# Scarsdale R1

#### Unions are limited to defending against the system instead of overthrowing it, reinforcing capitalism by making it easier for workers to be productive.

Eidlin, 20 (Barry Eidlin, Barry Eidlin is an 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, accessed on 6-28-2021, Jacobinmag, "Why Unions Are Good — But Not Good Enough", <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/01/marxism-trade-unions-socialism-revolutionary-organizing)//st>

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 (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 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 “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.

#### Capitalism’s successes necessitate human extinction and destroy the value to life – it’s try or die for alternative organizing

Duzgun 20 Eren Duzgun (teaches Historical Sociology and International Relations at Leiden University, Netherlands), 4-5-2020, "Capitalism, Coronavirus and the Road to Extinction," Socialist Project, https://socialistproject.ca/2020/04/capitalism-coronavirus-and-road-to-extinction/, SJBE

**Covid-19, by contrast, has begun its journey and taken its biggest toll thus far in the most advanced and affluent parts of the world**. This is to say, the contagion is no longer limited to the persistently undernourished, underdeveloped, and war-torn parts of the world; its impact is no longer restricted to a distant wet market or a third world country alone. **Instead, it has emerged and expanded in the very heart of the capitalist world order at a time when capitalism has not only been already firmly established across the globe but has been testing the eco-biological limits of the entire planet. Should things remain the same, Covid-19 and its future cousins are likely to claim the lives of not just ‘some’ people as they did in the past, but of humanity as a whole. In this sense, perhaps for the first time in modern history, the biological blitzkrieg activated by the coronavirus has thrown into sharp relief the immediately existential and undeniably global contradictions and consequences generated by capitalism.** Contradictions on a Global Scale Critical biologists and epidemiologists have put the blame on industrial agriculture as the root cause of the emergence of new pathogens since the 1990s. [According to Rob Wallace](https://climateandcapitalism.com/2020/03/11/capitalist-agriculture-and-covid-19-a-deadly-combination/), giant agribusiness and resource extraction firms have now reached the last virgin forests and smallholder-held farmlands in the world, subordinating them to the logic of capitalist markets. **The loss of the ecological diversity and complexity of these huge tracts of land has increasingly forced wild food operators to hunt in previously untouched parts of the jungle, which, in turn, has increased “the interaction with, and spillover of, previously boxed-in pathogens, including Covid-19.”** Likewise, global warming has forced or allowed pathogens to escape their natural habitat. As a result, new viruses against which we have no immunity “are being sprung free, threatening the whole world.” In short, [as John Vidal writes](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/mar/18/tip-of-the-iceberg-is-our-destruction-of-nature-responsible-for-covid-19-aoe), “we disrupt ecosystems, and we shake viruses loose from their natural hosts. When that happens, they need a new host. Often, we are it.” **That some agribusiness firms have been blatantly risking lives for profit would not come as a surprise to the critical reader**. Even [Bill Gates has been sounding the alarm](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Af6b_wyiwI) about the potentially deadly consequences of irresponsible business practices and new viruses. **Yet, what tends to remain underemphasized in these debates is that the blame belongs neither solely to ‘greedy’ firms that have driven viruses out of their natural habitat, nor to ‘short-sighted’ politicians who have not invested enough in vaccine technology or national health systems. Instead, the problem is rooted in the very structure and rationality of the system as a whole. That is, we may go extinct as a result of the ‘successes’ of the very system ‘we’ created in the first place, i.e., capitalism. How did we end up losing control of an ‘economic’ system of our own making?** This is indeed an anomaly in human history. The conception of the ‘economy’ as an autonomous sphere dictating its own rules over society did not exist in non-capitalist societies. As the economic anthropologist [Karl Polanyi](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Polanyi#Works) put it, “neither under tribal, nor feudal, nor mercantile conditions was there… a separate economic system in society.” The economy either “remained nameless” or had “no obvious meaning,” for the economic process and prices were instituted through non-market means, such as kinship, marriage, age-groups, status, political patronage, etc. Even “where markets were most highly developed, as under the mercantile system,” the economic system, as a rule, “[was absorbed in the social system](https://books.google.ca/books?id=SgHuxQEACAAJ)” and showed “no tendency to expand at the expense of the rest.” In this sense, the market with a distinctive logic, autonomy, and dynamic of its own was completely unknown to our ancestors, and indeed, the emergence of the idea of ‘self-regulating’ markets represented a complete reversal of the way in which past economies functioned. **In order for ‘self-regulating’ markets to ‘self-regulate’, a variety of political and institutional arrangements had to be initiated to progressively eliminate the non-market survival strategies that humans previously relied upon.