## 1

### 1NC – Theory – Must Spec “Right to Strike”

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must specify what kinds of strikes they defend an unconditional right for.

Vote Neg:

#### Topic lit proves its key -– 4 different major categories all with very different implications.

SHRM [The Society for Human Resource Management is a professional human resources membership association headquartered in Alexandria, Virginia. SHRM promotes the role of HR as a profession and provides education, certification, and networking to its members, while lobbying Congress on issues pertinent to labor management, “Are all types of strikes protected under the National Labor Relations Act?”, https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/tools-and-samples/hr-qa/pages/cms\_021003.aspx]//pranav

An employee's right to strike is a critical component of the right to organize but is not without limitations. Certain strikes qualify as protected activity under the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA), but not all strikes are protected. The main types of strikes covered by the NLRA are:

Unfair labor practice strikes, which protest employers' illegal activities.

Economic strikes, which may occur when there are disputes over wages or benefits.

Recognition strikes, which are intended to force employers to recognize unions.

Jurisdictional strikes, which are concerted refusals to work to affirm members' right to particular job assignments and to protest the assignment of work to another union or to unorganized employees.

A unionized employee's right to reinstatement after a strike ends varies based on the type of strike and the underlying reason for the strike. Employers are allowed to hire replacement workers during unfair labor practice strikes and economic strikes.

O/W on topic ed – we only get two months to debate about the topic.

Education’s a voter & comes first -

[1] only terminal impact in debate

[2] fairness isn’t a voter

[a] doesn’t exist – different starting points and biases all prove unfairness is inevitable

[b] doesn’t control the internal link – we can still learn things even if debate is unfair

CI –

[1] rtt – best possible norm

[2] collapses

No RVIs

[1] baiting – better theory debater will

[2] chilling effect – chills debaters from checking abuse

## 2

#### CP Text: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of all workers except police to strike.

#### The inclusion of the police into the right to strike erases difference – the essence of a cop is to practice brutality and crackdowns strikes

Marcy ’15 [Sam, “The year of the pig: Should workers support police strikes?”, 01-08-2015, https://www.workers.org/2015/01/17782/]//pranav

Are strikes by the police to be regarded approximately the same way as strikes by ordinary workers? A reading of the treatment accorded to the New York police strike by the Daily World (the paper of the Communist Party which professes to be Marxist-Leninist) clearly conveys this impression. A column by George Morris, the Daily World’s labor analyst, waxes eloquent about the cops’ strike and says “it is in the spirit of rebellion we see everywhere today as in unions against the long entrenched bureaucracy.” He further says that the cops are “beginning to see themselves as in much the same position as other city employees and workers.” Finally, he admonishes his readers that “fire should not be blunderbussed against all on the police force.” You see, the way to look at it is that there are good cops and bad cops, just like there are good capitalists and bad ones. We must assume then, that there are good storm troopers and bad ones if we use the logic of George Morris. In this way, Morris substitutes bourgeois morality for Marxist analysis of class antagonisms and contradictions between class groupings. The cops’ strike is not an isolated phenomenon. There is one in progress right now in Milwaukee. Earlier there were strikes or stoppages in Detroit and Youngstown, Ohio. Strike preparations are underway in perhaps a dozen other cities throughout the country. It is therefore necessary and in the vital interests of the working class to restate the fundamental position of revolutionary Marxism on this crucial question. Should strikes of cops be treated on an equal level with workers’ strikes? Emphatically, no! A striking worker and a striking police officer may on the surface appear to have the same immediate aims — to get higher pay and better conditions for themselves. But this is to take an extremely narrow and superficial view of their apparently similar situations. The truth, however, is that there is objectively speaking not a shred of class identity between workers and the police. The fundamental interests of the workers are diametrically opposed to those of the police and are absolutely irreconcilable with them. Producers or parasites? A worker is, above all, a producer. The police officer is a parasite who lives off what the worker produces. No truer words could be said! All the material wealth which is now in the possession of the capitalist class was produced by the workers. When a worker goes out on strike she [or he] is merely trying to retrieve a portion of the wealth which her [or his] labor power produced. The worker gets back in the form of wages only a portion of what he [or she] produces. The rest is what the capitalist class retains in the form of profit (really the unpaid labor of the workers). The gross national income of the U.S. last year reached the astronomical sum of one trillion dollars. It was all produced by workers: Black, Brown, white, men and women and even children. The struggles of all the workers, insofar as their immediate demands are concerned, are merely to retrieve a larger portion of this wealth which they produced for the bosses and which the bosses keep for themselves. Contribute nothing to social wealth What have the cops contributed to the production of this unprecedented amount of wealth? Nothing at all. In fact, their principal function is to guard the wealth for the capitalists, protect their monopolist profits from the demands of the workers. Even as the New York cops were out on strike, their emergency crews were busily clubbing the heads of striking telephone workers. That’s the very essence of a cop: to crack the heads of strikers and practice the most inhuman brutality against the Black, Puerto Rican and Chicano/a communities. A cop is a mercenary hired by the capitalist class through their agent (the city government) to keep the mass of the workers and the oppressed in complete subjection. They utilize all the forces and violence at their disposal whenever the masses rise up in rebellion against the unendurable conditions imposed by the master class. The police are the most parasitic social grouping in society. When they work — if that’s what it can possibly be called — their labor is directed against the workers and oppressed. Graft, corruption, intimate collaboration with all sorts of underworld figures and enterprises such as gambling, narcotics and a thousand other shady businesses — that’s what cops are really engaged in. They are utterly inseparable from crime and corruption itself. One could not exist without the other. Both are nourished and supported by the nature of the capitalist system itself. To put the police on a par with the workers is to erase the difference between the persecutors and their victims.

