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### 1 – harms

#### **Sustaining striketober momentum is k2 class consciousness and overhaul of capitalism**

Sims 10-22-21

Joe Sims (Joe Sims is co-chair of the Communist Party USA. He is also a senior editor of People's World and loves biking.), 10-22-2021, "Strike!," Communist Party USA, <https://www.cpusa.org/article/strike/> // Comrade AW

The class struggle is sharpening. Workers all across the country are striking and engaging in other job actions, large and small. Fed up with company attempts to impose two-tier wages, long hours, and inadequate pay, despite rising productivity and skyrocketing corporate profits, unions in several industries have had it. Now they’re marching on the picket lines. As late as last weekend, over 100,000 workers had voted to authorize strikes, and over 169 have occurred so far this year, the largest uptick since the wave of job actions in 2018–19. The AFL-CIO has aptly labeled this month #striketober. There is deep anger, unrest, and growing militancy among the working class. Why? Companies want more while labor is repeatedly asked to do with less. The Bureau of Labor Statistics [reported](https://www.bls.gov/news.release/prod2.nr0.htm) that “manufacturing sector labor productivity increased 8.0 percent in the second quarter of 2021, as output increased 5.5 percent and hours worked decreased 2.3 percent.” Overall, [productivity](https://www.ft.com/content/89098269-0889-4945-a120-2f8e7adf8cc4) “grew an average of 3 per cent in the first half of 2021. Unit labour costs fell 0.8 per cent during the same period.” But at what cost to the worker? Wages are too low to pay for the rising cost of housing, hours are too long to allow adequate time for caregiving, and lack of health care benefits force many to go to work sick. Workers are tired of supplying profits to billionaires like Jeff Bezos to fuel their rocket rides and egos. As the nation emerges from the pandemic, literally millions are so dissatisfied that they’re simply quitting in what some have described as a silent general strike. “The [seriousness of the situation](https://www.nakedcapitalism.com/2021/10/why-record-numbers-of-workers-are-quitting-and-striking.html) was confirmed by the latest Bureau of Labor Statistics report showing that a record 2.9 percent of the workforce quit their jobs in August, which is equivalent to 4.3 million resignations.” According to one poll, ”employees were so dissatisfied with their situation that more than one-quarter (28%) of all respondents left their jobs without another job lined up.” One of the main reasons workers are leaving is burnout, cited by 40% of the poll respondents. Big business is alarmed at the political significance of the resignations. The “Great Resignation,” [Forbes](https://www.forbes.com/sites/jackkelly/2021/10/08/the-great-resignation-is-a-workers-revolution-heres-what-real-leaders-must-do-right-now/?sh=78bc2697514f) writes, “is a sort of workers’ revolution and uprising against bad bosses and tone-deaf companies that refuse to pay well and take advantage of their staff.” Contributing to the spike in labor activism is growing confidence in collective action and knowledge that you can strike and win. A glut in job openings despite still significant unemployment has improved the unions’ bargaining position and power. Pro-union sentiment among the broad public is at its highest level in several decades. A Gallup poll released in the beginning of July showed that 68% of Americans [approve of labor unions](https://time.com/6105109/workers-strike-unemployment/), up significantly from the 48% approval in 2009 during the throes of the Great Recession. In this regard, the Biden-Harris administration’s pro-union stance should not be underestimated, not the least of which is reflected by new appointments to the [National Labor Relations Board.](https://inthesetimes.com/article/striketober-right-to-strike-nlrb-legal-john-deere) The new general counsel, Jennifer Abruzzo, for example, has “signaled that she is willing to reconsider all kinds of twisted and outdated precedents that have vastly favored bosses during a nearly four-decades-long union-busting drive . . . she’s indicated a willingness to issue bargaining orders — not elections — for new unions when employers commit Unfair Labor Practices, to certify [minority members-only bargaining units](https://inthesetimes.com/article/members-only-minority-unions) to help unions establish a foothold, and to be more creative about ‘make whole’ financial remedies for terminated union activists.” As Peoplesworld.org reports, 10,000 workers at John Deere are among the latest to go out: “The strike wave that has hit John Deere has been building nationwide for more than a month. Last week [Kellogg workers went on strike](https://www.peoplesworld.org/article/kelloggs-forces-1400-cereal-plant-workers-to-strike/) and over the summer Mondelez, the maker of Nabisco Oreos walked out. [Coal miners in Alabama](https://www.peoplesworld.org/article/warrior-met-forces-1100-mine-workers-in-alabama-into-long-strike/) have been on strike for months.” While uneven, the working class and people’s forces in local communities and workplaces are gathering in strength for the class and democratic battles that lie ahead. Today they’re focused on bread-and-butter issues of survival. But with the GOP blocking everything from strengthening voting rights to spending on climate change and human infrastructure, these economic struggles are becoming political. When that material force takes off and as the mid-terms loom — watch out. Big days are coming. But it’s a mistake for friends of labor to sit around awaiting their arrival. Visit the picket lines and be sure to bring your walking shoes. A box of donuts and coffee would be appreciated but more important are the smiles and solidarity of friends. Talk, learn, listen, and afterwards share the experience. In so doing you’ll add to the growing class-consciousness and militancy that’s sweeping the nation. It will do everyone concerned a whole lot of good. Building community support for striking workers is vital, calling on local politicians, clergy, and neighborhood leaders to lend solidarity. Letters to the editor along with social media campaigns can help build pro-strike sentiment. Community pickets at retail outlets and dealerships might also be helpful. Solidarity should also include boycotts and other forms of public pressure against companies that refuse to provide good wages, health care, working conditions and rights in the workplaces. Yes, there’s a rising tide of struggle occurring deep within our class. Let’s give it our every support.

#### Striketobershows strikes are possible and thump any disad link, but this burst will not last into any long-term change – the question of empowering the labor movement is whether strikes can be made sustainable

Greenhouse 10-23-21

(Steven, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/oct/23/striketober-unions-strikes-workers-lasting-change)

