## 1AC

### Framing

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being.

#### It outweighs---[1]binding---if I put my hand on a hot stove, I’d pull it back before a signal is sent to my brain---pleasure and pain always guide action, anything else regresses

#### [2] Actor specificity—governments must use util because the only way to make policy is to weigh aggregate costs and benefits and governments are constantly dealing with tradeoffs

#### [3] Threats to bodily security make it impossible to make decisions under any other framework --- we always act to preserve well-being. Means util is a prerequisite.

#### [4] Allows multiple weighing mechanisms we can measure consequences using probability of occurrence or the prevention of existential threat depending on particular circumstances

**And a particularist approach is key- overarching theories ignore material injustice.**

**Pappas 16** (Gregory Fernando Pappas [Texas A&M University] “The Pragmatists’ Approach to Injustice”, The Pluralist Volume 11, Number 1, Spring 2016, BE

The **pragmatists’ approach should be distinguished from** nonideal **theories whose starting point seems** to be the **injustices** of society **at large** that have a history and persist through time, where the task of political philosophy is to detect and diagnose the presence of these historical injustices in particular situations of injustice. For example, critical theory today has inherited an approach to social philosophy characteristic of the European tradition that goes back to Rousseau, Marx, Weber, Freud, Marcuse, and others. Accord- ing to Roberto Frega, this tradition takes society to be “intrinsically sick” with a malaise that requires adopting a critical historical stance in order to understand how the systematic sickness affects present social situations. In other words, **this** approach **assumes** that¶ a philosophical **critique** of specific social situations can be accomplished **only under** the assumption of a broader and full blown critique of soci- ety in its entirety: as a critique of **capitalism**, of **modernity**, of western **civilization,** of **rationality itself**. The idea of social pathology becomes intelligible only against the background of a philosophy of history or of an anthropology of decline, according to which the distortions of actual social life are but the inevitable consequence of longstanding historical processes. (“Between Pragmatism and Critical Theory” 63)¶ However, this particular approach to injustice is not limited to critical theory. It is present in those Latin American and African American political philosophies that have used and transformed the critical intellectual tools of ¶ critical theory to deal with the problems of injustice in the Americas. For instance, Charles W. Mills claims that the starting point and alternative to the abstractions of ideal theory that masked injustices is to diagnose and rectify a history of an illness—the legacy of white supremacy in our actual society.11 The critical task of revealing this illness is achieved by adopting a historical perspective where the injustices of today are part of a larger historical narrative about the development of modern societies that goes back to how Europeans have progressively dehumanized or subordinated others. Similary, radical feminists as well as Third World scholars, as reaction to the hege- monic Eurocentric paradigms that disguise injustices under the assumption of a universal or objective point of view, have stressed how our knowledge is always situated. This may seem congenial with pragmatism except the locus of the knower and of injustices is often described as power structures located in “global hierarchies” and a “world-system” and not situations.12¶ **Pragmatism** only questions that we live in History or a “World-System” (as a totality or abstract context) but not that we are in history (lowercase): in a present situation continuous with others where the past weighs heavily in our memories, bodies, habits, structures, and communities. It also **does not deny the importance of power structures** and seeing the connections be- tween injustices through time, but there is a difference between (a) inquiring into present situations of injustice in order to detect, diagnose, and cure an injustice (a social pathology) across history, and (b) inquiring into the his- tory of a systematic injustice in order to facilitate inquiry into the present unique, context-bound injustice. To capture the legacy of the past on present injustices, we must **study history but** also **seek present evidence of the weight of the past** on the present injustice.¶ If injustice is an illness, then the pragmatists’ approach takes as its main focus diagnosing and **treating** the particular present illness, that is, **the particular situation**-bound injustice **and not a global “social pathology**” or some single transhistorical source of injustice. The diagnosis of a particular injustice is not always dependent on adopting a broader critical standpoint of society in its entirety, but even when it is, we must be careful to not forget that such standpoints are useful only for understanding the present evil. The **concepts** and categories “white supremacy” and “colonialism” can be great tools that can be of planetary significance. One could even argue that they pick out much larger areas of people’s lives and injustices than the categories of class and gender, but in spite of their reach and explanatory theoretical value, they **are** nothing more than **tools to** make reference to and **ameliorate particular injustices** experienced (suffered) in the midst of a particular and unique re- lationship **in a situation**. No doubt many, but not all, problems of injustice are a consequence of being a member of a group in history, but even in these cases, we cannot a priori assume that injustices are homogeneously equal for all members of that group. Why is this important? The possible pluralism and therefore complexity of a problem of injustice does not always stop at the level of being a member of a historical group or even a member of many groups, as insisted on by intersectional analysis. There may be unique cir- cumstances to particular countries, towns, neighborhoods, institutions, and ultimately situations that we must be open to in a context-sensitive inquiry. If an empirical inquiry is committed to capturing and ameliorating all of the harms in situations of injustice in their raw pretheoretical complexity, then this requires that we try to begin with and return to the concrete, particular, and unique experiences of injustice.¶ Pragmatism agrees with Sally Haslanger’s concern about Charles Mills’s view. She writes: “The goal is not just a theory that is historical (v. ahistori- cal), but is sensitive to historical particularity, i.e., that resists grand causal narratives purporting to give an account of how domination has come about and is perpetuated everywhere and at all times” (1). For “**the forces that cause and sustain domination vary** tremendously context by context, and **there isn’t** necessarily **a single causal explanation**; a theoretical framework that is useful as a basis for political intervention must be highly sensitive to the details of the particular social context” (1).13¶ Although each situation is unique, there are commonalities among the cases that permit inquiry about common causes. We can “formulate tentative general principles from investigation of similar individual cases, and then . . . check the generalizations by applying them to still further cases” (Dewey, Lectures in China 53). But Dewey insists that the focus should be on the indi- vidual case, and was critical of how so many sociopolitical theories are prone to starting and remaining at the level of “sweeping generalizations.” He states that they “**fail to focus on the concrete problems which arise in experience, allowing such problems to be buried under their sweeping generalizations**” (Lectures in China 53).¶ The lesson pragmatism provides for nonideal theory today is that it must be careful to not reify any injustice as some single historical force for which particular injustice problems are its manifestation or evidence for its exis- tence. Pragmatism welcomes the wisdom and resources of nonideal theories that are historically grounded on actual injustices, but it issues a warning about how they should be understood and implemented. It is, for example, sympathetic to the critical resources found in critical race theory, but with an important qualification. It understands Derrick Bell’s valuable criticism as context-specific to patterns in the practice of American law. Through his inquiry into particular cases and civil rights policies at a particular time and place, Bell learned and proposed certain general principles such as the one of “interest convergence,” that is, “whites will promote racial advantages for blacks only when they also promote white self-interest.”14 But, for pragma- tism, these principles are nothing more than historically grounded tools to use in present problematic situations that call for our analysis, such as deliberation in establishing public policies or making sense of some concrete injustice. The **principles are falsifiable and open to revision** as we face situation-specific injustices. In testing their adequacy, we need to consider their function in making us see aspects of injustices we would not otherwise appreciate.15