** Most notably, the age-old communal systems of social and moral regulation needed to be eradicated, a process that systematically subordinated the ‘natural and human substance of society’, i.e., land and labour, to market relations for the first time in history. Rise of Capitalism **At the heart of the rise of capitalism, therefore, rested a ‘political’, legal, and violent process that led to the historically unprecedented characterization of land and labour as commodities. Without commodifying land and labour, i.e., without treating the planet’s living substance as commodities, it would have been impossible to view the ‘economy’ as an institutionally and motivationally self-regulating sphere of life, an almost robotic creature functioning at the expense of human lives and livelihoods. Capitalism presupposed from the very beginning a radical transformation in the human use of nature as well as in the provision of life’s essential requirements. In this sense, the danger of global extinction which we have been going through is not a temporary hiccup in an otherwise smoothly operating capitalist ecosystem but has always been a possibility built into the very structure of market society.** On the one hand, by treating land and labour as commodities, by subjecting people’s utilization of land and enjoyment of life to their ability to continuously increase market competitiveness and productivity, capitalism has enabled massive technological advancements in all spheres of life. This, in turn, has generated, above all, an unprecedented potential to feed, clothe, and accommodate an ever-increasing world population. **On the other hand, however,** [**as Ellen Wood argues**](https://monthlyreview.org/1998/07/01/the-agrarian-origins-of-capitalism/)**, by subordinating all other considerations to the imperatives of market competition, capitalism has also created poverty, homelessness, environmental destruction and pandemics**. Billions of people who could be fed and housed are subjected to immense doses of insecurity, living their lives under the constant threat of joblessness, homelessness, loss of status and starvation. **In a similar fashion, the environment that could be protected is systematically destroyed for profit, and killer viruses that could be contained are unleashed.** Undoubtedly, Covid-19 has become the archetypal example that lays bare “the destructive impulses of a system in which the very fundamentals of existence are subjected to the requirements of profit.” **Can the ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ outcomes of capitalism be somewhat reconciled? Indeed, for a brief period in the Global North, it seemed they could be**. During the so-called [Golden Age of Capitalism](https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-golden-age-of-capitalism-9780198287414) (1945-70), massive productivity increases (alongside working-class struggles) allowed for steady increases in wages, job security, expansion of welfare state, improvements in the living conditions of the majority of the labouring masses as well as the expansion of civil and political liberties. **Yet, this brief period of generalized prosperity and stability also facilitated the incorporation of the western working classes into the dominant capitalist ideology, causing them to turn a blind eye to the economically destabilizing, environmentally destructive, and socially degrading impact of global capitalism in the Global South.** The main ‘problem’ with the Global South has been, by and large, a question of ‘timing’. **Once capitalism was established and consolidated in the Global North, it has not only led to the birth of new and more effective forms of imperialist control and neocolonial expansion but has also irrevocably undermined the potentially positive outcomes of capitalist development elsewhere.** For example, the [MIT political economist Alice Amsden](https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-rise-of-the-rest-9780195170597), a large chunk of whose work in the 1970s and 1980s sought to explain the success of the ‘Asian Tigers’, more recently concluded that the massive technological and infrastructural gap between the North and the South has literally made impossible capitalist ‘development’ of any sort in the vast majority of southern economies since the 1990s. The economic situation in the Global North has gotten progressively worse too. Under the conditions of increased global economic competition wages have been stagnating or declining since the 1970s, while decades of fiscal austerity wiping out most of the economic and social gains of the earlier period. The new reality of high unemployment, stagnant wages, long work hours and precarious jobs has been masked for a while by a debt-driven growth, the unsustainability of which has been bitterly testified by millions of people since the 2008 financial crisis. All in all, market imperatives have been regulating social reproduction almost worldwide for a long time but with no prospect of capitalist ‘development’ for an overwhelming majority of the world’s population in the South and the North alike. **Furthermore, the ecologically disastrous and socially inhumane consequences of capitalism have long outweighed the prospects of material gain in the Global South.** In this respect, what is being painfully realized in the current conjuncture is that the North is no longer able to externalize the worst consequences of such an unsustainable mode of life. The North isn’t and won’t be spared the existential threats posed by global capitalism. **The implication is that any meaningful attempt at solving the present, and future crises needs to take the bull by the horn**. There is literally no choice to be made between ‘capitalism’ and ‘capitalism with a human face’. **As long as the underlying dynamics of our lives remain the same, as long as we keep treating nature and human beings as commodities, no** [**cosmetic surgery**](https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/09/12/why-growth-cant-be-green/) **will do. To the contrary, historical experience suggests that such minimal interventions will sooner or later backfire, re-legitimizing capitalism pure and simple. The only way to ‘re-embed’ our economies and save our lives from ecological collapse is by intervening in the very heart of the beast: land and human beings need to be taken out of the market. The beast is not tameable; it needs to be**[**killed**](https://monthlyreview.org/product/what_every_environmentalist_needs_to_know_about_capitalism/)**.**