US labor unions have been on the defensive for decades but this October there has been a surprising burst of worker militancy and strikes as workers have gone on the offensive to demand more. Experts are predicting more actions to come but whether “Striketober” can lead to permanent change remains an open question. The scale of industrial action is truly remarkable. Ten thousand John Deere workers have gone on strike, 1,400 Kellogg workers have walked out, as well as a walkout threatened by more than 30,000 Kaiser Permanente workers, all inflamed by a profound disconnect between labor and management. Many frontline workers – after working so hard and risking their lives during the pandemic – say they deserve substantial raises along with lots of gratitude. With this in mind and with myriad employers complaining of a labor shortage, many workers believe it’s an opportune time to demand more and go on strike. It doesn’t hurt that there’s a strongly pro-union president in the White House and there’s more public support for unions than in decades. But some corporations are acting as if nothing has changed and they can continue corporate America’s decades-long practice of squeezing workers and demanding concessions, even after corporate profits have soared. This attitude doesn’t sit well with Chris Laursen, who earns $20.82 an hour after 19 years at Deere’s farm equipment factory in Ottumwa, Iowa. Laursen is upset that Deere is offering just a one-dollar-an-hour raise and wants to eliminate pensions for future hires even when Deere anticipates a record $5.7bn in profits this year, more than double last year’s earnings. “We were deemed essential workers right out of the gate,” Laursen said, noting that many workers racked up lots of overtime during the pandemic. “But then they came with an offer that was appallingly low. It was a slap in the face of the workers who created all the wealth for them.” Many Deere workers complain that the company offered only a 12% raise over six years, which they say won’t keep pace with inflation, even as the CEO’s pay rose 160% last year to $16m and dividends were raised 17%. Deere’s workers voted down the company’s offer by 90% before they went on strike at 14 factories on 14 October, their first walkout in 35 years. “We really showed up during the pandemic and kept building equipment for them,” Laursen said. “Now we want something back. The stars are finally lined up for us, and we had to bring the fight.” Thomas Kochan, an MIT professor of industrial relations, agreed that it was a favorable time for workers – many corporations have substantially increased pay in response to the labor shortage. “It’s clear that workers are much more empowered,” he said. “They’re empowered because of the labor shortage.” Kochan added: “These strikes could easily trigger more strike activity if several are successful or perceived to be successful.” Robert Bruno, a labor relations professor at the University of Illinois, said workers have built up a lot of grievances and anger during the pandemic, after years of seeing scant improvement in pay and benefits. Bruno pointed to a big reason for the growing worker frustration: “You can definitely see that American capitalism has reigned supreme over workers, and as a result, the incentive for companies is to continue to do what’s been working for them. It’s likely that an arrogance sets in where companies think that’s going to last for ever, and maybe they don’t read the times properly.” Kevin Bradshaw, a striker at Kellogg’s factory in Memphis, said the cereal maker was being arrogant and unappreciative. During the pandemic, he said, Kellogg employees often worked 30 days in a row, often in 12-hour or 16-hour shifts. In light of this hard work, he derided Kellogg’s contract offer, which calls for a far lower scale for new hires. “Kellogg is offering a $13 cut in top pay for new workers,” Bradshaw said. “They want a permanent two-tier. New employees will no longer receive the same amount of money and benefits we do.” That, he said, is bad for the next generation of workers. Bradshaw, vice-president of the Bakery, Confectionery, Tobacco Workers and Grain Millers union local, noted that it made painful concessions to Kellogg in 2015. “We gave so many concessions, and now they’re saying they need more,” he said. “This is a real smack in the face during the pandemic. Everyone knows that they’re greedy and not needy.” Kellogg said its compensation is among the industry’s best and its offer will help the company meet competitive challenges. Deere said it was determined to reach an agreement and continue to make its workers “the highest paid employees in the agriculture industry”. There are many strikes beyond Deere and Kellogg. More than 400 workers at the Heaven Hill bourbon distillery in Kentucky have been on strike for six weeks, while roughly 1,000 Warrior Met coalminers in Alabama have been on strike since April. Hundreds of nurses at Mercy hospital in Buffalo went on strike on 1 October, and 450 steelworkers at Special Metals in Huntington, West Virginia, also walked out that day. More than 30,000 nurses and other healthcare professionals at Kaiser Permanente on the west coast have voted to authorize a strike. Sixty thousand Hollywood production employees threatened to go on strike last Monday, unhappy that film and TV companies were not taking their concerns about overwork and exhaustion seriously. But seeing that the union was serious about staging its first-ever strike, Hollywood producers flinched, agreed to compromises, and the two sides reached a settlement. Noting that Kaiser Permanente, a non-profit, had amassed $45bn in reserves, Belinda Redding, a Kaiser nurse in Woodland Hills, California, said, “We’ve been going all out during the pandemic. We’ve been working extra shifts. Our lives have been turned upside down. The signs were up all over saying, ‘Heroes Work Here’. And the pandemic isn’t even over for us, and then for them to offer us a 1% raise, it’s almost a slap in the face.” Redding is also fuming that management has proposed hiring new nurses at 26% less pay than current ones earn – which she said would ensure a shortage of nurses. “It’s hard to imagine a nurse giving her all when she’s paid far less than other nurses,” Redding said. Kaiser said that its employees earn 26% more than average market wages and that its services would become unaffordable unless it restrains labor costs. On a smaller scale but in an industry in increasing demand, striking workers at one of the world’s largest bourbon producers were scheduled to vote on a new contract on Saturday, a day after announcing a tentative agreement with Heaven Hill, the producer of Evan Williams bourbon. About 420 members of United Food and Commercial Workers Local 23D went on strike about six weeks ago, forming picket lines at the company’s operations in Bardstown, Kentucky, with the dispute revolving around healthcare and scheduling. Meanwhile, many non-union workers – frequently dismayed with low pay, volatile schedules and poor treatment – have quit their jobs or refused to return to their old ones after being laid off during the pandemic. In August, 4.2 million workers quit their jobs, part of what has been called the Great Resignation. Some economists have suggested this is a quiet general strike with workers demanding better pay and conditions. “People are using exit from their jobs as a source of power,” Kochan said. As for unionized workers, some labor experts see parallels between today’s burst of strikes and the much larger wave of strikes after the first and second world wars. As with the pandemic, those catastrophic wars caused many Americans to reassess their lives and jobs and ask: after what we’ve been through, don’t we deserve better pay and conditions? Professor Bruno said that in light of today’s increased worker militancy, unionized employers would have to rethink their approach to bargaining “and take the rank and file pretty seriously”. They can no longer expect workers to roll over or to strong-arm them into swallowing concessions, often by threatening to move operations overseas. Bruno questioned whether the surge in strikes will be long-lasting. He predicts that the improvements in pay and job quality will be long-lasting, adding that that was more likely than unions substantially increasing their membership. He said that if workers see others winning better wages and conditions through strikes, that will raise unions’ visibility and lead to more workers voting to join unions. Despite the recent turbulence, Ruth Milkman, a sociologist of labor at City University of New York, foresees a return to the status quo. “I think things will go back to where they were once things settle down,” she said. “The labor shortage is not necessarily going to last.” She sees the number of strikes declining once the labor shortage ends. In her view, union membership isn’t likely to increase markedly because “they’re not doing that much organizing. “There’s a little” – like the unionization efforts at Starbucks in Buffalo and at Amazon – “but it’s not as if there’s some big push.” A big question, Milkman said, was how can today’s labor momentum be sustained? She said it would help if Congress passed the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, which would make it easier to unionize workers. That law would spur unions to do more organizing and increase their chances of winning union drives. “That would be a real shot in the arm,” Milkman said.

#### Capitalism has hurled the world towards climate change and no chance to self-correct

Dawson, 16 [author, activist and professor of English at the CUNY Graduate Center, and at the College of Staten Island, City University of New York, Extinction A Radical History, Chapter 3 ‘Capitalism and Extinction,’ 2016] -TB

