#### Cap K

### Answers to Cap Kritiks:

Alt bad, cap better.

**No Solvency: Alternatives to capitalism fail – lack of individual choice results in tyranny or failure**

**Allan Meltzer March 12, 2009, “Why Capitalism?” 2008-2009 Bradley Lecture Series, Allan Meltzer is Professor of Political Economy at Carnegie Mellon University’s School of Business, Visiting Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, First Recipient of the AEI Irving Kristol Award, and Chairman of the International Financial Institution Advisory Commission,** [**http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.29525,filter.all/pub\_detail.asp**](http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.29525,filter.all/pub_detail.asp)

Alternatives to Capitalism **Critics of capitalism** emphasize their dislike of greed and self-interest. They talk a great deal about social justice and fairness, but they **do not propose an acceptable alternative to achieve their ends.** The alternatives that have been tried are types of Socialism or Communism or other types of authoritarian rule. Anti-capitalist proposals suffer from two crippling drawbacks. First, they ignore the Kantian principle about human imperfection. Second, they ignore individual differences. In place of individual choice under capitalism, they substitute rigid direction done to achieve some proclaimed end such as equality, fairness, or justice. These ends are not precise and, most important, individuals differ about what is fair and just. In practice, the rulers' choices are enforced, often using fear, terror, prison, or other punishment. The history of the twentieth century illustrates how enforcement of promised ends became the justification for deplorable means. And the ends were not realized. Transferring resource allocation decisions to government bureaus does not eliminate crime, greed, self-dealing, conflict of interest, and corruption. Experience tells us these problems remain. The form may change, but as Kant recognized, the problems continue. Ludwig von Mises recognized in the 1920s that fixing prices and planning resource use omitted an essential part of the allocation problem. Capitalism allocates by letting relative prices adjust to equal the tradeoffs expressed by buyers' demands. Fixing prices eliminates the possibility of efficient allocation and replaces consumer choice with official decisions. Some gain, but others lose; the losers want to make choices other than those that are dictated to them. Not all Socialist societies have been brutal. In the nineteenth century, followers of Robert Owen, the Amana people, and many others chose a Socialist system. Israeli pioneers chose a collectivist system, the kibbutz. **None of these arrangements produced sustainable growth. None survived.** All faced the problem of imposing allocative decisions that satisfied the decision-making group, sometimes a majority, often not. Capitalism recognizes that where individual wants differ, the market responds to the mass; minorities are free to develop their favored outcome. Walk down the aisles of a modern supermarket. There are products that satisfy many different tastes or beliefs. Theodor Adorno was a leading critic of postwar capitalism as it developed in his native Germany, in Europe, and in the United States. He found the popular culture vulgar, and he distrusted the workers' choices. He wanted a Socialism that he hoped would uphold the values he shared with other intellectuals. Capitalism, he said, valued work too highly and true leisure too little. He disliked jazz, so he was not opposed to Hitler's ban in the 1930s. But Adorno offered no way of achieving the culture he desired other than to impose his tastes on others and ban all choices he disliked. This appealed to people who shared his view. Many preferred American pop culture whenever they had the right to choose. Capitalism permits choices and the freedom to make them. Some radio stations play jazz, some offer opera and symphonies, and many play pop music. Under capitalism, advertisers choose what they sponsor, and they sponsor programs that people choose to hear or watch. Under Socialism, the public watches and hears what someone chooses for them. The public had little choice. In Western Europe change did not come until boats outside territorial limits offered choice. The Templeton Foundation recently ran an advertisement reporting the answers several prominent intellectuals gave to the question: "Does the free market corrode moral character?" Several respondents recognized that free markets operate within a political system, a legal framework, and the rule of law. The slave trade and slavery became illegal in the nineteenth century. Before this a majority enslaved a minority. This is a major blot on the morality of democratic choice that public opinion and the law eventually removed. In the United States those who benefitted did not abandon slave owning until forced by a war. Most respondents to the Templeton question took a mixed stand. The philosopher John Gray recognized that greed and envy are driving forces under capitalism, but they often produce growth and raise living standards so that many benefit. But greed leads to outcomes like Enron and WorldCom that critics take as a characteristic of the system rather than as a characteristic of some individuals that remains under Socialism. Michael Walzer recognized that political activity also corrodes moral character, but he claimed it was regulated more effectively. One of the respondents discussed whether capitalism was more or less likely to foster or sustain moral abuses than other social arrangements. Bernard-Henri Levy maintained that alternatives to the market such as fascism and Communism were far worse. None of the respondents mentioned Kant's view that mankind Middle School Packet 50 includes a range of individuals who differ in their moral character. Institutional and social arrangements like democracy and capitalism influence the moral choices individuals make or reject. **No democratic capitalist country produced any crimes comparable to the murders committed by Hitler's Germany, Mao's China, or Lenin and Stalin's Soviet Union.** As Lord Acton warned, concentrated power corrupts officials. Some use concentrated power to impose their will. Some allow their comrades to act as tyrants. Others proclaim that ends such as equality justify force to control opposition. Communism proclaimed a vision of equality that it never approached. It was unattainable because individuals differ about what is good. And what is good to them and for them is not the same as what is socially desirable to critics of capitalism. Kant's principle warns that utopian visions are unattainable. Capitalism does not offer a vision of perfection and harmony. Democratic capitalism combines freedom, opportunity, growth, and progress with restrictions on less desirable behavior. It creates societies that treat men and women as they are, not as in some utopian vision. In The Open Society and Its Enemies, Karl Popper showed why utopian visions become totalitarian. All deviations from the utopian ideal must be prevented. The Enrons, WorldComs, and others of that kind show that dishonest individuals rise along with honest individuals. Those who use these examples to criticize capitalism do not use the same standard to criticize all governments as failed arrangements when a Watergate or bribery is uncovered. Nor do they criticize government when politicians promise but do not produce or achieve. We live after twenty-five to forty years of talk about energy, education, healthcare, and drugs. Governments promise and propose, but little if any progress is visible on these issues.

**Capitalism Kritik Consequentialist Impact Scenario Answers Impact Turn: Capitalism is self-correcting and sustainable – war and environmental destruction are not profitable and innovation solves their impacts**

**Anatole Kaletsky, 2011, Capitalism 4.0: The Birth of a New Economy in the Aftermath of Crisis, p. 19-21, Anatole Kaletsky is editor-atlarge of The Times of London, where he writes weekly columns on economics, politics, and international relations and on the governing board of the New York-based Institute for New Economic Theory (INET), a nonprofit created after the 2007-2009 crisis to promote and finance academic research in economics**

Democratic **capitalism is a system built for survival**. It has adapted successfully to shocks of every kind, to upheavals in technology and economics, to political revolutions and world wars. Capitalism has been able to do this because, unlike communism or socialism or feudalism, it has an inner dynamic akin to a living thing. It can adapt and refine itself in response to the changing environment. And it will evolve into a new species of the same capitalist genus if that is what it takes to survive. In the panic of 2008—09, many politicians, businesses, and pundits forgot about the astonishing adaptability of the capitalist system. Predictions of global collapse were based on static views of the world that extrapolated a few months of admittedly terrifying financial chaos into the indefinite future. The selfcorrecting mechanisms that market economies and democratic societies have evolved over several centuries were either forgotten or assumed defunct. The language of biology has been applied to politics and economics, but rarely to the way they interact. Democratic capitalism’s equivalent of the biological survival instinct is a built-in capacity for solving social problems and meeting material needs. This capacity stems from the principle of competition, which drives both democratic politics and capitalist markets. Because market forces generally reward the creation of wealth rather than its destruction, they direct the independent efforts and ambitions of millions of individuals toward satisfying material demands, even if these demands sometimes create unwelcome by-products. Because voters generally reward politicians for making their lives better and safer, rather than worse and more dangerous, democratic competition directs political institutions toward solving rather than aggravating society’s problems, even if these solutions sometimes create new problems of their own. Political competition is slower and less decisive than market competition, so its self-stabilizing qualities play out over decades or even generations, not months or years. But regardless of the difference in timescale, capitalism and democracy have one crucial feature in common: Both are mechanisms that encourage individuals to channel their creativity, efforts, and competitive spirit into finding solutions for material and social problems. And in the long run, these mechanisms work very well. If we consider democratic capitalism as a successful problem-solving machine, the implications of this view are very relevant to the 2007-09 economic crisis, but diametrically opposed to the conventional wisdom that prevailed in its aftermath. Governments all over the world were ridiculed for trying to resolve a crisis caused by too much borrowing by borrowing even more. Alan Greenspan was accused of trying to delay an inevitable "day of reckoning” by creating ever-bigger financial bubbles. Regulators were attacked for letting half-dead, “zombie” banks stagger on instead of putting them to death. But these charges missed the point of what the democratic capitalist system is designed to achieve. In a capitalist democracy whose raison d’etre is to devise new solutions to long-standing social and material demands, a problem postponed is effectively a problem solved. To be more exact, a problem whose solution can be deferred long enough is a problem that is likely to be solved in ways that are hardly imaginable today. Once the selfhealing nature of the capitalist system is recognized, the charge of “passing on our problems to our grand-children”—whether made about budget deficits by conservatives or about global warming by liberals—becomes morally unconvincing. Our grand-children will almost certainly be much richer than we are and will have more powerful technologies at their disposal. It is far from obvious, therefore, why we should make economic sacrifices on their behalf. Sounder morality, as well as economics, than the Victorians ever imagined is in the wistful refrain of the proverbially optimistic Mr. Micawber: "Something will turn up."

**Capitalism Kritik Deontological Impact Scenario Answers Impact Turn: Capitalism is a morally sound system – it preserves freedom to act which is the core of the human condition**

**Peter Saunders, 2007, Why Capitalism is Good for the Soul, Peter Saunders is a Fellow at the Center for Independent Studies, http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders\_summer07.html** What Clive Hamilton airily dismisses as a ‘growth fetish’ has resulted in one hour of work today delivering twenty-five times more value than it did in 1850. This has freed huge chunks of our time for leisure, art, sport, learning, and other ‘soul-enriching’ pursuits. Despite all the exaggerated talk of an ‘imbalance’ between work and family life, the average Australian today spends a much greater proportion of his or her lifetime free of work than they would had they belonged to any previous generation in history. There is another sense, too, in which capitalism has freed individuals so they can pursue worthwhile lives, and that lies in its record of undermining tyrannies and dictatorships. As examples like Pinochet’s Chile and Putin’s Russia vividly demonstrate, a free economy does not guarantee a democratic polity or a society governed by the rule of law. But as Milton Friedman once pointed out, these latter conditions are never found in the absence of a free economy.(12) Historically, it was capitalism that delivered humanity from the ‘soul-destroying’ weight of feudalism. Later, it freed millions from the dead hand of totalitarian socialism. While capitalism may not be a sufficient condition of human freedom, it is almost certainly a necessary one. [continues] Wherever populations have a chance to move, the flow is always towards capitalism, not away from it. The authorities never had a problem keeping West Germans out of East Germany, South Koreans out of North Korea, or Taiwanese out of Communist China. The attraction of living in a capitalist society is not just that the economy works. It is also that if your version of the good life leads you to turn your back on capitalism, you don’t have to pick up sticks and move away. If you don’t like capitalism, there is no need to bribe people-smugglers to get you out of the country. You simply buy a plot of land, build your mudbrick house, and drop out(or, like Clive, you set up your own think tank and sell books urging others to drop out).

Next, I say that it is bogus for a white male to kritik black literature against an asian american who’s own grandparents have been racially segregated against and who ancestors were classified in as the same group as black.

On kritiking the Kritik:

Kritiks lead to infinite regression. If all underlying assumptions need to be challenged, we can never reach a meeting of minds between teams, there's always some other assumption in the way. The conventional debate round ends up in a decision one way or the other because there is always some common ground both teams can agree on, but the Affirmative has establishes the principle that every action of the Negative, the choice to speak in English, the choice to obey the rules of debate, is potentially abusive.

Kritiks are innately self-contradictory. The idea that "all assumptions must be questioned" is itself an assumption which must be answered before the kritik is allowed to go forward. In other words, the fundamental hurdle which must be passed is one Affirmative set up in introducing the kritik in the first place: they must show that their kritik is not vulnerable to the perils of hidden assumptions.

Kritiks are nihilistic. If everything is subject to being questioned, then there are no grounds for believing anything. We are left staring into the void of paralyzing skepticism. That's not a tolerable situation. We can reject the nihilism of kritiks on two grounds: (1) emotional grounds, it's just too bleak to stare into the void; and (2) pragmatic grounds, paralysis stops us from getting on with life. Reject the idea of the kritik and step away from the void.

Next, go back to real-world larp consequences:

#### Topicality

#### **A Topicality**

#### **Definition:** “A just government” is referred to as an “indefinite singular”. The phase is a singular noun with the indefinite article “a”. “Indefinite singulars have different meanings depending on the context, but for normative statements like debate resolutions, it generally refers to all members of a class. Therefore, aff must advocate for all governments.

#### **Violation:** Aff parametricizes to single countries, which is unfair.

#### **Standards:** With so many governments in the world, we cannot know which countries to research in terms of negative preparation, which makes it functionally impossible to ever engage on the topic. Use neg’s definition, we keep ground for both debaters.

#### **Voters:** Drop the debater, they aren’t being fair. Without being fair, we cannot have sufficient clash. Topicality is a priori voting issue, for fairness and education. Always default to competing interpretations, I have done the work above.

#### 

#### **Unconditional:**

**Definition:**<https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unconditional>: complete and not limited in any way: This includes if a strike violates other laws, therefore, aff must advocate for a truly unconditional right to strike.

**Violation: X**

**Standards:** My opponent must advocate for the resolution exactly, or else the debate is not fair. My definition puts limits on the number of cases that can be run which is beneficial because it allows for a fair debate in which the negative team does not have to research every possible case in the world. This increases education, increasing the amount of clash. Education is the reason schools fund debate, so if the debate is uneducation, it is antithetical to the reason why the activity was created and funded in the first place.

#### **Voters:** Reject all contentions that mention a partially conditional right to strike, as this is not topical, or in other words, my opponent does not advocate for the resolution.

#### Philosophy/Rights

A more momentous political issue concerns how liberal societies may respond to those engaged in terrorist activities that threaten their citizens. May they, for example, preemptively kill those who have been identified as suicide bombers? May they intern terrorist suspects without trial? May they torture known terrorists to gain information about forthcoming attacks? Responses such as these put some of the most fundamental human rights of the suspected terrorists into question. But one often hears it said that by engaging in a campaign of terror, these individuals have lost the protection of such rights. If the measures in question are indeed necessary to protect innocent people, it is not wrong to implement them, so it is claimed. These were the issues that led me to revisit certain passages in Locke’s Second Treatise in which he appears to assert quite boldly that human – or as he would say, natural – rights are indeed conditional. Locke is, of course, widely credited with inspiring much of the later development of human rights theory. But although his influence on contemporary liberalism

is undeniable, it is important also to recognize that his liberalism was developed as a fighting doctrine. Locke understood that liberal societies might have to defend themselves against would-be oppressors in their midst, and that gave his liberalism a harder edge than it usually has today. In 1689 (or thereabouts) one could not assume that liberal institutions were so firmly entrenched that liberal tolerance could be extended to those who sought to destroy them. This helps, I believe, to explain the conditionality of Locke’s theory of rights, which I shall now try to display and unravel. The relevant passages in the Second Treatise are those in which Locke is explaining how we may respond to those who have harmed us, or who approach us threatening harm. This category of persons may include enemies in war, common thieves, and political tyrants. In all these cases, Locke claims, someone who by virtue of his aggressive conduct ceases to acknowledge ‘The Rule of Reason’ loses his status as a rights-bearing human being, and may be treated in the same way as a dangerous animal. Here, for example, is Locke explaining how an aggressor forfeits his right to life:

Let’s look at it this way, a person’s right to life should always supersede a person’s right to free speech or the right to strike. I argue that a person’s death is worse than their bad working conditions that can be solved in the status quo in the first place. My opponent will likely come up in \_\_\_\_ next speech and say that neg doesn’t save lives, but we do. Not only that, but we prevent lives from dying. Let’s look at my subpoint a and b. My subpoint a states that if we have an unconditional right of military workers to strike, then the US military will become weak, allowing for another hegemony to rise, and this is horrible.

### Jobs Spec

##### Crane Workers:

We still must have conditions for the other jobs

##### Courts:

If courts still have the power, then an unconditional right to strike is useless, as courts can still strike down things like paga claims, making strikes useless.

##### Teachers:

**Teacher strikes harm students by decreasing their educational attainment, while simultaneously failing to provide enough in wages to improve the quality of education overall.**

**Belot & Webbink, ‘10** [Michéle Belot is professor of economics at Cornell University, Dinand Webbink is a professor of policy evaluation at the Erasmus School of Economics in Rotterdam, Published: 11/23/10, “Do Teacher Strikes Harm Educational Attainment of Students?” Labour,<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-9914.2010.00494.x> ] /Triumph Debate

This paper provides unique evidence on the effect of teacher strikes on final educational attainments. Any attempt to evaluate the effects of strikes will always be subject to the concern of endogeneity of strikes. **The Belgian case is interesting because the motive for the strikes was not related to the schooling environment, but was driven by a political reform that was uncorrelated with schooling conditions. Both communities were confronted at the same time by similar budgetary concerns, but the Flemish community succeeded in avoiding strikes by granting an immediate 2 per cent salary increase, whereas the French-speaking community did not. Eventually, the French community granted a 2 per cent salary increase as well, but this was only after a long battle between teachers and the government, and a long period of perturbation in all schools of the community. We find some evidence that the strikes decreased the educational attainment of students**, although the estimated effect is somewhat imprecise. A plausible mechanism for this lower investment in human capital seems to be an increase in grade repetition. We find that the young French-speaking cohort graduated half a year later on average. **Furthermore, we find that the strikes led to a reallocation of students from university studies to higher vocational education. Hence, students do not seem to have succeeded in compensating for the losses in terms of schooling due to the strikes. Also, the results we find breaks in the evolution of achievement and attainment, breaks that seem to coincide with the timing of the strikes.** Thus, it seems that these results are more consistent with a causal effect of strikes rather than a causal effect of a deterioration in schooling environment. Of course, this study could be seen as a specific ‘case-study’, and the question is whether we can draw more general conclusions and lessons from this analysis. **We would argue that the results provide a benchmark for a scenario that is not too unrealistic. There are a number of examples of long strikes in schools (Hayward teacher strikes and Marysville to name a few) and most strikes are driven by wage disputes. Higher wages might not only be beneficial for teachers themselves but also for students as higher wages might attract better teachers. However, the empirical literature provides little support for the latter argument. This paper suggests that long-term strikes might bear high costs in terms of detrimental effects on educational achievement of students.** These costs should be taken into account in discussions on the right to strike for teachers.