## Case

## Case

### Framing

#### The Role of the ballot is to only evaluate the material consequences of the aff and neg world. Prefer:

#### A] fairness - Fairness—Arbitrary frameworks moot the 1NC and destroy our possibility of engaging with the affirmative on an equal playing field. Our scholarship is tied to the consequences of the plan, so it makes no sense to separate assumptions from implementation. Both debaters get the resolution at the same time.

#### B] Clash—Debate is not about the content of what we debate about but the process of iterative testing through specific points of contestation. There is no 1-1 correspondence between the arguments we read and our ideologies. This turns the Aff—no matter your political worldview, critical thinking skills through an unrestrained framework is necessary for any revolutionary strategy.

#### Existential threats outweigh:

#### [1] Moral uncertainty proves extinction outweighs – if you aren’t 100% sure their arg is true, keep future generations alive to figure things out

Bostrom 12 [Nick Bostrom, Faculty of Philosophy & Oxford Martin School University of Oxford. Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority. 2012. www.existential-risk.org/concept.html]

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk; they also suggest a new way of thinking about the ideal of sustainability. Let me elaborate.

Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know — at least not in concrete detail — what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving — and ideally improving — our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

2] turns all their movement building offense bc everyone is dead – proves life is a pre-req

LBL on their pre-empts

1] freezes action is false a) winning internal link proves just our scenario b) requires them to read intenral link defense c) empirically denied – climate action disproves

2] 1ac 2 is incoherent and doesn’t have a warrant – just justifies prediction is impossible – that’s wrong a) robust ev proves our impact b) winning a scenario disporoves bc we know we stop extinction

Util preempts – don’t take out – j defend conseqeutnialism not util

Agg fails is emp denied

### t/l

#### 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.

#### Strikes fail and spark backlash – leads to fragmentation.

Grant and Wallace 91 [Don Sherman Grant; Ohio State University; Michael Wallace; Indiana University; “Why Do Strikes Turn Violent?” University of Chicago Press; March 1991; <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2781338.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aca3144a9ae9e4ac65e285f2c67451ffb>]//SJWen

\*\*RM = Resource-Mobilization, or Strikes

3. Violent tactics.-Violent tactics are viewed by RM theorists exclu- sively as purposeful strategies by challengers for inciting social change with little recognition of how countermobilization strategies of elites also create violence. The role of elite counterstrategies has been virtually ig- nored in research on collective violence. Of course, history is replete with examples of elites' inflicting violence on challenging groups with the full sanction of the state. Typically, elite-sponsored violence occurs when the power resources and legal apparatus are so one-sidedly in the elites' favor that the outcome is never in doubt. In conflicts with weak insiders, elites may not act so openly unless weak insiders flaunt the law. Typically, elite strategies do not overtly promote violence but rather provoke violence by the other side in hopes of eliciting public condemnation or more vigorous state repression of challenger initiatives. This is a critical dynamic in struggles involving weak insiders such as unions. In these cases, worker violence, even when it appears justified, erodes public support for the workers' cause and damages the union's insider status.