Capitalism’s Ceaseless Expansion Capitalism is dependent on the conditions of production that it relentlessly degrades. By fecklessly consuming the environment, capital is figuratively sawing off the tree branch it is sitting on. But it does so because it must: it is a system based on ceaseless accumulation. Capitalists must constantly reinvest their accumulated profits if they are to survive against competitors, driving capital to expand at a compound rate.70 Every limit to capital’s expansion appears as an obstacle that it strives to overcome and fold into a new round of accumulation. But we live on a planet that is self-evidently finite. Capital’s logic is consequently that of a cancer cell, growing uncontrollably until it destroys the body that hosts it. The whaling industry is perhaps the best instance of this all-consuming drive to expand accumulation. Whales have endured the most prolonged and vicious attack by humans of any single species of animal.71 Prior to the rise of capitalism, whales were hunted in sustainable numbers by indigenous communities such as the Inuit in the Arctic, and by coastal-dwelling peoples such as the Basques, who intercepted immense but timid Bowhead and right whales as they made their annual migratory trek throug the Bay of Biscay.72 The Inuit and Basques killed whales in relatively limited numbers. But, as the industrial revolution took off, whales provided valuable commodities, including oil used for illumination and for greasing machinery in the factories of the period. As a consequence, the growing markets of early modern capitalism exhausted stocks of coastal whales, and by the late seventeenth century whalers had to take to the open ocean in search of prey.73 Maritime powers of the time such as the Dutch articulated a doctrine of freedom of the seas for their whaling fleets, opening the rich fisheries of the North Atlantic to commercial whaling by the competing European powers of the day.74 No efforts were made by the Europeans and their North American competitors to conserve stocks of whales. Instead, whalers acted as if their quarry was inexhaustible. European whaling took the industrialized slaughter of animals to the far reaches of the globe. Competition led to increasingly sophisticated techniques of slaughter, from the faster sailing ships of the late eighteenth century that hunted right whales to near extinction in several decades, to the invention in the midnineteenth century of the explosive harpoon gun and huge steam-powered factory ships, which allowed whalers to hunt faster fin and sperm whales in devastating numbers.75 Although it was clearly in the industry’s interest to limit the accelerating predation, the competitive dynamic of industrial capitalism made such forms of conservation impossible. Instead, whalers came up with far-fetched arguments to justify their monumentally shortsighted plunder of the oceans. For instance, in a chapter of Moby Dick entitled “Does the Whale’s Magnitude Diminish? Will He Perish?” Melville’s protagonist Ishmael ponders the question of the whale’s extinction. Although he admits that whales were once far more easy to find in the oceans, he concludes that this is because whales now travel in bigger but less numerous groups, and that they have moved to the Poles in order to escape the whaling industry. As Ishmael’s torturous reasoning suggests, whale populations had to be represented as limitless in order to justify the unsustainable competition of the industry. By the early twentieth century, humans had emptied the world’s oceans of so many whales that commercial whaling was no longer a viable major industry.76 The decimation of whales and the crash of the whaling industry also illustrate the folly of the economic doctrines that grew up to legitimate capitalism. Adam Smith’s Wealth of Nations (1776) is the clearest formulation of these doctrines. Smith believed that self-interested competition in the free market would generate beneficial outcomes for all by keeping prices low and creating incentives for a variety of goods and services. As Smith put it, “by pursuing his own interest [the individual] frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it.”77 Private vices were purportedly transmuted into public virtues through the operation of what Smith described as the “invisible hand” of the market. Like many of his contemporaries, Smith believed in the inevitability of progress, which he assumed involved the production of greater material wealth. Yet, Smith’s invisible hand completely ignored the issue of depletion and even extinction of such natural “resources” as fur-bearing animals and whales. In fact, classical economics is blithely ignorant of the impact of turning the earth’s resources into capital, focusing only on the secondary problem of the distribution of resources between different competing ends.78 But the earth’s resources are not just scarce. They are finite. Like the whaling industry, classical economics is constitutively blind to this finitude, and consequently encourages both producers and consumers to use up resources as fast as possible in pursuit of greater profits and growth. Mainstream economics as formulated by Adam Smith and as practiced today celebrates values—selfishness, gluttony, competitiveness, and shortsightedness—that were once viewed as cardinal sins, and in the process provides intellectual justification for capitalism’s disastrous pillage of the planet. Capitalism’s Chaotic World If capitalism is based on the illusory hope that a mysterious “invisible hand” will reconcile ruthlessly self-interested competition with the common good, modern capitalist society is correspondingly organized around antagonistic nation-states whose competing interests, it is vainly hoped, will be attuned through various international forums. Yet, wracked by the periodic crises of over-accumulation that are a structural feature of capitalism, the bourgeoisie is impelled to seek markets abroad. Since their peers in other nations are driven to cope with system-wide crises through similar expansionary policies, the result is increasing inter-imperial competition and endemic warfare.79 Capitalism thus generates a chaotic world system that compounds ecological crises. In some cases, ecocide is a conscious strategy of imperialism, generating what might be termed ecological warfare. For example, the destruction of the great herds of bison that roamed the Great Plains of North America was European settlers proudly display skulls of slaughtered bison, carnage that was a key element in the campaign against Native Americans. a calculated military strategy designed to deprive Native Americans of the environmental resources on which they depended.80 When Europeans first arrived, the plains were inhabited by tens of millions of bison, providing indigenous peoples with resources that allowed them to maintain their autonomous, nomadic lifestyle. Commercial hunting of bison began in the 1830s, soon reaching a toll of two million animals a year.81 By 1891, there were less than 1,000 bison left on the continent, and the Native Americans had been crushed— defeated militarily and forced onto a series of isolated, barren reservations. Many of these reservations were subsequently turned into “national sacrifice zones” during the Cold War, when nuclear weapons were exploded in sites such as Nevada in order to perfect the US’s military arsenal.82 Similar ecological violence was meted out by the US military to other parts of the planet. During the Vietnam War, for instance, nearly twenty million gallons of pesticides were sprayed on the tropical forests of Vietnam in an effort to destroy the ecological base of the revolutionary Vietnamese forces. This virulent campaign of ecological warfare eventually generated a revolt among US scientists, who balked at what they called the systematic ecocide being carried out by the military in Vietnam.83 Despite this history of war resistance, the US military, with more than 700 bases worldwide, remains the single most polluting organization on the planet.84 In many cases, however, animals and plants simply suffer as collateral damage in the inter-imperial rivalries generated by capitalism. In a system of competing capitalist nations, no individual state has the power or responsibility to counteract the system’s tendencies toward ecological degradation. Indeed, inter-imperial competition impels individual states to shirk responsibility, seeking to score points by blaming their competitors for failing to address the environmental crisis. This fatal contradiction of capitalist society has been abundantly evident in the rounds of United Nations-sponsored climate negotiations during the last two decades. During these negotiations, advanced industrialized countries such as the United States and Great Britain have refused to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions significantly until developing nations such as China, India, and Brazil offer to cut their emissions as well. The industrializing nations respond by pointing out that their per capita emissions are still far lower than those of the wealthy nations of Europe and North America, and argue that these countries have benefited from two hundred years of industrial growth, effectively colonizing the atmosphere to the exclusion of formerly colonized nations. As a result of these antagonistic positions, no binding international agreement on emissions reductions has been reached, despite years of desperate pleas from scientists and civil society. It is not simply that the climate and extinction crises have arrived at a uniquely unpropitious moment when neoliberal doctrines of financial deregulation, corporate power, and emaciated governance are hegemonic.85 Rather, the deadlocked climate negotiations are a reflection of the fundamentally irrational, chaotic, violenceridden, and ecocidal world system produced by capitalism. Can capitalist society reform itself sufficiently to cope with the extinction crisis? This is not simply unlikely. It is impossible in the long run. While it is true that the environmental movement did manage to push corporations and the state into cleaning up local crises from the late 1960s onwards, climate change and extinction suggest that the capitalist system is destroying its ecological foundations when viewed on a longer temporal scale. Recall that capital’s solution to periodic systemic crises is to initiate a new round of accumulation. Capital essentially tries to grow itself out of its problems. But, as we have seen, the extinction crisis is precisely a product of unchecked, blinkered growth. In such a context, conservation efforts can never be more than a paltry bandage over a gaping wound. As laudable as they are, conservation efforts largely fail to address the deep inequalities that capitalism generates, which push the poor to engage in deforestation and other forms of over-exploitation. Many of today’s major conservation organizations were established in the last half of the twentieth century: the Nature Conservancy (1951), World Wildlife Fund (1961), Natural Resources Defense Council (1970), and Conservation International (1987). Yet during this same period, a new round of accumulation based on neoliberal principles of unrestrained hyper-capitalism has engulfed the planet. The neoliberal era has seen much of the global South become increasingly indebted, leading international agencies such as the World Bank to force debtor nations to harvest more trees, mine more minerals, drill for more oil, and generally deplete their natural resources at exponentially greater rates. The result has been a steeply intensifying deterioration in global ecosystems, including a massive increase in the rate of extinction.86 Despite this dramatic collapse of global ecosystems, the climate change crisis has unleashed a fresh round of accumulation, obscured by upbeat language about the investment opportunities opened up by the green economy. Neoliberal solutions to the climate crisis such as voluntary carbon offsets are not only failing to diminish carbon emissions, but are also dramatically augmenting the enclosure and destruction of the global environmental commons.87 Such programs allow polluting industries in wealthy nations to continue emitting carbon, while turning the forests and agricultural land of indigenous people and peasants in the global South into carbon dioxide “sinks” or biodiversity “banks.” Under the green economy, vast numbers of people, plants, and animals are being sacrificed as collateral damage in the ecocidal exploitation of the planet. Capitalism, it is clear, cannot solve the environmental crises it is causing.