### Advantage 1 is Labor Rights

#### Striketober and Republican obstruction prove now is the key time to institutionalize support for striking workers Sims 10/25 Joe Sims, People’s World. Worker power sweeps the country during #Striketober. <https://www.peoplesworld.org/article/worker-power-sweeps-the-country-during-striketober/> //AHS

**Workers** all across the country **are striking** and engaging in other job actions, large and small. Fed up with company attempts to impose two-tier wages, long hours, and inadequate pay—**despite rising productivity and** skyrocketing corporate **profits**—unions in several industries have had it. Now they’re marching on the picket lines. As of last weekend, **over 100,000** workers had **voted to authorize strikes**, and over 169 have occurred so far this year, the largest uptick since the wave of job actions in 2018-19. The AFL-CIO has **aptly labeled this month #striketober**. **The class struggle is sharpening.** There is deep **anger, unrest, and** growing **militancy among the working class**. Why? **Companies want more** **while labor is** repeatedly **asked to do with less**. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that “manufacturing sector labor productivity increased 8% in the second quarter of 2021, as output increased 5.5% and hours worked decreased 2.3%.” Overall, productivity “grew an average of 3% in the first half of 2021. Unit labor costs fell 0.8% during the same period.” But at what cost to the worker? **Wages are too low to pay for** the rising cost of **housing, hours are too long** to allow adequate time for caregiving, **and lack of health care** benefits **force many to go to work sick**. Workers are tired of supplying profits to billionaires like Jeff Bezos to fuel their rocket rides and egos. As the nation emerges from the pandemic, **literally millions are so dissatisfied that they’re simply quitting in** what some have described as **a silent general strike**. The business press calls it “The Great Resignation.” The left-wing Monthly Review writes: “The seriousness of the situation was confirmed by the latest Bureau of Labor Statistics report showing that **a record 2.9% of the workforce quit their jobs** in August, which is equivalent to 4.3 million resignations.” According to one poll, “employees were so dissatisfied with their situation that more than one-quarter (28%) of all respondents left their jobs without another job lined up.” One of the main reasons workers are leaving is burnout, cited by 40% of the poll respondents. Big business is alarmed at the political significance of so many workers quitting. “The Great Resignation,” Forbes writes, “is a sort of workers’ revolution and uprising against bad bosses and tone-deaf companies that refuse to pay well and take advantage of their staff.” Contributing to the spike in labor activism is growing confidence in collective action and knowledge that you can strike and win. A glut in job openings, despite still significant unemployment, has improved unions’ bargaining position and power. **Pro-union sentiment among the** broad **public is** at its **highest** level **in several decades**. A Gallup poll released at the beginning of July showed that 68% of Americans approve of labor unions, up significantly from the 48% approval in 2009 during the throes of the Great Recession. In this regard, the Biden-Harris administration’s pro-union stance should not be underestimated, not the least of which is reflected by new appointments to the National Labor Relations Board. The new general counsel, Jennifer Abruzzo, for example, has “signaled that she is willing to reconsider all kinds of twisted and outdated precedents that have vastly favored bosses during a nearly four-decades-long union-busting drive…she’s indicated a willingness to issue bargaining orders—not elections—for new unions when employers commit Unfair Labor Practices, to certify minority members-only bargaining units to help unions establish a foothold and to be more creative about ‘make whole’ financial remedies for terminated union activists.” 10,000 workers at John Deere are among the latest to go out: “The strike wave that has hit John Deere has been building nationwide for more than a month. Last week Kellogg workers went on strike, and over the summer Mondelez, the maker of Nabisco Oreos walked out. Coal miners in Alabama have been on strike for months.” While uneven, **the working class** and people’s forces in local communities and workplaces **are gathering** in strength **for** the class and democratic **battles** that lie ahead. Today they’re focused on bread-and-butter issues of survival. But **with the Republican Party blocking everything** from strengthening voting rights to spending on climate change and human infrastructure, these economic **struggles are becoming political**. When that material force takes off—especially with the midterm elections looming—watch out. Big days are coming. But **it would be a mistake for the friends of labor to sit around** awaiting their arrival. Visit the picket lines and be sure to bring your walking shoes. A box of donuts and coffee would be appreciated but more important are the smiles and solidarity of friends. Talk, learn, listen, and afterwards share the experience. In so doing, you’ll add to the growing class consciousness and militancy that’s sweeping the nation. It will do everyone concerned a whole lot of good. **Building** community **support for striking workers is vital, calling on** local **politicians**, clergy, and neighborhood leaders **to lend solidarity**. Letters to the editor along with social media campaigns can help build **pro-strike sentiment.** Community pickets at retail outlets and dealerships might also be helpful. Solidarity should also include boycotts **and other forms of public pressure** against companies that refuse to provide good wages, health care, working conditions, and rights in the workplace. Yes, there’s a rising tide of struggle occurring deep within our class. Let’s give it our every support.

#### And there is work to be done---current law prohibits secondary striking and undermines union leverage Rhinehart 21

https://www.epi.org/blog/six-ways-the-protecting-the-right-to-organize-pro-act-restores-workers-bargaining-power/

The PRO Act eliminates the ban on so-called “secondary” activity. In order to win a wage increase, a voice on new technology, safety improvements, or other bargaining priorities, workers need leverage to put economic pressure on their employer to accept their demands. But **current law robs workers of their leverage** in many ways, **including a prohibition on so-called “secondary” activity** that was enacted by Congress in 1947. In fact, current law instructs the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to give top priority to shutting down so-called “secondary” activity. These cases are given even higher priority than cases alleging that employers have illegally fired union activists, and statistics show this has in fact been the case. For example, in the first 12 years after the restriction on secondary activity was first implemented, the number of injunction proceedings against unions for engaging in illegal secondary activity skyrocketed by 1,188%, while virtually no injunction proceedings were brought against employers for violating workers’ rights. **This** restriction on secondary activity **forbids workers from picketing or otherwise putting pressure on so-called “neutral” companies other than their employer**, even if those companies could influence their employer’s practices by, for example, withholding purchases until workers and their employer reach a collective bargaining agreement. The restriction has been interpreted so broadly as to prohibit janitors from picketing a building management company over sexual harassment by its janitorial subcontractor. The Trump NLRB General Counsel unsuccessfully tried to argue that floating an inflatable Scabby the Rat balloon at a labor protest was illegal secondary activity, even though courts have consistently said such protests are protected by the First Amendment. Given the prevalence of subcontracting and the interrelated nature of business relationships, **the ban** on secondary activity does not reflect the realities of today’s business structures. It **deprives workers of an important tool in** **the bargaining process** **and** unfairly **tips the power balance to employers**. To correct this imbalance, the PRO Act repeals the ban on secondary activity.

