## Hong Kong DA

#### Hong Kong doesn’t allow political strikes

Tang and Pang 20 [Nickolas Tang, writer on Hong Kong’s self-determination for the Nation, and, Jun Pang, writer and researcher of migration and detention for the Nation, 3-12-2020, "‘I Am Willing to Take a Bullet for You. Are You Willing to Go on Strike for Me?’," Nation, https://www.thenation.com/article/world/hong-kong-unions-strike/]/Kankee

After the wave of political mobilization in the 1960s, the British colonial government attempted to defuse activism by strengthening social service provisions, including implementing free basic education, shorter working hours, and increasing the availability of public housing. Academic Agnes Ku notes that the government continually pointed to the example of the 1967 riots as an example of the threat of social upheaval, stressing instead the importance of state-directed efficiency, stability, and prosperity. This continued after the handover, with the government adopting policies prioritizing Hong Kong’s economic development and competitiveness, presenting them as a panacea to all social and distributive issues. Article 27 of Hong Kong’s Basic Law—the territory’s mini-constitution—guarantees residents the right to form and join associations, including trade unions. The right to form a union is reserved for those who ordinarily reside in Hong Kong; that does not necessarily include migrant workers, though some have mobilized through unions and other networks to fight for stronger protections. Notably, there are no provisions for collective bargaining for anyone, which means that negotiations between employers and trade unions are not protected by law. Furthermore, strikes are legally protected only when they pertain solely to labor disputes—which is why, for example, the Hospital Authority recently warned striking medics that they may face repercussions for their politicized strike action. Carol Ng, the chairperson of the Hong Kong Confederation of Trade Unions, the largest pro-democracy union organization in Hong Kong, believes that many of the city’s unions have failed to reflect their members’ political views. “For example, there are seven unions representing railway workers in Hong Kong, but they are all pro-establishment, and disconnected from their members’ grievances,” she says. “It wasn’t until the formation of Railway Power [a pro-democracy union] last October that rank-and-file workers have a union actively supporting their demands.”

#### Backing down on the Hong Kong strike implodes the CCP and escalates Chinese nationalism – star this card

Hiciano 20 [Lery Hiciano, graduate student at Claremont, 2020, “Nearly Halfway There: The Future of Hong Kong, China, and One Country Two Systems,” Claremont Colleges, https://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3513&context=cmc\_theses]/Kankee

Chapter 5: Domestic Legitimacy, The CCP, and Xi Jinping Today, Hong Kong’s democratic movements pose even less risk than before to China’s economic growth. In fact, 2019’s protest shows that an actively rebellious Hong Kong can still meet the requirements for China’s domestic market. With the 2047 date looming ever closer, the Central Government likely feels assured of eventual economic integration. The seriousness with which Beijing treats Hong Kong protest movements, as well as other offenses to China’s territorial integrity, are driven not by economic concerns, but more foundationally by concern about the CCP’s ability to survive into the future. Mainland reactions to the protests of 2003 and 2012 compared to the protests of 2014 and 2019 demonstrate China’s policymakers have become significantly less tolerant of Hong Kong demands for democracy, autonomy, and personal freedoms. The balancing act between Beijing’s credibility, China’s domestic security, and defense of its territorial sovereignty on one hand, and the need for a prosperous, placated Hong Kong on the other, is the central issue in Beijing’s calculations regarding the territory. The CCP betrays its anti-colonial roots when it suppresses local autonomy in the name of unification. China is not the first nation that disregarded its revolutionary origins. Zakaria’s theories are founded in the fact that the U.S underwent a similar process when it went from advocating a European-free hemisphere to seeking its own colonies. Within China, the same fears of Hong Kong secessionism and pro-independence ring even louder as Chinese officials view Hong Kong as merely an arena for Chinese nationalism to compete with local elements. As one expert put it, “Hong Kong’s resilient struggle for autonomy is seen as presenting similar challenges already apparent in China’s peripheries: terror attacks in Xinjiang, self-immolations in Tibet, and political agitation in Taiwan.”180 Xinjiang and Tibet, although different due to the role ethnicity has played in both region’s resistance to Chinese rule and subsequent Chinese tactics of repression, are fundamentally related to the issue of Hong Kong and stages on which the CCP can demonstrate its commitment to territorial integrity no matter the cost. Snyder’s most relevant observation is that states’ adherence to the myth of domino theory

