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I negate resolved: A just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike

# Inherency

**Capitalism is inherently immoral and exploits the worker**

[Under Capitalism, There’s No Such Thing as a “Fair Day’s Wage for a Fair Day’s Work”](https://jacobinmag.com/2020/09/capitalism-marxism-economics-hadas-thier-book-excerpt)BY

HADAS **THIER**, 09.07.**20**

**Modern capitalism is characterized by** an **immense expansion of wealth. Its entire history is marked by growth.** The US economy, when healthy, grows by about 4 percent per year. The Chinese economy, until recently, was growing by as much as 10 percent per year. And the world economy as a whole has expanded by roughly 3 percent annually since 1980, according to data from the World Bank. In fact, if any country’s output stops expanding, it goes into recession. If economies throughout the world contract all at once — as we’re seeing today — the result may well be a global depression.

How do **capitalists generate** this expanding **surplus**? Karl Marx, though he was writing 150 years ago, made an indispensable contribution to uncovering the internal laws of capitalism beneath the façade of equity. A useful starting point is to look at what Marx calls the “the general formula of capital,” which he summarized with a simple formula: M-C-M’.

Capitalists start **with money** (M)**,** which they use **to invest in the production of commodities** (C)**, and** then they **sell those commodities** on the market **to get back more money than they started with**, (M’).

**In a** pre-capitalist **bartered exchange, commodities of** roughly **equal value could change hands**, **using money** as an intermediary **to facilitate the process.** But the circuit of **capital** instead **turns money into the driver of the process.**

**…**

Wherein lies the secret? Let’s look more closely at the circuit of capital. The merchant bought commodities that had already been produced and then sold them for a higher price. However, **the capitalist invests not in** finished **products, but** rather purchases two different types of commodities: 1) **means of production** **and** 2) **labor-power.** The “means of production” are the tools and materials that are necessary to make goods (e.g. factories, office buildings, land, machinery, software, IT infrastructure, etc.). And “labor-power” is our ability to labor.

The capitalist employs both “inputs” in a production process (P) that creates a new set of commodities, worth more than the combined value of the original inputs. The circuit of capital can thus be expanded to a more precise formula: M-C (MP+L) . . . P . . . C’-M’.

The “secret” hidden within this production process lies in a special commodity of “labor-power” — the ability to work. **The ability to work has become a commodity under capitalism, which the capitalist buys in exchange for a wage.** At first look, this seems self-evident. We wake up, go to work, come home with a wage (or at least the promise of one to be paid at the end of the pay period). **We are selling our ability to work —** our labor-power. **And** since selling our old Beanie Baby collection will only get us so far, by and large, for most of us, if we are “lucky” enough to be considered employable, our **labor-power is the only commodity we really have to sell.**

But what makes this commodity special, and to whom?

**Labor-power is bought by the capitalists for a wage.** **But the value of this wage and the value that labor**, once employed, then **produces** for the bosses, **are two very different things.** **The worker** is paid one thing, but then **will normally create much more value during her shift than she is paid.**

The key to this arrangement for the boss is an agreement in which **your labor is put under** his **control** for a set amount of time, **and you are paid for** this **time, not** for the fruits of your **labor.** Just as a baker parts with the bread she has made once she sells it, so too does the worker part with her labor-power once she has sold it. As soon as she punches the clock, the conditions of her labor and the products of her labor are no longer hers, but the boss’s. Marx thus continued:

[L]abor, belongs just as little to its seller [the worker], as the use-value of oil after it has been sold belongs to the dealer who has sold it. The owner of the money has paid the value of a day’s labor-power; he therefore has the use of it for a day, a day’s labor belongs to him. On the one hand the daily sustenance of labor-power [paid out in a wage] costs only half a day’s labor, while on the other hand the very same labor-power can remain effective, can work, during a whole day, and consequently the value which its use during one day creates is double what he pays for that use; this circumstance is a piece of good luck for the buyer, but by no means an injustice towards the seller.

**In other words, the boss can** get away with **pay**ing you **for** just **half** (or some other fraction) **of the day** for the “daily sustenance of labor-power” **while reaping the full day of your labor.** On top of it, he can proclaim it a fair day’s wage.

**…**

**The cost of labor** also **reflects the injustice of oppression.**

As of 2019, women in the United States were still paid 79 cents to a man’s dollar. (Or in the case of the country’s most talented and famous soccer team, the United States women’s national soccer team earns 38 cents to their male counter- parts, despite generating greater revenue.) Black men are paid 70 cents and black women 61 cents in comparison to their white counterparts. Latina women earn 53 cents to a white man’s dollar. Increased education does little to change this ratio for women or people of color.

