### Framework

#### I value morality as per the word ought in the resolution denoting moral obligation.

#### The value criterion is minimizing structural violence

#### Prefer:

#### Effective politics must orient themselves towards action and solving suffering in front of us.

Sawchuk 02 Kim, PhD, Social and Political Thought, York University, prof of comm at Concordia, editor of the Canadian Journal of Communication, general book review of Distant Suffering by Luc Boltanski, Canadian journal of Communication Vol 27, No 1 (2002)

Inherent in the politics of pity in the modern period is the problem of dealing with suffering from a distance and the "massification of a collection of unfortunates who are not there in person" (p. 13). Although contemporary media may have "dramatized" the spectacle of distant suffering in the past 30 years, they neither invented nor caused this condition. Historical examples also bolster Boltanski's claim that the media did not inaugurate the politics of pity - rather, its logic was set out more than 200 years ago. Boltanski carefully examines this logic and the paradoxes it creates in the book's three sections. Part 1 lays out the argument. Part 2 relies heavily on literary sources to analyze the "topos," a term he borrows from rhetoric, of the idea of pity and suffering. The third section deals with the question of pity and misfortune, drawing primarily on historical and contemporary examples, such as the work of Doctors Without Borders and the clash in the late 1950s between Sartre and Merleau-Ponty. Each chapter is replete with insight, making this a difficult book to summarize. Every word and every argument is so intricately intertwined with the next that paraphrasing seems a travesty.¶ The third section should be of interest to those located in the disciplines of communications or media studies. Here it is important to recall the subtitle of the book, Morality, the Media and Politics. Boltanski returns to the question of the spectator and the anxieties of those who wish to do something about what they see unfolding on their screens. He asks: "[H]ow might the contemporary spectators' anxiety be reduced without averting their gaze from misfortune or by abandoning the project inherent in the modern definition of politics of facing up to unnecessary suffering and relieving it[?]" (p. 159). What could political action be, given the fact that suffering does occur at a distance and that not every struggle can be taken on with equal commitment? First, he argues that there is a political, technical, and moral necessity to open up a discussion of commitment and ideology, although what he means by ideology is not adequately explained. Second, he contends that witnessing suffering means that morally we are asked to act. Commitment is commitment to some kind of action. Third, he promotes the idea that speech is action. "One can commit oneself through speech; by taking a stance, even when alone, of someone who speaks to somebody else about what they have seen" (p. xv). By speaking - to others and even to oneself - we recognize and acknowledge that speech must be understood as a form of action (p. 154).¶ One of the conditions of Boltanski's argument is a clear distinction between the world of representation and the world of action. He writes: "Informed by representation, words must really be deployed in the world of action in order to be effective" (p. 154). He is critical of deconstructionist criticism, primarily meaning the writings of Jean Baudrillard, which blurs this distinction to too great an extreme, thereby "holding the order of action" at arm's length or making it illusionary (p. 154). He contends that this position makes the very intention to act nothing but a naïve illusion creating an "empire of suspicion" (p. 158). Boltanski does not claim that we remain without an emotional commitment to causes, but rather that "to prevent the unacceptable drift of emotions close towards the fictional we must maintain an orientation towards action, a disposition to act, even if this is only by speaking out in support of the unfortunate" (p. 153).¶ What then are the properties of effective speech? Boltanski turns to phenomenology and semantics, concluding that effective speech involves: (a) intentionality; (b) incorporation in bodily gestures and movements; (c) sacrifice of other possible actions; (d) the presence of others; and, (e) a commitment (p. 185). Intentionality involves an intention to speak meaningfully, not just engage in idle chatter. Action and intention are connected to each other in effective action realized in the world. Intention incorporated in action is "expression." This kind of expressive political speech must involve risk for spectators - they may be chastized, they may be contested, or they may be at physical risk in authoritarian regimes. Boltanski goes on to classify different types of action as strong and weak, collective and individual. He builds an argument for local chapters of groups supporting humanitarian movements, such as Amnesty International, for they enable one to avoid the alternative of either on-the-spot involvement or distant spectacle. They are one way to breach the schism between abstract universalism and communitarian withdrawal: "The humanitarian claim for more or less distant causes can thus avoid the alternative of abstract universalism - easily accused of being fired up for distant suffering the better to avert its eyes from those close at hand - or of communitarian withdrawal into itself - which only attends to misfortune when it affects those nearest - by being rooted in groups and thereby linked to preexisting solidarities and local interests" (p. 190). In other words, expression is most "authentic" for Boltanski when made manifest in actions, like participating in a demonstration or protest, which incarnates our beliefs and displays our commitments. By incorporating an action, the person communicates an observable tendency.¶ But is this enough? Boltanski is concerned by apathy and asks us to consider that we are doomed, inevitably, to imperfection in our politics. Despite this, we must make the attempt to be "moral subjects" - that is, committed and engaged subjects. Because he recognizes the difficulties of negotiating these contradictions, he avoids moralizing. He is no Habermasian trying to outline the conditions for an ideal-speech situation. In Boltanski's book, we live in imperfect worlds and we must contend with this. He asks that we resurrect compassion into our politics, which he says is always particular and practical, as it is oriented toward doing something about a situation. Unlike pity, it engages with the person suffering. But pity isn't always a bad thing in this analysis. Pity generalizes in order to deal with distance, and in so doing one may discover emotion and feeling for others that may translate into speech or action. A spectacle of suffering may end with a commitment to involvement.¶ Boltanski realizes the challenge, yet remains optimistic that humans are capable of such a move. There are, as he notes, an "excess of unfortunates" in our world. The problem remains to whom we extend aid or pity, given their great numbers (p. 155). This is true both in the realm of action, but also in the realm of representation. So many people are suffering and there is not enough media space for them all (p. 155). Boltanski does not prioritize causes or instances of grief. He does, however, suggest that the media represent any unfortunate groups taking action to confront and escape their distress. It is unethical to only depict them in the passive act of suffering (p. 190). He acknowledges that the mediatization of suffering may incite action. For example, it may protect populations against their own rulers, if only temporarily, for such depictions do not necessarily change the internal political situation. His analysis assumes that spectators, who are democratic citizens, have a role to play in lobbying and pressuring their own governments to take action (p. 184). Again, while aware that public opinion may be manipulated, he argues that public-opinion polls are powerful tools. Answering a poll is depicted as a potentially effective form of speech and an "adequate response to the call for action" (p. 185).¶ Distant Suffering thus describes, in sometimes painful detail, a wavering between selfish egoism and altruistic commitment to causes. Boltanski describes how we may, unfortunately, cultivate ourselves by becoming absorbed in our own pity when looking at the spectacle of someone else's suffering, a phenomenon that has been far too present since the September 11 bombing of the World Trade Center in New York. Boltanski tries to lead us out of this self-absorption into the world of effective political action by offering a range of involvement. While advocating commitment and debates about morality as part of the solution, this is no smug celebration of the "return to kindness" or an easy denunciation of the perverse delight of spectacles of suffering. In considering distant suffering as the "logical consequence" of the introduction of pity into politics over 200 years ago, we are asked to concern ourselves with the present.¶ Boltanski ends his fine treatise by exhorting us to quit looking to past injustices, to stop anticipating future injustice, and to stay focused on the present. "To be concerned with the present is no small matter. For over the past, ever gone by, and over the future, still non-existent, the present has an overwhelming privilege: that of being real" (p. 192). Naive? Perhaps. Boltanski does not provide simple or quick answers to the dilemma, but leaves one with the hope that pity might lead to compassion, commitment, and social change - even if such measures do not end all suffering once and for all. As such, this translation from the original French

