## Econ DA

#### [Bachman 9-16] Economic fundamentals are strong but Delta makes the econ more fragile

**Bachman 9/16** (Daniel Bachman, September 16, 2021, “United States Economic Forecast,” Deloitte Insights, <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/economy/us-economic-forecast/united-states-outlook-analysis.html>) //neth

Meanwhile, economic fundamentals remain strong. Household and business balance sheets are still in good shape, and consumers are sitting on piles of savings. GDP is now above the prepandemic level, even though employment is 4.4% below the fourth-quarter average. That’s not good for the people still not working—but the strong growth in productivity (output per worker) is a positive sign. And continued government action in the form of the bipartisan infrastructure agreement should support the economy in the short term and foster even greater productivity growth in the long run. Deloitte’s five-year baseline remains, therefore, quite positive (although slightly less so in the very near term). We expect GDP to remain above the prepandemic baseline level for the entire forecast horizon. That’s a surprising prospect and doesn’t alter the damage that the pandemic has done. The US economy’s ability to bounce back from such a sudden, damaging shock, is amazing. But don’t forget that alternative scenarios are a key part of our forecast. We continue to place a relatively high probability on our “Side effects in post-op” scenario, and the Delta variant could—if things get worse—easily lead there. One further consideration: Delta demonstrates the importance of vaccinations for the economic recovery. As of August 2021, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported that only about 50% of the total US population (60% of those age 12 and over) was fully vaccinated. The economy may well remain fragile until the vaccination rate hits much higher levels, so that people are comfortable returning to the prepandemic “normal.” Continued low vaccination rates risk creating shortages of ICU hospital beds, closed schools, and people once again avoiding shopping and entertainment venues. As we’ve said all along, the disease is determining the state of the economy, and vaccination rates are a good indicator of whether the disease can be kept under control—and whether the economy will be able to fully recover.

#### [Coon 2000] Strikes hurt the GDP – even small strikes can have a ripple effect – the gm strike proves

**Coon 2000** (Korey Harlyn Coon (1999) "The Ripple Effect of Union Strikes: A Case Study of the Micro- and Macroeconomic Effects of the General Motors Strike of 1998," The Park Place Economist: Vol. 7 Available at: <https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/parkplace/vol7/iss1/13>) //neth

The direct effects on General Motors Corporation are not slight in measure. Although the strike began in June, most of the effects of the strike were felt in the third quarter of 1998. Compared to the corresponding months in 1997, GM’s U.S. sales fell 38% in July and 37% in August (Peoria Journal Star, 1998). September saw only a 3.1 percent drop in sales compared to September 1997 (Reuters-Detroit, 1998). The total cost of the strike to GM in the third quarter was $1.2 billion, causing a net loss of $809 million compared to a net gain of $973 million in 1997. Worldwide market share for GM in the third quarter fell from 16.6% last year to 14.2 percent this year (Ellis, 1998). Its U.S. market share went from pre-strike levels of 31% to a level of about 21% in July and August 1998 (Reuters-Detroit, 1998). Obviously, the UAW strike that halted vehicle production for approximately 8 weeks had an enormous impact on GM. The strikes also had a large ripple effect in many various industries that saw sales and profits drop because of the strikes. For example, the earnings of steel companies lowered in the third quarter because the GM strike brought demand for steel down (Reuters-New York, 1998). Also, H.B. Fuller, who makes adhesives, sealants, coatings, and paints saw lower earnings because of the GM strike (Reuters-St. Paul, 1998). Companies not even in the manufacturing sector saw effects as well. For example, TheWashington Post’s earnings were slowed by the GM strike because of a decline in advertising revenue on its television stations and in its Newsweek Magazine (The Washington Post, 1998). In addition, many auto suppliers reported reduced earnings because of the GM strike. These include Dana Corp, an engine component supplier, Excel Industries, a doorframe maker, Gentex, a car mirror manufacturer, and Westcast Industries, an exhaust system maker (Eldridge, 1998). By taking all the above-mentioned data into perspective, it can be seen that the GM strike had a negative impact on the United States’ GDP, the best measurement of economic growth. As previously shown, vital statistics and data involving the impact the strike made on the GDP, production, buying power, trade deficit, and employment are evident. An effect was even felt globally as exports decreased. GM could very well have the largest Sinfluence on the U.S. economy compared to all other companies. With over $178 billion in sales per year and the employment of over 600,000 people, GM has a huge impact on the economy. Obviously, when a nearly complete shutdown of business occurs for a company providing that large of a share of the nation’s wealth, GDP is significantly effected. The GM strike halted production in almost all of their plants. Therefore, a shock to supply occurred in the U.S. economy. That can be shown as an upward shift in the SRAS (short-run aggregate supply) curve in the economic model shown below in Figure 1.

