# Off

## Police

#### CP Text: A just government should abolish police unions and recognize the unconditional right of all other workers to strike.

#### The aff makes police collective bargaining worse and gives more power to police unions.

Andrew **Grim, 20** Ph.D. candidate in history at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, is at work on a dissertation on anti-police brutality activism in post-WWII Newark

- ("What is The Blue Flue and How Has It Increased Police Power," Washington Post, 7-1-2020, 11-2-2021https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/07/01/what-is-blue-flu-how-has-it-increased-police-power/)//AW municipalities.

#### Police unions use collective bargaining to reinforce systems of racism and violence. Clark ‘19

Paul F. Clark [School Director and Professor of Labor and Employment Relations, Penn State], 10-10-2019, "Why police unions are not part of the American labor movement," Conversation, [https://theconversation.com/why-police-unions-are-not-part-of-the-american-labor-movement-142538 //accessed 10/20/2021](https://theconversation.com/why-police-unions-are-not-part-of-the-american-labor-movement-142538%20//accessed%2010/20/2021) //marlborough jh

This weekend, officers from the New York City Police Department are rumored to be planning a walkout to protest calls to defund the police. This builds on a similar tactic used by police in Atlanta less than a month ago. On June 16, Fulton County District Attorney, Paul L. Howard Jr. announced that Garrett Rolfe, the Atlanta police officer who fatally shot Rayshard Brooks, would face charges of felony murder and aggravated assault. That night, scores of Atlanta Police Department officers caught the “blue flu,” calling out sick en masse to protest the charges against Rolfe. Such walkouts constitute, in effect, illegal strikes — laws in all 50 states prohibit police strikes. Yet, there is nothing new about the blue flu. It is a strategy long employed by police unions and rank-and-file officers during contract negotiations, disputes over reforms and, like in Atlanta, in response to disciplinary action against individual officers. The intent is to dramatize police disputes with municipal government and rally the citizenry to their side. But the result of such protests matter deeply as we consider police reform today. Historically, blue flu strikes have helped expand police power, ultimately limiting the ability of city governments to reform, constrain or conduct oversight over the police. They allow the police to leverage public fear of crime to extract concessions from

