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#### 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.

### Framing

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

#### 1] Only pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable – all other frameworks collapse.

Moen 16 [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281] TDI

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that **pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable**. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for **there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels**, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 **The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values.** If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the **pleasure is not good for anything further**; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes: “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that **pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.**

#### 2] Extinction first --- moral uncertainty.

**Bostrom 12** [(Nick Bostrom, Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford) “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority.” Global Policy, 2012] TDI

#### These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

### Adv—Growth

#### The advantage is Workforce Retention.

#### The Great Resignation is here: the world is entering an era of unprecedented labor shortage with no end in sight. Tharoor 10/18

Ishaan Tharoor, a columnist on the foreign desk of The Washington Post, where he authors the Today's WorldView newsletter and column. He previously was a senior editor and correspondent at Time magazine, based first in Hong Kong and later in New York. He also teaches an undergraduate seminar at Georgetown University on digital affairs and the global age, 10-18-2021, "The Great Resignation Goes Global," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2021/10/18/labor-great-resignation-global/, 10-23-2021//Aanya

In the United States, the phenomenon dubbed as the “Great Resignation” seems to be picking up speed. A record 4.3 million U.S. workers quit their jobs in August, according to new data from the Labor Department — a figure that expands to 20 million if measured back to April. Many of these resignations took place in the retail and hospitality sectors, with employees opting out of difficult, low-wage jobs. But the quitting spans a broad spectrum of the American workforce, as the toll of the pandemic — and the tortuous path to recovery — keeps fueling what Atlantic writer Derek Thompson has described as “a centrifugal moment in American economic history.” Wages are up and businesses face staffing shortages, while the experience of a sustained public health emergency has prompted myriad Americans to reevaluate their work options. “This [pandemic] has been going on for so long, it’s affecting people mentally, physically,” Danny Nelms, president of the Work Institute, a consulting firm, told the Wall Street Journal. “All those things are continuing to make people be reflective of their life and career and their jobs. Add to that over 10 million openings, and if I want to go do something different, it’s not terribly hard to do.” The “Great Resignation” in the United States was preceded by a far greater — decades-long, arguably — stagnation in worker wages and benefits. In lower-end jobs, earnings have not matched the pace of inflation, while work grew more informal and precarious. Workers’ rights activists now see a vital moment for a course correction. October has been a banner month for American organized labor, with major strikes across various industries sweeping the country. “Workers are harder to replace and many companies are scrambling to manage hobbled supply chains and meet pandemic-fueled demand for their products. That has given unions new leverage, and made striking less risky,” my colleagues reported. For the average worker in a developed Western economy, there are reasons for encouragement. “The truth is people in the 1960s and ’70s quit their jobs more often than they have in the past 20 years, and the economy was better off for it,” wrote Thompson in the Atlantic. “Since the 1980s, Americans have quit less, and many have clung to crappy jobs for fear that the safety net wouldn’t support them while they looked for a new one. But Americans seem to be done with sticking it out. And they’re being rewarded for their lack of patience: Wages for low-income workers are rising at their fastest rate since the Great Recession.” In social democratic Western Europe, a stronger safety net has led to somewhat less disruption in the workforce. But similar trends are at play: “Data collated by the OECD, which groups most of the advanced industrial democracies, shows that in its 38 member countries, about 20 million fewer people are in work than before the coronavirus struck,” noted Politico Europe. “Of these, 14 million have exited the labor market and are classified as ‘not working’ and ‘not looking for work.’ Compared to 2019, 3 million more young people are not in employment, education or training.” A survey published in August found that a third of all Germany companies were reporting a dearth in skilled workers. That month, Detlef Scheele, head of the German Federal Employment Agency, told Süddeutsche Zeitung newspaper that the country would need to import 400,000 skilled workers a year to make up for shortfalls in a host of industries, from nursing care to green tech companies. Pandemic-era border closures and rising wages in Central and Eastern European countries have led to shortages of meatpackers and hospitality workers in countries like Germany and Denmark. “Frankly, this is a pay issue,” said Andrew Watt, head of the European economics unit at the Macroeconomic Policy Institute at the German trade unions’ Hans Böckler Foundation, to Politico. “Wages will have to increase in these sectors to get people back into tough, low-paid jobs. That’s no bad thing.” But the story gets a bit more uneven, and certainly more grim, in the developing world. In Latin America and the Caribbean, 26 million people lost their jobs last year amid pandemic-era shutdowns, according to the U.N.'s International Labour Organization. The vast majority of jobs that have returned are in the informal sector, an outcome that often means even lower pay and greater precarity in a region already defined by profound economic inequality. “These are jobs that are generally unstable, with low wages, without social protection or rights,” said Vinícius Pinheiro, regional director for the ILO, at a briefing last month. He also noted the disproportionate impact of the pandemic on the region’s youth. According to one study earlier this year, 1 in 6 people aged between 18 and 29 in Latin America and the Caribbean had left work since the pandemic began. In Asia’s diverse economies, other pains are being felt. China is seeing its own version of the “Great Resignation,” with a younger generation of workers more disenchanted by their prospects and turned off by the relatively low wages in the manufacturing centers that powered China’s economic rise. Authorities in Beijing warn of a growing shortage of skilled workers in its crucial tech industry, a challenge for China’s leadership as it tries to steer the national economy toward more skilled sectors. And as global demand picks up after the fallow months of the pandemic, China’s factories are feeling the pinch of labor shortages Another labor-related pandemic phenomenon is crystallizing in neighboring Vietnam: Many migrant workers who left for their rural homes when jobs in big cities dried up amid lockdowns are not coming back. “It’s clear that there was extreme hardship faced by both businesses and workers during the prolonged lockdown,” said Mary Tarnowka, executive director of AmCham Vietnam in Ho Chi Minh City, to the Financial Times. “And there was particular pain and hardship for people at lower income levels who didn’t have money for rent or food.” In their villages, many of Asia’s working poor can at least count on roofs over their head and food to eat. It’s another form of resignation. Those who clung to what jobs they could keep were often coping with more dire conditions. When the pandemic snarled fast-fashion supply chains, millions of garment workers in South Asia, as a recent study by the Asia Floor Wage Alliance documented, had to swallow wage losses and endure work arrangements marked by widespread human rights abuses.In a survey interviewing 1,140 garment workers in Myanmar, Honduras, Ethiopia and India, researchers from Britain’s University of Sheffield and the U.S.-based Worker Rights Consortium found that a majority had been forced to borrow money and many incurred greater debt over the course of the pandemic. About a third of workers who changed jobs reported worse working conditions, including lower pay and more risk. “Workers were already not being paid fair wages and had little savings at the beginning of the pandemic,” said Zameer Awan, field worker with the Pakistan Institute of Labour Education and Research, to Reuters. “Now most are deep in debt and those who have found jobs again find themselves in more abusive conditions but without a voice anymore.”

