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#### Interpretation: the affirmative may not spec a government

#### A: “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “just government” – The affirmative must defend in general that All just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike. They cannot defend individual just governments.

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

Violation- They spec Germany

#### This applies to the topic – 1] Upward entailment test – “China ought to have the unconditional right to strike does not entail that those governments ought to have the unconditional right to strike,” doesn’t imply that “in a just government workers ought to have the right to strike uncondo” because voting might not be compulsory in an authoritarian regime 2] Adverb test – “In a democracy workers uncondo right 2 strike” doesn’t substantially change the meaning of the topic

#### Vote neg for limits and ground---Their interp justifies endless country of the week affs that delink core generics---Kills fairness and education.

#### Semantics first---Resolution is the only stasis point for predictable preround prep, which is key to equitable division of ground and in-depth clash. There’s no brightline for topicality besides the topic, so anything else is arbitrary.

#### Fairness is a voter---debate is a game the judge needs to evaluate

#### Education is a voter---it’s the only portable impact

#### T before theory---if I was abusive it was because the plan was

#### No RVIS---encourage theory baiting and it’s illogical to win for proving they’re fair.

#### Competing Interps—better for norm setting, you can’t reasonably meet a definition, and prevents judge intervention

### Off

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

#### Just governments respect liberties

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

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

#### The German government is polluted with racism – that doesn’t’ secure liberties

Deutsche **Welle** (Www.Dw, 09.06.20**20**, "Racism on the rise in Germany," DW, [https://www.dw.com/en/racism-on-the-rise-in-germany/a-53735536 //](https://www.dw.com/en/racism-on-the-rise-in-germany/a-53735536%20//) JB

As Black Lives Matter protests persist worldwide, a German study reveals that discrimination against people based on their ethnic origin has increased. The report warns of serious consequences for society.

Ever since the [violent death of an African-American man, George Floyd](https://www.dw.com/en/george-floyd-killing-spurs-fresh-protests-across-europe/a-53706536), at the hands of police two weeks ago, a wave of protests has been rolling across the US.

Many people in [Germany were also shocked by footage](https://www.dw.com/en/germany-shocked-by-george-floyd-killing-calls-for-end-to-violence/a-53674811) in which he is seen in mortal agony while being subjected to brutal mistreatment for almost nine minutes. [Tens of thousands of people across the country took to the streets](https://www.dw.com/en/germany-thousands-attend-anti-racism-protests-honoring-george-floyd/a-53700909) this past weekend to protest against racism, despite restrictions imposed to stem the coronavirus pandemic,

Amid considerable media attention, they also decried racial discrimination in Germany. For the image of German society, too, has repeatedly been blemished by everyday racism, xenophobic riots and right-wing extremist attacks like those carried out by the [National Socialist Underground (NSU)](https://www.dw.com/en/germany-nsu-murder-verdict-facing-challenges-from-all-sides/a-53453001).

**Deep traces in society**

In the report's foreword, Franke writes that 2019 was a year in which "hatred and hostility toward particular groups left deep and painful traces" — from the [right-wing extremist murder of Walter Lübcke](https://www.dw.com/en/german-politicians-killing-leaves-unanswered-questions-one-year-on/a-53621981), a Christian Democratic (CDU) politician who campaigned for refugees, to the [terrorist attack on a synagogue in Halle](https://www.dw.com/en/germany-halle-synagogue-shooting-suspect-charged-with-double-murder/a-53201696). But he wrote that there were many small incidents and everyday discrimination that had left their mark as well.

To illustrate concretely what this means, the report includes anonymized quotes from people who describe the discrimination they face every day. For example: "A customer recently called through the store, '[Where's my (N-word)?](https://www.dw.com/en/always-derogatory-germany-battles-over-the-n-word/a-52327824) I like it best when he massages my head!'" Or: "A kid at school insulted my brother because he has dark skin. Then the kid hit him. The teacher saw everything, but did nothing.'"

One more example: "Two colleagues from another department approached me, laughing, and asked if I worked in the company to make coffee. I am a civil engineer from Syria and am employed as a structural engineer. When I told them that, they laughed even louder and asked whether I worked according to German or Syrian standards."