#### Vote neg for dual power organizing – only by refusing the 1ac’s opportunistic politics can we produce actual change.

Escalante 18 Alyson Escalante (Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist), 8-24-2018, "Against Electoralism, For Dual Power!," Forge News, https://theforgenews.org/2018/08/24/against-electoralism-for-dual-power/, pat recut sjbe

If we, as socialists, truly fight for a classless world, we must smash the mechanisms which ensure class domination. **We must smash the bourgeois state. This realization led the Bolsheviks to reject the opportunism of the Socialist Revolutionaries and Menshiviks in the Soviets and they chose to overthrow the provisional government themselves. Shockingly, their revolution was successful**. After months of compromise, the workers had grown tired of the opportunist bourgeois socialists. They had seen that the dual power of the soviets and the provisional government was not tenable. One side had to take unitary power. Most importantly, the workers saw that the bourgeois government had done nothing for them: it had smashed their printing presses, it had crushed their demonstrations, it had broken their strikes. Of course, it could do nothing else, the bourgeois state is designed to do precisely this. The events of October, 1917 ought to have concretely proven that the strategy of infiltrating the bourgeois government is untenable. **Lenin and the Bolsheviks proved that the workers are willing to throw the bourgeois state away in favor of a dictatorship of the proletariat. And yet, here we are 111 years later and large factions of the largest socialist organization in the United States echo the cowardly and worthless drivelings of the Menshiviks and Socialist Revolutionaries.** Dual Power Today **I am sure that at this point, the opportunists reading this have already begun to type out their typical objection: the world is different than it was in 1917, and the conditions of the United States in no way echo the conditions which enabled the Bolsheviks to achieve revolutionary success. To this tried and true objection, there is one simple answer: you are entirely correct, and that is why we need to abandon electoralism and working within the bourgeois state. What were the conditions which allowed the Bolsheviks to successfully revolt? The conditions were that of Dual Power. Alongside the capitalist state, there existed a whole set of institutions and councils which met the needs of the workers.** The soviets, a parallel socialist government made up of individual councils, successfully took over many governmental responsibilities in some parts of Petrograd. In the radical Viborg district, the Bolshevik controlled soviets provided government services like mail, alongside programs that could meet the needs of workers. **When a far right coup was attempted against the provisional government, it was troops loyal to the Bolshevik factions within the soviet who repelled the coup plotters, proving concretely to the workers of Petrograd that the socialists could not only provide for their needs, but also for their defense. In short: the Bolsheviks recognized that instead of integrating into the bourgeois state, they could operate outside of it to build dual power. They could establish programs of elected representatives who would serve the workers**. They would not bolster the capitalist state in the name of socialism, they would offer an alternative to it. **And so, when the time came for revolt, the masses were already to loyal to the Bolsheviks. The only party who had never compromised, who had denounced the unpopular imperialist wars, who had rejected the provisional government entirely, was the party who successfully gained the support of the workers.** And so, many of us on the more radical fringes of the socialist movement wonder why it is the the DSA and other socialist opportunists seem to think that we can win by bolstering the capitalist state? **We wonder, given this powerful historical precedent, why they devote their energy to getting more Ocasios elected; what good does one more left democrat who will abandon the workers do for us?** The answer we receive in return is always the same: we want to win small changes that will make life for the workers easier; we want to protect food stamps and healthcare. And do this, we reply: what makes you think reformism is the only way to do this. **When the bourgeois state in California was happy to let black children go to school unfed, the Black Panthers didn’t rally around democratic candidates, they became militant and fed the children themselves. In the 40s and 50s, socialists in New York saw people going without healthcare and instead of rallying behind democratic candidates, they built the IWO to provide healthcare directly. Both these groups took up our pressing revolutionary task: building dual power.** Imagine if all those hours the DSA poured into electing Ocasio were instead used to feed the people of New York, to provide them with medical care, to ensure their needs were met. **Imagine the masses seeing socialism not as a pipe dream we might achieve through electing more imperialists, but as a concrete movement which is currently meeting their needs?** The fact is, we are not nearly ready for revolution. Socialists in the United States have failed to meet the needs of the people, and as long as their only concrete interaction with the masses is handing them a voter registration form, they will continue to fail the people. **Our task now is not to elect representatives to advocate for the people; it is much more gruelingly laborious than that. Our task is to serve the people. Our task is to build dual power.** **The movement to do this is underway**. **Members of the DSA refoundation caucus have begun to move the left of the DSA in this direct, socialist groups like Philly Socialists have begun to build dual power through GED programs and tenants unions, many branches of the Party For Socialism and Liberation have begun to feed the people and provide for their concrete needs, and Red Guard collectives in Los Angeles have built serve the people programs and taken on a stance of militant resistance to gentrification**. The movement is growing, its time is coming, and dual power is achievable within our life time. The opportunists are, in a sense, correct. We are not where we were in 1917, but we can begin to move in that direction and dual power can take us there. **In order to achieve dual power we have to recognize that Lenin was right: there will be no socialist gains by working within state institutions designed to crush socialism. Furthermore, we must recognize that the strategies of the electoral opportunists trade off with dual power. Electing candidates drains resources, time, and energy away from actually serving the people.** **And so, we should commit to undertake the difficult and dangerous task of building dual power**. We must reject opportunism, we must name the democratic party as our enemy, we must rally around power directly in the hands of the socialist movement. **We do not have a parallel system of soviets in the United States. We can change that**. Someday the cry “all power to the soviets” will be heard again. Lets make it happen.

# K

#### CP: The United States should to recognize an unconditional right of agricultural laborers to strike through tribal law.

#### Normal means is federal law, but tribal law is key to respect indigenous sovereignty and solves the aff better. The perm is severance and creates an overlap that undermines tribal jurisdiction and 1ac plan text proves they defend the NLRA.

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

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

# NC

## NC

#### Permissibility negates:

#### [1] Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation[[1]](#footnote-1) which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility and proving one disproves the other two. Semantics outweighs – A. it’s key to predictability since we prep based on the wording of the res B. It’s constitutive to the rules of debate since the judge is obligated to vote on the resolutional text.

#### [2] Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.

#### [3] Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both the “P” and “~P” are true.

#### The metaethic is perspectivism – truth is not absolute but rather created by individuals based on their own individual perspective. Prefer it

#### [1] Opacity – we can never access another person’s perspective because we can never fully understand who someone else is or what they think. Every truth I create cannot be universalized because I can’t guarantee that they will create the same truth because they do what they want.

#### [2] Linguistics – Truth is constructed by language, which is completely arbitrary. Nothing tells me that a chair is a chair; I only assign it that name arbitrarily because I want to. Meaning can’t be contained within language if we make it up ourselves, and truth doesn’t exist absent language.

#### But, the state of nature leads to infinite violence – competing truth claims means conflicts cannot be resolved. Two warrants:

#### [1] Ambiguity – everyone can assert their own claims to be true and refuse contestation – this means we always fight over who is correct. This is irresolvable because there is no mediator to adjudicate the dispute and tell who is correct – we just fight forever

#### [2] Self-Interest – everyone wants their truth claims to be true because it benefits them – this leads to conflict because we can’t divide limited resources and must compete with each other – terminates in death because neither of us want to concede to the other

#### This state of nature is brutish and has no conception of morality because we don’t have any unified truth to guide us, and thus outweighs on magnitude. The solution is the creation of the sovereign to mediate what is true and enforce the law; they are the ultimate ruler and arbitrator. It must eliminate all conflicts to bring peace to our violent natures. Thus, the standard is consistency with the will of the sovereign. Prefer it because it outweighs on bindingness: Only the sovereign can get everyone to follow their rule and enforce the law, it creates motivations for any moral rules we create. Otherwise, the framework collapses and truth becomes impossible.