In the wake of George Floyd’s death at the hands of a Minneapolis police officer, news reports have suggested that [police unions bear some of the responsibility](https://www.salon.com/2020/06/27/police-unions-blamed-for-rise-in-fatal-shootings-even-as-crime-plummeted/) for the [violence perpetrated against African Americans](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/30/us/derek-chauvin-george-floyd.html). ¶Critics have assailed these unions for [protecting officers who have abused their authority](https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/06/09/limits-when-police-can-use-force-is-better-solution-than-banning-police-unions/). Derek Chauvin, the former police officer facing [second-degree murder charges for Floyd’s death](https://www.npr.org/2020/06/03/868910542/chauvin-and-3-former-officers-face-new-charges-over-george-floyds-death), had nearly [20 complaints filed against him during his career](https://www.mercurynews.com/2020/05/30/minneapolis-officers-work-personal-background-detailed-2/) but only received two letters of reprimand. ¶Many people who support labor unions in principle, who view them as a countervailing force against the power of employers, have only recently [come to view police unions as problematic](https://www.latimes.com/politics/story/2020-06-15/police-unions-george-floyd-reform) – as entities that [perpetuate a culture of racism and violence](https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-police-union-power-helped-increase-abuses). ¶But this sentiment reverberates through the history of the U.S. labor movement. As a [labor scholar](https://ler.la.psu.edu/people/pfc2) who has [written about unions](https://theconversation.com/essential-us-workers-often-lack-sick-leave-and-health-care-benefits-taken-for-granted-in-most-other-countries-136802) for [decades](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/bjir.12526), I think this viewpoint can be explained by the fact that police unions differ fundamentally from almost all trade unions in America. **¶**Foot soldiers for the status quo **¶**For many veterans of the labor movement, [police have been on the wrong side](https://plsonline.eku.edu/insidelook/history-policing-united-states-part-3) of the centuries-old struggle between workers and employers. [Rather than side with other members of the working class](https://www.businessinsider.com/mayhem-in-madison-police-remove-protesters-lockdown-capitol-2011-3), police have used their legal authority to protect businesses and private property, enforcing laws viewed by many as anti-union. **¶**The strain between law enforcement and labor goes back to the origins of [American unions in the mid 19th century](https://plsonline.eku.edu/insidelook/history-policing-united-states-part-3). Workers formed unions to fight for wage increases, reduced working hours and humane working conditions. **¶**For employers, this was an attack on the existing societal power structure. They enlisted the government as the defender of capital and property rights, and [police officers were the foot soldiers](http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2014/12/22/police-unions-havealwaysbeenalabormovementapart.html) who defended the status quo. **¶**When workers managed to form unions, companies called on local police to disperse union gatherings, marches and picket lines, using [violence and mass arrests to break the will of strikers](https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/how-1897-massacre-pennsylvania-coal-miners-morphed-galvanizing-crisis-forgotten-history-180971695/). **¶**A narrow focus **¶**Police work is a fundamentally conservative act. And police officers tend to be politically conservative and Republican. **¶**A poll of police [conducted in September 2016 by POLICE Magazine](https://www.policemag.com/342098/the-2016-police-presidential-poll) found that 84% of officers intended to vote for Donald Trump that November. And law enforcement unions like the Fraternal Order of Police, the International Union of Police Associations and the National Border Patrol Council [all endorsed Trump’s candidacy in 2016](https://theintercept.com/2016/10/09/police-unions-reject-charges-of-bias-find-a-hero-in-donald-trump/). **¶**This contrasts sharply with the 39% share of all [union voters who voted for Trump](https://www.wsj.com/articles/democrats-labor-to-stem-flow-of-union-voters-to-trump-11567422002) and the fact that every other union which made an [endorsement supported Hillary Clinton](https://justfacts.votesmart.org/candidate/evaluations/55463/hillary-clinton). **¶**Exclusively protecting the interests of their members, without consideration for other workers, also sets police unions apart from other labor groups. Yes, the first priority of any union is to fight for their members, but most other unions see that fight in the context of a [larger movement that fights for all workers](https://aflcio.org/what-unions-do/social-economic-justice). ¶Police unions do not see themselves as [part of this movement](https://www.teenvogue.com/story/what-to-know-police-unions-labor-movement). With one exception – the [International Union of Police Associations](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/jun/11/police-unions-american-labor-movement-protest), which represents just [2.7% of American police](https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ftelea9716.pdf) – law enforcement unions are not affiliated with the AFL-CIO, the U.S. labor body that unites all unions. ¶Alternative justice system ¶A central concern with police unions is that they use collective bargaining to negotiate contracts that reduce police transparency and accountability. This allows officers who engage in excessive violence to [avoid the consequences of their actions](https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2020/06/10/police-unions-violence-research-george-floyd/) and remain on the job. ¶In a way, some police unions have created an [alternative justice system](https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/06/restorative-justice-police-violence/489221/) that prevents police departments and municipalities from disciplining or discharging officers who have committed crimes against the people they are sworn to serve. ¶In Minneapolis, residents filed more than [2,600 misconduct complaints](https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-problem-with-police-unions-11591830984) against police officers between 2012 and 2020. But only 12 of those grievances resulted in discipline. The most significant [punishment any officer received was a 40-hour suspension](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/30/us/derek-chauvin-george-floyd.html). **¶**Besides collective bargaining, police have used the political process – including [candidate endorsements and lobbying](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2020/jun/23/police-unions-spending-policy-reform-chicago-new-york-la) – to secure local and state legislation that protects their members and quells efforts to provide greater police accountability. ¶Police officers are a formidable political force because they represent [the principle of law and order](https://www.thedailybeast.com/the-gop-and-police-unions-a-love-story). Candidates endorsed by the police unions can claim they are the law and order candidate. Once these candidates win office, police unions have [significant leverage to lobby for policies](https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2020/06/george-floyd-protests-police-abuse-reform-qualified-immunity-polls.html) they support or block those they oppose. ¶Because of this power, critics claim that police unions don’t feel accountable to the citizens they serve. An attorney who sued the Minneapolis Police Department on behalf of a Black resident who was [severely beaten by police officers](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/30/us/derek-chauvin-george-floyd.html) said that he is convinced that Minneapolis “officers think they don’t have to abide by their own training and rules when dealing with the public.” ¶George Floyd’s death has raised serious concerns about the current role of police and police unions in our society. Several unions have demanded that the International Union of Police Associations be expelled from the U.S. labor federation. Other [unions oppose expulsion](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/politics-news/national-labor-groups-mostly-close-ranks-defend-police-unions-n1231573). They argue that the labor movement can have a greater impact on a police union that is inside the “House of Labor.” ¶In any case, there is a growing recognition that police unions differ significantly from other unions. And there is a growing acceptance that they are not part of the larger American labor movement but rather a narrowly focused group pursuing their own self-interests, often to the detriment of the nation at large.

#### Police backed by unions are more violent than non-unionized police. Ingraham ’20.

Christopher Ingraham [Reporter] 20. ("Police Unions and Police Misconduct: What the Research Says About the Connection," Washington Post, 6-10-2020, 10-27-2021 https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2020/06/10/police-unions-violence-research-george-floyd/)//AW

