# Speech 1NC Longhorn Rd 1 vs Austin

## 1

#### Interp – debaters must disclose their contact information on the NDCA LD wiki.

#### Violation – your school doesn’t existText Description automatically generated with low confidence

#### 1] Inclusion – Novices would have a way to contact you about your positions and learn from them and debaters would tell you before round about triggering positions that you’ve read before.

#### 2] Prep Skew- Pre-round disclosure can’t happen if you don’t have a preferable means of contact because I would never know the aff. That triggers presumption since the aff wasn’t subject to well researched scrutiny and wasn’t tested.

## 2

#### Interp: All speech docs sent by debaters must be in the font “Comic Sans MS.”

#### Violation- theirs isn’t

#### Prefer

#### 1)Ableism- fonts that aren’t comic sans are harder for people with dyslexia to read

**Baer quotes Hudgins 17**[[Drake Baer](https://www.thecut.com/author/drake-baer/)(deputy editor at Business Insider, overseeing the strategy and executive life verticals. He was previously a correspondent covering similar beats. He has also served as a senior writer at New York Magazine and a contributing writer at Fast Company). “The Reason Comic Sans Is a Public Good.” The Cut. March 7, 2017. Accessed 3/23/20. <https://www.thecut.com/2017/03/the-reason-comic-sans-is-a-public-good.html> //Houston Memorial DX]

But, as Lauren Hudgins [argues](https://theestablishment.co/hating-comic-sans-is-ableist-bc4a4de87093#.vukjzcz1b) for the Establishment, the agreed-upon hatred of Comic Sans reflects a certain navel-gazing, since it’s one of the best fonts for people with dyslexia, including an estimated [15 percent](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/05/opinion/sunday/the-upside-of-dyslexia.html)of Americans. She tells the story of how her sister, who has the learning disability, has used Comic Sans as a tool to help her complete a degree in marine biology. Interestingly, it’s the idiosyncrasy of Comic Sans that makes it accessible. “The irregular shapes of the letters in Comic Sans allow her to focus on the individual parts of words,” Hudgins writes. “While many fonts use repeated shapes to create different letters, such as a ‘p’ rotated to made a ‘q,’ Comic Sans uses few repeated shapes, creating distinct letters (although it does have a mirrored ‘b’ and ‘d’).” The ubiquitous Times New Roman, with all its serifs, is often illegible.

#### 2)Cognitive Bias- people despise comic sans

**Kadavy** [David Kadavy(bestselling author of The Heart to Start & Design for Hackers, & host of Love Your Work). “[Why You Hate Comic Sans](https://designforhackers.com/blog/comic-sans-hate/).” Design for Hackers. No Date. Accessed 3/23/20. <https://designforhackers.com/blog/comic-sans-hate/> //Houston Memorial DX]

Everyone loves to hate Comic Sans. The child-like handwriting font is so infamous, there is [a movement to try to ban it](http://bancomicsans.com/). Mention its name to the common layman (aside from a preschool teacher), and you will likely get a chuckle, mention it to a trained designer, and you’ll get a look of disgust.

#### a)Resolvability- being at a psychological disadvantage, it proves that the judge was already unconsciously against me and makes it impossible for the judge to vote

#### b) Epistemically Suspect- the judge was already biased against me the moment you sent out the speech doc and was unconsciously biased toward you.

## 3

#### Interp: Debaters may not gain offense off of pre fiat methods. To clarify, you can read it, you just cant gain offense off of it.

#### Violation – that was cx

#### Prefer

#### 1] Resolvability

#### 2] Psychic Violence – a) judges b) debaters proper

#### 3] Limits

## 4

#### Interp: The affirmative must specify the jurisdiction the right to strike is recognized within a delimited text in the 1AC.