**Tip of the iceberg**

The annual report goes on to say that many of those affected have the feeling that the overall situation has not improved over the past years. They feel that although attacks and murders have shaken society, "the worries, fears and experiences of exclusion had by people with a migration background are ultimately not taken seriously."

Violence, hatred and agitation are only the tip of the iceberg of racist attitudes and resentment, which become apparent much earlier in acts of everyday discrimination, the report says. As examples of this, the report cites ads for rented apartments that stipulate "no foreigners," the discotheque where some are told that "people like you" always cause trouble and the bosses who say a colleague who made a racist joke "didn't really mean it."

In 2019, according to the report, one out of three people with migrant roots looking for housing within the last 10 years said they had experienced discrimination. At the same time, 41% of all respondents in a representative sample stated they had serious or very serious reservations about renting an apartment to an immigrant.

#### Prefer –

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

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

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

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

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

#### 4] TVA – Defend whole res – you can defend a full democracy or just don’t defend a state that has been committing racial atrocities and purposefully not giving legal support to victims

#### C/a DTD, CI, and Fairness

## Off

#### Framing strikes as a “right” to be granted instead of a “freedom” cements state power over the working class and destroys class solidarity.

Dimick 19

Matthew Dimick, Professor @ University at Buffalo School of Law, 12-13-2019, "Labor Rights Will Not Save the Labor Movement," Jacobin, <https://jacobinmag.com/2019/12/labor-rights-movement-freedom-nlra-nlrb-mass-picketing> //MLT

Everyone agrees that labor law is broken. Under the auspices of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) — which was passed in 1935 at the height of the New Deal and laid the foundation for our current regime of collective bargaining — union membership rates have declined to existentially low levels. Though the weaknesses in labor law have been glaringly apparent for some time, and intermittent attempts have been made to reform it, discussion about labor law reform is now reaching a critical mass. Labor law reform has been central to the campaign promises of both Bernie Sanders and Elizabeth Warren. There is much in common between the Sanders and Warren plans, though the level of detail in the Warren plan burnishes her reputation as a technocrat. Liberal think tanks have jumped on board. Left-leaning publications have also directed their attention to labor law reform. What unites most of these proposals is the idea of strengthening labor rights. I wrote an essay recently in Catalyst arguing that this approach is wrong. The labor movement should be wary of labor rights and instead seek to expand labor freedoms. A right is some legally enforceable claim, backed through the coercive machinery of the state (fines, injunctions, imprisonment, etc.), that one legal subject has against another because of some interference caused or threatened by that other. A freedom, in contrast, is the absence of a legally enforceable duty to refrain from some action. A “right to strike,” for example, means that workers are protected from any interference an employer might take against an employee for engaging in a strike. During a strike, hiring permanent replacement workers counts as the most obvious form of interference, and indeed such replacements have had a devastating impact on the effectiveness of strikes. A fully recognized right to strike would prohibit the hiring of permanent replacements and legally compel employers to discharge their replacements when striking workers decide to call off the strike and return to work. All well and good, except that this rights approach overlooks the most important reason employers get away with hiring permanent replacements: labor law effectively bans mass picketing, the picketing of large numbers of workers near the struck business. Before mass picketing was banned, it was the most potent weapon in labor’s arsenal in the 1940s, and its repeated use established an “unofficial norm” against hiring permanent replacements, a norm that lasted until employers started defying it in the 1980s. Elimination of the ban on mass picketing would give workers a labor freedom rather than a labor right. With the labor freedom, it is workers themselves, through mass picketing, who enforce their strike power; with the labor right, it is the state, through the ban on permanent replacements, that does the enforcement. One might ask, “What’s the difference, if workers win the strike in the end?” Part of the answer comes from asking yourself, “Which of the two will build stronger and longer-term working-class solidarity?” The other part of the answer is that in numerous other cases, the effect of labor rights has been far more insidious. Labor rights, unfortunately, have been frequently used by judges, politicians, and bureaucrats as reasons for prohibiting or eliminating protection for strikes and other forms of collective activity. One example of this is the NLRA’s ban on organization and recognition picketing. Labor law prohibits any picketing (or even threats of picketing) “where an object thereof is forcing or requiring an employer to recognize or bargain with a labor organization as the representative of his employees.” This provision exists not because of some cynical, ideologically motivated, anti-union impulse. Rather, it exists because the NLRA already provides workers with a “fair” and “neutral” administrative method for choosing a bargaining representative and establishing a bargaining relationship: the National Labor Relations Board’s election procedure. In practice, however, these provisions virtually compel workers to make use of the board’s election procedure, which is characterized by legal-bureaucratic delay and employer intimidation.

