# 1

#### Interpretation: Workers is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend a just democracy ought to recognize the unconditional right of a subset of workers to strike.

#### Violation: They do

#### The upward entailment test and adverb test determine the genericity of a bare plural

Leslie and Lerner 16 [Sarah-Jane Leslie, Ph.D., Princeton, 2007. Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. Served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University. Adam Lerner, PhD Philosophy, Postgraduate Research Associate, Princeton 2018. From 2018, Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow in the Center for Bioethics at New York University. Member of the [Princeton Social Neuroscience Lab](http://psnlab.princeton.edu/).] “Generic Generalizations.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. April 24, 2016. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/> TG

1. Generics and Logical Form

In English, generics can be expressed using a variety of syntactic forms: bare plurals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), indefinite singulars (e.g., “a tiger is striped”), and definite singulars (“the tiger is striped”). However, none of these syntactic forms is dedicated to expressing generic claims; each can also be used to express existential and/or specific claims. Further, some generics express what appear to be generalizations over individuals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), while others appear to predicate properties directly of the kind (e.g., “dodos are extinct”). These facts and others give rise to a number of questions concerning the logical forms of generic statements.

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), some individual tiger in ([2b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex2b)), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in ([3b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex3b))—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.

The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with “some” with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology “existential reading”. The application of the term “existential interpretation” is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a kind.

There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, “tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) does not entail that animals are striped, but ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.)

#### It applies to “workers” – 1] upward entailment test – “a just democracy ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike” doesn’t entail that” a just democracy ought to recognize the unconditional right of teachers to strike” cuz it doesn’t prove doctors ought to have the right to strike

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits – you can pick any type of worker and the possibility is endless. Teachers, doctors, sex workers, lawyers, etc. which explodes limits. PICs don’t solve – it’s absurd to say neg potential abuse justifies the aff being flat out not T, which leads to a race towards abuse. Limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep.

#### 2] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff.

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Precision o/w – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms

#### Evaluate T before 1AR theory – a) norms – we only have a couple months to set T norms but can set 1AR theory norms anytime, b) magnitude – T affects a larger portion of the debate since the aff advocacy determines every speech after it

# 2

#### Democracy is a form of bourgeois politics designed to suppress the proletariat – it upholds the illusion that the exploited have a say in how they are ruled

ICC 15 [(The ICC was founded in January 1975 by different political groups which had arisen in the wake of the historic revival of the working class at the end of the 1960s that uses Marxism as effective weapon of the proletarian struggle for emancipation while at the same time reaffirming the communist political positions which have been settled once and for all by the experience of the workers' movement.) “Proletarian politics against bourgeois electoralism” International Communist Current, 3/15] BC

The workers’ movement and bourgeois democracy

Electoralism, the parliamentary system, is a central plank of bourgeois politics. We know of course that the capitalist class has frequently dispensed with it in times of crisis - fascism being an obvious example - or where it is congenitally weak, as in the stalinist regimes or various military dictatorships in the peripheral countries. But brute repression is not the most effective form of class rule, and in the most developed countries democracy is favoured because it upholds the illusion among the exploited that they really do have a say in how they are ruled. The democratic state is the more subtle mask of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, the best framework for preventing class conflict from getting out of control.

But didn’t the working class fight for the vote in the nineteenth century, and didn’t support for this struggle distinguish the marxists from the anarchists in the workers’ movement? And what about the heroic struggle of the suffragettes? Surely we should honour their struggle by exercising the right they secured for us?

It’s true that Marx, Engels, Rosa Luxemburg and others argued that the working class, as well as forming trade unions to defend its interests at the economic level, should organise political parties whose programme would include the right to vote and the fight, inside bourgeois parliaments, for laws that would back up the improvements won through the economic struggle. And when the anarchists attacked them for being reformists and demanded an all-out and immediate fight for revolution, they replied by arguing that capitalist society was still in the ascendant and that the working class was therefore faced with the necessity to develop its class identity and its historical programme inside the confines of bourgeois society.

It’s also true that this perspective contained serious pitfalls. If the workers’ movement got too attached to the struggle for immediate gains, it would lose sight of the long-term goals of revolution and communism, and thus ran the risk that its painfully created organisations would become a functioning part of bourgeois society. And this indeed is what happened – the trade unions and the mass social democratic parties were gradually integrated into capitalism, and a whole new current of thought emerged from within them, justifying this process by revising the fundamentals of marxism, which had always been based on the prediction that capitalism would sooner or later enter into a historical crisis which would make revolution a necessity.

The culminating point of this revisionist or opportunist trend was reached in 1914, when the epoch of crisis dawned and the workers’ organisations were faced with the choice: hold onto to what you have achieved inside capitalism by selling yourself to the bourgeoisie and supporting the war, or hold onto your principles by defending the international interests of the working class and opposing the war. In 1917-21, the choice was posed just as starkly: support the ruling class against the threat of revolution, or join the revolutionary struggle.

Revolution, by definition, demands a radical break with the past, and in the first great wave of revolutions provoked by the imperialist war of 1914-18, those who remained loyal to the working class were faced with the necessity to break with the old organisations – trade unions and political parties – that had become part of the capitalist war effort. They were obliged to reject the tactics of the previous period, focused on the fight for reforms, and to participate in the new forms of organisation created by the need for revolution.

Soviets versus parliament

The question of the vote and of parliament was a key element in this debate about the tactics appropriate to the epoch of revolution. After three years of futile slaughter, the working class had responded with truly revolutionary methods: mutinies and mass strikes. These movements gave rise to forms of organisation that would allow the working class to unite its forces and pose the question of political power: the soviets or workers’ councils, based on elected and revocable delegates from general assemblies of workers or soldiers. These organs were directly opposed to bourgeois parliaments, founded on the atomised citizen who votes for a party that can now assume the reins of state and oppress and defraud the population for the next four or five years. And everywhere the councils emerged – especially in Germany – the ruling class did everything it could to get them to hand over power to parliament, above all via the influence of the social democratic parties which still had the majority in the councils.

It was no accident that the right to vote was granted to the majority of the working class precisely when it had gone beyond the parliamentary form and affirmed in practice the possibility of a new form of political power, directly controlled from below and aimed at the complete transformation of society. In Britain, it was also symbolic that the vote was given to women (though still not all of them) in 1918, after the majority of the suffragette movement had pledged its loyalty to capitalism by supporting the war. Having initially opposed granting the vote to the exploited and the oppressed majority for fear that it would result in the overthrow of class rule, the bourgeoisie now rushed to grant universal suffrage as the best way of preserving its threatened system. This deception was denounced at the time by Sylvia Pankhurst, still often presented to us as a famous suffragette, but who in fact broke politically with the suffragette movement, including her mother Emmeline, for supporting the war; identifying herself with the workers’ revolution, Sylvia and her paper The Workers’ Dreadnought entered the battle for soviets against parliament and bourgeois elections.

