**1AC - Plan**

**Plan – The United Kingdom ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.**

#### That boosts union participation, solves worker liberation, and re-establishes credible Collective Bargaining in the UK

Cammaerts 15 [Bart Cammaerts is Associate Professor in the Department of Media and Communications at the LSE. He has recently written an academic article on the discursive war of position between neoliberalism and its alternatives, entitled: ‘Neoliberalism and the post-hegemonic war of position: The dialectic between invisibility and visibilities’. This article has been published in the European Journal of Communication.] September 14th, 2015, “The efforts to restrict the freedom to strike and to deny a right to strike should be resisted fiercely,” <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/politicsandpolicy/the-efforts-to-restrict-the-freedom-to-strike-and-to-deny-a-right-to-strike-should-be-resisted-fiercely/#Author> VM

The announcement of the current Tory-led government to make the anti-strike legislation in the UK **even more stringent** than it already is, is taking things even further away from **what should be a right to strike**. The right of workers to strike is in many **ways a fundamental democratic right**. It is part of the broader civic right of association and this right is the outcome of a protracted struggle between the inherently conflictual interests of workers on the one hand and employers on the other or between labour and capital to put it in Marxist terms. The withdrawal of labour, the disruption of production and even acts of sabotage are longstanding weapons of the weak, which have always been considered in varying degrees as illegitimate weapons by the capitalist state and those that represent the dominant interests in society. Despite this, industrial action as it is now called is a widespread and hugely successful protest tactic in the hands of workers. It is usually a weapon of last resort, used when negotiations to reach an amicable settlement which balance workers’ and employers’ interests have failed. Without the right to strike, the process of collective bargaining between workers and employers would **amount to mere collective ‘begging’**, as a German Labour Court once pointed out in the 1980s. However, unlike in other EU countries, a fundamental right to strike does not exist in the UK, rather a strike is considered to be an exception to normal contract and tort law (and as we know exceptions are much easier to revoke than a fundamental right). For example, English law does not suspend the labour contract (and the obligations in them) during a strike, as is the case in many other European countries. In effect, striking in the UK is in itself a breach of contract. My point here is also that the legal framework regulating (or rather dissuading) strikes in this country is already highly complex, cumbersome and very costly for the unions to organise. As a result of this, employers have ample possibilities and opportunities to stop a strike through **seeking preemptive injunctions**, which tend to be granted easily by the courts. Unions and workers are, furthermore, not immune from **legal action from employers seeking damages if they do not abide to these stringent rules**. They can even be prosecuted for it, potentially incurring criminal penalties **including imprisonment**. Unsurprisingly, a comparative study into the right to strike across the EU is quite damning for the UK: “the situation of the right to strike in the United Kingdom is the most difficult and demeaning with respect to international standards. Making the strike hostage of the employer means, it must be stated very clearly, to delete that right. It is no coincidence that among the EU countries the UK has the lowest percentage of its workforce covered by a collective agreement (only 35% of UK workers are covered by a collective agreement).” Given the stringent rules to strike, the punitive legal system and the relatively low level of union membership, strike action tends to be very low in this country compared to other EU countries (see also this blog article)}.”

#### Fundamental to any credible union power is the right to strike.

Oates 18 [Oates serves as a freelance writer at European Public Service Union who specializes in health and safety and other workplace issues as well as current affairs from a trade union perspective.] Summary of report from the European Trade Union Institute, “The right to strike in the public sector in Europe,” <https://www.epsu.org/article/right-strike-public-sector-europe>, VM

“**The right to strike is** fundamental for trade unions in underpinning their ability to organise, collectively bargain and represent their members. However, this right has **often been restricted for public service workers** and in recent years has come under attack. EPSU is very grateful to the European Trade Union Institute for coordinating the production of factsheets on 35 countries, setting out the legal provisions on the right to strike, identifying in particular specific rules affecting the public services. This provides a wealth of information to trade unionists who can now compare and contrast the legislative requirements in their country with many other countries across Europe. As the 35 country factsheets show, **there are often** considerable limitations on the right to strike in public services. Many groups of public sector workers are restricted or even banned from taking strike action. Procedural rules and requirements to provide minimum levels of essential services can also further limit their rights. There have been a number of worrying developments in recent years where governments and international institutions have attempted to undermine the right to strike. These include: In July 2018, members of the UK public and commercial services PCS union delivered the highest “yes” vote and turnout in the union’s history. However, the vote was invalid because of restrictions on public sector strike action introduced by the centre-right Conservative government in 2016. Eighty-six per cent of almost 60,000 PCS members voted in favour of action to demand a pay rise, but although representing 42% of the workforce, their number fell short of the required 50% turnout threshold.”

**1AC - Political Mistrust Advantage**

#### The pandemic has exacerbated a growing government-worker ideological war, leaving millions of workers to abuse by employers or unemployment while the government does nothing – only recognizing the right to strike and sustaining flourishing trade unions switches the tide.