##### Manufacturers:

#### **Increased union power magnifies the supply chain crisis and threatens the economy**

**Elizabeth Hanke, Research Fellow, Labor Economics and Policy, Americans Struggle as President Biden Favors Unions During Supply-Chain Breakdown, 11-3-21, https://www.heritage.org/jobs-and-labor/report/americans-struggle-president-biden-favors-unions-during-supply-chain**

SUMMARY**The current supply-chain crisis** has led to a **significant disruption** of **global commerce** that will have far-reaching implications. Americans are already seeing these impacts in the form of empty store shelves, product shortages, rising prices, and inflation. At the epicenter are restrictive union contracts that discourage a 24/7 schedule in favor of an abbreviated work week and fewer working hours, causing lower productivity at the nation’s largest ports in Los Angeles and Long Beach. President Biden’s Build Back Better plan should be abandoned. The Biden Administration should support capital improvements that increase worker productivity, permit the purchase of fully automated equipment, and limit unions’ ability to hobble critical infrastructure. KEY TAKEAWAYSUnion practices play a large role in the nation’s supply-chain crisis, and Democrats’ reconciliation plan avoids any solutions to the issues at West Coast ports.The high labor rates paid by cargo carriers and terminal operators are passed on to U.S. businesses large and small, which, in turn, pass them on to customers.The U.S. cannot allow international commerce, the global supply-chain, and the American economy to exist at the mercy of a handful of labor leaders. Copied Select a Section 1/0 Some in the Biden Administration have used the supply-chain crisis as a talking point to encourage passage of the $3.5 trillion Build Back Better (BBB) plan. According to Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg, the supply-chain crisis “is one more reason why we do need to deliver this infrastructure package, so that we can have a more resilient, flexible physical infrastructure to support our supply chain in this country.”1 This claim is, at a minimum, disingenuous. While the BBB plan is touted as investing $17 billion in port infrastructure, the funding is centered on the Administration’s climate-change initiative and targets reduction of air pollution and greenhouse gases.2 Not only is there no funding for the implementation of productivity enhancements, bowing to union pressure, the plan also expressly prohibits the use of these funds for the purchase of fully automated cargo-handling equipment that is desperately needed to boost port efficiency.3 Reduction of air pollution is a good thing, but these proposed air-quality improvements will not alleviate the nation’s supply-chain issues. The Los Angeles and Long Beach Ports Union contracts and labor practices play a large and detrimental role in the nation’s supply-chain problem. The ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach (LA/LB) provide a good example. The adjacent ports’ location in a large population center explains their rankings as the first and second, respectively, busiest container ports in the U.S.4 Their West Coast proximity to Asian ports, especially top-importer China, and their ability to handle the largest container ships in the world explains why almost half of total U.S. imports move through these ports and why, combined, they rank as the 10th-busiest container port worldwide, handling an average of more than 330,000 containers per week.5 Despite these advantages, the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach seem to have found a way to squander them. Based on the statistical methodology results from the World Bank’s Container Port Performance Index 2020, the port of Los Angeles ranked 328th, and the port of Long Beach 333rd, of 351 global ports, placing them in the bottom 10 percent of global container ports evaluated.6 These two ports were also outpaced by most other U.S. ports, including Philadelphia (83rd), Virginia (85th), New York/New Jersey (89th), and Charleston (95th). Los Angeles and Long Beach posted abysmal scores in both the administrative procedures and the statistical measures that include time in port and other efficiency factors. A look at the contract with the labor union helps to explain why. Union Influence and Labor Costs Dock workers at these ports are represented by the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU). The current contract between the ILWU and the Pacific Maritime Association, the 70-member group of cargo carrier and terminal operator companies, reads like a union wish list. After meeting the baseline 4,000 hours, or just under two years, of industry work experience, members earn $46.23 per hour.7 International Longshore and Warehouse Union and Pacific Maritime Association, “Pacific Coast Longshore Contract Document 2019–2022,” pp. 30 and 31, https://apps.pmanet.org/pubs/LaborAgreements/2019-2022\_PCLCD.pdf (accessed October 26, 2021). Nearly $100,000 per year is a generous salary, but it is only the beginning of the lucrative compensation structure. Second-shift workers earn a 33 percent premium over the regular rate, pushing their hourly pay to $61.64, while third-shift workers’ 60 percent wage premium results in a $73.96 hourly pay rate.8 Ibid., pp. 31 and 32. The compensation package reflects the fact that longshoremen work a difficult and often dangerous job. It also translates to some impressive earnings, such as average dock workers making $171,000 and foremen pulling in $282,000, annually. Union employees receive free employer-paid health care, full pensions, and 15 paid holidays annually, including United Farm Workers founder Cesar Chavez’s birthday, July 5 (“Bloody Thursday”) to commemorate the deaths of two union members during a strike in 1934, and the birthday of ILWU founder Harry Bridges.10 Considering the ability of the ILWU to immediately hamper global commerce, and the large amounts of money being paid to its thousands of members, it is easy to understand the immense power this union wields and the hesitancy many people have in even the slightest criticism of it. Generous to near extravagant as this package is, union leaders who negotiated this contract are doing what is expected of them: acting in the best interest of their members. Unfortunately, while the interests of ILWU members are clearly being served under the contract, the interests of American businesses and everyday consumers are taking a back seat. The high labor rates paid by cargo carriers and terminal operators are passed along to American manufacturers, retailers, and other firms that, in turn, pass them along to customers in the form of higher prices. Ultimately, the impact of these exorbitant labor rates is borne by American consumers, many of whom are already struggling to pay their bills. High labor rates can contribute to higher consumer prices, but the impact of these rates can be offset significantly by higher productivity rates. Labor productivity, traditionally defined as output per unit of input, is a widely used measure of efficiency. Improvements to worker productivity can be a powerful tool in high-wage scenarios. When supported by training, capital improvements, and various forms of automation, many high-wage workers can be sufficiently productive to render themselves the low-cost alternative when performance is evaluated on a per-unit basis. For instance, if worker A is paid twice the hourly rate of worker B, this scenario will still be advantageous as long as worker A’s output is more than twice that of worker B. This is a critical concept when evaluating U.S. port performance. This is no small matter. Los Angeles and Long Beach ports have historically operated two eight-hour shifts plus a partial third shift Monday through Friday totaling 112 hours per week, compared to 168 hours per week at ports that operate 24/7.13 This variance means that LA/LB ports are only open two-thirds the hours of other major container ports, resulting in a corresponding drop in capacity. Further exacerbating the problem is that this represents only shipping unloading time, but the terminal gates have traditionally been open only 88 hours weekly for trucks to pick up containers.14 This restriction to the container pickup process adds time and unnecessary expense to the drayage process. Since any hours above the current 112-hour work week must be paid at an overtime rate, the union’s agreement to increase to a 24/7 schedule translates to a massive overtime payout for its members. Low Productivity. The traditional reliance on this high-cost, low-accessibility model tells only part of the story. When the two ports are actually working, their productivity is astonishingly slow compared to ports in China. Volume in container ports is generally measured by 20-foot equivalent unit (TEU) that is based on the size of a standard 20-foot-long shipping container.15 Since 10-foot and 40-foot shipping containers are also used, albeit less frequently, this metric provides a standard measure for purposes of comparison. Offloading of a typical 6,000 TEU mega-ship takes an average of 24 seconds per container in the ports of Yangshan, Qingdao, and Yantian, but double that time, totaling a full 48 seconds per container, in Los Angeles.16 ,,, Conclusion Americans should not be held hostage by unions. The situation in Los Angeles and Long Beach, which not only laid the groundwork for, but also exacerbated, the supply-chain crisis did not develop overnight. One need look no further than the ILWU’s annual recognition of the tragic “Blood Thursday” labor dispute that occurred nearly a century ago to see evidence of a long and deep-seated animosity. Toxic as labor relations are, the U.S. cannot allow international commerce, the global supply chain, and the American economy to exist at the mercy of a handful of labor leaders. Rectifying this situation will take years and, more importantly, a currently non-existent level of commitment and cooperation from management and unions at these facilities. Considering that President Joe Biden ran his 2020 election campaign as a self-professed “union guy” whose inauguration speech promised to “unify America,” this seems like an ideal time for him to get started on his promise by gaining ILWU cooperation to alleviate avoidable problems for all Americans.

#### **(turn aff arg)Higher wages increase inflation snowball**

**Boyle, 11-5, 21, Ryan James Boyle is a Vice President and Senior Economist within the Global Risk Management division of Northern Trust. In this role, Ryan is responsible for briefing clients and partners on the economy and business conditions, supporting internal stress testing and capital allocation processes, and publishing economic commentaries, Labor: Strike While the Iron Is Hot**

Inflation concerns are leading workers to demand higher wages. In most recent years, wages rose more rapidly than inflation; today, the opposite is true. As workers secure better increases, firms may be prompted to raise prices, initiating a feedback loop that could be difficult to arrest.

**This cycle of inflation leads to an economic recession**

On June 16, the Federal Reserve announced it may raise interest rates twice in 2023 in response to higher-than-expected increases in inflation. In his announcement, Fed Chairman Jerome Powell said the higher inflation recorded this year should be temporary, but the risks that it would be “higher and more persistent than we expect” could not be ignored.

John Horn, professor of practice in economics at Olin Business School at Washington University in St. Louis, agrees with Powell’s overall inflation forecast of 3.4% for 2021. Inflation in some high-demand categories — such as travel, construction material and automobiles — may be even higher, he said.

Horn

However, some prices, such as lumber, are already coming back down, providing hope that current inflation is a short-term corrective measure and not a sign of long-term systemic problems.

“The uncertainty for me is how this gets played politically and what messaging gets through,” Horn said.

Inflation, Horn explained, can be a self-fulfilling prophesy. Worry about rising inflation can lead employees to demand higher wages. In order to pay those higher wages, employers raise prices for their products and services, creating actual inflation. The wage-price spiral is a vicious cycle. Likewise, inflation expectations will cause banks to increase interest rates, making it more expensive for businesses and individuals to borrow money.

“It’s important for the Fed to make sure that this is seen as a temporary blip and not systemic. Because if it’s seen as a systemic problem, and inflation expectations take charge, it’s really hard to make it stop,” Horn said. “Once that happens, the only way to stop inflation is to raise the interest rates really high and cause a recession. Maybe not in 2022, but it will be on the Fed’s radar. They will want to stop [rising inflation] sooner than later.”

“However, if prices come down and people see this as a temporary blip related to COVID-19 and the supply chain problems — if that story takes hold — then I’m not worried about inflation,” he added.

What’s driving inflation?

In the simplest terms, inflation occurs when consumer demand increases or supply contracts causing prices to rise. The current economic situation is a little more complicated, in part because both effects are occurring.

**Sundaram, Jomo kwame, Jomo Kwame Sundaram, is a prominent Malaysian economist. He is Senior Adviser at the Khazanah Research Institute, Visiting Fellow at the Initiative for Policy Dialogue, Columbia University, and Adjunct Professor at the International Islamic University., and Vladimir Popov Vladimir Popov is an interregional adviser in the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations and professor emeritus at the New Economic School in Moscow. He is also professor at the Graduate School of International Business at the Russian Presidential Academy of the National Economy and Public Administration in Moscow, and an adjunct research professor at the Institute of European and Russian Studies at Carleton University in Ottawa. “Economic Crisis Can Trigger World War Jomo Kwame Sundaram and Vladimir Popov.” International Development Economics Associates (IDEAs), 13 Feb. 2019, www.networkideas.org/news-analysis/2019/02/economic-crisis-can-trigger-world-war.**

**Liberalization’s discontents**

Rising economic insecurity, inequalities and deprivation are expected to strengthen ethno-populist and jingoistic nationalist sentiments, and increase social tensions and turmoil, especially among the growing precariat and others who feel vulnerable or threatened.

Thus, ethno-populist inspired chauvinistic nationalism may exacerbate tensions, leading to conflicts and tensions among countries, as in the 1930s. Opportunistic leaders have been blaming such misfortunes on outsiders and may seek to reverse policies associated with the perceived causes, such as ‘globalist’ economic liberalization.

Policies which successfully check such problems may reduce social tensions, as well as the likelihood of social turmoil and conflict, including among countries. However, these may also inadvertently exacerbate problems. The recent spread of anti-globalization sentiment appears correlated to slow, if not negative per capita income growth and increased economic inequality.

To be sure, globalization and liberalization are statistically associated with growing economic inequality and rising ethno-populism. Declining real incomes and growing economic insecurity have apparently strengthened ethno-populism and nationalistic chauvinism, threatening economic liberalization itself, both within and among countries.

**Insecurity, populism, conflict**

Thomas Piketty has argued that a sudden increase in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Although causality is difficult to prove, with wealth and income inequality now at historical highs, this should give cause for concern.

Of course, other factors also contribute to or exacerbate civil and international tensions, with some due to policies intended for other purposes. Nevertheless, even if unintended, such developments could inadvertently catalyse future crises and conflicts.

Publics often have good reason to be restless, if not angry, but the emotional appeals of ethno-populism and jingoistic nationalism are leading to chauvinistic policy measures which only make things worse.

At the international level, despite the world’s unprecedented and still growing interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed as the US increasingly resorts to unilateral, sovereigntist policies without bothering to even build coalitions with its usual allies.

**Avoiding Thucydides’ iceberg**

Thus, protracted economic distress, economic conflicts or another financial crisis could lead to military confrontation by the protagonists, even if unintended. Less than a decade after the Great Depression started, the Second World War had begun as the Axis powers challenged the earlier entrenched colonial powers.

They patently ignored Thucydides’ warning, in chronicling the Peloponnesian wars over two millennia before, when the rise of Athens threatened the established dominance of Sparta!

Anticipating and addressing such possibilities may well serve to help avoid otherwise imminent disasters by undertaking pre-emptive collective action, as difficult as that may be.

The international community has no excuse for being like the owners and captain of the Titanic, conceitedly convinced that no iceberg could possibly sink the great ship.

**Liu, Qian, Managing Director, Greater China, The Economist Group. “The Next Economic Crisis Could Cause a Global Conflict. Here’s Why.” World Economic Forum, World Economic Forum, 7 Feb. 2020,** [**www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why**](http://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why)**.**

**Furthers this claim, stating**

The response to the 2008 economic crisis has relied far too much on monetary stimulus, in the form of quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates, and included far too little structural reform. This means that the next crisis could come soon – and pave the way for a large-scale military conflict.

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social, political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a major global military conflict.

The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates.

But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies.

Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment.

The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008.

In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929.

As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy.

If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war.

For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun.

##### Prison Gaurds:

##### Police:

In an era of declining labor power, police unions stand as a success story for worker organizing—they exert political clout and negotiate favorable terms for their members. Yet, despite support for unionization on the political left, police unions have become public enemy number one for commentators concerned about race and police violence. Much criti­cism of police unions focuses on their obstructionism and their prioritiza­tion of members’ interests over the interests of the communities they police. These critiques are compelling. But, taken seriously, they often sound like critiques of unions in general, not just police unions. If public-sector union­ism remains a social good, wholeheartedly embracing these critiques seems like a risky proposition.

This Essay examines the strange case of police unions and asks how they are (and are not) representative of U.S. unionism. More pointedly, this Essay asks what critiques of police unions should mean for policing reform and the future of public-sector unionism. How are police unions different from other public-sector unions, and how might critiques of police unions apply to other public-sector unions?

Ultimately, I argue that the challenge in articulating a theory of what makes police unions different highlights both the problem with police and the problem with how scholars think about unions. If police unions are objectionable because of their views and police conduct, this concern speaks to a problem with police—full stop. The problems with unions are only issues by extension. If the unions are objectionable because they prioritize their members’ interests, the critiques are properly understood as undercutting public-sector unions generally.

##### **Furthermore,**

##### **Adler-Bell, Sam. “How Police Unions Bully Politicians.” The New Republic, 20 Oct. 2020, newrepublic.com/article/159706/police-unions-bully-politicians-new-york-deblasio.**

On May 31, as another night of disruptive protest overtook New York City streets, the Sergeants Benevolent Association, one of the unions representing NYPD officers, posted a photo of an arrest record on Twitter. Derived from an internal police database, the image revealed the protester’s height, weight, address, date of birth, and driver’s license information. It also revealed her name: Chiara de Blasio, the 25-year-old daughter of New York Mayor Bill de Blasio. “How can the NYPD protect the city of NY from rioting anarchist when the Mayors object throwing daughter is one of them,” the typo-laden caption read. “Now we know why he is forbidding Mounted Units to be mobilized and keeping the NYPD from doing their jobs.” By morning, Twitter had removed the post, which violated its privacy rules, and temporarily suspended the union’s account. But the message to the mayor had been delivered.

De Blasio called the move “unconscionable” and defended his daughter. “I admire that she was out there trying to change something she thought was unjust,” he said. But as protests continued, de Blasio often sided with the NYPD against the movement in the streets, insisting—despite plentiful video evidence to the contrary—that the NYPD was showing “a lot of restraint.” Meanwhile, the SBA president, Edward Mullins, stuck to his guns. “Our police department is being held back,” Mullins told The New York Times. His intended audience was clear: “Is that why you’re tying our hands, because your daughter is out there?” Almost immediately, the city granted Mullins’s wish for a mounted unit, and on June 3, the NYPD deployed officers on horseback to protect “high-risk areas” from looters.

Mullins told me that he hadn’t realized the tweeted image revealed Chiara’s personal data. “In hindsight, I wish I looked at it closer,” he said. “I certainly didn’t mean to cause her any harm.” But he stood by his argument. The mayor had said he didn’t know she was there—“but what’s the real truth?” Mullins asked. “I can tell you where my kids are every day of the week.”

The conflict between de Blasio and the city’s police unions is storied. During two funerals for officers slain in 2014 in the wake of Black Lives Matter protests, members of the NYPD dramatically turned away from the mayor while he addressed them. The relationship has been strained ever since. Mullins, who has presided over the SBA for the past 18 years, is known for his bombast; he delights in provoking New York’s liberal political elite. This February, after another pair of officers were shot, he announced on Twitter that the NYPD was “declaring war” on the mayor. In May, he called the city’s health commissioner at the time a “bitch.” He calls himself a “crazy Irish guy.” These antics, he told me, get results. “If it didn’t work, we wouldn’t be talking about it, right?”

It may be a new extreme to dox a mayor’s daughter for exercising her First Amendment rights, but the act is consistent with an increasingly aggressive strategy undertaken by police associations across the country to secure their political aims. Police unions deploy ominous social media campaigns to vilify and intimidate reform-minded legislators. They exploit racialized law-and-order rhetoric to polarize the public. And they threaten liberal mayors with widespread civic chaos and destruction if their demands aren’t met. The goal is to preserve the privileges—chiefly, job security and scarce oversight—they have won during decades of agitating and political accommodation. The question is whether, amid widespread popular demonstrations against racist policing, the strategy will continue to work.

In the past few years, activists and scholars have identified police union contracts, which often shield misbehaving cops from accountability, as a key obstacle to reforming police departments. Multiple studies have shown a correlation between the existence of collective bargaining rights and the incidence of violent police misconduct. Disillusioned by the failure of Obama-era reforms to rein in abuse, many leaders of the new push for racial justice are calling to defund the police and abolish their unions altogether. In response, the unions have entered a defense crouch. The present era of protests, Mullins said, has left him feeling besieged from all sides, while politicians allow the fires to burn. “I’ve never felt that way in the time that I’ve been president,” he said. Another police union boss told me the atmosphere feels like “us against them.”

As their public image declines, police unions rely more heavily on fear tactics, singling out their political enemies for ridicule and worse. The SBA’s “abusive behavior” toward politicians such as de Blasio is being replicated all over the country, said Stuart Schrader, a lecturer in sociology at Johns Hopkins University who is writing a book about police as political actors. I’ve spoken with half a dozen pro-reform politicians who have been targeted by police unions in localities across America. Their stories are remarkably similar. All expressed fear for their own safety and the safety of their families. They feel scrutinized by beat cops when they walk the streets and worry their movements are being surveilled. Many said they refrain from calling the police in moments of need, assuming they will not be well served. Greg Casar, an Austin city councilman who recently convinced all nine of his colleagues and the mayor to refuse campaign contributions from the Austin Police Association, said that the implication is clear: “The police department shouldn’t be someone I should rely on to take care of me.”

Union tactics also contribute to an atmosphere of racial menace. Though police departments in many cities have diversified, the ranks of union leaders remain almost uniformly white and male. Police union bosses have variously called Black Lives Matter a “terrorist movement,” a “lynch mob,” and a “pack of rabid animals.” Last year, Mullins circulated a video to thousands of sergeants that referred to Black people as “monsters” and public housing as a “war zone.” (Mullins later apologized.) Police unions exhibit informal ties to right-wing hate groups whose members often direct more explicit threats of violence to politicians singled out by union leaders. The alt-right Proud Boys, for example, recently attended a “Back the Blue” party at the Philadelphia Fraternal Order of Police Lodge. Right-wing extremist groups actively recruit from the ranks of law enforcement and, as one expert told The Daily Beast, assume an “unofficial brotherhood” with rank-and-file cops.

Even mundane lobbying efforts are inflected by the police’s ever-present authority to use force or refrain from doing so.

Though police unions continue to exert influence by traditional means—endorsing candidates, contributing to campaigns, and threatening work stoppages—a sinister edge necessarily attaches itself to their political activities. Even mundane lobbying efforts are inflected by the police’s ever-present authority to use force or refrain from doing so. Aaron Bekemeyer, a graduate student at Harvard who is writing his dissertation on the history of police unions, said that while it’s hard to demonstrate empirically, “people know that police officers have guns, will use guns, do use guns.” The threat is “baked in” to the interaction.

It’s about fear, concurred Megan Green, a St. Louis alderwoman who has been a frequent target of attacks from the local police union. “They try to make an example out of us .... ‘You better not get out of line or we’re going to do to you what we’re doing to them.’” The approach is deliberate, Green believes, and sometimes effective. “These are bully tactics designed to stop us from fighting for change.”