Need for a proletarian perspective

Of course, this all happened a long time ago. The working class may have come close to revolution then, but today the working class hardly recognises itself as a class at all. For decades now it has been told that the attempt to build ‘communism’ in the USSR and the eastern countries was a total failure, that marxism has been refuted, that the working class doesn’t really exist anymore. Certainly the main parties contesting the next election no longer refer to class – including the ‘Labour’ party; and the ones that pretend to be a radical alternative to the established parties, such as UKIP on the right and the Greens on the left, call on us to vote on the basis of Britishness or as concerned citizens.

But capitalism is even more decrepit than in was in 1914 and the longer it continues, the more it threatens the very survival of humanity. In a world facing economic crisis, war and barbarism from all sides, the national solutions and reforms promised in bourgeois elections are more fraudulent than ever. And despite all the changes in its structure on a global scale since the first revolutionary wave, the working class is still the class that creates the wealth in this system, still the exploited class, and still the only force that can change society from top to bottom. What the working class lacks, above all, is a perspective, a sense not only of what it is today but of what it can become. And this perspective can only be a political one, because it is centred round the question of who will hold power - a minority of exploiters, or the majority made up of the exploited and the oppressed – and what they will do with power – defend their privileges even at the expense of the destruction of society and the natural environment, or create a new society based on solidarity and the satisfaction of human need.

All forms of bourgeois politics are a barrier to the self-organised, self-conscious movement we need if we are to challenge this social order. We are against participating in capitalist elections not because we favour apathy and withdrawal from political engagement, but because we are for proletarian politics and the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeois state. Amos 5/3/15

#### The aff’s rhetoric of unions and strikes as a solutions to labor disputes reinstates forces of capitalism

Eidlin 20 [(Barry Eidlin, assistant professor of sociology at McGill University and a former head steward for UAW Local 2865.), “Why Unions Are Good — But Not Good Enough”, JACOBIN, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2020/01/marxism-trade-unions-socialism-revolutionary-organizing>, 01.06.2020] SS

Unions After Marx and Engels: Aristocracy or Revolutionary Agent?

The problems Marx and Engels identified in their later writings on trade unions intensified after their deaths. Formations they found promising, like the US Knights of Labor, and the “new unions” in Britain, either foundered or soon resembled the conservative “old unions” they challenged. The International Workingmen’s Association, or First International, to which Marx and Engels devoted much time and energy, dissolved by 1876.

On the European continent, Bismarck’s Anti-Socialist Law, in effect from 1878 to 1890, drove most German unions underground save for an elite layer of skilled workers, leaving the bulk of the industrial working class unorganized. In France, unions were more politically radical than in England or Germany, but numerically smaller and weaker. Meanwhile, Europe and North America’s capitalist class, far from entering into crisis, proved resilient, growing and consolidating its power.

For Marxists, questions of explaining capitalism’s durability and working-class weakness and conservatism loomed large, sparking debate on why these problems existed and how to solve them. Some like Eduard Bernstein proposed revising Marx’s idea of the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeoisie. In his vision of “evolutionary socialism,” unions combined with parliamentary parties and cooperative associations would gradually expand democratic control over the economy, displacing capitalists.

Karl Kautsky disagreed, warning that “the more capitalism passes over from free competition to monopoly . . . the more indispensable it will be that the trades unionists are inspired with socialist discernment and socialist enthusiasm.” While he was optimistic that unions would “constitute the most energetic factors in surmounting” capitalism, the reality of the workers’ organizations of his time suggested otherwise.

To explain working-class conservatism, some drew on observations from Marx and Engels themselves to argue that employers in core industries had managed to “bribe” a stratum of skilled workers with super-profits. This resulted in a conservative “labor aristocracy” that aligned with its industry to protect its privileges rather than building a broad working-class movement of skilled and unskilled workers.

Lenin expanded the idea to the global stage, arguing that imperialists’ colonial possessions generated the super-profits with which to bribe their respective labor aristocracies. For Lenin, this helped explain not only working-class conservatism in general, but European workers’ movements’ rejection of international solidarity in favor of alliances with their national bourgeoisies in the run-up to World War I.

While it is true that some skilled workers did form conservative organizations to protect their privileges, the idea that this resulted from these layers being “bribed” by their national bourgeoisies does not withstand scrutiny. Most difficult for the labor aristocracy theory to explain is the fact that, in many cases, the most skilled workers formed the core of broader left movements, organizing for class-wide demands. Critics argue that how workers were organized to struggle against their national bourgeoisies, not the mere fact of skill-based wage differentials, better explains why unions took radical or conservative turns.

Other theorists blamed working-class conservatism on workers’ organization itself. For syndicalists like Georges Sorel, formal organization was an obstacle to workers’ ability to realize their revolutionary potential. Likewise, based on his experience operating in and observing the German SPD, Robert Michels reached the conclusion that “who says organization, says oligarchy.”

Both argued that over time, workers’ organizations, whether parties or unions, shied away from activities that might advance workers’ interests, but at the expense of jeopardizing the organization’s existence. Sorel saw salvation in the mythical vision of the general strike, while Michels remained pessimistic about escaping the “iron law of oligarchy.”

Based on her experience with the German SPD, Rosa Luxemburg was also wary of organization’s conservatizing effects. She emphasized the need for workers’ self-activity, particularly through mass strikes. But unlike Sorel, she understood that the success of seemingly “spontaneous” mass action depended on the prior organization of leadership layers.

In this, her theory of how to build organizations to unite workers against capital resembled Lenin’s, even though her “spontaneist” position is often counterposed to his “elitism.” Many emphasize Lenin’s argument that unions were insufficient vehicles for forging the revolutionary agent capable of overthrowing the bourgeoisie, which required unions to ally with political parties of intellectuals, often from outside the working class.

But this focus on Lenin’s “centralism” ignores the extent to which Lenin appreciated the fundamental importance of mass action by workers in creating revolutionary consciousness and organization.

Both Lenin and Luxemburg saw workers’ core problem as overcoming “economism.” This meant separating the struggle against capital into distinct economic and political components, with unions bargaining over economic questions and parliamentary parties handling political questions. This undermined labor by taking as given the laws governing the economy, obscuring the fact that these laws were part of a political system that facilitated capital’s rule.

#### The “right to strike” is a tactic of neoliberal legalism and gets circumvented. The state is thus able to decide legitimate parameters for violence and insulate itself from anticapitalist action.

