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#### Interp: The aff must defend a workers strike, with a legitimate worker.

#### A worker is an individual who works under contract.

Davidov 05 [Guy Davidov (full professor and the Elias Lieberman Chair in Labour Law, published dozens of articles in peer-review journals, including in the Oxford Journal of Legal Studies, Modern Law Review, the University of Toronto Law Journal, Law & Social Inquiry, Industrial Law Journal, and the Comparative Labour Law & Policy Journal, founding Chair of the Labour Law Research Network (LLRN), from 2011 through 2015. He has also been the Editor-in-Chief of the International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations). “Who is a Worker?”. Industrial Law Journal, Volume 34, Issue 1, March 2005, Pages 57–71. Accessed 11/6/21. <https://academic.oup.com/ilj/article-abstract/34/1/57/821218> //Xu]

The term ‘worker’ has been defined to include (a) an individual who has entered into or works under a contract of employment (ie an employee); and (b) an indi- vidual who has entered into or works under any other contract ‘Whereby the individual undertakes to do or perform personally any work or services for another party to the contract whose status is not by virtue of the contract that of a client or customer of any profession or business undertaking carried on by the individual’. Although hopelessly cumbersome and circular, the definition does make a couple of intentions clear. First, to include all employees and then some others. And second, to maintain a number of requirements associated with the term ‘employee’, in particular the contractual relationship, the personal nature of the engagement, and the lack of an independent business undertaking.

#### Prison labor is coerced.

Benns 15 [Whitney Benns (lecturer on education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education where she teaches the negotiation workshop and fugitive negotiation). “American Slavery, Reinvented”. SEPTEMBER 21, 2015. Accessed 11/6/21. <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2015/09/prison-labor-in-america/406177/> //Xu]

Some viewers of the video might be surprised to learn that inmates at Angola, once cleared by the prison doctor, can be forced to work under threat of punishment as severe as solitary confinement. Legally, this labor may be totally uncompensated; more typically inmates are paid meagerly—as little as two cents per hour—for their full-time work in the fields, manufacturing warehouses, or kitchens. How is this legal? Didn’t the Thirteenth Amendment abolish all forms of slavery and involuntary servitude in this country? Not quite. In the shining promise of freedom that was the Thirteenth Amendment, a sharp exception was carved out. Section 1 of the Amendment provides: “Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.” Simply put: Incarcerated persons have no constitutional rights in this arena; they can be forced to work as punishment for their crimes. Angola’s farm operations and other similar prison industries have ancestral roots in the black chattel slavery of the South. Specifically, the proliferation of prison labor camps grew during the Reconstruction era following the Civil War, a time when southern states established large prisons throughout the region that they quickly filled, primarily with black men. Many of these prisons had very recently been slave plantations, Angola and Mississippi State Penitentiary (known as Parchman Farm) among them. Other prisons began convict-leasing programs, where, for a leasing fee, the state would lease out the labor of incarcerated workers as hired work crews. Convict leasing was cheaper than slavery, since farm owners and companies did not have to worry at all about the health of their workers. In this new era of prison industry, the criminal “justice” system, the state determined the size of the worker pool. Scores of recently freed slaves and their descendants now labored to generate revenue for the state under a Jim Crow regime. More than a century later, our prison labor system has only grown. We now incarcerate more than 2.2 million people, with the largest prison population in the world, and the second highest incarceration rate per capita. Our prison populations remain racially skewed. With few exceptions, inmates are required to work if cleared by medical professionals at the prison. Punishments for refusing to do so include solitary confinement, loss of earned good time, and revocation of family visitation. For this forced labor, prisoners earn pennies per hour, if anything at all. Angola is not the exception; it is the rule.

#### Standards:

#### 1] Precision – any other interp lets affs do away with random words in the res a] that means no solid neg ground b] The judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote on non-topical ground.

#### 2] Limits – not being tied to defend workers means aff can spec any combo of 7 billion ppl on the earth from CEOs to volunteers, which kills neg ground and excaterbates aff prep skew, and kills predictable advocacies.

#### Paradigm Issues:

#### 1] Fairness debate is a game, if it’s unfair no-one will want to play.

#### 2] Education a) portability, it’s useful for the real world b) constitutive purpose, this is an educational activity.

#### And it’s drop-the-debater, k2 deterring further abuse, and the argument is their case

#### TVA solve – read the aff as a whole res aff with the same advantage area.

#### No RVI on T, you don’t win for being topical or fair, and incentives being non-topical to bait T and win off RVI every rnd.

#### Competing interps, a) reasonability is bad it requires judge intervention and b) arguing about the norms is the only way to get to the best norms possible.

#### T before theory a] I only get 2 months to set norms they get 4 years b] any NC abuse was a necessary check against AC abuse

## 2

#### History proves an effective right to strike is impossible in liberal capitalist society – courts will water it down and workers will be replaced – but its justification relies on the same tropes of property protection that will be used to delegitimize worker militancy.

