# AFF

#### I affirm the resolution, Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### Definition of unconditional right to strike:

**NLRB 85** [National Labor Relations Board; “Legislative History of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947: Volume 1,” Jan 1985; <https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=7o1tA__v4xwC&rdid=book-7o1tA__v4xwC&rdot=1>]

\*\*Edited for gendered language

As for the so-called absolute or **unconditional** right to strike—there are no absolute rights that do not have their **corresponding** **responsibilities**. Under our American Anglo-Saxon system, each individual is **entitled** to the maximum of freedom, provided however (and this provision is of first importance), his [their] freedom has **due** **regard** for the **rights** and **freedoms** of **others**. The very **safeguard** of our freedoms is the recognition of this fundamental principle

### Framework

#### Pleasure is an intrinsic good.

**Moen ’16** – (Ole Martin, PhD, Research Fellow in Philosophy @ University of Oslo, "An Argument for Hedonism." Journal of Value Inquiry 50.2 (2016): 267). Modified for glang

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues**.** This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels,** and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative. 2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good. 3 As Aristotle observes: “**We never ask what her**~~is~~ **end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.**”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value. Although pleasure and pain thus seem to be good candidates for intrinsic value and disvalue, several objections have been raised against this suggestion: (1) that pleasure and pain have instrumental but not intrinsic value/disvalue; (2) that pleasure and pain gain their value/disvalue derivatively, in virtue of satisfying/frustrating our desires; (3) that there is a subset of pleasures that are not intrinsically valuable (so-called “evil pleasures”) and a subset of pains that are not intrinsically disvaluable (so-called “noble pains”), and (4) that pain asymbolia, masochism, and practices such as wiggling a loose tooth render it implausible that pain is intrinsically disvaluable. I shall argue that these objections fail.

**And, consequentialism is true—**

**A] All actions are forward-looking, so intentions are constituted by foreseen consequences. If I throw my hand towards your face, I intend to punch you.**

**B] Moral substitutability—if I ought to mow the lawn, then I ought to turn on the lawnmower. Thus, an obligation requires all of its necessary enablers.**

**Thus, the standard is *maximizing pleasure and minimizing pain*. Prefer—**

**1 – Death first –agents can’t deliberate on ethics if they fear for their bodily security – this proves my offense turns and outweighs theirs.** **2 – A just government refers to one that acts utilitarian meaning that a util- framework is key to understand the perspective of the actor in the res  
MVO 18’** What does a just government mean? [https://www.mvorganizing.org/what-does-a-just-government-mean/]

**A just government is fair to ALL people that it governs**. This includes not only the governed, but also the governors. Subjecting the governors **to** the same laws as the governed will help to **ensure that no one group’s interests are served at the expense of others**.

## Contention 1: Climate

#### Climate strike participants get arrested now.

**Scanlan 19** [Quinn. Quinn Scanlan. Voting, campaigns & elections for [@ABC](https://twitter.com/ABC). “Jane Fonda arrested in climate change strike outside Capitol”. 10-11-2019. ABC News. https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/jane-fonda-arrested-climate-change-strike-capitol/story?id=66209415.]

