs and expertise will make innovation in the U.S. difficult, while, at the same time, building the brain trust of other countries.

#### US manufacturing and innovation lag gives China/Russia hypersonic dominance in the new arms race
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Russia, China, the U.S.: Who Will Win the Hypersonic Arms Race? When missiles fly beyond Mach 5, materials melt, airflow turns turbulent, and budgets enter the stratosphere | [Philip E. Ross](https://spectrum.ieee.org/author/ross-philip-e) (Philip E. Ross became a senior editor at IEEE Spectrum in June 2006. His interests include transportation, energy storage, artificial intelligence, natural-language processing, and the economic aspects of technology. He has reported on solar towers in Spain, cloud seeding in Nevada, telescopes atop a mountain in the Canaries, and robotic cars in California and Germany. He blogs mainly for [Cars That Think](https://spectrum.ieee.org/blog/cars-that-think), which won a 2015 Neal Award. Earlier in his career he worked for Red Herring, Forbes, Scientific American, and The New York Times. He has a master’s degree in international affairs from Columbia University and another, in journalism, from the University of Michigan.), 17 Nov 2020 | 16:00 GMT, https://spectrum.ieee.org/aerospace/aviation/russia-china-the-us-who-will-win-the-hypersonic-arms-race///(\*ak)

It’s obvious why the militaries of the world want missiles that can follow erratic paths at low altitude while flying at five times the speed of sound, eluding any chance at detection or interception. “Think of it as delivering a pizza, except it’s not a pizza,” says [Bradley Wheaton](https://www.facebook.com/afosr/posts/dr-brad-wheaton-and-his-team-at-jhu-applied-physics-laboratory-apl-are-working-t/10156523149046425/), a specialist in hypersonics at the Johns Hopkins University [Applied Physics Laboratory](https://www.jhuapl.edu/) (APL), in Maryland. “In the United States, just 15 minutes can cover the East Coast; a really fast missile takes 20 minutes to get to the West Coast. At these speeds, you have a factor of 50 increase in the area covered per unit of time.” So the question isn’t why the great powers are pursuing hypersonic arms, but why they are doing so now. Quick answer: They are once again locked in an arms race. The wider world first heard of this type of weaponry in March 2018, when Russian president Vladimir Putin [gave a speech](https://www.npr.org/sections/parallels/2018/03/01/590014611/experts-aghast-over-russian-claim-of-nuclear-powered-missile-with-unlimited-rang) describing his country’s plans for a nuclear-powered cruise missile that could fly around the world at blinding speed, then snake around hills and dales to a target. His bold assertions have been questioned, particularly the part about nuclear power. Even so, a year later [a nuclear accident killed seven people](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/12/world/europe/russia-nuclear-accident-putin.html) near a testing range off the northern coast of Russia, and U.S. intelligence officials speculated that it involved hypersonic experiments. The nature of that accident is still shrouded in mystery, but it’s clear there’s been a huge increase in the research effort in hypersonics. Here’s a roundup of what the superpowers of the 21st century are doing to pursue what is, in fact, an old concept. The hypersonic missiles in use or in testing in China and Russia can apparently carry either conventional warheads, aimed at ships and other small military targets, or nuclear ones, aimed at cities and government centers. These ship killers could deprive the United States of its preeminence at sea, which is more than enough reason for China, for instance, to develop hypersonics. But a nuclear-armed version that leaves the defender too little time to launch a retaliatory strike would do even more to shift the balance of power, because it would dismantle the painstakingly constructed system of deterrence known as mutually assured destruction, or by the jocular acronym MAD. “The nuclear side is very destabilizing, which is why the Russians are going after it,” says [Christopher Combs](https://engineering.utsa.edu/mechanical/team/combs/), a professor of mechanical engineering at the University of Texas at San Antonio. “But on the U.S. side we see no need for that, so we’re going conventional.” That is indeed the official U.S. policy. But in August, some months after Combs spoke with IEEE Spectrum, an Aviation Week article [pointed out](https://aviationweek.com/defense-space/missile-defense-weapons/usaf-errantly-reveals-research-icbm-range-hypersonic-glide) that an Air Force agency charged with nuclear weapons requested that companies submit ideas for a “thermal protection system that can support [a] hypersonic glide to ICBM ranges.” Soon after that, the request was hastily taken down, and the U.S. Air Force felt compelled to restate its policy not to pursue nuclear-capable hypersonic weapons. Today’s forays into hypersonic research have deep roots, [reaching back](https://www.nasa.gov/centers/dryden/history/milestones/50.html) to the late 1950s, in both the United States and the Soviet Union. Although this work continued for decades, in 1994, a few years after the Cold War ended with the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the United States pulled the plug on research into hypersonic flight, including its last and biggest program, the [Rockwell X-30](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rockwell_X-30). Nicknamed the “Orient Express,” the X-30 was to have been a crewed transport that would top out at 25 times the speed of sound, Mach 25—enough to take off from Washington, D.C., and land in Tokyo 2 hours later. Russia also discontinued research in this area during the 1990s, when its economy was in tatters. Today’s test vehicles just pick up where the old ones left off, explains [Alexander Fedorov](https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Alexander_Fedorov2), a professor at Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology and an expert on hypersonic flow at the boundary layer, which is right next to the vehicle’s skin. “What’s flying now is just a demonstration of technology—the science is 30 years old,” he says. Fedorov has lectured in the United States; he even helps U.S. graduate students with their research. He laments how the arms race has stifled international cooperation, adding that he himself has “zero knowledge” about the military project Putin touted two years ago. “But I know that people are working on it,” he adds. In the new race, Fedorov says, Russia has experience without much money, China has money without much experience, and the United States has both, although it revived its efforts later than did Russia or China and is now playing catch-up. For fiscal 2021, U.S. research agencies have budgeted US [$3.2 billion](https://fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R45811.pdf)[PDF] for all hypersonic weapons research, up from $2.6 billion in the previous year. Other programs are under way in India and Australia; even Israel and Iran are in the game, if on the sidelines. But Fedorov suggests that the Chinese are the ones to watch: They used to talk at international meetings, he says, but now they mostly just listen, which is what you’d expect if they had started working on truly new ideas—of which, he reiterates, there are very few on display. All the competing powers have shown vehicles that are “very conservative,” he says. One good reason for the rarity of radical designs is the enormous expense of the research. Engineers can learn only so much by running tests on the ground, using computational fluid-flow models and hypersonic wind tunnels, which themselves cost a pretty penny (and simulate only some limited aspects of hypersonic flight). Engineers really need to fly their creations, and usually when they do, they use up the test vehicle. That makes design iteration very costly. It’s no wonder hypersonic prototypes fail so often. In mere supersonic flight, passing Mach 1 is a clear-cut thing: The plane outdistances the sound waves that it imparts to the air to produce a shock wave, which forms the familiar [two-beat sonic boom](https://www.nasa.gov/centers/armstrong/news/FactSheets/FS-016-DFRC.html). But as the vehicle exceeds Mach 5, the density of the air just behind the shock wave diminishes, allowing the wave to [nestle along the surface](http://www.aerospaceweb.org/design/waverider/flow.shtml) of the vehicle. That in-your-face layer poses no aerodynamic problems, and it could even be an advantage, when it’s smooth. But it can become turbulent in a heartbeat. “Predicting when it’s going turbulent is hard,” says Wheaton, of Johns Hopkins APL. “And it’s important because when it does, heating goes up, and it affects how control surfaces can steer. Also, there’s more drag.” The pioneers of hypersonic flight learned about turbulence the hard way. On one of its many flights, in 1967, the U.S. Air Force’s X-15 experimental hypersonic plane went into a spin, killing the pilot, [Michael J. Adams](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_J._Adams). The right stuff, indeed. Hypersonic missiles come in two varieties. The first kind, launched into space on the tip of a ballistic missile, punches down into the atmosphere, then uses momentum to maneuver. Such “boost-glide” missiles have no jet engines and thus need no air inlets, so it’s easy to make them symmetrical, typically a tube with a cone-shape tip. Every part of the skin gets equal exposure to the air, which at these speeds breaks down into a plume of plasma, like the one that puts astronauts in radio silence during reentry. Boost-glide missiles are now operational. China appears to have deployed the first one, called the Dongfeng-17, a ballistic missile that carries glide vehicles. Some of those gliders are [billed as capable of knocking out U.S. Navy supercarriers](https://www.globaltimes.cn/content/1193485.shtml). For such a mission it need not pack a nuclear or even a conventional warhead, instead relying on its enormous kinetic energy to destroy its target. And there’s nothing that any country can now do to defend against it. “Those things are going so fast, you’re not going to get it,” General Mark Milley, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in March, in [testimony](https://www.armed-services.