#### 2050 scenario highly plausible- traditional impact assessment systemically undervalues climate impacts and we need action now

Ahmed, PhD, 19

(Naveez, <https://www.vice.com/en/article/597kpd/new-report-suggests-high-likelihood-of-human-civilization-coming-to-an-end-in-2050>, 6-3)

A harrowing scenario analysis of how human civilization might collapse in coming decades due to climate change has been endorsed by a former Australian defense chief and senior royal navy commander. The analysis, published by the Breakthrough National Centre for Climate Restoration, a think-tank in Melbourne, Australia, describes climate change as “a near- to mid-term existential threat to human civilization” and sets out a plausible scenario of where business-as-usual could lead over the next 30 years. The paper argues that the potentially “extremely serious outcomes” of climate-related security threats are often far more probable than conventionally assumed, but almost impossible to quantify because they “fall outside the human experience of the last thousand years.” On our current trajectory, the report warns, “planetary and human systems [are] reaching a ‘point of no return’ by mid-century, in which the prospect of a largely uninhabitable Earth leads to the breakdown of nations and the international order.” The only way to avoid the risks of this scenario is what the report describes as “akin in scale to the World War II emergency mobilization”—but this time focused on rapidly building out a zero-emissions industrial system to set in train the restoration of a safe climate. The scenario warns that our current trajectory will likely lock in at least 3 degrees Celsius (C) of global heating, which in turn could trigger further amplifying feedbacks unleashing further warming. This would drive the accelerating collapse of key ecosystems “including coral reef systems, the Amazon rainforest and in the Arctic.” The results would be devastating. Some one billion people would be forced to attempt to relocate from unlivable conditions, and two billion would face scarcity of water supplies. Agriculture would collapse in the sub-tropics, and food production would suffer dramatically worldwide. The internal cohesion of nation-states like the US and China would unravel. ADVERTISEMENT “Even for 2°C of warming, more than a billion people may need to be relocated and in high-end scenarios, the scale of destruction is beyond our capacity to model with a high likelihood of human civilization coming to an end,” the report notes. The new policy briefing is written by David Spratt, Breakthrough’s research director and Ian Dunlop, a former senior executive of Royal Dutch Shell who previously chaired the Australian Coal Association. Read More: Scientists Warn the UN of Capitalism's Imminent Demise In the briefing’s foreword, retired Admiral Chris Barrie—Chief of the Australian Defence Force from 1998 to 2002 and former Deputy Chief of the Australian Navy—commends the paper for laying “bare the unvarnished truth about the desperate situation humans, and our planet, are in, painting a disturbing picture of the real possibility that human life on Earth may be on the way to extinction, in the most horrible way.” Barrie now works for the Climate Change Institute at Australian National University, Canberra. Spratt told Motherboard that a key reason the risks are not understood is that “much knowledge produced for policymakers is too conservative. Because the risks are now existential, a new approach to climate and security risk assessment is required using scenario analysis.” Last October, Motherboard reported on scientific evidence that the UN’s summary report for government policymakers on climate change—whose findings were widely recognized as “devastating”—were in fact too optimistic. While the Breakthrough scenario sets out some of the more ‘high end’ risk possibilities, it is often not possible to meaningfully quantify their probabilities. As a result, the authors emphasize that conventional risk approaches tend to downplay worst-case scenarios despite their plausibility. Spratt and Dunlop’s 2050 scenario illustrates how easy it could be to end up in an accelerating runaway climate scenario which would lead to a largely uninhabitable planet within just a few decades. “A high-end 2050 scenario finds a world in social breakdown and outright chaos,” said Spratt. “But a short window of opportunity exists for an emergency, global mobilization of resources, in which the logistical and planning experiences of the national security sector could play a valuable role.”

### 2 - plan

#### Plan: The United States ought to recognize an unconditional right to strike

#### Recognition of a right means the US protects it when infringed

Macleod PhD 13

Macleod, A. M.(Professor Emeritus Philosophy Arts and Science, Ph.D., Queen’s ) (2013). Rights and Recognition: The Case of Human Rights. Journal of Social Philosophy, 44(1), 51–73. doi:10.1111/josp.12009 // Comrade AW

To recognize the existence of human rights—whatever the normative rationale for their content and scope is taken to be—is to be committed to an account of the duties that would have to be discharged for the rights to be respected or protected. The familiar philosophical doctrine of the correlativity of rights and duties has an application to human rights no less than to rights of other kinds. In its application to human rights, however, care must be taken to interpret it properly: it should not be assumed too readily that one and the same version of the doctrine applies to all rights no matter what sorts of rights they happen to be. For example, when A promises B to perform a particular action X, the right to promise generates for B—to the performance of X by A—can be correlated straightforwardly, and neatly, with the duty A incurs to do X. B’s right can be said to be a right against A, and A’s duty is one owed by A to B. The promise doesn’t generate any rights for third parties (C, D, etc.), and A incurs no duty to any of these third parties. Moreover, the content of the right A’s promise generates for B is fixed by the content of the promise: B’s right is to the performance of X by A. And the content of the duty A incurs is also fixed by the content of the promise: it is a duty to B to do X. To say that in such contexts, rights and duties are “correlative” is to say that B’s right to the performance of X by A is correlative to A’s duty to B to do X. There is no uncertainty about the identity either of the right.

#### Specifically means right to strike will be defended in court

Legal Dictionary no date

TheFreeDictionary, xx-xx-xxxx, "Right," [https://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/right //](https://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/right%20//) Comrade AW

[CivilRights](https://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/Civil+Rights) are those that belong to every citizen of the state, and are not connected with the organization or administration of government. They include the rights of property, marriage, protection by law, freedom to contract, trial by jury, and the like. These rights are capable of being enforced or redressed in a civil action in a court.