#### Jurisdiction is flexible and has too many interps– normal means shows no consensus and makes the round irresolvable – triggers presumption cuz the judge had to intervene

Leyton Garcia 17 [Jorge Andrés Leyton García (Postgraduate Research Student / Assistant Teacher en University of Bristol). “THE RIGHT TO STRIKE AS A FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN RIGHT: RECOGNITION AND LIMITATIONS IN INTERNATIONAL LAW”. Revista Chilena de Derecho, vol. 44, núm. 3, 2017, pp. 781-804. Accessed 6/24/21. <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/1770/177054481008.pdf> //Xu]

The fi eld in which these pages will revolve is indeed complex and full of paradoxes. The right to strike has been recognized in diverse forms in different international and national legal systems. In some cases it has been expressly recognized in the text of conventions and treaties (European Social Charter), while in others the recognition has been achieved through the principled work of supervisory or jurisdictional bodies (like it has been the case in the ILO and the ECHR), not without diffi culties and doubts, as we shall see in the following pages. The analysis that follows will show, however, that the form of recognition does not necessary defi ne the scope and extent of the right. 1.1. THE ILO Despite being the most important source of labor standards, there is no defi nition of the right to strike in any of the ILO binding instruments. The right to strike is not mentioned in the ILO Constitution or in the Declaration of Philadelphia, and Convention N°87 on Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organise contains no specifi c reference to it. There is no textual recognition and no canonical defi nition in any of the Conventions and Recommendations that constitute the ILO’s body of norms. Nevertheless, it is fair to say that throughout the history of the ILO there has been a wide consensus among its members regarding the existence of a right to strike which emanates from the dispositions of Convention N°87 as a fundamental aspect of Freedom of Association. As Janice Bellace has pointed out: “Over the past 60 years the ILO constituents have recognized that there is a positive right to strike that is inextricably linked to – and an inevitable corollary of – the right to freedom of association”3 .

#### Violation – you don’t.

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Stable Advocacy – they can redefine in the 1AR to wriggle out of DA’s which kills high-quality engagement and becomes two ships passing in the night – triggers presumption since the aff wasn’t subject to well researched scrutiny. We lose access to Readiness DA’s, Unions DA’s, basic case turns, and core process counter plans that have different definitions and 1NC pre-round prep.

#### 2] Real World – Policy makers will always define the entity that they are recognizing. It also means zero solvency, absent spec, governments can circumvent since there is no delineated way to enforce the aff and means their solvency can’t actualize.

#### JSpec isn’t regressive or arbitrary – its core topic lit for what happens when the aff is implemented and cannot be discounted from recognition policies that require enforcement to function.

#### Fairness – a) you conceded the judge will fairly evaluate your argument b) its constitutive to debate as competitive activity that requires objective evaluation

#### Education – a) it’s the only reason why schools fund debate b) it’s the only portable impact to debate

#### CI – a) brightlines are arbitrary and self-serving which doesn’t set good norms b) it collapses since weighing between brightlines rely on offense defense

#### DOD – a) it’s the only way to may up for time spent on theory b) it’s the only way to deter future abuse

#### Eval after 1NC since they had the first speech advantage so I should have the last speech advantage

#### No RVI’s- a) logic – you shouldn’t win for being fair b) clash – people go all in on theory which decks substance engagement c) chilling effect – people will be too scared to read theory because RVI’s encourage baiting theory

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier.

## 5

#### The ROB is to determine the truth of falsity of the resolution –

#### 1] Textuality – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true.

#### That OW –

#### a] Jurisdiction – judges are constrained through their constitutive purpose and proves it’s a side constraint on what arguments they can vote on.

#### b] Predictability – people base prep off the pregiven terms in the resolution.

#### 2] Isomorphism – alternative ROBs aren’t binary truth/false because of topic lit biases which increases intervention and takes the debate out of the hands of debaters.

#### 3] Inclusion – any offense functions under it as long as debaters implicate their positions to prove the truth or falsity of the resolution which maximizes substantive clash through ground and is a sequencing question for engaging in debate.

#### 4] Logic – any statement relies on a conception of truth to function – for example, I’m hungry is the same as its true that I’m hungry – logic is a litmus test for any argument and proves your ROB collapse since it relies on truth.