Crépon 19 – Marc Crépon is a professor of philosophy at the École Normale Supérieure, Paris. (“The Right to Strike and Legal War in Walter Benjamin’s “Toward the Critique of Violence”,” August 2019, pg. 252-253)

If we wish to understand how the question of the right to strike arises for Walter Benjamin in the seventh paragraph of his essay “Zur Kritik der Gewalt,” it is important to first analyze the previous paragraph, which concerns the state’s monopoly on violence. It is here that Benjamin questions the argument that such a monopoly derives from the impossibility of a system of legal ends to preserve itself as long as the pursuit of natural ends through violent means remains. Benjamin responds to this dogmatic thesis with the following hypothesis, arguably one of his most important reflections: “To counter it, one would perhaps have to consider the surprising possibility that law’s interest in monopolizing violence vis-à-vis the individual is explained by the intention not of preserving legal ends, but rather of preserving law itself. [This is the possibility] that violence, when it does not lie in the hands of law, poses a danger to law, not by virtue of the ends that it may pursue but by virtue of its mere existence outside of law.”1

In other words, nothing would endanger the law more than the possibility of its authority being contested by a violence over which it has no control. The function of the law would therefore be, first and foremost, to contain violence within its own boundaries. It is in this context that, to demonstrate this surprising hypothesis, Benjamin invokes two examples: the right to strike guaranteed by the state and the law of war.

Let us return to the place that the right to strike occupies within class struggle. To begin with, the very idea of such a struggle implies certain forms of violence. The strike could then be understood as one of the recognizable forms that this violence can take. However, this analytical framework is undermined as soon as this form of violence becomes regulated by a “right to strike,” such as the one recognized by law in France in 1864. What this recognition engages is, in fact, the will of the state to control the possible “violence” of the strike. Thus, the “right” of the right to strike appears as the best, if not the only, way for the state to circumscribe within (and via) the law the relative violence of class struggles. We might consider this to be the perfect illustration of the aforementioned hypothesis. Yet, there are two lines of questioning that destabilize this hypothesis that we would do well to consider.

First, is it legitimate to present the strike as a form of violence? Who has a vested interest in such a representation? In other words, how can we trace a clear and unequivocal demarcation between violence and nonviolence? Are we not always bound to find residues of violence, even in those actions that we would be tempted to consider nonviolent? The second line of questioning is just as important and is rooted in the distinction established by Georges Sorel, in his Reflections on Violence, between the “political strike” and the “proletarian general strike,” to which Benjamin dedicates a set of complementary analyses in §13 of his essay. Here, again, we are faced with a question of limits. What is at stake is the possibility for a certain type of strike (the proletarian general strike) to exceed the limits of the right to strike— turning, in other words, the right to strike against the law itself. The phenomenon is that of an autoimmune process, in which the right to strike that is meant to protect the law against the possible violence of class struggles is transformed into a means for the destruction of the law. The difference between the two types of strikes is nevertheless introduced with a condition: “The validity of this statement, however, is not unrestricted because it is not unconditional,” notes Benjamin in §7. We would be mistaken in believing that the right to strike is granted and guaranteed unconditionally. Rather, it is structurally subjected to a conflict of interpretations, those of the workers, on the one hand, and of the state on the other. From the point of view of the state, the partial strike cannot under any circumstance be understood as a right to exercise violence, but rather as the right to extract oneself from a preexisting (and verifiable) violence: that of the employer. In this sense, the partial strike should be considered a nonviolent action, what Benjamin named a “pure means.”

#### Capitalism is unsustainable and causes extinction – resource scarcity, environmental degradation, war

Trainer ’16 (Ted; 5/10/16; Conjoint Lecturer in the School of Social Sciences, University of New South Wales, leading proponent of de-growth and sustainability issues; Resilience; “Sustainability – The Simpler Way perspective”; <http://www.resilience.org/articles/General/2016/07_July/Sustainability%20The%20Simpler%20Way%20Perspective.pdf>; DOA: 7/15/17)

