## 1AC – Oppression FW

**Adopting the perspective of the oppressed is the only way to account for dominant ideologies that skew our thought processes.**

### Mills 5: Charles W. Mills (John Evans Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy) ““Ideal Theory” as Ideology” Hypatia vol. 20, no. 3 (Summer 2005) RW

Now what distinguishes ideal theory is not merely the use of ideals, since obviously nonideal theory can and will use ideals also (certainly it will appeal to the moral ideals, if it may be more dubious about the value of invoking idealized human capacities). What distinguishes ideal theory is the reliance on idealization to the exclusion, or at least marginalization, of the actual. As O’Neill emphasizes, this is not a necessary corollary of the operation of abstraction itself, since one can have abstractions of the ideal-as- descriptive-model type that abstract without idealizing. But ideal theory either tacitly represents the actual as a simple deviation from the ideal, not worth theorizing in its own right, or claims that starting from the ideal is at least the best way of realizing it. Ideal theory as an approach will then utilize as its basic apparatus some or all of the following concepts and assumptions (there is necessarily a certain overlap in the list, since they all intersect with one another): • An idealized social ontology. Moral theory deals with the normative, but it cannot avoid some characterization of the human beings who make up the society, and whose interactions with one another are its subject. So some overt or tacit social ontology has to be presupposed. An idealized social ontology of the modern type (as against, say, a Platonic or Aristotelian type) will typically assume the abstract and undifferentiated equal atomic individuals of classical liberalism. Thus it will abstract away from relations of structural domination, exploitation, coercion, and oppression, which in reality, of course, will profoundly shape the ontology of those same individuals, locating them in superior and inferior positions in social hierarchies of various kinds. • Idealized capacities. The human agents as visualized in the theory will also often have completely unrealistic capacities attributed to them—unrealistic even for the privileged minority, let alone those subordinated in different ways, who would not have had an equal opportunity for their natural capacities to develop, and who would in fact typically be disabled in crucial respects. • Silence on oppression. Almost by de nition, it follows from the focus of ideal theory that little or nothing will be said on actual historic oppression and its legacy in the present, or current ongoing oppression, though these may be gestured at in a vague or promissory way (as something to be dealt with later).

Correspondingly, the ways in which systematic oppression is likely to shape the Charles W. Mills 169 basic social institutions (as well as the humans in those institutions) will not be part of the theory’s concern, and this will manifest itself in the absence of ideal-as- descriptive-model concepts that would provide the necessary macro- and micro-mapping of that oppression, and that are requisite for understanding its reproductive dynamic. • Ideal social institutions. Fundamental social institutions such as the family, the economic structure, the legal system, will therefore be conceptualized in ideal-as-idealized-model terms, with little or no sense of how their actual workings may systematically disadvantage women, the poor, and racial minorities. • An idealized cognitive sphere. Separate from, and in addition to, the idealization of human capacities, what could be termed an idealized cognitive sphere will also be presupposed. In other words, as a corollary of the general ignoring of oppression, the consequences of oppression for the social cognition of these agents, both the advantaged and the disadvantaged, will typically not be recognized, let alone theorized. A general social transparency will be presumed, with cognitive obstacles minimized as limited to biases of self-interest or the intrinsic difficulties of understanding the world, and little or no attention paid to the distinctive role of hegemonic ideologies and group-specific experience in distorting our perceptions and conceptions of the social order.

**Oppression is created by social systems so only a focus on material conditions can solve.**

**Johnson no date:** Allan Johnson (PhD in sociology, he joined the sociology department at Wesleyan University) <http://www.cabrillo.edu/~lroberts/AlanJohnsonWhatCanWeDO001.pdf>. RW Privilege is a feature of social systems, not individuals. People have or don't have privilege depending on the system they're in and the social categories other people put them in. To say,

then, that I have race privilege says less about me personally than it does about [how] the society we all live in and how it is organized to assign privilege on the basis of a socially defined set of racial categories that change historically and often overlap. The challenge facing me as an individual has more to do with how I participate in society as a recipient of race privilege and how those choices oppose or support the system itself. In dealing with the problem of privilege, we have to get used to being surrounded by paradox. Very often those who have privilege don't know it, for example, which is a key aspect of privilege. Also paradoxical is the fact that privilege doesn't necessarily lead to a "good life," which can prompt people in privileged groups to deny resentfully that they even have it. But privilege doesn't equate with being happy. It involves having what others don't have and the struggle to hang on to it at their expense, neither of which is a recipe for joy,personal fulfillment, or spiritual contentment To be an effective part of the solution, we have to realize

that privilege and oppression are not a thing of the past. It's happening right now. It isn't just a collection of wounds inflicted long ago that now need to be healed. The wounding goes on as I write these words and as you read them, and unless people work to change the system that promotes it, personal healing by itself cannot be the answer. Healing wounds is no more a solution to the oppression that causes the wounding than military hospitals are a solution to war. Healing is a necessary process, but it isn't enough....