#### Negate –

#### 1] a[[3]](#footnote-3) “used when expressing rates or ratios; in, to, or for each; per” but there are no numbers in the rez

#### 2] just[[4]](#footnote-4) describes what is “(of treatment) deserved or appropriate in the circumstances” but the rez is aspatial

#### 3] government[[5]](#footnote-5) is “direction; control; management; rule” but a direction can’t perform an action

#### 4] to[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### 5] recognize[[7]](#footnote-7) is to “(of a person presiding at a meeting or debate) call on (someone) to speak” but a right can’t speak

#### 6] an[[8]](#footnote-8) “forming names of organic compounds, chiefly polysaccharides” but a right isn’t an organic compound

#### 7] of[[9]](#footnote-9) “expressing an age” but the rez is atemporal

## 6

#### Presumption and permissibility negates – a) more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted – there’s alwahys an institutional DA to going through Congress c) ought[[10]](#footnote-10) means “moral obligation” so the lack of that obligation means the aff hasn’t fulfilled their burden d) resolved[[11]](#footnote-11) indicates “firmly determined” which means they proactively did something, to negate that means that they aren’t resolved

#### The Greatest Conceivable Being exists and determines morality!

#### 1] Logic – entities can exist in mind and/or reality, but reality is definitionally greater, meaning solely imagining the GCB is illogical. Illogical guidelines allows agents to opt out of ethics and outweighs as uncertainty can’t guide action.

#### 2] Movement implies causality between different motions, which regresses to antecedents. Answering causality makes prediction uncertain, so it can’t consistently guide duty. Its inescapable – the GCB as the first mover is the culpable cause of any action.

#### 3] Ethics requires a frame of reference for weighing between impacts as a side-constraint on resolvable debates – absent degrees of wrongness, any action becomes justified for the greater good. Only the GCB as the pinnacle of perfection that unifies ethics solves – a] individuals can opt out of inconsistent empirical circumstances b] agents assert their own viewpoints and infinitely fight over indeterminate moral truths.

#### 4] Teleology – the GCB created every object with an inherent purpose, which is the only binding element to ethics – a] agents can opt out of contingent circumstances that arise through the constant influx of time b] morality can only be derived from constitutive properties that agents are bound to.

#### The standard is consistency with the GCB’s will – its infinitely good since GCB is the only source of goodness.

#### Negate – we defend the squo which the GCB willed, meaning its infinitely good and proves the aff is a departure.

# AC

## FW

#### Vote neg on presumption:

#### 1] Systems- the 1AC says institutions create social realities that replicate violence but in-round discourse does nothing to alter conditions. All you do is encourage teams to write better framework blocks.

#### 2] Spillover- they are missing an internal link as to why they need the ballot or why the reading of the aff forwards change. Empirically denied – judges vote on [x] all the time and nothing happens.

#### 3] Competition- debate is the wrong forum for change and competition moots any ethical value of the aff. Winning rounds just makes it seem like you want to win and a loss is internalized as a technical mistake.

#### Robo-phobia disrespects Asian and Native American culture, is anthropocentric, and fed slavery.

**Ito 18** [Joi Ito (former director of the MIT Media Lab, former professor of the practice of media arts and sciences at MIT, and a former visiting professor of practice at the Harvard Law School). “Why Westerners Fear Robots and the Japanese Do Not.” Wired. 7/30/18. Accessed 7/10/20. <https://www.wired.com/story/ideas-joi-ito-robot-overlords/> //Houston Memorial DX]