“losses in the empire’s periphery can easily bring a collapse of power at the imperial core” – can lead to strategic blunders and over-expansion.181 He cites this as, additionally, a product of the myth of the “turbulent frontier,” the belief that the best defensive strategy is one that continuously expands into the periphery in order to tame anarchic forces seeking to undermine the state in those same territories. Some of the first moves made by the newly founded PRC were on shoring up periphery, on the national front invading Tibet and forcing the Dalai Lama into exile, reintegrating the nascent second East Turkestan Republic into Xinjiang (literally translated to “new frontier”), and the First Taiwan Crisis. Within China, the concept of untamed, peripheral, frontiers is central to the nation’s creation myth. Zhongguo, or China, most accurately translates to “middle country,” a designation derived from the old imperial system in which the Chinese emperor not only governed China, but in fact, invested legitimacy in other monarchs. Confucian maps from pre-modern China show a world in which the emperor is at the center, with each concentric ring radiating out, signifying not just physical distance, but also cultural distance, or civilizational distance. Cartographers placed Korea in the second ring, since Koreans adopted Confucianism and used Chinese characters. Semi-nomadic, semi-Confucian barbarians in areas under nominal Chinese authority made up the third ring. Beyond them, untamed nomadic settlers made up the fourth. Centralized, Chinese authorities delegating autonomy to frontier, non-Chinese groups is part of a wider web of narratives that nationalist groups promote as an integral part of China’s legacy. The PRC, deriving legitimacy from this historical tradition, no doubt was inspired by dynastic precedent. The original basis for OCTS, even before Deng offered it to Taiwan, has its roots in a 17-point proposal from 1951 to allow Tibet to maintain autonomy. That proposal itself derived from Qing imperial policy that encouraged border areas to maintain local autonomy for a short period of time, before eventual integration within China. As Ho-fung Hung states, “The “one country, two systems” formula for Hong Kong is just a tactical and transitional arrangement. What awaits Hong Kong is what Tibet has seen since 1959: forced assimilation and tight direct control by Beijing.”182 Part of the CCP’s suppression of Hong Kong’s autonomy is the use of very paternal language. Xi himself stated in a 2017 speech, “It has been 20 years since Hong Kong’s return. According to China’s tradition, a man enters adulthood at the age of 20. So today, we are celebrating the coming of age of the Hong Kong Special Administration Region (HKSAR), which has grown with the vigor of a bamboo or pine tree.”183 His language is obviously patronizing, and by specifying that the HKSAR had not yet entered “adulthood,” he reduces the conflicts of the Umbrella Movement to adolescent rebelliousness. Xi’s words speak to a larger trend of thought within the ranks of the CCP. Another official once stated that Hong Kong residents’ different understanding of OCTS necessitated not just “serious attention,” but that “the people of Hong Kong should be re-enlightened about the ‘one country, two systems’ policy.”184 Behind this rhetoric, it is clear that there is growing tension within the PRC to how to resolve the issues within Hong Kong. Ultimately, the CCP finds itself at a critical juncture. Its core interests, and the lengths it goes to in order to protect them from slights, betray an inherent insecurity within the CCP apparatus. It has been abundantly clear for much of the decade that the way forward for the CCP and China looks very different from the path it has taken so far. The same methods of economic growth are no longer possible, the demographics of the nation are different, the global stage is changed, and institutional ossification within the CCP has only further set in. The 2019 Hong Kong protests touched on various sensitive nerves within a party that is increasingly wary of threats, however real or imaginary, to its rule. Simultaneously, the CCP is currently led by Xi Jinping, who is the first leader since Mao to abandon the party’s practices of ruling-bycommittee. The CCP Within a State-Party system such as China, the fundamental goal of the party is to survive. Following Mao, the CCP staked its legitimacy on economic progress, with its nationalist defense of Chinese honor in close second.185 To describe nationalism as natural, or to assume Chinese people are inherently more nationalistic than others, would be a mistake. The CCP has made it an explicit goal to foster nationalism within China through educational means and statecontrolled media. The Taiwan issue became the third rail of Chinese politics because of years of propaganda initiatives. It is such a problem that many within China, from officials to military generals to average citizens, remain convinced that “No regime could survive the loss of Taiwan.”186 There is no way for any observer to know if this is true, but Shirk states, “…the myth linking the political survival of the CCP regime to Taiwan is so pervasive that it creates its own political reality, especially in Communist Party headquarters.”187 If Taiwanese independence, something that has been the de-facto reality for seven decades, is a threat to the CCP’s survival, then Hong Kong’s moving away from China through democracy would assuredly be a setback. Hong Kong’s independence, the first time China would have lost territory following the Century of Shame, would be such a disaster for the party’s ability to rule that it is not mentioned as a potential possibility. The question of regime survival in the aftermath of Taiwanese, or worse, Hong Kong secession, is a question Chinese leadership is keen to avoid, hence the tension around the lack of any law in