#### Off their 1AC Robinision 16 card- Inevitable economic crises from capitalism are the root cause of populism – history proves the aff misdiagnoses the problem

Kaletsky 17

([Anatole Kaletsky, BA in Mathematics@King's CollegeCambridge, Econ@Harvard University,], “The role of capitalism in the rise of populism”, January 12, 2017, https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2017/01/the-role-of-capitalism-in-the-rise-of-populism)//HW-CC

LONDON – The biggest political surprise of 2016 was that everyone was so surprised. I certainly had no excuse to be caught unawares: soon after the 2008 crisis, I wrote a book suggesting that a collapse of confidence in political institutions would follow the economic collapse, with a lag of five years or so. We’ve seen this sequence before. The first breakdown of globalization, described by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in their 1848 The Communist Manifesto, was followed by reform laws creating unprecedented rights for the working class. The breakdown of British imperialism after World War I was followed by the New Deal and the welfare state. And the breakdown of Keynesian economics after 1968 was followed by the Thatcher-Reagan revolution. In my book Capitalism 4.0, I argued that comparable political upheavals would follow the fourth systemic breakdown of global capitalism heralded by the 2008 crisis. When a particular model of capitalism is working successfully, material progress relieves political pressures. But when the economy fails – and the failure is not just a transient phase but a symptom of deep contradictions – capitalism’s disruptive social side effects can turn politically toxic. That is what happened after 2008. Once the failure of free trade, deregulation, and monetarism came to be seen as leading to a “new normal” of permanent austerity and diminished expectations, rather than just to a temporary banking crisis, the inequalities, job losses, and cultural dislocations of the pre-crisis period could no longer be legitimized – just as the extortionate taxes of the 1950s and 1960s lost their legitimacy in the stagflation of the 1970s. If we are witnessing this kind of transformation, then piecemeal reformers who try to address specific grievances about immigration, trade, or income inequality will lose out to radical politicians who challenge the entire system. And, in some ways, the radicals will be right. The disappearance of “good” manufacturing jobs cannot be blamed on immigration, trade, or technology. But whereas these vectors of economic competition increase total national income, they do not necessarily distribute income gains in a socially acceptable way. To do that requires deliberate political intervention on at least two fronts. First, macroeconomic management must ensure that demand always grows as strongly as the supply potential created by technology and globalization. This is the fundamental Keynesian insight that was temporarily rejected in the heyday of monetarism during the early 1980s, successfully reinstated in the 1990s (at least in the US and Britain), but then forgotten again in the deficit panic after 2009. A return to Keynesian demand management could be the main economic benefit of Donald Trump’s incoming US administration, as expansionary fiscal policies replace much less efficient efforts at monetary stimulus. The US may now be ready to abandon the monetarist dogmas of central-bank independence and inflation targeting, and to restore full employment as the top priority of demand management. For Europe, however, this revolution in macroeconomic thinking is still years away. At the same time, a second, more momentous, intellectual revolution will be needed regarding government intervention in social outcomes and economic structures. Market fundamentalism conceals a profound contradiction. Free trade, technological progress, and other forces that promote economic “efficiency” are presented as beneficial to society, even if they harm individual workers or businesses, because growing national incomes allow winners to compensate losers, ensuring that nobody is left worse off. This principle of so-called Pareto optimality underlies all moral claims for free-market economics. Liberalizing policies are justified in theory only by the assumption that political decisions will redistribute some of the gains from winners to losers in socially acceptable ways. But what happens if politicians do the opposite in practice? By deregulating finance and trade, intensifying competition, and weakening unions, governments created the theoretical conditions that demanded redistribution from winners to losers. But advocates of market fundamentalism did not just forget redistribution; they forbade it.