Davies 21 [Ben Davies holds a Masters in History from Oxford. Some of his interests include housing, the environment, foreign policy and Chelsea Football Club.] January 18th, 2021, openDemocracy, “ The state of trade unions in the UK,” <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/can-europe-make-it/state-trade-unions-uk/> VM

“2021 will be the **most important year** for British trade unions in nearly a century. Following decades of neoliberal assaults on the power of unions, from the dismantling of sectoral collective bargaining, through to the introduction of employment tribunal fees and the 2016 Trade Union Act that introduced a 50% turnout requirement for strike ballots, many would have been sceptical of the ability of British unions to withstand a crisis on the scale of the coronavirus pandemic**. Since 1979, trade union membership in Britain** has more than halved, with secure, unionised work largely replaced by the euphemistic ‘flexible labour market’– resulting in millions working in the ‘gig economy’ in insecure, low-waged jobs, the vast majority in the private sector. Brexit can be partly viewed as a wider Conservative project aimed at **eroding the power of Britain’s trade unions**, with Westminster expending a gigatonne of political capital to claw back the ability to ‘level the playing field’, in this case by tearing up as many labour rights as possible. A plan was recently leaked which threatens to abolish the 48-hour week itself and could rob workers of the right to a weekend. In the face of these attacks, one would expect the Labour party to take up the mantle of defending workers’ rights, but Labour’s ‘New Leadership’™ are far more interested in silencing dissent from the left, which has brought them into direct conflict with several unions in recent weeks. The decision to back Boris Johnson’s Brexit deal and the inevitable assault on workers’ rights that this will entail has saddled Labour with baggage that it will take decades to deal with. Into this vacuum that many on the left would expect the party to fill, there has been a resurgence of union activity and strike action in the last year, with at least twenty major organised strikes underway at the time of writing. From Unite workers at Barnoldswick, who manned the picket line for nine weeks in the freezing cold to protect 350 jobs from being relocated overseas by Rolls-Royce, (and are currently negotiating a “landmark deal”) through to GMB workers at British Gas who are striking as we speak, trade unions are taking an active and visible lead in the struggle for job security and dignity. The ‘fire and rehire’ scheme One despicable tactic that unscrupulous employers like British Gas, British Airways and Tower Hamlets Council have been employing during the pandemic has been the “firing and rehiring” of staff on worse pay, longer hours and fewer benefits. For British Gas engineers like Paul Vowles, this has caused him anxiety, stress and sleepless nights. In the largest gas strike in 40 years, thousands of engineers with the support of GMB have refused to accept these detrimental employment terms and life-threatening conditions and are taking up the fight for security and dignity in their workplace. With an overwhelmingly hostile mainstream media unwilling to take up the cause of these workers, social media has been vital for striking workers, garnering wide visibility using hashtags like #StopTheBritishGasFire to flood Twitter with videos of solidarity. Matthew Bateman, the managing director of British Gas was thrilled that the strikes didn’t garner wider media coverage, so one can only hope that the leaked video of his laughing dismissal of the strike demonstrates the naked contempt with which he and other bosses hold their workers. As long as ‘fire and rehire’ tactics are legal, if unpopular, it is likely many employers will continue to use them and risk strike action. It goes without saying that unions must resist these measures, and Labour must fight to outlaw the practice. In the meantime, anyone looking to demonstrate practical solidarity with British Gas workers should give generously to the strike fund. Eroding protections and unemployment As well as practices like ‘fire and rehire’, millions of workers have had to endure life-threatening conditions. These include NHS staff, public transport and care home workers through to shop assistants, with many hundreds dying after being infected in the workplace. Even when told to self-isolate, many workers have been unable to do so due the woeful provision of statutory sick pay, which costs the average worker £800 over a two week period if they can’t work from home. The failure to provide decent statutory pay for those self isolating is a direct cause for the massive surge in cases in recent months — millions face the **inhumane choice** of being covid-safe or being financially secure. Unions have been **extremely vocal** in calling for an increase in statutory sick pay. Throughout the crisis, they have brought the continued lack of PPE to light. The NEU — the largest teachers’ union in the UK — organised a massive and ultimately victorious campaign earlier this month to force a characteristically late and shambolic Tory u-turn on school closures. In spite of horrific statistics showing that school children had some of the highest infection rates of any age group, and the deaths of many teachers, the government insisted that schools were in fact, safe. Shamefully, Keir Starmer refused to back the NEU until given the go-ahead by Boris Johnson, giving Starmer the dubious accolade of being one of the few Labour leaders to have been outflanked on the left by the Tories on workers’ rights. The NEU meanwhile has seen a massive surge in membership in recent weeks, with over 20,000 members having joined since the 1st January, and will likely use this enormous boost to continue their struggle against a pay freeze that is currently due to last until 2022. With nearly ten million jobs having been supported during the crisis by the furlough scheme, official unemployment figures **belie the true extent of the jobs crisis** in the UK — officially less than **7% are unemployed**. However, the major unemployment shock will come when the scheme is wound down and millions of jobs are lost. Even prior to the crisis, the ‘gig economy’ in the UK has created a subset of precariously employed workers — roughly 1 in 10 work via ‘gig economy’ platforms with irregular shifts. These workers are overwhelmingly young, with no savings or secure housing: nearly 60% of regular platform workers are aged 16 to 34. These workers, often in sectors hit hardest by the virus like hospitality have suffered disproportionately and seen their already meagre protections eroded. Into this space, unions like IWGB and UVW, founded in the last decade have risen to the challenge and secured recognition of many of their members, including outsourced cleaners and couriers as ‘employees’. This important distinction that earned many the right to sick pay, annual leave and a secure minimum wage for the first time. UVW are currently supporting SAGE care workers as well as Great Ormond Street Hospital cleaners in their struggle for a living wage and better terms. The victories won by IWGB and UVW show that **the power of union organising isn’t limited to ‘traditional’ industrialised or public sector jobs, and that as people’s patterns of work change**, new forms of union organising can support members in their struggle for decent pay and conditions.”

