## T

#### INTERPRETATION - the aff can't defend that one country ought to recognize a right to strike. The article “a” implies a nonspecific or generic reading of “a just government”

Walden 20 Walden University [The Writing Center provides a broad range of writing instruction and editing services for students at Walden University, including writing assistance for undergraduates, graduate students, and doctoral capstone writers], “"A" or "An"” last modified July 14 2020, <https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/writingcenter/grammar/articles> SM

When to Use "A" or "An" "A" and "an" are used with singular countable nouns when the noun is nonspecific or generic. I do not own a car. In this sentence, "car" is a singular countable noun that is not specific. It could be any car. She would like to go to a university that specializes in teaching. "University" is a singular countable noun. Although it begins with a vowel, the first sound of the word is /j/ or “y.” Thus, "a" instead of "an" is used. In this sentence, it is also generic (it could be any university with this specialization, not a specific one). I would like to eat an apple. In this sentence, "apple" is a singular countable noun that is not specific. It could be any apple.

#### Violation – they only defend the US

#### Vote neg—

#### 1] Semantics outweigh:

#### a] Topicality is a constitutive rule of the activity and a basic aff burden, they agreed to debate the topic when they came to the tournament

#### b] Jurisdiction -- you can’t vote affirmative if they haven’t affirmed

#### c] It’s the only stasis point we know before the round so it controls the internal link to engagement, and there’s no way to use ground if debaters aren’t prepared to defend it.

#### 2] Limits:

#### a] Education – they overexplode the topic making it impossible to negate and we need ground for us to prep – their interpretation allows them to basically cherry pick out of any resolution – skirts the topic from core to the fringes of the literature which kills topic education

#### b] Fairness – we would have to prep for over 195 affs + more subsets which kills fairness because there’s infinite affs it’s literally impossible to prep for everything

#### 3] TVA solves – read the aff as advantage

#### Paradigm Issues –

#### 1] T is DTD

#### a] their abusive advocacy skewed the debate from the start

#### b] DTA is incoherent because we indict their advocacy

#### 2] Comes before 1AR theory –

#### a] If we had to be abusive it’s because it was impossible to engage their aff

#### b] T outweighs on scope because their abuse affected every speech that came after the 1AC

#### c] Topic norms outweigh on urgency – we only have a few months to set them

#### 3] Use competing interps on T –

#### a] topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical

#### b] only our interp sets norms -- reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention

#### c] reasonability causes a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation

#### 4] No RVIs –

#### a] Forcing the 1NC to go all in on the shell kills substance education and neg strat

#### b] discourages checking real abuse

#### c] Encourages baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly

## K

#### The aff’s strike-focused politics privatizes and atomizes worker struggle – it channels it towards specific employers rather than class domination as a whole while ensuring the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by privileging alternative modes of settlement outside and in spite of the specifics of the law itself.

Feldman, 94

[George, Assistant Prof. @ Wayne State Law: “Unions, Solidarity, and Class: The Limits of Liberal Labor Law,” Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law, Volume 15, No. 2, 1994. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/berkjemp15&div=14&g\_sent=1&casa\_token=&collection=journals#]//AD