### Advocacy

#### ****I affirm: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.****

### Contention 1 – Marginalized Groups

#### Marginalized groups continue to be exploited in the status quo

**Roth 20** [Kenneth Roth, 5-31-2020, "World Report 2021: Rights Trends in United States," Human Rights Watch, <https://www.hrw.org/world-report/2021/country-chapters/united-states>] // VS

Racial Justice The Covid-19 pandemic has had a disproportionate impact on racial and ethnic minorities, primarily Black, Latinx, and Native communities, which faced increased risk for infection, serious illness, and death from the disease, as well as severe economic impacts. These disparities are linked to longstanding inequities in health outcomes and access to care, education, employment, and economic status. Some localities and the state of California recognized that these disparities are connected to the legacy of slavery and considered various forms of reparations to address them. At the federal level, HR 40, a bill in Congress proposing the establishment of a commission to investigate slavery’s legacy and create reparations proposals, gained unprecedented momentum, with 170 co-sponsors in the House of Representatives and 20 co-sponsors in the Senate as of November. In May, Human Rights Watch urged state and local authorities in Tulsa, Oklahoma, to provide reparations to descendants and the remaining survivors of the 1921 Tulsa Race Massacre, in which a white mob killed several hundred Black people and destroyed an affluent Black neighborhood. Thousands of people of Asian descent reported incidents of attacks and racial discrimination after the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic. President Donald Trump repeatedly described the virus using racist language. Poverty and Inequality The Covid-19 pandemic exacerbated poverty and inequality in the United States, and disproportionately affected Black, Latinx, and Native communities. The pandemic and public health measures necessary to slow its spread resulted in lost wages or jobs, reduced health coverage, and reduced access to other essential goods and services. People of color—particularly women and immigrants—continued to be over-represented in low-wage service jobs, putting them at greater risk. Many, particularly in agriculture and food production, faced unsafe working conditions leading to outbreaks. Increased unemployment protection and direct payments in relief packages that Congress passed significantly stemmed poverty rate growth. However, many protections expired in July and August. The relief bills lacked protections for those unable to pay bills or medical care costs, and excluded certain workers, including immigrants. The administration continued to undermine consumer protections against predatory lenders and abusive debt collectors. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau gutted a rule seeking to prevent small lenders—including so-called payday lenders—from charging exorbitant interest rates. California voters passed a ballot initiative sponsored by app-based companies stripping app-based rideshare and delivery drivers of the minimum wage, paid sick leave, and other critical labor protections provided by a state law passed in 2019, setting a dangerous precedent for workers’ rights in the US and globally.

#### Unions help to raise wages, increase the chance of health insurance and retirement plans, and aid in the development of long-term wealth for marginalized groups.

**Spievack, ‘19** [Natalie Spievack is a research analyst in the Income and Benefits Policy Center at the Urban Institute, Published: 2/1/2019, “Can labor unions help close the black-white wage gap?”, Urban Institute, <https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/can-labor-unions-help-close-black-white-wage-gap>] // VS

The steep decline in unionization rates among workers of all racial and ethnic groups over the past four decades has occurred in tandem with rising racial wage inequality. In 1983, 31.7 percent of black workers and 23.3 percent of the entire workforce were unionized. In 2017, those numbers had fallen to 12.6 percent and 10.7 percent, respectively (largely because of global competition, deindustrialization, and the passage of right-to-work laws in several states). Meanwhile, from 1979 to 2016, average hourly earnings of black men in the US fell from 80 percent of white male earnings to 70 percent of white male earnings. For black women, average earnings fell from near parity with white women to 82 percent of white female earnings. Strong unions play a role in the racial wage gap largely because of black workers’ overrepresentation in labor market sectors that have higher rates of union membership. Union jobs pay, on average, 16.4 percent higher wages than do nonunion jobs because of workers’ ability to bargain collectively for higher pay, more transparent hiring and promotion policies, and heavier regulation of grievance procedures. Recent research also finds that union membership delivers a larger wage premium to black workers than to white workers. Hourly wages for black union workers are 14.7 percent higher than those of their nonunion counterparts, while white unionized workers make 9.6 percent higher hourly wages than do nonunionized white workers. The impact of increased unionization on racial equality could extend beyond hourly wage increases. A 2016 study found that black union workers are 17.4 percentage points more likely than nonunion workers to have employer-provided health insurance and 18.3 percentage points more likely to have an employer-sponsored retirement plan, advantages that are even greater among workers with no high school degree. Higher union membership also narrows the racial wealth gap by supplying a larger wealth dividendto nonwhite workers than to white workers. The increase in earnings, benefits, and employment stability afforded by union membership translates to a higher likelihood of homeownership and larger contributions to 401(k) plans. Between 2010 and 2016, the median wealth of nonwhite union members was nearly five times greater than that of their nonunion counterparts, while the median wealth of white union members was only 39 percent greater than that of white nonunion workers. Research and history provide a compelling case for the role of strong unions in furthering economic progress for African Americans and in reducing economic inequality among all Americans. That’s why conversations about the importance of unions should be not only class based but racially conscious.