Sabrina Javellana is the vice mayor of Hallandale Beach, Florida, a small city 20 minutes south of Fort Lauderdale. Twenty-two years old, she was elected to the city’s five-person commission in 2018, during her junior year of college. In the past few months, she has become the local police union’s foremost enemy. “They don’t like me, and I fundamentally disagree with their agenda,” she told me. The roots of their conflict stretch back six years, to a SWAT raid on the home of 34-year-old Howard Bowe, who was gunned down within seconds of police knocking down his door. Officers found just 16 grams of cocaine in Bowe’s house and no weapons; Bowe died several days later.

Sabrina Javellana, the vice mayor of Hallandale Beach, Florida, endured a barrage of hostile messages after she demonstrated her support for Black Lives Matter. One officer wrote, “Don’t call us when your s\*\*\* gets broken into.”

He was the third person shot to death by police in Hallandale Beach—a city of just under 40,000 residents—in five years. An investigation by New Times Broward-Palm Beach found the city’s SWAT team had conducted 33 similar raids in the neighborhood around Bowe’s house, a predominantly Black enclave in a majority white city, none of which resulted in a substantial drug bust. Javellana, who was 16 at the time and watched coverage of the raid on local news, was outraged. But she was not shocked. Javellana had already grown to mistrust the criminal justice system in south Florida. She’d seen police profile friends and throw them “face down on the pavement,” she told me. Her father spent two and half years in jail for a felony conviction that was overturned on appeal. And twice her brother was hauled away in handcuffs for involuntary psychiatric examination—under a controversial Florida law allowing minors to be involuntarily committed for up to 72 hours if a teacher, friend, or police officer suspects they’re mentally unwell. (Javellana says her brother has had depressive episodes, but none as traumatic as the days he spent in a psych ward because of the Baker Act.)

In 2016, a grand jury declined to charge Bowe’s killer, and an internal affairs review cleared him and the other officer under investigation for the raid. “The community never healed from it,” Javellana said. She started attending protests organized by Broward County’s Black Lives Matter Alliance, and in 2018 the city agreed to pay Bowe’s family $425,000 to settle a wrongful death suit. A few months later, with the support of the activist community, Javellana ran for a seat on the city commission. The police union backed her opponent, but Javellana won. Twenty-one years old, she became the only woman of color on the five-person board. At their first meeting, Javellana’s new colleagues elected her vice mayor, a largely symbolic position.

The comity didn’t last. Elevated by the movement, Javellana set about asking questions on police policy: Why had the department stopped issuing citations and resumed making arrests for low quantities of marijuana? What could be done about use-of-force rules? She met fierce opposition. “Our commission meetings are like WWE matches,” she told me. “Personal attacks and shouting and insanity.” Meanwhile, the city was negotiating a new contract with its police department. By May 2020, negotiations had stalled. The police union wanted larger cost-of-living adjustments than the other public-sector unions had assented to. The commissioners, even those who were pro-police, agreed that the city couldn’t afford it. When the nation convulsed in protest over the death of George Floyd in Minneapolis, Hallandale’s own demons resurfaced. In early June, Javellana joined a march demanding the city reopen the investigation into Howard Bowe’s death. “We have our own George Floyds and Breonna Taylors in our own city,” Javellana told the local paper. During the march, Javellana kneeled with other marchers. Police Chief Sonia Quiñones took a knee as well.

The image enraged the police union. A day later, the city’s entire SWAT team resigned en masse. Among them were the union president, Sgt. Pietro Roccisano, and five other officers who took part in the raid on Howard Bowe’s house. (The 10 officers kept their jobs on the force; they only resigned their special detail to the tactical team.) The former SWAT team members blamed the 22-year-old vice mayor for stoking a “political climate” that was making them unsafe. “Sabrina Javellana has openly made ignorant and inaccurate statements attacking the lawful actions of the city’s officers,” they wrote in their resignation letter. The maneuver—which came days after 57 members of the Buffalo Police Department riot response team stepped down in solidarity with two officers who were suspended for shoving an elderly protester to the ground and seriously injuring him—made national news. Javellana went on CNN. The SWAT resignation, she explained, was a stunt, orchestrated by the union to generate sympathy from the city commission. And the stunt seemed to work. “You have received a lack of empathy from one of my colleagues,” Mayor Joy Cooper said to the SWAT team. “I want to apologize to you.”

For Javellana, the ordeal was just beginning. “I’m not thin-skinned,” she told me. “I get hate mail all the time and I’m just, like, ‘whatever.’” But after she was singled out by the union president in the SWAT team’s letter, the barrage of hostile comments, emails, and social media messages became more extreme, and she began to worry about the safety of her mother and brother. In June, Javellana learned of a public forum, LEO Affairs, where members of the city police department post anonymous messages. After the SWAT incident, she became a frequent topic of conversation on the platform. The posts, on threads about the Hallandale Beach Police Department, refer to Javellana as a “P.O.S.,” a “juice box,” and a “righteous slut.” Another stated that “if anybody deserves police brutality” it was her father. “No wonder you defend the NW drug dealers,” the poster wrote, referring to the part of town where Howard Bowe was killed. “You were raised by a criminal.” (As mentioned, Javellana’s father’s conviction was overturned.) “Don’t worry about her,” read another post. “Maybe at the next protest she attends, Ft Lauderdale [PD] will hit her with a rubber bullet, and she gets amnesia.” The commenter appended the post with a peace-sign emoji.

For Javellana, this last missive was particularly disturbing. It appeared a week after the protester LaToya Ratlieff was shot in the face by a rubber bullet, and nearly blinded, while marching in Fort Lauderdale. In body cam footage of the incident, officers can be seen laughing and celebrating after firing the barrage of bullets that hit Ratlieff and other marchers. Javellana had attended the same protest. (Ratlieff, who is the great-niece of civil rights icon Fannie Lou Hamer, testified before Congress in June about her experience.)

Another officer wrote, addressing Javellana, “Don’t call us when your s\*\*\* gets broken into.” “I don’t know if I’ve ever really felt safe calling the cops,” Javellana told me. But she said she certainly wouldn’t now. Javellana believes the police union has been monitoring her social media posts, investigating her, and looking for dirt. “I know I’m definitely a target of theirs, and I’m up for election in 2022.” (The police union did not respond to any of my requests for comment.) “I’ve started being more conscious about locking the doors to my house and being aware of my surroundings,” she said. “I don’t feel very trusting.”

In recent years, the image of police as impartial defenders of public safety has begun to unravel. But the idea of their neutrality is fairly new. American policing began as an explicitly partisan enterprise, openly aimed at protecting the interests of some and punishing others. For the first century of their history, police in Northern cities operated as appendages of competing political machines; graft and corruption were the norm. Often, companies enlisted them to violently break labor strikes. When an association of police officers petitioned to join the American Federation of Labor in 1897, they were rejected on the basis that police were “controlled by forces inimical to the labor movement.” In the South, policing originated as a method of enforcing white tyranny. The first policemen were the slave patrol, charged with ruthlessly controlling the movements of Black people.

These distinct Northern and Southern genealogies met in the years during and after the Great Migration (itself inspired by white racial terror and lynching, either inflicted or tolerated by Southern police), when African Americans settled in Northern and Midwestern cities. In New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia, cops earned their status in the white imagination as disinterested peacekeepers—and not merely the quasi-legal muscle of ethnic organized crime—by policing Black neighborhoods. The largely Irish, Italian, and Polish ranks of policemen earned their “whiteness,” in other words, by inflicting violence on Black bodies.

Meanwhile, administrative reforms barred hiring through patronage channels, and, by the early 1960s, police had become disentangled from the partisan, ethnic alliances of machine politics. At the zenith of this process of “professionalization,” as Schrader terms it, police associations achieved the right to collectively bargain. For the next 10 years, the unions built up their political muscle by resisting civil rights–era reform efforts, while depicting themselves—to the white majority—as the singular bulwark against racial disorder. During the 1966 fight over New York City’s civilian review board, Police Benevolent Association president John Cassese said, “I’m sick and tired of giving in to minority groups with their whims and their gripes and shouting.” Bekemeyer describes their organizing efforts as a reactionary form of “social movement unionism”; the unions expanded the privileges of police officers by igniting and allying with a societywide politics of white backlash.

By the 1970s, police unions had become the pivotal force in American politics that they would remain for four decades. Despite pockets of animosity from those who encountered them most, police enjoyed an exalted moral and political status: as disinterested experts on crime, as neutral enforcers of state legitimacy, and as heroic “first responders” who put their lives on the line. Their budgets were largely insulated during eras of austerity and anti-labor backlash. In times of acute fiscal crisis, like the 1980s, they abjured salary increases in exchange for greater job security and freedom from public oversight, moves that contributed to the impunity they enjoy today.

Until recently, most politicians competed for police union endorsements, which functioned as an easy signifier of their commitments to public safety and blue-collar workers. Police organizations can direct significant resources to campaigns for mayor, city council, and district attorney. In 2019, police unions from all over the country together spent $700,000 in an effort to stop Chesa Boudin from becoming San Francisco’s district attorney. (Boudin, a former public defender and the son of Weather Underground activists involved in the deaths of two cops in 1981, nevertheless won.) And although police strikes are illegal, unions threaten informal slowdowns and sick-outs (known as “the blue flu”) to influence city leaders. Schrader notes that mayors listen when unions tell city hall, “‘If you don’t give us what we want, crime’s going to go up, and your mayoralty is going to go down the tubes.’”

But as the bipartisan law-and-order consensus crumbles, police increasingly betray the degree to which their interests—as self-conscious political and economic actors—are not coterminous with the public’s. And as the mask of neutrality slips, a siege mentality is taking hold, signaling a return to the early days of explicitly partisan and ideological policing. Perhaps in reaction to the mounting public pressure, police unions have gravitated toward Donald Trump and other right-wing politicians, who share their worldview and embrace ever darker and more conspiratorial premonitions of social breakdown. In August, on the final night of the Republican National Convention, Pat Lynch, president of the New York City Police Benevolent Association, praised Trump for “standing up for law and order” and accused Democrats of surrendering “our streets and our institutions” to “the mob.” In their rhetoric, union leaders often describe cops themselves as a targeted class in need of special protection. “Police officers are being discriminated against around the country simply because of their job,” a former president of the Broward County PBA said in 2015. “African Americans fought against discrimination using boycotts. We’re exercising our First Amendment right to do the same.”

Police increasingly betray the degree to which their interests are not coterminous with the public’s.

Leftists often speak of the police in mechanical terms, as fabricators of the capitalist social order: Police protect the propertied classes at the expense of workers, incarcerate lumpen surplus labor, and enforce a racialized spatial hierarchy, by treating certain areas as criminogenic and others as uncontaminated zones that must be quarantined from infection by crime. Yet police union activity in the current era represents not merely the reassertion of a ruling class or white hegemony, but police acting as a “dominating class for itself,” as Schrader puts it. Unable to recover their authority through ideological means—or restore the public’s faith in their impartial enforcement of the social contract—they instead assert it by cracking skulls. The police response to this latest round of protests, Schrader insists, “has been fully political.” Through their actions and words, police departments are not restoring order, as they would like people to believe; they are “responding to the content of the critique being voiced in the streets.” As activists call for the reduction of police budgets and the redistribution of those resources to other public services, the police aim to “refuse, reject, and crush a demand that they see as impinging on their livelihoods.”

Like Sabrina Javellana, Megan Green, who sits on the St. Louis Board of Aldermen, has become accustomed to death threats. In 2019, she ran to unseat the board president in a Democratic primary. A democratic socialist elected in 2014, Green has criticized St. Louis police for their behavior toward protesters, opposed a police salary increase, and sued the department for tear-gassing her at a march. A few days before the 2019 contest, a series of incendiary posts appeared on the Facebook page of the St. Louis Police Officers Association. The POA called Green a “Communist Cop-Hater” and an “anti-police radical,” and crudely photoshopped her head on a picture of Mao Zedong. The next day, the account posted a hammer and sickle crossed out by a bloody red circle. BETTER DEAD THAN RED! the caption read.

“That wasn’t terribly subtle,” Green remarked to me. The meme was shared widely, then deleted. Soon after, flyers appeared throughout Green’s district printed with the same slogan and a website for the white nationalist group Patriot Front. Threats of violence poured in over social media. “Kike aldermen should be raped to death by niggers,” read an email from a dummy account. Green forwarded it to the city’s director of public safety; nothing came of her report. For three days following the POA posts, she didn’t stay in her home. “I didn’t feel safe,” she explained. Green narrowly lost the election. Sometimes, depending on the rhetoric of the police union, the fear she felt then still flares up.

Megan Green, an alderwoman in St. Louis, Missouri, criticized local police for their behavior toward protesters. Green has become accustomed to receiving death threats.
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The person responsible for the Facebook posts was Jeff Roorda, business manager for the St. Louis POA. “Megan Green deserves every word of criticism we’ve ever heaped on her and more,” Roorda told me. He said he had no regrets about the controversial posts. “She’s an unapologetic Marxist. I mean, why would I regret outing her political position?” He insisted the deleted post was not intended as a threat. “I didn’t develop the expression,” he explained. “It’s been spoken by American patriots for a hundred years.” In his view, it’s “me saying it, not me saying that she’s better dead than red.” Roorda accepts no responsibility for the impressions of those who may be unattuned to that fine grammatical distinction. “I get more death threats than any elected official in St. Louis,” he said. “If they want me to feel sorry ... they’ve come to the wrong place.”

Roorda, himself a cop in the city of Arnold, Missouri, until he was fired for filing false reports in 2001, acknowledged that he sometimes deploys strong rhetoric. He wouldn’t have to, he claimed, if other tools were available. “If you want us to be the same as other unions, then give us the right to strike,” Roorda said. “We resort to public criticism of our adversaries because we have no other recourse.”

This past January, Kim Gardner, the first Black circuit attorney in St. Louis, who was elected on a mandate to reform a notoriously violent police force, sued the POA, alleging a coordinated, racist conspiracy to keep her from doing her job. The union, Gardner said, had “gone out of its way to support white officers accused of perpetrating acts of violence and excessive force against African American citizens.” She singled out Roorda. A few months earlier, Roorda had told a radio interviewer that Gardner was a “menace to society” who should be removed from office “by force or by choice.” Roorda told me that he made the comment, which was interpreted as a threat by Gardner and the St. Louis NAACP, in the context of a “wide-ranging” discussion of various legal and political options for “getting Kim Gardner, who is a complete failure, out of office.” In August, Gardner fought off a primary challenge from a pro-police prosecutor.

Like Edward Mullins, Roorda believes police unions are unfairly maligned for doing what every union does: sticking up for their members. Heather Taylor, the president of the Ethical Society of Police (ESOP), a unionlike organization started in the 1970s to represent Black officers in St. Louis, disagrees. “They shouldn’t be in the business of protecting people’s jobs who shouldn’t keep their jobs,” she said. “We can’t have unions like the FOP and POA who say, ‘No matter what you do, you’re right.’” Taylor, a former St. Louis homicide detective, quit the POA in 2016, when the union paid a $100,000 bond to free Jason Stockley, a white officer who shot and killed a Black motorist in 2011. (Before the deadly encounter, Stockley was recorded saying, “Going to kill this motherfucker, don’t you know it.”) “Here’s my paperwork,” Taylor told the union. “I don’t want to be a part of your association, because I believe Jason Stockley committed murder.”

Heather Taylor, a former homicide detective in St. Louis, Missouri, quit the Police Officers Association in 2016, after the union paid a $100,000 bond to free a white officer who shot and killed a Black motorist in 2011.
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The ESOP is necessary, Taylor insists, because when it comes to the needs of Black officers, the POA goes quiet. During demonstrations following Jason Stockley’s acquittal in 2017, a Black undercover SLPD officer was thrown to the ground, beaten, and bloodied by three white SLPD officers who mistook him for a protester. The Black cop, Luther Hall, said his fellow officers beat him “like Rodney King.” Hall’s assailants, members of the “Civil Disobedience Team,” had exchanged gleeful text messages before the protests, looking forward to “beating the hell out of these shitheads once the sun goes down.” The POA provided legal representation to the white officers, who were ultimately charged with federal civil rights violations (one pleaded guilty; the other two await trial). The same year, an off-duty Black SLPD officer, Milton Green, was shot by a white colleague. Green survived. The POA raised $2,000 for the officer who shot him.

Roorda, for his part, maintained that his union fights for its African American members “as hard as anybody does.” Though their organizations share many members—most Black officers join both groups—Roorda and Taylor are no longer on speaking terms. Meanwhile, St. Louis remains one of the deadliest police departments in America. A project mapping police violence over the past six years found that the city had the highest number of police killings per capita of any major metropolitan area in the country—14 times more than New York City. Black people in St. Louis were killed by police at 12 times the rate of white people. “It is not a happy outcome when an officer has to take a life,” Roorda told me. “The only worse outcome is when the officer himself loses their life.”

 “The police association has gotten more and more extreme,” said Casar, the Austin city councilman. The Austin Police Association president, Ken Casaday, is a union boss in Roorda’s mold. In July, Casaday made national news after an armed BLM protester was shot and killed by a driver who plowed into a crowd of demonstrators in Austin. The victim, Casaday tweeted, was “looking for confrontation and he found it.”

Casaday has been targeting Casar since 2017, when the city council voted unanimously to reject a police contract that stymied effective public transparency and limited community oversight. When Casar accused the department of racial disparities in arrests, Casaday described the councilman’s criticisms as “race-baiting” and denounced him for stirring up “hatred towards police officers.” In Casar’s observation, Casaday’s rants often get picked up on right-wing radio and then recycled by InfoWars and similar outlets. InfoWars host Alex Jones lives in Austin and has a strong following in the city. From the number of insults and threats Casar receives from troll accounts online, he can tell when Jones or co-host Owen Shroyer has been talking about him on the show.

But Casar finds perverse reason for hope in the manically pugilistic tone adopted by police unions nationwide. They’re revealing their “true character,” he said. And their public image is declining. Just five or six years ago, it would have been impossible, he told me, to persuade his colleagues to refuse donations from the POA. Javellana has observed the same dynamic among police unions in south Florida. “They’re very flamboyant, very cartoonish,” she said. And the public has stopped responding to their shtick. When the Hallandale SWAT team retired, the union expected the community to respond with sympathy. In Javellana’s view, they had tried to incite fear in residents, to make them worry for their safety without a SWAT team to protect them, but the tactic backfired. “It started this whole debate in my city: Do you need a SWAT team?”

Greg Casar, a city councilman in Austin, Texas, accused the police department of racial disparities in arrests. From the number of insults and threats Casar receives from troll accounts online, he can tell when right-wing radio hosts have been talking about him.
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Javellana and the other activists hadn’t been calling to dismantle the SWAT team; they were merely asking for the city to reopen the Howard Bowe case. But when the team quit, Javellana urged the city manager not to refill the expensive positions. A majority of her colleagues agreed. Now, when there’s a SWAT call in Hallandale, neighboring cities will field it. Javellana has largely avoided calls to defund or abolish the police, preferring to use language about “reallocating resources” to other social needs. But in the case of the Hallandale Beach SWAT team, she said, “they self-defunded.”

During the first wave of Black Lives Matter protest, activists pushed the Obama administration to embrace a reform agenda. The President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing called for body cameras; anti-bias and de-escalation trainings; community engagement; officer wellness programs to prevent burnout, stress, and overwork; and limitations on the legitimate use of force. These reforms, which did not answer the movement’s more radical or transformational demands, aimed to re-professionalize police departments, to re-embed them in the communities they nominally serve, and to restore the public’s confidence in their neutrality and good faith. Police had lost legitimacy; reform meant to restore it.

But the measures tended to be costly, and required increases in police budgets across America. The Obama administration allocated $263 million for new police training and body cameras in 2014. (Meanwhile, the companies that manufacture body cameras and “less than lethal” weapons, like Tasers, have seen billions in profit.) Thus, the reformist program not only shored up the legitimacy of the police; it also poured more resources into their coffers. More moderate proponents of reform today point to evidence that hiring more rather than fewer cops, and providing those cops with more education, protective equipment, and financial rewards, would both reduce crime and lead to fewer incidents of violent misconduct. If elected president, Joe Biden plans to give police departments an additional $300 million.

