# 1AC

### 1AC – Framing

**Presumption and permissibility affirm –**

**A] Statements are true before false since if I told you my name, you’d believe me.B] Epistemics – we wouldn’t be able to start a strand of reasoning since we’d have to question that reason. C] Illogical – presuming statements false is illogical since you can’t say things like P and ~P are both wrong. D] Presuming obligations is logically safer since it’s better to be supererogatory than fail to meet an obligation.**

**The meta ethic should be moral pluralism. Prefer-**

#### 1] Quantum superposition proves different ethics can exist simultaneously – prag is the only metric to reconcile them

MIT ’19 (Emerging Technology from the arXiv archive page; Covers latest ideas from blog post about arXiv; 03/12/2019; “Emerging Technology from the arXiv archive page”; <https://www.technologyreview.com/2019/03/12/136684/a-quantum-experiment-suggests-theres-no-such-thing-as-objective-reality/>; *MIT Technology Review*; accessed: 11/19/2020; MohulA)

Back in 1961, the Nobel Prize–winning physicist Eugene Wigner outlined a thought experiment that demonstrated one of the lesser-known paradoxes of quantum mechanics. The experiment shows how the strange nature of the universe allows two observers—say, Wigner and Wigner’s friend—to experience different realities. Since then, physicists have used the “Wigner’s Friend” thought experiment to explore the nature of measurement and to argue over whether objective facts can exist. That’s important because scientists carry out experiments to establish objective facts. But if they experience different realities, the argument goes, how can they agree on what these facts might be? That’s provided some entertaining fodder for after-dinner conversation, but Wigner’s thought experiment has never been more than that—just a thought experiment. Last year, however, physicists noticed that recent advances in quantum technologies have made it possible to reproduce the Wigner’s Friend test in a real experiment. In other words, it ought to be possible to create different realities and compare them in the lab to find out whether they can be reconciled. And today, Massimiliano Proietti at Heriot-Watt University in Edinburgh and a few colleagues say they have performed this experiment for the first time: they have created different realities and compared them. Their conclusion is that Wigner was correct—these realities can be made irreconcilable so that it is impossible to agree on objective facts about an experiment. Wigner’s original thought experiment is straightforward in principle. It begins with a single polarized photon that, when measured, can have either a horizontal polarization or a vertical polarization. But before the measurement, according to the laws of quantum mechanics, the photon exists in both polarization states at the same time—a so-called superposition. Wigner imagined a friend in a different lab measuring the state of this photon and storing the result, while Wigner observed from afar. Wigner has no information about his friend’s measurement and so is forced to assume that the photon and the measurement of it are in a superposition of all possible outcomes of the experiment. Wigner can even perform an experiment to determine whether this superposition exists or not. This is a kind of interference experiment showing that the photon and the measurement are indeed in a superposition. From Wigner’s point of view, this is a “fact”—the superposition exists. And this fact suggests that a measurement cannot have taken place. But this is in stark contrast to the point of view of the friend, who has indeed measured the photon’s polarization and recorded it. The friend can even call Wigner and say the measurement has been done (provided the outcome is not revealed). So the two realities are at odds with each other. “This calls into question the objective status of the facts established by the two observers,” say Proietti and co. That’s the theory, but last year Caslav Brukner, at the University of Vienna in Austria, came up with a way to re-create the Wigner’s Friend experiment in the lab by means of techniques involving the entanglement of many particles at the same time. The breakthrough that Proietti and co have made is to carry this out. “In a state-of-the-art 6-photon experiment, we realize this extended Wigner’s friend scenario,” they say. They use these six entangled photons to create two alternate realities—one representing Wigner and one representing Wigner’s friend. Wigner’s friend measures the polarization of a photon and stores the result. Wigner then performs an interference measurement to determine if the measurement and the photon are in a superposition. The experiment produces an unambiguous result. It turns out that both realities can coexist even though they produce irreconcilable outcomes, just as Wigner predicted. That raises some fascinating questions that are forcing physicists to reconsider the nature of reality. The idea that observers can ultimately reconcile their measurements of some kind of fundamental reality is based on several assumptions. The first is that universal facts actually exist and that observers can agree on them. But there are other assumptions too. One is that observers have the freedom to make whatever observations they want. And another is that the choices one observer makes do not influence the choices other observers make—an assumption that physicists call locality. If there is an objective reality that everyone can agree on, then these assumptions all hold. But Proietti and co’s result suggests that objective reality does not exist. In other words, the experiment suggests that one or more of the assumptions—the idea that there is a reality we can agree on, the idea that we have freedom of choice, or the idea of locality—must be wrong. Of course, there is another way out for those hanging on to the conventional view of reality. This is that there is some other loophole that the experimenters have overlooked. Indeed, physicists have tried to close loopholes in similar experiments for years, although they concede that it may never be possible to close them all. Nevertheless, the work has important implications for the work of scientists. “The scientific method relies on facts, established through repeated measurements and agreed upon universally, independently of who observed them,” say Proietti and co. And yet in the same paper, they undermine this idea, perhaps fatally. The next step is to go further: to construct experiments creating increasingly bizarre alternate realities that cannot be reconciled. Where this will take us is anybody’s guess. But Wigner, and his friend, would surely not be surprised.