#### A right to strike is crucial to negotiating conditions for workforce retention—but unchecked, companies lash out with dismissals. Bogage 10/17

Jacob Bogage, writes about business and technology for The Washington Post, where he's worked since 2015. He's previously covered the automotive and manufacturing industries and wrote for the Sports section. He has previously reported for the Columbia Missourian, Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune, Bethesda Magazine and the Montgomery County Gazette. He is a Maryland native and a graduate of the University of Missouri, 10-17-2021, "Strikes are sweeping the labor market as workers wield new leverage ," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2021/10/17/strikes-great-resignation/, 10-22-2021//Aanya

Marcial Reyes could have just quit his job. Frustrated with chronic understaffing at the Kaiser Permanente hospital where he works in Southern California, he knows he has options in a region desperate for nurses. Instead, he voted to go on strike. While Americans are leaving their jobs at staggering rates — a record 4.3 million quit in August alone — hundreds of thousands of workers with similar grievances about wages, benefits and quality of life are, like Reyes, choosing to dig in and fight. Last week, 10,000 John Deere workers went on strike, while unions representing 31,000 Kaiser employees authorized walkouts. Some 60,000 Hollywood production workers reached a deal Saturday night, averting a strike hours before a negotiation deadline. All told, there have been strikes against 178 employers this year, according to a tracker by Cornell University’s School of Industrial and Labor Relations. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, which records only large work stoppages, has documented 12 strikes involving 1,000 or more workers so far this year. That’s considerably higher than 2020, when the pandemic took hold, but in line with significant strike activity recorded in 2019 and 2018. The trend, union officials and economists say, is an offshoot of the phenomenon known as the Great Resignation, which has thinned the nation’s labor pool and slowed the economic recovery. Workers are now harder to replace, especially while many companies are scrambling to meet heightened demand for their products and manage hobbled supply chains. That has given unions new leverage, and made striking less risky. In interviews, workers and labor leaders said union members are angry with employers for failing to raise pay to match new profits and are disappointed by the lack of high-quality jobs. They also are frustrated that wage growth is not keeping pace with inflation. Although the average U.S. worker’s hourly pay was up 4 percent in September compared with a year ago, according to the St. Louis Federal Reserve, inflation grew 5.4 percent over the same period. “The strikes are sending a signal, no doubt about it, that employers ignore workers at their peril,” AFL-CIO President Liz Shuler said in an interview with The Washington Post. “I think this wave of strikes is actually going to inspire more workers to stand up and speak out and put that line in the sand and say, ‘We deserve better.’ ” Not all work stoppages have been successful. More than 1,000 Alabama miners have been on strike at Warrior Met Coal since April. That same month, 14 oil workers staged a walkout against United Metro Energy in New York; eight have since been fired, according to the local Teamsters branch. And roughly 1,400 workers at Kellogg Co. cereal factories in four states are entering their third week on the picket line. Still, the labor movement has drawn support from the White House. President Biden made a public statement supporting the Amazon union drive in Alabama — a rare move by a sitting president. And his constant calls to raise the federal minimum wage to $15 an hour have delighted labor leaders. In Fontana, Calif., Reyes is hopeful. As a covid-19 patient who spent a month in the same Kaiser hospital where he works, he has a unique perspective on pandemic-related staffing shortages. “I think I got the best care that I could have gotten at Kaiser,” he said. “Now it’s time to pay back the nurses that took care of me” by striking for additional resources. The strike drives in 2021 run the gamut of American industry: Nurses and health workers in California and Oregon; oil workers in New York; cereal factory workers in Michigan, Nebraska, Pennsylvania and Tennessee; television and film production crews in Hollywood; and more. The surge in strike activity has yielded mixed results, economists say. Though work stoppages this summer at Nabisco and Frito-Lay helped secure higher raises and new vacation allowances for workers, employers have not made meaningful increases in their workforces or compensation structures. Both sides acknowledge the benefit of retaining workers. Management more often would rather deal with a brief strike than absorb higher costs associated with turnover and training new staff. For the employee, a new job isn’t necessarily a better one. A “There’s a cost to searching and a cost to leaving your current employer,” said William M. Rodgers III, director of the Institute for Economic Equity at the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. “And maybe some of the desire to strike is predicated out of a level of loyalty that these people have been with this company for a good duration.” Unions increasingly are seeking changes in the workplace and corporate culture. Some strike drives are pushing for better safeguards against sexual harassment and coronavirus safety protocols, including one at El Milagro, a Chicago-based tortilla manufacturer. Workers at a West Virginia producer of industrial pump parts went on strike Oct. 1 seeking better seniority rights. Some are attempting to claw back perks that vanished years ago during economic downturns. Striking John Deere workers contend that the company’s massive profit during the pandemic — earnings nearly doubled to a record $1.79 billion last quarter — should be reflected in their compensation, particularly retirement benefits. More than 60,000 members of the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE), which represents Hollywood production workers, had planned to strike Monday unless they reached a deal with the Alliance of Motion Picture and Television Producers. The two sides arrived at a tentative agreement Saturday night that guarantees workers meal breaks, weekends and breaks between shifts, plus significant raises. “They do have to change the way they do business,” IATSE President Matthew D. Loeb said, “to avoid a strike, to have good morale and to have safe, healthy employees.” A spokesman for the television and film producers alliance did not respond to a request for comment. Labor leaders have defined wage demands as a new frontier for workers’ rights. Unions helped deliver the 40-hour workweek, they note, and the coronavirus crisis has reinforced the need to secure living wages and safer workplaces. “Especially during the pandemic, where people have worked overtime, they’ve sacrificed. They want to be acknowledged and appreciated,” Shuler said. Workers took notice when their companies publicly praised them as heroic and essential in the early days of pandemic, labor leaders and experts say, and it made them angry. Many saw a disconnect between the accolades and the realities of their jobs, and now interpret “essential” more broadly: They’re not only crucial to helping put food on families’ tables or treating patients, they’re essential to very companies they serve — and can inflict pain by shutting down or slowing operations. “A strike is really the last resort. That’s labor’s power, a worker’s power is to withhold their labor,” said Kim Cordova, president of the Colorado branch of the United Food and Commercial Workers Union. “A company can function without a CEO, but they can’t function without the workers to actually go do the work.”

#### High wages are the crucial internal link for continued growth.

Bivens 17 – PhD @ The New School for Social Research (Josh, “Inequality is slowing US economic growth,” *Economic Policy Institute*, <https://www.epi.org/publication/secular-stagnation/)//BB>

This new attention to the crisis of American pay is totally proper. The failure of wages of the vast majority of Americans to benefit from economy-wide growth in productivity (or income generated in an average hour of work) has been the root cause of the stratospheric rise in inequality and the concentration of economic growth at the very top of the income distribution. Had this upward redistribution not happened, incomes for the bottom 90 percent of Americans would be roughly 20 percent higher today.3 In short, the rise in inequality driven by anemic wage growth has imposed an “inequality tax” on American households that has robbed them of a fifth of their potential income. There would be huge benefits to American well-being from blocking or reversing this upward redistribution. This welfare gain stemming from blocking upward redistribution is the primary reason to champion policy measures to boost wage growth and lead to a more equal distribution of income gains. Put simply, a dollar is worth more to a family living paycheck to paycheck than it is to families comfortably in the top 1 percent of the income distribution. Proponents of increases in the minimum wage and other measures to boost American wages have often argued that there are benefits to these policies besides the welfare gains stemming from pure redistribution. These proponents have often argued that boosting wages would even benefit aggregate economic outcomes, like growth in gross domestic product (GDP) or employment. Recent evidence about developments in the American and global economies strongly indicate that these arguments are correct: boosting wages of the bottom 90 percent would not just raise these households’ incomes and welfare (a more-than-sufficient reason to do so), it would also boost overall growth. For the past decade (and maybe even longer), the primary constraint on American economic growth has been too-slow spending by households, businesses, and governments. In economists’ jargon, the constraint has been growth in aggregate demand lagging behind growth in the economy’s productive capacity (including growth of the labor force and the stock of productive capital, such as plants and equipment). Much research indicates that this shortfall of demand could become a chronic problem in the future, constantly pulling down growth unless macroeconomic policy changes dramatically.

#### Low wages reduce productivity and innovation.

Meuris and Leana 15 – Jirs Meuris, Ph.D, Katz Graduate School of Business, University of Pittsburgh, Leana, C. R., Ph.D, Katz Graduate School of Business, University of Pittsburgh, 2015 (“The high cost of low wages: Economic scarcity effects in organizations.” Research in Organizational Behavior (2015), Available online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2015.07.001>, Accessed 06-24-2018)

Knowledge and skill acquisition

Individual learning is crucial to organizational success because, to exploit external information and successfully initiate and implement innovations, employees need to acquire new knowledge and skills and apply them in their professional context (e.g., Cohen & Levinthal, 1990; Klein & Knight, 2005; Simon, 1991). Even in jobs that are constrained through their design (like many low-wage jobs), employee learning remains a key factor in promoting and sustaining organizational functioning. Cognitively, the spillover of economic scarcity affects employee learning by reducing the mental bandwidth available for the acquisition of new knowledge and skills. Increased cognitive load can undermine learning by diminishing the ability for acquisition and storage of information and cognitive schemas (Sweller, 1988), and the ability to provide consistent attention during training sessions (Nissen & Bullemer, 1987). Kanfer and Ackerman (1989) show that reduced attention to learning tasks reduced the acquisition of skills in Air Force cadets. Nissen and Bullemer (1987) also provide evidence for reductions in learning proficiency by finding that introducing a second simultaneous task prevented the learning of a repeating sequence. Indeed, most of the recent research on learning in educational psychology is based on limiting ‘‘extraneous cognitive load’’ to promote skill acquisition (see Van Merrie¨nboer & Sweller, 2010 for example). Economic scarcity can leave employees with less spare cognitive capacity available to devote to learning new information (e.g., Kahneman, 1973), which in turn can impede the ability of the organization to successfully design and implement novel work practices and technology.