the territory supporting Article 23. The CCP’s Propaganda Ministry is ultimately responsible for the wellspring of domestic pressure that a Chinese official has termed a “hostage” situation, in which Chinese citizens, taught to care about Taiwan and Hong Kong as integral territories of China cut off by foreign powers, refuse to allow government acquiescence. The Chinese Communist Party depends on its nationalist image: the party fought off Japanese invasion in World War II, won the Civil War despite the KMT receiving significant amounts of foreign aid, and eventually negotiated the peaceful return of Hong Kong and Macau back to Chinese sovereignty. In the 1990s, in the aftermath of Tiananmen Square, the breakup of the Soviet Union, the impending return of Hong Kong, and the Taiwan Strait Crisis, the Propaganda Ministry led the “patriotic education campaign” to improve CCP legitimacy, a strategy that now severely distorts rhetoric with regards to Hong Kong democratic movements or Taiwanese elections. The Chinese professor who said that China can afford to let Taiwan go dared not voice this opinion even in a time of “soft politics” and the current domestic political situation in Mainland China is far from the softer politics that dominated pre-2008 and especially pre-Xi Jinping.188 In describing the CCP’s crisis of nationalism, Snyder states, “it may nonetheless become politically entrapped in its own rhetoric. Insofar as the elite’s power and policies are based on society’s acceptance of imperial myths, its rule would be jeopardized by renouncing the myths when their side effects become costly. To stay in power and to keep central policy objectives intact, elites may have to accept some unintended consequences of their imperial sales pitch.”189 In this case, the unintended consequences include political upheaval and the potential dissolution of the stateparty apparatus. Conventional logic dictates Chinese political survival is staked upon satisfying not the opinion of the “silent majority,” Chinese citizens who mostly likely could do without Taiwan or Hong Kong if it guaranteed continued economic growth, but instead those citizens who feel so strongly and buy into nationalist rhetoric so much that they may participate in mass protests against the government.190 This had led to a growing problem within Chinese policy-making: the country’s military power continues to increase relative to the United States and Taiwan, yet the party has lost control of the narrative of Taiwan’s flirtation with independence or US undermining of strategic interests.191 Furthermore, this nationalist juggernaut occurred nearly simultaneously with Taiwan’s switch from authoritarian, Chinese-facing and mainlander-dominated rule, to a democratic system in which younger generations of Taiwanese lack the romantic ideals of a reunified China.192 Ergo, the “unintended consequences” originally conceived decades ago have continuously increased in volatility. An earlier example of this would be the anti-American protests following the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade. 193 If such an accident were to happen today, with higher tensions, more modern weapons, and current leadership, the ensuing crisis could quickly spiral into conflict. In China’s Hong Kong, A Political and Cultural Perspective, Jiang Shigong attempts to reflect on Hong Kong’s role within China. Throughout the work, he uses the word “empire” with positive connotations, actively encouraging the CCP to incorporate elements of dynastic legitimacy and justifying the CCP’s decisions in Hong Kong by saying it ensured “patriotic people ruled Hong Kong.”194 According to him, “The return of Hong Kong was legitimate in political philosophy. Its legitimacy came from historical traditions- ‘Hong Kong as a part of China since ancient times.”195 The emphasis on history goes hand in hand with his earlier quote on “coercion” via modernity. Modernity inconveniences the government because Basic Law, the Sino-British Joint Declaration, and OCTS are not agreements that can easily be ignored. Ideally for him, the CCP could pick and choose when ‘one country’ or ‘two systems’ takes priority. However, his main thesis is that China must transform the identity of Hong Kong residents into people who first and foremost identify with the Chinese nation, or the arrangement of OCTS will never be sufficient. This is an opinion that is not unique to him, but that has circulated within policy-making circles.196 Jiang is not a harmless intellectual- he served as a researcher within the Hong Kong and Macau Liaison office, where he published several books.197 Throughout Jiang’s work, as well as in state media coverage of the city, the city’s history and independent culture is often reduced. Wai-Man Lam writes, “Hong Kong is re-emphasised, and in fact minimalised by Chinese officials as an economic city.”198 To briefly return to Anderson’s theories on nationalism and national identities, the goal of this language is to ensure that the imagined community of Hong Kong not only stays on the sub-national level, but that its existence is reduced to the imagination of just a few. Acknowledgement of democratic demands, or infractions against Basic Law, would implicitly not just support protestors, but also implicitly support the other imagined communities that the CCP hopes to erase. Even Xi himself stated, “China’s continuous and rapid development over the years provides an invaluable opportunity, an inexhaustible source of strength, and a broad space for Hong Kong’s development. As a saying in Hong Kong goes, “After leaving Suzhou, a traveler will find it hard to get a ride on a boat,” meaning an opportunity missed is an opportunity lost.”199 Hong Kong protestors waving British or American flags, Western media outlets’ favorable depiction of democratic movements, and increasing mutual suspicion all play a part in mainland depictions of the