**“Proletarians Have Nothing to Lose but Their Chains: They Have a World to Win: Workingmen of All Countries, Unite!”**

**To acknowledge Karl Marx, the resolution, “Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.”, must be affirmed**

# **VALUE**

## **Thus, the value of egalitarianism, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy in 2013 reads**

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/egalitarianism/#KarMarEquRig>

Egalitarianism is a trend of thought in political philosophy. An egalitarian favors equality of some sort: People should get the same, or be treated the same, or be treated as equals, in some respect. An alternative view expands on this last-mentioned option: People should be treated as equals, should treat one another as equals, should relate as equals, or enjoy an equality of social status of some sort. Egalitarian doctrines tend to rest on a background idea that all human persons are equal in fundamental worth or moral status. So far as the Western European and Anglo-American philosophical tradition is concerned, one significant source of this thought is the Christian notion that God loves all human souls equally. Egalitarianism is a protean doctrine, because there are several different types of equality, or ways in which people might be treated the same, or might relate as equals, that might be thought desirable. In modern democratic societies, the term “egalitarian” is often used to refer to a position that favors, for any of a wide array of reasons, a greater degree of equality of income and wealth across persons than currently exists.

AND...

## **In framing this round, the following criterion of diminishing workers’ pain and suffering, Bueno-Gomez in 2017 states**

Bueno-Gómez, N. Conceptualizing suffering and pain. *Philos Ethics Humanit Med* **12,**7 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13010-017-0049-5>

<https://peh-med.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13010-017-0049-5#Sec11>

A definition of pain cannot be based only on the neurological understanding of it, but has to incorporate other relevant factors such as cognitive awareness, interpretation, behavioral dispositions, as well as cultural and educational factors beyond the medical sphere. Hence, a formal, non-essential and non-naturalistic conceptualization of both terms is proposed. Suffering is an unpleasant or even anguishing experience which can severely affect a person on a psychophysical and even existential level. Like suffering, pain is also unpleasant. Both are experiences which affect the whole person (not merely their “body” or “mind”), and a crucial aspect of them is the personal attitude and choices which are in turn influenced by cultural and social patterns. Not only the natural sciences, but also the social sciences and humanities play a crucial role in understanding all the dimensions of these phenomena. Additionally, the view of a person as a psychophysical instead of a dualistic being demands a total paradigm shift in medicine and new research approaches which are able to challenge the boundaries of various disciplines.

# **CONTENTION 1**

## **Contention 1: Protecting the unconditional right to strike is the mechanism to ensure societal changes promoting a reduction in workers’ pain and suffering; fostering an egalitarian society.**

## **Empirics prove, the impact is decreased worker dehumanization, Kvilhaug in September of 2021 articulates,**

<https://www.investopedia.com/the-10-biggest-strikes-in-u-s-history-4773384>

U.S. History's Biggest Strikes

A strike is an organized stoppage of work conducted by laborers in order to impose bargaining power against employers. Strikes may be carried out in response to dangerous working conditions, unfair treatment, low wages, or any other workplace grievance that negatively impacts workers' safety or wellbeing. Strikes are usually a culmination of existing grievances that compound over time, often with an inciting, proximate incident. They can be set off by a long lack of wage increases that don't keep up with inflation, and workers may be galvanized to strike by political rhetoric or pushback from corporate management.

The ability to strike has long been a negotiation tool for many American workers and labor unions. Throughout the country's history, American workers in a variety of fields have held strikes demanding higher pay, more manageable work hours, better contracts and benefits, and improved working conditions. Most recently, fast food workers from various establishments across the country have been making the headlines, as they strike demanding higher than minimum wage pay.

These most recent walk-outs, however, have not come close to those strikes that make up the top 10 biggest in U.S. history. These strikers, whose numbers reached the hundreds of thousands, had varying degrees of success but were pivotal in shaping the state of the workplace today. Below, we list ten of the largest and most important strikes, in chronological order.

Key Concepts in Labor History

While strikes are often a last resort, they are an important and often effective tool for workers to use in order to gain certain rights, privileges, or protections. The 40-hour workweek, workers' compensation laws, safety regulations, and minimum wages are all the result of labor actions. This often comes through via collective bargaining, since any one individual worker usually has little bargaining power in relation to their boss or company owners. As a group, workers are better able to negotiate and make threats, such as a strike.