## Offense

#### Negate –

#### [1] The sovereign has absolute authority; strikes contest the rule of the authority of the sovereign which leads to infinite regress and freezes action. That applies to agriculture workers – unrest in any sector will breed more revolution.

Lloyd and Sreedhar (Sharon A. Lloyd and Susanne Sreedhar, Sharon Lloyd is Professor of Philosophy, Law, and Political Science at the University of Southern California. She co-founded the USC Center for Law and Philosophy, and directs the USC Levan Institute's Conversations in Practical Ethics Program., Susanne Sreedhar is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Boston University. Sreedhar's work on social contract theory has been influential, and has mostly been aimed at the nature and scope of obligation within political systems, and the possibility of ethical civil disobedience within a Hobbesian system., 2-12-2002, accessed on 6-29-2021, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2020 Edition), "Hobbes’s Moral and Political Philosophy (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)", <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hobbes-moral/)//st>

Although Hobbes offered some mild pragmatic grounds for preferring monarchy to other forms of government, his main concern was to argue that **effective government—whatever its form—must have absolute authority.** Its powers must be neither divided nor limited. **The powers of legislation, adjudication, enforcement, taxation, war-making (and the less familiar right of control of normative doctrine) are connected in such a way that a loss of one may thwart effective exercise of the rest;** for example, **legislation without interpretation and enforcement will not serve to regulate conduct. Only a government that possesses all of what Hobbes terms the “essential rights of sovereignty” can be reliably effective**, since **where partial sets of these rights are held by different bodies that disagree** in their judgments as to what is to be done, **paralysis of effective government, or degeneration into a civil war to settle their dispute, may occur.** Similarly, **to impose limitation on the authority of the government is to invite irresoluble disputes over whether it has overstepped those limits. If each person is to decide for herself whether the government should be obeyed**, factional disagreement—**and war to settle the issue, or at least paralysis of effective government—are [is] quite possible**. **To refer resolution of the question to some further authority, itself also limited and so open to challenge for overstepping its bounds, would be to initiate an infinite regress of non-authoritative ‘authorities’** (where the buck never stops). To refer it to a further authority itself unlimited, would be just to relocate the seat of absolute sovereignty, a position entirely consistent with Hobbes’s insistence on absolutism. **To avoid the horrible prospect of governmental collapse and return to the state of nature, people should treat their sovereign as having absolute authority.**

#### [2] The sovereign hasn’t granted the unconditional right to strike in the squo - proves that it doesn’t want it. Passing the res blocks the sovereign’s will.

# Case

## Hijack

#### [1] Util collapses to Hobbes – in order to aggregate pain and pleasure to make any calculations of death, there needs to be a sovereign to create meaning to explain why these things are bad – controls the internal link to a-spec because only the sovereign can have the final say in what causes pain or pleasure.

#### [2] perspectivism takes out util - humans have different conceptions of pain and pleasure - proved by disagreements over things like whether or not religion is good bc ppl feel them in different ways - hobbes solves by delegating the moral question to an absolute authority - o/w on certainty bc that way we’ll know that we’re making the right decision

#### [3] we have a duty under util to avoid pain and pleasure - the state of nature is infinitely bad bc it causes an infinite amount of pain since ppl have moral disagreements therefore we must avoid it at all costs

## Framework

First

#### Util fails:

#### [1] Aggregation – each type of pleasure is qualitatively different, so we can’t quantify and compare pleasures which answers calculations. This takes out a-spec – if the government doesn’t know how to calculate consequences even if it has a duty to do so it can’t take action

#### [2] Induction Fails – You only know induction works because past experiences have told you it has, but that is in itself a form of induction, so you use induction to prove induction – that’s circular.

#### [3] Desirability is circular – you define morality based off what is desirable, yet you only know what’s is desirable off of what is moral. Reject circular fwks since they’re logically invalid which means we can therefore justify anything.

#### [4] Supererogatory action objection – only maximally valuable actions can be good under util, but there’s always a better action that you can take – that turns intuitions because it guts counter-intuitive permissible actions. Donating to charity is good but supererogatory, and maximizing wellbeing would require you to do it.

Second

### Epistemic Confidence

#### Epistemic confidence:

#### [A] Resolvability – It’s impossible to know or multiply the numerical probability by the magnitude of an impact

#### [B] Vacuum – without an underlying moral theory we do not even know if it’s moral to engage in the multiplication process of epistemic modesty

#### [C] Circular – Modesty presumes confidence in modesty

#### [D] Key to phil ed – otherwise debaters will always go for extinction level impacts and never learn the nuances of a FW which outweighs since it’s key to LD

Third,

### Yes clac indicts

#### Calc indicts are good – there’s no warrant for why calc indicts are nibs, if your fw doesn’t work and has issues we should be able to point that out – k2 phil ed because we can point out the flaws in your framing which outweighs since phil is uq to ld and k2 resolvability since pointing out your framing is wrong is a calc indict and without them we could never resolve phil debates.

Calc indicts not a voter – this voter in itself is a nib and there’s no reason why nibs like theory are bad – debating calc indicts is better for phil ed because we can learn how to debate phiil better by practicing and we can still talk about the topic proven nby this round

#### Reject the argument --- prevents baiting of friv because youu’ll hide a million reasons why any argument is an indepnednet ovter– they haven’t warranted dtd I nthe 1ac so deafult to nc paradigm issues on 1ac theory

### Actor Spec

#### [1] Winning consequences fail takes out aspec – even if governments are supposed to use consequences if they don’t know how to calculate them then that freezes action.