#### Low wages cause deflation which decks the economy and leads to quantitative easing

Wessel 14 (David, Director of The Hutchins Center on Fiscal and Monetary Policy and Senior Fellow at the Brooking Institute, 10/16/14, “5 Reasons to Worry About Deflation”, https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/5-reasons-to-worry-about-deflation/, AZG)

So why worry? Here are five reasons: 1. Deflation is a generalized decline in prices and, sometimes, wages. Sure, if you’re lucky enough to get a raise, your paycheck goes further–but those whose wages decline or who are laid off or work fewer hours are not going to enjoy a falling price index. 2. It can be hard (though, as we’ve seen, not impossible) for employers to cut nominal wages when conditions warrant; it’s easier to give raises that are less than the inflation rate, which is what economists call a real wage cut. And if wages are, as economists say, marked by “downward nominal rigidity,” then employers will hire fewer people. As Paul Krugman put it in 2010: “in a deflationary economy, wages as well as prices often have to fall–and it’s a fact of life that it’s very hard to cut nominal wages. … What this means is that in general economies don’t manage to have falling wages unless they also have mass unemployment, so that workers are desperate enough to accept those wage declines. See Estonia and Latvia, cases of.” 3. As economic textbooks teach, the prospect that things will cost less tomorrow than they do today encourages people to put off buying. If enough people do that, then businesses are less likely to hire and invest, and that makes everything worse. 4. Deflation is terrible for debtors. Prices and wages fall, but the value of your debt does not. So you’re forced to cut spending. This applies to consumers and to governments, and it is one of the biggest issues in Europe right now. As Yale University economist Irving Fisher wrote decades ago, debtors are likely to cut spending more than creditors increase it, and this can turn into a really bad downward spiral. (The experience of Japan, though, proves that an economy can have a prolonged period of moderate deflation without falling into that downward spiral.) 5. Cutting interest rates below zero is very hard. Yes, one way that central bank magic works is that the Federal Reserve and the European Central Bank cut inflation-adjusted interest rates below zero when times are bad, hoping to spur borrowing, spending and investment. But it’s almost impossible for them to cut rates below zero. (Sure, there are some examples of negative interest rates, but they’re not very negative.) If there’s 4% inflation, a zero interest rate works out to a -4% real (or inflation-adjusted) rate. At no inflation, a zero interest rate is, well, zero. And with deflation, a zero interest rate is a positive real rate. Deflation just makes all this harder to do. When short-term rates hit zero the Fed turned to buying all those long-term bonds in what’s known as “quantitative easing,” or QE. But there is a lingering debate about how well QE works, and its side effects, and as the ECB demonstrates, there are political obstacles to launching QE that don’t apply to simply cutting interest rates. Once upon a time, the U.S. and other economies seemed so prone to inflation that even low rates of inflation didn’t provoke fears of deflation. “Today that belief in an inflationary bias is gone, or at least greatly attenuated,” Berkeley’s Brad DeLong observed in 1999. There are still some people fretting that, given all the money the Fed has pumped into the economy in quantitative easing, inflation is just around the corner. But today, the bigger fear–especially in Europe–is just the opposite.

#### Unions are critical to R&D and innovation.

Shin et al ’19 [Ilhang Shin, College of Business & Economics, Gachon University; Sorah Park, Ewha School of Business, Ewha Womans University; Seong Pyo Cho, School of Business, Kyungpook National University; Seungho Choi, Ewha School of Business, Ewha Womans University; “The effect of labor unions on innovation and market valuation in business group affiliations: new evidence from South Korea”; 10/26/19; Asian Bus Manage 19, 239–270 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41291-019-00089-9>; Accessed 7/7/20; NT] \*Edited for readability

In contrast, unions can facilitate innovation by reducing grievances and staff turnover or by improving employees’ moral and training (Freeman and Medof 1984). Ulph and Ulph (1989) argued that an increase in union power can actually increase R&D as the union bargains over employment and wages. Furthermore, unions may allow firms to increase the speed of diffusion and implementation of technology and, hence, increase the firm’s incentive to invest (Menezes-Filho et al. 1998a, b). For instance, in the European studies, there was no compelling evidence that unions have a detrimental effect on R&D (e.g., Menezes-Filho et al. 1998a, b; Schnabel and Wagner 1992). Menezes-Filho et al. (1998a) showed that a negative relationship between unions and R&D investment disappears when unions could control the availability of innovative technology in the industry in the UK. Furthermore, Menezes-Filho et al. (1998b) showed that unions in the UK improve a firm’s relative R&D performance. In addition, Schnabel and Wagner (1992) showed that unions do not impede innovation in Germany, because of the more cooperative nature of industrial relations. Strong labor unions may act as a corporate governance mechanism that monitors the agency problems, thereby mitigating managerial myopia. This may eventually encourage risk taking and innovative behaviors. According to Chen et al. (2011), labor unions can effectively monitor managerial actions because they can acquire their firms’ information more easily than can outside stakeholders can. Also, unions exert their power on management by using their bargaining power to increase the corporate transparency. For instance, affiliated labor unions in Korea have asked management to share information and to allow their participation in decision making in order to monitor whether managers harm the transparency and betray the trust of stakeholders.2

**Slower growth wrecks US leadership which is a prerequisite to solving all impacts**

Richard Haass 17, President of the Council on Foreign Relations, previously served as Director of Policy Planning for the US State Department (2001-2003), and was President George W. Bush's special envoy to Northern Ireland and Coordinator for the Future of Afghanistan “A World in Disarray: American Foreign Policy and the Crisis of the Old Order” published January 10, 2017