White ‘18

[Ahmed, University of Colorado Law School. 2018. “Its Own Dubious Battle: The Impossible Defense of an Effective Right to Strike,” <https://scholar.law.colorado.edu/articles/1261/>] pat

* 1947 Amendments to Wagner Act

Like every other aspect of Taft-Hartley, the 1947 amendments to the Wagner Act that directly touched on mass picketing and other forms of strike militancy were strongly supported by the business community, including prominent employers and business associations like the National Association of Manufactures, the American Iron and Steel Institute, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Promoted by these groups, witness after witness regaled the Congress with stories of how mass picketing, along with secondary boycotts and other militant tactics, gave unions too much power, eroded the power of owners and their supervisors, and threatened the American way. Time and again, senators and representatives expressed their support for new restrictions on the right to strike as mandates of a common faith, a commitment of the nation itself, to the principles of property and order. “They are a veritable pronouncement of contempt of law and order, private capitalism, and ownership of property, competition, and everything that even smacks of liberty,” said Ohio Representative Frederick Smith, speaking of NLRB positions that seemed to continence an expansive view of the right to strike. “He has been required to employ or reinstate individuals who have assaulted him and his employees and want only to destroy his property,” said New York Representative Ralph Gwinn, in defense of employers supposedly ravaged by such strikes. Under prevailing law, such employers endured “respectable robbery without liability,” Gwinn said.

We in America prize human individual liberty even above the state. We believe that property rights are natural to man. The best protection of those property rights and of that liberty is in the balancing of the rights of our workers and the rights of our businessmen so that the great majority of our citizens will enjoy that private property and that human liberty,

said Representative Charles Kersten of Wisconsin, condemning mass picketing of the sort that had recently featured at the Allis-Chalmers plants in his state. Consider, too, the remarks of Representative John Robsion of Kentucky:

There have been cases in this country where literally thousands of persons have picketed a plant and engaged in violence. In my honest opinion, labor nor management never did help its cause by engaging in lawlessness, violence, and the destruction of the property of others, and under this bill and the law the company cannot mistreat, browbeat and engage in violence and lawlessness against the workers.

Nor was it only conservatives who joined in this, as evidenced by remarks of Utah Senator Elbert Thomas, who had supported the New Deal and the work of the La Follette Committee, on which he had served, and who had joined with Robert La Follette Jr. in 1939 in sponsoring a pro-labor amendment to the Wagner Act. For a worker, he said,

to interpret his right to strike as being an absolute right, entitling him to quit work while the water is turned on in the plant, for leaving in a mine certain equipment in such a way as to result in costly destruction, would obviously be most improper. No person has a right to do such things. No one has a right to act against society. No one has a right to destroy it.

And so it went, the references to the inviolate values of property and order in defense of the legislation much too numerous to exhaustively cite. It is easy to dismiss these contentions, even from moderates like Thomas, as the contrived utterances of people who were singularly committed to advancing their narrow class and political interests. To some extent, they surely were that. But these views were hardly outside the mainstream of American politics, particularly among elites, broad swathes of the middle class, and important elements of the working class. Indeed, they comported very conveniently with commonplace views about the virtues of property and order and resonated with what much of the public believed at the time—this is what made them so resonant. And whether contrived or not, they performed an important function. By invoking the virtues of property and order in this way, these Congressmen and the witnesses before them who favored restricting mass picketing and other forms of coercive protest were conspicuously able to couch this position as something other than a malicious attack on the “legitimate” rights of labor. Instead, theirs was a mission to realign the labor law with fundamental American values, to save it from those who had allowed labor policies and the habits of union to stray beyond this field. In this way they were able to deflect, if not disprove, the all-too-apt contention by the legislation’s opponents, repeated many times in the process, that what Taft-Hartley was really about was elevating property rights over human rights.

Added proof that strike militancy was actually indefensible can be found in the fact that no scholars would justify it, not even mass picketing—at least not beyond the point at which it became coercive, which was of course the very point at which it was employed in an effective way. In the wake of the Memorial Day Massacre, most all the major papers sided with the police, declaring the strikers enemies of public order who brought the violence upon themselves. Initially, this stance was premised on distorted readings of the events of that day that charged the strikers with various acts of provocation. But even when the La Follette Committee publicized a Paramount Pictures newsreel (which the company had suppressed) and unearthed other evidence that proved that most all of the blame for what happened that day rested on the police, most of the papers still adhered to this reading of the events.

This attitude toward mass picketing was a centerpiece of revived interest in the right to strike in the major papers, one that extended from the mid 1930s into the 1940s and exceeded the surge in interest of the late 1910s and early 1920s. In 1941, for instance, the New York Herald Tribune described pending legislative attempts to limit mass picketing as “too thoroughly justified to require argument.” In 1946 the New York Times summoned up the rhetoric used to condemn the sitdown trikes and declared mass picketing a “seizure” that was “by its very nature illegal because it infringes both individual and property rights.” Conservative though he was, newspaperman David Lawrence, founder of U.S. News and World Report, spoke for many when he declared mass picketing an act of “violence” by which unionists were seeking to take the law into their own hands. In fact, Lawrence’s judgement that mass picketing was an affront to civil liberties aligned with that of the American Civil Liberties Union, long a champion of labor rights, which, as the New York Times was keen to note, also condemned the tactic in these terms.

Such views fit with a broader tendency to criticize the right to strike as being too aggressively employed by unionists and too generously construed by the courts and the NLRB. In the decade between the validation of the Wagner and the passage of Taft-Hartley, newspapers gave voice to a criticism of mass picketing and other erstwhile excessive forms of strike behavior, one that typically described the Wagner Act as having gone too far in protecting workers’ prerogatives to protest. A typical example of the content and tenor of these pieces is a 1941 editorial in the Chicago Daily Tribune:

“The right to strike” is now used frequently to mean the right of union leaders to force men who don’t want to strike to do so. It is used to justify the seizure of industries and the blockading of factories by mass picketing to prevent the entrance of workers who are satisfied with their working conditions and the movement of goods in and out of the plants. “The right to strike” in this sense means not only that every strike is right but that every measure which may be adopted to win a strike is right.

