### 1NC Shell:

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions in cite boxes on the 2019-20 NDCA LD wiki.

#### Violation: see the screenshot in the doc

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### 1] Pre-round prep: prep becomes atrocious when you make people sift through 20 word docs to figure out which links you’re reading and which impacts to prep. Discourages tricks—you can just hide a bunch of blippy arguments. Also key for inclusion since disadvantaged people have computers more prone to lag and even 3 or 4 can crash the program for them—outweighs accessibility is a multiplier for their impacts. Disclosing in cite boxes solves—people can quickly get a summary of your position and go to open source if they need more information – discludes disabled bodys in the debate space

#### 2] wiki rules—the wiki tells you to disclose like everyone else. Freeloading is bad and o/w—it cultivates passive citizenship and turns any hope of actually solving their impacts which is a voter for education.

#### D] Voter:

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Precision is key – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

**1NC – Economics DA**

**Strikes hurt the Economy – two warrants:**

**1] They hurt critical core industries that is necessary for economic growth**

**McElroy 19** John McElroy 10-25-2019 "Strikes Hurt Everybody" <https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody> (MPA at McCombs school of Business)

This creates a **poisonous relationship** between the company and its workforce. Many GM hourly workers don’t identify as GM employees. They identify as UAW members. And they see the union as the source of their jobs, not the company. It’s an unhealthy dynamic that puts GM at a disadvantage to non-union automakers in the U.S. like Honda and Toyota, where workers take pride in the company they work for and the products they make. Attacking the company in the media also **drives away customers**. Who wants to buy a shiny new car from a company that’s accused of underpaying its workers and treating them unfairly? Data from the Center for Automotive Research (CAR) in Ann Arbor, MI, show that **GM loses market share during strikes and never gets it back**. GM lost two percentage points during the 1998 strike, which in today’s market would represent **a loss of 340,000 sales**. Because GM reports sales on a quarterly basis we’ll only find out at the end of December if it lost market share from this strike. UAW members say one of their greatest concerns is job security. But causing a company to lose market share is a sure-fire path to **more plant closings and layoffs**. Even so, unions are incredibly important for boosting wages and benefits for working-class people. GM’s UAW-represented workers earn considerably more than their non-union counterparts, about $26,000 more per worker, per year, in total compensation. Without a union they never would have achieved that. Strikes are a powerful weapon for unions. They usually are the only way they can get management to accede to their demands. If not for the power of collective bargaining and the threat of a strike, management would largely ignore union demands. If you took away that threat, management would pay its workers peanuts. Just ask the Mexican line workers who are paid $1.50 an hour to make $50,000 BMWs. But strikes don’t just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they’re striking against. They hurt **suppliers, car dealers and the communities located near the plants.** The Anderson Economic Group estimates that 75,000 workers at supplier companies were temporarily laid off because of the GM strike. Unlike UAW picketers, those supplier workers won’t get any strike pay or an $11,000 contract signing bonus. No, most of them lost close to a month’s worth of wages, which must be financially devastating for them. GM’s suppliers also lost a lot of money. So now they’re cutting budgets and delaying capital investments to make up for the lost revenue, which is a further drag on the economy. According to CAR, the communities and states where GM’s plants are located collectively lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenue. Some economists warn that if the strike were prolonged it could knock the state of Michigan – home to GM and the UAW – **into a recession.** That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible. So, while the UAW managed to get a nice raise for its members, the strike left a path of destruction in its wake. That’s not fair to the innocent bystanders who will never regain what they lost. John McElroyI’m not sure how this will ever be resolved. I understand the need for collective bargaining and the threat of a strike. But there’s got to be a better way to get workers a raise without torching the countryside.

**2] Strikes create a stigmatization effect over labor and consumption that devastates the Economy**

**Tenza 20**, Mlungisi. "The effects of violent strikes on the economy of a developing country: a case of South Africa." Obiter 41.3 (2020): 519-537. (Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal)