A large portion of the burden of creating and maintaining order at the regional or global level will fall on the United States. This is inevitable for several reasons, only one of which is that the United States is and will likely remain the most powerful country in the world for decades to come. The corollary to this point is that no other country or group of countries has either the capacity or the mind-set to build a global order. Nor can order ever be expected to emerge automatically; there is no invisible hand in the geopolitical marketplace. Again, a large part of the burden (or, more positively, opportunity) falls on the principal power of the day. There is more than a little self-interest at stake. The United States cannot remain aloof, much less unaffected by a world in disarray. Globalization is more reality than choice. At the regional level, the United States actually faces the opposite problem, namely, that certain actors do have the mind-set and means to shape an order. The problem is that their views of order are in part or in whole incompatible with U.S. interests. Examples would include Iran and ISIS in the Middle East, China in Asia, and Russia in Europe. It will not be an easy time for the United States. The sheer number and range of challenges is daunting. There are a large number of actors and forces to contend with. Alliances, normally created in opposition to some country or countries, may not be as useful a vehicle in a world in which not all foes are always foes and not all friends are always friendly. Diplomacy will count for a great deal; there will be a premium on dexterity. Consultations that aim to affect the actions of other governments and their leaders are likely to matter more than negotiations that aim to solve problems. Another reality is that the United States for all its power cannot impose order. Partially this reflects what might be called structural realities, namely, that no country can contend with global challenges on its own given the very nature of these challenges. The United States could reduce its carbon footprint dramatically, but the effect on global climate would be modest if India and China failed to follow suit. Similarly, on its own the United States cannot maintain a world trading system or successfully combat terrorism or disease. Adding to these realities are resource limits. The United States cannot provide all the troops or dollars to maintain order in the Middle East and Europe and Asia and South Asia. There is simply too much capability in too many hands. Unilateralism is rarely a serious foreign policy option. Partners are essential. That is one of the reasons why sovereign obligation is a desirable compass for U.S. foreign policy. Earlier I made the case that it represents realism for an era of globalization. It also is a natural successor to containment, the doctrine that guided the United States for the four decades of the Cold War. There are basic differences, however. Containment was about holding back more than bringing in and was designed for an era when rivals were almost always adversaries and in which the challenges were mostly related to classical geopolitical competition.1 Sovereign obligation, by contrast, is designed for a world in which sometime rivals are sometime partners and in which collective efforts are required to meet common challenges. Up to this point, we have focused on what the United States needs to do in the world to promote order. That is what one would expect from a book about international relations and American foreign policy. But a focus on foreign policy is not enough. National security is a coin with two sides, and what the United States does at home, what is normally thought of as belonging to the domestic realm, is every bit as much a part of national security as foreign policy. It is best to understand the issue as guns and butter rather than guns versus butter. When it comes to the domestic side, the argument is straightforward. In order to lead and compete and act effectively in the world, the United States needs to put its house in order. I have written on what this entails in a book titled Foreign Policy Begins at Home.2 This was sometimes interpreted as suggesting a turn away from foreign policy. It was nothing of the sort. Foreign policy begins at home, but it ends there only at the country’s peril.3 Earlier I mentioned that the United States has few unilateral options, that there are few if any things it can do better alone than with others. The counterpart to this claim is that the world cannot come up with the elements of a working order absent the United States. The United States is not sufficient, but it is necessary. It is also true that the United States cannot lead or act effectively in the world if it does not have a strong domestic foundation. National security inevitably requires significant amounts of human, physical, and financial resources to draw on. The better the United States is doing economically, the more it will have available in the way of resources to devote to what it wants and needs to do abroad without igniting a divisive and distracting domestic debate as to priorities. An additional benefit is that respect for the United States and for the American political, social, and economic model (along with a desire to emulate it) will increase only if it is seen as successful. The most basic test of the success of the model will be economic growth. U.S. growth levels may appear all right when compared with what a good many other countries are experiencing, but they are below what is needed and fall short of what is possible. There is no reason why the United States is not growing in the range of 3 percent or even higher other than what it is doing and, more important, not doing.4



#### Default to status quo hegemony – it’s sustainable and creates a structural disincentive for great power war and escalation—collapse causes cascading prolif and extinction

Brands 15 ( Hal Brands is on the faculty at the Sanford School of Public Policy at Duke University The Elliott School of International Affairs The Washington Quarterly Summer 2015 38:2 pp. 7–28)

The fundamental reason is that both U.S. influence and international stability are thoroughly interwoven with a robust U.S. forward presence. Regarding influence, the protection that Washington has afforded its allies has equally afforded the United States great sway over those allies’ policies.43 During the Cold War and after, for instance, the United States has used the influence provided by its security posture to veto allies’ pursuit of nuclear weapons, to obtain more advantageous terms in financial and trade agreements, and even to affect the composition of allied nations’ governments.44 More broadly, it has used its alliances as vehicles for shaping political, security, and economic agendas in key regions and bilateral relationships, thus giving the United States an outsized voice on a range of important issues. To be clear, this influence has never been as pervasive as U.S. officials might like, or as some observers might imagine. But by any reasonable standard of comparison, it has nonetheless been remarkable. One can tell a similar story about the relative stability of the post-war order. As even some leading offshore balancers have acknowledged, the lack of conflict in regions like Europe in recent decades is not something that has occurred naturally. It has occurred because the “American pacifier” has suppressed precisely the dynamics that previously fostered geopolitical turmoil. That pacifier has limited arms races and security competitions by providing the protection that allows other countries to under-build their militaries. It has soothed historical rivalries by affording a climate of security in which powerful countries like Germany and Japan could be revived economically and reintegrated into thriving and fairly cooperative regional orders. It has induced caution in the behavior of allies and adversaries alike, deterring aggression and dissuading other destabilizing behavior. As John Mearsheimer has noted, the United States “effectively acts as a night watchman,” lending order to an otherwise disorderly and anarchical environment.45 What would happen if Washington backed away from this role? The most logical answer is that both U.S. influence and global stability would suffer. With respect to influence, the United States would effectively be surrendering the most powerful bargaining chip it has traditionally wielded in dealing with friends and allies, and jeopardizing the position of leadership it has used to shape bilateral and regional agendas for decades. The consequences would seem no less damaging where stability is concerned. As offshore balancers have argued, it may be that U.S. retrenchment would force local powers to spend more on defense, while perhaps assuaging certain points of friction with countries that feel threatened or encircled by U.S. presence. But it equally stands to reason that removing the American pacifier would liberate the more destabilizing influences that U.S. policy had previously stifled. Long-dormant security competitions might reawaken as countries armed themselves more vigorously; historical antagonisms between old rivals might reemerge in the absence of a robust U.S. presence and the reassurance it provides. Moreover, countries that seek to revise existing regional orders in their favor—think Russia in Europe, or China in Asia—might indeed applaud U.S. retrenchment, but they might just as plausibly feel empowered to more assertively press their interests. If the United States has been a kind of Leviathan in key regions, Mearsheimer acknowledges, then “take away that Leviathan and there is likely to be big trouble.”46 Scanning the global horizon today, one can easily see where such trouble might arise. In Europe, a revisionist Russia is already destabilizing its neighbors and contesting the post-Cold War settlement in the region. In the Gulf and broader Middle East, the threat of Iranian ascendancy has stoked region-wide tensions manifesting in proxy wars and hints of an incipient arms race, even as that region also contends with a severe threat to its stability in the form of the Islamic State. In East Asia, a rising China is challenging the regional status quo in numerous ways, sounding alarms among its neighbors—many of whom also have historical grievances against each other. In these circumstances, removing the American pacifier would likely yield not low-cost stability, but increased conflict and upheaval. That conflict and upheaval, in turn, would be quite damaging to U.S. interests even if it did not result in the nightmare scenario of a hostile power dominating a key region. It is hard to imagine, for instance, that increased instability and acrimony would produce the robust multilateral cooperation necessary to deal with transnational threats from pandemics to piracy. More problematic still might be the economic consequences. As scholars like Michael Mandelbaum have argued, the enormous progress toward global prosperity and integration that has occurred since World War II (and now the Cold War) has come in the climate of relative stability and security provided largely by the United States.47 One simply cannot confidently predict that this progress would endure amid escalating geopolitical competition in regions of enormous importance to the world economy. Perhaps the greatest risk that a strategy of offshore balancing would run, of course, is that a key region might not be able to maintain its own balance following U.S. retrenchment. That prospect might have seemed far-fetched in the early post-Cold War era, and it remains unlikely in the immediate future. But in East Asia particularly, the rise and growing assertiveness of China has highlighted the medium- to long-term danger that a hostile power could in fact gain regional primacy. If China’s economy continues to grow rapidly, and if Beijing continues to increase military spending by 10 percent or more each year, then its neighbors will ultimately face grave challenges in containing Chinese power even if they join forces in that endeavor. This possibility, ironically, is one to which leading advocates of retrenchment have been attuned. “The United States will have to play a key role in countering China,” Mearshimer writes, “because its Asian neighbors are not strong enough to do it by themselves.”48 If this is true, however, then offshore balancing becomes a dangerous and potentially self-defeating strategy. As mentioned above, it could lead countries like Japan and South Korea to seek nuclear weapons, thereby stoking arms races and elevating regional tensions. Alternatively, and perhaps more worryingly, it might encourage the scenario that offshore balancers seek to avoid, by easing China’s ascent to regional hegemony. As Robert Gilpin has written, “Retrenchment by its very nature is an indication of relative weakness and declining power, and thus retrenchment can have a deteriorating effect on relations with allies and rivals.”49 In East Asia today, U.S. allies rely on U.S. reassurance to navigate increasingly fraught relationships with a more assertive China precisely because they understand that they will have great trouble balancing Beijing on their own. A significant U.S. retrenchment might therefore tempt these countries to acquiesce to, or bandwagon with, a rising China if they felt that prospects for successful resistance were diminishing as the United States retreated.50 In the same vein, retrenchment would compromise alliance relationships, basing agreements, and other assets that might help Washington check Chinese power in the first place—and that would allow the United States to surge additional forces into theater in a crisis. In sum, if one expects that Asian countries will be unable to counter China themselves, then reducing U.S. influence and leverage in the region is a curious policy. Offshore balancing might promise to preserve a stable and advantageous environment while reducing U.S. burdens. But upon closer analysis, the probable outcomes of the strategy seem more perilous and destabilizing than its proponents acknowledge.