#### 2] Resolvability- Thousands of years of metaethical debates have concluded in indecisiveness so a 45-minute debate would be unable to correctly resolve nebulous ethical disputes and identify the correct theory. Resolvability outweighs on jurisdiction since it’s a meta-constraint on the judge’s final jurisdiction.

#### Thus, the standard is promoting pragmatic deliberation. Prefer-

#### 1] Value Pluralism- Other ethical theories rely on minimalistic criteria as their foundation, our framework resolves this by using these criteria to better inform our judgments LaFollete 2K "Pragmatic Ethics" [Hugh LaFollette](http://www.hughlafollette.com/index.htm) In [Blackwell Guide to Ethical Theory](http://www.hughlafollette.com/papers/b-guide.htm) 2000. Hugh LaFollette is Marie E. and Leslie Cole Professor in Ethics at the University of South Florida St. Petersburg. He is editor-in-chief of The International Encyclopedia of Ethics. <https://www.hughlafollette.com/papers/b-guide.htm> Dulles AS

Pragmatic ethics takes a more aggressive approach, insisting that mankind is responsible for determining the best ethical system possible, which will be refined as new discoveries are made. Put simply; truth does not exist in some abstract realm of thought independent of social relationship or actions; instead, the truth is a function of an active … Pragmatism, according to William James, is derived from the Greek word pragma, which means action and serves as the basis of our English words practical and practice. Pragmatism originated in the United States around 1870, and now presents a growing third alternative to both analytic and Continental philosophical traditions worldwide. 1 - Acceptance . Ethics is a branch of philosophy that is responsible for studying the principles that govern the conduct of an individual. Employs criteria, but is not criterial The previous discussions enable us to say more precisely why pragmatists reject a criterial view of morality. Pragmatism's core contention that practiceis primary in philosophy rulesoutthe hope of logically prior criteria. Any meaningful criteria evolve from our attempt to live morally – in deciding what is the best action in the circumstances. Criteriaare not discovered by pure reason, and they arenotfixed. As ends of action, they are always revisable. Asweobtainnewevidenceabout ourselves and our world, and as our worlds changes, wefindthat whatwasappropriatefor the old environment maynotbeconduciveto survival in thenew one. A style of teaching that might have been ideal for one kind institution (a progressive liberal arts college) at one time (the 60s) may be wholly ineffective in another institution (a regional state university) at another time (the 80s). But that is exactly what we would expect of an evolutionary ethic. Neither could criteria be complete. Themoralworldiscomplexandchangeable**.** No set of criteriacouldgiveusunivocalanswersabouthowwe should behave in all circumstances**.** If we cannot develop an algorithm for winning at chess, where there are only eighteen first moves, there is no way to develop an algorithm for living, which has a finitely large number of "first moves." Moreover, while the chess environment (the rules) stays constant, our natural and moral environments do not. We must adapt or fail. While there is always one end of chess -- the game ends when one player wins – the ends of life change as we grow, and asour environmentschange. Finally, we cannot resolve practical moral questions simply by applying criteria. We do not make personal or profession decisions by applying fixed, complete criteria. Why should we assume we should make moral decisions that way? Appropriates insights from other ethical theories Nonetheless, there is a perfectly good sense in which a pragmatic ethic employs what we might call criteria, but their nature and role dramatically differ from that in a criterial morality (Dewey 1985/1932) . Pragmaticcriteriaare not external rules we apply, but aretoolsweuseinmakinginformedjudgements. They embody learning from previous action, they express our tentative efforts to isolate morally relevant features of those actions. These emergentcriteriacanbecomeintegratedinto our habits**,** thereby informingthe waysthat wereactto, think about, and imagine ourworldsand our relations to others. This explains why pragmatists think other theories can provide guidance on how to live morally. Standard moral theories err not because they offer silly moral advice, but because they misunderstand that advice. Othermoral theoriescan help us isolate(and habitually focus on) morallyrelevantfeaturesof action. And pragmatists take help wherever they can get it. Utilitarianism does not provide an algorithm for deciding how to act, but it shapes habits to help us "naturally" attend to the ways that our actions impact others. Deontology does not provide a list of general rules to follow, but it sensitizes us to ways our actions might promote or undermine respect for others. Contractarianism does not resolve all moral issues, but it sensitizes us to the need for broad consensus. That is why it is mistaken to suppose that the pragmatist makes specific moral judgements oblivious to rules, principles, virtues, and the collective wisdom of human experience. Thepragmatistabsorbstheseinsightsinto her habits, andthereby shapeshowshehabituallyresponds**,** and how she habitually deliberates when deliberation is required. This also explains why criterial moralities tend to be minimalistic. They specify minimal sets of rules to follow in order to be moral. Pragmatism, on the other hand, like virtue theories, is more concerned to emphasize exemplary behavior – to use morally relevant features of action to determine the best way to behave, not the minimally tolerable way

