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#### Interpretation: Affs must specify an enforcement mechanism. To clarify, they must defend what the specific aff looks like or provide definitions in the 1AC that justify the plan.

#### Standards:

#### 1] Shiftiness – allows them to siphon out of key negative ground on how they pass the plan. It could be a long process or have unique nb’s that neg’s can’t predict – i.e. passing through the government might strengthen legitimacy.

#### [CX Fails]: They’re going to say that cx checks but a) it isn’t enough to formulate a large enough neg strat since by the time we read the 1nc the 1ar will shift out of the offense b) can’t solve the majority of our abuse which is lost prep time b/c we didn’t know how’d you defend it; that also allows new definitions per round which isn’t predictable

#### 2] Ground – neg’s can’t read process cp’s under their interp since the 1ar will either spin a new enforcement mech or not defend one at all. Process cp’s key because they challenge how the aff wants to pass the plan which is key nuanced education in real world scenarios.

#### DTD because the abuse was in the 1AC and any neg abuse is justified by this shell being a pre-req to engagement

#### Competing interps:

#### 1] specificity – you can’t win you’re reasonably right because any small shift of the right to strike is enough to trigger new debates in the 1ar

#### 2] race to the bottom and norm setting – we can’t set norms without setting a clear standard

#### 3] arbitrary and missing brightline – increases judge intervention AND new 2AR arguments since the counter-interp will be newly contextualized

#### No RVI’s:

#### 1] Logic – you’ve won that you’re predictable for the neg to engage with in the first place, you deserve a ribbon not a ballot

#### 2] No time skew – 1] 13-13 means its fair 2] more neg skew since affs can always restructure arguments in the 1ar and 2ar 3] non-uq; every argument that got up-layered OR weighed over is lost

## OFF

#### The global economy is recovering and is set to accelerate this year, but any shocks can devastate growth

World Bank 21 - [The World Bank is an international financial institution that provides loans and grants to the governments of low- and middle-income countries for the purpose of pursuing capital projects.] "The Global Economy: on Track for Strong but Uneven Growth as COVID-19 Still Weighs" 06/08/2021 <https://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2021/06/08/the-global-economy-on-track-for-strong-but-uneven-growth-as-covid-19-still-weighs> VS

A year and a half since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, the global economy is poised to stage its most robust post-recession recovery in 80 years in 2021. But the rebound is expected to be uneven across countries, as major economies look set to register strong growth even as many developing economies lag. Global growth is expected to accelerate to 5.6% this year, largely on the strength in major economies such as the United States and China. And while growth for almost every region of the world has been revised upward for 2021, many continue to grapple with COVID-19 and what is likely to be its long shadow. Despite this year’s pickup, the level of global GDP in 2021 is expected to be 3.2% below pre-pandemic projections, and per capita GDP among many emerging market and developing economies is anticipated to remain below pre-COVID-19 peaks for an extended period. As the pandemic continues to flare, it will shape the path of global economic activity. The United States and China are each expected to contribute about one quarter of global growth in 2021. The U.S. economy has been bolstered by massive fiscal support, vaccination is expected to become widespread by mid-2021, and growth is expected to reach 6.8% this year, the fastest pace since 1984. China’s economy – which did not contract last year – is expected to grow a solid 8.5% and moderate as the country’s focus shifts to reducing financial stability risks.

#### Strikes deck economy– 3 warrants

#### 1] Stop investment

Tenza 20 - Tenza, Mlungisi. . [Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal] “The Effects of Violent Strikes on the Economy of a Developing Country: A Case of South Africa.” Obiter, Nelson Mandela University, 2020, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&amp;pid=S1682-58532020000300004VS

These strikes are not only violent but take long to resolve. Generally, a lengthy strike has a negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty.

One of the measures that may boost the country's economic growth is by attracting potential investors to invest in the country. However, this might be difficult as investors would want to invest in a country where there is a likelihood of getting returns for their investments. The wish of getting returns for investment may not materialise if the labour environment is not fertile for such investments as a result of, for example, unstable labour relations. Therefore, investors may be reluctant to invest where there is an unstable or fragile labour relations environment.

#### 2] Strikes negatively impact labor and confidence, causing major economic losses

Tenza 20 - Tenza, Mlungisi. . [Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal] “The Effects of Violent Strikes on the Economy of a Developing Country: A Case of South Africa.” Obiter, Nelson Mandela University, 2020, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&amp;pid=S1682-58532020000300004. VS

When South Africa obtained democracy in 1994, there was a dream of a better country with a new vision for industrial relations.5 However, the number of violent strikes that have bedevilled this country in recent years seems to have shattered-down the aspirations of a better South Africa. South Africa recorded 114 strikes in 2013 and 88 strikes in 2014, which cost the country about R6.1 billion according to the Department of Labour.6 The impact of these strikes has been hugely felt by the mining sector, particularly the platinum industry. The biggest strike took place in the platinum sector where about 70 000 mineworkers' downed tools for better wages. Three major platinum producers (Impala, Anglo American and Lonmin Platinum Mines) were affected. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 25 June 2014. Business Day reported that "the five-month-long strike in the platinum sector pushed the economy to the brink of recession".7 This strike was closely followed by a four-week strike in the metal and engineering sector. All these strikes (and those not mentioned here) were characterised with violence accompanied by damage to property, intimidation, assault and sometimes the killing of people. Statistics from the metal and engineering sector showed that about 246 cases of intimidation were reported, 50 violent incidents occurred, and 85 cases of vandalism were recorded.8 Large-scale unemployment, soaring poverty levels and the dramatic income inequality that characterise the South African labour market provide a broad explanation for strike violence.9 While participating in a strike, workers' stress levels leave them feeling frustrated at their seeming powerlessness, which in turn provokes further violent behaviour.10 These strikes are not only violent but take long to resolve. Generally, a lengthy strike has a negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty.

#### 3] Even just the right to strike causes to these impacts– the right to strike is accompanied with increased strikes, many of them being violent, devastating key industries and the economy

Tenza 20 - Tenza, Mlungisi. . [Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal] “The Effects of Violent Strikes on the Economy of a Developing Country: A Case of South Africa.” Obiter, Nelson Mandela University, 2020, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci\_arttext&amp;pid=S1682-58532020000300004. VS

Economic growth is one of the most important pillars of a state. Most developing states put in place measures that enhance or speed-up the economic growth of their countries. It is believed that if the economy of a country is stable, the lives of the people improve with available resources being shared among the country's inhabitants or citizens. However, it becomes difficult when the growth of the economy is hampered by the exercise of one or more of the constitutionally entrenched rights such as the right to strike.1 Strikes in South Africa are becoming more common, and this affects businesses, employees and their families, and eventually, the economy. It becomes more dangerous for the economy and society at large if strikes are accompanied by violence causing damage to property and injury to people. The duration of strikes poses a problem for the economy of a developing country like South Africa. South Africa is rich in mineral resources, the world's largest producer of platinum and chrome, the second-largest producer of zirconium and the third-largest exporter of coal. It also has the largest economy in Africa, both in terms of industrial capacity and gross domestic product (GDP).2 However, these economic advantages have been affected by protracted and violent strikes.3 For example, in the platinum industries, labour stoppages since 2012 have cost the sector approximately R18 billion lost in revenue and 900 000 oz in lost output. The five-month-long strike in early 2014 at Impala Platinum Mine amounted to a loss of about R400 million a day in revenue.4 The question that this article attempts to address is how violent strikes and their duration affect the growth of the economy in a developing country like South Africa. It also addresses the question of whether there is a need to change the policies regulating industrial action in South Africa to make them more favourable to economic growth.

