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#### Link: The Aff attempts to argue for workers’ rights by arguing for an unconditional right to strike. But creating a right to strike will further entrench the capitalist ownership of workers’ labor, reinforcing oppressive class structures.

**Gourevitch 18** Alex Gourevitch, July 2018, “A Radical Defense of the Right to Strike,” (Alex Gourevitch is an associate professor of political science at Brown University and the author of From Slavery To the Cooperative Commonwealth: Labor and Republican Liberty in the Nineteenth Century.) https://jacobinmag.com/2018/07/right-to-strike-freedom-civil-liberties-oppression

C[lass-based oppression](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/03/working-class-capitalism-socialists-strike-power/) is inextricable from liberal capitalism. While meaningful variation exists across capitalist societies, one of the fundamental unifying facts is this: the majority of able-bodied people are forced to work for members of a relatively small group, who dominate control over productive assets and who, thereby, enjoy control over the activities and products of those workers. There are [workers](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2018/07/turning-to-the-working-class), and then there are owners and their managers. Workers are pushed into the labor market because they have no reasonable alternative to looking for a job. They cannot produce the goods they need for themselves, nor can they rely on the charity of others, nor can they count on adequate state benefits. Depending on how we measure income and wealth, about 60 to 80 percent of Americans [fall into this category](https://thenewpress.com/books/after-new-economy) for most of their adult lives. This structural compulsion is not symmetric. A significant minority of the population has enough wealth — whether inherited or accumulated or both — that they can avoid entering the labor market. They might happen to work, but they are not forced to do so. The oppression, then, stems not from the fact that some are forced to work. After all, if socially necessary work were shared equally, then it might be fair to force each to do their share. The oppression stems from the fact that the forcing is unequal —that only some are made to work for others, producing whatever employers pay them to produce. This structural inequality feeds into a second, interpersonal dimension of oppression. Workers are forced to join workplaces typically characterized by large swathes of uncontrolled managerial power and authority. This oppression is interpersonal because it is power that specific individuals (employers and their managers) have to get other specific individuals (employees) to do what they want. We can distinguish between three overlapping forms that this interpersonal, workplace oppression takes: subordination, delegation, and dependence. Subordination: Employers have what are sometimes called “[managerial prerogatives](https://books.google.com/books/about/Managerial_Prerogative_and_the_Question.html?id=NQLEBAAAQBAJ)” — legislative and judicial grants of authority to owners and their managers to make decisions about investment, hiring and firing, plant location, work process, and the like. Managers may change working speeds and assigned tasks, the hours of work, or, as Amazon currently does, force employees to spend up to an hour going through security lines after work [without paying them](https://www.oyez.org/cases/2014/13-433). They can fire workers for [Facebook comments](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/10/17/facebook-firings_n_1003789.html), [their sexual orientation](https://www.sgvtribune.com/2011/10/08/fired-gay-water-polo-coach-and-supporters-protest-at-charter-oak-board-meeting/), [for being too sexually appealing](http://www.slate.com/blogs/xx_factor/2013/07/29/borgata_babes_lawsuit_new_legal_cases_assess_discrimination_based_on_sex.html), or for not being appealing enough. They can [give](https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/71431/the-big-squeeze-by-steven-greenhouse/9781400096527/) workers more tasks than can be performed in the allotted time, lock employees in the workplace overnight, [require employees to labor](http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/money_co/2011/09/amazon-warehouse-employees-overheated-ahead-of-holiday-season.html) in extreme heat and [other physically hazardous conditions](https://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/31/us/osha-emphasizes-safety-health-risks-fester.html), or [punitively isolate](https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/caring-on-stolen-time-a-nursing-home-diary) workers from