By this reasoning, we don’t need to defund the police but reinvest in good policing. Jeff Roorda largely agrees with the logic. “Michael Brown would probably still be alive if Darren Wilson had a second officer in the car with him,” he insisted. “It’s self-defeating when what you’re asking us to do is have fewer lethal encounters with the public, but you give us fewer officers to do it and less training and less equipment and less political support.” Just as unions bargained for increased impunity when cash-strapped cities wouldn’t raise their wages, today they refuse increased oversight without increased funding.

The police have abandoned any pretense of neutrality, adopting a posture of unconstrained menace toward their critics and enemies.

The present era of protest rejects this approach. Activists do not aim to restore the public’s confidence in the legitimacy of the police. “There is not a single era in United States history in which the police were not a force of violence against Black people,” wrote abolitionist organizer Mariame Kaba in The New York Times. “When a police officer brutalizes a Black person, he is doing what he sees as his job.” Calls to “defund” or “abolish” police move the conversation away from the idea of police departments as dysfunctional—badly performing their role as neutral peacekeepers—and toward the question of their true social function. What, in other words, are police for?

Abolitionists believe police exist to manage the contradictions of a profoundly unequal society through the application of repressive violence. They may be “peacekeepers,” but the peace they keep is one that serves a white capitalist status quo. As workers, police have a perverse self-interest; their social necessity is premised on the maintenance of profoundly unequal property and race relations. As a result, according to this critique, police unions are bad labor allies, because a truly egalitarian society is one in which police are far less socially useful. In short, calls to “defund” the police encourage us to imagine, and build, a society in which police aren’t necessary.

Police unions appear to recognize the deeper challenge posed by this new demand—and its potency. Their response has been to abandon any pretense of neutrality. They appeal, more explicitly than ever, to the social factions they intend to protect, while adopting a posture of unconstrained menace toward their critics and enemies. They act and speak as a class for themselves. In this way, police unions are contributing to the dissolution of the myths that might otherwise preserve their political power. “My sense is that they’re in a process of overplaying their hand,” Schrader said.

##### Their only hope is that the crisis of legitimacy will pass, that politicians and the public will come crawling back when society—inevitably, in their view—comes undone at the seams. “The mayor is going to be gone in 18 months,” Edward Mullins told me. “City council is going to be gone.... Maybe we have a president that’s going to be gone. But at the end of the day, law enforcement is still going to be here.... And when things get really out of control, and they seem to be heading in that direction, people are going to want police…. We’re always going to have firemen because things are always going to burn. And there’s always going to be people who commit evil acts, and there’s always going to have to be people who deal with those evil acts. And they call those people police.”

##### Firefighters:

**Mars, Harvey. “Why Can Musicians Strike - But Not Firefighters?” Local 802 AFM, July 2006, www.local802afm.org/allegro/articles/why-can-musicians-strike-but-not-firefighters.**

When Congress formulated the National Labor Relations Act in 1935, a huge category of employees was unfortunately omitted from coverage: public sector employees. In New York State, until the Taylor Law was enacted in 1967, public sector employees were not granted the right to unionize and bargain collectively with their employers. Thus, on a superficial level, the Taylor Law appears to be a huge victory for public sector employees. Recent events, unfortunately, prove that it is just the opposite.

Not only has the Taylor Law exacted a huge toll on public sector employees who have violated its strike prohibition — imposing upon them and their union huge financial penalties — but fines and criminal sanctions may be imposed on labor leaders who permit their membership to engage in a strike against a public sector employer.

The recent incarceration of Roger Toussaint, one of New York’s most prominent labor leaders, and the multi-million dollar fine imposed upon his union, TWU Local 100, are prime examples of the draconian nature of the statute.

Why is it that private sector employees have the right to strike while public sector employees do not?

The major reason for this difference is the fact that public sector employers are governmental entities whose financial ability is determined by tax revenue. Hence, their ability to negotiate over enhanced wages and benefits is severely constrained by public fisc.

Additionally, many public sector employees work in essential areas such as fire, police, health and sanitation services. Many will argue that these services are so important to the public welfare that they must continue unabated.

Under the Taylor Law strikes against a public sector employer are therefore illegal.

Yet, while the Taylor Law’s penalties are a potent deterrent to strike activity , strikes still do occur. We can all remember the UFT strike of 1967, the sanitation strike of 1981 and of course, the transit strike of 2005.

Since the Taylor Law’s enactment, several significant public sector strikes have taken place. The dynamics which compel strike activity still exist, even within the public sector. This is even more the case when a public sector employer adamantly refuses to engage in good faith bargaining with a public sector union.

The recent TWU strike should be a catalyst to motivate labor leaders to seek reform of the Taylor Law. This statute should provide a potent penalty against an intransigent employer who refuses to engage in good faith bargaining. The fact that public employees do not have the right to strike is hardly the impetus to compel public sector employers to engage in true good faith negotiation.

As we know, the strike (or threat of a strike) is the most effective weapon in labor’s arsenal to combat employers who refuse to negotiate fairly. Giving public sector employees the right to negotiate but not the right to strike is like asking a soldier to engage in combat with blanks in his or her weapon.

At a minimum, then, public sector strikes should be permissible as a last resort, if it is proven that an employer has engaged in bad faith bargaining. If that were the current state of the law, I believe there probably would have been no transit strike of 2005.

Next, logic, when firefighters are off the jobs, fires destroy the natural environment, jeopardize safety for civilians, and destroy infastructure. My opponent will likely argue that they hire temporary replacements, but then the value of the strikes is gone.

##### Port employees:

Turn their arg.

### **First: short term. Strikes cost billions of dollars to the economy and affect thousands of jobs,**

### **Tomer & Kane, ‘15** [Adie Tomer is a Senior Fellow of the Metropolitan Policy Program, Joseph W. Kane is a Fellow of the Metropolitan Policy Program, Published: 1/20/15, “How the West Coast Port Strike is Hurting Metro Trade ” Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2015/01/20/how-the-west-coast-port-strike-is-hurting-metro-trade/ ] /Triumph Debate

#### **As a** [**contract dispute**](http://www.cnbc.com/id/102334727) **between dockworkers and shipping companies at 29 West Coast ports continues—and a** [**backlog of cargo**](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2015-01-13/west-coast-shippers-say-port-backups-untenable-amid-talks.html) **piles up—economic costs are mounting across the country. From terminal facilities in Long Beach and Los Angeles to Oakland and Seattle, the six-month-long negotiations between the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) and the Pacific Maritime Association (PMA) have not only** [**delayed thousands of trucks**](http://www.sfgate.com/business/bottomline/article/Port-of-Oakland-delays-Absolute-madness-5969642.php) **and** [**prompted railroads to reroute shipments**](http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/b4f216ea-9680-11e4-a40b-00144feabdc0.html#axzz3P06mntKX)**, but they have also stalled output for many** [**retailers**](http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/12/12/usa-ports-westcoast-idUSL1N0TW03R20141212) **and** [**manufacturers**](http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2015/01/02/manufacturers-lament-west-coast-port-issues/)**.** In the short term, congestion at these ports remains a thorny issue. **A potential** [**five-day work stoppage**](https://nrf.com/media/press-releases/negotiating-deadline-looms-west-coast-ports-economic-trouble-horizon) **could reduce U.S. GDP by almost $2 billion a day and disrupt up to 73,000 jobs.** However, the long-lasting effects may prove even more damaging to metropolitan areas across the country, especially as they look to boost trade in years to come. **After all, most of the** [**$3 trillion**](https://www.brookings.edu/research/reports2/2014/11/06-mapping-freight-tomer-kane) **of international goods traded annually are concentrated in the country’s 100 largest metro areas, including many of the highly valuable electronics, precision instruments, and other** [**advanced industrial products**](https://www.brookings.edu/about/programs/metro/advanced-industries) **used by innovative firms.** Exports and imports from East Asia are particularly important in this respect, including the exchange of $2.8 billion in electronics between Phoenix and China, $647 million in machinery between San Jose and South Korea, and $136 million in chemicals/plastics between San Diego and Japan. The fact that these large metro areas also contain most of the country’s critical port facilities further emphasizes the need to resolve the West Coast strike sooner rather than later. As our [Metro Freight series](https://www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2013/10/22-metro-freight-tomer-kane-puentes) will highlight in an upcoming release, only handful of markets house the essential seaports, airports and land border crossings that funnel the vast majority of international trade. Significantly, three metro areas—Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle—are mired at the center of the ongoing strike and rank among the country’s 10 biggest port complexes, transporting over one-third ($472 billion) of U.S. waterborne exports and imports . **While the seaports in each of these metro areas pump** [**billions of dollars**](http://www.portoflosangeles.org/finance/economic_impact.asp) **into their regional economies and support** [**thousands of direct infrastructure jobs**](https://www.brookings.edu/research/interactives/2014/infrastructure-jobs) **with competitive wages, their importance stretches far beyond local—or even state—boundaries. For example, among all the global goods passing through seaports in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle, $15.7 billion of these products are sourced in Houston, $14.8 billion in New York, and $13.4 billion in Chicago. Even Detroit is responsible for transporting over $8.4 billion through seaports in these three metros.** In this way, resolving the West Coast port strike extends far beyond the ILWU, PMA and their various constituencies. Metro areas throughout the country have a lot at stake as well, eager to see the standoff end and to continue trading the goods that power their economies.

#### **Next, long term: Increased union power magnifies the supply chain crisis and threatens the economy**

**Elizabeth Hanke, Research Fellow, Labor Economics and Policy, Americans Struggle as President Biden Favors Unions During Supply-Chain Breakdown, 11-3-21, https://www.heritage.org/jobs-and-labor/report/americans-struggle-president-biden-favors-unions-during-supply-chain**

SUMMARY**The current supply-chain crisis** has led to a **significant disruption** of **global commerce** that will have far-reaching implications. Americans are already seeing these impacts in the form of empty store shelves, product shortages, rising prices, and inflation. At the epicenter are restrictive union contracts that discourage a 24/7 schedule in favor of an abbreviated work week and fewer working hours, causing lower productivity at the nation’s largest ports in Los Angeles and Long Beach. President Biden’s Build Back Better plan should be abandoned. The Biden Administration should support capital improvements that increase worker productivity, permit the purchase of fully automated equipment, and limit unions’ ability to hobble critical infrastructure. KEY TAKEAWAYSUnion practices play a large role in the nation’s supply-chain crisis, and Democrats’ reconciliation plan avoids any solutions to the issues at West Coast ports.The high labor rates paid by cargo carriers and terminal operators are passed on to U.S. businesses large and small, which, in turn, pass them on to customers.The U.S. cannot allow international commerce, the global supply-chain, and the American economy to exist at the mercy of a handful of labor leaders. Copied Select a Section 1/0 Some in the Biden Administration have used the supply-chain crisis as a talking point to encourage passage of the $3.5 trillion Build Back Better (BBB) plan. According to Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg, the supply-chain crisis “is one more reason why we do need to deliver this infrastructure package, so that we can have a more resilient, flexible physical infrastructure to support our supply chain in this country.”1 This claim is, at a minimum, disingenuous. While the BBB plan is touted as investing $17 billion in port infrastructure, the funding is centered on the Administration’s climate-change initiative and targets reduction of air pollution and greenhouse gases.2 Not only is there no funding for the implementation of productivity enhancements, bowing to union pressure, the plan also expressly prohibits the use of these funds for the purchase of fully automated cargo-handling equipment that is desperately needed to boost port efficiency.3 Reduction of air pollution is a good thing, but these proposed air-quality improvements will not alleviate the nation’s supply-chain issues. The Los Angeles and Long Beach Ports Union contracts and labor practices play a large and detrimental role in the nation’s supply-chain problem. The ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach (LA/LB) provide a good example. The adjacent ports’ location in a large population center explains their rankings as the first and second, respectively, busiest container ports in the U.S.4 Their West Coast proximity to Asian ports, especially top-importer China, and their ability to handle the largest container ships in the world explains why almost half of total U.S. imports move through these ports and why, combined, they rank as the 10th-busiest container port worldwide, handling an average of more than 330,000 containers per week.5 Despite these advantages, the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach seem to have found a way to squander them. Based on the statistical methodology results from the World Bank’s Container Port Performance Index 2020, the port of Los Angeles ranked 328th, and the port of Long Beach 333rd, of 351 global ports, placing them in the bottom 10 percent of global container ports evaluated.6 These two ports were also outpaced by most other U.S. ports, including Philadelphia (83rd), Virginia (85th), New York/New Jersey (89th), and Charleston (95th). Los Angeles and Long Beach posted abysmal scores in both the administrative procedures and the statistical measures that include time in port and other efficiency factors. A look at the contract with the labor union helps to explain why. Union Influence and Labor Costs Dock workers at these ports are represented by the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU). The current contract between the ILWU and the Pacific Maritime Association, the 70-member group of cargo carrier and terminal operator companies, reads like a union wish list. After meeting the baseline 4,000 hours, or just under two years, of industry work experience, members earn $46.23 per hour.7 International Longshore and Warehouse Union and Pacific Maritime Association, “Pacific Coast Longshore Contract Document 2019–2022,” pp. 30 and 31, https://apps.pmanet.org/pubs/LaborAgreements/2019-2022\_PCLCD.pdf (accessed October 26, 2021). Nearly $100,000 per year is a generous salary, but it is only the beginning of the lucrative compensation structure. Second-shift workers earn a 33 percent premium over the regular rate, pushing their hourly pay to $61.64, while third-shift workers’ 60 percent wage premium results in a $73.96 hourly pay rate.8 Ibid., pp. 31 and 32. The compensation package reflects the fact that longshoremen work a difficult and often dangerous job. It also translates to some impressive earnings, such as average dock workers making $171,000 and foremen pulling in $282,000, annually. Union employees receive free employer-paid health care, full pensions, and 15 paid holidays annually, including United Farm Workers founder Cesar Chavez’s birthday, July 5 (“Bloody Thursday”) to commemorate the deaths of two union members during a strike in 1934, and the birthday of ILWU founder Harry Bridges.10 Considering the ability of the ILWU to immediately hamper global commerce, and the large amounts of money being paid to its thousands of members, it is easy to understand the immense power this union wields and the hesitancy many people have in even the slightest criticism of it. Generous to near extravagant as this package is, union leaders who negotiated this contract are doing what is expected of them: acting in the best interest of their members. Unfortunately, while the interests of ILWU members are clearly being served under the contract, the interests of American businesses and everyday consumers are taking a back seat. The high labor rates paid by cargo carriers and terminal operators are passed along to American manufacturers, retailers, and other firms that, in turn, pass them along to customers in the form of higher prices. Ultimately, the impact of these exorbitant labor rates is borne by American consumers, many of whom are already struggling to pay their bills. High labor rates can contribute to higher consumer prices, but the impact of these rates can be offset significantly by higher productivity rates. Labor productivity, traditionally defined as output per unit of input, is a widely used measure of efficiency. Improvements to worker productivity can be a powerful tool in high-wage scenarios. When supported by training, capital improvements, and various forms of automation, many high-wage workers can be sufficiently productive to render themselves the low-cost alternative when performance is evaluated on a per-unit basis. For instance, if worker A is paid twice the hourly rate of worker B, this scenario will still be advantageous as long as worker A’s output is more than twice that of worker B. This is a critical concept when evaluating U.S. port performance. This is no small matter. Los Angeles and Long Beach ports have historically operated two eight-hour shifts plus a partial third shift Monday through Friday totaling 112 hours per week, compared to 168 hours per week at ports that operate 24/7.13 This variance means that LA/LB ports are only open two-thirds the hours of other major container ports, resulting in a corresponding drop in capacity. Further exacerbating the problem is that this represents only shipping unloading time, but the terminal gates have traditionally been open only 88 hours weekly for trucks to pick up containers.14 This restriction to the container pickup process adds time and unnecessary expense to the drayage process. Since any hours above the current 112-hour work week must be paid at an overtime rate, the union’s agreement to increase to a 24/7 schedule translates to a massive overtime payout for its members. Low Productivity. The traditional reliance on this high-cost, low-accessibility model tells only part of the story. When the two ports are actually working, their productivity is astonishingly slow compared to ports in China. Volume in container ports is generally measured by 20-foot equivalent unit (TEU) that is based on the size of a standard 20-foot-long shipping container.15 Since 10-foot and 40-foot shipping containers are also used, albeit less frequently, this metric provides a standard measure for purposes of comparison. Offloading of a typical 6,000 TEU mega-ship takes an average of 24 seconds per container in the ports of Yangshan, Qingdao, and Yantian, but double that time, totaling a full 48 seconds per container, in Los Angeles.16 ,,, Conclusion Americans should not be held hostage by unions. The situation in Los Angeles and Long Beach, which not only laid the groundwork for, but also exacerbated, the supply-chain crisis did not develop overnight. One need look no further than the ILWU’s annual recognition of the tragic “Blood Thursday” labor dispute that occurred nearly a century ago to see evidence of a long and deep-seated animosity. Toxic as labor relations are, the U.S. cannot allow international commerce, the global supply chain, and the American economy to exist at the mercy of a handful of labor leaders. Rectifying this situation will take years and, more importantly, a currently non-existent level of commitment and cooperation from management and unions at these facilities. Considering that President Joe Biden ran his 2020 election campaign as a self-professed “union guy” whose inauguration speech promised to “unify America,” this seems like an ideal time for him to get started on his promise by gaining ILWU cooperation to alleviate avoidable problems for all Americans.

#### **(turn aff arg)Higher wages increase inflation snowball**

**Boyle, 11-5, 21, Ryan James Boyle is a Vice President and Senior Economist within the Global Risk Management division of Northern Trust. In this role, Ryan is responsible for briefing clients and partners on the economy and business conditions, supporting internal stress testing and capital allocation processes, and publishing economic commentaries, Labor: Strike While the Iron Is Hot**

Inflation concerns are leading workers to demand higher wages. In most recent years, wages rose more rapidly than inflation; today, the opposite is true. As workers secure better increases, firms may be prompted to raise prices, initiating a feedback loop that could be difficult to arrest.

**This cycle of inflation leads to an economic recession**

On June 16, the Federal Reserve announced it may raise interest rates twice in 2023 in response to higher-than-expected increases in inflation. In his announcement, Fed Chairman Jerome Powell said the higher inflation recorded this year should be temporary, but the risks that it would be “higher and more persistent than we expect” could not be ignored.

John Horn, professor of practice in economics at Olin Business School at Washington University in St. Louis, agrees with Powell’s overall inflation forecast of 3.4% for 2021. Inflation in some high-demand categories — such as travel, construction material and automobiles — may be even higher, he said.

Horn

However, some prices, such as lumber, are already coming back down, providing hope that current inflation is a short-term corrective measure and not a sign of long-term systemic problems.

“The uncertainty for me is how this gets played politically and what messaging gets through,” Horn said.

Inflation, Horn explained, can be a self-fulfilling prophesy. Worry about rising inflation can lead employees to demand higher wages. In order to pay those higher wages, employers raise prices for their products and services, creating actual inflation. The wage-price spiral is a vicious cycle. Likewise, inflation expectations will cause banks to increase interest rates, making it more expensive for businesses and individuals to borrow money.

“It’s important for the Fed to make sure that this is seen as a temporary blip and not systemic. Because if it’s seen as a systemic problem, and inflation expectations take charge, it’s really hard to make it stop,” Horn said. “Once that happens, the only way to stop inflation is to raise the interest rates really high and cause a recession. Maybe not in 2022, but it will be on the Fed’s radar. They will want to stop [rising inflation] sooner than later.”

“However, if prices come down and people see this as a temporary blip related to COVID-19 and the supply chain problems — if that story takes hold — then I’m not worried about inflation,” he added.

What’s driving inflation?

In the simplest terms, inflation occurs when consumer demand increases or supply contracts causing prices to rise. The current economic situation is a little more complicated, in part because both effects are occurring.

**Sundaram, Jomo kwame, Jomo Kwame Sundaram, is a prominent Malaysian economist. He is Senior Adviser at the Khazanah Research Institute, Visiting Fellow at the Initiative for Policy Dialogue, Columbia University, and Adjunct Professor at the International Islamic University., and Vladimir Popov Vladimir Popov is an interregional adviser in the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations and professor emeritus at the New Economic School in Moscow. He is also professor at the Graduate School of International Business at the Russian Presidential Academy of the National Economy and Public Administration in Moscow, and an adjunct research professor at the Institute of European and Russian Studies at Carleton University in Ottawa. “Economic Crisis Can Trigger World War Jomo Kwame Sundaram and Vladimir Popov.” International Development Economics Associates (IDEAs), 13 Feb. 2019, www.networkideas.org/news-analysis/2019/02/economic-crisis-can-trigger-world-war.**

**Liberalization’s discontents**

Rising economic insecurity, inequalities and deprivation are expected to strengthen ethno-populist and jingoistic nationalist sentiments, and increase social tensions and turmoil, especially among the growing precariat and others who feel vulnerable or threatened.