#### 4] Strikes decrease productivity, create investment risk, weaken capital, and market volatility– causes econ collapse

Wisniewski et al 19 - Wisniewski, T. P., Lambe, B. J., & Dias, A. (2019). The Influence of General Strikes against Government on Stock Market Behavior. Scottish Journal of Political Economy. doi:10.1111/sjpe.12224 VS

The research that has been done to date focused primarily on the incidence of general strikes and the motivations that drive the unions to stage opposition to government plans and reforms (Vandaele, 2011; Gall, 2013; Hamann et al., 2013a). A number of papers considered the determinants of union success, which can be measured according to the concessions granted by the government (Johnson, 2000; Hamann et al., 2013b; Nowak and Gallas, 2014).Implications for policy-makers were further highlighted by Hamann et al. (2013c) who documented the vote share losses of incumbents in the presence of general strikes. This is unsurprising considering the substantial efforts exerted by the unions to engage voters, generate news stories, and expose the alleged incompetency of the government. To counter the resultant electoral losses, a country’s leadership that faces popular protests is more likely to align fiscal policy with the election cycle. More specifically, Klomp and de Haan (2013) showed that affected governments increase their spending and deficits in the pre-election year in order to temporarily stimulate the economy and, as a consequence, boost popular support. While some clarity may have emerged with respect to the outcomes encountered by workers and governments, the literature remains silent with regards to the ramifications faced by employers. It is this void in the body of knowledge that our paper intends to fill. Even if the general strikes are not strictly directed against companies, their value may be adversely affected for several reasons. First, the unproductive periods impose costs in terms of lower levels of output and profits. Although general strikes are typically short in duration, the large number of employees involved has a bearing on the total number of days not worked (Gall, 2013). Second, such manifestations of popular dissent signal to the market the workforce’s frustration with the government and its policies. In the case where policy-makers are responsive to the demands being made, a general strike may also signal the weakening position of capital providers and other sources of power within the productive process. Corporations may also be forced into a position of carrying the burden of government concessions and the costs of social pacts that are agreed in the aftermath of a general strike. Third, in instances where the future response of the government is not known with certainty, additional investment risk is created. Such risk will raise the time-varying discount rates leading to lower stock valuations and increased market volatility. Fourth, conceding to workers’ demands may lead to a deterioration in a government’s financial position, which will exert upward pressure on bond yields and discount rates. This, in turn, would further aggravate the falls in stock prices. Our findings in this study reflect the abovementioned considerations. Through investigating a large sample spanning an array of countries, we demonstrate a valuation impact that is both statistically and economically significant. Since the magnitude of the fall in stock prices coinciding with the occurrence of a general strike is substantial, investors should pay particular attention to this type of event. Furthermore, we record significant increases in stock index return volatility and Value-at-Risk1 in the year of the event, which could be indicative of the policy uncertainty that arises alongside mass strike action. Such findings should be brought into consideration by those on both sides of the divide who are engaged in the collective bargaining process. Market vulnerability around times of mass strike action could be particularly distressing to shareholders who are not internationally diversified. The problem is of concern not only to frontline investors but extends to a wider swathe of the population invested in the market through pension funds. It is neither in the interest of trade unions nor governments to adversely affect the value of retirement portfolios. For this reason, both parties should seek alternative resolutions that do not involve walkouts. This means that in order to avoid costly economic frictions, governments should be wary of situations which may inflame worker indignation. Similarly, trade unions should consider the full welfare implications for their members before staging a mass protest.

#### Econ collapse goes nuclear

Mann 14 (Eric Mann is a special agent with a United States federal agency, with significant domestic and international counterintelligence and counter-terrorism experience. Worked as a special assistant for a U.S. Senator and served as a presidential appointee for the U.S. Congress. He is currently responsible for an internal security and vulnerability assessment program. Bachelors @ University of South Carolina, Graduate degree in Homeland Security @ Georgetown. “AUSTERITY, ECONOMIC DECLINE, AND FINANCIAL WEAPONS OF WAR: A NEW PARADIGM FOR GLOBAL SECURITY,” May 2014, <https://jscholarship.library.jhu.edu/bitstream/handle/1774.2/37262/MANN-THESIS-2014.pdf>)

The conclusions reached in this thesis demonstrate how economic considerations within states can figure prominently into the calculus for future conflicts. The findings also suggest that security issues with economic or financial underpinnings will transcend classical determinants of war and conflict, and change the manner by which rival states engage in hostile acts toward one another. The research shows that security concerns emanating from economic uncertainty and the inherent vulnerabilities within global financial markets will present new challenges for national security, and provide developing states new asymmetric options for balancing against stronger states.¶ The security areas, identified in the proceeding chapters, are likely to mature into global security threats in the immediate future. As the case study on South Korea suggest, the overlapping security issues associated with economic decline and reduced military spending by the United States will affect allied confidence in America’s security guarantees. The study shows that this outcome could cause regional instability or realignments of strategic partnerships in the Asia-pacific region with ramifications for U.S. national security. Rival states and non-state groups may also become emboldened to challenge America’s status in the unipolar international system.¶ The potential risks associated with stolen or loose WMD, resulting from poor security, can also pose a threat to U.S. national security. The case study on Pakistan, Syria and North Korea show how financial constraints affect weapons security making weapons vulnerable to theft, and how financial factors can influence WMD proliferation by contributing to the motivating factors behind a trusted insider’s decision to sell weapons technology. The inherent vulnerabilities within the global financial markets will provide terrorists’ organizations and other non-state groups, who object to the current international system or distribution of power, with opportunities to disrupt global finance and perhaps weaken America’s status. A more ominous threat originates from states intent on increasing diversification of foreign currency holdings, establishing alternatives to the dollar for international trade, or engaging financial warfare against the United States.
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### CP–Policy

#### CP Text:

#### 1] A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers except for police officers to strike.

- A police officer is a warranted law employee of a police force. "police officer" is a generic term not specifying a particular rank.(wikipedia)

#### 2]A just government ought to, through the corresponding union body in their society, threaten to remove police unions from the set of member unions unless they: eliminate due-processes protections police have won that prevent accountability from police misconduct through processes outlined in greenhouse

#### Only the CP can force police unions to change

Greenhouse, 20, The New Yorker, “How Police Unions Enable and Conceal Abuses of Power”, Steven Greenhouse is an American labor and workplace journalist and writer. He covered labor for The New York Times for 31 years, 2010 Society of Professional Journalists Deadline Club Award: Beat reporting for newspapers and wire services, for "World of Hurt" with N.R. Kleinfield; 2010 New York Press Club Award: Outstanding enterprise or investigative reporting, for "World of Hurt" with N.R. Kleinfield; 2009 The Hillman Prize for The Big Squeeze: Tough Times for the American WorkerURL: <https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-police-union-power-helped-increase-abuses>, KR

The string of police killings captured on mobile phones increased public dismay with police unions. After the killing of George Floyd, they became a pariah. Many protesters, and even some unions, including the Writers Guild of America, East, have called on the A.F.L.-C.I.O., the nation’s main labor federation, to expel the International Union of Police Associations, which represents a hundred thousand law-enforcement officers. The Association of Flight Attendants adopted a resolution demanding that police unions immediately enact policies to “actively address racism in law enforcement and especially to hold officers accountable for violence against citizens, or be removed from the Labor movement.” The Service Employees International Union, with two million members, has called for “holding public security unions accountable to racial justice,” and the Seattle area’s main labor coalition issued an ultimatum to the local police union: acknowledge and address racism in law enforcement or risk being kicked out.

If the A.F.L.-C.I.O. expelled the International Union of Police Associations, it would be a huge blow to police unions. So far, Richard Trumka, the federation’s president, has balked at kicking out a member union, saying that it’s best to work to reform unions from inside labor’s tent. “The short answer is not to disengage and just condemn,” Trumka said. “The answer is to totally reëngage and educate,” to improve police unions.

Suddenly, it seems, there are countless proposals to make police unions more accountable. Campaign Zero, a reform group, wants to eliminate many of the due-process protections that the police have won. Javier Morillo, a former president of a Twin Cities union that represents thousands of janitors, wrote an unusually sharp critique of a fellow union, the Minneapolis Police Federation: “Until we see big, fundamental and structural change in the [police] department and the union, Black and brown residents of Minneapolis cannot feel safe.” Morillo wrote that, “for decades, arbitrators have relied on bad precedent” to “justify overturning discipline against officers.” Paige Fernandez, the A.C.L.U.’s policing policy adviser, said that community members should join city officials at the bargaining table during police-contract negotiations. “There should be public input from communities that have been historically overpoliced, black communities and low-income communities,” Fernandez said.

Benjamin Sachs, the Harvard labor-law professor, argues that the union movement needs to join the push for police reform. “When unions use the power of collective bargaining for ends that we . . . deem unacceptable it becomes our responsibility—including the responsibility of the labor movement itself—to deny unions the ability to use collective bargaining for these purposes,” he wrote. “We have done this before. When unions bargained contracts that excluded Black workers from employment or that relegated Black workers to inferior jobs, the law stepped in and stripped unions of the right to use collective bargaining in these ways.” Sachs proposes amending the law to curb the range of subjects over which police unions can bargain, perhaps even prohibiting negotiations over anything involving the use of force.

Some labor leaders warn that conservatives are using today’s outrage against police unions to promote their long-term agenda of hobbling or eliminating public-sector unions. “Everyone should have the freedom to join a union, police officers included,” Lee Saunders, the president of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, wrote. “The tragic killing of George Floyd should not be used as a pretext to undermine the rights of workers.”