### 3 - solvency

#### The right to strike embraces a politics of *antisubordination* that explicitly puts confronting power relations at the forefront of policy as opposed to economics

Gourevitch, PhD, 16

(Alex, PoliSci@Brown, Gourevitch, A. (2016). Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike. Perspectives on Politics, 14(02), 307–323. doi:10.1017/s1537592716000049 )

For these reasons, it is time to think anew about the strike as a distinct form of collective action. The reissue of old classics, like Jeremy Brecher’s labor history Strike!, and the appearance of new reflections, like labor lawyer Joe Burns’ Reviving the Strike or journalist Micah Uetricht’s Strike for America, are signs of renewed interest. But a small group of disparate examples is not a concentrated mass, and none of these pieces are part of political science. It is a strange fact about the right to strike that over the past fifty years English-speaking political philosophers have published only one book-length study and a handful of articles on this subject,12 while neighboring political phenomena—civil disobedience, right of revolution, secession, civil war, social movements—attract vastly more attention. Further, despite ample discussion of the problem of inequality across all fields and subfields, there is relatively little discussion of labor rights. This is especially true among political philosophers, who, with those few aforementioned exceptions, have had much more to say about welfare rights and ideal distributions than about labor rights, especially the right to strike. Though the history of political thought offers many figures who thought about the strike either in systematic or piecemeal ways, the ideas of John Stuart Mill and Karl Marx, L.T. Hobhouse and Rosa Luxemburg, Georges Sorel and Big Bill Haywood seem to have had more influence on union organizers and social theorists, labor lawyers and intellectual historians, than current political philosophers.13 My basic thought is that the right to strike is a right of human freedom claimed against the social domination that the typical modern worker experiences. Ordinarily, the right to strike is thought to be an economic right whose purpose is to maintain a certain kind of bargaining relationship among self-interested economic actors. However, it is better understood as a political right that individuals claim against an unjust system of law and property in the name of justice and emancipation. It is a political right even when most strikes do not have explicitly political ends. Put another way, one reason strikes are political is the way they threaten the normal distinction between politics and economics itself. They do so by challenging the idea that the logic of commodity exchange and private contracts should govern labor relations. The best justification of the right to strike lies in the way strikers claim their liberty not just as abstract persons but as socially-situated agents, who find themselves in the historically specific relationships of domination associated with the labor market. It is this connection to resisting domination that makes the right to strike political. My central purpose is to develop an argument for the right to strike and in so doing to show how recent developments in political philosophy around concepts like domination and freedom can enrich our thinking about labor rights.14 While basically a normative argument, this is not an argument from what is sometimes called ideal theory. The procedure here is not to imagine the best regime and derive the right to strike from features of that regime—quite the opposite. It would, in fact, be hard to understand just why the strike protects a fundamental interest in non-domination if we began from perfectly just conditions. As we shall see, we can only make sense of the right to strike—of the interests it protects, of its scope, of the role it plays in our moral reasoning—against the background of injustice. Those unjust conditions of domination explain the right to strike. I make no general claims about the superiority of non-ideal versus ideal theory. Rather, my argument here is narrower: to explain and justify the right to strike, we must begin with the significantly unjust conditions of the typical labor market. The normative argument here connects to wider research programs on the politics of inequality and, in particular, to how we think about collective responses to economic injustice. While this article does not engage in the comparison, it certainly invites research into comparative labor regimes, especially comparisons among regimes where there is more robust strike activity compared with regimes that incorporate labor demands in other ways. More broadly, I introduce a distinctive kind of question we might ask when comparing political economies. The most familiar comparative questions ask who gets what and why or how do these institutions work compared to those. Since the right to strike is a right of actors who suffer injustice to attempt to remediate that injustice, sometimes by infringing the rights of others, it is one of those rights that touches on that other classic political question: ‘Who can do what to whom? Although I answer that question in a more analytic and normative vein, it is also an urgent empirical concern. My argument proceeds in five parts. I start by trying to answer a deceptively simple question—what is a right to strike?—and show that any answer raises some significant moral and conceptual puzzles. In the second section, I use current American labor law to show that these puzzles are not abstract questions but reach deep into law and policy. In the third, fourth, and fifth sections, I show how the right to strike can be understood as a way of resisting the forms of structural and personal domination that are associated with the modern labor markets

#### Labor rights are communal not individual- they resist capitalist norms

Lynd, JD, 84

(Staughton, Legal Services attorney in Youngstown, Ohio SYMPOSIUM: A CRITIQUE OF RIGHTS: Communal Rights. \* 62 Tex. L. Rev. 1417)