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/20-13_03-04-2020.pdf)[PDF] before Congress. You might think that you give up the element of surprise by starting with a ballistic trajectory. But not completely. Once the hypersonic missile comes out of its dive to fly horizontally, it becomes invisible to sparsely spaced radars, particularly the handful based in the Pacific Ocean. And that flat flight path can swerve a lot. That’s not because of any AI-managed magic—the vehicle just follows a randomized, preprogrammed set of turns. But the effect on those playing defense is the same: The pizza arrives before they can find their wallets. The second kind of hypersonic missile gets the bulk of its impulse from a jet engine that inhales air really fast, whirls it together with fuel, and burns the mixture in the instant that it tarries in the combustion chamber before blowing out the back as exhaust. Because these engines don’t need compressors but simply use the force of forward movement to ram air inside, and because that combustion proceeds supersonically, they are called supersonic ram jets—scramjets, for short. One advantage the scramjet has over the boost-glide missile is its ability to stay below radar and continue to maneuver over great distances, all the way to its target. And because it never enters outer space, it doesn’t need to ride a rocket booster, although it does need some powerful helper to get it up to the speed at which first a ramjet, and then a scramjet, can work. Another advantage of the scramjet is that it can, in principle, be applied for civilian purposes, moving people or packages that absolutely, positively have to be there quickly. The Europeans have such [a project](https://www.nbcnews.com/mach/science/hypersonic-airliner-would-take-you-los-angeles-tokyo-under-two-ncna1045986). So do the [Chinese](https://www.bbc.com/news/business-43151175), and Boeing has shown a [concept](https://www.space.com/41042-boeing-hypersonic-passenger-plane-concept.html). Everyone talks up this possibility because, frankly, it’s the only peaceable talking point there is for hypersonics. Don’t forget, though, that supersonic commercial flight happened long ago, made no money, and ended—and supersonic flight is way easier. The scramjet has one big disadvantage: It’s a lot harder technically. Any hypersonic vehicle must fend off the rapidly moving air outside, which can heat the leading edges to as high as [3,000 °C](https://www.asme.org/topics-resources/content/ceramics-make-hypersonic-flight-possibility#:~:text=Temperatures%20at%20the%20surface%20of,cones%20and%20leading%20edges%20intact.). But that heat and stress is nothing like the hellfire inside a scramjet engine. There, the heat cannot radiate away, it’s hard to keep the flame lit, and the insides can come apart second by second, affecting airflow and stability. Five minutes is a long time in this business. That’s why scramjets, though conceived in the 1950s, still remain a work in progress. In the early 2000s, NASA’s [X-43](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/NASA_X-43) used scramjets for about 10 seconds in flight. In 2013, [Boeing’s X-51 Waverider](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boeing_X-51_Waverider) flew at hypersonic speed for [210 seconds](https://www.flightglobal.com/pictures-and-animation-x-51a-waverider-reaches-mach-5-in-140s-scramjet-flight/93720.article) while under scramjet power. Tests on the ground have fared better. In May, workers at the Beijing Academy of Sciences ran a scramjet for 10 minutes, according to a [report](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/science/article/3086804/report-chinese-scramjet-test-challenge-most-advanced-missile) in the South China Morning Post. Two years earlier, the leader of the project, Fan Xuejun, [told the same newspaper](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/CASI/Display/Article/1604494/chinas-opening-a-factory-to-build-engines-for-hypersonic-missiles-and-spaceplan/) that a factory was being built to construct a variety of scramjets, some supposedly for civilian application. One engine would use a combined cycle, with a turbojet to get off the ground, a ramjet to accelerate to near-hypersonic speed, a scramjet to blow past Mach 5, and maybe even a rocket to top off the thrust. That’s a lot of moving parts—and an ambition worthy of Elon Musk. But even Musk might hesitate to follow Putin’s proposal to use a nuclear reactor for energy. The cost of developing a scramjet capability is only one part of the economic challenge. The other is making the engine cheap enough to deploy and use in a routine way. To do that, you need fuel you can rely on. Early researchers worked with a class of highly energetic fuels that would react on contact with air, like triethylaluminum. “It’s a fantastic scramjet engine fuel, but very toxic, a bit like the hydrazine fuels used in rockets nowadays, and this became an inhibitor,” says [David Van Wie](https://www.linkedin.com/in/dave-vanwie-a8030a29), of Johns Hopkins APL, explaining why triethylaluminum was dropped from serious consideration. Next up was liquid hydrogen, which is also very reactive. But it needs elaborate cooling. Worse, it packs a rather low amount of energy into a given volume, and as a cryogenic fuel it is inconvenient to store and transport. It has been and still is used in experimental missiles, such as the X-43. Today’s choice for practical missiles is hydrocarbons, of the same ilk as jet fuel, but fancier. The Chinese scramjet that burned for 10 minutes—like others on the drawing board around the world—burns hydrocarbons. Here the problem lies in breaking down the hydrocarbon’s long molecular chains fast so the shards can bind with oxygen in the split second when the substances meet and mate. And a split second isn’t enough—you have to do it continuously, one split second after another, “like keeping a match lit in a hurricane,” in the [oft-quoted words](https://www.nasa.gov/missions/research/X-43_overview.html) of NASA spokesman Gary Creech, back in 2004. Scramjet designs try to protect the flame by shaping the inflow geometry to create an eddy, forming a calm zone not unlike the eye of a hurricane. Flameouts are particularly worrisome when the missile starts jinking about, thus disrupting the airflow. “It’s the ‘unstart’ phenomenon, where the shock wave at the air inlets stops the engine, and the vehicle will be lost,” says [John D. Schmisseur](https://www.utsi.edu/dr-john-schmisseur/), a researcher at the University of Tennessee Space Institute, in Tullahoma. And you really only get to meet such gremlins in actual flight, he adds. There are other problems besides flameout that arise when you’re inhaling a tornado. One expert, who requested anonymity, puts it this way: “If you’re ingesting air, it’s no longer air; it’s a complex mix of ionized atmosphere,” he says. “There’s no water anymore; it’s all hydrogen and oxygen, and the nitrogen is to some fraction elemental, not molecular. So combustion isn’t air and fuel—it’s whatever you’re taking in, whatever junk—which means chemistry at the inlet matters.” Simulating the chemistry is what makes hypersonic wind-tunnel tests problematic. It’s fairly simple to see how an airfoil responds aerodynamically to Mach 5—just cool the air so that the speed of sound drops, giving a higher Mach number for a given airspeed. But blowing cold air tells you only a small part of the story because it heads off all the chemistry you want to study. True, you can instead run your wind tunnel fast, hot, and dense—at “high enthalpy,” to use the term of art—but it’s hard to keep that maelstrom going for more than a few milliseconds. “Get the airspeed high enough to start up the chemistry and the reactions sap the energy,” says [Mark Gragston](https://mabe.utk.edu/people/mark-gragston/), an aerospace expert who’s also at the UT Space Institute. Getting access to such monster machines isn’t easy, either. “At Arnold Air Force Base, across the street from me, the Air Force does high-enthalpy wind-tunnel experiments,” he says. “They’re booked up three years in advance.” Other countries have more of the necessary wind tunnels; even India has [about a dozen](https://fas.org/sgp/crs/weapons/R45811.pdf)[PDF]. Right now, the United States is spending loads of money building these machines in an effort to catch up with Russia and China. You could say there is a wind-tunnel gap—one more reason U.S. researchers are keen for test flights. Another thing about cooling the air: It does wonders for any combustion engine, even the kind that pushes pistons. [Reaction Engines](https://www.reactionengines.co.uk/about/about-us), in Abingdon, England, appears to be the first to try to apply this phenomenon in flight, with a special precooling unit. In its less-ambitious scheme, the precooler sits in front of the air inlet of a standard turbojet, adding power and efficiency. In its more-ambitious concept, called [SABRE](https://www.reactionengines.co.uk/beyond-possible/sabre) (Synergetic Air Breathing Rocket Engine), the engine operates in combined mode: It takes off as a turbojet assisted by the precooler and accelerates until a ramjet can switch on, adding enough thrust to reach (but not exceed) Mach 5. Then, as the vehicle climbs and the atmosphere thins out, the engine switches to pure rocket mode, finally launching a payload into orbit. In principle, a precooler could work in a scramjet. But if anyone’s trying that, they’re not talking about it. Fast forward five years and boost-glide missiles will no doubt be deployed in the service of multiple countries. Jump ahead another 15 or 20 years, and the world’s superpowers will have scramjet missiles. So what? Won’t these things always play second fiddle to ballistic missiles? And won’t the defense also have its say, by unveiling superfast antimissiles and Buck Rogers–style directed-energy weapons? Perhaps not. The defense always has the harder job. As President John F. Kennedy [noted in an interview](https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/television-and-radio-interview-after-two-years-conversation-with-the-president) way back in 1962, when talking about antiballistic missile defense, what you are trying to do is shoot a bullet with a bullet. And, he added, you have to shoot down not just one but many, including a bodyguard of decoys. Today there are indeed antimissile defenses that can protect particular targets against ballistic missiles, at least when they’re not being fired in massive salvos. But you can’t defend everything, which is why the great powers still count on deterrence through mutually assured destruction. By that logic, if you can detect cruise missiles soon enough, you can at least make those who launched them wish they hadn’t. For that to work, we’ll need better eyes in the skies. In the United States, the military wants around $100 million for research on low-orbit space sensors to detect low-flying hypersonic missiles, Aviation Week [reported](https://aviationweek.com/defense-space/mda-seeking-108m-more-hypersonic-defense-sensors) in 2019. Hardly any of the recent advances in hypersonic flight result from new scientific discoveries; almost all of it stems from changes in political will. Powers that challenge the international status quo—China and Russia—have found the resources and the will to shape the arms race to their benefit. Powers that benefit from the status quo—the United States, above all—are responding in kind. Politicians fired the starting pistol, and the technologists are gamely leaping forward. And the point? There is no point. It’s an arms race.