Randi Weingarten, the president of the American Federation of Teachers, told me that it’s important to persuade police unions to stop vehemently defending every police officer who is accused of misconduct. She pointed to her own union’s past. “Our position used to be that the member was always right, that, whatever happened, you did everything in your power to keep the member’s job,” she said. “It didn’t matter if you knew there was a problem.” She added that as public anger mounted against this hard-line approach—many said that it was shortchanging children—local A.F.T. branches moved away from rigidly defending every teacher accused of misconduct or poor performance. Weingarten told me, “Ultimately, if we are members of our community, we have to hold ourselves to a standard of treating people respectfully and decently, and misconduct has no place in that.” McCartin, the labor historian, told me, “Police unions haven’t done nearly as much as the teachers to counter the perception that they’re indifferent to the public’s concerns. They can learn a lot from the teachers.”

Last week, Patrick Yoes, the president of the Fraternal Order of Police, the nation’s largest law-enforcement group, told NPR he agrees that reforms are needed. “We welcome the opportunity to sit down and have some meaningful, fact-based discussions on ways to improve the law-enforcement community,” Yoes said. But some police-union leaders are less amenable to reform. Last week, Michael O’Meara, the president of the New York State Association of P.B.A.s, said, “Stop treating us like animals and thugs and start treating us with some respect. . . . We’ve been vilified.”

Mindful of the Black Lives Matter protests, many mayors and cities will seek to push through contract changes in the next round of police bargaining, but no one should expect police unions to roll over. Many police-union officials believe that the harder the line they take in defending officers (and ignoring the public’s concerns) the better their chances of being reëlected by their members. As a result, the unions’ critics might have a better shot at winning reforms through city councils and state legislatures. O’Meara’s remarks make clear that police unions often have an us-against-the-world view. The question now is whether police unions will get the message that they shouldn’t think only of protecting their members, that they should also think of the original purpose of labor unions: protecting all workers—in other words, protecting the public.

#### Excessive police union bargaining from strikes destroys accountability for police misconduct

Greenhouse, 20, The New Yorker, “How Police Unions Enable and Conceal Abuses of Power”, Steven Greenhouse is an American labor and workplace journalist and writer. He covered labor for The New York Times for 31 years, 2010 Society of Professional Journalists Deadline Club Award: Beat reporting for newspapers and wire services, for "World of Hurt" with N.R. Kleinfield; 2010 New York Press Club Award: Outstanding enterprise or investigative reporting, for "World of Hurt" with N.R. Kleinfield; 2009 The Hillman Prize for The Big Squeeze: Tough Times for the American WorkerURL: <https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-police-union-power-helped-increase-abuses>, KR

Police unions have long had a singular—and divisive—place in American labor. What is different at this fraught moment, however, is that these unions, long considered untouchable, due to their extraordinary power on the streets and among politicians, face a potential reckoning, as their conduct roils not just one city but the entire nation. Since the nineteen-sixties, when police unions first became like traditional unions and won the right to bargain collectively, they have had a controversial history. And recent studies suggest that their political and bargaining power has enabled them to win disciplinary systems so lax that they have helped increase police abuses in the United States.

A 2018 University of Oxford study of the hundred largest American cities found that the extent of protections in police contracts was directly and positively correlated with police violence and other abuses against citizens. A 2019 University of Chicago study found that extending collective-bargaining rights to Florida sheriffs’ deputies led to a forty per cent statewide increase in cases of violent misconduct—translating to nearly twelve additional such incidents annually.

In a forthcoming study, Rob Gillezeau, a professor and researcher, concluded that, from the nineteen-fifties to the nineteen-eighties, the ability of police to collectively bargain led to a substantial rise in police killings of civilians, with a greater impact on people of color. “With the caveat that this is very early work,” Gillezeau wrote on Twitter, on May 30th, “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 non-white population.”

Other studies revealed that many existing mechanisms for disciplining police are toothless. WBEZ, a Chicago radio station, found that, between 2007 and 2015, Chicago’s Independent Police Review Authority investigated four hundred shootings by police and deemed the officers justified in all but two incidents. Since 2012, when Minneapolis replaced its civilian review board with an Office of Police Conduct Review, the public has filed more than twenty-six hundred misconduct complaints, yet only twelve resulted in a police officer being punished. The most severe penalty: a forty-hour suspension. When the St. Paul Pioneer Press reviewed appeals involving terminations from 2014 to 2019, it discovered that arbitrators ruled in favor of the discharged police and corrections officers and ordered them reinstated forty-six per cent of the time. (Non-law-enforcement workers were reinstated at a similar rate.) For those demanding more accountability, a large obstacle is that disciplinary actions are often overturned if an arbitrator finds that the penalty the department meted out is tougher than it was in a similar, previous case—no matter if the penalty in the previous case seemed far too lenient.

To critics, all of this highlights that the disciplinary process for law enforcement is woefully broken, and that police unions have far too much power. They contend that robust protections, including qualified immunity, give many police officers a sense of impunity—an attitude exemplified by Derek Chauvin keeping his knee on George Floyd’s neck for nearly nine minutes, even as onlookers pleaded with him to stop. “We’re at a place where something has to change, so that police collective bargaining no longer contributes to police violence,” Benjamin Sachs, a labor-law professor at Harvard, told me. Sachs said that bargaining on “matters of discipline, especially related to the use of force, has insulated police officers from accountability, and that predictably can increase the problem.”

For decades, members of the public have complained about police violence and police unions, and a relatively recent development—mobile-phone videos—has sparked even more public anger. These complaints grew with the killings of Eric Garner, Laquan McDonald, Walter Scott, Tamir Rice, Philando Castile, and many others. Each time, there were protests and urgent calls for police reform, but the matter blew over. Until the horrific killing of George Floyd.

Historians often talk of two distinct genealogies for policing in the North and in the South, and both help to explain the crisis that the police and its unions find themselves in today. Northern cities began to establish police departments in the eighteen-thirties; by the end of the century, many had become best known for using ruthless force to crush labor agitation and strikes, an aim to which they were pushed by the industrial and financial élite. In 1886, the Chicago police killed four strikers and injured dozens more at the McCormick Reaper Works. In the South, policing has very different roots: slave patrols, in which white men brutally enforced slave codes, checking to see whether black people had proper passes whenever they were off their masters’ estates and often beating them if they did something the patrols didn’t like. Khalil Gibran Muhammad, a historian at Harvard, said that the patrols “were explicit in their design to empower the entire white population” to control “the movements of black people.”

At the turn of the twentieth century, many police officers—frustrated, like other workers, with low pay and long hours—formed fraternal associations, rather than unions, to seek better conditions—mayors and police commissioners insisted that the police had no more right to join a union than did soldiers and sailors. In 1897, a group of Cleveland police officers sought to form a union and petitioned the American Federation of Labor—founded in 1886, with Samuel Gompers as its first president—to grant them a union charter. The A.F.L. rejected them, saying, “It is not within the province of the trade union movement to especially organize policemen, no more than to organize militiamen, as both policemen and militiamen are often controlled by forces inimical to the labor movement.”

After the First World War, millions of workers began protesting that their wages lagged far behind inflation, and many police officers got swept up in the ferment. In 1919, Boston’s city police applied to the A.F.L. for a charter; they were angry about their meagre salaries and having to pay hundreds of dollars for uniforms. The police commissioner, Edwin Upton Curtis, forbade his officers from joining any outside organization other than patriotic groups, such as the American Legion. The police proceeded to unionize, and Curtis suspended nineteen of the union’s leaders for insubordination. When most of the city’s fifteen hundred police officers walked off the job, rioting and widespread looting engulfed the city. Curtis fired eleven hundred strikers, and Calvin Coolidge, who was then the governor of Massachusetts, supported his hard line, saying, “There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, anytime.” Coolidge’s stance thrust him into the national spotlight. He went on to serve as Vice-President and President.

For decades, that stance deterred police unionization. But, in the nineteen-fifties and sixties, with private-sector unions winning middle-class wages and solid benefits for millions of workers, police officers again started rumbling for a union. Their fraternal orders weren’t doing enough; the police wanted collective bargaining. Officers became increasingly impatient, and militant. In the early sixties, police engaged in a work slowdown in New York and a sit-in in Detroit.