When South Africa obtained democracy in 1994, there was a dream of a better country with a new vision for industrial relations.5 However, the number of violent strikes that have bedevilled this country in recent years seems to have shattered-down the aspirations of a better South Africa. South Africa recorded 114 strikes in 2013 and 88 strikes in 2014, which cost the country about **R6.1 billion** according to the Department of Labour.6 The impact of these strikes has been hugely felt by the mining sector, particularly the platinum industry. The biggest strike took place in the platinum sector where about 70 000 mineworkers’ downed tools for better wages. Three major platinum producers (Impala, Anglo American and Lonmin Platinum Mines) were affected. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 25 June 2014. Business Day reported that “the five-month-long strike in the platinum sector pushed the economy to the brink of recession”. 7 This strike was closely followed by a four-week strike in the metal and engineering sector. All these strikes (and those not mentioned here) were characterised with violence accompanied by damage to property, intimidation, assault and sometimes the killing of people. Statistics from the metal and engineering sector showed that about 246 cases of intimidation were reported, 50 violent incidents occurred, and 85 cases of vandalism were recorded.8 Large-scale unemployment, soaring poverty levels and the dramatic income inequality that characterise the South African labour market provide a broad explanation for strike violence.9 While participating in a strike, workers’ stress levels leave them feeling frustrated at their seeming powerlessness, which in turn provokes further violent behaviour.10 These strikes are not only violent but **take long to resolve.** Generally, a lengthy strike has a **negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation**. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty. One of the measures that may boost the country’s economic growth is by attracting potential investors to invest in the country. However, this might be difficult as investors would want to invest in a country where there is a likelihood of getting returns for their investments. The wish of getting returns for investment may not materialise if the labour environment **is not fertile** for such investments as a result of, for example, unstable labour relations. Therefore, investors may be reluctant to invest where there is an unstable or fragile labour relations environment. 3 THE COMMISSION OF VIOLENCE DURING A STRIKE AND CONSEQUENCES The Constitution guarantees every worker the right to join a trade union, participate in the activities and programmes of a trade union, and to strike. 11 The Constitution grants these rights to a “worker” as an individual.12 However, the right to strike and any other conduct in contemplation or furtherance of a strike such as a picket13 can only be exercised by workers acting collectively.14 The right to strike and participation in the activities of a trade union were given more effect through the enactment of the Labour Relations Act 66 of 199515 (LRA). The main purpose of the LRA is to “advance economic development, social justice, labour peace and the democratisation of the workplace”. 16 The advancement of social justice means that the exercise of the right to strike must advance the interests of workers and at the same time workers must refrain from any conduct that can affect those who are not on strike as well members of society. Even though the right to strike and the right to participate in the activities of a trade union that often flow from a strike17 are guaranteed in the Constitution and specifically regulated by the LRA, it sometimes happens that the right to strike is exercised for purposes not intended by the Constitution and the LRA, generally. 18 For example, it was not the intention of the Constitutional Assembly and the legislature that violence should be used during strikes or pickets. As the Constitution provides, pickets are meant to be peaceful. 19 Contrary to section 17 of the Constitution, the conduct of workers participating in a strike or picket has changed in recent years with workers trying to emphasise their grievances by causing disharmony and chaos in public. A media report by the South African Institute of Race Relations pointed out that between the years 1999 and 2012 there were 181 strike-related deaths, 313 injuries and 3,058 people were arrested for public violence associated with strikes.20 The question is whether employers succumb easily to workers’ demands if a strike is accompanied by violence? In response to this question, one worker remarked as follows: “[T]here is no sweet strike, there is no Christian strike … A strike is a strike. [Y]ou want to get back what belongs to you ... you won’t win a strike with a Bible. You do not wear high heels and carry an umbrella and say ‘1992 was under apartheid, 2007 is under ANC’. You won’t win a strike like that.” 21 The use of violence during industrial action affects not only the strikers or picketers, the employer and his or her business but it also affects innocent members of the public, non-striking employees, the environment and the economy at large. In addition, striking workers visit non-striking workers’ homes, often at night, threaten them and in some cases, assault or even murder workers who are acting as replacement labour. 22 This points to the fact that for many workers and their families’ living conditions remain unsafe and vulnerable to damage due to violence. In Security Services Employers Organisation v SA Transport & Allied Workers Union (SATAWU),23 it was reported that about 20 people were thrown out of moving trains in the Gauteng province; most of them were security guards who were not on strike and who were believed to be targeted by their striking colleagues. Two of them died, while others were admitted to hospitals with serious injuries.24 In SA Chemical Catering & Allied Workers Union v Check One (Pty) Ltd,25 striking employees were carrying various weapons ranging from sticks, pipes, planks and bottles. One of the strikers Mr Nqoko was alleged to have threatened to cut the throats of those employees who had been brought from other branches of the employer’s business to help in the branch where employees were on strike. Such conduct was held not to be in line with good conduct of striking.26 These examples from case law show that South Africa is facing a problem that is affecting not only the industrial relations’ sector but also the economy at large. For example, in 2012, during a strike by workers employed by Lonmin in Marikana, the then-new union Association of Mine & Construction Workers Union (AMCU) wanted to exert its presence after it appeared that many workers were not happy with the way the majority union, National Union of Mine Workers (NUM), handled negotiations with the employer (Lonmin Mine). AMCU went on an unprotected strike which was violent and resulted in the loss of lives, damage to property and negative economic consequences including a weakened currency, reduced global investment, declining productivity, and increase unemployment in the affected sectors.27 Further, the unreasonably long time it takes for strikes to get resolved in the Republic has a negative effect on the business of the employer, the economy and employment. 3 1 Effects of violent and long strikes on the economy Generally, South Africa’s economy is on a downward scale. First, it fails to create employment opportunities for its people. The recent statistics on unemployment levels indicate that unemployment has increased from 26.5% to 27.2%. 28 The most prominent strike which nearly brought the platinum industries to its knees was the strike convened by AMCU in 2014. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 24 June 2014. It affected the three big platinum producers in the Republic, which are the Anglo American Platinum, Lonmin Plc and Impala Platinum. It was the longest strike since the dawn of democracy in 1994. As a result of this strike, the platinum industries lost billions of rands.29 According to the report by Economic Research Southern Africa, the platinum group metals industry is South Africa’s second-largest export earner behind gold and contributes just over 2% of the country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP).30 The overall metal ores in the mining industry which include platinum sells about 70% of its output to the export market while sales to local manufacturers of basic metals, fabricated metal products and various other metal equipment and machinery make up to 20%. 31 The research indicates that the overall impact of the strike in 2014 was driven by a reduction in productive capital in the mining sector, accompanied by a decrease in labour available to the economy. This resulted in a sharp increase in the price of the output by 5.8% with a **GDP declined by 0.72 and 0.78%**.32