#### US domestic manufacturing competitivity is vital to hypersonic deterrence- The risk is existential
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OCTOBER 20, 2020 [Nuclear War Makes a Comeback](https://www.counterpunch.org/2020/10/20/nuclear-war-makes-a-comeback/) BY [CAROL POLSGROVE](https://www.counterpunch.org/author/carolpolsgrove/) (She holds Ph. D. and M.A. degrees in English from the University of Louisville and an M.A.) | <https://www.counterpunch.org/2020/10/20/nuclear-war-makes-a-comeback/>//(\*ak)

On websites where policy makers, scholars, and military leaders gather, concern about the possibility of nuclear war has been rising sharply in recent months as China, the United States, and Russia develop new weapons and new ways of using old ones. On [War on the Rocks](https://warontherocks.com/2020/08/managing-the-sino-american-dispute-over-missile-defense/), an online platform for national security articles and podcasts, Tong Zhao, a senior fellow at the Carnegie-Tsinghua Center for Global Policy, reported August 11 on public calls in China “to quickly and massively build up its nuclear forces” on the theory that only a “more robust nuclear posture” would prevent war with the United States. The biggest nuclear arms budget ever is nearing approval in the US Congress, and the Trump administration has raised the possibility of resuming nuclear tests. President Trump has pulled the United States out of the1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty with Russia, while the New Start Treaty capping Russian and U.S. nuclear warheads and delivery systems is set to expire next February if the two countries don’t agree to extend it. For its part, Russia appears poised to equip its navy with hypersonic nuclear strike weapons, and according to the British newspaper [The Independent](https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/russia-nuclear-weapons-hypersonic-vladimir-putin-poseidon-drone-tsirkon-a9638921.html), “The Russian premier has repeatedly spoken of his wish to develop a new generation of nuclear weapons that can be targeted anywhere on the planet.” Meanwhile, momentum to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapons has faltered. Nine nations now hold nuclear arms in an increasingly unsettled international scene. [Recent research](https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/5/10/eaay5478) has shown that a nuclear exchange between just two of those with lesser arsenals—India and Pakistan— “could directly kill about 2.5 times as many as died worldwide in WWII, and in this nuclear war, the fatalities could occur in a single week.” Burning cities would throw so much soot into the upper atmosphere that temperatures and precipitation levels would fall across much of the earth—bringing widespread drought, famine, and death. Clashes between India, Pakistan, and other nuclear armed states have become frequent enough that the International Red Cross marked the 75th anniversary of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki with [a warning](https://media.ifrc.org/ifrc/press-release/international-red-cross-red-crescent-movement-urges-nations-end-nuclear-era): “[T]he risk of use of nuclear weapons has risen to levels not seen since the end of the Cold War.” For 75 years, the nuclear Sword of Damocles has dangled over the earth. There is widespread agreement among analysts that the long lull may soon be over—due in part, to the end of the Cold War. During those decades, the United States and the USSR cooperated not only to avoid bombing each other into oblivion but also to discourage other nations from gaining their own nuclear arms, in part by spreading their nuclear umbrellas over their allies. That international system has dissolved. In addition to the United States, Russia, and China, other nations have nuclear weapons and more are likely to acquire them. And a new possibility has appeared on the horizon: the increased likelihood that nuclear weapons could be introduced into conventional warfare in regional wars. In [a monograph](https://cgsr.llnl.gov/content/assets/docs/CGSR_LP4-FINAL.pdf) published by Lawrence Livermore Laboratory, US defense policy and strategy analyst John K. Warden writes that “in the capitals of potential adversary countries,” the idea is taking hold “that nuclear wars can be won because they can be kept limited, and thus can be fought—even against the United States.” What can the United States do to convince adversaries not to introduce nuclear weapons into a conventional war—to make clear, in advance, that taking such a step would lead to fatal consequences for the country that took it? The answer from the US national security establishment, as the fiscal 2021 defense budget suggests, is a readiness to fight fire with fire: If the “adversaries” of the United States hold out the threat of introducing nuclear weapons in a conventional war, then (the argument goes) they should expect that the United States will respond in kind. How many weapons and delivery systems would that require? A lot, according to the nuclear budget for the Departments of Defense and Energy now going through Congress. At a time when Covid-19 has shaken the foundations of the federal budget, Congress is close to [approving $44.5 billion](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2020-03/news/us-nuclear-budget-skyrockets) for fiscal 2121 to modernize nuclear warheads, delivery systems, and the infrastructure that supports them. Sierra Club Nuclear Policy Director John Coequyt has [called on Congress](https://www.sierraclub.org/press-releases/2020/08/75th-anniversary-japan-nuclear-bombings-sierra-club-continues-calls-for#:~:text=In%20response%2C%20Sierra%20Club%20Nuclear,of%20all%20nuclear%20weapons%20worldwide) “to resist the current renewal of the nuclear arms race and to ban the use of nuclear weapons,” and Sierra Club members have mobilized to try to stop funding for nuclear war projects in their neighborhoods. In South Carolina, for instance, Tom Clements, Sierra Club member and director of Savannah River Site Watch, has joined other groups in [challenging plans](file:///\\users\carolpolsgrove\Downloads\%5bhttps:\srswatch.org\wp-content\uploads\2020\06\SRS-Watch-news-on-pit-plant-petition-to-DOE-June-24-2020.pdf) for expanded plutonium pit production at the Savannah River Site. And the Ohio Sierra Club’s Nuclear Free Committee has [opposed production](https://content.sierraclub.org/grassrootsnetwork/sites/content.sierraclub.org.activistnetwork/files/teams/documents/Ohio%2C%20Centrus%2C%20Saudi%20Nuclear%20Bomb%20Sierra%201-2020.pdf) at the Portsmouth Nuclear Site in Piketon of “high-assay low-enriched uranium” that could be upgraded for weapons use, in the United States or elsewhere. While such efforts often focus on local effects of nuclear weapons production, they also manifest a larger concern. Says the Club’s Nuclear Free Core Team’s Mark Muhich, the renewed nuclear arms race is “an existential threat both to human civilization and to the earth.”

## Solvency

#### Plan text: The United States ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike

#### The plan enforces all relevant parts of the PRO Act that restores worker’s right to strike

Rhinehart 21 Posted February 26, 2021 at 12:09 pm by [**Lynn Rhinehart**](https://www.epi.org/people/lynn-rhinehart/) (J.D., Georgetown University Law Center  
B.A., University of Michigan, Lynn Rhinehart is a senior fellow at EPI, where she works on labor and employment policy, with a focus on collective bargaining. ) <https://www.epi.org/blog/six-ways-the-protecting-the-right-to-organize-pro-act-restores-workers-bargaining-power/> [Working Economics Blog](https://www.epi.org/blog)///(\*ak)