AS A JAPANESE, I grew up watching anime like Neon Genesis Evangelion, which depicts a future in which machines and humans merge into cyborg ecstasy. Such programs caused many of us kids to become giddy with dreams of becoming bionic superheroes. Robots have always been part of the Japanese psyche—our hero, Astro Boy, was officially entered into the legal registry as a resident of the city of Niiza, just north of Tokyo, which, as any non-Japanese can tell you, is no easy feat. Not only do we Japanese have no fear of our new robot overlords, we’re kind of looking forward to them. It’s not that Westerners haven’t had their fair share of friendly robots like R2-D2 and Rosie, the Jetsons’ robot maid. But compared to the Japanese, the Western world is warier of robots. I think the difference has something to do with our different religious contexts, as well as historical differences with respect to industrial-scale slavery. The Western concept of “humanity” is limited, and I think it’s time to seriously question whether we have the right to exploit the environment, animals, tools, or robots simply because we’re human and they are not. SOMETIME IN THE late 1980s, I participated in a meeting organized by the [Honda Foundation](http://asimo.honda.com/) in which a Japanese professor—I can’t remember his name—made the case that the Japanese had more success integrating robots into society because of their country’s indigenous Shinto religion, which remains the official national religion of Japan. Followers of Shinto, unlike Judeo-Christian monotheists and the Greeks before them, do not believe that humans are particularly “special.” Instead, there are spirits in everything, rather like the Force in *Star Wars*. Nature doesn’t belong to us, we belong to Nature, and spirits live in everything, including rocks, tools, homes, and even empty spaces. The West, the professor contended, has a problem with the idea of things having spirits and feels that anthropomorphism, the attribution of human-like attributes to things or animals, is childish, primitive, or even bad. He argued that the Luddites who smashed the automated looms that were eliminating their jobs in the 19th century were an example of that, and for contrast he showed an image of a Japanese robot in a factory wearing a cap, having a name and being treated like a colleague rather than a creepy enemy. The general idea that Japanese accept robots far more easily than Westerners is fairly common these days. Osamu Tezuka, the Japanese cartoonist and the creator of Atom Boy [noted the relationship between Buddhism and robots](https://www.nytimes.com/1982/01/10/magazine/japan-s-love-affair-with-the-robot.html), saying, ''Japanese don't make a distinction between man, the superior creature, and the world about him. Everything is fused together, and we accept robots easily along with the wide world about us, the insects, the rocks—it's all one. We have none of the doubting attitude toward robots, as pseudohumans, that you find in the West. So here you find no resistance, simply quiet acceptance.'' And while the Japanese did of course become agrarian and then industrial, Shinto and Buddhist influences have caused Japan to retain many of the rituals and sensibilities of a more pre-humanist period. In *Sapiens*, Yuval Noah Harari, an Israeli historian, describes the notion of “humanity” as something that evolved in our belief system as we morphed from hunter-gatherers to shepherds to farmers to capitalists. As early hunter-gatherers, nature did not belong to us—we were simply part of nature—and many indigenous people today still live with belief systems that reflect this point of view. Native Americans listen to and talk to the wind. Indigenous hunters often use elaborate rituals to communicate with their prey and the predators in the forest. Many hunter-gatherer cultures, for example, are deeply connected to the land but have no tradition of land ownership, which has been a source of misunderstandings and clashes with Western colonists that continues even today. It wasn’t until humans began engaging in animal husbandry and farming that we began to have the notion that we own and have dominion over other things, over nature. The notion that anything—a rock, a sheep, a dog, a car, or a person—can belong to a human being or a corporation is a relatively new idea. In many ways, it’s at the core of an idea of “humanity” that makes humans a special, protected class and, in the process, dehumanizes and oppresses anything that’s not human, living or non-living. Dehumanization and the notion of ownership and economics gave birth to slavery at scale. In Stamped from the Beginning, the historian Ibram X. Kendi describes the colonial era debate in America about whether slaves should be exposed to Christianity. British common law stated that a Christian could not be enslaved, and many plantation owners feared that they would lose their slaves if they were Christianized. They therefore argued that blacks were too barbaric to become Christian. Others argued that Christianity would make slaves more docile and easier to control. Fundamentally, this debate was about whether Christianity—giving slaves a spiritual existence—increased or decreased the ability to control them. (The idea of permitting spirituality is fundamentally foreign to the Japanese because everything has a spirit and therefore it can’t be denied or permitted.) This fear of being overthrown by the oppressed, or somehow becoming the oppressed, has weighed heavily on the minds of those in power since the beginning of mass slavery and the slave trade. I wonder if this fear is almost uniquely Judeo-Christian and might be feeding the Western fear of robots. (While Japan had what could be called slavery, it was never at an industrial scale.)

#### Technophobia exacerbates anxiety- you actively promote an exclusive environment.

**Baylor** [Baylor University. “People afraid of robots much more likely to fear losing their jobs, suffer anxiety.” Phys.org. 3/22/17. Accessed 7/10/20. <https://phys.org/news/2017-03-people-robots-jobs-anxiety.html> //Houston Memorial DX]

"Technophobes"—people who fear robots, artificial intelligence and new technology that they don't understand—are much more likely to be afraid of losing their jobs to technology and to suffer anxiety-related mental health issues, a Baylor University study found. More than a third of those in the study fit its definition of "technophobe" and are more fearful of automation that could lead to job displacement than they are of potentially threatening or dangerous circumstances such as romantic rejection, public speaking and police brutality, according to the study. "If you're afraid of losing your job to a robot, you're not alone," said researcher Paul McClure, a sociologist in Baylor's College of Arts & Sciences. "This is a real concern among a substantial portion of the American population. They are not simply a subgroup of generally fearful people." Previous research has found that employees with little job security suffer from poorer [mental health](https://phys.org/tags/mental+health/) and that unemployment and job insecurity are often linked to heart disease and mortality rates.

