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#### L: The Right to Strike legitimates neoliberal domination – it marks strikes as a restriction of one’s own personal labor power, which equivocates the right to strike with the right of contract – the plan is subtended by an assumption that workers are economic subjects who turn their labor into human capital, leaving the terms and conditions of neoliberal capitalism intact. Tomassetti, 21

**[Julia, Assistant Prof. Law @ City University of Hong Kong, JD @ Harvard, PhD Sociology @ UCLA: “Neoliberal Conceptions of the Individual in Labour Law,” Chapter 7 in The Collective Dimensions of Employment Relations: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Workers’ Voices and Changing (Palgrave Macmillan, 2021).** [**https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-75532-4]//AD**](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-75532-4%5d/AD)

**\*legerdemain = slight-of-hand**

Neoliberal theory telescopes the corporation to the individual subject through the concept of ‘human capital’. **What is human capital? Simulating the emic perspective of the neoliberal subject, Feher (2009, p. 26) provides: ‘my human capital is me, as a set of skills and capabilities that is modified by all that affects me and all that I effect’. Whereas liberal agency is grounded in possessive individualism (Gershon 2011), neoliberal agency is based on human capital (Feher 2009; Brown 2015). Neoliberalism transmutes the firm from a coordinator of labour to the manager of an asset portfolio, and the worker from an owner of labour to the manager of a human capital portfolio.**

The shift from labour to human capital reflects ‘neoliberal rationality’, which views neoliberalism as an ‘order of normative reason’ **(Brown 2015; Foucault 2008). From an analysis of policies, economic arrangements, and other contemporary institutions, Brown (2015) distils neoliberal rationality as a complex of categories, practices, logics, and principles that differ from their liberal counterparts. Scholars have been addressing how platform companies, as part of the ‘gig economy’, enact, benefit from, and propel neoliberal policies and work arrangements (Zwick 2018). We see less work examining neoliberalism as a form of rationality. Yet, scholars are beginning to explore how neoliberal rationality and its construction of the individual manifest in and shape different social relations, including work. Moisander, Groß, and Eräranta (2018), for example, explore how a digital platform company, in order to manage precarious labour, sought to shape its workers’ subjectivity so that workers thought of themselves as little enterprises, or neoliberal agents.**

**This chapter argues that** we **can also** see neoliberal rationality at work in legal reasoning, when companies, and sometimes legal decisionmakers, construe workers as neoliberal agents**.**

**Using the SuperShuttle DFW dispute as my primary example, I show how a company can index the worker and ‘entrepreneur’ in neoliberal terms** through practical and discursive techniques.The worker becomes an ‘entrepreneur’, **but with a meaning far removed from a liberal understanding of the term.** For example, on the practical side, the company designs the labour process to **permit/**require workers to determine their own working times by logging in and out of the platform.The platform then argues that, since workers can earn more money the more hours they log in, they are deploying a managerial strategy in deciding when and how long to work. **For the liberal subject, choosing to work longer hours under the command of another for mostly fixed returns is not entrepreneurial. However,** for the neoliberal subject, a decision to work **longer hours** reflects her discretionary commitment of human capital— her time.**1** Human capital is like any other capital. It is ‘invested’ like other capital and earns ‘profit’ like any other capital.Therefore, working longer **hours** is the equivalent of risking any other capital for the sake of gain, **like investing additional money in a business to expand production or enter a new market.**

**This is how** the practice of permitting—requiring—workers to determine their own schedules facilitates a neoliberal legerdemain: the company provides the individual, as holder of human capital, the opportunity to make decisions about the use of this capital.In fact, it requires the worker to make these decisions.As a consequence, no matter **how unskilled** the work, **and even where the costs and returns vary little or not at all with the duration of the work,** time management becomes an entrepreneurial venture.

**The analysis of SuperShuttle DFW shows how** neoliberal rationality can transform discretion in carrying out work tasks into economic autonomy. **Conceptualizing the worker as a manager of human capital makes it possible to interpret almost all worker discretion as entrepreneurial opportunity. As illustrated by the working hours example,** within neoliberal rationality, the discretion need not be exercised in the context of product market competition to be entrepreneurial or involve activities characteristic of product market competition, like investing in advertising or making production more efficient**. Nor does the desired end need to be monetary,** because neoliberal rationality does not distinguish between the domains of production and reproduction **(Feher 2009).** Thus, taking time off from work can be an entrepreneurial opportunity. **Further,** the discretion need not be exercised in as methodological a fashion as expected **under a liberal notion of entrepreneurialism.** It can be more speculative and sporadic.

**By showing how neoliberal rationality can shape legal evaluations of platform work, including what it means to be an entrepreneur, my analysis carries some implications for our understanding of digitally coordinated work.** Advancements **in information and communications technology have** facilitated changes in how companies organize production and exchange. Yet, these changes do not always involve major shifts in the organization of authority relations, sites of entrepreneurial ferment, or loci of power. **The analysis of SuperShuttle DFW suggests that** some of these apparent transformations in the organization of work are artefacts of changes in our conception of individuals as economic agents.

#### L: 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.**

#### I: Our critique independently TURNS and 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 – and treat this as a no long-term solvency argument – the inequalities of labor relations are fundamental to capitalism. 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**.**

#### A: New radical party politics are key—we need a new political ecology of class. That solves 100% of labor problems, the environment, and imperialism.

