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#### The aff’s refusal to work is not a refusal of work – their endorsement of striking reinforces the belief that withholding labor puts people in a position of power. This reduces humans to labor capital, which causes work-dependency and inhibits alternatives.

Hoffmann, 20 (Maja, "Resolving the ‘jobs-environment-dilemma’? The case for critiques of work in sustainability research. Taylor & Francis, 4-1-2020, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23251042.2020.1790718)//usc-br/

The societal dependence on work

If work is associated with environmental pressures in at least four different ways, why do we have to maintain it at constant or increased levels? We hold that in industrial society four distinct levels of structural and cultural dependency on work may be discerned. These are to be understood as broad analytical categories which in reality comprise and cross individual and structural levels in various ways, and are all interdependent.

Personal dependence. A first aspect is individual or personal dependence on work: Work as regular, gainful employment constitutes one of the central social relations in modern ‘work society’ and is a central point of reference in people’s lives. As a principal source of income, waged work fulfils the existential function of providing livelihoods and social security. It is constructed to secure basic social rights, social integration, recognition, status, and personal identity (Frayne 2015b; Weeks 2011). This is probably why ‘social’ is so often equated with ‘work’.

State dependence. Secondly, dependence on work pertains to the modern welfare state: the revenues and economic growth generated through work contribute substantially to the financing of social security systems. Affording welfare is therefore a main argument for creating jobs. Wage labour is thus a dominating tool for redistribution; through wages, taxes on wages and on the consumption that production generates, almost all distribution takes place. Hence, what the job is, and what is being produced, is of secondary importance (Paulsen 2017). Work is moreover a convenient instrument of control that structures and disciplines society, and ‘renders populations at once productive and governable’ (Weeks 2011, 54; Gorz 1982; Lafargue 2014 [1883]). Specifically, the dominant neoliberal ideology, its condemnation of laziness and idealisation of ‘hardworking people’ has intensified the ‘moral fortification of work’. Accordingly, the neoliberal ‘workfare’ reforms have focused on job creation and the relentless activation for the labour market, effectively ‘enforcing work (…) as a key function of the state’ (Frayne 2015b, 16).

Economic dependence. Thirdly, besides the economic imperative for individuals to ‘earn a living’ and pay off debt, modern economies are dependent on work in terms of an industrious labour force, long working hours for increasing economic output under the imperatives of capital accumulation, growth and competition, and rising incomes for increasing purchasing power and demand. Creating or preserving jobs constitutes the standard argument for economic growth. In turn, work as one basic factor of production creates growth. However, the relation between growth and employment is conditioned, amongst other factors, primarily by constantly pursued labour productivity: for employment to rise or stay stable, the economy must grow at a sufficiently high rate to exceed productivity gains, in order to offset job losses and avoid ‘jobless growth’. Moreover, faltering expansion triggers a spiral of recession which not only affects economic stability but results in societal crises as a whole (Jackson 2009; Paech 2012). However, besides being unsustainable and insatiable, growth is also increasingly unlikely to continue at the rates required for economic stability (Kallis et al. 2018; IMF 2015). The individual and structural economic dependence on work and economic growth therefore implies profound vulnerability as livelihoods and political stability are fatefully exposed to global competition and the capitalist imperative of capital accumulation, and constrained by ‘systemically relevant’ job and growth creating companies, industries and global (financial) markets (Gronemeyer 2012; Paech 2012).

Cultural dependence. A fourth aspect concerns cultural dependence: The ‘work ethic’ is the specific morality described by Max Weber (1992[1905]) as constitutive of modern industrial culture, 2 and determining for all its subjects as shared ‘common senses’ about how work is valued and understood. It means an ingrained moral compulsion to gainful work and timesaving, manifested in the common ideals of productivity, achievement and entrepreneurship, in the feeling of guilt when time is ‘wasted’, in personal identification with one’s ‘calling’, in observations of busyness, even burnout as a ‘badge of honour’ (Paulsen 2014), and in descriptions of a culture that has lost the ‘capacity to relax in the old, uninhibited ways’ (Thompson 1967, 91). Even for those who do not share such attitudes towards work, in a work-centred culture it is normal to (seek) work. It is so commonsensical that it seems impractical to question it, and it continues to be normalised through socialisation and schooling. Consequently, people become limited in their imagination of alternatives, the prospect of losing one’s job usually causes heartfelt fear (Standing 2011). For a work society that ‘does no longer know of those other higher and more meaningful activities for the sake of which this freedom would deserve to be won’, there can be nothing worse than the cessation of work (Hannah Arendt, cited in Gorz 1989, 7–8).