**Academy Award winning actress Jane Fonda, 81, was arrested by police with a group of about a dozen protesters Friday after being warned repeatedly to leave the steps of the U.S. Capitol.** Inspired by youth climate activists like Sweden's Greta Thunberg, 16, who herself recently came to Washington to [testify in front of Congress](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/greta-thunberg-teen-climate-activist-tells-us-lawmakers/story?id=65692288), Fonda, who, throughout her long career, has engaged in activism, dating as far back as the Vietnam War, recently told ABC News that while she's in the nation's capital, every Friday, she'll attend "Fire Drill Friday," a weekly event featuring scientists, celebrities and activists addressing the various facets and impacts of climate change. **The event title is a play on Thunberg saying during a speech at the World Economic Forum's annual meeting in Davos, Switzerland in January, "I want you to act as if our house is on fire. Because it is." "11 o'clock every Friday morning come get arrested with me or choose not to it doesn't matter," told ABC News in an earlier interview about her planned effort.**  Fonda said she decided to leave her home, and comfort zone, through the holidays, and move to Washington for four months, because she wanted to "make a commitment to" the issue of climate change. In an interview with ABC News Deputy Political director MaryAlice Parks for an episode of of ABC News Live's "The Briefing Room," Fonda said that while they bear no blame for causing it, the [kids are leading the charge](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/teenage-climate-change-activist-greta-thunbeerg-takes-global/story?id=65601228) on fighting climate change. "They're saying, 'Come on, you know, you're taking our future away from us. We need -- we need you to support us.' And so grandmas unite," she said. "I want to stand with them and raise up... their message. This is -- this is serious... This is a crisis unlike anything that has ever faced humankind." Stressing she was not being hyperbolic, Fonda said this is the "one issue" that matters because it "will [determine the survival of our species](https://abcnews.go.com/International/united-nations-report-details-looming-climate-crisis/story?id=58354235)," and said that's why she'll be attending Fire Drill Fridays weekly. David Swanson/AP, FILE *Actress and activist Jane Fonda talks to a crowd of protestors during a global climate rall...Read More* "I think every single human being has to say, 'What can I do to put this at the forefront?'" she said. "(With) everything that's going on in the news, well, we have to fight our way through that and find ways to get climate change in people's minds." **The esteemed actress pushed back against criticism that Hollywood's presence could make climate change a more polarizing issue.** "What we're facing is so important and so urgent, it doesn't matter. Those -- those things don't even matter," she told Parks. "This is the future. This is whether we're going to survive." **Fonda also said that the United States needs "to lead the way" on this issue, so that other countries who contribute heavily to greenhouse gas emissions, like China and India, "follow suit." While she's been passionate about this issue for "decades," she credits her current endeavors on** [**Thunberg's recurring protest**](https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/teenage-climate-change-activist-greta-thunbeerg-takes-global/story?id=65601228) **outside Swedish parliament, and other student climate strikers around the world for taking on this issue so passionately.**

#### Strikes incentivize companies to take climate action seriously.

**Ivanova 19** [Irin. Work, tech, climate and data for [@CBSNews](https://twitter.com/CBSNews). Priors: [@HuffPost](https://twitter.com/HuffPost), [@CrainsNewYork](https://twitter.com/CrainsNewYork), [@newmarkjschool](https://twitter.com/newmarkjschool). “These businesses are closing for Friday's climate strike”. 9-20-2019. No Publication. https://www.cbsnews.com/news/global-climate-strike-businesses-close-their-doors-in-time-for-climate-strike-2019/.]

**Thousands of people are planning to walk out of work or school on Friday to press global leaders for solutions to rapidly escalating climate change. And while it was students who started the movement, more and more workers—and even companies—are joining them in support.** Some businesses are letting workers take the day off to protest, while others plan to close their doors outright. They tend to be small or mid-sized businesses — most of the country's largest corporations have yet to weigh in on the strike, although plenty of people who work at them might yet participate when walkouts are set to start Friday afternoon. Here are the ways workers and companies are supporting the strike. **Walkouts Amazon is expected to see more than 1,500 employees walk out, with the largest contingent exiting its Seattle headquarters, as they push the company to cut ties with fossil-fuel companies and stop funding groups that deny climate science. The company on Thursday announced it would make its operations carbon-neutral by 2040 and run entirely on renewable energy within a decade.** More than 900 **Google** workers and unknown numbers of workers from **Facebook, Atlassian, Cobot, Ecosia, Microsoft** and **Twitter** are vowing walkouts. The strikers have details at [Tech Workers Coalition.](https://techworkerscoalition.org/climate-strike/) Some smaller companies are giving workers paid time off to participate in the walkouts. These include **Atlassian, Sustain Natural, Grove Collaborative** and others. **Closures Ben & Jerry's corporate offices in South Burlington, Vermont, will be closed during the strike** on Friday, while shops worldwide will either be closed or open later than usual. The company is also stopping production at its manufacturing plants in Vermont and the Netherlands, according to [Adweek](https://www.adweek.com/brand-marketing/brands-are-closing-their-doors-in-support-of-the-global-climate-strike/). **"We recognize that climate change is an existential threat to our planet and all its inhabitants, and therefore we are proud standing with the youth-led movement demanding bold action in response to the climate emergency," a spokesperson said.** **Patagonia** is closing its retail stores for 24 hours on Friday. "For decades, many corporations have single-mindedly pursued profits at the expense of everything else — employees, communities and the air, land and water we all share," CEO Rose Marcario wrote on [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/enough-join-climate-strikes-demand-action-rose-marcario/?sf219300827=1). "[C]apitalism needs to evolve if humanity is going to survive." **Lush Cosmetics will close its manufacturing facilities and retail outlets on September 20 in the U.S. and on September 27 in Canada.** It's also halting online sales on Friday. **Badger Balm** is closing for the day and giving workers paid time off to demonstrate or volunteer. The company is also donating 5% of online sales from September 16 to 27 to AmazonWatch.org to aid in preserving the shrinking Amazon's ecological systems, it said. **Burton**, the outdoor retailer, is closing its offices and owned retail stores on September 20th or 27th (depending on their country of location). It also won't make any online sales for 24 hours on Friday. **SodaStream**, the seltzer maker owned by PepsiCo, is shuttering its headquarters and closing e-commerce on Friday. **Digital doings and more The heart of the strike will be in the streets, but that doesn't mean the action stops there. More than 7,000** [**companies**](https://digital.globalclimatestrike.net/) **have pledged to draw attention to the protest by either donating ad space or putting banners on their sites.** Participants include **Tumblr, WordPress, Imgur, Kickstarter, BitTorrent,** **Tor, BoingBoing**, **Greenpeace, Change.org**, among many others.