Collective bargaining among workers is often coordinated through a labor union, an organization of workers in a particular company or industry, that work together to achieve their collective goals. While not as prevalent today as in the past, unions still have a great deal of power as well as political influence. Because union workers can often demand higher wages and other benefits, employers can be reluctant or even hostile to the prospect of unionization. Today's unions also tend to be more diplomatic. The labor strikes of the 19th and early 20th century could be violent affairs, leaving many dead and wounded as part of the labor struggle.

The Great Southwest Railroad Strike of 1886

The Great Southwest Railroad Strike, which spanned across Arkansas, Illinois, Kansas, Missouri, and Texas, took place from March to Sept. 1886. It included some 200,000 strikers. At the time, American railroads had been fast expanding across state lines, but by 1886, the Knights of Labor workers called a strike against their employers, the Union Pacific Railroad and the Missouri Pacific Railroad, both owned by Jay Gould, a robber baron.2

The strikers protested unsafe conditions, oppressive hours, and paltry pay. When railroad worker Charles Hall was fired unfairly, it was the final straw. During the strike, violent clashes broke out between pro-labor crowds and company-hired security forces & police across the country from Texas to Illinois, leaving at least nine dead and dozens injured.2 Unfortunately for the strikers, the members of other railroad unions did not support the walkout. The railroad companies eventually prevailed by hiring non-union workers, resulting in the weakening of power of the union Knights of Labor.

The Pullman Strike of 1894

The Pullman Strike took place in 1894, during the months of May to July, when some 250,000-factory workers at the Pullman Palace Car Company in Chicago walked off the job. The workers had been enduring 12-hour workdays and reduced wages, due in part to the depressed economy. Members of the American Railway Union (the largest labor union of its time and one of the first), joined forces, under union leader Eugene Debbs, with the strikers and refused to work on or run any trains that included Pullman-owned cars.

As many as 30 people were killed by the National Guard as the Pullman strike turned bloody after rioters destroyed hundreds of railcars. Labor Day as a national holiday was a direct result of the Pullman strike, signed into law by President Grover Cleveland in July 1894, and marking the end of the strike.3

The Great Anthracite Coal Strike of 1902

The Great Anthracite Coal Strike started when 147,000 coal miners who were part of the United Mine Workers of America (UMWA) went on strike in Eastern Pennsylvania from May to Oct. 1902.4 Many feared the strike would result in a major energy crisis, as the area of Pennsylvania where they works were striking held the nation's largest supply of anthracite coal. The miners were seeking better wages and improved conditions.

Finally, in the winter of 1903, President Theodore Roosevelt intervened, fearing a heating crisis if the miners did not go back to work. His negotiating efforts proved unsuccessful. It wasn’t until banker and industrialist J.P. Morgan, worried about how the strike would negatively affect his own businesses, stepped in and a resolution was found. The miners eventually agreed to a 10% raise, down from their initial 20% wage increase demand.4

The Steel Strike of 1919

The Steel Strike of 1919 included some 350,000 steelworkers in Pittsburgh who worked for The United States Steel Corporation and were represented by the American Federation of Labor (the first federation of labor unions in the U.S.). After enduring years of long hours, low wages, corporate harassment, and poor working conditions, the strikers shut down almost half of the country's steel industry.5 The strike lasted from Sept. 1919 to Jan. 1920.

The U.S. Steel Corporation (X) fought back by using scare tactics to turn public sentiment away from the strikers, linking them to communism and immigration problems. The strike finally proved unsuccessful, and for the next 15 years, there were no union organizations in the steel industry.

The Railroad Shop Workers Strike of 1922

The Railroad Shop Workers Strike of 1922 took place from July to Oct. 1922, and included some 400,000 strikers. The walkout was touched off when the Railroad Labor Board cut wages for railroad shop workers by 7 cents. Rather than negotiate, the railroad companies replaced three-quarters of the strikers with non-union workers. During the strike, at least 10 workers were killed by the National Guard and private security at various incidents around the country.6 U.S. Attorney General Harry Daugherty also convinced a federal judge to ban strike-related activities, leading the strikers to return to work, after they settled for a 5 cent pay cut.