### Since privilege is rooted primarily in systems—such as families, schools, and workplaces— change isn't simply *a* matter of changing people. People, of course, will have to change in order for systems to change, but the most important point is that changing people isn't enough. The solution also has to include entire systems, such as capitalism, whose paths of least resistance [that] shape how we feel, think, and behave as individuals, how we see ourselves and one another.

**The standard is minimizing oppression, defined as promoting the material conditions necessary for inclusion.**

### Debate is a space for real world change, but we have to consider tangible policy action above all else—ideal theory abstracts away from material consequences and legitimizes oppression

**Curry 14:** Dr. Tommy J. Curry 14, “The Cost of a Thing: A Kingian Reformulation of a Living Wage Argument in the 21st Century”, Victory Briefs, 2014

**Despite the pronouncement of debate as an activity** and intellectual exercise **pointing to the real world consequences** of dialogue, thinking, and (personal) politics when addressing issues of racism, sexism, economic disparity, global conflicts, and death, many of the discussions concerning these ongoing challenges to humanity are fixed to a paradigm which sees the adjudication of material disparities and sociological realities as the conquest of one ideal theory over the other. In “Ideal Theory as Ideology,” Charles Mills outlines the problem contemporary theoretical-performance styles in policy debate and value- weighing in Lincoln-Douglass are confronted with in their attempts to get at the concrete problems in our societies. At the outset, Mills concedes that “ideal theory applies to moral theory as a whole (at least to normative ethics as against metaethics); [s]ince ethics deals by definition with normative/prescriptive/evaluative issues, [it is set]

against factual/descriptive issues.”At the most general level, the conceptual chasm between what emerges as actual problems in the world (e.g.: racism, sexism, poverty, disease, etc.) and how we frame such problems theoretically—the assumptions and shared ideologies we depend upon for our problems to be heard and accepted as a worthy “problem” by an audience—is the most obvious call for an anti-ethical paradigm, since such a paradigm insists on the actual as the basis of what can be considered normatively. Mills, however, describes this chasm as a problem of an ideal-as- descriptive model which argues that for any actual-empirical-observable social phenomenon (P), an ideal of (P) is necessarily a representation of that phenomenon. In the idealization of a social phenomenon (P), one

#### “necessarily has to abstract away from certain features” of (P) that is observed before abstraction occurs. ¶ This gap between what is actual (in the world), and what is represented by theories and politics of debaters proposed in rounds threatens any real

discussions about the concrete nature of oppression and the racist economic structures which necessitate tangible policies and reorienting changes in our value orientations. As Mills states: “What distinguishes ideal theory is the reliance on idealization to the exclusion, or at least marginalization, of the actual,” so what we are seeking to resolve on the basis of “thought” is in fact incomplete, incorrect, or ultimately irrelevant to the actual problems which our “theories” seek to address. Our attempts to situate social disparity cannot simply appeal to
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#### one set of theories within an ideological frame be it our most cherished notions of Afro-

pessimism, feminism, Marxism, or the like. At best, theoretical endorsements make us aware of sets of actions to address ever developing problems in our empirical world, but even this awareness does not command us to only do X, but rather do X and the other ideas which compliment the material conditions addressed by the action X. As a whole, debate(policy and LD) neglects the need to do X in order to remedy our cast-away-ness among our ideological tendencies and politics. How then do we pull ourselves from this seeming ir-recoverability of thought in general and in our endorsement of socially actualizable values like that of the living wage? It is my position that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s thinking about the need for a living wage was a unique, and remains an underappreciated, resource in our attempts to impose value reorientation (be it through critique or normative gestures) upon the actual world. In other words, King aims to reformulate the values which deny the legitimacy of the living wage, and those values predicated on the flawed views of the worker, Blacks, and the colonized (dignity, justice, fairness, rights, etc.) used to currently justify the living wages in under our contemporary moral parameters.

### This outweighs – dlearning philosophy makes us immoral

Posner 98: The Problematics of Moral and Legal Theory, Richard A. Posner ~Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit; University of Chicago Law School.~, Harvard Law Review, Vol. 111, No. 7 (May, 1998), pp. 1637-1717

The better read you are in philosophy or literature, and the more imaginative and analytically supple you are, the easier you will find it to reweave your tapestry of moral beliefs so that your principles allow you to do what your id tells you to do. My point is not that it's costless to change one's moral stripes, but only that the cost is less for a highly educated person. Ignorance is the ally of morality, as the medieval Roman Catholic Church recognized when it instructed priests not to ask parishioners in the confessional about specific sexually deviant practices, lest they give them ideas. Moral education equips the student to argue against moral preceptors. So even if instruction in moral reasoning improves people's moral beliefs (which I greatly doubt), the effect may be completely offset by the reduction in the likelihood that people would conform their behavior to moral precepts. To be confident that moral instruction would not have this effect, you would have to agree with Socrates that people are naturally good and do bad things only out of ignorance.

### Trust your basic intuitions about oppression—otherwise debate is made unsafe

Teehan 14 ~Ryan Teehan, NSD staffer and competitor from the Delbarton School~ – NSD Update comment on the student protests at the TOC in 2014.

