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**Counterplan: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike except in the instance that strikes directly demand discrimination towards certain groups of individuals**

**BPSC** [Unfair Labor Practices by Union, <http://bpscllc.com/unfair-labor-practices-by-unions.html>, N.D., Business & People Strategy Consulting Group, California's trusted source for workplace human resources and employment law] [SS]

Causing or Attempting to Cause Discrimination: Section 8(b)(2) makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of Section 8(a)(3). The section is violated by agreements or arrangements with employers, other than lawful union-security agreements, that condition employment or job benefits on union membership, on the performance of union membership obligations or on arbitrary grounds. But union action that causes detriment to an individual employee does not violate Section 8(b)(2) if it is consistent with nondiscriminatory provisions of a bargaining contract negotiated for the benefit of the total bargaining unit, or if the action is based on some other legitimate purpose. A union’s conduct, accompanied by statements advising or suggesting that action is expected of an employer, may be enough to find a violation of this section if the union’s action can be shown to be a causal factor in the employer’s discrimination. Contracts or informal arrangements with a union under which an employer gives preferential treatment to union members also violate Section 8(b)(2). However, an employer and a union may agree that the employer will hire new employees exclusively through the union hiring hall if there is no discrimination against nonunion members on the basis of union membership obligations. In setting referral standards, a union may consider legitimate aims such as sharing available work and easing the impact of local unemployment. The union may also charge referral fees if the amount of the fee is reasonably related to the cost of operating the referral service. A union that attempts to force an employer to enter into an illegal union-security agreement, or that enters into and keeps in effect such an agreement, also violates Section 8(b)(2), as does a union that attempts to enforce such an illegal agreement by bringing about an employee’s discharge. Even when a union-security provision of a bargaining contract meets all statutory requirements, a union may not lawfully require the discharge of employees under the provision unless they were informed of the union-security agreement and their specific obligation under it. A union violates Section 8(b)(2) if it tries to use the union-security provisions of a contract to collect payments other than those lawfully required, such as assessments, fines and penalties. Other examples of Section 8(b)(2) violations include: Causing an employer to discharge employees because they circulated a petition urging a change in the union’s method of selecting shop stewards Causing an employer to discharge employees because they made speeches against a contract proposed by the union Making a contract that requires an employer to hire only members of the union or employees “satisfactory” to the union Causing an employer to reduce employees’ seniority because they engaged in anti-union acts Refusing referral or giving preference on the basis of race or union activities when making job referrals to units represented by the union Seeking the discharge of an employee under a union-security agreement for failure to pay a fine levied by the union

**Racist union strikes have happened before**

Allison **Keyes**, JUNE 30, **2017**, "The East St. Louis Race Riot Left Dozens Dead, Devastating a Community on the Rise," Smithsonian Magazine, <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/east-st-louis-race-riot-left-dozens-dead-devastating-community-on-the-rise-180963885/> //SR

Racial tensions began simmering in East St. Louis—a city where thousands of blacks had moved from the South to work in war factories—as early as February 1917. The African-American population was 6,000 in 1910 and nearly double that by 1917. In the spring, the largely white workforce at the Aluminum Ore Company went on strike. Hundreds of blacks were hired. After a City Council meeting on May 28, angry white workers lodged formal complaints against black migrants. When word of an attempted robbery of a white man by an armed black man spread through the city, mobs started beating any African-Americans they found, even pulling individuals off of streetcars and trolleys. The National Guard was called in but dispersed in June.

