## 1

**Biden’s effectively leveraging political capital to pass infrastructure and social spending.**

**Romm et al. ‘10/28** [Tony; 10/28/21; congressional news reporter at the Washington Post; "Biden unveils revised spending plan, exhorts Democrats to back it," https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/biden-to-announce-democratic-agreement-on-social-spending-deal/2021/10/28/2781863c-37d3-11ec-91dc-551d44733e2d\_story.html]

President Biden on Thursday unveiled a new **$1.75 trillion** package to **overhaul** the country’s **health-care**, **education**, **climate** and **tax laws**, muscling through a slew of policy disagreements and internecine political feuds that had stalled his economic agenda for months.

The announcement marked a **critical moment** in Biden’s tenure, prompting the president to pay a visit to Capitol Hill and call on Democrats to **adopt the spending** along with a second, roughly $1.2 trillion package to improve the country’s roads, bridges, pipes, ports and Internet connections.

“We spent hours and hours and hours over months and months working on this,” Biden said in televised remarks. “No one got everything they wanted, including me, but that’s what compromise is. That’s consensus, and that’s what I ran on.”

Biden’s moves reflected a **pivotal decision** to **assume ownership** of the sweeping safety-net proposal in a **new way**. He is **investing enormous political capital** in the **new plan**, following days of **intensive**, **secretive meetings** with key lawmakers, and **ratcheting up** his **warnings** that gun-shy Democrats risk damaging him and the party if they do not get on board.

“I don’t think it’s hyperbole to say that the [Democratic] House and Senate majorities — and my presidency — will be determined by what happens in the next week,” he told House Democrats in a closed-door meetings, according to one person in the room, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the discussions.

The president added that he expected the framework to gain the Democrats’ support, emphasizing the framework had **50 votes in the Senate** and telling reporters, “**Everyone’s** on board,” as he arrived on Capitol Hill.

The call to action appeared to **galvanize** some **Democrats**, and the $1.75 trillion **framework** soon **generated praise** — crucially from the party’s **moderate** and **liberal ranks**. Even former president Barack Obama, who has largely stayed out of the day-to-day political battles, put out a statement in support of the framework, calling it a “giant leap forward.” One of the longtime holdouts, Sen. Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.), quickly offered positive comments about the deal, but without committing to vote for it.

“After months of productive, good-faith negotiations with President Biden and the White House, we have made **significant progress** on the proposed budget reconciliation package,” **Sinema** said in a statement. “I look forward to **getting this done**, expanding economic opportunities and helping everyday families get ahead.”

Sen. Joe Manchin III (D-W.Va.), the other centrist holdout, similarly offered little comment, saying only, “In the hands of the House” when asked about the new framework in the Capitol on Thursday.

The proposal did contain some longtime Democratic priorities, including universal prekindergarten, new sums to combat climate change and additional taxes on the ultrawealthy. But it jettisoned other items, including a plan to provide paid leave to millions of Americans. The president made the cuts to satisfy **Sinema** and **Manchin**, who were concerned about overspending, though some liberal Democrats later said they had not given up fighting for those items.

#### Labor reform saps PC – empirically prove with Obama, corporate opposition, and Democratic resistance

Leon 21 Luis Feliz Leon, 01-06-2021, “"If we want it, we’re going to have to fight like hell for it" - Labor faces an uphill battle to pass the PRO Act,” Strike Wave, https://www.thestrikewave.com/original-content/labor-faces-uphill-battle-to-pass-pro-act/SJKS

The Employee Free Choice Act (EFCA), which died in the Senate during President Barack Obama’s first term, had similar potential to increase union membership, as it would have enabled workers to get union representation if a majority signed union cards (“card check”) rather than through an election. It died because Obama was unwilling to put political capital behind it to overcome opposition from Republicans and center-right Democrats. “EFCA was very close to becoming law. At the end of the day, in my view, the Obama administration did not put the necessary political capital into securing its passage,” said EPI's McNicholas. “The Obama administration decided to focus on ‘bipartisan’ and ‘reach across the aisle’ type solutions to the 2008 financial crisis, and thus didn't care about EFCA in the face of the anti-EFCA mobilization by strong ‘antis’ like the Chamber of Commerce,” says Susan Kang, a professor of political science at John Jay College who studies political economy, labor, and human rights. “Basically, labor was swept aside by the Obama administration … at the exact moment when he had the strongest mandate and political capital.” Another issue, said Patrick Burke, an organizer with United Auto Workers Local 2322 in Massachusetts, was that EFCA's card-check provisions, when framed as a replacement for elections, “became very easy to demonize and difficult to explain to people not already familiar with labor law.” “The short story is that the EFCA was doomed from a few moderate Dems not being willing to go through with card check once actually in power to enact it. The long story is that the labor movement's disappearance from the ‘adult table’ of Democratic politics has cyclical downward effects. They're less able to convince Dems to go out on the limb for them and to prioritize their legislative requests,” said Brandon Magner, a labor lawyer in Indiana. Despite a history of betrayal and rejection, labor and immigrant rights organizations, [coalesced](https://progressive.org/dispatches/power-behind-win-feliz-leon-201123/) around Biden, a self-professed “[union guy](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/11/16/biden-holds-joint-meeting-with-union-leaders-and-retail-auto-tech-ceos.html),” after the primaries and [helped deliver](https://progressive.org/dispatches/bargaining-rights-with-that-feliz-leon-201229/) him to the White House in the hope that doing so would lead to [executive action](https://indypendent.org/2020/12/immigrants-rights-advocates-descend-on-delaware/) on immigration and labor law reform. “We call on Congress to pass and Biden to sign the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act early in 2021 to make sure every worker who wants to form or join a union is able to do so freely and fairly,” AFL-CIO President Richard Trumka said in a [statement](https://aflcio.org/press/releases/afl-cio-looks-forward-working-president-elect-joe-biden-0) after the election. But union organizers, researchers, and labor lawyers see dim prospects for winning significant labor reform during the Biden administration. “The PRO Act is obviously dead in the Senate unless Mitch McConnell gets knocked into the minority, but I don't see it being passed without full-throated support for gutting the filibuster from Biden, Harris, Schumer, Durbin, and more,” said Magner, the labor lawyer, adding that “the history of failed labor law reform efforts indicates you need 60 votes to pass anything.” That is particularly true of Democrats in “right-to-work” states like [South Carolina](https://www.postandcourier.com/politics/scs-rep-joe-cunningham-to-vote-against-pro-union-bill-in-break-with-democrats/article_426b38e2-4862-11ea-a0d9-77a96531c47e.html) where U.S. Rep. Joe Cunningham was a reliable opponent in the House. But the greatest liability might be Biden himself. “The few times that Biden met McConnell at the negotiating table during the Obama years, McConnell [left with Biden’s wallet](https://theintercept.com/2019/06/24/joe-biden-tax-cuts-mitch-mconnell/),” dryly [observed](https://theintercept.com/2020/12/28/mcconnell-trump-election/) The Intercept’s Ryan Grim. “Even if the Democrats capture the Georgia Senate seats, their margin will be too small to overcome a Republican filibuster or, if they change the rules, more than one Democrat will break ranks, and no Republicans will support the act,” said Friedman. Even if Biden were to somehow outmaneuver McConnell’s chicanery, there would be fierce opposition to contend with on the corporate side from the likes of Americans for Tax Reform, which has [used](https://www.atr.org/ab5) Georgia runoff elections as an opportunity to fearmonger on the PRO Act, and, when backed against the wall, Biden may revert to his timeworn moderate instincts and not go to bat for labor reform unless forced to. “Prospects for major labor law reform under the Biden administration are directly tied to unions’ and union federations’ willingness to hold the administration’s feet to the fire. They are not going to do it on their own – if we want it, we’re going to have to fight like hell for it,” said Pitkin, the former UNITE HERE organizer. “The biggest question is whether there is enough street heat and organizing to prioritize legislation like this," said Burke, the UAW organizer. “Workers in motion spur labor-law reforms, not the other way around.”