#### [2] Is-ought fallacy – just because some states use util doesn’t make it right.

#### [3] The NC hijacks – if I prove my theory is right, states ought to use it

#### [4] Turn – proves calc responses are true since governments make wrong predictions like the Iraq war constantly.

### No Intent-Foresight Distinction

#### [1] Assumes consequentialism – if predictions are incoherent, then we can't be culpable for certain foresights.

#### [2] Contradiction – If I give somebody CPR but still foresee them dying, I am not intending for them to die – I am still intending them to live.

### Phenomenal Introspection

#### [1] No warrant – it asserts pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable but provides no reason why

#### [2] Impact justified – there’s no reason why we need to follow our biological intuitions to develop moral theories

#### [3] Triggers permissibility – this doesn’t justify valuing other people’s pain or pleasure, just your own, which means we don’t have obligations under util to do good for others

[4] we can observe the state of nature too – it’s always been bad

### Extinction

#### [1] Winning epistemic confidence takes out extinction first – proves that my framework is the only true one and consequences don’t matter so a 1% risk is negligible. That’s prefiat so moral uncertainty doesn’t exist.

#### [2] Policy paralysis – if we only focus on preventing extinction, we will never take action if it has a 0.1% chance of causing death

#### [3] Fallacy of Origin – just because extinction precludes moral theorizing, doesn’t meant that extinction is necessarily a good or a bad thing – breathing is a prereq to theorizing but that isn’t our moral standard.

#### [4] They conflate postfiat and prefiat – they have justifications for why extinction might happen but only within the debate round. They don’t solve extinction, so they don’t solve moral uncertainty in the prefiat world.

#### [5] Flips moral uncertainty – if we always value extinction first then we can never value other theories because there’s always going to be a risk of extinction which prevents theorizing of any kind

## Case

#### [1] Strength of link on biodiversity – increasing the wage of ag workers isn’t going to solve for all the environmental harms of things like fracking and mining that aren’t agricultural.

#### Agriculture is being automized – means that if workers strike, they’ll just be replaced. 1AC Bhaskar evidence goes neg – if we increase the reliance on tech they’ll replace workers.

Brown 21 [Dalvin Brown, 4-22-2021, "Farmers have more mouths to feed. Bring in the robots.," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/04/22/tech-in-farming-growth/]