The Textile Workers Strike of 1934

The Textile Workers Strike of 1934 included some 400,000 strikers. It took place in Sept. 1934 and stretched across the Eastern Seaboard. Textile workers were protesting long hours and low wages, as well as a lack of representation in the National Recovery Administration, a New Deal agency put forth by President Roosevelt. The strike persisted for over 20 days but ultimately failed, due to little popular support and a surplus of textiles available in the South. None of the workers demands were met, and many of them were ultimately blocklisted due to their involvement in the strike.7

United Mine Workers of America of 1946

The United Mine Workers of America went on strike in 1946, during the months of April to December, rallying some 400,000 miners to walk off the job. The walkout became known as the Bituminous Coal Strike and affected over 26 states. The strikers demanded safer working conditions, health benefits, and better pay. President Truman attempted to reach a settlement with the union, but his efforts were rebuffed. In response, he fined the workers $3.5 million and forced them to accept a deal, which put an end to the strike.8 Eventually, the strikers' demands were met in a compromise with the President in a deal known as The Promise of 1946, and enshrined in the Krug-Lewis Agreement, creating health and welfare funds for miners.9

The Steel Strike of 1959

The Steel Strike of 1959 ran from July to November and included a half a million workers. With profits skyrocketing, members of the United Steelworkers of America went on strike to demand higher wages. Simultaneously, the steel company managers were seeking to get rid of a clause in the workers' contract that protected jobs and hours. The nationwide strike finally ended with a triumph for the union members, who received an increase in wages and the disputed contract clause went untouched.10

The U.S. Postal Strike of 1970

The U.S. Postal Strike, which took place in March 1970, included 210,000 strikers. It was brought on by what the workers perceived as low wages, poor working conditions, and meager benefits. The strike began in New York City and spread nationwide. During the years that Nixon was president, collective bargaining by the U.S. postal workers was banned. Ignoring the ban, the workers refused to end the strike, leaving mail delivery at a standstill.11

In retaliation, the Nixon administration sent in the National Guard to deliver the mail. The move was ineffective and two weeks later negotiations began again, resulting in the strikers demands being met, including an 8% raise. The workers also reinstated their right to bargain and negotiate.11

UPS Workers Strike of 1997

The UPS Workers Strike kicked off in Aug. 1997, lead by the Teamsters. It rallied some 185,000 delivery-workers across the nation and was the largest strike of the decade. Workers wanted part-time jobs turned into full-time work, higher wages, and the safeguarding of their multiemployer pension plan. With public support high, the strikers' demands were granted.12

# **CONTENTION 2**

## **Contention 2: Propagating the proletariat class curbs monopolization of the market, hence developing a world view of egalitarianism and devoid of suffering for the worker is key.**

## **First, it is essential for the working class to rise against megacorporations in collective action, Schneider and Vaheesan report in 2020,**

<https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2019/08/fighting-monopoly-will-require-collective-power/595729/>