In fact, at this crucial moment it was common for elites of all stripes to claim that they supported the right to strike and yet to assert that it was being abused by unionists who insisted on winning every labor dispute and using coercive and disorderly methods to do so. In 1946, Hebert Hoover, who might well have denied just such a thing fifteen years earlier, inveighed that “Nobody denies that there is a ‘right’ to strike”; but that right, he said, had been abused to the detriment of the public interest. Although considerably more liberal than Hoover, Walter Lippmann, the extremely popular political commentator, offered a similar judgement about a railroad strike that same year, concluding “we must henceforth refuse to regard the right to strike as universal and absolute, and as one of the inalienable rights of man.” Also writing in 1946, Henry Ford II, whose father had used a small army of thugs and toughs to enforce the open shop at his plants and bitterly fought unionization until 1941, now purported at once to support the right to strike—and to believe that it should be limited. “There is no longer any question of the right of organized workers to strike, but that right,” he said, “is being misused.”

Like Taft-Hartley’s supporters in Congress, figures like Hoover, Lippmann, and Ford did not trouble themselves to confess that such tactics as they so blithely condemned might actually be necessary to counterbalance the power of employers and give life and meaning to a statute that did not take adequate account of this basic reality, let alone that they were essential in establishing the idea that workers enjoyed any enforceable right to strike. But they did not have to, either; for they honestly did not believe that labor should generally prevail. Liberal or conservative, it did not matter; these were capitalists in a capitalist society, contented, consistent with their values, with a right to strike that went little further than a right to withhold one’s labor. To be sure, these were not the views of ordinary people. But the public’s perspective did not seem to vary all that much from those of elites. Although overall approval of union membership as measured in Gallup surveys slipped noticeably after 1937, it remained quite high—well above fifty percent right through the 1940s. Nevertheless, Gallup surveys taken in June 1937, after the big wave of sit-strikes had waned noticeably, but while mass picketing and overall levels of labor militancy remained high, revealed that fifty-seven percent supported the proposition that the militia should “be called out whenever strike trouble threatens.”

As with the sit-down strikes, too, the status of mass picketing and other forms of strike militancy can also be gauged by the way these tactics were defended. During the hearings on Taft-Hartley, only a few labor leaders stood against the torrent of criticism of these practices by businessmen, conservative unionists, and congressmen and senators, and tried to parry the move to prohibit the strikes. With only a couple of exceptions, most of them consistently qualified their defense of these tactics by downplaying their coercive qualities—again the very thing that made them so effective in the first place—while also describing them as expedients, presumably temporary, that were justified by the unreasonable stances of some employers.

While the political motivations and implications of this campaign against these forms of strike militancy might be as dubious as the attacks on the sit-down strikes, their value in expressing dominant political judgments concerning these tactics is not. Repeatedly, it was taken for granted that workers could not be allowed to excessively coerce their fellow workers, that they should be obliged to adhere to their contractual obligations, that they did not own the streets or the workplace, and that whatever the right to strike was, it was surely, as Brandeis had insisted, not an absolute right. Of course, all of this was controversial for many unionists. But unionists were almost the only ones to really push back against these measures. Even President Harry Truman’s dramatic veto of Taft-Hartley is widely regarded as a political move taken with the expectation that Congress would override the veto anyway. It is also notable that despite dedicating itself to this aim, the labor movement has never come close to repealing the Taft-Hartley Act, or even securing the enactment of favorable amendments to any of its provisions.

And then there is the replacement worker doctrine where, if anything, the change in the law even more clearly reflected the depth and power of liberal norms. For the rule established in Mackay Radio came out of the blue. It was set forth in a case which required no such question to be resolved, in a manner that drew no support from the text of the Wagner Act, and on the basis of legislative history that was ambiguous at best. Worse, as Getman points out, the rule is in direct conflict with the very statutory principle of barring discrimination on the basis of a worker’s assertion of the basic labor rights laid out in § 7 that it was, itself, supposedly derived from.

As an exercise in statutory construction and administration, Mackay Radio makes no sense; but as a defense of property rights it makes all the sense in the world. One way to see this is to consider what would have happened had the Court decided the matter in a fundamentally different way. If employers were barred from replacing economic strikers, it seems likely that strikes would have proliferated to an extraordinary extent, as workers could at least plausibly have expected to be able to strike under a broad array of circumstances and yet be restored to their jobs no matter the outcome. But precisely because such a doctrine would have given workers so much power, Congress would almost certainly have stepped in with its own rule, codifying employers’ right to permanently replace striking workers and bringing this to an end. Ultimately, it is difficult to imagine a much more liberal alternative to the Mackay Radio rule surviving for very long—a point that also draws support from labor’s failure to repeal the rule in Congress in the early 1990s.