In 1964, New York’s mayor, Robert F. Wagner, Jr., blessed a compromise between his police commissioner and the Patrolmen’s Benevolent Association. The P.B.A. renounced the right to strike and was recognized as the bargaining agent for the city’s police. Wagner had previously agreed to bargain with other municipal unions, but he had held off with the police, because of its singular role and of fears that officers might strike. (The National Labor Relations Act of 1935—sponsored by Wagner’s father, Senator Robert F. Wagner, Sr.—gave most private-sector workers a federal right to unionize and collectively bargain, but left it up to individual states and cities to decide whether to grant the same rights to government employees.) As a full-fledged union, the P.B.A. didn’t wait long to declare war against any push for increased accountability. In 1966, New York’s new mayor, John V. Lindsay, after being pressed by the Congress of Racial Equality, added four civilian members to the city’s Civilian Complaint Review Board; the original three members were deputy police commissioners. Then, as now, many African-Americans complained about police misconduct. The P.B.A., which renamed itself the Police Benevolent Association last year, bitterly resisted adding civilians to the board. When the City Council held a hearing on civilian review, the union mounted a five-thousand-member picket line in protest. The P.B.A. then organized a public referendum aimed at eliminating the board. It put up posters showing a young white woman exiting a subway and heading onto a dark, deserted street. “The Civilian Review Board must be stopped,” the poster read. “Her life . . . your life . . . may depend on it. . . . [A] police officer must not hesitate. If he does . . . the security and safety of your family may be jeopardized.” As the vote approached, the P.B.A.’s president, John Cassese, had played on racial divisions, declaring, “I’m sick and tired of giving in to minority groups with their whims and their gripes and shouting.” Lindsay, the American Civil Liberties Union, and New York’s two senators—the Republican Jacob Javits and the Democrat Robert F. Kennedy—opposed the P.B.A.-backed referendum. In a humbling defeat for liberals, sixty-three per cent of New Yorkers voted to abolish the review board.

Across the U.S., a similar dynamic played out. First, many cities followed New York’s lead and agreed to bargain with their police unions. Initially, newly established unions focussed on winning better wages and benefits. A major recession in the early eighties and the anti-tax fervor of the Reagan era caused budget crunches in many cities. Local leaders told police unions and other public-sector unions that they had little money for raises. In turn, the police demanded increased protections for officers facing disciplinary proceedings.

Since the eighties, police contracts in New York and many other cities have added one protection after another that have made it harder to hold officers accountable for improper use of force or other misconduct. Such protections included keeping an officer’s disciplinary record secret, erasing an officer’s disciplinary record after a few years, or delaying any questioning of officers for twenty-four or forty-eight hours after an incident such as a police shooting. “They have these unusual protections they’ve bargained very hard for, measures that insulate them from accountability,” William P. Jones, a history professor at the University of Minnesota and the president of the Labor and Working-Class History Association, told me. Jones said that other public-employee unions have some of the same protections but that police unions “are particularly effective utilizing them in their favor.”

In 2017, a Reuters a special report on police-union contracts in eighty-two cities found that most required departments to erase disciplinary records, in some cases after only six months. Eighteen cities expunged suspensions from an officer’s record in three years or less. Anchorage, Alaska, removed demotions, suspensions, and disciplinary transfers after twenty-four months. Reuters also found that almost half of the contracts let officers accused of wrongdoing see their entire investigative file—including witness statements, photos, and videos—before being questioned, making it easier for them to finesse their way through disciplinary interrogations.

Joseph McCartin, a labor historian at Georgetown, told me that one political factor explains why police unions have won so many protections. “They have more clout than other public-sector unions, like the teachers or sanitation workers, because they have often been able to command the political support of Republicans,” he said. “That’s given them a big advantage.”

v

#### Police brutality causes death, mistrust in police crosses over to other institutions which causes violence

Todd, 20, 6/17/20, “Why Police Brutality Is a Public Health Issue”, Self, URL: <https://www.self.com/story/police-brutality-public-health-issue>, Carolyn Todd is a senior health writer, calling upon multiple experts during the article, KR

Police brutality directly causes death and injury

The most direct connection between police violence and public health is the fact that police violence kills people. And perhaps the clearest indication out there that we don’t regard police violence as a public health issue is the fact that our government doesn’t even keep track of the number of people the police kill every year at a national level. Instead, we rely on incomplete compilations of data from media outlets and activist organizations: The Washington Post has tracked reported fatal shootings by police since 2015, finding that about 1,000 people die per year; the Mapping Police Violence project has reported similar numbers since 2013.

“Police brutality affects public health because it affects an indicator of population health, which is life expectancy,” Alang says. “It causes death, reduces life expectancy, and increases the death rates for particular populations.”

Those particular populations are largely BIPOC. “People of all races are impacted by police violence, Black people and indigenous people at much higher rates,” Justin M. Feldman, M.P.H., Sc.D., assistant professor in the department of population health at the NYU Grossman School of Medicine and researcher of police violence and racial/economic segregation, tells SELF. Other vulnerable groups highly affected by police brutality incude people with a mental illness, LGBTQI individuals, people experiencing homelessness, sex workers, people who use drugs, and people with low incomes, according to a policy statement declaring police violence a public health issue published by the American Public Health Association (APHA) in 2018.

You may have seen one particularly striking statistic being widely shared recently: 1 in 1,000 Black men will die at the hands of police. That number comes from a study published in the journal Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences (PNAS) in 2019. Researchers analyzed data from 2013 to 2018, aggregated by Fatal Encounters, another effort to create a national database of deaths involving police. They found that Black men are about 2.5 times more likely to be killed by police use of force than white men; Black women, 1.4 times more likely than white women. The risk is highest for young Black men: Police violence is a leading cause of death for Black men aged 25 to 29. Among their other findings: Indigenous people are also significantly more likely to be killed by police (although those estimates are less accurate), and Latinx men are 1.3 to 1.4 times more likely (while Latinx women are slightly less likely).

Police brutality, however, “is about much more than the incidents of police killing folks,” Georges C. Benjamin, M.D., executive director of the APHA, tells SELF. “It’s also about the violence that occurs, the hostile engagements, the way [people] are treated when they’re stopped and arrested and incarcerated.” For every person who dies at the hands of law enforcement, many more are hurt badly enough to go to the hospital, Dr. Benjamin points out.

A study published in JAMA Surgery in 2017 found that there are on average 51,000 emergency room visits annually by people injured by law enforcement (based on data from 2006–2012). According to more recent data collected by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), there were an estimated 85,075 ER visits for nonfatal injuries resulting from legal intervention in 2018, which includes police but also other law enforcement agents and on-duty military. That was not an unusual year by any means: From 2008 to 2018, there were an estimated 950,882 law enforcement–inflicted nonfatal injuries that sent people to the ER, according to CDC data. (Keep in mind, injuries that do not result in an ER visit are not included here.)

This violence affects Black people disproportionately, to an alarming degree. A study published in the Journal of Urban Health in 2016 (co-authored by Feldman) analyzed data collected from a nationally representative sample of 66 U.S. hospital emergency departments on injuries caused by legal intervention in people aged 15–34 (the highest risk age group), from 2001 to 2014. (In this study, private security guards were included alongside police officers and other legal authorities.) They found that Black people went to the ER for law enforcement–perpetrated injuries at a 4.9-fold higher rate than white people. Researchers also found that legal intervention violence increased dramatically, by 47.4 percent, over the 14-year period they studied. If we saw any particular use of force or group of people kill 1,000 people a year and send over 50,000 more to the ER, we’d call it a public health threat.

Police brutality directly (and indirectly) affects mental health

“Police violence is a cause of death and injury to people who experience it directly, and then there’s this other category of police violence that perhaps has broader effects on public health,” Feldman says. “There’s growing evidence that the mental health and well-being of individuals and entire communities are affected after a high profile incident of police violence.”

Before we get into the data here, it’s worth taking a moment to reflect on why police violence against Black people in this country is uniquely traumatizing. Of course, seeing a loved one or member of any race injured or killed unexpectedly due to any cause is horrific. And although Black people are killed by the police at a rate disproportionate to their population size, about half of the people shot and killed by police are white, according to the Washington Post police shootings database.

But there are particular dimensions to the pain of seeing a Black individual brutalized or killed by a police officer that are not immediately apparent to most non-Black people, beginning with the historical weight these incidents bear and the collective trauma they evoke. “It’s really important to think about [police brutality] in the context of the American slave trade and [how] the origins of police are really rooted in slave patrol,” Alang explains. A Black person being injured or killed at the hands of the police in 2020 is a devastating reminder of that disturbing period in American history. “People’s contemporary experiences of police brutality really in every single way mirror the period of enslavement and slave patrol,” Alang says.

Police killings of Black people also represent the continued oppression and devaluation of Black lives at a systemic level. “They died because someone thought they were a threat. They died because someone didn’t value their life at that moment,” Alang says. “So it’s the stress of losing someone who looks like you, and what that means for your community...the stress of knowing that that loss is grounded in the color of your skin as a second class citizen as a Black person, or as an indigenous person, or as a Latinx person,” Alang explains.