Honestly, I don't think that 99% of what has been said in this thread so far actually matters. It doesn't matter whether you think that these types of assumptions should be questioned. It doesn't matter what accepting this intuition could potentially do or not do. It doesn't matter if you see fit to make, incredibly trivializing and misplaced I might add, links between this and the Holocaust. All of the arguments that talk about how debate is a unique space for questioning assumptions make an assumption of safety . They say that this is a space where one is safe to question assumptions and try new perspectives. That is not true for everyone. When we allow arguments that question the wrong ness of racism, sexism, homophobia, rape, lynching, etc., we make debate unsafe for certain people. The idea that debate is a safe space to question all assumptions is the definition of privilege, it begins with an idea of a debater that can question every assumption. People who face the actual effects of the aforementioned things cannot

question those assumptions, and making debate a space built around the idea that they can is hostile. So, you really have a choice. Either 1) say that you do not want these people to debate so that you can let people question the w rongness of everything I listed before, 2) say that you care more about letting debaters question those things than making debate safe for everyo ne, or 3) make it so that saying things that make debate u nsafe has actual repercussions. On "debate is not the real world". Only for people who ca n separate their existence in "the real world" from their existence in debate. That means privileged, white, heterosexual males like myself. I don't understand how you can make this sweeping claim whe n some people are clearly harmed by these arguments. At the end of the day, you have to figure out whether you care about debate being safe for everyone involved. I don't think anyone has contested that these arguments make debate unsafe for certain people . If you care at all about the people involved in debate then don't vote on these arguments . If you care about the safety and wellbeing of competi tors, then don't vote on these arguments. If you don't, then I honestly don't understand why you give up your time to coach and/or j udge . The pay can't be that good. I don't believe that you' re just in it for the money, which is why I ask you to ask yourselves whether you can justify making debate unsa fe for certain people.

## Plan

#### Attacks on the fundamental right to strike violate the fundamental right to the freedom of association inherent to the International Labor Organization. This affront to the ILO decimates the very foundations of International labor law and eviscerates it’s effectiveness. Only a right to strike protects this.

Vogt 2016 (Jeffrey Vogt, The Right to Strike and the International Labour Organisation (ILO), King’s Law Journal, Vol 27, 2016, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09615768.2016.1148297?journalCode=rklj20)//NotJacob

For nearly 40 years after 1952, when the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association (CFA) was established, there was no challenge by the Employers’ Group to the body of jurisprudence on the right to strike as developed by the ILO Committee on Freedom of Association (a tripartite body) and the ILO Committee of Experts.1 Indeed, the CFA had routinely issued conclusions and recommendations, by tripartite consensus, affirming the right to strike and regulating its exercise. The ILO Committee of Experts’ observations on the right to strike were also regularly approved by the tripartite constituents at the International Labour Conference. With the end of the Cold War, the alliance between the Employers’ Group and Workers’ Group against Eastern Bloc repression of independent trade union rights was no longer relevant; the Employers’ Group’s acceptance of a right to strike recognised and protected by the ILO therefore started to wane.2 Employers’ Group complaints surfaced initially in 1989 and 1992. In 1994, with the publication of the Committee of Experts’ General Survey on Freedom of Association and Collective Bargaining, the Employers’ Group elaborated a lengthy critique on the right to strike as it had been developed by the ILO supervisory system and in particular by the Committee of Experts.3 However, the Employers’ Group had clarified that ‘they were not so much criticizing the fact that the Committee of Experts wanted to recognize the right to strike in principle, but rather that it took as a point of departure a comprehensive and unlimited right to strike’. 4 Of course, neither the Committee on Freedom of Association nor the Committee of Experts had ever posited an unlimited right to strike and have in fact recognised numerous limitations on the right over the years. Three years later, in 1997, the Employers’ Group again ‘acknowledged that the principle of industrial action, including the right to strike and lockouts, formed part of the principles of freedom of association as set out in Convention No. 87’. 5 Not until 2012 did the Employers’ Group argue that the right to strike protected by the convention did not exist at all. The Employers’ Group’s new, hard stance was motivated in part by the fact that the ILO’s jurisprudence, once largely self-contained within Geneva, now took on a life of its own outside the ILO. National and regional courts were now turning more frequently to the observations of the ILO’s supervisory system to understand the scope of freedom of association under their own laws and instruments (discussed below). The drafters of business and human rights principles and guidelines also incorporated the principles of the fundamental ILO conventions, and took into consideration the attendant body of jurisprudence. The OECD Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights refer directly to the ILO core labour standards, including the ILO’s 1998 Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, which includes the principle of freedom of association.6 Further, free trade agreements and trade preference programmes increasingly make explicit reference to the ILO core conventions, the 1998 ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work and the ILO supervisory system.7 Together, this has had the effect of slowly converting the ‘soft’ law of the ILO supervisory system to ‘hard’ law.8 For the Employers’ Group, these developments were deemed unacceptable and provoked their rejection not only of the existence of a right to strike but of the ILO supervisory system in general.