## Adv

#### The utilization of strikes is a reformist smokescreen that reinforces capitalist labor-relations.

IP 16 [Note – the website cntrl c+v is really weird so there might be a misspelled word (like “down” to “clown”) or a misplaced comma or period. I’m not sure how to fix it but please let me know if you do! Internationalist Perspective (left-communist publication defending Marxism as a living theory and critiquing left-communist theory). “Trade unions: pillars of capitalism - Internationalist Perspective”. LibCom. 1/5/16. Accessed 11/12/21. <https://libcom.org/library/trade-unions-pillars-capitalism-internationalist-perspective> //Recut Xu from Majeed]

Most of us agree that the unions are an integral part of the capitalist system. Not just the corrupt ones and those with a heavy bureaucratic apparatus but also those who profess a belief in "grass roots democracy" or even in "revolution". The arguments given for that position have been mostly empirical. Indeed, time and time again, the unions have screwed the workers, contained and defanged their struggle, have spread capitalist ideology in the working class and acted as capital's police on the shop floor. But empirical arguments are not enough. Indeed, on the basis of past experience alone, one could very well conclude that global revolution is impossible, as Paul wrote. Some have argued that it's the union's function within the capitalist economy - to manage the sale of labor power- which inevitably ties it to the system and hence opposes it to the class whose fundamental interests are irreconciliable with those of that system. That is true but it's not sufficient either. One could argue that as long as the goals of the struggle don't go beyond obtaining better wages and working conditions, or preventing their deterioration, and as long as those goals are achievable within capitalism, the irreconcilability is not immediate and the existence of permanent institutions to negotiate a better price for variable capital remains in the interests of the workers. In short one could argue, as does Adam [Buick of the Socialist Party of Great Britain], that despite the empirical evidence and despite the integration of the unions in the structure of the capitalist economy, the existing unions are bad but unionism is good. Moreover, despite the widespread disillusion, many workers still see the unions as their (imperfect) organisations, and sometimes the most combative workers are active in them. And sometimes capitalists fight the unions and try to get rid of them. When they attack a union and the workers rise up to defend "their" organisation, should revolutionaries who understand the real role of the union tell them not to wage that fight, even though the attack is clearly meant to defeat the workers and have a free hand to impose more exploitation? What to do when the workers most willing to fight are shop stewards and others who ardently defend the unions - not the leadership but the organisation? Should we simply call upon workers to leave the unions? And what do we offer as alternative, not just in limes of open struggle but also when the conditions for collective struggle aren't ripe while the pressure from capital continues? Is the 'outside and against' directive more than an empty slogan when the only meetings where workers gather are those organised by the unions? To answer those and many other questions pertaining to the practical aspects of class struggle and the defense of workers' immediate interests, the question why unions are not just counter- revolutionary but against the working class in their daily practice, must be answered first. The answer is not that obvious. After all, it is a logical reaction of workers, who are utterly powerless as individuals towards their employers who seek to exploit them as much as possible, to band together in permanent organisations to defend the price of their labor power. The first unions were clearly created by the working class even though many did bear the corporatist imprints of the guilds (professional organisations from the pre-capitalist era). Their existence as permanent organisations was a necessity, not only because of the permanency of capitalist pressure, but also because of the need of permanent preparation for confrontations with the capitalists, confrontations which often look the form of wars of attrition which the workers were doomed to lose without this preparation (the build-up of strike funds etc). Likewise, the growth of unions into bigger organisations, operating on a national scale, reflected the need of workers to increase their power by extending their class solidarity. So the growth of the unions reflected and stimulated class consciousness. Capitalists feared and loathed them and fought them bitterly. Yet very soon, the permanency of these large organisations posed a problem. The class struggle goes through ups and clowns which reflect the contradictory tendencies to which the workers, as an exploited class, are subjected. The conditions of exploitation push the workers to fight collectively and thereby to assert itself as a class with interests separate and opposed to those of capital; but those same conditions also create competition among workers, atomisation, alienation, passivity, receptiveness to the ideology of the dominant class. Those two tendencies do not neutralize each other but give the class struggle a very non-linear character, with sudden advances and retreats, moments of rising class consciousness and stretches of 'social peace', as one or the other of those tendencies dominate. During those periods of no collective struggle, when atomisation and alienation prevail, these big permanent organisations cannot express what isn't there, a class collectively fighting. It does not mean they immediately become bourgeois but they inevitably acquire an autonomy from the class they are supposed to represent. As autonomous institutions they inevitably develop hierarchical, authoritarian attitudes and relations and come to have interests which are distinct from those of the class as a whole. Thus the source of conflict of interests between the working class and the unions is already potentially present in the permanence of unions as social institutions. I write 'potentially' because from this does not yet follow that these institutions must side with capital against the workers. For this to happen, these institutions must first become part of capital, absorbed into the social fabric weaved by the law of value. This did not happen immediately because the extension of the law of value throughout society was a slow, gradual process. ln the early stages of this process, the domination of capital over society was only 'formal'. The work process itself was at first not yet intrinsically capitalist, capitalism only squeezed as much surplus value as possible from it by making the working day as long as possible and keeping the wages as measly as possible. It look a long time for a specifically capitalist method of production (based on machinism, which reversed the relation worker-technology: the tool was an extension of the worker's hand but now the worker became an appendage of the machine) to develop and become dominant. The giant leaps in productivity which technology-based