#### The impact is worldwide oppression and violence against millions of workers in the squo---labor solidarity through striking is key to solve ITF 21 International Transport Workers Federation (ITF Seafarers), April 30, 2021. “It’s time to end oppression and respect workers’ civil liberties.” <https://www.itfseafarers.org/en/news/its-time-end-oppression-and-respect-workers-civil-liberties> //AHS

May Day is when workers of the world stop and reflect. We’re seeing so many human rights abuses — workers being denied their right to free association, free speech being suppressed. **It is the responsibility of us all to defend** our fundamental human rights. **The right to strike**. The right protest. The right to freedom of association. These **civil liberties**, that run through the veins of trade unionist globally **are under attack**. And collectively we need to stand shoulder to shoulder and say, “no more oppression”. Today, on May Day, the ITF and its 20 million transport workers call on governments, employers and civil society to respect our rights, end the persecution of trade unionists, and protect our freedoms. Solidarity is our most powerful weapon in the fight to uphold human rights – and defend the persecution of our sisters, brothers and friends around the globe. This is also very real for 13 activists at **the** **Thai state railway**. The “SRUT 13” were handed three-year jail sentences last October, after legal action brought by the railway company. Their crime? **Campaigning for better safety.** They **were scapegoated** **for an accident in 2009** that both the National Human Rights Commission of Thailand and an internal investigation concluded was primarily caused by poor maintenance. The Thai **authorities used false charges** to deflect attention from their own incompetence. Leonardo Escala no longer has any human rights. In February, he was **shot over and over and killed** outside his home in Tondo, Manila. Escala, **president of the dockers’ union at an ICTSI port in Manila**, continued to **exercising his right to freedom of association**, despite receiving threats on his life. Clearly, the authorities are not doing enough to protect people’s human right to life. In **Myanmar, the military coup is seeing workers imprisoned and protesters shot dead** on the streets. **Brazil has a new president who endorses political killings**. **In Belarus, worker rights are routinely trampled. The list of human rights abuses and oppression** that ITF sees **goes on and on**. Some can be dealt with at a local level. But increasingly we need a global response. **Workers** who escape oppression **must stand** steadfast with those who cannot. It is the responsibility of each and every trade unionists to act – **solidarity is our most powerful weapon** **in the fight for justice, equality, freedom and dignity.** Demands must be put on shareholders to stop doing business with oppressive regimes. CEOs of global businesses must be held to account for human rights violations in their global supply chains. And our politicians must stiffen their resolve on human rights. It should be absolutely clear to them and the rest of the world that we will not stand for oppression. **If we all stand firm** on human rights, **there will be no more oppression**. By defending the human rights of others, we are defending our own way of life. The madness can stop, if we human beings decide to collectively stop it.

### Advantage 2 is Income Inequality

#### Union membership is down despite strikes---failure to protect workers including RTS means the squo can’t solve Rosenberg 20 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2020/01/22/workers-are-fired-up-union-participation-is-still-decline-new-statistics-show/> //AHS

In a year when teachers and autoworkers mounted lengthy strikes, **participation in labor unions** in 2019 **continued their** decades-long **decline**. Union membership in the American workforce was down to 10.3 percent from 10.5 percent in 2018, according to statistics released Wednesday by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The continued slide shows how **energy and momentum around the labor movement** **is not translating into equivalent growth for unions, whose memberships have fallen sharply** as a percentage of the U.S. workforce over the past roughly 40 years. In 1983, unions represented about 1 out of 5 workers; now it’s 1 in 10 workers. “They’re disappointing numbers for workers and unions,” said Professor Joseph McCartin, the executive director of the Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor at Georgetown University. “The expansion of the labor market in 2019 didn’t produce a proportional expansion in union members. Unions would have hoped to make gains in the course of the past year and they didn’t.” The number of total union members — 14.6 million — is relatively unchanged from 2018. But in a robust jobs market, the number of union workers added has not been enough to replace those who retired or left the workforce. The drop in union representation in the workforce is sobering news for the labor movement, which otherwise saw an eventful year. Major strikes including grocery workers in the Northeast, teachers in cities such as Chicago and Little Rock, Ark., and autoworkers around the country attracted public attention and became a crucial stop for 2020 candidates on the campaign trail. The 47,000 General Motors workers who brought the company’s car production to a halt during a six-week strike that culminated with a contract — and concessions — from the company in the fall marked one of the largest private-sector strikes in the last 20 years. And even nonunion workers have taken advantage of the tight labor market to advocate for more workers’ rights. Employees have circulated petitions around Silicon Valley companies, calling for tech companies to cut ties with immigration enforcement, and gig-economy drivers at Lyft and Uber have rallied for better pay and more rights. The numbers of **workers who participated in** large-scale **strikes ballooned to 500,000** in 2018, up from 25,000 in 2017, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Strike participation numbers for 2019 have yet to be finalized. **But** the broader factors that have contributed to union declines over the last few decades appear to still be in play. “The lack of an increase in union membership points to the fact that **there are still so many barriers to organizing**,” said Heidi Shierholz, the director of policy at the Economic Policy Institute. “When people try to organize at their workplace there is just **a relentless, fierce opposition on the part of employers**.” One reason why union membership may have declined is that 2019 was the first full year since the Supreme Court’s decision in the Janus case. The court ruled that it was unconstitutional to allow unions to require collective bargaining fees from public employees — a decision that was seen as a major blow for unions and their budgets. Local public employees saw a small dip in membership to 39.4 percent in 2019, down from 40.3 the previous year, Shierholz noted. But union membership among state government workers has grown. Public support for unions appears to be growing. Some 64 percent of people said they approved of unions last year, among the highest numbers the company has collected in the last 50 years, according to Gallup. And nearly half of nonunion workers say they would join a union if given the opportunity to do so — a 40-year high. “People look at decline of unionization and think that people don’t want unions anymore,” Shierholz said. “But its just demonstrably false.” The momentum in the labor movement has fostered a political discussion on the left about workers’ rights and strengthening the labor movement. Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) wants **to give federal workers the right to strike** and ban “at will” employment, which allows companies to fire workers without cause. Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) has called for banning the permanent replacement of striking workers and strengthening the National Labor Relations Board, which **enforces laws meant to protect unions and organizing** in workplaces. Both of them, along with Democratic presidential candidate Pete Buttigieg, say they want to undo “right to work” laws that Republicans have championed in states throughout the country that allow workers to opt out of paying union dues. Some labor advocates said that **union participation could** eventually **rise if** worker **strikes fortify** the **political will to make changes** like these. “The way that huge upsurges in union membership have happened in this country is when workers have taken control, gone on massive strikes and forced corporate elite to enter grand bargains,” said Jane McAlevey, a former labor organizer and the author of “A Collective Bargain: Unions, Organizing and the Fight for Democracy." McAlevey noted that **previous waves of unionization** — in the 1930s after the National Labor Relations Act passed, and a few decades later as the public sector began to unionize — **were preceded by large scale strikes**. “Strikes are a precursor,” she said. "I believe we’re at the beginning of that cycle.” The International Association of Fire Fighters is one of the larger unions that has seen growth over the years. The union was at 321,000 last year up, from 220,000 20 years ago. Harold Schaitberger, the union’s general president, said their **success is due to** showing their members the **benefits the union helped secure** for them, including better government codes on firefighting and success **in collective bargaining.** “**There’s a direct** connection to what the union does to having **tangible effect on their lives**,” he said.