other coworkers. They can [pressure](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2018/03/labor-law-corporations-workers-political-influence) employees to take unwanted political action, or, in the case of nurses, force employees to [work for twenty-two different doctors](https://socialistworker.org/2018/07/03/nurses-are-set-to-strike-uvm). What unifies these seemingly disparate examples is that, in all cases, managers [are exercising](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/06/private-government-interview-elizabeth-anderson) legally permitted prerogatives. The law does not require that workers have any formal say in how those powers are exercised. In fact, in nearly every liberal capitalist country (including social democracies like Sweden), employees are defined, in law, as “subordinates.” This is subordination in the strict sense: workers are subject to the will of the employer. Delegation: There are additional discretionary legal powers that managers enjoy not by legal statute or precedent but because workers have delegated these powers in the contract. For instance, workers might sign a contract [that allows managers to require employees](https://www.aclu.org/issues/criminal-law-reform/drug-testing?redirect=workplace-drug-testing) to submit to random drug testing or unannounced searches. In the United States, 18 percent of current employees and 37 percent of workers in their lifetime [work under noncompete agreements](http://equitablegrowth.org/why-its-time-to-rethink-non-compete-agreements/). These clauses give managers the legal power to forbid employees from working for competitors, in some cases reducing these workers to near indentured service. The [contract](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/04/verizon-wireless-strike-bernie-sanders-cwa/) that the Communications Workers of America had with Verizon until 2015 included a right for managers to force employers to perform from ten to fifteen hours of overtime per week and to take some other day instead of Saturday as an off-day. While workers have granted these prerogatives to employers voluntarily, in many cases it’s only technically voluntary because of the compulsion to work. This is especially true if workers can only find jobs in sectors where these kinds of contracts proliferate. Which leads to the third face of oppression: the *distributive effects*of class inequality. The normal workings of liberal capitalism elevate a relatively small group of owners and highly paid managers to the pinnacle of society, where they accumulate most of the wealth and income. Meanwhile, most workers do not earn enough to both meet their needs and to save such that they can employ themselves or start their own businesses. The few that do rise displace others or take the structurally limited number of opportunities available. The rest remain workers. *Dependence*: Finally, managers might have the material power to force employees to submit to commands or even to accept violations of their rights because of the worker’s dependence on the employer. A [headline example](https://jacobinmag.com/2018/06/heres-how-much-money-americas-biggest-corporations-have-stolen-from-their-own-workers) is [wage theft](https://www.epi.org/blog/wage-theft-by-employers-is-costing-u-s-workers-billions-of-dollars-a-year/), which affects [American workers](https://www.nelp.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/WinningWageJusticeSummaryofResearchonWageTheft.pdf) to the tune of $8 to $14 billion per year. Employers [regularly break](http://www.jwj.org/free-and-fair-how-labor-law-fails-u-s-democratic-election-standards) labor law, by disciplining, threatening, or firing workers who wish to organize, strike, or otherwise exercise supposedly protected labor rights. In other cases, workers have been [refused bathroom breaks](https://www.oxfamamerica.org/livesontheline/) and resorted to wearing diapers, [denied legally required lunch breaks](https://www.sfgate.com/business/article/Employers-must-pay-if-they-deny-lunch-breaks-2474407.php) or [pressured to work through them](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/08/14/indiana-att-technicians-class-action-lawsuit-lunch-breaks_n_1777166.html), [forced to keep working](https://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/08/business/media/ads-for-mcdonalds-and-las-vegas-aimed-at-harried-workers.html) after their shift, or denied the right to read or turn on air conditioning during break. In [particularly egregious examples](https://www.buzzfeed.com/jessicagarrison/the-new-american-slavery-invited-to-the-us-foreign-workers-f#.nmJN7Yg27), employers have forced their workers to stay home rather than go out on weekends or to switch