production unleashed created mass production and set the stage for capitalism to transform the totality of society in its own image, which meant that the law of value came to determine social relations not just in the sphere of production but also in distribution, education, entertainment, culture, media and every other aspect of human life. But before that process (called the transition to real domination of capital) amassed critical weight, there remained a large space within society that was not yet penetrated by the law of value. Therein, not only expressions of pre-capitalist classes survived but organisations of the fledging working class too could maintain a relative autonomy. Unions were not the only permanent workers organisations that flourished in that space: there were workers' cooperatives, mutual aid societies, political mass parties, cultural organisations, newspapers, etc. that were genuine expressions of the working class. The modest size of the bourgeois state apparatus also reflected the merely formal control of capital over society. The fact that the state's policy towards the unions was largely repressive shows that capital had not yet developed the means to organically integrate them; the unions were still by and large standing outside the state. As the real domination of capital progressed and the complexity, technification and interwovenness of the capitalist economy developed, the state gradually fused with the economy and its tentacles spread over civil society. It's striking how this transformation of the economy and the integration of the unions into the structure of capitalist society went hand in hand, in particular towards the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. The test of that integration came when the interests of capitalism and those of the working class (and humanity) became diametrically opposed as never before. What was at issue was not the price of variable capital but its survival or destruction. In the first world war, many millions of proletarians were slaughtered and it happened with the active collaboration of the unions. This epochal event signalled a new paradigm in which both crisis and war meant something different than before: they became both catastrophic and global in nature as well as essential to the continuation of capitalist accumulation. Today more than ever, there cannot exist any large permanent institution outside of the fabric of capital. That is true not just for unions but also for churches, political parties, cultural institutions and so on. The market either absorbs them, accords them a specialized function within its overall operating structure, a niche according to what they can do for the valorisation of capital, or marginalizes them, makes them disappear. When the class struggle heats up , the market shifts, a demand is created for a company of management of 'human resources' that has a more radical market image, which is quickly filled, either by a new union or by a radicalisation of the existing ones. Neither represents a gain for the working class. Today, there are no longer any progressive factions of capital. The unions' interests are inextricably bound to those of capital, to those of the nation. The logic of capital makes them complicit in trying to impose the worst possible fate on the working class. In the revolutionary struggle, which is a defensive struggle, the working class will have to take on the entire capitalist machinery, including the unions. It is true that this does not mean that every act or every word of the unions are opposed to the immediate interests of the working class. The productivity-increases made possible by the progress of capital's real domination allowed capital to accord improvements of the living standards and to increase exploitation (increase the portion of the labor day that is unpaid) at the same time, at least in period of expansion. It doesn't like to do this, of course, since every wage gain is a profit loss, but over lime it came to realize that this can be in its own interests. The main reason is that the production process under real domination, with its huge assembly lines and increased specialisation and thus interdependency, became more vulnerable to interruptions, to class struggle. That was a powerful incentive, especially in the post-world war two period, to grant better wages and to give the unions a bigger say in the management of the economy. The unions have their own particular interests. As companies that manage the sale and the smooth exploitation of variable capital, they compete among themselves and have a market image to defend, both in regard to the workers the y seek to represent and in regard to the enterprises with whom they seek to negotiate. Their credibility is their most valuable asset and if it's necessary to protect it, they can sometimes drive a hard bargain with the buyers of labor power. The most intelligent capitalists realize that unions can only fulfil their capitalist function if they have some credibility as defenders of the workers and must do what they have to do to maintain it. The international waves of class struggle in the '60's and '70's which repeatedly broke through the dykes of unionism and did great damage to capitalist profits and to the myth of unions as defenders of the working class, was a powerful stimulant to the restructuring of the capitalist economy that followed it. The 'post-Fordism' in which it resulted, with its increased automation, the computerization of labor, the decentralisation of production, the explosion of outsourcing, subcontracting and temp work, the increased mobility of capital (vastly expanding the use layoffs and closings, and the threat thereof, as social weapons) decreased the vulnerability of production to industrial action considerably. By decreasing that vulnerability, capital also decreased its dependence on the unions. This allowed for more anti-unionism among capitalists, and led to a marked increase of 'union-busting'. But this also helped the unions to shore up. their credibility in the eyes of the workers somewhat, because the enemy of your enemy can seem to be your friend. The unions resisted the post-Fordist trend, in part to maintain their credibility in the eyes of the workers and in part because it was and is a threat to their own power. But since the trend reflected not a mere policy choice but the direction in which capitalism, of which they are a part, was going, their resistance was doomed to be ineffective. The alternative of the unions to this trend is conservative, to resist changes in capitalism. As this is impossible, they end up almost invariably defending 'capitalism lite', layouts, but less layoffs than the bosses are demanding, wage cuts, but with a percentage and a half shaved off. But, they need a culprit, a scapegoat for the worker's anger, and since they are tied to national capital, the scapegoat is usually foreign competition (foreign workers really). That makes the unions the most ardent defenders of protectionism. As an economic recipe that is plain stupid and sometimes really annoying to other factions of capital, but politically it is very useful to capital because it makes them work tirelessly to spread the nationalist poison into the working class.

