### Social Spending/BBB DA

#### The social spending bill is set to pass, but Biden’s PC is key and decisions in the coming weeks are crucial.

BBC ’21 – “Biden Announces Revamped $1.75 Trillion Social Spending Plan,” October 28, 2021, https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-59081791

US President Joe Biden unveiled a revamped $1.75tn (£1.27tn) spending plan on Thursday, calling it a historic investment in the country's future.

"No-one got everything they wanted, including me," he said, acknowledging the struggle within his party to reach consensus on a pair of landmark bills.

Narrow margins in Congress require nearly unanimous support from the Democrats for the bills to pass.

They include major investments in infrastructure, climate and childcare.

The White House has said the plan has the support of all 50 Democrats in the evenly divided Senate and expressed confidence that it could also pass the House. But it remains to be seen whether Mr Biden has actually achieved the level of cooperation needed from within his party to move the spending plan forward.

The administration was hoping to have a deal in place before Mr Biden flew off to Europe on Thursday. He is heading for Rome, the Vatican and later to Glasgow, Scotland, for the United Nations climate conference, COP26.

This new proposal is a stripped-down version of the roughly $3.5tn social spending plan Mr Biden unveiled earlier this year.

The Democratic president was expected to use his Thursday morning meeting with House Democrats to convince progressives in the party that this new version is close enough to the original bill, and to persuade progressives in the House of Representative to pass a separate, $1tn infrastructure bill that has already passed in the Senate.

It's a delicate balance for Mr Biden, as he tries to appeal to his party's progressives - who say they need action on the social spending bill before passing infrastructure - and some moderates, for whom the infrastructure bill is priority. Others had concerns over the price tag of the original social spending bill.

What's in the proposed new spending plan?

$555bn aimed at fighting climate change, mainly through tax-incentives for renewable and low-emission sources of energy

$400bn for free and universal preschool for all 3- and 4-year-olds

$150bn to build one million affordable housing units

Speaking on Thursday, Mr Biden said the US was at risk of "losing our edge as a nation".

"Somewhere along the way we stopped investing in ourselves, and investing in our people," he said. "We can't be competitive in the 21st Century global economy if we continue this slide."

What's been left out?

The scaled-back spending plan announced by Mr Biden on Thursday is missing several big promises from the original bill.

Paid family leave was removed entirely - a blow to progressives and American voters who hoped the US would join the majority of other countries in providing paid time off for new parents. The US is one of just eight countries without national paid maternity leave.

A plan to lower prescription drug prices has also been slashed.

The AARP, the nation's largest interest group focused on elderly Americans, released a statement after Mr Biden's announcement saying it was "outraged" that the new framework does not lower drug prices.

How does Biden say he will pay for it?

The president on Thursday made the case that his spending plan was "fiscally responsible and fully paid for" and that it will not add to the deficit.

Here is what's proposed:

The plan promises to offset its $1.75tn cost with an estimated $2tn in revenue increases, according to the White House

A 15% minimum tax on the reported profits of large firms

An additional 5% tax on incomes of more than $10m annually and another 3% tax on incomes above $25m

Increased enforcement to cut down on tax evasion by large corporations and the wealthy

What's next?

A 50-50 seat split in the Senate - and Republican resistance - means Mr Biden must bring his entire party on board if he hopes to pass the spending bill. In the coming days, Mr Biden will know if he has those numbers.

Two moderate Democrats, Senators Kyrsten Sinema of Arizona and Joe Manchin of West Virginia, appeared to signal some support for the bill in separate statements on Thursday.

"After months of productive, good-faith negotiations with President Biden and the White House, we have made significant progress," Ms Sinema said. "I look forward to getting this done."

Both Ms Sinema and Mr Manchin are widely seen to have tanked the original bill by refusing to vote for it.

Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi is expected to hold a vote on the infrastructure bill - already passed in the Senate - as early as Thursday. To get there, she'll need progressives to agree to it.

The head of the House Progressive Caucus, Washington State Representative Pramila Jayapal, said the president made a "compelling speech" but said she'd have to wait and see where the progressives stood.

Ms Jayapal has repeatedly insisted that the infrastructure bill and the social spending bill be passed in tandem.

For Mr Biden a lot is riding on the fate of these two bills: his presidential legacy.

"I don't think it's hyperbole to say that the House and Senate majorities and my presidency will be determined by what happens in the next week," he told Democrats on Thursday morning, according to US media.

#### Preserving comfortable union relations maintains PC.

**Kerrissey and Schofer 13** [Kerrissey, Jasmine, and Evan Schofer. Jasmine Kerrissey Department of Sociology University of California, Irvine Evan Schofer Department of Sociology University of California, Irvine. “Union Membership and Political Participation in the United States.” *Social Forces*, vol. 91, no. 3, 2013, pp. 895–928. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/23361125]

Discussion and Conclusion We observe consistent evidence that union members are more politically engaged than non-members. The effect of union membership is broad, spanning most types of political and civic involvement, including voting, protesting, signing petitions, association membership, and so on, and holds up with a large range of control variables. 36 The prior literature looks mainly at voting outcomes – and often finds weak results when many variables are controlled – so even these basic findings represent a step forward. The magnitude of the union membership effect varies across outcomes, but is generally substantial. For instance, union members have 20% greater odds of voting than comparable non-members. The odds of participating in a protest were 73% to 100% higher among union members, according to the Roper and Verba datasets, respectively. Many of the large and highly significant effects are in areas of social protest and electoral participation. In the case of volunteering and charitable donations, for instance, we see substantially larger effects in political forms of those activities – whereas general measures of volunteering and donations show smaller effects. We observe weaker or non-significant effects of union membership on activities that are far removed from union agendas, such as general civic membership, volunteering, or blood donation. It appears that unions build ‘political capital’ more than generalized ‘social capital’.8 These patterns are broadly consistent with our structural arguments, discussed above, that contemporary American labor unions face strong pressures to mobilize members to prepare for collective action with employers and to maintain political capital with the Democratic party.

#### Strike would divide the Union

Israelstam 17 [Ivan. Ivan Israelstam is the Chief Executive of Labour Law Management Consulting. “What is the impact of strikes for employers and employees?”. 11-22-2017. Skills Portal. https://www.skillsportal.co.za/content/what-impact-strikes-employers-and-employees.]