#### Infrastructure secures the grid against worsening and increasing cyberattacks.

Carney 21 [Chris; 8/6/21; Senior policy advisor at Nossaman LLC, former US Representative, former professor of political science at Penn State University; "*The US Senate Infrastructure Bill: Securing Our Electrical Grid Through P3s and Grants*," JDSupra, <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-us-senate-infrastructure-bill-4989100/>] Justin

As we begin to better understand the main components of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act that the US Senate is working to pass this week, it is clear that public-private partnerships ("P3s") are a favored funding mechanism of lawmakers to help offset high costs associated with major infrastructure projects in communities. And while past infrastructure bills have used P3s for more conventional projects, the current bill also calls for P3s to help pay for protecting the US electric grid from cyberattacks. Responding to the increasing number of cyberattacks on our nation’s infrastructure, and given the fragile physical condition of our electrical grid, the Senate included provisions to help state, local and tribal entities harden electrical grids for which they are responsible. Section 40121, Enhancing Grid Security Through Public-Private Partnerships, calls for not only physical protections of electrical grids, but also for enhancing cyber-resilience. This section seeks to encourage the various federal, state and local regulatory authorities, as well as industry participants to engage in a program that audits and assesses the physical security and cybersecurity of utilities, conducts threat assessments to identify and mitigate vulnerabilities, and provides cybersecurity training to utilities. Further, the section calls for strengthening supply chain security, protecting “defense critical” electrical infrastructure and buttressing against a constant barrage of cyberattacks on the grid. In determining the nature of the partnership arrangement, the size of the utility and the area served will be considered, with priority going to utilities with fewer available resources. Section 40122 compliments the previous section as it seeks to incentivize testing of cybersecurity products meant to be used in the energy sector, including SCADA systems, and to find ways to mitigate any vulnerabilities identified by the testing. Intended as a voluntary program, utilities would be offered technical assistance and databases of vulnerabilities and best practices would be created. Section 40123 incentivizes investment in advanced cybersecurity technology to strengthen the security and resiliency of grid systems through rate adjustments that would be studied and approved by the Secretary of Energy and other relevant Commissions, Councils and Associations. Lastly, Section 40124, a long sought-after package of cybersecurity grants for state, local and tribal entities is included in the bill. This section adds language that would enable state, local and tribal bodies to apply for funds to upgrade aging computer equipment and software, particularly related to utilities, as they face growing threats of ransomware, denial of service and other cyberattacks. However, under Section 40126, cybersecurity grants may be tied to meeting various security standards established by the Secretary of Homeland Security, and/or submission of a cybersecurity plan by a grant applicant that shows “maturity” in understanding the cyber threat they face and a sophisticated approach to utilizing the grant. While the final outcome of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act may still be weeks or months away, inclusion of these provisions not only demonstrates a positive step forward for the application of federal P3s and grants generally, they also show that Congress recognizes the seriousness of the cyber threats our electrical grids face. Hopefully, through judicious application of both public-private partnerships and grants, the nation can quickly secure its infrastructure from cyberattacks.

#### Cyberattacks on the grid spiral to all-out nuclear conflict.

Klare 19 [Michael; November 2019; Professor emeritus of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College; “*Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation*,” Arms Control Association, <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation>] Justin

Yet another pathway to escalation could arise from a cascading series of cyberstrikes and counterstrikes against vital national infrastructure rather than on military targets. All major powers, along with Iran and North Korea, have developed and deployed cyberweapons designed to disrupt and destroy major elements of an adversary’s key economic systems, such as power grids, financial systems, and transportation networks. As noted, Russia has infiltrated the U.S. electrical grid, and it is widely believed that the United States has done the same in Russia.12 The Pentagon has also devised a plan known as “Nitro Zeus,” intended to immobilize the entire Iranian economy and so force it to capitulate to U.S. demands or, if that approach failed, to pave the way for a crippling air and missile attack.13 The danger here is that economic attacks of this sort, if undertaken during a period of tension and crisis, could lead to an escalating series of tit-for-tat attacks against ever more vital elements of an adversary’s critical infrastructure, producing widespread chaos and harm and eventually leading one side to initiate kinetic attacks on critical military targets, risking the slippery slope to nuclear conflict. For example, a Russian cyberattack on the U.S. power grid could trigger U.S. attacks on Russian energy and financial systems, causing widespread disorder in both countries and generating an impulse for even more devastating attacks. At some point, such attacks “could lead to major conflict and possibly nuclear war.”14

## 2

#### The stock market is trending upwards but it’s uncertain – blips aren’t enough to disprove the general trend and recent developments prove.