A simple exercise in counterfactual speculation bears similar fruit in regard to other, more basic, limitations on the right to strike, including those imposed relative to sit-down strikes, mass picketing, and secondary boycotts. Shrill and self-interested though it was, all the testimony from employers and their allies during the hearings on Taft-Hartley or Landrum-Griffin about the perils posed by these tactics, was fundamentally correct. For were workers able to make unfettered use of sit-down strikes, mass picketing, and general strikes and sympathy walkouts, they could have very much challenged the sovereignty of capitalists in and about the workplace, and with this the bedrock institutions and norms of liberal society. As Jim Pope puts it, Charles Evans Hughes’ opinion in Fansteel established the maxim that “the employer could violate the workers’ statutory rights without sacrificing its property rights, while the workers could not violate the employer’s property rights without sacrificing their statutory rights.” This is unquestionably true. But equally unquestionable is that neither this court nor any other important arbiter of legal rights in this country was ever prepared to endorse the contrary view that property rights might be sufficiently subordinate to labor rights as to justify the kinds of tactics by which workers could routinely defeat powerful employers on the fields of industrial conflict.

Significantly, there is no reason to believe that any of this has changed or is poised to change today. Quite the contrary: In a culture and political system more immersed than ever in the veneration of order and control, mediated by criminal law and police work, by the celebration of property rights, and by a readiness to punish violence, it is all but unthinkable that the courts or the NLRB would deign to give legal sanction to workers to engage in any sustained way in the kinds of tactics that might make going on strike a worthwhile thing to do.

#### Capitalist imperialism enables hypermilitarization, dooms world economic prosperity to inevitable collapse, and plunges the human species into extinction.

Robinson et al 17 (Robinson, William I., et al. “Global Capitalist Crisis and Trump's War Drive.” Truthout, Truthout, 19 Apr. 2017, truthout.org/articles/global-capitalist-crisis-and-trump-s-war-drive/.)//LK [RCT] [Accessed 8/28/19]