#### Companies’ influence is the key internal link to passing important Climate Policy while also boosting the economy WRL 19’ [WRI develops practical solutions that improve people’s lives and protect nature. Our more than 1,200 staff have deep expertise in policy, research, data analysis, economics, political dynamics and more. We work with partners in more than 50 countries and currently have offices in 12 countries: Brazil, China, Colombia, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico, the Netherlands, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. https://www.wri.org/insights/3-ways-business-must-use-political-influence-champion-climate-ambition] Reducing your "carbon footprint" may have qualified your company as a leader on climate change 10 years ago. But today you must do more than that. The definition of leadership has changed—and it increasingly includes responsible, proactive lobbying for climate action that reduces emissions. More than 500 companies have committed to emissions reductions targets based in science, and more than 150 have committed to powering their operations entirely with renewable energy by 2030. Businesses are disclosing their emissions and evaluating their supply chains for climate risks. But checking even these boxes won't be enough to be considered a corporate leader on climate in 2019, and it certainly won't be enough to stop a changing climate's worst impacts. A new report from EDF highlights how most corporate climate leadership rankings overlook policy advocacy, and argues that this is a huge "blind spot" for any true measure of a company's contribution to climate change solutions. They are correct. Companies can and must reduce emissions, but only public policy can elevate these efforts to the scale and pace of emissions reductions needed to mitigate climate change. The political influence of climate-forward businesses with long histories of successful lobbying on other industry-specific issues can lend climate policies the credibility they need to achieve lasting impact. For aspiring firms looking to start real impact at the state and national level, here are 3 important starting points for responsible climate policy advocacy. This is your 2019 corporate climate lobbying checklist: 1. Share Your "Climate Story" Companies have an authentic and credible perspective to share on the long-term threat from climate change to their operations. This perspective is your climate story; crafting an honest, persuasive one is the first step in engaging elected officials. Corporate government affairs teams need to know and show how climate connects to the company's interest areas. Climate change poses real business risks that affect the economy, jobs and the private sector's ability to provide goods and services. The person who knows the company's climate story best and the person who relays it to policymakers may not be the same. Do those who interface with policymakers in your company know what your firm is doing on climate? When sustainability and policy don't interact internally, the result is that most businesses are not getting the credit they deserve for their science-based targets and emissions reduction measures within the halls of government or having influence. When companies can share their "climate story" using data points and anecdotes, it gives policymakers the credibility and confidence to then go and advocate for ambitious policy. When elected officials can be informed by business, it gives them the confidence to speak to climate issues with authority. 2. Meet Policymakers "Where They Are" Most of us want a safe, stable climate, but engaging policymakers while lobbying isn't a conversation that starts with "I want." Government Affairs staff know this, but sustainability practitioners helping to draft talking points for interaction with policymakers may not. Recognizing that elected officials represent constituents with certain needs is an important baseline for drawing a Venn diagram between what responsible business wants and what policymakers want. Understand the local context in order to make compelling cases about whatever your issue is, whether that's procuring renewable energy or buying fleets of electric vehicles. Tailor your advocacy to issues at the core of a district or state's interests, and you are more likely to generate buy-in from elected officials. 3. Push Government to Be Bolder When businesses advocate for climate ambition and send governments clear signals of commitment, this enables governments to be bolder in their own commitments. Likewise, when government sends the private sector clear, long-term signals about climate policy, business can act with the confidence it needs to make low-carbon investments. The Ambition Loop, a paper produced by WRI with We Mean Business and the UN Global Compact, highlights instances where business and government have sent one another these clear signals, which created the enabling conditions for more confident climate action. A few market leaders have begun to harness their influence and engage in thoughtful climate advocacy. Danone North America, Nestle USA, Unilever United States and Mars, Incorporated formed the Sustainable Food Policy Alliance to advocate for public policy in the United States in five key areas, one of which is the environment and climate change. The group focuses on communicating to policymakers their support of policies such as putting a price on carbon, and recently released a set of principles advocating for ambitious action on climate. Time to Lobby Firms on the leading edge must harness their political influence and recognize that climate policy is urgently needed to protect their customers, employees, suppliers and their own business interests. The Global Commission on the Economy and Climate found that bold climate action could deliver at least $26 trillion in economic benefits and generate over 65 million new low-carbon jobs in 2030. One of the most compelling narratives a business can tell comes from the private sector harnessing the potential trillions in economic growth to be had when they do well by doing good. The pressure is on companies to put their lobbying where their climate leadership is, with investors, NGOs, and US consumers increasingly expecting companies to act. Policymakers will need to listen, but companies first must step up with authentic, credible narratives and demonstrate that they are willing to spend their political capital to further climate objectives.