**NLRB doesn’t take this out -**

* **Cambridge Dictionary defines unconditional as:**

Cambridge Dictionary n/d, “Unconditional” [https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unconditional //SR](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unconditional%20//SR)

complete and not limited in any way:

**Prefer dictionary definitions - they’re more accessible as not everyone is able to buy textbooks or knows how to get past paywalls while definitions are one of the first sources we see**

* **This card is ONLY in the context of the US and describing why the unconditional right to strike is bad if it dangers the welfare of people - its NOT an intent to define**
* **Prefer our definition - theirs creates a ton of shifty debates where they can just go any reason strikes are bad is a reason those strikes don’t increase welfare thus aren’t included in the right to strike - our definition of unconditional is the most stable by creating the least arbitrary brightline**
* **Unconditional right to strike has no reasonable limits - ev outweighs on recency**

**ITUC ‘14** [THE RIGHT TO STRIKE AND THE ILO: THE LEGAL FOUNDATIONS, INTERNATIONAL TRADE UNION CONFEDERATION (ITUC), March 2014, <https://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/ituc_final_brief_on_the_right_to_strike.pdf>, The International Trade Union Confederation is the world's largest trade union federation.] [SS]

Between the extremes of an unconditional right to strike and an absolute prohibition on strikes “in accordance with national law,” the international community is converging on the general principle of the right to strike within reasonable limits. The authors of this document acknowledge the tension between countries’ varying degrees of limitations on the right to strike and the normal requirement of uniformity of state practice to find customary international law. It is believed that the tension can be resolved by distinguishing between divergence in detail and convergence in principle. Procedural requirements in national law are details; the right to strike within reasonable limits is the common principle.
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**CP: A just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike except in the instance of indigenous enterprises. For indigenous enterprises, tribal law ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike.**

**It’s competitive – normal means is through some international treaty/federal law that applies to Native reservations. The counterplan is key to recognize indigenous sovereignty, but the perm is severance and creates an overlap that undermines tribal jurisdiction**

**HLR, 1-11**-21, “Tribal Power, Worker Power: Organizing Unions in the Context of Native Sovereignty” <https://harvardlawreview.org/2021/01/tribal-power-worker-power-organizing-unions-in-the-context-of-native-sovereignty/> //SR