Robots are shouldering more responsibility at Church Brothers Farms in Gonzalez, Calif. From sunrise through sundown, rows of lettuce, broccoli, and cauliflower are planted, tended to and harvested on the thousand-acre ranch — partially by humans, increasingly by machines. The products are then packaged and shipped to major grocery store chains and restaurants nationwide. You might have seen their products in the frozen food aisle under the Green Giant brand at Walmart, Target or virtually every other major supermarket. But what you probably haven’t seen is how much more work autonomous machines and drones are doing on the farm as the minimum wage ticked up a dollar in California this year, heading toward $15 an hour for larger employers across the Golden State, effective 2022. “In the past, labor was relatively cheap compared to technology. Today the cost of labor has risen. So technology and labor costs are getting much closer,” said Josh Ruiz, vice president of agricultural operations at Church Brothers Farms, which employs 60 full-time workers. He runs the firm’s innovation department, which brings in tech from other companies and toys with building in-house farm contraptions. “While I wish I could pay everybody who works for me $100 an hour, the problem is our consumers are not willing to pay that kind of food price,” he said. [Farmworkers could be replaced by robots sooner than we think](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/national/wp/2019/02/17/feature/inside-the-race-to-replace-farmworkers-with-robots/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_9) It’s not just California, and Church Brothers is far from the only farm going hi-tech. Labor costs, climate change and growing food demand are ushering in an era of machine modernization across the nation’s agricultural landscape. The situation prompted Church Brothers to invest in several autonomous robots and drones in recent years. The company even spent a million dollars to create a broccoli harvesting contraption that works, but it requires more investment, Ruiz said. Advocates for robotic farming tout increased automation as a step toward improving efficiency while freeing people from monotonous, backbreaking tasks that few laborers want to do. Labor unions welcome more machines, so long as farmworkers benefit, too. “Technological change can be advantageous. We don’t want to stand in the way of creating a production method that’s less taxing on the (human) body,” said Baldemar Velasquez, president of the [Farm Labor Organizing Committee,](http://www.floc.com/wordpress/) a union representing farmworkers in the Midwest and North Carolina. “But agriculture is like any other job. As soon as automation begins to take place, it creates a problem (for) job opportunities.” [Why it will be years before robot butlers take over your household chores](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/03/23/future-robots-home-jetsons/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_16) Automation has been plucking away at the work humans have to do on the farm for decades. Machines now milk cows, unearth vegetables and package products faster and more cheaply than humans can. But now, in the age of artificial intelligence, robots and computer vision are enabling mechanisms to do even more. Cameras on drones provide vast information on crop health. Robotic lenses can zoom in on seedlings to predict when vegetables will be ripe for picking. Autonomous machines can roam around and get rid of weeds without a human operator. Many small farms operate with slim profit margins and can’t or don’t want to invest in the latest gadgetry. However, those that can afford to welcome a shift, have more options than ever to choose from as “AgTech” start-ups prepare AI-powered systems for a full farm invasion. Last week, Seattle-based Carbon Robotics released a new weed-eliminating robot that autonomously drives through fields to target unwanted plants. Unlike other automated weeders on the market, which apply targeted herbicide or move soil to attack weeds at the root, the latest machine uses high-power lasers to zap away pest plants without disrupting the ground. “We’re pretty proud of the fact that we don’t tear up the topsoil,” said Paul Mikesell, founder and CEO of Carbon Robotics, the manufacturer of the Autonomous Weeder. The company primarily sells its products on the West Coast throughout Washington, New Mexico, Oregon and California, but it’s expanding into other regions. Other firms take different approaches to automate tasks on the farm. This year, Tevel Aerobotics Technologies unveiled [a flying autonomous robot](https://www.tevel-tech.com/) that uses artificial intelligence to identify ripe fruit and pluck it all day. Industry heavyweight John Deere is investing in autonomy and AI to have its tractors embed individual seeds in the ground perfectly at the same distance and depth thousands of times in mere seconds. Start-ups like [Bear Flag Robotics](https://www.bearflagrobotics.com/) are working to bring computer vision to tried-and-true tractors already on the market. This comes as drones become more commonplace, too, enabling ranchers to monitor plants and livestock from above. [Robotic lizards may have a place in future disaster response, researchers say](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/04/06/innovations-robot-lizard-australia/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_31) It all contributes to what’s known as precision agriculture, where farmers use less to grow more or adopt new gadgets to increase crop production while cutting down on waste. The field is increasing in popularity. The market for advanced farming tools was estimated to be about $7 billion in 2020, and it’s projected to reach $12.8 billion over the next four years, according to the research firm MarketsandMarkets. Part of the projected rise stems from farms wanting greater efficiency in the face of labor issues. The number of people working as farmers, ranchers and other agricultural professionals is expected to drop 6 percent by 2029, according to the [Bureau of Labor Statistics.](https://www.bls.gov/ooh/management/farmers-ranchers-and-other-agricultural-managers.htm#tab-6) The industry has already faced decades of job declines in the United States, even as agricultural production rises to feed a growing population. Government investment is also expected to contribute to more intelligent devices on farms, analysts say. And not just in the United States. In October, the United States Department of Agriculture announced a $14.6 million development fund for institutions working on innovations to support farmers. Earlier this year, the European Union kicked off a [$9.4 million program](https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101016807) to replace unsafe, laborious tasks with machines across Spain, Greece, France and the Netherlands. The European agency also plans to enhance older-model farm equipment with autonomous systems to keep costs down. It’s the kind of thing Bear Flag Robotics specializes in. For the past four years, the Sunnyvale, Calif.-based company has worked on its suite of AI-powered cameras, GPS and lidar systems designed to be retrofitted onto ordinary tractors. It raised $7.9 million in funding to bring the tech to more tractors. The firm buys the 15-feet-tall vehicles from dealerships, suits them up with navigation systems and lets growers rent them. The company works with farmers to set up a boundary map of the area that needs work. Its algorithm plots a path for the tractor to follow, and the equipment uses that pattern to traverse a field. Farming operations pay per acre to use them. A real-time video feed is shared with the farmer, who can command and control the machine if something goes wrong. Church Brothers Farms is a customer, though it’s illegal for tractors to move without a safety driver onboard in California, so they assign a worker to be onboard. “One day, the autonomous tractor might allow me to operate at night with one person managing five tractors, versus having five drivers that don’t want to work through the middle of the night,” Ruiz said. The farm also deploys weed-killing robots from [FarmWise](https://farmwise.io/) and [Naio Technologies](https://www.naio-technologies.com/en/) that use computer vision to find and weed crops. Smart weeding is a crowded field of AgTech, with companies taking varying approaches to get the task done. San Francisco-based FarmWise scans the ground for invasive weeds around crops and plucks them out. France-based Naio uses a series of brushes and tools to scrape, suffocate or pull weeds to kill them. [In these West Virginia and California agricultural towns, farmers and ranchers are battling the pandemic and big industry](https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2020/road-to-recovery/farmers-ranchers-coronavirus-food-california-west-virginia/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_51) Carbon Robotics says it wants to avoid damaging the soil, so it has used thermal bursts to fry weeds since the company started in 2018. The firm’s latest weeding machine has eight lasers, twice as many as the previous generation to kill more weeds faster, CEO Mikesell says. Growers are interested in the robots because hand-weeding is physically taxing, expensive and time-consuming for humans to do. Robots, on the other hand, can get the job done again, and again. And they don’t cut corners if they get tired. “The machines don’t know that it’s Friday at five o’clock. They can just keep running, and do the job properly, regardless of what the time clock says,” Ruiz said. “They’re programmable and sometimes do a better job because they operate at the right speed.” It’s true that AI-powered farm machines may one day be able to perform most tasks that require people today. But for the time being, humans have a leg up in some areas, such as handling delicate objects. Robots tend to have [dexterity problems](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2020/12/23/innovations-bionic-hand-ai/?itid=lk_inline_manual_56), which can cause them to hold objects like fruit and vegetables too aggressively.

#### And automation of jobs kills the leverage of worker strikes – Paris proves

Cokelaere 20 [Hanne Cokelaere, 1-15-2020, "Robot scab! How automation is threatening striking French workers," POLITICO, https://www.politico.eu/article/robot-scab-automation-threatening-striking-french-workers/]