#### 2] Performativity- Responding to our framework concedes the validity of agonism since that in and of itself is a process of contestation that agonism would say is valuable and necessary for spaces like debate to function.

**3] Hume’s Guillotine – experience only tells us what is since we can only perceive what is, not what ought to be. But it’s impossible to derive an ought from descriptive premises since there’s an is/ought gap.**

#### 4] TJFS- Frameworks should be fair/educational like any other argument. A] Inclusion – Deliberation definitionally is a procedural for allowing almost any argumentation in the debate space which controls the internal link to inclusion which is an impact multiplier B] Resource Disparities- Discursive frameworks ensure big squads don’t have a comparative advantage since debates become about quality of arguments rather than quantity and require a higher level of analytic thinking that small schools have. C] Evaluate the debate after the 1ac and before the 1nc – prevents anxiety caused by giving speeches.

#### 5] Accept aff interps and definitions A] causes regress since we can infinitely debate what something means but the aff speaks first which means they should define it However, let me recontextualize their arguments since they can collapse for 6 minutes on something I misunderstood in the 1ar to end the round since the 2ar can’t answer.

#### 6] Deliberation is procedural not substantive, which means that we are first concerned with the decision-making procedure of deliberation and then evaluation of what impacts matter most. To clarify, consequences are a sequencing question. Serra 2

BY WAY OF CONCLUSION: As LaFollette presents it, the key to understanding pragmatist ethics is that it is not an ethical theory per se, but rather it is an anthropology, a way of understanding the human being and his moral action. Therefore, pragmatist ethics in reality does not propose a new ethical theory, but rather “reconstructs” through a new prism the basic intuitions of the best ethical theories. The fundamental element on which the attention of pragmatist ethics centers is deliberation. Deliberationisnotdirectlyresponsible for directing action,butonly doessoindirectly**,** bymeans of a critique of past actions, theefforttocorrect or reinforce certain habits and mental experiments that each actor performs in order to determine his own future conduct, and even to determine in a general manner the way in which one wishes to live one’s life (or, what amounts to the same thing, the type of person one wishes to be). Thetaskofapragmatistethics, therefore**,** isnottoprovidefinalsolutions**,** butrather to indicate that it is onlyvia thetestingandcommunicationofexperiencesthatthe superiorityof onemoral ideaover another can be demonstrated. In this sense, one of the principal missions of any given version of pragmatist ethics is to indicate some general manner in which habits can be acquired which, later, will facilitate personal deliberation – both internal and external – in the broad variety of circumstances which make up the moral life.

**7] All negative arguments presuppose the aff being true since they begin with an descriptive premise about the affirmative, and then justify why X is bad. However, if the aff does not have truth value, that entails the descriptive premise would also not have truth value, which makes the argument a contradiction**

#### 8] a sentence p asserts p is false. if p is true or false, it is what it says so it is true. Denying truth claims collapses to all statements being true.

#### 9] lemons are purple or Santa exists proves the second part true cuz lemons aren’t purple and means any statement is true when swapped with santa exists including the rez

#### 10] The rules of logic claim that the only time a statement is invalid is if the antecedent is true, but the consequent is false.

SEP [Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.] “An Introduction to Philosophy.” Stanford University. <https://web.stanford.edu/~bobonich/dictionary/dictionary.html> TG Massa

Conditional statement: an “if p, then q” compound statement (ex. If I throw this ball into the air, it will come down); p is called the antecedent, and q is the consequent. A conditional asserts that if its antecedent is true, its consequent is also true; any conditional with a true antecedent and a false consequent must be false.  For any other combination of true and false antecedents and consequents, the conditional statement is true.

#### If the aff is winning, they get the ballot is a tacit ballot conditional which means denying the premise proves the conclusion that I should get the ballot.

#### 11] Resolved is defined as[[1]](#footnote-1) firm in purpose or intent; determined and I’m determined,

#### 12] affirm means to express agreement[[2]](#footnote-2) and I did.

#### 13] Resolved is past tense which means the rez is already decided to affirm

#### 14] The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – answers collapse because you presume urs is true

#### A] The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[3]](#footnote-3) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[4]](#footnote-4) as to prove true so it's constitutive and jurisdictional

#### B] it’s the most logical since you don’t say vote for the player who shoots the most 3 points, the better player wins since debate is a game with rules given by how there’s a winner and loser.