### Advocacy

#### Plan Text: Resolved: The United States Federal Government ought to recognize an unconditional right to strike.

#### I’ll defend enforcement through Congress.

#### The Unconditional Right to Strike is defined in the NLRA as

[National Labor Relations Board](https://www.nlrb.gov/), [The National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) is comprised of a team of professionals who work to assure fair labor practices and workplace democracy nationwide. Since its creation by Congress in 1935, this small, highly respected, independent Federal agency has had daily impact on the way America's companies, industries and unions conduct business. Agency staff members investigate and remedy unfair labor practices by unions and employers.],"NLRA and the Right to Strike," NLRA https://www.nlrb.gov/about-nlrb/rights-we-protect/your-rights/nlra-and-the-right-to-strike

NLRA and the Right to Strike The Right to Strike. Section 7 of the Act states in part, “Employees shall have the right. . . to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.” Strikes are included among the concerted activities protected for employees by this section. Section 13 also concerns the right to strike. It reads as follows: Nothing in this Act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right. It is clear from a reading of these two **provisions** that: the law not only guarantees the right of employees to strike, but also **places limitations** and qualifications **on** the exercise of **that right**. **Lawful** and unlawful strikes. The lawfulness of a **strike** may **depend on the object, or purpose, of the strike, on its timing, or on the conduct of the strikers.** The object, or objects, of a strike and whether the objects are lawful are matters that are not always easy to determine. Such issues often have to be decided by the National Labor Relations Board. The consequences can be severe to striking employees and struck employers, involving as they do questions of reinstatement and backpay. Strikes for a lawful object. Employees who strike for a lawful object fall into two classes: economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers. Both classes continue as employees, but unfair labor practice strikers have greater rights of reinstatement to their jobs. Economic strikers defined. If the object of a strike is to obtain from the employer some economic concession such as higher wages, shorter hours, or better working conditions, the striking employees are called economic strikers. They retain their status as employees and cannot be discharged, but they can be replaced by their employer. If the employer has hired bona fide permanent replacements who are filling the jobs of the economic strikers when the strikers apply unconditionally to go back to work, the strikers are not entitled to reinstatement at that time. However, if the strikers do not obtain regular and substantially equivalent employment, they are entitled to be recalled to jobs for which they are qualified when openings in such jobs occur if they, or their bargaining representative, have made an unconditional request for their reinstatement. Unfair labor practice strikers defined. Employees who strike to protest an unfair labor practice committed by their employer are called unfair labor practice strikers. Such strikers can be neither discharged nor permanently replaced. When the strike ends, unfair labor practice strikers, absent serious misconduct on their part, are entitled to have their jobs back even if employees hired to do their work have to be discharged. If the Board finds that economic strikers or unfair labor practice strikers who have made an unconditional request for reinstatement have been unlawfully denied reinstatement by their employer, the Board may award such strikers backpay starting at the time they should have been reinstated. **Strikes unlawful because of purpose**. A strike may be unlawful because an object, or purpose, of the strike is unlawful. **A strike in support of** a union **unfair labor practice**, or one that would cause an employer to commit an unfair labor practice, may be a strike for an unlawful object. For example, it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge an employee for failure to make certain lawful payments to the union when there is no union security agreement in effect (Section 8(a)(3)). A strike to compel an employer to do this would be a strike for an unlawful object and, therefore, an unlawful strike. Furthermore, Section 8(b)(4) of the Act prohibits strikes for certain objects even though the objects are not necessarily unlawful if achieved by other means. An example of this would be a strike to compel Employer A to cease doing business with Employer B. It is not unlawful for Employer A voluntarily to stop doing business with Employer B, nor is it unlawful for a union merely to request that it do so. It is, however, unlawful for the union to strike with an object of forcing the employer to do so. In any event, employees who participate in an unlawful strike may be discharged and are not entitled to reinstatement. Strikes unlawful because of timing—Effect of no-strike contract. A strike that violates a no-strike provision of a contract is not protected by the Act, and the striking employees can be discharged or otherwise disciplined, unless the strike is called to protest certain kinds of unfair labor practices committed by the employer. It should be noted that not all refusals to work are considered strikes and thus violations of no-strike provisions. A walkout because of conditions abnormally dangerous to health, such as a defective ventilation system in a spray-painting shop, has been held not to violate a no-strike provision. Same—Strikes at end of contract period. Section 8(d) provides that when either party desires to terminate or change an existing contract, it must comply with certain conditions. If these requirements are not met, a strike to terminate or change a contract is unlawful and participating strikers lose their status as employees of the employer engaged in the labor dispute. If the strike was caused by the unfair labor practice of the employer, however, the strikers are classified as unfair labor practice strikers and their status is not affected by failure to follow the required procedure. Strikes unlawful because of misconduct of strikers. Strikers who engage in serious misconduct in the course of a strike may be refused reinstatement to their former jobs. This applies to both economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers. Serious misconduct has been held to include, among other things, violence and threats of violence. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that a “sitdown” strike, when employees simply stay in the plant and refuse to work, thus depriving the owner of property, is not protected by the law. Examples of serious misconduct that could cause the employees involved to lose their right to reinstatement are: • Strikers physically blocking persons from entering or leaving a struck plant. • Strikers threatening violence against nonstriking employees. • Strikers attacking management representatives.

#### Status Quo protections don’t solve—locks in income inequality, wage stagnation, and years of structural interference. Samuels 10/8

Alana Semuels October 8, 2021 10, 2-24-2021, "U.S. Workers Are Realizing It's the Perfect Time to Go on Strike," Time, https://time.com/6105109/workers-strike-unemployment/, 10-26-2021//Aanya

Greater income inequality, more strikes Part of the support of unions and organizing may come from Americans’ discontent with growing inequality, much as inequality a century ago galvanized a labor movement then, says Tom Kochan, a professor of work and employment research at MIT. There are a growing number of billionaires in America–708 as of August—with a net worth of $4.7 trillion as of August 17. That’s more than the total net worth of the bottom 50% of Americans. “I think the accumulated effects of the loss of good jobs in manufacturing, stagnant wages, growing inequality, and the growing disparity between executives and managers and the workforce—all of that is fueling increases in organizing,” he says. Some of this labor activism was happening before the pandemic, Kochan says, when even the government’s strike tracker showed an uptick in unrest. Teachers in states like Arizona and Oklahoma started striking in 2018 because of low pay and a lack of public funding. In 2020, NBA athletes walked out of a playoff game to protest the shooting of Jacob Blake in Kenosha, Wisc.