The loss of production and of customers is usually the first consequence of a strike. However, indirect strike costs incurred later can be just as serious. In the case of *NUM and others vs Chrober Slate (Pty) Ltd* (2008, 3 BLLR 287) the mine dismissed its quarry workers and factory staff due to an unprocedural strike by the quarry workers. The employer admitted that the factory staff were not to blame for the work stoppage as it had been the quarry workers who had refused to work. The dismissals of the factory staff were found to be unfair and the Labour Court ordered the mine to reinstate the 42 dismissed employees with back pay. In order to avoid the snowballing costs and loss of business that strikes can cause the employer needs to understand: What constitutes a strike in legal terms, The economic effects of a strike for both parties, The effects of a strike on the employment relationship, How to resolve constructively the conflict that causes industrial action, How to minimise the damage caused by a strike, and How to bring a strike to a speedy end. WHAT CONSTITUTES A STRIKE? A strike is any concerted withholding of labour by a group of employees in support of a demand made by them to the employer. Examples of this are work stoppages, go-slows, overtime bans and work-to-rule. THE ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF A STRIKE FOR BOTH PARTIES. The employer is likely to lose money due to delayed service to clients or to lost production time. The employees will lose their pay due to the no work, no pay principle. If the strikers are dismissed they will lose their livelihoods altogether. THE EFFECTS OF A STRIKE ON THE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONSHIP. Once the strike is over, even if the business has not been closed down by it, the feelings of hostility resulting from the strike can severely damage teamwork, productivity and profitability. HOW TO RESOLVE CONSTRUCTIVELY THE CONFLICT THAT CAUSES INDUSTRIAL ACTION. Before the conflict gets to the stage of impasse that results in a strike the parties need to utilise the services of an expert in conflict resolution. The CCMA was set up with the purpose of helping the parties to resolve conflict peacefully. However, in practice, the warring parties too often go to the CCMA because the law says they must rather than in a sincere attempt to sort out their differences. In other words, by the time the parties end up at the CCMA the conflict is often beyond the point of no return. For this reason, during times of industrial peace, employers and employees should identify and agree upon the use of a trained and reputable conflict resolution expert to be called in when the parties are unable to solve the problem themselves. HOW TO MINIMISE THE DAMAGE CAUSED BY A STRIKE. Employees should allow the business to continue to run in order to avert the likelihood of a closure that could result in job losses. Employers should use the services of a reputable labour broker who can provide alternative labour during the strike. Both parties should behave in a civil and professional manner towards each other. HOW TO BRING A STRIKE TO A SPEEDY END. Where the parties are unable to find common ground they should not delay in bringing in the services of their mutually agreed strike resolution expert. An expert in this field will not only have techniques of bringing the parties together but will also be able to see solutions that the emotions of the parties have prevented them from seeing. The expert should also be able to help the parties rebuild their relationship once the strike

#### The social spending bill solves climate change.

#### **Chow ’21 -** NBC reporter focused on science and climate change

Denise Chow, “Biden’s Scaled-Down Spending Bill has Big Upsides for Climate Fight,” NBC, October 28, 2021, https://www.nbcnews.com/science/environment/bidens-scaled-spending-bill-big-upsides-climate-fight-rcna4061

Many climate activists are applauding the [$1.75 trillion spending bill](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/congress/biden-expects-win-full-democratic-support-new-proposal-sweeping-spending-n1282608)unveiled Thursday by President Joe Biden, a move that experts say will be crucial to staving off the worst effects of global warming and building a more livable future.

Biden’s proposed framework includes $555 billion in clean energy investments, incentives and tax credits that would help the country meet its goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions by at least 50 percent by 2030. If passed, environmental experts said it’s the type of legislation that could create much-needed momentum to slash pollution levels and [address the climate crisis](https://www.nbcnews.com/science/environment/un-releases-blistering-assessment-state-climate-change-rcna1622) in the United States and on the global stage.

The proposal also backs up [promises that Biden campaigned on](https://www.nbcnews.com/science/environment/how-biden-s-climate-plan-makes-clean-energy-2035-very-n1234528), making climate change a sizable focus of his administration’s biggest spending bill.

“This would be an absolutely historic investment in clean energy and environmental justice — both of which are essential for climate progress,” said Abigail Dillen, president of Earthjustice, a nonprofit environmental law group based in San Francisco. “A package that makes all those investments at a scale that will be transformative over the next eight years is incredible.”

The new framework comes after prolonged negotiations between the White House and two moderate Democratic senators, Joe Manchin of West Virginia and Krysten Sinema of Arizona, who opposed key parts of Biden’s original “Build Back Better” plan.

Some environmental advocates had hoped for an even larger climate package.

“The Build Back Better Framework announced by the White House today doesn’t go far enough to address the economic and climate crises facing our generation,” Cristina Tzintzún Ramirez, president of NextGen America, a progressive advocacy nonprofit started by billionaire and former Democratic presidential candidate Tom Steyer, said in a news release. “A few moderate Democrats negotiated against the best interest of the American people, forcing the rest of their party to renege on essential promises.”

Biden on Thursday urged Congress to pass the proposal, saying that the investments will “truly transform this nation.” Earlier this year, the Senate passed a nearly $1 trillion infrastructure bill with robust bipartisan support, but the House has yet to vote on that measure, citing the need for parallel action on the social safety net portion of Biden’s agenda.

The bill’s timing is crucial as Biden is set to meet with other world leaders in Scotland next week for the United Nations Climate Change Conference, where countries are expected to negotiate and set forth targets to reduce emissions in line with the goals of the Paris Agreement.

Stalled negotiations had generated concern among environmentalists around the world that Biden could show up to the conference empty-handed, leaving little incentive for other countries to offer their own aggressive plans to cut carbon emissions.

Sam Ricketts, co-founder and co-director of the climate advocacy group Evergreen Action, said lawmakers should feel increased urgency to pass the revamped Build Back Better act, but added that the proposal itself should benefit Biden by demonstrating to other nations that the U.S. is actively working to achieve its emissions targets.

“This will show the global community that America really is an ally and can be a leader in driving forward global climate efforts,” Ricketts said. “It shows that after four years of President Trump’s outright climate denial, the U.S. government is moving with leadership against this global crisis.”

The proposed climate bill will also give the U.S. stronger footing in Scotland during negotiations with other top emitters, including China.

“The Biden administration will have more leverage to push other countries to make strong commitments,” said Danielle Arostegui, a senior climate analyst at the Environmental Defense Fund. “We can show that we’re putting our money where our mouth is.”

The bill would significantly boost investments in renewable energy, including for solar and wind power, and would provide clean energy tax credits and an electric vehicle tax credit that would lower the cost of an electric vehicle by up to $12,500 per middle-class family, according to the White House.

The framework also prioritizes [environmental justice](https://www.nbcnews.com/science/environment/why-i-can-t-breathe-resonating-environmental-justice-activists-n1228561) by earmarking 40 percent of the overall benefits of investment for disadvantaged communities. The plan would fund the electrification of ports, in addition to electrifying bus and truck fleets, and would provide grants to communities that are disproportionately affected by climate change and economic injustice.

“This marks a new beginning in the fight against injustice in this country, and a long-overdue boost to the communities that have struggled with the toxic legacy of environmental pollution and systemic racism,” officials with the Equitable and Just National Climate Platform, a consortium of climate change and environmental justice advocates, said in a statement.

Dan Lashof, U.S. director of the World Resources Institute, a Washington-based research nonprofit group, said the legislation could bring the country significantly closer to meeting its emissions goals, but added that there is still ground to make up.

The White House said the bill will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 1 billion tons by 2030, but Lashof said a total of 2 billion tons of emissions need to be cut to reach Biden’s target by the end of the decade.

Still, he said these types of investments could spur other developments in the private sector, or at the state and local level, which could make up the difference.

“It’s important to recognize that this is a huge amount of progress,” Lashof said. “This bill together with the infrastructure bill really does lay the foundation for meeting the 2030 target. It’s all moving in the right direction.”