**Economic Collapse goes Nuclear.**

**Tønnesson 15**, Stein. "Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace." International Area Studies Review 18.3 (2015): 297-311. (the Department of Peace and Conflict, Uppsala University, Sweden, and Peace research Institute Oslo (PRIO), Norway)

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, **decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations**. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. **Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly**, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The **greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy** alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.

# Case

#### CP Text: In a just government voting ought to be compulsory.

**Herrle and Dionne 7/24** Amber Herrle and E.J. Dionne, 7-24-2020, Why shouldn’t voting be mandatory?, [https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2020/07/24/why-shouldnt-voting-be-mandatory/](about:blank) Amber Herrle Research Analyst - Governance Studies E.J. Dionne, Jr. W. Averell Harriman Chair and Senior Fellow//sjvc

The United States should require all of its citizens to vote. Doing so will push back against voter suppression and tear down barriers to participation because the best way to protect the right to vote is to underscore that it is also a civic duty. This is the message of a report issued this week by the Universal Voting Working Group, a joint initiative by the Brookings Institution and the Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation at Harvard’s Kennedy School. Its opening words: “Imagine an American democracy remade by its citizens in the very image of its promise, a society where the election system is designed to allow citizens to perform their most basic civic duty with ease. Imagine that all could vote without obstruction or suppression. Imagine Americans who now solemnly accept their responsibilities to sit on juries and to defend our country in a time of war taking their obligations to the work of self-government just as seriously.” We argue that the United States should require citizens to participate in elections as Australia and two dozen other nations do. As it is with jury service, so it is with voting: Asserting a civic duty is the best way to guarantee the right this duty entails. Our report, “Lift Every Voice: The Urgency of Universal Civic Duty Voting,” aims to build on the achievements of the civil rights, voting rights and democracy movements by continuing to push for a series of reforms to ease access to the ballot box and make voting simpler and easier. Our working group was under no illusions that mandatory participation in elections would be adopted quickly or easily in the United States. Between now and November 2020, there is much that needs to be done simply to ensure that voters will be able to cast ballots safely. For the medium term, we urge that the first steps toward universal civic duty voting might begin with local or state experiments of the sort that have, in our nation’s past, pushed good ideas to the national stage. But we also hope to shake up the nation’s voting debate to lay out an expansive vision of what our democracy could and should look like, and to show that this idea, which has only rarely entered the American debate, is exceedingly practical. Australia has had mandatory participation on the books for nearly a century, and it has worked. Over the course of 18 months, our working group studied systems of universal voting, met with civil rights, voting rights and democracy advocates, immigrant rights groups, state legislative organizations, election officials at all levels, and many others to refine  our ideas and create a detailed policy proposal. Our intervention reflects a sense of alarm and moral urgency, but also a spirit of hope and patriotism. That we consider 50% turnout in midterm elections a historical achievement (as was the case in 2018) should be a warning. The disparities in turnout between different groups, detailed in our report, are equally worrying. Boosting turnout, we insist, is a matter of justice and representation. This mandate also takes seriously the Declaration of Independence’s insistence that political legitimacy depends on the “consent of the governed.” Our turnout levels, at 60 percent on the high end in presidential elections and 40 percent in the typical case in midterm elections, means that elected leaders earn their legitimacy from a small group of individuals even in landslide elections. This suggests that many voters are withholding their consent from our government, passively in some cases and actively by the most alienated voters. Civic duty voting shifts elections from an “opt-in” to an “opt-out” system. It does not force voters to elect any one candidate and therefore, we believe, it survives constitutional muster. In addition to allowing for a wide variety of exceptions to the voting mandate, the policy laid out in the report also encourages None of the Above options to be added to the ballot. Any civic duty voting policy should allow for religious and conscientious objection to voting. Casting a ballot in countries with civic duty voting is often easier than it is in the United States. Registering to vote is a straightforward and accessible process, if not automatic; requesting a ballot or finding your polling place typically does not require calls to your local supervisor of elections or constantly checking online resources to ensure that your polling location has not changed; and voting in person does not mean standing in line for hours. Many opponents of compulsory participation worry about imposing penalties on non-voters. We are careful to insist that fines for non-voting not be more than $20, that neither civil nor criminal penalties would be imposed for not paying the fine, that the amount would not compound over time, and that it would be set aside for those willing to meet a modest community service requirement. Included in the proposal is a conscientious objector provision for those who have religious or moral qualms about voting, and provide a wide range of legitimate reasons voters could give to escape any penalties. In Australia, only 13 percent of non-voters ever have to pay the penalty. Our emphasis is not on imposing sanctions but on sending a strong message that voting is a legitimate expectation of citizenship in a nation dedicated to democratic self-rule. At a time when our nation is in the midst of a new struggle to end entrenched racial injustice, we see universal voting as a way to amplify long-suppressed voices. The John Lewis, whose loss we mourn and whose life we celebrate, risked his life again and again on behalf of voting rights and full participation. “Voting access is the key to equality in our democracy, Lewis declared. “The size of your wallet, the number on your Zip Code shouldn’t matter. The action of government affects every American so every citizen should have an equal voice.” Our proposal is rooted in the obligation of all citizens to our democracy and represents an effort to make our system more equal and more participatory. We hope it can serve as a spur for a new and more vibrant democracy.