Support for labor unions has increased in recent years Gallup

The year 2019 saw 25 work stoppages involving 1,000 or more workers, the most since 2001. In 2017, 48% of non-unionized workers said they would vote to join a union if given the chance, higher than the share who said that in 1995 (32%) and 1977 (33%), according to Kochan’s research. The pandemic worsened working conditions for thousands of workers like Deyo. Kellogg workers at a plant in Battle Creek, Mich., told the local news that they were lauded as heroes for working 16 hour days, seven days a week during the pandemic, and rather than reward them, the company recently decided to offshore some of their jobs. They went on strike on Oct. 5. Musicians at the San Antonio Symphony say they voluntarily accepted an 80% pay cut last season, and that the symphony then proposed first to permanently cut their pay by 50% and then to cut the number of full-time members from 72 to 42. They went on strike on Sept. 27. Do strikes work? For their part, employers say that they’re being fair, and that workers are being unreasonable. Kellogg provides workers with benefits and compensation that are among the industry’s best, a company spokesman, Kris Bahner, said in a statement. The company says it has not proposed moving any jobs from the Ready to Eat Cereal plants, which are the plants where the workers are striking, as part of negotiations. The San Antonio Symphony said, in a statement, that the union and the symphony agreed to a 25% reduction in weekly salary for the 2020-2021 season, but that because there were fewer performances and because fewer musicians could fit on stage because of social distancing guidelines, some musicians did make 80% less than they would have made in a normal season. The symphony needs to make “fundamental changes,” a spokesperson said, and it cannot afford to spend more than it makes through ticket sales and donations. Carolyn Jackson, the CEO of St. Vincent’s, where Deyo and hundreds of other nurses are striking, says that the nurses are trying to push a 1:4 nurse to patient ratio that Massachusetts voters rejected by a large margin in 2018. The hospital has done research and decided its staffing is appropriate, and that its staffing ratios are in fact better than most other hospitals in the state, she says. Ryan says the hospital announced it was hiring 100 permanent replacement nurses in May during a COVID-19 surge, and that the striking nurses are insisting on getting their old positions back. That the hospital is not budging speaks to the fact that despite this increase in worker activism, workers may not gain much more power in the long run. Over the last 40 years, the government has made it much more difficult for workers to both form unions and to strike, says Heidi Shierholz, the president of the Economic Policy Institute, a progressive think tank. Amazon was able to effectively interfere in a union vote among its workers this spring, she says, preventing the union from succeeding.

#### A right to strike is the foundational aspect of collective workforce power and unionized negotiation. Myall 19

James Myall, MECEP’s lead on the inclusive economy, including research on labor issues, gender and racial equity, and health care policy. James conducts research and impact analyses, writes educational materials, and collaborates with partners. He is skilled in data collection, research, and statistical and policy analysis. He studied public policy and management at the University of Southern Maine and holds a master’s degree in ancient history and archaeology from the University of St. Andrews in Scotland. 4-17-2019, "Right to strike would level the playing field for public workers, with benefits for all of us," MECEP, https://www.mecep.org/blog/right-to-strike-would-level-the-playing-field-for-public-workers-with-benefits-for-all-of-us/, 10-26-2021//Aanya

The right to strike would enable fairer negotiations between public workers and the government. All of us have reason to support that outcome. Research shows that union negotiations set the bar for working conditions with other employers. And as the largest employer in Maine, the state’s treatment of its workers has a big impact on working conditions in the private sector. Unions support a fairer economy. Periods of high union membership are associated with lower levels of income inequality, both nationally and in Maine. Strong unions, including public-sector unions, have a critical role to play in rebuilding a strong middle class. Source: MECEP analysis of U.S. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, National Health Expenditure Survey data (spending by state of residence, 1991-2014). Adjusted for inflation using the Consumer Price Index, and for population using the U.S. Census Bureau’s population estimates. 2018 spending estimate from Maine Health Data Organization. Unions help combat inequities within work places. Women and people of color in unions face less wage discrimination than those in nonunion workplaces. On average, wages for nonunionized white women in Maine are 18 percent less than of those of white men. Among unionized workers, that inequality shrinks to just 9 percent. Similarly, women of color earn 26 percent less than men in nonunionized jobs; for unionized women of color, the wage gap shrinks to 17 percent.[i] All of us have a stake in the success of collective bargaining. But a union without the right to strike loses much of its negotiating power. The right to withdraw your labor is the foundation of collective worker action. When state employees or teachers are sitting across the negotiating table from their employers, how much leverage do they really have when they can be made to work without a contract? It’s like negotiating the price of a car when the salesman knows you’re going to have to buy it — whatever the final price is. Research confirms that public-sector unions are less effective without the right to strike. Public employees with a right to strike earn between 2 percent and 5 percent more than those without it.[ii] While that’s a meaningful increase for those workers, it also should assuage any fears that a right to strike would lead to excessive pay increases or employees abusing their new right. LD 900, “An Act to Expand the Rights of Public Employees Under the Maine Labor Laws,” ensures that Maine’s public-sector workers will have the same collective bargaining rights as other employees in Maine. The bill would strengthen the ability of Maine’s public-sector workers to negotiate, resulting in higher wagers, a more level playing field, and a fairer economy for all of us.

### Underview

#### 1AR Theory Paradigm—7-6-4-3 time skew means it checks NC infinite abuse—and fairness and education are voters—gateway issue, all your arguments presuppose it—and constitutive and the only portable skill we get from debate.

#### Bill contains massive labor reforms that far surpass the aff’s—zero risk of a link. Noah 4/2

Timothy Noah, [a New Republic staff writer and author.] 4-2-2021, "Repair the Crumbling Infrastructure of the American Labor Movement," New Republic, https://newrepublic.com/article/161929/biden-infrastructure-plan-repair-american-labor-unions, 11-1-2021//Aanya

President Biden’s $2.3 trillion infrastructure bill, the so-called American Jobs Plan, contains buried treasures … for labor unions. Touted as an effort to bolster this country’s crumbling infrastructure while creating jobs, the plan stealthily incorporates major provisions of the Protecting the Right to Organize Act (PRO Act) of 2021. Buried in the bill are labor law provisions that some critics say are a ploy by the Biden administration to avoid an anticipated Senate filibuster of the Pro Act. If passed in its present form, the bill would enact the most salient changes in U.S. labor laws since 1935. Calculated to “level the playing field” in labor relations between companies and unions, the plan goes much further. It would enact sweeping amendments to the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), the federal law that governs the collective bargaining relationship between companies and unions and accords employees the right to act collectively to alter their working conditions. Among the key components of the bill relating to labor relations are the following: Right to work. The bill would preclude states from enacting or enforcing existing statutes that prohibit compulsory unionization. States’ so-called “right to work” statutes forbid companies and unions from negotiating agreements that all employees must join the union (or at least pay union dues) to continue working for the company. This provision is intended to eliminate “free-riders,” employees who must be represented by the union but need not pay dues — a panacea for unions, since member dues are their only source of revenue. “Backdoor” card check. The cornerstone of the National Labor Relations Board’s (NLRB) election procedures is the right of employees to vote for or against unionization in secret-ballot elections. The Biden bill would erode this process by permitting unions to be certified as representative of employees if the employer committed any violation of the labor law, whether serious or minimal, prior to the election, and the union can demonstrate objective majority support among the employees despite losing a representation election. Unions say this provision is necessary to curtail unlawful company interference in the election process. Companies say this provision deprives employees of free choice through a secret ballot. For employees, the provision may frustrate their option to change their minds about union representation after they are offered the company’s perspective about unionization. Permanent replacements in strikes. Under existing law, economic strikers cannot be discharged but they can be permanently replaced, a distinction that affords little comfort to a striking employee. The bill would ban a company’s use of permanent replacements in strikes, depriving companies of a potent weapon to successfully weather a strike. For unions and unionized employees, this provision would remove a major impediment to striking by ensuring that strikers can return to work with the company when the strike ends. The result could be an increased willingness of unions to call strikes and a concomitant reluctance by employers to push labor negotiations to a bargaining impasse that might trigger a strike. Secondary boycotts. Under current law, a union may not seek to enmesh a neutral company in its dispute with a target company by picketing or otherwise attempting to induce the neutral company’s employees to cease work in support of the union’s dispute with the targeted employer. This bill would eliminate this “secondary boycott” restriction and greatly expand unions’ use of picketing at locations where more than just the target employer is working. Particularly in the construction industry, the elimination of the ban on secondary boycotts will greatly enhance the impact of a union’s picketing, while potentially embroiling companies in disputes not of their making. The provision also increases the likelihood that unions will engage in so-called “top-down organizing,” a means for attempting to secure recognition from an employer without utilizing the election process. This, in turn, could deprive employees of the free choice of electing or rejecting union representation. Enhanced remedies. Commentators have long characterized the remedies available to workers who are discharged or otherwise discriminated against because of their union activities as anemic. The Biden bill would introduce a panoply of new remedies for discrimination based on union activity. It would allow for imposition of fines, liquidated damages, punitive damages and other civil remedies not presently available to workers or to the NLRB. It also would impose personal liability on corporate directors and officers in some circumstances. In practice, it would convert NLRB claims of discrimination against companies from a nuisance to a serious financial and personal risk. These enhanced remedies are likely to embolden workers to engage in union-organizing activities with less concern about retaliation from their employers. In turn, this new attitude among workers is expected to contribute to an uptick in organizing efforts by the unions. Introduction of interest arbitration. Currently, under the NLRA, following an impasse in negotiations over a collective bargaining agreement, a company may impose on its workers its last offer to the union; the union’s only leverage is to call a strike. This bill would require such disputes to be resolved by an arbitrator, commonly referred to as “interest arbitration.” For both companies and unions, this provision may moderate the content of proposals offered by either side in negotiations. For workers, this provision removes a serious impediment to pushing harder for a more attractive package of wages, benefits and working conditions from their employer. The bill contains many other provisions that may be regarded as “union friendly” or “worker friendly.” For example, it would expand the “joint employer” doctrine through which one company may be drawn into the labor concerns of another company with whom it has certain types of close affiliations. It would aid gig-economy workers by redefining many of them as “employees” rather than “independent contractors,” which would encourage unionization since independent contractors are not subject to union organizing. For the worker, this redefinition would mean that many more workers may become eligible for fringe benefits awarded by companies only to workers classified as “employees.” bill also significantly narrows the definition of who is a “supervisor” under the NLRA, in order to limit the ability of companies to shield certain workers from union organizing by labeling them as supervisors. Moreover, the bill codifies the concept of “micro units,” allowing the NLRB to certify a union as representative of a group of workers as small as a departmental or sectional unit; that would enable unions to obtain a foothold in companies by organizing a single small facet of their operations. By concentrating publicly on the infrastructure aspects of the bill, Democrats have diverted attention away from the monumental impact the bill will have on relations between companies, workers and labor unions. But given the proposed changes above and many others inserted into this bill, it is no exaggeration to state that it would fundamentally revise labor laws in a manner welcomed by labor unions and some workers but derided by most employers.