#### A: 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.

#### R: 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.

#### R: 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

### Solvency

**Vote neg on inherency – The National Labor Relation Act already protects workers right to strike – any 1AR response will prove that the law serves to circumvent legal protections on activism.  
National Labor Relations Board, no date, “The Right to Strike”,** [**https://www.nlrb.gov/strikes#:~:text=Section%207%20of%20the%20National,for%20employees%20by%20this%20section**](https://www.nlrb.gov/strikes#:~:text=Section%207%20of%20the%20National,for%20employees%20by%20this%20section)**., //NL**

**Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act states in part, “Employees shall have the right. . . to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.” Strikes are included among the concerted activities protected for employees by this section. Section 13 also concerns the right to strike. It reads as follows:**

**Nothing in this Act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right.**

**It is clear from a reading of these two provisions that: the law not only guarantees the right of employees to strike, but also places limitations and qualifications on the exercise of that right. See for example, restrictions on strikes in health care institutions (set forth below).**

### Adv. Democracy

#### A democratic recession is underway now

Jones and Taussig, PhDs, 19 – \*PhD @ LSE, Hamburg fellow in conflict prevention at Stanford University, vice president and director of the Foreign Policy program at Brookings and a senior fellow in the Institution’s Project on International Order and Strategy, \*\*PhD @ Tufts, nonresident fellow in the Foreign Policy program’s Center on the United States and Europe at Brookings. In 2018-19, she is based in Berlin as a Robert Bosch Foundation Fellow. Taussig works on U.S. foreign policy, European and Asian security, authoritarian politics, and U.S.-Russia relations (Bruce, Torrey, “Democracy and Disorder: The Struggle for Influence in the New Geopolitics,” Kindle Edition)

2. Democratic states are under increasing strain from an interconnected set of domestic challenges—political, economic, and cultural. At this crucial geopolitical juncture, key regions and countries around the world are experiencing a recession in democratic liberalism brought on by a culmination of long-term challenges including ineffective governance, economic inequality, and socio-cultural upheaval. Backsliding among advanced democracies across the West is most prominently a crisis of liberalism, as economic grievances along with identity-based struggles have resulted in the rise of populist movements on both the left and right of the ideological spectrum, some of which have authoritarian-leaning tendencies. In emerging and non-Western democracies, the internal challenges are more prominent in the service delivery realms, where governments prove incapable or unwilling to reduce corruption and violent crime.

#### I: Democracy will catastrophically delay action on climate change---authoritarianism is necessary to ensure rapid state-led transformation

Mann & Wainwright ’18 (Geoff, teaches political economy and economic geography at Simon Fraser University, where he directs the Centre for Global Political Economy, Joel *Climate Leviathan: A Political Theory of Our Planetary Future*, pp. 38-40, ME)

Relative to the institutional means currently available to capitalist liberal democracy and its sorry attempts at “consensus,” this trajectory has some distinct advantages with respect to atmospheric carbon concentration, notably in terms of the capacity to coordinate massive political-economic reconfiguration quickly and comprehensively. In light of our earlier question—how can we possibly realize the necessary emissions reductions?—it is this feature of Climate Mao that most recommends it. As the climate justice movement struggles to be heard, most campaigns in the global North are premised on an unspoken faith in a lop-sided, elite-biased, liberal proceduralism doomed to failure given the scale and scope of the changes required. If climate science is even half-right in its forecasts, the liberal model of democracy is at best too slow, at worst a devastating distraction. Climate Mao reflects the demand for rapid, revolutionary, state-led transformation today. Indeed, calls for variations on just such a regime abound on the Left. Mike Davis and Giovanni Arrighi have more or less sided with Climate Mao, sketching it as an alternative to capitalist Climate Leviathan.35 We might even interpret the renewal of enthusiasm for Maoist theory (including Alain Badiou’s version) as part of the prevailing crisis of ecological-political imagination.36 Minqi Li’s is arguably the best developed of this line of thought, and like Arrighi he locates the fulcrum of global climate history in China, arguing that Climate Mao offers the only way forward: [U]nless China takes serious and meaningful actions to fulfill its obligation of emissions reduction, there is little hope that global climate stabilization can be achieved. However, it is very unlikely that the [present] Chinese government will voluntarily take the necessary actions to reduce emissions. The sharp fall of economic growth that would be required is something that the Chinese government will not accept and cannot afford politically. Does this mean that humanity is doomed? That depends on the political struggle within China and in the world as a whole.37 Taking inspiration from Mao, Li says a new revolution in the Chinese revolution—a re-energization of the Maoist political tradition—could transform China and save humanity from doom. He does not claim this is likely; one need only consider China’s massive highway expansions, accelerated automobile consumption, and subsidized urban sprawl.38 But he is right that if an anticapitalist, planetary sovereign is to emerge that could change the world’s climate trajectory, it is most likely to emerge in China.

#### I: Even if democratic institutions could generate pro-climate policy making, rampant corruption precludes compliance

Povitkina 18’(Marina Povitkina, Postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Political Science at the University of Oslo and Center for Collective Action Research at the University of Gothenburg, The Limits of Democracy in tackling climate change, March 2018, <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323530041_The_limits_of_democracy_in_tackling_climate_change>, ME)