A. Tribal Law as Alternative to Federal Law Unions’ fight to apply the NLRA to tribal enterprises rests on a false premise: that without federal law, tribal employees will lack any legal protections. Like other sovereigns exempted from the NLRA, Native nations have the authority to promulgate labor regulations and an economic and sovereign interest in doing so. Many tribal governments have developed comprehensive labor codes. The following examples provide some insight into how unions and Native nations can coexist and exhibit mutual respect — even, in some cases, allowing workers greater protection than is currently available under federal law. The Navajo Nation provides a leading example of effective tribal-labor relations. In the 1990s, the Navajo Council promulgated a labor code that established collective bargaining rights for employees of the Navajo government and tribally owned corporations. The Laborers’ International Union of North America (LiUNA) subsequently campaigned to unionize the Navajo Area Indian Health Service (IHS). The IHS — unlike many tribal enterprises — employs a majority Native workforce. The union therefore served as a tool for both improving workplace conditions and amplifying the political will of tribal citizens. Union organizers found that Navajo law presented some advantages over federal law: Unlike federal law, the Navajo code mandates employer neutrality, thus prohibiting employers from engaging in anti-union campaigns. Navajo law also provides for card-check recognition, whereby a union is automatically recognized if more than fifty-five percent of workers express support by signing union cards. Ultimately, the IHS campaign yielded a collective bargaining agreement without Board or court involvement. The Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation provides a contrasting example. In 2007, the United Auto Workers (UAW) won an NLRB-administered election among majority non-Native dealers at Foxwoods Casino. Earlier that year, in response to both the UAW campaign and the San Manuel decisions, the Tribe, which owns Foxwoods, had promulgated a labor code that was largely hostile to unions. Following the election, the Tribe unsuccessfully challenged the NLRB’s jurisdiction; in parallel, the Tribe and union negotiated. Following this negotiation, the Tribe’s labor ordinance was amended both to allow union security agreements for contracts negotiated under tribal law and to establish a neutral third-party dispute resolution procedure. The ordinance retained its no-strike provision. The result was a legal framework resembling many public-sector collective bargaining laws, without injuring Mashantucket Pequot sovereignty. At least three unions have since organized under Mashantucket Pequot law. California’s IGRA compacting process has created a third example of how Native nations may regulate tribal labor relations. Many Native nations in California have adopted tribal labor relations ordinances (TLROs) as a condition of their gaming compacts negotiated with the state. TLROs promulgated in response to compacting provide an interesting model of what Professor David Kamper calls “interdependent self-determination,” as compacting requires unions and Native governments to work together to build a labor-relations framework that is rooted in Native sovereign power. In some cases, the resulting ordinances are more friendly to labor than many state labor laws. Although the model California TLRO prohibits most strikes, it allows them when collective bargaining has reached an impasse. In these cases, the TLRO also permits secondary boycotting — thus offering protection beyond that offered by the NLRA. The San Manuel ordinance authorizes unions to negotiate subjects beyond the “terms and conditions of employment,” and the Tribe’s gaming compact prohibited discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation before federal law did. California’s TLROs have been criticized by champions of sovereignty. But the underlying principle of encouraging the promulgation of tribal labor law through the compacting process presents a promising model of interdependent self-determination. As the California and Mashantucket Pequot examples illustrate, many tribal labor codes are promulgated in response to ongoing union organizing. As a result, these codes, unlike state and federal laws, arise out of both explicit and implicit negotiations over jurisdiction, sovereignty, and worker power. This context provides an opportunity for worker advocates and tribal governments to engage in collaborative lawmaking, moving away from the “negative” approach identified by Guss and toward a positive, interdependent approach to power-building that better serves both workers and sovereignty. Against the backdrop of a legal landscape that is hostile to tribal jurisdiction over labor relations, unions may voluntarily recognize a tribal government’s authority to gain bargaining power in tribal enterprises. On the other hand, if, as this Note argues, tribal enterprises are not employers under the NLRA, the absence of federal law allows Native nations to build systems that better support workers. Scholars have argued that the NLRA is inadequate to protect efforts to build worker power. Professors Sharon Block and Benjamin Sachs have called for a “clean slate” for labor law. Tribal labor regulation presents just such a clean slate. Several of the Clean Slate proposals have already been implemented in tribal labor codes, including improved organizer access to workers, card-check recognition, and an expanded range of bargaining subjects. The resolution of labor disputes under tribal jurisdiction also benefits from small dockets and culturally specific alternative dispute resolution mechanisms. Federal labor law’s inadequacy as a tool for building worker power therefore grants Native governments their own positive leverage — not the implicit threat that accompanies the lack of NLRB jurisdiction, but the promise of a better alternative. It is this promise of a better alternative that Professor Scott Lyons had in mind when, shortly after San Manuel, he called on Native nations to “head [the Board] off at the pass and develop even stronger labor laws and worker protections — that is, stronger unions — than what the Americans currently enjoy. Make Indian enterprises the envy of workers everywhere.” B. Reinforcing Sovereignty as an Act of Solidarity Realizing Professor Lyons’s vision requires cooperation from both Native nations and labor activists. Outside of the United States, some unions and indigenous groups have come together as allies in combating the harms of capitalism and settler colonialism, recognizing the shared mission of unions and indigenous communities as power-building institutions. Solidarity is the core value of the labor movement; a motivating sentiment of organized labor is the conviction that “[a]n injury to one is an injury to all.” This value is not always reflected in American unions’ relationships to Native nations. Using language that echoes countless employer reactions to union campaigns, the AFL-CIO has stated that it supports “the principle of sovereignty” for Native nations while advocating for the United States government to assert control over tribal-labor relations. Twenty-first-century American unions have positioned themselves as tools for combating racist power structures. Yet even as Native income per capita is less than half of the national average, unions have exploited fears of “rich Indians” to garner support from non-Native workers. And unions, through litigation, have encouraged and benefited from courts’ racist preconceptions of “Indianness” in setting the boundaries of acceptable exercises of sovereign power. It does not serve the mission of the labor movement to benefit from these wrongs. As union leaders and labor activists fight for a world in which power is redistributed away from the hands of the few, solidarity requires that those efforts be situated within the broader context of genocide, systematic dispossession, and the destruction of Native sovereignty. When unions approach organizing in the tribal context as a fight over NLRB jurisdiction, they seek to build worker power at the expense of Native self-determination. But power-building is not a zero-sum game. By centering tribal organizing on disputes over Board jurisdiction rather than turning to tribal labor law as a first choice, unions miss the opportunity to engage collaboratively with Native nations to build institutions that better serve both.