churches and alter religious practices on pain of being fired and deported. There are also the many cases of systematic [sexual harassment](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2018/03/metoo-workplace-discrimination-sexual-harassment-feminism), in those wide regions of the economy where something more than a public shaming is needed to control bosses. In all these instances, employers are not exercising legal powers to command. Instead they are taking advantage of the material power that comes with threatening to fire or otherwise discipline workers. This material power to get workers to do things that employers want is in part a function of the class structure of society, both in the broad sense of workers being unequally dependent on owners, and in the narrower sense of workers being legally subordinate to employers. The oppression lies not just in the existence of these powers, nor in some capitalist bad apples, but in how these powers are typically used. Managers tend to use these powers “rationally,” to exploit workers and extract profits. Each of these different faces of oppression — structural, interpersonal, and distributive — is a distinct injustice. Together they form the interrelated and mutually reinforcing elements of class domination that are typical of capitalist societies. Defenders of liberal capitalism insist that it provides the fairest way of distributing work and the rewards of social production. They often speak in the idiom of freedom. Yet liberal capitalism fundamentally constrains workers’ liberty, generating the exploitation of one class by another. It is this oppression that explains why workers have a right to strike and why that right is best understood as a right to resist oppression. Workers have an interest in resisting the oppression of class society by using their collective power to reduce, or even overcome, that oppression. Their interest is a liberty interest in a double sense. First, resistance to that class-based oppression carries with it, at least implicitly, a demand for freedoms not yet enjoyed. A higher wage expands workers’ freedom of choice. Expanded labor rights increase workers’ collective freedom to influence the terms of employment. Whatever the concrete set of issues, workers’ strike demands are always also a demand for control over portions of one’s life that they do not yet enjoy. Second, strikes don’t just aim at winning more freedom — they are themselves expressions of freedom. When workers walk out, they’re using their own individual and collective agency to win the liberties they deserve. The same capacity for self-determination that workers invoke to demand more freedom is the capacity they exercise when winning their demands. Freedom, not industrial stability or simply higher living standards, is the name of their desire. Put differently, the right to strike has both an intrinsic and instrumental relation to freedom. It has intrinsic value as an (at least implicit) demand for self-emancipation. And it has instrumental value insofar as the strike is an effective means for resisting the oppressiveness of a class society and achieving new freedoms. But if all this is correct, and the right to strike is something that we should defend, then it also has to be meaningful. The right loses its connection to workers’ freedom if they have little chance of exercising it effectively. Otherwise they’re simply engaging in a symbolic act of defiance — laudable, perhaps, but not a tangible means of fighting oppression. The right to strike must therefore cover at least some of the coercive tactics that make strikes potent, like sit-downs and mass pickets. It is therefore often perfectly justified for strikers to exercise their right to strike by using these tactics, even when these tactics are illegal. Still, the question remains: why should the right to strike be given moral priority over other basic liberties? The reason is not just that liberal capitalism produces economic oppression but that the economic oppression that workers face is in part created and sustained by the very economic and civil liberties that liberal capitalism cherishes. Workers find themselves oppressed because of the way property rights, freedom of contract, corporate authority, and tax and labor law operate. Deeming these liberties inviolable doesn’t foster less oppressive, exploitative outcomes, as its defenders insist — quite the opposite. The right to strike has a stronger claim to be protecting a zone of activity that serves the aims of justice itself — coercing people into relations of less oppressive social cooperation. Simply put, to argue for the right to strike is to prioritize democratic freedoms over property rights.