#### Continued exploitation of marginalized groups leads to higher rates of mortality, death, and structural violence among these groups

**Aldridge, Story, Hwange 05** [Aldridge RW, Story A, Hwang SW. et al, 1-1-2005, "Morbidity and mortality in homeless individuals, prisoners, sex workers, and individuals with substance use disorders in high-income countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis," Lancet, <https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(17)31869-X/fulltext>] // VS

The excess mortality associated with considerable social exclusion (marginalized groups) is extreme. We found all-cause mortality SMRs (standardised mortality ratios) of 7·9 in male individuals and 11·9 in female individuals. By comparison, mortality rates for individuals aged 15–64 years in the most deprived areas of England and Wales are 2·8 times higher than those in the least deprived areas for male individuals and 2·1 times higher for female individuals.56 The relative excesses were greatest for injury, poisoning, and external causes, but extend across almost all health conditions and across the inclusion health populations that we studied. The available body of evidence is largest for infectious diseases, with a substantial amount of existing research on morbidity associated with mental and behavioural disorders. By contrast, evidence on non-communicable diseases and injury, poisoning, and external causes is scarce despite these causes having the highest SMRs across ICD-10 categories in our study. SMRs across disease categories were consistently higher in female than male individuals. Of the four inclusion health populations considered, sex workers were the least well investigated, which should be addressed as a matter of priority in future research. Our study comprehensively describes for the first time, to our knowledge, the relative mortality and morbidity burden in selected inclusion health populations. We have reviewed the existing literature in this area using a comprehensive search strategy to identify the balance of evidence available to inform policy making around inclusion health. Data were extracted and reviewed by a second author to reduce the likelihood of errors. Our approach enabled the identification of relative gaps in both categories of disease and inclusion health categories. Our analysis was informed by an intersectionality perspective, which focuses on how social characteristics in combination affect health.7, 57 We have therefore specifically investigated how the health consequences of exclusion might vary as a result of other socially influenced characteristics, with differences between sexes being particularly noteworthy. However, several limitations should be considered. Caution must be taken when interpreting the summary estimates because of the heterogeneity of studies. The absence of internationally agreed definitions of inclusion health groups is likely to explain some of this variation. Similarly, comparison groups varied, with some studies using the general population and others using groups living in socially deprived areas. Studies also varied according to the extent of adjustment for social deprivation and other risk factors. We used a random-effects method and noted the recommendations58 that meta-analyses should be pursued whenever possible, acknowledging heterogeneity. We limited our search to articles published from 2005 onwards and therefore we have not examined longer-term trends. Furthermore, for pragmatic reasons, we were unable to investigate other health inclusion groups and believe that further work is needed to describe their health experiences. We found that the SMRs were consistently higher for female than male individuals. Because general population mortality rates are lower in female individuals than male individuals for most conditions, this result does not necessarily indicate that outcomes were worse in female inclusion health groups than in male groups. These results might reflect an increased vulnerability of women in inclusion health populations or different risk distributions among female individuals and male individuals in inclusion health groups. SMRs are a relative measure, and the lower (but still greater than 1) SMRs for more common diseases such as cardiovascular disease and cancer than for other conditions might underplay the number of excess cases of mortality that occurred as a result of these conditions. Conversely, high SMRs might not indicate a large number of excess deaths if the condition is rare. Further work should report absolute as well as relative measures of mortality. These extreme inequities demand an intensive cross-sectoral policy and service response to prevent exclusion and improve health outcomes. An accompanying Review,1 published in The Lancet outlines interventions that respond to these increases in morbidity and mortality. Determining the burden of disease remains challenging in inclusion health populations because membership of such populations is not recorded in most vital registration and health information systems. Deaths and health service use in excluded populations are therefore largely invisible and neglected aspects of routine statistics. By contrast, the availability of area-based measures of social deprivation across high-income countries has allowed the impact of less extreme social inequalities to be measured at the major population level. The outcomes of these measurements have supported extensive cross-sectoral policy initiatives to address these inequities.59 Better routine data is also needed to drive the policy response to the inclusion health agenda. Two broad potential approaches are available to address this problem. First, health services could routinely record membership of health inclusion groups. This would require agreed definitions of each group. Individuals responsible for recording data would need guidance to help them ascertain membership and avoid reinforcement of stigma.60 The feasibility of this approach outside of specialist services remains unclear. Alternatively, and more feasibly in the short term, data linkage methods could be used to match data from services that work with inclusion health groups, with vital registration data, electronic health records, and existing disease surveillance systems.61 Data linkage has been the primary method used to estimate SMRs in the studies reported in this Article. These linked datasets would facilitate systematic estimates of mortality and morbidity over time and help to measure the effect of interventions. To inform the content of this Article and the accompanying Review1 we held an engagement workshop with 16 people with experience of homelessness and social exclusion. We asked this group about their views on collecting operational data with ethical and appropriate research governance approvals, but without specific individual level consent. Although this sample was only small (and we acknowledge that people who face exclusion and are willing to attend a workshop might differ from those who do not), acceptability of collection of this sort of data was extremely high. 13 (100%) of 13 participants were happy for homeless hostel records to be collected, eight (73%) of 11 agreed to the collection of criminal records, eight (62%) of 13 to health records, and 11 (85%) of 13 to these records being linked together. A vertical approach to tackling inclusion health (ie, one that focuses on specific diseases or specific risk groups) can overlook multimorbidity and the social issues faced by excluded populations.62 This approach can result in inefficiencies and missed opportunities for prevention, early diagnosis, and management, and missed opportunities for mitigation of social risk factors. The emerging field of inclusion health should advocate for and deliver joined up health and social services for overlapping marginalised groups. These services should address not only diseases with extreme disparities, but also prevention and management of more common conditions with a lower relative risk but high excess mortality, such as cardiovascular disease. The ability of health and social policy to address the needs of the most marginalised populations should be a key indicator of quality. Such initiatives need to be supported by information systems that can provide data for continuing advocacy, guide service development, and monitor the health of marginalised populations over time. Our study highlights an extreme health inequity that persists in high-income countries. An inclusion health policy response must build on the evidence regarding who is at risk and the events that trigger exclusion to highlight the social and economic benefits of sustained action to prevent social exclusion.