**3**

**The economy is recovering now, but Covid has made it sensitive - even a small setback is devastating**

**UN** News, **1-5**-2021, "World Bank expects global economy to expand by 4% in 2021," UN News, [https://news.un.org/en/story/2021/01/1081392 HYPERLINK "https://news.un.org/en/story/2021/01/1081392%20//SR" //SR](https://news.un.org/en/story/2021/01/1081392%20//SR)

The World Bank Group on Tuesday issued a guarded growth forecast for the global economy this year, saying that a four per cent overall expansion was likely, although the recovery will likely be a “subdued” one. Policy makers must move decisively, according to January’s Global Economic Prospects, and although it is already growing again following the 4.3 per cent contraction of 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic has caused “a heavy toll of deaths and illness, plunged millions into poverty, and may depress economic activity and incomes for a prolonged period”, said a press release issued by the World Bank – a key financial institution within the United Nations system. Immediate policy priorities should now focus on controlling the spread of coronavirus and ensuring rapid and widespread vaccine deployment. “To support economic recovery, authorities also need to facilitate a re-investment cycle aimed at sustainable growth that is less dependent on government debt”, the Bank advises. ‘Formidable challenges’ “While the global economy appears to have entered a subdued recovery, policymakers face formidable challenges—in public health, debt management, budget policies, central banking and structural reforms—as they try to ensure that this still fragile global recovery gains traction and sets a foundation for robust growth”, said World Bank Group President, David Malpass. “To overcome the impacts of the pandemic and counter the investment headwind, there needs to be a major push to improve business environments, increase labour and product market flexibility, and strengthen transparency and governance.” Less severe contraction The collapse in global economic activity in 2020 due to the onset of the pandemic, is estimated to have been slightly less severe than previously projected, mainly due to shallower contractions in advanced economies overall, and a more robust recovery in China, the forecast states. However, for most emerging market and developing economies, the impact was more acute than expected. “Financial fragilities in many of these countries, as the growth shock impacts vulnerable household and business balance sheets, will also need to be addressed”, said Vice President and World Bank Group Chief Economist, Carmen Reinhart. Known unknowns The variables in the near-term remain “highly uncertain” the World Bank warned, and a continuing rise in infections coupled with a delayed vaccine rollout, could limit global expansion this year to just 1.6 per cent. “Meanwhile, in an upside scenario with successful pandemic control and a faster vaccination process, global growth could accelerate to nearly five per cent”, according to the press statement. In the United States, GDP, or gross domestic product, is forecast to increase by around 3.5 per cent this year, after an estimated 3.6% contraction in 2020. In the Eurozone, output is anticipated to grow 3.6%, following a 7.4% decline in 2020. Activity in Japan, which shrank by 5.3% during 2020, is forecast to grow by 2.5% in 2021. Aggregate GDP in emerging market and developing economies, including China, is expected to grow 5% in 2021, after a contraction of 2.6%, according to the World Bank prospects. Near 8% growth forecast for China China’s economy is expected to expand by 7.9% this year following 2% growth last year. Excluding China, emerging market and developing economies are forecast to expand 3.4% in 2021 after a contraction of 5% in 2020. Among low income economies, activity is projected to increase 3.3% in 2021, after a contraction of 0.9% in 2020. Debt concerns The Prospects also examine how the pandemic has amplified risks around taking on increasing debt and its impact on long term growth. “The pandemic has greatly exacerbated debt risks in emerging market and developing economies; weak growth prospects will likely further increase debt burdens and erode borrowers’ ability to service debt,” World Bank Acting Vice President for Equitable Growth and Financial Institutions Ayhan Kose said. “The global community needs to act rapidly and forcefully to make sure the recent debt accumulation does not end with a string of debt crises. The developing world cannot afford another lost decade.”