National-level carbon dioxide emissions depend on a multitude of factors, including countries’ economies, geography, demographics, and, not least, politics. The aim of this study has been to focus specifically on the political 424 M. POVITKINA determinants of CO2 emissions and revisit the findings reported in previous literature indicating that the amount of countries’ CO2 emissions is associated with their level of democracy. Here, I instead argue that while democratic institutions shape preference aggregation within a polity and favor environmental commitments, the benefits of democracy for climate change mitigation are limited in the presence of corrupt institutions, which obstruct coercive capacity, extractive capacity of the state, actors’ compliance, and pro-climate policy-making. To test this claim, I investigate whether the association between democracy and CO2 emissions is conditional on the levels of corruption. In pursuing this aim, I analyze the emitting behavior of countries across the globe over time and estimate a within-between regression, which takes into account the variation between countries and simultaneously accounts for the developments in countries over time. Such investigation brings a number of insights into the political factors behind the differences in CO2 emissions between countries and the political drivers of emission reduction within states. The results of this study show that after taking into account the common economic, geographical, and demographic explanations of CO2 emissions, political factors still make a difference. In accordance with most previous results, my findings show that more democratic countries do tend to emit less. However, this is only true for those democracies where corruption is low. When corruption is high, democracy does not seem to make a difference for the level of emissions**,** all else equal. It does not matter for the level of emissions whether a country has free elections, freedom of the press, and freedom of association if the executive, judicial and legislative branches of the state do not function well and are drenched in corruption and clientelism. In such a case, democracies do not seem to do any better than authoritarian regimes, where decision-making power is in the hands of a narrow elite. To exemplify, the results imply that it makes no difference for the national levels of CO2 emissions if a country is a democratic and corrupt Jamaica or an authoritarian and corrupt Azerbaijan. The results also show that a political system with a low level of corruption is not a universal cure. Lower corruption seems to matter only for the levels of CO2 emissions in democratic regimes and the level of corruption does not seem to play a role if a country is authoritarian. For example, being democratic and relatively non-corrupt Austria is more beneficial for lower CO2 emissions than being democratic but moderately corrupt Slovakia. However, at the same time, being an authoritarian regime with relatively low-corrupt institutions, such as Saudi Arabia, does not seem to be associated with lower emissions than being an authoritarian and corrupt regime, such as Yemen. While we can only gain insights about the associational relationship between democracy, corruption, and CO2 emissions from the between country estimates, the analysis of changes over time brings us closer to causal claims. The results from the within-part of the analysis show a similar picture to the between-part: positive changes in democracy are associated with the reduction in emission levels only when countries experience relatively low levels of corruption. When corruption levels in countries are low relative to what these countries experienced on average over the time period under investigation, steps toward democracy go together with steps toward climate change mitigation. When corruption is relatively high, more democracy does not seem to make a difference for emission control.

#### I: Climate change is an existential threat and risk multiplier – disease, resource wars, geopolitical shift, and non-linear changes.

Melton 19

(Michelle, 1-7, 3L@HarvardLaw, FormerAssocFellowClimatePolicy@CNAS, https://www.lawfareblog.com/climate-change-and-national-security-part-ii-how-big-threat-climate)