Thus, ethno-populist inspired chauvinistic nationalism may exacerbate tensions, leading to conflicts and tensions among countries, as in the 1930s. Opportunistic leaders have been blaming such misfortunes on outsiders and may seek to reverse policies associated with the perceived causes, such as ‘globalist’ economic liberalization.

Policies which successfully check such problems may reduce social tensions, as well as the likelihood of social turmoil and conflict, including among countries. However, these may also inadvertently exacerbate problems. The recent spread of anti-globalization sentiment appears correlated to slow, if not negative per capita income growth and increased economic inequality.

To be sure, globalization and liberalization are statistically associated with growing economic inequality and rising ethno-populism. Declining real incomes and growing economic insecurity have apparently strengthened ethno-populism and nationalistic chauvinism, threatening economic liberalization itself, both within and among countries.

**Insecurity, populism, conflict**

Thomas Piketty has argued that a sudden increase in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Although causality is difficult to prove, with wealth and income inequality now at historical highs, this should give cause for concern.

Of course, other factors also contribute to or exacerbate civil and international tensions, with some due to policies intended for other purposes. Nevertheless, even if unintended, such developments could inadvertently catalyse future crises and conflicts.

Publics often have good reason to be restless, if not angry, but the emotional appeals of ethno-populism and jingoistic nationalism are leading to chauvinistic policy measures which only make things worse.

At the international level, despite the world’s unprecedented and still growing interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed as the US increasingly resorts to unilateral, sovereigntist policies without bothering to even build coalitions with its usual allies.

**Avoiding Thucydides’ iceberg**

Thus, protracted economic distress, economic conflicts or another financial crisis could lead to military confrontation by the protagonists, even if unintended. Less than a decade after the Great Depression started, the Second World War had begun as the Axis powers challenged the earlier entrenched colonial powers.

They patently ignored Thucydides’ warning, in chronicling the Peloponnesian wars over two millennia before, when the rise of Athens threatened the established dominance of Sparta!

Anticipating and addressing such possibilities may well serve to help avoid otherwise imminent disasters by undertaking pre-emptive collective action, as difficult as that may be.

The international community has no excuse for being like the owners and captain of the Titanic, conceitedly convinced that no iceberg could possibly sink the great ship.

**Liu, Qian, Managing Director, Greater China, The Economist Group. “The Next Economic Crisis Could Cause a Global Conflict. Here’s Why.” World Economic Forum, World Economic Forum, 7 Feb. 2020,** [**www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why**](http://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why)**.**

**Furthers this claim, stating**

The response to the 2008 economic crisis has relied far too much on monetary stimulus, in the form of quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates, and included far too little structural reform. This means that the next crisis could come soon – and pave the way for a large-scale military conflict.

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social, political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a major global military conflict.

The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates.

But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies.

Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment.

The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008.

In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929.

As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy.

If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war.

For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun.

To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict.

According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels.

##### Municipal

B. Costs of Collective Bargaining

Wellington and Winter's discussion of the cost of substituting collective for individual bargaining in the public sector includes a chain

of causation which runs from (1) an allegation that market restraints

are weak in the public sector, largely because the services are essential;

to (2) an assertion that the public puts pressure on civic officials to

arrive at a quick settlement; to (8) a statement that other pressure

groups have no weapons comparable to a strike; to (4) a conclusion that

the strike thus imposes a high cost since the political process is distorted.

Let us discuss these steps in order:

(1) Market Restraints: A key argument in the case for the inappropriateness of public sector strikes is that economic constraints are not

present to any meaningful degree in the public sector.22 This argument

is not entirely convincing. First, wages lost due to strikes are as important to public employees as they are to employees in the private sector.

Second, the public's concern over increasing tax rates may prevent the

decision-making process from being dominated by political instead of

economic considerations. The development of multilateral bargaining

in the public sector is an example of how the concern over taxes may

result in a close substitute for market constraints.2 In San Francisco,

for example, the Chamber of Commerce has participated in negotiations

between the city and public employee unions and has had some success

in limiting the economic gains of the unions. A third and related

economic constraint arises for such services as water, sewage and, in some

instances, sanitation, where explicit prices are charged. Even if representatives of groups other than employees and the employer do not

enter the bargaining process, both union and local government are

aware of the economic implications of bargaining which leads to

higher prices which are clearly visible to the public. A fourth economic

constraint on employees exists in those services where subcontracting

to the private sector is a realistic alternative. 4 Warren, Michigan, resolved a bargaining impasse with an American Federation of State,

County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) local by subcontracting

its entire sanitation service; Santa Monica, California, ended a strike of

22. "It further seems to us that, to the extent union power is delimited by market or other forces in the public sector, these constraints do not come into play nearly as quickly as in the private." Wellington and Winter, supra note 2, at 1117.

23. McLennan and Moskow, Multilateral Bargaining in the Public Sector, 21 IND. RE.

REs. ASSN. PROCEEDINGS 31 (1968).

24. The subcontracting option is realistic in functions sud as sanitation and street or highway repairs, and some white collar occupations. Several other functions, including

hospitals and education, may be transferred entirely to the private sector. The ultimate

response by government is to terminate the service, at least temporarily. In late 1968,

Youngstown, Ohio, dosed its schools for five weeks due to a taxpayer's revolt. 281 Gov.

Emp. REL. REP. B-6 (1969). In late 1969, 10 Ohio school districts ran out of money and

were dosed down. Wall Street Journal, Dec. 19, 1969, at 1, col. I.
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city employees by threatening to subcontract its sanitation operations.

If the subcontracting option is preserved, wages in the public sector

need not exceed the rate at which subcontracting becomes a realistic

alternative.

An aspect of the lack-of-market-restraints argument is that public

services are essential. Even at the analytical level, Wellington and

Winter's case for essentiality is not convincing. They argue:

The Services performed by a private transit authority are neither

less nor more essential to the public than those that would be

performed if the transit atuhority were owned by a municipality.

A railroad or a dock strike may be much more damaging to a community than "job action" by teachers. This is not to say that

government services are not essential. They are both because they

may seriously injure a city's economy and occasionally the physical

welfare of its citizens. 25

This is a troublesome passage. It ends with the implicit conclusion

that all government services are essential. This conclusion is important

in Wellington and Winter's analysis because it is a step in their demonstration that strikes are inappropriate in all governmental services.

But the beginning of the passage, with its example of "job action" by

teachers, suggests that essentiality is not an inherent characteristic of

government services but depends on the specific service being evaluated.

Furthermore the transit authority example suggests that many services

are interchangeable between the public and private sectors. The view

that various government services are not of equal essentiality and

that there is considerable overlap between the kinds of services provided in the public and private sectors is reinforced by our field

work and strike data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Examples

include:

1. Where sanitation services are provided by a municipality, such as

Cleveland, sanitationmen are prohibited from striking. Yet, sanitationmen in Philadelphia, Portland, and San Francisco are presumably

free to strike since they are employed by private contractors rather

than by the cities.

2. There were 25 local government strikes by the Teamsters in

1965-68, most involving truck drivers and all presumably illegAl. Yet

the Teamsters' strike involving fuel oil truck drivers in New York

25. Wellington and Winter, supra note 2, at 1123.
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City last winter was legal even though the interruption of fuel oil

service was believed to have caused the death of several people.20

(2) Public Pressure: The second argument in the Wellington and

Winter analysis is that public pressure on city officials forces them to

make quick settlements. The validity of this argument depends on

whether the service is essential. Using as a criterion whether the service

is essential in the short run, we believe a priori that services can be

divided into three categories: (1) essential services-police and firewhere strikes immediately endanger public health and safety; (2) intermediate services-sanitation, hospitals, transit, water, and sewagewhere strikes of a few days might be tolerated; (3) nonessential services

-streets, parks, education, housing, welfare and general administration

-where strikes of indefinite duration could be tolerated.2 These

categories are not exact since essentiality depends on the size of the

city. Sanitation strikes will be critical in large cities such as New York

but will not cause much inconvenience in smaller cities where there

are meaningful alternatives to governmental operation of sanitation

services.

Statistics on the duration of strikes which occurred in the public

sector between 1965 and 1968 provide evidence not only that public

services are of unequal essentially, but also that the a priori categories

which we have used have some validity. As can be seen from Table 1,

strikes in the essential services (police and fire) had an average duration

of 4.7 days, while both the intermediate and the nonessential services

had an average duration of approximately 10.5 days. It is true that

the duration of strikes in the intermediate and nonessential services is

only half the average duration of strikes in the private sector during

these years.28 However, this comparison is somewhat misleading since

al of the public sector strikes were illegal, and many were ended by

injunction, while presumably a vast majority of the private sector

strikes did not suffer from these constraints. It would appear that with

the exception of police and fire protection, public officials are, to some

degree, able to accept long strikes. The ability of governments to

so choose indicates that political pressures generated by strikes are not

so strong as to undesirably distort the entire decision-making process

26. N.Y. Times, Dec. 26, 1968, at 1, col. 1, and Dec. 27, 1968, at 1, col. 5.

27. We consider education a nonessential service. However, because our portion of

the Brookings Institution study excludes education, our analysis in this article will also

largely exclude education.

28. U.S. BuRAu OF LABOR STATSTIcs, DFr'T or LABOR, BULL. No. 1611, AvALTSLS OF

WORK STOPPAGFS 1967, at 4 (1969).
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of government. City officials in Kalamazoo, Michigan, were able to

accept a forty-eight day strike by sanitationmen and laborers; Sacramento County, California, survived an eighty-seven day strike by welfare workers. A three month strike of hospital workers has occurred in

Cuyahoga County (Cleveland), Ohio.

(3) The Strike as a Unique Weapon: The third objection to the

strike is that it provides workers with a weapon unavailable to the

employing agency or to other pressure groups. Thus, unions have a

superior arsenal. The Taylor Committee Report opposes strikes for

this reason, among others, arguing that "there can scarcely be a countervailing lockout."29 Conceptually, we see no reason why lockouts

are less feasible in the public than in the private sector, Legally,

public sector lockouts are now forbidden, but so are strikes; presumably

both could be legalized. Actually, public sector lockouts have occurred.

The Social Service Employees Union (SSEU) of New York City sponsored a "work-in" in 1967 during which all of the caseworkers went

to their office but refused to work. Instead, union-sponsored lectures

were given by representatives of organizations such as CORE, and

symposia were held on the problems of welfare workers and clients.

The work-in lasted for one week, after which the City locked out

the caseworkers,

A similar assertion is made by Wellington and Winter, who claim

that no pressure group other than unions has a weapon comparable

to the strike. But this argument raises a number of questions. Is

the distinctive characteristic of an inappropriate method of influencing

decisions by public officials that it is economic as opposed to political?

If this is so, then presumably the threat of the New York Stock

Exchange to move to New Jersey unless New York City taxes on stock

transfers were lowered and similar devices should be outlawed along

with the strike.

(4) Distortion of the Political Process: The ultimate concern of both

the Taylor Committee and Wellington and Winter is that "a strike

of government employees ...introduces an alien force in the legis.

lative process."30 It is "alien" because, in the words of the Taylor

Committee Report:

Careful thought about the matter shows conclusively, we believe,

that while the right to strike normally performs a useful function

in the private enterprise sector (where relative economic power

29. TAYLOR CO I ,rrmTE R.E ORT, supra note 1, at 15.

30. Id.
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is the final determinant in the making of private agreements),

it is not compatible with the orderly functioning of our democratic

form of representative government (in which relative political

power is the final determinant).31

The essence of this analysis appears to be that certain means used to

influence the decision-making process in the public sector-those which

are political-are legitimate, while other-those which are economicare not. For several reasons, we believe that such distinctions among

means are tenuous.

First, any scheme which differentiates economic power from political

power faces a perplexing definitional task. The International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences defines the political process as "the activities of people in various groups as they struggle for-and use-power

to achieve personal and group purposes."32 And what is power?

Power in use invariably involves a mixture of many different

forms-sometimes mutually reinforcing-of persuasion and pressure . . ..

Persuasion takes place when A influences B to adopt a course

of action without A's promising or threatening any reward or

punishment. It may take the form of example, expectation, proposals, information, education, or propaganda ....

Pressure is applied by A upon B whenever A tries to make

a course of action more desirable by promising or threatening

contingent rewards or punishments. It may take the form of force,

commands, manipulation, or bargaining ....

Physical force is a blunt instrument .... Besides, more flexible

and reliable modes of pressure are available. Rewards, in the form

of monetary payments, new positions, higher status, support, favorable votes, cooperation, approval, or the withdrawal of any anticipated punishment, may be bestowed or promised. Punishment,

in the form of fines, firing, reduction in status, unfavorable votes,

noncooperation, rejection, disapproval, or withdrawal of any anticipated reward, may be given or threatened ....

Bargaining is a still more fluid-and far more persuasiveform of using pressure. In bargaining, all sides exercise power upon

each other through reciprocal promises or threats .... Indeed,

force, command, and manipulation tend to become enveloped in

the broader and more subtle processes of bargaining.-

We have quoted at length from this discussion of the political process

because we believe it illustrates the futility of attempting to distinguish

31. Id. at 18-19.

32. 12 INT'L ENCYC. SOCIAL ScENcEs 265 (1968).

33. Id. at 269-70.
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**LII 6 [Cornell Legal Information Institute, 2006, "10 U.S. Code § 976," Cornell Legal Information Institute, https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/10/976]/Kankee**

(a)In this section: (1)The term “member of the armed forces” means (A) a member of the armed forces who is serving on active duty, (B) a member of the National Guard who is serving on full-time National Guard duty, or (C) a member of a Reserve component while performing inactive-duty training. (2)The term “military labor organization” means any organization that engages in or attempts to engage in— (A)negotiating or bargaining with any civilian officer or employee, or with any member of the armed forces, on behalf of members of the armed forces, concerning the terms or conditions of military service of such members in the armed forces; (B)representing individual members of the armed forces before any civilian officer or employee, or any member of the armed forces, in connection with any grievance or complaint of any such member arising out of the terms or conditions of military service of such member in the armed forces; or (C)striking, picketing, marching, demonstrating, or any other similar form of concerted action which is directed against the Government of the United States and which is intended to induce any civilian officer or employee, or any member of the armed forces, to— (i)negotiate or bargain with any person concerning the terms or conditions of military service of any member of the armed forces, (ii)recognize any organization as a representative of individual members of the armed forces in connection with complaints and grievances of such members arising out of the terms or conditions of military service of such members in the armed forces, or (iii)make any change with respect to the terms or conditions of military service of individual members of the armed forces. (3)The term “civilian officer or employee” means an employee, as such term is defined in section 2105 of title 5. (b)It shall be *unlawful* for a member of the *armed forces*, knowing of the activities or objectives of a particular military labor organization— (1)to join or maintain membership in such organization; or (2)to *attempt to enroll any other member of the armed forces as* a member of such organization. (c)It shall be unlawful for any person— (1)to enroll in a military labor organization any member of the armed forces or to solicit or accept dues or fees for such an organization from any member of the armed forces; or (2)to negotiate or *bargain*, or attempt through any *coercive act* to negotiate or bargain, with any civilian officer or employee, or any member of the armed forces, on behalf of members of the armed forces, concerning the terms or conditions of service of such members; (3)to *organize* or attempt to organize, or *participate* in, *any strike*, picketing, march, demonstration, or other similar form of *concerted action* involving members of the armed forces that is *directed* *against* the Government of the United States and that is intended to induce any civilian officer or employee, or any member of the armed forces, to— (A)negotiate or bargain with any person concerning the terms or conditions of service of any member of the armed forces, (B)recognize any military labor organization as a representative of individual members of the armed forces in connection with any complaint or grievance of any such member arising out of the terms or conditions of service of such member in the armed forces, or (C)make any change with respect to the terms or conditions of service in the armed forces of individual members of the armed forces; or (4)to use any military installation, facility, reservation, vessel, or other property of the United States for any meeting, march, picketing, demonstration, or other similar activity for the purpose of engaging in any activity prohibited by this subsection or by subsection (b) or (d). (d)It shall be unlawful for any military labor organization to represent, or attempt to represent, any member of the armed forces before any civilian officer or employee, or any member of the armed forces, in connection with any grievance or complaint of any such member arising out of the terms or conditions of service of such member in the armed forces. (e)No member of the armed forces, and no civilian officer or employee, may— (1)negotiate or bargain on behalf of the United States concerning the terms or conditions of military service of members of the armed forces with any person who represents or purports to represent members of the armed forces, or (2)permit or authorize the use of any military installation, facility, reservation, vessel, or other property of the United States for any meeting, march, picketing, demonstration, or other similar activity which is for the purpose of engaging in any activity prohibited by subsection (b), (c), or (d). Nothing in this subsection shall prevent commanders or supervisors from giving consideration to the views of any member of the armed forces presented individually or as a result of participation on command-sponsored or authorized advisory councils, committees, or organizations. (f)Whoever violates subsection (b), (c), or (d) shall be fined under title 18 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, except that, in the case of an organization (as defined in section 18 of such title), the fine shall not be less than $25,000. (g)Nothing in this section shall limit the right of any member of the armed forces— (1)to join or maintain membership in any organization or association not constituting a “military labor organization” as defined in subsection (a)(2) of this section; (2)to present complaints or grievances concerning the terms or conditions of the service of such member in the armed forces in accordance with established military procedures; (3)to seek or receive information or counseling from any source; (4)to be represented by counsel in any legal or quasi-legal proceeding, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations; (5)to petition the Congress for redress of grievances; or (6)to take such other administrative action to seek such administrative or judicial relief, as is authorized by applicable laws and regulations.

Amendments 1997—Subsec. (f). Pub. L. 105–85 substituted “shall be fined under title 18 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, except that, in the case of an organization (as defined in section 18 of such title), the fine shall not be less than $25,000.” for “shall, in the case of an individual, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, and in the case of an organization or association, be fined not less than $25,000 and not more than $250,000.” 1987—Subsec. (a)(1) to (3). Pub. L. 100–26 inserted “The term” after each par. designation and struck out uppercase letter of first word after first quotation marks in each paragraph and substituted lowercase letter. 1986—Subsec. (a)(1). Pub. L. 99–661 struck out the second of two commas before “(B)”. 1984—Subsec. (a)(1). Pub. L. 98–525 added cl. (B) and redesignated existing cl. (B) as (C). Findings; Purpose Pub. L. 95–610, § 1, Nov. 8, 1978, 92 Stat. 3085, provided that: “(a)The Congress makes the following findings: “(1)Members of the armed forces of the United States must be prepared to fight and, if necessary, to die to protect the welfare, security, and liberty of the United States and of their fellow citizens. “(2)Discipline and prompt *obedience* to lawful orders of superior officers are *essential* and time-honored *elements* of the American *military* tradition and have been reinforced from the earliest articles of war by laws and regulations prohibiting conduct detrimental to the military chain of command and lawful military authority. “(3)The processes of conventional collective bargaining and labor-management negotiation cannot and should not be applied to the relationships between members of the armed forces and their military and civilian superiors. “(4)Strikes, slowdowns, picketing, and other traditional forms of job action have no place in the armed forces. “(5)Unionization of the armed forces would be *incompatible* with the military *chain of command*, would *undermine* the role, authority, and position of the commander, and would *impair* the morale and *readiness* of the armed forces. “(6)The circumstances which could constitute a threat to the ability of the armed forces to perform their mission are not comparable to the circumstances which could constitute a threat to the ability of Federal civilian agencies to perform their functions and should be viewed in light of the need for effective performance of duty by each member of the armed forces. “(b)The purpose of this Act [enacting this section] is to promote the readiness of the armed forces to defend the United States.”