Firstly let’s set the scene; The deteriorating state of the planet. The resource base and environmental conditions on which the present levels of global production and consumption are built are obviously deteriorating at an alarming rate. Few if any would not be aware of this but it is important to briefly remind ourselves before focusing on how impossible it would be for this base to sustain affluence and growth for all. A glance at the situation reveals that resources are becoming more scarce and costly, including energy, productive land, minerals, food, fish, wood and water, and ecosystems are being severely damaged. We are losing species, forests, land, coral reefs, grasslands and fisheries at accelerating rates. A sixth era of massive biodiversity loss appears to have begun. We are polluting the planet with excess carbon dioxide, nitrogen and many toxic chemicals. The mass of big animals on the planet has declined sharply in recent decades, probably down by 90% in the sea. The World Wildlife Fund says that in general the quality of global ecosystems has deteriorated 30% since about 1970, and its “Footprint” measure indicates that we are now taking biological resources at a rate that would take 1.5 planets to provide in a sustainable way. (2014.) The reason for all this massive resource depletion and damage to the environment is simply that there is far too much producing and consuming going on. This is causing too many resources to be taken from nature and too many wastes to be dumped back into nature. Now consider the limits case: Could everyone live as we do? The 10-15% of the world’s people living in regions such as North America, Australia and Europe have per capita levels of resource use that are around 20 times the average for the poorest half of people. How likely is it that all the 9.7 billion people expected by 2050 could rise to the present rich world level of resource use? If they did live as we do then world annual resource production and consumption, and ecological damage, would be approaching 6 times as great as at present. Yet present levels of resource use and environmental impact are far from sustainable. The World Wildlife Fund’s ”Footprint” analysis yields an even higher multiple. They estimate that it takes about 8 ha of productive land to provide water, energy settlement area and food for one person living in Australia. So if 9 billion people were to live as we do we would need about 72 billion ha of productive land. But that is about 9 times all the available productive land on the planet. Now add the absurdly impossible implications of economic growth. But the foregoing argument has only been that the present levels of production and consumption are quite unsustainable. **Yet** we are determined to increase present living standards and levels of output and consumption, as much as possible and **without any end** in sight. In other words, our supreme national goal is economic growth. Few people seem to recognise the absurdly impossible consequences of pursing economic growth. If we rich countries have a 3% p.a. increase in economic activity until 2050 then our output, **resource use and environmental impact will be** around **4 times as great** as it is now, **and doubling every 23 years** thereafter. Now what if by 2050 all the expected 9.7 billion people expected to be living on earth had risen to the “living standards” we in rich countries would then have given 3% economic growth. Total world output, resource, use and environmental impact would be approaching 15 times as great as they are now … unless technical advance and efficiency gains could greatly reduce them. (See below.) These multiplies must be the focal point in discussions of sustainability. **Grasping the magnitude of** the **overshoot and** of the **unsustainability is crucial** here. The numbers show that present, let alone probable **2050** rich world **levels of consumption, are grossly unsustainable** and could never be extended to all people. But can’t technical advance solve the problems? Most people hold the "technical fix faith", believing that technical advance will solve the resource and environmental problems and thereby make it unnecessary for us to question the commitment to affluence and growth. When considering the following evidence keep in mind that what we need is not just to stop increases in impacts as growth goes on -- we need to reduce impacts dramatically before sustainable levels are reached. There is a very strong case that technical advance is nowhere near capable of solving the sustainability problems facing us. Note that many miraculous technical developments, e.g., in physics, astronomy, genetics, and medicine, are not so relevant here where the focus is on the possibility of making big improvements in the efficiency and energy costs of producing energy and materials, and of cutting ecological impacts. Following are some of the main elements in the case. 1. Efficiency gains to date. It is not the case that technical achievements in the relevant areas have been very encouraging. Ayres and Vouroudis (2009) note that for many decades the efficiency of production of electricity and fuels, electric motors, ammonia and iron and steel has more or less plateaued. In many crucial areas such as producing energy and minerals (below) the trend is towards worse efficiency, i.e., the need is for increasing inputs per unit of output. 2. The deteriorating productivity growth rate. **Technical advance** is regarded as a major determinant of productivity growth and that **has been in long term decline since the 1970s**. Even the advent of computerisation has had a surprisingly small effect, a phenomenon now labelled the “Productivity Paradox.” In fact the UK productivity growth rate has recently has gone below zero; i.e., productivity has actually deteriorated. (Weldon, 2016.) 3. Little or no “decoupling” is occurring for materials or energy use. This is the most important issue; does recent history indicate that economic output has been or can be separated from materials and energy use, so that growth can continue while resource demand falls? The “Tech-Fix faith” is fundamentally dependent on the assumption that massive decoupling is possible. But all the evidence seems to say that the amount of materials or energy needed to produce a unit of GDP in rich countries has not improved much if at all in recent years. The box below refers to some of the evidence. Weidmann et al. (2014) say “…for the past two decades global amounts of iron ore and bauxite extractions have risen faster than global GDP.” “… resource productivity…has fallen in developed nations.” “There has been no improvement whatsoever with respect to improving the economic efficiency of metal ore use.” Giljum et al. (2014, p. 324) report in the world as a whole only a 0.9% p.a. improvement in the dollar value extracted from the use of each unit of minerals between 1980 and 2009, and that over the 10 years before the GFC there was no improvement. “…not even a relative decoupling was achieved on the global level.” They point out that the picture would have been worse had they included the many materials in rich world imports. **Diederan’s account** (2009) **of** the **productivity** of minerals discovery effort **is even more pessimistic**. **Between 1980 and 2008 the** annual major **deposit discovery rate fell from 13 to less than 1, while discovery expenditure went from** about **$1.5 billion** p.a. **to $7 billion** p.a., **meaning** the **productivity** of expenditure **fell by a factor** in the vicinity **of** around **100, which is an annual decline of** around **40%** p.a. Recent **petroleum figures are similar**; in the last decade or so **the discovery rate has not increased but discovery expenditure** more or less **trebled**. (Johnson, 2010.) **Schandl** et al. (2015) **say “ …** there is a very high coupling of energy use to economic growth, meaning that an increase in GDP drives a proportional increase in energy use.” “Our results show that while relative **decoupling can** be achieved in some scenarios, **no**ne would **lead to an absolute reduction in energy or materials footprint**.” **In all three** of their **scenarios** “… **energy use continues to be strongly coupled with economic activity**...” **Alvarez found that for Europe, Spain and the US, GDP increased 74% in 20 years, but materials use actually increased 85%**. (Latouche, 2014.) **Similar conclusions** re stagnant or declining materials use productivity etc. **are arrived** at **by Aadrianse**, 1997, **Dittrich** et al., (2014), **Schutz**, **Bringezu and Moll**, (2004), **Warr**, (2004), **Berndt**, (1990), **Smil**, (2014) **and Victor** (2008, pp. 55-56). (Note that economists often claim that the “energy intensity” of rich world economies is improving, but this is only because they fail to take into account the huge amounts of energy used overseas to produce imports, and “fuel switching”; see Kaufman, 2004.) 4. There is ecological deterioration in almost all domains. Technical advance has obviously not slowed, halted or reversed overall damage to the planet’s ecosystems. The “Environmental Kuznets Curve” thesis is an application of the decoupling claim to environmental impacts, asserting that as countries become richer impacts increase for a time but then plateau and fall. There is little doubt now that the thesis is not valid. Rich countries are in general not solving their most serious environmental problems. Alexander’s review (2014) concludes that for the world as a whole, ”… decades of extraordinary technological development have resulted in increased, not reduced, environmental impacts.” These many sources and figures show the extreme implausibility of the tech-fix faith that in future technical advances will enable us to stop worrying about limits and any need to dramatically reduce consumption or the obsession with economic growth. Conclusions on the limits to growth case. In view of these lines of argument it is difficult to see how anyone could disagree with the basic limits to growth case. Present ways are so grossly unsustainable there is no possibility of all people rising to the living standards we take for granted today in rich countries, let alone those we are seeking. Again the most important point is the magnitude of the overshoot. Most people have no idea of how far beyond sustainable levels of consumption we are or how big the reductions should be. For decades many scientists and agencies are have been emphasizing the validity and importance of the basic limits case. Sustainable ways that all could share appear to require us to go down to per capita rates of resource consumption around 10% of those we have now. It follows from the above discussion that the only solution is to shift to some kind of Simpler Way, i.e., to lifestyles, settlements and systems that make it possible for us to live well on a small fraction of our present rich world levels, with no economic growth.

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

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

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

### Underview

#### The alt is not a rejection of the state, thus I do not cede the political and can engage in state action.

#### Don’t let the aff make a perm, each of the links acts as an independent DA to the aff that turns the case. That means that the perm will never solve those disadvantages, but the alt alone will. Any inclusion of the aff fails.

#### Weigh the K above the case—capitalism controls the root cause of all of their impacts. If we don’t analyze capitalism, we allow it to run rampant and continue on its unsustainable path towards extinction.

## 1NC- Off

#### CP: The United States should recognize an unconditional right to strike for worker with the exception of law enforcement

#### Police are losing grip of power

Willis 20 [(Jay Willis, senior contributor at The Appeal.) ,” POLICE UNIONS ARE LOSING THE WAR ON CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM” ,The Appeal , <https://theappeal.org/police-unions-are-losing-the-war-on-criminal-justice-reform/>, Nov 10, 2020] SS

Law enforcement organizations have long treated mass incarceration as a job creation program. In 2020, the tide began turning against them.

This commentary is part of The Appeal’s collection of opinion and analysis.

Law enforcement unions are maybe the most powerful force in politics that most voters never think twice about. By quietly dumping millions of dollars in key prosecutor elections and ballot initiative fights, these organizations manage to affect everything in the criminal legal system’s orbit, usually while flying well beneath the political radar. Police unions are sort of like gravity, if gravity played a significant role in enabling agents of the state to systematically terrorize communities of color without facing meaningful consequences.

In races that take place outside the quadrennial spending bonanzas for control of the White House, these strategic allocations of time and outlays of resources can be decisive in elections, especially since no cohesive pro-reform interest group exists to counteract their influence. (Tight-knit, well-organized police unions can coordinate in ways that the larger but more heterogenous and dispersed coalition of people who favor criminal justice reform cannot.) One recent study found that law enforcement groups have spent about $87 million in local and state elections over the past 20 years, including almost $65 million in Los Angeles alone. At the federal level, their recent campaign contributions and lobbying expenditures approach $50 million, according to The Guardian.