#### [Baird 20] Decrease in US GDP causes crisis – ensuring continued growth is key

**Baird ’20** [Zoe; October 2020; C.E.O. and President of the Markle Foundation, Member of the Aspen Strategy Group and former Trustee at the Council on Foreign Relations, J.D. and A.B. from the University of California at Berkeley; Domestic and International (Dis)order: A Strategic Response, “Equitable Economic Recovery is a National Security Imperative,” Ch. 13] A strong and inclusive economy is **essential** for American **national security** and **global leadership**. As the nation seeks to return from a historic economic crisis, the national security community should support an equitable recovery that helps every worker adapt to the **seismic shifts** underway in our economy. Broadly shared economic prosperity is a **bedrock** of America’s **economic** and **political strength**—both **domestically** and in the **international** arena. A **strong** and **equitable** recovery from the economic crisis created by COVID-19 would be a **powerful testament** to the **resilience** of the American system and its **ability to create prosperity** at a time of **seismic change** and persistent **global crisis**. Such a recovery could attack the profound economic inequities that have developed over the past several decades. Without **bold action** to help all workers access good jobs as the economy returns, the **U**nited **S**tates risks **undermining** the **legitimacy of its institutions** and its **international standing**. The **outcome** will be a **key determinant** of America’s **national security** for years to come. An equitable recovery requires a national commitment to help all workers obtain good jobs—particularly the two-thirds of adults without a bachelor’s degree and people of color who have been most affected by the crisis and were denied opportunity before it. As the nation engages in a historic debate about how to accelerate economic recovery, ambitious public investment is necessary to put Americans back to work with dignity and opportunity. We need an intentional effort to make sure that the jobs that come back are good jobs with decent wages, benefits, and mobility and to empower workers to access these opportunities in a profoundly changed labor market. To achieve these goals, **America**n policy makers need to establish **job growth strategies** that address **urgent public needs** through **major programs** in green energy, infrastructure, and health. Alongside these job growth strategies, we need to recognize and develop the talents of workers by creating an adult learning system that meets workers’ needs and develops skills for the digital economy. The national security community must lend its support to this cause. And as it does so, it can bring home the lessons from the advances made in these areas in other countries, particularly our European allies, and consider this a realm of international cooperation and international engagement. Shared Economic Prosperity Is a National Security Asset A **strong economy** is **essential** to America’s **security and diplomatic strategy**. Economic strength increases our **influence** on the global stage, **expands markets**, and **funds** a **strong and agile military** and **national defense**. Yet it is not enough for America’s economy to be strong for some—prosperity must be broadly shared. **Widespread belief** in the ability of the American **economic system** to create economic security and mobility for all—the American Dream— creates **credibility** and **legitimacy** for America’s **values**, **governance**, and **alliances** around the world. After World War II, the **U**nited **S**tates grew the middle class to historic size and strength. This achievement made America the **model** of the free world—**setting the stage** for decades of American political and economic **leadership**. Domestically, broad participation in the economy is **core** to the **legitimacy** of our democracy and the strength of our political institutions. A belief that the economic system works for millions is an important part of creating trust in a democratic government’s ability to meet the needs of the people. The COVID-19 Crisis Puts Millions of American Workers at Risk For the last several decades, the American Dream has been on the wane. Opportunity has been increasingly concentrated in the hands of a small share of workers able to access the knowledge economy. Too many Americans, particularly those without four-year degrees, experienced stagnant wages, less stability, and fewer opportunities for advancement. Since COVID-19 hit, millions have lost their jobs or income and are struggling to meet their basic needs—including food, housing, and medical care.1 The crisis has impacted sectors like hospitality, leisure, and retail, which employ a large share of America’s most economically vulnerable workers, resulting in alarming disparities in unemployment rates along education and racial lines. In August, the unemployment rate for those with a high school degree or less was more than double the rate for those with a bachelor’s degree.2 Black and Hispanic Americans are experiencing disproportionately high unemployment, with the gulf widening as the crisis continues.3 The experience of the Great Recession shows that without intentional effort to drive an inclusive recovery, inequality may get worse: while workers with a high school education or less experienced the majority of job losses, nearly all new jobs went to workers with postsecondary education. Inequalities across racial lines also increased as workers of color worked in the hardest-hit sectors and were slower to recover earnings and income than White workers.4 The Case for an Inclusive Recovery A recovery that promotes broad economic participation, renewed opportunity, and equity will strengthen American moral and political authority **around the world**. It will **send a strong message** about the strength and **resilience** of **democratic government** and the American people’s **ability to adapt** to a changing global economic landscape. An inclusive recovery will reaffirm American leadership as core to the success of our most critical international alliances, which are rooted in the notion of shared destiny and interdependence. For example, NATO, which has been a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy and a force of global stability for decades, has suffered from American disengagement in recent years. A strong American recovery—coupled with a renewed openness to international collaboration—is core to **NATO’s ability** to solve **shared geopolitical and security challenges**. A renewed partnership with our European allies from a **position of economic strength** will enable us to address **global crises** such as **climate change**, **global pandemics**, and **refugees**. Together, the United States and Europe can pursue a commitment to investing in workers for shared economic competitiveness, innovation, and long-term prosperity. The U.S. has **unique advantages** that give it the **tools** to emerge from the crisis with **tremendous economic strength**— including an entrepreneurial spirit and the technological and scientific infrastructure to lead global efforts in developing industries like green energy and biosciences that will shape the international economy for decades to come.

