### My value is morality for two reasons

1. The resolution’s use of the word “ought” implies a moral obligation
2. Morality allows us to perceive what is inherently good or bad. It’s the value upon which we can conceptualize all other values, thus it must be prioritized.

### My criterion is minimizing structural violence

#### Structural violence outweighs all impacts – it destroys access and overwhelms individual’s abilities to live

**Ansell 17** (David A. Ansell, Senior Vice President, Associate Provost for Community Health Equity, and Michael E. Kelly Professor of Medicine at Rush University Medical Center (Chicago), holds an M.D. from the State University of New York Upstate Medical University College of Medicine, 2017, “American Roulette,” The Death Gap: How Inequality Kills, Published by the University of Chicago Press, ISBN 9780226428291, p. kindle 307-363)

There are many different kinds of violence. Some are obvious: punches, attacks, gunshots, explosions. These are the kinds of interpersonal violence that we tend to hear about in the news. Other kinds of violence are intimate and emotional. But the deadliest and most thoroughgoing kind of violence is woven into the fabric of American society. It exists when some groups have more access to goods, resources, and opportunities than other groups, including health and life itself. This violence delivers specific blows against particular bodies in particular neighborhoods. This unequal advantage and violence is built into the very rules that govern our society. In the absence of this violence, large numbers of Americans would be able to live fuller and longer lives. This kind of violence is called structural violence, because it is embedded in the very laws, policies, and rules that govern day-to-day life.8 It is the cumulative impact of laws and social and economic policies and practices that render some Americans less able to access resources and opportunities than others. This inequity of advantage is not a result of the individual’s personal abilities but is built into the systems that govern society. Often it is a product of racism, gender, and income inequality. The diseases and premature mortality that Windora and many of my patients experienced were, in the words of Dr. Paul Farmer, “biological reflections of social fault lines.”9 As a result of these fault lines, a disproportional burden of illness, suffering, and premature mortality falls on certain neighborhoods, like Windora’s. Structural violence can overwhelm an individual’s ability to live a free, unfettered, healthy life. As I ran to evaluate Windora, I knew that her stroke was caused in part by lifelong exposure to suffering, racism, and economic deprivation. Worse, the poverty of West Humboldt Park that contributed to her illness is directly and inextricably related to the massive concentration of wealth and power in other neighborhoods just miles away in Chicago’s Gold Coast and suburbs. That concentration of wealth could not have occurred without laws, policies, and practices that favored some at the expense of others. Those laws, policies, and practices could not have been passed or enforced if access to political and economic power had not been concentrated in the hands of a few. Yet these political and economic structures have become so firmly entrenched (in habits, social relations, economic arrangements, institutional practices, law, and policy) that they have become part of the matrix of American society. The rules that govern day-to-day life were written to benefit a small elite at the expense of people like Windora and her family. These rules and structures are powerful destructive forces. The same structures that render life predictable, secure, comfortable, and pleasant for many destroy the lives of others like Windora through suffering, poverty, ill health, and violence.

### Labor Reporting

#### Labor Journalism is necessary to positively frame unions and inform citizens of the benefits of unionization, leading to positive change.

**Dean 12,** (Amy B. Dean Amy B. Dean is a fellow of the Century Foundation and a principal of ABD Ventures, a consulting firm that works to develop innovative strategies for organizations devoted to social change. She is a co-author, with David Reynolds, of “A New New Deal: How Regional Activism Will Reshape the American Labor Movement.”) 12-11-2012, "OPINION: We need labor journalism now more than ever", America.aljazeera, http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2016/2/we-need-labor-journalism-now-more-than-ever.html PM