If a new society is struggling to be born from the womb of capitalist society, one would expect to find a rudimentary world view and a corresponding new conception of right. The new kind of right would not be conceptualized as individual property, nor would it presuppose that one person's gain was inevitably another's loss. It would articulate, in however preliminary a form, the values of community, compassion, and solidarity. A. The Right to Engage in Concerted Activity I suggest that the right of workers "to engage in concerted activities for . . . mutual aid or protection" 21Link to the text of the note now guaranteed by federal labor law is an example of a communal right. More than any other institution in capitalist society, the labor movement is based on communal values. Its central historical experience is solidarity, the banding together of individual workers who are alone to weak to protect themselves. 22Link to the text of the note Thus, there has arisen the value expressed by the phrase, "an injury to one is an injury to all." To be sure, at times particular labor organizations, and to some extent trade unionism in general, fall short of this communal aspiration. Yet it is significant that trade union members still address one another as "Brother" and "Sister" and sign their correspondence "Fraternally yours." These conventions evidence an underlying attitude and practice fundamentally different from that in business and even in academia, where one person's job security subtracts from, or at most is separate from, another's. Whatever rights the critique of the traditional rights rhetoric properly calls into question, it misses the mark when it applies its critical analysis to the right to engage in concerted labor activities. There is nothing metaphysical or indeterminate about this right. It articulates the historical experience of rank and file workers. It is, if anything, more specific in content than most legal rules. No one has ever doubted that "concerted activity" meant strikes, picketing, the formation of labor organizations, and related activities. And it is clearly not [\*1424] a right akin to an individual's ownership of property. On the contrary, it is a right to act together, to engage in activity commonly and most effectively undertaken by groups. This in no way endorses the National Labor Relations Act, in which the right is presently embodied. On the one hand, the protection of concerted activity in section 7 of the NLRA makes it "perhaps the most radical piece of legislation ever enacted by the United States Congress." 23Link to the text of the note On the other hand, the American Civil Liberties Union predicted at the time the Act was passed that it would "impair labor's rights in the long run, however much its authors may intend precisely the contrary." 24Link to the text of the note I have felt for some years that this assessment by the ACLU was correct: [I]t took a lot of backtracking by the Supreme Court to get there, but maybe that was part of the prediction, at least in its more sophisticated form: no matter how the law was written, once you had the government that far into controlling the labor movement, given the nature of power in American society, it was going to wind up controlling the labor movement for the sake of business. 25Link to the text of the note But from my point of view, the historical miscarriage of the NLRA makes it more and not less important to "celebrate and seek to restore to its intended vigor the right to engage in concerted activity for mutual aid or protection." 26Link to the text of the note It may not be immediately clear why this right is so different from other rights. 27Link to the text of the note The best approach to understanding the special features of this right is to examine the underlying forms of struggle from which the right is derived. Consider the following example. After Anna Walentynowicz was discharged from her job as a crane operator in the Lenin shipyard in Gdansk in August 1980, her workmates struck demanding her reinstatement. 28Link to the text of the note Other shipyards struck in sympathy. In two days the workers at the Lenin yard had [\*1425] won their demands. Walentynowicz and Lech Walesa were reinstated and the Polish government promised to build a monument honoring workers killed in the strike of 1970. The strike would have ended in failure, however, had it not been for the intervention of two individuals, Walentynowicz and her friend Alina Pienkowska. As Walentynowicz tells the story: Alina Pienkowska and I went running back to the hall to declare a solidarity strike, but the microphones were off. The shipyard loudspeakers were announcing that the strike was over and that everyone had to leave by six P.M. The gates were open, and people were leaving. So Alina and I went running to the main gate. And I began appealing to them to declare a solidarity strike, because the only reason that the manager had met our demands was that the other factories were still on strike. I said that if the workers at these other factories were defeated, we wouldn't be safe either. But somebody challenged me. "On whose authority are you declaring this a strike? I'm tired and I want to go home." I too was tired, and I started to cry. . . . Now, Alina is very small, a tiny person, but full of initiative. She stood up on a barrel and began to appeal to those who were leaving. "We have to help the others with their strikes, because they have helped us. We have to defend them." Somebody from the crowd said, "She's right!" The gate was closed. 29Link to the text of the note The strike that gave birth to Polish Solidarity followed. I believe that this piece of history embodies a good deal of what legal workers for a new society care about. In Gdansk, one worker was fired and a whole shipyard walked off the job in protest. Although one recounts this as if it were an everyday occurrence, I have never known a university faculty to do this for a colleague who had been fired or denied tenure. It does, however, occur regularly in the labor movement. Ed Mann tells of an incident in Youngstown in the late 1960s: We had a man killed in the open hearth. . . . He had seven days to go to retirement. Two or three months before that I'd filed a grievance, requesting that certain safety features be adopted.The grievance was rejected out of hand. He was killed by a truck backing up. One of the items on the grievance was that trucks backing up have a warning system. The guy gets killed. Everybody liked him. He'd worked there . . . how many years? . . . you know. All right, I led a strike. I had to scream and holler, drag people out by the heels, [\*1426] but I got them out, shut the place down. 30Link to the text of the note In Gdansk, after the first yard struck in protest, workers at other shipyards also left their jobs. As is often the case in wildcat strikes, the workers developed their own demands, 31Link to the text of the note in addition to demanding Walentynowicz' reinstatement. When the question was posed whether the Lenin yard strikers should stay out on behalf of the demands of other shipyards, Anna Walentynowicz took the position that only if the Lenin workers continued their strike on behalf of the workers at the other shipyards would they be "safe." Clearly she was saying that workers, to secure their rights, need above all else to preserve their solidarity. This distinctive experience of solidarity, underlying the right to engage in concerted activity, has three unusual attributes. First, the well-being of the individual and the well-being of the group are not experienced as antagonistic. Justice O'Connor has written that "the concepts of individual action for personal gain and 'concerted activity' are intuitively incompatible." 32Link to the text of the note This is the view from the outside, the view of someone who has not experienced the wage worker's elemental need for the support of other workers. Learned Hand came much closer to the reality in a passage written soon after the enactment of section 7: When all other workmen in a shop make common cause with a fellow workman over his separate grievance, and go out on strike in his support, they engage in a "concerted activity" for "mutual aid or protection," although the aggrieved workman is the only one of them who has any immediate stake in the outcome. The rest know that by their action each one of them assures himself, in case his turn ever comes, of the support of the one whom they are all then helping; and the solidarity so established is "mutual aid" in the most literal sense, as nobody doubts. So too of those engaging in a "sympathetic strike," or secondary boycott; the immediate quarrel does not itself concern them, but by extending the number of those who will make the enemy of one the enemy of all, the power of each is vastly increased. 33Link to the text of the note [\*1427] I have heard a rank and file steelworker use almost identical language in trying to persuade fellow workers to support each other's grievances. What is counterintuitive to Justice O'Connor is the common sense of those engaged in the struggle. Second, the group of those who work together -- the informal work group, the department, the local union, the class -- is often experienced as a reality in itself. Thus, Hand's rationale misses something crucial to the right to engage in concerted activity. I do not scratch your back only because one day I may need you to scratch mine. Labor solidarity is more than an updated version of the social contract through which each individual undertakes to assist others for the advancement of his or her own interest. In a family, when I as son, husband, or father, express love toward you, I do not do so in order to assure myself of love in return. I do not help my son in order to be able to claim assistance from him when I am old; I do it because he and I are in the world together; we are one flesh. Similarly in a workplace, persons who work together form families-at-work. 34Link to the text of the note When you and I are working together, and the foreman suddenly discharges you, and I find myself putting down my tools or stopping my machine before I have had time to think -- why do I do this? Is it not because, as I actually experience the event, your discharge does not happen only to you but also happens to us? Justice Brennan's majority opinion in NLRB v. City Disposal Systems Inc. 35Link to the text of the note portrays this experienced reality of the working group. The case dealt with a truck driver who refused to drive an unsafe truck. Nobody was with Brown, the driver, when he told two supervisors that the truck in question, No. 244, "has got problems and I don't want to drive it." 36Link to the text of the note One of the supervisors went on to tell Brown that "[w]e've got all this garbage out here to haul and you tell me about you don't want to drive." 37Link to the text of the note Brown responded, "Bob, what are you going to do, put the garbage ahead of the safety of the men?" 38Link to the text of the note Thus Brown, although he was quite alone, put his case as a matter of "the safety of the men," because this is how he experienced it. And in fact, Brown initially had become aware of the problems with the truck when, two days earlier, he had been driving a different truck and, because of its brake [\*1428] problems "truck No. 244 nearly collided with Brown's truck"; 39Link to the text of the note when that happened, Brown and the driver of No. 244 together brought No. 244 to the employer's repair facility. Accordingly, Justice Brennan is profoundly right to say in City Disposal that when Brown invoked the clause in the collective bargaining agreement permitting a driver to refuse to drive an unsafe truck, he did "not stand alone" but brought "to bear on his employer the power and resolve of all his fellow employees." 40Link to the text of the note When James Brown refused to drive a truck he believed to be unsafe, he was in effect reminding his employer that he and his fellow employees . . . had extracted a promise from City Disposal that they would not be asked to drive unsafe trucks. He was also reminding his employer that if it persisted in ordering him to drive an unsafe truck, he could reharness the power of that group to ensure the enforcement of that promise. It was just as though James Brown was reassembling his fellow union members to reenact their decision not to drive unsafe trucks. 41Link to the text of the note Finally -- and again in dialectical tension with the attribute just emphasized -- the solidarity of workers articulated in the right to engage in concerted activity can and must be individually exercised. The Walentynowicz story contains this theme, too. When Walentynowicz was asked, "On whose authority are you declaring this a strike?," she began to cry.But her friend, now acting completely alone, stood up on the barrel and finished the job. Any conception of the right to concerted activity that might make the rights to strike and to picket less capable of exercise by individuals flies in the face of legislative history. 42Link to the text of the note In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, workers were understood to be free to quit work or to picket individually (however ineffectual that might be), but were found liable under conspiracy or common law tort theories if they performed the same acts jointly. The intent of the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts was to protect activities by groups that were assumed to be protected when practiced by individuals. Both laws expressly protected striking, and Norris-LaGuardia protected picketing as well, whether undertaken "singly or in concert." 43Link to the text of the note [\*1429] Section 7 of the Wagner Act, 44Link to the text of the note enacted only three years after the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, protected "concerted activity" against the private employer but failed to add that individual exercise of the same rights was also protected. There is not the slightest evidence to suggest that this omission indicated any change in the conception of the rights as expressed in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Nonetheless, for many years the National Labor Relations Board and the United States Supreme Court took advantage of the omission, funding "statutory protection for an activity engaged in by two employees while the very same activity engaged in by one remains unprotected" 45Link to the text of the note and creating the concept of the right to engage in concerted activity for mutual aid or protection as a "collective right" that can be exercised by individual workers only with the approval of their union representatives. 46Link to the text of the note These doctrines are contrary to the legislative history and policy of the statute. Professors Gorman and Finkin conclude an authoritative survey as follows: [T]here are not two abstract and distinguishable categories of action -- individual action for self-interest and collective action for mutual interest -- one which Congress chose not to protect and the other which Congress chose to protect, but rather a continuum of individual activity -- of individuals choosing to speak and act on their own behalf, singly and in small and large groups. Thus, the narrow reading of the Act proceeds upon a false dichotomy, for at the core of the freedom of the individual to protest in a group necessarily lies the freedom of the individual to protest at all. 47Link to the text of the note In City Disposal, the Supreme Court acknowledged the Gorman-Finkin critique and accepted it in situations where a union has been recognized and a collective bargaining agreement has been negotiated. The majority opinion points out that the language of section 7 protects the rights "to join, or assist labor organizations . . . and to engage in other concerted activities," although both joining and assisting are "activities in which a single individual can engage." 48Link to the text of the note Brown's individual refusal to drive an unsafe truck was, according to the Court, "integrally" related to the group activity that had created the union and [\*1430] brought into being a contract protecting the right to refuse to drive an unsafe truck: When an employee joins or assists a labor organization, his actions may be divorced in time, and in location as well, from the actions of fellow employees. Because of the integral relationship among the employees' actions, however, Congress viewed each employee as engaged in concerted activity. The lone employee could not join or assist a labor organization were it not for the related organizing activities of his fellow employees. Conversely, there would be limited utility in forming a labor organization if other employees could not join or assist the organization once it is formed. Thus, the formation of a labor organization is integrally related to the activity of joining or assisting such an organization in the same sense that the negotiation of a collective-bargaining agreement is integrally related to the invocation of a right provided for in the agreement. In each case, neither the individual activity nor the group activity would be complete without the other. 49Link to the text of the note This extraordinary opinion comes close to suggesting that even without a collective bargaining provision articulating the right to refuse unsafe work, such refusal might be an "efficient substitute" for filing a "formal" grievance. 50Link to the text of the note Under this suggestion, the right to refuse unsafe work could be exercised by an individual, as well as by the union as representative of the individuals. The right to engage in concerted activity for mutual aid or protection is the paradigm communal right. Neither a narrowly individual nor a merely collective right, it is a right derived from the actual character of working-class solidarity and accordingly a right that foreshadows a society in which group life and individual self-realization mutually reinforce each other.