### 1AC – Offense

#### Plan – The People’s Republic of China ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### 1] Destroying the right to strike takes away workers’ basic right to argumentation – the right to strike preserves contestability,

**Lindblom**, Lars. "Consent, contestability, and unions." *Business ethics quarterly* 29.2 (2019): 189-211.

To provide a justification of unions is to give justificatory reasons for the rights to form unions and non-discrimination of union members and the duty of good faith bargaining. Moreover, the theory we are looking for must be able to handle the problem concerning acts of employer authority that created difficulties for the consent-based theories, such as libertarianism. Let us, then, turn to how unions can implement contestability and thereby solve the problem of consent. Starting with the basis of contestation, the demand for transparency solves, as was noted above, the problem of information. With transparency in place, employees will be informed about the policies and decisions that affect them. This aspect of contestability demands that parties make clear the reasons that are moving them when making decisions. This, in turn, underwrites some preconditions for good faith bargaining and provides a link between contestability and unions. Now, it is quite obvious that there is a connection between unions and voice. Part of the purpose of a union is to enable its members to express their views or demands and to make their voices heard. The fact that a group of people, rather than an individual, expresses itself when a union speaks out makes it more probable that what is being expressed is also heard. If we want to get serious about voice, we should have mechanisms that implement it efficiently. Therefore, a right to form unions would seem to follow from the implementation of contestability. This indicates, furthermore, that the right to strike should be protected as a part of the implementation of the mechanism of contestability, since such a right safeguards the possibility to make one’s voice heard.12 Moreover, discrimination of union members would undermine this mechanism for voice. If employees fear that they will be retaliated against if they speak out, they will clearly be hesitant to voice their concerns. Nondiscrimination of union members is, therefore, a demand of the ideal of contestation. These two points imply that the standard of cooperation should include a norm against the discrimination union members and respect for the right to form unions.

#### 2] Strikes are intrinsically tied to public forums that provide opportunities for deliberation.

**Simm 18** Melanie Simms, 3-23-2018, "Why workers go on strike," Conversation, https://theconversation.com/why-workers-go-on-strike-93815

Both of these demonstrate how a strike around a fairly technical employment issue can develop a momentum of its own and become a catalyst for a much wider expression of dissatisfaction about the changing bargains being made. As with the concerns raised by junior doctors about [the management of the NHS](https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/sep/01/what-you-need-to-know-about-the-junior-doctors-strike), the higher education pension dispute has rapidly become a space in which to question the [broader direction of the sector](https://theconversation.com/university-lecturer-explains-why-academics-are-striking-over-pension-cuts-93039). In this context, emotions can run high. Many relationships are strengthened, but some inevitably become strained. By definition, strikes are not business as usual. What then becomes important, is how the parties can explicitly negotiate compromises that smooth the way back to work – even if that means negotiating a new normal.

### 1AC – Underview

#### 1] Affs get 1ar theory, its key to checking infinite nc abuse that o/w on magnitude, anything else incentivizes negs to purposely read silly positions that deter from substantive engagement, its drop the debater with no rvis, and competing interps, dtd is key to rectifying abuse because the 1ar is time crunched, reasonability is arbitrary and triggers judge intervention, and rvis make affirming impossible because they can collapse for 6 minutes to an rvi on a 1ar shell, 1ar theory o/w because the 1ar is 4 minues and the 1nc is 7 so theres more abuse if im willing to dedicate that time to theory, eval the theory debate after the 1ar because we both had 1 speech to read theory which is reciprocal. No 1NC contestation of paradigm issues because I would need to win 2 things, which is irreciprocal. Evaluate theory after the 1ar is a paradigm issue because it dictates how the judge evaluates theory.

#### 2] No 2NR “I meet” arguments A] Skews theory ground because they’re each a NIB for me to winning theory which kills my ability to check abuse.

#### 3] No new 2n arguments, weighing, and paradigm issues. A] overloads the 2AR with a massive clarification burden B] it becomes impossible to check NC abuse if you can dump on reasons the shell doesn't matter in the 2nr

#### 4] Check all neg interps and K/DA links in CX – 1) avoids infinite regress due to links and interps 2) otherwise reevlaute under the neg’s K 3) norms – you’d do the same with TFW

#### 5] Reject neg counterinterpretations since aff speaks first which means they constitutively define the terms of the round, any abuse is solved for you next round which makes fairness a question of your ability to engage in the same practice, any other conception is incoherent since the rules are clearly defined before entering. No neg analytics - I don’t have time to cover 100 blippy arguments in the NC since you can read 7 min of analytics and extend any of them to win.