#### Effective ILO is key to global labor standards – studies of the preparatory process prove it’s effectiveness.

Kolliev 2021 (Faradj Koliev is a researcher at the Department of Political Science, Promoting international labour standards: The ILO and national labour regulations, July 21, 2021)//NotJacob

How and when do intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) shape domestic regulations? Can IGOs shape domestic policies during the development phase of an international law or norm? The role of IGOs as shapers of domestic laws and policies is well established in the international relations (IR) and international law (IL) literatures. Extant research has shown that IGOs can influence national policies within various domains, such as labour rights (Strang and Chang, 1993), human rights (Risse and Sikkink, 1999), economic growth (Blanton et al., 2018) and educational policies (Finnemore, 1993). However, we still lack answers as to how and when IGOs can influence national policies. This article contributes to the strand of research that explains and assesses the impact of IGOs on domestic politics by focusing on international labour standards and the International Labour Organization (ILO). The ILO – a Nobel Peace Prize laureate for its contribution to the sustenance of peace – is one of the oldest IGOs, which has the task to create and monitor international labour standards. Currently, it governs over 180 conventions dealing with various issues, such as the right to organise and bargain collectively, child labour, discrimination and job security. Existing research on the ILO has exclusively focused on how the organisation can promote labour standards through the ratification or monitoring of labour rights conventions (Peksen and Blanton, 2017; Rodrik, 1996; Strang and Chang, 1993; Thomann, 2011). By focusing on ratifications, this literature has overlooked alternative efforts by the ILO to influence state policies. Indeed, there are reasons to assume that efforts that precede ratification and monitoring may produce tangible results for national labour rights. For instance, in 2011, the ILO adopted a convention on Decent Work for Domestic Workers (C189). C189 asks countries to recognise the legal rights of domestic workers and include provisions that protect these workers from discrimination and various forms of abuse. Following the formal adoption, many countries ratified the convention and introduced new regulations regarding domestic workers. However, some countries, such as Spain and Zambia, introduced appropriate regulations during the development phase of C189 (ILO, NORMLEX 2020). Do countries adjust their regulations during the development phase of international treaties? If so, why and when do they do that? I argue that the ILO can shape domestic labour regulations already during the preparatory process of new conventions. Drawing on previous studies and interviews with senior ILO staff, I theorise that the ILO can shape national labour regulations during the adoption period through the mechanisms of elite socialisation, learning and domestic mobilisation. While not all states are receptive to these mechanisms – especially those who vote against the conventions – the ILO is in a particularly favourable position to motivate many states to pass relevant regulations during the adoption period. For the purpose of the argument, I focus on national dismissal regulations and the Termination of Employment Convention (C158), which is considered the most important international convention that regulates dismissal. C158 was formally adopted by the ILO in 1982 and requires national labour regulations that protect workers from unjust dismissals by their employers. I test my argument using data on national dismissal regulations covering the period 1970–2012. The empirical analysis suggests that states adjust their regulations during the adoption period. The adoption process is characterised by exchange and dialogue between the ILO and member states, which facilitates elite socialisation, learning and domestic mobilisation. I do not assert that the adoption path is the exclusive road to domestic implementation; rather, I advance the argument of an additional part of the broader standard-setting efforts of the ILO, which previously has been overlooked. Neither do I provide undisputable proofs of the theorised mechanisms. I do, however, identify propitious conditions for these mechanisms to operate in the ILO context based on the existing literature and interviews with senior ILO officials. The findings of this article have substantial implications for our understanding of IGO influence and the impact of the ILO on labour rights. First, this article is the first to theorise and assess the impact of the ILO through states’ adoption of conventions. One important implication of this study is that the ratification or ILO monitoring of conventions is not the exclusive path to domestic influence. I show how seemingly ‘toothless’ processes pertaining to the drafting of conventions may be effective in bringing domestic regulations into compliance with international standards. I surmise that similar effects should be identifiable within issue areas such as environment, trade and human rights, although generalisations from this study to other IGOs require caution. Second, the article suggests that studies focusing on the impact of ILO conventions are not only underestimating this but are also likely to be biased as countries that fail to ratify a convention after formal adoption might improve their regulations during the adoption phase, which is overlooked.

**Solving ILO reduces inequality and benefits the global economy creating sustainable enterprises**

**ILO 21.** “The benefits of International Labor Standards,” International Labor organization; https://www.ilo.org/global/standards/introduction-to-international-labour-standards/the-benefits-of-international-labour-standards/lang--en/index.htm//Trusha

International labor standards have been sometimes perceived as being costly and therefore hindering economic development. However, a growing body of research has indicated that compliance with international labour standards is often accompanied by improvements in productivity and economic performance. Minimum wage and working-time standards, and respect for equality, can translate into greater satisfaction and improved performance for workers and reduced staff turnover. Investment in vocational training can result in a better trained workforce and higher employment levels. Safety standards can reduce costly accidents and expenditure on health care. Employment protection can encourage workers to take risks and to innovate. Social protection, such as unemployment schemes, and active labour market policies can facilitate labour market flexibility, and make economic liberalization and privatization sustainable and more acceptable to the public. Freedom of association and collective bargaining can lead to better labour–management consultation and cooperation, thereby improving working conditions, reducing the number of costly labour conflicts and enhancing social stability. The beneficial effects of labour standards do not go unnoticed by foreign investors. Studies have shown that in their criteria for choosing countries in which to invest, foreign investors rank workforce quality and political and social stability above low labor costs. At the same time, there is little evidence that countries which do not respect labour standards are more competitive in the global economy. **International labour standards not only respond to changes in the world of work for the protection of workers, but also take into account the needs of sustainable enterprises.**

## 2- democracy

### The right to strike is a core check against concentration of power – failing to protect it erodes democratic principles

**IER ’17:** Institute of Employment Rights. “UN Rights Expert: Right to strike is essential to democracy”. March 10th, 2017. <https://www.ier.org.uk/news/un-rights-expert-right-strike-essential-democracy/>. FD.