Neoliberalism makes extinction inevitable because of environmental degradation.

Clark and Clausen 08 – Clark: assistant professor of sociology and sustainability studies at the University of Utah; Clausen: Professor of Sociology at Fort Lewis College in Durango, Colorado. [Brett and Rebecca. “The Oceanic Crisis: Capitalism and the Degradation of Marine Ecosystem”. <http://monthlyreview.org/2008/07/01/the-oceanic-crisis-capitalism-and-the-degradation-of-marine-ecosystem>.]//jwang

Turning the Ocean into a Watery Grave

The world is at a crossroads in regard to the ecological crisis. Ecological degradation under global capitalism extends to the entire biosphere. Oceans that were teeming with abundance are being decimated by the continual intrusion of exploitive economic operations. At the same time that scientists are documenting the complexity and interdependency of marine species, we are witnessing an oceanic crisis as natural conditions, ecological processes, and nutrient cycles are being undermined through overfishing and transformed due to global warming. The expansion of the accumulation system, along with technological advances in fishing, have intensified the exploitation of the world ocean; facilitated the enormous capture of fishes (both target and bycatch); extended the spatial reach of fishing operations; broadened the species deemed valuable on the market; and disrupted metabolic and reproductive processes of the ocean. The quick-fix solution of aquaculture enhances capital’s control over production without resolving ecological contradictions. It is wise to recognize, as Paul Burkett has stated, that “short of human extinction, there is no sense in which capitalism can be relied upon to permanently ‘break down’ under the weight of its depletion and degradation of natural wealth.”44 Capital is driven by the competition for the accumulation of wealth, and short-term profits provide the immediate pulse of capitalism. It cannot operate under conditions that require reinvestment in the reproduction of nature, which may entail time scales of a hundred or more years. Such requirements stand opposed to the immediate interests of profit. The qualitative relation between humans and nature is subsumed under the drive to accumulate capital on an ever-larger scale. Marx lamented that to capital, “Time is everything, man is nothing; he is at the most, time’s carcase. Quality no longer matters. Quantity alone decides everything.”45 Productive relations are concerned with production time, labor costs, and the circulation of capital—not the diminishing conditions of existence. Capital subjects natural cycles and processes (via controlled feeding and the use of growth hormones) to its economic cycle. The maintenance of natural conditions is not a concern. The bounty of nature is taken for granted and appropriated as a free gift. As a result, the system is inherently caught in a fundamental crisis arising from the transformation and destruction of nature. István Mészáros elaborates this point, stating: For today it is impossible to think of anything at all concerning the elementary conditions of social metabolic reproduction which is not lethally threatened by the way in which capital relates to them—the only way in which it can. This is true not only of humanity’s energy requirements, or of the management of the planet’s mineral resources and chemical potentials, but of every facet of the global agriculture, including the devastation caused by large scale de-forestation, and even the most irresponsible way of dealing with the element without which no human being can survive: water itself….In the absence of miraculous solutions, capital’s arbitrarily self-asserting attitude to the objective determinations of causality and time in the end inevitably brings a bitter harvest, at the expense of humanity [and nature itself].46 An analysis of the oceanic crisis confirms the destructive qualities of private for-profit operations. Dire conditions are being generated as the resiliency of marine ecosystems in general is being undermined. To make matters worse, sewage from feedlots and fertilizer runoff from farms are transported by rivers to gulfs and bays, overloading marine ecosystems with excess nutrients, which contribute to an expansion of algal production. This leads to oxygen-poor water and the formation of hypoxic zones—otherwise known as “dead zones” because crabs and fishes suffocate within these areas. It also compromises natural processes that remove nutrients from the waterways. Around 150 dead zones have been identified around the world. A dead zone is the end result of unsustainable practices of food production on land. At the same time, it contributes to the loss of marine life in the seas, furthering the ecological crisis of the world ocean. Coupled with industrialized capitalist fisheries and aquaculture, the oceans are experiencing ecological degradation and constant pressures of extraction that are severely depleting the populations of fishes and other marine life. The severity of the situation is that if current practices and rates of fish capture continue marine ecosystems and fisheries around the world could collapse by the year 2050.47 To advert turning the seas into a watery grave, what is needed is nothing less than a worldwide revolution in our relation to nature, and thus of global society itself.

#### RoB: Vote for the debater who best tears down capitalist structures.

#### Alternative: Vote Neg to support the formation of a party of a united working class to spearhead the global movement against capitalism.

**Alaniz et al 20** Maryam Alaniz, Olivia Wood, Nina DeMeo, Carmin Maffea, Ezra Brain, Madeleine Freeman, June 26 2020, “Socialism Is The Future. Our Generation Will Win It,” (Maryam Alaniz is a socialist journalist, activist, and PhD student living in NYC. She mostly writes about the international situation and social movements. Follow her on Twitter: @MaryamAlaniz) https://www.leftvoice.org/socialism-is-the-future-our-generation-will-win-it/