First, those working to improve social justice know that framing the narrative is critical in allowing movements to be successful. Whoever sets the terms of the conversation gets to define what the acceptable solutions to a problem might be. It follows that the business community would argue that its preferred policies — low taxes, less regulation, lower wages — lead to economic success. But what we see again and again is that traditional measures of economic growth do not translate into well-being for the majority of people in this country. Without the concerted efforts of working people to organize and bargain in their collective self-interest, the economy won’t provide a dignified living. The second reason I’ve covered labor issues is that doing so provides an opportunity to highlight the successes of grass-roots movements across the country. While a massive infrastructure of business news and management journals exists to highlight innovation in the corporate world, rarely do we hear about how working people are able to make progress, particularly at the state and local levels. As a result, many Americans are under-informed about how they can take concrete steps to rebuild the middle class. Sharing the stories of local grass-roots success is an important part of reversing this trend. Third, good labor coverage allows us to see the faces behind dry economic statistics — to see whose communities are being affected by changes in our economy and how. Al Jazeera America gave an outlet to such coverage; it helped to fill a critical gap in American journalism, putting significant resources behind stories that rarely found audiences elsewhere. The site showed the world that readers were engaged in this conversation, and indeed, wanted more. The economic situation looks bleak to many of us working in 2016. In fact, in 1929, the level of inequality in this country looked a lot like it does today: a huge boom for some, frightening debt for many and an uncertain future for most. But Americans organized. They formed unions to win fair conditions in their workplaces. By taking such measures as public demonstrations, active political participation in city and state government, and mass sit-down strikes to shut down workplaces, they won laws establishing collective bargaining, minimum wage and Social Security. Those institutions law underpinned the broadly egalitarian growth of the next 40 years. As political organizations, labor unions were the institutional bulkhead providing the lobbying muscle and electoral legwork behind Medicaid, Medicare, the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act and the Occupational Safety and Hazard Administration. They were able to do so, in part, because of a journalistic culture that considered the demands of working people reasonable and worth listening to — as a legitimate part of the public conversation. As part of the broader mobilization of civil society, journalism helped ensure that these demands would not be dismissed as naïve or merely self-interested. By setting the terms of the conversation, the media set the terms of the possible. Today the economy is changed. While manufacturing hasn’t disappeared, it is the service sector today that is creating the most jobs. The bulk of today’s workers are home health aides and food service workers. They are retail salespeople and nursing assistants. They are warehouse movers and data-entry clerks. While these jobs are providing much-needed services, the truth is that most of them are not good jobs in the old sense. They often pay low wages and have few benefits. Opportunities for promotion are limited, and the positions themselves aren’t secure. What determines whether these jobs will be able to support middle-class families with the same aspirations as generations past is not an iron law of economics. Rather, it is a question of bargaining power. It is a question of whether people are willing to stand up and negotiate for a different future — and whether our society continues to afford them the legal right to do so. This is why labor coverage is essential. Whether it’s low wage workers joining in the Fight for $15, or adjunct professors trying to secure a decent contract, or service employees dealing with subcontracting in Silicon Valley, today’s employees are struggling to make sure our new economy is one that sustains more than just the fortunate few at the top. Whether they register with the public, however, is determined largely by the media. Collectively, these struggles will determine whether or not new jobs will be good jobs. Although they are often not stories we see in the news, they tell us what the future is going to look like for a majority of Americans, and whether or not this is going to be a just future. It is up to us to demand that news outlets cover these stories. And it is up to us, through engagement at work and at the polls, to help create movements that cannot be ignored.

#### So-called “Objectivity” is a tool by the rich to eliminate dissent and reinforce the status quo. “Objectivity” kills labor journalism.

Wallace 21, (Lewis Raven Wallace is a journalist based in Durham, NC. He writes and produces audio about oppression in journalism, transgender issues, race and class) 12-26-2021, "The View from Somewhere," University of Chicago Press, <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/V/bo29172094.html> (Cut from *Conclusion: The End of Journalism)* PM