#### Union decline leads to increased income inequality---strengthening labor laws i.e. codifying RTS can solve Da Costa 19 [Pedro Nicolaci da Costa, senior Markets contributor for Forbes, August 29, 2019. https://www.forbes.com/sites/pedrodacosta/2019/08/29/u-s-inequality-wage-stagnation-tied-to-falling-union-membership-in-the-private-sector/?sh=324a34917ff7](file://C:\Users\migha\OneDrive\Documents\Pedro%20Nicolaci%20da%20Costa,%20senior%20Markets%20contributor%20for%20Forbes,%20August%2029,%202019.%20https:\www.forbes.com\sites\pedrodacosta\2019\08\29\u-s-inequality-wage-stagnation-tied-to-falling-union-membership-in-the-private-sector\?sh=324a34917ff7)

Need further proof that **stagnant wages and rising inequality** can be **directly traced to a sharp drop in union membership in corporate America**? Look no further than a comprehensive new report from the Hamilton Project at Brookings, entitled "The Shift in Private Sector Union Membership: Explanations and Effects." The research chronicles the role of **the long-term decline of worker power, and unions** specifically, in **creating an economy that is highly unequal** and where the benefits of economic growth are not widespread. "We present evidence on the labor market effects of private sector unions, showing that unions reallocate income from employers to workers, with particularly large effects on the lower part of the wage distribution," write economists Ryan Nunn, Jimmy O’Donnell and Jay Shambaugh. "Consequently, the decline of union participation was **an important driver of the increase in wage inequality** and wage stagnation for some workers." This incredible chart traces the growth and retreat in union membership back to the 19th century. As the figure shows, the number of unionized workers has shrunk back to early 20th century levels with only 10.5% of all workers belonging to a union. Among private sector workers that number is even tinier—just 6.4% of the workforce. "The decline in union membership (also referred to as union density) over the past 45 years has occurred almost entirely within the private sector," the report said. The Hamilton study says employers have inherent advantages over workers in terms of information and power in the labor market, findings corroborated by a long history of research at the Economic Policy Institute, where I work. "**The classic solution to this asymmetry in bargaining power is the labor union**," the Hamilton report says. "By representing individual workers at the bargaining table, a union can ameliorate many of the disadvantages listed above and improve workers’ compensation and conditions of work." The Trump administration has turned what was an uphill battle for organized labor into an outright fight for survival, nominating pro-corporate judges that favor harmful arrangements like forced arbitration, stacking the National Labor Relations Board with anti-worker appointees and, most recently nominating former Walmart lawyer and Wall Street darling Eugene Scalia to the role Secretary of Labor. What can be done? According to Nunn, O’Donnell and Shambaugh, it’s the politics, stupid. "If unions are to regain a larger role in representing worker interests, **changes would** likely **need to be made to** current **labor** relations **law** and institutions," they write. "Options for doing so include making more use of sectoral bargaining, wage boards, works councils, and co-determination in addition to making it easier for workers to form unions." Fortunately, there’s legislation out there currently that would do much of that. **All Congress needs to do is act.**

#### Income inequality causes perpetual cycle of poverty for millions---historical trends confirm Gould 14 https://www.epi.org/blog/inequality-main-persistent-poverty/

I couldn’t agree more with Paul Krugman’s blog post this morning when he says, “**the main cause of persistent poverty** now **is** high **inequality of** market **income**.” We looked at precisely this question in the latest edition of State of Working America. (And the White House Council of Economic Advisors cited our work on this in their War on Poverty 50 Years Later Report, released today.) **In** the roughly **three decades** leading up to the most recent recession, **looking at the** **officially measured poverty rate**, educational upgrading and overall income growth were the two biggest poverty-reducing factors, while **income inequality was the largest poverty-increasing factor**. Relative to these factors, the racial composition of the U.S. population over this period (the growth of nonwhite populations with higher likelihoods of poverty) and changes in family structure (the growth of single mother households) have contributed much less to poverty, particularly in recent years. The figure below plots the impact of these economic and demographic factors on the official poverty rate from 1979 to 2007. *The impact of income inequality and income growth were quantitatively large, but in the opposite directions.* **Had income growth been equally distributed**, which in this analysis means that all families’ incomes would have grown at the pace of the average, **the poverty rate would have been** 5.5 points lower, essentially, **44 percent lower than what it was**. This rise in inequality, in turn, has been dominated by inequality of pre-tax, pre-transfer, market incomes. This means that **making real progress on pushing the poverty rate down** going forward **would be** helped enormously **by checking or** even **reversing** this growth in market **income inequality**. In concrete terms, this means we need wages to go up for those at the bottom and middle of the income distribution.

#### Poverty is the worst form of violence and controls the root cause to numerous forms of oppression based on race, class, ability, and gender Taniguchi 15

“[Why Poverty Is the Worst Form of Oppression . . . and Why We Should Start Giving a $hit](https://www.pacificcitizen.org/why-poverty-is-the-worst-form-of-oppression-and-why-we-should-start-giving-a-hit/)” By Rhianna Taniguchi AUGUST 6, 2015 [<https://www.pacificcitizen.org/why-poverty-is-the-worst-form-of-oppression-and-why-we-should-start-giving-a-hit/>]

