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#### Low Air Traffic Strikes now due to lack of Right to Strike – the plan reverses penalties.

Youn 19 Soo Youn 1-22-2019 "Why TSA and FAA workers can't just go on strike to end the shutdown" <https://abcnews.go.com/US/tsa-faa-workers-strike-end-shutdown/story?id=60540070> (Freelance Journalist)//Elmer

All over Twitter and Facebook, citizen commentators are offering a solution to end the partial U.S. government shutdown: **airport workers should just go on strike**. "How many hours after all the TSA workers went on strike would the government be re-opened?" tweeted consultant David Rothkopf, a sentiment echoed throughout the Twittersphere, calling on Transportation Security Administration workers and air traffic controllers to not show up for work. [Tweet Omitted] "The employees of the TSA can do even more. I propose a MASS sickout in Atlanta, the Monday after the Super Bowl. I'm not saying to disrupt the game...but make it impossible for those people to go back home. MAKE Congress and the President pay attention," radio host Joe Madison tweeted. The employees of the TSA can do even more. I propose a MASS sickout in Atlanta, the Monday after the Super Bowl. I'm not saying to disrupt the game...but make it impossible for those people to go back home. MAKE Congress and the President pay attention.https://t.co/N4nio3yudz — Joe Madison (@MadisonSiriusXM) January 22, 2019 But **striking is illegal for federal workers.** "Federal employees are **governed** chiefly **by** the **F**ederal **S**ervice **L**abor **M**anagement **R**elations **A**ct of 1978. That statute prohibits strikes by federal workers," University of Michigan law professor Kate Andrias told ABC News in an email. Moreover, the act **bars workers from getting a future federal government** job "if he or she 'participates in a strike, or asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States," Andrias added, quoting the act. **For many air traffic controllers**, whose ranks are already at 30-year lows, **the last strike has been seared** into their memories. In **1981**, nearly **13,000 controllers walked out** after contract talks between their union, The Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization (PATCO), and the Federal Aviation Administration broke down. Then-President Ronald **Reagan** **fired 11,000 controllers** within days and the **union was decertified**. Reagan also instituted **a lifetime ban** for working for the FAA for the striking controllers. While then-President Bill Clinton issued an executive order to modify the ban, "it's a short shelf-life profession," Georgetown University history professor Joseph A. McCartin told ABC News. There's also a mandatory retirement age of 56. "That's more than 13 years," McCartin, who wrote a book about the PATCO strike, explained. "Many were not interested in coming back." **Were they to strike** today, **federal workers could face prosecution and even jail time**. "While the clear majority of states make public-sector strikes illegal, the statute covering most federal employees **has some of the toughest penalties for illegal strikes**. Specifically, the statute covering most federal workers makes striking a crime, which is unusual," Joseph E. Slater, a law professor at the University of Toledo and an expert in public sector labor law, told ABC News in an email. "The typical penalties are (i) you can be fired and (ii) you and your union can be fined. But in addition to that, you can be jailed for striking against the federal government. And indeed, a number of the PATCO strikers were back in the early 1980s," Slater explained. The suggestion of a strike, or another way to walk off the job, is something Nick Daniels, president of the National Air Traffic Controller’s Association (NATCO) Fort Worth Center's chapter hears a lot. But as a union leader, he's well aware of the penalties.

#### Trade is rebounding now.

Wood 9-16 Laura Wood 9-16-2021 “Global Terminal Tractor Market (2021 to 2026) - Advancements in Terminal Tractors Presents Opportunities” <https://www.globenewswire.com/en/news-release/2021/09/16/2298189/28124/en/Global-Terminal-Tractor-Market-2021-to-2026-Advancements-in-Terminal-Tractors-Presents-Opportunities.html> (Senior Press Manager at Research and Markets)//Elmer

However, **a strong rebound in global trade** **with** the **recovery of major industries** across the globe since the middle of last year has **helped soften** the **impact of the pandemic** for trade. The **global economic recovery** is also **expected to be fueled by** the **higher production of vaccines** and vaccination rates, allowing businesses to reopen more quickly. According to World Trade Organization (WTO), the **volume** of world merchandise trade is **expected to increase by 8.0%** in 2021 after having fallen 5.3% in 2020, continuing its rebound from the pandemic-induced collapse that bottomed out in the second quarter of 2020.

#### Strong Airline Industry key to global trade and the economy – strikes obliterate these benefits.

PWC 16, Pricewaterhouse Coopers. "Economic impact of air traffic control strikes in Europe." (2016). (PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP)//Elmer

2.2.1 The importance of connectivity The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) defines connectivity as an indicator of a network’s concentration and its ability to move passengers from their origin to their destination seamlessly22. **Air connectivity is key to economic growth**, in part because it **enables States to attract business investment and human capital**. An increase in air connectivity **also spurs tourism, which is vital to many countries’ economic prosperity**. There is a **range of evidence produced** by airline industry authorities and academics which **suggests** that **as aviation expands, productivity and hence GDP increases**.23 In 2013 PwC completed a **deep-dive analysis** into **how aviation connectivity** **contributes to** the UK’s economy. The study identified five channels through which aviation plays a “positive enabling role”: **trade** in services, trade in goods, tourism, **business investment and innovation**, and productivity. A key finding emerging from academic and industry studies is the **strong linkage that has been observed over the last 20 years between airline industry growth and GDP growth.** In addition, studies have found that **a 10 percent increase in business air usage, or air travel connectivity, leads to an increase in whole economy productivity of between 0.07 percent and 0.9 percent.24** This includes: x reducing air travel times, giving businesses greater efficiency of access to a wider marketplace; x facilitating oversight of far-flung operations and thereby helping control their risks; thus x enabling investment and human capital to flow more freely across borders and exploit comparative advantages. In particular, a 2006 Oxford Economics study highlights the statistical linkage between business air usage and the level of GDP – in technical terms the study found that business air usage and Total Factor Productivity have a robust co-integrating relationship. Their key result implies that, “other things equal, a 10% increase in business air usage could raise GDP by 0.6% in the long run”. The report also notes that the growth in air transport in the 10 years prior to 2006 “boosted long-run underlying productivity by 2.0% across the EU25.”25 Further evidence on the specific channels of impact of aviation on GDP is outlined in the literature review in Section 4.3 of this report. Air transport is an important enabler to achieving economic growth and development. **Air transport facilitates integration into the global economy** **and provides vital connectivity on a** national, regional, and **international scale**. World Bank In the context of this study, if an **air traffic control strike** **causes** a reduction in the ability for airlines to operate flights as scheduled, this reduces the number of passengers and shipments able to reach their desired destinations as planned. Both **cancelled and delayed flights** **obstruct trade and connectivity**. Furthermore, a **pattern of disruptions will create** **uncertainty and discourage businesses** and consumers **from activities** that require air travel, therefore **reducing trade and connectivity further**. Given the importance of the link between the whole economy productivity and the airline sector output, it is therefore crucial to incorporate this linkage directly into our economic modelling of the impact of ATC strikes.

#### Collapse of Trade causes Hotspot Escalation – goes Nuclear.

Kampf 20 David Kampf 6-16-2020 “How COVID-19 Could Increase the Risk of War” <https://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/28843/how-covid-19-could-increase-the-risk-of-war> (Senior PhD Fellow at the Center for Strategic Studies at The Fletcher School)//Elmer