Miao and Macheel 10/21 [Tanaya and Hannah; 10/21/21; Reporter at CNBC, Associate Markets Reporter, graduated summa cum laude from Duke University with a degree in public policy; “S&P 500 slips from record, but heads for winning week on strong earnings,” CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/10/21/stock-market-futures-open-to-close-news.html>] Justin

The S&P 500 edged lower a day after the benchmark closed at a record. The broad market index fell 0.3% while the Dow Jones Industrial Average added 12 points, or 0.03%, helped by a 4% rise in shares of American Express, which reported strong quarterly earnings Thursday. Meanwhile, the Nasdaq Composite shed 1% after poor results from two technology companies. Shares of Intel retreated more than 10% following a weaker-than-expected sales report. The semiconductor company blamed an industry-wide chip shortage for its revenue miss. Social media stocks also dropped after Snap said its advertising business declined due to Apple’s privacy changes. Snap shares sunk more than 23%. Facebook and Twitter pulled back 4% and 3%, respectively. However, several tech stocks rose to all-time highs. Tesla shares extended their rally, rising 1% after hitting a new intraday high earlier in the morning. The stock closed 3% higher Thursday after posting record profit and revenue, along with strong margins. Netflix, Ebay and Microsoft also climbed to new all-time highs. Despite the blips in the tech sector, overall earnings season has been terrific so far, boosting the broader market back to an all-time high following a two-month lull. So far for the third quarter earnings season, 84% of the 117 companies that have reported have beat analysts’ earnings estimates, according to Refinitiv. Profits are on pace in the quarter to increase 34.8%, according to Refinitiv. “After a 5% rally on seven green days in a row for the S&P it makes some sense for the market to consolidate,” said Cliff Hodge, Cornerstone Wealth’s chief investment officer, adding that disappointing results from Intel and IBM and hawkish comments from Federal Reserve chair Jerome Powell on inflation and policy tightening “are adding some jitters.” “The setup into year-end looks great given the liquidity dynamics on corporate buybacks,” Hodge said, “but longer term there are still the unresolved headwinds of valuation, the transition to mid-cycle in the economy, and a tightening Fed that may prove challenging now that we’re back at all-time highs.” S&P 500 posts new record Stephen Kolano, CIO for BNY Mellon Investor Solutions, added that although the S&P 500 is up 20% for the year, things may still seem a little uncertain for investors looking toward the end of the year due to cost pressures, labor shortages and commentary from company management on earnings calls and comments from Fed chair Jerome Powell and other policymakers. “You’re starting to see some profit taking as a result of that,” Kolano told CNBC. “Where investors are going first and foremost is the companies that have run the fastest, which is a lot of the tech.” In Thursday’s regular session, the S&P 500 notched both a fresh intraday high and new record close. The broad index rose 0.3% for its seventh consecutive positive session. The Nasdaq Composite rose 0.6%, while the Dow shed 6.26 points, or 0.02%. All three major averages are on track to close the week higher for three straight weeks of gains. The Dow touched an intraday record earlier in the week. On the month, the Dow and S&P are up 5% while the Nasdaq is up 4%. “In a quarter where we thought things would slow down and there was concern about what profit margins were going to look like, these companies are still doing well,” said Victoria Fernandez, chief market strategist at Crossmark Global Investments. Strong jobs data also added to the positive market sentiment on Thursday. Initial jobless claims fell to a new pandemic low of 290,000 last week, the Labor Department reported Thursday — down 6,000 from the previous week and lower than the 300,000 expected from economists surveyed by Dow Jones. One of investors’ fears during the market’s recent struggles was a China property crisis. However, investors got good news on that front overnight with China’s Evergrande reportedly paying a key interest payment that was due to foreign bondholders, staving off a default for the property developer.
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#### Best data proves union strike victories statistically cause stock market crash.

Lee and Mas 12 [David; Princeton University and National Bureau of Economic Research; Alexandre; Princeton University and National Bureau of Economic Research; “Long-Run Impacts of Unions on Firms: New Evidence from Financial Markets, 1961–1999,” The Quarterly Journal Of Economics; February 2012; <https://academic.oup.com/qje/article-abstract/127/1/333/1834007?redirectedFrom=fulltext>] Justin

We begin analyzing the stock market reaction to union victories using event-study methodologies. The most distinctive feature of our data—crucial for our research design—is the long panel (up to 48 months before and after the election) of high frequency data on stock market returns for each firm. This feature allows us to use the pre-event data to test the adequacy of the benchmarks used to predict the counterfactual returns in the postevent period. The long panel also allows us to examine returns several months beyond the event, so as to capture the long-run expected effects of new unions, without having to rely heavily on the assumption that the stock price immediately and instantaneously adjusts to capture the expected presence of the unions.9

Our event-study analysis reveals substantial losses in market value following a union election victory—about a 10% decline in market value, equivalent to about $40,500 per unionized worker. According to our calculations, if unionization represented a one-to-one transfer from investors to workers through higher wages, this magnitude would be in line with a union wage premium of 10%. Because the total loss of market value represents the sum of transfers to workers and any other productivity impacts of unionization this implies, for example, that if the true union compensation premium were greater than 10%, there would be positive productivity effects of unions. The evidence supporting our event-study estimates is compelling: we find that these firms’ average returns are quite close to the benchmark returns every month leading up to the election, but precisely at the time of the election, the actual and benchmark returns diverge. The results for these firms are robust to a number of different specifications. In the sample of firms where we know that the union is a small fraction of the workforce, we donot find a similar divergence of returns from the benchmark.

Importantly, we find that the effect takes 15 to 18 months to fully materialize, a somewhat slow market reaction. As we discuss, this short-run mispricing can persist if exploiting the slow reaction is not sufficiently profitable to arbitrageurs. Indeed, our own analysis shows that strategies designed to exploit the mispricing entail a significant degree of fundamental risk. The fact that union victories are sufficiently rare and spread throughout time prevents the necessary diversification that could generate an attractive arbitrage opportunity. For example, our analysis suggests that attempts to exploit the short-lived mispricing would lead to a portfolio that would be dominated by simple buy-and hold strategies

The event-study estimate appears to average a great deal of heterogeneity in the effects. We additionally employ a regression discontinuity (RD) design, implicitly comparing close union victories to close union losses, and consistent with DiNardo and Lee (2004), we find little evidence of a significant discontinuous relationship between the vote share and market returns. If anything, the RD point estimates show a 4% positive (though statistically insignificant) effect of union certification (vis-`a-vis union defeat). The event-study estimates vary systematically by the observed vote share, with the largest negative abnormal returns for cases where the union won the election by a large margin.