Money is power — at least that’s what they say. In America, it is clear that race, money and power have a strong connection. So, why don’t we talk about it more? Asian Americans are commonly viewed as well-assimilated, educated and highly competent. However, 12.7 percent of Asian Americans are estimated to live in poverty according to the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2013 report. Unfortunately, this is one of the least-addressed issues within the model minority myth. Mahatma Gandhi said that “Poverty is the worst form of violence,” and quite frankly, I agree. Poverty is society’s way of perpetually dehumanizing people and subjecting them to unlivable conditions while calling it “just.” Those within society believe (or pretend to believe) that the system creating poverty is equitable and therefore fair. It is hard to deny the strong correlation between wealth and race, but ironically, that’s exactly what we do. The effects of poverty include mental and physical illness, inadequate nutrition, food insecurity, adverse effects on academic outcomes . . . the list goes on. The effects of poverty are most felt by women. This topic is never discussed with the urgency it deserves, and how can it? Where in the world do we start? Let’s first define poverty in the United States. The 2014 poverty thresholds by size of family and number of related children would define a two-adult household with one child in poverty if their total income was less than $16,317. That means living off of less than $15 per day per person. It doesn’t sound too bad, until you factor in rent, utilities, transportation to and from work, education, medicine, health care and food. So, why is race tied to poverty? Well, there are many speculations. The American Psychological Assn. has found that “while non-Hispanic whites still constitute the largest single group of Americans living in poverty, ethnic minority groups are overrepresented. These disparities are associated with the historical marginalization of ethnic minority groups and entrenched barriers to good education and jobs.” According to the APA, there are a few barriers. First and foremost is marginalization, which is assigning and confining a group to inferior conditions. As a result of marginalization, access to good education and jobs are limited. What are we doing as individuals, as a society, and as a country to battle the inequities? Whatever efforts we’re making, they’re not working — at least not fast enough. Financial education and social reconfiguration are the missing components of the equation to equity. On an individual level, we need to get smart about money in order to increase our income, increase our savings and increase our investments. I highly recommend LearnVest for affordable financial planning. We also need to change the way our society thinks — no person is inferior based on race, gender, sexual orientation or ability. Lastly, we need to provide access, education and tools to those who are most vulnerable in our community. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau actively listens to our community’s needs and concerns, but we must be vigilant and continuously seek progress. The JACL Credit Union is another resource that provides a higher interest rate than most banks with high standards of privacy, security and service. In a nutshell, you should care about poverty because it is one more way that society is using racial prejudice to violate your right to the pursuit of happiness. It is one more way that people of color are being targeted, and it is working. Here are eight ways you can make some change

### Advantage 3 is Democracy

#### Global democracy is collapsing now.

Freedom House 3/3 [Freedom House. Freedom House works to defend human rights and promote democratic change, with a focus on political rights and civil liberties. We act as a catalyst for freedom through a combination of analysis, advocacy, and action. Our analysis, focused on 13 central issues, is underpinned by our international program work. “New Report: The global decline in democracy has accelerated”. 3-3-2021. . https://freedomhouse.org/article/new-report-global-decline-democracy-has-accelerated.] //recut AHS

Washington - March 3, 2021 — **Authoritarian actors grew bolder** during 2020 as major democracies turned inward, contributing to the 15th consecutive year of decline in global freedom, according to [***Freedom in the World 2021***](https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2021/democracy-under-siege), the annual country-by-country assessment of political rights and civil liberties released today by Freedom House. The report found that the share of **countries designated Not Free has reached** its **highest level** since the deterioration of democracy began in 2006, and that countries with declines in political rights and civil liberties outnumbered those with gains by the largest margin recorded during the 15-year period. The report downgraded the freedom scores of 73 countries, representing 75 percent of the global population. Those affected include not just authoritarian states like China, Belarus, and Venezuela, but also troubled democracies like the United States and India. In one of the year’s most significant developments, **India’s status changed from Free to Partly Free**, meaning less than 20 percent of the world’s people now live in a Free country—the smallest proportion since 1995. Indians’ political rights and civil liberties have been eroding since Narendra Modi became prime minister in 2014. His Hindu nationalist government has presided over increased pressure on human rights organizations, rising intimidation of academics and journalists, and a spate of bigoted attacks—including lynchings—aimed at Muslims. The decline deepened following Modi’s reelection in 2019, and the government’s response to the coronavirus pandemic in 2020 featured further abuses of fundamental rights. The changes in India formed part of a **broader shift in the international balance between democracy and authoritarianism**, with authoritarians generally enjoying impunity for their abuses and seizing new opportunities to consolidate power or crush dissent. In many cases, promising democratic movements faced major setbacks as a result. In **Belarus and Hong Kong**, for example, **massive prodemocracy protests met with brutal crackdowns by governments** that largely disregarded international criticism. The **Azerbaijani regime’s** military offensive in Nagorno-Karabakh indirectly **threatened recent democratic gains in Armenia**, while the armed conflict in Ethiopia’s Tigray Region dashed hopes for the tentative political opening in that country since 2018. All four of these cases notably featured some degree of intervention by an autocratic neighbor: Moscow provided a backstop for the regime in Belarus, Beijing propelled the repression in Hong Kong, Turkey’s government aided its Azerbaijani counterpart, and Ethiopia’s leader called in support from Eritrea. The malign **influence of** the regime in **China**, the world’s most populous dictatorship, **ranged far beyond Hong Kong** in 2020. Beijing ramped up its global disinformation and censorship campaign to counter the fallout from its cover-up of the initial coronavirus outbreak, which severely hampered a rapid global response in the pandemic’s early days. Its efforts also featured increased meddling in the domestic political discourse of foreign democracies, as well as transnational extensions of rights abuses common in mainland China. The Chinese regime has gained clout in multilateral institutions such as the UN Human Rights Council, which the United States abandoned in 2018, as Beijing pushed a vision of so-called noninterference that allows abuses of democratic principles and human rights standards to go unpunished while the formation of autocratic alliances is promoted. “This year’s findings make it abundantly clear that we have not yet stemmed the authoritarian tide,” said Sarah Repucci, vice president of research and analysis at Freedom House. “**Democratic governments will have to work in solidarity** with one another, and **with democracy advocates and human rights defenders** in more repressive settings, if we are to reverse 15 years of accumulated declines and build a more free and peaceful world.” **A need for reform in the United States** While still considered Free, the United States experienced further democratic decline during the final year of the Trump presidency. The US score in [Freedom in the World](https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2021/democracy-under-siege) has dropped by 11 points over the past decade, and fell by three points in 2020 alone. The changes have moved the country out of a cohort that included other leading democracies, such as France and Germany, and brought it into the company of states with weaker democratic institutions, such as Romania and Panama. Several developments in 2020 contributed to the United States’ current score. The Trump administration undermined government transparency by dismissing inspectors general, punishing or firing whistleblowers, and attempting to control or manipulate information on COVID-19. The year also featured mass protests that, while mostly peaceful, were accompanied by high-profile cases of violence, police brutality, and deadly confrontations with counterprotesters or armed vigilantes. There was a significant increase in the number of journalists arrested and physically assaulted, most often as they covered demonstrations. Finally, the outgoing president’s shocking attempts to overturn his election loss—culminating in his incitement of rioters who stormed the Capitol as Congress met to confirm the results in January 2021—put electoral institutions under severe pressure. In addition, the crisis further damaged the United States’ credibility abroad and underscored the menace of political polarization and extremism in the country. ”January 6 should be a wake-up call for many Americans about the fragility of American democracy,” said Michael J. Abramowitz, president of Freedom House. “**Authoritarian powers**, especially China, are **advancing** their interests **around the world**, while **democracies have been divided** and consumed by internal problems. **For freedom to prevail** on a global scale, **the U**nited **S**tates **and** its **partners must band together** and work harder **to strengthen democracy at home and abroad**.