#### The aff’s strike-focused politics privatizes and atomizes worker struggle – it channels it towards specific employers rather than class domination as a whole while ensuring the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by privileging alternative modes of settlement outside and in spite of the specifics of the law itself.

Feldman, 94

[George, Assistant Prof. @ Wayne State Law: “Unions, Solidarity, and Class: The Limits of Liberal Labor Law,” Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law, Volume 15, No. 2, 1994. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/berkjemp15&div=14&g\_sent=1&casa\_token=&collection=journals#]//AD

In other ways, however, the liberal vision of labor law that Justice Brennan exemplified has been severely limited. 19 One obvious limitation, for instance, has been the Court's preference for arbitration.20

\*\*\*FOOTNOTE 20 STARTS HERE\*\*\*

20. The Court's tendency to privilege arbitration has led it to impose legal limitations on the right to strike that are unsupported by the language, policy, or history of the labor laws. See Boys Mkts., Inc. v. Retail Clerks Union, Local 770, 398 U.S. 235 (1970); Gateway Coal Co. v. United Mine Workers of Am., 414 U.S. 368 (1974), discussed infra at part III.C. For criticism of the Court's weakening of the right to strike, see Matthew W. Finkin, Labor Policy and the Enervation of the Economic Strike, 1990 U. ILL. L. REV. 547, 548-49; JAMES B. ATLESON, VALUES & AssuMiPTIONS IN AMERICAN LABOR LAW

\*\*\*FOOTNOTE 20 ENDS HERE\*\*\*

(1983). Yet a different kind of limit also has been present in the labor jurisprudence of the Court's liberal wing-a limit that is less obvious, usually has less immediate impact, but that is perhaps more deeply seated. The Court's privileging of arbitration restricts the means by which unions legally may act in response to concerns that are concededly legitimate. The limits discussed here, by contrast, define the legitimate boundaries of collective actions and collective concerns. The cases discussed here reflect the liberal doctrine that labor law protects unions only insofar as they limit their role to that of representative of the employees of an individual employer, and that the law will resist any union attempt to move beyond this limitation. That doctrine rejects protection when the underlying issue implicates the proper role of unions in American society.

That question emerges in a variety of contexts. In some, a broad definition of unions' societal function may require, or may seem to require, limiting individual rights;21 in others, the Court's conclusion, or something very similar to it, is so clearly required by statute that the conclusion cannot be ascribed to the conscious or unconscious ideological views of the Justices.22

\*\*\*FOOTNOTE 21 STARTS HERE\*\*\*

21. When such a conflict is actually present, the proper place to draw the line is fairly subject to debate; a judge determined to protect both strong unions and individual employee rights might resolve apparent conflicts between the two in different ways without forfeiting a claim of taking each seriously. See infra notes 237-41; cf Emporium Capwell Co. v. Western Addition Community Org., 420 U.S. 50 (1975).

\*\*\*FOOTNOTE 21 ENDS HERE\*\*\*

At other times, however, liberal members of the Court have narrowed the range of permissible union concerns and therefore of unions' social role in contexts in which the law would have allowed a broader understanding, and in which the danger of conflict with individual rights was either absent or too attenuated to serve as a reasonable justification. In some cases this desire to narrow the sphere of union activity is central to the Court's reasoning; in others, it is a subsidiary theme, or is present only as an underlying assumption, unstated and perhaps unconscious, whose presence helps account for the result reached.