When it was passed in 1935, the National Labor Relations Act declared that its purpose was to promote the practice of collective bargaining, where workers and their union sit down with their employer to negotiate over wages, safety, fairness, and other important issues. But over time, this promise has become hollow because weaknesses in the law have been exploited by [employers and the courts](https://www.epi.org/unequalpower/publications/private-sector-unions-corporate-legal-erosion/) to undermine workers’ bargaining power. Here are six ways the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act helps to level the playing field and restore workers’ bargaining power: The PRO Act has a process for reaching a first collective bargaining agreement. When workers first form a union, too often employers drag out the bargaining process and avoid reaching an initial agreement, because there are no monetary penalties in the law for bad faith bargaining. A year after forming their union, [more than half](https://www.epi.org/publication/bp235/) of all workers do not yet have an initial bargaining agreement with their employer. This leads to worker frustration, which employers exploit to undermine the new union. The PRO Act addresses this problem by establishing a mediation and arbitration process for reaching an initial agreement. The PRO Act requires employers to continue bargaining instead of taking unilateral action. Current law gives employers too much power to force its position on workers by unilaterally declaring that the parties have reached an impasse in bargaining and then either locking out workers—preventing them from working and getting paid—or implementing the employer’s proposals. This power, either alone or combined with the restrictions on workers’ ability to strike or put other economic pressure on the employer, puts employers in the driver’s seat in bargaining and greatly undermines workers’ bargaining power. To address this problem, the PRO Act prohibits employers from declaring impasse and locking out workers—a so-called “offensive lockout.” And the PRO Act requires employers to maintain the status quo on wages and benefits during bargaining—no more unilateral changes to put pressure on workers to cave in to the employer’s demands. The PRO Act gets the economic players to the bargaining table. Under current law, staffing firms, contractors, temporary agencies, and other employers try to evade their responsibility to bargain with workers and their union even when they have power over workers’ health and safety, schedules, wages, and other key issues. This leaves workers without the real economic players at the bargaining table. The PRO Act fixes this problem by adopting a strong joint-employer standard that will bring employers with power over wages or working conditions to the bargaining table. The PRO Act eliminates the ban on so-called “secondary” activity. In order to win a wage increase, a voice on new technology, safety improvements, or other bargaining priorities, workers need leverage to put economic pressure on their employer to accept their demands. But current law robs workers of their leverage in many ways, including a prohibition on so-called “secondary” activity that was enacted by Congress in 1947. In fact, current law instructs the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to give top priority to shutting down so-called “secondary” activity. These cases are given even higher priority than cases alleging that employers have illegally fired union activists, and statistics show this has in fact been the case. For example, in the first 12 years after the restriction on secondary activity was first implemented, the number of injunction proceedings against unions for engaging in illegal secondary activity [skyrocketed by 1,188%,](https://www.epi.org/unequalpower/publications/private-sector-unions-corporate-legal-erosion/) while virtually no injunction proceedings were brought against employers for violating workers’ rights. This restriction on secondary activity forbids workers from picketing or otherwise putting pressure on so-called “neutral” companies other than their employer, even if those companies could influence their employer’s practices by, for example, withholding purchases until workers and their employer reach a collective bargaining agreement. The restriction has been interpreted so broadly as to prohibit janitors from picketing a building management company over sexual harassment by its janitorial subcontractor. The Trump NLRB General Counsel [unsuccessfully tried to argue](https://www.huffpost.com/entry/biden-labor-appointee-frees-scabby-the-rat-from-legal-peril_n_6022e83dc5b6c56a89a4fa6a) that floating an inflatable Scabby the Rat balloon at a labor protest was illegal secondary activity, even though courts have consistently said such protests are protected by the First Amendment. Given the prevalence of subcontracting and the interrelated nature of business relationships, the ban on secondary activity does not reflect the realities of today’s business structures. It deprives workers of an important tool in the bargaining process and unfairly tips the power balance to employers. To correct this imbalance, the PRO Act repeals the ban on secondary activity. The PRO Act prohibits employers from permanently replacing strikers. Workers’ ultimate leverage in bargaining is to withhold their labor—in other words, to strike. The law technically protects workers from being fired when they go on a lawful strike, but this right has been gutted by a 1938 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court that stated that employers can permanently replace, i.e., terminate, workers who are on strike over economic issues. Despite a slight increase in strike activity last year, the number of strikes continues to be at a historic low in part because of this weakness in the law. The PRO Act restores the right to strike by prohibiting employers from permanently replacing economic strikers. The PRO Act overrides state “right-to-work” laws that weaken unions. So-called right-to-work laws have nothing to do with getting or keeping a job—they are about weakening workers’ collective voice on the job. Under the law, unions are required to represent all workers protected by the collective bargaining agreement, but so-called right-to-work laws prohibit unions and employers from voluntarily agreeing that all workers covered and protected by the agreement should share in the costs of union representation through union dues or fees. This creates a “free rider” problem, where workers get the benefits of unionization but do not contribute toward the costs, creating a financial drain on unions. The PRO Act overrides state right-to-work laws and allows unions and employers to negotiate fair share agreements whereby all workers covered by the collective bargaining agreement share in the cost of representation.

#### Restoring union ability to strike solves for inequality

Shierholz 20 January 27, 2020 at 3:18 pm by [Heidi Shierholz](https://www.epi.org/people/heidi-shierholz/) (Ph.D., Economics, University of Michigan M.A., Economics, University of Michigan M.S., Statistics, Iowa State University B.A., Mathematics, Grinnell College, Senior Economist and Director of Policy ) Weakened labor movement leads to rising economic inequality https://www.epi.org/blog/weakened-labor-movement-leads-to-rising-economic-inequality///(\*ak)

The basic facts about inequality in the United States—that for most of the last 40 years, pay has stagnated for all but the highest paid workers and inequality has risen dramatically—are widely understood. What is less well-known is the role the decline of unionization has played in those trends. The share of workers covered by a collective bargaining agreement dropped from [27 percent to 11.6 percent between 1979 and 2019](https://www.epi.org/data/#?subject=unioncov), meaning the union coverage rate is now less than half where it was 40 years ago. Research shows that this de-unionization accounts for a sizable share of the growth in inequality over that period—[around 13–20 percent for women and 33–37 percent for men](https://www.epi.org/publication/labor-day-2019-collective-bargaining/). Applying these shares to annual earnings data reveals that working people are now losing on the order of $200 billion per year as a result of the erosion of union coverage over the last four decades—with that money being redistributed upward, to the rich. The good news is that restoring union coverage—and strengthening workers’ abilities to join together to improve their wages and working conditions in other ways—is therefore likely to put at least $200 billion per year into the pockets of working people. These changes could happen through organizing and policy reform. Policymakers have introduced legislation, the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act, that would significantly reform current labor law. Building on the reforms in the PRO Act, the [Clean Slate for Worker Power Project](https://lwp.law.harvard.edu/clean-slate-project) proposes further transformation of labor law, with innovative ideas to create balance in our economy. How is it that de-unionization has played such a large role in wage stagnation for working people and the rise of inequality? When workers are able to join together, form a union and collectively bargain, their pay goes up. On average, a worker covered by a union contract earns [13.2 percent](https://www.epi.org/publication/how-todays-unions-help-working-people-giving-workers-the-power-to-improve-their-jobs-and-unrig-the-economy/) more than a peer with similar education, occupation and experience in a non-unionized workplace in the same sector. Furthermore, the benefits of collective bargaining extend well beyond union workers. Where unions are strong, they essentially set broader standards that non-union employers must match in order to attract and retain the workers they need and to avoid facing an organizing drive. The combination of the direct effect of unions on their members and this “spillover” effect to non-union workers means unions are crucial in fostering a vibrant middle class—and has also meant that as unionization has eroded, pay for working people has stagnated and inequality has skyrocketed. Unions also help shrink racial wage gaps. For example, black workers are more likely than white workers to be represented by a union, and black workers who are in unions get a larger boost to wages from being in a union than white workers do. This means that the decline of unionization has played a significant role in the [expansion of the black–white wage gap](https://www.epi.org/publication/black-white-wage-gaps-expand-with-rising-wage-inequality/#epi-toc-16). But isn’t the erosion of unionization because workers don’t want unions anymore? No—survey data show that in fact, a [higher](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0019793918806250) share of non-union workers say they would vote for a union in their workplace today than did 40 years ago. Isn’t the erosion of unionization due to the shifts in employment from manufacturing to service-producing industries? No again—changing industry composition [explains only a small share](https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-shift-in-private-sector-union-participation-explanations-and-effects/) of the erosion of union coverage. What has caused declining unionization? One key factor is fierce corporate opposition that has smothered workers’ freedom to form unions. Aggressive anti-union campaigns—once confined to the most anti-union employers—have become widespread. For example, it is now standard, when workers seek to organize, for their employers to hire union avoidance consultants to coordinate fierce anti-union campaigns. We estimate that employers spend nearly [$340 million per year](https://www.epi.org/publication/unlawful-employer-opposition-to-union-election-campaigns/) hiring union avoidance advisers to help them prevent employees from organizing. And though the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) makes it illegal for employers to intimidate, coerce or fire workers in retaliation for participating in union-organizing campaigns, the penalties are grossly insufficient to provide a meaningful disincentive for such behavior. This means employers often engage in illegal activities, such as threatening to close the worksite, cutting union activists’ hours or pay, or reporting workers to immigration enforcement authorities if employees unionize. In [at least 1 in 5](https://www.epi.org/publication/unlawful-employer-opposition-to-union-election-campaigns/) union elections, employers are charged with illegally firing workers involved in organizing. In the face of these attacks on union organizing, policymakers have egregiously failed to update labor laws to balance the system. Fundamental reform is necessary to build worker power and guarantee all workers the right to come together and have a real voice in their workplace. Restoring the right to representation on the job will likely put at least $200 billion in the pockets of working families each year, reducing income inequality and racial wage gaps, building a vibrant middle class and creating an economy that works for all, not just the privileged few.