#### Post-Pandemic Britain is having a trust crisis – economic and social repercussions are being felt by all – aff is try-or-die

El-Bar 20 [Karim El-Bar is a dual Egyptian-British citizen with six years of journalism experience, including a year in Turkey, and a masters in Russian politics. Former Director of Strategic Communications at GEO Strategic Partners, a strategic communications company. LLB in Laws from LSE, MA Russian and Post-Soviet Studies from UCL.] “ Public trust in UK government crashes in new poll,” <https://www.aa.com.tr/en/europe/public-trust-in-uk-government-crashes-in-new-poll/1861361> VM

**“Trust in the British government** has crashed in recent weeks **according to a new poll, as British authorities announced on Monday that the total number of those who have died from coronavirus across the UK** passed 39,000**. The COVID-19 death toll in Britain is now 39,45, with 111 new deaths over the past 24 hours. Health Secretary Matt Hancock said this was the lowest figure since the lockdown began. The total number of dead also includes a further 445 deaths, in a revision of previous figures. Public trust A new poll carried out by YouGov for the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism found that trust in the government** over the course of the coronavirus pandemic has plummeted **since April. The Guardian quoted Rasmus Kleis Nielsen, the institute’s director, as saying: “I have never in** 10 years of research **in this area seen a** drop in trust **like what we have seen for the UK government** in the course of six weeks**.” Less than half, 48%, said the government was relatively trustworthy in late May, down from 67% just six weeks earlier. Trust in news organizations also slipped from 57% to 46% over the same period. “**These drops are large and significant**,” the institute said in their statement, “and much more dramatic than the significantly smaller changes around other institutions.” Delving deeper into the numbers, they said the drop in trust in the government extends across the political spectrum: the right (down 10%), the center (down 19%), and the left (down 24%). Britain is governed by the center-right Conservative Party. The new poll also found that more Brits were worried about false or misleading information about coronavirus from the UK government, reaching 38% (up 11%), and from politicians, reaching 40% (up 9%). “There has been no significant parallel change in the number of people who say they are concerned about false or misleading information about coronavirus from news organisations or other institutions,” the institute said. The poll went on to find that the number of Brits who said that the UK government was doing a good job responding to the crisis was down 21% since April, including a 25% drop for those in the political center, and 21% drop for those on the right.”**

#### Unemployment and socioeconomic inequality are the root causes of this political mistrust – empirics prove

Muro and Vidal 17 [Dr Diego Muro is Senior Lecturer (Associate Professor) in International Relations at the Centre for the Study of Terrorism and Political Violence (CSTPV) at the University of St Andrews. He previously held positions at King’s College London (2003-2009) and the Pompeu Fabra University (2009-2016). He has also been Max Weber postdoctoral fellow at the European University Institute (2008-09) and Senior Fellow at the University of Oxford (2011-12). Guillem Vidal is a postdoctoral researcher at the chair for comparative politics at the Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich, and at the Center for Civil Society Research at the WZB Berlin Social Science Center. He obtained his Ph.D. in the Department of Social and Political Sciences at the European University Institute, where he was involved in the ERC-POLCON project. With a background in economics and international relations, he has a multidisciplinary approach to his areas of interest, which span across the fields of comparative politics, politi cal economy and political sociology. “Is Unemployment the Worst Enemy of Democracy? Political Mistrust and the Economic Crisis in Southern Europe”; pg. 16-20; <https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/59773/Muro_Vidal_Political_Mistrust_post-print_version.pdf?sequence=1> As+ Recut VM