This article examines what the members of the Supreme Court who have been identified with its liberal wing have said explicitly or by necessary implication about what is the legitimate sphere of union activity in American life. This vision of the role that unions should play in society has both practical and ideological consequences. Modern labor law, faithful to the Wagner Act's premises, aims to particularize rather than generalize workers' struggles; it directs them towards their specific relationship to their employer, rather than to the larger relationship of their class to employers and to work; it privatizes and depoliticizes those struggles.23

\*\*\*FOOTNOTE 23 STARTS HERE\*\*\*

23. It is in this sense that I think the frequently voiced point of authors associated with the Critical Legal Studies movement is correct. It is not that workers' struggles are channeled to arbitration rather than to a public body like the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), see Katherine Van Wezel Stone, The Post-War Paradigm in American Labor Law, 90 YALE L.J. 1509 (1981). but rather that whatever method workers employ-even including a strike or other collective job actions-the locus of the struggle remains the particular workplace or employer. It is in this sense that workers' struggles are channeled away from "political" dimensions.

\*\*\*FOOTNOTE 23 ENDS HERE\*\*\*

Given the contextual limitations mentioned, this analysis necessarily must be cautious. It must take account of the constraints of statutory language and congressional intent and, where applicable, of judicial deference to the decisions of the NLRB. 24 This analysis also must recognize the presence of other policy or ideological considerations that are unrelated to the theme of limiting the breadth of union concerns. Nonetheless, this theme is demonstrably present in a wide variety of legal settings, transecting the doctrinal categorizations that abound in labor law.

#### Class consciousness is the single and easiest possible solution to inequality and insatiable consumption under capitalism

Edles 15

Edles, Laura Desfor,  (PhD, University of California, Los Angeles, 1990 is Professor of Sociology at California State University, Northridge.)

2015, “Sociological theory in the classical era : text and readings,” ISBN 978-1-4522-0361-4 // Comrade AW

This was precisely the purpose of Marx’s political activities: he sought to generate class consciousness—an awareness on the part of the working class of its common relationship to the means of production and common source of the workers’ oppressive conditions. Marx believed that this awareness was a vital key for sparking a revolution that would create a “dictatorship of the proletariat,” transforming it from a wage-earning, propertyless mass into the ruling class. Unlike all previous class-based revolutions, however, this one would be fought in the interests of the vast majority of the population and not for the benefit of a few, because the particular class interests of the proletariat had come to represent the universal interests of humanity. The epoch of capitalism was a necessary stage in this evolution—and the last historical period rooted in competitive class conflict (see Figure 2.2). Capitalism, with its unleashing of immense economic productivity, had created the capital and technology needed to sustain a communist society—the final stage of history —capable of providing for the needs of all of its inhabitants

#### Our critique independently outweighs the case - neoliberalism causes extinction and massive social inequalities – the affs single issue legalistic solution is the exact kind of politics neolib wants us to engage in so the root cause goes unquestioned – and treat this as a no long-term solvency argument – the inequalities of labor relations are fundamental to capitalism. F

Farbod 15

( Faramarz Farbod , PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College, Monthly Review, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html, 6-2)