PARIS — A national strike has brought most public transport in the French capital to a halt for 42 days and counting, but two Metro lines have been operating as if nothing is amiss. The secret? They run without drivers. Unions have long been worried that automating public transport could cost jobs, but the ongoing standoff between workers and the government over [pension reform](https://www.politico.eu/article/never-mind-the-strikes-heres-the-french-pension-reform-strikes-edouard-philippe-emmanuel-macron/) is highlighting the potential advantages of replacing humans with machines. During the Christmas break, strike action saw hundreds of dazed tourists and exasperated Parisians hoping to travel across the city jammed into a hallway at the Saint-Lazare station — a hub where trains, suburban rail and Metro lines intersect. But only one of the four Metro lines usually servicing the second-busiest station on the Paris Metro system was operating. “The No. 14 is the only one running,” an employee of the Paris public transport operator told the seething crowd. Paris has two automated lines: The No. 14 connecting Saint-Lazare with stops across the Seine River was the first to be opened in 1998. The No. 1, the capital’s busiest link from East to West, went driverless in 2012 to allow trains to run at a higher frequency than would be possible with human operators. Work to upgrade a [third Metro](https://www.ratp.fr/automatisationdela4) connection — a key link crossing the city north to south — is due to be completed in 2022, and Paris public transport operator RATP is [mulling](http://www.leparisien.fr/info-paris-ile-de-france-oise/transports/comment-valerie-pecresse-veut-automatiser-la-ligne-13-du-metro-12-04-2019-8051640.php) a fourth automated line. The strikes have made driverless trains a political issue, and it's being seized on by candidates for the Paris mayoral election in March. Benjamin Griveaux, a candidate to replace Anne Hidalgo in the town hall, [pledged](https://twitter.com/BGriveaux/status/1206520951913033728) in December to work with regional authorities to speed up the automation of the Metro network to “make the lives of Parisians easier — even during strikes.” His competitor, a [rebel candidate](https://www.ft.com/content/73c7a6a6-ee57-11e9-ad1e-4367d8281195) from Griveaux's own La République En Marche party, echoed the plan. “An automated Metro is a more punctual Metro — [a Metro] that can continue to operate in times of strikes,” he said in an [LCI interview](https://twitter.com/VillaniCedric/status/1214859687163768832). That's dismaying unions. Frédéric Delebarre, a representative of the CGT union at the RATP, complained that advocating the automation of public transport to soften the blow of the strikes “is cutting corners left and right.” Delebarre said automation would take years and would be very expensive, so it makes sense for the government to negotiate an end to the strikes instead. “To prevent conflicts ... it's easier for the government to abandon its reform program than to automate the [Metro] lines. That's less costly,” he said. But so far the government isn't backing down on reforming the pension system, although it is showing signs of movement on the actual retirement age. It wants to introduce a [universal points system](https://www.politico.eu/article/never-mind-the-strikes-heres-the-french-pension-reform-strikes-edouard-philippe-emmanuel-macron/) to save up a pension, and do away with France's more than 42 industry-specific systems. Among the unions' concerns are [an increase of the retirement age,](https://www.cgt.fr/actualites/france/retraite/mobilisation/et-ma-retraite-cest-pour-quand) exceptions for taxing jobs and a [decrease](https://www.cgt.fr/comm-de-presse/reforme-des-retraites-aujourdhui-dans-la-rue-demain-continue) of pension payments. As the strikes drag on, public opinion is shifting against workers while enthusiasm grows for driverless trains. Some fed-up Parisians have launched an [online petition](https://www.change.org/p/gouvernement-et-ratp-lancons-l-automatisation-de-l-ensemble-des-lignes-de-m%C3%A9tro-parisien) calling for a full automation of the Metro network, which has gathered over 10,000 signatures. Any acceleration of the current robot plans would be a bitter outcome for transport worker unions, which argue that they've got the best interests of passengers at heart by sticking with people. “It’s not about [opposition to] automation in itself, or modernization,” Delebarre said. “It simply has an impact on employment.” Having a human on board trains also “allows for a faster intervention for users, and it reduces feelings of insecurity,” he added. The Solidaires union in September [sought](https://solidaires.org/Train-fou-sur-la-ligne-1-Quand-l-usager-devient-otage-de-l-automatisation) to highlight what it sees as the safety risks of automation following an incident it described as an “unhinged” Metro whizzing past three stops. That showed the need for a “human presence” on trains, the union said. It “remains opposed to the politics of automation of metro lines, which eliminates jobs, dehumanizes the network and creates a drop in security.” The company admitted the events may have been upsetting but [denied](https://twitter.com/Ligne1_RATP/status/1174299887741165568) passengers were in any danger. According to a RATP spokeswoman, automating lines doesn’t remove the Metro’s reliance on staff. There are still people controlling the system even if they're no longer driving trains. Even the No. 1 and No. 14 lines still need human backup. “If we’re able to open those lines, that’s because there’s enough staff to open them,” she said. While the strikes have focused attention on automated metro lines, the main goal of the RATP is to make its system more efficient rather than get rid of occasionally striking workers. "We’re in favor of automated Metro links, but we're not unrealistic," said Michel Babut, deputy president of the transport users' association AUT. “We know not all lines will be automated.” The main aim of increasing automation is to tackle overcrowding. “Saturation happens every day of the year. Strikes, fortunately, don't.”

# 2NR

## Sovgt bad

#### Don’t drop me, drop the sovereign – I’ll concede that the sovereign is corrupt, so we shouldn’t unify our moral truths with it.

#### [1] Use an active vs passive distinction for independent voters – if I’m saying slurs, that’s obviously bad, but anyone can twist a framework to sound wrong – e.g. I could say util is bad because it would justify slavery since states could assume that some people don’t feel pain and pleasure and manipulate them – absent me explicitly saying something harmful in round, I shouldn’t be dropped.

#### [2] Dropping the sovereign solves – that was the part of my moral theory that you were indicting so I’ll concede that I’m wrong but don’t drop me because I should be able to learn from my mistakes – we can’t rectify the abuse that already happened so it’s a question of norm setting. If you don’t give me a chance to learn from my mistakes I’ll just prep out this argument instead of never running it again.