### Contention 2 – Income Inequality

#### Union membership is down despite strikes - failure to allow workers to strike means the status quo can’t solve Rosenberg 20 <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2020/01/22/workers-are-fired-up-union-participation-is-still-decline-new-statistics-show/>

In a year when teachers and autoworkers mounted lengthy strikes, **participation in labor unions** in 2019 **continued their** decades-long **decline**. Union membership in the American workforce was down to 10.3 percent from 10.5 percent in 2018, according to statistics released Wednesday by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The continued slide shows how **energy and momentum around the labor movement** **is not translating into equivalent growth for unions, whose memberships have fallen sharply** as a percentage of the U.S. workforce over the past roughly 40 years. In 1983, unions represented about 1 out of 5 workers; now it’s 1 in 10 workers. “They’re disappointing numbers for workers and unions,” said Professor Joseph McCartin, the executive director of the Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor at Georgetown University. “The expansion of the labor market in 2019 didn’t produce a proportional expansion in union members. Unions would have hoped to make gains in the course of the past year and they didn’t.” The number of total union members — 14.6 million — is relatively unchanged from 2018. But in a robust jobs market, the number of union workers added has not been enough to replace those who retired or left the workforce. The drop in union representation in the workforce is sobering news for the labor movement, which otherwise saw an eventful year. Major strikes including grocery workers in the Northeast, teachers in cities such as Chicago and Little Rock, Ark., and autoworkers around the country attracted public attention and became a crucial stop for 2020 candidates on the campaign trail. The 47,000 General Motors workers who brought the company’s car production to a halt during a six-week strike that culminated with a contract — and concessions — from the company in the fall marked one of the largest private-sector strikes in the last 20 years. And even nonunion workers have taken advantage of the tight labor market to advocate for more workers’ rights. Employees have circulated petitions around Silicon Valley companies, calling for tech companies to cut ties with immigration enforcement, and gig-economy drivers at Lyft and Uber have rallied for better pay and more rights. The numbers of **workers who participated in** large-scale **strikes ballooned to 500,000** in 2018, up from 25,000 in 2017, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Strike participation numbers for 2019 have yet to be finalized. **But** the broader factors that have contributed to union declines over the last few decades appear to still be in play (like). “The lack of an increase in union membership points to the fact that **there are still so many barriers to organizing**,” said Heidi Shierholz, the director of policy at the Economic Policy Institute. “When people try to organize at their workplace there is just **a relentless, fierce opposition on the part of employers**.” One reason why union membership may have declined is that 2019 was the first full year since the Supreme Court’s decision in the Janus case. The court ruled that it was unconstitutional to allow unions to require collective bargaining fees from public employees — a decision that was seen as a major blow for unions and their budgets. Local public employees saw a small dip in membership to 39.4 percent in 2019, down from 40.3 the previous year, Shierholz noted. But union membership among state government workers has grown. Public support for unions appears to be growing. Some 64 percent of people said they approved of unions last year, among the highest numbers the company has collected in the last 50 years, according to Gallup. And nearly half of nonunion workers say they would join a union if given the opportunity to do so — a 40-year high. “People look at decline of unionization and think that people don’t want unions anymore,” Shierholz said. “But its just demonstrably false.” The momentum in the labor movement has fostered a political discussion on the left about workers’ rights and strengthening the labor movement. Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) wants **to give federal workers the right to strike** and ban “at will” employment, which allows companies to fire workers without cause. Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) has called for banning the permanent replacement of striking workers and strengthening the National Labor Relations Board, which **enforces laws meant to protect unions and organizing** in workplaces. Both of them, along with Democratic presidential candidate Pete Buttigieg, say they want to undo “right to work” laws that Republicans have championed in states throughout the country that allow workers to opt out of paying union dues. Some labor advocates said that **union participation could** eventually **rise if** worker **strikes fortify** the **political will to make changes** like these. “The way that huge upsurges in union membership have happened in this country is when workers have taken control, gone on massive strikes and forced corporate elite to enter grand bargains,” said Jane McAlevey, a former labor organizer and the author of “A Collective Bargain: Unions, Organizing and the Fight for Democracy." McAlevey noted that **previous waves of unionization** — in the 1930s after the National Labor Relations Act passed, and a few decades later as the public sector began to unionize — **were preceded by large scale strikes**. “Strikes are a precursor,” she said. "I believe we’re at the beginning of that cycle.” The International Association of Fire Fighters is one of the larger unions that has seen growth over the years. The union was at 321,000 last year up, from 220,000 20 years ago. Harold Schaitberger, the union’s general president, said their **success is due to** showing their members the **benefits the union helped secure** for them, including better government codes on firefighting and success **in collective bargaining.** “**There’s a direct** connection to what the union does to having **tangible effect on their lives**,” he said.

#### Leads to increased income inequality - strengthening the right to strike is the only way to solve

**Rosenfeld, Denice, and Laird 16** [Jake Rosenfeld, Patrick Denice, and Jennifer Laird, 8-30-2016, "Union decline lowers wages of nonunion workers: The overlooked reason why wages are stuck and inequality is growing," Economic Policy Institute, <https://www.epi.org/publication/union-decline-lowers-wages-of-nonunion-workers-the-overlooked-reason-why-wages-are-stuck-and-inequality-is-growing/>] // VS