protests. News stories for The People’s Daily, all throughout the Umbrella Movement, as well as the Anti-Extradition Protests, cite “hostile foreign forces” as attempting to undermine Chinese sovereignty.200 The Simon Cheng incident during the 2019 protest illustrates how protests strike at the heart of the CCP’s PR problem, and how the divergent international and domestic audiences conflict. In August, Chinese security forces detained, interrogated, and tortured Simon Cheng, a Hong Kong resident and British consulate worker. At the Hong Kong-Shenzhen high-speed rail link, Chinese police stopped Cheng and placed him on a train going back to Shenzhen, reinforcing the increasing blurriness of the legal boundaries between Hong Kong and the Mainland.201 During interrogation, police mostly focused on his role as an agent for the British government to incite unrest in Hong Kong UK government sources found his claims credible, and Chinese police later released a tape of Cheng confessing to soliciting prostitutes, a common tactic used to shame political prisoners. The incident greatly inflamed China-UK relations, whose officials increasingly took a pro-protestor position, and it also further incited anger in the city as Cheng alleged that with him in prison were several Hong Kong protestors. 202 However, domestically, it is effective for the CCP to kidnap a consular worker as it allows them to continue to cite outside enemies. This tactic not only perpetuates myths about a hostile Western world, when the reality is a much murkier situation of aggression on both sides, but also undermines the legitimate complaints of the Hong Kong population. In one small study about news coverage of the Hong Kong protests, the writers found that there was a negative correlation between nationalism and attitudes toward democracy or pro-democratic movements.203 The same study also showed that people who were against the protests were more likely to read state news media in China. Overseas Chinese who had access to outside sources were more likely to support protestors, and less likely to cite reasons such as “foreign forces” as arguments behind the protests. However, like many other propaganda tactics, this narrative severely limits the government’s ability to bargain with protestors. To acquiesce in Hong Kong is not to listen to fellow Chinese citizens, it is to be misled by the West once again attempting to transform China into a liberal democracy. Therefore, the protests, Hong Kong, and democracy are inextricable from the tension in China’s relationship with the United States. Snyder’s relevant observations do not end at merely describing domino theory. His analysis of the domestic situations within Japan and Germany that led both countries down a path of world war and eventual destruction has several parallels within modern day China. He finds that late industrialization, including “large government role in in mobilizing and allocating investment, centralized financial institutions, relatively low levels of mass consumption, and economic concentration in the hands of a few giant cartels,” played a massive role in the expansion undertaken by both nations, as the melding of government and financial institutions led to a feedback loop with little space for democratic intervention.204 China’s economic rise demonstrates all of these issues: state-owned enterprises dominate the economy and a political banking sector secures cheap lines of credit for favorite firms. Successful Chinese enterprises often work in tandem with the state on matters such as trade policy and the development of technologies considered essential for the CCP’s larger goals. The limited levels of consumption in turn limit firm’s abilities to expand within China’s domestic market, and contribute to severe wealth stratification and income inequality that threatens cohesion as economic progress is confined to select urban areas primarily located on the eastern seaboard.205 The byzantine nature of the CCP, with its many councils, committees, and massive membership adds more complications with regard to China’s policy aims. As Snyder explains, a cartelized government, in which various different factions pull policy in different ways may lead to a situation in which the end result is an unintended consequence by all parties involved. In China, this is reflected in the complex process by which CCP leadership is chosen, a process that over the years has increasingly played out in the public sphere. For example, during the campaigns by Bo Xilai and Xi Jinping, both publicly criticized each other in the media, previously unheard of within internal CCP politics.206 Nien-Ching Chang Liao states, “China’s provocative behavior is driven by the dysfunctional internal dynamics of the government’s decision-making process. Certain ministries or agencies- the military, the fishing industry, the oil industry, various maritime agencies, provincial governments, and other local actors- might harbor parochial objectives of increasing their budget, promoting trade, or ensuring adequate supplies of energy.”207 The different goals of various government actors, either local officials, leaders of state-owned enterprises, or institutional actors, reflects inconsistency and unreliability. How does this relate to Hong Kong? Due to the autonomy promised within Basic Law, the Liaison Office in Hong Kong, the Office of the HKSAR in Beijing, and the Office of the Commissioner of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region all influence policy with regards to Hong Kong. Some believe that the Hong Kong government’s initial missteps during the early stages of 2019’s crisis were caused in part by the conflicting instructions received from different offices. 208 Therefore, not only does cartelization make China’s domestic and foreign policy unwieldly, it also played a direct role in how the situation in Hong Kong deteriorated further.