#### 6] The neg may not read nibs or OCIs (offensive counterinterps) a) you can up-layer for 7 minutes that I have to answer before I even have access to offense

#### 7] No neg arguments – skews me to answer those. Answering this triggers a contradiction since it relies on an analytic argument and those affirm since I spoke first and they were your fault for creating.

#### 8] The neg may not read meta-theory – I only have time to check abuse 1 time but you can do it in the NC and 2N, up-layering my attempt means we never get to the best norm. This means reject any reason why an aff spike is bad since they claim aff theory is unfair.

#### 9] The neg may not read overview answers to aff arguments – they can up-layer all aff arguments for 7 minutes and the 1ar has to shift through it all. I have a computer virus that prevents changing font size and everything’s in an overview.

#### 10] Allow new 2ar responses to nc arguments but not new 2n responses for reciprocity - the NC has 7 minutes of rebuttal time while I only have 4 minutes, the 2ar makes it 7-7.

#### 11] Theory or K indicts on spikes is drop the arg a] my theory paradigms are simply presented models for debate

#### 12] All neg interps are counter interps since the aff takes an implicit stance on every issue which means you need an rvi to become offensive. You should accept all aff interps and assume I meet neg theory since the aff speaks in the dark and I have to take a stance on something, you can at least react and adapt.

#### 13] If I win one layer, vote aff A]they have 7 minutes to uplayer and nullify my offense B] forces engagement with the aff since they have to defend all arguments which means they read better ones. C] Not saying the word pumpkin is a voter to deter future abuse– k2 celebrate Halloween which o/ws on portability because it makes us happy.

### 1AC – Advantage

#### Lack of Chinese Right to Strike devastates Collective Bargaining – undermines any legal leverage for Strikes.

Friedman 17 Eli Friedman 4-20-2017 "Collective Bargaining in China is Dead: The Situation is Excellent" <https://www.chinoiresie.info/collective-bargaining-in-china-is-dead-the-situation-is-excellent/> (Assistant Professor of International and Comparative Labour at Cornell University)//Elmer

For many years reform-oriented labour activists and scholars working in China have seen **collective bargaining** as the **cure for** the **country’s severe labour problems**. The logic underlying this was often unstated, but straightforward: collective bargaining was crucial for twentieth century labour movements in capitalist countries in giving workers a voice and creating a more equitable social distribution of wealth. With growing levels of labour unrest in China over the past twenty years, collective bargaining seemed like a logical next step. Hopeful reformers—both within the official unions as well as labour NGO activists and academics—envisioned rationalised, legalised bargaining between labour and capital as a central pillar in the construction of a more just workplace and society. The **challenges to institutionalising** a robust **collective bargaining** system **in** the People’s Republic of **China** (PRC) **have** always **been profound**. **Fundamental** to labour relations theory **is** that collective bargaining rights must be accompanied by the **right to strike** and freedom of association—**capital** **has no reason to take workers seriously without labour possessing some coercive power**. But independent unions have long been an anathema to the Communist Party. From the Lai Ruoyu debacle of the 1950s to the crushing of the Beijing Workers Autonomous Federation in 1989, the Party has made it clear time and again that independent worker organisations are forbidden. Although workers have never enjoyed the right to strike in practice, the right was formally included in the Chinese constitutions of 1975 and 1978. It **was Deng Xiaoping who removed it from the constitution just as private capital began pouring into China in the early 1980**s. Working Within the System Nonetheless, with no signs of articulated worker movements since 1989, many well-intentioned people thought it was worth trying to advance worker rights within the system. Especially from the mid 2000s on, academics (myself included) launched research projects, NGOs held training sessions, and foreign unions engaged with the All-China Federation of Trade Unions (ACFTU). Many assumed that the state would eventually decide that worker insurgency was exacting too high a cost, and that serious labour reforms were therefore necessary. And indeed, beginning in the late 2000s the ACFTU made collective negotiations (xieshang)—rather than the more antagonistic sounding ‘bargaining’ (tanpan)—a high priority, investing time and resources into expanding the coverage of collective contracts. At its best, **collective bargaining in China** **has been woefully inadequate**.