In other ways, however, the liberal vision of labor law that Justice Brennan exemplified has been severely limited. 19 One obvious limitation, for instance, has been the Court's preference for arbitration.20 \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 20 STARTS HERE\*\*\* 20. The Court's tendency to privilege arbitration has led it to impose legal limitations on the right to strike that are unsupported by the language, policy, or history of the labor laws. See Boys Mkts., Inc. v. Retail Clerks Union, Local 770, 398 U.S. 235 (1970); Gateway Coal Co. v. United Mine Workers of Am., 414 U.S. 368 (1974), discussed infra at part III.C. For criticism of the Court's weakening of the right to strike, see Matthew W. Finkin, Labor Policy and the Enervation of the Economic Strike, 1990 U. ILL. L. REV. 547, 548-49; JAMES B. ATLESON, VALUES & AssuMiPTIONS IN AMERICAN LABOR LAW \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 20 ENDS HERE\*\*\* (1983). Yet a different kind of limit also has been present in the labor jurisprudence of the Court's liberal wing-a limit that is less obvious, usually has less immediate impact, but that is perhaps more deeply seated. The Court's privileging of arbitration restricts the means by which unions legally may act in response to concerns that are concededly legitimate. The limits discussed here, by contrast, define the legitimate boundaries of collective actions and collective concerns. The cases discussed here reflect the liberal doctrine that labor law protects unions only insofar as they limit their role to that of representative of the employees of an individual employer, and that the law will resist any union attempt to move beyond this limitation. That doctrine rejects protection when the underlying issue implicates the proper role of unions in American society. That question emerges in a variety of contexts. In some, a broad definition of unions' societal function may require, or may seem to require, limiting individual rights;21 in others, the Court's conclusion, or something very similar to it, is so clearly required by statute that the conclusion cannot be ascribed to the conscious or unconscious ideological views of the Justices.22 \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 21 STARTS HERE\*\*\* 21. When such a conflict is actually present, the proper place to draw the line is fairly subject to debate; a judge determined to protect both strong unions and individual employee rights might resolve apparent conflicts between the two in different ways without forfeiting a claim of taking each seriously. See infra notes 237-41; cf Emporium Capwell Co. v. Western Addition Community Org., 420 U.S. 50 (1975). \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 21 ENDS HERE\*\*\* At other times, however, liberal members of the Court have narrowed the range of permissible union concerns and therefore of unions' social role in contexts in which the law would have allowed a broader understanding, and in which the danger of conflict with individual rights was either absent or too attenuated to serve as a reasonable justification. In some cases this desire to narrow the sphere of union activity is central to the Court's reasoning; in others, it is a subsidiary theme, or is present only as an underlying assumption, unstated and perhaps unconscious, whose presence helps account for the result reached. This article examines what the members of the Supreme Court who have been identified with its liberal wing have said explicitly or by necessary implication about what is the legitimate sphere of union activity in American life. This vision of the role that unions should play in society has both practical and ideological consequences. Modern labor law, faithful to the Wagner Act's premises, aims to particularize rather than generalize workers' struggles; it directs them towards their specific relationship to their employer, rather than to the larger relationship of their class to employers and to work; it privatizes and depoliticizes those struggles.23 \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 23 STARTS HERE\*\*\* 23. It is in this sense that I think the frequently voiced point of authors associated with the Critical Legal Studies movement is correct. It is not that workers' struggles are channeled to arbitration rather than to a public body like the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), see Katherine Van Wezel Stone, The Post-War Paradigm in American Labor Law, 90 YALE L.J. 1509 (1981). but rather that whatever method workers employ-even including a strike or other collective job actions-the locus of the struggle remains the particular workplace or employer. It is in this sense that workers' struggles are channeled away from "political" dimensions. \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 23 ENDS HERE\*\*\* Given the contextual limitations mentioned, this analysis necessarily must be cautious. It must take account of the constraints of statutory language and congressional intent and, where applicable, of judicial deference to the decisions of the NLRB. 24 This analysis also must recognize the presence of other policy or ideological considerations that are unrelated to the theme of limiting the breadth of union concerns. Nonetheless, this theme is demonstrably present in a wide variety of legal settings, transecting the doctrinal categorizations that abound in labor law.

#### Strikes cause worker atomization – decks class consciousness

Smith 78

Michael R. Smith,( professor of sociology @mcgill) “The Effects of Strikes on Workers: A Critical Analysis” The Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers canadiens de sociologie Vol. 3, No. 4 (Autumn, 1978), pp. 457-472 (16 pages), <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3339777?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents> // Comrade AW