#### The perception of backing down on a “core interest” magnifies the link – the aff is seen as compromising national sovereignty

Hiciano 20 [Lery Hiciano, graduate student at Claremont, 2020, “Nearly Halfway There: The Future of Hong Kong, China, and One Country Two Systems,” Claremont Colleges, https://scholarship.claremont.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3513&context=cmc\_theses]/Kankee

Core Interests In Mainland criticisms and observations of Hong Kong’s status, several sources present a focus on the definition of “one country.” In another speech contained within The Governance of China, Xi highlights that for OCTS to function, there must be a “strong sense of one country.” He further adds that sovereignty is not for negotiation, and that it is China’s “red line.”209 The mythmaking around China’s history: the imperial system that placed Han civilization at the center of the world, which was then erased in “The Century of Shame,” in turn defines the CCP’s core interests. The nationalist core of CCP legitimacy and mythmaking is that the party will be the vanguard to lead China out of the ruins of that horrible period. Starting with the First Opium War and continuing until the CCP’s victory over the communists, China was the scene of some of history’s most tragic stories. The First Opium War was followed by the Second Opium War, the Taiping Rebellion, Dungan Rebellion, Boxer Rebellion, the First Sino-Japanese War, the Warlord Period, the First Chinese Civil War, and the Second World War. In one century, China suffered tens of millions of deaths inflicted by combat, disease, famine, and natural disasters. Following the CCP’s victory in 1949, Chinese leaders across different eras have all explicitly made reference to the goal of returning the nation to its previous heights. Despite the party’s missteps in the 20th century, it has succeeded in rapidly moving China up in the global hierarchy. In a country such as China, a framework like OCTS is particularly groundbreaking because it is an agreement between the CCP and the people of Hong Kong. Not only that, it is also an agreement with the people of China, as it forever alters the contract between rulers and subjects by creating distinctions between the rights of different subnational entities. At the same time, it drastically widens the purview of “politics,” as the individual distinctions between subnational entities are negotiated. To do this between the PRC, a nominally communist authoritarian state, and one of the world’s most free-market cities required a significant amount of compromise to ensure a smooth transition. One writer states, “By casting reunification as an uncompromisable issue of national sovereignty, the Chinese government made this a default justification for all political, economic, social, and cultural changes. That is, reunification with Hong Kong demanded the supreme power of sovereignty to act ethically by not abiding by existing (Maoist) socialist norms and laws.” Now that the initial transition is complete, the justifications used to drive reform and originally put forward the concept of OCTS can now be used to harshly respond to the city’s democratic impulses. As the matter of reunification is “uncompromisable” to the extent that socialism is no longer at the core of the CCP, at the very least in one area, then any attempts to damage that relationship strike at the heart of the CCP’s authority. Since 2009, the CCP has given the general policies associated with this goal the name “core interests.”210 Starting with the territorial claims in Taiwan, Tibet, and Xinjiang, they have now expanded to include regime stability, and continued economic development. The CCP is unwilling to negotiate on these issues. However, the full list of core interests as defined by the CCP has never been published or revealed. One army advisor stated, “as China becomes stronger, we can publicize by installments those core interests that our country can effectively safeguard”211 That quote is a clear admission that as China gains strength, the core interests will expand. In other words, there is no effective route of appeasement or clear stopping point for China’s potential expansion. However, the CCP is not only unwilling to negotiate on this vague list of issues, it also has a tendency to force others to acknowledge its position. For external audiences, the punishment for failing to follow the CCP agenda could come in the form of economic sanctions or corporate espionage. H.R McMaster, a former White House national security advisor, stated that the CCP’s tactics were “successful in part because the party is able to induce cooperation, wittingly or unwittingly, from individuals, companies, and political leaders.”212 In 2010, the CCP sanctioned Norway for the decision to award a Nobel Prize to dissident Liu Xiaobo. In another episode, Marriot International Hotels had to apologize for “violating national laws and hurting the feelings of the Chinese people” after perhaps insinuating that Tibet, Hong Kong, Macau, and Taiwan are independent from China.213 When Daryl Morey, General Manager of the Houston Rockets, tweeted his support for the 2019 Hong Kong Protests, the Houston Rockets had all their games banned from Chinese television, with threats that the same would happen to other NBA franchises. Other international firms consistently face the same pressure to conform to these narratives. Internal audiences, subject to actual enforcement of these policies, have no ability to dissent. The CCP’s track record regarding human rights and civil liberties is well-known to be abysmal. Human rights activists accurately compare it to a 21st century 1984, complete with mass surveillance, censored news & media, advanced facial recognition software, and much more. The personal costs of disagreeing can be extraordinarily high, even for something as apparently innocuous as a social media post. This also obscures whatever the true opinions of Chinese citizens may be. During the 2019 Hong Kong protests, many famous Chinese celebrities posted messages in support of the police or of the CCP.214 However, could any celebrity realistically have posted any message in support of the protestors? In a recent Athenaeum speech at Claremont McKenna College, a Chinese human rights lawyer questioned if the “resistance” had the ability to resist, if the state had made it impossible to do so. Hong Kong residents, through cases such as the disappearances of the booksellers, have already seen what awaits them under the CCP’s human rights regime. The CCP has succeeded in lasting this long by continuously adapting, however it is approaching the longest rule ever by a single party government. Minxin Pei, a foremost China expert, writes about how the CCP has survived by fueling mass consumerism, nationalism, and learning how to “fine tune” its repression tactics.215 However, with slowing economic growth and contentious power politics in the Asia-Pacific, it remains to be seen if increased repression is an effective tool with which to ensure regime survival. In South Korea and Taiwan, the authoritarian, economically focused, developmental states eventually gave way to democratic transitions. China is now nearing the point at which middle class citizens would call for democracy and greater participation in government ($10,000 per capita GDP).216 It remains to be seen whether in the face of growing potential crises, the CCP once again faces internal calls for democracy.

#### Authoritarianism limits the CCP’s ability to make concessions

Sala 19 [Ilaria Maria Sala, journalist based in Hong Kong, 8-7-2019, "Hong Kong Strikes, and Strikes a Nerve in Beijing The Chinese government is acting as though it would come unmoored if it made any concession to the protesters.," NYT, https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/07/opinion/hong-kong-protests-strike-china.html]/Kankee

This is not to say that all Hong Kongers are of one mind. Demonstrations in support of the police have taken place regularly, too, if less frequently and with fewer participants. In those rallies, which are never visited by riot police officers, participants stress their support for China, waving Chinese flags and wielding banners that declare their roots in various Chinese cities and provinces. The fault line running through Hong Kong is, more and more, about how much the city should be allowed to maintain its distinct identity or be refashioned as China’s Hong Kong. On Tuesday, Yang Guang, the spokesman for the Hong Kong and Macau Affairs Office in Beijing, held his office’s second news conference since the beginning of the crisis more than two months ago. Previously, the office had only one in more than two decades, after Britain handed control of Hong Kong to China in 1997. Mr. Yang didn’t address any of the protesters’ grievances or demands, such as the withdrawal of the proposed extradition bill that set off the unrest or an independent inquiry into police brutality. The mainland authorities repeated their support for the city’s chief executive and the police. They strongly condemned the violence — by protesters, that is — calling them “reckless violent groups” who will “pay the price if they play with fire.” They admonished, patronizingly, that all this striking and demonstrating was damaging Hong Kong’s economy. “Do not mistake our restraint as being soft,” Mr. Yang also said. “Do not underestimate the central government’s determination in maintaining stability.” It was a veiled threat, and an admission of weakness, too. One of the most powerful governments in the world is acting as though it would come unmoored if it made any concession to popular demands. China seems as fragile as only a truly authoritarian government can be.