Our second hypothesis (H2) is that political mistrust may be caused by changes in macroeconomic conditions. As we observe that changes of political attitudes coincide with the worsening of the global and European crisis, and that institutional performance appears not to be strongly correlated with political mistrust, we now turn to macroeconomic variables, in particular unemployment, to see whether there is any causal relationship. This second hypothesis is in line with recent empirical research (Roth, Nowak-Lehmann & Otter 2013; Morlino and Quaranta 2014), where unemployment levels appear to be closely related to the changes in the trust towards the main political institutions since 2008 in the EU. The underlying theory behind this hypothesis holds close parallelisms with studies of ‘economic voting’. According to this punishment-reward framework, growing levels of political mistrust would be the result of citizens’ unmet expectations with the perceived macroeconomic performance. In a nutshell, higher unemployment levels would generate higher rates of political mistrust. Figures 3 and 4 illustrate the changes in trust towards the parliament, the unemployment levels for each country and the institutional performance rank, so as to provide an overall picture of each of these trends. Moreover, figure 5 illustrates those same variables conglomerated for each of the two 17 clusters. As opposed to the previous results, we find that unemployment behaves in a very similar manner to the changes in trust towards institutions, in particular from 2008 onwards. This is of course the case for the ‘debtor countries’, as little variation can be observed from the Northern European cluster. [Insert Figures 3, 4, and 5 about here] Regression analysis further supports the robustness of these results, as illustrated in Table 1. In order to account for the fixed effects of changes in unemployment on political mistrust we have controlled for other macroeconomic variables as well as institutional performance. Both clusters as well as the fixed effects from running panel data regressions indicate a strong positive impact of unemployment on mistrust towards parliament, that is, on political mistrust. Although other macroeconomic indicators such as inflation or GDP per capita also prove significant in the main regression, unemployment clearly remains the strongest indicator for both clusters. [Insert Table 1 about here] Thus our analysis produces results that corroborate existing research on the empirical correlation between unemployment and trust towards parliament. Variables that measure economic performance are significantly more relevant in describing changes towards political attitudes than perceptions of institutional performance. While it would be an oversimplification to assert that economic variables can explain mistrust without taking into account other perfectly compatible institutional performance explanations such as corruption, we observe that during the period studied unemployment is a far better predictor of mistrust. The fact that other economic indicators appear to have a smaller effect on political mistrust than unemployment suggests that citizens’ trust towards institutions is shaped on the basis of the information they receive from the national economic situation instead of ‘pocketbook evaluations’, that is, egotropic evaluations on personal finances. Confirming these results, Lewis-Beck and Stegmaiter (2007, p. 519) point out that ‘[i]n the overwhelming majority of studies, researchers have found that instead of emphasizing on personal finances, votes are much more likely to be considering the national economic situation when casting their vote’. This type of sociotropic evaluation could also serve as a framework to understand the formation of institutional trust beyond the punishment of the incumbent, especially under dire economic circumstances such as economic depressions. Although some studies have concluded that the weight of unemployment, as opposed to other macroeconomic variables, is relatively ‘modest’ (Clarke et al. 1992), our results side with scholarly literature that has found that ‘there is a major role for macroeconomic conditions in shaping confidence in democratic institutions [...] through the effects of unemployment’ (McAllister 1999, p. 189). This further suggests that unemployment becomes a key determinant of trust during economic depression or when its levels reach a certain point. To sum up, we find that sociotropic evaluations of the national economy (unemployment in particular) become the main explanatory variable of political mistrust in times of economic crisis for Southern European cases. 4. Conclusion This paper has examined the sources of political mistrust in Western Europe before and after the Great Recession. Prior to the collapse of Lehman Brothers, continental levels of mistrust were remarkably stable. After 2008, it was possible to trace an important variation between Southern and Northern clusters of EU member states. The combined effect of the Great Recession and the Eurozone’s debt crisis was especially hard-felt in the Southern periphery of the EU, which struggled with austerity measures and structural reforms in an attempt to regain competitiveness and market confidence from 2009 onwards. Europe’s internal disparity between creditor and debtor countries was due to the fact that the ‘economic crisis’ was not one and the same for everyone. Besides being a multi-level crisis of global, regional and national dimensions, the crisis was multifaceted and its impact on each country’s sovereign debt, banking system and economic growth was also different. Needless to say, country-level causes of the crisis – from housing bubbles to structural deficits – also accounted for the inner disparity. In order to explain variation in political mistrust, this paper has sided with the scholarly view that privileges short-term explanations of mistrust, as opposed to arguments that explain trust as a function of longstanding processes of political socialization. The paper rejected the so-called cultural model early on because one of the assumptions of this approach is that political attitudes change in the longterm and, as result, this approach could not account for short-term variations caused by the economic depression. Instead, the paper focused on two variants of the performance model. More specifically, the paper tested two hypotheses that connected political mistrust with either institutional performance (H1) or macroeconomic performance (H2). Another important research choice was to identify the Eurozone as a conglomerate of countries in which we could examine the role of an external shock (e.g., the Great Recession) in creating distinct clusters of countries (debtors vs. creditors) and producing different levels of political mistrust. The initial expectation of the paper was that different levels of trust (dependent variable) could be affected by the efficiency and responsiveness of political institutions to the economic crisis. We originally anticipated that effective and responsive political institutions that provided the general public with policies and goods they desired would have a positive impact on citizens’ evaluation of these institutions. Similarly, we expected governments that neglected the electorate’s preferences while insisting on fiscal austerity and structural reforms to alienate the public and implement self-defeating policies. This initial argument was both intuitive and plausible but our research findings suggested that, contrary to what political scientists may expect of an efficient principal-agent relationship, institutional performance is a less relevant independent variable than macroeconomic performance in predicting political mistrust. In the analysis we also discussed clarity of responsibility, that is, the extent to which citizens’ are able to identify the responsible agents of the economic situation and thus trust or mistrust institutions accordingly, as an intervening variable that could explain such unexpected results. The paper has shown that unemployment may be considered the worst enemy of democracy. In times of want individual citizens get first-hand experience of the economic crisis in the form of declining disposable income, lower social mobility, rising inequality and, above all, joblessness. However, it appears to be the case that individuals’ negative perception of the national economy (sociotropic evaluations) greatly affects political opinions and eventually produces a critical assessment of political institutions as ultimately responsible for the dire economic situation. The unemployment rate accurately predicts the increase of mistrust but it is unclear that a causal mechanism connects employment growth and decline of mistrust.