The U.S. national security establishment has been increasingly vocal that climate change is a national security threat—and the U.S. is not alone in this regard. But exactly how serious is this threat? How concerned should policymakers be? Assessing the magnitude of the national security threat posed by climate change requires addressing the antecedent issue of timing. Climate change is unfolding—for now—in a relatively linear, gradual way, and as a result, the magnitude of the threat depends on the time horizon. The national security implications of climate change are different between now and 2050, between now and 2100, and between now and 2300. At least until 2050, and possibly for decades after, climate change will remain a creeping threat that will exacerbate and amplify existing, structural global inequalities. While the developed world will be negatively affected by climate change through 2050, the consequences of climate change will be felt most acutely in the developing world. The national security threats posed by climate change to 2050 are likely to differ in degree, not kind, from the kinds of threats already posed by climate change. For the next few decades, climate change will exacerbate humanitarian crises—some of which will result in the deployment of military personnel, as well as material and financial assistance. It will also aggravate natural resource constraints, potentially contributing to political and economic conflict over water, food and energy. The question for the next 30 years is not “can humanity survive as a species with 1.5°C or 2°C of warming,” but, “how much will the existing disparities between the developed and developing world widen, and how long (and how successfully) can these widening political/economic disparities be sustained?” The urgency of the climate threat in the next few decades will depend, to a large degree, on whether and how much the U.S. government perceives a widening of these global inequities as a threat to U.S. national security. By contrast, if emissions continue to creep upward (or if they do not decline rapidly), by 2100 climate-related national security threats could be existential. The question for the next hundred years is not, “are disparities politically and economically manageable?” but, “can the global order, premised on the nation-state system, itself based on territorial sovereignty, survive in a world in which substantial swathes of territory are potentially uninhabitable?” National Security Consequences of Climate Change to 2050 Scientists can predict the consequences of climate change to 2050 with some measure of certainty. (Beyond that date, the pace and magnitude of climate change—and therefore, the national security threat posed by it—depend heavily on the level of emissions in the coming years, as I have explained.) There is relative agreement across modeled climate scenarios that the world will likely warm, on average, at least 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels by about 2050—but perhaps as soon as 2030. This level of warming is likely to occur even if the world succeeds in dramatically reducing greenhouse gas emissions, as even the recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report implicitly admits. In other words, a certain amount of additional warming—at least 1.5°C, and probably more than that—is presumptively unavoidable. Looking ahead to 2050, it can be said with relative confidence that the national security consequences of climate change will vary in degree, not in kind, from the national security threats already facing the United States. This is hardly good news. Even small differences in global average temperatures result in significant environmental changes, with attendant social, economic and political consequences. By 2050, climate change will wreak increasing havoc on human and natural systems—predominantly, but not exclusively, in the developing world—with attenuated but profound consequences for national security. In particular, changes in temperature, the hydrological cycle and the ranges of insects will impact food availability and food access in much of the world, increasing food insecurity. Storms, flooding, changes in ocean pH and other climate-linked changes will damage infrastructure and negatively impact labor productivity and economic growth in much of the world. Vector-borne diseases will also become more prevalent, as climate change will expand the geographic range and intensity of transmission of diseases like malaria, West Nile, Zika and dengue fever, and cholera. Rising public health challenges, economic devastation and food insecurity will translate into an increased demand for humanitarian assistance provided by the military, increased migration—especially from tropical and subtropical regions—and geopolitical conflict. Long-term trends such as declining food security, coupled with short-term events like hurricanes, could sustain unprecedented levels of migration. The 2015 refugee crisis in Europe portends the kinds of population movements that will only accelerate in the coming decades: people from Africa, Southwest and South Asia and elsewhere crossing land and water to reach Europe. For the United States, this likely means greater numbers of people seeking entry from both Central America and the Caribbean. Such influxes are not unprecedented, but they are unlikely to abate and could increase in volume over the next few decades, driven in part by climate change-related food insecurity, climate change-related storms and also by economic and political instability. Food insecurity, economic losses and loss of human life are also likely to exacerbate existing political tensions in the developing world, especially in regions with poor governance and/or where the climate is particularly vulnerable to warming (e.g., the Mediterranean basin). While the Arab Spring had many underlying causes, it also coincided with a period of high food prices, which arguably contributed to the protests. In some situations, food insecurity, economic losses and public health crises, combined with weak and ineffectual governance, could precipitate future conflicts of this kind—although it will be difficult to know where and when without more precise local studies of both underlying political dynamics and the regionally-specific impacts of climate change. 2100 and Beyond While the national security impacts of climate change to 2050 are likely to be costly and disruptive for the U.S. military—and devastating for many people around the world—at some point after 2050, if warming continues at its current pace, changes to the climate could fundamentally reshape geopolitics and possibly even the current nation-state basis of the current global order. To be clear, both the ultimate level of warming and its attendant political consequences is highly speculative, for the reasons I explained in my last post. Nonetheless, we do know that the planet is currently on track for at least 3-4°C of warming by 2100. The “known knowns” of higher levels of warming—say, 3°C—are frightening. At that 3°C of warming, for example, scientists project that there will be a nearly 70 percent decline in wheat production in Central America and the Caribbean, 75 percent of the land area in the Middle East and more than 50 percent in South Asia will be affected by highly unusual heat, and sea level rise could displace and imperil the lives hundreds of millions of people, among other consequences. But even higher levels of warming are physically possible within this century. At these levels of warming, some regions of the world would be literally uninhabitable, likely resulting in the depopulation of the tropics, to say nothing of the consequences of sea-level rise for economically important cities such as Amsterdam and New York. Even if newly warmed regions of the far north could theoretically accommodate the resulting migrants, this presumes that the political response to this unprecedented global displacement would be orderly and conflict-free borders on fantasy. The geopolitical consequences of significant levels of warming are severe, but if these changes occur in a linear way, at least there will be time for human systems to adjust. Perhaps more challenging for national security is the possibility that the until-now linear changes give way to abrupt and irreversible ones. Scientists forecast that, at higher levels of warming—precisely what level is speculative—humanity could trigger catastrophic, abrupt and unavoidable consequences to the ecosystem. The IPCC has considered nine such abrupt changes; one example is the potential shutting down of the Indian summer monsoon. Over a billion people are dependent upon the Indian monsoon, which provides parts of South Asia with about 80 percent of its annual rainfall; relatively minor changes in the monsoon in either direction can cause disasters. In 2010, a wetter monsoon led to the catastrophic flooding in Pakistan, which directly affected 20 million people; a drier monsoon in 2002 led to devastating drought. Studies suggest that the Indian summer monsoon has two stable states: wet (i.e., the current state) and dry (characterized by low precipitation over the subcontinent). At some point, if warming continues, the monsoon could abruptly shift into the second, “dry” state, with catastrophic consequences for over a billion people dependent on monsoon-fed agriculture. The IPCC suggests that such a state-shift is “unlikely”—that is, there is a 10 to 33 percent chance that a state-shift will happen in the 21st century—but scientists also have relatively low confidence in their understanding of the underlying mechanisms in this and other large-scale natural systems. The consequences of abrupt, severe warming for national security are obvious in general, if unclear in the specifics. In 2003, the Defense Department asked a contractor to explore such a scenario. The resulting report outlined the offensive and defensive national security strategies countries may adopt if faced with abrupt climate change, and highlighted the increased risk of inter- and intra-state conflict over natural resources and immigration. Although the report may be off in its imagined timeframe (positing abrupt climate change by 2020), the world it conjures is improbable but not outlandish. If the Indian monsoon were to switch to dry state, and a billion people were suddenly without reliable food sources, for example, it is not clear how the Indian government would react, assuming it would survive in its current form. Major wars or low-intensity proxy conflicts seem likely, if not inevitable, in such a scenario.

### Adv Inequality

#### 1. The entire advantage is a link – their discourse says economic decline is bad because it causes diversionary war, which is most likely to occur via class war as per their scenario – this proves the aff is literally the front man for the squid game – keeping workers satisfied through the chance to regain economic stature through strikes while we all know in the background they’re way more likely to die before they ever see the payoff.

#### 2. Double bind – either the contradictions of capitalism will inevitably cause its collapse and trigger their war impacts OR capitalism sustains itself through rendering its surplus populations from prisons to inner cities killable, which is a system so monolithic that only the alt’s principled structure can solve it.

#### 3. A right to strike has an underside of a right for employers to replace – turns case and proves our links because failed strikes chill worker organizing and cause union-busting.

