

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.

[Tenza 20] Strikes stop investments to grow 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." Obitar, Nelson Mandela University, 2020, http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004) SJ

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.

[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, The Washington 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 influence 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 United States 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, American 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 United States 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 gap 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.

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 – neg prep – the topic specifically says “just governments” which means that all of our research is about countries that are topical – means that the aff's choice to defend a country outside of the topic kills our pre round prep and gives the aff unfair access to the ballot. Also kills education bc we won't have a nuanced debate

2 – 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 – you need fairness to evaluate debate rounds – 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 are a result of education – knowing how to discuss the merits of broad policy options has more real world implications than knowing how to go for an rvi or knowing how to defend policies that are so obscure they'd never be passed.

Paradigm issues –

1 – No RVIs

a] logic – you don't get to win just for proving you're topical

b] chilling effect – rvis disincentivize debaters from checking abuse

c] theory baiting – rvis incentivize affs to be as unnegatable as possible so they can bait t or theory and win

2 – competing interpretations over reasonability

a] arbitrariness – reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention

b] brightlines mean competing interps – it becomes a debate of whose brightline is best which is the same thing as competing interps – you're debating about whose model is best

3 – drop the debater

a] logic – drop the argument doesn't make sense – the shell indicis their entire advocacy

b] severance – if they go for drop the argument it's severance and an independent reason to negate – kicking out of the aff no-links all neg offense and forces us to restart and finish the debate in the 2nr – means there's no way the neg can access the ballot because 2ar gets recontextualizations

c] norm setting – negate on t to set a norm for being fair and topical – affirming incentivizes sketchy non-t affs and better t prepouts and less substantive debate – leads to worse and less educational debates

Case

The economy is dependent on agriculture – 28 percent of jobs and \$6.7 trillion in economic activity-

Carlin 17 - IDFA senior vice president of legislative affairs and economic policy (Dave, IDFA, 11/16/17, What's Feeding the US Economy? Food and Ag Production, Study Shows, <https://www.idfa.org/news-views/headline-news/article/2017/11/16/what-s-feeding-the-us-economy-food-and-ag-production-study-shows>, 7/12/18, DB)

More than one-fifth of the nation's economy is linked, either directly or indirectly, to the food and agriculture sectors, according to a nationwide economic impact study commissioned by IDFA and 21 other trade associations. The study, released today, also shows that 28 percent of all American jobs are linked to food and agriculture. This data includes the \$628.27 billion overall economic impact of dairy products produced and sold in the United States. The associations launched a new website, www.FeedingTheEconomy.com, that features the economic impact of the overall food and ag

industry and links to interactive tools used by each of the associations. IDFA's Dairy Delivers provides specific dairy industry data. "IDFA was pleased to help shape and drive the Feeding the Economy study, which clearly proves that **food and agriculture is the largest manufacturing sector in our nation**," said Michael Dykes, D.V.M., IDFA president and CEO. "With officials threatening U.S. withdrawal from free-trade pacts, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), this study provides hard evidence that **food and agriculture exports are an important part of the health of the U.S. economy. U.S. food and agricultural exports account for more than \$146 billion in trade.**" Results of the study are being shared with policymakers on Capitol Hill and in statehouses across the country because jobs and economic development are relevant to discussions on both tax reform and trade negotiations. In fact, the food and agricultural trade associations sent a letter to all 50 governors this week, urging them to voice their support for modernization, not withdrawal, of NAFTA. Key findings from the study: Total Jobs: 43,311,057 Total Wages: \$1.9 trillion Total Taxes: \$894.13 billion Exports: \$146.32 billion **Total Food and Industry Economic Impact: \$6.7 trillion.**

Therefore, hurting the revenue of the agriculture industry is strong enough to cause a significant reduction in the US economy's GDP and also have ripple effects in other industries. This is a further link into the disad.