**Labor strikes hurt the economy by decreasing worker productivity**

**CMEN**, 10-01-**18**, *Provides accurate and timely information about economic developments, including in-depth reporting on industrial and mining project developments and on the policies and personalities shaping the real economy. After over 30 years of business-to-business publishing Engineering News Weekly have earned wide respect for consistently providing South African businesses with information which opens doors to new business opportunities*."Strikes And Their Economic Consequences," Engineering News, <https://www.engineeringnews.co.za/article/strikes-and-their-economic-consequences-2018-10-01>

After conducting intensive research\* into the topic of strikes and labour unrest, the Mandela Initiative came to several conclusions. One of these was that the right to strike is made up of a delicate balance between the power of firms and the rights of employees, and is considered a sign of a healthy democracy. “Whilst there are potential benefits from strikes (e.g. better work morale, lower absenteeism, or improved labour productivity), strike action also brings about numerous direct and indirect economic costs that can be high, depending on duration, number of workers involved and divisions affected,” the Initiative confirmed. According to labour expert Suleyman Alley, there are seven key causes of labour unrest: health hazards in the workplace; excessive working hours; low wages; demand for leave with pay; discrimination; inadequate working tools; and aggressive behaviour of managers towards employees. While several activities can be taken in an effort to prevent strikes from occurring or escalating, in the South African context, the tendency towards violent outbursts seems to outweigh reasonable action. “Strikes and labour unrest have marked negative impacts on the employees themselves, the employers and their stakeholders, the government, consumers, and the economy,” advises Jacki Condon, Managing Director of Apache Security Services. “The negative effects on international trade include the hinderance of economic development, creating great economic uncertainty – especially as the global media continues to share details, images and videos of violence, damage to property and ferocious clashes between strikers and security.” Strike action results in less productivity, which in turn means less profits. Labour Law expert, Ivan Israelstam confirms that; “The employer is likely to lose money due to delayed service to clients or to lost production time. The employees will lose their pay due to the no work, no pay principle. If the strikers are dismissed they will lose their livelihoods altogether.” This year alone, Eskom, Prasa, various manufacturing plants, Sasol and the Post Office have faced crippling strikes – to name but a few. Condon argues that there are more immediate consequences to consider than loss of income. “As the socio-economic issues continue to affect South Africans across the board, tensions are constantly rising,” states Condon. “Businesses must protect themselves, their assets, business property, and their non-striking employees from violence and intimidation.” Condon believes that this requires the deft hand of well-trained and highly qualified close protection operatives. These operatives provide not only protection, but video evidence as well, ensuring those responsible for damage can be held to account. “The key is to create a strategic partnership with a reliable security provider. Plans must be put into place to protect businesses against vandalism, physical assault, property invasion and intimidation during labour unrest,” concludes Condon.