#### [3] K2 Testing the aff from multiple angles – i shouldn’t be punsiehd for wanting to test ur aff from different perspectives

#### [4] soverign isnt’ oppressive- I’ll still agree that we shouldn’t use the sovereign but if they decide to push in the 2ar the sovgt isnt oppressive because a sovgt has the obligation to protect its people from harm – if the sovgt was to allow racism or oppress them the nit wouldn’t be alegitmate contract in the first place, so nobody would have to follow it

#### [5] The sovereign is inevitable – people will inevitably form groups to protect themselves and have one person be the elader - evne if the sovereign is bad, it’s the only thing that we can ever reach using morala deliberation.

## Pic

#### The US ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike through tribal law.

#### The net benefit is coopting the aff offense – we respect indigenous sovereignty by using Navajo law to maintain employer neutrality so they can’t discriminate against their workers. This solves for worker power – it covers what the employee and worker are and are not allowed to do in their relationship with each other. Using cultural mechanisms enables tribal jurisdiction and gives the natives more legitimacy. Historically unions have been used against natives to strike against them, but tribal law enables unions to work with natives instead of opposing them.

#### The perm fails –

#### [A] It’s severance – the aff explicitly says that they defend the NLRA so defending tribal law would be a complete shift. Severance is a voter – a) it allows them to shift out of any off position I read like a disad – shiftiness is bad because it prevents my ability to form a coherent 2nr b) kills clash since I won’t know what your actual advocacy is until the 1ar or 2ar.

#### [B] Settler shiftiness – settlers will always make empty promises to natives to fix things e.g. they’ll say that they’ll return native land after x policy is done but it never happens – insofar as they’re defending the NLRA any alternate action besides the counterplan text allows for it to get coopted.

#### [C] Tribal law and the NLRA policies are distinct – NLRA sets different relations between the employer and the employee – e.g. tribal law maintains employer neutrality and uses card check recognition while these don’t exist in federal law.

#### That solves the aff – agriculture workers are allowed to strike but instead they do it under tribal law, which protects natives from having unions used against them and allows for better labor organization using policies card check recognition. Use sufficiency framing, they have to prove a substantial solvency deficit or presume it doesn’t exist and judge kick if we lose the cp – it’s a logical extension of conditionality.

## K

## Thesis Claim

#### IT’S TRY OR DIE FOR SOLVING EXTINCTION. Capitalism relies on using a self-regulating market strategy to reward those who generate profit, but that relies on the oppression of non-market survival strategies and results in the commodification of land, labor, and human livelihoods. The threat of extinction is built into the market society – control and expansion into land for money creates disease threats that mutate into extinction scenarios as well as causing poverty and other pandemics. The endless consumption of resources means busting through the carbon budget, rushing towards 2 degrees, which locks in irreversible feedback effects that make the planet uninhabitable.

Smith card was cut before any warrant was read – our ev is better and explainst he cuase

Purely theoretical babt hwo ppl can stop growth but it’s impossible isnce pol willl always prpirotze short term success over actual change bc cap is more profitable

#### That outweighs the aff –

### O/W Climate

#### [1] Value to life – even if they can claim extinction scenarios, capitalism destroys any meaningful life that you can live. We’ve won that people have their labor commodified and they are treated as pawns within the system proven by things like increasing rates of homelessness and poverty – even if they can win that they save lives, these lives only matter insofar as people can truly live to enjoy them, otherwise it creates cycles of misery which turns the aff under util. We both have extinction scenarios but only I have the value to life impact – it’s a sufficient tiebreaker.

#### [2] Capitalism is the root cause – we exploit the environment for profit so we can gain more natural resources to keep up with the market e.g. Jeff Bezos cutting down forests so that he can get more resources to Amazon. Our Duzgun evidence is amazing on this – we’ll push further and further into the environment to gain any advantage that we can. Solving for capitalism solves for the root motive for destroying the environment – if people are no longer pressured to keep up with the market they won’t have the need to abuse the environment. Solves for the aff and is better – banning one type of worker isn’t going to solve long lasting problems like fracking, mining, and invading habitats for non agricultural reasons but dual power will.

### Eidlin

#### Unions strengthen capitalism – they only exist in response to unfair capitalist practices, but they aren’t enough because they’re purely defensive – instead of resisting against the state and the bourgeoisie, unions and strikes serve only to make the workplace more efficient. This strengthens cap – they’re only improving the system so they can work in it harder. Two impacts – a) Improving companies is bad – as more people get employed, the bourgeoisie uses competition for profit to split the workers apart, eliminating the possibility of dual power organizing and party politics since they will never unify with each other b) workers will think “oh look all my problems have been solved because my workplace isn’t abusing me anymore” and continue to work and support the people who are oppressing them in the first place.

### AT Perm

Havnet read oen and fails

#### [1] The perm fails – they don’t address the underlying problem which is the abusive system of the bourgeoisie which no bargaining will change. The alt solves this because a rejection of capitalism means that we eliminate the state and replace it with dual power organizing.

#### [2] Don’t give them severance – even if you don’t buy that the link is a disad to the perm, they need to change their entire advocacy but that’s bad since a) it allows them to shift out of any off position I read like a disad – shiftiness is bad because it prevents my ability to form a coherent 2nr b) kills clash since I won’t know what your actual advocacy is until the 1ar or 2ar.

## Alt

#### The alternative is dual power organizing. Instead of working inside the state to change policies, we work outside of it, providing our own institutions to create change – proven by past events like the Black Panthers distributing food and socialists providing childcare and healthcare to the people by themselves instead of through the state. That solves for any violent transition and makes the aff feasible – instead of relying on the state, people will naturally transition to the socialist organizations which allows them to take power and override the authority of the state.

#### That solves case – dual power allows for fiari woring conditiosinb y getting rid of the motive to oppress I nthe first place

Not a communist reovlition – dual power allows for a shift

No reason why only pa can fund things and they dindt read a crad so it’s my assertion vs theirs – empirically proven and can be done using intstitituions

1. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)