#### Democratic backsliding breaks down the liberal international order and leads to worldwide authoritarianism and conflict

Kendall-Taylor 16 [Andrea; Deputy national intelligence officer for Russia and Eurasia at the National Intelligence Council, Senior associate in the Human Rights Initiative at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington; “How Democracy’s Decline Would Undermine the International Order,” CSIS; 7/15/16; <https://www.csis.org/analysis/how-democracy%E2%80%99s-decline-would-undermine-international-order>/] //recut AHS

It is rare that policymakers, analysts, and academics agree. But there is an emerging consensus in the world of foreign policy: **threats to** the stability of the current **international order are** rising. The norms, values, laws, and institutions that have undergirded the international system and governed relationships between nations are being gradually dismantled. The most discussed sources of this pressure are [the ascent of China](http://nationalinterest.org/feature/how-china-sees-world-order-15846) and other non-Western countries, Russia’s assertive foreign policy, and the diffusion of power from traditional nation-states to nonstate actors, such as nongovernmental organizations, multinational corporations, and technology-empowered individuals. Largely missing from these discussions, however, is the [**specter of widespread democratic decline**](http://www.journalofdemocracy.org/article/facing-democratic-recession). Rising challenges to democratic governance across the globe are a major strain on the international system, but they receive [far less attention](http://www.iiss.org/en/publications/survival/sections/2016-5e13/survival--global-politics-and-strategy-april-may-2016-eb2d/58-2-03-boyle-6dbd) in discussions of the shifting world order.

In the 70 years since the end of World War II, the **U**nited **S**tates has **fostered** a global **order dominated by states that are liberal**, capitalist, **and democratic**. The United States has promoted the spread of democracy to strengthen global norms and rules that constitute the foundation of our current international system. However, despite the steady rise of democracy since the end of the Cold War, over the last 10 years we have seen dramatic **reversals in** respect for **democratic principles** across the globe. [A 2015 Freedom House report](https://freedomhouse.org/sites/default/files/01152015_FIW_2015_final.pdf) stated that the “acceptance of democracy as the world’s dominant form of government—and of an international system built on democratic ideals—is under greater threat than at any point in the last 25 years.”

Although the number of democracies in the world is at an all-time high, there are a number of [key trends](file:///C:\Users\PMeylan\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\5V2CJVRN\160715_KendallTaylor_DemocracysDecline_Commentary.docx#http://www.journalofdemocracy.org/article/democracy-decline) that are working to undermine democracy. The rollback of democracy in a few influential states or even in a number of less consequential ones would almost certainly accelerate meaningful changes in today’s global order.

Democratic decline would weaken U.S. partnerships and erode an important foundation for U.S. cooperation abroad. [Research demonstrates](file:///C:\Users\PMeylan\AppData\Local\Microsoft\Windows\Temporary%20Internet%20Files\Content.Outlook\5V2CJVRN\160715_KendallTaylor_DemocracysDecline_Commentary.docx#http://cmp.sagepub.com/content/18/1/49.abstract) that domestic politics are a key determinant of the international behavior of states. In particular, **democracies** are more likely to **form alliances and cooperate** more fully with other democracies than with autocracies. Similarly, **authoritarian countries** have established mechanisms for cooperation and sharing of “worst practices.” An increase in authoritarian countries, then, would provide a broader platform for coordination that could enable these countries to overcome their divergent histories, values, and interests—factors that are frequently cited as obstacles to the **form**ation of a cohesive **challenge to** the U.S.-led international **system**.

Recent examples support the empirical data. Democratic backsliding in Hungary and the hardening of Egypt’s autocracy under Abdel Fattah el-Sisi have led to enhanced relations between these countries and Russia. Likewise, democratic decline in Bangladesh has led Sheikh Hasina Wazed and her ruling Awami League to seek closer relations with China and Russia, in part to mitigate Western pressure and bolster the regime’s domestic standing.

Although none of these burgeoning relationships has developed into a highly unified partnership, democratic backsliding in these countries has provided a basis for cooperation where it did not previously exist. And while the United States certainly finds common cause with authoritarian partners on specific issues, the depth and reliability of such cooperation is limited. Consequently, further democratic **decline** could seriously compromise the United States’ ability to form the kinds of **deep** **partnerships that will be required** to confront today’s increasingly complex challenges. Global issues such as **climate change, migration,** and violent extremism demand the coordination and cooperation that democratic backsliding would put in peril. Put simply, the United States is a less effective and influential actor if it loses its ability to rely on its partnerships with other democratic nations.

**And the LIO uniquely prevents the risk of nuclear escalation and rogue tech**

Yuval Noah **Harari 18**, Professor of History at Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 9/26/18, “We need a post-liberal order now,” The Economist, <https://www.economist.com/open-future/2018/09/26/we-need-a-post-liberal-order-now> //AHS