Finally, the need for tougher antitrust enforcement is dawning on politicians across the American political spectrum. One company dominates online retail. Two ride-hailing companies dictate wages for hundreds of thousands of drivers. In agriculture, two chemical companies control the market for the most important seeds and have the leverage to gouge farmers. This is why a number of Democratic presidential contenders, including Bernie Sanders on the left and Amy Klobuchar in the center, have vowed to act against concentrated corporate power. Meanwhile, Donald Trump’s Department of Justice has initiated investigations of big tech companies. If federal agencies start busting up monopolies, halting big corporate mergers, and stopping predatory practices, the two of us would enthusiastically welcome the government’s new vigor. But government agencies like the Justice Department and the Federal Trade Commission shouldn’t be the only check on corporate power. The other, equally vital way to keep monopolies and near-monopolies in check is to build up the power of everyone else in the economy—the workers and small-business owners who, in making their livelihoods, must interact with ever-larger corporate giants. Especially when regulators stand down, ordinary people have to be able to join forces and create unions and cooperatives that could hold the largest corporations in check. But all too often, American laws—including, ironically, antitrust laws—put up barriers to this kind of collective power. You might think of antitrust law, which led to the breakup of Standard Oil and AT&T, as applying primarily to giant corporations. Yet the same set of laws also prevents some of the weakest players in the economy from finding their strength. A corporate cartel whose members set artificially high prices for goods is illegal under long-standing antitrust rules, but so are groups of powerless independent contractors—Uber drivers, home health-care providers, and millions of other workers—or small firms banding together to compete on fairer terms. Indeed, while antitrust enforcers have done little or nothing to check the power of corporate monopolies and stop consolidation, they have attacked the collective action of workers and small firms as illegal collusion. Promoting a rebalancing of power in the economy will require not just more antitrust enforcement against big corporations but a reorientation of antitrust. Antitrust law should distinguish between huge companies and economic minnows. And collective power—that is, allowing independent workers and small businesses to collaborate to negotiate better treatment from megacorporations, or to start enterprises of their own—should be a pillar of creating an equitable economy. Workers in traditional employment relationships have an antitrust exemption for some of their concerted activities. That’s how labor unions became synonymous with collective power among workers. But unions are in a beleaguered state. Due to legal and political changes over the past 40 years, only about one in 10 American workers belongs to a union. A 2018 Supreme Court decision threatens the viability of public-sector unions, the one segment of organized labor that has bucked the downward trend. All of this has left the American labor movement in a weak position to counter the stagnation of wages or confront the rise of the app-emboldened gig economy. Nationally, more than a third of workers have part- or full-time arrangements in the gig economy. Indeed, an entire gig economy is built on denying drivers and food deliverers the benefits and protections that would come with treating them as employees. If ride-sharing drivers, home contractors, and freelance editors could band together—if not in a union, then as employees of a co-op or as a coalition of businesses—they could negotiate better terms. Yet when the city of Seattle tried to facilitate collective bargaining for Uber drivers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, with an assist from the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, sued the city using the Sherman Antitrust Act and compelled it to back down. This was not an aberrant misuse of antitrust; it was official policy. The Federal Trade Commission has repeatedly targeted the collective action of professionals and small firms and sued, among other collectives, associations of music teachers, organists, and public defenders. Where independent producers are allowed to collaborate, they gain leverage. Rural organizations like the Farmers’ Alliance and the Grange formed producers’ cooperatives that enjoyed significant bargaining power in their dealings with railroads and agricultural middlemen. These efforts formed the basis for later co-op brands like Cabot Creamery and Land O’Lakes, as well as for the New Deal–era electric cooperatives that still bring electricity to 42 million Americans. Collective power is even more relevant in the internet age. For some time, courts and public-policy makers have been wrestling with whether ride-hailing drivers, whom Uber and Lyft treat as independent contractors, should be reclassified as employees and gain the rights that come with that status. A California Supreme Court ruling has nudged the state’s legislature in that direction. Yet converting drivers into Uber employees isn’t the only option. An intriguing new bill proposed by the SEIU-affiliated United Healthcare Workers West puts forth another possible arrangement—establishing a new category of cooperative, worker-owned companies that would supply labor to gig-economy platforms. Drivers and other gig-economy workers would be employees of these cooperatives, which would negotiate with Uber, Lyft, and other platforms to set contract terms, such as wages and working conditions. (This approach may be aided by the fact that federal law allows state legislators to protect co-ops from antitrust enforcement, as long as legislatures authorize and supervise their activities.) Another kind of collective power could transform the governance of the Amazon Marketplace in which 2.5 million third-party sellers participate. While the Marketplace offers new opportunities for small sellers around the world, it also leaves them subject to Amazon’s whims. Sellers of most products pay Amazon 15 percent of every sale and can be removed from the platform, or banished to the bottom of search results, for any reason at all. They are at the mercy of rules set by Amazon and, in the event of a legal dispute, forced into individual arbitration. Even while sellers are at the mercy of Amazon, they often resort to unfair and unethical practices against one another as a means of obtaining a competitive advantage, however fleeting. These tactics include submitting fake reviews of rivals’ products and making specious trademark-infringement allegations. Although Amazon does punish the worst of these tactics, it benefits immensely from pitting independent sellers against one another. Organized sellers could build their own cooperative online commerce platform—or at least wield real power against Amazon. An association of sellers could negotiate a lower cut for Amazon, and members could keep 90 or 95 percent of their sales revenue, instead of the typical 85 percent. They could also establish dispute-resolution processes with more transparent rules. Much like what labor unions do with employers, collective power among sellers would transfer some power from Amazon’s executives and shareholders to the people whose daily exertions actually make the platform work. New forms of collective power will require, among other legal reforms, significant legislative revision of the antitrust laws. To protect beneficial cooperation, as we have explained in detail elsewhere, Congress has a template on which to build. The 1922 Capper-Volstead Act grants farmers and other agricultural producers the right to engage in collective action free from antitrust interference. They can cooperate in selling and processing their crops, milk, and other output and marketing the resulting products. While protected from the antitrust prohibition on collusion, farmer cooperation is still subject to oversight by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Congress should generalize the Capper-Volstead Act and extend its protection to all powerless actors in the economy—workers, professionals, consumers, and small firms. To prevent abuse of the cooperative form, Congress should also ensure this new protection is restricted to bona fide small players. While restructuring large corporations and establishing rules of fair market conduct are crucial, these aren’t the only ways to protect the powerless in today’s version of the Gilded Age economy. Cooperation among small actors can remedy the yawning imbalance of power between corporate giants and everyone else.