Negative feedback loops check for warming—takes out their impacts

Singer et al 15. (Dr. Siegfried Fred Singer is an Austrian-born American physicist and emeritus professor of environmental science at the University of Virginia. Dr. Robert Merlin Carter was an English palaeontologist, stratigrapher and marine geologist. Dr. Craig D. Idso is the founder, former president and current chairman of the board of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change. Why Scientists Disagree About Global Warming. December 4, 2015. https://www.heartland.org/sites/default/files/12-04-15_why_scientists_disagree.pdf)
A doubling of CO₂ from pre-industrial levels (from 280 to 560 ppm) would likely produce a temperature forcing of 3.7 Wm⁻² in the lower atmosphere, for about ~1°C of prima facie warming. # IPCC models stress the importance of positive feedback from increasing water vapor and thereby project warming of ~3–6°C, whereas empirical data indicate an order of magnitude less warming of ~0.3–1.0°C. # In ice core samples, changes in temperature precede parallel changes in atmospheric CO₂ by several hundred years; also, temperature and CO₂ are uncoupled through lengthy portions of the historical and geological records; therefore CO₂ cannot be the primary forcing agent for most temperature changes. Atmospheric methane (CH₄) levels for the past two decades fall well below the values projected by IPCC in its assessment reports. IPCC's temperature projections incorporate these inflated CH₄ estimates and need downward revision accordingly. # The thawing of permafrost or submarine gas hydrates is not likely to emit dangerous amounts of methane at current rates of warming. # Nitrous oxide (N₂O) emissions are expected to fall as CO₂ concentrations and temperatures rise, indicating it acts as a negative climate feedback. # Other negative feedbacks on climate sensitivity that are either discounted or underestimated by IPCC include increases in low-level clouds in response to enhanced atmospheric water vapor, increases in ocean emissions of dimethyl sulfide (DMS), and the presence and total cooling effect of both natural and industrial aerosols.

Strikes fail and spark backlash – leads to fragmentation

Grant and Wallace 91 [Don Sherman Grant; Ohio State University; Michael Wallace; Indiana University; "Why Do Strikes Turn Violent?" University of Chicago Press; March 1991; [//SJWen">https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2781338.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aca3144a9ae9e4ac65e285f2c67451ffb](https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2781338.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aca3144a9ae9e4ac65e285f2c67451ffb)]/SJWen

****RM = Resource-Mobilization, or Strikes**

3. Violent tactics.-Violent tactics are viewed by **RM theorists exclu- sively** as purposeful strategies by challengers for inciting social change with **little recognition of how countermobilization strategies of elites also create violence**. The role of **elite counterstrategies** has been **virtually ig- nored in research on collective violence**. Of course, **history is replete with examples of elites' inflicting violence** on challenging groups with the full sanction of the state. Typically, elite-sponsored violence occurs when the power resources and legal apparatus are so one-sidedly in the elites' favor that the outcome is never in doubt. In conflicts with weak insiders, elites may not act so openly unless weak insiders flaunt the law. Typically, **elite strategies do not overtly promote violence but rather provoke violence by the other side in hopes of eliciting public condemnation** or more vigorous state repression of challenger initiatives. This is a critical dynamic in struggles involving weak insiders such as unions. In these cases, **worker violence, even when it appears justified, erodes public support for the workers' cause and damages the union's insider status**.

4. Homogeneity and similarity.-Many RM **theorists incorrectly as- sume that members of aggrieved groups are homogeneous in their inter- ests** and share similar positions in the social structure. This (assumed) homogeneity of interests is rare for members of outsider groups and even more suspect for members of weak-insider groups. Indeed, **groups are rarely uniform** and often include relatively advantaged persons who have other, **more peaceful channels in which to pursue their goals**. Internal stratification processes mean that **different persons have varying invest- ments in current structural arrangements**, in addition to their collective interest in affecting social change. Again, these forces are especially prev- alent for weak insiders: even the group's lowest-status members are likely to have a marginal stake in the system; high-status members are likely to have a larger stake and, therefore, less commitment to dramatic change in the status quo.

Internal differences may lead to fragmentation of interests and lack of consensus about tactics, especially tactics suggesting violent confronta- tion. While group members share common grievances, individual **mem- bers may be differentially aggrieved by the current state of affairs or differentially exposed to elite repression**. White's (1989) research on the violent tactics of the Irish Republican Army shows that working-class members and student activists, when compared with middle-class partici- pants, are **more vulnerable to state-sponsored repression**, more likely to be available for protest activities, and reap more benefits from political violence. When we apply them to our study of strike violence, we find that differences in skill levels are known to coincide with major intraclass 1120 Strikes divisions in material interests (Form 1985) and are likely to coincide with the tendency for violent action. For instance, skilled-craft workers, who are more socially and politically conservative than unskilled workers, are less likely to view relations with employers as inherently antagonistic and are prone to separate themselves from unskilled workers, factors that should decrease their participation in violence.