#### Compulsory voting is key to bolster democratic elections

Herrle and Dionne 7/24 Amber Herrle (research analyst – governance studies) and E.J. Dionne, Jr. (W. Averell Harriman Chair and Senior Fellow), 7-24-2020, “Why shouldn’t voting be mandatory?” Brookings, [https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2020/07/24/why-shouldnt-voting-be-mandatory/](about:blank), SJBE

But we also hope to shake up the nation’s voting debate to lay out an expansive vision of what our democracy could and should look like, and to show that this idea, which has only rarely entered the American debate, is exceedingly practical. Australia has had mandatory participation on the books for nearly a century, and it has worked. Over the course of 18 months, our working group studied systems of universal voting, met with civil rights, voting rights and democracy advocates, immigrant rights groups, state legislative organizations, election officials at all levels, and many others to refine our ideas and create a detailed policy proposal. Our intervention reflects a sense of alarm and moral urgency, but also a spirit of hope and patriotism. That we consider 50% turnout in midterm elections a historical achievement (as was the case in 2018) should be a warning. The disparities in turnout between different groups, detailed in our report, are equally worrying. Boosting turnout, we insist, is a matter of justice and representation. This mandate also takes seriously the Declaration of Independence’s insistence that political legitimacy depends on the “consent of the governed.” Our turnout levels, at 60 percent on the high end in presidential elections and 40 percent in the typical case in midterm elections, means that elected leaders earn their legitimacy from a small group of individuals even in landslide elections. This suggests that many voters are withholding their consent from our government, passively in some cases and actively by the most alienated voters. Civic duty voting shifts elections from an “opt-in” to an “opt-out” system. It does not force voters to elect any one candidate and therefore, we believe, it survives constitutional muster. In addition to allowing for a wide variety of exceptions to the voting mandate, the policy laid out in the report also encourages None of the Above options to be added to the ballot. Any civic duty voting policy should allow for religious and conscientious objection to voting. Casting a ballot in countries with civic duty voting is often easier than it is in the United States. Registering to vote is a straightforward and accessible process, if not automatic; requesting a ballot or finding your polling place typically does not require calls to your local supervisor of elections or constantly checking online resources to ensure that your polling location has not changed; and voting in person does not mean standing in line for hours. Many opponents of compulsory participation worry about imposing penalties on non-voters. We are careful to insist that fines for non-voting not be more than $20, that neither civil nor criminal penalties would be imposed for not paying the fine, that the amount would not compound over time, and that it would be set aside for those willing to meet a modest community service requirement. Included in the proposal is a conscientious objector provision for those who have religious or moral qualms about voting, and provide a wide range of legitimate reasons voters could give to escape any penalties. In Australia, only 13 percent of non-voters ever have to pay the penalty. Our emphasis is not on imposing sanctions but on sending a strong message that voting is a legitimate expectation of citizenship in a nation dedicated to democratic self-rule. At a time when our nation is in the midst of a new struggle to end entrenched racial injustice, we see universal voting as a way to amplify long-suppressed voices. The John Lewis, whose loss we mourn and whose life we celebrate, risked his life again and again on behalf of voting rights and full participation. “Voting access is the key to equality in our democracy, Lewis declared. “The size of your wallet, the number on your Zip Code shouldn’t matter. The action of government affects every American so every citizen should have an equal voice.” Our proposal is rooted in the obligation of all citizens to our democracy and represents an effort to make our system more equal and more participatory. We hope it can serve as a spur for a new and more vibrant democracy.