Some of the most shocking images to emerge from the demonstrations that have dominated recent headlines stem from violent interactions between law enforcement officers and peaceful protesters. They’ve also escalated calls for police reform. But police unions tend to be resistant to such efforts, as their mandate is to protect the interests of their members — even in cases when those interests may be counter to democratic norms and values. Though an understudied topic of criminology, what research that does exist is unequivocal: “Virtually **all** of the **published items** that express an opinion **on the impact of police unions regard them as having a negative effect**, particularly **on innovation, accountability, and police — community relations**,” as a review in the journal Police Practice and Research put it. Researchers say unionized officers draw more excessive-force complaints and are more likely to kill civilians, particularly nonwhite ones. Here are some key findings: Unionization emboldens violent officers A recent University of Chicago working paper found violent misconduct among sheriff’s officers increased about 40 percent after a state supreme court ruling allowing the officers to unionize. The incidents examined in this paper are among the most serious types of violent misconduct, including sexual assault and excessive force. It’s worth noting the baseline numbers of these types of incidents are very low, such that the 40 percent increase translates into roughly one additional violent incident per sheriff’s office every five years. Certain union-negotiated contract provisions — including time limits on misconduct investigations, expungement of misconduct records, and mechanisms allowing officers to challenge disciplinary findings — make it more difficult to detect and punish officers who abuse their position, the researchers say. Additionally, the authors write, unionization “may increase solidarity among officers and thereby strengthen a code of silence that impedes the detection of misconduct.” Use-of-force complaints more likely among unionized officers A 2006 report from the federal Bureau of Justice Statistics found unionized police agencies garnered 9.9 use-of-force complaints for every 100 officers, compared with 7.3 for non-unionized agencies. During the disciplinary process, about 7 percent of those complaints were sustained, or found to have merit, in unionized agencies. In nonunion agencies, the sustain rate was more than double, at 15 percent. In effect, officers in unionized police forces are more likely to be the subjects of an excessive-force complaint, but more likely to beat the allegations in disciplinary hearings. Lengthy appeals processes make it more difficult to fire ‘bad apples’ Writing in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review, Stephen Rushin analyzed 656 police union contracts to examine the role of the disciplinary appeals process in misconduct cases. “The median police department in the data set offers police officers as many as four layers of appellate review in disciplinary cases,” he found. Some provided six or seven layers of review. After those levels are exhausted, most departments then allow officers accused of misconduct to appeal to a third-party arbitrator. More than half gave the offending officers some control over the selection of the arbitrator. The result, as detailed in a 2017 Washington Post investigation, is that a stunningly high percentage of officers fired for misconduct are eventually rehired after a lengthy appeals process. In Washington, D.C., for instance, 45 percent of the officers fired for misconduct from 2006 to 2017 were rehired on appeal. In Philadelphia, the share is 62 percent. In San Antonio, it’s 70 percent. Other contract provisions also shield police from accountability In a separate paper in the Duke Law Journal, Rushin analyzed 178 police union contracts and found a number of provisions that played a role in shielding police from the consequences of misconduct, including provisions that “limit officer interrogations after alleged misconduct, mandate the destruction of disciplinary records, ban civilian oversight, prevent anonymous civilian complaints, indemnify officers in the event of civil suits, and limit the length of internal investigations.” He found that “overall, 156 of the 178 police union contracts examined in this study — around 88 percent — contained at least one provision that could thwart legitimate disciplinary actions against officers engaged in misconduct.” Police unions advocate shielding disciplinary records from public view Writing in the Stanford Law & Policy Review, Katherine Bies notes that “police disciplinary records are public in only 12 states,” due in no small part to lobbying efforts by police unions. The article deals specifically with the efforts of police unions to pass laws in two states — New York’s notorious Section 50-a and a similar law in California — that shield disciplinary records from public scrutiny. “Police unions often strategically frame any opposition to their agenda of secrecy as endangering public safety and harming the public interest,” Bies writes. “However, police unions often conflate ‘the public interest’ with the private interests of police officers.” Unionized police may be more likely to kill civilians, particularly nonwhite ones Economist Rob Gillezeau recently previewed his research examining the relationship between unionization and police killings of U.S. citizens. While provisional, his initial results suggest the police unionization happening in the 1950s through the 1980s led to “about 60 to 70″ additional civilians killed by police each year. The “overwhelming majority” of those civilians were nonwhite. “With the caveat that this is very early work, it looks like collective bargaining rights are being used to protect the ability of officers to discriminate in the disproportionate use of force against the nonwhite population,” he recently said on Twitter.

#### Police unions are anti-labor- means the aff can never solve without getting rid of them AND turns case. Modak 20.

Ria Modak [Student Coordinator, Muslim American Studies Working Group, Harvard Student Labor Action Movement and the Harvard Graduate Students Union] 20 - ("Police Unions Are Anti-Labor," Ria Modak, Harvard Political Review, 9-9-2020, 10-27-2021 https://harvardpolitics.com/police-unions-are-anti-labor/)//AW