#### The next market crash causes economic collapse – conditions are ripe for failure.

Vallejo 10/4 [Justin; 10/4/21; Citing personal finance expert Robert Kiyosaki; “‘Biggest crash in world history’: Personal finance expert Robert Kiyosaki predicts economic crisis in October,” Independent, <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/robert-kiyosaki-market-crash-october-b1930754.html>] Justin

"This is going to be the biggest crash in world history. We have never had this much debt pumped up… the debt to GDP ratio is out of sight," Mr Kiyosaki said. Mr Kiyosaki said the stock market was being artificially inflated by the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve with decisions disconnected from the realities of the current economy in the United States. The reason why Ms Yellen and Mr Powell are "scrambling", he said, is they’ve expanded the volume of money while the velocity of money is plummeting as no one spends and their cash lingers in savings. Mr Kiyosaki said people don’t have to go to Harvard University to understand that "you can’t keep printing fake money … that’s not good". "So they pump all this money in, prices go up," he told Kitco News on Wednesday. "So it is transitory inflation, but we’re stacked with this massive debt and all it’s done is bump up the stock market and real estate market." "The money has not gone into the economy, that’s the sad part. So the rich get richer, but the poor and middle class are getting poorer. It’s tragic what’s happening today." He added earlier that the "house of cards" is coming down and that real estate would crash with the stock market, while the impact from China’s Evergrande Group implosion would spread to the United States. Evergrande, the second-largest developer in China, is on the brink of bankruptcy with more than $300bn in debt – the most indebted company in the world.

#### Extinction.

Liu '18 [Qian; 11/13/18; Managing Director of Greater China for The Economist Group, previously director of the global economics unit and director of Access China for the Economist Intelligence Unit, PhD in economics from Uppsala University; "The next economic crisis could cause a global conflict. Here's why," <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why/>] Justin

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social, political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a major global military conflict. The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates. But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies. Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment. The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929. As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy. If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war. For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun. To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict. According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels. This is all the more worrying in view of the numerous other factors stoking social unrest and diplomatic tension, including technological disruption, a record-breaking migration crisis, anxiety over globalization, political polarization, and rising nationalism. All are symptoms of failed policies that could turn out to be trigger points for a future crisis. Voters have good reason to be frustrated, but the emotionally appealing populists to whom they are increasingly giving their support are offering ill-advised solutions that will only make matters worse. For example, despite the world’s unprecedented interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed, as countries – most notably, Donald Trump’s US – pursue unilateral, isolationist policies. Meanwhile, proxy wars are raging in Syria and Yemen. Against this background, we must take seriously the possibility that the next economic crisis could lead to a large-scale military confrontation. By the logic of the political scientist Samuel Huntington , considering such a scenario could help us avoid it, because it would force us to take action. In this case, the key will be for policymakers to pursue the structural reforms that they have long promised, while replacing finger-pointing and antagonism with a sensible and respectful global dialogue. The alternative may well be global conflagration.

## Case

### 1NC – Plan Flaw

#### Vote negative on presumption

#### The plan text is “Just governments” but inherency of the 1AC and Indian oppression of dalits proves that India is not a just government so they can’t do the aff

#### Jurisdiction- FBK says we have to debate the topic “A just government ought to recognize workers unconditional right to strike” not your plan text- you violate pre-set rules and is independent voter

### 1NC – AT: Solvency

#### Top Level- there is no 1AC evidence on how a right to strike creates more strikes- missing a key internal link that takes out all of their offense because its predicated on the actions of strikes being good

#### Illegal strikes solve better and aff strikes become water downed and negotiated out by the state- TURNS CASE

Reddy 21 Reddy, Diana (Doctoral Researcher in the Jurisprudence and Social Policy Program at UC Berkeley) “" There Is No Such Thing as an Illegal Strike": Reconceptualizing the Strike in Law and Political Economy." Yale LJF 130 (2021): 421. <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy>

In recent years, consistent with this vision, there has been a shift in the kinds of strikes workers and their organizations engage in—increasingly public-facing, engaged with the community, and capacious in their concerns.[178](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref178) They have transcended the ostensible apoliticism of their forebearers in two ways, less voluntaristic and less economistic. They are less voluntaristic in that they seek to engage and mobilize the broader community in support of labor’s goals, and those goals often include community, if not state, action. They are less economistic in that they draw through lines between workplace-based economic issues and other forms of exploitation and subjugation that have been constructed as “political.” These strikes do not necessarily look like what strikes looked like fifty years ago, and they often skirt—or at times, flatly defy—legal rules. Yet, they have often been successful. Since 2012, tens of thousands of workers in the Fight for $15 movement have engaged in discourse-changing, public law-building strikes. They do not shut down production, and their primary targets are not direct employers. For these reasons, they push the boundaries of exiting labor law.[179](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref179) Still, the risks appear to have been worth it. A 2018 report by the National Employment Law Center found that these strikes had helped twenty-two million low-wage workers win $68 billion in raises, a redistribution of wealth fourteen times greater than the value of the last federal minimum wage increase in 2007.[180](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref180) They have demonstrated the power of strikes to do more than challenge employer behavior. As Kate Andrias has argued: [T]he Fight for $15 . . . reject[s] the notion that unions’ primary role is to negotiate traditional private collective bargaining agreements, with the state playing a neutral mediating and enforcing role. Instead, the movements are seeking to bargain in the public arena: they are engaging in social bargaining with the state on behalf of all workers.”[181](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref181) In the so-called “red state” teacher strikes of 2018, more than a hundred thousand educators in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and other states struck to challenge post-Great Recession austerity measures, which they argued hurt teachers and students, alike.[182](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref182) These strikes were illegal; yet, no penalties were imposed.[183](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref183) Rather, the strikes grew workers’ unions, won meaningful concessions from state governments, and built public support. As noted above, public-sector work stoppages are easier to conceive of as political, even under existing jurisprudential categories.[184](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref184) But these strikes were political in the broader sense as well. Educators worked with parents and students to cultivate support, and they explained how their struggles were connected to the needs of those communities.[185](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref185) Their power was not only in depriving schools of their labor power, but in making normative claims about the value of that labor to the community. Most recently, 2020 saw a flurry of work stoppages in support of the Black Lives Matter movement.[186](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref186) These ranged from Minneapolis bus drivers’ refusal to transport protesters to jail, to Service Employees International Union’s Strike for Black Lives, to the NBA players’ wildcat strike.[187](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref187) Some of these protests violated legal restrictions. The NBA players’ strike for instance, was inconsistent with a “no-strike” clause in their collective-bargaining agreement with the NBA.[188](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref188) And it remains an open question in each case whether workers sought goals that were sufficiently job-related as to constitute protected activity.[189](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref189) Whatever the conclusion under current law, however, striking workers demonstrated in fact the relationship between their workplaces and broader political concerns. The NBA players’ strike was resolved in part through an agreement that NBA arenas would be used as polling places and sites of civic engagement.[190](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref190) Workers withheld their labor in order to insist that private capital be used for public, democratic purposes. And in refusing to transport arrested protestors to jail, Minneapolis bus drivers made claims about their vision for public transport. Collectively, all of these strikes have prompted debates within the labor movement about what a strike is, and what its role should be. These strikes are so outside the bounds of institutionalized categories that public data sources do not always reflect them.[191](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref191) And there is, reportedly, a concern by some union leaders that these strikes do not look like the strikes of the mid-twentieth century. There has been a tendency to dismiss them.[192](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref192) In response, Bill Fletcher Jr., the AFL-CIO’s first Black Education Director, has argued, “People, who wouldn’t call them strikes, aren’t looking at history.”[193](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref193) Fletcher, Jr. analogizes these strikes to the tactics of the civil-rights movement.