Such expenditures are savvy investments for police unions, who keenly understand the value of having sympathetic friends in high places. Because prosecutors work so closely with police, they have a strong incentive to develop a friendly relationship with rank-and-file officers, even if earning that trust comes at the price of turning a blind eye to abuse: It is not a coincidence that researchers have tracked the rise of police unions to an increase in on-the-job police killings. In a country where law-and-order rhetoric is deeply embedded in the cultural zeitgeist, if you’re a prosecutor intent on keeping your job, filing charges against the badge-wearing hand that feeds might not feel worth the retaliatory smear campaign that will inevitably follow.

In recent years, however—and especially as a result of the sustained protests of police violence in the aftermath of George Floyd’s killing in Minneapolis—people have grown more attuned to how these organizations bend the criminal legal system to their will and stymie efforts to reform it. A growing number of elected officials have pledged to refuse the support of law enforcement organizations; in California, a coalition of reform-minded prosecutors has been lobbying for a state bar ethics rule that would prohibit DAs from accepting donations from these sources altogether, arguing that prosecutors cannot ethically prosecute police officers if they are receiving the support of their unions.

“The ties that bind elected officials to police unions must be broken,” the Los Angeles Times editorial board wrote in June. “An elected official considering whether to prosecute officers should not be, in essence, on the political payroll of the agency defending the very same people.”

On Election Day 2020 in California, voters delivered police unions a series of resounding defeats that threaten to flip this time-honored paradigm on its head.

In the race for Los Angeles County District Attorney, reform-oriented challenger George Gascón ousted incumbent Jackie Lacey, earning control of a sprawling office that employs nearly 1,000 line prosecutors and retains jurisdiction over more than 10 million people. Lacey was the clear favorite of law enforcement organizations, who spent some $5 million boosting her candidacy and attacking her opponent’s. And for good reason: During Lacey’s eight years on the job, she reviewed more than 250 fatal shootings by on-duty law enforcement officers. She filed charges in one of them.

Occasionally, Lacey’s penchant for lenience extended beyond even that of high-profile police officials. None other than then-LAPD chief Charlie Beck called on Lacey to charge one of his officers, Clifford Proctor, in the 2015 killing of Brendon Glenn, an unarmed, homeless Black man. Lacey declined. “As independent prosecutors, we’re supposed to look at the evidence and the law,” she said. “And that’s what we did.” When the time came for Lacey to seek re-election, it seems that grateful police unions did not forget her choice.

Gascón’s résumé is one that might seem as if it would appeal to law enforcement types: A former LAPD patrol officer who rose to the rank of assistant chief, he also served as police chief in San Francisco and Mesa, Arizona, and as district attorney in San Francisco, before returning to run for DA in the city where he grew up. But Gascón is among the group of prosecutors who have disclaimed the support of police unions, and his campaign pledges include reducing the population of the county’s chronically overcrowded jail system, reopening investigations of high-profile police shootings that Lacey had closed, and declining to seek the death penalty altogether. For the unions, loyalty apparently extends only so far as it will allow their members to evade accountability.

Their efforts echoed those of the San Francisco Police Officers Association during last year’s DA election, when it spent some $650,000 on, among other things, mailers that declared progressive DA candidate Chesa Boudin to be “the #1 choice of criminals and gang members.” These scaremongering predictions were insufficient to prevent the city’s voters from electing Boudin—also a member of the no-money-from-cop-unions coalition—as Gascón’s successor.

Further down the ballot in 2020, California voters rejected Proposition 20, which would have reclassified certain misdemeanor theft offenses as felonies and reduced the availability of parole. (Incidentally, this would have rolled back the reforms of Proposition 47, a successful 2014 referendum co-authored by Gascón.) In other words, Proposition 20 would have resulted in more incarceration for more people for longer periods of time, which is why law enforcement organizations contributed roughly $2 million to the campaign to pass it.

Police unions also opposed San Francisco’s Proposition E, which eliminated the city’s minimum police staffing requirement, and Los Angeles’s Measure J, which earmarked hundreds of millions of dollars in public resources for non-police community investment. The Los Angeles County Professional Peace Officers Association, which represents sheriff’s deputies, claimed that Measure J would “cripple public safety,” and local law enforcement organizations combined to spend more than $3.5 million fighting it. Both measures nonetheless passed with overwhelming support.

Law enforcement unions reliably oppose criminal justice reform for the simple reason that any attempts to reduce the criminal justice system’s footprint will make police less relevant. (Over the years, they have opposed everything from body camera mandates to the simple requirement that officers wear nametags.) For them, mass incarceration is the world’s most lucrative job creation machine. To justify their lavish spending habits and the generous rules that apply to their conduct, police always frame themselves as a mere half-step ahead of staving off mass chaos, warning that any abrogation of their authority by naive do-gooders will put everyone in danger.

What this year’s election results demonstrate is that people understand the lies that infuse this narrative, which conspicuously omits from the ledger the staggering human costs that policing imposes on the communities it purports to keep safe. These losses won’t put an end to incidents of police brutality, or any other strain of rot that pervades the American criminal justice system. But they do signal that police unions are likelier to have to answer for their myriad failures, instead of relying on beneficiaries of their largesse to pretend that these failures do not exist.

#### The plan reverses that

Lopez 20 [(Laura Barrón-López, is a White House Correspondent for POLITICO.), “Democrats’ Coming Civil War Over Police Unions” , POLITICO , <https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2020/10/14/police-reform-police-unions-qualified-immunity-democratic-party-420122>, 10/14/2020] SS

Earlier this year, House Democrats were close to pushing through a bill that would have cemented the power of police unions across the country. For a pro-labor party, the bill, which gave police officers the federal right to collectively bargain on working conditions, appeared to be a no-brainer. Nearly every Democrat in the House co-signed the legislation, including members of the Squad, a group of progressive superstars that includes Reps. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez and Rashida Tlaib.

The Democrats have supported public-sector unions for generations — often fighting with Republican state officials who’ve worked to gut the memberships of public employee unions and limit bargaining abilities. The bill would have granted the right to form a union and bargain contracts to firefighters, emergency medical personnel and police, including in states that currently prohibit some in public safety from negotiating collectively for wages and working conditions.

As talk of moving the bill increased in March, Rep. Joaquin Castro of Texas was a rare voice raising alarms. He warned his colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee that the bill would formalize the authority of police unions to determine misconduct standards in their contracts, which are increasingly viewed as a barrier to holding police accountable for wrongdoing. Castro, a Democrat, fought it, asking racial justice groups like Campaign Zero and Color of Change to talk to his Democratic colleagues. He suggested new language limiting how much police could negotiate over accountability provisions with cities.

But labor organizations weren’t pleased with the idea of singling out police affiliates by restricting their ability to bargain over disciplinary standards in the bill. Then the coronavirus pandemic exploded, and negotiations stalled.