The wage relation based on the commodity labour is, in other words, an essential functional feature of the industrial-capitalist system, and the exaltation of work remains its social ethic. For modern industrial society work is ‘both its chief means and its ultimate goal’ (Gorz 1989, 13; Weber 1992 [1905]; Weeks 2011); it is centred and structurally dependent on work, despite work’s environmentally adverse implications. This constellation constitutes the dilemma between work and the environment, and it is why we argue that work is absolutely central to present-day unsustainability and should accordingly be dealt with in sustainability research.

#### The right to strike presupposes a capital-controlled model of corporate governance against which workers strike. Vote neg for economic bicameralism. Only full incorporation of workers into the firm structure itself can give true control over the means of production. Labor organization has failed.

Ferreras 17

Isabelle Ferreras (professor at the University de Louvain, a tenured fellow of the Belgian National Science Foundation, and a senior research associate of the Labor and Worklife Program at Harvard Law School). Response to “The Right to Strike.” Boston Review, Spring 2017. JDN. <https://bostonreview.net/forum/right-strike/isabelle-ferreras-ferreras-responds-pope>

To me, two words are holding them back: “acting like.” There can be no “acting like” for organized labor, for in today’s world of global finance capitalism, labor is the new frontier in the historic struggle for rights—which is in fact a phase in the struggle for emancipation. For anyone concerned with nurturing the democratic project, the state of disenfranchisement faced by workers the minute they enter the workplace is cause for alarm. This disenfranchisement is alarming because of the dramatic consequences it has for the health of workers to the state and the credibility of our democratic politics. The distress it causes can engender disastrous responses, as the election of Donald Trump has shown. Such responses are a menace to our democracies. Yet, the institution from which democracy is most lacking today—the firm—has managed to stay off our political radar. We should all—rights and labor activists, unions, progressive thinkers, citizens of the world—be adopting the same refrain: “It’s the corporation, stupid!”

The term emancipate comes from the Latin emancipare: “to free a slave,” derived from e-manu-capare: to cease to hold by the hand. In the Roman Forum, slaveowners signaled their intent to purchase a slave by taking him by the hand. The word thus implies release from slavery, guardianship, domination, alienation—from constraint in general, be it physical, moral, intellectual, or otherwise. In concrete terms, it is used to describe a situation in which a given category of the population is granted the same rights that others have already secured. Today, in the wake of struggles to emancipate colonies, enslaved peoples, ethnic groups, and women, the time has come to emancipate workers. Why? Because workers are no less equal than others, i.e., the capital investors. They indeed invest at least as much in firms as capital investors do. Capital investors, organizing their capital through the corporation, have the right to govern firms. Workers, on the other hand, **although their labor has been organized to varying degrees** over the centuries, have no fitting institutional mechanism by which they might contribute to the government of their firms. It is high time to recognize workers’ right to organize in this complete sense—that is, through an institutional mechanism that gives them the same rights as capital investors to participate in governing the firm. While corporation and firm are two terms often conflated, corporations are actually only the organizing vehicle for capital investors—that is, only a part of the broader entity of the firm. Firms, strangely enough, have no real existence yet in law. They require proper institutionalization, with appropriate, equally shared sets of rights between capital and labor.

Studying **the history of political revolutions since Roman antiquity**, when the Tribunes of the plebs held veto rights over all decisions made by the Patricians, we learn that the prosperity of Western societies was made possible through moments of emancipation, in which a dominated—and often more numerous—group in a given society acceded to the same rights as the minority, and began to participate in its government. In each of these moments, a single institutional innovation was put in place, that of **bicameral politics**, engineered to produce productive compromise between two divergent sets of interests.