Pay for private-sector workers has barely budged over the past three and a half decades. In fact, for men in the private sector who lack a college degree and do not belong to a labor union, real wages today are substantially lower than they were in the late 1970s. In the debates over the causes of wage stagnation, the decline in union power has not received nearly as much attention as globalization, technological change, and the slowdown in Americans’ educational attainment. Unions, especially in industries and regions where they are strong, help boost the wages of all workers by establishing pay and benefit standards that many nonunion firms adopt. But this union boost to nonunion pay has weakened as the share of private-sector workers in a union has fallen from 1 in 3 in the 1950s to about 1 in 20 today. While we avoid strict causal claims about wage determination, the analytical approaches summarized in this report enable us to assess the independent effects of union decline on wages and lend confidence to our core contention that private-sector union decline since the late 1970s has contributed to substantial wage losses among workers who do not belong to a union. This is especially true for men. And most hurt by the decades-long decline in the nation’s labor movement are those nonunion men who did not complete college, or go beyond high school—groups with the largest erosion of union membership over the last few decades. Key findings from our report include the following: For nonunion private-sector men, weekly wages would be an estimated 5 percent ($52) higher in 2013 if private-sector union density (the share of workers in similar industries and regions who are union members) remained at its 1979 level. For a year-round worker, this translates to an annual wage loss of $2,704. For the 40.2 million nonunion private-sector men the loss is equivalent to $2.1 billion fewer dollars in weekly paychecks, which represents an annual wage loss of $109 billion. For nonunion private-sector men without a bachelor’s degree or more education (non–college graduates), weekly wages would be an estimated 8 percent ($58) higher in 2013 if union density remained at its 1979 levels. For a year-round worker, this translates to an annual wage loss of $3,016. As a benchmark, consider that the wage loss from increased trade with low-wage nations (Bivens 2013) among non–college graduates is estimated to be 5 percent. For nonunion private-sector men with a high school diploma or less education, weekly wages would be an estimated 9 percent ($61) higher if union density remained at its 1979 levels. For a year-round worker, this translates to an annual wage loss of about $3,172. The effects of union decline on the wages of nonunion women are not as substantial because women were not as unionized as men were in 1979. Weekly wages would be approximately 2 to 3 percent higher if union density remained at its 1979 levels for all nonunion women; nonunion, non–college graduate women, and nonunion women with a high school diploma or less education. However the cumulate effects are still sizable. For 32.9 million full-time nonunion women working in the private sector, weekly pay would be a total of $461 million more (and roughly $24.0 billion more per year) in 2013 if unions had remained as strong as they were in 1979. The degree of nonunion wage decline reflects how much unionization has declined since 1979 among private-sector men (by two-thirds, from 34 to 10 percent), among women (by more than one-half, from 16 to 6 percent), and especially among non–college degree men (by more than two-thirds, from 38 to 11 percent). As unions have receded from the private sector, their effects on the wages of nonmembers (per percent of unionization) have declined. In recent years, these effects have fallen to between one-half and two-thirds of their late-1970s levels. Union decline has exacerbated wage inequality (and) in the United States by dampening the pay of nonunion workers as well as by eroding the share of workers directly benefitting from unionization. Earlier research (Western and Rosenfeld 2011) shows that union erosion can explain about one-third of the growth of wage inequality among men and about one-fifth of the growth of wage inequality among women from 1972 to 2007. At least for middle-wage men, the impact of the erosion of unions on the wages of both union and nonunion workers is likely the largest single factor underlying wage stagnation and wage inequality. Nonunion workers benefit from a strong union presence in their labor market in many ways. Strong unions set pay and benefits standards that nonunion employers follow. Those employers may raise pay for some workers to forestall an organizing drive, which leads to an upward adjustment in wages of workers above them, to maintain relative pay differentials (similar to the effects of minimum-wage increases). Even absent organizing activities in their spheres, nonunion employers may also follow the standards that unions help establish through politicking for labor-friendly policies, instituting informal and formal rules governing labor conditions, and generally serving as a cultural force arguing for a “fairer share” for working men and women. (For example, highly unionized states helped lift minimum wages above the levels of states where labor was comparatively weak.) Higher pay in organized establishments increases competition for labor so that nonunion firms lift wages to prevent their employees from leaving for higher, union wages. And in setting wages, new market entrants often look to what industry leaders are doing; when organized labor was strong, many of these leaders were unionized. Rebuilding our system of collective bargaining is an important tool available for fueling wage growth for both low- and middle-wage workers and ending the era of persistent wage stagnation.

#### Causes a perpetual cycle of poverty for millions---historical trends confirm Gould 14 https://www.epi.org/blog/inequality-main-persistent-poverty/

I couldn’t agree more with Paul Krugman’s blog post this morning when he says, “**the main cause of persistent poverty** now **is** high **inequality of** market **income**.” We looked at precisely this question in the latest edition of State of Working America. (And the White House Council of Economic Advisors cited our work on this in their War on Poverty 50 Years Later Report, released today.) **In** the roughly **three decades** leading up to the most recent recession, **looking at the** **officially measured poverty rate**, educational upgrading and overall income growth were the two biggest poverty-reducing factors, while **income inequality was the largest poverty-increasing factor**. Relative to these factors, the racial composition of the U.S. population over this period (the growth of nonwhite populations with higher likelihoods of poverty) and changes in family structure (the growth of single mother households) have contributed much less to poverty, particularly in recent years. The figure below plots the impact of these economic and demographic factors on the official poverty rate from 1979 to 2007. *The impact of income inequality and income growth were quantitatively large, but in the opposite directions.* **Had income growth been equally distributed**, which in this analysis means that all families’ incomes would have grown at the pace of the average, **the poverty rate would have been** 5.5 points lower, essentially, **44 percent lower than what it was**. This rise in inequality, in turn, has been dominated by inequality of pre-tax, pre-transfer, market incomes. This means that **making real progress on pushing the poverty rate down** going forward **would be** helped enormously **by checking or** even **reversing** this growth in market **income inequality**. In concrete terms, this means we need wages to go up for those at the bottom and middle of the income distribution.