But that overlooked the ways in which the risk of interstate war was already rising before COVID-19 began to spread. Civil wars were becoming more numerous, lasting longer and attracting more outside involvement, with dangerous consequences for stability in many regions of the world. And the global dynamics most commonly cited to explain the falling incidence of interstate war—democracy, economic prosperity, international cooperation and others—were being upended. If the spread of democracy kept the peace, then its global decline is unnerving. **If globalization and** economic **interdependence kept** the **peace, then** a looming global depression and the **rise of** nationalism and **protectionism are disconcerting**. If regional and global institutions kept the peace, then their degradation is unsettling. If the balance of nuclear weapons kept the peace, then growing risks of proliferation are disquieting. And if America’s preeminent power kept the peace, then its relative decline is troubling. Now, the pandemic, or more specifically the world’s reaction to it, is revealing the extent to which the factors holding major wars in check are withering. The idea that war between nations is a relic of the past no longer seems so convincing. The Pessimists Strike Back More than any other individual, it was cognitive scientist Steven Pinker who popularized the idea that we are living in the most peaceful moment in human history. Starting with his 2011 bestseller, “The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined,” Pinker argued that the frequency, duration and lethality of wars between great powers have all decreased. In his 2019 book, “Enlightenment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress,” he wrote that war “between the uniformed armies of two nation-states appears to be obsolescent. There have been no more than three in any year since 1945, none in most years since 1989, and none since the American-led invasion of Iraq in 2003.” Optimists like Pinker held that, rather than the world falling apart, as a quick glance at headline news might suggest, the opposite was true: Humanity was flourishing. More regions are characterized by peace; fewer mass killings are occurring; governance and the rule of law are improving; and people are richer, healthier, better educated and happier than ever before. In their book, “Clear and Present Safety: The World Has Never Been Better and Why That Matters to Americans,” Michael A. Cohen and Micah Zenko argued that the evidence is so overwhelming that it is difficult to argue against the idea that wars between great powers, and all other interstate wars, are becoming vanishingly rare. Even when wars do break out, they tend to be shorter and less deadly than they were in the past. John Mueller, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, also reasoned that the idea of war, like slavery and dueling before it, was in terminal decline, while Joshua Goldstein, an international relations researcher at American University, credited the United Nations and the rise of peacekeeping operations for helping win the “war on war.” But in recent years, a range of critics have begun to poke holes in these arguments. Tanisha M. Fazal, an international relations professor at the University of Minnesota, contends that the decline in war is overstated. Major advances in medicine, speedier evacuations of wounded soldiers from the field of battle and better armor have made war less fatal—but not necessarily less frequent. Fazal and Paul Poast, who is at the University of Chicago, further assert that the notion of war between great powers as a thing of the past is based on the assumption that all such conflicts resemble World War I and II—both are historical anomalies—and overlooks the actual wars fought between great powers since 1945, from the Korean War and the Vietnam War to proxy wars from Afghanistan to Ukraine. Meanwhile, Bear F. Braumoeller, an Ohio State political science professor, analyzed the same historical data on conflicts used by Pinker, Mueller and Goldstein, and found no general downward trend in either the initiation or deadliness of warfare over the past two centuries. What’s more, Braumoeller contends that the so-called “long peace”—the 75 years that have passed without systemic war since World War II—is far from invulnerable, and that wars are just as likely to escalate now as they used to be. Just because a major interstate war hasn’t happened for a long time, doesn’t mean it never will again. In all probability, it will. And by focusing solely on interstate wars, the optimists miss half the story, at least. Wars between states have declined, but civil wars never disappeared—and these **internal conflicts** **could easily escalate into regional or global wars**. The number of conflicts in the world reached its highest point since World War II in 2016, with 53 state-based armed conflicts in 37 countries. All but two of these conflicts were considered civil wars. To make matters worse, new studies have shown that civil wars are becoming longer, deadlier and harder to conclusively end, and that these internal conflicts are not really internal. Civil wars harm the economies and stability of neighboring countries, since armed groups, refugees, illicit goods and diseases all spill over borders. Some 10 million refugees have fled to other countries since 2012. The countries that now host them are more likely to experience war, which means states with huge refugee populations like Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey face legitimate security challenges. Even after the threat of violence has diminished in refugees’ countries of origin, return migration can reignite conflicts, repeating the brutal cycle. A Yugoslav Federal Army tank. Perhaps most importantly, recent research indicates that civil wars increase the risk of interstate war, in large part because they are attracting more and more outside involvement. In a 2008 paper, researchers Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, Idean Salehyan and Kenneth Schultz explained that, in addition to the spillover effects, two other factors in civil wars increase international tensions and could possibly provoke wider interstate wars: external interventions in support of rebel groups and regime attacks on insurgents across international borders. Immediately after the Cold War, none of the ongoing civil wars around the world were internationalized. According to the Uppsala Conflict Data Program, there were 12 full-fledged civil wars in 1991—in Afghanistan, Iraq, Peru, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and elsewhere—and foreign militaries were not active on the ground in any of them. Last year, by contrast, every single full-fledged civil war involved external military participants. This is due, in part, to the huge growth in U.S. military interventions abroad into civil conflicts, but it’s not only the Americans. All of today’s major wars are in essence proxy wars, pitting external rivals against one another. Conflicts in Syria, Yemen and Libya are best understood not as civil wars, but as international warzones, attracting meddlers including the United States, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Turkey, Iran, France and many others, which often intervene not to build peace, but to resolve conflicts in a way that is favorable to their own interests. These internationalized wars are more lethal, harder to resolve and possibly more likely to recur than civil wars that remain localized. It is not that difficult to imagine how these conflicts could spark wider international conflagrations. Wars, after all, can quickly spiral out of control. As Risks Increase, Deterrents Decline To make matters worse, most of the global trends that explained why interstate war had decreased in recent decades are now reversing. The theories that democracy, prosperity, cooperation and other factors kept the peace have been much debated—but if there was any truth to them, their reversals are likely to increase the chance of war, irrespective of how long the coronavirus pandemic lasts. Democracy is often considered a prophylactic for war. Fully democratic countries are less likely to experience civil war and rarely, if ever, go to war with other democracies—though, of course, they do still go to war against non-democracies. While this would be great news if democracy and pluralism were spreading, there have now been 14 consecutive years of global democratic decline, and there have been signs of additional authoritarian power grabs in countries like Hungary and Serbia during the pandemic. If democracy backslides far enough, internal conflicts and foreign aggression will become more likely. Other theories posit that **economic bonds between countries** have **limited wars** in recent decades. Dale Copeland, a professor of international relations at the University of Virginia, has argued that **countries work to preserve ties when there are high expectations for future trade**, **but war becomes** increasingly **possible when trade is predicted to fall.** If **globalization brought peace**, the recent wave of far-right nationalism and populism around the world may increase the chances of war, as tariffs and other trade barriers go up—mostly from the United States under President Donald Trump, who has launched trade wars with allies and adversaries alike. The coronavirus pandemic immediately elicited further calls to reduce dependence on other countries, with Trump using the opportunity to pressure U.S. companies to reconfigure their supply chains away from China. For its part, China made sure that it had the homemade supplies it needed to fight the virus before exporting extras, while countries like France and Germany barred the export of face masks, even to friendly nations. And widening economic inequalities, a consequence of the pandemic, are not likely to enhance support for free trade. This assault on open trade and globalization is just one aspect of a decaying liberal international order, which, its proponents argue, has largely helped to preserve peace between nations since World War II. But that old order is almost gone, and in all likelihood isn’t coming back. The U.N. Security Council appears increasingly fragmented and dysfunctional. Even before Trump, the world’s most powerful country ratified fewer treaties per year under the Obama administration than at any time since 1945. Trump’s presidency only harms multilateral cooperation further. He has backed out of the Paris Agreement on climate change, reneged on the Iran nuclear deal, picked fights with allies, questioned the value of NATO and defunded the World Health Organization in the middle of a global health crisis. Hyper-nationalism, rather than international collaboration, was the default response to the coronavirus outbreak in the U.S. and many other countries around the world. It’s hard to see the U.S. reluctance to lead as anything other than a sign of its inevitable, if slow, decline. The country’s institutionalized inequalities and systemic racism have been laid bare in recent months, and it no longer looks like a beacon for others to follow. The global balance of power is changing. China is both keen to assert a greater leadership role within traditionally Western-led institutions and to challenge the existing regional order in Asia. Between a rising China, revanchist Russia and new global actors, including non-state groups, we may be heading toward an increasingly multipolar or nonpolar world, which could prove destabilizing in its own right. Finally, the pacifying effect of nuclear weapons could be waning. While vast nuclear arsenals once compelled the United States and the Soviet Union to reach arms control agreements, old treaties are expiring and new talks are breaking down. **Mistrust is growing**, and the **chance of an** unwanted **U.S.-Russia nuclear confrontation is** arguably as **high** as it has been since the Cuban missile crisis. The theory of nuclear peace may no longer hold if more countries are tempted to obtain their own nuclear deterrent. Trump’s decision to abandon the Iran nuclear deal, for one thing, has only increased the chance that Tehran will acquire nuclear weapons. It’s almost easy to forget that, just a few short months ago, the United States and Iran were one miscalculation or dumb mistake away from waging all-out war. And despite Trump’s efforts to negotiate nuclear disarmament with Kim Jong Un’s regime in Pyongyang, it is wishful thinking to believe North Korea will give up its nuclear weapons. At this point, negotiators can only realistically try to ensure that North **Korea’s** **nuclear menace** **doesn’t get** even **more potent**. In other words, by turning inward, the United States is choosing to leave other countries to fend for themselves. The end result may be a less stable world with more nuclear actors. If leaders are smart, they will take seriously the warning signs exposed by this global emergency and work to reverse the drift toward war. If only one of these theories for peace were worsening, concerns would be easier to dismiss. But **together**, they are unsettling. While the world is not yet on the brink of **World War III** and no two countries are destined for war, the odds of avoiding future conflicts don’t look good. The pandemic is already degrading democracies, harming economies and curtailing international cooperation, and it also seems to be fostering internal instability within states. Rachel Brown, Heather Hurlburt and Alexandra Stark argue that the coronavirus could in fact sow more civil conflict. If this proves accurate, the increase in civil wars is likely to lead to more external meddling, and these next **proxy wars** **could** soon **precipitate all-out international conflicts** if outsiders aren’t careful. **With** the **usual deterrents to conflict declining** around the world, **major wars could soon return**.