The state and the ACFTU have been very cautious about controlling workers’ aspirations, and have insisted on the fundamental harmony of interests between labour and capital. Experiments with bargaining have been almost **exclusively restricted to single enterprises**, thereby preventing workers from constituting cross-workplace ties. The overwhelming majority of collective contracts are **formulaic**: **actual bargaining rarely occurs**, and **enforcement is** largely **non-existent**. The few shining examples where employers have made real compromises during collective bargaining have followed autonomously organised wildcat strikes. The best-known case is the 2010 strike from a Honda transmission plant in Guangdong province, which resulted in major wage gains as well as an (ultimately unsuccessful) effort to reform the enterprise union. It is not coincidental that substantive worker-led bargaining is much more likely in Japanese or American firms, where the state must be cautious not to inflame patriotic sentiments. State-sanctioned economic nationalism is a shaky foundation for a robust collective bargaining system. The Death of Collective Bargaining under Xi Even these timid efforts have been smothered in recent years, as the central government has turned in a markedly anti-worker direction under Xi Jinping. There was a brief moment in 2010 when discussion about the right to strike emerged from hushed whispers into the public discourse. But this opening was ephemeral, and union reformers in Guangdong who had pushed gentle reforms in the mid-late 2000s were replaced with typical Party apparatchiks. The country’s pre-eminent centre for labour studies at Sun Yat-sen University in Guangzhou was shuttered. The academic study of employment has now been left almost entirely to business schools, as the government has stymied further expansion of labour relations programs. Labour NGOs in Guangzhou were subjected to a brutal crackdown in December 2015, with the government specifically targeting those groups that had been helping workers to engage in collective negotiations to resolve strikes. And the ACFTU has seemingly given up on advancing collective negotiations altogether. The Chairman of the ACFTU Li Jianguo does not even mention the term in his speeches anymore. Under the ‘work developments’ section of the ACFTU’s website, a lonely single report on collective contracts for the entirety of 2016 is a stark indication that the union has almost totally forsaken this agenda. Collective bargaining is not dead in the sense that it will disappear from China’s labour-capital relations. It is almost certain that official unions will continue to pursue bargaining in its current vacuous, bureaucratic, and worker-exclusionary form. Collective contracts will continue to be signed, tabulated, and then hidden from view from workers. Somewhat less pessimistically, workers will continue to force management to bargain with the collective via wildcat strikes. This latter form will still be an important means by which workers can attempt to ensure their most basic rights, and these efforts are absolutely worth supporting. But collective bargaining is dead as a political aim. It is not going to be the cornerstone of twentieth century-style class compromise in China, it is not generative of worker power, and it certainly does not herald broader social transformation. To the extent that legal bargaining does develop, it will be as a mechanism for the state to deprive workers of autonomous power. What then might Chinese workers and allied intellectuals and activists aim for? At the risk of stating the obvious, **the working class needs more power**. The question is, how to foster proletarian power in the face of a highly competent authoritarian state that views organised workers as an existential threat? In the absence of independent organisations, the only option is an intensification of already widespread worker insurgency. The more wildcat strikes, mass direct action, and worker riots, the more the state and capital will be forced to take worker grievances seriously. Of course such forms of collective action come at great risk for workers, and many have already paid a high price. In any particular case, the risks may certainly outweigh the benefits. But in the aggregate, expansive unrest is just what the working class needs. With the institutions firmly oriented towards advancing the inter-related goals of state domination and exploitation by capital, disruption on a large scale is the only chance workers have of forcing change. Ungovernability will be the necessary prelude to any institutional reform worthy of the name.

#### Hong Kong – China’s exploiting lack of Strike Protection to dismantle and de-power Hong Kong’s unions.

Wang 21 Maya Wang 9-22-2021 "China Is Dismantling Hong Kong’s Unions" [https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/09/22/china-dismantling-hong-kongs-unions#](https://www.hrw.org/news/2021/09/22/china-dismantling-hong-kongs-unions) (China Senior Researcher for Human Rights Watch)//Elmer

**Chinese state** media outlets are **railing against** **groups** **they claim** are **involved in** money laundering, inciting **riots**, and supporting gangsters. They warn against “a chronic poison of society” and “a malignant tumor that must be destroyed.” The situation is so bad, the newspapers say, that it is time for the Hong Kong government to crack down. One would think they’re talking about some major crime syndicate, perhaps a terrorist group. But no: The pro-Beijing press is talking about **Hong Kong labor unions**. For 48 years the Hong Kong Professional Teachers’ Union has served 95,000 members; its members’ center is well-known for selling stationery supplies. And as with the teachers’ union, the Hong Kong Journalist Association, the Hong Kong Confederation of Trade Unions (HKCTU), and the Association of Hong Kong Nursing Staff have long and illustrious histories of defending civil liberties and workers’ rights. Often, after Beijing spotlights people in its papers, **Hong Kong police swoop** into action. **Fearing** investigation and **arrests**, many civic groups—the **teachers’ union and** now the city’s second-largest labor union, the **HKCTU**—have **opted to disband**.