#### Marginalized Groups are Disproportionately Affected by Climate Change Yip 21 Why Marginalized Groups are Disproportionately Affected by Climate Change<https://earth.org/marginalised-groups-are-disproportionately-affected-by-climate-change/>

**Environmental racism refers to the injustices suffered by marginalized communities in terms of unequal distribution of environmental resources and hazards, and discrimination in environmental support and policy-making.** In essence, the burdens of pollution, natural disasters, and poisoned resources are distributed unequally in society, with marginalised communities being hit disproportionately harder.When it comes to severing climate change, this means that racial minorities will be bearing the brunt of the environmental impacts. One such case of environmental racism can be observed **in the United States**, where **people of color suffer from a multitude of environmental injustices. In the US, air pollution is distributed unevenly among the different racial groups, with people of color being hit the hardest**. An important ratio to consider when assessing the distribution of adverse impacts of pollution is the ratio of how much pollution one is responsible for relative to how much pollution one is exposed to. **Scientists have found that Hispanics and African-Americans breathe in** [**63% and 56%**](https://apnews.com/article/f6bf2f47c81c4958811dc4e99d526197) **more pollution than they make respectively. On the other hand, Caucasians are exposed to 17% less air pollution than they make. This means that relative to their contribution to pollution, people of color in the US are disproportionately exposed to pollutants.** Across the country, people of colour on average are also exposed to [far higher levels of air pollutants](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/people-of-color-breathe-more-unhealthy-air-from-nearly-all-polluting-sources/) (PM2.5), regardless of region or household income. In short, people of colour in the United States are disproportionately impacted by an increasingly polluted climate, both in relative and absolute terms. **Inequality also exists on the global scale, where there exist large disparities in emissions and climate impacts from country to country.** There is a large asymmetry when it comes to the proportion of CO2 emissions from region to region. For example, **North America is home to only 5% of the world’s population, but it emits 18% of the world’s total CO2. Conversely, Africa is home to 16% of the world’s population, but emits only 4% of total CO2**. In other words, different continents hold different amounts of responsibility when it comes to climate change, and some regions should bear more of the blame. Moreover, in terms of aggregate income, **86% of global CO2 emissions are emitted by the richest half of countries in the world, whilst the bottom half only emits 14%.** This inequality in global emissions renders the issue of international climate change responsibility very delicate and contentious. In light of this, the countries hit hardest by climate change are coincidentally the countries with less relative responsibility for climate change. **For example, the Philippines** consists of 1.41% of the total world population, but it only **produces** [**0.35% of total world’s emissions of CO2**](https://www.worldometers.info/co2-emissions/philippines-co2-emissions/)**. Yet, it has been hit disproportionately hard from climate change; every year it suffers numerous casualties and damage from typhoons, floods, and landslides of increasing frequency and intensity.**