Workers in an industry are no doubt aware that their managers earn substantially more than them; they exist in a work environment where supervision and, increasingly, the design of work itself circumscribe their capacity for discretion; they may well feel insecure in the context of an unpredictable labor market. Going on strike as Blackburn has argued, and as the Vauxhall incident tends to show, is likely to lead them to focus the discontent associated with this condition on their employers. That is an 469 This content downloaded from 67.209.48.103 on Tue, 16 Nov 2021 17:23:39 UTC All use subject to htt increased sense of opposition. But the consequences of such an action for a sense of identity are likely to be problematic. Those consequences will depend upon the extent to which their strike is supported by other workers. In North America in particular where many unions do seem to operate with a business union philosophy (cf. Bell, 1962; Laxer, 1976) with decentralized bargaining (cf. Task Force, 1968), significant support will often fail to materialize. If consciousness "explodes" in a strike the result is likely to be an acute sense of inequality, but by no means necessarily a sense of a fate shared with a class. On the contrary, it is often likely to be a sense that the workers in a particular plant (or sometimes, industry) should look after themselves. That, of course, would constitute an obstacle to a shift to the level of consciousness that Mann calls totality. Moreover, the political configuration in capitalist societies with universal suffrage will not only depend upon the consciousness of workers who strike but also on the reaction to strikes of workers who, because conditions are not favorable, themselves rarely strike. These kinds of workers are likely to be increasingly unenthusiastic about the strikes of their more fortunate fellow workers. Both groups, of course, are less privileged in comparison to employers and managers but, as Runciman (1966) has shown, **much of the working class compares its own condition with other members of the working class rather than with capital**. The consequence of the extant distribution of strikes is, then, to reduce the sense of identity of a good part of the working class.12 The Gallup Poll data suggest that it is not simply a question of identity which is at issue. In Mann's view, the most advanced stage of development of consciousness involves "The conception of an alternative society" which develops "through the struggle with the opponent" (Mann, 1973:13). The opponent that Mann has in mind is employers. But the analysis that has been presented in this paper suggests that intra-working class antagonisms may be equally important in determining workers' conceptions of an alternative society. Sentiment on the part of many trade unionists seems to be linked to a conception of an alternative society in which the government acts as an authoritative arbiter in industrial relations. For these trade unionists, its role is just as much to keep wage increases (of other workers) moderate as to keep price increases moderate. The anti free collective bargaining sentiments that appear in Table 6 tend to support this interpretation. In his conclusion to Consciousness and Action among the Western Working Class, Mann argues that: Coexisting with a normally passive sense of alienation is an experience of (largely economic) interdependence with the employer at a factual, if not normative level. Surges of class consciousness are continually undercut by economism and capitalism survives. (1973:68) In this paper I have accepted the view that strikes are quite likely to generate surges of class consciousness on the part of the strikers. But the actual distribution of strikes, the fact that the bulk of man-days lost from strikes are accounted for by a better off section of the labor force, means that those same **strikes are an additional obstacle to the development of class consciousness. This is true not only because of their effect on workers' sense of identity: it is also true because the reaction of many workers to the maldistribution of strikes** 12. Deaton (1973) has already dealt with this for the case of public service workers. 470 This content downloaded from 67.209.48.103 on Tue, 16 Nov 2021 17:23:39 UTC All use subject to htt and, in particular, to the fact that striking is not a resource as readily available to them, seems to be to look to the Canadian state for solutions rather than to trade unions which are more directly organizations of the working class. Since the state, at the very least, can be said to have "links" with the class of employers (cf. Porter, 1965; Clement, 1975), that kind of policy preference provides the elements of a sort of interclass alliance between employers and less well off workers against better off workers. Even if strikes in Canada do serve to "advance" the consciousness of that section of the working class involved in them (some of the time), with their present distribution, they are as likely to "retard" the consciousness of a good part of the rest of the working class with rather unprogressive political consequences. A strike wave then, may be rather less of a threat to capitalist hegemony than is sometimes thought.

#### Class consciousness is the single and easiest possible solution to inequality and insatiable consumption under capitalism

Edles 15

Edles, Laura Desfor,  (PhD, University of California, Los Angeles, 1990 is Professor of Sociology at California State University, Northridge.)

2015, “Sociological theory in the classical era : text and readings,” ISBN 978-1-4522-0361-4 // Comrade AW

This was precisely the purpose of Marx’s political activities: he sought to generate class consciousness—an awareness on the part of the working class of its common relationship to the means of production and common source of the workers’ oppressive conditions. Marx believed that this awareness was a vital key for sparking a revolution that would create a “dictatorship of the proletariat,” transforming it from a wage-earning, propertyless mass into the ruling class. Unlike all previous class-based revolutions, however, this one would be fought in the interests of the vast majority of the population and not for the benefit of a few, because the particular class interests of the proletariat had come to represent the universal interests of humanity. The epoch of capitalism was a necessary stage in this evolution—and the last historical period rooted in competitive class conflict (see Figure 2.2). Capitalism, with its unleashing of immense economic productivity, had created the capital and technology needed to sustain a communist society—the final stage of history —capable of providing for the needs of all of its inhabitants