4. Homogeneity and similarity.-Many RM theorists incorrectly as- sume that members of aggrieved groups are homogeneous in their inter- ests and share similar positions in the social structure. This (assumed) homogeneity of interests is rare for members of outsider groups and even more suspect for members of weak-insider groups. Indeed, groups are rarely uniform and often include relatively advantaged persons who have other, more peaceful channels in which to pursue their goals. Internal stratification processes mean that different persons have varying invest- ments in current structural arrangements, in addition to their collective interest in affecting social change. Again, these forces are especially prev- alent for weak insiders: even the group's lowest-status members are likely to have a marginal stake in the system; high-status members are likely to have a larger stake and, therefore, less commitment to dramatic change in the status quo.

Internal differences may lead to fragmentation of interests and lack of consensus about tactics, especially tactics suggesting violent confronta- tion. While group members share common grievances, individual mem- bers may be differentially aggrieved by the current state of affairs or differentially exposed to elite repression. White's (1989) research on the violent tactics of the Irish Republican Army shows that working-class members and student activists, when compared with middle-class partici- pants, are more vulnerable to state-sponsored repression, more likely to be available for protest activities, and reap more benefits from political violence. When we apply them to our study of strike violence, we find that differences in skill levels are known to coincide with major intraclass 1120 Strikes divisions in material interests (Form 1985) and are likely to coincide with the tendency for violent action. For instance, skilled-craft workers, who are more socially and politically conservative than unskilled workers, are less likely to view relations with employers as inherently antagonistic and are prone to separate themselves from unskilled workers, factors that should decrease their participation in violence.

#### [2] Corruption – unions fall to embezzlement and crime that disrupts union goals and fractures collective actions.

Jennifer Orechwa 18 [With over 25 years in the industry, and now as IRI's Director of Business Development, Jennifer has gained a unique perspective on what it takes to build a culture of engagement. By blending a deep understanding of labor and employee relations with powerful digital marketing knowledge, Jennifer has helped thousands of companies achieve behavioral change at a cultural level. "Union Corruption Today: The Risk to Employers?," UnionProof (No date, but cited article from 2018), https://projectionsinc.com/unionproof/union-corruption-today-whats-the-risk-to-employers/]//anop