#### CP solves – Socioeconomic inequality is high when turnout is low – high turnouts decreases the gap.

Lijphart 97 Arend Lijphart. PhD, Research Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of California, San Diego. “Unequal Participation: Democracy's Unresolved Dilemma.” American Political Science Review, 91(1), pp. 1-14. Mar. 1997. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2952255?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents> [Premier]

First of all, as already indicated, low voter turnout means unequal and socioeconomically biased turnout. This pattern is so clear, strong, and well known in the United States that it does not need to be belabored further. Compared with the United States, the class bias in other democracies tends to be weaker-leading some analysts to regard it as an almost unique Amer- ican phenomenon (Abramson 1995, 918; Piven and Cloward 1988a, 117-9). There is, however, abundant evidence of the same class bias, albeit usually not as strong, in other democracies. In Switzerland, the other major example of a Western democracy with low levels of turnout, the participation gap between the least and most highly educated citizens in the March 1991 refer- endum was 37 percentage points; Wolf Linder (1994, 95-6) calls this a "typical profile of a popular vote," and concludes that "especially when participation is low, the choir of Swiss direct democracy sings in upper- or middle-class tones." In survey data covering refer- enda between 1981 and 1991, the gap was almost 25 percentage points (Mottier 1993, 134). The class bias in turnout also affects Swiss parliamentary elections (Farago 1996, 11-2; Sidjanski 1983, 107).

In countries with higher turnout, as expected, the link between socioeconomic status and turnout tends to be less strong, often not strong enough to be statistically significant and sometimes even negative. However, G. Bingham Powell, Jr. (1986, 27-8) com- bined data for seven European nations and Canada and found a consistent effect of the level of education on turnout: a difference of 10 percentage points be- tween the lowest and highest of five education levels and a consistent increase of 2 to 3 percentage points at each higher level in the averages of eight nations. A similar study of six Central American countries also reports mixed results, but these averages show similar turnout increases at higher educational levels and a difference of 12 percentage points between the highest and lowest levels, with the "more dramatic differenc- es ... found in countries with lower turnout rates" (Seligson et al. 1995, 166-71).

Richard Topf (1995, 48-9), who surveys data from 16 European countries in six periods since 1960, finds several instances in which the least educated cohorts actually have slightly higher turnouts than the most highly educated-contrary to the expected pattern- and concludes that there is "no generalized education effect for voting." His own figures, however, show that the instances of the expected positive link between educational level and turnout are four times more numerous than the deviant instances; without the countries with compulsory voting the ratio is almost five to one. Similarly, a study of the 1989 European Parliament elections in the 12 member countries finds several negative correlations between levels of educa- tion, income, and social class on the one hand and voting turnout on the other, but positive correlations prevail by a better than two-to-one ratio; without the four countries with compulsory voting, the ratio is higher than three to one (Oppenhuis 1995, 186-90). The same expected, but not huge, class bias is also the usual finding in Russell B. Dalton's (1996, 57-8) comparative analysis of the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, as well as in single-country studies of these countries plus Spain and the Netherlands (Dent- ers 1995; Denver 1995; Font and Viros 1995; Justel 1995; Sarlvik and Crewe 1983, 79; Schultze 1995).