The United Nations’ Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai, has reminded member states of the International Labour Organization (ILO) – including the UK – that they have a positive obligation to uphold the right to strike. Speaking at an ILO meeting on Monday 06 March 2017 in Geneva, Kiai argued that the right to strike is fundamental to the preservation of democracy. “The concentration of power in one sector – whether in the hands of government or business – inevitably leads to the erosion of democracy, and an increase in inequalities and marginalization with all their attendant consequences. The right to strike is a check on this concentration of power,” he explained. The right to strike has been established in international law as a corollary to the right of freedom of association for decades, and is enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights as Article 11. As a member state of the ILO and of the EU, the UK is legally obliged to uphold the right to strike, although through the Trades Union Act 2016 and the anti-trade union laws that preceded it, the government is making it harder and harder for trade unions to take industrial action. Kiai criticised such actions, saying government’s have a duty not to impede workers’ ability to take industrial action. “I deplore the various attempts made to erode the right to strike at national and multilateral levels,” the expert said, reminding delegates: “Protest action in relation to government social and economic policy, and against negative corporate practices, forms part of the basic civil liberties whose respect is essential for the meaningful exercise of trade union rights. This right enables them to engage with companies and governments on a more equal footing, and Member States have a positive obligation to protect this right, and a negative obligation not to interfere with its exercise.”

### The plan allows for greater voter turnout-especially for minorities thereby reinforcing key ideas of democracy

**McElwee 15**, Sean. (Sean McElwee is a research associate at [Demos](http://www.demos.org/sean-mcelwee).) "How Unions Boost Democratic Participation." The American Prospect, 16 Sept. 2015, prospect.org/labor/unions-boost-democratic-participation/.

Labor organizer Helen Marot once observed, "The labor unions are group efforts in the direction of democracy." What she meant is that more than simply vehicles for the economic interests of workers (which they certainly are), labor unions also foster civic participation for workers. And nowhere is this clearer than in voter turnout, which has suffered in recent years along with union membership. Indeed, new data from the Census Bureau and a new analysis of American National Election Studies data support the case that unions' declining influence has also deeply harmed democracy. In 2014, voter turnout was abysmal, even for a midterm. Census data suggest that only 41.9 percent of the citizen population over 18 turned out to vote. However, as I note in my new Demos report Why Voting Matters, there are dispiriting gaps in turnout across class, race, and age. To examine how unions might affect policy, I performed a new analysis of both Census Bureau and American National Election Studies data. The data below, from the 2014 election, show the differences in voter turnout between union and non-union workers (the sample only includes individuals who were employed, and does not include self-employed workers). While only 39 percent of non-union workers voted in 2014, fully 52 percent of union workers did. As part of ongoing research, James Feigenbaum, an economics PhD candidate at Harvard, ran a regression using American National Election Studies data suggesting that union members are about 4 percentage points more likely to vote and 3 points more likely to register (after controlling for demographic factors) and individuals living in a union household are 2.5 points more likely to vote and register. This is largely in line with the earlier estimates of Richard Freeman. These numbers may appear modest, but in a close national election they could be enough to change the result. Other research has found an even stronger turnout effect from unions. Daniel Stegmueller and Michael Becher find that after applying numerous demographic controls, union members are 10 points more likely to vote. What's particularly important is that unions boost turnout among low- and middle-income individuals. In a 2006 study, political scientists Jan Leighley and Jonathan Nagler found that, "the decline in union membership since 1964 has affected the aggregate turnout of both low and middle-income individuals more than the aggregate turnout of high-income individuals." In 2014, the gap between unions and non-union workers shrunk at the highest rung of the income ladder. There was a 15-point gap among those earning less than $25,000 (40 percent turnout for union workers, and 25 percent turnout for non-union workers). Among those earning more than $100,000, the gap was far smaller (49 percent for non-union workers and 52 percent for union workers). Individuals living in union households are also more progressive than those in non-union households. I examined 2012 ANES data and find that union households aren't largely different from non-union households on many issues regarding government spending, but they are more likely to have voted for Obama, identify as Democratic, and support a robust role for the government in reducing income inequality. When looking at union members specifically, the gaps become slightly larger. More upscale union members are far more progressive than their non-union counterparts. Non-union households with an income above $60,000 oppose government intervention to reduce inequality by 11 points, with 32.2 percent in favor and 43.4 percent against. But richer union households support government intervention, with 42.5 percent in favor and 29.9 percent opposed. As Richard B. Freeman has pointed out, "union members are more likely to vote for a Democrat for the House or Presidency than demographically comparable nonunion voters." He similarly finds that "unionism moves members to the left of where they would be given their socioeconomic status," in line with the data I examined from 2012. A 2013 study by Jasmine Kerrissey and Evan Schofer finds that union members are not only more likely to vote, but also more likely to belong to other associations, and to protest. They also find that these effects are strongest among people with lower levels of education, suggesting that unions may help mobilize the least politically active groups. A recent study of European countries finds union members vote more and identifies those aspects of union membership that contribute to the higher turnout. The strongest factor is that workers who engage in democratic organizations in the workplace (via collective bargaining) are more likely to engage in democracy more broadly by, for instance, voting. Other studies support the idea that civic participation creates a feedback loop that leads to higher voting rates. Another factor is that union members make more money, and higher income is correlated with voting behavior. Finally, union members are encouraged by peers and the union to engage in politics, which also contributes to higher levels of turnout. It's not entirely surprising that politicians who savage unions often share a similar contempt for the right to vote. Democracy in the workplace leads to democracy more broadly throughout society. Workers with more democratic workplaces are more likely to democratically engage in in society. Further, when unions and progressives demonstrate that government can benefit them, Americans are more likely to want to participate in decision-making. For all these reasons, unions play a unique and indispensable role in the progressive project. As Larry Summers, certainly not a leftist, recently argued, "the weakness of unions leaves a broad swath of the middle class largely unrepresented in the political process."