## 3

#### SCOTUS’s decision on *Roe v. Wade* hinges on Roberts’ political capital.

Robinson ’21 (Kimberly; reporter for Bloomberg Law; 6-18-2021; “Barrett Channels Roberts’ ‘Go-Slow’ Approach in Landmark Cases”; Bloomberg Law; https://news.bloomberglaw.com/us-law-week/barrett-channels-roberts-go-slow-approach-in-landmark-cases; Accessed: 10-1-2021; AU)

The U.S. Supreme **Court’s** newest justice is showing signs that she’s more **aligned with** John **Roberts** and Brett Kavanaugh **in the center** than she is with her other conservative colleagues, **refusing to support** broad **rulings that** could **shake** the **court’s credibility**. Amy Coney Barrett is “starting to show her stripes” as a moderate who prefers small movements in the law, not huge shifts, South Texas College of Law Houston professor Josh Blackman said. The justices handed down victories to both liberals and conservatives on Thursday saving the Affordable Care Act again but siding with a religious group in the latest battle over LGBT protections. **Roberts**, the chief justice, is viewed as an **institutionalist** **who wants to conserve** the public’s **confidence** in the court. So far, he **favors incremental shifts** in the law. “That’s been one of the Chief’s primary goals all along,” said Case Western Reserve law professor Jonathan Adler. He recently gained an **ally in Kavanaugh** in this pursuit, **and** it appears **Barrett** may join their ranks. The court as a whole has has largely agreed in cases this year. The unanimous decision in the LGBT case was the 25th time the justices were unanimous in 41 rulings so far this term. There are 15 to go in coming days. But the **big test** for Barrett **will be** next term starting in October when the justices will tackle hot-button issues like guns, **abortion**, and possibly affirmative action. “It is a very conservative Court, even if we will only get glimpses of it this year,” said UC Berkeley law school Dean Erwin Chemerinsky. Kicking the Can Both the **A**ffordable **C**are **A**ct **and LGBT** rulings **were** “very, very **narrow**,” Georgia State law professor EricSegall said. In the Obamacare case, California v. Texas, the 7-2 majority handed down a procedural ruling to avoid undoing the landmark 2010 law. The justices said red states led by Texas didn’t have a legal basis—or standing—to challenge it. Only Justices Samuel Alito and Neil Gorsuch would have voted to gut the act, long a priority of Republicans. The LGBT ruling, while unanimous in its outcome, was splintered in its reasoning. Hiding under the 9-0 breakdown was a dispute about whether to overturn the court’s divisive ruling in Employment Division v. Smith, which sparked the passage of the bipartisan Religious Freedom Protection Act and mini state versions across the country. The court in Smith refused to require an exception from Oregon’s prohibition on peyote, saying religious objectors don’t get a free pass on “generally applicable” laws. On opposite ends in the court’s LGBT ruling were the liberal justices—Stephen Breyer, Sonia Sotomayor, and Elena Kagan—along with Roberts, who wanted to uphold the court’s precedent in Smith, and the court’s most conservative members—Clarence Thomas, Alito, and Gorsuch—who wanted it overruled once and for all. In **the middle** was Barrett, joined by Kavanaugh, who acknowledged Smith‘s shortcomings but was **concerned with** the **fallout** should the court overrule it. “Yet what should replace Smith?” Barrett asked in a short concurrence. Both cases were a punt, Blackman said, with the issues likely to return to the court at some point in the future. End of the World But the ACA and LGBT cases, along with the extraordinary agreement all term, suggests a **majority** of the justices **don’t think** **it’s** the right **time to make major changes** in the law. “In the throes of everything"—the pandemic, Barrett’s first term, Kavanaugh’s biting confirmation, calls for Breyer to retire, and the caustic 2020 presidential election—"they didn’t want to shock the world this year,” Segall said. “**Preserving** the **court’s** own political **capital** **is** incredibly **important** to the justices because they know their only capital is the confidence of the American people,” he added. **Adler said the court has developed a sort of 3-3-3 split**—that is, three liberals, three conservative justices willing to chuck precedents they don’t agree with, and three conservative justices hesitant to overturn cases they may disagree with. **Roberts, Kavanaugh, and now, apparently, Barrett make up that last group.** Adler said that split will create some interesting pressures for the three justices in the middle next term, when—as Segall said—"the world will end.” **The end of the world was a reference—in part—to the court’s abortion case, which could call into question the landmark ruling in Roe v. Wade and later cases**.

#### The court’s center is skeptical of overturning precedent in Roe, but the path’s narrow.

Feldman ‘9/2 (Noah; Bloomberg Opinion columnist and host of the podcast “Deep Background.” He is a professor of law at Harvard University and was a clerk to U.S. Supreme Court Justice David Souter.; “Is the Supreme Court Ready to Overturn Roe? We Don’t Know”; 9/2/21; Bloomberg; https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2021-09-02/supreme-court-ruling-on-texas-abortion-law-isn-t-death-knell-for-roe; Accessed 9/17/21]

Every nonlawyer on the planet — and no doubt a few lawyers, too — is likely to read this outcome as prefiguring a 5-to-4 vote to overturn Roe v. Wade, the 1973 precedent that made abortion a constitutional right. Later this year, **the court will address** a Mississippi anti-**abortion law** that lacks the cleverly diabolical enforcement mechanism of the Texas law but is equally unconstitutional. Indeed, the day after the law went into effect and before the Supreme Court ruled, many non-lawyers who were so unfamiliar with court procedures that they didn’t know it would eventually issue a ruling on the Texas law had already concluded that they knew how the upcoming Mississippi case would come out. That’s a possible interpretation of the latest opinion, to be sure. But the **opinion** for the five conservatives **explicitly denied** it. “We stress,” said the justices, “that we do not purport **to resolve** definitively any jurisdictional or **substantive claim** in the applicants’ lawsuit.” That’s lawyer-speak for **saying** both that the **law could** still **be unconstitutional** and that there might still be some procedural way to block its operation. For good measure, the opinion said the challengers “have raised serious questions regarding the constitutionality of the Texas law.” These **formulations indicate** that at least **some** of the five **conservatives** who joined it wanted to take pains **not to** **send** the **message** **that Roe** v. Wade **is sure to be overturned**. What is less clear is whether anyone on the political battlefield wants to hear that message. The pro-choice camp will doubtless spend the months until the court term ends in June whipping up public sentiment, either in the hopes of changing the outcome or turning any decision overturning Roe into the impetus for packing the court or producing a heavy Democratic turnout in the 2022 midterm elections. The pro-life camp has an equal interest in making the overturning of Roe seem inevitable. Consequently, neither side cares much for dispassionate analysis. But the fact remains that the majority in the Texas ruling did not address the underlying issues, so it would be premature to predict the outcome in the Mississippi case based on it. Taken strictly on its own terms, the **opinion** made a point that **is incorrect** in my view, **but** that is **legally plausible**. That is that there’s no clear precedent for courts to block in advance the operation of a law that creates a civil penalty — not a criminal violation — to be applied by the courts after private lawsuits by private parties. Ordinarily, when a criminal law is obviously unconstitutional, the courts issue an order to the state attorney general not to enforce it. Such an order would not have any effect in this case, since the Texas attorney general isn’t empowered to enforce the law.

#### Expanding Rights Protection is perceived as judicial activism – it strays from the Constitution and forces Roberts to expend court capital.

Tribe et al. ‘10 [Laurence; January 2010; Carl M. Loeb University Professor at Harvard Law School, et al.; "TOO HOT FOR COURTS TO HANDLE: FUEL TEMPERATURES, GLOBAL WARMING, AND THE POLITICAL QUESTION DOCTRINE," https://s3.us-east-2.amazonaws.com/washlegal-uploads/upload/legalstudies/workingpaper/012910Tribe\_WP.pdf/]

We can stipulate that the **Constitution’s** framers were **not driven by** the **relationships** among chemistry, temperature, combustion engines, and global climate when they **assigned** **to** the **judicial process** the task of **interpreting** and applying **rules of law**, and to the political process the mission of making the basic policy choices underlying those rules. Yet the framework established by the Constitution they promulgated, refined over time but admirably constant in this fundamental respect, wisely embodied the recognition that enacting the ground rules for the conduct of commerce in all of its manifestations—including designing incentives for innovation and creative production (through regimes of intellectual property), establishing the metrics and units for commercial transactions (through regimes of weights and measures), and coping with the cross-boundary effects of economic activity (through the regulation of interstate and foreign commerce)—was a task quintessentially political rather than judicial in character. Yet the litigious **character of** American **society**, observed early in the republic’s history by deTocqueville, has ineluctably **drawn** American **courts**, federal as well as state, into problems within these spheres more properly and productively addressed by the legislative and executive branches. This has occurred in part because **political solutions** to complex problems of policy choice inevitably **leave some** citizens and consumers **dissatisfied** and inclined to seek judicial redress for their woes, real or imagined. And it has occurred in part because the toughest **political problems** appear on the horizon long before solutions can be identified, much less agreed upon, **leaving courts** to **fill the vacuum** that social forces abhor no less than nature itself. One can believe strongly in access to courts for the protection of judicially enforceable rights and the preservation of legal boundaries—as the authors of this WORKING PAPER do— while still deploring the perversion of the judicial process to meddle in matters of policy formation far removed from those judicially manageable realms. Indeed, the two concerns are mutually reinforcing rather than contradictory, for **courts squander** the **social and cultural capital** they need **in order to do** what may be **politically unpopular in preserving rights and protecting boundaries** when they yield to the temptation to treat lawsuits as ubiquitously useful devices for making the world a better place.