Evidence demonstrates that police killings of Black people indeed have effects that extend far beyond the Black families or social circles that know the individual who died into Black communities across the country. A study published in the Lancet in 2018 used two sets of data—police killings of unarmed Black Americans and the self-reported mental health of Black Americans in the state where the person was killed—to see if they could establish a causal link. Of the 103,710 respondents, 38,993 of them had had at least one police killing of an unarmed Black person in their state in the last three months. Researchers found that for each additional police killing of an unarmed Black person, Black respondents living in that state reported an additional 0.14 poor mental health days. (No such correlations were found among white respondents or for killings of armed Black Americans.) Another study, this one published in the American Journal of Public Health in 2017, found that the prevalence of depressive symptoms in 1,095 mothers (93 percent of whom were African American) living in Baltimore increased significantly in neighborhoods where there was civil unrest after Freddie Gray’s death in police custody in 2015.

Police brutality impacts mental health above and beyond the actual incidents of it, though. “The thing is, it’s not just when [an incident of police violence] happens. It is the constant anticipation that it could happen to you, it could happen to someone you know,” Alang explains. The interminable uncertainty of the looming threat of police brutality can take severe psychological tolls on the people who are most vulnerable to it—i.e., the BIPOC who are most likely to be injured, killed, or traumatized at the hands of the police. This kind of stress and anticipation "is not visible to other people. It’s just part of the day-to-day experiences of groups that are disproportionately policed that the stress has become so chronic that it’s invisible,” Alang says. “[Something] that makes a stressor really chronic and really painful and significantly more associated with mental health is the uncertainty of it, [not knowing] when it will happen and when it will end,” Alang notes. “It’s that uncertain yet permanent stressor that really makes police brutality impact mental health the way that it does.”

As Dr. Benjamin puts it, “Imagine getting up every day and having to be afraid—not just to leave your house but even be in your house…of being [harmed or killed] by someone that’s supposed to be protecting you.” One study published in Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences in 2017 analyzed survey data from 1,615 participants in four U.S. cities (Baltimore, New York, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C.) and found correlations between not only lifetime history of victimization by police (including physical, sexual, and psychological, as well as neglect) and distress/depression, but also how likely people believed they were to experience police violence in the future.

It’s worth pointing out here how this dynamic of fear and distrust bred by racist police brutality feeds into a self-perpetuating cycle of escalation in police encounters—leading to more violence, and even more distrust—with devastating impacts on public health. Black individuals, and especially Black men, bring this fear and stress into every interaction with police (of which Black people have many more, due to policies and practices that support racial profiling), Alang says—including what should be peaceful encounters, like when they get stopped on the street or pulled over for a traffic violation. “The problem is that increasingly those encounters are encounters that are fearful, particularly for people of color,” Dr. Benjamin says. “It's been shown that you are being profiled totally because of your color. The police officer approaches you differently than others, approaches you as if you're a threat or you're not worth dignity and respect.” This fear can create defensiveness in these encounters, and sometimes aggression, he explains. “So what should be a non-escalating event becomes an escalating event.”

Even stops that are not physically violent harm mental health. The APHA policy statement cites a number of studies showing a connection between stops that people perceive as discriminatory, unfair, or intrusive and symptoms of psychological distress, including anxiety, depression, and PTSD. Beyond that, survey data suggests Black individuals are more likely to report stress resulting from police encounters than white individuals—especially troubling, the APHA statement authors write, given that stress due to perceived racial discrimination is generally associated with chronic disease risk factors and early death in Black people.

Indeed, like all forms and threats of violence, “[Police violence] certainly creates stress, which we know affects a range of health outcomes,” Dr. Benjamin says. Evidence shows that the constant stress of the looming threat, the actual experience, and the devastating aftermath of police brutality in all of its forms (physical, emotional, verbal) at a personal (first- or secondhand) and societal level can have tremendous effects on the mental and physical health of people. “Those are experiences that cause stress and that wear and tear the body systems of people of color that increase the allostatic load, that cause weathering,” Alang explains. As SELF previously reported, allostatic load refers to the damaging biological effects of overexposure to stress hormones, and weathering refers to how the ongoing stress of racism can result in higher levels of disease and biological aging in Black people, including, for example, Black maternal mortality.

Police brutality also has massive indirect effects on public health by breeding mistrust in the institutions meant to keep us safe

There’s also a category of ripple effects that police brutality has on communities that are profoundly detrimental to public health but difficult to quantify due to a severe lack of data. Take the fact that police brutality, applied disproportionately to BIPOC, engenders a lack of confidence in the police. “[People] don't believe that the police will trust them and protect them,” Dr. Benjamin explains, and this lack of faith in law enforcement makes people less likely to call on the police when they are in danger. Furthermore, “When people don't trust the police, they don't tell the police stuff [about] other crimes and safety threats that occur in the communities,” Dr. Benjamin says. “Crimes don’t get solved.” Police brutality in effect makes effective police work more difficult, and the communities they serve less safe, resulting in more public health threats.

Furthermore, mistrust in one institution tends to carry over into others. “Police represent ‘the man,’ whatever that man means to you…they represent in people’s minds the systems that are [working] against them,” Dr. Benjamin explains. So a lack of confidence in the police “trickles down to other institutions” and contributes to a broader “distrust of government in our society, [distrust] of anyone who’s [in] a uniform,” Dr. Benjamin says. “That carries over to people who are EMTs, people who are firefighters, people who are social workers.”

The institutional mistrust that has the most direct effect on public health is, of course, health care—another institution that is supposed to take care of all people equally, but disproportionately harms Black Americans. Police violence and perceived discrimination reinforce a longstanding distrust of medical institutions among BIPOC, which “affects public health indirectly by shaping access to health care,” Alang says. “People don’t live their lives in silos,” she explains. “When I go to the doctor, I don’t stop from being a Black woman. I still carry that racial trauma with me and that distrust.”

## OFF

#### Counterplan Text: A just government ought to recognize a right of workers to strike when authorized by a majority of striking workers through a secret balloting process

#### That solves

Tenza 19 -- Mlungisi Tenza (LLB, LLM, LLD @ University of KwaZulu-Natal), Investigating the need to reintroduce a ballot requirement for a protected strike in South Africa, August 1 2019, *Obiter*Volume 40, Issue 2, https://journals.co.za/doi/10.10520/EJC-1936af7594 WJ

Violent protracted strikes can have devastating effects on employers, employees and the economy at large. Despite the fact that workers have a constitutional right to strike, it is important that the exercising of such a right not be allowed to go beyond the necessary limits. Currently, strikes are often characterised by violent conduct. Resolution of strikes also takes a long time, leaving many people unemployed by the time a solution is found. This not only affects the employees concerned, but is a contributing factor to poverty. To prevent long and violent strikes from taking place, it is suggested that there should be changes to existing labour law so as to include a ballot requirement. The law should compel a convening union to ballot members before staging a strike. To be credible, the balloting process should be chaired by an independent body, such as the IEC or a representative from the CCMA. This is the position in Australia and Canada. In these countries, if a union calls a strike without having balloted its members, such a strike is unlawful and civil action can be taken against the union and its members. Balloting members prior to strike action would help to establish their willingness to embark on a strike. If the majority vote in favour of a strike, it would send a signal to the employer that workers are serious and that it must consider their concerns or demands in a serious light. The employer and employee representatives are expected to engage fruitfully during negotiations and to avoid impending industrial action.

#### Mandatory pre-strike ballots empirically increase intra-organizational cohesion

Orchiston et al 19 -- Alice Orchiston (Lecturer, Faculty of Law, University of New South Wales), Breen Creighton (Honorary Professor, Graduate School of Business and Law, RMIT University), Catrina Denvir (Research Fellow, Director of Ulster Legal Innovation Centre, School of Law, Ulster University), Richard Johnstone (Professor, Faculty of Law, Queensland University of Technology), and Shae Mccrystal (Professor of Labour Law, Sydney Law School, The University of Sydney), PRE-STRIKE BALLOTS AND ENTERPRISE BARGAINING DYNAMICS: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS, Melbourne University Law Review, Vol 42(2):593 2019 WJ

As identified above, the introduction of the mandatory pre-strike ballot requirement was justified by reference to democratic imperatives, specifically the need to implement a ‘fair, effective and simple process for determining if a group of employees in an enterprise want to take industrial action’.136 In practice, mandatory pre-strike ballots have had a positive effect on intra- organisational communication and internal union decision-making around industrial action. The analysis revealed that, on the whole, the unions in the study implemented democratic processes for member consultation and engagement over every step of the PABO process, including the decision to apply for a PABO, the ballot itself and the subsequent decision to take industrial action. These decisions were almost universally referred to by union interviewees as ‘member’ decisions subject to internal union processes with high levels of member engagement.