**…**

Inequality has long been built into the core fabric of the American business model. Pitting black workers against white workers against immigrant workers has been a particularly potent, tried-and-true tactic of employers to drive down all wages. But the cursory sketch laid out here does not even begin to discuss **the** very many **oppression**s — **of immigrants,** of **people with disabilities,** of **gay people,** of **transgender people,** of **Native peoples,** of **elders, and more** — that **play an integral role in upholding the profitability of US capitalism.**

In fact, **any place where bosses can hold down the wages of one section of the workforce not only ensures** a **cheaper labor** pool **among the oppressed** demographic, **but** also, in the words of abolitionist Frederick Douglass, divides both in order to conquer each, so that **everyone’s wages are pushed down.**

**And,**

**Socialist Governments Do Not Solve**

[The Triumph and Tragedy of Poland’s Solidarity Movement (jacobinmag.com)](https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/08/poland-solidarity-communism-solidarnosc) by David **Ost**, 08.24.20**20**

**Forty years ago,** this week, **Poland’s independent trade union** movement, Solidarność, burst onto the scene after a wildcat strike wave. The movement **posed a direct challenge to the Polish Communist regime**, which temporarily granted Solidarność freedom to organize, but later drove it underground after imposing martial law in December 1981.

**The spectacle of a powerful workers’ movement challenging a self-proclaimed workers’ state had a huge impact throughout the Eastern Bloc**; in many ways**, it was the beginning of the end for Soviet-style Communism.** Jacobin is marking the anniversary of Solidarność with several articles exploring aspects of Polish history and politics, from the origins of socialism in Poland to the conservative backlash in the country today.

**Poland’s** Solidarność (“**Solidarity**”) **movement emerged** in August 1980 **as a** left-wing **workers’ movement against the** putatively left-wing **workers’ state governing the country**. It was a time of militant strikes, mass participation, and nascent workers’ control of enterprises**, with workers and intellectuals** jointly **challenging** bureaucratic **state socialism and posing demands for** greater **democracy, but not for** the restoration of **capitalism.**

# Link

**Strikes Uphold Unjust Systems**

Definition of strike by The Editors of Encyclopaedia **Britannica** in 20**11**

**Strikes arise** for a number of reasons, though **principally in response to economic conditions** (defined as an economic strike **and meant to improve wages and benefits**) or labour practices (intended to improve work conditions). Other strikes can stem from sympathy with other striking unions or from jurisdictional disputes between two unions. Illegal strikes include sitdown strikes, wildcat strikes, and partial strikes (such as slowdowns or sick-ins). Strikes may also be called for purely political reasons (as in the general strike). In most industrialized countries, the right to strike is granted in principle to private-sector workers. Some countries, however, require that specific efforts toward settlement be made before a strike can be called, while other countries forbid purely political strikes or strikes by public employees. Most strikes and threats of strikes are intended to inflict a cost on the employer for failing to agree to specific wages, benefits, or other conditions demanded by the union. Strikes by Japanese unions are not intended to halt production for long periods of time; instead, they are seen as demonstrations of solidarity. Occasionally, **strikes** have been politically motivated, and they **sometimes have been directed** **against governments and their policies**, as was the case with the Polish union Solidarity in the 1980s. Strikes not authorized by the central union body may be directed against the union leadership as well as the employer. The decision to call a strike does not come easily, because union workers risk a loss of income for long periods of time. They also risk the permanent loss of their jobs, especially when replacement workers hired to continue operations during the strike stay on as permanent employees.

In the United States, this strike-breaking tactic was seldom used on a large scale before the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization (PATCO) strike of 1981, when Pres. Ronald Reagan ordered the hiring of permanent replacement controllers. **Most federal, state, and municipal unions in the United States are**, by law, **denied the right to strike**, and the air traffic controllers’ strike was thus illegal. Laws administered by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) govern the replacement of workers who go on strike, permitting the permanent replacement of workers only when an economic strike is called during contract negotiations.

**As a general rule, striking implies the protest of a higher authority that has more power than the worker, fundamentally subjugating the worker by nature, even if they get what they want out of the strike.**

# Alt:

**Mutualism as an Alternative**

“Justice, Order and Anarchy” by Alex **Prichard**, Sept. 20**07**

Being among the first and most influential socialists of his time, **Proudhon recognized that the economy could not be entrusted to capital**, which imposes its own disciplining forces on society derived from the control of labor and the power derived from the appropriation of productive surplus. **Moreover,** Proudhon argued that **the state**, a largely destructive institution with no productive capacity of its own, **was no less parasitical upon society than capitalists.** He argued that together capital and the state produce ‘ruptures in the economic equilibrium’ which routinely cause famine, social conflict and ultimately the resource wars to solve them. This demands that the state generate its military capacity to protect its internal monopoly on resources against internal and external rivals.”

**Proudhon argued that** this **re-enfranchisement would transform our natural destructive urges and regulate our** martial **impulses through the** strictures of the **industrial domain.** **He saw** economic **enfranchisement as central to realizing our** own passionate and **creative potential in the fullest and most benign way.** This economic plan has a political corollary. **Towns, industries, workshops and regions** – all natural groups – **ought to reclaim their autonomy and then federate.** Proudhon argued for a politico-economic mutualist contract. He recognized that federalism is ‘liberal par excellence’ but the point is that the contract must be real as opposed to ‘a legal fiction, imagined as an alternative to divine right, paternal authority, or social necessity, in explaining the origins of the state and relations between government and individual’.