#### A British populist surge driven by socioeconomic insecurity and political mistrust is inevitable absent the plan—robust studies prove

[Martin Wolf (2017), Chief economics commentator at the Financial Times, London. He was awarded the CBE (Commander of the British Empire) in 2000 “for services to financial journalism”, The economic origins of the populist surge, Financial Times, 6-27-2017] //CHS PK Recut VM

Why has the appeal of populist ideas grown in western countries? Is this a temporary phenomenon? In the wake of Brexit and the election of Donald Trump, the collapse in support for established political parties in France and the rise of the Five Star Movement in Italy, not to mention the surge of authoritarian populism in central and eastern Europe, these are important questions. What, first of all, is a populist? The abiding characteristic of populism is its division of the world into a virtuous people on the one hand, and corrupt elites and threatening outsiders on the other. Populists distrust institutions, especially those that constrain the “will of the people”, such as courts, independent media, the bureaucracy and fiscal or monetary rules. Populists reject credentialed experts. They are also suspicious of free markets and free trade. Rightwing populists believe certain ethnicities are “the people” and identify foreigners as the enemy. They are economic nationalists and support traditional social values. Often they put their trust in charismatic leaders. Leftwing populists identify workers as “the people” and the rich as the enemy. They also believe in state ownership of property. Why have these sets of ideas become more potent? Ronald Inglehart of the university of Michigan and Pippa Norris of Harvard Kennedy School argue that the reaction of older and less educated white men against cultural change, including immigration, better explains the rise of populism than economic insecurity. This is part of the truth but not the whole truth. Economic and cultural phenomena are interrelated. This study considers immigration a cultural shift. Yet it can also be reasonably viewed as an economic one. More important, the study does not ask what has changed recently. The answer is the financial crisis and consequent economic shocks. These not only had huge costs. They also damaged confidence in — and so the legitimacy of — financial and policymaking elites. These emperors turned out to be naked. This, I suggest, is why Mr Trump is US president and the British chose Brexit. Cultural change and the economic decline of the working classes increased disaffection. But the financial crisis opened the door to a populist surge. To assess this, I have put together indicators of longer-term economic change and the crisis, for the G7 leading economies, plus Spain. The longer-term indicators include the loss of manufacturing jobs, the globalisation of supply chains, immigration, inequality, unemployment and labour force participation. The indicators of post-crisis developments include unemployment, fiscal austerity, real incomes per head and private sector credit (see charts). The four most adversely affected of these economies in the long term were (in order) Italy, Spain, the UK and US. Post-crisis, the most adversely affected were Spain, the US, Italy and the UK. Germany was the least affected by the crisis, with Canada and Japan close to it. It is not surprising, then, that Canada, Germany and Japan have been largely immune to the post-crisis surge in populism, while the US, UK, Italy and Spain have been less so, though the latter two have contained it relatively successfully.

#### Prosperous and flourishing British trade unions solve –

#### 1 -- Wage Boosts and Restoration of Worker-Employer Power Dynamics

Chu 18 [Ben Chu is economics editor of The Independent. In 2019 he spent a year as economics editor of BBC Newsnight. Previously he was the Independent's chief leader writer. He is also the author of ‘Chinese Whispers: Why Everything You’ve Heard About China is Wrong’, published in 2013] “Weakening of trade union power has hit workers' pay, says Bank of England chief economist Andy Haldane,” <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/news/trade-union-pay-bank-england-andy-haldane-chief-economist-a8577696.html>, VM

**“The historic decline of the role of trade unions in the UK economy** has held back British workers’ pay**, the chief economist of the Bank of England has warned. In a speech in London, Andy Haldane, who was also this week unveiled as the chair of the Government’s new Industrial Strategy Council, noted that the share of UK workers in unions has declined from half in the late 1970s to just a fifth today. He said trade union membership has been** associated with higher pay for workers **of between 10 and** 15 per cent **and that the decline of unionisation is therefore likely to have exerted** downward pressure on pay**. “Using the long-run estimates that will have lowered wage growth by around 0.75 percentage points per year over the past 30 years,** a significant effect**,” he said. Haldane added that if the decline of unionisation continued over the coming decades, so would the drag on pay. “If this trajectory were to continue the fraction of the workforce unionised would fall by a further 16 percentage points by 2030. According to our estimates,** that could suppress wage growth by over 0.25 percentage points each year**,” he said. The remarks come at the end of the worst decade for inflation-adjusted average pay in almost 200 years (described by Mr Haldane as a “lost decade”) and when the Labour Party is pledging to give trade unions a major boost in order to** “restore the balance of power in the workplace**”. John McDonnell, the shadow chancellor, told Labour’s conference last month that a future Labour government would extend union rights to part-time and temporary workers. He has also said he will roll out “sectoral collective bargaining” across the economy.”**