#### A radical right to strike snowballs n sympathy strikes become general strikes which challenges the very edifice of capitalism and commodified labor- the plan is not a “reform”

Gourevitch, PhD, 16

(Alex, PoliSci@Brown, Gourevitch, A. (2016). Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike. Perspectives on Politics, 14(02), 307–323. doi:10.1017/s1537592716000049 )

We now have a way of explaining the right to strike as something decidedly more modern than just residual protection of some feudal guild privilege. The right to strike springs organically from the fact of structural domination. Striking is a way of resisting that domination at the point in that structure at which workers find themselves—the particular job they are bargaining over. It is not that workers believe they have some special privilege but quite the opposite. It is their lack of privilege, their vulnerability, that generates the claim. Structural domination makes its most immediate appearance in the threat of being exploited by a particular employer, even though the point of structural domination is that workers can be exploited by any potential employer. The sharpest form that the structural domination takes is through the threat of being fired, or of never being hired in the first place. The claim that strikers make to their job is therefore, in the first instance, a dramatization of the fact that their relationship is not voluntary, it is not accidental and contingent. They are always already forced to be in a contractual relationship with some employer or another. The refusal to perform work while retaining the right to the job is a way of bringing to the fore this social and structural element in their condition. It vivifies the real nature of the production relationship that workers find themselves in. Quitting the work but not the job is a way of saying that this society is not and cannot be just a system of voluntary exchanges among independent producers. There is an underlying structure of unequal dependence, maintained through the system of contracts, that even the “most voluntary” arrangements conceal. This is not just a dramaturgical fact about strikes, though the drama has, in many cases, been nearly Greek in its intensity and tragedy. It is a point about power. It would not have the drama if it were not a power play. By demanding the job as a matter of right workers do not just publicize their domination, they attempt to challenge the forcing to which they are subject. Limiting the employer’s ability to make contracts with others, and preventing other workers from taking those jobs, is a way of reversing the power relationship. It is a way of neutralizing the threat of losing the job, which is the most concrete, immediate point of contact with that background structure of domination. If you cannot lose your job, you are less vulnerable, less immediately economically dependent. Of course, this does not do away with the background structure itself, but a particular strike can never do that. Though even here, there are times when a strike, as it becomes a more generalized rejection of structural domination—say in large-scale sympathy strikes or general strikes—can begin to challenge the broad structure of economic control itself.60 This is a challenge to the logic of the capitalist labor market that begins from within, at the location of the strike itself. At that point in the system, strikers temporarily reverse the relationships of power by eliminating that employers’ ability to use the threat of jobloss against them. They do that not just by claiming the job but by claiming it as a matter of right. The thought is that the exploitation of workers is unjustifiable, an unjustifiability that appears in the terms of the employment itself. Workers have the right to the job, and therefore to interfere with the employer’s property rights and other workers’ contract rights, because it is unjustifiable to subject workers to exploitative conditions. To be sure, many strikes and many strikers never articulate the argument in this language. But the point is not what workers always explicitly say, but rather what they do and what that doing presupposes. I am reconstructing the ideal presuppositions of a strike, and in particular, how to think about the peculiar set of assumptions about the right to a job. We have seen that it is no atavistic recovery of traditional rights and guild privileges but is a way of resisting a thoroughly modern form of social domination from a point within that structure of domination. Again, facing a freedom to quit the job but not the work, workers assert a right to quit working but keep the job. To put this all another way, though strikes are still about bargaining, and in that sense like market exchanges, they are simultaneously a challenge to the market as the appropriate standard by which to judge the fairness of workers’ compensation. The market is unfair because of workers’ structural disadvantage. Over and against the market value, strikers can argue that there are shared, or at least shareable, standards of fair compensation that employers should adhere to. While here again we see the echoes of feudal theories of “just price” and equity jurisprudence,61 we must note that in principle the claim is not, or does not have to be, based on special privilege. Rather, it begins by challenging the view that labor“freely” finds its value on the market. Workers are always already in relationships with employers and they cannot leave the basic relationship of earning money only by selling laborpower, no matter how many jobs they might quit. The standards we use for evaluating those kinds of forced relationships, like the state, are different, based on shared conceptions of justice and human need, not private agreement.