The recent US attack on Syria and mega-bombing of Afghanistan come at a time when the Trump regime is facing a mounting scandal over alleged Russian involvement in its 2016 electoral campaign, historically low approval ratings for an incoming presidency, and a growing mass grassroots resistance movement. US rulers have often launched military adventures abroad to deflect attention from political crises and problems of legitimacy at home.¶ Beyond Syria and Afghanistan, the Trump regime has quietly escalated military intervention throughout the Middle East and has proposed an increase of US$55 billion in the Pentagon budget. It has threatened military force in a number of hotspots around the world, including Syria, Iran, Southeast Asia, along NATO’s eastern flank and in the Korean Peninsula. As rival centers of power emerge in the international system any such military adventure could snowball into a global conflagration with devastating consequences for humanity.¶ Journalists and political observers have focused on geopolitical analysis in attempting to explain rising international tensions. While such analysis is important, there are deep structural dynamics in the global capitalist system that are pushing ruling groups towards war. The crisis of global capitalism is intensifying despite what we have heard from mainstream economists and elites giddy with recent growth spurts and the inflation of stock prices. In particular, the system is facing what appears to be an intractable structural crisis of overaccumulation and of legitimacy.¶ Cyclical crises, or recessions, occur about every 10 years in the capitalist system and typically last some 18 months. There were recessions in the early 1980s, the early 1990s, and the early 2000s. Structural crisis, so called because the only way out of crisis is to restructure the system, occur approximately every 40-50 years. A new wave of colonialism and imperialism resolved the first recorded structural crisis of the 1870s and 1880s. The next structural, the Great Depression of the 1930s, was resolved through a new type of redistributive capitalism, referred to as the “class compromise” of Fordism-Keynesianism, social democracy, New Deal capitalism, and so on.¶ Capital responded to the structural crisis of the 1970s by going global. The emerging transnational capitalist class, or TCC, promoted vast neoliberal restructuring, trade liberalization, and integration of the world economy. The global economy experienced a boom in the late 20th century as the former socialist countries entered the global market and as capital, liberated from nation-state constraints, unleashed a vast new round of accumulation worldwide. The TCC unloaded surpluses and resumed profit-making in the emerging globally integrated production and financial system through the acquisition of privatized assets, the extension of mining and agro-industrial investment on the heels of the displacement of hundreds of millions from the countryside, a new wave of industrial expansion assisted by the revolution in Computer and Information Technology (CIT).¶ Yet capitalist globalization has also resulted in unprecedented social polarization worldwide. According to the development agency Oxfam, just 1 percent of humanity owns over half of the world’s wealth and the top 20 percent own 94.5 of that wealth, while the remaining 80 percent must make due with just 4.5 percent.¶ Given such extreme polarization of income and wealth, the global market cannot absorb the output of the global economy. The global financial collapse of 2008 marked the onset of a new structural crisis of overaccumulation, which refers to accumulated capital that cannot find outlets for profitable reinvestment. Data from 2010 showed, for instance, that companies from the United States were sitting on $1.8 trillion in uninvested cash that year. Corporate profits have been at near record highs at the same time that corporate investment has declined.¶ As this uninvested capital accumulates, enormous pressures build up to find outlets for unloading the surplus. Capitalist groups, especially transnational finance capital, push states to create new opportunities for profit-making. Neoliberal states have turned to four mechanisms in recent years to help the TCC unload surplus and sustain accumulation in the face of stagnation.¶ One is the raiding and sacking of public budgets. Public finance has been reconfigured through austerity, bailouts, corporate subsidies, government debt and the global bond market as governments transfer wealth directly and indirectly from working people to the TCC.¶ A second is the expansion of credit to consumers and to governments, especially in the Global North, to sustain spending and consumption. In the United States, for instance, which has long been the “market of last resort” for the global economy, household debt is higher than it has been for almost all of postwar history. US households owed in 2016 nearly US$13 trillion in student loans, credit card debt, auto loans and mortgages. Meanwhile, the global bond market — an indicator of total government debt worldwide — had already reached US$100 trillion by 2011.¶ A third is frenzied financial speculation. The global economy has been one big casino for transnational finance capital, as the gap between the productive economy and “fictitious capital” grows ever wider. Gross world product, or the total value of goods and services produced worldwide, stood at some US$75 trillion in 2015, whereas currency speculation alone amounted to US$5.3 trillion a day that year and the global derivatives market was estimated at a mind-boggling US$1.2 quadrillion.¶ All three of these financial mechanisms may resolve the problem momentarily but in the long run they end up aggravating the crisis of overaccumulation. The transfer of wealth from workers to capital further constricts the market, while debt-financed consumption and speculation increase the gap between the productive economy and “fictitious capital.” The result is ever-greater underlying instability in the global economy. Many now see a new crash as inevitable.¶ There is another mechanism that has sustained the global economy: militarized accumulation. Here there is a convergence around the system’s political need for social control and its economic need to perpetuate accumulation. Unprecedented global inequalities can only be sustained by ever more repressive and ubiquitous systems of social control and repression. Yet quite apart from political considerations, the TCC has acquired a vested interest in war, conflict, and repression as a means of accumulation. CIT has revolutionized warfare and the modalities of state-organized militarized accumulation, including the military application of vast new technologies and the further fusion of private accumulation with state militarization.¶ As war and state-sponsored repression become increasingly privatized, the interests of a broad array of capitalist groups shift the political, social, and ideological climate toward generating and sustaining social conflict — such as in the Middle East — and in expanding systems of warfare, repression, surveillance and social control. The so-called wars on drugs, terrorism, and immigrants; the construction of border walls, immigrant detention centers, and ever-growing prisons; the installation of mass surveillance systems, and the spread of private security guard and mercenary companies, have all become major sources of profit-making.¶ The US state took advantage of the 9/11 attacks to militarize the global economy. US military spending skyrocketed into the trillions of dollars through the “war on terrorism” and the invasions and occupations of Iraq and Afghanistan. The “creative destruction” of war acted to throw fresh firewood on the smoldering embers of a stagnant global economy. The Pentagon budget increased 91 percent in real terms between 1998 and 2011, and even apart from special war appropriations, it increased by nearly 50 percent in real terms during this period. In the decade from 2001 to 2011 defense industry profits nearly quadrupled. Worldwide, total defense outlays (military, intelligence agencies, Homeland Security/Defense) grew by 50 percent from 2006 to 2015, from $1.4 trillion to $2.03 trillion.¶ The cutting edge of accumulation in the “real economy” worldwide shifted from CIT before the dot-com bust of 1999-2001 to a military-security-industrial-financial complex — itself integrated into the high-tech conglomerate – that has accrued enormous influence in the halls of power in Washington and other political centers around the world. An emergent power bloc bringing together the global financial complex with the military-security-industrial complex appeared to crystallize in the wake of the 2008 collapse. The class interests of the TCC, geo-politics, and economics come together around militarized accumulation. The more the global economy comes to depend on militarization and conflict the greater the drive to war and the higher the stakes for humanity.¶ The day after Donald Trump’s electoral victory, the stock price of Corrections Corporation of America, the largest for-profit immigrant detention and prison company in the United States, soared 40 percent, given Trump’s promise to deport millions of immigrants. Military contractors such as Raytheon and Lockheed Martin report spikes each time there is a new flare-up in the Middle East conflict. Within hours of the April 6 tomahawk missile bombardment of Syria Raytheon stock increased by $1 billion. Hundreds of private firms from around the world have put in bids to construct Trump’s infamous US-Mexico border wall.¶ Populist rhetoric aside, the Trump regime’s economic program constitutes neo-liberalism on steroids. Corporate tax cuts and deregulation will exacerbate overaccumulation and heighten the power bloc’s proclivity for military conflict. Politicized and increasingly autonomous generals and retired military officials that occupy numerous posts in the regime control the US war machine. The generals may play a key role in geopolitical conjunctures and in the timing and circumstances around which US intervention and war escalate. Yet behind the Trump regime and the Pentagon, the TCC seeks to sustain global accumulation through expanding militarization, conflict, and repression. This gives a built-in war drive to the current course of capitalist globalization. Only a worldwide push back from below, and ultimately a program to redistribute wealth and power downward, can counter the upward spiral of international conflagration.

#### The alternative is a dual power approach to communist strategy. We must build independent communist institutions capable of surviving and defending themselves against the capitalist world. Not only does the alt solve for material violence in the transition period, it also eliminates the material and ideological dependences on capital that prevent revolution.