## **Second, megacorporations, corporate greed and monopolization impoverishes workers and their families, intensifying suffering; Schmitz Jr. and Fettig find**

<https://promarket.org/2020/08/14/monopolies-silent-spreaders-of-poverty-and-economic-inequality/#:~:text=First%2C%20monopolies%20are%20a%20major%20source%20of%20poverty%20and%20inequality.&text=One%20method%20used%20by%20monopolists,that%20the%20poor%20would%20purchase>.

The Covid-19 crisis has exposed the vast inequalities that exist within the US economy. Monopoly power should be at the top of policymakers’ list when they consider reforms to benefit our most vulnerable citizens. It’s only been a few months since the United States was hit by the Covid-19 pandemic, a significant health crisis that has laid bare other crises that face our nation—especially the economic vulnerabilities of the country’s poor and marginalized. With Covid-19, we learned the ironic lesson that this country’s essential workers were often just one paycheck from going hungry or facing eviction. We’ve seen from up close large swaths of our nation that live in poverty. The pandemic has also highlighted inequality: Groups face vastly different abilities to protect themselves from infection, and, if infected, to survive. As the US is marshaling its resources to limit the harm of the pandemic, the path forward is clear: Finding better ways to treat those with the disease, to limit deaths, and to find a vaccine to prevent further infections. As many Americans also call for reforms to alleviate poverty and inequality, we would do well to consider the proposals offered during the Great Depression—a period when the US faced similar challenges to today’s economic crises—by some of the greatest scholars and policymakers of the time, including Henry Simons, a leader in economics at the University of Chicago, and Thurman Arnold, the Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust for President Roosevelt (from 1938-43). Simons presented his proposals for solving the economic crises of the 1930s in his A Positive Program for Laissez Faire. Among his proposals, Simons called for progressive taxation to limit inequality. Yet for Simons, the most important policy change to limit poverty and inequality was “the elimination of monopoly in all its forms.’’ Arnold shared this view. He described the lessons of the Great Depression as showing “The fundamental axiom [is] that in a monopoly economy luxuries expand while the necessities of life contract,’’ and “The exploitation of monopolies is always the most dangerous in the things people cannot do without.’’ What these scholars and policymakers also knew was that monopolies were widespread and took many forms, and were therefore often difficult to detect. Frank Knight, an early mentor of Simons and his colleague at the University of Chicago, observed: “The imperfections of the market, including monopoly of all kinds and bases, create power relations of infinite complexity as to kind and degree. They are by no means limited to ‘big business’ or to ‘trusts’…” Simons and Arnold knew monopolies employed deceit and misinformation as they inflicted harm on the poor. Monopoly injury, then, could go undetected for years. Wendell Berge, who followed Arnold as Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Department of Justice’s antitrust division, wrote: “Monopoly conditions have often grown up almost unnoticed by the public until one day it is suddenly realized that an industry is no longer competitive but is governed by an economic oligarchy.’’ What was true of the 1930s is also true today. First, monopolies are a major source of poverty and inequality. Second, monopolies often hide and disguise actions that lead to great harm among low-income communities. To borrow from the pandemic’s lexicon, monopolies are silent spreaders of poverty and economic inequality. As emphasized by Simons and Arnold, monopolies are concentrations of power formed by groups to enrich members, typically through illegal means. One method used by monopolists is to sabotage substitutes for the monopoly’s goods, typically low-cost substitutes that the poor would purchase. This leads to increased poverty. But since the sabotage disproportionately harms the poor, it also increases inequality. And today’s sabotage often goes unnoticed. As for the harm inflicted by today’s monopolies, let’s begin with the most important good purchased by Americans: Housing. Today, the vast majority of US housing is produced using methods that have been around for centuries. It’s often called stick-built construction, a highly labor-intensive method of making houses. There is, of course, a much more efficient way to produce housing, a low-cost substitute: factory production of homes. The costs per square foot can be as much as one-third lower with factory methods. There was a brief period, in fact, when US factory production flourished. Factory production of homes soared during the 1960s, reaching 60 percent of single-family production by early 1970, threatening the very existence of traditional builders, especially those constructing smaller houses purchased by lower-income Americans. In response, monopolies of stick-builders, including the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) and the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), developed extensive weapons to sabotage and harm factory producers of houses. NAHB and HUD strangled the production of factory homes. Production collapsed in the 1970s. Figure 1 shows the shipments of manufactured homes in the United States from 1947-2019. These homes represent a major part of factory-built homes in the United States each year. The surge in production during the 1960s, and its subsequent collapse in the 1970s, is evident. The effect of the collapse on poor households was devastating and remains so to this day, as affordable housing tops the list of economic issues facing lower-income Americans. Figures 2 and 3 present pictures of manufactured homes that, through sabotage, have been blocked from most areas of the country. Where they are allowed, sabotage by monopolies has meant much higher costs of production than necessary. Moreover, through deceit and misinformation, this monopoly sabotage of factory production has been forgotten, so that this history is unknown today. Monopolies have silently spread their harm.  