#### [Tonnesson 15] Extinction

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

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.

## Bubbles CP

#### CP text: States will cover 4.8% of the Earth’s ocean-surface in a 0.1 μm (micrometer) monolayer of latex particles that bear a conventional stabilization system that is inactivated in salt water.

#### Solves warming in a cheap, effective, and feasible way – they can be reformed which avoids any solvency defecit.

**Morgan 11** John Morgan, 10-8-2011, “[Low intensity geoengineering – microbubbles and microspheres](https://bravenewclimate.com/2011/10/08/low-intensity-geoengineering-microbubbles-and-microspheres/),” Brave New Climate, [John runs R&D programmes at a Sydney startup company. He has a PhD in physical chemistry, and research experience in chemical engineering in the US and at CSIRO. He is a regular commenter on BNC.], <https://bravenewclimate.com/2011/10/08/low-intensity-geoengineering-microbubbles-and-microspheres/>, SJBE

The chief virtues of **latex particles over bubbles is they don’t dissolve, they don’t coalesce, they are durable, and they can be made much smaller**. They have a density of just over 1 g cm-3 so they sink, but at 0.2 micron the sedimentation velocity is too slow to matter. This presents a different problem – the chief loss mechanism now is not dissolution but loss by convection to deeper waters. Is there some way to keep these particles afloat? I think there is. **Most of these latex polymers, polystyrene, for example, are hydrophobic – they’re water repellent.** To keep the particles in suspension requires added surfactants, or putting electrically charged groups on the surface. But when diluted with salt water, both these stabilization mechanisms fail. Without stabilization a polystyrene sphere will attach to the water surface. Breaking waves will drive them under, but rising bubbles will scavenge them back to the surface again. This mechanism is well known and extensively studied in the mineral separation process of flotation, where particles of mineral ores are recovered from slurries by attachment to rising bubbles. The natural bubble population from breaking waves could keep even submicron particles concentrated at and near the ocean surface (Figure 6). **The use of latex technology opens other doors for engineering particle properties. For instance, rather than producing a particle composed of a single polymer, its possible to construct a particle with two different polymers in a core-shell morphology, or even hollow particles. Such particles can have much higher scattering power than simple spheres, and are also made in bulk at commodity prices.** Indeed, they are used as opacifiers in paint. We could paint the oceans white. Painting by numbers Lets run the numbers on this and ask, what would it take to reverse current warming? First we need to know how much light these particles scatter back to space. **I used** [**Mie theory**](http://omlc.ogi.edu/calc/mie_calc.html) **to analyse scattering of 500 nm wavelength light (roughly the solar peak) from 0.1 μm diameter polystyrene spheres, as if the sun were overhead. The back scattering from these very small particles is intense – 42% of overhead light returns to space. And this is just direct scattering. Some of the light that scatters forward will scatter off a second particle, and a third. Multiple scattering will see more than 42% of light returned to space.** Since these particles attach to the surface, lets consider, for the moment, **a monolayer on the water surface. This requires 1014 particles per square metre, with a volume of 5.2×10-8 m3 per m2 (or 5 parts per billion of the top 10 m, for comparison with Seitz’ figures).