Escalante 19 [Alyson Escalante is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. "Communism and Climate Change: A Dual Power Approach" in Regeneration. March 26, 2019. [https://regenerationmag.org/communism-and-climate-change-a-dual-power-approach/] KZaidi](https://regenerationmag.org/communism-and-climate-change-a-dual-power-approach/%5d%20KZaidi) //LK [RCT 12/10/19]

Much has been written over the last few years about a dual power approach to communist strategy. I have written extensively about it at The Forge News, and discussed in video format in my YouTube video, Climate Change, Imperialism, and The End of The World. I will not be using this article to give a comprehensive recap on what dual power strategy is, so I suggest checking out those two links. In short: dual power strategy is an approach to communist revolution which seeks to build independent socialist institutions which exist in parallel to the currently existing capitalist state, in order to serve the masses. The goal of a dual power strategy is not to compete with capitalism or reform it out of existence, but rather to radicalize the masses through meeting their needs, to recognize and politicize capitalist crisis as it occurs, and to have a real infrastructure in place for a revolutionary movement to self-sustain at the point that it must inevitably combat the capitalist state. This strategy focuses on building counter-institutions like tenants’ unions, agricultural cooperatives, radical labor unions, and Serve the People programs that not only demonstrate on-the-ground worker power but can provide for the needs of the masses without an appeal to reforming the currently existing capitalist state. I previously argued that a crucial advantage to dual power strategy is that it gives the masses an infrastructure of socialist institutions which can directly provide for material needs in times of capitalist crisis. Socialist agricultural and food distribution programs can take ground that the capitalist state cedes by simultaneously meeting the needs of the masses while proving that socialist self-management and political institutions can function independently of capitalism. This approach is not only capable of literally saving lives in the case of crisis, but of demonstrating the possibility of a revolutionary project which seeks to destroy rather than reform capitalism. One of the most pressing of the various crises which humanity faces today is climate change. Capitalist production has devastated the planet, and everyday we discover that the small window of time for avoiding its most disastrous effects is shorter than previously understood. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change predicts that we have twelve years to limit (not even prevent) the more catastrophic effects of climate change. The simple, and horrific, fact that we all must face is that climate change has reached a point where many of its effects are inevitable, and we are now in a post-brink world, where damage control is the primary concern. The question is not whether we can escape a future of climate change, but whether we can survive it. Socialist strategy must adapt accordingly. In the face of this crisis, the democratic socialists and social democrats in the United States have largely settled on market-based reforms. The Green New Deal, championed by Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and the left-wing of the Democratic Party, remains a thoroughly capitalist solution to a capitalist problem. The proposal does nothing to challenge capitalism itself but rather seeks to subsidize market solutions to reorient the US energy infrastructure towards renewable energy production, to develop less energy consuming transportation, and the development of public investment towards these ends. The plan does nothing to call into question the profit incentives and endless resource consumption of capitalism which led us to this point. Rather, it seeks to reorient the relentless market forces of capitalism towards slightly less destructive technological developments. While the plan would lead to a massive investment in the manufacturing and deployment of solar energy infrastructure, National Geographic reports that “Fabricating [solar] panels requires caustic chemicals such as sodium hydroxide and hydrofluoric acid, and the process uses water as well as electricity, the production of which emits greenhouse gases.” Technology alone cannot sufficiently combat this crisis, as the production of such technology through capitalist manufacturing infrastructure only perpetuates environmental harm. Furthermore, subsidizing and incentivizing renewable energy stops far short of actually combating the fossil fuel industry driving the current climate crisis. The technocratic market solutions offered in the Green New Deal fail to adequately combat the driving factors of climate change. What is worse, they rely on a violent imperialist global system in order to produce their technological solutions. The development of high-tech energy infrastructure and the development of low or zero emission transportation requires the import of raw material and rare earth minerals which the US can only access because of the imperial division of the Global South. This imperial division of the world requires constant militarism from the imperial core nations, and as Lenin demonstrates in Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, facilitates constant warfare as imperial states compete for spheres of influence in order to facilitate cheap resource extraction. The US military, one of many imperialist forces, is the single largest user of petroleum, and one of its main functions is to ensure oil access for the US. Without challenging this imperialist division of the world and the role of the US military in upholding it, the Green New Deal fails even further to challenge the underlying causes of climate change. Even with the failed promises of the Green New Deal itself, it is unlikely that this tepid market proposal will pass at all. Nancy Pelosi and other lead Democrats have largely condemned it and consider it “impractical” and “unfeasible.” This dismissal is crucial because it reveals the total inability of capitalism to resolve this crisis. If the center-left party in the heart of the imperial core sees even milquetoast capitalist reforms as a step too far, we ought to have very little hope that a reformist solution will present itself within the ever-shrinking twelve-year time frame. There are times for delicacy and there are times for bluntness, and we are in the latter. To put things bluntly: the capitalists are not going to save us, and if we don’t find a way to save ourselves, the collapse of human civilization is a real possibility. The pressing question we now face is: how are we going to save ourselves? Revolution and Dual Power If capitalism will not be able to resolve the current encroaching climate crisis, we must find a way to organize outside the confines of capitalist institutions, towards the end of overthrowing capitalism. If the Democratic Socialists of America-backed candidates cannot offer real anti-capitalist solutions through the capitalist state, we should be skeptical of the possibility for any socialist organization doing so. The DSA is far larger and far more well-funded than any of the other socialist organizations in the US, and they have failed to produce anything