While there many not be any major motion pictures in the works about today’s union activity, once upon a time, union corruption was a hot topic in the entertainment industry. Audiences lined up for a look at the inner workings of labor unions, and they got a glimpse of connections with organized crime, embezzlement, and worse. Though fictionalized, these films touched on a critical topic: union corruption and the impact on both employers and the workers that unions are supposed to represent. Hollywood might have lost interest in exposing the seedy side of unions, but massive scandals persist. Regular news reports on this issue are a stark reminder that union corruption is still a major concern. In fact, U.S. Department of Labor records show more than 300 union locations uncovered theft in the past two years. Incidents of theft range from $1,051 up to nearly $6.5 million, and of course, records only include cases where the individual was caught. It is likely there are many more issues that have not yet been uncovered. These are just a few examples of recent union-related scandals: Fiat Chrysler and the United Auto Workers Union A $4.5 million corruption scandal involving Fiat Chrysler executives and the United Auto Workers Union has resulted in criminal charges, many of which are still working their way through the court system. In one allegation, Fiat Chrysler executives are accused of making more than $1.5 million in payments to UAW officers and employees for the purpose of influencing contract negotiations in favor of the automaker. A significant portion of the misappropriated funds were explicitly intended for employee training and development – that is, for the benefit of the very individuals the union is supposed to serve. Thrive Leads Shortcode could not be rendered, please check it in Thrive Leads Section! International Brotherhood of Boilermakers Local 684 Another recent case involves the Secretary-Treasurer of International Brotherhood of Boilermakers Local 684. The union officer stole a total of $24,600 from the organization, more than $21,400 of which came from a special account intended to provide financial assistance to union members experiencing catastrophic illness or other significant personal tragedies. Instead of ensuring the funds were used as intended, she diverted them to pay for a variety of luxuries, including a cruise. She has now pled guilty to embezzlement. United Steelworkers Local Union 12-990 In a similar incident, the Secretary-Treasurer of the United Steelworkers Local Union 12-990 embezzled approximately $40,000 in just nine months. He has pled guilty to the charges, and he admitted that he took the money for personal use. Unfortunately, these three are just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to 21st century union corruption. When union funds are misappropriated, both employers and employees are negatively impacted. Your workers don’t receive the benefits they expect as a result of paying their dues, and you are tasked with the impossible job of negotiating a fair agreement with individuals more focused on what is best for their personal financial situation than the best interests of the workers they represent. The solution is simple. Union organizing in your organization is a direct result of your management practices, which means you can create an environment that is union-proof. Transparency, equity, and employee-centered management practices go a long way towards keeping your company union-free. Learn more about how to create a union-proof environment with specialized training from Projections.

#### [3] Politics – unions are weak not because of laws against big labor, but because of disapproval of unions involved in politics – aff doesn’t solve

Oren Cass 21 [Oren Cass is the executive director of American Compass and author of The Once and Future Worker: A Vision for the Renewal of Work in America. "American labour unions should stop playing politics," Financial tIMES, https://www.ft.com/content/cf6d837f-4605-4060-8513-38f396bddc7e, accessed 11-30-2021]//anop

This Labor Day, American labour stands not at a crossroads but a dead end. Only 6 per cent of private sector workers in the US are union members, and a high-profile organising push at Amazon failed miserably. The death last month of longtime AFL-CIO president Richard Trumka has rekindled the debate within the labour movement about its priorities. Should the focus be on organising more workers into unions or on political activism that might elect labour-aligned politicians in order to achieve through legislation what unions can no longer secure at the bargaining table? The correct answer is none of the above. The US labour movement’s big problem is that it no longer serves the interests of working-class Americans. Political activism is not an alternative if organising is proving too difficult. Rather, the emphasis on political activism is why organising has become so difficult in the first place. A new survey of workers to be released on Monday by American Compass in partnership with YouGov demonstrates just how badly unions have missed their mark with their focus on partisan politics. Given a list of tasks that a labour organisation could perform, workers ranked politics and social activism last and second to last in importance, giving them together about a tenth of the weight they gave to collective bargaining, benefits and training, and workplace collaboration. Among those who would vote against a union in their own workplace, union involvement in politics was the top concern. One striking consequence of this gap between what workers want and what unions do is that the working class, who should in theory be the target of the labour movement’s efforts, are in practice mostly alienated from it. It is middle and upper-class Democrats who have the most favourable opinions about unions and are enthusiastic about hearing politicians support them, not lower and working-class Americans of any political allegiance. While doubling down on politics runs directly counter to workers’ stated preferences, a strategy of pouring resources into organising in the workplace, or changing the law to make organising easier, is unlikely to fare much better. Just look at the Protecting the Right to Organise Act (known as the PRO Act) which was passed by the House of Representatives in March. Trumka’s successor as AFL-CIO president, Liz Shuler, said the act “is how we reform our woefully outdated labour laws [and] build a better future by empowering workers to organise and bargain”. The PRO Act imposes harsher penalties on employers who threaten and retaliate against employees for supporting a union. The reform itself has merit: employers should be sanctioned if they retaliate against efforts at organising. But the idea that bad employer behaviour is what’s really standing in the way of unions is belied by the evidence. More than two-thirds of workers say they’re not sure why they’re not unionised or have never thought about it; just 2 per cent cite a threat of retaliation by their employer. Likewise, while union involvement in politics was the top reason given for voting against a union, retaliation was the least commonly chosen. Rather than pointing fingers elsewhere, labour reformers need to focus on reforming labour. Opportunities for better bargains abound. For instance, workers express a strong preference for a positive relationship with management, and even for organisations run cooperatively by the two sides, rather than adversarial ones. A better bargain would allow such options, but also require that companies using them allow workers to elect a representative to the company board. Unions could become vital providers of benefits and training for members, as they are in many European countries, even channelling funds from government programmes and employers. But to do this they would need to get out of politics, like other not-for-profit groups. That’s a bargain popular with Americans by enormous margins. And with political spending out of the picture, labour law could also move towards a model known as “sectoral bargaining”, where representatives for workers and employers across an industry work together to establish rules that will govern them, instead of federal regulation. Giving workers more power in the labour market and voice in the workplace would improve their economic outcomes and job satisfaction, improve the competitiveness of companies and enhance civil society. But it requires union leaders and policymakers to listen to them.