My own experiences with HUPD are reflective of a long history fraught with violence. For two centuries, **the police have been used to suppress labor action** and promote corporate interests. **The police**, the National Guard and the U.S. Army **played an integral role in suppressing the Great Strike of 1877**, the Homestead Strike of 1892 **and** the **Lawrence Strike** of 1912, to name a few examples. **In** each of **these incidents,** the **police resorted to extreme violence**, acquiring new legal powers and protections as they terrorized working class communities. By the middle of the 20th century, **the police had become** **a**n autocratic, **militarized force whose** primary **role was to challenge organized labor through union-busting and strike-breaking.** They continue to occupy this role. For evidence, we have to look no further than the ongoing protests for racial justice in which the police have been called to attend to instances of rioting. Their brutal treatment of protesters, including the use of teargas and rubber bullets, is further proof of their commitment to property over people. It is no coincidence that cops interfere with labor action; the fundamental objective of the police is to protect property. Modern day police forces in urban cities like Boston were founded to safeguard trade and protect commercial property, and in the South, policing evolved from slave patrols tasked with chasing down runaway slaves. **Policing** was, and **continues to** be, a way to protect and **serve capitalism, not people**. By attending to private property, which itself depends on the extraction of labor from the working class, the police align themselves with capitalists, rather than with workers**. The** material **interests of** the **police are antithetical to the very ethos of organized labor, which seeks to protect workers from capitalist exploitation.** It is impossible to build a working class movement while supporting an institution that was founded to oppress working class and Black communities. Police unions are also complicit in anti-labor action in the federal political arena. The Fraternal Order of Police and **the International Union of Police Associations**, the two largest police unions in the country, endorsed President Trump in 2016 and recently endorsed his reelection campaign. By funneling money into President Trump’s campaign, **the IUPA is** directly **responsible for** hisblatantly **anti-labor policies, which have restricted the freedom to join unions, silenced workers, and gutted health and safety protections.** Furthermore, much of the power **of** policing lies in **police unions,** which **enable racist, anti-labor action by making it** nearly **impossible for** police **officers to be held accountable** for their actions. Collective bargaining agreements allow officers to evade the consequences of innumerable wrongs — including the violent killing of Black people, sexual assault, lying to investigators and falsifying documents — by limiting independent oversight and expunging misconduct records. In addition, unions spend millions of dollars lobbying against police reform on the local, state and federal levels. By shielding officers from consequences and blocking reform, **police unions embolden violence against the Black and Brown communities** that are the most vulnerable to police brutality. One way to put an end to racialized police violence is to put an end to police unions. **Dismantling police unions is a** crucial **step in taking power away from the police and giving it back to** working class communities and **communities of color.** Although not all police departments are unionized or affiliated with a larger labor federation like the AFL-CIO, those that are must be expelled. However, disaffiliation must be only the first step in a broader struggle to dismantle the police in its entirety. Police abolition means building a world that does not rely on capitalism and racism to structure society. Although some critics of abolition argue that disaffiliating police unions would threaten other public sector unions, many trade unionists disagree with this position, indicating support from public sector workers themselves. Union members represented by the Service Employees International Union and United Auto Workers have demanded the disaffiliation of police unions from the larger labor movement. In addition, a coalition of labor organizers called “No Cop Unions” have called on the AFL-CIO to expel IUPA and urged AFL-CIO affiliates with partial law enforcement membership to terminate their relationships with unionized police and correctional officers. Ultimately, the call to separate **police unions** from the labor movement is a recognition that they **have no role in a society that truly values workers**. The **goals of the police**, which are maintained and facilitated by police unions, **are incompatible with pro-labor ideology**. The labor movement must take a firm stance against police unions and work to develop an anti-racist praxis. There can be no labor justice while police unions continue to protect anti-worker interests.

## WSDE

#### Plan text: Firms should be transformed into worker self-directed enterprises.

Wolff ND - Richard D. Wolff [professor of economics emeritus at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst and a visiting professor at the New School in New York City. He has also taught economics at Yale University, the City University of New York, and the University of Paris I (Sorbonne)], “Start with Worker Self-Directed Enterprises,” *The Next System Project*. <https://thenextsystem.org/sites/default/files/2017-08/RickWolff.pdf> AT

We therefore propose reorganizing enterprises such that workers become their own bosses. Specifically, that means placing the workers in the position of their own collective board of directors, rather than having directors be nonworkers selected by major shareholders. This is not primarily a matter of workers as owners of these enterprises (fine, but not required), nor primarily as managers (likewise fine, but not required). It is the tasks of direction—the decision making now assigned usually and primarily to corporate boards of directors and only secondarily to the major shareholders who choose them—that must be transferred to the workers collectively. We call such enterprises worker self-directed enterprises (WSDEs). They embody and concretize what we mean by economic democracy by locating it first and foremost inside the enterprises producing the goods and services upon which society depends. WSDEs represent the goal and their growth and proliferation represent the mechanism to transition from the present capitalist system to a far better next system. The strategic focus, then, is not upon the government, as in traditional liberal and socialist thinking; it is rather more microeconomic than macroeconomic. Of course, winning government support of WSDEs and their proliferation would be helpful and sought after—perhaps by political parties rooted in and funded by an emerging WSDE sector within otherwise private or state capitalist economies. But the main emphasis would be on working people who either convert existing enterprises into WSDEs or start new enterprises as WSDEs. Core Goals Briefly, what are the principal, core goals your model or system seeks to realize? Our core goal is the development of a major—and, if possible, prevailing—sector of the economy that is comprised of enterprises (offices, factories, farms, and stores) in which the employees democratically perform the following key enterprise activities: (a) divide all the labors to be performed, (b) determine what is to be produced, how it is to be produced, and where it is to be produced, and (c) decide on the use and distribution of the output or revenues (if output is monetized) therefrom. Major Changes What are the principal changes you envision in the current system—the major differences between what you envision and what we have today? A large portion of existing capitalistically organized enterprises would have to transition out of structures in which owners, top managers, or boards of directors perform the key enterprise activities mentioned above. Principal Means What are the principal means (policies, institutions, behaviors, whatever) through which each of your core goals is pursued? The means to achieve the transition would need to be several. Laws would need to be enacted or changed to facilitate the conversion of capitalistically organized enterprises into WSDEs, the formation of new WSDEs, and the functioning of WSDEs. School curriculums would need to be changed and teachers be trained to explain, explore, and study WSDEs systematically as alternative-enterprise organizations alongside their traditional capitalist counterparts (corporations, partnerships, and family enterprises). Political parties and platforms need to emerge to represent the interests of WSDEs—the WSDE sector—in terms of state policies, much as now the Democrats and Republicans represent the interests of the capitalist sector.