#### Declining credibility causes CCP war over Taiwan to distract attention – it’s a key driver of Chinese political dynamics

Blumenthal 20 [Dan Blumenthal, senior fellow and the director of Asian studies at the American Enterprise Institute9-28-2020, "China's aggressive tactics aim to bolster the Communist Party's legitimacy," American Enterprise Institute - AEI, https://www.aei.org/articles/chinas-aggressive-tactics-aim-to-bolster-the-communist-partys-legitimacy/]/Kankee

Why does China seem to be on the warpath? In the first half of the 2020, Chinese soldiers killed dozens of Indian troops over disputed borders, sank a Vietnamese fishing vessel, and launched a record number of incursions into Taiwanese airspace. Beyond military coercion, China’s belligerence included selling arms to Serbia despite concerns expressed by NATO about military dependence, pressuring the WHO to censor anti-China content, and sentencing a Canadian national to death. and placing crushing tariffs on Australia for criticizing Beijing’s handling of the coronavirus. The prevailing wisdom is that Beijing is more aggressive now because it is ascendant and the United States is distracted and declining. This “Chinese ascendancy school” argues that President Xi Jinping has successfully consolidated domestic power and built China’s military and economic might to enable his vision of an aggressive, revisionist foreign policy. But this account is overly-simplistic: Chinese aggression is not merely a result of China’s strength, but also of its weakness. Xi Jinping’s overwhelming concern with domestic stability, the Chinese Communist Party’s (CCP) legitimacy and party unity are crucial drivers of China’s bellicosity. China has faced two disasters in 2020—the coronavirus and historic floods—which exposed its fragilities and created internal unrest. Its response to both was the same: escalating aggression against its neighbors. China’s economic and military power made these provocations possible, but its need to suppress internal divisions made them necessary. The question is not why China has disputes with neighbors, but why now. If China’s aggression were only a result of its economic and military strength, then it could have paused its aggressive foreign policy as the political leadership back in Beijing refocused on dealing with the destructive wages of the coronavirus. Typically, governments in chaos have little time for adventurism abroad and must focus on remedies at home. In fact, many experts predicted that China would face inward during 2020, to focus on restarting economic growth and preventing new coronavirus cases. Yet for the CCP, external aggression is a necessary tool to combat internal weakness. The CCP is obsessed with its fragilities, such as the threat of losing popular support and legitimacy and demands for more justice and freedoms. When Chinese people criticize their government, China must act more aggressively abroad. Beijing uses external aggression to fan Chinese nationalism and cast the CCP as the protector of the people and champion of a new era of Chinese glory. Coronavirus was a true moment of weakness for the CCP, as it exposed fissures in China’s overcentralized authoritarian political system to light. A now-infamous example of Chinese paranoia over potentially out-of-control domestic crises was the case of Dr. Li Wenliang. On February 7, Li, a doctor who warned of the coronavirus but was quickly censored by the Wuhan police, died from the virus himself. Li’s death quickly became the top trending topic on Chinese social media with hashtags such as “We want freedom of speech.” The CCP censored all mentions of Li or any coronavirus failings, fearing more organized protests. Simultaneously, the coronavirus battered China’s economic growth, which underpins the CCP’s claim to legitimacy, with an unprecedented 6.8 percent Q1 contraction. Far from the unified front which Beijing seeks to project, the coronavirus revealed the CCP’s dysfunction. For example, Dali, a midsize city, intercepted and distributed a shipment of surgical masks headed to the hard-hit municipality of Chongqing. Similarly, the City of Qingdao instructed customs officials to hold on to a shipment of masks and medical products headed to Shenyang. At the same time, Hong Kong dealt the CCP a major political embarrassment when it halted traffic coming in from the mainland. These reports demonstrate the government’s inability to enforce basic order among competing cities and provinces. In response to the tumult caused by the coronavirus crisis, the CCP mobilized popular support by reigniting conflicts with its neighbors. On April 2, during the peak of the coronavirus, a Chinese maritime security vessel sank a Vietnamese fishing boat near the Parcel islands. Just two weeks later on April 16, China escalated a month’s long standoff with Malaysia by deploying the coast guard to a disputed oil shelf. China also stepped up its military activities targeting Taiwan—who’s coronavirus response was strong and effective—with as many as three incursions in a single week in June. These episodes were widely condemned by the international community, but greeted with nationalist revelry at home. The need to project strength and unity domestically explains the timing of China’s border dispute with India. In May, violent brawls broke out between Chinese and Indian soldiers near Sikkim. On June 15, the Indian government reported that twenty Indian soldiers were killed by Chinese soldiers in the Galwan River Valley, a disputed border region controlled by India but claimed by China. The CCP has made full use of the crisis to rally nationalism. China’s foreign ministry issued statements blaming India for the clashes and state-propaganda popularized the slogan “China is not afraid.” The Global Times, a propaganda outlet, cast the clashes as an Indian invasion, saying “India has illegally constructed defense facilities across the border into Chinese territory in the Galwan Valley region.” Importantly, Chinese state-owned news outlets were also running news about India’s poor coronavirus response at the time, in contrast to its own “successes.” The recent border clashes mirror China’s 2017 standoff with India at Doklam, a strategic point near Bhutan. During the conflict, Foreign Minister Wang Yi made statements that cast the conflict as an Indian attack upon China, and state media circulated images from the 1962 Sino-Indian War, to remind the China populace that Beijing had defeated Delhi before. The India clashes coincided with another threat to CCP legitimacy: a fight to remove pro-democracy advocates from the Hong Kong Legislative Council. China ended up harshly cracking down on the supposedly autonomous city as well. Understanding China’s weaknesses is essential for policymakers attempting to make sense of its aggression. This dynamic is not only a Xi Jinping phenomenon: China’s modern history shows that domestic crises are often followed by belligerence. A study that pre-dated Xi’s rule, with a dataset of over three thousand interactions between the United States and China, found that the CCP was twice as likely to initiate disputes when the Shanghai Stock Exchange (SSE) experienced a substantial drop. The SSE is a barometer of elite sentiment in China because the government pledges to protect elite investments and uses SSE listings to reward party insiders. Insight into the CCP’s domestic political objectives helps determine the magnitude of the conflict and appropriate response. The editor of the Global Times wrote that a belligerent foreign policy was “necessary to satisfy the Chinese people.” Policymakers can use history to deduce what levels of aggression are “necessary” for the CCP’s goals. In India, it is unlikely that clashes will escalate into invasion because the current skirmishes satisfy the CCP’s purpose of bolstering legitimacy. However, Taiwan may be in particular danger from China’s reactionary aggression. This is because the ways in which conflict with Taiwan would bolster the CCP’s legitimacy align more closely with more violent coercion—reunification is a core element of the CCP’s platform and Taiwan’s clear success fighting the coronavirus is a major blow to Beijing’s legitimacy. Because Taiwan’s “threat” to the CCP stems from its mere existence, it is particularly vulnerable to reactionary aggression. Xi is a self-proclaimed follower of Mao. So, the 1958 Taiwan Strait Crisis is a powerful example; Mao needed to generate support for the great leap forward and deflect criticism from poor economic growth. To stir the nation, Mao seized islands controlled by Taiwan and threatened an invasion of the country until restrained by American nuclear brinksmanship. Over the last three months, China has faced another crisis in the form of historic floods. The Yangtze river basin has been inundated, affecting sixty-three million Chinese and inflicting over twenty-five billion dollars in direct damages. Many Chinese have raised concerns that the government’s massive infrastructure projects have worsened the crisis by draining wetlands and promoting development in flood-prone areas. Poor transparency has stirred more backlash as the CCP has been accused of hiding the extent of damages and censoring criticism. One political commentator in Beijing even predicted that the “Chinese public will question Beijing from this year’s continuous natural and man-made disasters, and even question China’s governance model and its effectiveness.” Instead of hoping that the crisis created by the current floods will give China’s neighbors breathing space, the United States should brace itself for the possibility of renewed aggression. The CCP must prove its worthiness to the tens of millions of displaced people across China, making it prone to lashing out. Taiwan may be an appealing target; it has been spared from flooding and has been visible in assisting neighboring countries like Japan with post-flood reconstruction. Already, China has begun live-fire sea-crossing drills near Taiwan. Recognizing the nature of the problem is the first step to successfully confronting China’s threats. China’s aggression is enabled by its power but motivated by its fragility. The coronavirus crisis makes it clear that the CCP views external aggression as a key tool to shore up its domestic support and legitimacy. Instead of viewing China’s aggressions merely as a “natural” function of its supposedly inevitable ascendency, neighbors, policymakers should start examining China’s weaknesses for signs of looming threats. The United States and its allies can both better prepare for onslaughts of aggression and devise better deterrent policies.