#### Climate Change leads to extinction

**Spratt and Dunlop, 19** David Spratt is a Research Director for Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, Melbourne, and co-author of Climate Code Red: The case for emergency action. Ian T. Dunlop is a member of the Club of Rome. Formerly an international oil, gas and coal industry executive, chairman of the Australian Coal Association, chief executive of the Australian Institute of Company Directors, and chair of the Australian Greenhouse Office Experts Group on Emissions Trading 1998-2000. “Existential climate-related security risk: A Scenario Approach” Breakthrough - National Centre for Climate Restoration May 2019 https://docs.wixstatic.com/ugd/148cb0\_b2c0c79dc4344b279bcf2365336ff23b.pdf   
  
An existential risk to civilisation is one posing permanent large negative consequences to humanity which may never be undone, either annihilating intelligent life or permanently and drastically curtailing its potential. With the commitments by nations to the 2015 Paris Agreement, the current path of warming is 3°C or more by 2100. But this figure does not include “long-term” carbon-cycle feedbacks, which are materially relevant now and in the near future due to the unprecedented rate at which human activity is perturbing the climate system. Taking these into account, the Paris path would lead to around 5°C of warming by 2100. 7 Scientists warn that warming of 4°C is incompatible with an organised global community, is devastating to the majority of ecosystems, and has a high probability of not being stable. The World Bank says it may be “beyond adaptation”. But an existential threat may 8 also exist for many peoples and regions at a significantly lower level of warming. In 2017, 3°C of warming was categorised as “catastrophic” with a warning that, on a path of unchecked emissions, low-probability, high-impact warming could be catastrophic by 2050. 9 The Emeritus Director of the Potsdam Institute, Prof. Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, warns that “climate change is now reaching the end-game, where very soon humanity must choose between taking unprecedented action, or accepting that it has been left too late and bear the consequences.” He says 10 that if we continue down the present path “there is a very big risk that we will just end our civilization. The human species will survive somehow but we will destroy almost everything we have built up over the last two thousand years.” 11

## Contention 2: Econ

#### Strikes spill-over to broader support of the labor movement and unions – every strike encourages more strikes

**Hertel-Fernandez et al. 20** [Alexander Hertel-Fernandez, associate professor of public affairs at Columbia University, where he studies American political economy, with a focus on the politics of business, labor, wealthy donors, and policy, Suresh Naidu, professor of economics and public affairs at Columbia University, where he researches economic effects of political transitions, the economic history of slavery and labor institutions, international migration, and economic applications of natural language processing, and Adam Reich, associate professor of sociology at Columbia University, where he studies economic and cultural sociology, especially how people make sense of their economic activities and economic positions within organizations, 2020, “Schooled by Strikes? The Effects of Large-Scale Labor Unrest on Mass Attitudes toward the Labor Movement,” American Political Science Association, https://sci-hub.se/https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592720001279]/Kankee