Richman, 10-20-21

**[Shaun, Program Director of the Harry Van Arsdale Jr. School of Labor Studies at SUNY Empire State College: “Happy Striketober. Let's Restore the Legal Right to Strike.” Published by In These Times on 10-20-21.** [**https://inthesetimes.com/article/striketober-right-to-strike-nlrb-legal-john-deere]//AD**](https://inthesetimes.com/article/striketober-right-to-strike-nlrb-legal-john-deere%5d/AD)

**A moment in which tens of thousands of workers are on strike — at John Deere, at Kellogg’s, at Warrior Met Coal—might seem like a strange time to talk about a ​“right” to strike. But a legal right to strike must include the right to return to the job when the strike is over — win, lose or draw — and U.S.** workers haven’t had that right **since corporations and Ronald Reagan’s National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) conspired to** weaponize a long-dormant Supreme Court decision **to legalize union-busting.**

**Strikes are contagious. The example set by one group of workers going on strike and returning to their jobs with their heads held high (and their bosses massively inconvenienced) can inspire other workers to take action. But the contagion can** cut both ways. **A** failed strike **that ends with the strikers permanently replaced by scabs can** spread fear and hopelessness across communities and industries**.**

**The last year that some touted as a ​“strike wave” — 2018, when some 485,000 workers went on strike in over 20 large job actions — still only saw unions return to mid-1980s levels of strike activity. The 1980s were the midpoint of a historic long-range decline in strike activity. What happened, of course, was that President Ronald Reagan fired the federal air traffic controllers in 1981, signaling a new era of union-busting. A so-called ​“PATCO syndrome” kicked in: Workers were afraid to go on strike because it could mean not just the loss of their pay and the other hazards of the strike itself, but because a lost strike could mean the loss of their jobs.**

**Far more significant, however, was a copper mining company called Phelps Dodge that in 1983 bargained its union to impasse over draconian cuts in benefits and working standards. The company successfully** dared its union out on strike**, then** bussed in scabs **and** offered them replacement jobs that would continue after the strike was over**. And after 12 months,** the company had the scabs vote to decertify the union**. PATCO was symbolic; Phelps Dodge was the blueprint for** getting rid of private-sector unions through failed strikes**.**

**Phelps Dodge dusted off a 1938 Supreme Court decision NLRB v. Mackay Radio that purportedly** granted employers the right to permanently replace strikers. **And this is where the stars align for #Striketober and the new NLRB: The Mackay decision was poorly decided in the first place, rarely revisited and leaves the labor board with pretty wide discretion to narrow the Mackay doctrine to the point of meaninglessness for rich corporations.**

**First, it bears stressing that the National Labor Relations Act clearly states, ​“Nothing in this Act…shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right.” And the substance of the** Mackay decision actually upheld the right to strike **by ruling in favor of an NLRB ruling that the employer could not discriminate against the strike’s leaders. Unfortunately, the patrician judge who wrote the majority’s decision, Justice Owen Roberts, had to put himself in the boss’s shoes and hem and haw about ​“right to protect and continue his business,” during those pesky strikes, ​“by supplying places left vacant by strikers.” And if business conditions required it, he pointlessly opined, he should be able to have the scabs continue after the strike as long as he is not motivated by anti-union animus and he doesn’t discriminate against the strikers for the remaining vacant positions.**

#### 4. Unions can’t solve for inequality anyway – TURNS CASE, aff puts a veneer over the worst excesses of capitalism.

Eidlin 20

**Barry Eidlin, assistant professor of sociology @ McGill University, author of of Labor and the Class Idea in the United States and Canada, 1-6-2020, "Why Unions Are Good — But Not Good Enough," No Publication,** [**https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/01/marxism-trade-unions-socialism-revolutionary-organizing**](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/01/marxism-trade-unions-socialism-revolutionary-organizing) **//MLT**

**Labor unions have long occupied a paradoxical position within Marxist theory. They are an essential expression of the working class taking shape as a collective actor and an essential vehicle for working-class action. When we speak of “the working class” or “working-class activity,” we are often analyzing the actions of workers either organized into unions or trying to organize themselves into unions. At the same time, unions are an imperfect and incomplete vehicle for the working class to achieve one of Marxist theory’s central goals: overthrowing capitalism.** Unions by their very existence affirm and reinforce capitalist class society. **As organizations which primarily negotiate wages, benefits, and working conditions with employers,** unions only exist in relation to capitalists. This makes them almost by definition reformist institutions**, designed to mitigate and manage the employment relationship, not transform it.**

**A. An unconditional right legalizes strikes with misconduct and without a legal purpose – turns case by giving strikes a bad rep**

**Guerin J.D. 13**

Lisa Guerin, J.D., 2013-06-17 (date from source code), "Strikes," nolo, <https://www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/strikes.html/> //AW

No-Strike Clauses Even **strikes with a legal purpose are not protected** by the NLRA If the union's contract with the employer (the [collective bargaining](https://www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/collective-bargaining.html) agreement) includes a no-strike clause. With a few limited exceptions (for example, if employees are refusing to work because of unusually dangerous working conditions), a strike that violates a no-strike provision is illegal. Strike Misconduct A strike can also become unlawful if strikers engage in serious misconduct, such as violence or threats, physically preventing other from entering or leaving the workplace, or sit-down strikes, in which employees refuse to leave the workplace and refuse to work. These strikes are not protected by the [NLRA](https://www.nolo.com/legal-encyclopedia/free-books/employee-rights-book/chapter15-2.html).