#### RECENT TEACHER STRIKES PROVE, ILLEGAL STRIKES ARE MORE EFFECTIVE. THEY DON’T HAVE TO PLAY BY LAWS THAT WATER DOWN EFFICACY

Blanc 20 Blanc, Eric (doctoral candidate in sociology at NYU researching public sector labor organizing) "Breaking the law: Strike bans and labor revitalization in the red state revolt." Labor Studies Journal 45.1 (2020): 74-96.

For decades, labor leaders and sympathetic scholars have put forward a wide array of proposals for reversing the fortunes of the labor movement. Most have sought either to work around draconian legal restrictions or to reform these away through legislative efforts. This paper has examined the early 2018 statewide education strikes to test the feasibility of an alternative path to labor revitalization: illegal strike action. Breaking the law was a central dynamic in the two most successful strikes of the 2018 red state revolt—that is, West Virginia and Arizona. Organizers systematically built up the school-site organization and momentum necessary to enable individual educators to take the risk of participating in an illegal strike. In contrast, Oklahoma’s legal work stoppage floundered, at least in part, because a legal walkout required that teachers rely on the support of their district employers, rather than their own independent organization. In addition, respecting the law undercut the potential for a united walkout of all school employees.

#### Mackay ruling rendered the right to strike useless- employers can legally hire permanent replacements for striking workers- trumps Section 7

Popes 04 Pope, James Gray (Distinguished Professor of Law Emeritus, Rutgers University). "How American workers lost the right to strike, and other tales." Michigan Law Review 103.3 (2004): 518-553.

In NLRB v. Mackay Radio & Telegraph Co., the Supreme Court laid down a dictum that has puzzled legal scholars and vexed unions increasingly over the years.so According to this dictum, an employer enjoys the right permanently to replace workers who strike for better wages and conditions. The dictum is puzzling because the strike is one of those "concerted activities" protected under section 7, and employers are prohibited from discharging or otherwise interfering with, restraining, coercing or discriminating against employees for exercising section 7 rights.s1 Yet the Mackay Court simply asserted the employer right, offering no explanation why strikers -who are admittedly protected against "discharge" -can nevertheless be replaced permanently at the discretion of the employer. The employer's right to hire permanent replacements operates as an unqualified trump over the section 7 right to strike for better conditions and higher wages. The employer need not show any business reason for its exercise (for example, that unless replacements are offered permanent employment the company will be unable to continue operating), and the rule leaves no room for the Board to argue that the impact of permanent replacement on the section 7 right outweighs the employer's interest.s2 Theoretically, an employer violates the Act if it replaces strikers for reasons of anti-union animus. But because animus is virtually impossible to prove (unless the employer is clumsy enough to reveal it in public), the law does nothing to prevent an employer from seizing on the strike as an opportunity to replace union with nonunion workers.s3 In effect, when workers go out on strike, they give the employer a license to discriminate; the employer need only limit itself to (1) "permanently replacing" union workers as opposed to "discharging" them, and (2) discriminating only between strikebreakers and strikers as opposed to discriminating among loyal strikers (as on the facts of Mackay, where the employer targeted active unionists for replacement) or among strikebreakers.

#### NO STRIKE CLAUSES IN UNION CONTRACTS MEAN STRIKES WON’T HAPPEN EVEN IF GOVERNMENTS PERMIT THEM

Hamilton 5-4 HAMILTON NOLAN (labor reporter for In These Times. He has spent the past decade writing about labor and politics for Gawker, Splinter, The Guardian, and elsewhere) 5/4/21, Get Rid of No-Strike Clauses and Stop Begging, https://inthesetimes.com/article/no-strike-clause-labor-peace-union-contracts

Two of the candidates running for president of a 100,000-member public employee union in California, SEIU Local 1000, have a notable plank in their platforms: they want to get no-strike clauses out of their union contracts. They have an uphill battle, in large part because, on this particular issue, the labor movement will tend to act as a rock pulling them down, rather than helping them up. In post WWII America, union contracts work more or less like this: The company guarantees workers certain wages and benefits, and the workers agree to give up their right to strike for the term of the contract. This fundamental agreement — material gains in exchange for labor peace — defines modern labor relations. And where has this arrangement gotten the labor movement? Near death. For decades, union membership has declined, wages have stagnated, and capital has gained more and more power over working people. This devastating collapse in the power of organized labor has coincided with the post ​“Treaty of Detroit” period in which a very dangerous idea was cemented and enshrined as conventional wisdom. That is the idea that employers agree to union contracts in order to purchase labor peace—that the incentive for a company to bargain and sign a contract with its workers is to receive, in turn, a guarantee that those workers will be quiescent.

### 1NC – AT: India

**1] There is no uniqueness or solvency- 1AC Guardian is about protests and coverages not strikes- those are two different things that the aff doesn’t resolve**

**2] Their entire scenario is missing an IL- no 1AC evidence about how lack of journalistic freedom causes indo pak escalation- 1AC Somos is just power tagged and doesn’t make a causal claim**

**3] No solvency- all the 1AC solvency warrants are for engagement, corruption and electoral legitimacy- those are not the warrants within 1AC Singh- it doesn’t resolve free speech, raids on media outlets, etc**

**4] No Solvency- AC evidence doesn’t mention the right to strike or how it would result in an increase in press freedom. Their own evidence proves rights are not enforced by Indian Government**

**5] ARTICLE 19 OF THE INDIAN CONSTITUTION ALREADY ENSURES A RIGHT TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND EXPRESSION. PROVES THE PROBLEM IS ENFORCEMENT NOT THE EXISTENCE OF RIGHTS**

Jain 3-20 Palak Jain (law student) 3/20/21, Right to peaceful protest; an absolute emblem, lifeblood of democracy, Times of India, <https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/readersblog/right-to-write/right-to-peaceful-protest-an-absolute-emblem-lifeblood-of-democracy-30396/>