Consider also legal services, where lawyer monopolies—that is, state bar associations—prohibit anyone who is not a member of the bar from providing legal counsel of any kind. This prevents paralegals, who could effectively provide advice on many issues, from practicing independently. The vast majority of lower-income Americans thus face hearings on evictions, child custody, and wage-theft without legal advice. The same is true of women who are victims of domestic violence. In health care, monopolies inflict great harm on the poor in many industries, including oral healthcare, hearing aids, eyeglasses, and, of course, pharmaceuticals. In oral health care, monopolies of dentists prohibit the practice of dental therapists, professionals that treat cavities. They prevent hygienists from practicing independently of dentists. Hence, filling of cavities and teeth cleaning are more expensive in locations where they are provided. Much more importantly, it means the filling of cavities and teeth cleaning is not available in low-income areas, both rural and urban, since dentists are not practicing in many of these areas. The experience of monopolies in oral health provides important lessons that pertain to most monopolies. The monopoly harm to high-income households, who live in areas where dentists practice, is higher prices, though this harm is small if not trivial for them. However, the harm to the poor is great and does not come from paying high prices, but rather from not consuming the goods at all. While monopolies in oral health care have spread misinformation to hide their sabotage, other groups—including economists—have inadvertently contributed to this insidious concealment. In particular, in searching for monopoly harm, a major exercise is to look for “excessive” prices. But there are no markets, and hence no prices, in the areas where these monopolies inflict the greatest harm. Another extremely important lesson is that many of the low-cost substitutes sabotaged by monopolies, like in oral health, have investment components to them. Hence, the poor are blocked from making investments in their households’ futures, pushing them further behind and into poverty. Monopolies not only sabotage markets, they also infiltrate and damage public institutions to enrich themselves. Such monopolies were formed to sabotage black voting. These monopoly groups, in effect, infiltrated existing voting institutions and hijacked them for their own enrichment. As University of Maryland economist Mancur Olson argued: “… the first important special-interest coalitions [i.e., monopoly] that emerged in the South during and after Reconstruction were small, local, and white-only coalitions, sometimes without formal organization.” One consequence of these coalitions was that “The much weaker black population was in essence denied political organization and often the opportunity to vote through extra-legal coercion …’’ The monopolies that sabotaged black voting rights were to a large extent, as Olson tells us, informally organized. Among other groups, they consisted of hundreds of voting registrars across the south, throwing up roadblocks to black registration, as well as tens of thousands of those operating polling places that harassed those able to register. These groups acted out of the spotlight. We cannot even name the members of these monopolies that created such great harm. When monopolies infiltrate and damage public institutions, the harm often “grows up unnoticed by the public.” The monopolies are not damaging markets, but institutions. Without markets, there are no prices. Again, the usual tool to diagnose monopolies is worthless. With no market, such concepts as ‘’concentration’’ have little meaning as well. These monopolies fly under the radar of such concepts. They spread harm silently. Over the last decade or so, there has been an explosion in the study and concern over monopolies. Extremely large firms and concentrated industries are rightly a source of concern and, because of their size, attract a lot of attention. However, we should not let these larger companies distract us from the many hidden monopolies that have silently spread harm to the poor for the last 100 years. Both Arnold and Simons, in fact, wrote about how monopolies in stick-built construction led to the housing crises of their era. When Arnold was at the Department of Justice, he indicted many of these monopolies for blocking the production of factory-made homes. As argued in Schmitz (2020), the harm caused by monopolies that have mostly avoided detection—often existing in markets with small firms and low concentration levels, as in residential construction, or wreaking their harm in public institutions where prices and concentration have no meaning—very likely cause much greater harm to the poor than the great-sized firms. The events of recent months have shined a bright light on the poverty and inequalities that exist in the US economy. Now is the time to consider all the many ways that our economic system is aligned against the poor, as well as many middle-income families. Monopoly power should be at the top of policymakers’ list when they consider reforms to benefit our most vulnerable citizens.