#### RTS is treated as an issue of corporate free speech - Robert’s legacy is built on its rejection - ensures sustained backlash.

Thomson-DeVeaux 18 (, A., 2018. Chief Justice Roberts Is Reshaping The First Amendment. [online] FiveThirtyEight. Available at: <https://fivethirtyeight.com/features/chief-justice-roberts-is-reshaping-the-first-amendment/> [Accessed 5 November 2021] Amelia Thomson-DeVeaux is a senior writer at FiveThirtyEight. Before joining FiveThirtyEight’s staff, she was a regular contributor to the site and a freelance writer and editor with a wide portfolio of work. Her writing has been published in a variety of outlets, including CNN, Cosmopolitan, National Journal, and New York Magazine. She is a graduate of Princeton University and holds a master's degree in religious studies from The University of Chicago. Between degrees, she was on the staff of The American Prospect and worked as a writer and editor for PRRI, a public opinion research organization in Washington, DC.)-rahulpenu

It’s been a big year for free speech at the Supreme Court. Two of the most high-profile cases argued before the court so far have revolved around free speech rights, four other cases on the docket this term involve free speech questions, and yet another case where the issue is paramount greets the court on Tuesday.

The court today is hearing arguments on whether the state of California is trampling on the free speech rights of crisis pregnancy centers — nonprofit organizations that do not perform abortions and encourage women to seek alternatives to the procedure — by requiring them to post notices explaining patients’ ability to access abortion and other medical services. In December, attorneys for a baker at Masterpiece Cakeshop in Colorado argued that a state anti-discrimination law violates his free speech rights as a self-described cake artist by requiring him to make a wedding cake for a gay couple. Last month, the justices heard oral arguments in a case about whether state laws allowing unions to require nonmembers to pay fees violate those employees’ right to free speech.

Whichever way the rulings come down this spring and summer, it’s almost certain that the winning side will include Chief Justice John Roberts, who has spent his 12-plus years at the helm of the high court quietly carving out a space as a prolific and decisive arbiter of free speech law. Supporters and critics both agree that during his tenure, the court has dramatically expanded the reach of the First Amendment by striking down a wide range of statutes for encroaching on free speech rights. And **Roberts** has **authored** more **majority** **opinions** **on** **free** **speech** than any other justice during his tenure, signaling that this is an area where he **wants** **to** **create** a **legacy**.

But just what that legacy will be is **highly** **contested**. Roberts’s admirers argue that his commitment to the First Amendment transcends ideological boundaries. But others contend that his decisions don’t protect speech across the board. Instead, they say that **Roberts** is more than willing to **allow** the government to restrict speech when it’s speech he disagrees with — meaning **free** **speech** is becoming **a** legal **tool** **that** **favors** **corporations** **over** **individuals**.

The chief justice gets to decide who writes the majority opinion in any case where he’s on the winning side, which means that Roberts is able to stake a claim over a particular area of law if he so chooses. And that seems to be what’s happening with free speech: As of the end of the 2016 term, Roberts had written 34 percent of the free speech decisions the court has handed down since he joined its ranks, and 14 percent of his majority opinions were devoted to the topic.1 Even when he’s not writing for the majority, Roberts is rarely on the losing side: Out of the 38 free speech cases we counted,2 he voted with the minority only once.

The First Amendment appears to be a topic of deep personal interest for Roberts, and he’s not commanding the majority opinion in these cases simply to reinforce earlier decisions. Roberts has presided over — and participated in — a deliberate and systematic expansion of free speech rights in the realm of campaign finance and commercial speech. The court’s determination that campaign spending limits on corporations violated free speech in the 2010 case Citizens United v. FEC was just one in a series that struck down a range of campaign finance laws on First Amendment grounds and expanded corporations’ right to speech in other venues, like drug advertising and trademark regulations.

According to legal experts, these rulings represent a clear and unprecedented reversal of previous Supreme Court interpretations of the First Amendment, particularly with regard to corporations. Those interpretations began taking shape early in the last century, as the court only began to strike down federal statutes for abridging free speech after World War I. As it did so, it at first explicitly rejected the idea that commercial speech was constitutionally protected. In the 1970s and ’80s, the justices walked this decision back somewhat as it related to certain types of ads, but they continued to maintain that advertising remained categorically different from other kinds of speech, especially when it was presenting inaccurate information.

At the same time, the justices issued groundbreaking rulings that protected the speech of unpopular individuals and groups against government censorship. It was these cases, which involved government attempts to quash union picketing, student protests of the Vietnam war, flag-burning and Nazi protests, that established free speech as an essential protection for people with minority opinions who were in danger of being silenced by the majority.

This is decidedly not the principle that the Roberts court has embraced with its rulings on campaign finance and commercial speech. Starting in the 1970s, campaign finance laws restricting the flow of money into politicians’ coffers aimed to make space for more voices in the political sphere by preventing the wealthy from buying influence. But in the Citizens United case, the court ruled that the government couldn’t restrict the free speech rights of corporations simply because they were corporations — even if citizens with fewer financial resources were less able to command the attention of their elected officials as a result.

Although the Roberts court seems to be interpreting free speech in a new way with these decisions, some historians say that free speech has always been ideologically flexible. According to Laura Weinrib, a historian and professor of law at the University of Chicago, corporate titans like the Ford Motor Company were part of the early push for broader **free** **speech** **protections** precisely because they recognized the power of the First Amendment for **advancing** **their** **own** **causes**, while organizations like the ACLU strategically accepted a “neutral” vision of free speech that **protected** the strong (**companies** like Ford) as well as the weak (union **workers** **seeking** the **right to strike**) in order to secure early victories for **labor** **rights**. Those twin forces helped **pave** the **way** **for** **today’s** understanding of **free** **speech** **under** the **Roberts** court.

It’s that question of what free speech protections should do — and whether it’s acceptable to muzzle stronger voices if they’re drowning out weak or unpopular opponents — that may help explain the Roberts court’s **rightward** **turn** **on** **corporate** **speech**.

Burt Neuborne, a law professor at New York University and a former legal director of the ACLU, said that the liberal justices are willing to tolerate some restrictions on speech because they see them as necessary to build a fair society. “In this view, you can, for example, limit free speech when it threatens our democracy,” Neuborne said. The **conservative** **justices**, on the other hand, tend to **view** **free** **speech** **itself** **as** the **goal**. “They don’t care what happens afterward or who they’re affecting — they just **want** **to** **get** the **gov**ernment **out** **of** the business of **meddling** with speech,” he said.

This explanation is complicated, though, by the fact the Roberts court — and Roberts himself — has painted a muddier picture of other speech limits. Roberts authored opinions striking down a civil judgment holding the Westboro Baptist Church liable for damages resulting from church members picketing outside a soldier’s funeral, and a law prohibiting the distribution of videos showing animal cruelty. Those rulings are clearly in line with previous ones permitting flag-burning and Nazi protests. But Roberts also issued decisions or signed onto rulings that allowed the government to restrict the speech of students, even when they’re off school property, and limit the expression of public employees in a variety of contexts.

There’s disagreement about whether the Roberts court, by upholding these government restrictions on speech, is undermining its reputation as a court dedicated to a broad view of free speech. “It’s very much to Roberts’s credit that his Supreme Court has a genuinely expansive view of free speech that can’t be explained by political favoritism,” said Michael McConnell, a professor at Stanford Law School. He acknowledged that there are a few exceptions but said they aren’t significant or frequent enough to undermine his broader characterization of Roberts’s record.

But Genevieve Lakier, another University of Chicago law professor, disagreed. “The court does make judgments about when the government needs to restrict speech,” she said. “And in contexts like schools, or when the government says there are national security needs, it’s shockingly willing to allow those restrictions.”

Whether or not it’s fair to say that the Roberts court has been broadly protective of free speech, there’s little question that the court is reshaping it in ways that will resonate for years to come. And the cases this term could play a pivotal role in defining and clarifying that legacy — especially Masterpiece Cakeshop.

Neuborne predicted that the wedding cake case would be challenging for Roberts, but that either way, it would further illuminate his stance on free speech. “This case could have serious ramifications for nondiscrimination law,” Neuborne said. “But there is a free speech claim involved, so we’ll see how much of an absolutist Roberts is willing to be.”