The legislation would create a 300,000-member environmental workforce, known as the Civilian Climate Corps. The program is designed to provide opportunities for people to learn skills and trades as the country transitions to a “greener” economy.

The proposal also includes grants and loans for rural communities to deploy renewable energy technologies and will bolster state and local efforts to electrify buildings, migrate to clean transportation and electric buses and help communities build protections against extreme weather and other climate-fueled disasters.

“When folks hear tax credits, they tend to think of only utilities and wind and solar power, which of course are hugely important,” Dillen said. “But this is a holistic package that accelerates clean energy across every sector of the economy.”

#### Warming causes extinction—causes lethal heat conditions, droughts, destruction of ecosystems, and wars over resources.

Specktor ’19 – Senior writer at Live Science, formerly a staff writer and editor at Reader’s Digest Magazine

Brandon Specktor, “Human Civilization Will Crumble by 2050 If We Don’t Stop Climate Change Now, New Paper Claims,” Live Science, June 4, 2019, https://www.livescience.com/65633-climate-change-dooms-humans-by-2050.html

What might an accurate worst-case picture of the planet's climate-addled future actually look like, then? The authors provide one particularly grim scenario that begins with world governments "politely ignoring" the advice of scientists and the will of the public to decarbonize the economy (finding alternative energy sources), resulting in a global temperature increase 5.4 F (3 C) by the year 2050. At this point, the world's ice sheets vanish; brutal droughts kill many of the trees in the [Amazon rainforest](https://www.livescience.com/57266-amazon-river.html) (removing one of the world's largest carbon offsets); and the planet plunges into a feedback loop of ever-hotter, ever-deadlier conditions.

"Thirty-five percent of the global land area, and 55 percent of the global population, are subject to more than 20 days a year of [lethal heat conditions](https://www.livescience.com/55129-how-heat-waves-kill-so-quickly.html), beyond the threshold of human survivability," the authors hypothesized.

Meanwhile, droughts, floods and wildfires regularly ravage the land. Nearly one-third of the world's land surface turns to desert. Entire ecosystems collapse, beginning with the planet's coral reefs, the rainforest and the Arctic ice sheets. The world's tropics are hit hardest by these new climate extremes, destroying the region's agriculture and turning more than 1 billion people into refugees.

This mass movement of refugees — coupled with [shrinking coastlines](https://www.livescience.com/51990-sea-level-rise-unknowns.html) and severe drops in food and water availability — begin to stress the fabric of the world's largest nations, including the United States. Armed conflicts over resources, perhaps culminating in nuclear war, are likely.

The result, according to the new paper, is "outright chaos" and perhaps "the end of human global civilization as we know it."

### Cap K

#### The telos of the 1ac’s politics is the strike – that naturalizes capital’s control and is parasitic on political organizing.

Eidlin 20 Barry Eidlin (assistant professor of sociology at McGill University and the author of Labor and the Class Idea in the United States and Canada), 1-6-2020, “Why Unions Are Good – But Not Good Enough,” Jacobin, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/01/marxism-trade-unions-socialism-revolutionary-organizing

Labor unions have long occupied a paradoxical position within Marxist theory. They are an essential expression of the working class taking shape as a collective actor and an essential vehicle for working-class action. When we speak of “the working class” or “working-class activity,” we are often analyzing the actions of workers either organized into unions or trying to organize themselves into unions. At the same time, unions are an imperfect and incomplete vehicle for the working class to achieve one of Marxist theory’s central goals: overthrowing capitalism. Unions by their very existence affirm and reinforce capitalist class society. As organizations which primarily negotiate wages, benefits, and working conditions with employers, unions only exist in relation to capitalists. This makes them almost by definition reformist institutions, designed to mitigate and manage the employment relationship, not transform it. Many unions have adapted to this conservative, managerial role. Others have played key roles in challenging capital’s power. Some have even played insurgent roles at one moment and managerial roles at others. When unions have organized workplace insurgencies, this has sometimes translated into political pressure that expanded democracy and led to large-scale policy reforms. In the few revolutionary historical moments that we can identify, worker organization, whether called unions or something else, has been essential. Thus, labor unions and movements have long been a central focus of Marxist debate. At its core, the debate centers around the role of unions in class formation, the creation of the revolutionary working-class agent. The debate focuses on four key questions. First, to what degree do unions simply reflect existing relations of production and class struggle, or actively shape those relations? Second, if unions actively shape class struggle, why and under what conditions do they enhance or inhibit it? Third, how do unions shape class identities, and how does this affect unions’ scope of action? Fourth, what is the relation between unions and politics? This question is comprised of two sub-questions: to what degree do unions help or hinder struggles in the workplace becoming broader political struggles? And how should unions relate to political parties, the more conventional vehicle for advancing political demands? The following is a chapter from [The Oxford Handbook of Karl Marx](https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190695545.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780190695545) (Oxford University Press, 2019). It assesses Marxist debates surrounding trade unions, oriented by the four questions mentioned previously. It proceeds historically, first examining how Marx and Engels conceived of the roles and limitations of trade unions, then tracing how others within Marxism have pursued these debates as class relations and politics have changed over time. While the chapter includes some history of labor unions and movements themselves, the central focus is on how Marxist theorists thought of and related to those movements. Marx and Engels wrote extensively about the unions of their time, although never systematically. The majority of their writings on unions responded to concrete labor struggles of their time. From their earliest works, they grasped unions’ necessity and limitations in creating a working-class agent capable of advancing class struggle against the bourgeoisie. This [departed](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/wusa.12021) from previous variants of socialism, often based in idealized views of rebuilding a rapidly eroding community of artisanal producers, which did not emphasize class organization or class struggle. Writing in The Condition of the Working Class in England about emerging forms of unionism, Engels observed that even though workers’ primary struggles were over material issues such as wages, they pointed to a deeper social and political conflict: What gives these Unions and the strikes arising from them their real importance is this, that they are the first attempt of the workers to abolish competition. They im­ ply the recognition of the fact that the supremacy of the bourgeoisie is based wholly upon the competition of the workers among themselves; i.e., upon their want of cohesion. And precisely because the Unions direct themselves against the vital nerve of the present social order, however one-sidedly, in however narrow a way, are they so dangerous to this social order. At the same time, Engels saw that, even as union struggles “[kept alive] the opposition of the workers to the … omnipotence of the bourgeoisie,” so too did they “[compel] the admission that something more is needed than Trades Unions and strikes to break the power of the ruling class.” Here Engels articulates the crux of the problem. First, unions are essential for working-class formation, creating a collective actor both opposed to the bourgeoisie and capable of challenging it for power. Second, they are an insufficient vehicle for creating and mobilizing that collective actor. Marx and Engels understood that unions are essential to working-class formation because, under capitalism, the system of “free labor,” where individual workers sell their labor power to an employer for a wage, fragments relations between workers and makes them compete with each other. As described in the Communist Manifesto, the bourgeoisie “has left no other nexus between man and man than naked self-interest, than callous ‘cash payment,’” leaving workers “exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market.” While workers organized based on other collective identities, such as race, ethnicity, or religion, only unions could unite them as workers against the source of their exploitation — the bourgeoisie. Unions serve “as organized agencies for superseding the very system of wage labor and capital rule.” But just as unions could allow the proletariat to take shape and challenge the bourgeoisie for power, Marx and Engels also saw that they were a partial, imperfect vehicle for doing so for two reasons. First, unions’ fundamentally defensive role, protecting workers against employers’ efforts to drive a competitive race to the bottom, meant that they [limited themselves](https://www.amazon.com/Wage-Labour-Capital-Value-Price-Profit/dp/0717804704) “to a guerrilla war against the effects of the existing system, instead of simultaneously trying to change it.” Thus, even militant trade unions found themselves struggling for “a fair day’s work for a fair day’s wage” without challenging the bourgeoisie’s fundamental power, particularly the wage labor system. And some layers of the trade union officialdom were content to fight for privileges for their small segment of the working class, leaving most workers behind. Second, unions’ focus on wages and workplace issues tended to reinforce a division between economic and political struggles. This division was explicit with the more conservative “old” unions in Britain, which “bar[red] all political action on principle and in their charters.” But even with more progressive formations, such as the early nineteenth century’s Chartists, or the late nineteenth century’s “new” unions, Marx and Engels saw that the transition from workplace struggles to politics was not automatic. For one, it varied across national contexts. Engels observed that French workers were much more likely to mobilize politically, while English workers “fight, not against the Government, but directly against the bourgeoisie.” But beyond national variation, they saw a recurring pattern of division, separating economic and political struggles by organization. Reflecting on the early to mid-nineteenth century English working-class movement, Engels noted a threefold divide between “socially-based” Chartists, “politically-based” Socialists, and conservative, craft-based trade unions. While the Chartists were “purely a working-men’s [sic] cause freed from all bourgeois elements,” they remained “theoretically the more backward, the less developed.” Socialists may have been more theoretically sophisticated, but their bourgeois origins made it difficult to “amalgamate completely with the working class.” Although young Engels thought an alliance of Chartism and socialism was underway, the alliance proved elusive. By the 1870s, Marx opined that politically, the English working class was “nothing more than the tail of the great Liberal Party, i.e., henchmen of the capitalists.” Likewise, Engels had soured on the English working class. Both saw promise in the militant worker protest in the United States at the time, seeing the seeds of a nascent labor party. But that too fell short. Thus, unions failed in Marx and Engels’s central task: the formation of “a political organization of the working class as a whole.”