**Proudhon’s proposal of reclaiming autonomy from an employer and government is the advocacy of the negative. The plan proposed is a world composed entirely of federations and unions of alike communities of workers.**

[The Mutualist Society – Minnesota Women's Press](https://www.womenspress.com/the-mutualist-society-sara-horowitz/) – by Mikki **Morrissette** 05/20/20**21**

One of the priority topics at Minnesota Women’s Press is telling the story of co-operatives, collectives, collaboratives, mutual aid, and “mutualist societies.” **This is how we build equitable economies and sustainable ecosystems in ways that are not possible otherwise.** We are calling this Ecolution — a revolution in which people invest support and action into the wholeness of our ecos, not individual parts.

Rural broadband, for example, cannot be effectively created on market economies alone because there are not enough consumers for profit-driven providers to want to invest in the infrastructure without government incentives, or co-operatives. Find our story about that here.

**For example,**

**Black farmers cannot get the financing they need from traditional institutions, so they build their own co-operative networks.** Here is one of our video conversations about that, with Angela Dawson of 40 Acres Co-op.

**Although “socialism” has a bad name in some circles, “co-ops”** are long known in agricultural communities — which **are similar in definition: allowing people to collaborate together in the production**, sales, distributions, rewards, **and profits of a service or product.**

**And,**

In a May 20 conversation with Sara Horowitz, author of the new book “Mutualism,” she pointed out to host Nathan Schneider, of Media Enterprise Design Lab, that **we can reduce polarization by looking at the values we agree on.** She says **red** agricultural **states have a strong base of support for self-sufficiency and independence.** She believes **we can break bread around similar values, incorporating fairness and equity into the evolution of our economic systems.**

The U.S. once had more energy around collectives — **more than 100 years ago, credit unions and farmer co-ops stepped in when industry did not**, Schneider pointed out**.** **In Italy,** he says, the building of **infrastructure is intended to be for future generations,** **not simply current members.** **They learned** from fascism **that the “right to cooperation” needs to be a requirement** in its constitution**.** “When they saw what fascists wanted to do, they learned to appreciate” **the core virtue of civic and economic life requires collaboration.**

# Solvency

**Impacts:**

1. Under a mutualist system of federations free from the control of the government and employers, strikes will be eliminated in favor of delegation and negotiation between federations and collectives
2. The power balance between employer and employee will be eliminated, as all members of a collective share equity
3. Neg solves for compensation for time and not labor
4. Morrissette 21 proves that this plan has the advantage of probability and can feasibly happen
5. Mutualism has a unique contractual nature of consent to sharing your labor that capitalism and traditional socialist governments don’t

**We solve for the inherent problems in the resolution, and it is for these reasons why I stand in negation**

*S. Tomsu feedback:*

*How long does this case take to deliver? I only ask as my case writing approach always separates out the quotations in the evidence to read as opposed to the entire passage with only portions highlighted. It’s difficult for this old guy to estimate how much content there is. I would be interested in you being able to flood the flow with this case as well as as disad on the aff flow and still have time for some standards discussion and response to AC proper.*

*Speaking of standards… are you planning to run any with this negative? If the AC ran anything remotely individualistic / centric, then you could just co-opt their standard and demolish them with this as the strategy here is to highlight the structures of power imbedded in traditional societal organization. Any system where all those who are members answer to hierarchy of authority and must plead for audience by those who get to ultimately decide their fate is abusive and unjust. This requires emphasis on standards which get away from societal impact analysis, utilitarian approaches, and the like. Those approaches all seek to reconcile the suppression of the some for the benefit of the whole. Like… well sure, you might still be scum of society, but you’re better off being part of this awesome society that rocks than without them. That’s not cool, according to the strat this neg employs.*

*Some people will think this is just a wild kritik – but I think you have the foundation to help illustrate why there is real merit to the arguments being made. There are very specific situations in real life observed to help prove what is happening and why it’s important to consider a different dynamic than the affirmative. The affirmative must support the resolution and that resolution builds on the existing hierarchical construction of society where governments and corporations have all of the authority – you’re offering a radical solution, but only radical because it hasn’t really been tried on any grand scale. By the judge giving consideration to ideas which expand how we view individual and society and government and corporation, it’s possible the traditional construction of society and its operation and it’s values might be drawn in to question – and perhaps then we might be able to take the next big leap in the evolution of how we all live together.*

*As for construction and evidence (and format of this is different than what I’m used to so I may have missed scripted analysis), I think you have what you need. I’m assuming you have evidence to assist with extensions and for blocking out responses. I think my concern is more with how you’ll execute this strategy… I’d like to see a practice round.*