### Cap

t/l – no no links – 1) they defend a subset of capitalism as being bad – that was cx 2)

1] no shot aff solves for all of semio-capitalism – tons of other things they can’t solve for

#### 2] Cap solves disease mutation

Jackson 16. Kerry, Pacific Research Institute; 12/19/16; Free Market Policies Needed To Incentivize Creation Of New Life-Saving Treatments; https://www.pacificresearch.org/article/free-market-policies-needed-to-incentivize-creation-of-new-life-saving-treatments/

“Our strongest antibiotics don’t work and patients are left with potentially untreatable infections,” Director Dr. Tom Frieden said when the CDC issued its warning. He asked doctors, hospitals and public health officials to “work together” to “stop these infections from spreading.” The 2014 Report to the President expressed a similar concern: “The evolution of antibiotic resistance is now occurring at an alarming rate and is outpacing the development of new countermeasures capable of thwarting infections in humans. This situation threatens patient care, economic growth, public health, agriculture, economic security and national security.” For those thinking this sort of thing shouldn’t be happening when medical science is more advanced than can almost be conceived, be assured that it is. And unless there are public policy interventions, it’s likely to get worse. “More and more microorganisms will continue to gain resistance to the current drug therapies because (antimicrobial resistance, or AMR) is basic evolution,” Wayne Winegarden writes in the Pacific Research Institute’s newly-released report “Incenting the Development of Antimicrobial Medicines to Address the Problem of Drug-Resistant Infections.” The International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers says the problem is caused by “a dearth of new antibiotic medicines.” At the same time that there’s been an increase in AMR, there has been “a sharp decline in the development of new antibiotic medicines.” The group reports that only two new classes of antibiotics have been discovered in the last three decades compared to 11 in the previous 50 years. The answers to many medical problems are still not within reach of researchers. But the hazards of AMR can be diminished. Winegarden suggests we begin with public health campaigns that encourage handwashing, which he calls a highly effective and low-cost way to reduce the spread of infection. He further recommends policy that would address the problem of antibiotic overuse and greater use of vaccines to cut the incidents of infection. But Winegarden’s primary concern is establishing the correct incentives for developing new antimicrobial medicines that would be effective against AMR microorganisms. He’s specifically referring to policies “based on a thorough understanding of the disincentives that are currently inhibiting their development.” “These disincentives are well-recognized,” he writes. “Despite the medical need, and despite the generally strong return on investment for many other drug classes, the return on investment for developing new antimicrobial medicines (particularly antibiotics) is too low.” Producing a new drug is a grinding and expensive endeavor. It can take 10 to 15 years to develop a single prescription drug that is introduced to the market, and a company can spend as much as $5.5 billion on research and development for each medication that is eventually approved and prescribed. Less than 2 percent of all projects launched to create new drugs succeed. This is not an environment in which pharmaceutical companies can get too amped up about pursuing new treatments. Yet new drug approvals increased over the last decade. Don’t look for a surge of antimicrobial drugs in that pipeline, though. Winegarden says that particular drug class is among several that “face unique impediments” that serve as disincentives for innovation. To overcome the steep hill that impedes the development of new AMR drugs, lawmakers must implement policies that unleash the incentives of the free market. Policymakers also should look at the 1983 federal Orphan Drug Act and its market-oriented reforms that increased the number of drugs developed to treat rare diseases. More than 400 have been introduced to the market since the law was enacted, compared to fewer than 10 in the 1970s. Put another way, government needs to remove its anchors from the process and let the market do what it does so well. In this case, that’s restoring patients’ health, enriching innovative companies that create jobs, and inspiring biotech start-ups such as the group of Stanford undergraduates that has been capitalized to develop new antibiotics. If the proper incentives are in place, the needed treatments will follow.