Two months later, a video of a white police officer using his knee to pin George Floyd’s neck to the pavement for nine minutes rocketed around the country. Hundreds of thousands took to the streets across the nation in response to Floyd’s killing, calling for a full re-imagining of policing and thrusting police unions into the center of the national argument. Activists, multiple legal experts and even some conservative think tanks, say police unions are one of the biggest impediments to reform, pushing hard to weaken accountability rules, and preventing new ones from being passed.

In the wake of Floyd’s killing, the bill expanding bargaining rights for police unions is all but dead as currently written, and not because of the pandemic. House Democrats rushed to pass a first of its kind police reform bill that would, among other measures, ban choke holds, establish a national database tracking misconduct and end the doctrine of qualified immunity, which shields police officers from civil lawsuits. More quietly, they quickly backed away from the collective-bargaining bill. In the span of three months, the party had changed its calculus, now viewing a labor bill that was endorsed by nearly every House Democrat as recently as March as untouchable in its current form.

Rep. Dan Kildee (D-Mich.), co-author of the measure, said in a statement that he asked House leadership to not move the bill unless the right for police to negotiate on accountability standards is addressed. Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez of New York, who also signed on to the bill, is “withdrawing her support” from it “as long as it remains in its current form,” said Lauren Hitt, a spokesperson for the New York Democrat. Rep. Matt Cartwright of Pennsylvania, author of a separate broader bill to expand collective bargaining rights of public-sector workers, is also deciding “whether any changes need to be made to [his] bill to hold officers with problematic records accountable” and will consider changes Kildee makes to his legislation, said Cartwright spokesman Matt Slavoski.

All Democrats POLITICO spoke to said they support police’s right to unionize and bargain over wages and working conditions; it’s police’s ability to negotiate misconduct standards through union contracts that some are now questioning or flat out opposing.

#### Police strikes allow police to gain overwhelming amount of power

Wish 20 [(Brian E. Wish, PhD), “What If The Police Revolt?” , Medium, https://medium.com/illumination/what-if-the-police-revolt-ca5a44ba4790, Jun 16, 2020] SS

Police labor actions are successful

When police go on strike, they usually win. The most likely outcome of police labor unrest is quick resolution in favor of the police officers. The consequences can hurt individual officers but police forces as a whole tend to win concessions and solve their problems. Politicians realize that if things are bad enough for the police to strike, then the problems won’t go away even if all the strikers are fired.

The September 1919 Boston Police Strike is the most famous police labor action. Striking for higher pay, seventy percent of the police department walked out. Vandalism and looting ensued across the city. Calvin Coolidge sent in the state militia, which shot at least eight people over the next few days. The strike was unpopular, coming towards the end of the Red Summer of white rioting and at the beginning of the Red Scare. All striking officers were fired and replaced, with the State Guard staying on until December. Despite the firings, wages and benefits were raised substantially and a pension was instituted.

In the modern era, when finally roused to fight, police labor activity proves successful without mass firings.

In New York City, in 1971, virtually the entire police department stopped patrolling, responding only to major crimes. Strikers were eventually fined but won pay concessions and back pay to a disputed contract.

In Baltimore, Maryland, in 1974, hundreds of police officers went on strike. The city ultimately gave in to pay concessions, though the union was disbanded and participating probationary officers were fired

In Boston, Massachusetts, in 1975, hundreds of police officers called in sick or skipped work to avoid enforcing bussing or suppressing protests; national guard troops deployed to keep the peace

In Milwaukee, Wisconson, just before Christmas in 1981, police went on strike after an alderman made statements in support of a suspect accused of killing two officers; after sixteen hours the city council repudiated the statement and increased police funding.

In Columbus, Ohio, in 1993, hundreds of police and firefighter called in sick, quickly winning contract concessions and a 5% raise.

#### Enables police unions to conceal abuses of power

Greenhouse 20 [(Steven Greenhouse, reporter at the New York Times for thirty-one years; he covered labor and workplace matters there for nineteen. He is the author of “Beaten Down, Worked Up: The Past, Present, and Future of American Labor”), “How Police Unions Enable and Conceal Abuses of Power”, The New Yorker , <https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/how-police-union-power-helped-increase-abuses>, June 18, 2020 ] SS

Police unions have long had a singular—and divisive—place in American labor. What is different at this fraught moment, however, is that these unions, long considered untouchable, due to their extraordinary power on the streets and among politicians, face a potential reckoning, as their conduct roils not just one city but the entire nation. Since the nineteen-sixties, when police unions first became like traditional unions and won the right to bargain collectively, they have had a controversial history. And recent studies suggest that their political and bargaining power has enabled them to win disciplinary systems so lax that they have helped increase police abuses in the United States.

A 2018 University of Oxford study of the hundred largest American cities found that the extent of protections in police contracts was directly and positively correlated with police violence and other abuses against citizens. A 2019 University of Chicago study found that extending collective-bargaining rights to Florida sheriffs’ deputies led to a forty per cent statewide increase in cases of violent misconduct—translating to nearly twelve additional such incidents annually.

In a forthcoming study, Rob Gillezeau, a professor and researcher, concluded that, from the nineteen-fifties to the nineteen-eighties, the ability of police to collectively bargain led to a substantial rise in police killings of civilians, with a greater impact on people of color. “With the caveat that this is very early work,” Gillezeau wrote on Twitter, on May 30th, “it looks like collective bargaining rights are being used to protect the ability of officers to discriminate in the disproportionate use of force against the non-white population.”

Other studies revealed that many existing mechanisms for disciplining police are toothless. WBEZ, a Chicago radio station, found that, between 2007 and 2015, Chicago’s Independent Police Review Authority investigated four hundred shootings by police and deemed the officers justified in all but two incidents. Since 2012, when Minneapolis replaced its civilian review board with an Office of Police Conduct Review, the public has filed more than twenty-six hundred misconduct complaints, yet only twelve resulted in a police officer being punished. The most severe penalty: a forty-hour suspension. When the St. Paul Pioneer Press reviewed appeals involving terminations from 2014 to 2019, it discovered that arbitrators ruled in favor of the discharged police and corrections officers and ordered them reinstated forty-six per cent of the time. (Non-law-enforcement workers were reinstated at a similar rate.) For those demanding more accountability, a large obstacle is that disciplinary actions are often overturned if an arbitrator finds that the penalty the department meted out is tougher than it was in a similar, previous case—no matter if the penalty in the previous case seemed far too lenient.

To critics, all of this highlights that the disciplinary process for law enforcement is woefully broken, and that police unions have far too much power. They contend that robust protections, including qualified immunity, give many police officers a sense of impunity—an attitude exemplified by Derek Chauvin keeping his knee on George Floyd’s neck for nearly nine minutes, even as onlookers pleaded with him to stop. “We’re at a place where something has to change, so that police collective bargaining no longer contributes to police violence,” Benjamin Sachs, a labor-law professor at Harvard, told me. Sachs said that bargaining on “matters of discipline, especially related to the use of force, has insulated police officers from accountability, and that predictably can increase the problem.”