#### 2 -- Mitigation of Job Insecurity and Employer Abuse

TUC 17 [The Trades Union Congress is a national trade union centre, a federation of trade unions in England and Wales, representing the majority of trade unions. There are 48 affiliated unions, with a total of about 5.5 million members. The current General Secretary is Frances O'Grady.] 2017, “The Gig is Up” <https://www.tuc.org.uk/sites/default/files/the-gig-is-up.pdf> VM

**“Over three million people –** one in ten of the UK workforce **– now face** insecurity at work**. Not only do they often face uncertainty about their working hours, they also miss out on rights and protections that many of us take for granted, including being able to return to the same job after having a baby, or the right to sick pay when they cannot work. This insecurity is sometimes described as an inevitable feature of a modern economy, fuelled by new technology and a desire for more flexible ways of working. But the so-called ‘flexibility’ we outline in this report has been one-way. Employers have sought to manage the financial risk that comes from the inability to guarantee a constant demand for a product or service** by employing workers on contracts that offer flexibility for the employer, at the expense of pay and certainty for the employee**. And (as we set out in Section 1), because these contracts often come with lower pay and fewer rights and protections, the risk of being unable to work due to sickness or caring responsibilities is also transferred to working people. Technology has played a role in these developments, with online platforms offering a way for employers to break up work into smaller tasks and contract out work on a piece-rate basis. But the change in the balance of risks between workers and employers cannot simply be attributed to new technology. The jobs in which insecurity has grown most swiftly are those that have been around for centuries, such as teaching, caring or providing hospitality. And while some of today’s insecure workers may work for ‘platform’ companies like Uber or Deliveroo, many of them work in areas that use little technology. What unites the agency worker at ASOS, the care worker missing out on the minimum wage and the lecturer employed on a zerohours contract is not an app, but** the lack of rights, protection and power they experience at work.**”**

#### Aff spills over – workplace democracy offsets authoritarian populism

Spiegelaere 18 [Stan De Spiegelaere is a researcher at the European Trade Union Institute (ETUI). "An Unlikely Cure For Populism: Workplace Democracy." <https://socialeurope.eu/an-unlikely-cure-for-populism-workplace-democracy>] Recut VM

Trump in the White House, Orban in Hungary, the Law and Justice party in Poland, the AfD in Germany, Erdoğan in Turkey… It seems like the list of challenges to our democracies is becoming worryingly extensive. Time to act! And the area where one should act might surprise you: our companies. Democracy lives on values of speaking up, participating in decision making and being involved. It’s when societies think their voices and votes don’t matter, that democracies are threatened in their core. Yet, the place where we spend a good deal of our active days, companies, is quite authoritarian. Speaking up is not always values, participating in decision making not welcome and don’t even think about suggesting to vote out your management.Think about it. Our societies want us to spend about 40 hours a week in non-democratic environments, doing as we are told and at the same time be critical, voicing and engaged citizens in the remaining time. No surprise that many resolve this cognitive dissonance by retreating from political democracy altogether, with all due consequences. Democracy starts at work It’s not the first time our societies are confronted with this limbo between democracy and the capitalist organization of the firm. And many countries have found ways to at least lessen this painful spread by introducing some types of democracy in the companies: employees are given a vote. Not to choose the company management (yet), but to choose some representatives that can talk with the management on their behalf.Unions, works councils and similar institutions take democracy down to the company floors. Imperfect, sure, but they give at least a slim democratic coating **to our rather autocratic working lives. They enable workers to voice their demands, suggest changes and denounce issues without risking personal** retaliation. And by doing so**, they create an environment in which individual employees feel more comfortable to speak up too about their own work.** About how it can be improved, about when to do what. And these hands-on experiences of democracy breed a more general democratic culture. According to two recent studies, employees being involved in decision making about their work are more likely to be interested in politics, have a pro-democratic attitude, vote, sign a petition or be active in parties or action groups. And this is what democracy is all about. It’s more than just casting a vote every so often, it’s about being engaged and involved in decision making that affects you. The picture is quite clear: if we want political democracy to succeed we need citizens to have practical experiences with participation and involvement. And where better to organize this then in companies by giving people a vote on their representatives and a say in how they do their day-to-day work. Empowered employees bring emancipated citizens. No coincidence the European Trade Union Confederation aims to put this back on the policy agenda.Populism gives us a fish, workplace democracy teaches us how to fishLacking voice in the workplace, lacking hands on experiences with the (often difficult) democratic decision making, many turn to politicians promising to be their voice. “I am your voice” said Trump to working America in 2016. Similarly, the German AfD stressed to be the voice of the ‘little man’.They all promise of restoring ‘real democracy’ by being their voice on the highest level. At the same time, all these populists take measures which break the voice of workers on the company level. Trump is making it harder for unions to organize or bargain collectively. In Hungary, the Orban government has limited the right to strike and made organizing more difficult.