#### Labor is the best starting point for radical politics- workplace exploitation makes every other form of resistance harder

White, PhD, 19

(Damian, Prof@RhodeIslandSchoolofDesign, in *Rethinking the Environment for the Anthropocene* eds. Manuel Arias-Maldonado & Zev Trachtenberg p.198-199)

More generally, agencies are everywhere in critical design but the potential creativity of labor is almost completely missing from a great deal of the discussion (see Wark 2015; Goldstein 2018). By referencing labor, of course, I take it as given that we cannot understand this in the traditional singular and masculine fashion that would take us back behind the gains and insights of feminist, queer, post-colonial political economy or political ecology. Our labor is always hybrid (enrolling humans and non-humans) and queer in being simultaneously classed, gendered, racialized, bound up in the dichotomies of first/third world, able/disabled and other modes of social domination and subordination (Moore 2015; Battistoni 2016). A coherent accounting of labor in worlds torn between industrial and post industrial economies must acknowledge how it is material and immaterial, direct and affective, physical, cognitive and emotional. Our socio-natural reality is a product of constant hybrid organism-environment-interactions where all organ- isms, including humans are in a process of actively making their worlds (Harvey 1996; Arias-Maldonado 2015; Wark 2016; White, Rudy and Gareau 2016). But nevertheless, the relations between critical design and labor need to be carefully explored for an Anthropocene politics that is committed to the just transition. Much critical design futuring to date has placed a great deal of attention on everyday life as the site for transition experimentation (see Fry, 2009; Manzini 2014; Irwin, Kossoff and Tonkinwise 2015). This has value, but a credible vision of the just transition has to acknowledge the extent to which many of our fellow working men and women across the planet find themselves in conditions of servitude at work. There are debts to be paid, childcare to be done, eldercare to engage with, bosses to please and all manner of other modes of subordination to carefully negotiate as we make our way through everyday life. Unless we grapple with the way so many of our fellow citizens are effectively still feudal subjects “in the family, the factory and the field” (Robin 2011:15), we will not only delimit the audience for transition futuring but underestimate the forces that press against the possibility of having the time or energy to be involved in civic experiments to enable just and democratic transition futures. Critical forms of design futuring must address the question of work simply because the workplace and control over terms and conditions in the workplace will continue to be a critical site for political struggle for the foreseeable future as will the demand for more leisure (see White 2015b).

#### Now is the perfect time for strikes

Mordock 10-14-21

(Jeff, https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2021/oct/14/strikes-increase-poses-political-test-biden/)

But more recent events, including Mr. Biden‘s pro-union stance and the worker shortage caused by COVID-19 shutdowns, have given labor a shot in the arm. “Right now, the stars are aligned in favor of unions,” Mr. Clark said. “They have both low unemployment, and you have a very friendly administration in Washington supportive of unions. Everything is in order for unions to take advantage of the situation right now.”

#### Ableism and disability as a concept are products of the capitalist system – economic and ideological motivations exist to keep disabled people down and below, living as less, meaning that only a communist movement can solve because the system constantly recreates oppression as long as it exists

Chris Costello 17 (Chris Costello, contributor to TheMighty, 10-29-2017, "How Capitalism Contributes to Ableism," Mighty, https://themighty.com/2017/10/how-capitalism-contributes-to-ableism/, Accessed: 7-15-2018 /Kent Denver-YBJL)

I have argued that the category of disability arose with the development of capitalism. This is, however, only half the story. Not only does capitalism give rise to disability oppression, I believe it also perpetuates it. The capitalists have both an economic and ideological interest to exclude workers based on perceived disability. The social model of disability put forward by UPIAS in 1975 is vital for understanding this question. The capitalist needs the average worker to produce commodities — that is, goods and services to be sold on a market. The capitalist also needs the worker to produce these commodities to be produced in the average amount of socially-necessary labor time. If a worker is too slow and cannot meet these requirements, the capitalist loses time that could be adding more value for himself. If a worker is too slow, they earn less profits for the given capitalist. Thus, there are purely economic reasons for a capitalist system to reject disabled people as workers. These workers cost more and cut into profit. But there is a contradiction here: although capitalism rejects disabled workers, the system also disables workers. Production takes place at tremendous speeds with little regard for the safety of the workers (unless the class struggle results in temporary gains for the working class). The dynamic of profit-over-people leads to unsafe production processes. Marx’s longtime collaborator. Marx reiterated this in “Capital Volume One,” writing, “capital takes no account of the health… of the worker unless society forces it to do so.” This is an absolutely key point: although capitalism is inherently bad for disabled people, we have the power to remake society. We can force capital to work for our needs, to take our health and safety into account. The answer to the outcry about physical and mental degradation, the premature death and torture of overwork, exists. Before we can determine what that answer is, however, we must figure out what the answer is not. The oppression of the disabled does not depend on the individual will, good or bad, of any particular capitalists. The objective, systemic laws of capitalist production confront the capitalists as a coercive force external to them. Even the bosses are not in full control of the system: market forces are. It is not about a capitalist being good or bad, it is about the logic of the system. For instance, capitalism relies on a “reserve army of the unemployed” to maintain competition among workers and prevent them from seeing their common enemy. Unemployment also allows the bosses to drive down the quality of working conditions across the board. Unemployment forces workers to take low wages, unsafe conditions, and so on. If one worker refuses to do so, the poverty conferred by unemployment means that someone else will. Many people who are considered disabled under capitalism are forced to fill the role of a reserve army of labor, but this is not universal. Under capitalism, the state has also stepped in to manage the exclusion of people with disabilities. The state has used the invented category of disability to determine the “deserving poor” and the “undeserving poor” when doling out benefits that would discourage workers from making revolution. This ensured the impaired lived uncomfortable lives in workhouses or prisons. Being categorized as disabled conferred poverty status on a member of the working class, and usually on their families as well. Disability care has always been expensive. Then and now, having a disabled child could mean destitution. This would force disabled workers and their families to seek employment in low-wage or unsafe industries, in addition to driving down wages and conditions for the non-disabled sections of the working class. First and foremost, the economics of capitalist production have been and are responsible for disability oppression. In addition to this, the

capitalists also had an ideological reason for perpetuating disability oppression. It discouraged workers from not working, yes, but also engendered in the workers the idea that they had no right to a basic standard of living. Charities that served the poor and disabled were roundly criticized because they did not convey enough of this moral stigma. The widespread belief that poor and disabled people were unworthy of decent lifestyles served to disenchant these populations from making revolution. A revolution was a way for the oppressed to improve their conditions, but the oppressed would never attempt to do this if they did not believe improvement was possible. As the disabled population grew increasingly under the purview of laws and state institutions, the category of disability itself began to be seen as a problem to be banished from public view. This was done using whatever methods were effective, up to and including institutionalization, sterilization, and euthanasia. The state’s ideological motivations were not entirely separate from their economic ones. If a person is perceived as being unable to work, then they are unable make a living. To be working class is to be compelled to sell one’s labor in order to survive. Disabled workers were unable to do this. They became either a public charge or a burden on their impoverished families. But the state under capitalism did not and does not often provide disabled workers with adequate care. To do so would be to “waste” resources on someone who could not perform productive labor in return. This is most clearly the case for working class and disabled people, but the stigma around disability has meant that even middle and ruling class disabled people were kept in custodial care or in remedial schooling. The oppression of disabled people has its roots in capitalist relations of production; it eventually “trickled down” to affect the entire society. While the capitalist economy as such rejected disabled people as unproductive, the state institutions created and reinforced negative social attitudes towards disability. Capitalist society had relegated disabled people to the most negative status of poverty and isolation. These negative attitudes were used to justify disadvantageous social positions, which strengthened the attitudes themselves. Institutions and attitudes were and are in a constant interplay with one another, feeding back into and altering each other. In Marxist terms, they interact dialectically. The discrimination and oppression of impaired people based on a manufactured category of disability rested on the underlying assumption that being “able-bodied” or “able-minded” was the social norm, the desirable default. Today, this attitude goes by the name “ableism.” It is part and parcel of capitalist society because production for profit at all costs means excluding workers who require individual accommodations. The state and other institutions, such as education and the media, promote ableist ideas by rationalizing our exclusion from the workplace. The stigma, while it originates in the workplace, goes beyond this sphere as well. It encompasses all realms of social existence.