## T Just gov

#### Interpretation: the affirmative must defend that only just governments ought to recognize the right to strike

#### Just governments respect liberties

Dorn 12 James A. Dorn, Cato Journal, "The Scope of Government in a Free Society", Fall 2012, https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2012/12/v32n3-10.pdf

If laws are just, liberty and property are secure. The most certain test of justice is negative—that is, justice occurs when injustice (the violation of natural rights to life, liberty, and property) is prevented. The emphasis here is on what Hayek (1967) called “just rules of conduct,” not on the fairness of outcomes. No one has stated the negative concept of justice better than the 19th century French classical liberal Frederic Bastiat ([1850] 1964: 65): When law and force confine a man within the bounds of justice, they do not impose anything on him but a mere negation. They impose on him only the obligation to refrain from injuring others. They do not infringe on his personality, or his liberty or his property. They merely safeguard the personality, the liberty, and the property of others. They stand on the defensive; they defend the equal rights of all. They fulfill a mission whose harmlessness is evident, whose utility is palpable, and whose legitimacy is uncontested. In short, the purpose of a just government is not to do good with other people’s money, but to prevent injustice by protecting property and securing liberty.

#### Violation—[china] is not just. It commits genocide against Uyghurs and denies it

BBC 21 Who are the Uyghurs and why is China being accused of genocide?, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-22278037,

Human rights groups believe China has detained more than one million Uyghurs against their will over the past few years in a large network of what the state calls "re-education camps", and sentenced hundreds of thousands to prison terms.

There is also evidence that Uyghurs are being used as forced labour and of women being forcibly sterilised. Some former camp detainees have also alleged they were tortured and sexually abused.

The US is among several countries to have accused China of committing genocide in Xinjiang. The leading human rights groups Amnesty and Human Rights Watch have published reports accusing China of crimes against humanity.

China denies all allegations of human rights abuses in Xinjiang, claiming its system of "re-education" camps are there to combat separatism and Islamist militancy in the region.

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Precision — 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.

#### 2] Limits – there are 200 governments in the world – letting them pick an unjust ones explodes limits via infinite permutations of governments

#### 3] Phil ed – 1AR will claim no government is just but that just means that we defend ideal theory. That’s good –

#### A] forces philosophical contestation which can uniquely happen in LD debate whereas you can util debate on any topic

#### B] outweighs – framework debate allows to identify injustice which is a prereq to any other theory voter because they’re all philosophically grounded

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Outweighs because it’s the only intrinsic part of debate – all other rules can be debated over but rely on some conception of fairness to be justified.