# **CONTENTION 3**

## **Contention 3: Proletariat governmental approaches expand the Sharing Economy; this builds equality among peoples and ensures that each is removed from suffering.**

## **Cross apply the Schneider and Vaheesan in 2020 evidence, the technological era economy is developing collectivist capitalistic actions by the working class--this drives innovation, prefer the Aff analysis on this question**

## **Further, there are five implications to expanding the Sharing Economy: Access to public transport, high cost of rentals and property, food waste, environmental confidence in fashion markets and access to renewable energy--Lovick in 2020 states**

<https://www.businessbecause.com/news/in-the-news/6678/sharing-economy-problems-solving>

Peer-to-peer apps, collaborative consumption—the sharing economy has many faces and many names. The first reference to the sharing economy grew out of coding, where programmers would contribute to programs to be shared for free. But in the wake of the 2008 financial crash and in the face of the climate crisis, the sharing economy has come to change how we make the most out of limited, costly resources, while minimizing our carbon footprint. Technology and the sharing economy have transformed our lives, allowing us to tackle problems like high rent and carbon emissions. Here are five problems that the sharing economy has offered a solution for, and changed the world as a result.

1. Access to public transport

In the push to reduce carbon emissions, car ownership has come under greater scrutiny. But for places where public transport isn’t reliable or available, alternatives are necessary. The sharing economy has transformed public transport possibilities, both in terms of sustainability but also cost saving. For many, it started at Uber—frustrated at paying $800 for a private hire car on New Year’s Eve, Silicon Valley entrepreneur Garrett Camp was keen to transform and democratise ride hailing. Uber’s POOL service allows customers to hop into other people’s taxis and share the cost accordingly. In many US cities, it’s almost as cheap as a bus or subway, and reduces emissions from private hire taxis. For those travelling slightly further afield, apps like Croozen, founded by a Chicago Booth MBA, teams up people on roadtrips, halving their emissions and splitting the cost of their journeys. But Uber’s legacy goes far beyond cars. With sustainability and healthy living overlapping, cycling has been conquered by the sharing economy, with apps like Ofo, Mobike, Lime, and Jump (owned by Uber) bringing their brightly colored contraptions to a street corner near you. Between 2014 and 2018, the number of public shared bicycles increased from 2.3 million to 18.2 million. The catch? A desire to gain market share has meant that many bike sharing apps have expanded far too quickly. Mountains of scrapped Ofo bikes have been photographed in countries like China, raising the question about whether the millions of bikes filling our streets are actually being used.