#### Empirics prove that self-directed firms are more democratic and successful.

Jerry **Ashton, 13** - ("The Worker Self-Directed Enterprise: A "Cure" for Capitalism, or a Slippery Slope to Socialism?," HuffPost, 1-2-2013, accessed 11-16-2021, https://www.huffpost.com/entry/worker-self-directed-enterprise\_b\_2385334)//MS

Decidedly so, Wolff responds, providing two financially successful examples of **the workplace being a social activity governed by the norms of community**, one in Spain and one in California. ¶ Wolff offers as his first example, **the Mondragon Cooperative** in the North of Spain. ¶ This co-op took its name from the Mondragan University founded by a local Catholic priest by the name of "Father Arizmendi" as a mechanism to enable the poor in that community to learn how to cooperatively run their own business. ¶ Beginning with six workers producing agrarian goods, some 55 years later **it now employs 120,000** people employed **in some 100 worker-owned enterprises** and affiliated organizations. It is the **10th largest cooperative in Spain** and a bulwark against that country's steep (elsewhere) unemployment rate of 22 percent. ¶ "This is a 'a family of cooperatives' in which the first commitment is to preserve jobs -- not satisfy stockholders." Wolff points out. ¶ That same philosophy infuses **the Arizmendi Bakery** comprising five "sister cooperatives" in the San Francisco Bay Area. Proudly assuming the name of the famous Basque Priest, this group **gets rave reviews** for its pastries and thin-crust pizza **and handily outperforms** its more traditional bakery competitors **in both revenue and employee satisfaction**. ¶ As their website [proudly states](http://arizmendi.coop/), "We are a cooperative -- a worker-owned and operated business. We make decisions democratically, sharing all of the tasks, responsibilities, benefits and risks." ¶

## UBI

#### CP Text: A just government ought to provide universal basic income

#### Striking can’t solve layoffs when the employer doesn’t need their workers anymore – UBI would give workers a cushion to survive unemployment AND increase their ability to strike by providing a strike fund

Tascha Shahriari-Parsa, 21 [Tascha Shahriari-Parsa is a student at Harvard Law School.] ("Why Universal Basic Income is a Labor Issue," OnLabor, 4-30-2021, https://onlabor.org/why-universal-basic-income-is-a-labor-issue/)//va

For both Stern and Yang, UBI is, at least in large part, a solution to growing concerns over the role that automation will play in creating mass unemployment. As Yang pointed out on his campaign trail, self-driving truck technology could easily render millions of Americans without a job in the blink of an eye. And it’s not just truck drivers: a [2016 federal report](https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/documents/Artificial-Intelligence-Automation-Economy.PDF) found that 83% of jobs making less than $20 per hour could be lost due to automation. This doesn’t mean that labor will become obsolete—jobs displaced by technology will eventually be replaced by jobs in other areas. But what are you supposed to do if you’ve been driving trucks your whole life? Learn how to code? How would you survive in the interim? ¶ Perhaps unions can mitigate the ‘side-effects’ of technology. In 1812, the Luddites famously smashed textile machinery, giving rise to the modern usage of the term “luddite” to refer to a person opposed to technological progress. But contrary to the common myth, the Luddites [were not](https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/what-the-luddites-really-fought-against-264412/) against machinery. They were against their terrible labor conditions, demanding that whoever runs the machines should receive sufficient training and be paid a fair wage. In that sense, the Luddites’ demands were comparable to those of [UNITE HERE](https://www.seattletimes.com/business/technology/as-seattles-new-hotels-roll-out-automation-to-serve-guests-workers-worry/) hotel workers who went on strike throughout the country in 2018, [winning](https://usw.org/blog/2018/members-of-unite-here-set-standard-in-contract-with-marriott) mandated training for workers affected by new technology as well as a say over how new technology would be implemented. ¶ Collective bargaining over the implementation of technology is an important part of the solution. But even if we organized the entire U.S. workforce into unions with enough power to negotiate such agreements, we wouldn’t stop mass layoffs. The key source of workers’ leverage over their employer—the ability to withhold labor—is predicated on the employer’s need for their labor in the first place. UBI isn’t a replacement for a union, but it can help fill a gap where labor otherwise has very little power. ¶ And it’s not just about technology. When Marriot workers were negotiating their agreements in 2018, what they likely weren’t expecting was that [98%](https://www.propublica.org/article/inside-the-union-where-coronavirus-puts-98--of-members-out-of-work) of their members would be out of work not as a consequence of automation, but rather, a global pandemic. Moreover, mass unemployment has always been endemic to capitalism. Even in the absence of crisis, there will always be millions of Americans without a job. ¶ In a society as rich as ours, UBI is a declaration that everyone is entitled to an income, whether they work or not. UBI is also a proclamation that the poor should have the right to use their money as they see fit—that poverty is itself the [issue](https://www.apa.org/advocacy/socioeconomic-status/scarcity-fact-sheet.pdf), rather than a symptom of a [lack of character](https://thecorrespondent.com/283/poverty-isnt-a-lack-of-character-its-a-lack-of-cash/37442933638-a4773584#:~:text=%E2%80%9CPoverty%20is%20a%20great%20enemy,It's%20a%20lack%20of%20cash.) or a [‘poor gene](https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/669034#metadata_info_tab_contents)’. And given how wealth and power go hand in hand, UBI gives the working class a fighting chance to counter the power of the elite. ¶ Moreover, a UBI would substantially alter the landscape of labor. If everyone is guaranteed a paycheck whether they show up to work or not, workers will have far more bargaining power than they do in the present. A $1,000/month UBI is not a living wage, but it’s a cushion that would give workers more power to leave a bad job—and thus more power to negotiate to make that job better. Serving the function of a strike fund, a UBI would also make it easier for workers to go on strike. Additionally, UBI would raise minimum standards on top of prevailing wages, allowing workers to save more of their bargaining leverage for everything else that matters. ¶