#### 1] Strikes violate individual autonomy by exercising coercion.

Gourevitch 18 [Alex; Brown University; “The Right to Strike: A Radical View,” American Political Science Review; 2018; [https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321]](https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321%5d//SJWen) Justin

\*\*Edited for ableist language

Every liberal democracy recognizes that workers have a right to strike. That right is protected in law, sometimes in the constitution itself. Yet strikes pose serious problems for liberal societies. They involve violence and coercion, they often violate some basic liberal liberties, they appear to involve group rights having priority over individual ones, and they can threaten public order itself. Strikes are also one of the most common forms of disruptive collective protest in modern history. Even given the dramatic decline in strike activity since its peak in the 1970s, they can play significant roles in our lives. For instance, just over the past few years in the United States, large illegal strikes by teachers ~~paralyzed~~ froze major school districts in Chicago and Seattle, as well as statewide in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and Colorado; a strike by taxi drivers played a major role in debates and court decisions regarding immigration; and strikes by retail and foodservice workers were instrumental in getting new minimum wage and other legislation passed in states like California, New York, and North Carolina. Yet, despite their significance, there is almost no political philosophy written about strikes.1 This despite the enormous literature on neighboring forms of protest like nonviolence, civil disobedience, conscientious refusal, and social movements.

The right to strike raises far more issues than a single essay can handle. In what follows, I address a particularly significant problem regarding the right to strike and its relation to coercive strike tactics. I argue that strikes present a dilemma for liberal societies because for most workers to have a reasonable chance of success they need to use some coercive strike tactics. But these coercive strike tactics both violate the law and infringe upon what are widely held to be basic liberal rights. To resolve this dilemma, we have to know why workers have the right to strike in the first place. I argue that the best way of understanding the right to strike is as a right to resist the oppression that workers face in the standard liberal capitalist economy. This way of understanding the right explains why the use of coercive strike tactics is not morally constrained by the requirement to respect the basic liberties nor the related laws that strikers violate when using certain coercive tactics.