#### Pandemics end civilization – no burnout

Kerscher 14. Karl-Heinz, professor and management consultant “Space Education”, Wissenschaftliche Studie, 2014

The death toll for a pandemic is equal to the virulence, the deadliness of the pathogen or pathogens, multiplied by the number of people eventually infected. It has been hypothesized that there is an upper limit to the virulence of naturally evolved pathogens. This is because a pathogen that quickly kills its hosts might not have enough time to spread to new ones, while one that kills its hosts more slowly or not at all will allow carriers more time to spread the infection, and thus likely out-compete a more lethal species or strain. This simple model predicts that if virulence and transmission are not linked in any way, pathogens will evolve towards low virulence and rapid transmission. However, this assumption is not always valid and in more complex models, where the level of virulence and the rate of transmission are related, high levels of virulence can evolve. The level of virulence that is possible is instead limited by the existence of complex populations of hosts, with different susceptibilities to infection, or by some hosts being geographically isolated. The size of the host population and competition between different strains of pathogens can also alter virulence. There are numerous historical examples of pandemics that have had a devastating effect on a large number of people, which makes the possibility of global pandemic a realistic threat to human civilization.

#### 3] Cap solves warming

Hansen and Wethal 14 Arve Hansen is a Research Fellow in interdisciplinary development studies and geography at the Centre for Development and the Environment, University of Oslo, Norway. Ulrikke Wethal is a Research Fellow in development and economic geography at the Centre for Development and the Environment, University of Oslo, Norway. October 10, 2014, “Emerging Economies and Challenges to Sustainability: Theories, Strategies, Local Realities”, https://books.google.com/books?id=uxbEBAAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\_atb#v=onepage&q&f=false

As discussed in Chapter 3 by McNeill and Wilhite, the Kuznets curve has been used to describe the alleged relation between the environment and economic growth. The idea is that, as economies grow, growth will first lead to environmental degradation, but beyond a certain point, the fruits of this same growth can be used to prevent or ameliorate degradation. However, in advanced economies, most reduction in environmental degradation has taken place due to outsourcing of production rather than any innovative way of mitigating the challenges. In terms of achieving global sustainable development, the exportation of environmental problems through a relocalisation of production makes no positive contribution. While there has been increasing acknowledgement of the environmental crisis we are facing, radical action remains absent. So-called green-washing has been the main response to the call for sustainable development. This is not, we argue, necessarily because the idea of sustainable development is wrong, but mainly because countries are not willing to commit deeply to the required trans-formations. It is also because of the lack of visions that are both viable and appeal to large segments of societies. Economic growth enables job creation and increases living standards, and can allow governments to avoid the uncomfortable questions of more radical redistribution. Halting growth in a capitalist economy leads to recessions and unemployment. Even though it tends to hit the poorest hardest, the ramifications are felt across all groups in society. For a powerful political party (whether in a one-party system or a democracy) to preach no-growth or degrowth in this context is political suicide. Politics is the art of the possible (as von Bismarck famously said), and green-washing and technological fixes are much more palatable alternatives than the societal trans-formations required by deeper understandings of sustainability.