#### Legal Abortion key to Fetal Tissue research that creates treatments and vaccines for disease

LRM 19 Medicine, The Lancet Respiratory. "Fetal tissue research: focus on the science and not the politics." (2019): 639. (ranked as the number one journal in the fields of critical care and respiratory medicine)//Found by JM + BUBU//Re-cut by Elmer

**Stem cell** therapy **research** in lung disease is still at early stages, but the research output is **increasing** and the area is a **promising** one. However, there are **limits** to the use of MSC and other adult multipotent stem cells, because **substantial numbers** are **required for therapeutic effects**. The cells also have a shorter replicative lifespan and can only make a restricted number of specialised cell types that are specific for their organ of origin. **Fetal tissue**, by contrast, provides cell lines that grow rapidly, are able to **easily differentiate** into multiple cell types, and are **less likely to be rejected** by the body. In the future, fetal tissue might be replaced in certain areas of research with the use of induced pluripotent stem cells and organoids, which are human-cell cultures that can be crafted to replicate an organ. However, in areas such as fetal development, a suitable replacement to fetal tissue is unlikely to be found. Although research into fetal tissue alternatives is worthwhile, it will take time and until then, the use of fetal tissue is **essential** so that **research efforts**, which are crucial for the development of new therapeutic treatments in often difficult-to-treat lung diseases, are not severely hampered. And those in the field need to ensure their voices are heard. Indeed, the American Thoracic Society released a statement the day after the Trump administration announcement saying that “Scientific research with fetal tissue is **vital for** the **development of new treatments for** many **deadly** **diseases** and conditions, such as cystic fibrosis and acute lung injury. **There are no alternative research models that can replace all fetal tissue research”.** Fetal tissue has been a **key** **part of** the development of multiple **vaccines**, **treatments** for cystic fibrosis, and ongoing research into cancer immunotherapy. The major objection to fetal tissue research is that the **source of** the **fetal tissue is** **mainly from** **elective abortions**. However, there is no suggestion that the number of abortions will decrease as a result of removing funding for fetal tissue research. **Abortion is still legal** in all 50 states in the USA and fetal tissue would otherwise be discarded. **Fetal tissue research**, in fact, holds the **potential to save lives** through the development of new treatments and vaccines. Politicising scientific research in this way means denying hope to millions of patients with life-limiting diseases.

#### Diseases cause Extinction

Bar-Yam 16 Yaneer Bar-Yam 7-3-2016 “Transition to extinction: Pandemics in a connected world” <http://necsi.edu/research/social/pandemics/transition> (Professor and President, New England Complex System Institute; PhD in Physics, MIT)//Elmer

Watch as one of the more aggressive—brighter red — strains rapidly expands. After a time it goes extinct leaving a black region. Why does it go extinct? The answer is that it spreads so rapidly that it kills the hosts around it. Without new hosts to infect it then dies out itself. That the rapidly spreading pathogens die out has important implications for evolutionary research which we have talked about elsewhere [1–7]. In the research I want to discuss here, what we were interested in is the effect of adding long range transportation [8]. This includes natural means of dispersal as well as unintentional dispersal by humans, like adding airplane routes, which is being done by real world airlines (Figure 2). When we introduce long range transportation into the model, the success of more aggressive strains changes. They can use the long range transportation to find new hosts and escape local extinction. Figure 3 shows that the more transportation routes introduced into the model, the more higher aggressive pathogens are able to survive and spread. As we add more long range transportation, there is a critical point at which pathogens become so aggressive that the entire host population dies. The pathogens die at the same time, but that is not exactly a consolation to the hosts. We call this the phase transition to extinction (Figure 4). With increasing levels of global transportation, human civilization may be approaching such a critical threshold. In the paper we wrote in 2006 about the dangers of global transportation for pathogen evolution and pandemics [8], we mentioned the risk from Ebola. Ebola is a horrendous disease that was present only in isolated villages in Africa. It was far away from the rest of the world only because of that isolation. Since Africa was developing, it was only a matter of time before it reached population centers and airports. While the model is about evolution, it is really about which pathogens will be found in a system that is highly connected, and Ebola can spread in a highly connected world. The traditional approach to public health uses historical evidence analyzed statistically to assess the potential impacts of a disease. As a result, many were surprised by the spread of Ebola through West Africa in 2014. As the connectivity of the world increases, past experience is not a good guide to future events. A key point about the phase transition to extinction is its suddenness. Even a system that seems stable, can be destabilized by a few more long-range connections, and connectivity is continuing to increase. So how close are we to the tipping point? We don’t know but it would be good to find out before it happens. While Ebola ravaged three countries in West Africa, it only resulted in a handful of cases outside that region. One possible reason is that many of the airlines that fly to west Africa stopped or reduced flights during the epidemic [9]. In the absence of a clear connection, public health authorities who downplayed the dangers of the epidemic spreading to the West might seem to be vindicated. As with the choice of airlines to stop flying to west Africa, our analysis didn’t take into consideration how people respond to epidemics. It does tell us what the outcome will be unless we respond fast enough and well enough to stop the spread of future diseases, which may not be the same as the ones we saw in the past. As the world becomes more connected, the dangers increase. Are people in western countries safe because of higher quality health systems? Countries like the U.S. have highly skewed networks of social interactions with some very highly connected individuals that can be “superspreaders.” The chances of such an individual becoming infected may be low but events like a mass outbreak pose a much greater risk if they do happen. If a sick food service worker in an airport infects 100 passengers, or a contagion event happens in mass transportation, an outbreak could very well prove unstoppable.

## 4

#### The aff is sua sponte – it makes a decision in absence of arguments presented before the court – that crushes court legitimacy

Milani & Smith 02 (Adam and Michael, both are Assistant Professors, Mercer University School of Law, “Playing God: A Critical Look at Sua Sponte Decisions by Appellate Courts,” 69 Tenn. L. Rev. 245, Winter, lexis)

The heart of the American legal system is the adversary process in which trained advocates present the parties’ facts and arguments to neutral decision makers. The fundamental premise of the adversary process is that these advocates will uncover and present more useful information and arguments to the decision maker than would be developed by a judicial officer acting on his own in an inquisitorial system.3 The adversary process is also said to “promote[] litigant and societal acceptance of decisions rendered by the courts”4 because a party who “is intimately involved in the adjudicatory process and feels that he has [they have] been given a fair opportunity to present his case . . . is likely to accept the results whether favorable or not.”5 Indeed, the Joint Conference on Responsibility of the American Bar Association and the Association of American Law Schools stated that “[i]n a very real sense it may be said that the integrity of the adjudicative process itself depends upon the participation of the advocate.”6 Accordingly, most lawyers probably never think about the possibility that a court will decide a case on an issue that the court itself raises and which was neither briefed nor argued by the parties. But we all know it happens. We even have a name for such a decision: [is] sua sponte. Translated from its original Latin, “sua sponte” means “on his or its own motion.”7 In the legal setting, sua sponte describes a decision or action undertaken by a court on its own motion8 as opposed to an action or decision done in response to a party’s request or argument. As such, the concept of “sua sponte” is an important exception to two basic [the] principles of our adversary system of adjudication: (1) that the parties will control the litigation, and (2) that the decision maker will be neutral and passive.9 One of the clearest manifestations of these principles is that the parties themselves, not the decision maker, determine what issues will be adjudicated. In the context of judicial decision making, a court deviates from its traditional “passive” role in the adjudicatory process when it raises an issue not identified by the parties but which it deems relevant to the legal controversy before it. Nonetheless, raising issues sua sponte is not an uncommon practice.10 In fact, legal scholars have identified several kinds of issues that are commonly raised by courts on their own. First, both trial and appellate courts often raise jurisdictional issues such as standing, subject matter jurisdiction, and mootness sua sponte.1

#### Court legitimacy is key to effectively combat terrorism

Shapiro 3 (Jeremy, Nonresident Senior Fellow at the Brookings institute - Foreign Policy, Center on the United States and Europe, Project on International Order and Strategy, 3-1-2003, “French Lessons: The Importance of the Judicial System in Fighting Terrorism”, The Brookings Institute, https://www.brookings.edu/articles/french-lessons-the-importance-of-the-judicial-system-in-fighting-terrorism/)

The unique nature of terrorism means that maintaining the appearance of justice and democratic legitimacy will be much more important than in past wars. The terrorist threat is in a perpetual state of mutation and adaptation in response to government efforts to oppose it. The war on terrorism more closely resembles the war on drugs than World War II; it is unlikely to have any discernable endpoint, only irregular periods of calm. The French experience shows that ad-hoc anti-terrorist measures that have little basis in societal values and shallow support in public opinion may wither away during the periods of calm. In the U.S., there is an enormous reservoir of legitimacy, established by over 200 years of history and tradition, in the judiciary. That reservoir represents an important asset that the U.S. government can profit from to maintain long-term vigilance in this type of war.