**Caforio 18 [Giuseppe Caforio, Brigadier General with degrees in law, political science, and strategic studies (FYI, the author died ~2015, but this was republished in 2018 in an anthology book), 5-20-2018, "Unionisation of the Military: Representation of the Interests of Military Personnel," SpringerLink,** [**https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-71602-2\_19]/Kankee**](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-71602-2_19%5D/Kankee)

**Agrees, saying:**

THE OPPOSITION TO UNIONIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES But if a convergence between the military establishment and civil society is in progress and has brought the two areas of life and work much closer together, why is there a unionization issue for the armed forces? Why is there opposition to a collective bargaining system for military personnel? The fundamental reason must be sought in the specificity of the military, which is summarized thusly by David R. Segal: Because of its unique social function—the legitimate management of violence—the military requires of its personnel a degree of commitment that differs from that required by other modern organizations. Military personnel, unlike their civilian counterparts, enter into a contract of *unlimited liability* with their employer. They cannot unilaterally terminate their employment any time they wish. They are subject to moving and working in any environment where the service decides they are needed. They are required to place the needs of service above the needs of their families, and must frequently endure long periods of separation. They are often called upon to work more than an eight-hour day, for which they receive no additional compensation. And in time of war, they must face prolonged danger, and may even forfeit their lives. Obviously, the man on *the firing line* *is* required to make a commitment of a *different* order *from* that made by the worker on *the assembly line*. (D. Segal and Kramer, 1977, p. 28). Bernhard Boene, in a study devoted to a different research topic (Boene, 1990), is both precise and efficacious in differentiating military "work" from civilian work. Military specificity, writes Boene, does not lie only in the area of the risks to which one supposes the combatant is exposed, but also in the limits of application of common rationality in combat and in the situation of habitual transgression of social norms that it entails. This implies a particular type of socialization. Notwithstanding partial analogies, according to Boene, civil emergencies belong to a different reality than military ones do. An officer, in particular, is not an ordinary civil servant: he must respond to a "call," consisting of a particular interest in military things, dedication to the common welfare, acceptance of risking his life, and submission to a series of obligations that are peculiar to the military profession. SOME THEORETICAL POSITIONS ON THE ISSUE Discussing a sample survey, David Segal observes that in the United States, in the absence of a union for military personnel, there is a considerable "misfit" between soldiers' perception of the characteristics of their role and the preferred characteristics, while in an analogous sample of civilian manpower this misfit is much smaller. In examining the attempted remedies, Segal states: "Any change to be achieved through organizational interventions, however, is likely to be incremental, and not to resolve the discrepancy between the characteristics that military personnel would like in their jobs and the characteristics that they perceived their jobs to have" (D. Segal and Kramer, 1977, p. 46). According to Segal, unionization can solve this problem, but it presents two dangers that must be carefully weighed: the first is that it tends to extend its influence also to aspects of management and direction of the military apparatus; the second is that it involves a politicisation of the personnel. Gwyn Harries Jenkins examines the consequences that unionisation would have on the operational efficiency of the armed forces and identifies three fundamental ones: 1. The creation of a dual authority structure: Since there has been a change in the basis of authority and discipline in the military establishment and a shift from authoritarian domination to greater reliance on manipulation, persuasion and group consensus, unionization extends the boundaries of these changes: it brings into armed forces the full effects of the organizational revolution which pervades contemporary society, creating a *dual authority* structure while modifying the traditional basis of *compliance*. (H. Jenkins, 1977, p. 70) 2. A much greater resemblance of the style of military command to that of civilian management. The new tasks and the introduction of unionization would require commanders to possess skills and orientations more and more like those of civilian managers. 3. An abdication by the officer of his traditional image. Indeed, if the officer "wishes to retain his self-image and ideas of honor, then the introduction of trade unions into the military creates a conflict situation with *substantial dysfunctional consequences*" (H.Jenkins, 1977, p. 71). Harries Jenkins concludes, however, by affirming that, as a radical criticism of the existing military system, "the unionization of the armed forces can only result in an improvement to an otherwise defective situation" (H. Jenkins, 1977, p. 69). According to William Taylor and Roger Arango (Taylor et al., 1977b), many reasons offered in the United States for or against the unionization of military personnel appear to be rhetorical and not sufficiently investigated. Those who take a negative critical stance, for example, contend that unionization would lead to a *breakdown in discipline*; *threaten the chain of command*; and, especially, *undermine* the military's *ability* to carry out its assigned mission. Through a concrete field analysis, these authors believe they can shed light on the advantages and disadvantages of this process. Among the advantages are the acquisition of a greater sense of individual security, a valorization of the dignity of individuals, improved social communication, and greater competitiveness with other occupations and professions in recruiting personnel. The real *drawbacks* would essentially be reduced to two: a risk of *divisiveness* within units, due to acquired *strife* between personnel categories; and an increase in *personnel costs*. Carlo Jean (Jean, 1981) states that in itself, the creation of unions would inevitably produce increased *confrontation*; without it, the union representatives would have neither prestige nor *credibility*. He does not believe, however, that the biggest drawback that would derive from it would be that of undermining the internal cohesiveness of the armed forces and their operational capacity. According to this author military leaders would align themselves with the union's demands out of necessity to avoid internal breakup. An unacceptable corporative force would be produced that sooner or later would inevitably oppose it to the political power. The danger that a union of military personnel involves for civil society is, in his opinion, much greater than its negative implications on the efficiency of the military itself. Along the same line is the fear expressed by Sen. Thurmond (reported by David Cortright, cited essay) that unionization might *reinforce* the military *establishment* and increase its *influence* over society at large, decreasing the capacity for political control. This issue had already been treated by Cortright in another essay (Cortright and Thurmond, 1977b), where on the one hand he argued that unionization in the armed forces would help to prevent any form of separateness from civil society while noting on the other that little attention was given to the possibility that unionization substantially strengthens the military's ability to *wield* *influence*. Thurmond, again, judges the European experience negatively and asks himself how unionized troops would respond in battle. However, to remain faithful to his position, Thurmond conceives the armed forces as a separate body from civil society, argues that military personnel are not comparable to other labor force categories, and advances the fear that union representation of the interests of military personnel would bring the defence budget to unacceptable levels. Of the countries included in our study, unions for military personnel exist in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Belgium, and The Netherlands. Unionization is prohibited in England, the United States, Canada, France, Portugal, Turkey, and Greece. Strikes are allowed only in Austria and Sweden. ANALYSIS OF HISTORICAL EXPERIENCES THROUGH THE THOUGHT OF VARIOUS AUTHORS

**Schmidt, Brian. “The Debate on American Hegemony.” DOC Research Institute, 13 June 2019, doc-research.org/2019/06/the-debate-on-american-hegemony.**

US hegemony

Given the diversity that exists among how the different theories comprehend the concept of hegemony, it is not surprising that there have been endless debates about the character and durability of US hegemony. From the perspective of contemporary American foreign policy, two questions about US hegemony have become fundamental today: one, does the maintenance of hegemony continue to serve American interests; and two, is American hegemony in decline? The answers to these two questions are actually interrelated.

If one believes that hegemony is beneficial for the United States, as proponents of both primacy and liberalism assert, then every effort should be made to maintain it. Conversely, if one does not believe that hegemony serves American interests, which is the position of balance-of-power realists and offensive realists, then instead of pursuing policies to maintain it, the United States should begin adjusting to the reality of inevitable hegemonic decline and the rise of peer-competitors such as China.

One of the advantages of the realist conception of hegemony is its focus on the material basis of hegemony: military and economic strength. Yet even while agreeing that material capabilities are the cornerstone of hegemony, there are a number of contending views on the relative power position of the United States today. A key point of contention in the debate about the durability of American hegemony is the degree to which the United States continues to have unrivalled capabilities.

If one does not believe that hegemony serves American interests, which is the position of balance-of-power realists and offensive realists, then instead of pursuing policies to maintain it, the United States should begin adjusting to the reality of inevitable hegemonic decline and the rise of peer-competitors such as China

In Layne’s terminology, “unipolar optimists believe that American hegemony will last for a very long time and that it is beneficial for the United States and for the international system as a whole” (Layne, 2007, p. 134). The best representatives of this view are William Wohlforth and Stephen Brooks. Wohlforth and Brooks dispute the popular view that China’s rise represents a challenge to US hegemony, insisting that the United States continues to have preponderant material capabilities that are vastly greater than any other state (Brooks and Wohlforth, 2008).

According to Brooks and Wohlforth, American hegemony is beneficial to both the United States and the world primarily because it greatly reduces security competition by rendering the balance of power inoperable and continues to confer significant benefits to the United States. For Brooks and Wohlforth, it is of vital importance that the United States continues to pursue a grand strategy of primacy or “deep engagement” in order to prevent the return of balance-of-power politics, which they argue is not possible in a unipolar system (Brooks, Ikenberry, and Wohlforth, 2013, pp. 7-51).

In contrast, ‘unipolar pessimists’ believe that the United States’ relative power position is declining and view the grand strategy of primacy to be antithetical to American interests. Most structural realists believe that global hegemony is either impossible to achieve or fleeting. Not only is it difficult to dominate the entire globe, but structural realists strongly believe in the prevalence of balance-of-power politics.

Contrary to unipolar optimists, structural realists do not believe that balancing has failed to take place since the dawn of the unipolar moment. Indeed, it is for the very reason that active balancing is taking place especially on the part of China and Russia, that many structural realists argue that the United States needs to abandon the grand strategy of primacy or deep engagement and adopt a grand strategy of restraint or offshore balancing (Posen, 2002, pp. 36-42).

Liberal conceptions of hegemony have much to offer on the debate about US hegemony. Instead of simply emphasising material capabilities, proponents of liberal hegemony accentuate the leadership and institutionalised components of hegemony. However, like unipolar optimists, those adhering to liberal versions of hegemonic stability theory argue that American hegemony is beneficial to both the United States and the world and should be maintained.

Without US hegemony, there would be more global tensions, increasing the chances of conflict and possibly wars that would kill thousands if not millions.

Next, if we allow Medical Workers to strike, even when their moral obligation is to save lives, there would be deaths.

The argument is that the United States is better able to pursue a liberal grand strategy – democracy promotion, free trade, interdependence, and multilateral institutionalism – when it has unrivaled capabilities (Ikenberry, 2000). With respect to whether the United States can maintain its unipolar position indefinitely, liberals are, in Layne’s terminology, unipolar agnostics. The question about the durability of American hegemony is not just about trends in the relative distribution of power but about the character of American leadership.

According to liberal conceptions of hegemonic stability theory, US power is not used to dominate others, but rather to provide the leadership that is necessary for an open, liberal international order to exist. This is the crux of Ikenberry’s story of how the United States after World War Two built and maintained a liberal hegemonic order that has produced peace and prosperity for the world. According to Ikenberry, the United States did not use its preponderant power after World War Two to dominate the world and create an empire. Instead, American hegemonic leadership was wisely used to strike a grand bargain and establish the foundations of a liberal international order.

With the rise of new powers, the growth of right-wing populism, the turn to authoritarianism, and the election of Donald Trump, the durability of the liberal international order is being called into question. Yet most liberals remain confident that the liberal international order will endure. Their basic argument is that the rules and institutions the United States helped build under Pax Americana will persist, making it difficult for revisionist states to fundamentally change the liberal international order.

The English School and Social Constructivism move the discussion of American hegemony and unipolarity away from raw material capabilities to the dynamics of legitimacy. Instead of engaging in the endless debate about China’s rise and the future of US power they emphasise the role of legitimacy in maintaining any given hegemonic order. Only time will tell if future US presidents will be able to reclaim a legitimate liberal order or if China is able to provide the legitimacy necessary either to take over leadership of the liberal international order or offer an alternative vision (Schweller and Pu, 2011, pp.41-72).

##### Medical

**Gruber & Kleiner 10** [Jonathan Gruber, research associate at MIT & Samuel A. Kleiner, economist with the Federal Trade Commission, 2010, “Do strikes kill? Evidence from new york state (Working Paper No. 15855),” National Bureau of Economic Research. [https://doi.org/10.3386/w15855]/](https://doi.org/10.3386/w15855%5d/) Triumph Debate

A long standing concern with strikes as a means of resolving labor disputes is that they may be unproductive, and **recent research in some production sectors has demonstrated reduced productivity during strikes. But a sector where strikes may be particularly pernicious is hospitals, where the consequences are not just lower quality products but life and death.** To address this question, this study utilizes a **unique dataset collected on every nurses’ strike over the 1984 to 2004 period in New York State**. Our restricted-use dataset allows us to match our strike data with exact dates of patient admission, discharge and treatment, and allows for a rich set of demographic and illness severity controls. **Each striking hospital over this period is then matched with the set of hospitals in their geographic area, and the evolution of outcomes is examined before, during, and after the strike in the striking versus non-striking hospitals. We find a substantial worsening of patient outcomes for hospitals struck by their nurses. Our mortality results show a 19.4% increase during strikes relative to their baseline values, and our estimates imply a 6.5% increase in readmission rates for patients admitted during a strike. Our results show no difference in the characteristics of patients admitted during strikes, and little difference in observable aspects of hospital utilization during these strikes**. **We find that patients with particularly nursing intensive conditions are more susceptible to these strike effects, and that hospitals hiring replacement workers perform no better during these strikes than those that do not hire substitute employees.** Our results imply that strikes were costly to hospital patients in New York. **In our sample, there were 38,228 patients admitted during strikes, and we estimate that 138 more individuals died because of strikes than would have died had there been no strike. By a similar calculation, 344 more patients were readmitted to the hospital than if there had been no strike.** Moreover, these poor outcomes do not reflect less intensity of care. So this is very clear evidence of a reduction in productivity; hospitals functioning during nurses’ strikes do so at a lower quality of patient care. The effects of these strikes must, however, be considered in the context of a total union effect on hospital output and patient outcomes. Our results reveal a short-run adverse consequence of hospital strikes. These strikes may, however, contribute to long-run improvements in hospital productivity and quality driven by union-related workplace improvement initiatives. Such improvements have been implied by both Register (1988) and Ash and Seago (2004) who respectively document both a hospital union output effect and lower heart-attack mortality rates in unionized hospitals. Future work could usefully incorporate these short term costs and longer-term benefits in a full evaluation of hospital unionization.

**Even if deaths do not increase as a result of the strike, medical strikes can disrupt the healthcare system and hurt trust**

**Jamaluddin et al 21** [Jazlan Jamaluddin, Department of Radiology, Faculty of Medicine, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Nurul Nadia Baharum, Family Medicine Specialist, Klinik Kesihatan Bukit Cherakah, Malaysia Siti Nuradliah Jamil, Family Medicine Trainee, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia, Mohd Azzahi, Family Medicine Trainee, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia, 2021, “Doctors strike during covid-19 pandemic in Malaysia: Between right and wrong,” Voices in Bioethics, 7. [https://doi.org/10.52214/vib.v7i.8586]/](https://doi.org/10.52214/vib.v7i.8586%5d/) Triumph Debate

**Although doctor strikes** do not seem to increase patient mortality, they can **disrupt delivery of healthcare.[32] Disruptions in delivery of service from prolonged strikes can result in decline of in-patient admissions and outpatient service utilization, as suggested during strikes in the UK in 2016**.[33] When emergency services were affected during the last strike in April, regular service was also significantly affected. **Additionally, people might need to seek alternative sources of care from the private sector and face increased costs of care.** HCWs themselves may feel guilty and demotivated because of the strikes. **The public health system may also lose trust as a result of service disruption caused by high recurrence of strikes. During the COVID-19 pandemic, as the healthcare system remains stretched, the potential adverse effects resulting from doctor strikes remain uncertain and potentially disruptive.** In the UK, it is an offence to “willfully and maliciously…endanger human life or cause serious bodily injury.”[34] Likewise, the General Medical Council (GMC) also requires doctors to ensure that patients are not harmed or put at risk by industrial action. In the US, the American Medical Association code of ethics prohibits strikes by physicians as a bargaining tactic, while allowing some other forms of collective bargaining.[35] However, the American College of Physicians prohibits all forms of work stoppages, even when undertaken for necessary changes to the healthcare system. Similarly, the Delhi Medical Council in India issued a statement that “under no circumstances doctors should resort to strike as the same puts patient care in serious jeopardy.”[36]

**We ought to require that strikes be taken in such a way as to avoid the collapse of health systems, this does not require banning, but structuring them to allow their occurrence.**

**Irimu et al., 2018** [Grace Irimu is a senior lecture in paediatrics and child health at the University of Nairobi, Morris Ogero, George Mbevi, David Gathara, Samuel Akech, Edwine Barasa, Benjmain Tsofa and Mike English are all researchers at the Kenya Medical research Instititute, Celia Kariuki is from the Department of Paediatrics at Mama Lucy Kibaki Hospital, Published: 11/28/18, “Tackling health professionals’ strikes: an essential part of health system strengthening in Kenya”, BMJ Global Health, doi:10.1136/bmjgh-2018-001136 ] /Triumph Debate

**National and county healthcare leadership need to rebuild relationships with professional groups who, in turn, need to better define their own professional norms and values** 11 **so that, during health system level ‘shocks’ professional and societal values might be better aligned.** Spaces need to be created for all groups to contribute to planning of healthcare and policies that are cognizant of economic and social realities spanning training, deployment of staff, management of performance and definition of working conditions. 12 Such **efforts are needed to rebuild trust. Specifically, there needs to be a national and inclusive dialogue (with patient representation) to develop minimum operating requirements in the event of strikes to prevent the near total collapse of the public health system seen in 2017**. 9 This is especially important as the Kenya Constitution permits HRH strikes and also states that ‘A person shall not be denied emergency medical treatment’. 2 Special consideration therefore needs to be given to handling of emergencies, ensuring continued care of already hospitalised patients and how to safely staff vital facilities, such as the emergency rooms, obstetric and neonatal departments. 13 **In some countries, for example, senior clinicians continue to give services when junior staff are on strike**. 14 **This arrangement provides at least some cover while maintaining positive elements of an overarching professional ethos. These risk management plans are best agreed on outside times of crisis and might be enshrined in specific agreements or even in the Constitution or Government legislation. Such actions need to be taken now.**

**And looking at the Recent Kaiswer Permanente strikes**

**Sisson, Paul. “Kaiser Strike on Monday to Affect Some Services - The.” San Diego Union-Tribune [San Diego], 15 Nov. 2021, www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/health/story/2021-11-12/kaiser-strike-on-monday-to-affect-some-services.**

Kaiser Permanente’s 4.6 million members in Southern California, including more than 630,000 in San Diego County, are already feeling the effects of an open-ended strike set to start Monday.

As the weekend approached, the massive health care provider began notifying members that it is switching some appointments from in-person to virtual and has also “canceled or rescheduled some appointments, elective surgeries and procedures, including non-urgent appointments.”

Hospitals, emergency departments and urgent locations are expected to remain open “throughout the duration of any union activity,” according to a Kaiser members statement that was sent Thursday. The precise number in San Diego County affected by those changes was not immediately available. Led by the United Nurses Associations of California, the planned work stoppage is billed as representing 32,000 workers from registered nurses and pharmacists to pharmacists and midwives. The group’s main cited grievance is a proposed “two-tier” wage system that, starting in 2023, would pay new hires 15 percent less than current employees. As is always the case when labor negotiations devolve to the point of work stoppage, the two sides disagree on many of the facts surrounding the proposal. In a statement, the union notes that all of health care is currently experiencing a labor shortage, the fallout of the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in burnout for many workers while a handful have decided to walk away from their jobs rather than become vaccinated. A two-tier structure, the union says, “would impact our ability to hire, recruit and retain during a severe shortage of nurses, health care workers and professionals.” The less dangerous tobacco seems to teens, the more they use it. Learn about the tobacco industry's latest tricks. Kaiser responds by stating on its website that its current wage structure is unsustainable in an ever-more-cost-conscious health care world. Union-represented workers, Kaiser states, “earn about 26 percent above the average market wage, and in some places 38 percent above market levels.” “We simply must reduce expenses to remain competitive long term,” Kaiser says. “We are looking beyond wages and taking purposeful actions across all parts of Kaiser Permanente to slow our overall cost growth to address the growing challenges of affordability and our changing membership.” The timing of the labor impasse could not be worse. Just Friday, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics announced that the rate of people quitting their jobs in September hit 3 percent, representing a record 4.4 million people leaving their jobs. Health care had the largest number of job openings, which does not surprise Nathan Kaufman, managing director of Kaufman Strategic Advisors in Rancho Bernardo. In certain job categories, the national health care consultant noted, the unemployment rate is currently zero. Workers have the most leverage they’ve ever had. “If you lose a nurse in the operating room and you can’t replace them, you can’t do the surgeries you need to do to bring in revenue,” Kaufman said. Health care has always had a certain number of traveling workers willing to take temporary contracts in places far from home if the price is right. But, at the moment, it isn’t. “You go out and hire travelers, it’s $150 an hour right now,” Kaufman said. He added that data his firm collects by examining federal data on each health insurance company’s medical loss ratio — essentially the percentage of premiums that go toward the provision of care — show that Kaiser California, at least in terms of its small and largebusiness-coverage, has claims rates that were higher than others in the market in 2019, the most recent year for which data was available. Adjustment of the premiums that members pay, and also better management of the claims made, he said, could also help close budget gaps. “The idea of trying to reduce personnel costs during this time is just the wrong thing to do,” he said. “You have to find it someplace else.” Laurel Lucia, director of the Health Care Program at UC Berkeley Labor Center, said she is also somewhat surprised that a health care company would move toward a two-tier wage system at this particular moment when workforce shortages make worker happiness and satisfaction especially important. “Moving toward a two-tier strategy can end up creating a lot of division in a workforce,” Lucia said. “It seems completely counterproductive that they would propose this now.” Unless a deal appears over the weekend, premium-paying members appear to be caught in the crossfire. The union lists 25 picket locations across Southern California, including four in greater San Diego: Zion Medical Center in Grantville, San Diego Medical Center in Kearny Mesa and large medical office complexes in San Marcos and La Mesa.