#### Capitalism results in environmental destruction, mass violence, surveillance, war, and fascism—culminates in extinction.

Robinson ’14 – Professor of sociology at the University of California, Santa Barbara, researches political economy, globalization, and historical materialism

William I. Robinson, “Global Capitalism: Crisis of Humanity and the Specter of 21st Century Fascism,” June 2014, https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.739.2380&rep=rep1&type=pdf

1. The system is fast reaching the ecological limits of its reproduction. Global capitalism now couples human and natural history in such a way as to threaten to bring about what would be the sixth mass extinction in the known history of life on earth.3 This mass extinction would be caused not by a natural catastrophe such as a meteor impact or by evolutionary changes such as the end of an ice age but by purposive human activity. According to leading environmental scientists there are nine “planetary boundaries” crucial to maintaining an earth system environment in which humans can exist, four of which are experiencing at this time the onset of irreversible environmental degradation and three of which (climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and biodiversity loss) are at “tipping points,” meaning that these processes have already crossed their planetary boundaries.

2. The magnitude of the means of violence and social control is unprecedented, as is the concentration of the means of global communication and symbolic production and circulation in the hands of a very few powerful groups. Computerised wars, drones, bunker-buster bombs, star wars, and so forth, have changed the face of warfare. Warfare has become normalised and sanitised for those not directly at the receiving end of armed aggression. At the same time we have arrived at the panoptical surveillance society and the age of thought control by those who control global flows of communication, images and symbolic production. The world of Edward Snowden is the world of George Orwell; 1984 has arrived;

3. Capitalism is reaching apparent limits to its extensive expansion. There are no longer any new territories of significance that can be integrated into world capitalism, deruralisation is now well advanced, and the commodification of the countryside and of pre- and non-capitalist spaces has intensified, that is, converted in hot-house fashion into spaces of capital, so that intensive expansion is reaching depths never before seen. Capitalism must continually expand or collapse. How or where will it now expand?

4. There is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a “planet of slums,”4 alienated from the productive economy, thrown into the margins, and subject to sophisticated systems of social control and to destruction - to a mortal cycle of dispossession-exploitation-exclusion. This includes prison- industrial and immigrant-detention complexes, omnipresent policing, militarised gentrification, and so on;

5. There is a disjuncture between a globalising economy and a nation-state based system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and have not been able to play the role of what social scientists refer to as a “hegemon,” or a leading nation-state that has enough power and authority to organise and stabilise the system. The spread of weapons of mass destruction and the unprecedented militarisation of social life and conflict across the globe makes it hard to imagine that the system can come under any stable political authority that assures its reproduction.

Global Police State

How have social and political forces worldwide responded to crisis? The crisis has resulted in a rapid political polarisation in global society. Both right and left-wing forces are ascendant. Three responses seem to be in dispute.

One is what we could call “reformism from above.” This elite reformism is aimed at stabilising the system, at saving the system from itself and from more radical responses from below. Nonetheless, in the years following the 2008 collapse of the global financial system it seems these reformers are unable (or unwilling) to prevail over the power of transnational financial capital. A second response is popular, grassroots and leftist resistance from below. As social and political conflict escalates around the world there appears to be a mounting global revolt. While such resistance appears insurgent in the wake of 2008 it is spread very unevenly across countries and regions and facing many problems and challenges.

Yet another response is that I term 21st century fascism.5 The ultra-right is an insurgent force in many countries. In broad strokes, this project seeks to fuse reactionary political power with transnational capital and to organise a mass base among historically privileged sectors of the global working class – such as white workers in the North and middle layers in the South – that are now experiencing heightened insecurity and the specter of downward mobility. It involves militarism, extreme masculinisation, homophobia, racism and racist mobilisations, including the search for scapegoats, such as immigrant workers and, in the West, Muslims. Twenty-first century fascism evokes mystifying ideologies, often involving race/culture supremacy and xenophobia, embracing an idealised and mythical past. Neo-fascist culture normalises and glamorises warfare and social violence, indeed, generates a fascination with domination that is portrayed even as heroic.

The need for dominant groups around the world to secure widespread, organised mass social control of the world’s surplus population and rebellious forces from below gives a powerful impulse to projects of 21st century fascism. Simply put, the immense structural inequalities of the global political economy cannot easily be contained through consensual mechanisms of social control. We have been witnessing transitions from social welfare to social control states around the world. We have entered a period of great upheavals, momentous changes and uncertainties. The only viable solution to the crisis of global capitalism is a massive redistribution of wealth and power downward towards the poor majority of humanity along the lines of a 21st century democratic social- ism, in which humanity is no longer at war with itself and with nature.

#### The alternative is to build a dual power strategy—forming institutions that help meet the needs of those in a capitalist crisis and demonstrating the possibility of revolutionary projects that can destroy capitalism.