For several generations, the world has been governed by what today we call “the global liberal order”. Behind these lofty words is the idea that all humans share some core experiences, values and interests, and that no human group is inherently superior to all others. Cooperation is therefore more sensible than conflict. All humans should work together to protect their common values and advance their common interests. And the best way to foster such cooperation is to ease the movement of ideas, goods, money and people across the globe. Though **the global liberal order** has many faults and problems, it **has proved superior to all alternatives**. The liberal world of the early 21st century is more prosperous, healthy and peaceful than ever before. For the first time in human history, starvation kills fewer people than obesity; plagues kill fewer people than old age; and violence kills fewer people than accidents. When I was six months old I didn’t die in an epidemic, thanks to medicines discovered by foreign scientists in distant lands. When I was three I didn’t starve to death, thanks to wheat grown by foreign farmers thousands of kilometers away. And when I was eleven I wasn’t obliterated in a nuclear war, thanks to agreements signed by foreign leaders on the other side of the planet. If you think we should go back to some pre-liberal golden age, please name the year in which humankind was in better shape than in the early 21st century. Was it 1918? 1718? 1218? Nevertheless, people all over the world are **now losing faith in the liberal order**. Nationalist and religious views that privilege one human group over all others are back in vogue. Governments are increasingly restricting the flow of ideas, goods, money and people. Walls are popping up everywhere, both on the ground and in cyberspace. Immigration is out, tariffs are in. **If the liberal order is collapsing,** **what** new kind of global order **might replace it?** So far, those who challenge the liberal order do so mainly on a national level. They have many ideas about how to advance the interests of their particular country, but they don’t have a viable vision for how the world as a whole should function. For example, Russian nationalism can be a reasonable guide for running the affairs of Russia, but Russian nationalism has no plan for the rest of humanity. Unless, of course, nationalism morphs into imperialism, and calls for one nation to conquer and rule the entire world. A century ago, several nationalist movements indeed harboured such imperialist fantasies. Today’s nationalists, whether in Russia, Turkey, Italy or China, so far refrain from advocating global conquest. In place of violently establishing a global empire, some nationalists such as Steve Bannon, Viktor Orban, the Northern League in Italy and the British Brexiteers dream about a peaceful “Nationalist International”. They argue that all nations today face the same enemies. The bogeymen of globalism, multiculturalism and immigration are threatening to destroy the traditions and identities of all nations. Therefore nationalists across the world should make common cause in opposing these global forces. Hungarians, Italians, Turks and Israelis should build walls, erect fences and slow down the movement of people, goods, money and ideas. The world will then be divided into distinct nation-states, each with its own sacred identity and traditions. Based on mutual respect for these differing identities, all nation-states could cooperate and trade peacefully with one another. Hungary will be Hungarian, Turkey will be Turkish, Israel will be Israeli, and everyone will know who they are and what is their proper place in the world. It will be a world without immigration, without universal values, without multiculturalism, and without a global elite—but with peaceful international relations and some trade. In a word, the “Nationalist International” envisions **the world as** a network of **walled-but-friendly fortresses**. Many people would think this is quite a reasonable vision. Why isn’t it a viable alternative to the liberal order? Two things should be noted about it. First, it is still a comparatively liberal vision. It assumes that no human group is superior to all others, that no nation should dominate its peers, and that international cooperation is better than conflict. In fact, liberalism and nationalism were originally closely aligned with one another. The 19th century liberal nationalists, such as Giuseppe Garibaldi and Giuseppe Mazzini in Italy, and Adam Mickiewicz in Poland, dreamt about precisely such an international liberal order of peacefully-coexisting nations. The second thing to note about this vision of friendly fortresses is that it **has been tried—and** it **failed spectacularly**. **All attempts to divide the world** into clear-cut nations have so far **resulted in war and genocide**. When the heirs of Garibaldi, Mazzini and Mickiewicz managed to overthrow the multi-ethnic Habsburg Empire, it proved impossible to find a clear line dividing Italians from Slovenes or Poles from Ukrainians. This had set the stage for the second world war. The key problem with the network of fortresses is that each national fortress wants a bit more land, security and prosperity for itself at the expense of the neighbors, and without the help of universal values and global organisations, rival fortresses cannot agree on any common rules. Walled fortresses are seldom friendly. But if you happen to live inside a particularly strong fortress, such as America or Russia, why should you care? Some nationalists indeed adopt a more extreme isolationist position. They don’t believe in either a global empire or in a global network of fortresses. Instead, they deny the necessity of any global order whatsoever. “Our fortress should just raise the drawbridges,” they say, “and the rest of the world can go to hell. We should refuse entry to foreign people, foreign ideas and foreign goods, and as long as our walls are stout and the guards are loyal, who cares what happens to the foreigners?” Such extreme isolationism, however, is completely divorced from economic realities. Without a global trade network, all existing national economies will collapse—including that of North Korea. Many countries will not be able even to feed themselves without imports, and prices of almost all products will skyrocket. The made-in-China shirt I am wearing cost me about $5. If it had been produced by Israeli workers from Israeli-grown cotton using Israeli-made machines powered by non-existing Israeli oil, it may well have cost ten times as much. Nationalist leaders from Donald Trump to Vladimir Putin may therefore heap abuse on the global trade network, but none thinks seriously of taking their country completely out of that network. And we cannot have a global trade network without some global order that sets the rules of the game. Even more importantly, whether people like it or not, humankind today faces three **common problems** that make a mockery of all national borders, and that can **only be solved through global cooperation**. These are **nuclear war, climate change and technological disruption**. You **cannot build a wall against nuclear winter or** against global **warming**, and no nation can regulate artificial intelligence (AI) or bioengineering single-handedly. It won’t be enough if only the European Union forbids producing killer robots or only America bans genetically-engineering human babies. Due to the immense potential of such disruptive technologies, if even one country decides to pursue these high-risk high-gain paths, other countries will be forced to follow its dangerous lead for fear of being left behind **An AI arms race** or a biotechn**ological arms race almost guarantees the worst outcome**. **Whoever wins** the arms race, **the loser will likely be humanity itself**. For in an arms race, all regulations will collapse. Consider, for example, conducting genetic-engineering experiments on human babies. Every country will say: “We don’t want to conduct such experiments—we are the good guys. But how do we know our rivals are not doing it? We cannot afford to remain behind. So we must do it before them.” Similarly, consider developing autonomous weapons systems that can decide for themselves whether to shoot and kill people. Again, every country will say: “This is a very dangerous technology, and it should be regulated carefully. But we don’t trust our rivals to regulate it, so we must develop it first”. **The only thing that can prevent** such destructive **arms races is greater trust between countries**. **This is not an impossible mission**. If today the Germans promise the French: “Trust us, we aren’t developing killer robots in a secret laboratory under the Bavarian Alps,” the French are likely to believe the Germans, despite the terrible history of these two countries. We need to build such trust globally. We need to reach a point when Americans and Chinese can trust one another like the French and Germans. Similarly, we need to create a global safety-net to protect humans against the economic shocks that AI is likely to cause. Automation will create immense new wealth in high-tech hubs such as Silicon Valley, while the worst effects will be felt in developing countries whose economies depend on cheap manual labor. There will be more jobs to software engineers in California, but fewer jobs to Mexican factory workers and truck drivers. We now have a global economy, but politics is still very national. Unless we find solutions on a global level to the disruptions caused by AI, entire countries might collapse, and the resulting chaos, violence and waves of immigration will **destabilise the entire world**. This is the proper perspective to look at recent developments such as Brexit. In itself, Brexit isn’t necessarily a bad idea. But is this what Britain and the EU should be dealing with right now? How does Brexit help prevent nuclear war? How does Brexit help prevent climate change? How does Brexit help regulate artificial intelligence and bioengineering? Instead of helping, Brexit makes it harder to solve all of these problems. Every minute that Britain and the EU spend on Brexit is one less minute they spend on preventing climate change and on regulating AI. In order **to survive** and flourish in the 21st century, **humankind needs** **effective global cooperation**, and so far the **only viable blueprint** for such cooperation **is** offered by **liberalism**. Nevertheless, governments all over the world are undermining the foundations of the liberal order, and the world is turning into a network of fortresses. The first to feel the impact are the weakest members of humanity, who find themselves without any fortress willing to protect them: refugees, illegal migrants, persecuted minorities. But if the walls keep rising, eventually **the whole of humankind will feel the squeeze**.