**Economic collapse causes nuclear war - deterrence collapses, trade tensions, diversionary theory, and use it or lose it pressures**

**Tønnesson 15** [(Stein, Research Professor, Peace Research Institute Oslo; Leader of East Asia Peace program, Uppsala University) “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace,” International Area Studies Review, Vol. 18, No. 3, p. 297-311, 2015] SJDI

Several recent works on China and Sino–US relations have made substantial contributions to the current understanding of how and under what circumstances a combination of nuclear deterrence and economic interdependence may reduce the risk of war between major powers. At least four conclusions can be drawn from the review above: first, those who say that interdependence may both inhibit and drive conflict are right. Interdependence raises the cost of conflict for all sides but asymmetrical or unbalanced dependencies and negative trade expectations may generate tensions leading to trade wars among inter-dependent states that in turn increase the risk of military conflict (Copeland, 2015: 1, 14, 437; Roach, 2014). The risk may increase if one of the interdependent countries is governed by an inward-looking socio-economic coalition (Solingen, 2015); second, the risk of war between China and the US should not just be analysed bilaterally but include their allies and partners. Third party countries could drag China or the US into confrontation; third, in this context it is of some comfort that the three main economic powers in Northeast Asia (China, Japan and South Korea) are all deeply integrated economically through production networks within a global system of trade and finance (Ravenhill, 2014; Yoshimatsu, 2014: 576); and fourth, decisions for war and peace are taken by very few people, who act on the basis of their future expectations. International relations theory must be supplemented by foreign policy analysis in order to assess the value attributed by national decision-makers to economic development and their assessments of risks and opportunities. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately refuse to be deterred by either nuclear arms or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. The greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious. If China and the US fail to rebalance their financial and trading relations (Roach, 2014) then a trade war could result, interrupting transnational production networks, provoking social distress, and exacerbating nationalist emotions. This could have unforeseen consequences in the field of security, with nuclear deterrence remaining the only factor to protect the world from Armageddon, and unreliably so. Deterrence could lose its credibility: one of the two great powers might gamble that the other yield in a cyber-war or conventional limited war, or third party countries might engage in conflict with each other, with a view to obliging Washington or Beijing to intervene.

**Nuclear war causes extinction**

**Starr 15** [Steven, Senior Scientist for Physicians for Social Responsibility ([www.psr.org](http://www.psr.org/)) and Director of the Clinical Laboratory Science Program at the University of Missouri. Starr has published in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and the Strategic Arms Reduction (STAR) website of the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology] “Nuclear War: An Unrecognized Mass Extinction Event Waiting To Happen.” Ratical. March 2015. <https://ratical.org/radiation/NuclearExtinction/StevenStarr022815.html> TG

A war fought with 21st century strategic nuclear weapons would be more than just a great catastrophe in human history. If we allow it to happen, such a war would be a mass extinction event that ends human history. There is a profound difference between extinction and “an unprecedented disaster,” or even “the end of civilization,” because even after such an immense catastrophe, human life would go on. But extinction, by definition, is an event of utter finality, and a nuclear war that could cause human extinction should really be considered as the ultimate criminal act. It certainly would be the crime to end all crimes. The world’s leading climatologists now tell us that nuclear war threatens our continued existence as a species. Their studies predict that a large nuclear war, especially one fought with strategic nuclear weapons, would create a post-war environment in which for many years it would be too cold and dark to even grow food. Their findings make it clear that not only humans, but most large animals and many other forms of complex life would likely vanish forever in a nuclear darkness of our own making. The environmental consequences of nuclear war would attack the ecological support systems of life at every level. Radioactive fallout produced not only by nuclear bombs, but also by the destruction of nuclear power plants and their spent fuel pools, would poison the biosphere. Millions of tons of smoke would act to destroy Earth’s protective ozone layer and block most sunlight from reaching Earth’s surface, creating Ice Age weather conditions that would last for decades. Yet the political and military leaders who control nuclear weapons strictly avoid any direct public discussion of the consequences of nuclear war. They do so by arguing that nuclear weapons are not intended to be used, but only to deter. Remarkably, the leaders of the Nuclear Weapon States have chosen to ignore the authoritative, long-standing scientific research done by the climatologists, research that predicts virtually any nuclear war, fought with even a fraction of the operational and deployed nuclear arsenals, will leave the Earth essentially uninhabitable.
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**Infrastructure will pass now but Biden’s backing out means its whisker thin**