**B. Strikes hurt worker’s relationship with the company – no chance for higher wages**

**Orechwa 19**

Jennifer Orechwa (30 years of supporting Human Resources & Labor Relations professionals. Award-winning Employee Engagement Expert ProjectHR Podcast Host ), 10-01-2019, "How Unions Hurt Workers: The 2019 GM Strike," Projections, <https://projectionsinc.com/unionproof/how-unions-hurt-workers-the-gm-strike-continues/>

The reality is that a strike hurts the workers the most. They don’t hurt the union. In fact, union leaders see a strike as a chance to get some nationwide publicity as an organization helping the “little guys” take on the big bad abusive employer. Strikes don’t permanently hurt the company because a large company like GM has a contingency plan and is prepared to keep operating without the striking workers by taking steps like temporarily shutting down some plants and consolidating operations. It’s the workers that are hurt, encouraged by the unions and some politicians to subject themselves to **loss of income and job stability**. Instead of encouraged, it should read that workers are “used” by the unions and [political parties](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/09/16/2020-election-democrats-cheer-uaw-strike-against-gm-criticize-trump.html) to push their agenda. Unions thrive on making employers look bad, and politicians that believe America’s big businesses take advantage of employees use the strikes as proof. The general line is that, “If employees are willing to suffer a loss of income, benefit and job stability, the workplace policies must be abusive.” The negotiations for a new 4-year collective bargaining agreement started July 16, 2019, and two months later the strike began after negotiations reached an [impasse](https://projectionsinc.com/unionproof/collective-bargaining-good-faith-impasse/). On September 16, 2019, more than 48,000 union members at 55 plants in the Midwest and South GM factories went on strike. […] You may think a company suffers as much as or more than workers during a strike. That is the message unions give workers. If union members didn’t believe that, there would be no reason to go on strike. The whole purpose of a strike is to hurt the business so the employer caves in to union demands. Of course, strikes are a powerful example in which unions hurt workers. However, consider the fact it’s the employees walking picket signs in all kinds of weather. It’s not the employer. As the strike starts its second week, it’s the employees who will have to live on $250 per week strike pay after the eighth day of the strike. It’s the workers who toss-and-turn at night while wondering how they will support their families pay their bills. During the first week of the strike, GM chose to [shift the cost of healthcare payments](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-autos-labor/gm-switches-health-insurance-costs-to-union-for-striking-workers-talks-continue-idUSKBN1W21TW) for striking employees to the union, in order to help make up for likely stalled vehicle production and to demonstrate the costs the company carries (over $900 million each year) to provide excellent benefits to its workers. The unions will have to pay the money for health insurance out of their strike fund, including for COBRA payments for hourly employees. The strike fund does not cover vision, dental, and hearing, so all workers are penalized again for striking. […]Stay Union Free [Unions use words](https://projectionsinc.com/unionproof/the-language-of-unionization/) like “sacrifice” and “taken advantage of” to appeal to people’s emotions. They don’t talk about local businesses hurt by the strikes. They don’t make mortgage payments for their members. Additionally, they don’t offer to increase strike pay to put food on people’s tables. Ultimately, they don’t recognize or address the ways unions hurt workers. All of this is a good reminder that keeping a business union free remains an important strategy for long-term business sustainability. [Educate your leaders and employees on unions](https://projectionsinc.com/) by taking advantage of communication tools like [video, web and eLearning](https://projectionsinc.com/unionproof), engage your employees and be transparent about changes needed to remain competitive. It’s the path to becoming an employer of choice with a workforce that has no need for unions.

# NR

#### **Growth is unsustainable and depletes valuable resources**

Speth 08 - professor at Vermont Law School, former dean of the Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies, and co-founder of the Natural Resources Defense Council (James Gustave, *The Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing From Crisis to Sustainability*, Yale University Press, 2008, 52-53, EBSCOhost) //gordon

There are many good reasons for concern that future **growth** could easily **continue its environmentally destructive ways**. First, economic activity and its enormous forward momentum can be accurately characterized as **“out of control” environmentally**, and this is true in even the advanced industrial economies that have modern environmental programs in place. Basically, the economic system does not work when it comes to protecting environmental resources, and the political system does not work when it comes to correcting the economic system.

Economist Wallace Oates has provided a clear description of “market failure,” one reason the market does not work for the environment: “Markets generate and make use of a set of prices that serve as signals to indicate the value (or cost) of resources to potential users. Any activity that imposes a cost on society by using up some of its scarce resources must come with a price, where that price equals the social cost. For most goods and services (‘private goods’ as economists call them), the market forces of supply and demand generate a market price that directs the use of resources into their most highly valued employment.

“There are, however, circumstances where a market price may not emerge to guide individual decisions. This is often the case for various forms of environmentally damaging activities. . . . The basic idea is straightforward and compelling: **the absence of an appropriate price for certain** scarce **resources** (such as clean air and water) **leads to their excessive use and** results in what is called **‘market failure.’**

“The source of this failure is what economists term an externality. A good example is the classic case of the producer whose factory spreads smoke over an adjacent neighborhood. The producer imposes a real cost in the form of dirty air, but this cost is ‘external’ to the firm. The producer does not bear the cost of the pollution it creates as it does for the labor, capital, and raw materials that it employs. The price of labor and such materials induces the firm to economize on their use, but there is no such incentive to control smoke emissions and thereby conserve clean air. The point is simply that whenever a scarce resource comes free of charge (as is typically the case with our limited stocks of clean air and water), it is virtually certain to be used to excess.