#### Other methods fail, having the ability to unconditionally strike is key to securing protections against outsourcing and bad conditions

Poydock et al 21

Downturn in strike activity reflects COVID-19 recession but fails to capture many walkouts for worker safety Report • By Margaret Poydock (Margaret Poydock joined EPI in 2016. As the policy analyst, she assists the policy team in managing EPI’s legislative and policy initiatives to build a more just economy. Previously, Poydock was EPI’s communications assistant. In that position, she provided support for the media relations, publications, and web departments.), Celine McNicholas (Celine McNicholas is the director of policy and government affairs/general counsel at the Economic Policy Institute, a nonprofit, nonpartisan think tank that uses the power of its research on economic trends and the impact of economic policies to advance reforms that serve working people, deliver racial justice, and guarantee gender equity. McNicholas assumed the policy director position in October 2021. She has served as EPI’s director of government affairs and labor counsel since 2017.), and Heidi Shierholz (Heidi Shierholz is the president of the Economic Policy Institute, a nonprofit, nonpartisan think tank that uses the power of its research on economic trends and on the impact of economic policies to advance reforms that serve working people, deliver racial justice, and guarantee gender equity. In 2021 she became the fourth president EPI has had since its founding in 1986.) • February 19, 2021 https://www.epi.org/publication/2020-work-stoppage-report////(\*ak)

University of Illinois at Chicago workers strike for pay raises and safety protections On September 14, 2020, more than 4,000 workers at the University of Illinois at Chicago went on strike.[11](https://www.epi.org/publication/2020-work-stoppage-report/#_note11) The workers, represented by the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 73, authorized the strike after a year’s worth of failed contract negotiations to address fair pay and working conditions. The striking workers called for minimum wage increases, adequate staffing levels, and safer working conditions during the coronavirus pandemic. The strike also served as a solidarity action with nurses at the University of Illinois Hospital, who had just begun a strike of their own to call for adequate staffing levels and protective equipment.[12](https://www.epi.org/publication/2020-work-stoppage-report/#_note12) After ten days, the UIC strike concluded when SEIU Local 73 and the university agreed to a four-year contract that provided across-the-board raises and back pay for all workers, safe staffing levels to limit exposure to the coronavirus, personal protective equipment, protections against outsourcing, and for establishing a $15 minimum wage for building service workers.{{13}

#### The right to strike is guaranteed by U.S. law but its conditionality depends on the status of the limitations placed on it.

NLRB <https://www.nlrb.gov/strikes> | [National Labor Relations Board](https://www.nlrb.gov/) (The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) is comprised of a team of professionals who work to assure fair labor practices and workplace democracy nationwide)///(\*ak)

Section 7 of the [National Labor Relations Act](https://www.nlrb.gov/how-we-work/national-labor-relations-act) states in part, “Employees shall have the right. . . to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.” Strikes are included among the concerted activities protected for employees by this section. Section 13 also concerns the right to strike. It reads as follows: Nothing in this Act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right. It is clear from a reading of these two provisions that: the law not only guarantees the right of employees to strike, but also places limitations and qualifications on the exercise of that right. See for example, restrictions on strikes in health care institutions (set forth below).

## Framing

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being, or hedonistic act utilitarianism.

#### Prefer:

#### 1] Bindingness—All forms of deliberation or intent depend on what motivates them biologically, there’s no way to verify deduction exists noumenally but we do know neuroscience proves dopamine controls what actions we take, anything else regresses because we can always ask why or refuse to even ask.

#### 2] Actor spec—governments must inherently use util because they don’t have intentions and constantly deal with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations

#### 3] Reject calc indicts and util triggers permissibility:

#### A] they’re functionally NIBs that everyone knows are silly but skew the aff and move the debate away from the topic and actual philosophy, harming valuable education

#### B] the latter means there’s no obligation to prevent genocide or slavery which is morally abhorrent and makes debate unsafe

#### 4] Fairness, education, and access influence all facets of debate, therefore frameworks must be theoretically justified- util o/w

#### A] wide breadth of accessible topical literature since contention level arguments are centered around current events. Access to phil journals and backfiles is often paywalled or scarce for novices.

#### B] Util ensures topic ed, anything else makes debate stale, i.e. the answers to Kant are the same regardless of the topic—Outweighs on reversibility because topical debate is confined to 2 months but debates on Kant are ever-present.

**5]** **Extinction first –**

**1– Rhetoric- denying the inexorable pain and violation of consent tied to mass extinction is a voting issue against impact turns of death and extinction good**

**2– Objectivity – extinction is a binary which means its easier to weigh, other mechanisms fail, i.e. you can’t weigh breaking one perfect duty over another**

**3– Moral uncertainty – if we’re unsure at all about which interpretation of the world is true – we ought to preserve the world to keep debating about it**

## UV

#### 1] 1AR theory is legit – anything else means infinite abuse – drop the debater – 1AR is too short to make up for the time trade-off – no neg RVIs – the 6 min 2NR means they can brute force me every time.

#### 2] The role of the ballot is to determine the desirability of a topical plan relative to the squo or a competitive alt. To clarify – vote aff if the plan is a good idea – prefer:

#### A] Predictable clash-- Anything else moots the 1AC which independently kills fairness -- outweighs: research around the res cultivates epistemic humility and argumentative rigor – “you link, you lose” warps debate into a purity test that obstructs practical strategies

#### B] Idea testing-- Young people should debate about ways to reform labor rights. Just debating the “right” isn’t enough – specific proposals are key to reverse collective ignorance of organized labor. Topic knowledge comes first due to the short time we have on the topic

Preston 18, Caroline Preston is a senior editor. She previously worked as a features editor with Al Jazeera America's digital team and a senior reporter with The Chronicle of Philanthropy. B.A. in history from Brown University and an M.S. from Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism. The Hechinger Report, March 8, 2018. “Can educating kids about unions prepare them for the future of work?” <https://hechingerreport.org/can-educating-kids-about-unions-prepare-them-for-the-future-of-work/> BC

SKOKIE, Ill. — The young woman in the black sweatshirt was indignant. Across the negotiating table, a stern, occasionally sharp-tongued adversary refused to budge — first on wages and now on the organization’s social media policy. “We’re a hospital,” said the woman with marked intensity. “Don’t you agree that our first responsibility is to our patients?” A cluster of young people nearby hotly debated the fairness of random drug tests for employees. Over in a far corner, a third group traded opinions on whether to accept management’s proposal to offer new hires 401(k)s instead of pensions. “It’s just for new employees,” said one young man, clad in a purple T-shirt. “But we have to think about solidarity,” replied a young woman in clear-framed glasses. The speakers weren’t impassioned union representatives or managers concerned with the bottom line. They were juniors at Niles West High School, an economically diverse school serving approximately 2,500 students in the Chicago suburbs. The collective bargaining simulation was organized by the DePaul University Labor Education Center, which runs the exercises in roughly 10 high schools a year to introduce students to economic justice and the negotiating power of unions. For most of the students, it was the first time they were exposed to what unions do — not to mention their first encounter with terms like “HR,” “401(k)” and “union security.” Lessons like these help students gain critical thinking skills and give them an opportunity to learn about workers’ rights and labor history, subjects that are often missing from classroom discussions, educators say. And, with a stack of studies suggesting that the decline of unionized labor since the 1970s has deepened America’s economic inequality, some say teaching teens about organizing might offer a chance of preserving the country’s middle class. “Many of the gains made by the labor movement, people just take for granted,” said Matthew Hardy, communications director for the California Federation of Teachers (CFT), which hopes to introduce labor history and bargaining exercises in five school districts this fall. “From things like workplace safety laws, to child labor laws, to vacations, holidays, civil rights, Medicare, Social Security, you name it — these didn’t appear out of thin air.… Working people standing together did that.” CFT, which represents roughly 120,000 educators, is lobbying for $2.7 million in state funds for a three-year pilot that would incorporate labor history in civics, economics and history classes, along with simulations like those run by the DePaul center. Students aren’t likely to learn much about how labor unions have shaped economic and social policy if they stick to traditional textbooks, according to a report by the Albert Shanker Institute, a pro-labor group named for the longtime leader of the American Federation of Teachers. The 2011 study of four popular US history textbooks found that coverage of the labor movement was “spotty, inadequate, or slanted.” “Textbooks tend to be tilted to the perspectives of the Rockefellers and the DuPonts and the Morgans, and don’t do a fair job in terms of representing the conditions that working people were toiling under, or the often-difficult struggles they had to engage in to establish basic rights,” said Leo Casey, the Shanker institute’s executive director. Striking workers, for example, are often portrayed as menacing and violent. In its treatment of politics during the mid-20th century, the Houghton Mifflin Harcourt textbook The Americans downplays the concerns of steel and railroad workers about their wages and celebrates President Harry Truman for threatening to draft striking workers into the Army. Truman, the book declares, refused to let organized labor “cripple the nation.” But the textbooks mostly minimize or ignore the role of unions. One reason for this, according to Casey, is the outsize influence of Texas on the country’s textbook market. The state’s Board of Education meddles more than most in the process of approving textbooks, and looks unfavorably on progressive social movements. As a result, publishers have tended to gear their textbooks toward pleasing this deep-pocketed buyer.