** Polystyrene has a density of 1050 kg m-3, so that’s a mass of 55 mg m-2. Over 3.16×1014 m2 of ocean that’s 1.7×1010 kg polymer. What would this do to the earth’s energy balance? Average insolation (accounting for cloud cover [Jin et al. 2002, cited by Seitz]) is 239 Wm-2. The monolayer cross sectional area fraction is pi/4. **So the energy returned by direct overhead scattering is about 78 W. That’s huge compared to the current CO2 forcing of about 2.25 Wm-2.** Modelling reported by Seitz indicates an increase of ocean albedo of 0.05 translates to an increase of planetary albedo by 0.031 [Seitz 2010; Figure 5]. So I’ll assume planetary albedo increase is 60% of the ocean albedo increase, which means we need ocean backscattering of 3.75 Wm-2. **We would only need 4.8% of a monolayer to offset current CO2 forcing** (ignoring the contribution from multiple scattering). 4.8% of a whole ocean monolayer is 8.3×108 kg of dry polymer, or about 1.7×109 kg wet latex. **At say $1.20 per kg, this would cost $2.0 billion and account for 17% of 2005 global production capacity. This is, surprisingly, well within reach**. $2.0b to reverse global warming is cheap. Restricting dispersal to the mid latitudes where the greatest effect is achieved, using core-shell latex technology, and properly accounting for multiple scattering would see this cost drop even further. Annual growth in latex production grew organically by [4.5% per annum](http://books.google.com.au/books?id=3CdgNiBrHfIC&pg=PA43&lpg=PA43&dq=cost+of+bulk+synthetic+latex&source=bl&ots=X5hv6DcDeR&sig=48ZERM5d3UWtW2yZ4NDtjhiKriU&hl=en&ei=5iGITuPBHayUiQeAwe2jDw&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=5&ved=0CDoQ6AEwBA#v=onepage&q&f=false) between 2000-2005. **Ramping production by 17% would be completely feasible**. The ongoing cost depends on the residence time of the particles at the ocean surface. Equatorial currents [run at about 1 ms-1](http://oceanmotion.org/html/resources/oscar.htm), which would imply a traversal time of about 1 year for the Pacific ocean. Mid latitude the currents are much slower. The latex particles themselves will degrade in the environment, and there will be losses by association and entrainment in a complex marine environment. But let’s provisionally estimate a cost of $2b per year. This is significantly cheaper than, say, stratospheric sulfur aerosol injection which is estimated at $25-50b per year, let alone space sunshades. **And it doesn’t require exotic engineering, enabling R&D, or orbital launches – it uses existing materials at a rate well inside existing production capacity. Conclusion So consider this final elaboration of Russell Seitz’ bright idea: 0.1 μm diameter latex particles, possibly hollow, or of core-shell morphology, bearing a conventional stabilization system that is inactivated in salt water ensuring that the particles are retained at and near the surface, are produced in bulk using about 17% of existing production capacity and using commercial recipes, and are sprayed onto the sea from tanks aboard ships or crop dusting aircraft, oil rigs, and other structures, in the mid latitudes**. For a cost in the order of a mere $2b per year **we could offset current global warming**, subject to the many disclaimers and qualifications discussed above, and many others not mentioned. More limited, local applications, such as the direct cooling of coral reefs as envisaged by Seitz for the microbubble concept, are also possible.