Today’s employees feel a constant strain between their own aspiration to more justice in the workplace and the domestic regime imposed on them by the power structure of the corporate firm. Although its name connotes a “private home”—from oikos-nomos in Greek: the rules of the household—the economy (particularly the service economy) has become more and more part of the public space. Employees work in constant contact with or under the constant gaze of customers—the public, in other words. This gaze transforms work into a political experience grounded in the expectation of democratic justice that underpins the culture of our civic life. Outside the workplace, workers are enjoined to behave as responsible citizens, as voters capable of taking a stance on major “political” questions (for example, who should govern the country). Arriving at their jobs—the very place where they are best qualified to assess situations and make decisions, they become not citizens but instruments, a workforce, subject to the unilateral decisions of a firm government structured entirely around capital. Capitalism and the democratic ideal coexist in burning contradiction, and employees today are experiencing its heat firsthand. For the sake of both efficiency and justice, it is the moment to recognize that **firms are political entities in need of democratization.** Placing firms in the context of the political history of Western societies makes it clear that we should set our sights at democratizing their government. To unlock the democratization process, history teaches us the importance of what I call “bicameral moments” as being key to enabling moments of institutional innovation.

We find ourselves in the throes of economic and democratic crisis: inequalities keep on rising, some firms are closing or some low-skilled jobs are lost because of automation; outsourcing, subcontracting, and offshoring are everyday realities; workers and citizens are losing both their motivation and their trust. These problems will not be solved from the outside. Firms require governments worthy of that name, legitimate, reasonable, and intelligent. Our challenge today is to help them—and the societies in which they function—to evolve toward this goal, to create a stable and vibrant economic fabric while remaining open to the world. A new political compromise struck within an appropriate legal framework would foster everyone’s capacity to innovate—labor investors and capital investors alike.

The people investing their labor in our economy’s firms want to be fully involved in the creation of the norms governing their workplaces. The most innovative businesses have already figured this out: business school courses in participatory management and methods for “liberating the firm” abound. Capitalism, as always, has seen and recycled the political critique of the restraints on worker productivity—its ability to do so should not be underestimated. Once again, as Pope, Bruno, and Kellman write, “The problem is structural.” In some European countries, such as Germany, France, and Belgium, labor representatives are present but underrepresented in the government of firms; in the UK or the United States, they are almost entirely absent. How can our economy advance if the firms that drive it are governed in such a lopsided, unicameral, and outmoded fashion? To overcome this weakness, the institutional model of bicameral politics should be expanded to include firms. Today it hardly needs to be explained that England could not be governed by the House of Lords alone—why should the contemporary capitalist firm be governed by the Board alone? **“Economic bicameralism”** would change that. Two houses, a “Capital Investors’ House of Representatives”—the current Board—and a “Labor Investors’ House of Representatives” would work together to govern the firm in the interests of all its stakeholders. They would do so as an elected, representative government, in the form of the firm’s top management, which, to set the rules governing the existence of the firm, would have to receive a majority vote in both houses.

Corporate social responsibility is a failed strategy; **asking capital to respect workers’ rights to organize is futile.** This is clear in the United States, where the consequences have been dire. Capital investors hold the real power; organized labor has little more than the crumbs. But the long history of human emancipation shows us that there is another way forward. **Institutions matter.** Capital has the institution of the Board; labor does not —yet. To truly organize labor would mean obtaining for it the same sets of rights that capital holds through the corporation. Workers need actual equal rights—which means equivalent institutional channels within a bicameral firm. The capitalist corporate firm as we know it should become as obsolete and preposterous as patricians ruling Rome without representatives of the plebs (a bicameral moment that took place in 494 BCE). If they really want to further workers’ interests and dignity, unions must fully embrace a rights agenda. And, as Pope, Bruno, and Kellman so rightly point out, this requires relinquishing a system of exclusive representation, which does not fit with a renewed, fuller understanding of democratic citizenship broad enough to embrace the economic as well as what is currently institutionally recognized as the political. The future of organized labor depends on it—as does the future of our democracies. Firms are the new frontier in the democratic experiment, where it is time for citizens—whether they are partners, collaborators, employees, or workers—to truly become equals.

#### No permutations. Three reasons.

#### 1. The counterplan puts workers directly in control of the means of production, so in the world of the alt, a strike against the leadership would be a strike against labor power. There’s also no net benefit because workers would already be internally represented in corporate governance.

#### 2. The perm creates competing factions that fracture labor unity. An overbroad right to strike would allow dissident wildcat strikers to challenge labor power.