**Article 19(1)(a) of the Indian constitution “Freedom of speech and expression” is a fundamental right given to its citizen against the state, which includes carrying out the peaceful public demonstration.** During the freedom struggle Indians largely built their foundation for liberation through peaceful protests. In 1915 Gandhi ji introduced satyagraha, a movement firmly based on non-violence resistance and kept truth as its force. And later in years, numerous movements were based on the non-violence-peaceful march, which led to unshackling of Indians “aazadi”. As we know history repeats itself, and all these movements of the past have inspired modern protest profusely and not only in India but worldwide too, either we talk about the current farmers protest or the 2019 CAA protest, all this outcry started peacefully but later at some places and at some point, they weren’t peaceful anymore, there is a thin line between peaceful protest and riots, a-few actions by protesters can turn the tables and one should understand the difference and should not act in alee of its rights. All the fundamental rights are, however, not absolute, one should exercise their rights without curtailing others individual rights. In the case of Mazdoor Kisan Shakti Sangathan v. Union of India, (AIR 2018 SC 3476), National Green Tribunal held that the “right to hold demonstration or protest does not include the right to hold a demonstration at one particular place. Protest at Jantar Mantar road in New Delhi, on the ground of nuisance and causing air and noise pollution to the residents of the area. The supreme court directed to devise a proper mechanism for limited use of the area for such purpose because guarded and regulated peaceful protests would not violate the rights of protestors.” **In the case of Bijoe Emmanuel v. the State of Kerala, (1986)3 SCC 615, “on appeal Supreme court held that there was no law under which their fundamental rights under Article 19(1)(a) could be curtailed. The rights under Article 19(a) can only be regulated by law and on grounds mentioned in the Constitution and not by executive instructions.”** In Romesh Thappar v. State of Madras (AIR 1950 SC 124), the court held that until it’s not hampering the security of the state, it would be unconstitutional to restrain an individual from its rights under Article 19(1)(a). Right to protest v. Convenience of the Public, On October 7, 2020, Supreme Court held that ‘it is important to concede the democratic polity comes with the right to protest and express dissent. However, public places cannot be occupied for an indefinite period of time.’ Calcutta High Court on 12th January 2021 observed that “a balance has to be struck between the rights of petitioners and public order as well as security, in view of the stipulations in Article 19 of the Constitution of India itself. **In precise, all the cases are judged on their own virtue and over the year’s courts have widened the scope of freedom of speech and expression. There is no widespread or accurate or conventional standard that can be considered but reasonable restrictions mentioned in the constitution (Article 19(2) – Article 19(6)) can only monitor the law.**

### 1NC – AT: Corruption Reduction

#### Concentration of power is good---anything else collapses union leverage---empirics.

Magner 20 [Brandon; Deputy Prosecutor at Marion County Prosecutor's Office; “Labor Law and Corporate Concentration,” 11/22/20; LaborLawLite; <https://brandonmagner.substack.com/p/labor-law-and-corporate-concentration>] Justin

On the side favoring increased centralization in the labor market is usually Matt Bruenig. Bruenig argues that dispersing corporate power also disperses union leverage, as unions can only exert maximum pressure on an industry when strikes affect the core of production. This is harder to do when the labor market is spread out across a series of smaller and less powerful firms. Organizing thus becomes a game of whack-a-mole under the National Labor Relations Act’s model of facility-specific [enterprise bargaining](https://americancompass.org/discussions/the-wagner-acts-original-sin/).

There is a historic attractiveness to Bruenig’s argument. Arguably the most famous concerted job action in American history, the Flint Sit-Down Strike at General Motors, involved a few thousand workers bringing the largest and most powerful employer in the world to a grinding halt by ceasing production in merely one of the company’s several hundred plants. GM eventually capitulated and signed a labor agreement that officially birthed the UAW. (Ironically, this act of union recognition by GM would likely be considered illegal under [today’s interpretations](https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/366/731/) of the NLRA, as there was n ever any showing by the UAW that it actually represented anything close to a majority of GM’s 136,000 workers.)

### 1NC – AT: Civic Engagement

#### There are study weaknesses – evidence fails to consider alternate causes and overestimates effects.

Ahlquist 17 [John; School of Global Policy and Strategy, University of California San Diego; “Labor Unions, Political Representation, and Economic Inequality,” 3/9/17; AnnualReviews; https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051215-023225] Justin

There are two notable weaknesses in existing work on unions and the union vote premium. First, although we have robust regression-controlled comparisons yielding consistent estimates in the neighborhood of 5–10%, the literature has not yet settled on a clearly defined counterfactual scenario of interest. Some possibilities include:

1. What is the effect on an individual’s decision to vote if the establishment where she works becomes unionized?

2. What is the effect on the turnout decision of one member of a household if another household member takes a union job?

3. What is the effect of an additional year as a union member on an individual’s decision to vote?

4. What is the effect on overall turnout of a change in the level of unionization?

Each is an important question with different underlying causal mechanisms highlighting the fact that unions’ political activities likely affect the voting decisions of both union members and nonmembers. Research design challenges are nontrivial. For example, at the macro level, declining unionization is associated with greater economic inequality, which is, in turn, linked to reduced turnout in the lower half of the income distribution (Iversen & Soskice 2015b). But this relationship appears conditional on electoral institutions and the structure of the party system (Anderson & Beramendi 2012), which may itself be a (complicated) function of historical levels of union strength (Huber & Stephens 2001).

Second, all the work linking union membership and turnout relies on survey respondent selfreports. It is well known that more educated, higher-income, more partisan, and more politically engaged survey respondents are more likely to overreport having voted, which can lead to erroneous descriptions of the electorate (Karp & Brockington 2005, Ansolabehere & Hersh 2012). Given findings connecting union membership to political knowledge, engagement, and norms of participation, it seems plausible that the reported union turnout effect could be overstated, perhaps significantly so. Resolution of this issue awaits further research and micro-level data linking validated voting to union membership (ideally, also validated).

### 1NC – Democracy Turn

#### Strikes inhibit democratization and aren’t enough to induce transition – your evidence is overly optimistic.

Ahlquist 17 [John; School of Global Policy and Strategy, University of California San Diego; “Labor Unions, Political Representation, and Economic Inequality,” 3/9/17; AnnualReviews; https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051215-023225] Justin

But strikes and union alliances are almost never sufficient to induce a regime transition on their own. Unions, even if successful at mobilizing workers under authoritarian systems or as voters, are not always prodemocratic elements (Valenzuela 1989, Levitsky & Mainwaring 2006). Unions deeply incorporated into populist or Marxist parties can end up inhibiting democratization, even when independent labor organizations are pushing in the opposite direction (Levitsky 2001). Union leaders, when insulated from rank-and-file pressure, can become co-opted by parties or even criminal elements. Whether unions are part of pro- or antidemocratic coalitions can vary across cases and across unions within a country, depending on the instrumental benefits offered to union leaders and members as well as the expected outcomes under different regime types.