more revolutionary than the Green New Deal. We have to abandon the idea that electoral strategy will be sufficient to resolve the underlying causes of this crisis within twelve years. While many radicals call for revolution instead of reform, the reformists often raise the same response: revolution is well and good, but what are you going to do in the meantime? In many ways this question is fair. The socialist left in the US today is not ready for revolutionary action, and a mass base does not exist to back the various organizations which might undertake such a struggle. Revolutionaries must concede that we have much work to be done before a revolutionary strategy can be enacted. This is a harsh truth, but it is true. Much of the left has sought to ignore this truth by embracing adventurism and violent protest theatrics, in the vain hope of sparking revolutionary momentum which does not currently exist. If this is the core strategy of the socialist left, we will accomplish nothing in the next twelve years. Such approaches are as useless as the opportunist reforms pushed by the social democrats. Our task in these twelve years is not simply to arm ourselves and hope that magically the masses will wake up prepared for revolution and willing to put their trust in our small ideological cadres. We must instead, build a movement, and with it we must build infrastructure which can survive revolution and provide a framework for socialist development. Dual power is tooled towards this project best. The Marxist Center network has done an impressive amount of work developing socialist institutions across the US, largely through tenants organizing and serve the people programs. The left wing factions within the DSA itself have also begun to develop mutual aid programs that could be useful for dual power strategy. At the same time, mutual aid is not enough. We cannot simply build these institutions as a reform to make capitalism more survivable. Rather, we must make these institutions part of a broader revolutionary movement and they ought to function as a material prefiguration to a socialist society and economy. The institutions we build as dual power outside the capitalist state today ought to be structured towards revolutionary ends, such that they will someday function as the early institutions of a revolutionary socialist society. To accomplish this goal, we cannot simply declare these institutions to be revolutionary. Rather they have to be linked together through an actual revolutionary movement working towards revolutionary ends. This means that dual power institutions cannot exist as ends in and of themselves, nor can abstract notions of mutual aid cannot be conceptualized as an end in itself. The explicit purpose of these institutions has to be to radicalize the masses through meeting their needs, and providing an infrastructure for a socialist movement to meet the needs of its members and the communities in which it operates. Revolutionary institutions that can provide food, housing, and other needs for a revolutionary movement will be crucial for building a base among the masses and for constructing the beginnings of a socialist infrastructure for when we eventually engage in revolutionary struggle. What I want to suggest here is that the production of food through dual power institutions should be a central project for this revolutionary movement. There are several reasons why I think this is the case. First, food production allows us to meet the most immanent needs of the masses. The US is plagued by food deserts which deprive huge portions of the population access to fresh food. Poverty exacerbates this further, and the devastating effects of lack of access of healthy food due to poverty are well documented. This is an urgent need that socialists can meet in order to demonstrate to the masses that it is socialists who can serve them where the capitalist state has failed. Second, food production is a major contributor to climate change. Large-scale meat production produces massive amounts of greenhouse gas, and the transportation of food from rule agricultural areas to urban populations centers is a major contributor as well. Urban agricultural projects and the development of sustainable permaculture are not sufficient to fix these problems, as they are not able to overthrow the capitalist system of agricultural production. However, paired with a broader revolutionary movement, these projects allow us to undertake scientific experimentation with meeting food needs, in order to test and demonstrate the effectiveness of alternative food production methods that can eventually replace the current unsustainable capitalist model. After all, if our revolution cannot replace unsustainable production models, we will not be able to resolve climate change any better than the capitalists. Given these considerations, I think it is crucial that the revolutionary socialist movement begin to investigate and develop food production strategies that are part of a broader dual power project. If we hold that revolution is the only way to resolve climate crisis within the next twelve years, we need to have tested, demonstrably superior methods of food production ready to go. A revolutionary movement which cannot demonstrate an ability to meet the needs of the masses does not deserve their support, and food production is a crucial need. I am incapable of providing a comprehensive strategy here, I want to look at the ongoing organopónicos in Cuba, in order to demonstrate that the successes of Cuban urban agriculture can be of great a source of insight and strategy for our dual power projects. Learning from Cuba: Organopónicos Thankfully, we do not have to start from scratch when developing food production strategies. The development of urban agriculture in Cuba provides some important insights that can inform our own projects. In the 1990s, the collapse of the Soviet Union had a devastating effect on Cuba. The loss of a major trade partner paired with an ongoing imperialist embargo forced the Cuban state to pursue experimental solutions to food shortages. The loss of trade not only produced a food shortage but also ended import of agricultural machinery and pesticides needed for large-scale industrial farming. Access to gasoline also diminished, forcing the Cuban state to prioritize urban agriculture which did not need to be transported long distances. This crisis led to Cuba, almost incidentally, developing a sustainable and ecologically-oriented project of urban agriculture. Over the course of many years, this led to a system of civilian controlled organopónicos. This system of urban gardens, run by community members, has since grown to significant proportions. By 2003, Havana produced 90% of the fresh produce within the city because of the success of the organopónicos, largely without pesticides and with minimal fossil fuel expenditure for transportation. That same year, the Cuban Ministry of Agriculture reported a 50% decrease in fossil fuel usage. The system is made up of a variety of institutions, from state owned and operated plots, to cooperatively purchased and maintained gardens. In total, 87,000 acres of land are now being used for urban agriculture in Havana. Although the organopónicos are largely run by communities themselves, they receive support and funding from the Cuban state. For an incredibly in-depth analysis of the organopónico system, I