Savannah **Behrmann &** Ledyard **King, 6/29**/21, "Senators celebrate bipartisan compromise on infrastructure. Now the hard part begins," <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2021/06/29/infrastructure-deal-big-challenge-ahead-biden-congress-plan/5324218001/> //SR

“Today is proof that bipartisanship is alive and well in the United States Senate and in our country,” Arizona Sen. Krysten Sinema, the lead Democratic negotiator, said at the Capitol. The celebration over the eight-year, $1.2 trillion deal lasted only a few hours. Despite the marathon negotiations that led to the compromise, the hardest work lies ahead: cobbling together a coalition of liberals, Democratic moderates and – perhaps – Republican centrists to pass the traditional transportation funding bill while pushing a more ambitious "human infrastructure" program that touches subsidized child care, home caregiving and climate change that only Democrats support. Evidence of how complicated that will be was clear when Biden declared at the news conference he would not sign the bipartisan proposal into law without the "human infrastructure" elements – only to carefully walk back those comments Saturday after some Republicans accused him of a bait and switch and hinted at backing out of the compromise. The back-and-forth signals just how fragile the infrastructure deal is in Congress, where Democrats control both chambers by whisker-thin margins. Over the next few weeks, Democrats will craft a budget proposal that will need to please liberals and moderates within their party if they hope to pass a separate bill with Biden's priorities using a special legislative maneuver called reconciliation.

**Congressional fights decimates Biden political capital and sways from his ability for bipartisan talks on the infrastructure plan**

**Stanage, 1/24**/2021 (Niall, “The Memo: Biden gambles that he can do it all,” The Hill, <https://thehill.com/homenews/the-memo/535502-the-memo-biden-gambles-that-he-can-do-it-all>, YY) RCT//SR

President Biden is seeking to push forward on multiple fronts right away, even as he grapples with the coronavirus pandemic. Biden has submitted an immigration reform plan to Congress already, and he aims to advance on other topics from climate change to racial justice. There’s an argument for taking such a multipronged approach. Every president tends to have the greatest leverage at the start of their term, and momentum can be harder to generate as time goes on. But there is also the question of political capital, which tends to be finite. If Biden proves to have less heft than he thinks to pass legislation, he will disappoint key constituencies. “We’re going to need ... to be able to act on multiple fronts,” Brian Deese, director of the National Economic Council, said in the White House briefing room Friday. Deese was making that point in the context of the president’s proposed $1.9 trillion COVID-19 relief package advancing even as the Senate conducts former President Trump’s impeachment trial next month. But the same principle applies to other issues. Some Democrats are optimistic that across-the-board progress is possible. They suggest the pressure is on their Republican counterparts not to appear obstructionist. “If Biden does well, then people will be very upset if it looks like the Republicans are obstructing, particularly on the economy and on health — that will be very bad for them,” said Democratic strategist Tad Devine. “I’m not predicting that we are going to have immigration reform and all this stuff right at once,” Devine added. “But I do believe he has a very strong hand right now. There are a lot of votes out there for what Democrats want.” The issue of political capital and how best to deploy it is always a vexing one for new presidents. Former President Obama stuck to his commitment to enact health care reform even amid an economic catastrophe, persevering past the point when some advisers counseled him to settle for a more modest goal. He signed the Affordable Care Act into law in March 2010, only to see his party suffer crushing losses in the midterm elections later that year. Former President Clinton fared worse. His 1993 effort at health care reform ran aground, and other controversies also slowed his progress. Clinton early on sought to end the ban on LGBT people serving in the military and then backed off to the “Don’t Ask Don’t Tell” compromise policy that didn’t really satisfy anyone. Republicans suggest Biden could be vulnerable to comparable missteps. “He has got a very slim majority in the House and no real majority in the Senate,” said John Feehery, a Republican strategist and former GOP leadership aide who is also a columnist for The Hill. “I think the problem is when you throw a punch of spaghetti up on the wall and hope something sticks. You really want to be more targeted. Biden is going to be disappointing a lot of people if he is making promises he can’t keep.”

