## **CP**

#### [Blechman] CP Text: I advocate that states ought to eliminate their nuclear arsenals by agreeing to remove their collections of nuclear weapons.

Blechman: Blechman, Barry M. [Distinguished Fellow, Stimson Center] “Why We Need to Eliminate Nuclear Weapons – And How to Do It.” In *Elements of a Nuclear Disarmament Treaty*, Barry M. Blechman & Alexander K. Bollfrass, eds. The Henry L. Stimson Center, Washington, D.C., 2010. CH

Long relegated to the fringes of policy discussions, nuclear disarmament has moved to center stage in the past few years. The continuing deterioration of the nonproliferation regime, the sudden emergence of North Korea as a nuclear weapon state and of Iran as a potential weapon state, concerns about the stability of another new nuclear power, Pakistan, and revelations about nuclear weapon programs in Libya, Syria, and possibly Burma have all raised great concerns. Given the vulnerability of the great powers to terrorist bombings—made clear by the attacks on Moscow in 1999, New York and Washington in 2001, Madrid in 2004, and London in 2005—the prospect of a proliferation cascade and the rising danger of nuclear terrorism have made clear the risks of a business-as-usual approach to nuclear issues. Relying on the severely strained nonproliferation regime and its perennial backstop, ad hoc diplomacy, no longer seems responsible. The alternative of multilateral nuclear disarmament is an idea as old as the bomb itself, but it has rarely been espoused seriously by the great powers—and then mainly as a rhetorical tool to encourage political support for related but less ambitious initiatives. Recent well-publicized conversions of national security leaders to the disarmament cause, however, to say nothing of a new, more serious tone in pronouncements on the subject by many governments, including those of the nuclear-weapon states, suggest that support is growing for the notion that the only permanent solution to nuclear dangers is an agreement that would eliminate all nuclear weapons, verifiably, from all nations.

#### [Nixon et al 2] When one country disarms, others will too – South African proves.

**Nixon et al 2:** Nixon, Shelly [Originally from Flint, Michigan, Shelly is an educator, writer, and activist. She holds a B.S. in chemistry from Eastern Michigan University, a masters in Women and Gender Studies from Eastern Michigan University, and a masters in Liberal Arts from UNCA] “Nuclear Weapons: The World’s Greatest Threat to Peace” *Academia.edu*, University of North Carolina at Asheville, 2009. GC

**First, it is clear from the case of South Africa that diminishing military threats is a precursor. South Africa’s voluntary nuclear weapons disarmament provides a successful model that can serve as a** springboard for a global plan. Several of the steps carried out in South Africa can be successfully repeated in most other countries.First and foremost, before a nation can contemplate nuclear disarmament, it must end all international conflicts unilaterally. Obviously this is easier said than done, but nuclear disarmament depends directly on diminished threats to a nation’s sovereignty. South Africa could not even begin a coherent discussion about nuclear disarmament, let alone conceptualize and carry out a comprehensive plan, until the Soviet Union had withdrawn communist troops from Angola. **This easing of tension allowed South Africa to feel secure enough to undertake the process of nuclear disarmament.**

They add:

**Positive signs in the reduction of nuc**lear threat**s in other parts of the globe appeared as well during the** early 19**90’s. As South Africa’s apartheid-based regime began to crumble, the government revealed its clandestine nucl**ear weapon**s program and devices and voluntarily began their dismantlement. Argentina and Brazil ceased their nuc**lear weapon**s programs and signed on to the NPT as NNWS (Bidwai and Vanaik 2000, 31-32). Three former Soviet republics – Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine – finding themselves with nuclear stockpiles after the USSR’s collapse, all agreed to hand the weaponry over to Russia and become NNWS. The 1991 war in Iraq revealed and, with United Nations oversight, reversed Saddam Hussein’s chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons program (Beckman et al. 2007, 204-205). The specter of unbridled nuc**lear **proliferation – at first blush – appeared contained.**

This solves the aff because their advantages impact out to nuclear war – that can’t happen if states don’t have nuclear arsenals. They have no impacts SPECIFIC or INHERENT to Strikes. The CP has a 100% risk of solving.