#### Our critique independently outweighs the case - neoliberalism causes extinction and massive social inequalities – the affs single issue legalistic solution is the exact kind of politics neolib wants us to engage in so the root cause goes unquestioned. Farbod 15

( Faramarz Farbod , PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College, Monthly Review, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html, 6-2)

Global capitalism is the 800-pound gorilla. The twin ecological and economic crises, militarism, the rise of the surveillance state, and a dysfunctional political system can all be traced to its normal operations. We need a transformative politics from below that can challenge the fundamentals of capitalism instead of today's politics that is content to treat its symptoms. The problems we face are linked to each other and to the way a capitalist society operates. We must make an effort to understand its real character. The fundamental question of our time is whether we can go beyond a system that is ravaging the Earth and secure a future with dignity for life and respect for the planet. What has capitalism done to us lately? The best science tells us that this is a do-or-die moment. We are now in the midst of the 6th mass extinction in the planetary history with 150 to 200 species going extinct every day, a pace 1,000 times greater than the 'natural' extinction rate.1 The Earth has been warming rapidly since the 1970s with the 10 warmest years on record all occurring since 1998.2 The planet has already warmed by 0.85 degree Celsius since the industrial revolution 150 years ago. An increase of 2° Celsius is the limit of what the planet can take before major catastrophic consequences. Limiting global warming to 2°C requires reducing global emissions by 6% per year. However, global carbon emissions from fossil fuels increased by about 1.5 times between 1990 and 2008.3 Capitalism has also led to explosive social inequalities. The global economic landscape is littered with rising concentration of wealth, debt, distress, and immiseration caused by the austerity-pushing elites. Take the US. The richest 20 persons have as much wealth as the bottom 150 million.4 Since 1973, the hourly wages of workers have lagged behind worker productivity rates by more than 800%.5 It now takes the average family 47 years to make what a hedge fund manager makes in one hour.6 Just about a quarter of children under the age of 5 live in poverty.7 A majority of public school students are low-income.8 85% of workers feel stress on the job.9 Soon the only thing left of the American Dream will be a culture of hustling to survive. Take the global society. The world's billionaires control $7 trillion, a sum 77 times the debt owed by Greece to the European banks.10 The richest 80 possess more than the combined wealth of the bottom 50% of the global population (3.5 billion people).11 By 2016 the richest 1% will own a greater share of the global wealth than the rest of us combined.12 The top 200 global corporations wield twice the economic power of the bottom 80% of the global population.13 Instead of a global society capitalism is creating a global apartheid. What's the nature of the beast? Firstly, the "egotistical calculation" of commerce wins the day every time. Capital seeks maximum profitability as a matter of first priority. Evermore "accumulation of capital" is the system's bill of health; it is slowdowns or reversals that usher in crises and set off panic. Cancer-like hunger for endless growth is in the system's DNA and is what has set it on a tragic collision course with Nature, a finite category. Secondly, capitalism treats human labor as a cost. It therefore opposes labor capturing a fair share of the total economic value that it creates. Since labor stands for the majority and capital for a tiny minority, it follows that classism and class warfare are built into its DNA, which explains why the "middle class" is shrinking and its gains are never secure. Thirdly, private interests determine massive investments and make key decisions at the point of production guided by maximization of profits. That's why in the US the truck freight replaced the railroad freight, chemicals were used extensively in agriculture, public transport was gutted in favor of private cars, and big cars replaced small ones. What should political action aim for today? The political class has no good ideas about how to address the crises. One may even wonder whether it has a serious understanding of the system, or at least of ways to ameliorate its consequences. The range of solutions offered tends to be of a technical, legislative, or regulatory nature, promising at best temporary management of the deepening crises. The trajectory of the system, at any rate, precludes a return to its post-WWII regulatory phase. It's left to us as a society to think about what the real character of the system is, where we are going, and how we are going to deal with the trajectory of the system -- and act accordingly. The critical task ahead is to build a transformative politics capable of steering the system away from its destructive path. Given the system's DNA, such a politics from below must include efforts to challenge the system's fundamentals, namely, its private mode of decision-making about investments and about what and how to produce. Furthermore, it behooves us to heed the late environmentalist Barry Commoner's insistence on the efficacy of a strategy of prevention over a failed one of control or capture of pollutants. At a lecture in 1991, Commoner remarked: "Environmental pollution is an incurable disease; it can only be prevented"; and he proceeded to refer to "a law," namely: "if you don't put a pollutant in the environment it won't be there." What is nearly certain now is that without democratic control of wealth and social governance of the means of production, we will all be condemned to the labor of Sisyphus. Only we won't have to suffer for all eternity, as the degradation of life-enhancing natural and social systems will soon reach a point of no return**.**

#### The alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only party organizing can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct chauvinist tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for global liberation.