### **Strong democracies are key to global homogeneity and allows for better solvency for global issues.**

Kendall-Taylor 16 [Andrea; Deputy national intelligence officer for Russia and Eurasia at the National Intelligence Council, Senior associate in the Human Rights Initiative at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington; “How Democracy’s Decline Would Undermine the International Order,” CSIS; 7/15/16; <https://www.csis.org/analysis/how-democracy%E2%80%99s-decline-would-undermine-international-order>/]

Democratic decline would weaken U.S. partnerships and erode an important foundation for U.S. cooperation abroad. [Research demonstrates](file:///C:\Users\PMeylan\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\5V2CJVRN\160715_KendallTaylor_DemocracysDecline_Commentary.docx#http://cmp.sagepub.com/content/18/1/49.abstract) that domestic politics are a key determinant of the international behavior of states. In particular, **democracies** are **more likely to form alliances and cooperate more fully with other democracies than with autocracies**. Similarly, **authoritarian countries have established mechanisms for cooperation and sharing of “worst practices.” An increase in authoritarian countries**, then, **would provide a broader platform** for coordination that could enable these countries to overcome their divergent histories, values, and interests—factors that are frequently cited as obstacles to the **formation of a cohesive challenge to the U.S.-led international system**. Recent examples support the empirical data. **Democratic backsliding in Hungary and** the hardening of **Egypt’s autocracy** under Abdel Fattah el-Sisi **have led to enhanced relations between these countries and Russia. Likewise, democratic decline in Bangladesh has led Sheikh Hasina Wazed and her ruling Awami League to seek closer relations with China and Russia**, in part **to mitigate Western pressure and bolster** the **regime’s domestic standing**. Although none of these burgeoning relationships has developed into a highly unified partnership, democratic backsliding in these countries has provided a basis for cooperation where it did not previously exist. And while the United States certainly finds common cause with authoritarian partners on specific issues, **the** depth and reliability of such cooperation is limited. Consequently, **further democratic decline could** seriously compromise **the United States’ ability to form the kinds of deep partnerships that will be required** to confront today’s increasingly complex challenges. Global issues such as **climate change, migration, and** violent extremism demand the coordination and cooperation that democratic backsliding would put in peril. Put simply, **the United States is a less effective and influential actor if it loses its ability to rely on its partnerships** with other democratic nations. A **slide toward authoritarianism could also** challenge the current global order by diluting U.S. influence in critical international institutions, including the [United Nations](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/christopher-walker-authoritarian-regimes-are-changing-how-the-world-defines-democracy/2014/06/12/d1328e3a-f0ee-11e3-bf76-447a5df6411f_story.html) , the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Democratic decline would **weaken Western efforts within these institutions to advance issues such as Internet freedom and the responsibility to protect**. In the case of Internet governance, for example, Western **democracies support an open, largely private, global Internet. Autocracies**, in contrast, **promote state control over the Internet**, including laws and other mechanisms that facilitate their ability to censor and persecute dissidents. Already many autocracies, including Belarus, China, Iran, and Zimbabwe, have coalesced in the “Likeminded Group of Developing Countries” within the United Nations to advocate their interests. Within the IMF and World Bank, autocracies—along with other developing nations—seek to water down conditionality or the reforms that lenders require in exchange for financial support. If successful, diminished conditionality would enfeeble an important incentive for governance reforms. In a more extreme scenario, **the rising influence of autocracies could enable these countries to bypass the IMF and World Bank all together**. For example, **the Chinese-created Asian Infrastructure** and Investment Bank and the BRICS Bank—which includes Russia, China, and an increasingly authoritarian South Africa—**provide countries with the potential to bypass existing global financial institutions when it suits their interests. Authoritarian-led alternatives pose the risk that global economic governance will become** [**fragmented and less effective**](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00396338.2016.1161899?journalCode=tsur20#.V2H3MRbXgdI)**.**  **Violence and instability would** also likely increase if more democracies give way to autocracy. [International relations literature](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/1995-05-01/democratization-and-war) tells us that **democracies are** less likely to fight wars **against other democracies, suggesting that interstate wars would rise as the number of democracies declines**. Moreover, **within countries that are already autocratic, additional movement** away from democracy, or an “authoritarian hardening,” would **increase global instability**. Highly repressive autocracies are the most likely to **experience state failure, as was the case in the Central African Republic**, Libya, Somalia, Syria, and Yemen. In this way, **democratic decline would significantly strain the international order** because rising levels of instability would exceed the West’s ability to respond to the tremendous costs of peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, and refugee flows.