Global capitalism is the 800-pound gorilla. The twin ecological and economic crises, militarism, the rise of the surveillance state, and a dysfunctional political system can all be traced to its normal operations. We need a transformative politics from below that can challenge the fundamentals of capitalism instead of today's politics that is content to treat its symptoms. The problems we face are linked to each other and to the way a capitalist society operates. We must make an effort to understand its real character. The fundamental question of our time is whether we can go beyond a system that is ravaging the Earth and secure a future with dignity for life and respect for the planet. What has capitalism done to us lately? The best science tells us that this is a do-or-die moment. We are now in the midst of the 6th mass extinction in the planetary history with 150 to 200 species going extinct every day, a pace 1,000 times greater than the 'natural' extinction rate.1 The Earth has been warming rapidly since the 1970s with the 10 warmest years on record all occurring since 1998.2 The planet has already warmed by 0.85 degree Celsius since the industrial revolution 150 years ago. An increase of 2° Celsius is the limit of what the planet can take before major catastrophic consequences. Limiting global warming to 2°C requires reducing global emissions by 6% per year. However, global carbon emissions from fossil fuels increased by about 1.5 times between 1990 and 2008.3 Capitalism has also led to explosive social inequalities. The global economic landscape is littered with rising concentration of wealth, debt, distress, and immiseration caused by the austerity-pushing elites. Take the US. The richest 20 persons have as much wealth as the bottom 150 million.4 Since 1973, the hourly wages of workers have lagged behind worker productivity rates by more than 800%.5 It now takes the average family 47 years to make what a hedge fund manager makes in one hour.6 Just about a quarter of children under the age of 5 live in poverty.7 A majority of public school students are low-income.8 85% of workers feel stress on the job.9 Soon the only thing left of the American Dream will be a culture of hustling to survive. Take the global society. The world's billionaires control $7 trillion, a sum 77 times the debt owed by Greece to the European banks.10 The richest 80 possess more than the combined wealth of the bottom 50% of the global population (3.5 billion people).11 By 2016 the richest 1% will own a greater share of the global wealth than the rest of us combined.12 The top 200 global corporations wield twice the economic power of the bottom 80% of the global population.13 Instead of a global society capitalism is creating a global apartheid. What's the nature of the beast? Firstly, the "egotistical calculation" of commerce wins the day every time. Capital seeks maximum profitability as a matter of first priority. Evermore "accumulation of capital" is the system's bill of health; it is slowdowns or reversals that usher in crises and set off panic. Cancer-like hunger for endless growth is in the system's DNA and is what has set it on a tragic collision course with Nature, a finite category. Secondly, capitalism treats human labor as a cost. It therefore opposes labor capturing a fair share of the total economic value that it creates. Since labor stands for the majority and capital for a tiny minority, it follows that classism and class warfare are built into its DNA, which explains why the "middle class" is shrinking and its gains are never secure. Thirdly, private interests determine massive investments and make key decisions at the point of production guided by maximization of profits. That's why in the US the truck freight replaced the railroad freight, chemicals were used extensively in agriculture, public transport was gutted in favor of private cars, and big cars replaced small ones. What should political action aim for today? The political class has no good ideas about how to address the crises. One may even wonder whether it has a serious understanding of the system, or at least of ways to ameliorate its consequences. The range of solutions offered tends to be of a technical, legislative, or regulatory nature, promising at best temporary management of the deepening crises. The trajectory of the system, at any rate, precludes a return to its post-WWII regulatory phase. It's left to us as a society to think about what the real character of the system is, where we are going, and how we are going to deal with the trajectory of the system -- and act accordingly. The critical task ahead is to build a transformative politics capable of steering the system away from its destructive path. Given the system's DNA, such a politics from below must include efforts to challenge the system's fundamentals, namely, its private mode of decision-making about investments and about what and how to produce. Furthermore, it behooves us to heed the late environmentalist Barry Commoner's insistence on the efficacy of a strategy of prevention over a failed one of control or capture of pollutants. At a lecture in 1991, Commoner remarked: "Environmental pollution is an incurable disease; it can only be prevented"; and he proceeded to refer to "a law," namely: "if you don't put a pollutant in the environment it won't be there." What is nearly certain now is that without democratic control of wealth and social governance of the means of production, we will all be condemned to the labor of Sisyphus. Only we won't have to suffer for all eternity, as the degradation of life-enhancing natural and social systems will soon reach a point of no return**.**

#### New radical party politics are key—we need a new political ecology of class.

#### Class consciousness on the rise globally – workers are hype to revolutionize and fight

Ackerman 10-25-21

Seth Ackerman (excecutive editor @ jacobin), 10-25-2021, "Class Politics in America Is Far From Dead," No Publication, [https://www.jacobinmag.com/2021/10/class-politics-democrats-gop-materialism-david-shor-eric-levitz //](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2021/10/class-politics-democrats-gop-materialism-david-shor-eric-levitz%20//) AW