Escalante, Philosophy @ UOregon, 18

[Alyson, M.A., is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/>] rVs

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for holding party members accountable, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions. It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement. Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism. The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

#### K First - There is no material world that we can separate from the lens through which we view it. Deconstructing the AFF scholarship is a prior question that has material effects.

#### Therefore the ROB is one of deconstruction – vote for the side which best challenges neoliberal scholarship

Springer ‘12

Simon Springer - Department of Geography, University of Otago. “Neoliberalism as discourse: between Foucauldian political economy and Marxian poststructuralism.” Routledge. May 2012. JJN from file \*bracketing in original

Conclusion In arguing for an understanding of neoliberalism as discourse, I do not presume that comprehending neoliberalism separately as a hegemonic ideology, a policy and program, a state form, or as a form of governmentality is wrong or not useful. Rather I have simply attempted to provoke some consideration for the potential reconcilability of the different approaches. My argument should accordingly be read as an effort to destabilize the ostensible incompatibility that some scholars undertaking their separate usage seem keen to assume. Without at least attempting to reconcile the four approaches we risk being deprived of a coherent concept with which to work, and thus concede some measure of credibility to Barnett’s (2005) claim that ‘there is no such thing as neoliberalism’. Such a position renders the entire body of scholarship on neoliberalism questionable, as scholars cannot be sure that they are even discussing the same thing. More perilously, to accept such a claim throws the project of constructing solidarities across space into an uneasy quandary, where the resonant violent geographies of our current moment may go unnoticed, a condition that plays perfectly into the ideological denial maintained by the current capitalist order (Zizek, 2011). In ignoring such relational possibilities for resistance to the contemporary zeitgeist, Barnett (2005) seems keen to engage in disarticulation ad nauseam. Yet deconstruction is meant to be interruptive not debilitating. As Spivak (1996, p. 27) contends, ‘Deconstruction does not say there is no subject, there is no truth, there is no history. ... It is constantly and persistently looking into how truths are formed’. It is about noticing what we inevitably leave out of even the most searching and inclusive accounts of phenomena like neoliberalism, which opens up and allows for discursive understandings. Rather than making nice symmetrical accounts of the ‘real’ at the meeting point of representational performance and structural forces, neoliberalism understood as a discourse is attuned to processual interpretation and ongoing debate. While there are inevitable tensions between the four views of neoliberalism that are not entirely commensurable, their content is not diametrically opposed, and indeed a considered understanding of how power similarly operates in both a Gramscian sense of hegemony and a Foucauldian sense of governmentality points toward a dialectical relationship. Understanding neoliberalism as discourse allows for a much more integral approach to social relations than speech performances alone. This is a discourse that encompasses material forms in state formation through policy and program, and via the subjectivation of individuals on the ground, even if this articulation still takes place through discursive performatives. By formulating discourse in this fashion, we need not revert to a presupposed ‘real-world’ referent to recognize a materiality that is both constituted by and constitutive of discourse. Instead, materiality and discourse become integral, where one cannot exist without the other. It is precisely this understanding of discourse that points to a similitude between poststructuralism and Marxian political economy approaches and their shared concern for power relations. I do not want to conclude that I have worked out all these tensions, my ambition has been much more humble. I have simply sought to open an avenue for dialogue between scholars on either side of the political economy/ poststructuralist divide. The importance of bridging this gap is commensurate with ‘the role of the intellectual ... [in] shaking up habits, ways of acting and thinking, of dispelling commonplace beliefs, of taking a new measure of rules and institutions ... and participating in the formation of a political will’ (Foucault, quoted in Goldstein, 1991, pp. 11– 12). Such reflexivity necessarily involves opening ourselves to the possibility of finding common ground between the epistemic and ontological understandings of political economy and poststructuralism so that together they may assist in disestablishing neoliberalism’s rationalities, deconstructing its strategies, disassembling its technologies, and ultimately destroying its techniques. In changing our minds then, so too might we change the world.