International attention to Beijing’s repression in Hong Kong has focused on widely recognized figures like the charismatic young protest leader Joshua Wong or the Apple Daily tycoon Jimmy Lai. But too few outside of Hong Kong realize that **China is** also **dismantling** the city’s **unions and detaining unionists**, **a backbone of civil society. Fighting for labor rights** has always been a slog in a city known for hyper-capitalism, but doing so **now is downright perilous.** In late July, the police arrested five people from the Speech Therapist Union for “sedition” for publishing children’s books depicting cops as wolves and protesters as sheep. Prominent unionists and labor activists have been arrested and jailed for endangering national security and other vague charges. For decades, labor unionists like Lee Cheuk-yan, the former head of HKCTU, organized strikes and camped out at factories to demand that employers negotiate with their workers—acts considered rather “radical” by the public in the 1980s. Knowing that the lack of **democracy and** the **exploitation of workers are intimately linked**, the teachers’ union and the HKCTU participated in electoral politics. Lee was an elected legislator for over 20 years, until 2016. Hong Kong’s labor movement gained momentum during the 2019 protests, in which two in seven Hong Kongers participated. Citywide strikes became more broadly accepted. People from various professions—ranging from hairstylists to accountants—formed nearly 4,000 new unions. The Chinese government knows the power of grassroots organizing and doubtlessly sees the developments in Hong Kong as threatening. Nowadays, the top ranks of the Chinese Communist Party—far from its humble origins—are packed with billionaires whose family fortunes are entwined with the Party’s fate. They, like the capitalist elites they handpicked to run the city, know that empowered workers are antithetical to their political and business model. In June 2020, Beijing imposed a draconian National Security Law on Hong Kong, arresting activists, banning protests, enveloping the city with pervasive fear. To square the circle of the purported people’s proletariat repressing workers’ advocates, the authorities portray these unions and other civil society groups with the usual authoritarian trope—that they are “foreign agents” out to “destabilize Hong Kong.” Beijing-controlled unions—such as the Hong Kong Federation of Education Workers—are poised to claim the mantle of workers’ sole representatives in the city, much like their counterparts in China. The **demise of Hong Kong’s unions** is not just a loss for the territory. These unions have **long been part of** **overlapping communities of labor organizations that promote workers’ rights and democracy in China and Asia**. **With** the Chinese government also **cracking down on labor** rights **groups in mainland China**, **a valuable window is being lost** into the plight of workers amid a global supply chain heavily dependent on China-made products. Labor unions around the world can support their embattled counterparts in Hong Kong, reviving an important legacy of similar efforts from Poland to South Africa. They can press the Chinese government for the release of Hong Kong union leaders, urge their own governments to place escalating sanctions targeting Chinese and Hong Kong officials and entities responsible for the crackdown, and assist counterparts who are still able to promote labor rights in Hong Kong and mainland China.

#### Aggressive Hong Kong policy undermines China’s soft power.

Yuan 19 Li Yuan 8-20-2019 "China's Soft-Power Fail: Condemning Hong Kong's Protests" <https://archive.md/NcYnR#selection-311.0-311.7> (writes the New New World column for The New York Times, which focuses on the intersection of technology, business and politics in China and across Asia.)//Elmer

Images of masked thugs massing in Hong Kong’s streets. Unproven allegations that protesters are being led by the C.I.A. Comparisons between activists and Nazis. As protests continue to roil Hong Kong’s streets, **China’s state-led propaganda** machine has gone into overdrive **to persuade the world** **that** **radical Hong Kong protesters have put the city in peril**. Through social media and other digital arenas, English-language messages from China have painted a picture of a tiny minority of foreign-influenced ruffians intimidating a silent majority of law-and-order residents. These efforts have largely failed. They took a further blow on Monday, when Facebook and Twitter removed hundreds of accounts that they said appeared to be state-backed efforts to sow misinformation and discord in Hong Kong. Perhaps more significantly, Twitter took the further step of forbidding state-run media outlets from paying to get their tweets promoted so that they appear prominently in users’ timelines. Chinese state-run outlets like the English-language China Daily newspaper and Xinhua, the officials news agency, have used promoted tweets to put their own spin on Hong Kong’s turmoil. Instead of making China’s case, **Beijing’s** ham-handed international **efforts** **have** simply **underscored** Beijing’s inability to sway world public opinion. Call it **a failure of Chinese “soft power**”