Escalante ’19 – Marxist, feminist, and anti-imperialist activist

Alyson Escalante, “Communism and Climate Change: A Dual Power Approach,” March 26, 2019, <https://regenerationmag.org/communism-and-climate-change-a-dual-power-approach/>

Much has been written over the last few years about a dual power approach to communist strategy. I have written extensively about it[at The Forge News](https://theforgenews.org/2018/08/24/against-electoralism-for-dual-power/), and discussed in video format in my YouTube video,[Climate Change, Imperialism, and The End of The World](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wLzZ-H4tpBM). I will not be using this article to give a comprehensive recap on what dual power strategy is, so I suggest checking out those two links. In short: dual power strategy is an approach to communist revolution which seeks to build independent socialist institutions which exist in parallel to the currently existing capitalist state, in order to serve the masses. The goal of a dual power strategy is not to compete with capitalism or reform it out of existence, but rather to radicalize the masses through meeting their needs, to recognize and politicize capitalist crisis as it occurs, and to have a real infrastructure in place for a revolutionary movement to self-sustain at the point that it must inevitably combat the capitalist state. This strategy focuses on building counter-institutions like tenants’ unions, agricultural cooperatives, radical labor unions, and Serve the People programs that not only demonstrate on-the-ground worker power but can provide for the needs of the masses without an appeal to reforming the currently existing capitalist state.

I previously argued that a crucial advantage to dual power strategy is that it gives the masses an infrastructure of socialist institutions which can directly provide for material needs in times of capitalist crisis. Socialist agricultural and food distribution programs can take ground that the capitalist state cedes by simultaneously meeting the needs of the masses while proving that socialist self-management and political institutions can function independently of capitalism. This approach is not only capable of literally saving lives in the case of crisis, but of demonstrating the possibility of a revolutionary project which seeks to destroy rather than reform capitalism.

One of the most pressing of the various crises which humanity faces today is climate change. Capitalist production has devastated the planet, and everyday we discover that the small window of time for avoiding its most disastrous effects is shorter than previously understood. The[Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predicts](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/oct/08/global-warming-must-not-exceed-15c-warns-landmark-un-report) that we have twelve years to limit (not even prevent) the more catastrophic effects of climate change. The simple, and horrific, fact that we all must face is that climate change has reached a point where many of its effects are inevitable, and we are now in a post-brink world, where damage control is the primary concern. The question is not whether we can escape a future of climate change, but whether we can survive it. Socialist strategy must adapt accordingly.

In the face of this crisis, the democratic socialists and social democrats in the United States have largely settled on market-based reforms. The Green New Deal, championed by Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and the left-wing of the Democratic Party, remains a thoroughly capitalist solution to a capitalist problem. The proposal does nothing to challenge capitalism itself but rather seeks to subsidize market solutions to reorient the US energy infrastructure towards renewable energy production, to develop less energy consuming transportation, and the development of public investment towards these ends.

The plan does nothing to call into question the profit incentives and endless resource consumption of capitalism which led us to this point. Rather, it seeks to reorient the relentless market forces of capitalism towards slightly less destructive technological developments. While the plan would lead to a massive investment in the manufacturing and deployment of solar energy infrastructure,[National Geographic reports](https://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/energy/2014/11/141111-solar-panel-manufacturing-sustainability-ranking/) that “Fabricating [solar] panels requires caustic chemicals such as sodium hydroxide and hydrofluoric acid, and the process uses water as well as electricity, the production of which emits greenhouse gases.” Technology alone cannot sufficiently combat this crisis, as the production of such technology through capitalist manufacturing infrastructure only perpetuates environmental harm. Furthermore, subsidizing and incentivizing renewable energy stops far short of actually combating the fossil fuel industry driving the current climate crisis.

The technocratic market solutions offered in the Green New Deal fail to adequately combat the driving factors of climate change. What is worse, they rely on a violent imperialist global system in order to produce their technological solutions. The development of high-tech energy infrastructure and the development of low or zero emission transportation requires the import of raw material and rare earth minerals which the US can only access because of the imperial division of the Global South. This imperial division of the world requires constant militarism from the imperial core nations, and as Lenin demonstrates in Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, facilitates constant warfare as imperial states compete for spheres of influence in order to facilitate cheap resource extraction. The US military, one of many imperialist forces, is the single largest user of petroleum, and one of its main functions is to ensure oil access for the US. Without challenging this imperialist division of the world and the role of the US military in upholding it, the Green New Deal fails even further to challenge the underlying causes of climate change.

Even with the failed promises of the Green New Deal itself, it is unlikely that this tepid market proposal will pass at all. Nancy Pelosi and other lead Democrats have largely condemned it and consider it “impractical” and “unfeasible.” This dismissal is crucial because it reveals the total inability of capitalism to resolve this crisis. If the center-left party in the heart of the imperial core sees even milquetoast capitalist reforms as a step too far, we ought to have very little hope that a reformist solution will present itself within the ever-shrinking twelve-year time frame.

There are times for delicacy and there are times for bluntness, and we are in the latter. To put things bluntly: the capitalists are not going to save us, and if we don’t find a way to save ourselves, the collapse of human civilization is a real possibility. The pressing question we now face is: how are we going to save ourselves?

Revolution and Dual Power

If capitalism will not be able to resolve the current encroaching climate crisis, we must find a way to organize outside the confines of capitalist institutions, towards the end of overthrowing capitalism. If the Democratic Socialists of America-backed candidates cannot offer real anti-capitalist solutions through the capitalist state, we should be skeptical of the possibility for any socialist organization doing so. The DSA is far larger and far more well-funded than any of the other socialist organizations in the US, and they have failed to produce anything more revolutionary than the Green New Deal. We have to abandon the idea that electoral strategy will be sufficient to resolve the underlying causes of this crisis within twelve years.

While many radicals call for revolution instead of reform, the reformists often raise the same response: revolution is well and good, but what are you going to do in the meantime? In many ways this question is fair. The socialist left in the US today is not ready for revolutionary action, and a mass base does not exist to back the various organizations which might undertake such a struggle. Revolutionaries must concede that we have much work to be done before a revolutionary strategy can be enacted. This is a harsh truth, but it is true.

Much of the left has sought to ignore this truth by embracing adventurism and violent protest theatrics, in the vain hope of sparking revolutionary momentum which does not currently exist. If this is the core strategy of the socialist left, we will accomplish nothing in the next twelve years. Such approaches are as useless as the opportunist reforms pushed by the social democrats. Our task in these twelve years is not simply to arm ourselves and hope that magically the masses will wake up prepared for revolution and willing to put their trust in our small ideological cadres. We must instead, build a movement, and with it we must build infrastructure which can survive revolution and provide a framework for socialist development.

Dual power is tooled towards this project best. The Marxist Center network has done an impressive amount of work developing socialist institutions across the US, largely through tenants organizing and serve the people programs. The left wing factions within the DSA itself have also begun to develop mutual aid programs that could be useful for dual power strategy. At the same time, mutual aid is not enough. We cannot simply build these institutions as a reform to make capitalism more survivable. Rather, we must make these institutions part of a broader revolutionary movement and they ought to function as a material prefiguration to a socialist society and economy. The institutions we build as dual power outside the capitalist state today ought to be structured towards revolutionary ends, such that they will someday function as the early institutions of a revolutionary socialist society.