## Public Perceptions

#### [Sainato 21] Strikes are at an all-time high – this month’s strikes prove.

**Sainato 21:** Sainato, Micheal. [Michael Sainato writes on civil rights issues for the Miami Times] “Wave of US labor unrest could see tens of thousands on strike within weeks” *The Guardian,* October 2021. JP

**Tens of thousands of workers around the US could go on strike in the coming weeks in what would be the largest wave of labor unrest since a series of teacher strikes in 2018 and 2019, which won major victories and gave the American labor movement a significant boost.** The unrest spans a huge range of industries from healthcare to Hollywood and academia, and is largely focused on higher wages, fighting cuts and better working and safety conditions, especially in light of Covid-19. ‘I was doing a job where people who were sitting next to me were getting paid three to four times as much as me,’ one contract worker said. ‘A race to the bottom’: Google temps are fighting a two-tier labor system Read more It also plays out against a backdrop of an economy bouncing back from the torrid experience of widespread economic shutdowns during the coronavirus pandemic, but one that is still marked by profound inequality. However, the pandemic is also seen as potentially providing a shot in the arm for US labor unions by increasing bargaining power amid increased union drives and labor shortages in some industries. **About 24,000 nurses and other healthcare workers at Kaiser Permanente in California represented by the United Nurses Associations of California/Union of Health Care Professionals will vote on a strike authorization from 1 to 10 October.** The union took issue with Kaiser Permanente’s 1% wage increase for workers, cuts to wages for new staff, and benefit cuts in the company’s most recent offer. “We have people burned out, complaining of mental health issues and PTSD. We’re in a situation as a union where we’re concerned about the future of nursing, [and] how we recruit and retain nurses and other healthcare professionals,” said Denise Duncan, president of UNAC/UHCP and a registered nurse. **About 700 building engineers at Kaiser Permanente in the San Francisco area are already on strike. An additional 3,400 health workers in Oregon and 7,400 health workers with USW at Kaiser Permanente also announced strike authorization votes. Other unions representing thousands of workers at the company with expiring union contracts are considering strike authorization votes.**

#### [Bennett et al] Teachers strikes anger the public – they disrupt social order.

**Bennett et al**: Bennett, William J. [Writer at Education Week] Nussle, Karen. [Writer at Education Week] “No, Teacher Strikes Do Not Help Students” *EducationWeek,* 2018. JP

There is a fundamental problem in education that has been on vivid display recently: confusion about whom our schools exist to serve. Our public school system exists to give our children a foundation in literacy and numeracy and to help them become informed citizens. **It is not the purpose of the public schools to use children as leverage for the gains of others. Only that base misconception could drive mass school closures and disruptions right in the midst of a critical time in the school year. Only that misconception could lead adults to go on strike, thrusting chaos and untenable choices on the most vulnerable families least able to cope with abrupt changes in the routines of their children.** When coal miners strike they lay down their equipment. When teachers strike, they lay down their students’ minds." We strongly believe in the importance and honor of great teaching and teachers. We believe policymakers should set budgets so that the best teachers are attracted and retained. Those decisions must be made at each state and district level. **We strongly disagree that adults in our public schools should use systematic disruption of students and families—that is, strikes or walkouts—as a tactic to secure financial outcomes**. There are several basic reasons for this: First, abrupt school closure interrupts and damages the progress of students. We either believe that school and teaching time matters, or we do not. Teaching time does matter, and we should be very reluctant to interrupt it. Strikes (and walkouts) do exactly that. When coal miners strike they lay down their equipment. When teachers strike, they lay down their students’ minds. **Second, teachers want us to treat them as professionals**. To be treated as such, they must act as such. Certainly, individuals and groups have every right to seek changes to their compensation or pensions. **But to do so in a manner that damages both students and the critical role public schools play is the antithesis of professionalism**. No other professionals have a summer in which they can pursue their financial goals or other endeavors. Let’s be honest and recognize that the past weeks have not been about serving students, but rather pursuing financial ends, thus hurting the cause of professionalism. There is a time, place, and manner for these fiscal discussions. Strikes during the school year are not it. Finally, many publicly stated “demands” associated with these strikes and walkouts do not withstand review. In Kentucky, teachers are angry at their state’s current governor when their anger should be directed at the pension-fund board that set policies rife with selfish abuse and headed to collapse over the course of decades. The current leaders are left to stabilize the situation. In Colorado, state legislators do not set teacher salaries—that is the role of the local school boards. But the walkout organizers in Colorado clearly think they can maneuver a sweeter deal through disruption, regardless of the consequences for the state’s children and families.

#### [Riley] The public negatively reacts to strikes – parents are pulling kids out of school, and literacy rates are declining.