## T just gov

**Interpretation: the affirmative must defend governmental actions taken by just governments.**

**Violation: they defend the US, which historically has disenfranchised Black voters.**

**Black voters still don’t have full access to the US democratic process**

**Solomon et al 2019** (Systematic Inequality and American Democracy, By Danyelle Solomon, Connor Maxwell, and Abril Castro August 7, 2019, 7:00 am, Center for American Progress, <https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/race/reports/2019/08/07/473003/systematic-inequality-american-democracy/>) //neth

In recent years, policymakers have tested the limits of how far they can go to prevent people of color from voting. Discriminatory voter purges, modern-day poll taxes, and the revocation of citizenship threaten to upend American democracy. In 2018, the U.S. Supreme Court again gave voter suppression its stamp of approval when it ruled in Husted v. A. Philip Randolph Institute that states were permitted to throw eligible Americans off their voter rolls—also known as purging—just because they decided to skip some elections.55 The ruling upheld Ohio’s decision to purge 846,000 disproportionately Black voters from its rolls for infrequent voting over a six-year period.56 The court’s Husted decision opens the door to remove millions of Americans of color on voter rolls.

**Standards:**

**1 – anti racism – positing the US as a just government papers over a racist history that serves to disenfranchise POC – independent voter for inclusion bc it makes POC feel like their experiences don’t matter as long as the US is considered a “just government.” Also kills education bc you’re inaccurately representing the topic**

**Voters –**

**1 -- Fairness –the judge needs to vote for the better debater not the better cheater. Unfair advantages in debate rounds make decisions illegitimate and hurt our ability to access real world skills.**

**2 – education – it’s a voter because it’s the reason schools fund debate and the only portable skills we gain from debate**

**Drop the debater – a] deter future abuse and b] set better norms for debate.**

**Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.**

**No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices**

**1nc theory first – if the aff was abusive we had to be abusive to compensate.**

## T teachers

**Interpretation: The aff may not specify a subset of workers**

**Violation: They specify teachers**

**Standards:**

**1] Limits – There are infinite subsets of workers that they could defend – explodes neg limits – no way to prep against each of them**

**2] Topic education: Forces negative to defend hyper-specific positions, moving the debate away from the core of the topic which is about workers in general – no good substance on either side nor meaningful debate**

**3] Generics: Workers is a generic bare plural, cherry-picking specific examples of workers is not enough to justify that workers generally should have the unconditional right to strike**

**4] TVA Solves: run the plan as an advantage to whole res**

**CA voters and paradigm issues from first off**

## Case

ON THE PLAN

1 – the shanker 73 evidence says nothing about teachers strikes – you shold be super sus of any solvency they try to garner bc their solvency advocate isn’t even about teachers

2 – the plan is too vague – they don’t specify an enforcement mechanism which means that the plan will always be circumvented

3 – vague plans are a reason not to vote for debaters on a prefiat level – creates incentives to write terrible plans to preclude engagement – sets a bad norm and kills educaiotn bc policymakers produce specific advocacies. Edu ow bc it’s the most portable

4 – they cant generate offense bc the plan is too vague to do anything – reason to presume neg

### Adv 1

#### *alt causes for low educational achievement like underfunding schools, conservative states banning certain subjects, and lack of standardized curriculum – means no solvency*

**Illegal strikes solve better and aff strikes become water downed and negotiated out by the state- TURNS CASE**

**Reddy 21** Reddy, Diana (Doctoral Researcher in the Jurisprudence and Social Policy Program at UC Berkeley) “" There Is No Such Thing as an Illegal Strike": Reconceptualizing the Strike in Law and Political Economy." Yale LJF 130 (2021): 421. <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy>