It can’t be stressed enough that the public opinion data Inglehart analyzed in his initial works, in which he discovered the existence of a sharp and growing materialist/postmaterialist cleavage in rich countries, reflected the divergence in values between a generation that had been raised in the most cataclysmic era of modern history and a generation raised in what was, on average, probably the least threatening of all time. But that is no longer true today. The end of rising security has, as Inglehart’s theory always predicted it would, brought the postmaterialist tide to a halt in country after country. In Inglehart’s cowritten book on the Trump-Brexit populism phenomenon, again with Pippa Norris, the authors trace out the underlying reasons for the reversal. They note that while intergenerational population replacement is still taking place, in recent years it seems to have been offset by powerful period-effects linked with declining economic security. Millennials face greater risk of unemployment, stagnant wages, welfare cuts, and growing levels of student debt, so they are no longer growing up under dramatically more secure conditions than their elders. The declining strength of organized labor, economic liberalization, and the opening of borders to the free flow of labor, goods, trade, and services, has brought falling real income and the loss of job security to unskilled workers and the less educated populations in Western societies. And what would a true believer in postmaterialism expect to happen under those conditions? What else, if not a return of class struggle? In a 2016 article in Foreign Affairs, Inglehart laid out the reasons he believed the political shifts caused by postmaterialism’s ascent, which he’d been documenting uninterruptedly for virtually the whole of his long career, would go into reverse. What had happened, he explained, was that the success of the modern welfare state made further redistribution seem less urgent. . . . Globalization and deindustrialization underm

ined the strength of unions. And the information revolution helped establish a winner-take-all economy. Together these eroded the political base for redistributive policies, and as those policies fell out of favor, economic inequality rose once more. Today, large economic gains are still being made in developed countries, but they are going primarily to those at the very top of the income distribution, whereas those lower down have seen their real incomes stagnate or even diminish. The rich, in turn, have used their privilege to shape policies that further increase the concentration of wealth, often against the wishes and interests of the middle and lower classes. The “crucial questions for future politics in the developed world,” he reflected, were “how and when that majority develops a sense of common interest.” Would a sufficient number of “today’s dispossessed” come to “develop what Marx might have called ‘class consciousness’” and transform themselves into “a decisive political force?” It wouldn’t happen overnight, he suspected, given how “crosscutting cultural divisions still exist and can still divert attention from common economic interests.” But Inglehart saw clear signs that cultural issues were already losing their potency — pointing to the unexpected implosion of the anti-same-sex-marriage crusade, whose comprehensive defeat no one would have predicted just a few years earlier. Moreover, this time the fight would be “between a tiny elite and the great majority of citizens,” so that “the more current trends continue, the more pressure will build up to tackle inequality once again.” “The signs of such a stirring are already visible,” wrote the father of postmaterialism, a few years before he died, “and in time, the practical consequences will be as well.” This might seem sudden and unexpected; just a few years earlier, the idea of class struggle returning to the center of politics would have seemed absurd. But the story Inglehart tells is a tale as old as time. “Postmaterialism,” he concluded, “eventually became its own gravedigger.”

#### The alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only party organizing. That solves 100% of labor problems, the environment, and imperialism.
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I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for holding party members accountable, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions. It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement. Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism. The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

### Framing

#### The K OW and turns the aff –

#### (1) Form v Content – the K indicts the rhetoric or the pedagogical way that the aff is exported to fit in the debate space and is also the best model for clash because you clash with our theory of power instead of plan focus which we’ve indicted. It’s not unfair to expect you to defend your epistemological consequences anything else is academically irresponsible.

#### (2) Epistemology – neoliberalism imposes that our knowledge is formed through an endless cycle of production which means the 1AC “skills” are irrelevant and the exportation of their pedagogy is flawed

#### (3) Neoliberalism controls the value to life through affectivity which presupposes evaluation of body counts. Extinction has already happened and the criticism controls that value.

#### (5) Fiat is illusory none of their policymaking offense is solved but our representations can be rectified with a rejection which outweighs on ballot proximity

#### (6) No permutations – a) justifies infinite aff conditionality which kills negative route to the ballot b) it’s a methods debate to solve harms – combining them is nonsense because it abandons maxims about the initial movement and then it gets fragmented c) You should evaluate the aff as a research project because that’s how the semiotic economy coopts their offense d) it’s severance out of the 1ac’s representations which makes the aff a moving target

# Case

ROB- Vote for the best debater

* Anything else is abritraryad
* Their ROB is self serving
* No way to verify who best opens up spaces for collectivity better
* Fair since we can have ROB debates- educates us on materilal, immaterial, and other impacts that we would be exposed too