#### 2] Litany of thumpers – abortion rights, disaster relief, eviction moratorium, infrastructure package.

**Kapur 9-7** (Sahil Kapur, 9-7-2021, "'A train wreck': Congress faces a daunting September as deadlines pile up," NBC News, https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/train-wreck-congress-faces-daunting-september-deadlines-pile-n1278565)

"The question is whether the muscle memory of fighting Republicans on the debt limit and the rest of the policy cliff helps paper over the party's divisions and heal intramural wounds," he added. "Either way, it's the biggest inflection point left in what might be the last fruitful year of the Democratic trifecta."

In addition to all that, Pelosi last week [put a bill on the schedule](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/democrats-face-few-options-preserve-abortion-rights-after-supreme-court-n1278364) to enshrine protections for abortion rights into federal law after the Supreme Court [refused to block](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/elections/texas-law-could-flip-script-abortion-politics-democrats-eying-gains-n1278303) a new law in Texas that bans the vast majority of abortions.

And the devastation wrought by Hurricane Ida, from Louisiana to New York, could spark a debate about authorizing new relief funding.

There are also calls from progressive Democrats to extend the lapsed eviction moratorium, as well as unemployment benefits that expired over the recess, but neither appears to have the votes to pass.

Democrats' ability to handle these grueling tasks in September will shape their prospects to [maintain control of Congress in the midterm elections next year](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/politics-news/early-indicators-suggest-democrats-house-majority-jeopardy-n1276703), as history favors the party out of power to make gains.

Party elites want to campaign on the multitrillion-dollar safety net package, which includes new benefits that voters could feel quickly in the form of Medicare expansion, paid leave and a direct cash allowance for raising children.

"It's crunch time for Washington Democrats. Their odds of holding the House in the midterms are long, and campaign season will begin soon," said Michael Steel, a former House GOP leadership aide. "They have the slimmest margin possible and no room for error."

#### ‘A’ is not interchangeable with ‘any’ and does not imply genericity. Burton-Roberts 76

Noel. “On the Generic Indefinite Article.” Language, vol. 52, no. 2, Linguistic Society of America, 1976, pp. 427–48, https://doi.org/10.2307/412569//Aanya