In recent years, consistent with this vision, there has been a shift in the kinds of strikes workers and their organizations engage in—increasingly public-facing, engaged with the community, and capacious in their concerns.[178](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref178) They have transcended the ostensible apoliticism of their forebearers in two ways, less voluntaristic and less economistic. They are less voluntaristic in that they seek to engage and mobilize the broader community in support of labor’s goals, and those goals often include community, if not state, action. They are less economistic in that they draw through lines between workplace-based economic issues and other forms of exploitation and subjugation that have been constructed as “political.” These strikes do not necessarily look like what strikes looked like fifty years ago, and they often skirt—or at times, flatly defy—legal rules. Yet, they have often been successful. **Since 2012, tens of thousands of workers in the Fight for $15 movement have engaged in discourse-changing, public law-building strikes. They do not shut down production, and their primary targets are not direct employers. For these reasons, they push the boundaries of exiting labor law**.[179](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref179) Still, the risks appear to have been worth it. A 2018 report by the National Employment Law Center found that th**ese strikes had helped twenty-two million low-wage workers win $68 billion in raises,** a redistribution of wealth fourteen times greater than the value of the last federal minimum wage increase in 2007.[180](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref180) They have demonstrated the power of strikes to do more than challenge employer behavior. As Kate Andrias has argued**: [T]he Fight for $15 . . . reject[s] the notion that unions’ primary role is to negotiate traditional private collective bargaining agreements, with the state playing a neutral mediating and enforcing role.** Instead, the movements are seeking to bargain in the public arena: they are engaging in social bargaining with the state on behalf of all workers.”[181](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref181) **In the so-called “red state” teacher strikes of 2018, more than a hundred thousand educators** in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and other states **struck** to challenge post-Great Recession austerity measures, which they argued hurt teachers and students, alike.[182](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref182) **These strikes were illegal; yet, no penalties were imposed.**[**183**](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref183) **Rather, the strikes grew workers’ unions, won meaningful concessions from state governments, and built public support.** As noted above, public-sector work stoppages are easier to conceive of as political, even under existing jurisprudential categories.[184](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref184) But these **strikes were political in the broader sense as well**. Educators worked with parents and students to cultivate support, and they explained how their struggles were connected to the needs of those communities.[185](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref185) Their power was not only in depriving schools of their labor power, but in making normative claims about the value of that labor to the community. Most recently, **2020 saw a flurry of work stoppages in support of the Black Lives Matter movement.**[186](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref186) These ranged from Minneapolis bus drivers’ refusal to transport protesters to jail, to Service Employees International Union’s Strike for Black Lives, to the NBA players’ wildcat strike.[187](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref187) Some of these **protests violated legal restrictions**. The NBA players’ strike for instance, was **inconsistent with a “no-strike” clause in their collective-bargaining agreement with the NBA**.[188](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref188) And it remains an open question in each case whether workers sought goals that were sufficiently job-related as to constitute protected activity.[189](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref189) Whatever the conclusion under current law, however, **striking workers demonstrated in fact the relationship between their workplaces and broader political concerns.** The NBA players’ strike was resolved in part through an agreement that NBA arenas would be used as polling places and sites of civic engagement.[190](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref190) Workers withheld their labor in order to insist that private capital be used for public, democratic purposes. And in refusing to transport arrested protestors to jail, Minneapolis bus drivers made claims about their vision for public transport. Collectively, all of these strikes have prompted debates within the labor movement about what a strike is, and what its role should be. **These strikes are so outside the bounds of institutionalized categories that public data sources do not always reflect them**.[191](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref191) And there is, reportedly, a concern by some union leaders that these strikes do not look like the strikes of the mid-twentieth century. There has been a tendency to dismiss them.[192](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref192) In response, Bill Fletcher Jr., the AFL-CIO’s first Black Education Director, has argued, “**People, who wouldn’t call them strikes, aren’t looking at history.**”[193](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref193) Fletcher, Jr. analogizes these strikes to the tactics of the civil-rights movement.

**RECENT TEACHER STRIKES PROVE, ILLEGAL STRIKES ARE MORE EFFECTIVE. THEY DON’T HAVE TO PLAY BY LAWS THAT WATER DOWN EFFICACY**

**Blanc 20** Blanc, Eric (doctoral candidate in sociology at NYU researching public sector labor organizing) "Breaking the law: Strike bans and labor revitalization in the red state revolt." Labor Studies Journal 45.1 (2020): 74-96.

**For decades, labor leaders** and sympathetic scholars have put forward a wide array of proposals for reversing the fortunes of the labor movement. Most have **sought either to work around draconian legal restrictions or to reform these away through legislative efforts**. This paper has examined the early 2018 statewide education strikes to test **the feasibility of an alternative path to labor revitalization: illegal strike action. Breaking the law was a central dynamic in the two most successful strikes of the 2018** red state revolt—that is, West Virginia and Arizona. Organizers systematically built up the school-site organization and momentum necessary to enable individual educators to take the risk of participating in an illegal strike. **In contrast, Oklahoma’s legal work stoppage floundered**, at least in part, **because a legal walkout required that teachers rely on the support of their district employers,** rather than their own independent organization. In addition, **respecting the law undercut the potential for a united walkout of all school employees.**

### Adv 2

**Strikes inhibit deliberative democracy by increasing coercive violence.**

**Gourevitch 18** [Alex; Brown University; “The Right to Strike: A Radical View,” American Political Science Review; 2018; [https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321]](https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321%5d/SJWen) Justin