#### Intra-organizational democracy is key to labor power – union leadership trails worker support

Vesoulis 21 -- Abby Vesoulis and Julia Zorthian, Workers Are Furious. Their Unions Are Scrambling to Catch Up, https://time.com/6110014/worker-anger-unions/, October 2021 WJ

The other thing getting under Geiger’s skin is how his union, United Auto Workers (UAW), is handling this moment. After all, it was UAW that agreed to the contract of the two-tiered system back in the 1990s. “We don’t trust the international union” says Geiger. “They brought that lousy contract for us to vote on.”

Geiger’s frustration with his union is not unique. In recent weeks, as tens of thousands of workers from Colorado to Georgia have gone on strike to demand better pay and work conditions, much of the organizing has been driven by workers themselves. The dynamic has left national and international union leadership scrambling to keep up with their own members’ decisions to strike, their shifting goals, and how to support the social media-driven communications strategies workers are employing.

“There is this grassroots push,” says David Madland, senior adviser to the American Worker Project at the Center for American Progress, “and leaders have to catch up.”

A year and a half into the COVID-19 pandemic, in which most blue-collar workers risked their health and safety to go to work while their white-collar colleagues largely worked from home, some top union brass and union members are at a disconnect. Union leadership is sometimes so focused on state and federal power structures that they’re missing the tectonic shifts among workers on the ground, labor experts and striking workers say.

“There is a danger and a concern that some of the heads of unions tend to be DC-focused. [They are] too interested in, ‘What are the debates on reconciliation? Who’s working with the administration? Are we invited to the meetings in DC?’ Yes, there’s an important role to play there,” argues Faiz Shakir, the founder of advocacy journalism startup More Perfect Union and former Bernie Sanders’ 2020 campaign manager. “But right now, especially at this moment in history, the worker fights are out there around the country.”

## OFF

#### Public-sector unions crush effective governance through the fueling of massive debt

Disalvo 10 [Daniel DiSalvo is an assistant professor of political science at the City College of New York.] “The Trouble with Public Sector Unions” National Affairs, Fall 2010, <https://www.nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/the-trouble-with-public-sector-unions>, VM

“The firestorm that these proposals have sparked demonstrates the political clout of state-workers' unions. Christie's executive order met with vicious condemnation from union leaders and the politicians aligned with them; his fight with the public-school teachers prompted the New Jersey Education Association to spend $6 million (drawn from members' dues) on anti-Christie attack ads over a two-month period. Clearly, the lesson for reform-minded politicians has been: Confront public-sector unions at your peril. Yet confront them policymakers must. As Christie said about the duel with the NJEA, "If we don't win this fight, there's no other fight left." Melodramatic as this may sound, for many states, it is simply reality. The **cost of public-sector pay and benefits** (which in many cases far exceed what comparable workers earn in the private sector), **combined** with hundreds of billions of dollars in unfunded pension liabilities for retired government workers, are weighing down state and city budgets. And staggering as these burdens seem now, they are actually poised to grow exponentially in the years ahead. If policymakers **fail to rein in this growth,** a fiscal crack-up will be the inevitable result. New Jersey has drawn national attention as a case study, but the same scenario is playing out in state capitals from coast to coast. New York, Michigan, California, Washington, and many other states also find themselves **heavily indebted**, with **public-sector unions at the root** of their problems. In exchange, taxpayers in these states are rewarded with larger and more expensive, yet less effective, government, and with elected officials who are afraid to cross the politically powerful unions. As the Wall Street Journal put it recently, public-sector unions "may be the single biggest problem...for the **U.S. economy** and small-d **democratic governance**." They may also be the biggest challenge facing state and local officials — a challenge that, unless economic conditions dramatically improve, will dominate the politics of the decade to come.”

#### **Controlling state debt key to infrastructure investment across America – it’s try or die.**

Siripurapu and Masters 21 [Anshu Siripurapu covers economics, energy, and geopolitics, and helps edit the Daily News Brief. He holds a BA in political economy from the University of Southern California. Jonathan Masters leads writers and editors who produce wide-ranging content for CFR.org, including Backgrounders, visual stories, and events.] Council of Foreign Relations, “How COVID-19 Is Harming State and City Budgets,” <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/how-covid-19-harming-state-and-city-budgets>, VM

“The U.S. national economy is composed of a vast collection of local and regional economies, where state and local policies **play a significant role**. Collectively, state and local governments outspend Washington on direct goods and services, employ more workers than the domestic manufacturing sector, and are responsible for about 15 percent of national GDP. States and cities supply nearly 80 percent of the $441 billion spent nationally on transportation and water infrastructure, according to the Congressional Budget Office’s most recent data. These investments help fuel the economy directly by **creating jobs in sectors such as construction**, experts say, and are also essential for improving long-term **economic efficiency and international competitiveness.** (For example, less congestion lowers business costs.) The 2019 Global Competitiveness Report from the World Economic Forum (WEF) ranked the United States second overall in economic competitiveness, but thirteenth in quality of infrastructure. The American Society of Civil Engineers **gave the United States a D+ in its 2017 Infrastructure Report Card**—the same grade it gave in 2013. State and local governments contribute more than 90 percent of the money spent nationally on K–12 education, as well as provide substantial financing for the public university system, which graduates the majority of U.S. college students. While education has typically been the largest budget category of total state spending, Medicaid’s share has been growing over the past decade. At a more basic level, states and cities are where life is lived and economic decisions are made. While budget austerity at the federal level can seem removed to many families and businesses, **the effects of cutbacks in their home states and localities are tangible**. Cuts to police and fire departments, for instance, mean some neighborhoods are less safe. **Fewer teachers and more students** per classroom erode the quality of education, making U.S. workers less competitive in the long run. Crumbling roads and bridges discourage businesses from investing.

#### Declining US infrastructure jeopardizes economic stability, competitive production, and global trade webs.

Puentes 15 [Robert Puentes is President and CEO of the Eno Center for Transportation a non-profit think tank with the mission of improving transportation policy and leadership. Prior to joining Eno, he was a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program where he also directed the program’s Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative. He is currently a non-resident senior fellow with Brookings. Before that Robert was the director of infrastructure programs at the Intelligent Transportation Society of America], 1-20-2015, "Why Infrastructure Matters: Rotten Roads, Bum Economy," Brookings, <https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/why-infrastructure-matters-rotten-roads-bum-economy/> mvp Recut VM

Cities, states and metropolitan areas throughout America face an unprecedented economic, demographic, fiscal and environmental challenges that make it imperative for the public and private sectors to rethink the way they do business. These new forces are incredibly diverse, but they share an underlying need for modern, efficient and reliable infrastructure. Concrete, steel and fiber-optic cable are the essential building blocks of the economy. Infrastructure enables trade, powers businesses, connects workers to their jobs, creates opportunities for struggling communities and protects the nation from an increasingly unpredictable natural environment. From private investment in telecommunication systems, broadband networks, freight railroads, energy projects and pipelines, to publicly spending on transportation, water, buildings and parks, infrastructure is the backbone of a healthy economy. It also supports workers, providing millions of jobs each year in building and maintenance. A Brookings Institution analysis Bureau of Labor Statistics data reveals that 14 million people have jobs in fields directly related to infrastructure. From locomotive engineers and electrical power line installers, to truck drivers and airline pilots, to construction laborers and meter readers, infrastructure jobs account for nearly 11 percent of the nation’s workforce, offering employment opportunities that have low barriers of entry and are projected to grow over the next decade. Important national goals also depend on it. The economy needs reliable infrastructure to connect supply chains and efficiently move goods and services across borders. Infrastructure connects households across metropolitan areas to higher quality opportunities for employment, healthcare and education. Clean energy and public transit can reduce greenhouse gases. This same economic logic applies to broadband networks, water systems and energy production and distribution. Big demographic and cultural changes, such as the aging and diversification of our society, shrinking households and domestic migration, underscore the need for new transportation and telecommunications to connect people and communities. The percentage of licensed drivers among the young is the lowest in three decades, as more of them use public transit and many others use new services for sharing cars and bikes. The prototypical family of the suburban era, a married couple with school-age children, now represents only 20 percent of households, down from over 40 percent in 1970. Some 55 percent of millennials say living close to public transportation is important to them, according to a recent survey by the Urban Land Institute. Yet unlike Western Europe and parts of Asia, the United States still has a growing population. We’ve added 25 million people in the past 10 years. This tremendous growth, concentrated in the 50 largest metropolitan areas, will place new demands on already overtaxed infrastructure. Metropolitan areas must be ready to adapt not only to serve millions of new customers but also to help poorer residents, many of whom are jobless, have the best chance possible to find work.