**NBC Staff Bay Area. “Potential Kaiser Pharmacists Strike Averted: Here’s What to Know.” NBC Bay Area, 15 Nov. 2021, www.nbcbayarea.com/news/local/kaiser-pharmacists-in-bay-area-may-strike-monday-heres-what-to-know/2731297.**

Negotiations between Kaiser Permanente and the union representing its pharmacists continued late Sunday. A spokesperson for Kaiser confirmed to NBC Bay Area Sunday night that the two parties were still negotiating an increase in pay. If there's no deal, the pharmacists are planning to go on strike for eight days, starting Monday.

The possible work stoppage would come after the health care provider [reached a tentative agreement Saturday](https://www.nbclosangeles.com/news/local/kaiser-permanente-workers-reach-tentative-deal-to-avoid-strike/2758887/) with thousands of Kaiser nurses and other health care workers who were also planning to hit the picket line across Southern California and other locations in the United States. **How Will Kaiser Pharmacies be Impacted?**

Monday's planned strike by pharmacists could last up to Nov. 22 and shut down Kaiser's outpatient pharmacies, leaving many patients searching for medication and refills at retail pharmacies.

Here's what Kaiser sent to its members:

"Should a strike occur, our outpatient pharmacies will be temporarily closed from November 15 to the morning of November 22. If you don’t need your refill right away, our outpatient pharmacies will reopen on the morning of Monday, November 22. Our Mail Delivery pharmacy will remain open during the strike. In the event an urgent prescription is needed during the outpatient pharmacy closure, Kaiser Permanente staff will provide you with direction on how to fill your prescription at a retail pharmacy. For Medi-Cal members, there will be no cost. For other members, your usual cost share for in-network pharmacy services will apply. Hospital pharmacies for inpatient care and critical infusion services will remain in operation. Please check [kp.org](https://urldefense.com/v3/__https:/app.respond.kaiserpermanente.org/e/er?s=936847217&lid=12026&elqTrackId=E89A58A5FB64D8DE18391B276F076A13&elq=35587528b8184479bb00628f350212d2&elqaid=9302&elqat=1__;!!PIZeeW5wscynRQ!9V3AVlvohG9Cl0HZ2rlAiDWE-2k2ykhjylOtvL5TuEGTYdFXUg4xYip5WpOneQC-dZA$) for more information starting November 15." **Kaiser's Update on Contract Negotiations** "At this time there is no change in Pharmacy Guild strike plans for next week in the Northern California region, and our contingency plans remain in effect," Kaiser Permanente Northern California spokesperson Karl Sonkin said in an e-mail to NBC Bay Area on Saturday morning. "We are continuing to bargain in good faith with Local 39 Operating Engineers and the Guild for Professional Pharmacists, and hope to reach agreements very soon." Kaiser in a statement earlier this week said it has an offer on the table that keeps its pharmacists among the highest paid in the profession. "The proposal includes wage increases over 4 years, including a 3% increase in year one, and a 2% increase plus 2% bonus each year thereafter," Kaiser said in the statement. "In addition, there is a 120% increase in Guild members’ potential incentive payouts, no changes to Guild members’ excellent medical benefits, and enhancements to Guild members’ retirement contributions. In fact, the cash value of this contract is the richest contract offered to Guild members by Kaiser Permanente in the past decade." Kaiser officials released this following statement Sunday on the continued talks: "Kaiser Permanente is in active bargaining with the Pharmacy Guild and hope to reach an agreement as soon as possible.”

#### Uniquness

Affirmation’s advocacy is non-unique, meaning that what they propose achieves something that is already happening in the status quo.

**Chaykowski, ‘19** [Richard P. Chaykowski is a professor of law at Queen’s University, Published: April 2019, “Time to Tweak or Re-boot? Assessing the Interest Arbitration Process in Canadian Industrial Relations” C.D. Howe Institute, https://www.cdhowe.org/sites/default/files/attachments/research\_papers/mixed/Commentary\_539.pdf/ ] /Triumph Debate

**Many jurisdictions have been moving away from compulsory arbitration for public-sector workers (outside of public safety) and toward a designation model with a limited right to strike. Under the designation model, the parties negotiate an essential services agreement that determines the type and number of workers that are chosen as essential.** In Ontario, for example, this includes corrections officers (from 1994 to 2016),17 provincial employees (since 1994) and paramedics (since 2000) (Dachis and Hebdon 2010, table A1). **These workers must remain on the job in the event of a work stoppage to maintain a level of service that ensures public health and safety. In circumstances where the parties are in disagreement, an independent administrative agency, usually the jurisdiction’s labour relations board, may issue an order determining the number of designated workers** (Doorey 2017, 173; Rootham 2017, 273–4). In their study of essential service strikes, Adell, Grant, and Ponak (2001) ultimately conclude that the designation model is better than either the no-strike/compulsory arbitration model or unrestricted strike model in maintaining essential services, inducing voluntary settlements and producing outcomes acceptable to both parties.18 There are, however, some issues of concern with the essential services designation model. Campolieti, Hebdon, and Dachis (2016) find that this model is associated with reduced wages, while Adell, Grant, and Ponak (2001) suggest that it could increase both the frequency and duration of strikes. **Strikes might occur more often as unions adapt to the model by substituting tactics such as rotating strikes or work-to-rule in place of a full strike. Thus, similar to the case of interest arbitration, the conflict could manifest itself in other ways if disputes that produced the impasse are not resolved.** Strikes also might last longer since services would continue, albeit at a diminished level, which would lessen public pressure for the work stoppage to end. **Despite such concerns, however, Campolieti, Hebdon, and Dachis (2016) find that the essential service designation model is not (statistically) associated with either a greater likelihood of strikes or the increased duration of strikes relative to the unrestricted strike model.**

#### Hong Kong

Argument is as follows: currently, hong kong doesn’t allow politicized strikes. Once they do, the Chinese Communist Party would view this as a threat to their nationalism and territorial sovereignty. In fact, as Hiciano says, the citizens of china “buy into national rhetoric so much that they may participate in mass protests against the government.” He furthers that the crisis could quickly spiral into conflict. This results in a concept called diversionary war, a tactic instigated by a country's leader in order to distract its population from their own domestic strife. This will be targeted Taiwan, says Blumenthal 20. Because the US and Taiwan have robust military alliances, many global superpowers may become involved in this conflict, which would be potentially disastrous. Judge, this is crucial.

#### 

#### Teacher Strikes

**External Argument**

**Teacher strikes harm students by decreasing their educational attainment**

**Belot & Webbink, ‘10** [Michéle Belot is professor of economics at Cornell University, Dinand Webbink is a professor of policy evaluation at the Erasmus School of Economics in Rotterdam, Published: 11/23/10, “Do Teacher Strikes Harm Educational Attainment of Students?” Labour,<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-9914.2010.00494.x> ] /Triumph Debate

This paper provides unique evidence on the effect of teacher strikes on final educational attainments. Any attempt to evaluate the effects of strikes will always be subject to the concern of endogeneity of strikes. **The Belgian case is interesting because the motive for the strikes was not related to the schooling environment, but was driven by a political reform that was uncorrelated with schooling conditions. Both communities were confronted at the same time by similar budgetary concerns, but the Flemish community succeeded in avoiding strikes by granting an immediate 2 per cent salary increase, whereas the French-speaking community did not. Eventually, the French community granted a 2 per cent salary increase as well, but this was only after a long battle between teachers and the government, and a long period of perturbation in all schools of the community. We find some evidence that the strikes decreased the educational attainment of students**, although the estimated effect is somewhat imprecise. A plausible mechanism for this lower investment in human capital seems to be an increase in grade repetition. We find that the young French-speaking cohort graduated half a year later on average. **Furthermore, we find that the strikes led to a reallocation of students from university studies to higher vocational education. Hence, students do not seem to have succeeded in compensating for the losses in terms of schooling due to the strikes. Also, the results we find breaks in the evolution of achievement and attainment, breaks that seem to coincide with the timing of the strikes.** Thus, it seems that these results are more consistent with a causal effect of strikes rather than a causal effect of a deterioration in schooling environment. Of course, this study could be seen as a specific ‘case-study’, and the question is whether we can draw more general conclusions and lessons from this analysis. **We would argue that the results provide a benchmark for a scenario that is not too unrealistic. There are a number of examples of long strikes in schools (Hayward teacher strikes and Marysville to name a few) and most strikes are driven by wage disputes. Higher wages might not only be beneficial for teachers themselves but also for students as higher wages might attract better teachers. However, the empirical literature provides little support for the latter argument. This paper suggests that long-term strikes might bear high costs in terms of detrimental effects on educational achievement of students.** These costs should be taken into account in discussions on the right to strike for teachers.

#### Economics Block

#### **Strikes cost billions of dollars to the economy and affect thousands of jobs,**

**Tomer & Kane, ‘15** [Adie Tomer is a Senior Fellow of the Metropolitan Policy Program, Joseph W. Kane is a Fellow of the Metropolitan Policy Program, Published: 1/20/15, “How the West Coast Port Strike is Hurting Metro Trade ” Brookings, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2015/01/20/how-the-west-coast-port-strike-is-hurting-metro-trade/ ] /Triumph Debate

**As a** [**contract dispute**](http://www.cnbc.com/id/102334727) **between dockworkers and shipping companies at 29 West Coast ports continues—and a** [**backlog of cargo**](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2015-01-13/west-coast-shippers-say-port-backups-untenable-amid-talks.html) **piles up—economic costs are mounting across the country. From terminal facilities in Long Beach and Los Angeles to Oakland and Seattle, the six-month-long negotiations between the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) and the Pacific Maritime Association (PMA) have not only** [**delayed thousands of trucks**](http://www.sfgate.com/business/bottomline/article/Port-of-Oakland-delays-Absolute-madness-5969642.php) **and** [**prompted railroads to reroute shipments**](http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/b4f216ea-9680-11e4-a40b-00144feabdc0.html#axzz3P06mntKX)**, but they have also stalled output for many** [**retailers**](http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/12/12/usa-ports-westcoast-idUSL1N0TW03R20141212) **and** [**manufacturers**](http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2015/01/02/manufacturers-lament-west-coast-port-issues/)**.** In the short term, congestion at these ports remains a thorny issue. **A potential** [**five-day work stoppage**](https://nrf.com/media/press-releases/negotiating-deadline-looms-west-coast-ports-economic-trouble-horizon) **could reduce U.S. GDP by almost $2 billion a day and disrupt up to 73,000 jobs.** However, the long-lasting effects may prove even more damaging to metropolitan areas across the country, especially as they look to boost trade in years to come. **After all, most of the** [**$3 trillion**](https://www.brookings.edu/research/reports2/2014/11/06-mapping-freight-tomer-kane) **of international goods traded annually are concentrated in the country’s 100 largest metro areas, including many of the highly valuable electronics, precision instruments, and other** [**advanced industrial products**](https://www.brookings.edu/about/programs/metro/advanced-industries) **used by innovative firms.** Exports and imports from East Asia are particularly important in this respect, including the exchange of $2.8 billion in electronics between Phoenix and China, $647 million in machinery between San Jose and South Korea, and $136 million in chemicals/plastics between San Diego and Japan. The fact that these large metro areas also contain most of the country’s critical port facilities further emphasizes the need to resolve the West Coast strike sooner rather than later. As our [Metro Freight series](https://www.brookings.edu/research/reports/2013/10/22-metro-freight-tomer-kane-puentes) will highlight in an upcoming release, only handful of markets house the essential seaports, airports and land border crossings that funnel the vast majority of international trade. Significantly, three metro areas—Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle—are mired at the center of the ongoing strike and rank among the country’s 10 biggest port complexes, transporting over one-third ($472 billion) of U.S. waterborne exports and imports . **While the seaports in each of these metro areas pump** [**billions of dollars**](http://www.portoflosangeles.org/finance/economic_impact.asp) **into their regional economies and support** [**thousands of direct infrastructure jobs**](https://www.brookings.edu/research/interactives/2014/infrastructure-jobs) **with competitive wages, their importance stretches far beyond local—or even state—boundaries. For example, among all the global goods passing through seaports in Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle, $15.7 billion of these products are sourced in Houston, $14.8 billion in New York, and $13.4 billion in Chicago. Even Detroit is responsible for transporting over $8.4 billion through seaports in these three metros.** In this way, resolving the West Coast port strike extends far beyond the ILWU, PMA and their various constituencies. Metro areas throughout the country have a lot at stake as well, eager to see the standoff end and to continue trading the goods that power their economies.

Aff’s advocacy has major economic implications, link turn this argument toward neg.

#### Anarchy Block

**Schneirov, R. “‘To the Ragged Edge of Anarchy’: The 1894 Pullman Boycott.” Semanticscholar.Org, 1999, www.semanticscholar.org/paper/%E2%80%9CTo-the-Ragged-Edge-of-Anarchy%E2%80%9D%3A-The-1894-Pullman-Schneirov/9e3832e065b63aa4defbf5b665c3336af74b8ace.**

The 1894 Pullman strike and boycott, which pitted one of the nation's first large industrial unions against the combined forces of the Pullman Sleeping Car Company, the nation's railroads, and the federal government, remains the best known of all the great strikes American workers have undertaken. From 26 June to mid-July the boycott closed the rail arteries of half the United States, from Chicago to the West Coast. The Pullman boycott culminated two decades of intensifying labor conflict in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, especially on the railroads. Coming amidst the nation's worst depression, marches on Washing ton, DC by unemployed workers, a series of large and bitterly contested strikes in the bituminous coal industry, and the spreading Populist political insurgency, the boycott and the turbulence that attended it helped define "the crisis of the 1890s," which marked the boundary between the Gilded Age and the Progressive Era. Before that crisis was surmounted, the Pullman boycott sent convulsions of fright and foreboding through the ranks of the respectable elements of the nation. In the memorable phrase of U.S. Attorney General Richard Olney, the strike seemed to have brought the nation "to the ragged edge of anarchy"

#### Italy Block

#### Before 1990, Italy had a nearly unconditional right to strike, but this changed after a series of strikes caused massive public disruption.

**“Strikes in Italy: Background Summary.” Etui, European Trade Union Institution, 16–09-20,** [**www.etui.org/covid-social-impact/italy/strikes-in-italy-background-summary**](http://www.etui.org/covid-social-impact/italy/strikes-in-italy-background-summary)**.**

With the entry into force of the Constitution, the right to strike enshrined by Article 40 as an individual right (in the sense that individuals can freely choose to exercise such a right) obtained formal recognition. It was the continuation of the recognition of trade union freedom of association enshrined in Article 39, as recognized by the Italian legal system.

The Workers' Statute (Law no. 300 of 1970) introduced in the Articles 15, 16 and 28 workers’ protection provisions against anti-union abuses, such as replacing striking workers with those who do not join the strike or discriminatory acts of employers. The right to strike does not affect the employment relationship or social security contributions. However, in practice, the employer may take into account the hours of absence from work due to strike for the calculation of days off or Christmas bonus.

In Italy there are strikes in both the public and private sectors. In order to adjust the exercise of the right to strike and limit the harmful consequences for citizens, especially in the essential public services sector, the legislator intervened by adopting two important measures: law no. 146 of 1990 and law no. 83 of 2000, as a complement of the first. Law 146 of 1990 regulates the exercise of the right to strike in the health sector, the urban and suburban public transport, the education sector, garbage collection, public administration and basic goods. In these areas, the right to strike is regulated in order to ensure citizens’ basic needs.

For this purpose, the legislator states that every strike must be announced at least 10 days in advance, and that methods, times and reasons must be communicated. To ensure a right balance between the opposing interests of citizens and workers, there is a so-called Guarantee Commission (Commissione di Garanzia) required to ascertain the legitimacy of strike.

Armed forces (law no. 203 of 1978) and police forces (law no. 121 of 1981), do not have the right to strike, with the aim of not compromising public order or security protection and judiciary police activities.

#### Inflation Nuc. War

**Liu, Qian, Managing Director, Greater China, The Economist Group. “The Next Economic Crisis Could Cause a Global Conflict. Here’s Why.” World Economic Forum, World Economic Forum, 7 Feb. 2020,** [**www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why**](http://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why)**.**

**Furthers this claim, stating**

The response to the 2008 economic crisis has relied far too much on monetary stimulus, in the form of quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates, and included far too little structural reform. This means that the next crisis could come soon – and pave the way for a large-scale military conflict.

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social, political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a major global military conflict.

The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates.

But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies.

Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment.

The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008.

In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929.

As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy.

If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war.

For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun.

To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict.

According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels.

#### **(turn aff arg)Higher wages increase inflation snowball**

**Boyle, 11-5, 21, Ryan James Boyle is a Vice President and Senior Economist within the Global Risk Management division of Northern Trust. In this role, Ryan is responsible for briefing clients and partners on the economy and business conditions, supporting internal stress testing and capital allocation processes, and publishing economic commentaries, Labor: Strike While the Iron Is Hot**

Inflation concerns are leading workers to demand higher wages. In most recent years, wages rose more rapidly than inflation; today, the opposite is true. As workers secure better increases, firms may be prompted to raise prices, initiating a feedback loop that could be difficult to arrest.