#### Only an unconditional right to strike is key – movements are prevalent in every sector

Pope 18 [James Gray Pope is a distinguished professor of law at Rutgers Law School and serves on the executive council of the Rutgers Council of AAUP/AFT Chapters, AFL-CIO. He can be reached at jpope@law.rutgers.edu. "Labor’s right to strike is essential." <https://www.psc-cuny.org/clarion/september-2018/labor%E2%80%99s-right-strike-essential>] Recut VM

The recent teacher strikes underscore another, equally vital function of the strike: political democracy. It is no accident that strikers often serve as midwives of democracy. Examples include Poland in the 1970s, where shipyard strikers brought down the dictatorship, and South Africa in the 1970s and 1980s, where strikers were central to the defeat of apartheid. Even in relatively democratic countries like the United States, workers often find it necessary to withhold their labor in order to offset the disproportionate power of wealthy interests and racial elites. During the 1930s, for example, it took mass strikes to overcome judicial resistance to progressive economic regulation. Today, workers confront a political system that has been warped by voter suppression, gerrymandering and the judicial protection of corporate political expenditures as “freedom of speech.” With corporate lackeys holding a majority of seats on the Supreme Court, workers may soon need strikes to clear the way for progressive legislation just as they did in the 1930s. But if the right to strike is a no-brainer, then how did Cuomo and de Blasio justify attacking it? “The premise of the Taylor Law,” said Cuomo, “is you would have chaos if certain services were not provided,” namely police, firefighters and prison guards. If that’s the premise, then why not endorse Nixon’s proposal as to teachers and most public workers, and propose exceptions for truly essential services? That’s the approach of international law, and that’s what Nixon clarified she supports. But Cuomo couldn’t explain why teachers and other non-essential personnel should be denied this basic human right. As for de Blasio, he claimed that the Taylor Law accomplishes “an important public purpose” and that “there are lots of ways for workers’ rights to be acknowledged and their voices to be heard.” What public purpose? Forcing workers to accept inadequate wages and unsafe conditions? What ways to be heard? Groveling to politicians for a raise in exchange for votes? The ban forces once-proud unions to serve as cogs in the political machines of Wall Street politicians. No sooner did Nixon endorse the right to strike than two prominent union leaders rushed to provide cover for Cuomo. Danny Donohue, president of the Civil Service Employees Association, called her “incredibly naive” and charged that “clearly, she does not have the experience needed to be governor of New York.” Evidently Cuomo, who was elected governor on a program of attacking unions and followed through with cuts to public workers’ pensions and wages, does have the requisite experience. John Samuelsen of the Transport Workers Union, which represents more than 40,000 New York City transit workers, also lashed out, saying, “I believe that she will cut and run when we shut the subway down…. As soon as her hipster Williamsburg supporters can’t take public transit to non-union Wegmans to buy their kale chips, she will call in the National Guard and the Pinkertons.”= Tough talk. Roger Toussaint, the TWU Local 100 president who led a subway strike in 2005 and was jailed for it, once tagged Samuelsen a “lapdog” for Cuomo. But “attack dog” might be more accurate in this case. Presented with a rare opportunity to trumpet workers’ most fundamental right in the glare of media attention, Samuelsen chose instead to drive a cultural wedge between traditionally minded workers and nonconformists, many of whom toil as baristas, restaurant servers and tech workers – constituencies that are fueling the anti-Trump resistance and pushing the Democratic Party to break with Wall Street. Here we see shades of former AFL-CIO President George Meany, who helped to elect a very different Richard Nixon by refusing to endorse George McGovern, one of the most consistently pro-labor candidates in US history, on the ground that he was supported by “hippies.” Samuelsen’s descent to Cuomo attack dog is inexplicable except as a response to the crushing pressures generated by the Taylor Law. He stands out from most other public-sector labor leaders not for sucking up to establishment politicians, but for minimizing it. Just two years ago, Samuelsen was one of the few major labor leaders who had the guts to endorse Bernie Sanders over Wall Street’s choice, Hillary Clinton. And when he was elected president of the New York local, it was on a promise to be more effective at mobilization and confrontation than Toussaint. Once on the job, however, he and his slate had to confront the devastating results of the strike ban. In addition to jailing Toussaint and penalizing strikers two days’ pay for each day on strike, a court had fined the union millions of dollars and stripped away its right to collect dues through payroll deductions. No wonder Samuelsen quietly redirected the union’s strategy away from striking and toward less confrontational mobilizations and political deal-making. A WAY FORWARD Any way you look at it, striking will be absolutely essential if American organized labor, now down to 11 percent of the workforce, is to revive. As AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka once warned, workers must have “their only true weapon – the right to strike,” or “organized labor in America will soon cease to exist.” Red-state teachers have shown the way, exercising their constitutional and human right to strike in defiance of “law.” Will Democrats and labor leaders celebrate their example, or will they follow Cuomo, de Blasio and the Republicans down the path of suppression?