## CASE

### ADV

#### ] No reason an unconditional right to strike is key

#### Can’t solve electoral legitimacy

**1AC. Luce 20** [Stephanie; Professor, received her B.A. in economics from the University of California, Davis and both her Ph.D in Sociology and her M.A. in Industrial Relations from the University of Wisconsin at Madison. Her research focuses on low-wage work, globalization and labor standards, and labor-community coalitions. She is the author of Labor Movements: Global Perspectives. Well-known for her research on living wage campaigns and movements, she is also the author of Fighting for a Living Wage and co-author (with Robert Pollin) of The Living Wage: Building a Fair Economy. She is co-author of A Measure of Fairness; and co-editor of What Works for Workers?: Public Policies and Innovative Strategies for Low-Wage Workers. She has published numerous reports on labor and wages in the New York City area, including the annual “State of the Unions” report co-authored with Ruth Milkman; “Strike for Democracy!” 10/26/20; OrgUP; <https://www.organizingupgrade.com/strike-for-democracy/>]

. The Rochester Central Labor Council in New York passed a resolution calling for a general strike in the event that Trump loses and does not step down. The resolution calls on the **national** **AFL**-**CIO** and all other labor organizations to “prepare for and enact a **general** **strike**, if necessary, to ensure a **Constitutionally** **mandated** **peaceful** **transition** of power as a result of the 2020 Presidential Elections.”

### Dem Bad

**Democracy doesn’t solve war---it increases hostility.**

**Ghatak et al. 17**—Sam Ghatak is a Lecturer in Political Science at the University of Tennessee Knoxville; Aaron Gold is a PhD Student in Political Science at UT Knoxville; Brandon C. Prins is a Professor and Director of Graduate Studies of Political Science at UT Knoxville [“External threat and the limits of democratic pacifism,” *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, Vol. 34, No. 2, p. 141-159, Emory Libraries]

Conclusion It has become a **stylized fact** that dyadic democracy lowers the hazard of armed conflict. While the Democratic Peace has faced many challenges, we believe the most significant challenge has come from the argument that the pacifying effect of democracy is **epiphenomenal to territorial issues**, specifically the external threats that they pose. This argument sees the lower hazards of armed conflict among democracies **not** as a product of shared norms or institutional structures, but as a **result of settled borders**. Territory, though, remains only one geo-political context generating threat, insecurity, and a higher likelihood of armed conflict. Strategic rivalry also serves as an environment associated with fear, a lack of trust, and an expectation of future conflict. Efforts to assess democratic pacifism have largely **ignored rivalry** as a context conditioning the behavior of democratic leaders. To be sure, research demonstrates rivals to have higher probabilities of armed conflict and democracies rarely to be rivals. But fundamental to the Democratic Peace is the notion that even in the face of difficult security challenges and salient issues, dyadic democracy will associate with a lower likelihood of militarized aggression. But the presence of an **external threat**, be that threat disputed territory or strategic rivalry, may be the key mechanism by which democratic leaders, owing to **audience costs**, **resolve** and **electoral pressures**, **fail to resolve problems nonviolently**. This study has sought a ‘‘hard test’’ of the Democratic Peace by testing the conditional effects of joint democracy on armed conflict when external threat is present. We test three measures of threat: territorial contention, strategic rivalry, and a threat index that sums the first two measures. For robustness checks, we use two additional measures of our dependent variable: fatal MID onset, and event data from the Armed Conflict Database, which can be found in our Online Appendix. As most studies report, democratic dyads are associated with less armed conflict than mixed-regime and autocratic dyads. In every one of our models, when we control for each measure of external threat, joint democracy is strongly negative and significant and each measure of threat is strongly positive and significant. Here, liberal institutions maintain their pacific ability and external threats clearly increase conflict propensities. However, when we test the **interactive relationship** between democracy and our measures of external threat, the pacifying effect of democracy is **less visible**. Park and James (2015) find some evidence that when faced with an external threat in the form of territorial contention, the pacifying effect of joint democracy holds up. This study does not fully support the claims of Park and James (2015). Using a longer timeframe, we find more **consistent evidence** that when faced with an external threat, be it territorial contention, strategic rivalry, or a combination, **democratic pacifism does not survive**. What are the implications of our study? First, while it is clear that we do not observe a large amount of armed conflict among democratic states, if we organize interstate relationships along a continuum from highly hostile to highly friendly, we are probably observing what Goertz et al. (2016) and Owsiak et al. (2016) refer to as ‘‘lesser rivalries’’ in which ‘‘both the frequency and severity of violent interaction decline. Yet, the sentiments of threat, enmity, and competition that remain—along with the persistence of unresolved issues—mean that lesser rivalries still experience isolated violent episodes (e.g., militarized interstate disputes), diplomatic hostility, and non-violent crises’’ (Owsiak et al., 2016). Second, our findings show that the pacific benefits of **liberal institutions** or externalized **norms** are **not** always able to lower the likelihood of armed conflict when faced with external threats, whether those hazards are disputed territory, strategic rivalry, or a combination of the two. The structural environment clearly influences democratic leaders in their foreign policy actions more than has heretofore been appreciated. **Audience costs**, **resolve**, and **electoral pressures**, produced from external threats, are **powerful forces** that are present even in jointly democratic relationships. These forces make it difficult for leaders to **trust one another**, which **inhibits conflict resolution** and facilitates persistent **hostility**. It does appear, then, that there is a **limit** to the Democratic Peace.

**BUT---pursuit of democracy now uniqely causes nuclear war with China, Russia, and Iran.**

**Miller 17** (Benjamin; 4/27/17; Professor of International Relations at the School of Political Sciences, The University of Haifa; The International Security Studies Forum; “Policy Series: Will Trumpism increase the Danger of War in the International System?: IR Theory and the Illiberal Turn in World Politics”; <https://issforum.org/roundtables/policy/1-5ag-war>; DOA: 12/6/17)