#### A Universal Basic Income solves income inequality. Wright 17

Erik Olin Wright, American analytical Marxist sociologist, author, and educator 2-14-2017, "Can the universal basic income solve global inequalities?," UNESCO Inclusive Policy Lab, https://en.unesco.org/inclusivepolicylab/news/can-universal-basic-income-solve-global-inequalities/ JRG

The universal basic income (UBI) is spreading and becoming front and centre in the public discussion. What if this idea, suggesting a flat income given to every citizen regardless of employment or social status, was part of the solution to today’s inequalities? In his contribution to the World Social Science Report 2016, renowned sociology Professor Erik Olin Wright explored the concept for us: The idea of an unconditional basic income (UBI) is quite simple: **every legal resident in a country receives a monthly stipend sufficient to live above the poverty line. Let’s call this the ‘no frills culturally respectable standard of living’. The grant is unconditional on the performance of any labour or other form of contribution, and it is universal – everyone receives the grant,** rich and poor alike**. Grants go to individuals, not families. Parents are the custodians of under-age children’s grants, which may be smaller than the grants for adults. Universalistic programmes such as public education and healthcare, that provide services to people rather than cash, continue alongside UBI, but most other redistributive transfers are eliminated since the UBI provides everyone with a decent subsistence. This means that in welfare systems that already provide generous anti-poverty income support through a patchwork of specialized programmes, the net increase in cost represented by UBI is not large. Special needs subsidies** of various sorts **continue – for example, for people with disabilities – but they are also smaller than now since the basic cost of living is covered by UBI. Minimum wage rules are relaxed, since there is little need to prohibit below-subsistence wages if all earnings in effect generate discretionary income. While everyone receives the grant, most people at any given point in time are probably net contributors since their taxes rise by more than the basic income they receive**. **UBI has potentially profound ramifications for inequality. Poverty is eliminated, the labour contract becomes more nearly voluntary, and** the **power relations between workers and employers become less unequal since workers have the option of exit. The possibility of people forming cooperative associations to produce goods and services to serve human need outside the market increases since such activity no longer needs to provide the basic standard of living for participants**. Sceptics of basic income typically raise two main objections: that UBI would reduce incentives to work and reduce the supply of labour, and that the tax rates needed to fund UBI would be prohibitively high. Two things can be said about the incentive issue. First, **means-tested income support programmes are plagued by poverty traps in which people lose their benefits when their earned income crosses some threshold**. By contrast, **a UBI creates no disincentive to work. Paid work always increases the discretionary income of people with a UBI.** Second, **while no country has adopted a full basic income, there have been a few limited experiments in various places in the world which enable us to examine the effects of UBI on labour force participation**. In the United States and Canada in the 1970s there were a number of randomized controlled trials, most notably in Seattle and Denver, in which randomly selected low-income individuals received a UBI. More recently, in India in 2011, eight villages were selected in which all residents were given a basic income. **In all of these experiments, receiving a UBI significantly improved the lives of people while having at most a modest effect on labour force participation**. The level of taxation needed to pay for a basic income is, of course, an important issue. But **the sustainable level of taxation in any country is not mainly an economic issue.** It is a political issue that depends on the administrative capacity to extract taxes and the political will to do so.

# Case

### Backlash Turn

**Turn: More strikes lead to backlash bills that weaken unions – empirically proven. Partelow ‘19**

Lisette Partelow [Lisette Partelow is the director of K-12 Strategic Initiatives at American Progress. Her previous experience includes teaching first grade in Washington, D.C., working as a senior legislative assistant for Rep. Dave Loebsack (D-IA), and working as a legislative associate at the Alliance for Excellent Education. She has also worked at the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor and the American Institutes for Research. “Analysis: A Looming Legislative Backlash Against Teacher Strikes? Why Walkouts Could Become Illegal in Some States, With Strikers Facing Fines, Jail, or Loss of Their License”. 02-18-2019. The 74. https://www.the74million.org/article/analysis-a-looming-legislative-backlash-against-teacher-strikes-why-walkouts-could-become-illegal-in-some-states-with-strikers-facing-fines-jail-or-loss-of-their-license/. Accessed 11-3-2021; MJen]