Graham 63

James Graham (A.B., Fordham University; LL.B., St. John's University). “A Reconsideration of the Right to Strike.” The Catholic Lawyer, Volume 9, Number 2, Spring 1963. JDN. <https://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1434&context=tcl>

Ironically enough, the Sinclair decision will also **add to the woes of many harassed union leaders.** It is unfortunate but true that those labor organizations which are most democratic in their internal affairs are often most guilty of illegal strike activities; either **the leaders cannot control dissident elements in the ranks** or, facing re-election difficulties, **must cater to the desire of the members for dramatic action** to protest real or imagined grievance. In the past, the threat of an imminent injunction has been urged when necessary by union officials, without losing face, as a compelling reason for resorting to arbitration rather than a work stoppage for satisfaction of the grievance. It is quite likely that in the next few years, Congress will avoid the effect of the Sinclair decision by either amending the venerable Norris-LaGuardia Act or, more likely, by amending the NLRA to make an unjustified breach of a no strike clause an unfair labor practice, enjoinable at the discretion of the NLRB. In certain vital industries or occupations, compulsory arbitration may be the necessary alternative to strikes of any kind. Teachers and hospital workers, for example, who in effect are denied the right to strike under all circumstances, should not be forced to rely solely on the generosity or political sensibilities of public officials for redress.

#### 3. Unions kill the alt. They are intrinsically invested in labor being good – they don’t strike to get rid of work; they strike to get people back to work. Lundström 14:

Lundström, Ragnar; Räthzel, Nora; Uzzell, David {Uzell is Professor (Emeritus) of Environmental Psychology at the University of Surrey with a BA Geography from the University of Liverpool, a PhD Psychology from the University of Surrey, and a MSc in Social Psychology from London School of Economics and Political Science, University of London. Lundstrom is Associate professor at [Department of Sociology](https://www.umu.se/sociologiska-institutionen/) at Umea University. Rathzel is an Affiliated as professor emerita at [Department of Sociology](https://www.umu.se/sociologiska-institutionen/) at Umea University.}, 14 - ("Disconnected spaces: introducing environmental perspectives into the trade union agenda top-down and bottom-up," Taylor & Francis, 12-11-2014, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23251042.2015.1041212?scroll=top&amp;needAccess=true)//marlborough-wr/

Even though there was support for environmental perspectives in LO at this time – after all, the National Congress commissioned the programme, an environmental unit was established at headquarters and a majority of the congress accepted the programme – this waned significantly when the economy was threatened. This reflects the influence of the ‘jobs vs. environment’ conflict on processes of integrating environmental perspectives into the union agenda (Räthzel and Uzzell [2011](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23251042.2015.1041212)). Union policies are embedded in a mode of production marked by what Marx called the ‘metabolic rift’. The concept is one of the pillars upon which Foster develops ‘Marx’s Ecology’ (Foster [2000](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23251042.2015.1041212), 155 f). It argues that the capitalist industrial system exploits the earth without restoring its constituents to it. More generally, Marx defined the labour process as metabolism (Stoffwechsel) between nature (external to humans) and human nature. When humans work on and with nature to produce the means of their survival, they also develop their knowledge and their capabilities, and transform their own human nature (Marx [1998](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23251042.2015.1041212)). Polanyi later reduced the concept of the ‘metabolic rift’ to the commodification of land (Polanyi [1944](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23251042.2015.1041212)), thus paving the way for a perspective that sees the solution in the control of the market, but disregards the relations of production as they are lived by workers in the production process. But to understand why trade unions have difficulties developing and especially holding on to environmental policies it is important to recognise that since nature has become a privately owned ‘means of production’ it has become workers’ Other. Unions have been reduced and have reduced themselves to care only for one part of the inseparable relationship between nature and labour. On the everyday level of policies this means that environmental strategies lose momentum in times of economic crises and when jobs are seen to be threatened. In this respect, unions are no different from political parties and governments. In spite of numerous publications by the ILO and Union organisations, which show that a move to a ‘green economy’ can create new jobs (Poschen [2012](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23251042.2015.1041212); Rivera Alejo and Martín Murillo [2014](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/23251042.2015.1041212)), unions have been reluctant to exchange ‘a bird in the hand for two in the bush’ – even if the bird in the hand becomes elusive.