### 1AR---AT: Spec Gov (US Spec)

#### CI---debaters must spec the United States

#### the US is the best and most predictable model for a just government

Berner 15

<http://www.theellipsis.org/why-the-united-states-constitution-established-a-just-government/#:~:text=Although%20at%20the%20time%20of,States%27%20government%20to%20remain%20just>. | MACKENZI BERNER (Student at Lafayette College) ellipsis 2015///(\*AK)

As the 1790s neared in the newly formed United States, it became evident that the Articles of Confederation — the very document that established an independent nation — had to be rewritten. From new ideas emerging from the Enlightenment reverberating throughout Europe, to perceived inequitable treatment leading to chaotic outbursts of unchecked outrage and fury such as Shay’s and Whiskey Rebellions, the young nation was ready for change. Thus, the document that would dictate the lives of future generations for the next two hundred and fifty years was crafted: the United States Constitution. The document embarked on and succeeded in the seemingly insurmountable task of cultivating a potent government whose potency is not so strong as to reminisce about the monarch the colonies just escaped. It took a weak confederacy of states plagued with instability and chaos to construct a centralized government while simultaneously incorporating a system of checks and balances. It established a Bill of Rights to relinquish any fears of mimicking the very government that quashed independence and limited freedom. While the document had some downfalls that juxtaposed the very ideals and fundamentals that the “supreme law of the land” was founded upon, such as failing to protect citizens in times of war, upholding the act of slavery for another eighty-five some odd years, and limiting the rights of women, it left room to amend these shortcomings and evolve to what society and human nature would eventually become with advancements in philosophies and technologies. The United State’s Constitution is inherently just because of its ability to acknowledge its faults and grievances and change accordingly; this adaptability comes from the Elastic Clause, an organized legislative representation selected by the people of the United States, and the presence of the Bill of Rights.

The true justice of the United States’ Constitution came from its ability to adapt itself toward changing philosophies. Article V of the original document states that the document could be “amended” if “two thirds of both houses deem[ed] it necessary.” Thus, the ability of the government to adapt not only technologically, but also ideologically, with passing time was granted. While changing ideologies are often theorized as having to happen gradually over a long span of time, there have been instances where the Constitution was able to make necessary changes more rapidly. This capacity of the government to adapt to changing values both rapidly and gradually is a pertinent characteristic of its justice. For example, the Eighteenth Amendment was swiftly passed in 1920 as a result of the prohibition movement, immediately prohibiting the consumption of alcohol. While in theory, restricting alcohol consumption would encourage men to spend more time with their families and lower crime rate, it ended up having the opposite effect, bringing alcohol underground and leading officers to take bribes. Because the detriments of Prohibition proved to outweigh the benefits, leaders were able to use the Elastic Clause in the Constitution to pass the Twenty-first Amendment, repealing Prohibition and allowing the law to revert back to a more suitable philosophy. Gradual changes in ideals have also been able to be met using the Elastic Clause of the Constitution. The slowly evolving issues of slavery and women’s rights were important considerations neglected in the original documents of the United States Constitution. However, the amendment process has proven its capability to modify: the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments served as examples of this fact, abolishing slavery and granting more rights to African Americans. Later, the Nineteenth Amendment gave women the right to vote. While these changes certainly did not make up for the hardship inflicted, and it would be another hundred years until segregation would end, the justness of the Constitution provided the structure to enable the changes to take place when society was ready.

While the Elastic Clause of the United States Constitution played a critical role in determining whether or not the government was in fact able to remain just, other factors such as the implementation of the legislative branch of government also perpetuated its justness. The ability of citizens to elect representatives in this particular branch of government contributes immensely to the justness of the United States government as a whole. Although Alexander Hamilton argued that the legislation was not just, insisting “a large [sum] of people is not necessary for thorough representation”, no matter how large the group of representatives was, it was the inequity among different groups of people at the time that inhibited true democracy. Even if the Anti-Federalists claimed everyone should have thorough representation, any individual who was not white or male during this time period had no voice and nobody advocated for the possibility of them getting one.  Even if this was the cultural reality at the time, the Constitution had everything it needed to correct these grievances, and eventually would do so when society was ready.

The legislative branch was not the only point of contention between the Federalists and the Anti-Federalists. One of the most crucial aspects to ensure a just government that perhaps even settled the Federalist/Anti-Federalist debate was the adoption of the Bill of Rights. The Anti-Federalists refused to sign the Constitution without said rights. This was due in part to the fact that the Bill of Rights guaranteed essential liberties what would be known as the first ten amendments of the document that was aimed to prevent the cultivation of a monarchy. These rights directly juxtaposed the experiences prevalent in the British monarch, citing the rights against “quartering” soldiers and the right to “search and seizure” which necessitates a warrant before searching private property without probable cause. The Bill of Rights would become essential in ensuring limited power to the executive branch of government, and because of this structure, it would remain just.

While there are several flaws that could be ascertained through close examination of the United States Constitution, it is imperative that one takes into account the time period and circumstances under which it was written. Critics of the United States Constitution point to specific times in the country’s history where the government failed to uphold constitutional rights, especially in times of conflict or war. While the Bill of Rights guaranteed American citizens the “freedom of speech, religion, and press,” historians who question the justice of the United States Constitution note that these rights have been specifically challenged throughout the nation’s history.  In 1798, John Adams passed The Sedition Act, limiting freedom of speech and press, as the United States prepared for the Quasi War with France. In recent years, suppression and discrimination have violated freedom of religion, brought on by fears of national security. However, while this prejudicial repression should not have been condoned, it has proved to be the only possible way to avert higher casualties and more violence. For example, had President Abraham Lincoln been more sensitive toward constitutional liberties and not suspended habeas corpus, the Civil War could have ended with more fatalities, as well as the demise of the Union. This would have come with issues such as slavery taking even longer to dissolve, for different values would have been imposed separately rather than being blended. The notion of slavery not being abolished is inarguably far worse than a short suspension of civil liberties.

Despite its shortcomings, the United States Constitution succeeded in taking an unstable, loose confederation of states and creating a centralized government, not so strong as to limit liberty, while simultaneously balancing state and federal control. Although at the time of its ratification, major contradictions to justice were prominent — and civil liberties were not always upheld during times of conflict — the Constitution’s ability to change itself, even today, enables the United States’ government to remain just. Only time will tell whether or not American leaders and their people will continue to use the elasticity of the Constitution to ultimately serve and protect all people.

#### CI: Affs can specify a government

#### “a” implies specification

Merriam Webster [Merriam Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/a>] srey

a—used as a function word before a singular noun followed by a restrictive modifier

a man who was here yesterday

b: [ANY](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/any)

a person who is sick can't work

c—used as a function word before a mass noun to denote a particular type or instance

a bronze made in ancient times

d—used as a function word before a proper noun representing an example or type

#### Pragmatics over semantics---we’re not grammar professors, the topic should mirror what’s best for debates so we can maximize our understanding of the lit

#### Prefer:

#### 1] We live in the US and many past topics have US-based affs so debaters are already ready to defend arguments like politics---A] Proves we are predictable, B] Key to ground—ensures stable generics on a topic w/ poor neg ground

#### 2] International fiat bad---leads to unpredictable caselists and a huge explosion in possible advantage grounds

#### 3] Terminal defense on limits---we only have 1 country under our CI

#### 4] PICs flips limits---there’d be hundreds of different country PICs for every aff to prep out---spec is inevitable, it’s just a question of if ONLY the neg can do it---that’s WORSE due to the timecrunched 1AR

#### 5] Resolvability---their model forces vagueness in actor which ensures we never know specifities of right to strike---we’ll likely only have a few debates on this topic so we should make these rounds as resolvable as possible

#### 6] Yes RVIs---key to ensure the timecrunched 1AR can get back in the game and split the 6 min 2NR. But even if we don’t get the RVI, competing interps is still a voting issue because the only way to promote better norms and rectify abuse is through the ballot.

#### Voters

#### 1. Fairness is a voter: A] fair debates are k2 actual idea testing that checks back against things like ableism, unfair debate prevents us from fully evaluating the integrity of an argument B] it’s the i/l to every other voter because fairness is a meta constraint on our ability to evaluate any truth claims, therefore it comes first.