We want to see these demands realized and to do so must unite with the strongest force, the working class, which has the power to crush capitalism and see through the demands we have so ardently been fighting for like the abolition of police and an end to racism.  We cannot put our organizing efforts into the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party is called the graveyard of social movements for a reason, and many past generations of leaders have led their social movements there to die. Our generation cannot fall into that trap. The Democratic Party has nothing to offer us. Nowhere is this clearer than in Bernie Sanders disappointing capitulation to the Democratic establishment. Sanders’ campaign was a political awakening for many of us. Many of us donated to, voted for, and campaigned for him because he seemed to promise something different — the possibility of a better world for young people. But, after five years of building a so-called “political revolution,” what happened? Sanders dropped out, threw all of his support behind Joe Biden, and is now [shaming those of us who don’t support him](https://www.leftvoice.org/not-me-biden). Our generation is called irresponsible for refusing to vote for an accused sexual assaulter who has a long history of racism and imperialism, and who helped create the mass incarceration and student debt crises that are crippling our futures. This seeming betrayal from Sanders is disappointing but, unfortunately, to be expected. He has shown us what George McGovern, Jesse Jackson, and all others who tried to reform the Democratic Party have shown us: that it is impossible to make a bourgeois party into a party of the working class. Time and time again, all attempts at reforming the Democrats have ended in co-optation and defeat. Once again, we are being preached to about the necessity of voting for the lesser evil of the Democrats. But now, in this moment of uprisings, we can see that this notion is ridiculous. It was Democrats who let the men who murdered George Floyd get away scot-free until protests forced their arrest. In many states, it was Democratic governors who called in the National Guard, and it was Democratic mayors who supported them. Thousands of us have been beaten, gassed, shot with rubber bullets, and imprisoned in cities that are run by Democrats. They are not the lesser evil, but rather another wing of the same evil. We need a party of our own.  Judging by these historical lessons, working class youth can come to the conclusion that Sanders, AOC, and all other members of the progressive wing of the Democratic Party aren’t on our side. They do not want to build a socialist party of the working class. Instead, they are happy to serve the party that chose Joe Biden, a disgusting example of the depravity of capitalism and the complicity of the Democrats in that system, as their presidential candidate. We are in an incredibly dynamic political moment. Class struggle is returning worldwide, and for the first time in years, the U.S. is the global center of this struggle. We are winning greater and greater concessions from the state, but we cannot squander this moment or let it go to waste. We cannot simply jump from social movement to social movement, trying to address this and that issue in society. The way to liberate Black people, queer people, women, and all other specially oppressed communities is to destroy the system of capitalism, which we can only do by uniting with the working class and weaponizing their strategic position. Social movements, by themselves, will not be enough. You cannot cure an illness by *only*treating its symptoms. We know this isn’t an easy task. We’ve seen many activists of previous movements burn out trying to fight against this system. And we’ve seen the leaderships of these movements betray their bases and sell themselves out to the Democratic Party. We’ve also seen other youth-led movements, like the climate movement, claim to be apolitical. The current moment is a dynamic one, and we could be at the beginning of an epoch of uprisings and revolutions. But it is our responsibility to develop this moment and to continue the fight, even after the bourgeoisie offers us concessions. We can’t settle for crumbs any longer. The fight against capitalism can’t happen on a local scale, nor can it happen at the ballot box or through mutual aid networks alone. To be able to defend ourselves against the state and fight for more, we need a political organization that is made up of and led by the working class. Working class youth must be a central part of this organization — as immigrants, as students, as people of color, as disabled people, as women, and as queer and trans\* folks. Young workers are a vital part of the fight against capitalism because we can bring renewed energy and more forces into the ranks of labor. But a strong and fighting labor movement isn’t enough, on its own. We need to organize ourselves into a party around a shared program and strategy for socialism and against capitalism — to clarify our goals and the way we achieve them. We need a party to help organize the working class against the capitalist state and all the exploitation and oppression that it represents. Our generation can help break the spell and join with our members of the working class to build a party of our own. We need a party that doesn’t put the question of revolution off for another day, but rather seizes upon every capitalist injustice and fights against it using our strongest weapon — the united forces of the working class. A party that can coordinate protests in the streets and strikes in the workplace to learn how to fight and win; a party that is grounded in the working class and united by a common strategy for socialist revolution — against capitalism and oppression in all forms. We need a party because we want to win.  Our generation has shown amazing bravery and combativeness in this current moment, with Black youth leading the struggle on the streets. Young workers are standing up and demanding more than the scraps that the capitalist system has given us. We have shown an unyielding commitment to fighting for the most oppressed, be they Black people, queer people, women, or undocumented immigrants. We have shown that we are willing to fight social ills, and now we must extend that fight to take on capitalism itself. Because a better world is possible. A world free of exploitation and oppression, a world where we don’t make every decision about our futures with the looming specter of economic and climate collapse on the horizon. We can be on the vanguard of building a socialist future. We have shown, time and time again, that we are willing to fight. Let us take that fight to the system that exploits, oppresses, and murders us. We know the wall is rotten, and we know a shove will bring it down. The task now is organizing a strong enough force to make that final shove.