**Riley:** Riley, Jason L. [Jason Riley is an opinion columnist at The Wall Street Journal, where his column, Upward Mobility, has run since 2016. He is also a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute and provides television commentary for various news outlets] “Teachers Unions Don’t Really Strike for ‘the Kids’” *WSJ,* 2019. JP

**Before the Los Angeles strike began, local officials took steps to keep schools open by hiring substitute instructors and aides. The striking teachers did everything they could to sabotage those efforts, like taking textbooks and supplies home to ensure that they weren’t used during the strike. That’s an odd way of looking out for the interests of your students.** Ms. Weingarten’s reference to “all public schools” is misleading. She really means all public schools that employ union members. Public charter schools, which are mostly nonunionized and growing rapidly in the city, don’t count in her estimation. Charters now enroll about 20% of public school students in Los Angeles, up from 12% seven years ago, and curbing the expansion of schools that don’t employ their members has long been a major priority of teachers unions. **The Los Angeles Times reports that only 42% of the district’s students can read at grade level, and math proficiency is an even lower 32%. Families are fleeing union-run schools, so labor leaders are trying to block the exits**. Whether students benefit from more school choice is not something that concerns teachers unions. They care whether their members benefit. Los Angeles teachers were following a path blazed last year by educators who demonstrated in places like Arizona, North Carolina, West Virginia, Colorado and Washington state. They demanded bigger budgets, higher salaries, smaller class sizes and less standardized testing. Put another way, they want more pay for less work and accountability. Gee, who doesn’t? For teachers, reducing the size of each class means fewer children to mind and assignments to grade. For unions, it means more jobs for dues-paying teachers and ultimately more money in AFT and NEA coffers to spend lobbying politicians and policy makers to keep schools organized in a way that benefits their members first and foremost. **The union has won some concessions on pay and class size, but whether the deal will improve test scores, graduation rates or college readiness is an afterthought for labor leaders. And we have every reason to believe it won’t. The U.S. spends more than twice as much on education—per student and after inflation—as it did in 1970 and more than three times as much as in 1960.** School expenditures in high-poverty districts are typically well above the national average. **Yet standardized test results show little improvement, and large racial gaps persist**. We’ve long known that class size matters much less than teacher quality. Charter schools with larger classes have outperformed traditional public schools with smaller classes. And in countries such as Japan and South Korea, which regularly outperform the U.S. on international tests, average class sizes are larger than here. Teachers unions are unions first, not reformers or student advocates. Their real agenda—their only agenda—is to protect their members by any means possible. **No matter what those picket signs said, the unions weren’t helping students. They were using them.**

## Unions DA

#### [Boldea] Strikes DESTROY unions – they decrease support for them and cause harm to communities.

**Boldea**: Boldea Patrick [University of California-Berkeley] “Striking Out: Why Strikes Weaken Union Positions Politically” Berkeley Political Review, 2019. MB

The GM strike, beginning in September of 2019, is set to be the largest strike of the past 18 years. In fact, 2018 as a whole saw the largest number of strikes in decades and support for labor unions has polled at a 20 year high with candidates like Bernie Sanders highlighting their importance in his economic and political strategies. Many left-leaning individuals often express admiration for the union golden era of the 1940s and 50s, when there were sometimes as many as 400 strikes of over 1000 people per year and union membership was at a historic high. With all the positive rhetoric surrounding unions, it may be difficult for someone to understand why anyone, aside from cartoonish caricatures of capitalist pig-men in coat and tails, would ever dislike unions. However, the unintended consequences of the GM strike highlight the ways in which the main tool of unions, the strike, is deeply flawed from a political economy perspective. With a decline in union membership and manufacturing in the US and the interconnectivity of global supply chains, the benefits of a strike fall to fewer and fewer hands while the direct consequences of the strike can still cause great harm to the local economy. Many in America live paycheck-to-paycheck, and strikes can have a strong impact on the financial well-being of the strikers who have to tighten their belt or go into debt. In communities that rely on money from manufacturing workers to spend, this can cause an intense ripple effect that can be felt for miles. If Bob the tire quality control specialist doesn’t have any money, then he doesn’t buy coffee from his local diner, which in turn affects the income of the cooks in the diner who may then forgo purchases at other stores. This is essentially the so-called “virtuous cycle” of economic growth working in reverse, which can cause an intense contraction, which some fear could cause a recession locally as well as statewide. Thusly, even ordinary working people in an area attached to a factory town have a vested interest in ensuring union strikes are ended quickly and do not happen often. This generally results in anti-union legislation or in legislation to cement union desires into public policy without causing the type of damage typically associated with strikes. Locals near an autoplant are not the only people that have direct financial stake in ensuring strikes don’t happen. Suppliers up and down the chain are also deeply affected and even more intimately attached to these strikes. Within GM itself, roughly 10,000 non-union workers have been placed on furlough as a result of the strike mentioned at the beginning of the piece. This is because without unionized labor in certain fields, the whole cycle of production shuts down, and everyone involved is unable to continue working. With chains of supply so directly interlinked, a stop at any point, union or non-union, could cause a work-stop for all other points in the chain. Workers in Canada and Mexico have also been placed on unpaid furlough, causing them to lose income without any possibility of gain and with no incentive on behalf of their American counterparts to represent their competing interests. Auto parts suppliers to GM, such as American Axle & Manufacturing Holdings, have already reported having to lay off workers due to projected losses from the strike. Car dealerships, which are up the supply chain from the plant, have reported hardships in servicing GM cars due to shortages of materials as well. This point brings me to the last victim of strikes: the wider public. America is fundamentally a consumption heavy economy. Our strength relies on our ability to purchase and consume. Almost 70 percent of our GDP comes from consumption. Any reduction in consumption affects the economy as a whole in a big way, and strikes cause a reduction in production and consumption of the product in question and other products inadvertently. If prices or parts get too scarce, that causes prices to go up and consumers to be shut out of the market. Even worse than that, many states such as Tennessee rely almost exclusively on sales tax for government revenue (California still nets about 20 billion a year in sales taxes). A strike not only affects consumers but also affects the most vulnerable members of our society who rely on government sponsored welfare. In conclusion, part of the reason for the decline in political support for unions is due to incredible destructive and disruptive power of strikes. While national labor standards laws can be achieved through the ballot box, the picket line drives a wedge between union interests and the rest of society. Unions should stick to grassroots and political organization because, while strikes can bring them short term gains, they hurts those around them and expose the single-minded interest that unions have for their membership and the ability to disregard and harm their community at large.