## case

impacts – econ inequality solved w alt

lio bad – capitalism

agreed inequality bad

**US**

**Existing committees represented by workers monitor and combat inequality in the squo**James J **Brudney 21**, “The Right to Strike as Customary International Law”, <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1710&context=yjil#:~:text=Using%20international%20labor%20and%20human,customary%20international%20law%20(CIL)>., //NL  
ILO = International Labour Organization

Convention 87, addressing freedom of association and protection of the right to organize, 33 was promulgated by the ILO in 1948. Unlike other U.N. specialized agencies, the ILO has a tripartite governing structure. Each of the 187 Member States is represented not only by governments but also by organizations of employers and of workers (referred to as “social partners”). Their right of participation as representatives includes the right to vote; the standard ratio of representation is 2:1:1, or two government, one employer, and one worker. 34 In the absence of an express provision on strikes in Convention 87, two leading ILO supervisory bodies have developed over many decades recognition for the right to strike as an essential component of FOA. The independent CEACR was established in 1926; it is charged with making impartial observations that address questions or concerns regarding a country’s progress toward compliance with ratified conventions in law and practice.35 The tripartite CFA was established in 1951, based on recognition that the principles of FOA and the rights to organize and engage in collective bargaining required a dedicated supervisory procedure to monitor compliance even in countries that had not ratified Conventions 87 and 98.36

### turnz

#### Strikes hurt innocent bystanders and cause more layoffs than union victories.

McElroy 19 [John McElroy, editorial director of Blue Sky Productions and producer of “Autoline Detroit” for WTVS-Channel 56, Detroit. "Strikes Hurt Everybody", 10-25-2019, accessed 11-1-2021, https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody] HWIC

The recent strike at General Motors shows traditional labor practices must change. Not only did the strike cause considerable financial damage at GM, it drove another wedge between the company and its workers. And worst of all, it hurt a lot of innocent bystanders. Thanks to the UAW, the hourly workforce at GM earns the highest compensation in the U.S. auto industry. But you would never know that by listening to union leaders. They attack GM as a vile and heartless corporation that deliberately tries to oppress honest working men and women. Of course, they kind of have to say that. Union officials are elected, not appointed, and they are just as political as any Republican or Democrat. No UAW official ever got elected by saying, “You know what? Management is right. We’ve got to make sure our labor costs are competitive.” It’s the opposite. Union leaders get elected by attacking management’s greed and arrogance. This creates a poisonous relationship between the company and its workforce. Many GM hourly workers don’t identify as GM employees. They identify as UAW members. And they see the union as the source of their jobs, not the company. It’s an unhealthy dynamic that puts GM at a disadvantage to non-union automakers in the U.S. like Honda and Toyota, where workers take pride in the company they work for and the products they make. Attacking the company in the media also drives away customers. Who wants to buy a shiny new car from a company that’s accused of underpaying its workers and treating them unfairly? Data from the Center for Automotive Research (CAR) in Ann Arbor, MI, show that GM loses market share during strikes and never gets it back. GM lost two percentage points during the 1998 strike, which in today’s market would represent a loss of 340,000 sales. Because GM reports sales on a quarterly basis we’ll only find out at the end of December if it lost market share from this strike. UAW members say one of their greatest concerns is job security. But causing a company to lose market share is a sure-fire path to more plant closings and layoffs. Even so, unions are incredibly important for boosting wages and benefits for working-class people. GM’s UAW-represented workers earn considerably more than their non-union counterparts, about $26,000 more per worker, per year, in total compensation. Without a union they never would have achieved that. Strikes are a powerful weapon for unions. They usually are the only way they can get management to accede to their demands. If not for the power of collective bargaining and the threat of a strike, management would largely ignore union demands. If you took away that threat, management would pay its workers peanuts. Just ask the Mexican line workers who are paid $1.50 an hour to make $50,000 BMWs. But strikes don’t just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they’re striking against. They hurt suppliers, car dealers and the communities located near the plants. The Anderson Economic Group estimates that 75,000 workers at supplier companies were temporarily laid off because of the GM strike. Unlike UAW picketers, those supplier workers won’t get any strike pay or an $11,000 contract signing bonus. No, most of them lost close to a month’s worth of wages, which must be financially devastating for them. GM’s suppliers also lost a lot of money. So now they’re cutting budgets and delaying capital investments to make up for the lost revenue, which is a further drag on the economy. According to CAR, the communities and states where GM’s plants are located collectively lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenue. Some economists warn that if the strike were prolonged it could knock the state of Michigan – home to GM and the UAW – into a recession. That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible. So, while the UAW managed to get a nice raise for its members, the strike left a path of destruction in its wake. That’s not fair to the innocent bystanders who will never regain what they lost. I’m not sure how this will ever be resolved. I understand the need for collective bargaining and the threat of a strike. But there’s got to be a better way to get workers a raise without torching the countryside.