In Belgium, surveys have found little or no relation- ship between educational level and voting participa- tion. However, they have also discovered that, if com- pulsory voting were abolished, turnout would drop from well over 90% to about 60%, resulting in a strong class bias from which the more conservative parties would benefit (Ackaert and De Winter 1993, 77-9; 1996; De Winter and Ackaert 1994, 87-9). Similarly, Venezuela had high turnouts in its elections under compulsory voting until the mid-1980s and, like Bel- gium, relatively little class bias in turnout. Here, too, however, a survey found that, under voluntary voting, turnout would decline dramatically, to 48%, and that "electoral demobilization would introduce socioeco- nomic distinctions in voting turnout" (Baloyra and Martz 1979, 71; see also Molina Vega 1991

In the early 1960s, two authoritative volumes sum- marized the most important findings of political scien- tists and sociologists. On the subject of voter turnout, Seymour Martin Lipset (1960, 182) stated that "pat- terns of voting participation are strikingly the same in various countries: Germany, Sweden, America, Nor- way, Finland, and many others for which we have data.... The better educated [vote] more than the less educated; ... higher-status persons, more than lower." Similarly, one of the findings in Bernard Berelson and Gary A. Steiner's (1964, 423) Inventory of Scientific Findings was that "the higher a person's socioeconomic and educational level-especially the latter-the higher his [or her] political interest, participation, and voting turnout." More than three decades later, these conclusions are clearly still valid.5

#### 1NC – Wages

**Low wages inevitable and structural---labor monopsony, non-compete agreements and no unions**

**Smith 6-11**-2018 – PhD, former assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University (Noah, “Commentary: A job market this tight should deliver bigger raises,” *Chicago Tribune*, <http://www.chicagotribune.com/business/columnists/ct-biz-job-market-raises-20180611-story.html)//BB>

**With the economy strong and unemployment low, why is wage growth so sluggish**? Lots of economists and pundits are debating this vexing question. **When the labor market gets tight, wages are supposed to rise faster. Instead, median wage growth is slower** than it was back in 2016: The most benign explanation is that there's no mystery here -- total compensation, which includes both wages and benefits, may be accelerating: The first quarter of 2018 did see substantial compensation increases -- an annualized rate of almost 4 percent. But one quarter doesn't make a trend. In 2017, compensation growth was running at about 2.5 percent. That's lower than in the early 2000s, even though more prime-age Americans are at work now than then. Another benign explanation is that despite extremely low unemployment, the economy still isn't really at full employment yet. The Great Recession lasted so long that many workers simply gave up looking for jobs -- these people were classified not as unemployed, but as out of the labor force altogether. Some argue that when we take this shadow unemployment into account, the recovery -- and the associated wage growth -- are right on track. However, even in this picture, 2017 looks a bit weak. Also, using total compensation instead of wages might not be a good idea, because benefits might be increasing due to factors unrelated to the business cycle, such the rapid rise in health-care costs. If this is the case, then the disparity between now and the early 2000s increases -- wage growth in early 2018 has been equal to or lower than the trough of the early 2000s business cycle. There's also a possibility that some of the people who dropped out of the labor force during the Great Recession weren't really unemployed, but were just people who decided not to have formal jobs anymore by working under the table or in the black market. If that's true, then using prime-age employment overstates the unemployment rate, meaning that wage growth is even slower than it ought to be at this point in the cycle. So perhaps things aren't OK. It's possible that **structural forces, unrelated to the business cycle, may be putting long-term downward pressure on wages. One such factor might be what economists call monopsony, or concentrated market power**. **Evidence is piling up that employers in the U.S. are able to hold down wages because it's hard for workers to find new jobs at higher pay in the area.** If this power is greater now than in past years, it could be restraining wages, as Nobel economist Paul Krugman explains in an excellent blog post. **Other structural factors -- increased use of noncompete agreements, and the continued decline of unions -- might be increasing employers' power to avoid raising pay**. The idea that employer power is holding down wages is becoming more popular.

**More ev---tech and globalization, also makes strikes ineffective**

**Cohen 18** - covers the national economy for The New York Times (Patricia, “Globalization and Automation,” in 6 Reasons That Pay Has Lagged Behind U.S. Job Growth, *New York Times*, Lexis)//BB

**Technology and globalization have both made it easier for businesses to find cheaper alternatives to paying their workers more money**. American manufacturing jobs, once a mainstay of well-paying blue-collar work, started rapidly declining after 2000, as China rose as an exporting power. At the Rexnord Corporation’s steel bearings plant in Indiana, for example, **American employees used to earn an average of $25 an hour plus benefits. Last year, the company moved the entire factory and its operations to Monterrey, Mexico, where the pay would average less than $6 an hour.** Rexnord said the move would save the company $30 million and enable its products to compete better with cheaper imported bearings. The savings and increased profits would benefit stockholders. The losers were Rexnord employees. **The same dynamic occurs when businesses see they can save money by replacing workers with technology that reduces costs in the long run. Manufacturers that kept operations in the United States or built new ones have increasingly relied more on automation and advanced technology than on people. Thus, domestic output has expanded significantly even as payrolls have fallen.**