#### 2. Applicable Education is a voter: A] it’s the sole focus of the activity and only inherent benefit B] it’s the reason schools fund debate, no education means no debate

#### Competing interps: A] reasonability leads to more abuse that minimally fits the brightline B] We should always set the better norms C] Collapses- you use offense-defense to determine reasonability being good which concedes the authority of competing interps- saying reasonability is reasonable is circular

#### DTD- 1) theory can’t be solely defense otherwise the incentive structure makes abuse inevitable because theres little to no risk 2) debaters already kick arguments so it’s minimally effective to set norms

### PICs bad

#### Interp-- the negative can't read plan inclusive counterplans

#### Violation—they did

#### Standards

#### 1. strat skew

#### a. the neg can run an infinite amt of diff pics with different countries or counties or states whatever it's impossible for the aff to prep for every single one

#### b. predictability-- if we can't predict what they're going to run there's no way we can prep there are millions of different PICs they can run

#### c. this means we don't get any clash which controls the internal link to education because we don't get to know stuff

#### 2. time skew

#### a. the aff already only gets very short 643 speeches but the aff gets 2 long speeches where they can spew out a lot of arguments and we only get a 4 minute 1ar to defend out 6 minute case and 7 minute nc/nr

### 1AR – Spec Status

#### Interp: Neg must spec the status of the alt or cp at the top of the NC, anything else is a voting issue

#### 1] Prep skew – I lose 7 minutes of prep because I don’t know what to prep for during the speech which decks aff prep – o/w since prep skew determines the arguments read and the quality of those arguments

#### 2] Inclusion – Novices are most likely to forget to ask which exacerbates an already skewed activity

## Mindset Alt Bad

A. Interpretation: Kritik alternatives must only be specific, solvent policy actions implemented by a single actor. The alt must have a solvency advocate that explains the implementation of the policy, and cannot fiat a rejection, mindset shift, or (what they did)

B. Violation

1. Strat Skew – Mindset alts skew my strategy because a) I don’t know how the shift is implemented so the neg can delink from solvency deficits and link turn and b) I don’t know what mindset replaces it, so the neg can sever out of impact turns to the k. Preventing strat skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to leverage arguments and positions against opponents to access the ballot. Strat skew also turns the K; if my opponent is vague and shifty then they don’t actually believe in the discourse and are being disingenuous.

2. Reciprocity – without a concrete policy action alt with solvency, they can win by only showing something bad about my advocacy or state of affairs, and then claim utopian fiat through mindset shift. For example, I can’t show that the world of the alt is more capitalist if the alt is “reject capitalism” which destroys my ability to turn the K, making the entire position functionally an a priori, destroying fairness since winning any disadvantage to the aff is sufficient to win but I can’t prove a disadvantage to their world. The only way to solve this would be to give the aff utopian fiat, in which case I fiat away all of their disadvantages and all of my advantages, meaning I win on a post-fiat level and outweigh the K.

Extend paradigm issues and voters from last shell

### Generics – Framework

#### Framework: Weigh the consequences of the plan against a competitive alternative

#### Clash, Alternative metrics are arbitrary and skew the aff out of in-depth testing since we have to restart in the 1AR

#### Fairness – “you link, you lose” makes debate unwinnable because the neg will always make the rounds win conditions fit them best

#### Fairness matters since debate is a game – competitive equity precedes all since it is the basic precondition for any of debate’s benefits – no debate bad in 1N means no new debate bad args in the 2N.

#### Perms

#### 1- Do both – alt isn’t competitive with the aff – it’s a different actor than the aff which means the average person doesn’t die from extinction AND they get to do the alt. Net benefit is case

#### Double bind: either the alt is strong enough to overpower the links or it can’t do anything. Net benefit is case

#### 3- Do the aff to do the alt- either the alt is a positive moral obligation, in which case we should be alive to do it, or it isn’t which means terminal defense on the alt

### At: work k specifically

#### It’s non unique which means extinction flows to the top, individuals already strike and are thought of as labour capital which means we do the aff first to prevent extinction, that outweighs on moral uncertainity.

#### Degrowth bad—3 warrants

Van den Bergh, 17 PhD, ICREA Research Professor at Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and Deputy Director for Research of its Institute of Environmental Science and Technology, and professor of Environmental and Resource Economics at VU University Amsterdam**,** ‘2/1/17 (Jeroen C. J. M., “A third option for climate policy within potential limits to growth,” Nature Climate Change 7, 107–112)

The 2008 global economic crisis, which negatively affected wellbeing around the world, did reduce[d] carbon emissions. But it was a tiny blip on the overall increasing trend, and was in fact smaller than expected38. In view of this, the scale of any GDP decline strategy would have to be huge to reach a significant reduction of emissions. Moreover, factors other than growth co-determine emissions, notably the composition of consumption and production, and the nature of all energy generating and energy using technologies in the economy. Since nobody knows the dynamic balance between these factors, the required magnitude of GDP degrowth is unknown. This means we cannot plan for it: any concrete degrowth rate would be arbitrary. In addition, thinking in terms of degrowth confuses cause and effect: perhaps serious climate policy will result in low, zero or even negative growth, temporarily or even permanently39. But this does not imply the reverse causality that zero or negative growth will solve the problem of climate change, or is even a necessary ingredient of any solution. Next, a deliberate degrowth strategy involves three severe risks. Through reducing consumer and investor confidence in the state of the economy, it might create[s] an extended period of economic instability characterized by high unemployment. Moreover, [second] as degrowth is not something that can be well controlled or planned, it could result in production [could] becoming less efficient and even more polluting. [third] Last but not least, a smaller size of the market economy would reduce[s] tax revenue, implying less public funding for public goods.

#### We outweigh on timeframe, their impact takes much longer than ours.

Coops cp

### 2ar

#### THE ROUND COMES DOWN TO T, THEIR ONLY RESPONSE IS NO RVIS on T, but this CONCEDES the CRUCIAL PART OF THE SHELL WHICH SAYS “But even if we don’t get the RVI, competing interps is still a voting issue because the only way to promote better norms and rectify abuse is through the ballot” THAT MEANS IF WE WIN T THE BALLOT GOES AFF.

#### OV: THEY CONCEDE BOTH COUNTER INTERPS AND GO FOR NO RVIS, THAT’S GG

#### Extend both c/is, us must be specced because it’s the most predictable and best model for clash and fairness, and debaters can spec a country because A implies specification. Those outweigh their author because of the contextual nature of debate supercedes stale normative statements, o/w on clash and predictability.

#### Aff rvis

#### Comp interps is a voter

### 1AR---AT: Spec Gov (US Spec)

#### CI---debaters must spec the United States

#### the US is the best and most predictable model for a just government

Berner 15

<http://www.theellipsis.org/why-the-united-states-constitution-established-a-just-government/#:~:text=Although%20at%20the%20time%20of,States%27%20government%20to%20remain%20just>. | MACKENZI BERNER (Student at Lafayette College) ellipsis 2015///(\*AK)

As the 1790s neared in the newly formed United States, it became evident that the Articles of Confederation — the very document that established an independent nation — had to be rewritten. From new ideas emerging from the Enlightenment reverberating throughout Europe, to perceived inequitable treatment leading to chaotic outbursts of unchecked outrage and fury such as Shay’s and Whiskey Rebellions, the young nation was ready for change. Thus, the document that would dictate the lives of future generations for the next two hundred and fifty years was crafted: the United States Constitution. The document embarked on and succeeded in the seemingly insurmountable task of cultivating a potent government whose potency is not so strong as to reminisce about the monarch the colonies just escaped. It took a weak confederacy of states plagued with instability and chaos to construct a centralized government while simultaneously incorporating a system of checks and balances. It established a Bill of Rights to relinquish any fears of mimicking the very government that quashed independence and limited freedom. While the document had some downfalls that juxtaposed the very ideals and fundamentals that the “supreme law of the land” was founded upon, such as failing to protect citizens in times of war, upholding the act of slavery for another eighty-five some odd years, and limiting the rights of women, it left room to amend these shortcomings and evolve to what society and human nature would eventually become with advancements in philosophies and technologies. The United State’s Constitution is inherently just because of its ability to acknowledge its faults and grievances and change accordingly; this adaptability comes from the Elastic Clause, an organized legislative representation selected by the people of the United States, and the presence of the Bill of Rights.