#### 4] Market failure wrong and capitalism creates *sustainable living conditions* – India and China prove – this takes out Robinson

Smith 17. Noah Smith is a Bloomberg View columnist. He was an assistant professor of finance at Stony Brook University, and he blogs at Noahpinion [“Free-Market Failure Has Been Greatly Exaggerated,” 11-15-2017, *Bloomberg*, URL: https://www.bloomberg.com/view/articles/2017-11-15/free-markets-improved-more-lives-than-anything-ever]//vikas

As someone who has done decades of pioneering work in the field of trade and growth, and who has been intimately involved in practical policy-making, Rodrik is as much of an expert on this topic as anyone . But although his criticisms are accurate, he overlooks much of the good that neoliberalism has done. Rodrik very wisely explains why it's so easy for economists to seem like shills for simplistic free-market policies. Confronted with a desire for quick fixes and easy explanations, many economists instinctively revert back to the toy models they learned in their introductory economics courses -- models where free-market competition solves almost any problem. As Rodrik notes, these models represent a common fable -- University of Connecticut law professor James Kwak calls it "economism" -- that ignores a million and one important features of real-world markets. **Government institutions**, for example, **matter a lot** -- from the corporatism of 20th century Japan to Germany's innovative unions**, there are many flavors of capitalism** that all seem to work fairly well. And without good institutions, capitalism can easily degenerate into inefficient monopoly, crash-prone financial excess, short-sighted environmental destruction, or a number of other undesirable conditions. But when it comes to the harms that neoliberalism has wrought, Rodrik cherry-picks quite a bit. He focuses on two countries -- Mexico and Chile. In the 1970s and 1980s, under dictator Augusto Pinochet, Chile took advice from a number of free-market economists, but the results were underwhelming. Since undertaking its own free-market reforms and signing the North American Free Trade Agreement, Mexico's economy has underperformed more interventionist countries like South Korea and China. These examples of neoliberal disappointment are real enough. It's no accident that both come from Latin America -- the region where neoliberal advice, in the form of a 10-point plan called the Washington Consensus, garnered the most publicity. The Washington Consensus has been the target of bitter criticism for years, and Rodrik himself has been one of its most prominent detractors. But Latin America is only one part of the world. Elsewhere, broadly neoliberal ideas have been much more of a success. Rodrik's essay should have taken these into consideration. Take China. **In the 1980s, after decades of economic and social disaster under Mao Zedong, China started experimenting with a market economy under** party leader **Deng Xiaoping**. The regime began to allow small businesses and granted limited land rights. **State**-owned **enterprises were partially privatized.** The country opened to foreign investment, and went from a state of isolation to the world's biggest trading economy. By 2005, China's market economy passed its state-run economy in size. What happened after China's market reforms is now well-known -- **the most dramatic explosion of economic growth in world history.** As Rodrik points out, state intervention still plays a prominent role in China's economy. But the shift from a rigid command-and-control economy to one that blended state and market approaches -- and the liberalization of trade -- was undoubtedly a neoliberal reform. Though Deng's changes were mostly done in an ad-hoc, common sense manner, he did invite famed neoliberal economist Milton Friedman to give him advice. A decade after China began its experiment, India followed suit. In 1991, after a sharp recession, **Prime Minister Narasimha Rao and Finance Minister Manmohan Singh scrapped a cumbersome system of business licensing, eased curbs on foreign investment, ended many state-sanctioned monopolies, lowered tariffs and** did a bunch of other neoliberal things. Although the results were not as dramatic as in China, **there was a** sustained **rise in economic growth**: It's almost impossible to overstate how important the growth explosions of India and China have been. So many people live in these two supergiant countries -- almost 40 percent of humanity, several times the total living in the developed world -- that together they determine the entire shape of human progress. During the last three decades, India and China have done more to reduce world poverty than any other force in history: Dry facts and figures shouldn't obscure the poignant human reality of this miracle. People who once bathed in dirty rivers, defecated outside and saw a quarter of their children die before age 5 are getting food, shelter and clean water. Hundreds of millions of **indigent farmers have moved on to better lives in cities.** Child mortality in India is down by almost five-sixths. It could reasonably be argued that nothing this good has ever happened before in human history. And **India and China's growth appears far from over.** So sure, the Washington Consensus didn't boost Latin America into the ranks of rich countries. And the neoliberal reforms in the former Soviet Union met with mixed success. But India and China account for more than three times as many people as all of those countries combined. Their sweeping reduction in extreme poverty alone makes neoliberalism a qualified success. Though the free-market approach unquestionably has its shortcomings, it would be wrong to label it "bad economics," as Rodrik does. The truth, as usual, is more complicated.