Some realists might, however, not see these recent developments as necessarily leading to more conflict, although they may not see them as leading to stable peace either.[22] In the eyes of these realists, the seemingly unconditional U.S. security umbrella for America’s allies has **allowed them to ‘free-ride’** on the U.S. commitment and to **avoid allocating** the **necessary resources** for their own national defense.[23] Moreover, some of the allies have been **provocative toward** their **opponents**, while relying on the U.S. security umbrella. This could **cause** **unnecessary conflict**. Especially provocative toward Russia, for example, was the enlargement of NATO to the east and the EU economic agreement with Ukraine in 2014. Such anti-Russian expansionist Western moves, in the realist view, compelled Moscow to **behave** more **assertively** and to **annex Crimea** and to **intervene in** Eastern **Ukraine**.[24] Somewhat similarly, it seems **less costly** for American allies in East Asia to engage in maritime conflicts with China so long they are under the U.S. protective shield. Realists believe that moving away from such ever-growing commitments will **stabilize the international system**, or at the very least **reduce** the likelihood of a **great-power conflict**. The realists are especially concerned about the American policies to shape the domestic character of other states, particularly by advancing democracy-promotion, “nation-building,” and the universal protection of human rights.[25] In this context they highlight what they see as **disastrous** American **military interventions**, notably, in Iraq in 2003 and in Libya in 2011 and also the continuously costly intervention in Afghanistan since 2001. In their eyes such military interventions are not necessary for the protection of American national interests. Moreover, such military engagements are **unlikely to succeed** and in many cases are **de-stabilizing** and are causing unnecessary conflicts. Such interventions simply **increase the perceived threat** posed by the U.S. to some other countries. Thus, lessening—if not **completely abandoning**—the U.S. commitment to advance these liberal values is likely, in realist eyes, to **stabilize the international system** and to **serve well** the American national security interests. Even though liberals see trade as a major pacifying mechanism, realists view trade—and economic interdependence more broadly—as potential sources for conflict.[26] They highlight the earlier U.S. trade conflicts with Japan and currently with Mexico and China. Thus, moving away from free trade might diffuse conflicts rather than accelerate them. Moreover, there is a growing populist opposition in the West to globalization. In this sense, it cannot work as a useful recipe for the promotion of peace. Similarly, despite the high levels of economic interdependence between Japan and China, for example, such interdependence does not prevent conflict between them and definitely does not result in stable peace even if it might have helped to prevent a shooting war between them, at least thus far. Realists are also skeptical about the ability of international institutions to advance stable peace.[27] Such institutions are not independent actors, which can influence the behavior of the member-states in important ways. International institutions just reflect the balance of power among states. States follow their national interests, and even more so in this age of rising nationalism. Thus we **cannot** expect much from the ability of international institutions to **pacify intense conflicts**, especially among the great powers. Even the most remarkable of international intuitions—the EU—has recently **failed in advancing cooperation** among its members with regard to the key issues of immigration, terrorism and the Euro financial crisis. Realists might be a bit skeptical about a potential reconciliation between the U.S. and Russia based on factors such as the personal friendship between Trump and Russian President Vladimir Putin or the supposedly common traditional/illiberal values of key figures in their respective administrations. Yet, the presence of a common enemy might be a good source of friendship. In this sense the Islamic State and perhaps even China create a potential basis for cooperation and avoidance of conflict between Moscow and Washington. But on the whole this will not advance a high-level ‘warm’ peace in Europe or elsewhere; rather it may, at most, lead to some kind of an unstable spheres-of-influence arrangement, which is unlikely to endure for an extended period. In sum, while liberals offer a menu of mechanisms for promoting peace, these mechanisms seem now **under assault** or in some process of weakening **under Trumpism** and the illiberal turn in quite a few other countries. Realists, for their part, do not believe in the far-reaching peace-producing effects of such liberal mechanisms. They tend to see some level of great-power competition as the natural order under international anarchy. Realists at most expect that there will be some stabilizing effects of deterrence, especially **nuclear deterrence**, and of the balance of power among the great powers. These kind of factors might — also under Trumpism—**maintain world stability** and **prevent war** even if some level of great-power conflict is expected to endure at any rate. The **most effective instrument** for cooperation—applicable even under the illiberal turn– is based on common threats faced by the great powers such as large-scale terrorism or risky behavior by a small nuclear power such as North Korea and potentially Iran. Evaluation of the Realist and the Liberal Views At this stage, less than three months into the Trump administration, it is quite difficult to determine which approach is right. Still, on the whole, we might be able to distinguish between short-term versus long-term effects and among different types of peace. In the short-term, **realists** may **have a point**: the avoidance of American interventions for democracy-promotion and humanitarian interventions might **stabilize the international system**. The key American adversaries—Russia, China, and Iran— will be **less troubled** by regime–change strategies or ‘color revolutions’ advanced by the U.S. that are **perceived to be posing major threats** to their regimes. The eastward expansion of NATO and the EU, which realists argue has provoked Russia, **will** also **stop**. Such reassurances are likely to **increase stability** in international politics and to produce at least a ‘cold peace’ in the international system and in key regions.

### Warming Good

#### Climate change is key to food security, solve water scarcity, economic growth, and increased trade

Lamar Smith 17, B.A. in American Studies from Yale University, J.D. from Southern Methodist University, a business and financial writer for the CSM, “Don’t Believe the Hysteria Over Carbon Dioxide”, https://www.dailysignal.com/2017/07/24/dont-believe-hysteria-carbon-dioxide/

The benefits of a changing climate are often ignored and under-researched. Our climate is too complex and the consequences of misguided policies too harsh to discount the positive effects of carbon enrichment. A higher concentration of carbon dioxide in our atmosphere would aid photosynthesis, which in turn contributes to increased plant growth. This correlates to a greater volume of food production and better quality food. Studies indicate that crops would utilize water more efficiently, requiring less water. And colder areas along the farm belt will experience longer growing seasons. While crops typically suffer from high heat and lack of rainfall, carbon enrichment helps produce more resilient food crops, such as maize, soybeans, wheat, and rice. In fact, atmospheric carbon dioxide is so important for plant health that greenhouses often use a carbon dioxide generator to increase production. Besides food production, another benefit of increased carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is the lush vegetation that results. The world’s vegetated areas are becoming 25-50 percent greener, according to satellite images. Seventy percent of this greening is due to a rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide. Greater vegetation assists in controlling water runoff, provides more habitats for many animal species, and even aids in climate stabilization, as more vegetation absorbs more carbon dioxide. When plant diversity increases, these vegetated areas can better eliminate carbon from the atmosphere. Also, as the Earth warms, we are seeing beneficial changes to the earth’s geography. For instance, Arctic sea ice is decreasing. This development will create new commercial shipping lanes that provide faster, more convenient, and less costly routes between ports in Asia, Europe, and eastern North America. This will increase international trade and strengthen the world economy. Fossil fuels have helped raise the standard of living for billions of people. Furthermore, research has shown that regions that have enjoyed a major reduction in poverty achieved these gains by expanding the use of fossil fuels for energy sources. For nations to progress, they need access to affordable energy. Fossil fuels provide the energy necessary to develop affordable food, safe drinking water, and reliable housing for those who have never had it before. Studies indicate that in the U.S. alone, the natural gas industry is responsible for millions of jobs and has increased the wealth of Americans by an average of $1,337. Economic growth as well as greater food production and increased vegetation are just some of the benefits that can result from our changing climate.

#### Food shortages cause war and go nuclear.

FDI 12 Future Directions International, a Research institute providing strategic analysis of Australia’s global interests; citing Lindsay Falvery, PhD in Agricultural Science and former Professor at the University of Melbourne’s Institute of Land and Environment, “Food and Water Insecurity: International Conflict Triggers & Potential Conflict Points,” http://www.futuredirections.org.au/workshop-papers/537-international-conflict-triggers-and-potential-conflict-points-resulting-from-food-and-water-insecurity.html

There is a growing appreciation thatthe conflicts in the next century willmost likelybe fought over a lack of resources. Yet, in a sense, this is not new. Researchers point to the French and Russian revolutions as conflicts induced by a lack of food**.** More recently, Germany’s World War Two efforts are said to have been inspired, at least in part, by its perceived need to gain access to more **food.** Yet the general sense among those that attended FDI’s recent workshops, was that **the scale of the problem in the future could be** significantly greateras a result of population pressures, changing weather, urbanisation, migration, loss of arable land and other farm inputs, and increased affluence in the developing world. In his book, Small Farmers Secure Food, Lindsay Falvey, a participant in FDI’s March 2012 workshop on the issue of food and conflict, clearly expresses the problem and why countries across the globe are starting to take note. .He writes (p.36), “…if people are hungry, especially in cities, the state is not stable – riots, violence, breakdown of law and order and migration result.”¶ “Hunger feeds anarchy.”¶ This view is also shared by Julian Cribb, who in his book, The Coming Famine, writes that if “large regions of the world run short of food, land or water in the decades that lie ahead, then wholesale, bloody wars are liable to follow.

” He continues: “An increasingly credible scenario for World War 3 is not so much a confrontation of super powers and their allies, as afestering**,** self-perpetuatingchainof resource conflicts.” He also says: “The wars of the 21st Century are less likely to be global conflicts with sharply defined sides and huge armies, than a scrappy mass of failed states, rebellions, civil strife, insurgencies, terrorism and genocides, sparked by bloody competition over dwindling resources.”¶ As another workshop participant put it, people do not go to war to kill; they go to war over resources, either to protect or to gain the resources for themselves.¶ Another observed that hunger results in passivity not conflict. Conflict is over resources, not because people are going hungry.¶ A study by the International Peace Research Institute indicates that where food security is an issue, it is more likely to result in some form of conflict.Darfur, Rwanda, Eritrea and the Balkansexperienced such wars. Governments, especially in developed countries, are increasingly aware of this phenomenon.¶ The UK Ministry of Defence, the CIA, theUS Center for Strategic and International Studies and the Oslo Peace Research Institute, all identify famine as a potential trigger for conflicts and possibly even nuclear war

#### No extinction from warming

Seidov 14—Researcher at NOAA and PhD in Geophysics, Fluid Dynamics, and Thermodynamics [Dan, “Are you aware of any peer-reviewed paper that explicitly classifies current global climate change as an existential risk (risk of human extinction)?” Research Gate, 4 Nov 2014, http://tinyurl.com/jrnfafu, accessed 6 Sep 2016]

The current global climate change does not have a potential to cause human extinction. Past severe climate changes were critical for many ancient civilizations, yet our existence proofs that they were not potent enough to cause entire termination of the humankind. The projected changes, even in the worst case scenarios, can cause many dramatic local changes. For example, change in rainfall patterns in agricultural countries may lead to possible famine and other dramatic events. However, any imaginable climate changes based on modern climate science cannot generate existential risks for the entire human civilization. In my view, a paper predicting such a catastrophe in any foreseeable future, at least on the time scale of human civilization, that is, thousands of years, has no chance of being published in any serious research journal.