#### Poverty is the worst form of violence and controls the root cause to numerous forms of oppression based on race, class, ability, and gender Taniguchi 15

“[Why Poverty Is the Worst Form of Oppression . . . and Why We Should Start Giving a $hit](https://www.pacificcitizen.org/why-poverty-is-the-worst-form-of-oppression-and-why-we-should-start-giving-a-hit/)” By Rhianna Taniguchi AUGUST 6, 2015 [<https://www.pacificcitizen.org/why-poverty-is-the-worst-form-of-oppression-and-why-we-should-start-giving-a-hit/>]

Money is power — at least that’s what they say. In America, it is clear that race, money and power have a strong connection. So, why don’t we talk about it more? Asian Americans are commonly viewed as well-assimilated, educated and highly competent. However, 12.7 percent of Asian Americans are estimated to live in poverty according to the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2013 report. Unfortunately, this is one of the least-addressed issues within the model minority myth. Mahatma Gandhi said that “Poverty is the worst form of violence,” and quite frankly, I agree. Poverty is society’s way of perpetually dehumanizing people and subjecting them to unlivable conditions while calling it “just.” Those within society believe (or pretend to believe) that the system creating poverty is equitable and therefore fair. It is hard to deny the strong correlation between wealth and race, but ironically, that’s exactly what we do. The effects of poverty include mental and physical illness, inadequate nutrition, food insecurity, adverse effects on academic outcomes . . . the list goes on. The effects of poverty are most felt by women. This topic is never discussed with the urgency it deserves, and how can it? Where in the world do we start? Let’s first define poverty in the United States. The 2014 poverty thresholds by size of family and number of related children would define a two-adult household with one child in poverty if their total income was less than $16,317. That means living off of less than $15 per day per person. It doesn’t sound too bad, until you factor in rent, utilities, transportation to and from work, education, medicine, health care and food. So, why is race tied to poverty? Well, there are many speculations. The American Psychological Assn. has found that “while non-Hispanic whites still constitute the largest single group of Americans living in poverty, ethnic minority groups are overrepresented. These disparities are associated with the historical marginalization of ethnic minority groups and entrenched barriers to good education and jobs.” According to the APA, there are a few barriers. First and foremost is marginalization, which is assigning and confining a group to inferior conditions. As a result of marginalization, access to good education and jobs are limited. What are we doing as individuals, as a society, and as a country to battle the inequities? Whatever efforts we’re making, they’re not working — at least not fast enough. Financial education and social reconfiguration are the missing components of the equation to equity. On an individual level, we need to get smart about money in order to increase our income, increase our savings and increase our investments. I highly recommend LearnVest for affordable financial planning. We also need to change the way our society thinks — no person is inferior based on race, gender, sexual orientation or ability. Lastly, we need to provide access, education and tools to those who are most vulnerable in our community. The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau actively listens to our community’s needs and concerns, but we must be vigilant and continuously seek progress. The JACL Credit Union is another resource that provides a higher interest rate than most banks with high standards of privacy, security and service. In a nutshell, you should care about poverty because it is one more way that society is using racial prejudice to violate your right to the pursuit of happiness. It is one more way that people of color are being targeted, and it is working. Here are eight ways you can make some change

### Contention 3 – Climate Change

#### Lack of a “*right to strike*” means the UK makes it near *impossible* for workers to climate strike.

Aspinall ’19 [Georgia, acting features editor at Grazia UK, formerly at The Debrief, “How Do You Strike For A Social Issue Without Getting In Trouble At Work?”, 09-02-2019, https://graziadaily.co.uk/life/in-the-news/how-to-strike-climate-crisis/]//pranav

But for many of us, striking for the climate crisis seems unthinkable. Not because it’s not a gravely important issue, but because we have no idea how to strike for a social issue. It’s complicated enough striking for industrial action (that is, when the majority of employees have a grievance with their employer) but to strike for something outside of that – many of us wouldn’t even know where to start without getting in trouble at work. Because, thanks to Margaret Thatcher, laws around strike action in the UK are extreme. According to Employment Law Watch, ‘there is no right to strike’ in the UK and calling one is ‘in principle unlawful as it amounts to inducing employees to breach their contracts of employment’. It is therefore described as a ‘privilege’, not a right. However, there are a bunch of rules strike action must follow to be legally immune. For industrial action, it must be about a trade dispute between the workers and employers, the result of a properly organised ballot and can only occur if the employer has been given detailed notice seven days prior. Typically, this means strikes are organised by trade unions that actually understand all of the rules that must be followed for a strike to be legal. But, non-union members have the same rights as union members as long as they take part in legal, official industrial action. Which is useful to know given that only 26% of UK employees are union members. This strike however, is not industrial action at all – it’s a social strike. So what rights do workers have to even take part? Well, none – which is unsurprising given that we don’t even have the legal right to strike against industrial action. What it does mean though, is that striking for climate change would involve taking some all-important holiday time. ‘Someone wanting to take part in the Climate Strike would have to request this as holiday, as it wouldn’t constitute a workplace dispute,’ says HR Advisor Kyle Taylor. ‘Otherwise, they would be classed as Absent Without Leave (AWOL)’ Going AWOL can be grounds for disciplinary action, however it is at the discretion of your employer how serious they take the incident. For example, you may simply not be paid for the day’s work or it could go on your record – it’s not typically grounds for dismissal.

**Collective action incentivizes policy change, but status quo sustains science as usual which embraces climate skep.**

**Green ’19** [Matthew, Reuters Journalist, “Scientists endorse mass civil disobedience to force climate action”, 10-12-2019, Reuters, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-climate-change-scientists/scientists-endorse-mass-civil-disobedience-to-force-climate-action-idUSKBN1WS01K]//pranav

In a joint declaration, **climate scientists, physicists, biologists, engineers and others from at least 20 countries broke with the caution traditionally associated with academia to side with peaceful protesters** courting arrest from Amsterdam to Melbourne.

**Wearing white laboratory coats to symbolize their research credentials, a group of about 20 of the signatories gathered on Saturday to read out the text outside London’s century-old Science Museum in the city’s upmarket Kensington district**.

“**We believe that the continued governmental inaction over the climate and ecological crisis now justifies peaceful and non-violent protest and direct action**, even if this goes beyond the bounds of the current law,” said Emily Grossman, a science broadcaster with a PhD in molecular biology. She read the declaration on behalf of the group.

“**We therefore support those who are rising up peacefully against governments around the world that are failing to act proportionately to the scale of the crisis**,” she said.

The declaration was coordinated by a group of scientists who support Extinction Rebellion, a civil disobedience campaign that formed in Britain a year ago and has since sparked offshoots in dozens of countries.

**The group launched a fresh wave of international actions on Monday, aiming to get governments to address an ecological crisis caused by climate change and accelerating extinctions of plant and animal species**.