#### Nuclear terrorism causes extinction

Hellman 8 (Martin, emeritus prof of engineering @ Stanford, “Risk Analysis of Nuclear Deterrence” SPRING 2008 THE BENT OF TAU BETA PI, http://www.nuclearrisk.org/paper.pdf)

The threat of nuclear terrorism looms much larger in the public’s mind than the threat of a full-scale nuclear war, yet this article focuses primarily on the latter. An explanation is therefore in order before proceeding. A terrorist attack involving a nuclear weapon would be a catastrophe of immense proportions: “A 10-kiloton bomb detonated at Grand Central Station on a typical work day would likely kill some half a million people, and inflict over a trillion dollars in direct economic damage. America and its way of life would be changed forever.” [Bunn 2003, pages viii-ix]. The likelihood of such an attack is also significant. Former Secretary of Defense William Perry has estimated the chance of a nuclear terrorist incident within the next decade to be roughly 50 percent [Bunn 2007, page 15]. David Albright, a former weapons inspector in Iraq, estimates those odds at less than one percent, but notes, “We would never accept a situation where the chance of a major nuclear accident like Chernobyl would be anywhere near 1% .... A nuclear terrorism attack is a low-probability event, but we can’t live in a world where it’s anything but extremely low-probability.” [Hegland 2005]. In a survey of 85 national security experts, Senator Richard Lugar found a median estimate of 20 percent for the “probability of an attack involving a nuclear explosion occurring somewhere in the world in the next 10 years,” with 79 percent of the respondents believing “it more likely to be carried out by terrorists” than by a government [Lugar 2005, pp. 14-15]. I support increased efforts to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism, but that is not inconsistent with the approach of this article. Because terrorism is one of the potential trigger mechanisms for a full-scale nuclear war, the risk analyses proposed herein will include estimating the risk of nuclear terrorism as one component of the overall risk. If that risk, the overall risk, or both are found to be unacceptable, then the proposed remedies would be directed to reduce which- ever risk(s) warrant attention. Similar remarks apply to a number of other threats (e.g., nuclear war between the U.S. and China over Taiwan). his article would be incomplete if it only dealt with the threat of nuclear terrorism and neglected the threat of full- scale nuclear war. If both risks are unacceptable, an effort to reduce only the terrorist component would leave humanity in great peril. In fact, society’s almost total neglect of the threat of full-scale nuclear war makes studying that risk all the more important. The cosT of World War iii The danger associated with nuclear deterrence depends on both the cost of a failure and the failure rate.3 This section explores the cost of a failure of nuclear deterrence, and the next section is concerned with the failure rate. While other definitions are possible, this article defines a failure of deterrence to mean a full-scale exchange of all nuclear weapons available to the U.S. and Russia, an event that will be termed World War III. Approximately 20 million people died as a result of the first World War. World War II’s fatalities were double or triple that number—chaos prevented a more precise deter- mination. In both cases humanity recovered, and the world today bears few scars that attest to the horror of those two wars. Many people therefore implicitly believe that a third World War would be horrible but survivable, an extrapola- tion of the effects of the first two global wars. In that view, World War III, while horrible, is something that humanity may just have to face and from which it will then have to recover. In contrast, some of those most qualified to assess the situation hold a very different view. In a 1961 speech to a joint session of the Philippine Con- gress, General Douglas MacArthur, stated, “Global war has become a Frankenstein to destroy both sides. … If you lose, you are annihilated. If you win, you stand only to lose. No longer does it possess even the chance of the winner of a duel. It contains now only the germs of double suicide.” Former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara ex- pressed a similar view: “If deterrence fails and conflict develops, the present U.S. and NATO strategy carries with it a high risk that Western civilization will be destroyed” [McNamara 1986, page 6]. More recently, George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn4 echoed those concerns when they quoted President Reagan’s belief that nuclear weapons were “totally irrational, totally inhu- mane, good for nothing but killing, possibly destructive of life on earth and civilization.” [Shultz 2007] Official studies, while couched in less emotional terms, still convey the horrendous toll that World War III would exact: “The resulting deaths would be far beyond any precedent. Executive branch calculations show a range of U.S. deaths from 35 to 77 percent (i.e., 79-160 million dead) … a change in targeting could kill somewhere between 20 million and 30 million additional people on each side .... These calculations reflect only deaths during the first 30 days. Additional millions would be injured, and many would eventually die from lack of adequate medical care … millions of people might starve or freeze during the follow- ing winter, but it is not possible to estimate how many. … further millions … might eventually die of latent radiation effects.” [OTA 1979, page 8] This OTA report also noted the possibility of serious ecological damage [OTA 1979, page 9], a concern that as- sumed a new potentiality when the TTAPS report [TTAPS 1983] proposed that the ash and dust from so many nearly simultaneous nuclear explosions and their resultant fire- storms could usher in a nuclear winter that might erase homo sapiens from the face of the earth, much as many scientists now believe the K-T Extinction that wiped out the dinosaurs resulted from an impact winter caused by ash and dust from a large asteroid or comet striking Earth. The TTAPS report produced a heated debate, and there is still no scientific consensus on whether a nuclear winter would follow a full-scale nuclear war. Recent work [Robock 2007, Toon 2007] suggests that even a limited nuclear exchange or one between newer nuclear-weapon states, such as India and Pakistan, could have devastating long-lasting climatic consequences due to the large volumes of smoke that would be generated by fires in modern megacities. While it is uncertain how destructive World War III would be, prudence dictates that we apply the same engineering conservatism that saved the Golden Gate Bridge from collapsing on its 50th anniversary and assume that preventing World War III is a necessity—not an option.

## 5

#### [A just government ought to] request the International Court of Justice issue an advisory opinion over whether they ought to [establish an unconditional right to strike]. [A just government] ought to abide by the outcome of the advisory opinion.

#### Solves – the ICJ will rule in favor of an unconditional right to strike.

Seifert ’18 (Achim; Professor of Law at the University of Jena, and adjunct professor at the University of Luxembourg; December 2018; “The protection of the right to strike in the ILO: some introductory remarks”; CIELO Laboral; http://www.cielolaboral.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/12/seifert\_noticias\_cielo\_n11\_2018.pdf; Accessed: 11-3-2021; AU)

The **recognition of a right to strike** in the legal order of the **International Labour Organization** (ILO) is probably one of the most controversial questions in international labor law. Since the foundation of the ILO in the aftermath of World War I, the recognition of the right to strike as a **core element** of the principle of freedom of association has been discussed in the International Labour Conference (ILC) as well as in the Governing Body and the International Labour Office. As is well known, the ILO, in its long history spanning almost one century, has not explicitly recognized a right to strike: neither Article 427 of the Peace Treaty of Versailles (1919), the Constitution of the ILO, including the Declaration of Philadelphia (1944), nor the Conventions and Recommendations in the field of freedom of association - namely Convention No. 87 on Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise (1948) - have explicitly enshrined this right. However, the Committee on Freedom of Association (CFA), established in 1951 by the Governing Body, recognized in 1952 that Convention No. 87 guarantees also the **right to strike** as an **essential element of trade** union rights enabling workers to collectively defend their economic and social interests1. It is worthwhile to note that it was a complaint of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU), at that time the Communist Union Federation on international level and front organization of the Soviet Union2, against the United Kingdom for having dissolved a strike in Jamaica by a police operation; since that time the controversy on the right to strike in the legal order of the ILO was also embedded in the wider context of the Cold War. In the complaint procedure initiated by the WFTU, the CFA **recognized** a **right to strike** under Convention No. 87 but considered that the police operation in question was lawful. In the more than six following decades, the CFA has elaborated a **very detailed case law** on the right to strike dealing with many concrete questions of this right and its limits (e.g. in essential services) and manifesting an even more complex structure than the national rules on industrial action in many a Member State. This case law of the CFA has been compiled in the “Digest of Decisions and Principles of the Freedom of Association Committee of the Governing Body of the ILO”3. In 1959, i.e. seven years after case No. 28 of the CFA, the Committee of Experts for the Application of Conventions and Recommendations (CEACR) also recognized the right to strike as **a core element of freedom** of association under Article 3 of Convention No. 874. Since then, the CEACR has **reconfirmed** its view on many occasions. Both CFA and CEACR coordinate their interpretation of Article 3 of Convention No. 875. Hence there is one single corpus of rules on the right to strike developed by both supervisory Committees of the Governing Body. Moreover, the ILC also has made clear in various Resolutions adopted since the 1950s that it considers the **right to strike** as an **essential element of freedom of association6**. On the whole, the recognition of the right to strike resulted therefore from the interpretative work of CFA and CEACR as well as of the understanding of the principle of freedom of association the ILC has expressed on various occasions. It should not be underestimated the wider political context of the Cold War had in this constant recognition of a right to strike under ILO Law. Although the very first recognition of the right to strike -as mentioned above- went back to a complaint procedure before the CFA, initiated by the Communist dominated WFTU, it was the Western world that particularly emphasized on the right to strike in order to blame the Communist Regimes of the Warsaw Pact that did not explicitly recognize a right to strike in their national law or, if they legally recognized it, made its exercise factually impossible; to this end, unions, employers’ associations but also Governments of the Western World built up an alliance in the bodies of the ILO7. In accomplishing their functions, CFA and CEACR necessarily have to interpret the Conventions and Recommendations of the ILO whose application in the Member States they shall control. In so doing, they need to concretize the principle of freedom of association that is only in general terms guaranteed by the ILO Conventions and Recommendations on freedom of association. But as supervisory bodies, which the Governing Body has established and which are not foreseen in the ILO Constitution, both probably do not have the power to interpret ILO law with binding effect8. This is also the opinion that the CEACR expresses itself in its yearly reports to the ILC when explaining that, “its opinions and recommendations are non-binding”9. As a matter of fact, the Governing Body, when establishing both Committees, could not delegate to them a power that it has never possessed itself: nemo plus iuris ad alium transferre potest quam ipse haberet10. According to Article 37(1) of the ILO Constitution, it is within the **competence of the International Court of Justice** to decide upon “any question or dispute relating to the **interpretation of this Constitution** or of any subsequent Convention concluded by the Members in pursuance of the provisions of this Constitution.” Furthermore, the ILC has not established yet under Article 37(2) of the ILO Constitution an ILO Tribunal, competent for an authentic interpretation of Conventions11. However, it **cannot be denied** that this constant interpretative work of CFA and CEACR possesses an **authoritative character** given the high esteem the twenty members of the CEACR -they are all internationally renowned experts in the field of labor law and social security law- and the nine members of the CFA with their specific expertise have. As the CEACR reiterates in its Reports, “[the opinions and recommendations of the Committee] derive their persuasive value from the legitimacy and rationality of the Committee’s work based on its impartiality, experience and expertise”12. Already this interpretative authority of both Committees justifies that **national legislators or courts take into consideration** the views of these supervisory bodies of the ILO when implementing ILO law. Furthermore, the long-standing and uncontradicted interpretation of the principle of freedom of association by CFA and CEACR as well as its recognition by the Member States may be considered as a **subsequent practice** in the application of the ILO Constitution under Article 31(3)(b) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1968): such subsequent practices shall be taken into account when interpreting the Agreement. Their constant supervisory practice probably reflects a volonté ultérieure, since other bodies of the ILO also have **recognized a right to strike** as the two above-mentioned Resolutions of the ILC of 1957 and 1970 as well as the constant practice of the Conference Committee on the Application of Standards to examine **cases of violation** of the right to strike as **examples for breaches of the principle of freedom of association** demonstrate. As this constant practice of the organs of the ILO has not been contradicted by Member States, there is a **strong presumption** for recognition of a right to strike as a subsequent practice of the ILO under Article 31(3)(b) of the **Vienna Convention** on the Law of Treaties.