## 1AC- unions

**Striking is an essential tool used by labor Unions to protect workers’ interests and ensure fair bargaining processes**

**Metcalf ’18:** Thomas Metcalf. “Tactics Used by Labor Unions: Striking & Collective Bargaining”. Small Business Chronicles. Spring 2018. <https://smallbusiness.chron.com/labor-laws-union-strikes-61040.html>. FD.

Two of the most powerful tools that unions have to promote their members’ interests are collective bargaining and strikes. Fair labor practices were written into law in 1935 with the passing of the National Labor Relations Act, often called the NLRA. Over the years, additional legislation has been passed to create a balance between unions and employers. Collective bargaining is the negotiating process between your company and unions to settle a variety of issues, including wages, hours, plant and safety rules, and grievance procedures. It's called "collective bargaining" because the union employees, collectively, are negotiating with you through union representatives. Each side is obligated by law to negotiate in good faith, which generally means openness and fairness. Negotiating a new contact starts several months before the old one expires. Both sides lay out their positions, which usually start far apart to give each side plenty of bargaining room. If everything works, the two sides come together and sign a new contract. Negotiations can become heated. If they reach an impasse, the conflict can be referred to mediation, but it's not binding. If the union doesn't get satisfaction, it can resort to a strike. Economic Strike by Workers An economic strike is held over issues such as wages, hours and working conditions. When workers engage in an economic strike they're at risk of losing their jobs. You can hire replacement workers, and even retain them after the strike ends. Terminated ex-strikers can apply unconditionally for employment, but the you're under no obligation to rehire them. While an economic strike is a powerful tool for a union, its use can weaken the union. Not only can workers lose their jobs, but the replacement workers may not be interested in joining the union. Unfair Labor Practices Strike When workers strike to protest unfair labor practices by your company, they retain their employee status and their right to be reinstated when the strike ends. Temporary workers hired during the strike will be terminated at the end of the strike. If a striker finds full-time employment during the strike, he's not entitled to reinstatement. If strikers engage in any unfair practices, including threatening workers who cross the picket line or acts of violence, they'll lose their right to employment when the strike ends. Workers on an economic strike may attempt to convert it to an unfair labor practices strike if they could prove, for example, that your company wasn't negotiating in good faith. If the economic strike can be converted, then the striking workers retain their job security. Unfair Management Practices Labor legislation also places restraints on your company. You must negotiate with a union that represents its workers. It must sign any contract that's reached with its union and cannot make negotiation conditional on any prior activity. Employers cannot retaliate against union workers who file grievances against them, nor can they discriminate against any worker for his union activity. Failure to maintain safe working conditions is also an unfair labor practice. There can be regulatory consequences from the National Labor Relations Board if you fail to comply with its regulatory obligations.

**Strong labor unions are k2 protecting works from inequity by produced automation**

**Green ’19:** Ken Green. “How Unions Can Protect the Workers Who Are Most Vulnerable to Automation”. Union Track. September 17th, 2019. <https://www.uniontrack.com/blog/unions-and-automation>. FD.