In 2018 and 2019, after a decade of disinvestment in education that led to stagnant teacher salaries, policymakers have introduced [proposals in states](https://thehill.com/homenews/state-watch/426030-states-race-to-prevent-teacher-strikes-by-boosting-pay) across the country to begin reinvesting, spurred in part by teacher walkouts and activism nationwide. While it is wonderful to finally see broad support for raising teacher salaries and investing in public schools, a predictable backlash has also emerged. Legislators in some states that were hotbeds of teacher activism are [introducing bills](http://nymag.com/intelligencer/2019/01/teacher-walkouts-gop-lawmakers-push-retaliatory-bills.html) to explicitly prohibit walkouts or punish teachers who participate, often with a sprinkling of additional anti-union provisions. **Weakening unions and refusing to invest in education** are long-standing conservative tenets, and these bills are evidence that we should expect conservative policymakers to return to them as soon as they believe them to be politically viable. The consequences of a decade of education funding cuts came into sharp relief last spring, after teachers staged walkouts in [half a dozen states](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/05/16/us/teacher-walkout-north-carolina.html). The [decade of disinvestment](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-k-12/reports/2018/09/20/457750/fixing-chronic-disinvestment-k-12-schools/) in education had its roots in the Great Recession, when many states were forced to drastically cut their K-12 education funding. But as the recovery got underway, many governors — particularly in red states — made intentional policy choices to cut taxes for wealthy residents and corporations rather than allow education funding to rebound to pre-recession levels as revenue increased. As a [result](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-k-12/reports/2018/09/20/457750/fixing-chronic-disinvestment-k-12-schools/%5b), teacher wages stagnated, school budgets were strapped, and expenses such as building repairs and learning materials were deferred year after year. By 2018, reports of [crumbling schools](https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2018/01/its-not-just-freezing-classrooms-in-baltimore-americas-schools-are-physically-falling-apart/), students learning from [decades-old textbooks](https://www.cnn.com/2018/04/03/us/oklahoma-teachers-textbooks-trnd/index.html), high teacher turnover, and staff [shortages](https://tucson.com/news/local/we-continue-to-worsen-nearly-arizona-teaching-jobs-remain-vacant/article_1c8d665a-a422-5c7b-95b9-98afe0cb0c6f.html) in these states became common. Teachers had reached their [boiling point](https://morningconsult.com/opinions/americas-teachers-are-at-their-boiling-point/). The teacher walkouts have been very effective. Though they were a last resort, they finally got lawmakers’ attention in states that had seen the most chronic and severe cuts to education. In the states where teachers walked out, governors who hadn’t historically supported [education funding](https://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/education/news/2018/10/09/171813/little-late-many-gubernatorial-candidates-education-funding/) agreed to enact significant [pay raises](https://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-teacher-funding-20180306-story.html) and increases in education funding. For example, in Arizona, Republican Gov. Doug Ducey was forced to sign off on a teacher pay bill he had [previously opposed](https://tucson.com/news/local/gov-ducey-teachers-aren-t-going-to-get-percent-pay/article_75a9b7dc-930b-5374-be12-61fb840e4ced.html) that provided a [20 percent raise](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-education-arizona/arizona-governor-signs-bill-to-boost-teachers-wages-amid-strike-idUSKBN1I40N8) to the state’s teachers — some of the lowest-paid in the nation — and invested an additional $100 million in schools in the state. And now, in several states with low teacher pay that have so far avoided major protests, some governors have proposed salary increases. Remarkably, much of this movement is happening in [deep-red states](https://thehill.com/homenews/state-watch/426030-states-race-to-prevent-teacher-strikes-by-boosting-pay) with historically low education spending. In South Carolina, Gov. Henry McMaster wants to give teachers a 5 percent pay raise; in Texas, Lt. Gov. Dan Patrick has proposed a $5,000 increase; and in Georgia, Gov. Brian Kemp has proposed a $3,000 increase. In all three of these states, teachers are [paid less](http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/180413-Rankings_And_Estimates_Report_2018.pdf) than the national average. It’s likely that last year’s walkouts nudged these governors to consider teacher pay in a way that they wouldn’t have otherwise. Though it goes against traditional conservative principles, supporting these raises is smart politics for these governors. There is widespread public [support for increasing teacher pay](https://www.apnews.com/883e9d387709112a11ee8901c223294e), particularly in the states where walkouts occurred. But even as some conservative policymakers agree to raise teacher salaries, as the 2019 legislative sessions have begun, others in Arizona, Oklahoma, and West Virginia have introduced bills that would [make walkouts illegal](http://nymag.com/intelligencer/2019/01/teacher-walkouts-gop-lawmakers-push-retaliatory-bills.html) and penalize teachers with fines, loss of their teaching licenses, or even [jail time](https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2018/4/23/17270422/colorado-teachers-strike-jail-bill). Some of the bills also contain provisions designed specifically to weaken teachers unions, such as a requirement that teachers must [opt in to dues each year](https://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2019/01/28/us/ap-us-education-bill-west-virginia.html), which sponsors hope will reduce membership by adding an extra step to the process. Legislators in walkout states have also introduced stand-alone proposals designed to **make union membership more difficult** and, therefore, less likely, such as a prohibition on districts [withholding union dues](https://newsok.com/article/5593286/bill-is-revenge-for-teacher-walkout-unions-say) from teachers’ paychecks. These backlash bills hint at a much more familiar conservative education agenda of slashing funding and working to weaken teachers unions. After all, it is this agenda that led to stagnant teacher salaries, deplorable conditions in many school buildings, and consequences for students whose schools were chronically underfunded in the first place. Supporting increases to teacher pay and greater investment in schools is the right thing to do for America’s students. Unfortunately, this wave of backlash makes clear that for some policymakers, it’s all about politics — and as soon as they have the chance, they’ll once again slash education funding and attack hardworking teachers.