For decades, members of the public have complained about police violence and police unions, and a relatively recent development—mobile-phone videos—has sparked even more public anger. These complaints grew with the killings of Eric Garner, Laquan McDonald, Walter Scott, Tamir Rice, Philando Castile, and many others. Each time, there were protests and urgent calls for police reform, but the matter blew over. Until the horrific killing of George Floyd.

Historians often talk of two distinct genealogies for policing in the North and in the South, and both help to explain the crisis that the police and its unions find themselves in today. Northern cities began to establish police departments in the eighteen-thirties; by the end of the century, many had become best known for using ruthless force to crush labor agitation and strikes, an aim to which they were pushed by the industrial and financial élite. In 1886, the Chicago police killed four strikers and injured dozens more at the McCormick Reaper Works. In the South, policing has very different roots: slave patrols, in which white men brutally enforced slave codes, checking to see whether black people had proper passes whenever they were off their masters’ estates and often beating them if they did something the patrols didn’t like. Khalil Gibran Muhammad, a historian at Harvard, said that the patrols “were explicit in their design to empower the entire white population” to control “the movements of black people.”

At the turn of the twentieth century, many police officers—frustrated, like other workers, with low pay and long hours—formed fraternal associations, rather than unions, to seek better conditions—mayors and police commissioners insisted that the police had no more right to join a union than did soldiers and sailors. In 1897, a group of Cleveland police officers sought to form a union and petitioned the American Federation of Labor—founded in 1886, with Samuel Gompers as its first president—to grant them a union charter. The A.F.L. rejected them, saying, “It is not within the province of the trade union movement to especially organize policemen, no more than to organize militiamen, as both policemen and militiamen are often controlled by forces inimical to the labor movement.”

#### Police brutality re-enforces racial stereotypes, creates a public mental and physical health crisis and creates an endless cycle of injustice and hostility

SNMA 2019 [(Mavis Britwum, Region IX Political Advocacy Liaison), ( Eloho E. Akpovi, HPLA Policy Statements Subcommittee Chairperson), (Jeniffer Okungbowa-Ikponmwosa, HPLA Committee Chairperson), (Veronica Wright, HPLA Committee Chairperson), “Statement on Police Brutality” , Health Policy and Legislative Affairs Committee, Third Review, <https://cdn.ymaws.com/snma.org/resource/resmgr/hlpa/policy_statements/police_brutality.pdf>, ] SS

INTRODUCTION

Established in 1964 by students of Meharry Medical College, the Student National Medical Association (SNMA) is the nation's oldest and largest organization focused on the needs and concerns of medical students of color. In addition, the SNMA is dedicated to practices leading to better health care for minority and underrepresented communities. As these communities are disproportionately subject to the practice and consequences of police brutality, defined as any act of unmerited excessive and aggressive physical, mental, and/or emotional abuse, above and beyond the law, enacted upon by an individual or groups of individuals in law enforcement, 1 the SNMA strongly opposes the medical, social, and political infractions incurred via these acts of excessive force.

BACKGROUND

Epidemic levels of racial minorities are being unjustly scrutinized, brutalized, and even killed at the hands of law enforcement in the United States. According to limited research that exists, more than two thousand individuals have been killed by police officers since 1990 – 75% of whom were people of color.1 Due to underreporting, some incidences of police brutality that result in nonfatal civilian injury are unaccounted for, resulting in a staggering underestimation well below the actual number.

Police departments are established for the protection of the community they serve, and as such, should be responsible for treating their assigned communities with respect and fairness. Unfortunately, in reality, that is not the case. Historically, society has internalized the idea that Blackness is inherently associated with criminality in order to justify unreasonably use of deadly force on Black/African American men and women who are considered to be “suspects” or “persons of interest” in acts of wrongdoing.2 This includes the US law enforcement community, members of which have been influenced by socially ingrained stereotyping and demonstrated unjust scrutiny against Black/African American and Hispanic/Latinx members of society.

In 2015, 19% of Black/African American and 17% of Hispanics/Latinxs admitted to being mistreated unfairly by police officers in the past 30 days, in comparison to 3% of White responders.3 This scrutiny has, in turn, led to numerous unmerited physical and psychological attacks on individuals of color, resulting not only in permanent disability, but also death of innocent law abiding Americans. A few prominent national cases include Eric Garner, Tamir Rice, Michael Brown, Sandra Bland, and Jordan Edwards. Such unwarranted incidents resulting in injury and murder constitute direct attacks upon the civil rights of many ethnic minorities in the United States. Police brutality, and the use of unwarranted physical and emotional force, ultimately compromise the physical and mental health of victims and their families while ignoring the need for psychological and social intervention and support of law enforcement officers.

SCOPE OF THE PROBLEM

Police brutality results in potentially severe mental and physical injury. The types of physical injuries sustained are similar to those experienced by victims of violent crime such as assault and homicide. These injuries commonly result from night-stick or baton beatings, pistol whippings, beatings by fist or boot, restraint holds, and shootings. Examples of physical injuries include, but are not limited to, skin abrasion/laceration, bone fracture, asphyxiation, parenchymal nerve injury, contusion, concussion, skull fracture, epidural and subdural hematomas, pneumothorax, and hemothorax. Complications of such injuries include post-traumatic cerebral edema, infections, hydrocephalus (secondary to blood or infection in the subarachnoid space), post-traumatic epilepsy (secondary to sustained contusions and lacerations), paralysis, permanent disability and death.2

Damage caused by police brutality goes beyond the physical manifestations. Psychological trauma faced by victims manifests itself in many ways, such as stress, anxiety, fear, paranoia, distrust, insomnia, anorexia, and depression.

Such psychological symptoms can further be manifested as Acute Stress Disorder (ASD) and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). Psychological stress often consumes many facets of victims’ lives, adversely affecting job performance, ability to sustain employment, and everyday interactions with family and associates. 2 Moreover, the families of fatally injured victims often suffer many of the same psychological tolls. Police brutality must be recognized, investigated, and acted upon as a serious health concern because of its obvious deleterious effects on individuals, their families and communities.

A Public Health Issue

Police brutality, which was once thought of as isolated incidences, has grown into a public health issue.4 Police violence not only negatively affects those individuals directly involved but also creates a tidal wave of chaos that spans across state and regions lines. Police brutality directly increases the divide between communities of color and police officials, which present in multiple way. It has resulted in an increasing number of individuals and communities that feel distrust toward police officials.4 They are, therefore, reluctant to report instances to police and bypass the unjust judicial systems by taking matters into their own hands.