To accomplish this goal, we cannot simply declare these institutions to be revolutionary. Rather they have to be linked together through an actual revolutionary movement working towards revolutionary ends. This means that dual power institutions cannot exist as ends in and of themselves, nor can abstract notions of mutual aid cannot be conceptualized as an end in itself. The explicit purpose of these institutions has to be to radicalize the masses through meeting their needs, and providing an infrastructure for a socialist movement to meet the needs of its members and the communities in which it operates. Revolutionary institutions that can provide food, housing, and other needs for a revolutionary movement will be crucial for building a base among the masses and for constructing the beginnings of a socialist infrastructure for when we eventually engage in revolutionary struggle.

### Util

#### Prioritize preventing extinction.

Seth D. Baum & Anthony M. Barrett 18. Global Catastrophic Risk Institute. 2018. “Global Catastrophes: The Most Extreme Risks.” Risk in Extreme Environments: Preparing, Avoiding, Mitigating, and Managing, edited by Vicki Bier, Routledge, pp. 174–184.

2. What Is GCR And Why Is It Important? Taken literally, a global catastrophe can be any event that is in some way catastrophic across the globe. This suggests a rather low threshold for what counts as a global catastrophe. An event causing just one death on each continent (say, from a jet-setting assassin) could rate as a global catastrophe, because surely these deaths would be catastrophic for the deceased and their loved ones. However, in common usage, a global catastrophe would be catastrophic for a significant portion of the globe. Minimum thresholds have variously been set around ten thousand to ten million deaths or $10 billion to $10 trillion in damages (Bostrom and Ćirković 2008), or death of one quarter of the human population (Atkinson 1999; Hempsell 2004). Others have emphasized catastrophes that cause long-term declines in the trajectory of human civilization (Beckstead 2013), that human civilization does not recover from (Maher and Baum 2013), that drastically reduce humanity’s potential for future achievements (Bostrom 2002, using the term “existential risk”), or that result in human extinction (Matheny 2007; Posner 2004). A common theme across all these treatments of GCR is that some catastrophes are vastly more important than others. Carl Sagan was perhaps the first to recognize this, in his commentary on nuclear winter (Sagan 1983). Without nuclear winter, a global nuclear war might kill several hundred million people. This is obviously a major catastrophe, but humanity would presumably carry on. However, with nuclear winter, per Sagan, humanity could go extinct. The loss would be not just an additional four billion or so deaths, but the loss of all future generations. To paraphrase Sagan, the loss would be billions and billions of lives, or even more. Sagan estimated 500 trillion lives, assuming humanity would continue for ten million more years, which he cited as typical for a successful species. Sagan’s 500 trillion number may even be an underestimate. The analysis here takes an adventurous turn, hinging on the evolution of the human species and the long-term fate of the universe. On these long time scales, the descendants of contemporary humans may no longer be recognizably “human”. The issue then is whether the descendants are still worth caring about, whatever they are. If they are, then it begs the question of how many of them there will be. Barring major global catastrophe, Earth will remain habitable for about one billion more years 2 until the Sun gets too warm and large. The rest of the Solar System, Milky Way galaxy, universe, and (if it exists) the multiverse will remain habitable for a lot longer than that (Adams and Laughlin 1997), should our descendants gain the capacity to migrate there. An open question in astronomy is whether it is possible for the descendants of humanity to continue living for an infinite length of time or instead merely an astronomically large but finite length of time (see e.g. Ćirković 2002; Kaku 2005). Either way, the stakes with global catastrophes could be much larger than the loss of 500 trillion lives. Debates about the infinite vs. the merely astronomical are of theoretical interest (Ng 1991; Bossert et al. 2007), but they have limited practical significance. This can be seen when evaluating GCRs from a standard risk-equals-probability-times-magnitude framework. Using Sagan’s 500 trillion lives estimate, it follows that reducing the probability of global catastrophe by a mere one-in-500-trillion chance is of the same significance as saving one human life. Phrased differently, society should try 500 trillion times harder to prevent a global catastrophe than it should to save a person’s life. Or, preventing one million deaths is equivalent to a one-in500-million reduction in the probability of global catastrophe. This suggests society should make extremely large investment in GCR reduction, at the expense of virtually all other objectives. Judge and legal scholar Richard Posner made a similar point in monetary terms (Posner 2004). Posner used $50,000 as the value of a statistical human life (VSL) and 12 billion humans as the total loss of life (double the 2004 world population); he describes both figures as significant underestimates. Multiplying them gives $600 trillion as an underestimate of the value of preventing global catastrophe. For comparison, the United States government typically uses a VSL of around one to ten million dollars (Robinson 2007). Multiplying a $10 million VSL with 500 trillion lives gives $5x1021 as the value of preventing global catastrophe. But even using “just" $600 trillion, society should be willing to spend at least that much to prevent a global catastrophe, which converts to being willing to spend at least $1 million for a one-in-500-million reduction in the probability of global catastrophe. Thus while reasonable disagreement exists on how large of a VSL to use and how much to count future generations, even low-end positions suggest vast resource allocations should be redirected to reducing GCR. This conclusion is only strengthened when considering the astronomical size of the stakes, but the same point holds either way. The bottom line is that, as long as something along the lines of the standard riskequals-probability-times-magnitude framework is being used, then even tiny GCR reductions merit significant effort. This point holds especially strongly for risks of catastrophes that would cause permanent harm to global human civilization. The discussion thus far has assumed that all human lives are valued equally. This assumption is not universally held. People often value some people more than others, favoring themselves, their family and friends, their compatriots, their generation, or others whom they identify with. Great debates rage on across moral philosophy, economics, and other fields about how much people should value others who are distant in space, time, or social relation, as well as the unborn members of future generations. This debate is crucial for all valuations of risk, including GCR. Indeed, if each of us only cares about our immediate selves, then global catastrophes may not be especially important, and we probably have better things to do with our time than worry about them. While everyone has the right to their own views and feelings, we find that the strongest arguments are for the widely held position that all human lives should be valued equally. This position is succinctly stated in the United States Declaration of Independence, updated in the 1848 Declaration of Sentiments: “We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and 3 women are created equal”. Philosophers speak of an agent-neutral, objective “view from nowhere” (Nagel 1986) or a “veil of ignorance” (Rawls 1971) in which each person considers what is best for society irrespective of which member of society they happen to be. Such a perspective suggests valuing everyone equally, regardless of who they are or where or when they live. This in turn suggests a very high value for reducing GCR, or a high degree of priority for GCR reduction efforts.