**A total of 1,307 volunteers had since been arrested at various protests in London by 2030 GMT on Saturday, Extinction Rebellion said. A further 1,463 volunteers have been arrested in the past week in another 20 cities**, including Brussels, Amsterdam, New York, Sydney and Toronto, according to the group’s tally. More protests in this latest wave are due in the coming days.

While many scientists have shunned overt political debate, fearing that being perceived as activists might undermine their claims to objectivity, the 395 academics who had signed the declaration by 1100 GMT on Sunday chose to defy convention.

“**The urgency of the crisis is now so great that many scientists feel, as humans, that we now have a moral duty to take radical action**,” Grossman told Reuters.

**Other signatories included several scientists who contributed to the U.N.-backed Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC),** which has produced a series of reports underscoring the urgency of dramatic cuts in carbon emissions.

“**We can’t allow the role of scientists to be to just write papers and publish them in obscure journals and hope somehow that somebody out there will pay attention**,” Julia Steinberger, an ecological economist at the University of Leeds and a lead IPCC author, told Reuters.

“**We need to be rethinking the role of the scientist and engage with how social change happens at a massive and urgent scale,”** she said. “**We can’t allow science as usual.”**

**Strikes spill over and cause corporate policy change – empirically proven in tech – that bypasses politicians & avoids legal disputes.**

**Ghaffary ’19** [Shirin Ghaffary, 9-20-2019, "Here’s why the Amazon climate walkout is a big deal," Vox, https://www.vox.com/recode/2019/9/20/20874497/amazon-climate-change-walkout-google-microsoft-strike-tech-activism]//pranav

On Friday, over 1,500 Amazon workers plan to walk out of work to protest their company’s environmental impact. It will be the first time in Amazon’s 25-year history that its corporate employees have participated in a walkout demonstration. **Employees are calling on Amazon to reduce its carbon footprint as part of a larger**, youth-led global **climate strike that has planned hundreds of events around the world**. **Even ahead of their walkout, protesters have already seen results.** On Thursday morning, Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos announced in Washington, DC, **that the company is making a pact to follow the Paris climate agreement — a cross-country pledge for nations to reduce greenhouse gas emissions — and it is also pledging to be carbon neutral by 2040.** But Amazon employees who plan to walk out of work say it’s not enough. Organizers told Recode they want to see Amazon set a more aggressive plan for the company to reduce its carbon emissions to zero; they want it to stop selling its cloud services to the oil and gas industry; and they want it to stop donating to politicians who deny climate change’s existence. (**Bezos said he would “take a hard look” at whether donations are going toward climate-change deniers** but made no promises.) Amazon declined to comment directly on the strike. “I would love to be in a meeting where one of the criteria or goals around the design that I’m proposing is, ‘How much carbon does this remove from our footprint?’” Weston Fribley, a software engineer at Amazon and one of the organizers of Amazon Employees for Climate Justice, the group organizing the walkout, told Recode. “Our work is interesting and challenging, and it’s tough to see the company not prioritizing things that are so important.” **Employees from several other major tech companies have joined Amazon’s lead, calling on their companies to change business practices to reduce climate change**. So far, 700 **Google** employees have pledged to walk out, along with others at several other major tech companies including **Microsoft, Facebook, and Twitter**. **(Google announced a day ahead of the walkout that it’s making a major investment in wind and solar energy.)** These employees’ **coordinated involvement is a sign of how far the growing tech labor movement has come since rank-and-file workers began organizing over the past several years**. In 2019, as public and political scrutiny of their companies increases, **these employees have mobilized to pressure their companies on political issues ranging from selling AI tech military use, providing products to oppressive governments, and discrimination and harassment in the workplace**. Several leaders of the Amazon protest say they were inspired by last year’s Google walkout in which 20,000 employees left work to protest the company’s payout of high-powered executives accused of sexually harassing employees. The walkout was a historic moment for tech activism and the largest-ever company protest by workers in the industry. **It’s remarkable that employees at Amazon, known for a grueling work culture in which employees put on a unified public front and are sworn to secrecy, are now leading a protest in their sector.** “**The tech climate strike is proof that tech workers across the industry are becoming more confident in our power to shape the future,”** the organizing group Tech Workers Coalition (TWC) said in a statement to Recode. TWC helped coordinate employees at major companies who planned to join Amazon workers in participating in the strike. “This is a historic milestone for our industry and shows that we will only continue getting stronger until tech treats everyone equitably.” **The walkout is indeed a sign of a growing, cross-industry movement by employees to move the needle on their employer’s business practices on social and political issues**. A few months ago, employees at e-commerce home decor giant Wayfair walked out of work to demand their employer stop providing beds to children in US immigration detention facilities. Similarly, employees at the advertising firm Ogilvy protested their company’s contract with US Border Patrol, prompting the CEO to hold a lengthy meeting addressing concerns to a room full of angry employees. (Neither Ogilvy nor Wayfair have said they will cancel their contracts.) And at Amazon, workers have also formed a “We Won’t Build It” organizing group to protest the company’s Amazon Web Services contracts with companies like Palantir, which provide a technological infrastructure that helps US immigration agencies enforce deportation policies. **At a time when many of these workers are feeling doubtful about politicians’ ability to pass laws enforcing changes they want to see, they’re increasingly calling on their employers to set the ethical standard**. “**It goes beyond climate change**,” one Amazon employee who plans to walk out and who requested anonymity told Recode. “It demonstrates that, ‘Hey, you guys can organize on something together that you feel strongly about that maybe your managers don’t like but that you think is the right thing to do.’