Strikes and Labor Power in an Era of Union Decline We examined the political consequences of large-scale teacher strikes, studying how firsthand exposure changed mass **attitudes** and public preferences. Across a range of specifications and approaches, we find that increased exposure to the strikes led to **greater support** for the walkouts, more support for legal rights for teachers and unions, and, especially, greater personal interest in labor action at people’s own jobs, though not necessarily through traditional unions. Returning to the theoretical expectations we outlined earlier, the teacher strikes appear to have changed the ways that parents think about the labor movement, generating greater public support. The results regarding workers’ interest in undertaking labor action in their own jobs also suggests **evidence** in favor of the public inspiration and imitation hypothesis, underscoring the role that social movements and mobilizations can play in **teach**ing noninvolved members about the movement and tactics. Still, an important caveat to these findings is that strike-exposed parents were not more likely to say that they would vote for a traditional union at their jobs, possibly reflecting the fact that the strikes emphasized individual teachers and not necessarily teacher unions as organizations either in schools or in parents’ own workplaces. Further research might explore this difference, together with the fact that we find somewhat stronger evidence in favor of the imitation hypothesis (i.e., support for labor action at one’s own work) than for the public support hypothesis (i.e., support for the striking teachers). Before we discuss the broader implications of our findings for the understanding of the labor movement, we briefly review and address several caveats to the interpretation of our results. One concern is whether the results we identify from a single survey can speak to enduring changes in public opinion about the strikes and unions. Given the timing of the teacher strikes in the first half of 2018, our respondents were reflecting on events that happened 7–12 months in the past. We therefore think that our results represent more durable changes in opinion as a result of the strikes, in line with other studies of historical mobilizations and long-term changes in attitudes (Mazumder 2018). The AFL-CIO time-series polling data, moreover, further suggest that there were increases in aggregate public support for unions in the strike states after the strikes occurred. Nevertheless, follow-up studies should examine how opinion toward, and interest in, unions evolve in the mass teacher strike states, and it would be especially interesting to understand whether unions have begun capitalizing on the interest in the labor movement that the strikes generated. We also note that, despite the large sample size of our original survey, we still lack sufficient statistical power to fully explore the effects of the strikes on all of our survey outcomes. Future studies ought to consider alternative designs with the power to probe the individual outcomes that were not considered in this study. Another question is how to generalize from our results to other strikes and labor actions. Although it is beyond the scope of this article to develop and test a more general theory of strike action, there are factors that suggest that the teacher strikes we study here represent a hard test for building public support. The affected states had relatively weak public sector labor movements, meaning that few individuals had personal connections to unions; most were also generally conservative and Republican leaning, further potentially reducing the receptivity of the public to the teachers’ demands. And lastly, the type of work we study —teaching—involves close interaction with a very sympathetic constituency: children and their parents. This should make strike disruptions more controversial and increase the likelihood of political backlash (and indeed, we do find that the strikes were less persuasive for parents who may have lacked access to childcare). Nevertheless, additional factors may have strengthened the effects of the strikes; namely, that education spending in the strike and walkout states had dropped so precipitously since the Great Recession, giving teachers the opportunity to connect their demands to broader public goods. Considering these factors together, we feel comfortable arguing that strikes are likely to be successful in other contexts where involved employees can successfully leverage close connections to the clients and customers they serve and connect their grievances to the interests of the broader community. This is likely to be especially true in cases where individuals feel they are not receiving the level of quality service they deserve from businesses or governments. The flip side of our argument is that strikes are less likely to be successful—and may produce backlash—when the mass public views striking workers’ demands as illegitimate or opposed to their own interests or when individuals are especially inconvenienced by labor action and do not have readily available alternatives (such as lacking childcare during school strikes). This suggests that teachers’ unions’ provision of meals and childcare to parents (as happened in a number of the recent strikes) is a particularly important tactic to avoid public backlash. In addition, our results suggest that future strikes on their own are unlikely to change public opinion if all they do is to provide information about workers’ grievances or disrupt work routines. Our exploratory analysis of the mechanisms driving our results suggests that it was not necessarily information about poor school quality or the strikes themselves that changed parents’ minds, but perhaps the fact that the teachers were discussing the public goods they were seeking for the broader community. We anticipate that strikes or walkouts that adopt a similar strategy—similar to the notion of “bargaining for the common good”—would be most likely to register effects like ours in the future (McCartin 2016). Notably, that is exactly the strategy deployed by teachers in Los Angeles, who spent several years building ties to community members and explaining the broader benefits that a stronger union could offer to their community in the run-up to a strike in early 2019 (Caputo-Pearl and McAlevey 2019). In all, our results complement a long line of work arguing for the primacy of the strike as a tactic for labor influence (e.g. Burns 2011; Rosenfeld 2006; Rubin 1986). Although this literature generally has focused on the economic consequences of strikes, we have shown that strikes can also have significant effects on public opinion. Even though private sector strikes have long sought to amass public support, public-facing strikes are even more important for public sector labor unions, given their structure of production and the fact that their“managers”are ultimately elected officials. But how should we view strikes relative to the other strategies that public sector unions might deploy in politics, such as campaign contributions, inside lobbying, or mobilization of their members (cf. DiSalvo 2015; Moe 2011)? Given the large cost of mass strikes in terms of time and grassroots organizing, we expect that public sector unions will be most likely to turn to public-facing strikes (like the 2018 teacher walkouts) when these other lower-cost inside strategies are unsuccessful and when their demands are popular in the mass public. Under these circumstances, government unions have every reason to broaden the scope of conflict to include the mass public (cf. Schattschneider 1960). But when unions can deploy less costly activities (like simply having a lobbyist meet with lawmakers) or when they are pursuing demands that are more controversial with the public, we suspect that unions will opt for less public-facing strategies (on the logic of inside versus outside lobbying more generally, see, for example, Kollman 1998). Indeed, our results complement work by Terry Moe and Sarah Anzia describing how teacher unions work through low-salience and low-visibility strategies, such as capturing school boards, pension boards, or education bureaucracies, when they are pushing policies that tend not to be supported by the public (Anzia 2013; Anzia and Moe 2015; Moe 2011). Our results yield a final implication for thinking about the historical development of the labor smovement: they suggest that the decline of strikes we tracked in Figure 1 may form a vicious cycle for the long-term political power of labor. As we have documented, strikes seem to be an important way that people form opinions about unions and develop interest in labor action. As both strikes and union membership have declined precipitously over the past decades, few members of the public have had opportunities to gain firsthand knowledge and interest in unions. Moreover, strikes appear to foster greater interest in further strikes, feeding on one another. If unions are to regain any economic or political clout in the coming years, our study suggests that the strike **must** be a **central strategy** of the labor movement.