#### Democracy

**Some strikes, along with denying access to other non-striking workers are both violations of others rights. Therefore, their restrictions function as conditions on the right to strike.**

**The Institute of Employment Rights, ‘09** [The Institute of Employment Rights is a think tank for the trade union movement which publishes an annual conference of reports from various presentations regarding the status of labor rights, Published: 4/4/09, “The Right to Strike: A Comparative Perspective. A study of national law in six EU states ” IER, http://old.adapt.it/adapt-indice-a-z/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/strike\_2008.pdf ] /Triumph Debate

**The right to strike is a fundamental social right. However, it is not absolute but is limited by the subjective rights of others insofar as such limitations are prescribed by law and necessary in a democratic society for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others, or for the protection of the public interest, national security, public health or morals**. 17 The right to work is guaranteed by Article 23(3) of the Constitution, and provides the right of the employee to execute the agreed labour contract. Picketing falls within the scope of the right to strike, provided it is used normally and not accompanied by acts of violence (‘feitelijkheden’, voies de fait)18 towards persons and property. **Picketing therefore becomes illegal when accompanied by acts of violence that affect the subjective rights of other persons, for example, the right to work, which can be affected when non-strikers are denied access to the company, the freedom to conduct business and property rights which can be affected when the employer is denied access to his company. It is generally agreed, and confirmed by summary procedures by means of ex-parte proceedings, that workers who participate in a strike cannot use acts of violence that affect an employers’ freedom of commerce. It is therefore illegal for strikers to take control of the company.** The principle of freedom of commerce was adopted in the French Decree D’Allarde of 1791. This provision of law was preserved in Belgian legislation after the end of the French occupation. At European level, the freedom of commerce is guaranteed by the aforementioned Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union which contains the “freedom to conduct a business” in Article 16. Furthermore, freedom of commerce can be derived from WTO regulations and from provisions regarding freedom of establishment in the EC Treaty. 19 **The right to strike is also limited by provisions of a penal nature. It goes without saying, for example, that strikers cannot take their employers hostage during a strike**. 20

### Hospitals close

**Strikes could close over 450 hospitals across the nation.**

**Topchik et al., ‘20 [Michael Topchik is a National Leader of the Chartis Center for Rural Health, Ken Gross is the Chief Data Scietnist of The Chartis Group, Melanie Pinette is a Data Analyst for The Chartis Center for Rural Health, Troy Brown is the Client Services Manager for The Chartis Center for Rural Health, Billy Balfour is the Director of Communications for The Chartis Center, Hayleigh Kein is an Analyst for The Chartis Center, Published: February 20, “Insight and Solutinos to Address Today’s Most Complex Challenges” The Chartis Group, https://www.ivantageindex.com/wpcontent/uploads/2020/02/CCRH\_Vulnerability-Research\_FiNAL-02.14.20.pdf ] /Triumph Debate**

As of January 1, 2020, the rural hospital closure crisis has claimed 120 facilities across the nation. Although the number of rural hospital closures slowed somewhat in 2016 (12) and 2017 (10), there have been 34 closure announcements in the last 24 months. In fact, calendar year 2019 was the single worst year of the closure crisis as 19 rural hospitals closed (see Figure 1). 1 The accelerated rate at which rural hospitals are closing continues to unsettle the rural healthcare community and demands a more nuanced investigation into rural hospital performance. Building upon its existing research into the stability of the rural health safety net, The Chartis Center for Rural Health developed a multilevel logistic regression model designed to identify the probability of closure for the nation’s 1,844 open rural hospitals. Specifically, this research aimed to: Expand our understanding of the downward trajectory of key performance indicators in the 36 months prior to closure; Determine which rural hospitals are performing at levels similar to those facilities that have closed since 2010, and therefore vulnerable to closure; and Identify which performance variables have the greatest impact on increasing or decreasing a rural hospital’s likelihood of closing. Our analysis of a series of financial and operational metrics for closed hospitals revealed a rapid decline in performance in the 12 months prior to closure. Informed by the findings of this analysis, our regression model assessed the impact of 16 variables of which nine were shown to be statistically significant. The model identified 453 open rural facilities which can be considered ‘vulnerable’ to closure based on performance levels. Within this group, two distinct cohorts emerged; a group of 216 which can be considered ‘most vulnerable’ and a second group of 237 which are defined as ‘at risk.’

#### Economics separate impacts

#### **long term: Increased union power magnifies the supply chain crisis and threatens the economy**

**Elizabeth Hanke, Research Fellow, Labor Economics and Policy, Americans Struggle as President Biden Favors Unions During Supply-Chain Breakdown, 11-3-21, https://www.heritage.org/jobs-and-labor/report/americans-struggle-president-biden-favors-unions-during-supply-chain**

SUMMARY**The current supply-chain crisis** has led to a **significant disruption** of **global commerce** that will have far-reaching implications. Americans are already seeing these impacts in the form of empty store shelves, product shortages, rising prices, and inflation. At the epicenter are restrictive union contracts that discourage a 24/7 schedule in favor of an abbreviated work week and fewer working hours, causing lower productivity at the nation’s largest ports in Los Angeles and Long Beach. President Biden’s Build Back Better plan should be abandoned. The Biden Administration should support capital improvements that increase worker productivity, permit the purchase of fully automated equipment, and limit unions’ ability to hobble critical infrastructure. KEY TAKEAWAYSUnion practices play a large role in the nation’s supply-chain crisis, and Democrats’ reconciliation plan avoids any solutions to the issues at West Coast ports.The high labor rates paid by cargo carriers and terminal operators are passed on to U.S. businesses large and small, which, in turn, pass them on to customers.The U.S. cannot allow international commerce, the global supply-chain, and the American economy to exist at the mercy of a handful of labor leaders. Copied Select a Section 1/0 Some in the Biden Administration have used the supply-chain crisis as a talking point to encourage passage of the $3.5 trillion Build Back Better (BBB) plan. According to Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg, the supply-chain crisis “is one more reason why we do need to deliver this infrastructure package, so that we can have a more resilient, flexible physical infrastructure to support our supply chain in this country.”1 This claim is, at a minimum, disingenuous. While the BBB plan is touted as investing $17 billion in port infrastructure, the funding is centered on the Administration’s climate-change initiative and targets reduction of air pollution and greenhouse gases.2 Not only is there no funding for the implementation of productivity enhancements, bowing to union pressure, the plan also expressly prohibits the use of these funds for the purchase of fully automated cargo-handling equipment that is desperately needed to boost port efficiency.3 Reduction of air pollution is a good thing, but these proposed air-quality improvements will not alleviate the nation’s supply-chain issues. The Los Angeles and Long Beach Ports Union contracts and labor practices play a large and detrimental role in the nation’s supply-chain problem. The ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach (LA/LB) provide a good example. The adjacent ports’ location in a large population center explains their rankings as the first and second, respectively, busiest container ports in the U.S.4 Their West Coast proximity to Asian ports, especially top-importer China, and their ability to handle the largest container ships in the world explains why almost half of total U.S. imports move through these ports and why, combined, they rank as the 10th-busiest container port worldwide, handling an average of more than 330,000 containers per week.5 Despite these advantages, the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach seem to have found a way to squander them. Based on the statistical methodology results from the World Bank’s Container Port Performance Index 2020, the port of Los Angeles ranked 328th, and the port of Long Beach 333rd, of 351 global ports, placing them in the bottom 10 percent of global container ports evaluated.6 These two ports were also outpaced by most other U.S. ports, including Philadelphia (83rd), Virginia (85th), New York/New Jersey (89th), and Charleston (95th). Los Angeles and Long Beach posted abysmal scores in both the administrative procedures and the statistical measures that include time in port and other efficiency factors. A look at the contract with the labor union helps to explain why. Union Influence and Labor Costs Dock workers at these ports are represented by the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU). The current contract between the ILWU and the Pacific Maritime Association, the 70-member group of cargo carrier and terminal operator companies, reads like a union wish list. After meeting the baseline 4,000 hours, or just under two years, of industry work experience, members earn $46.23 per hour.7 International Longshore and Warehouse Union and Pacific Maritime Association, “Pacific Coast Longshore Contract Document 2019–2022,” pp. 30 and 31, https://apps.pmanet.org/pubs/LaborAgreements/2019-2022\_PCLCD.pdf (accessed October 26, 2021). Nearly $100,000 per year is a generous salary, but it is only the beginning of the lucrative compensation structure. Second-shift workers earn a 33 percent premium over the regular rate, pushing their hourly pay to $61.64, while third-shift workers’ 60 percent wage premium results in a $73.96 hourly pay rate.8 Ibid., pp. 31 and 32. The compensation package reflects the fact that longshoremen work a difficult and often dangerous job. It also translates to some impressive earnings, such as average dock workers making $171,000 and foremen pulling in $282,000, annually. Union employees receive free employer-paid health care, full pensions, and 15 paid holidays annually, including United Farm Workers founder Cesar Chavez’s birthday, July 5 (“Bloody Thursday”) to commemorate the deaths of two union members during a strike in 1934, and the birthday of ILWU founder Harry Bridges.10 Considering the ability of the ILWU to immediately hamper global commerce, and the large amounts of money being paid to its thousands of members, it is easy to understand the immense power this union wields and the hesitancy many people have in even the slightest criticism of it. Generous to near extravagant as this package is, union leaders who negotiated this contract are doing what is expected of them: acting in the best interest of their members. Unfortunately, while the interests of ILWU members are clearly being served under the contract, the interests of American businesses and everyday consumers are taking a back seat. The high labor rates paid by cargo carriers and terminal operators are passed along to American manufacturers, retailers, and other firms that, in turn, pass them along to customers in the form of higher prices. Ultimately, the impact of these exorbitant labor rates is borne by American consumers, many of whom are already struggling to pay their bills. High labor rates can contribute to higher consumer prices, but the impact of these rates can be offset significantly by higher productivity rates. Labor productivity, traditionally defined as output per unit of input, is a widely used measure of efficiency. Improvements to worker productivity can be a powerful tool in high-wage scenarios. When supported by training, capital improvements, and various forms of automation, many high-wage workers can be sufficiently productive to render themselves the low-cost alternative when performance is evaluated on a per-unit basis. For instance, if worker A is paid twice the hourly rate of worker B, this scenario will still be advantageous as long as worker A’s output is more than twice that of worker B. This is a critical concept when evaluating U.S. port performance. This is no small matter. Los Angeles and Long Beach ports have historically operated two eight-hour shifts plus a partial third shift Monday through Friday totaling 112 hours per week, compared to 168 hours per week at ports that operate 24/7.13 This variance means that LA/LB ports are only open two-thirds the hours of other major container ports, resulting in a corresponding drop in capacity. Further exacerbating the problem is that this represents only shipping unloading time, but the terminal gates have traditionally been open only 88 hours weekly for trucks to pick up containers.14 This restriction to the container pickup process adds time and unnecessary expense to the drayage process. Since any hours above the current 112-hour work week must be paid at an overtime rate, the union’s agreement to increase to a 24/7 schedule translates to a massive overtime payout for its members. Low Productivity. The traditional reliance on this high-cost, low-accessibility model tells only part of the story. When the two ports are actually working, their productivity is astonishingly slow compared to ports in China. Volume in container ports is generally measured by 20-foot equivalent unit (TEU) that is based on the size of a standard 20-foot-long shipping container.15 Since 10-foot and 40-foot shipping containers are also used, albeit less frequently, this metric provides a standard measure for purposes of comparison. Offloading of a typical 6,000 TEU mega-ship takes an average of 24 seconds per container in the ports of Yangshan, Qingdao, and Yantian, but double that time, totaling a full 48 seconds per container, in Los Angeles.16 ,,, Conclusion Americans should not be held hostage by unions. The situation in Los Angeles and Long Beach, which not only laid the groundwork for, but also exacerbated, the supply-chain crisis did not develop overnight. One need look no further than the ILWU’s annual recognition of the tragic “Blood Thursday” labor dispute that occurred nearly a century ago to see evidence of a long and deep-seated animosity. Toxic as labor relations are, the U.S. cannot allow international commerce, the global supply chain, and the American economy to exist at the mercy of a handful of labor leaders. Rectifying this situation will take years and, more importantly, a currently non-existent level of commitment and cooperation from management and unions at these facilities. Considering that President Joe Biden ran his 2020 election campaign as a self-professed “union guy” whose inauguration speech promised to “unify America,” this seems like an ideal time for him to get started on his promise by gaining ILWU cooperation to alleviate avoidable problems for all Americans.

**Inflation won’t stop**

**Savat, Sara. “WashU Expert: Crisis or Momentary Blip? Explaining Inflation Concern - The Source - Washington University in St. Louis.” The Source, Washington University in St. Lious, 18 June 2021, source.wustl.edu/2021/06/washu-expert-crisis-or-momentary-blip-explaining-inflation-concern.**

On June 16, the Federal Reserve announced it may raise interest rates twice in 2023 in response to higher-than-expected increases in inflation. In his announcement, Fed Chairman Jerome Powell said the higher inflation recorded this year should be temporary, but the risks that it would be “higher and more persistent than we expect” could not be ignored.

John Horn, professor of practice in economics at Olin Business School at Washington University in St. Louis, agrees with Powell’s overall inflation forecast of 3.4% for 2021. Inflation in some high-demand categories — such as travel, construction material and automobiles — may be even higher, he said.

Horn

However, some prices, such as lumber, are already coming back down, providing hope that current inflation is a short-term corrective measure and not a sign of long-term systemic problems.

“The uncertainty for me is how this gets played politically and what messaging gets through,” Horn said.

Inflation, Horn explained, can be a self-fulfilling prophesy. Worry about rising inflation can lead employees to demand higher wages. In order to pay those higher wages, employers raise prices for their products and services, creating actual inflation. The wage-price spiral is a vicious cycle. Likewise, inflation expectations will cause banks to increase interest rates, making it more expensive for businesses and individuals to borrow money.

“It’s important for the Fed to make sure that this is seen as a temporary blip and not systemic. Because if it’s seen as a systemic problem, and inflation expectations take charge, it’s really hard to make it stop,” Horn said. “Once that happens, the only way to stop inflation is to raise the interest rates really high and cause a recession. Maybe not in 2022, but it will be on the Fed’s radar. They will want to stop [rising inflation] sooner than later.”

“However, if prices come down and people see this as a temporary blip related to COVID-19 and the supply chain problems — if that story takes hold — then I’m not worried about inflation,” he added.

What’s driving inflation?

In the simplest terms, inflation occurs when consumer demand increases or supply contracts causing prices to rise. The current economic situation is a little more complicated, in part because both effects are occurring.

**Sundaram, Jomo kwame, Jomo Kwame Sundaram, is a prominent Malaysian economist. He is Senior Adviser at the Khazanah Research Institute, Visiting Fellow at the Initiative for Policy Dialogue, Columbia University, and Adjunct Professor at the International Islamic University., and Vladimir Popov Vladimir Popov is an interregional adviser in the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations and professor emeritus at the New Economic School in Moscow. He is also professor at the Graduate School of International Business at the Russian Presidential Academy of the National Economy and Public Administration in Moscow, and an adjunct research professor at the Institute of European and Russian Studies at Carleton University in Ottawa. “Economic Crisis Can Trigger World War Jomo Kwame Sundaram and Vladimir Popov.” International Development Economics Associates (IDEAs), 13 Feb. 2019, www.networkideas.org/news-analysis/2019/02/economic-crisis-can-trigger-world-war.**

**Liberalization’s discontents**

Rising economic insecurity, inequalities and deprivation are expected to strengthen ethno-populist and jingoistic nationalist sentiments, and increase social tensions and turmoil, especially among the growing precariat and others who feel vulnerable or threatened.

Thus, ethno-populist inspired chauvinistic nationalism may exacerbate tensions, leading to conflicts and tensions among countries, as in the 1930s. Opportunistic leaders have been blaming such misfortunes on outsiders and may seek to reverse policies associated with the perceived causes, such as ‘globalist’ economic liberalization.

Policies which successfully check such problems may reduce social tensions, as well as the likelihood of social turmoil and conflict, including among countries. However, these may also inadvertently exacerbate problems. The recent spread of anti-globalization sentiment appears correlated to slow, if not negative per capita income growth and increased economic inequality.

To be sure, globalization and liberalization are statistically associated with growing economic inequality and rising ethno-populism. Declining real incomes and growing economic insecurity have apparently strengthened ethno-populism and nationalistic chauvinism, threatening economic liberalization itself, both within and among countries.

**Insecurity, populism, conflict**

Thomas Piketty has argued that a sudden increase in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Although causality is difficult to prove, with wealth and income inequality now at historical highs, this should give cause for concern.

Of course, other factors also contribute to or exacerbate civil and international tensions, with some due to policies intended for other purposes. Nevertheless, even if unintended, such developments could inadvertently catalyse future crises and conflicts.

Publics often have good reason to be restless, if not angry, but the emotional appeals of ethno-populism and jingoistic nationalism are leading to chauvinistic policy measures which only make things worse.

At the international level, despite the world’s unprecedented and still growing interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed as the US increasingly resorts to unilateral, sovereigntist policies without bothering to even build coalitions with its usual allies.

**Avoiding Thucydides’ iceberg**

Thus, protracted economic distress, economic conflicts or another financial crisis could lead to military confrontation by the protagonists, even if unintended. Less than a decade after the Great Depression started, the Second World War had begun as the Axis powers challenged the earlier entrenched colonial powers.

They patently ignored Thucydides’ warning, in chronicling the Peloponnesian wars over two millennia before, when the rise of Athens threatened the established dominance of Sparta!

Anticipating and addressing such possibilities may well serve to help avoid otherwise imminent disasters by undertaking pre-emptive collective action, as difficult as that may be.

The international community has no excuse for being like the owners and captain of the Titanic, conceitedly convinced that no iceberg could possibly sink the great ship.

**Liu, Qian, Managing Director, Greater China, The Economist Group. “The Next Economic Crisis Could Cause a Global Conflict. Here’s Why.” World Economic Forum, World Economic Forum, 7 Feb. 2020,** [**www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why**](http://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why)**.**

**Furthers this claim, stating**

The response to the 2008 economic crisis has relied far too much on monetary stimulus, in the form of quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates, and included far too little structural reform. This means that the next crisis could come soon – and pave the way for a large-scale military conflict.

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social, political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a major global military conflict.

The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates.

But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies.

Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment.

The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008.

In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929.

As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy.

If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war.

For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun.

To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict.

According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels.

### 1NC

**Hong kong disad on authoritarian**

**Authoritarian govs don’t increase civic part. Or don’t matter**

**The Institute of Employment Rights, ‘09** [The Institute of Employment Rights is a think tank for the trade union movement which publishes an annual conference of reports from various presentations regarding the status of labor rights, Published: 4/4/09, “The Right to Strike: A Comparative Perspective. A study of national law in six EU states ” IER, http://old.adapt.it/adapt-indice-a-z/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/strike\_2008.pdf ] /Triumph Debate

**The right to strike is a fundamental social right. However, it is not absolute but is limited by the subjective rights of others insofar as such limitations are prescribed by law and necessary in a democratic society for the protection of the rights and freedoms of others, or for the protection of the public interest, national security, public health or morals**. 17 The right to work is guaranteed by Article 23(3) of the Constitution, and provides the right of the employee to execute the agreed labour contract. Picketing falls within the scope of the right to strike, provided it is used normally and not accompanied by acts of violence (‘feitelijkheden’, voies de fait)18 towards persons and property. **Picketing therefore becomes illegal when accompanied by acts of violence that affect the subjective rights of other persons, for example, the right to work, which can be affected when non-strikers are denied access to the company, the freedom to conduct business and property rights which can be affected when the employer is denied access to his company. It is generally agreed, and confirmed by summary procedures by means of ex-parte proceedings, that workers who participate in a strike cannot use acts of violence that affect an employers’ freedom of commerce. It is therefore illegal for strikers to take control of the company.** The principle of freedom of commerce was adopted in the French Decree D’Allarde of 1791. This provision of law was preserved in Belgian legislation after the end of the French occupation. At European level, the freedom of commerce is guaranteed by the aforementioned Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union which contains the “freedom to conduct a business” in Article 16. Furthermore, freedom of commerce can be derived from WTO regulations and from provisions regarding freedom of establishment in the EC Treaty. 19 **The right to strike is also limited by provisions of a penal nature. It goes without saying, for example, that strikers cannot take their employers hostage during a strike**. 20

On the extinction, no explicit stating of extinction nor a link.

On puting disads away, turn their argument. I will not be throwing away my disads because they do minimize risk.

**Dem backsliding causes extinction delinked because democracy refuted**

### 1NR

First- offense:

Makes the aff defend the entire plan- causes better plan righting and in depth debate

Key to neg ground and flex- important on aff leaning topics- affs can be bidirectional and list topics make neg ground stale- also, aff gets first and last speech

PICs check extra-topical plan planks

Education- it’s the most real world and germane to the topic

Vital to search for best policy option

Second- Defense

Reject the arg not the team- that’s our world view on all theory questions

Nearly inevitable- almost all CPs are PICs

Net benefits check abuse

Aff chooses the plan- proves not infinitely regressive

First- offense

1. Key to neg ground and flex- important on aff leaning topics- affs can be bidirectional and list topics make neg ground stale- also, aff gets first and last speech

Testing entire aff key to search for best policy option

Increases strategic thinking- 2ACs have to prioritize

Most real world- multiple choices for policy makers

Reciprocity- they can kick out of 2AC arguments or advantages

Perms are worse- they’re conditional and you can run more than one

Next- defense

Reject the arg not the team- that’s our world view on all theory questions

2NR solves abuse the 1AC is 9 minutes of offense against the status quo- they also get the 2AR after

Perms solve all of their warrants

Time and strategy skews are inevitable- speed difference, bigger teams, short T shells

Don’t vote on potential abuse- allows judge intervention

Vote on RVIs because it checks my opponent from running an abusive theory position and checks time abuse.

Extinction first conceded, and I agree

Weigh civic engagement on timeframe for enviorn both impacts on advantages

Authoritarian gov still stands cause if you can strike, doesn’t mean you can vote

Us heg is good

Nurses has impact of billions of lives

Weigh on econ and hong kong