### Case

#### [1] All-out strikes endanger patients and violates moral duties to others AND hurts trust between patients and doctors – this culminates in the intrinsic inability to fulfil our obligation toward the other

Campbell 16 Denis Campbell 4-9-2016 "All-out junior doctors’ strike unethical and reckless, says NHS chief" <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2016/apr/09/doctors-strike-nhs-chief-england> (Denis Campbell is health policy editor for the Guardian and the Observer. He has written about the NHS, public health and medicine since 2007 and shares health-writing duties with Sarah Boseley, the health editor) JG

A total withdrawal of labour, scheduled for later this month, **will threaten hospitals’ ability to deliver safe care** in areas such as A&E, childbirth and intensive care, according to Prof Sir Bruce Keogh, the national medical director of NHS England. In a strongly worded article in the Observer, Keogh writes that such an escalation of the dispute with the government would be **reckless, unethical**, a breach of the medical profession’s **fundamental duty to “do no harm**” and a move that will destroy the public’s trust in doctors. “Despite the fact that consultants will do their best to cover, the fact is that junior doctors are key to the safe and effective running of our NHS. So this new action will put additional, significant strain on A&E, intensive care and maternity services, particularly in smaller hospital,” Keogh explains. “I worry that withdrawal of emergency cover will put our sickest and most vulnerable patients at greater risk. This challenges the ethical framework on which our profession is founded and runs against the grain of our NHS and our personal and **professional values**”, he adds. Junior doctors are due to refuse to work in any medical setting at all between 8am and 5pm on 26 and 27 April as part of their campaign of industrial action in the bitter and long-running row with Jeremy Hunt, the health secretary, over the new contract he intends to impose on them from August. The British Medical Association reacted angrily to Keogh’s intervention. Johann Malawana, the BMA’s junior doctor chair, said: “No junior doctor wants to take this action but we have been left with no choice. They have already done everything else in their power to make their voices heard - protests, marches, petitions, emergency care only strikes. By continuing to ignore them, the government has left them left with no choice. “We regret any disruption caused to patients and have given trusts enough notice for them to plan ahead, and to ensure that senior hospital doctors, GPs and other NHS staff will continue to provide excellent care for patients. Please be assured that should someone need emergency care on a day of action, they will receive it. “It is disappointing that Bruce Keogh is attacking frontline doctors rather than echoing calls, from patients’ groups to senior NHS managers, for the government to get back around the table and end this dispute through talks. In his article, Keogh argues that the continuing series of strikes have caused too much “distress, anxiety and confusion” to patients already through the cancellation of almost 25,000 operations, as a result of four walkouts since January. He says an all-out strike would be “a watershed moment for the NHS”. Keogh is the first senior doctor to articulate in public the warnings that many leaders of the profession have recently given the BMA privately about the danger of patients dying because too few doctors were on duty. Many of the medical royal colleges, which represent different types of doctors professionally, are torn between support for their striking trainees and fear that doctors’ high standing with the public could be ruined if a total withdrawal of cover is seen as a step too far.

#### [2] Strikes hurt everybody including innocent people not at the company

McElroy 19 John McElroy 10-25-2019 "Strikes Hurt Everybody" <https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody> <https://www.wardsauto.com/ideaxchange/strikes-hurt-everybody> (MPA at McCombs school of Business) JG

But **strikes don’t just hurt the people walking the picket lines or the company they’re striking against.** They **hurt suppliers, car dealers and the communities** located near the plants. The Anderson Economic Group estimates that 75,000 workers at supplier companies were temporarily laid off because of the GM strike. Unlike UAW picketers, those supplier workers won’t **get any strike pay** or an $11,000 contract **signing bonus**. No, most of them lost close to a month’s worth of wages, which must be financially devastating for them. GM’s suppliers also lost a lot of money. So now they’re cutting budgets and delaying capital investments to make up for the lost revenue, which is a further drag on the economy. According to CAR, the communities and states where GM’s plants are located collectively lost a couple of hundred million dollars in payroll and tax revenue. Some economists warn that if the strike were prolonged it could knock the state of Michigan – home to GM and the UAW – **into a recession.** That prompted the governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, to call GM CEO Mary Barra and UAW leaders and urge them to settle as fast as possible. So, while the UAW managed to get a nice raise for its members, the strike **left a path of destruction** in its wake. That’s not fair to the innocent bystanders who will never regain what they lost.

#### [3] Strikes use others as a mere means to an end.

Fourie 17 Johan Fourie 11-30-2017 "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers" <https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html> (Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG

A further formula of the Categorical Imperative is "so, act as to treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of any other context, never solely as a means to an end but always as an end within itself' (Parrott, 2006, p. 51). By this Kant meant people should be valued and respected as an individual and not used for the benefit of others. Participating in a labor-strike demonstration/action is **a direct violation of this** categorical perspective as it would not be ethically permissible because the severe dependence and well-being of clients, the effective functioning of the employer organization, and society **is used to duly and unduly influence the bargaining process for better working conditions**. In participating in the labor strike demonstration, the humanity, and well-being of clients and society **is not seen as crucial** **and as an 'end'**, but rather used to demonstrate the undeniable need for the skills and expertise of social workers. Furthermore, through withholding services, social worker professionals demonstrate that the well-being and welfare of society have lost its inherent importance/value. Though the value of overall well-being is taught throughout the social work training process and is enshrined in the professional ethical codes.

#### [4] Strikes in essential services hurt the patient but not the employer which reduces the patient to a mere means to an end.

Loewy 2K, Erich H. "Of healthcare professionals, ethics, and strikes." Cambridge Q. Healthcare Ethics 9 (2000): 513. (Erich H. Loewy M.D., F.A.C.P., was born in Vienna, Austria in 1927 and was able to escape first to England and then to the U.S. in late 1938. He was initially trained as a cardiologist. He taught at Case Western Reserve and practiced in Cleveland, Ohio. After 14 years he devoted himself fully to Bioethics and taught at the University of Illinois for 12 years. In 1996 he was selected as the first endowed Alumni Association Chair of Bioethics at the University of California Davis School of Medicine and has taught there since.) JG

“Essential” Work and Strikes Healthcare professionals, garbage collectors, and other “essential” workers have a responsibility that is considered to be different from, say, the responsibilities of workers in a supermarket chain. There are almost certainly other supermarkets, but there is generally only one municipal garbage collection service**, one police force, and one fire department; and in general, only one healthcare system available to us. In the medical setting, furthermore, workers are much more apt to deal with identified lives**: they know their patients and often have known them for some time. Striking against their employer (even if it is done in part to benefit the patient) is **denying meaningful and often essential services to some of these identified lives**. We tend to relate differently with those lives we know and therefore call “identified” from those whom we consider “unidentified” or statistical lives, in part, because we have obligations as a result of relationships; in part because we fail to recognize that these so-called unidentified lives are not in fact unidentified but are merely not identified by us.4 When strikes are called by healthcare professionals, both types of lives are apt to be injured or, at least, severely inconvenienced. Except in the pocketbook, strikes in the healthcare setting generally do not directly hurt the employer. The employer **is hurt through the** **patient**. The patient thus becomes a **means toward the employees’ ends**, a football being kicked between two contending parties—**even if one of the employees’ goals is to serve the good of patients in general.** Theoretically, patients will then bring pressure on the employer (be it the government or a managed care organization), thus, quite frankly, using the patient as a means toward the ends of the health professionals.5 The dilemma, of course, is that without significantly inconveniencing or even endangering patients, no pressure is likely to be brought and, therefore, no amelioration of working conditions is effected. To be effective, a strike of healthcare professionals has to “hurt” patients and often patients known to the healthcare professionals.

#### 1] When you strike you keep your job but refuse to work, arbitrarily limiting the freedom of others who need a job to get one.