### Thus, the advocacy:

#### A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### RTS is a fundamental part of international law that solves oppression and preserves democracy worldwide---states have a moral obligation to enforce UN 17 UN Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights, partially quoting Maina Kiai, UN Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and association, March 9, 2017. <https://www.ohchr.org/EN/NewsEvents/Pages/DisplayNews.aspx?NewsID=21328&LangID=E> //AHS

GENEVA (9 March 2017) – Further to the Human Rights Council side event on freedoms of association and of peaceful assembly in the workplace which took place on Monday 6 March, and on the occasion of a key meeting of the International Labour Organization (ILO), the UN Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai, is recalling that **the right to strike is a fundamental one** enshrined in international human rights and labour law, **and** that its protection is **necessary in ensuring just, stable and democratic societies**: “As the 329th session of the Governing Body of the ILO starts today, I wish to reiterate the utmost importance of the right to strike in democratic societies. As stated in my 2016 thematic report to the General Assembly (A/71/385), the right to strike has been **established in international law for decades**, in global and regional instruments, such as in the ILO Convention No. 87 (articles 3, 8 and 10), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (article 8), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (article 22), the European Convention on Human Rights (article 11), and the American Convention on Human Rights (article 16). **The right is also enshrined in the constitutions of at least 90 countries**. The right to strike has in effect become customary international law. **The right to strike is** also an intrinsic corollary of the fundamental right of freedom of association. It is **crucial for millions** of women and men around the world to assert collectively their rights in the workplace, including the right to just and favourable conditions of work, and **to work** in dignity **and without fear of** intimidation and **persecution.** Moreover, protest action in relation to government social and economic policy, and against negative corporate practices, forms part of the basic civil liberties whose respect is essential for the meaningful exercise of trade union rights. This right enables them to engage with companies and governments on a more equal footing, and **Member States have a positive obligation to protect this right, and a negative obligation not to interfere with its exercise.** Moreover, protecting the right to strike is not simply about States fulfilling their legal obligations. **It is also about** them creating **democratic and equitable societies that are sustainable** in the long run. The **concentration of power** in one sector – whether in the hands of government or business – inevitably **leads to the erosion of democracy**, and an **increase in inequalities and marginalization** with all their attendant consequences. **The right to strike is a check on this** concentration of power. I deplore the various attempts made to erode the right to strike at national and multilateral levels. In this regard, I welcome the positive role played by the ILO’s Government Group in upholding workers’ right to strike by recognizing that ‘without protecting a right to strike, freedom of association, in particular the right to organize activities for the purpose of promoting and protecting workers’ interests, cannot be fully realized.’ I urge all stakeholders to ensure that the right to strike be fully preserved and respected across the globe and in all arenas”, the expert concluded.

#### And the plan solves oppression and inequality---change spills over to broad public dialogue Lim 19 <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2019/12/11/lim-right-to-strike/> //AHS

The **right to strike is a right to resist oppression**. The strike (and the credible threat of a strike) is an indispensable part of the collective bargaining procedure. Collective bargaining (or “agreement-making”) provides workers and employees with the opportunity to influence the establishment of workplace rules that govern a large portion of their lives. The concerted withdrawal of labor allows workers to promote and defend their unprotected economic and social interests from employers’ unilateral decisions, and provide employers with pressure and incentives to make reasonable concessions. Functionally, **strikes provide workers with the bargaining power** to drive fair and meaningful negotiations, **offsetting the inherent inequalities of bargaining power in the employer-employee relationship**. **The right to strike is essential in preserving and winning rights**. Any curtailment of this right involves the risk of weakening the very basis of collective bargaining. **Strikes are** not only a means of demanding and achieving an adequate provision of basic liberties but also are themselves **intrinsic, self-determined expressions of freedom and human rights**. The exercise of the power to strike affirms a quintessential corpus of **values akin to liberal democracies, notably those of dignity, liberty, and autonomy.** In acts of collective defiance, strikers assert their freedoms of speech, association, and assembly. **Acts of striking**, marching, and picketing **command the attention of the media and prompt public forums of discussion and dialogue**. The question of civic obligations, however, remains at stake. Perhaps those disgruntled with the strike might claim on a whiff that the strike impedes upon their own freedom of movement, educational rights, privacy, and so forth. **Do strikers**, in virtue of expressing their own freedoms, **shirk valid civic norms of reciprocity** they owe to members of the community, for instance, to students? **No. The right to strike stems from the premise of an unjust flaw in the social order, that is, the recognition that the benefits from shouldering the burdens of social cooperation are not fairly distributed**. **Strikes and protests** **publicize this recognition and demand reform.**

#### And we are \*indisputably\* better off because of strikes---Remembering the successes and failures of organized labor is a call to action in the present to create a fairer, more democratic future Lisa 21 Andrew Lisa, August 31, 2021, Stacker. 30 victories for workers’ rights won by organized labor over the years. <https://stacker.com/stories/2505/30-victories-workers-rights-won-organized-labor-over-years> //AHS

Today, American workers have a host of rights and recourses should their workplace be hostile or harmful. While **the modern labor movement** works to continue to improve the working conditions for all, with big efforts around a fair minimum wage and end of employer wage theft, the movement has a history rich with fights and wins. It **put an end to child labor**, 10-to-**16 hour workdays, and unsafe** **working conditions**. Stacker compiled a list of 30 of the most consequential victories that unions fought for in the name of **workers**' rights. The list includes information about the milestones unions achieved and the circumstances that made those victories worth fighting for. Today, every wage-earning American **owes a debt of gratitude to organized labor for** the 40-hour workweek, minimum wage (such as it is), anti-discrimination laws, and other **basic protections**. Far from basic, those protections **were**, until fairly recently, **pipe dreams to the millions** of American men, women, and children **who labored endlessly in dreadful conditions for poverty wages**. The gratitude is owed mostly to the unions those nameless and disposable **workers organized**, which they did **under the threat of being fired, harassed, evicted** from company homes, **beaten, jailed, and**, in many cases, **killed**. In 1886, for example, over 200,000 railroad workers went on strike to protest an unjust firing. In 1894, over 250,000 workers walked out of the Pullman Palace Car Company factories to protest 12-hour workdays and wage cuts. The 2018 Supreme Court case Janus v. AFSCME established that public-sector workers who are protected by unions—of which there are five times as many as private workers—but don't wish to join, no longer have to pay fees on behalf of the union's collective bargaining. This dealt a blow to public-sector unions, though it didn't result in the mass exodus union detractors had hoped for. Overall union membership in the U.S. in 2020 was at 10.8%, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. While that's a historical low rate, some industries—like digital media, museums, and non-profits—are making inroads with new unions. Over the decades, **there have been far more losses than victories**, **but the** victories the labor **movement** did achieve **made earning a living** in the United States a much **more equitable, fair, safe, and profitable** proposition. **These wins show what is possible** for the modern labor movement. Keep reading to explore 30 hard-fought victories that America's working class won in our names.