Perlmutter proposes deriving GEN a from any, and cites a number of examples designed to demonstrate that they have the same distribution. In fact, I reject several of the examples that he accepts; furthermore, where we both find any unacceptable, this is sometimes not because of the particular struc- ture in which it appears, but because any does not readily accept a generic interpretation. Consider the following generic sentences where substitution of any for GEN a yields quite odd results: (40) a. A beaver is an amphibious rodent. b. ?\*Any beaver is an amphibious rodent. (41) a. A kitchen is a cooking room. b. ?\*Any kitchen is a cooking room. (42) a. A whale suckles its young. b. ?\*Any whale suckles its young. Conversely, consider these: (43) a. Any cat drinks milk served up in a Wedgewood saucer. b. ?A cat drinks milk served up in a Wedgewood saucer. (44) a. Any guy will punch you on the nose if you insult him. b. ?A guy will punch you on the nose if you insult him. (45) a. Any businessman drives fast. b. ?A businessman drives fast. Even if the b-examples are acceptable, the difference between them and the a-examples is quite marked. It is not pedantic to question the truth of generic sentences (the b-examples); but it would be pedantic to question the truth of the a-examples which, I suggest, are not generic. We shall return to the status of any in due course. Before going on to examine Perlmutter's data, another objection to any as the underlying form of GEN a should be made clear. To do this, we must first discuss C. Smith's suggestion (1961) that N's determined by GEN a accept only restrictive relative clauses. Stockwell et al., who report this, remark (86) that 'there are some apparent counter-examples, although the generalization seems basically valid'. The apparent 'counter-examples' given are: (46) a. An eagle, which is the national bird, is generally only seen by zoo visitors. b. An owl, which can see in the dark, can pounce on a rabbit from a great distance, even on a moonless night. Quite simply, relative clauses, like other sentences, may or may not make generic statements. Those that do make generic statements are necessarily non-restrictive: to make them restrictive would be to imply that the characteristic mentioned in the relative defined a sub-class within the class as a whole, and this in turn would imply that there could be members of the class as a whole which did not have that characteristic-and this would be incompatible with the fact that the relative was generic. N's determined by GEN a will accept as many non-restrictive relatives as make generic statements, and reject as many as cannot make generic statements; conversely, they will accept as many restrictive relatives as do not make generic statements, and reject those that do. Thus the non-restrictive relatives in 46a-b (which are generic, and only two of an indefinitely large set) are unacceptable as restrictive: (47) a. \*An eagle which is the national bird is generally seen only by zoo visitors. b. \*An owl which can see in the dark can pounce on a rabbit ... even on a moonless night. Similarly in 48-49, the b-examples are unacceptable: (48) a. A whale which is ill yields no blubber. b. \*A whale, which is ill, yields no blubber. 436 This content downloaded from 209.122.160.79 on Mon, 25 Oct 202 (49) a. A whale, which is a mammal, suckles its young. b. \*A whale which is a mammal suckles its young. It is quite clear, then, that N's determined by GEN a do accept non-restrictive relatives. The point of this is that any does NOT accept non-restrictive relatives: (50) \*Any eagle, which is the national bird, is generally seen only by zoo visitors. (51) \*Any owl, which can see in the dark, can pounce ... (52) \*Any whale, which is a mammal, suckles its young. Thus any cannot underlie GEN a. The underlying structure proposed in this paper, on the other hand, is acceptable: (53) To be an eagle, (to be) which is to be the national bird, is generally to be seen only by zoo visitors. We can now show that the proposal outlined in this paper accounts for all the phenomena considered by Perlmutter, as follows: (i) GEN the and GEN 0 can determine N's conjoined with and; GEN a cannot, and neither can any: (54) a. The beaver and the otter build dams. b. Beavers and otters build dams. c. \*A beaver and an otter build dams. d. \*Any beaver and any otter build dams. Conjoined with or, however, N's determined by GEN a are acceptable: (55) A beaver or an otter builds dams. Perlmutter maintains that this is also true for any; but for me, 56 is as odd as 54d: (56) ?Any beaver or any otter builds dams. The underlying structure analysis proposed here for N's determined by GEN a blocks 54c in a more explanatory manner. The transformation that derives 1 from 13 must not only delete all instances of to be, but must simultaneously generate subject-verb agreement when a lexical verb is present in the complement. This, I suggest, should be done roughly in the following way: the agreement carried by the matrix copula is mapped into the lexical verb, and what remains of the matrix copula is deleted. This, of course, is a very rough-and-ready account; but the operation must be along these lines. This has the effect of converting the string is to build into builds, and \*are to build into build. The important point here is the unacceptability of the string in which the matrix copula carries agreement with a plural subject. Thus 54c has the underlying structure (57) \*To be a beaver and to be an otter are to build dams. Given this generic structure, there seems to be no way in which the plural form of the verb, build, could be derived.6 The interesting point about 57 is that the subject seems in some respects to be singular; thus there is no way to block a further collapsing of the conjuncts to yield (58) \*To be a beaver and an otter (is to build dams)" Here the subject is singular, and suggests that there is such a thing as a beaver- otter-or else that there is a thing which comprises a beaver and an otter, and that this thing builds dams. Note that no such problem arises in the case of conjunction with or, where the verb remains singular: (59) a. To be a beaver or to be an otter is to build dams. b. To be a beaver or an otter is to build dams. (ii) N's determined by GEN the and GEN 0 can occur as agents in passives, while those determined by GEN a and any cannot: (60) a. Dams are built by the beaver. b. Dams are built by beavers. c. \*Dams are built by a beaver. d. \*Dams are built by any beaver. We have already noted that non-attributive N's determined by GEN a can only occupy subject position: they must always be the topic. Note that 60c must be derived from the unpassivizable 61:7 (61) To be a beaver is to build dams. (= 15b) (iii) N's determined by GEN the and GEN 0 can occur in of phrases; but, Perlmutter claims, those determined by GEN a or any cannot: (62) a. I said of the beaver that it builds dams. b. I said of beavers that they build dams. c. '\*'I said of a beaver that it builds dams. d. \*I said of any beaver that it builds dams. Here I agree with Perlmutter that 62d is unacceptable; but 62c seems perfectly good to me, as does the following: (63) In my last lecture, I said of a beaver that it builds dams in the spring and of an otter that it builds them in the autumn ... This is impeccable, surely. Then 62c would be derived from the perhaps pedantic but acceptable 64: (64) I said of being a beaver that it is to build dams. (iv) N's determined by GEN the and GEN 0 occur with predicates which require non-conjoined plural subjects, and which predicate something of the entire group rather than any individual. Those determined by GEN a or any cannot: (65) a. The beaver is found in Canada. b. Beavers are . . , b. Beavers are < increasing in numbers. c. \*A beaver is etic.I ,~~~~ I. , extinct. d. \*Any beaver isj The examples of 65c are, according to the present proposal, derived from these: (66) \*To be a beaver is to be increasing in numbers. Lextinct. (v) N's determined by GEN the and GEN 0 can occur with verbs in the progressive. Perlmutter claims that those determined by GEN a and any cannot. He notes that, in order to make a verb with progressive aspect acceptable in a generic sentence, an adverbial is required, and he chooses these days: (67) a. The beaver is b. Beavers are I \* . >~ building dams these days. c. \*A beaver is d. \*Any beaver isJ In fact, the choice of these days as the adverbial is unfortunate; only 67b seems entirely acceptable (and we shall return to this in due course). If, for these days, we substitute at this time of year, all the sentences seem acceptable (except perhaps 68d):8 (68) a. The beaver is) b. Beavers are I building dams at this time of year. c. A beaver is d. ?Any beaver isJ The difference between these days and at this time of year is that the former can be interpreted as specifying an INDIVIDUAL location in time, and as such seems to be incompatible with genericity; but the latter is generalized and recursive (it can be taken to be coreferential with spring, summer, etc.) Thus the location in time that it specifies is not individual, and therefore not a strict one: we could perhaps call it a generic location in time. This difference becomes important, it seems, only when egocentric particulars are involved (as in both the adverbials we are considering). Other, non-egocentric adverbials such as in ancient times, so long as they are sufficiently generalized, can specify individual locations in time and still be compatible in generic sentences. The underlying structure analysis of 68c, then, would be (69) To be a beaver is to be building dams at this time of year. Incidentally, there does not seem to be universal agreement on acceptability in 68; however, those who find 68c unacceptable will almost certainly find 69 unacceptable as well. (vi) Finally, Perlmutter maintains that N's determined by GEN the and by GEN 0 can co-occur with verbs in the past tense, while those determined by GEN a and any cannot: (70) a. The beaver 1 b. Beavers I , .,.. . \*Beavers l built dams in prehistoric times. c. \*A beaver I d. \*Any beaverJAgain, the choice of adverbial (and predicate) is unfortunate, since it carries the suggestion that building dams distinguishes prehistoric beavers from all others. In this respect, all the sentences in 70 seem unacceptable. But it is quite clear that GEN a can occur with verbs in the past tense: (a soldier fought with a sword. (a) (71) In Roman times, a student studied rhetoric. (b) a senator was a patrician. (c) Here 71a-c would be derived from 72a-c (the past tense of the verb is derived like subject-verb agreement, as described above): to be a soldier was to fight with a sword (a) (72) In Roman times, to be a student was to study rhetoric. (a) to be a senator was to be a patrician. (c) From this survey of Perlmutter's material, we can see that my proposed derivation of nouns determined by GEN a is quite explanatory from the syntactic point of view, and does not encounter the difficulties that face derivation from any. How- ever, this raises the question of the status of any. We saw that paraphrase of GEN a by any was inappropriate (see 40-45). There is, however, a distinct group of putative generic sentences where any does appropriately paraphrase the indefinite article in the subject NP-namely those in which the subject is modified by a restrictive relative clause (i.e. a non-generic relative clause), or by a preposed modifier derived from one. Thus, in 73-74, the b-examples seem valid paraphrases of the a-examples: (73) a. A whale which is sick yields no blubber. b. Any whale which is sick yields no blubber. (74) a. A hungry lion is a dangerous animal. b. Any hungry lion is a dangerous animal. Moreover, in contexts where the unmodified NP is not acceptable (as in 67c), the MODIFIED NP is acceptable AND is paraphrasable by any: (75) a. \*A beaver is suffering from pollution these days. b. A sensitive beaver is suffering from pollution these days. c. Any sensitive beaver is suffering from pollution these days. In 75b-c, sensitive should perhaps carry emphatic stress. The same thing is demon- strated in 76: (76) a. \*A beaver lives in Canada. b. A sensible beaver lives in Canada. c. Any sensible beaver lives in Canada. Now this is interesting, in that we have shown that any cannot underlie GEN a- which suggests that the kind of sentences considered here (those with complex NP's as subjects) are not generic.9 The acceptable sentences in 73-76 are GENERAL statements, certainly-but not, it would seem, generic statements/sentences.

#### “A” implies singular,

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/a

used as a function word before singular nouns when the referent is unspecified

#### A implies specific when put before a modifier like “Just”

1NC CCC (“Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles, Capital Community College Foundation, a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation) LHSLA JC/SJ

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. **Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already**," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class