highly recommend this impressively thorough report from Monthly Review. We must now ask: how might the development of the organopónico system inform dual power projects today? First, it is worth noting that the system cannot be directly copied and pasted into urban centers within the US. Subsidies from the Cuban state are crucial to maintaining the system at such a large-scale. Any projects undertaken in a dual power context will necessarily be smaller, due purely to funding for land acquisition. One other complication is that the population of US urban centers is largely unfamiliar with agriculture, a problem that was not so serious in Cuba. As such, application of lessons learned from the organopónico system will require socialist organizations in the US to develop agricultural education alongside actual food production. Despite these differences, the organopónico system proves that socialist approaches to food production are viable, and more importantly, environmentally sustainable. Not only has the socialist Cuban state found a way for its urban centers to collectively produce much of their food, it has done so without using environmentally destructive pesticides, and while driving down fuel consumption by a huge margin. There is more learning and experimenting to be done, as organopónicos do not yet provide complete self-sustenance for the cities in which they exist, but they demonstrate that socialist solutions can move us in that direction. For socialists in the US who are invested in dual power, the organopónico system ought to inspire us to begin our own collective production of food. For those who can acquire access to land in urban areas, it is possible to begin to develop small-scale projects integrating the lessons learned from the organopónico system. This not only allows us to combat the effects of food deserts by producing fresh produce within those deserts themselves but allows us to begin to further investigate and experiment with agricultural models that can be scaled up in a revolutionary socialist society to meet the needs of the populace. For those who cannot access sizable plots of land, small-scale permaculture can still be developed in yards, with windowsill gardens, and with public gardening spaces. The development of permaculture skills should be prioritized even if it can only occur at a small-scale. We must take a scientific, not a utopian, approach to socialism, and that means beginning to experiment and develop socialist infrastructure here and now. A climate catastrophe is on the horizon now. Even if we manage to achieve the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism within the twelve-year window, we will still see many devastating effects of climate change. Unfortunately, it is likely that global capitalism will survive much longer than twelve more years, so learning how to meet needs in a state of crisis will be crucial for socialist projects of the future. We will be forced to begin developing socialist projects in less than ideal conditions. As such, the lessons learned from organopónicos are of extra importance. Cuba’s urban agriculture is a product of crisis and demonstrates that even under conditions of intense crisis, socialist states can create solutions to meet the needs of the masses. I have not offered a particularly thorough investigation into the organopónico system in this article. For that, I really do recommend the Monthly Review piece linked above. Regardless, I hope that I have demonstrated that climate change poses a serious challenge for socialist organizing. It creates an intense urgency and requires us to develop strategies which can respond to horrific instances of crisis. I truly believe that dual power remains the best strategy for responding climate change, but it must be scientifically informed, and capable of actually providing sustainable socialist alternatives. We should be grateful for the Cuba’s experiments with organopónicos, and should commit to investigation and study of their experiments in order to inform our own projects. We are running out of time to act, and the stakes have never been higher.
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Concurrently, the Army Information and Education Group, which would become the core of the Hovland-Yale Communication and Persuasion Group, led by Carl Hovland, was conducting experiments testing the relationship between inducement and internalized attitude change. In 1953, Hovland, Janis, and Kelley published their highly influential book Communication and Persuasion, which established a positive relation between verbalization and the intensification of belief and predicted that being forced to overtly defend a position discrepant from one’s own private beliefs would result in the internalization of the overtly defended position. This prediction was further supported by the forced-compliance and cognitive dissonance studies of Festinger (1957) and his colleagues at Stanford. For decades, the ability to understand the merits of opposing arguments had been championed as one of the prime pedagogical benefits of intercollegiate debate training. However, in the fall of 1954, Hovland’s and Festinger’s studies coupled with the anti- Communist rhetoric of Schlesinger, which would, much to Schlesinger’s dismay, come to underwrite McCarthy’s witch hunts, would be articulated in such a way that debate’s ability to train students to take the other’s perspective might be framed as a threat to national security. The fear that defending the diplomatic recognition of ‘Red China’ would turn American youth into Communist sympathizers saturated the debating both sides controversy with an anxiety over the virility of ‘democratic faith’. Those choosing to defend the virtues of intercollegiate debate and the practice of debating both sides were careful not to question the basic tenets of the anti-Communism that constituted the ideological core of Cold War liberalism. Democracy, if it were to survive the seductive appeal of totalitarianism, had to become a fighting faith, a faith born out of and tested in social and political conflict. Debate, in particular the format of debating both sides of controversial issues embodied the sort of political conflict that could engender sound conviction, rational decisions, and a committed youth impervious to Communist propaganda. Moreover, debate provided the antidote to communist propaganda. Baird concluded, ‘[c]ollege debate teams are the last groups in this nation where Communist propaganda has any chance of making headway’ (1955, p. 7). No student wishing to win the debate, Burns argued, ‘would take the affirmative on the grounds that we must love the Chinese or that they are merely agrarian radicals’ (p. 7). Burns, so confident in the anti-Communist sentiment of the majority of students, contended that no student would dare argue in favour of Communism but ‘pitch his [sic ] case on the argument that recognition might help pull China out of the Moscow orbit, that it might help build a firmer anti-Communist alliance, that it might make peaceful coexistence possible. He [sic ] would, in short, be directing our attention to the very questions that all American’s might well be debating’ (p. 7). For Schlesinger, however, the ground of the anti-Communist consensus Baird believed to be evident in ‘the majority of students’ was unstable.
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