“Many of our environmental resources are unprotected by the appropriate prices that would constrain their use. From this perspective, it is hardly surprising to find that the environment is overused and abused. **A market system simply doesn’t allocate the use of these resources properly**.”15

#### The last 30 years prove neolib exacerbates wealth inequality and creates unsustainable debt that is the root cause of economic collapse – refuse their theoretical defenses of neolib because they are all contrary to fact

Monbiot 13

(George, honorary doctorates from the University of St Andrews and the University of Essex, and an honorary fellowship from Cardiff University, has held visiting fellowships or professorships at the universities of Oxford (environmental policy), Bristol (philosophy), Keele (politics), Oxford Brookes (planning), and East London (environmental science), January 14, 2013, “Bang Goes the Theory”, http://www.monbiot.com/2013/01/14/bang-goes-the-theory/)

How they must bleed for us. In 2012, the world’s 100 richest people became $241 billion richer(1). They are now worth $1.9 trillion: just a little less than the GDP of the United Kingdom. This is not the result of chance. The rise in the fortunes of the super-rich is the direct result of policies. Here are a few: the reduction of tax rates and tax enforcement; governments’ refusal to recoup a decent share of revenues from minerals and land; the privatisation of public assets and the creation of a toll-booth economy; wage liberalisation and the destruction of collective bargaining. The policies which made the global monarchs so rich are the policies squeezing everyone else. This is not what the theory predicted. Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman and their disciples – in a thousand business schools, the IMF, the World Bank, the OECD and just about every modern government – have argued that the less governments tax the rich, defend workers and redistribute wealth, the more prosperous everyone will be. Any attempt to reduce inequality would damage the efficiency of the market, impeding the rising tide that lifts all boats(2). The apostles have conducted a 30-year global experiment and the results are now in. Total failure. Before I go on, I should point out that I don’t believe perpetual economic growth is either sustainable or desirable(3). But if growth is your aim – an aim to which every government claims to subscribe – you couldn’t make a bigger mess of it than by releasing the super-rich from the constraints of democracy. Last year’s annual report by the UN Conference on Trade and Development should have been an obituary for the neoliberal model developed by Hayek and Friedman and their disciples(4). It shows unequivocally that their policies have created the opposite outcomes to those they predicted. As neoliberal policies (cutting taxes for the rich, privatising state assets, deregulating labour, reducing social security) began to bite from the 1980s onwards, growth rates started to fall and unemployment to rise. The remarkable growth in the rich nations during the 1950s, 60s and 70s was made possible by the destruction of the wealth and power of the elite, as a result of the Depression and the second world war. Their embarrassment gave the other 99% an unprecedented chance to demand redistribution, state spending and social security, all of which stimulated demand. Neoliberalism was an attempt to turn back these reforms. Lavishly funded by millionaires, its advocates were amazingly successful: politically(5). Economically they flopped. Throughout the OECD countries, taxation has become more regressive: the rich pay less, the poor pay more(6). The result, the neoliberals claimed, would be that economic efficiency and investment would rise, enriching everyone. The opposite occurred. As taxes on the rich and on business diminished, the spending power of both the state and poorer people fell, and demand contracted. The result was that investment rates declined, in step with companies’ expectations of growth(7). The neoliberals also insisted that unrestrained inequality in incomes and flexible wages would reduce unemployment. But throughout the rich world both inequality and unemployment have soared(8). The recent jump in unemployment in most developed countries – worse than in any previous recession of the past three decades – was preceded by the lowest level of wages as a share of GDP since the second world war(9). Bang goes the theory. It failed for the same obvious reason: low wages suppress demand, which suppresses employment. As wages stagnated, people supplemented their incomes with debt. Rising debt fed the deregulated banks, with consequences of which we are all aware. The greater inequality becomes, the UN report finds, the less stable the economy and the lower its rates of growth. The policies with which neoliberal governments seek to reduce their deficits and stimulate their economies are counter-productive. The impending reduction of the UK’s top rate of income tax (from 50% to 45%) will not boost government revenue or private enterprise(10), but it will enrich the speculators who tanked the economy: Goldman Sachs and other banks are now thinking of delaying their bonus payments to take advantage of it(11). The welfare bill approved by parliament last week will not help to clear the deficit or stimulate employment: it will reduce demand, suppressing economic recovery. The same goes for the capping of public sector pay. “Relearning some old lessons about fairness and participation,” the UN says, “is the only way to eventually overcome the crisis and pursue a path of sustainable economic development.”(12) As I say, I have no dog in this race, except a belief that no one, in this sea of riches, should have to be poor. But staring dumbfounded at the lessons unlearned in Britain, Europe and the United States, it strikes me that the entire structure of neoliberal thought is a fraud. The demands of the ultra-rich have been dressed up as sophisticated economic theory and applied regardless of the outcome. The complete failure of this world-scale experiment is no impediment to its repetition. This has nothing to do with economics. It has everything to do with power.

**Capitalist growth makes war inevitable, thus by collapsing capitalism the alt actually solves for transition wars**

**Trainer, ’07** [Ted, Senior Lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of New South Wales, “Renewable Energy Cannot Sustain A Consumer Society”, p. 125-159]

**If all nations go on trying to increase their wealth, production, consumption and "living standards" without limit in a world of limited resources, then we must expect increasing armed conflict.** **Rich-world affluent lifestyles require us to be heavily armed and aggressive, in order to guard the empire from which we draw more than our fair share of resources**. Many people within the Peace Movement fail to grasp that ***there is no possibility of a peaceful world while a few are taking far more than their fair share and the rest aspire to live as the rich few do***. **If we want to remain affluent we should remain heavily armed, so we can prevent others from taking "our" oil fields etc**. (For a detailed argument see Trainer, 2002.)