#### US compliance ensures faith in global democratic institutions – solves nuclear war.

Hawksley ’16 [Humphrey; formerly the BBC’s Beijing Bureau Chief and author of The Third World War: A Novel of Global Conflict and Asian Waters: American, China, and the Global Paradox; 11-19-2016; "Trump makes International Law Crucial for Peace"; Humphrey Hawksley; https://www.humphreyhawksley.com/trump-makes-international-law-crucial-for-peace/; Accessed 4-1-2020; AH]

Major powers tend to reject international law when rulings run counter to their interests insisting that the distant courts carry no jurisdiction. China rejected a Permanent Court of Arbitration’s ruling in July and clings to expansive claims in the South China Sea, including Scarborough Shoal near the Philippines. China’s response mirrored US rejection of a 1986 International Court of Justice ruling against US support for rebels in Nicaragua. “With these stands, both China and the United States weakened a crucial element of international law – consent and recognition by all parties,” writes journalist Humphrey Hawksley for YaleGlobal Online. Disregard for the rule of law weakens the legal system for all. Hawksley offers two recommendations for renewing respect for international law: intuitional overhaul so that the all parties recognize the courts, rejecting decisions only as last resort, and governments accepting the concept, taking a long-term view on balance of power even when rulings go against short-term strategic interests. Reforms may be too late as China organizes its own parallel systems for legal reviews and global governance, Hawksley notes, but international law, if respected, remains a mechanism for ensuring peace. – YaleGlobal LONDON: Flutter over the surprise visit to China by Philippines President Rodrigo Duterte may soon fade. But his abrupt and public dismissal of the United States in favor of China has weakened the argument that international rule of law could underpin a changing world order. The issue in question was the long-running dispute between China and the Philippines over sovereignty of Scarborough Shoal, situated 800 kilometers southeast of China and 160 kilometers west of the Philippines mainland, well inside the United Nations–defined Philippines Exclusive Economic Zone. Despite a court ruling and Duterte’s cap in hand during his October mission to Beijing, Philippine fishing vessels still only enter the waters around Scarborough Shoal at China’s mercy. The dispute erupted in April 2012, when China sent ships to expel Filipino fishing crews and took control of the area. The standoff became a symbol of Beijing’s policy to lay claim to 90 percent of the South China Sea where where it continues to build military outposts on remote reefs and artificially created islands in waters claimed by other nations. Lacking military, diplomatic or economic muscle, the Philippines turned to the rule of law and the Permanent Court of Arbitration in the Hague. A panel of maritime judges ruled China’s claim to Scarborough Shoal invalid in July this year. China refused to recognize the tribunal from the start and declared the decision “null and void,” highlighting the complex balance in the current world order between national power and the rule of law. Beijing’s response mirrored a 1986 US response to Nicaragua’s challenge in the International Court of Justice. The court ruled against the United States for mining Nicaragua’s harbors and supporting right-wing Contra rebels. The United States claimed the court had no jurisdiction. China’s response on the South China Sea ruling mirrors a 1986 US response.With these stands, both China and the United States weakened a crucial element of international law – consent and recognition by all parties. The Western liberal democratic system is being challenged, and confrontations in Asia and Europe, as in Crimea and Ukraine, replicate the lead-up to the global conflicts of last century’s Cold War. As Nicaragua and Central America were a flashpoint in the 1980s, so Scarborough Shoal and South China Sea are one now. Other flashpoints are likely to emerge as China and Russia push to expand influence. Western democracies being challenged by rising powers have a troubled history. The 1930s rise of Germany and Japan; the Cold War’s proxy theaters in Vietnam, Nicaragua and elsewhere; and the current US-Russian deadlock over Syria are evidence that far more thought must be given in the deployment of international law as a mechanism for keeping the peace The view is supported, on the surface at least, by Russia and China who issued a joint statement in June arguing that the concept of “strategic stability” being assured through nuclear weapons was outdated and that all countries should abide by principles stipulated in the “UN Charter and international law.” Emerging power India, with its mixed loyalties, shares that view. “The structures for international peace and security are being tested as never before,” says former Indian ambassador to the UN, Hardeep Singh Puri, author of Perilous Interventions: The Security Council and the Politics of Chaos. “It is everyone’s interest to re-establish the authority of the Security Council and reassert the primacy of law.”

## Case

#### Extinction comes first!

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

### Oppression

#### Strikes have no effect – tech, replacement workers, public influence, employer costs, etc. Independently, only public workers solve strike ineffectiveness, not workers – all worker strikes do is anger the public

Waldersee 17 [Victoria Waldersee; former Co-Director and Commissioning Editor for Economy; 9-7-2017; "We asked economists whether strikes really work"; Our Economy; https://www.ecnmy.org/engage/we-asked-economists-whether-strikes-really-work/; 11-20-2021] //Miller

What makes or breaks a strike?

It depends on a few things: One, how much it’s going to affect the employer’s business in the short term; two, how replaceable the workers are; and three, to what extent the strikers have the public and the government on their side.

“I work at a university,” says Simms. “If I decide not to work today, not much happens to my employer’s business. But if I were a train driver, and I decided not to do my job, it would obviously have an immediate effect.”

If workers can easily be replaced by other workers, their ‘bargaining power’ is pretty low. If there is what economists call ‘surplus labour’ – i.e., people available and willing to do the job in the current conditions – then companies can just fire unhappy staff and call on a bank of new workers. When public sector workers go on strike, there are often private companies happy to do the work instead.

And then there’s technology “Advances in technology are really reducing the power of workers to fight their corner,” says Crossman. In low-wage, manufacturing jobs, people can just be replaced by obedient robots, and that’s the end of that.

If the government and the public take a stand against the way workers are being treated – regardless of whether they could be replaced by other workers, or by robots – all this changes. Customers could simply boycott a product or service, and governments could launch official inquiries as to whether people’s rights are being breached. That puts companies in a vulnerable place, which workers can’t do.

Aren’t strikes a bit unfair to customers or service users?

“Trade unions would say customers are secondary,” says Simms. “The workers have decided it’s necessary, because someone isn’t listening to them.”

According to Crossman, it’s a matter of opinion. “If you look at the train strike [in the UK], customers were angry about the fact they couldn’t get to work, but they knew the service was bad before. So they tend to blame government and management, not unions. But there’s only so much they’ll take before they start turning on staff.”

What’s the role of governments in all this?

“Governments have got to try and help the parties reach an agreement – a bit like a marriage counselor,” says Simms. Whether they’ve got an obligation to get involved varies country to country – in the UK, it’s optional, bu in other places, it’s mandatory.

The other option is setting rules to avoid the things that cause strikes to kick off in the first place from happening. But, as Crossman points out, companies tend to find a way around them.”When companies were supposed to regulate how much they could increase executive pay in the 1970s, they just started handing out company cars. It’s like a computer virus: the virus comes after the computer has been created, so you’re always playing catch up.”

Governments can do the opposite, too: make it harder for unions to go on strike, by doing things like requiring a minimum vote among union members to allow industrial action. You can also make votes secret, to avoid any kind of peer pressure.

#### Strikes have no impact and hurt workers, Orechwa 19

Jennifer Orechwa, 2019, "General Motors Strike A Reminder Unions Hurt Workers," UnionProof, https://projectionsinc.com/unionproof/how-unions-hurt-workers-the-gm-strike-continues/

**Employees Hurt the Most by a Strike** 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 hurt 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.”