**Non unique Wages are up now and will continue**

**Kline, Boston Globe, Motley Today, USA Today, writer and editor 2018**

[Daniel B., 7-5-18, USA Today, “Salaries: US wage growth in June was 2018's strongest so far”, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/economy/2018/07/05/us-wage-growth-in-june-was-2018s-strongest-so-far/36579285/>, accessed 7-12-18, ZA]

**Median base pay for workers in the United States climbed by 1.6 percent in June** to $52,052, according to the latest edition of Glassdoor's Local Pay Report. **That was the strongest growth in the wage statistic so far in 2018.**

"**With unemployment hovering around historic lows, employers' need to fill roles climbs**," said Glassdoor Chief Economist Andrew Chamberlain in a press release. "What results is that more workers, especially in high demand industries like healthcare, finance, and e-commerce, are in the driver's seat to negotiate for better pay in order to fill these roles."

The Glassdoor data showed that traditional blue-collar jobs -- such as truck driver, warehouse associate, and materials handler -- posted large wage gains. The increases were tied to the increasing demand for manpower in those areas created by growth in e-commerce, and Chamberlain expects **that wages for these positions will continue to climb throughout 2018.**

### 1NC – AT UV

#### Reject 1ar theory on face –

#### [1] 1ar theory time skews the rest of the round since they have the 1ar and 2ar, which is 7 minutes compared to my 2nr, which is 6 minutes. This gives them a whole minute advantage on the theory debate, that’s a lot in such a time crunched event and outweighs their strat args since I need time to execute strat and get ground.

#### [2] I lose the flex of being able to indict practices of the aff without going new in the 2nr, which gives them the ability to effectively weigh on the theory debate. Also outweighs on spikes because you have the ability to weigh an entirely conceded theory spike while I have to weigh my theory interp against all possible interps of the aff.

#### [3] 1ar theory is a no risk issue because the aff can go hard for no rvi in the 2ar, which skews my strat because either I either lose on substance or theory, screws the 2nr because I can’t respond to the initial spike, only the violation.

#### [4] I only have once chance to respond after it is introduced while they have two chances

#### [5] they get to speak before and after me which means they get to frame the debate and end the debate, which is abusive in the 2n I have to go for a counterinterp and respond to their shell while they can choose either in the 2ar.

### 1NC- No UQ

#### STRIKES ARE HIGH NOW AND MORE ARE COMING- PROVES NO UNIQUENESS OR REASON WHY THE AFF IS KEY

Romero 10-21 Dani Romero (REPORTER, yahoo finance) 10/21/21, ‘Strikes are contagious’: Wave of labor unrest signals crisis in tight job market, [https://news.yahoo.com/strikes-are-contagious-wave-of-labor-unrest-signals-crisis-in-tight-jobs-market-135052770.html](about:blank)

As employers of all sizes grapple with an acute worker shortage amid what’s being called the pandemic era’s Great Resignation, it’s become increasingly clear that people with jobs aren’t all that happy, either. At an ever-lengthening list of workplaces around the country, workers this year have been getting loud about the state of wages, working hours and conditions. From healthcare to entertainment, nearly 100,000 U.S. workers are either striking or preparing to strike in a bid to improve working conditions. New data signals that worker unrest is growing: a Cornell Labor Action Tracker shows that more than 180 strikes have been recorded this year, and over 24,000 workers have walked off the job this month. This all plays out against a backdrop of an economy bouncing back from an economic shutdown during the pandemic. More than 10,000 John Deere workers went on strike Thursday, the first major walkout at the agricultural machinery giant in more than three decades. “We have noticed a bit of an uptick in late September into early October, for example, we've already documented 39 strikes on the month of October,” Johnnie Kallas, a Ph.D. student at Cornell University’s School of Industrial and Labor Relations, or ILR, who tracks labor actions across the country, said in an interview. “Those numbers are already the largest of any month in 2021,” he added. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, which records only large work stoppages, has documented 12 strikes involving 1,000 or more workers. That represents a big jump from when the pandemic started over 19 months ago. “What will happen is you'll see more workers going on strike,” Kate Bronfenbrenner, director of labor education research and senior lecturer at Cornell school of industrial and labor relations, told Yahoo Finance. “Each time there's a ripple effect with each one of those, if the John Deere strike isn’t settled, you're going to see another big group go out,” she said. “If companies don't move, you're going to see this spread from one group to another. Strikes are contagious,” Bronfenbrenner added.