**Turn again: The right to strike just leads businesses to take stronger steps to stop unionization.**

Gordon **Lafer, 20** - ("Fear at work: An inside account of how employers threaten, intimidate, and harass workers to stop them from exercising their right to collective bargaining," Economic Policy Institute, 7-23-2020, https://www.epi.org/publication/fear-at-work-how-employers-scare-workers-out-of-unionizing/)//va

NLRB elections are fundamentally framed by one-sided control over communication, with no free-speech rights for workers. Under current law, employers may require workers to attend mass anti-union meetings as often as once a day (mandatory meetings at which the employer delivers anti-union messaging are dubbed “captive audience meetings” in labor law). Not only is the union not granted equal time, but pro-union employees may be required to attend on condition that they not ask questions; those who speak up despite this condition can be legally fired on the spot.[19](https://www.epi.org/publication/fear-at-work-how-employers-scare-workers-out-of-unionizing/#_note19) The most recent data show that nearly 90% of employers force employees to attend such anti-union campaign rallies, with the average employer holding 10 such mandatory meetings during the course of an election campaign.[20](https://www.epi.org/publication/fear-at-work-how-employers-scare-workers-out-of-unionizing/#_note20) ¶ In addition to group meetings, employers typically have supervisors talk one-on-one with each of their direct subordinates.[21](https://www.epi.org/publication/fear-at-work-how-employers-scare-workers-out-of-unionizing/#_note21) In these conversations, the same person who controls one’s schedule, assigns job duties, approves vacation requests, grants raises, and has the power to terminate employees “at will” conveys how important it is that their underlings oppose unionization. As one longtime consultant explained, a supervisor’s message is especially powerful because “the warnings…come from…the people counted on for that good review and that weekly paycheck.”[22](https://www.epi.org/publication/fear-at-work-how-employers-scare-workers-out-of-unionizing/#_note22) ¶ Within this lopsided campaign environment, the employer’s message typically focuses on a few key themes: unions will drive employers out of business, unions only care about extorting dues payments from workers, and unionization is futile because employees can’t make management do something it doesn’t want to do.[23](https://www.epi.org/publication/fear-at-work-how-employers-scare-workers-out-of-unionizing/#_note23) Many of these arguments are highly deceptive or even mutually contradictory. For instance, the dues message stands in direct contradiction to management’s warnings that unions inevitably lead to strikes and unemployment. If a union were primarily interested in extracting dues money from workers, it would never risk a strike or bankruptcy, because no one pays dues when they are on strike or out of work. But in an atmosphere in which pro-union employees have little effective right of reply, these messages may prove extremely powerful. ¶ It is common for unionization drives to start with two-thirds of employees supporting unionization and still end in a “no” vote. This reversal points to the anti-democratic dynamics of NLRB elections: voters are not being convinced of the merits of remaining without representation—they are being intimidated into the belief that unionization is at best futile and at worst dangerous. When a large national survey asked workers who had been through an election **to name “the most important reason people voted against union representation,” the single most common response was management pressure, including fear of job loss**.[24](https://www.epi.org/publication/fear-at-work-how-employers-scare-workers-out-of-unionizing/#_note24) Those who vote on this basis are not expressing a preferenceto remain unrepresented. Indeed, many might still prefer unionization if they believed it could work. Where fear is the motivator, what is captured in the snapshot of the ballot is not preference but despair. ¶To understand what union elections look like in reality, we have profiled two cases in which workers sought to create a union and met with a harsh (and typical) employer backlash. In both cases—a tire plant in Georgia and a satellite TV company in Texas—the employer response ranges from illegally firing union activists to engaging in acts of coercion and intimidation that are illegal in any normal election to public office but are allowed under the NLRA. ¶

#### The turns outweigh the Aff. Their solvency is about how *unionization* is key to prevent monopsonies, not a stronger right to strike. Their own solvency card says that “unions serve as countervailing power” but the plan weakens unions. THEIR EV – Marlborough reads yellow - Protecting the right to organize is key to reverse monopsony power

**Bahn 19** [Kate Bahn, 8-29-2019, "The once and future role of strikes in ensuring U.S. worker power," Equitable Growth, https://equitablegrowth.org/the-once-and-future-role-of-strikes-in-ensuring-u-s-worker-power/, accessed 10-31-2021] BCortez

The role of monopsony power in the U.S. labor market

[Monopsony power](https://equitablegrowth.org/understanding-the-importance-of-monopsony-power-in-the-u-s-labor-market/) is a situation in the labor market where individual employers exercise effective control over wage setting rather than wages being set by competitive forces (akin to monopoly power, where a limited number of firms exercise pricing power over their customers.) In a new Equitable Growth [working paper](https://equitablegrowth.org/working-papers/how-does-market-power-affect-wages-monopsony-and-collective-action-in-an-institutional-context/) by Mark Paul of New College of Florida and Mark Stelzner of Connecticut College, the **role of collective action** in offsetting employer monopsony power is examined in the context of **institutional support for labor.** Paul and Stelzner construct an abstract model with the assumption of monopsonistic markets and follow the originator of monopsony theory Joan Robinson’s **insight that unions can serve as a countervailing power against employer power.**

Their model shows that **institutional support for unions**, such as legislation **protecting the right to organize**, is **necessary for this dynamic process of balancing employers’ monopsony power.** In an accompanying [column](https://equitablegrowth.org/rethinking-collective-action-and-u-s-labor-laws-in-a-monopsonistic-economy/), the two researchers write that they **“find that a lack of institutional support will devastate unions’ ability to function as a balance to firms’ monopsony power, potentially with major consequences … In turn, labor market outcomes will be less socially efficient.”**

In short, policies and enforcement that support collective action such as strikes not only creates benefits for workers directly but also addresses a larger problem of concentrated market power.

#### COVID thumps econ inequality – US allegiances crumbling + global war would’ve happened by now