#### Warming kills millions

**Krosofsky ’21** [Andrew, Green Matters Journalist, “How Global Warming May Eventually Lead to Global Extinction”, Green Matters, 03-11-2021, https://www.greenmatters.com/p/will-global-warming-cause-extinction]//pranav

Eventually, yes. **Global warming will invariably result in the mass extinction of millions of different species,** humankind included. In fact, **the Center for Biological Diversity says that global warming is currently the greatest threat to life on this planet**. **Global warming causes a number of detrimental effects on the environment that many species won’t be able to handle long-term**. Extreme weather patterns are shifting climates across the globe, eliminating habitats and altering the landscape. **As a result, food and fresh water sources are being drastically reduced**. Then, of course, **there are the rising global temperatures themselves, which many species are physically unable to contend with**. Formerly frozen arctic and antarctic regions are melting, increasing sea levels and temperatures. Eventually, **these effects will create a perfect storm of extinction conditions**. The melting glaciers of the arctic and the searing, **unmanageable heat indexes being seen along the Equator are just the tip of the iceberg, so to speak.** **The species that live in these climate zones have already been affected by the changes caused by global warming.** Take polar bears for example, whose habitats and food sources have been so greatly diminished that they have been forced to range further and further south. **Increased carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and oceans have already led to ocean acidification**. **This has caused many species of crustaceans to either adapt or perish and has led to the mass bleaching of more than 50 percent of Australia’s Great Barrier Reef**, according to National Geographic. According to the Center for Biological Diversity, the current trajectory of global warming predicts that more than 30 percent of Earth’s plant and animal species will face extinction by 2050. By the end of the century, that number could be as high as 70 percent. We won’t try and sugarcoat things, humanity’s own prospects aren’t looking that great either. According to The Conversation, **our species has just under a decade left to get our CO₂ emissions under control. If we don’t cut those emissions by half before 2030, temperatures will rise to potentially catastrophic levels. It may only seem like a degree or so, but the worldwide ramifications are immense.** The human species is resilient. We will survive for a while longer, even if these grim global warming predictions come to pass, **but it will mean less food, less water, and increased hardship across the world — especially in low-income areas and developing countries. This increase will also mean more pandemics, devastating storms, and uncontrollable wildfires**.

### Contention 4 – Democracy

#### Strikes are the internal link to uphold democracy – empirics prove

Pope 18 [ Before joining Rutgers in 1986, James Gray Pope worked in a shipyard and represented labor unions at the Boston law firm of Segal, Roitman & Coleman. He has a doctorate in politics from Princeton and specializes in constitutional law, constitutional theory, and labor law. “Labor’s right to strike is essential” Sept 2018 <https://www.psc-cuny.org/clarion/september-2018/labor%E2%80%99s-right-strike-essential>] //aaditg

What provoked Cuomo and de Blasio to close ranks and launch a simultaneous attack on workers’ rights? Gubernatorial candidate Cynthia Nixon had the audacity to include in her platform a plank endorsing public workers’ right to strike. No wonder Cuomo and de Blasio struck back: Like Bernie Sanders, Nixon threatened the grip of Wall Street-backed politicians on what was once the party of working people. The right to strike should be a no-brainer for any self-respecting candidate who claims to care about working people. It isn’t some transitory policy fix; it’s a fundamental human right, recognized in international law. Without the right to strike, workers have no effective recourse against unhealthy conditions, inadequate wages, or employer tyranny. Before the American labor movement began its long decline, unions made the right to strike a litmus test for supporting candidates. Labor leaders held that anti-strike laws imposed “involuntary servitude” in violation of the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. Corporate interests ridiculed this claim, arguing that the Amendment guaranteed only the individual right to quit and go elsewhere. But workers and unions held their ground. “The simple fact is that the right of individual workers to quit their jobs has meaning only when they may quit in concert, so that in their quitting or in their threat to quit they have a real bargaining strength,” Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) General Counsel Lee Pressman explained. “It is thus hypocritical to suggest that a prohibition on the right to strike is not in practical effect a prohibition on the right to quit individually.” Labor leaders quoted the Supreme Court’s statement that the Amendment was intended “to make labor free, by prohibiting that control by which the personal service of one man is disposed of or coerced for another’s benefit which is the essence of involuntary servitude.” Although they never convinced the Supreme Court that this principle covered the right to strike, Congress did embrace the core of their claim when it protected the right to strike in two historic statutes, the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932 and the Wagner National Labor Relations Act of 1935. The “individual unorganized worker,” explained Congress, “is helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and to protect his freedom of labor.” A DEMOCRATIC NEED The recent teacher strikes underscore another, equally vital function of the strike: political democracy. It is no accident that strikers often serve as midwives of democracy. Examples include Poland in the 1970s, where shipyard strikers brought down the dictatorship, and South Africa in the 1970s and 1980s, where strikers were central to the defeat of apartheid. Even in relatively democratic countries like the United States, workers often find it necessary to withhold their labor in order to offset the disproportionate power of wealthy interests and racial elites. During the 1930s, for example, it took mass strikes to overcome judicial resistance to progressive economic regulation. Today, workers confront a political system that has been warped by voter suppression, gerrymandering and the judicial protection of corporate political expenditures as “freedom of speech.” With corporate lackeys holding a majority of seats on the Supreme Court, workers may soon need strikes to clear the way for progressive legislation just as they did in the 1930s. But if the right to strike is a no-brainer, then how did Cuomo and de Blasio justify attacking it? “The premise of the Taylor Law,” said Cuomo, “is you would have chaos if certain services were not provided,” namely police, firefighters and prison guards. If that’s the premise, then why not endorse Nixon’s proposal as to teachers and most public workers, and propose exceptions for truly essential services? That’s the approach of international law, and that’s what Nixon clarified she supports. But Cuomo couldn’t explain why teachers and other non-essential personnel should be denied this basic human right. As for de Blasio, he claimed that the Taylor Law accomplishes “an important public purpose” and that “there are lots of ways for workers’ rights to be acknowledged and their voices to be heard.” What public purpose? Forcing workers to accept inadequate wages and unsafe conditions? What ways to be heard? Groveling to politicians for a raise in exchange for votes? The ban forces once-proud unions to serve as cogs in the political machines of Wall Street politicians. No sooner did Nixon endorse the right to strike than two prominent union leaders rushed to provide cover for Cuomo. Danny Donohue, president of the Civil Service Employees Association, called her “incredibly naive” and charged that “clearly, she does not have the experience needed to be governor of New York.” Evidently Cuomo, who was elected governor on a program of attacking unions and followed through with cuts to public workers’ pensions and wages, does have the requisite experience. John Samuelsen of the Transport Workers Union, which represents more than 40,000 New York City transit workers, also lashed out, saying, “I believe that she will cut and run when we shut the subway down…. As soon as her hipster Williamsburg supporters can’t take public transit to non-union Wegmans to buy their kale chips, she will call in the National Guard and the Pinkertons.”