#### [Perez et al] TURNS CASE: union legitimacy is key to worker retention, good conditions, and more.

**Perez et al:** Perez, Daniel [a research assistant at the Economic Policy Institute] McNicholas, Celine [the director of policy and government affairs/general counsel at the Economic Policy Institute] Rhinehart, Lynn [a senior fellow at EPI] Poydock, Margaret [assists the policy team in managing EPI’s legislative and policy initiatives] Schierholtz, Heidi [the president of the Economic Policy Institute] “Why unions are good for workers—especially in a crisis like COVID-19,” *Economic Policy Institute,* August 25, 2020, <https://www.epi.org/publication/why-unions-are-good-for-workers-especially-in-a-crisis-like-covid-19-12-policies-that-would-boost-worker-rights-safety-and-wages/> AA

Reform must be responsive to the lessons we have learned from the challenges working people have faced during the pandemic. One of the main lessons is the need for and power of workers’ collective voice in the workplace. **Where workers have been able to act collectively and through their union, they have been able to secure enhanced safety measures, additional premium pay, and paid sick time.** **Unionized workers have had a voice in how their employers navigate the pandemic, including negotiating for terms of furloughs or work-share arrangements to save jobs.** Research shows the advantages workers in unions have over nonunionized workers. **Workers with strong unions have been able to set industry standards for wages and benefits that help all workers**, both union and nonunion (Rhinehart and McNicholas 2020). Never in recent history has this dynamic been more clear. **Never has it been more important that all workers have a voice in the workplace and access to a union.** Workers’ lives and the health and safety of working families depends on their ability to have a say in how they do their jobs.

**They add:**

The **Trump** administration**’s failure to provide** essential workers with **basic protections** during the coronavirus pandemic **has underscored the importance of unions** (McNicholas and Poydock 2020b). **With a union, workers have negotiated additional pay**,[10](https://www.epi.org/publication/why-unions-are-good-for-workers-especially-in-a-crisis-like-covid-19-12-policies-that-would-boost-worker-rights-safety-and-wages/#_note10) **health and safety measures,**[11](https://www.epi.org/publication/why-unions-are-good-for-workers-especially-in-a-crisis-like-covid-19-12-policies-that-would-boost-worker-rights-safety-and-wages/#_note11)**paid sick leave,**[12](https://www.epi.org/publication/why-unions-are-good-for-workers-especially-in-a-crisis-like-covid-19-12-policies-that-would-boost-worker-rights-safety-and-wages/#_note12) **and job preservation.**[13](https://www.epi.org/publication/why-unions-are-good-for-workers-especially-in-a-crisis-like-covid-19-12-policies-that-would-boost-worker-rights-safety-and-wages/#_note13) Furthermore, unionized workers have felt more secure speaking out about hazards (Jamieson 2020). **Without unions, many workers are forced to work without personal protective equipment or access to paid leave or premium pay. And when nonunion workers have advocated for health and safety protections or wage increases, they have often been retaliated against or even fired for doing so** (Paul 2020; Davenport, Bhattarai, and McGregor 2020; Kruzel 2020; Eidelson 2020; Miller 2020). The lack of these basic protections has led to thousands of essential workers becoming infected with the coronavirus, and many are dying as a result (Bhattarai 2020; Kaplan and Kent 2020; Jewett, Bailey, and Renwick 2020).