\*\*Edited for ableist language

Every liberal democracy **recognizes** that workers have a **right** to **strike**. That right is protected in law, sometimes in the constitution itself. Yet strikes pose **serious** **problems** for **liberal** **societies**. They involve **violence** and **coercion**, they often violate some **basic** **liberal** **liberties**, they appear to **involve** group rights having **priority** over **individual** **ones**, and they can **threaten** **public** **order** itself. Strikes are also one of the most common forms of **disruptive** **collective** **protest** in modern history. Even given the dramatic decline in strike activity since its peak in the 1970s, they can play significant roles in our lives. For instance, just over the past few years in the United States, large illegal strikes by teachers ~~paralyzed~~ **froze** major school districts in Chicago and Seattle, as well as **statewide** in **West** **Virginia**, **Oklahoma**, **Arizona**, and **Colorado**; a **strike** by taxi drivers played a **major** role in debates and court decisions regarding **immigration**; and strikes by retail and foodservice workers were instrumental in getting new minimum wage and other legislation passed in states like California, New York, and North Carolina. Yet, despite their significance, there is almost no political philosophy written about strikes.1 This despite the enormous literature on neighboring forms of protest like nonviolence, civil disobedience, conscientious refusal, and social movements.

The right to strike raises **far** more **issues** than a **single** **essay** can handle. In what follows, I address a particularly significant problem regarding the right to strike and its **relation** to **coercive** **strike** **tactics**. I argue that strikes present a **dilemma** for liberal societies because for **most** **workers** to have a reasonable chance of **success** they need to use some **coercive** **strike** **tactics**. But these coercive strike tactics both **violate** the law and **infringe** upon what are widely held to be **basic** **liberal** **rights**. To resolve this dilemma, we have to know **why** workers have the right to strike in the first place. I argue that the best way of **understanding** the right to strike is as a right to **resist** the **oppression** that workers face in the **standard** **liberal** **capitalist** **economy**. This way of **understanding** the right explains why the use of **coercive** **strike** **tactics** is not morally **constrained** by the requirement to respect the **basic** **liberties** nor the related laws that strikers violate when using certain coercive tactics.

**Sexual Violence turn – labor unions have abandoned women and forced them to face violence – independent voter – they should lose for endorsing violent institutions**

**Avendaño 2019** (Ana Avedaño, “#MeToo Inside the Labor Movement,” CUNY Academic Commons, January 2019, <https://newlaborforum.cuny.edu/2019/01/24/metoo-inside-the-labor-movement/>) //neth

The history of unions and sexual harassment is in part shaped by labor markets that, to this day, remain highly segmented by gender and race. The gender composition of unions, particularly those that are occupationally based, mirrors gender segmentation in the labor market. Some unions represent overwhelmingly male constituencies: the building trades, pilots, and firefighters, to name a few.[3] Other unions have large female memberships, namely teachers’ and nurses’ unions. Unions that are organized around industrial or sectoral lines, such as auto and steel, also tend to be male-dominated. The result is what sociologist Ruth Milkman calls “the two worlds of unionism,” which remain distinct not only in their gender composition but also in their openness to reform.[4] Labor’s Legacy of Failure to Protect Women The 1970s brought radical opportunity and enormous challenges for working women. As they entered the workforce in record numbers, women quickly began to challenge workplace norms, especially in occupations that had been the province of men. Those jobs—in construction sites, firehouses, auto manufacturing plants, mines from Minnesota to Tennessee, and many others—paid the highest wages, and often came with a union card. Women faced difficult, often brutal, and sometimes violent conditions. In coal mines, they faced a strong fraternal culture built on generations of men working together in dangerous conditions, and a long-held superstition that women were bad luck in the mines. When forced to admit women into the mines by the courts and the government, the men in some places brought back an initiation rite where miners would strip and grease a new miner—a rite that had long been abandoned.[5] In construction, tradeswomen fought their way into the industry, and documented the ram- pant sex discrimination in the industry and sex discrimination in hiring. They “were met with universal hostility, contempt, or passive disregard,” and faced vicious hazing, sexual harassment, and isolation.[6] In the auto plants, the “new Rosies” [women] confronted masculine shop culture that was “coarser, grosser, and more violent” than the sexist culture of earlier years. In the past, supervisors had been the main harassers and abusers, but now, coworkers became the harassers.[7] Women “endured the inappropriate language and touching and the degrading and humiliating treatment their work- mates meted out. At the same time, the shop floor was a man’s world, and upper-level managers, local union officials, and arbitrators were indifferent to the plight of women.”[8] As women fought their way into these male-dominated workplaces, masculine privilege was deeply ingrained in the functioning of unions—masculinist assumptions were normalized elements of bargaining strategies, contract provisions, and the day-to-day functioning of the union. The International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU), for example, maintained a provision in its contract that allowed the “son of an active deceased longshoreman” the right to join the union by “taking his father’s union book”—a provision that remained until the mid-1970s, when a Southern California female dock worker sued the union.[9] Unions were noticeably absent from the early efforts to combat sexual harassment. To the contrary, many labor leaders fought vehemently to lessen liability under Title VII for themselves, by trying to weaken the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), and diverting claims away from the courts to EEOC, for both gender and race. Some unions also strongly urged the EEOC to narrowly interpret bona fide occupational qualifications, which would allow employers and unions to continue to discriminate based on gender and race despite anti-discrimination laws.[10]