#### Every empiric flows neg.

Greenhouse 18 [Steven; Editor at NYT, author of a book about history of labor unions; "Making Teachers’ Strikes Illegal Won’t Stop Them,” The New York Times; 5/9/18; [https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/09/opinion/teacher-strikes-illegal-arizona-carolina.html](about:blank)] Justin

In the five states where teachers have gone on strike this year, teachers complain about many of the same things: low salaries, an education funding squeeze and teacher shortages. They have something else in common. In four of the five — Arizona, Kentucky, Oklahoma and West Virginia — these strikes are illegal under state law. (Colorado, the fifth state where teachers walked out, allows them.)

While private-sector workers generally have a right to strike under federal law, state law governs whether teachers and other state and local government workers can strike. Three dozen states have laws prohibiting teachers from striking. Clearly, making teacher strikes illegal will not necessarily prevent them.

In the states where teachers walked out, many teachers felt they had to beg their state legislatures to approve raises and the funding to pay for them. But their pleas were largely ignored. Joseph McCartin, a labor historian at Georgetown University, says that when workers feel they are at a dead end in negotiating raises, militant outbursts — such as illegal walkouts — are inevitable. “When collective bargaining isn’t allowed or doesn’t work, that doesn’t mean collective action isn’t possible,” he said.

Labor’s most potent weapon is the strike, even when it’s illegal. Workers will often risk engaging in an illegal strike, even though it could mean getting fined, fired and conceivably jailed. In a legal strike, workers typically lose just a few days’ or weeks’ pay.

Explosions of worker militancy have been a recurring pattern throughout American history. West Virginia teachers, for example, said their walkout was inspired by their state’s coal miners, who were part of a historic miners’ strike during World War II.

Ten days after Pearl Harbor was attacked in 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt summoned labor and business leaders to a conference where unions pledged not to strike during the war. The National War Labor Board, which included labor representatives, dictated a nationwide formula that capped how large a raise unions could obtain in bargaining. But the raises often failed to keep up with inflation, angering millions of workers.

As a result, there were dozens of short wildcat strikes — strikes without union authorization — in defiance of Roosevelt and union leaders. The biggest confrontation came in 1943, when the United Mine Workers’ brilliant but bullheaded president, John L. Lewis, gave 500,000 coal miners a wink and a nod, tacit approval for a walkout.

Roosevelt implored the miners to return to work. “Every idle miner directly and individually is obstructing the war effort,” he said in a fireside chat. He had the federal government seize the mines and ordered miners back to work, but eager to restore labor peace, he figured out a way to meet most of their pay demands.

In 1962, President John F. Kennedy issued an executive order giving most federal employees the right to bargain collectively over some working conditions, but not wages, and he barred them from striking. For years, postal workers seethed about low pay, and their frustration boiled over after members of Congress received a 41 percent raise in 1969.

On March 18, 1970, letter carriers walked out in New York City, and within days, more than 150,000 of the nation’s 600,000 postal workers had joined the illegal strike. One letter carrier boasted that the strikers were “standing 10 feet tall, instead of groveling in the dust.”

During the 1970 postal workers’ strike, military personnel sorted mail at New York City’s main post office.

President Richard M. Nixon denounced the strike, but he didn’t seek to fire or jail the strikers. He mobilized 24,000 military personnel to deliver the mail — not very successfully — and reached a deal that ended the strike after eight days. The postal workers won an initial 6 percent raise, and when Nixon signed the Postal Reorganization Act that summer, they received an additional 8 percent.

H. R. Haldeman, Nixon’s chief of staff, acknowledged a big obstacle to punishing these unlawful strikers. “The mailman is a family friend, so you can’t hurt him,” Haldeman said.

State officials unhappy about the recent strikes have realized the same thing: They can’t really punish or replace the teachers. They’re too popular, there are too many to replace, and if state officials try to jail a few ringleaders, that might spur new strikes.

Not every illegal walkout ends well for workers. When air traffic controllers went on strike in 1981, President Ronald Reagan fired 11,345 controllers and rallied the public against their union, the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization, emphasizing that every controller had taken a no-strike pledge upon being hired. Reagan also lambasted the union for rejecting the 11 percent raise his administration was offering, about twice what other federal employees had received at the time.

With the end of the Arizona teachers’ walkout last Thursday, there are rumblings about which state might be next. In North Carolina, educators are angry that teacher salaries and per-pupil spending have not kept up with inflation. Even though teacher strikes are illegal in North Carolina, teachers there say they will walk out next Wednesday, the day that the state legislature opens. Lawmakers should take them seriously. Teachers have so far managed to win gains and skirt the law without any penalty because public opinion — and a lot of history — seems to be on their side.