### 1NC- AT: Climate

#### The democracy IL means other countries can fill in- no India key evidence- and their only democracy UQ is India specific

#### Climate strikes aren’t sufficient to reduce reliance on fuels.

Hayes 19 [Jason; Contributor to The Hill, director of environmental policy at the Mackinac Center for Public Policy, a research and education institute in Midland, Mich; “A global climate strike isn't enough,” The Hill; 9/19/19; <https://thehill.com/opinion/energy-environment/461809-a-global-climate-strike-isnt-enough>] Justin

A collective of influential green groups and corporations is supporting a campaign for a global climate strike from Sept. 20-27. The strike pushes young people to walk out of schools and workplaces to protest the energy sources that keep us alive and thriving. That many people are concerned about the global climate is obvious, but how will encouraging them to abandon their jobs or schools for a day or two, or seven, reduce greenhouse gas emissions?

The campaign website — globalclimatestrike.net — tells people they must “demand an end to the age of fossil fuels.” But, in the United States, we rely on these fuels for over 80 percent of the energy we use to provide basic necessities such as food, clean water, heating and air conditioning, medicine, transportation and so much more.

To make things worse, the energy sources offered up as replacements for fossil fuels — typically wind and solar — couldn’t even exist without fossil fuels. Natural gas, oil and coal are needed to mine, refine, process and ship the metals, rare earth minerals, silicone, plastics and various chemicals that go into renewables. Without steel, there are no towers to hold up wind turbines. Without rare earths, there are no solar panels. Adding to this conundrum is the fact that wind and solar cannot provide reliable power. They are intermittent, meaning they must be propped up by more reliable energy sources, such as natural gas.

A group of environmental policy experts has put together MyClimatePledge.com as our response, because we’d like to challenge climate strikers and to help them appreciate that striking won’t be enough.

#### Climate strikers don’t have enough leverage.

Dolsak and Prakash 19 [Nives and Aseem; We write on environmental issues, climate politics and NGOs; “Climate Strikes: What They Accomplish And How They Could Have More Impact,” 9/14/19; Forbes; <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/09/14/climate-strikes-what-they-accomplish-and-how-they-could-have-more-impact/?sh=2244a9bd5eed>] Justin

But strikers must have the leverage to accomplish their goals

Strikers represent the demand for climate action. But who will supply these policies and what leverage do strikers have over these policymakers? This is where climate strikes could run into a problem.

Strikers have leverage when their absence from work disrupts activities that are valuable to policymakers. If railway workers go on strike, trains cannot run and the public is upset. When airline pilots go on strike, people cannot fly, and airlines lose revenue. By some accounts, the 48-hour strike of British Airways pilots (regarding a pay dispute) in September 2019 will cost the company about £100 million.

What leverage do the climate strikers have? Assuming most of the strikers are students, what costs might their strikes impose on the actors that need to change their climate policies (namely, governments and fossil fuel firms)?

Student strikes probably do not disrupt the government or fossil fuel firms. The main bearer of these costs are the conscientious teachers who need to figure out how they are going to make up for the lost teaching time.

#### Climate strikes cause governments to shift blame---that stalls effective climate action.

Evenson 19 [Darrick; Teachings lie in the broad area of environmental politics and governance. He is particularly focused on energy policy, both at domestic and international/global scales. Much of his research examines the public as a non-state actor in environmental and energy policy debates. He investigates public perceptions, preferences, and public actions taken in response to environmental issues and policy decisions; “Students’ climate strikes: **Right goals but wrong words**,” EURACTV; 5/7/19; <https://www.euractiv.com/section/energy-environment/opinion/students-climate-strikes-right-goals-but-wrong-words/>] Justin

Whilst I have great respect for Thunberg and her compatriots in the social movement, this message is problematic for several reasons.

Above all, science describes what is; it cannot directly indicate what should be. Science at most is a point of departure for the normative thought necessary to make decisions about climate policy. The science has been clear for some time that horrible things will happen due to climate change and that the effects of climate change pose huge risks to infrastructure, livelihoods, economies, and lives across the world (with the scientific predictions increasing in severity over time). Nevertheless, being more aware does not solve the problem of action. In contrast to Thunberg’s remarks about the need for more education, this is not a problem of knowledge, but one of values.

Highly developed nations can point to accelerating emissions growth in developing economies – a critique to imply developing nations need to undertake substantial mitigation. Those developing nations can invoke historical emissions in industrialised countries – an unparalleled legacy of pollution. We can pontificate over total carbon emissions, per capita emissions, rate of emissions increase, etc. Each accounting approach has implications for who is most responsible to act.

The dialectic between the ‘global north’ and ‘global south’ has been readily observable since at least the first major international environmental negotiation – the Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm (1972).

Listening to the science may affirm that something needs to be done on climate change mitigation, but it is far from clear that it makes leaders think they need to do more themselves (save those leaders who already thought this anyway). Listening to the science might just confirm that other actors are being irresponsible and not carrying their own weight in mitigation of climate-causing emissions.

### 1NC- AT: IndoPak War

#### 4] No war: India’s NFU and Pakistan has no incentive- is emprically proven

**Herrera 19**, Jack. “Could the Conflict Between Pakistan and India Lead to Nuclear War?” Pacific Standard, 27 Feb. 2019, psmag.com/news/could-the-conflict-between-pakistan-and-india-lead-to-nuclear-war. SJCP//JG

Does that mean the current conflict between Pakistan and India could escalate into a nuclear confrontation? Commentators regard that possibility as unlikely. Pakistan first began developing nuclear weapons in response to its humiliating loss of territory in 1971. Thus far, the current conflict with India does not appear to be a land grab, which suggests Pakistan does not have reason to engage its nuclear option. "To be clear, escalating tensions to the point of nuclear conflict would be catastrophic for both India and Pakistan and would destabilize the entire region—an option unlikely to be taken by either New Delhi or Islamabad," Saheli Roy Choudhury wrote for [CNBC](https://www.cnbc.com/2019/02/27/india-pakistan-air-strike-claims-what-you-need-to-know.html) on Wednesday. History bolsters Choudhury's analysis. In 1999, Pakistan and India became the first nuclear powers ever to engage in direct war with each others' forces. On the ice of the Kargil Glacier, nestled nine miles above sea level between Himalayan peaks, Pakistani soldiers, initially disguised as a Kashmiri militants, exchanged fire with Indian soldiers. The high-altitude fighting only lasted two months before the two sides agreed to de-escalate.