2. High cost of rent and property

As residents in major cities like London and San Francisco can attest to, the rising cost of rent and depleting housing stock is a real issue. Property sharing offers its own solution, ensuring that no space—from spare rooms to spare couches—goes to waste. Airbnb, conceived when its founders rented out air mattresses in their San Francisco apartment, has changed the landscape of homeowners and holidaymakers. The ‘hosting’ experience feels as much a lifestyle choice as a financial one—in staying in someone’s spare room, you’ll share the experience of what it’s like to be a local in that city. This is even truer for innovations like Homestay and CouchSurfing, the latter of which is free. Even the stresses of homeownership has been alleviated by the sharing economy. Tipi, a property development first established in London, provides a shared living experience, where renters share communal facilities like a gym and a cinema. Meanwhile the nightmares of renting—deposits, utility bills, insurance—is all sorted for you. The catch? Airbnb has come under great scrutiny for its effects on local economies, namely driving up rent, increasing gentrification, and creating a dependency for residents on renting out their rooms.

3. Food waste

One third of all food—1.3 billion tonnes annually—goes to waste, while 12.9 percent of the world is undernourished. The spectre of food waste looms large. Food sharing apps are coming up with new, innovative ways of reducing waste on personal to industrial levels. Take the app Too Good To Go, which allows restaurants to sell off leftover food at highly discounted rates at the end of the day. Or Olio, which connects consumers who are getting rid of stock. For the more adventurous, there’s HomeDine, an opportunity to share a unique culinary experience in the heart of someone’s home. Before you chuck out that last helping of curry, it’s worth checking out food sharing possibilities. The catch? The sharing economy has also heralded the arrival of food delivery apps like Uber Eats and Deliveroo. Meals are transported in plastic packaging, meaning while food might not be filling the landfill, the plastic will be.

4. Fast fashion and consumerism

Fast fashion and quick, easy consumerism have skyrocketed in popularity with online shopping. But their rise is footnoted by the impact they’re having on the environment. The fashion industry is believed to contribute to 10% of the world’s carbon emissions; a desire to save money doesn’t give you licence to kill the planet. Rent The Runway hires out top fashion label clothes on subscription, allowing its customers to try out and return clothing which won’t end up on the scrapheap. Sites like Neighborrow and Fat Llama apply this same logic to just about any household item, allowing you to rent out anything from speakers to power tools—things you wouldn’t need to buy, and could split the cost by sharing. Freecycle takes this a step further, where you can swap or give away things you have no use for anymore, for free.

The catch? It's been suggested that clothes sharing apps has actually increased the amount of clothing that people are buying, in the knowledge that they'll be able to hire them out online to recoup the money.

5. Access to renewable energy

It’s covered everything food to transport, but what could be the next frontier for the sharing economy? Many expect it to be energy. The climate crisis has seen a sharp increase in attention on renewable energies, particularly for major corporations. But for the ordinary consumer, installing solar panels or wind turbines in your back garden isn’t feasible—more than anything, they’re very expensive. But between several households, or small communities, suddenly the cost isn’t so large. Why not apply the same UberPOOL logic to energy? Brooklyn Microgrid is one of the first examples of this system, where residents can subscribe to locally produced renewable energy. The cost is divided, and excess energy is sold off to energy companies. Energy sharing is far from being a national, let alone regional, economy; but given impending climate disasters, and the need to cut carbon emissions, it could become the most important innovation of the sharing economy. The catch? Energy sharing doesn't really seem to have a catch—or perhaps it's too soon to tell. The real challenge will be whether it catches on enough to have an impact, to make renewable energy the norm.