#### Wages are key to the economy—Leads to increased productivity growth due to more demand.

**Manyika et al 18** (Manyika is San Francisco-based director of the McKinsey Global Institute. Jan Mischke is senior fellow at the McKinsey Global Institute based in Zurich, 2/21/2018, “The U.S. Economy Is Suffering from Low Demand. Higher Wages Would Help”, Harvard Business Review, AJ)

After a year-long analysis of seven developed countries and six sectors, we have concluded that demand matters for productivity growth and that increasing demand is key to restarting growth across advanced economies. The impact of demand on productivity growth is often underappreciated. Looking closer at the period following the financial crisis, 2010 to 2014, we find that weak demand played a key role in the recent productivity growth decline to historic lows. In fact, about half of the slowdown in productivity growth — from an average of 2.4% in the United States and Western Europe in 2000 to 2004 to 0.5% a decade later — was due to weak demand and uncertainty. For example, in the mid-1990s to the mid-2000s, rising consumer purchasing power boosted productivity growth in both the retail and the auto sector, by encouraging a shift to higher-value goods that can be supplied at higher productivity levels. In the auto sector, as customers in the early 2000s purchased higher value-added SUVs and premium vehicles in both the United States and Germany, they spurred incremental productivity growth of 0.4 to 0.5 percentage points. Today, that trend has slowed slightly in both countries, contributing only 0.3 percentage points to productivity growth in the period 2010 to 2014. Similarly, in retail, we estimate that consumers shifting to higher-value goods, for example higher-value wines or premium yogurts, contributed 45% to the 1995-2000 retail productivity acceleration in the United States. This subsequently waned, dragging down productivity growth. To put it simply, **when consumers have more to spend, they buy more sophisticated things**. That’s good not just for consumers and producers, but for the overall economy, because making more sophisticated, higher-value things makes everyone involve more productive, and therefore helps increase overall standards of living. In addition, we found two other ways weak demand hurt productivity growth in the aftermath of the financial crisis: a reduction in economies of scale and weak investment. First, the economies of scale effect. In finance, productivity growth declined particularly in the United States, United Kingdom, and Spain due to contractions in lending volumes that banks were unable to fully offset with staff cuts due to the need for fixed labor (for example to support branch networks and IT infrastructure or to deal with existing loans and bad debt). The utilities sector, which has seen flattening demand growth due to both energy efficiency policies as well as a decline in economic activity during the crisis, was similarly not able to downsize labor due to the need for labor to support electricity distribution and the grid infrastructure, and here, too, productivity growth fell. Second, the effect of weak investment. We have found from our global surveys of businesses that almost half of companies that are increasing their investment budgets are doing so because of an increase in demand. Demand is the single most important factor driving corporate investment decisions. Investment, in turn, is critical for productivity growth, as it equips workers with more – and with more recent and innovative – equipment, software, and structures. But we have seen capital intensity growth fall to the lowest levels in post-WWII history. **Weaker demand leads to weaker investment and creates a vicious cycle for productivity and income growth.**