#### 2] Free-riding: strikes are a form of free-riding since those who don’t participate still reap the benefits.

Dolsak and Prakash 19 [Nives and Aseem; We write on environmental issues, climate politics and NGOs; “Climate Strikes: What They Accomplish And How They Could Have More Impact,” 9/14/19; Forbes; <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/09/14/climate-strikes-what-they-accomplish-and-how-they-could-have-more-impact/?sh=2244a9bd5eed>] Justin

While strikes and protests build solidarity among their supporters, they are susceptible to collective action problems. This is because **the goals that strikers pursue tend to create non-excludable benefits**. That is, benefits such as climate protection can be enjoyed by both strikers and non-strikers. Thus, large participation in climate strikes will reveal that in spite of free-riding problems, a large number of people have a strong preference for climate action.

#### 3] The 1AC’s offense is bogus – it conflates “right to strike” with “right to quit” – striking is not a legitimate right and is fundamentally unfair.

**Gourevitch, 16** (Alex Gourevitch, associate professor of political science at Brown University, 6-13-2016, accessed on 10-12-2021, *Perspectives on Politics*, "Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike", <https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/S1537592716000049>) \*brackets in original //D.Ying

The right to strike is peculiar. It is not a right to quit. The right to quit is part of freedom of contract and the mirror of employment-at-will. Workers may quit when they no longer wish to work for an employer; employers may fire their employees when they no longer want to employ them. Either of those acts severs the contractual relationship and the two parties are no longer assumed to be in any relationship at all. The right to strike, however, assumes the continuity of the very relationship that is suspended. Workers on strike refuse to work but do not claim to have left the job. After all, the whole point of a strike is that it is a collective work stoppage, not a collective quitting of the job. This is the feature of the strike that has marked it out from other forms of social action. If a right to strike is not a right to quit, what is it? It is the right that workers claim to refuse to perform work they have agreed to do while retaining a right to the job. Most of what is peculiar, not to mention fraught, about a strike is contained in that latter clause. Yet, surprisingly, few commentators recognize just how central and yet peculiar this claim is. 16 Opponents of the right to strike are sometimes more alive to its distinctive features than defenders. One critic, for instance, makes the distinction between quitting and striking the basis of his entire argument: the unqualified right to withdraw labour, which is a clear right of free men, does not describe the behaviour of strikers.… Strikers … withdraw from the performance of their jobs, but in the only relevant sense they do not withdraw their labour. The jobs from which they have withdrawn performance belong to them, they maintain. 17 On what possible grounds may workers claim a right to a job they refuse to perform? While many say that every able-bodied person should have a right to work, and they might say that the state therefore has an obligation to provide everyone with a job, the argument for full employment never amounts to saying that workers have rights to specific jobs from specific private employers. For instance, in 1945, at the height of the push for federally-guaranteed full employment, the Senate committee considering the issue took care to argue that “the right to work has occasionally been misinterpreted as a right to specific jobs of some specific type and status.” After labeling this a “misinterpretation,” the committee’s report cited the following words from one of the bill’s leading advocates: “It is not the aim of the bill to provide specific jobs for specific individuals. Our economic system of free enterprise must have free opportunities for jobs for all who are able and want to work. Our American system owes no man a living, but it does owe every man an opportunity to make a living.” 18 These sentences remind us how puzzling, even alarming, the right to specific jobs can sound. In fact, in a liberal society the whole point is that claims on specific jobs are a relic of feudal thinking. In status-based societies, specific groups had rights to specific jobs in the name of corporate privilege. Occupations were tied to birth or guild membership, but not available to all equally. Liberal society, based on freedom of contract, was designed to destroy just that kind of unfair and oppressive status-based hierarchy. A common argument against striking workers is that they are latter-day guilds, protecting their sectional interests by refusing to let anyone else perform “their jobs.” 19 As one critic puts it, the strikers’ demand for an inalienable right to, and property in, a particular job cannot be made conformable to the principles of liberty under law for all … the endowment of the employee with some kind of property right in a job, [is a] prime example of this reversion to the governance of status. 20
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