#### **Strikes have no impact and hurt workers.**

**Orechwa 19**

Jennifer Orechwa, 2019, "General Motors Strike A Reminder Unions Hurt Workers," UnionProof, <https://projectionsinc.com/unionproof/how-unions-hurt-workers-the-gm-strike-continues/>

**Employees Hurt the Most by a Strike** The reality is that a strike hurts the workers the most. They don’t hurt the union. In fact, union leaders see a strike as a chance to get some nationwide publicity as an organization helping the “little guys” take on the big bad abusive employer. Strikes don’t hurt permanently hurt the company because a large company like GM has a contingency plan and is prepared to keep operating without the striking workers by taking steps like temporarily shutting down some plants and consolidating operations. It’s the workers that are hurt, encouraged by the unions and some politicians to subject themselves to loss of income and job stability. Instead of encouraged, it should read that workers are “used” by the unions and [political parties](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/09/16/2020-election-democrats-cheer-uaw-strike-against-gm-criticize-trump.html) to push their agenda. Unions thrive on making employers look bad, and politicians that believe America’s big businesses take advantage of employees use the strikes as proof. The general line is that, “If employees are willing to suffer a loss of income, benefit and job stability, the workplace policies must be abusive.”

#### **Unions are inaccessible to minorities – that leads to increasing inequality.**

**Ahlquist 17** [John; School of Global Policy and Strategy, University of California San Diego; “Labor Unions, Political Representation, and Economic Inequality,” 3/9/17; AnnualReviews; <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051215-023225>] Justin

Immigration may **exacerbate** inequality to the extent that immigrants take **jobs** for **lower** **wages** than **native** **workers** do. Immigration may also put **pressure** on **existing** **unions**, since **immigrants** may be harder to **organize** owing to **linguistic** or **cultural** **differences**. For these reasons—along with simple prejudice—unions in **immigrant**-**receiving** **countries**, mainly Australia, Canada, and the United States, **opposed** immigration for **several** **decades**. Rosenfeld & Kleykamp (2009) use CPS data to look at the most recent wave of Hispanic immigration and find that Hispanics continue to join unions. They find that Hispanic unionization rates, unlike those for African Americans, can largely be explained by positional factors. Many American unions have recognized that organizing immigrants is crucial to their survival (Milkman 2006), but immigrants’ more **precarious** **job** **status** has made union gains harder to consolidate through the Great Recession (Catron 2013).

The situation for **female** **workers** is more **complicated**. The **gendering** of **employment** and the **expectation** that **women** would leave the **labor** **force** after marriage have **long** limited **women’s** **access** to **unionized** parts of the **economy** (Iversen & Rosenbluth 2011). In some countries union bargaining objectives, norms of **fairness**, and **public** **policy** were predicated on an assumed **singleearner** **household**. But standardized terms of employment and promotion along with an expanded public sector may attract more women into union jobs. The effect of **unionization** on wage inequality between men and women is therefore **ambiguous**. **Union** **density** in rich democracies shows **no** **association** with the gap between **median** **male** and **female** wages. However, in the United States and United Kingdom, the gender wage gap **narrowed** at the same time **unionization** **fell**.