#### British populism causes nuclear war

von der Heyden 17 [Karl von der Heyden, Co-Chairman of the American Academy in Berlin, was awarded the Duke University Medal for Distinguished Meritorious Service, recipient of The International Center in New York's Award of Excellence, M.B.A. from the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, “I Survived World War II. Nationalism Is a Path to War”, 2017, <https://time.com/4815170/wwii-nationalism-donald-trump-america-first/>] Recut VM This collective tendency to forget is not a new phenomenon. After the horrors of the Napoleonic Wars, Europe was given a new order of nation states under the Treaty of Vienna, signed in 1815. The new order lasted relatively well, surviving the revolutions of 1848 and the subsequent Crimean and Franco-Prussian wars. By the time World War I began in 1914, institutional and personal memories of the post-Napoleonic order had been weakened or forgotten. Similarly, seventy years after World War II, millions of people in the U.S. and Europe have forgotten the lessons learned from that war and from the peace that followed. Nascent nationalist and popular movements converged in Britain to produce a vote to leave the [European Union](https://time.com/4696437/european-union-future-maastricht/). Similar coalitions heavily influence the American political scene today, as they do in Poland, Hungary and even the Netherlands. White House communications that appear to realign foreign policy put in place over the last half-century are beginning to concern America’s allies. I understand why the “[America First](https://time.com/4569845/donald-trump-america-first/)” movement propagated by Donald Trump sounds patriotic to many voters, as do other movements that favor isolationism. It is natural to blame others for our failure to adjust to new technologies, to immigration and to competition from countries whose growth rates are higher than our own. But the truth is that the “America First” movement runs the risk that it could trigger a global decline in productivity. Free trade has benefitted the U.S, Europe and much of the rest of the world. Many new businesses, particularly in information technology, can now start with a global footprint on Day One instead of being confined to a local market. NATO has preserved the freedom of the Western World from Communism. It has recently become more relevant again in view of the Russia’s efforts to disrupt it. Perhaps most worrisome is the apparent cooling of relations between European NATO allies and the United States, which has compelled German Chancellor [Angela Merkel](https://time.com/4797241/angela-merkel-us-german-tensions-g7-summit/) to say, “The times when we could fully rely on others are to some extent over… We Europeans must really take our fate into our own hands.” Problems arise when we start classifying our own and other countries as “winners” or “losers.” Free trade, immigration and the treatment of refugees will never be perfect — far from it. But the alternatives of walling off people, as well as trade, are worse. Appealing to ultra-nationalist and xenophobic feelings is playing with fire. With easy access to weapons of mass destruction, the danger is greater than ever. Growing up in Germany, I saw the dangers of fascism and nationalism. I saw leaders who only made matters worse by appealing to the majority of voters who feared minorities and foreigners. Anyone who appreciates history would know better than to make even casual references to the possibility of [nuclear war](http://www.cnn.com/2017/04/18/politics/kfile-trump-north-korea-nuclear-war/index.html).

#### Tensions on the brink between Britain and Russia – populist rhetoric risks nuclear war

Ali 21 [Taz Ali; Researching and producing in-depth and data-led stories covering Norfolk, east Suffolk and east Cambridgeshire for the Eastern Daily Press, Norwich Evening News] “Belarus border crisis: UK talk of war with Russia ‘unhelpful’, says expert as Britain sends military to region,” <https://inews.co.uk/news/world/belarus-border-crisis-poland-migrants-uk-war-with-russia-britain-military-region-1300758>, VM

“Britain’s suggestion of a possible war with Russia over the **tensions in eastern Europe** is “unhelpful”, an expert has said after the UK warned the military needed to be prepared for conflict. “It’s easy for both Russia and the UK/US to fall to Cold War rhetoric. A lot of it is posturing,” Eleanor Bindman, senior lecturer in eastern European politics at Manchester Metropolitan University, told i. Ukraine has said nearly 100,000 Russian soldiers have amassed near its border, with US intelligence sources telling their European counterparts that there could be another invasion similar to Russia’s annexation of Crimea in 2014. The head of the UK’s Armed Forces, General Sir Nick Carter, warned the military will have to be ready for war with Russia, which he said was using the escalating migrant crisis on the Belarus-Poland border as a distraction. “We have to be on our guard and make sure deterrence prevails, but critically we have to make sure there is unity in the Nato alliance and that we don’t allow any gaps to occur in our collective position,” Sir Nick told the BBC’s The Andrew Marr Show. He said that migrants at the Polish-Belarusian border were being pushed by Minsk “on to European Union borders” in an attempt to destabilise the region, in a tactic that was straight out of the “Russian playbook”. There was now a greater risk of accidental conflict breaking out with Russia than at any time since the Cold War, he added.”

### Fw

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### Prefer it:

#### 1] Actor specificity:

#### A] Aggregation – every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### B] No act-omission distinction – choosing to omit is an act itself – governments decide not to act which means being presented with the aff creates a choice between two actions, neither of which is an omission

#### C] No intent-foresight distinction – If we foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen

#### 2] Lexical pre-requisite: threats to bodily security preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibits the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose

#### 3] Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet up for lunch, that is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital. Only the consequences of breaking the promise explain why the second one is much worse than the first. Intuitions outweigh—they’re the foundational basis for any argument and theories that contradict our intuitions are most likely false even if we can’t deductively determine why.

#### 4] Phenomenal introspection --- it’s the most epistemically reliable --- historical moral disagreement over internal conceptions of morality such as questions of race, gender, class, religion, etc prove the fallibility of non-observational based ethics --- introspection means we value happiness because we can determine that we each value it --- just as I can observe a lemon’s yellowness, we can make those judgements about happiness.