#### Autocracies are better suited to enact meaningful climate action

Gardels 18’ (Nathan Gardels, editor in chief of The WorldPost, Democracy may fatally slow climate action, The World Post, September 13th, 2018, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/theworldpost/wp/2018/09/13/saving-the-planet/, ME)

In his recent book, “How Democracy Ends,” the Cambridge scholar David Runciman doubts that democracies can effectively battle oncoming challenges that have not yet fully arrived. “Climate change,” he writes, “lacks political grip on our imaginations because it is so incremental. The environmental apocalypse is only ever a creeping catastrophe. We experience it as a rumor.”In other words, the future, by definition, has no present political constituency in systems legitimated by consent of the governed. In this sense, democratic politics can disable the requisite will to act until climate calamity is already upon us. That will likely be too late. Ominous signs, such as intense storms like Hurricane Florence or this season’s wildfires, from California to the forests above the Arctic Circle in Sweden, are hopefully bringing forward a concrete awareness of what the future holds. Yet, as Barack Obama reminded Americans last week — referring to President Trump’s rollback on a wide range of policies, including on the environment — progress does not advance in a straight line. Two steps forward often entail one step back, the former president lamented. This is particularly true in democracies where partisan fever is so high that a new election can result in totally overturning a course of action that the public embraced only a few years earlier But there is no time to waste. As the Global Commission on the Economy and Climate recently reported, we are facing “a unique ‘use it or lose it’ moment.” If the world cannot reach the goal of the Paris climate accord to keep the global average temperature below 2 degrees Celsius in the next decade, the planet will heat up past the point of no return. In short, when it comes to climate change, time is an ethical dimension. Whether our species can regain the time lost during this “one step back” is the open question upon which our ability to radically adapt, or even survive, depends. In this respect, China’s one-party, long-term-oriented system presents yet another challenge to the West. Indeed, California Governor Jerry Brown warned this week that by sabotaging America’s electric car industry, Trump was handing the future of auto manufacturing to the modernizing Middle Kingdom, which is vigorously pursuing new battery technologies. China’s leaders believe in science. They have the will and capacity to take decisive and meaningful climate action on a large scale, without a break in the continuity of governance. Whether democracies can similarly rise to this challenge without resorting to authoritarian means will determine if, one dire day, the choice comes down to liberty or survival. In The WorldPost this week, we publish varying perspectives on this challenge in tandem with the Global Climate Action Summit taking place in San Francisco, co-chaired by Governor Brown, former New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg and China’s top climate negotiator, Xie Zhenhua. Christiana Figueres, who presided over the successful negotiations that led to the Paris climate accord, focuses on particulate pollutants in the air that are the consequence of our civilization’s carbon exhaust. “Global warming is not just manifesting in devastating fires, floods and heatwaves; its causes are impacting nearly every breath we take,” she writes. “Thick, heavy smog caused by the burning of fossil fuels and crops is choking cities around the world. China has been forced to close tens of thousands of factories to reduce its air pollution. Air pollution in Africa has been ruled responsible for more deaths than unsanitary water or malnutrition. Last November, Arvind Kejriwal, chief minister of India’s capital city, wrote: ‘Delhi has become a gas chamber.' Figueres, however, is optimistic that we are on the cusp of a shift. “Driven in part by the demand for and the undeniable benefits of clean, breathable air, the paradigm in which development and economic growth depend on coal in particular is rapidly being replaced,” she writes. “The truth is that addressing global warming and its causes is now the only real way to secure economic growth. That means powering it with clean, everlasting, abundant alternatives. Governments everywhere can reap enormous benefits, including saving billions of dollars on healthcare, by fostering a shift to electric transport, eliminating fossil fuel subsidies and scaling ecosystem restoration including mangroves, peat bogs and forests.” Erik Hoffner agrees on this last point. While carbon sequestration technologies are promising, he says, they are likely prohibitively expensive. The same result can be accomplished by the low-tech and far less capital-intensive alternative of agroforestry, which is “essentially a forest-mimicking agriculture that involves growing trees, shrubs and vegetables in tight assemblages.” James Redford and Adam Browning argue that what unites Americans on climate action is, ultimately, the jobs and an improved economy that clean energy can bring. In a short video, they report from their road trip through Minnesota on local communities that are building a solar-based energy grid in this northern state not known for its sunshine. Ali Hasanbeigi and Daniel Moran ponder an entirely new aspect in the climate change debate. While the Paris accord is based on measuring domestic emissions within a country’s borders, it does not count “emissions associated with the products countries import — which can often constitute significant shares of a nation’s economic activity.” As a result, “more than 25 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions are embodied in trade and flow through this glaring ‘carbon loophole,’ one of the most critical and under-discussed problems in international climate policy circles.” To close the carbon loophole, the authors call on nations and companies to “buy clean” by establishing “rules that favor the purchase of cleaner, low-carbon products and that drive clean innovation through the power of the purse.” One of the essential elements in fighting climate change is putting a worldwide price on carbon. To move toward this goal, I propose in my profile of Jerry Brown that he take on the role of a global elder statesman on the issue when he leaves office next year. He has not only made his state a leader in battling global warming; he has also strung together a global “network of the willing” to implement the Paris accord despite America’s official withdrawal. First and foremost among his tasks would be to integrate California’s sizable carbon trading market created by its “cap-and-trade” programs with similar markets in China and Europe. “The model for Brown’s elder statesman role,” I write, “is Jean Monnet, a former French official and diplomat who devised the idea of the European Coal and Steel Community implemented in the 1950s. The driving notion was that regional integration of heavy industry in the Ruhr Valley along the French-German border in the years following World War II would accelerate economic reconstruction and make war ‘not only unthinkable but materially impossible.’”Similarly, I argue, “the integration of cap-and-trade markets today would not only ultimately establish a global carbon price that would diminish reliance on fossil fuels; it would also create a bridge of common intent across boundaries to save the planet despite national conflicts arising today in trade and security matters. Tying our climate fates together would in effect serve as a kind of preemptive version of the Coal and Steel Community.”