— what the political scientist Joseph S. Nye Jr., who coined term, defined as getting others to want what you want. China wants soft power but, judging by Beijing’s propaganda, doesn’t know how to get it. The contrast has been stark. On Sunday, hundreds of thousands of peaceful demonstrators clogged the city streets to call once again for the city’s leaders to give in to their demands and to give the people greater say in a political system controlled by Beijing. The protesters — organizers put their number at 1.7 million — offered a softer narrative than the world saw the week before, when violent clashes broke out in protests at Hong Kong’s airport. Chinese state media, on the other hand, in recent days has shown images of Chinese paramilitary police across the border in the mainland engaged in crowd-clearing exercises. The Twitter account of Global Times, a nationalist tabloid controlled by the Chinese Communist Party, posted a video on Monday calling four pro-democracy Hong Kong figures “The Gang of Four,” a term that refers to the former Chinese leaders who were blamed for plunging the country into the disastrous Cultural Revolution. (The tweet has since disappeared.) Pro-China activists appeared as well in Australia, Canada and Europe in recent days, putting on less-than-wholesome displays. In Toronto on Sunday, pro-mainland protesters shouted words like “traitor” and “loser” as well as crude epithets at a crowd of Hong Kong supporters. One widely circulated video showed four flashy sports cars revving their engines with Chinese flags hoisted out their windows. “Worst ‘Fast & Furious’ movie ever,” said one person on Twitter. China’s hard power tactics may ultimately work in Hong Kong, though so far protesters appear unbowed by threats of a crackdown. And at home, where independent news sources like The New York Times are blocked, China’s propaganda push appears to be astonishingly effective. Many internet users there reacted with outrage at the images last week of a Global Times reporter who was beaten by protesters at the airport. Chinese social media is awash with the bloodied faces of police and shaky images of foreigners who state media have alleged — often wrongly — are secret protest leaders. Chinese propaganda efforts abroad are using the same tactics that they use at home. In most cases, they don’t play well. Those efforts include comparing protesters to cockroaches and some cringe-inducing anti-democracy rapping. “Who are you?/Who’s hiding behind the scenes?,” go the lyrics to a rap disseminated by the foreign arm of China Central Television, the state broadcaster. “All I see is a beautiful dream turning to nightmare.” China, since 2010 the world’s second largest economy after the United States, has been determined to build up the nation’s soft power. It envies the sort of unconscious sway that the United States enjoys simply through the pervasiveness of its economic and cultural heft. President Trump isn’t going to win any trade wars because people in China love the “Transformers” movies or watch “Game of Thrones,” but American mass media and other cultural exports increase people’s familiarity and warmth with the country’s ideals. **China** could use some of that soft power about now. Its **credibility and legitimacy are under assault** in Washington and elsewhere as China hawks rise in prominence. Under Xi Jinping, China’s top leader, China has come up with a wide range of initiatives to woo the world with its ideals and its wallet. The “**China Dream**” **envisions** a **peaceful world** in **which** **China plays a leading role**. Projects like the Belt and Road Initiative and the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank are intended to show the benefits of China’s growing wealth. “It is easy to dismiss such talk as ‘slogan diplomacy,’” wrote David Shambaugh of the George Washington University in 2015. “But Beijing nonetheless attaches great importance to it.” “We should increase China’s soft power, give a good Chinese narrative, and better communicate China’s messages to the world,” Mr. Xi said not long after he took power in 2013. In his most important media policy speech in 2016, Mr. Xi instructed the top official media organizations to learn to tell compelling Chinese stories and build flagship foreign-language media outlets with global influences. Xinhua, CCTV, Global Times and the rest have built up their presence in the United States and elsewhere. They have also taken to the very same social media outlets like Facebook and Twitter that Beijing blocks at home. Some accounts have amassed followers of over 10 million. However, the Hong Kong protests have suggested that Beijing still knows hard power much better than soft. Instead of offering a competing narrative of a Hong Kong that could prosper under Chinese rule, it has instead made itself look like a bully. Though troops haven’t crossed the border, images distributed around the world by Chinese media outlets show heavily armed personnel preparing for urban conflict. Beijing is forcing businesses, both global and local, to keep their Hong Kong employees in line or risk getting cut off from the vast Chinese market. On Sunday Beijing announced a new policy that will buff up the socialist city of Shenzhen just across the border so it can compete head-to-head with capitalist Hong Kong. Some young mainlanders are so worked up with nationalistic fervor that they are using software to bypass Chinese censors to log into Facebook, Twitter and Instagram to blast and shame those who support Hong Kong. While that may have some impact on Chinese students living abroad, it has had little impact beyond that. Contrast China’s approach with Russia. Moscow-tied groups have used social media to tremendously disruptive effect in the United States, Europe and elsewhere. But China needs to build a positive image for itself, not tear down the reputation of others. That is in part why a recent CCTV tweet, comparing Hong Kong’s protest to the Nazi rise to power in Germany in the 1930s, **undermines Beijing more than it helps**. The post quotes a rewritten version of the poem by Martin Niemöller, the church leader who opposed Hitler, which ends with, “Then they came for me — and there was no one left to speak for me.” The People’s Daily version compares the persecution of Jews, socialists and trade unionists with protesters storming Hong Kong’s main legislative building, blocking roads and attacking reporters, including an accusation that demonstrators “trampled the freedom of the press.” China risks eroding what little soft power it has should it continue down the same rhetorical path. As Mr. Nye once explained to Chinese university students, “the best propaganda is not propaganda,” because during the Information Age, “credibility is the scarcest resource.”

1. http://www.dictionary.com/browse/resolved [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. http://www.dictionary.com/browse/affirm [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
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