The media’s coverage of incidences of police brutality is often presented in a manner that skews the lines of victim and perpetrator. One of the most common examples of subliminal biases can be seen in the choice of photographs selected to accompany police violence coverage. This is often achieved by presenting a picture of the officer cloaked in his uniform and heavily decorated in awards while the civilian, often a Black/African American male, is pictured in “street clothes” and often in surroundings as to perpetuate stereotypes such as thug, uneducated or violent. This type of bias representation further increases racial divides, creating a barrier among civilians and law enforcement.5 To look one step further, the failure to prosecute police officers in cases where “excessive force” was documented, further alienates minorities and perpetuates social injustices and oppression. While there are some national statutes in place, the United States Department of Justice has been unable to eliminate this growing issue. Any hopes of eradicating this public health issue will come with collaboration of federal and local reform.5

Furthermore, increases in police sensitivity training, higher educational requirements for officer recruits, community policing, and other progressive approaches have not produced a measurable decrease in police brutality against Black/African American males because none of these initiatives specifically address the larger societal issues of police brutality (case study).2

Psychological Impact on Members of the Target Population

Police violence has been linked to negative impacts on the mental health of victims, specifically leading to the development of anxiety and depressive symptoms. As the number of incidents and level of police violence used increases, the likelihood of the victim developing PTSD also increases.6 PTSD is associated with an increased risk for maladaptive behaviors such as alcohol and drug dependence most notably in Black/African Americans.7 This risk is further compounded by the negative impacts of PTSD on one’s perception of self. Traumatic experiences such as police violence cannot only cause an individual to develop an altered sense of self, but they can also alter a victim’s perceptions of those around them leading to an almost global sense of mistrust; with victims reporting increased skepticism of the world and a decreased feeling of safety in society.7 At the most extreme, victims have described their experience following an incidence of police violence as one of agoraphobia; they are afraid to leave their homes, afraid to interact with large groups of people.

While treatment strategies for individuals with PTSD following acts of violence are improving, barriers to treatment still exist specifically in the Black/African American community.2 Some barriers are financial. These include decreased access to mental health services due to lower health insurance rates and incomprehensive policies. Other barriers are related to cultural stigma associated with seeking mental health treatment. These include but are not limited to negative perceptions of mental health treatment and question of its utility.

Many patients have a preference for a mental health practitioner of the same race. However, the healthcare system harbors an underrepresentation of Black/African American mental health workers,7 as almost 90% of mental/behavioral health workers identify as non-Hispanic White and the other 10% is comprised of those that identify as “racial and ethnic minorities.”8 Though true, the effects of police brutality reach beyond victim and the resources available to them. Broadly it touches families, friends and loved ones in many ways. The growing issue of police brutality shows that American societies have not socially developed very far from the days of oppressive and violent tactics that were prevalent during previous times of intense social climates such as those seen during desegregation and the civil rights movements. A generation that marched on the front line for social justice decades ago so that their children and grandchildren could grow up in a more accepting society must still endure the tragedies of systemic racism and oppression.

A parent’s first instinct is to protect and nurture their offspring to the best of their ability. However, in the face of police brutality, parents are left feeling betrayed and helpless at the hands of the very individuals who are embarked with the responsibility to protect and serve. These feelings of grief and bereavement for their lost loved ones is compounded by mental anguish, frustrations, and anger when families learn that no one will be prosecuted for these crimes, often times in the presence of substantial evidence.8

Members of the community who do not have a loved one directly affected by police brutality and violence are still mentally affected in ways that often change their outlook on the world and consequently how they carry themselves in society. Witnessing police brutality instills distrust in the younger generation which undoubtedly grows the separation between minorities and police officers. Many younger individuals will take on a sense of hopelessness and believe that their societies do not value individuals of color. Because the parents in these situations are undergoing their own grieving process, the mental effects of police brutality on young children are often undertreated.5

Case-

#### Democracy causes global famine and increases child and maternal mortality

Treanor 6 [(Paul, Political Scientist) “Why Democracy is Wrong” http://web.inter.nl.net/users/Paul.Treanor/democracy.html, 13 May 2006] MCM

Although the democratic states are the most prosperous in history, democracy has failed to eliminate inequality at global level. Despite the great personal wealth evident in some democratic nations, millions of people in the poorest regions of Africa live under conditions, comparable to mediaeval European averages. Although not all states were democratic during the 20th century, the richest states were. Nevertheless, the general global distribution of wealth has not shifted substantially in the last 150 years. This also seems a permanent and structural failure of democracy. Democracy does not induce the rich to give their money to the poor: not locally, not globally. Not as individuals, not as societies, not as states.

Every year the wealth of the democracies increases: every year the gap between the richest democracies and the poorest countries increases. Mass resource transfer, for instance in the form of transfer taxes, is increasingly feasible - and also increasingly urgent.

#### **Democracy doesn’t deliver instead causes lack of accountability that destroys infrastructure**

Moyo 18 [(Dambisa Moyo, international economist and the author, most recently, of Edge of Chaos: Why Democracy Is Failing to Deliver Economic Growth—and How to Fix It. She serves on the boards of 3M and Chevron), “Why Democracy Doesn’t Deliver”, Foreign Policy, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/04/26/why-democracy-doesnt-deliver/>, April 26, 2018] SS

Only 19 percent of Americans today say they can trust their government to do what is right. Meanwhile, citizens in developing countries see authoritarian leaders as more trustworthy than democratic politicians. Increasingly, it seems that people across the globe are skeptical of the ability of democratic governments to act effectively — including as good custodians of the economy. Indeed, the liberal democratic system is unwittingly undermining the economic growth that is necessary for its continued survival.

At the root of the problem is a predilection for short-​termism that has become embedded in the political and business culture of modern democracies. By design, Western politicians have relatively short political horizons; they are often in office for terms of less than five years. So they find their duties regularly interrupted by elections that distract from the job of addressing long-​term policy challenges. As a result, politicians are naturally and rationally drawn to focus their efforts on seducing their electorates with short-​term sweeteners — including economic policies designed to quickly produce favorable monthly inflation, unemployment, and GDP numbers.

Voters generally favor policies that enhance their own well-​being with little consideration for that of future generations or for long-​term outcomes. Politicians are rewarded for pandering to voters’ immediate demands and desires, to the detriment of growth over the long term. Because democratic systems encourage such short-​termism, it will be difficult to solve many of the seemingly intractable structural problems slowing global growth without an overhaul of democracy.

One of the most fundamental obstacles to effective governance is the short electoral cycle embedded in many democratic systems. Frequent elections taint policymaking, as politicians, driven by the rational desire to win elections, opt for quick fixes that have a tendency to undermine long-term growth. Meanwhile, they neglect to address more entrenched, longer-​term economic challenges, such as worsening education standards, the imminent pension crisis, and deteriorating physical infrastructure, that don’t promise immediate political rewards.

America’s failing infrastructure encapsulates the problem of both public and private myopia. A 2017 report by the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) gave the country a grade of D+ for overall infrastructure, citing 2,170 high-​hazard dams, 56,007 structurally deficient bridges (9.1 percent of the nation’s total), and $1 trillion in needed upgrades to drinking water systems