**Strikes are symbolic gestures that are accessible only to privileged workers—there are more concrete ways to solve workplace conditions on a structural level.**

**Foster 18** [Serrin M. Foster, creator of the Women Deserve Better® campaign and President of Feminists for Life of America, “A Way to Actually Help Women on International Women’s Day,” National Review, 2-27-2017, accessed 10-26-2021, https://www.nationalreview.com/2017/02/international-womens-day-strike-no]//GirlsDebate

Work together instead of striking on March 8 Organizers of the Women’s March are calling on women to strike on March 8, International Women’s Day. Originally called International Working Women’s Day, it traditionally celebrates women’s achievements in politics, the workplace, and society. Before we have a #daywithoutwomen, though, let’s take a moment to consider how it will advance the needs of women if hospital staff, EMTs, police officers, or attorneys don’t show up to work. Consider a rape victim who doesn’t have a woman in those roles to help her. I don’t know how many working mothers can afford to take a day without pay, or what it will really accomplish. And how does it enrich the needs of our daughters — or sons — if their teachers strike? Every day matters for students who are learning the basics to compete in a global economy. More and more small businesses are owned by women. Are they supposed to strike against their own companies or family farms? Are women who managed to break through the glass ceiling and are in positions of leadership really expected to not show up for the jobs they fought so hard to win? Moreover, while we, as feminists, talk about ending the “feminization of poverty,” **this is a strike that may appeal to the privileged but does nothing for workers who struggle every day to put food on the table and are one paycheck away from being homeless**. **Women who have fought for equality should be present — not absent — at our workplaces**. But march organizers expect to turn a day about women into a day without women. This is a disservice to women and children and should be rejected as such. Better that **feminists who can afford to take the day off should do something for organizations serving poor and low-income women** who need job training, a path to higher education, workplace accommodations for pregnant women and parents. Instead of striking, we at Feminists for Life ask the Women’s March and strike organizers to look at the Guttmacher Institute’s statistics and consider that most women who have abortions are poor or low-income (75 percent), and most are already mothers (59 percent). Their children are no less precious than children of privilege. Women have sought real solutions since entering the workforce. Women want — and deserve — equal opportunities for pay and positions in the workplace, through flextime, job sharing, and telecommuting; comprehensive health care that includes maternity benefits, with policies that include parental leave; and affordable, high-quality child care. All this starts with a culture that supports and celebrates pregnant and parenting employees. On March 8, in the tradition of the first-wave feminists who supported both mothers and children, born and unborn, we invite both employees and employers to take FFL’s Workplace Inventory to help you assess the supportiveness of your workplace. As you evaluate your workplace and seek to address unmet needs in any area, think about the best way for your company to create meaningful and cost-effective solutions. Take into consideration the size of the employer and what kind of work the employees do. For some types of employment, on-site day-care or child-care subsidies are essential. For others, telecommuting, shorter shifts, or flextime would be the best option. Update your evaluation annually. Solutions may change with circumstances, such as emerging technologies. And as your company grows, it may be possible to offer more benefits. Tell your customers, too. And remember to share in the celebration of every new family member. Employers who create this culture will be rewarded with loyalty by their employees and customers. **Deciding how to make a workplace better for women is a much more productive way to celebrate International Women’s Day than a misdirected strike that can hurt the very women organizers seek to support.**