### 1NC – AT: Unions

#### 1] None of their offense is India specific- which is the only impact scenario they have read- 1AC Rhomberg is contextual to the US, and 1AC Nussbaum Europe and America specific- means that India unions are either fine now and not affected by the plan

#### 2] Its NUQ- union membership in India is at record levels- o/w their evidence on specificity and recency

Anner 7-15 Anner, M. S., 7-15-2021, "Turning the tide? Economic reforms and union revival in India," Wiley Online Library, https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/irj.12340

Data from Table [1](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/irj.12340#irj12340-tbl-0001) suggest that aggregate union membership of just five national trade union federations combined has increased nearly four times from around 20 million in 2008 to about 79 million workers in 2013. The largest increase has been recorded by the INTUC union federation affiliated to the Congress Party, which governed the country and several federal states for over five decades since independence and lost power to BJP in May 2014 general elections. The BMS affiliated to the BJP has recorded nearly three times increase in its national membership levels during this period. The socialist and communist trade union federations too have reported a significant rise in their membership levels from 2008 to 2013. For instance, Communist Party of India affiliated to AITUC has recorded a fourfold rise in its national membership during this period. Thus, if the aggregate union membership in 2013 was estimated to be around 100 million workers, then the five major national union federations by themselves account for nearly 80% of this gross membership. The National Front of Indian Trade Unions reports its membership to be 15.59 million (<https://nfitu.org/strength/>). Other national but smaller union federations too have reported substantial union membership levels in 2013. For instance, the United Trade Union Centre (4.7 million workers), Trade Union Co-ordination Centre (1.6 million workers), Self-Employed Women's Association (1.4 million workers), All India Central Council of Trade Unions (2.5 million workers) and Confederation of Free Trade Unions of India (1.8 million workers). The trade union membership figures reported by the national union federations for 2013 are until to date unverified by the Ministry of Labour and Employment. We interviewed senior officials from the ministry who confirmed that the verification process has been suspended until further notice due to objections raised by some national unions about the verification process. Table [2](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/irj.12340#irj12340-tbl-0002) shows our calculations of worker population and trade union membership from 1993–1994 to 2011–2012 from NSS samples and figures adjusted to the total census population. Our calculations suggest that aggregate trade union membership in India has indeed increased from about 55.4 million in 1993–1994 to 73.5 million in 2011–2012. Thus, our estimates of union membership growth though lower than those claimed by the union federations broadly support their claims and show a rising trajectory. It is important to note however that the NSS data only allow us to estimate Net Union Density and not Gross Union Density. Consequently, it only includes those union members that are employed. As rightly pointed out by Eurofound ([n.d](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/irj.12340#irj12340-bib-0022).), ‘Gross trade union density rates, on the other hand, consider all union members, irrespective of whether they are active in the labour market. As such, net and gross trade union density rates provide different information: while the net union density rate constitutes a more accurate approach in terms of the actual power and representation of trade unions in the workforce, the gross union density rate provides information about trade unions' representation in society’. Thus, it may well be that the NSS data underestimate the societal presence and political influence of trade unions in India. Anti-union strategies of management to prevent workers from joining unions with threats of retaliation and violence are also likely to underplay union membership below the actual societal support for unions in India (International Trade Union Confederation [ITUC], [2020](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/irj.12340#irj12340-bib-0033)). During interviews, this was pointed out by a number of senior trade union officials from the HMS, CITU, AITUC and INTUC. They highlighted the fact that large-scale redundancies in the public and private sectors under false pretext of ‘voluntary retirement schemes’ had dented aggregate union membership in the late 1990s and early 2000s. However, several unions made concerted efforts to retain union membership of workers who were essentially forced to ‘retire’. These members were supported through subsidized access to medical care, financial support through union funds in case of family emergencies, educational support for children of union members, help with retraining and securing grants or subsidized loans through various government schemes. These interventions had helped Indian trade unions to retain membership of a large number of workers who had lost their jobs during economic reforms. Union officials also highlighted the political influence they had over federal governments with respect to social security and retraining provisions for displaced workers (see Gordon, [2015](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/irj.12340#irj12340-bib-0027)). Some analysts suggest that overall union membership levels in India are likely to be under-reported for at least two reasons. First, the Ministry of Labour and Employment figures indicate that only 21.9% of registered trade unions in India submitted their returns in 2013. Most of these unions are affiliated to national political parties and their labour federations. There are a large number of politically independent (non-affiliated) unions in India who are irregular in submitting their returns to the state agencies. Second, there are estimated to be several hundred unions in India representing sections of the workforce officially classified as the ‘scheduled castes and scheduled tribes’ (SC/ST). These are individuals commonly referred to as ‘Dalits’ who belong to the lower castes among Hindus (the majority religious group in India) and have been historically discriminated against in education and employment. Most of these SC/ST unions are not registered under the Trade Unions Act but under the Societies Registration Act and are officially known as ‘associations’ of SC/ST workers. During interviews, senior Labour Commission officials from six industrialized states confirmed that there are no restrictions on SC/ST workers of any occupational category or industry sectors to register their organization as ‘charities’ under the Societies Registration Act and in fact the state labour commissions are encouraging such caste-based workers organizations to register as trade unions. Although some caste-based organizations of SC/ST workers have registered themselves as trade unions in the construction, garment sector, retail and hospitality industries, their numbers remain small and there is no central register of caste-based trade unions at either the federal or central level. For all purposes though, caste-based workers organizations are involved in collective bargaining with employers on issues such as recruitment, promotions, transfers, working hours, health and safety, and pay agreements and also represent members on individual disputes often relating to workplace discrimination. For instance, the SC/ST association in the State Bank of India, the largest public sector bank, represents around 80,000 members but is not a registered trade union. It has representation on the joint negotiating committee with other trade unions in the bank (Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India, [2017](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/irj.12340#irj12340-bib-0045); Ray, [2015](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/irj.12340#irj12340-bib-0056); Saravade, [2001](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/irj.12340#irj12340-bib-0058)).

#### 3] No link- 1AC Hertel-Fernandez is about public support for unions not actual increased unionization- those are two different things- it literally says “teaches noninvolved members” which are people who can’t unionize

#### 4] No internal link- even if they win why strikes cause more strikes- they haven’t warranted why that causes increased unionization

#### 5] Don’t let them access the stock markets impact- 1AC Hindrey is about wages not the stock market whih is a key internal link to recession