The true justice of the United States’ Constitution came from its ability to adapt itself toward changing philosophies. Article V of the original document states that the document could be “amended” if “two thirds of both houses deem[ed] it necessary.” Thus, the ability of the government to adapt not only technologically, but also ideologically, with passing time was granted. While changing ideologies are often theorized as having to happen gradually over a long span of time, there have been instances where the Constitution was able to make necessary changes more rapidly. This capacity of the government to adapt to changing values both rapidly and gradually is a pertinent characteristic of its justice. For example, the Eighteenth Amendment was swiftly passed in 1920 as a result of the prohibition movement, immediately prohibiting the consumption of alcohol. While in theory, restricting alcohol consumption would encourage men to spend more time with their families and lower crime rate, it ended up having the opposite effect, bringing alcohol underground and leading officers to take bribes. Because the detriments of Prohibition proved to outweigh the benefits, leaders were able to use the Elastic Clause in the Constitution to pass the Twenty-first Amendment, repealing Prohibition and allowing the law to revert back to a more suitable philosophy. Gradual changes in ideals have also been able to be met using the Elastic Clause of the Constitution. The slowly evolving issues of slavery and women’s rights were important considerations neglected in the original documents of the United States Constitution. However, the amendment process has proven its capability to modify: the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments served as examples of this fact, abolishing slavery and granting more rights to African Americans. Later, the Nineteenth Amendment gave women the right to vote. While these changes certainly did not make up for the hardship inflicted, and it would be another hundred years until segregation would end, the justness of the Constitution provided the structure to enable the changes to take place when society was ready.

While the Elastic Clause of the United States Constitution played a critical role in determining whether or not the government was in fact able to remain just, other factors such as the implementation of the legislative branch of government also perpetuated its justness. The ability of citizens to elect representatives in this particular branch of government contributes immensely to the justness of the United States government as a whole. Although Alexander Hamilton argued that the legislation was not just, insisting “a large [sum] of people is not necessary for thorough representation”, no matter how large the group of representatives was, it was the inequity among different groups of people at the time that inhibited true democracy. Even if the Anti-Federalists claimed everyone should have thorough representation, any individual who was not white or male during this time period had no voice and nobody advocated for the possibility of them getting one.  Even if this was the cultural reality at the time, the Constitution had everything it needed to correct these grievances, and eventually would do so when society was ready.

The legislative branch was not the only point of contention between the Federalists and the Anti-Federalists. One of the most crucial aspects to ensure a just government that perhaps even settled the Federalist/Anti-Federalist debate was the adoption of the Bill of Rights. The Anti-Federalists refused to sign the Constitution without said rights. This was due in part to the fact that the Bill of Rights guaranteed essential liberties what would be known as the first ten amendments of the document that was aimed to prevent the cultivation of a monarchy. These rights directly juxtaposed the experiences prevalent in the British monarch, citing the rights against “quartering” soldiers and the right to “search and seizure” which necessitates a warrant before searching private property without probable cause. The Bill of Rights would become essential in ensuring limited power to the executive branch of government, and because of this structure, it would remain just.

While there are several flaws that could be ascertained through close examination of the United States Constitution, it is imperative that one takes into account the time period and circumstances under which it was written. Critics of the United States Constitution point to specific times in the country’s history where the government failed to uphold constitutional rights, especially in times of conflict or war. While the Bill of Rights guaranteed American citizens the “freedom of speech, religion, and press,” historians who question the justice of the United States Constitution note that these rights have been specifically challenged throughout the nation’s history.  In 1798, John Adams passed The Sedition Act, limiting freedom of speech and press, as the United States prepared for the Quasi War with France. In recent years, suppression and discrimination have violated freedom of religion, brought on by fears of national security. However, while this prejudicial repression should not have been condoned, it has proved to be the only possible way to avert higher casualties and more violence. For example, had President Abraham Lincoln been more sensitive toward constitutional liberties and not suspended habeas corpus, the Civil War could have ended with more fatalities, as well as the demise of the Union. This would have come with issues such as slavery taking even longer to dissolve, for different values would have been imposed separately rather than being blended. The notion of slavery not being abolished is inarguably far worse than a short suspension of civil liberties.

Despite its shortcomings, the United States Constitution succeeded in taking an unstable, loose confederation of states and creating a centralized government, not so strong as to limit liberty, while simultaneously balancing state and federal control. Although at the time of its ratification, major contradictions to justice were prominent — and civil liberties were not always upheld during times of conflict — the Constitution’s ability to change itself, even today, enables the United States’ government to remain just. Only time will tell whether or not American leaders and their people will continue to use the elasticity of the Constitution to ultimately serve and protect all people.

#### CI: Affs can specify a government

#### “a” implies specification

Merriam Webster [Merriam Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/a>] srey

a—used as a function word before a singular noun followed by a restrictive modifier

a man who was here yesterday

b: [ANY](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/any)

a person who is sick can't work

c—used as a function word before a mass noun to denote a particular type or instance

a bronze made in ancient times

d—used as a function word before a proper noun representing an example or type

#### Pragmatics over semantics---we’re not grammar professors, the topic should mirror what’s best for debates so we can maximize our understanding of the lit

#### Prefer:

#### 1] We live in the US and many past topics have US-based affs so debaters are already ready to defend arguments like politics---A] Proves we are predictable, B] Key to ground—ensures stable generics on a topic w/ poor neg ground

#### 2] International fiat bad---leads to unpredictable caselists and a huge explosion in possible advantage grounds

#### 3] Terminal defense on limits---we only have 1 country under our CI

#### 4] PICs flips limits---there’d be hundreds of different country PICs for every aff to prep out---spec is inevitable, it’s just a question of if ONLY the neg can do it---that’s WORSE due to the timecrunched 1AR

#### 5] Resolvability---their model forces vagueness in actor which ensures we never know specifities of right to strike---we’ll likely only have a few debates on this topic so we should make these rounds as resolvable as possible

#### 6] Yes RVIs---key to ensure the timecrunched 1AR can get back in the game and split the 6 min 2NR. But even if we don’t get the RVI, competing interps is still a voting issue because the only way to promote better norms and rectify abuse is through the ballot.

#### Voters

#### 1. Fairness is a voter: A] fair debates are k2 actual idea testing that checks back against things like ableism, unfair debate prevents us from fully evaluating the integrity of an argument B] it’s the i/l to every other voter because fairness is a meta constraint on our ability to evaluate any truth claims, therefore it comes first.

#### 2. Applicable Education is a voter: A] it’s the sole focus of the activity and only inherent benefit B] it’s the reason schools fund debate, no education means no debate

#### Competing interps: A] reasonability leads to more abuse that minimally fits the brightline B] We should always set the better norms C] Collapses- you use offense-defense to determine reasonability being good which concedes the authority of competing interps- saying reasonability is reasonable is circular

#### DTD- 1) theory can’t be solely defense otherwise the incentive structure makes abuse inevitable because theres little to no risk 2) debaters already kick arguments so it’s minimally effective to set norms

### PICs bad

#### Interp-- the negative can't read plan inclusive counterplans

#### Violation—they did

#### Standards

#### 1. strat skew

#### a. the neg can run an infinite amt of diff pics with different countries or counties or states whatever it's impossible for the aff to prep for every single one

#### b. predictability-- if we can't predict what they're going to run there's no way we can prep there are millions of different PICs they can run

#### c. this means we don't get any clash which controls the internal link to education because we don't get to know stuff

#### 2. time skew

#### a. the aff already only gets very short 643 speeches but the aff gets 2 long speeches where they can spew out a lot of arguments and we only get a 4 minute 1ar to defend out 6 minute case and 7 minute nc/nr

### 1AR – Spec Status

#### Interp: Neg must spec the status of the alt or cp at the top of the NC, anything else is a voting issue

#### 1] Prep skew – I lose 7 minutes of prep because I don’t know what to prep for during the speech which decks aff prep – o/w since prep skew determines the arguments read and the quality of those arguments

#### 2] Inclusion – Novices are most likely to forget to ask which exacerbates an already skewed activity

## Mindset Alt Bad

A. Interpretation: Kritik alternatives must only be specific, solvent policy actions implemented by a single actor. The alt must have a solvency advocate that explains the implementation of the policy, and cannot fiat a rejection, mindset shift, or (what they did)

B. Violation

1. Strat Skew – Mindset alts skew my strategy because a) I don’t know how the shift is implemented so the neg can delink from solvency deficits and link turn and b) I don’t know what mindset replaces it, so the neg can sever out of impact turns to the k. Preventing strat skew is key to fairness because debaters must be able to leverage arguments and positions against opponents to access the ballot. Strat skew also turns the K; if my opponent is vague and shifty then they don’t actually believe in the discourse and are being disingenuous.

2. Reciprocity – without a concrete policy action alt with solvency, they can win by only showing something bad about my advocacy or state of affairs, and then claim utopian fiat through mindset shift. For example, I can’t show that the world of the alt is more capitalist if the alt is “reject capitalism” which destroys my ability to turn the K, making the entire position functionally an a priori, destroying fairness since winning any disadvantage to the aff is sufficient to win but I can’t prove a disadvantage to their world. The only way to solve this would be to give the aff utopian fiat, in which case I fiat away all of their disadvantages and all of my advantages, meaning I win on a post-fiat level and outweigh the K.