**The plan has significant republican opposition**

C.M. **Lewis and** Kevin **Reuning, 10-04**-2020, "New polling data shows complicated politics of union members — Strikewave", *C.M. Lewis is an editor of Strikewave and a union activist in Pennsylvania. Kevin Reuning (@KevinReuning) is an assistant professor of political science at Miami University.* [https://www.thestrikewave.com/original-content/complicated-politics-of-union-members //SR](https://www.thestrikewave.com/original-content/complicated-politics-of-union-members%20//SR)

Union members vote blue—at least, that is the common wisdom. Organized labor has been a key part of the Democratic Party coalition since the New Deal. Unions’ unparalleled ability to reach and mobilize a bloc of voters has been crucial to Democratic victories, and research has shown a clear correlation between union strength and Democratic vote share. In return, Democrats pledge—with mixed sincerity—to support organized labor legislatively. With a recent strike wave and the resurgence of organized labor’s popularity and political power, labor is back at the forefront of the agenda. Politicians are taking note. Democrats, including Democratic nominee Joe Biden, are pledging policy changes that, if enacted, would represent the most substantial pro-labor reforms since the New Deal. Given the key role of organized labor within their donor network, union expansion would stand to help future Democratic victories. Republicans realize that, too—which is why they have waged a war against labor unions. In the past ten years Republican majorities in states like Wisconsin, Michigan, and Ohio moved to kneecap organized labor, with success in both Wisconsin and Michigan. Similar moves in Missouri have been fought off through ballot initiatives and legal action. The attacks follow a similar pattern, and model legislation promoted by groups like the American Legislative Exchange Council provides templates for legislators to introduce anti-bargaining and “Right-to-Work” laws.

**The infrastructure bill solves climate change**

Emma **Newburger, 1-27**-2021, *Emma Newburger covers climate change and breaking news for CNBC.com* “Here’s how Biden’s $2 trillion infrastructure plan addresses climate change,” CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/03/31/biden-infrastructure-plan-spending-on-climate-change-clean-energy.html> //SR

President Joe Biden on Wednesday introduced a massive infrastructure proposal to reshape the U.S. economy and build out clean energy infrastructure as part of a broader effort to curb climate change. If signed into law, the proposal would rank as one of the largest federal efforts ever to curb the country’s greenhouse gas emissions and advance the president’s commitment to put the country on a path to net-zero carbon emissions by 2050. The measure, called the American Jobs Plan, includes $174 billion in spending to boost the electric vehicle market and shift away from gas-powered cars. It proposes replacing all the country’s lead pipes and updating water systems to ensure drinking water is safe. The administration’s plan, which also includes measures unrelated to climate and infrastructure, is ambitious and could be difficult to impose even if it does pass through both chambers of Congress. “If we act now, in 50 years people are going to look back and say: ‘This was the moment that America won the future,’” Biden said at a union hall in Pittsburgh. The initiatives involve funding to install half a million charging stations across the country by 2030, incentives for Americans to buy EVs and money to retool factories and boost domestic supply of materials. Electric cars only make up about 2% of new auto sales in the U.S. The proposal also includes $100 billion in funding to update the country’s electric grid and make it more resilient to worsening climate disasters, such as the recent winter storm that caused widespread blackouts in Texas. As global temperatures rise, the U.S. will update aging infrastructure like roads and bridges to be more resilient to weather events like droughts, floods and wildfires. The plan will retrofit millions of homes to increase energy efficiency, with efforts focused on the low-income and minority communities most vulnerable to climate change. Biden also proposes the creation of a “Energy Efficiency and Clean Electricity Standard,” a mandate that would require a portion of U.S. electricity come from zero-carbon sources like wind and solar power. The mandate would require congressional approval.