I’ll admit: I seek refuge in the NPR newscast at the top of every hour—even though, for my whole life, it’s given me a vision of the world that doesn’t align with my own. Still, there’s something comforting in a world that seems fundamentally the same as it did last week, last month, last millennium, something comforting in the distillation of the news of the day into a three-minute clip. My friend Ramona Martinez, who used to be a producer at the NPR newscast, once said that “objectivity is the ideology of the status quo.” On the one hand, as this book has made clear, I can’t stand the status quo: it doesn’t have room for me and my communities, it’s an emperor with no clothes, it’s a mess. But on some days, for me, that status quo can feel like a refuge—it relieves me of responsibility and fear. Let’s just pretend those are clothes on that monarch, that everything is fine. Wildfires and hurricanes, wars and mass shootings, celebrity deaths and congressional stalemates become something easy to digest. The calm voices keep the listener at a distance, and I get to be the listener, a member of the anonymous crowd. That distance, the sense that we are not implicated, yields a temporary comfort—probably a false one, but this, too, is part of the promise of “objectivity.” If you can stand outside of the world, you can afford not to change it. Mine is not an argument against the rigorous pursuit of facts, or even an argument that the job of every journalist is to write opinion pieces all day and then protest by night. I love the NPR newscast like a childhood stuffed animal (in an alternative universe, I once fancied myself a less-cool Korva Coleman). I feel sure that there is still a place—a big, important place—for people who seek the truth, who shape and give it meaning. But we have to know what power we have in the shaping. At this point, an “objective” approach to news is easy to poke holes in. As we’ve seen, news judgment is never neutral, and movements like #BlackLivesMatter and #MeToo have shifted the way we think about what’s news for the better. And not affiliating with political parties may be valuable and possible, but not when it’s conflated with impartiality on issues of justice—many Black journalists like T. Thomas Fortune, Ida B. Wells, and Marvel Cooke have stood outside of political affiliation while also speaking out against racism and their own erasure. But because it is so often conflated with the viewpoint of people in power, “objectivity” has been used again and again for gatekeeping, to discourage labor organizing and exclude diverse voices. “Objectivity” also excludes certain people by suggesting that a detached observer is a better one, even as many of the most important stories of our times have been told by people who were close to the issue, not detached outsiders. Finally, “objectivity” has a tendency to objectify, turning people into flattened-out “sources” whose stories are there for the taking, encouraging an extractive approach to journalism in which the journalist is never implicated or accountable.

#### Labor Unions decrease the impact and extent of poverty. When unions suffer, poverty increases.

**VanHeuvelen and Brady 21,** (Tom VanHeuvelen assistant professor of sociology @ University of Minnesota and David Brady, Professor of public policy @ University of California, Riverside) 7-7-2021, "How labor unions can help reduce the risk of poverty", Insider, https://www.businessinsider.com/how-labor-unions-help-reduce-risk-poverty-2021-7 PM

Belonging to a union or living in a US state where organized labor is relatively strong helps lower the likelihood that you'll fall into poverty, according to our new research. In a peer-reviewed study, we examined how unionization is correlated with poverty. We analyzed data on poverty and unionization rates from 1975 through 2015 using the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, which is widely considered to be the gold standard for tracking individuals over time. We used a variety of poverty measures in our analysis. We found that households in which there was at least one union member had an average poverty rate of 5.9%, compared with 18.9% for nonunion households, based on a relative measure of poverty rather than an absolute measure, by which what it means to be poor is fixed over time. We also wanted to examine the impact of living in a state with a higher rate of unionization to see whether this broadly affected the likelihood that someone would be in poverty compared with states with lower union membership. Using the same relative measure of poverty, we found that states with higher unionization rates had average poverty levels about 7% lower than states with lower unionization rates. Our findings imply that a 5% decline in union membership translates, on average, into a 2% increase in the probability that a resident of the state will fall into poverty. When policymakers and academics develop plans to address poverty, they rarely, to our knowledge, consider the impact of labor unions. And yet research across social science disciplines show time and again that labor unions have been central to bolstering the American middle class by raising wages and expanding access to fringe benefits. Thus, it is logical, though rarely discussed, that unions would also reduce the risk that people become impoverished. Our study also helps explain why the United States has a relatively high rate of poverty — 18% as of 2017 — compared with other rich democracies. France and the Norway, for example, boast poverty rates in the single digits as well as higher rates of union membership. Our results suggest that had union membership not declined dramatically since the 1970s, we could reasonably expect poverty rates would be significantly lower. We intend to conduct additional research, both within the United States and among other countries, to better understand the mechanisms linking unionization to poverty. More broadly, the biggest open question is whether US labor unions can expand their membership again and provide these types of protections against adverse economic forces.

#### Poverty is the equivalent to a would-be thermonuclear war between the former-USSR and the US every 15 years.

Gilligan, 2K James, Department of Psychiatry Harvard Medical School Violence: Reflections on Our Deadliest Epidemic, 2000, p 195-196.

The 14 to 18 million deaths a year caused by structural violence compare with about 100,000 deaths per year from armed conflict. Comparing this frequency of deaths from structural violence to the frequency of those caused by major military and political violence, such as World War II (an estimated 49 million military and civilian deaths, including those caused by genocide--or about eight million per year, 1935-1945), the Indonesian massacre of 1965-1966 (perhaps 575,000 deaths), the Vietnam war (possibly two million, 1954-1973), and even a hypothetical nuclear exchange between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R (232 million), it was clear that even war cannot begin to compare with structural violence, which continues year after year. In other words, every fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths; and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide, perpetrated on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world.