### econ

#### Turning the Economy Internal Links –

#### Increased strikes sabotage the economy – they cause major disruptions and lower income for workers.

Grabianowski 6 [Ed; Author and freelance writer. He’s worked as a contributing writer for io9, HowStuffWorks, and Sweethome. His fiction has appeared in Black Static, Fear Project, and other publications and anthologies, including Fear After Fear; “How Strikes Work,” HSW; 3/24/06; <https://money.howstuffworks.com/strike.htm>] Justin

Labor strikes can cause major disruptions to industry, commerce and the lives of many people who aren't even connected to the strike itself. The Professional Air Traffic Controllers Association strike in 1981 resulted in the firing of thousands of air traffic controllers, and the New York City transit strike in late 2005 affected millions of people. The history of strikes and labor unions is a key chapter in the story of the Industrial Revolution.

While the reasons behind strikes can be complex, they all boil down to two key elements: money and power. In this article, we'll find out how labor strikes have affected the balance of power between corporations and workers, what laws regulate strikes and learn about some important strikes in history.

It's difficult to say when the first real labor strike occurred. The word "strike" was first used in the 1700s, and probably comes from to notion of dealing a blow to the employer [ref]. In 1786, a group of printers in Philadelphia requested a raise and the company rejected it. They stopped working in protest and eventually received their raise. Other professionals followed suit in the next few decades. Everyone in a city who practiced the same profession agreed to set prices and wages at the same rate. Members would shun anyone who diverged from the agreement, refusing to work in the same shop and forcing employers to fire them. By the 1800s, formal trade societies and guilds began to emerge.

To have a strike today, you must have a union (though not necessarily an official union) -- an organization of workers that bargain collectively with an employer. Workers form unions because an individual worker is powerless compared to an employer, who can set low wages and long working hours as long as it adheres to labor laws. When workers combine to form a union, they collectively have enough power to negotiate with the employer. The main weapon the union has against the employer is the threat of a strike action.

At its most basic level, a strike occurs when all the workers in the union stop coming to work. With no workers, the business shuts down. The employer stops making money, though it is still spending money on taxes, rent, electricity and maintenance. The longer the strike lasts, the more money the employer loses. Of course, the workers aren't getting paid either, so they're losing money as well. Some unions build up "war chests" -- funds to pay striking workers. But it isn't usually very much, and it's often not enough for a prolonged strike.

Strikes help explain why unions are more powerful than individuals. Imagine if an employer refuses to give a raise to an individual worker. She then decides to stop coming to work in protest. The employer simply fires her for not coming to work. That one worker has no power to influence the employer. However, it can be very costly for an employer to fire every single worker when a union goes on strike (though it has happened).

#### Turning Wages – this answers their Internal Link to Education Innovation AND the Economy.

#### 1] Unions reduce wages for the majority and harm general employment rates – flips their labor shortage links

Hazlitt 19 [Henry Hazlitt; Author on Economics; 12/17/2019; " How Unions Reduce Real Wages"; Mises Institute; https://mises.org/wire/how-unions-reduce-real-wages] //Miller

For more than a century the economic thinking not only of the public but of the majority of economists has been dominated by a myth — the myth that labor unions have been on the whole a highly beneficent institution, and have raised the level of real wages far above what it would have been without union pressure. Many even talk as if the unions had been chiefly responsible for whatever gains labor has made. Yet the blunt truth is that labor unions cannot raise the real wages of all workers. We may go further: the actual policies that labor unions have systematically followed from the beginning of their existence have in fact reduced the real wages of the workers as a whole below what they would otherwise have been. Labor unions are today the chief antilabor force. To realize why this is so we must understand what determines wages in a free market. Wage rates are prices. Like other prices they are determined by supply and demand. And the demand for labor is determined by the marginal productivity of labor. If wage rates go above that level, employers drop their marginal workers because it costs more to employ them than they earn. They cannot long be employed at a loss. If, on the other hand, wage rates fall below the marginal productivity of workers, employers bid against each other for more workers up to the point where there is no further marginal profit in hiring more or bidding up wages more. So assuming mobility of both capital and labor, assuming free competition between workers and free competition between employers, there would be full employment of every person wanting and able to work, and the wage rate of each would tend to equal his marginal productivity. It will be said — it has in fact repeatedly been said — that such an analysis is merely a beautiful abstraction and that in the actual world this mobility and competition of labor and capital do not exist. There is, some economists have argued, in fact a wide range of "indeterminacy" in wages, and it is the function of unions to make sure that wage rates are fixed at the top rather than the bottom of this range or zone. We cannot reply that this indeterminacy theory is wholly wrong; but what we can say is that in relation to the problem of unions it is unimportant. The indeterminacy theory is true of wages only to the extent that it is true of other prices: it is true where the market is narrow or specialized. It is true, say, of highly specialized jobs in journalism, or in the universities, or in scientific research, or in the professions. But wherever we have large numbers of unskilled workers, or large numbers of approximately equal special but widespread skills — such as carpenters, bricklayers, painters, plumbers, printers, train-men, truckdrivers — this zone of indeterminacy shrinks or disappears. It is the craft unions themselves who insist that their individual members are so nearly equal to each other in competence that all should be paid on equal "standard" wage. And so we have the paradox that the unions exist and flourish precisely where they are least necessary to assure that their members get a market wage equal to their marginal productivity. It is true, of course, that an individual union can succeed in forcing the money wage rates of its members above what the free market rate would be. It can do this through the device of a strike, or often merely through the threat of a strike. Now a strike is not, as it is constantly represented as being, merely the act of a worker in "withholding his labor," or even merely a collusion of a large group of workers simultaneously to "withhold their labor" or give up their jobs. The whole point of a strike is the insistence by the strikers that they have not given up their jobs at all. They contend that they are still employees — in fact, the only legitimate employees. They claim an ownership of the jobs at which they refuse to work; they claim the "right" to prevent anybody else from taking the jobs that they have abandoned. That is the purpose of their mass picket lines, and of the vandalism and violence that they either resort to or threaten. They insist that the employer has no right to replace them with other workers, temporary or permanent, and they mean to see to it that he doesn't. Their demands are enforced always by intimidation and coercion, and in the last resort by actual violence. So wherever a union makes a gain by a strike or strike threat, it makes it by forcibly excluding other workers from taking the jobs that the strikers have abandoned. The union always makes its gains at the expense of these excluded workers. Overlooking the Victims It is amazing to find how systematically the self-proclaimed humanitarians, even among professional economists, have managed to overlook the unemployed, or the still more poorly paid workers, who are the victims of the union members' "gains." It is important to keep in mind that the unions cannot create a "monopoly" of all labor, but at best a monopoly of labor in certain specific crafts, firms, or industries. A monopolist of a product can get a higher monopoly price for that product, and perhaps a higher total income from it, by deliberately restricting the supply, either by refusing to produce as much as he can of it, or by withholding part of it, or even by destroying part of it that has already come into existence. But while the unions can and do restrict their membership, and exclude other workers from it, they cannot reduce the total number of workers seeking jobs. Therefore whenever the unions gain higher wage rates for their own members than free competition would have brought, they can do this only by increasing unemployment, or

#### 2] Strikes empirically reduce wages, job opportunities, and hurt economic recovery – reject their surface level studies that don’t account for specific factors

Sherk 09 [James Sherk; Bradley Fellow in Labor Policy in the Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation; 5-21-2009; "What Unions Do: How Labor Unions Affect Jobs and the Economy"; Heritage Foundation; https://www.heritage.org/jobs-and-labor/report/what-unions-do-how-labor-unions-affect-jobs-and-the-economy; 11-16-2021] //Miller

Unions function as labor cartels. A labor cartel restricts the number of workers in a company or industry to drive up the remaining workers' wages, just as the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) attempts to cut the supply of oil to raise its price. Companies pass on those higher wages to consumers through higher prices, and often they also earn lower profits. Economic research finds that unions benefit their members but hurt consumers generally, and especially workers who are denied job opportunities. The average union member earns more than the average non-union worker. However, that does not mean that expanding union membership will raise wages: Few workers who join a union today get a pay raise. What explains these apparently contradictory findings? The economy has become more competitive over the past generation. Companies have less power to pass price increases on to consumers without going out of business. Consequently, unions do not negotiate higher wages for many newly organized workers. These days, unions win higher wages for employees only at companies with competitive advantages that allow them to pay higher wages, such as successful research and development (R&D) projects or capital investments. Unions effectively tax these investments by negotiating higher wages for their members, thus lowering profits. Unionized companies respond to this union tax by reducing investment. Less investment makes unionized companies less competitive. This, along with the fact that unions function as labor cartels that seek to reduce job opportunities, causes unionized companies to lose jobs. Economists consistently find that unions decrease the number of jobs available in the economy. The vast majority of manufacturing jobs lost over the past three decades have been among union members--non-union manufacturing employment has risen. Research also shows that widespread unionization delays recovery from economic downturns. Some unions win higher wages for their members, though many do not. But with these higher wages, unions bring less investment, fewer jobs, higher prices, and smaller 401(k) plans for everyone else. On balance, labor cartels harm the economy, and enacting policies designed to force workers into unions will only prolong the recession.