#### Reviving unions revives the economy

**Hindrey 20** [Leo Hindrey Jr., columnist for Fortune, 10-19-2020, "Commentary: Why stronger labor unions would speed up America's post-COVID recovery," https://fortune.com/2020/10/19/labor-unions-covid-19-economic-recovery/]/Kankee

Recessions always inflict the most pain on Americans in the middle and lower end of the income distribution range, destroying jobs, eroding wages and wiping out savings for those working in industries such as construction, manufacturing, hospitality and retail. But the crushing economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic have reached levels unseen in the last four decades, and the long-term scarring will be severe without intervention from Congress – not just in the form of emergency relief, but also with targeted policy solutions. One solution lawmakers should prioritize is a historic workers’ rights proposal, given that defanged labor protections are a large part of the reason the downturn has been so devastating to those who can least afford it. We need to bring back fairness to an economy that is increasingly **plagued** by a fundamental **imbalance of power** between workers and employers. And at a time when our nation is engaged in a vital conversation about economic justice, we need to make union membership a **civil** **right**. When the pandemic struck, only about one in ten workers were unionized, a steep decline from the nearly one-third of workers who were members of a union in 1964, myself among them. As a result, millions of Americans—many of them essential workers—were left without a voice at the table when employers were deciding their fate. They had no ability to **minimize layoffs** or to define what paid sick leave would look like during the pandemic. The consequences of this are hard to overstate. At the peak of the pandemic, jobs in **low-wage** occupations—many of which have chronically low rates of union membership, such as food services—disappeared at roughly eight times the rate at which high-wage jobs did. This inequity has especially ravaged communities of color. It’s long past time to reverse the trend in declining union membership. The Protecting the Right to Organize Act (PRO Act), which passed the House in February just weeks before the coronavirus began to spread in the US, would authorize financial penalties for employers that violate workers’ rights, strengthen the ability of workers to join together in boycotts and strikes, and facilitate collective bargaining agreements, along with a number of other sweeping reforms. In so doing, the PRO Act would modernize federal labor laws. Republicans in the Senate said in February that they would not take up the legislation, and some in the business community have claimed that it is “completely stacked against employers.” But after eight months of economic devastation to workers, Senate leadership owes it to the American people to give the bill a fair hearing. When enabled, unions have proven remarkably effective in helping workers during the pandemic. The International Brotherhood of Teamsters, for example, reached an agreement with UPS guaranteeing paid leave for any worker who is diagnosed with COVID-19 or who is required to be quarantined due to their illness or that of a family member. Stronger union membership must be a **pillar** of our nation’s recovery plan. When unions are strong, America is strong: Unions **boost wages** of both union and non-union workers, they create a more **balanced economy**, and they improve the health and safety of the workplace. By contrast, when unions are weak, inequality **skyrockets**. In order to protect America’s most vulnerable workers, it’s time for lawmakers to update our nation’s outdated labor laws. And we especially need to make union membership a civil right which is just as codified and protected as all other civil rights.

#### Recessions cause immense amount of death, pain and suffering

Doerr 20’ [https://www.bis.org/publ/bisbull35.pdf // The recession-mortality nexus and Covid-19 // Sebastian Doerr and Boris Hofmann]

Key takeaways. Countries with a stronger predicted GDP decline in 2020 have also seen a larger number of deaths in excess of official Covid-19 fatalities. Historical data show that recessions are systematically associated with higher mortality, especially in developing economies. Following a recession, death rates remain elevated for several years. The eventual death toll of Covid-19 may be understated if the impact of the pandemic-induced recession is neglected. Limiting the economic fallout of the pandemic could also reduce excess mortality.