Automation has irrevocably changed the workplace and workers’ roles in it. There’s no arguing that the advances in workplace automation have made — and will continue to make — many jobs obsolete. According to McKinsey researchers [James Manyika](https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work/jobs-lost-jobs-gained-what-the-future-of-work-will-mean-for-jobs-skills-and-wages), et al., by the year 2030 some 800 million workers across the globe will have lost their jobs due to automation. “Even in the best of times, many, if not most, workers will strain to manage the coming necessary adjustments as automation and AI change or eliminate many jobs, while simultaneously creating new ones,” write [Robert Maxim and Mark Muro](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2019/02/25/automation-and-ai-will-disrupt-the-american-labor-force-heres-how-we-can-protect-workers/) at The Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program. It’s a future for which many workers are unsure how to prepare. That’s where unions have to step in and lead the charge by giving workers a roadmap for navigating such a future while holding employers accountable. Here’s are some ways organized labor can mitigate automation’s threats to workers. Adaptation is going to be the key to survival for workers in a more-automated economy. “Unions need to figure out how to help workplaces and workers adapt to new technologies to reduce layoffs if workers are to have hope of surviving and even thriving in the face of this threat,” writes labor reporter [Steven Greenhouse](https://www.huffpost.com/entry/american-workers-jobs-inequality-union-automation_n_5ae043f9e4b061c0bfa32e0c). Most workers, either through job change or role transition, will eventually have to learn how to work side-by-side with automated machines, says [Michael Chui](https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/future-of-work/the-digital-future-of-work-what-will-automation-change), partner at the McKinsey Global Institute. “People increasingly, over time, will have to be complements to the work that machines do.” For workers, this will mean reskilling for new roles and responsibilities to stay relevant in the workforce. “The people are going to require a new set of skills to maintain their ability to support themselves and have a decent quality of life,” [Susan Schurman](https://news.bloomberglaw.com/daily-labor-report/employers-and-unions-talk-retraining-just-not-in-contracts), a labor studies professor at Rutgers University, tells Bloomberg Law. Unions are in a position to lead the way in helping workers adapt to new technologies and reskill to prepare them for successful transitions in the automated workplace, but they must work together with employers to be effective. [Daniel Bustillo](https://news.bloomberglaw.com/daily-labor-report/employers-and-unions-talk-retraining-just-not-in-contracts), director of the Healthcare Career Advancement Program, a national network of Service Employees International Unions and healthcare employers, says unions and employers both have equal responsibility to provide retraining programs to workers. For unions, the collective bargaining agreement is the best mechanism available to push companies for employee retraining. Unions can help secure that training for workers by including language for retraining programs in collective bargaining contracts. This holds employers accountable to their workers and helps ensure that employees continue to have a place in the workforce. Unions can also collaborate with employers to facilitate the retraining programs. That’s the approach the [Culinary Workers Union Local 226](https://www.culinaryunion226.org/blog/contract-language-automation-technology) in Las Vegas took when negotiations with hotels began in 2018. The union gained a big win by securing language to protect workers when employers bring in new technologies. Some of those protections include: Up to six months’ notice of the adoption of new technology that could lead to layoffs and/or reduction of hours. Free reskilling to use new technology in current jobs. Access and free job training if any new jobs are created because of automation and technology. The Transportation Trades Department (TTD) of the AFL-CIO is taking a similar approach by outlining eight principles for collective bargaining and legislation that transportation unions should pursue to protect workers as driverless technology matures. These principles include advanced notice before automated vehicles are deployed, a workforce training program and having drivers remain onboard driverless vehicles as a safety measure. “We cannot allow safety to be compromised or the good jobs in this sector to be steamrolled just so tech companies and Wall Street investors can have their way,” says TTD President [Larry Willis](https://smart-union.org/news/transportation-labor-announces-eight-key-policies-to-promote-safety-protect-transit-jobs-in-era-of-automation/). Automation has been shown to exacerbate [income inequality and wage polarization](https://www.uniontrack.com/blog/unions-closing-the-wage-gap). Researchers [Sungki Hong and Hannah Shell](https://research.stlouisfed.org/publications/economic-synopses/2018/11/19/the-impact-of-automation-on-inequality) at The Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis conclude that the gap widens because automation more often displaces the lowest-paid workers. This is where the issue of automation dovetails with grassroots campaigns such as the Fight for $15. Workers must collectively demand their fair share of the profits created by automation’s efficiencies. This is also where unions must step in to protect wages and mitigate income inequality. As a collective force, workers are better able to bargain for living wages when faced with employers looking to cut costs through automation. One questionable use of automation in the workforce is Amazon’s “auto-firing” of fulfillment center employees. The Verge’s [Colin Lecher](https://www.theverge.com/2019/4/25/18516004/amazon-warehouse-fulfillment-centers-productivity-firing-terminations) details how those workers’ productivity is tracked by robots that then issue warnings and termination orders based on a workers’ production. One of the stats the system tracks is someone’s “time off task.” If a person’s time between package scans is too long, the system automatically issues warnings that can eventually lead to the person’s firing. Termination paperwork can get generated without a human supervisor intervening at any point (though the company says the final decision to terminate is up to a manager). To avoid termination, employees report going without bathroom breaks to meet their quotas, which can be up to 100 packages an hour. In one year, Lecher reports, Amazon used the automated system to fire approximately 300 full-time workers at a fulfillment center in Baltimore for failing to meet productivity quotas, more than 10 percent of the fulfillment center’s workforce. “It is surreal to think that any company could fire their own workers without any human involvement,” says [Marc Perrone](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/amazon-under-fire-for-software-that-recommends-firing-workers/), president of the United Food and Commercial Workers International Union. That’s the type of automation that unions can step in to mitigate through collective bargaining contracts. These are just a few of the many threats that automation poses to jobs and workers. Unions are in a position to help protect jobs and support workers as they navigate these challenges. By using a communication tool like [UnionTrack’s ENGAGE](https://uniontrack.com/), union leaders can maintain constant contact with members to better understand those challenges and strategize approaches for dealing with the threats.