#### Edu- funded ny schools

#### No RVI’s- illogical, baiting

#### C/A other paradigm issues

## E Spec

#### Interpretation: Debaters must specify how they enforce the unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### 1] Topic lit – enforcement is the core question of the topic and there's no consensus on normal means so you must spec. Weiss

Marley S. Weiss [Professor of Law, University of Maryland School of Law], 2000, “The Right To Strike In Essential Services Under United States Labor Law”, https://digitalcommons.law.umaryland.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2189&context=fac\_pubs

2. Strikes, Lockouts, and Other Lawful Primary Weapons under the NLRA The parties, both labor and management, are under a duty to bargain in good faith with each other, “but such obligation does not compel either party to agree to a proposal or require the making of a concession”. The essential idea here is that both sides must genuinely try to reach mutual agreement. However, this simple concept is extremely difficult to enforce, and employers too often resort to bad faith bargaining, bargaining on the surface with no real intention of concluding an agreement, as part of a strategy to eliminate union representation from the workplace. In addition, the duty to bargain is limited to matters falling within the Section 8(d) statutory phrase, “wages, hours, and other terms and conditions of employment”, and the right to strike is similarly limited to issues falling within the scope of mandatory bargaining as defined by that phrase. Although the phrase has been broadly construed in many respects, as to certain issues, the contrary has been the case. Capital redeployment, that is, relocation of operations, disinvestment in unionized plants, subcontracting, and plant closure decisions, provide employers with a potent set of weapons against unions. While bargaining over the effects of such decisions is plainly mandatory, the extent to which bargaining is required over the decisions themselves have been hotly contested.

#### This acts as a resolvability standard. Debate has to make sense and be comparable for the judge to make a decision which means it's an independent voter and outweighs.

#### 2] Stable advocacy – 1AR clarification delinks neg positions that prove why enforcement in a certain instance is bad by saying it isn't their method of enforcement – wrecks neg ballot access and kills in depth clash – CX doesn't check since it kills 1NC construction pre-round since I don't know advocacy till in round, and judges do not flow cross ex so its not verifiable.

#### 3] Prep skew – I don't know what they will be willing to clarify until CX which means I could go 6 minutes planning to read a disad and then get screwed over in CX when they spec something else.

# Case

#### Strikes fail and spark backlash – leads to fragmentation.

Grant and Wallace 91 [Don Sherman Grant; Ohio State University; Michael Wallace; Indiana University; “Why Do Strikes Turn Violent?” University of Chicago Press; March 1991; <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2781338.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aca3144a9ae9e4ac65e285f2c67451ffb>]//SJWen

\*\*RM = Resource-Mobilization, or Strikes

3. Violent tactics.-Violent tactics are viewed by RM theorists exclu- sively as purposeful strategies by challengers for inciting social change with little recognition of how countermobilization strategies of elites also create violence. The role of elite counterstrategies has been virtually ig- nored in research on collective violence. Of course, history is replete with examples of elites' inflicting violence on challenging groups with the full sanction of the state. Typically, elite-sponsored violence occurs when the power resources and legal apparatus are so one-sidedly in the elites' favor that the outcome is never in doubt. In conflicts with weak insiders, elites may not act so openly unless weak insiders flaunt the law. Typically, elite strategies do not overtly promote violence but rather provoke violence by the other side in hopes of eliciting public condemnation or more vigorous state repression of challenger initiatives. This is a critical dynamic in struggles involving weak insiders such as unions. In these cases, worker violence, even when it appears justified, erodes public support for the workers' cause and damages the union's insider status.

4. Homogeneity and similarity.-Many RM theorists incorrectly as- sume that members of aggrieved groups are homogeneous in their inter- ests and share similar positions in the social structure. This (assumed) homogeneity of interests is rare for members of outsider groups and even more suspect for members of weak-insider groups. Indeed, groups are rarely uniform and often include relatively advantaged persons who have other, more peaceful channels in which to pursue their goals. Internal stratification processes mean that different persons have varying invest- ments in current structural arrangements, in addition to their collective interest in affecting social change. Again, these forces are especially prev- alent for weak insiders: even the group's lowest-status members are likely to have a marginal stake in the system; high-status members are likely to have a larger stake and, therefore, less commitment to dramatic change in the status quo.

Internal differences may lead to fragmentation of interests and lack of consensus about tactics, especially tactics suggesting violent confronta- tion. While group members share common grievances, individual mem- bers may be differentially aggrieved by the current state of affairs or differentially exposed to elite repression. White's (1989) research on the violent tactics of the Irish Republican Army shows that working-class members and student activists, when compared with middle-class partici- pants, are more vulnerable to state-sponsored repression, more likely to be available for protest activities, and reap more benefits from political violence. When we apply them to our study of strike violence, we find that differences in skill levels are known to coincide with major intraclass 1120 Strikes divisions in material interests (Form 1985) and are likely to coincide with the tendency for violent action. For instance, skilled-craft workers, who are more socially and politically conservative than unskilled workers, are less likely to view relations with employers as inherently antagonistic and are prone to separate themselves from unskilled workers, factors that should decrease their participation in violence.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### 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.

#### king CI