#### Gourevitch summarizes in 2016,

Gourevitch, A.. “Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike.” Perspectives on Politics 14 (2016): 307 - 323. //LHP AV Accessed 7/4/21

If **a right to strike** is not a right to quit what is it? It **is the right that workers claim to refuse to perform work they have agreed to do while retaining a right to the job**. Most of what is peculiar, not to mention fraught, about a strike is contained in that latter clause. Yet, surprisingly, few commentators recognize just how central and yet peculiar this claim is (Locke 1984).2 Opponents of the right to strike are sometimes more alive to its distinctive features than defenders. One critic, for instance, makes the distinction between quitting and striking the basis of his entire argument: **the unqualified right to withdraw labour, which is a clear right of free men, does not describe the behaviour of striker**s...**Strikers**...**withdraw from the performance of their jobs, but in the only relevant sense they do not withdraw their labour**. The 2 Don Locke is one of the few to note both how central the claim to ‘keeping the job’ is and how hard it is to ground this claim. “So what is distinctive about **a strike is**....**the refusal to do a particular job, combined with the insistence that the job is none the less still yours.”** Locke 1984, 181. jobs from which they have withdrawn performance belong to them, they maintain. (Shenfield 1986, 10-11) On what possible grounds may workers claim a right to a job they refuse to perform? While many say that every able-bodied person should have a right to work, and they might say that the state therefore has an obligation to provide everyone with a job, **the argument for full employment never amounts to saying that workers have rights to specific jobs from specific private employers.** For instance, in 1945, at the height of the push for federally guaranteed full employment, the Senate committee considering the issue took care to argue that, “**the right to work has occasionally been misinterpreted as a right to specific jobs of some specific type and status.” After labeling this a “misinterpretation,” the committee’s report cited the following words from one of the bill’s leading advocates:** “It is not the aim of the bill to provide specific jobs for specific individuals. **Our economic system of free enterprise must have free opportunities for jobs for all who are able and want to work**. **Our American system owes no [person] ~~man~~ a living, but it does owe every man an opportunity to make a living**.” (Senator Murray, quoted in United States, Wagner, and Radcliffe 1945, 8). These sentences remind us how puzzling, even alarming, the right to ‘specific jobs’ can sound. In fact, **in a liberal society, the whole point is that claims on specific jobs are a relic of feudal thinking.** In status-based societies, specific groups had rights to specific jobs in the name of corporate privilege. Occupations were tied to birth or guild membership, but not available to all equally. **Liberal society, based on freedom of contract, was designed to destroy just that kind of unfair and oppressive status-based hierarchy**. A common argument against striking workers is that they are latter day guilds, protecting their sectional interests by refusing to let anyone else perform ‘their jobs’ (e.g. Hayek 2011, 384-404). As one critic puts it, the strikers’ demand for an inalienable right to, and property in, a particular job cannot be made conformable to the principles of liberty under law for all...the endowment of the employee with some kind of property right in a job, [is a] prime example of this reversion to the governance of status. (Shenfield 1986, 13) If such criticisms fundamentally misunderstand the entirely modern basis for the right to strike, we still need an account of how anyone could claim something like a property right in a job she not only never acquired but that she then refuses to perform.

#### 2] The right to strike necessarily involves violating the right to property and contract – it threatens others’ freedoms, Gourevitch summarizes:

Gourevitch, A.. “Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike.” Perspectives on Politics 14 (2016): 307 - 323. //LHP AV Accessed 7/4/21

A second problem follows on the first. **If workers have rights to the jobs they are striking then they must have some powers to enforce those rights**. **Such powers might include** mass picketing, secondary boycotts, sympathy strikes, **coercion and intimidation of replacement workers, even destruction or immobilization of property** – the familiar panoply of strike actions. While workers have sometimes defended such actions without using the specifically juridical language of ‘rights,’ in many cases they have used that kind of appeal.3 Even when they have not employed rights-discourse, they have invoked some related notion of demanding fair terms to their job (Frow, Frow and Katanka 1971). Each and any of the above listed activities of a strike – pickets, boycotts, sympathy actions – are part of the way workers not only press their demands but claim their right to 3 See James Gray Pope’s (1997) remarkable reconstruction of the way, in the 1920s, rights-discourse helped organize and sustain a ‘constitutional strike’ against attempts to curtail and outlaw the strike. the job. Strikers regularly implore other workers not to cross picket lines and take struck jobs. **These are more than speech-acts. At the outer edges, they amount to intimidation and coercion**. Or at least, workers claim the right to intimidate and coerce if the state will not itself enforce this aspect of their right to strike. Liberal societies rarely permit a group of individuals powers that come close and even cross over into rights of private coercion. It is no surprise that regulation and repression of these strike-related activities have been the source of some of the most serious episodes of strike-related violence in US and European history (Brecher 2014; Lambert 2005; Forbath 1991; Adamic 1971; Taft and Ross 1969; Liebknecht 1917). So, alongside the unclear basis for the strikers’ rights to their jobs, the problem for a liberal society is that this right seems to include private rights of coercion or at least troubling forms of social pressure. Yet there is more. **The standard strike potentially threatens the fundamental freedoms of three specific groups**. • Freedom of contract **It conflicts with the freedom of contract of those replacement workers who would be willing to take the job** on terms that strikers will not. Note, this is not a possible conflict but a necessary one. **Strikers claim the job is theirs, which means replacements have no right** to it. But replacements claim everyone should have the equal freedom to contract with an employer for a job. • Property rights **A strike seriously interferes with the employer’s property rights**. **The point of a strike is to stop production**. **But the point of a property right is that, at least in the owner’s core area of activity, nobody else has the right to interfere with his use of that property**. **The** **strikers**, by claiming the employer has no right to hire replacements and thus no way of employing his property profitably, **effectively render the employer unfree to use his property as he sees fit**. To be clear, strikers claim the right not just to block replacement workers, but to prevent the employer from putting his property to work without their permission. For instance, New Deal ‘sit-down’ strikes made it impossible to operate factories, which was one reason why the courts claimed it violated employer property rights (Atleson 1983, 46-48). Similarly, during the Seattle general strike in 1919, the General Strike Committee forced owners to ask permission to engage in certain productive activities – permission it often denied (Brecher 2014, 106-111). • Freedom of association Though the conceptual issues here are complicated, a strike can seriously constrain a worker’s freedom of association. It does so most seriously when the strike is a group right, in which only authorized representatives of the union may call a strike. In this case, the right to strike is not the individual’s right in the same way that, say, the freedom to join a church or volunteer organization is. Moreover, the strike can be coercively imposed even on dissenting members, especially when the dissenters work in closed or union shops. That is because refusal to follow the strike leads to dismissal from the union, which would mean loss of the job in union or closed shops. The threat of losing a job is usually considered a coercive threat. So not only might workers be forced to join unions – depending on the law – but also they might be forced to go along with one of the union’s riskiest collective actions. **Note that each one of these concerns follows directly from the nature of the right to strike itself**. **Interference with freedom of contract, property rights**, and the freedom of association **are all part and parcel of defending the right** that striking workers claim to the ‘their’ jobs. These are difficult forms of coercive interference to justify on their own terms and **they appear to rest on a claim without foundation**. Just what right do workers have to jobs that they refuse to perform?