Strikes have no impact and hurt workers.

Orechwa 19

Jennifer Orchwa, 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** 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."

Labor unions corrupt and they don't help the people

Graham 16' Graham, James. "A Reconsideration of the Right to Strike." *The Catholic Lawyer* 9.2 (2016): 4. //RD Debatedrills

We need not conclude from all this that the right to strike is, or should be, obsolete. 4 Baerwald, *The Labor Encyclicals Today*, 49 CATHOLIC MIND 622, 629 (1951). 35 WEBB & WEBB, *THE HISTORY OF TRADE UNIONISM* 664 (1920). Proposed alternatives which have been successful in other nations, such as compulsory arbitration and the formation of a Labor Party, might prove unworkable here and even obnoxious to the American eco-political system. **It is also true that in this country most employers will never welcome unions with open arms and in the last analysis, despite the protections and prohibitions of the federal and state labor statutes, unions, in most cases, will be forced to resort to a show of economic strength to force recognition and/or just bargaining demands upon recalcitrant employers.** But the point sought to be made here is that the right to strike is by no means absolute. A democratic desire to sympathize with the "underdog" should not obscure the fact that the entire community, including employers, has a legitimate interest in industrial peace. Mr. Justice Brennan argued in his vigorous dissenting opinion in the Sinclair case that the justification for the Norris-LaGuardia Act in 1932 was that federal court injunctions had stripped unions of their strike weapon without substituting any reasonable alternative. **However, an agreement, freely made, to arbitrate all disputes arising during the term of the contract obviously does offer such an alternative.** Ironically enough, the Sinclair decision will also add to the woes of many harassed union leaders. **It is unfortunate but true that those labor organizations which are most democratic in their internal affairs are often most guilty of illegal strike activities;**

- *Unions don't solve inequality – they're too weak and tons of alt causes*

Epstein 20 [Richard A. Epstein Peter and Kirsten Bedford Senior Fellow @ the Hoover Institution. "The Decline Of Unions Is Good News." <https://www.hoover.org/research/decline-unions-good-news>]

So what then could justify this inefficient provision? **One common argument is that unions help reduce the level of income inequality by offering union members a high living wage,** as seen in the golden age of the 1950s. But **that argument misfires on several fronts. Those high union wages could not survive in the face of foreign competition or new nonunionized firms. The only way a union can provide gains for its members is to extract some fraction of the profits that firms enjoy when they hold monopoly positions.**

When tariff barriers are lowered and domestic markets are deregulated, as with the airlines and telecommunications industries, **the size of union gains go down. Thus the sharp decline in union membership** from 35 percent in both 1945 and 1954 to about 15 percent in 1985 led to no substantial increase in the fraction of wealth earned by the top 10 percent of the economy during that period. However, the income share of the top ten percent rose to about 40 percent over the next 15 years as union membership fell to below 10 percent by 2000.

But don't be fooled—that 5 percent change in union membership cannot drive widespread inequality for the entire population, which is also affected by a rise in the knowledge economy as well as a general aging of the population. The far more powerful distributive effects are likely to be those from nonunion workers whose job prospects within a given firm have been compromised by higher wages to union workers.

It is even less clear that the proposals of progressives like Sanders, Warren, and Buttigieg to revamp the labor rules would reverse the decline of unions. Not only is the American labor market more competitive, but the work place is no longer dominated by large industrial assembly lines where workers remain in their same position for years. Today, workforces are far more heterogeneous and labor turnover is far higher. It is therefore much more difficult for a union to organize a common front among workers with divergent interests.

Employers, too, have become much more adept at resisting unionization in ways that no set of labor laws can capture. It is no accident that plants are built in states like Tennessee and Mississippi, and that facilities are designed in ways to make it more difficult to picket or shut down. None of these defensive maneuvers would be necessary if, as I have long advocated, firms could post notices announcing that they will not hire union members, as they could do before the passage of the NLRA.