#### 5] Mobilization is impossible – self-hatred, love for the game, and lack of recognition of subjugation all disprove their thesis. Independently, neoliberal governments crack down on unions which kills aff solvency.

Han ’15 [Byung-Chul, “Why revolution is no longer possible”, 10-23-2015, https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/transformation/why-revolution-is-no-longer-possible/]//pranav

Accordingly, I tried to say why revolution is no longer possible today. Why is the neoliberal system of domination so stable? Why is there so little resistance to it? Why does the resistance that does occur so quickly come to naught? Why, despite the ever-expanding divide between rich and poor, is revolution no longer possible? To explain this state of affairs, we need a precise understanding of how power and domination function today. Anyone wishing to install a new system of rule must eliminate resistance. The same holds for the neoliberal order. Implementing a new system of dominion requires an instance of power that posits; often, this entails the use of force. However, power that posits a system is not identical to power that stabilizes a system internally. As is well known, Margaret Thatcher, the standard bearer of neoliberalism, treated unions as “internal enemies” and combated them violently. For all that, using force to establish the neoliberal agenda does not amount to system-preserving power. System-preserving power is not repressive, but seductive In disciplinary and industrial society, system-preserving power was repressive. Factory workers were brutally exploited by factory owners. Such violent exploitation of others’ labor entailed acts of protest and resistance. There, it was possible for a revolution to topple the standing relations of production. In that system of repression, both the oppressors and the oppressed were visible. There was a concrete opponent — a visible enemy —and one could offer resistance. The neoliberal system of domination has a wholly different structure. Now, system-preserving power no longer works through repression, but through seduction — that is, it leads us astray. It is no longer visible, as was the case under the regime of discipline. Now, there is no longer a concrete opponent, no enemy suppressing freedom that one might resist. Neoliberalism turns the oppressed worker into a free contractor, an entrepreneur of the self. Today, everyone is a self-exploiting worker in their own enterprise. Every individual is master and slave in one. This also means that class struggle has become an internal struggle with oneself. Today, anyone who fails to succeed blames themselves and feels ashamed. People see themselves, not society, as the problem. The subjugated subject is not even aware of its subjugation Any disciplinary power that expends effort to force human beings into a straitjacket of commandments and prohibitions proves inefficient. It is significantly more efficient to ensure that people subordinate themselves to domination on their own. The efficacy defining the system today stems from the fact that, instead of operating through prohibition and privation, it aims to please and fulfill. Instead of making people compliant, it endeavors to make them dependent. This logic of neoliberal efficiency also holds for surveillance. In the 1980s, to cite one example, there were vehement protests against the German national census. Even schoolchildren took to the streets. From today’s perspective, the information requested therein— profession, education levels, and distance from the workplace — seem almost laughable. At the time, people believed that they were facing the state as an instance of domination wresting data from citizens against their will. That time is long past. Today, people expose themselves willingly. Precisely this sense of freedom is what makes protest impossible. In contrast to the days of the census, hardly anyone protests against surveillance. Free self-disclosure and self-exposure follow the same logic of efficiency as free self-exploitation. What is there to protest against? Oneself? Conceptual artist Jenny Holzer has formulated the paradox of the present situation: “Protect me from what I want.” It is important to distinguish between power that posits and power that preserves. Today, power that maintains the system assumes a “smart” and friendly guise. In so doing, it makes itself invisible and unassailable. The subjugated subject does not even recognize that it has been subjugated. The subject thinks she is free. This mode of domination neutralizes resistance quite effectively. Domination that represses and attacks freedom is not stable. The neoliberal regime proves stable by immunizing itself against all resistance, because it makes use of freedom instead of repressing it. Suppressing freedom quickly provokes resistance; exploiting freedom does not. After the Asian financial crisis, South Korea stood paralyzed and shocked. The IMF intervened and extended credit. In return, the government had to assert its neoliberal agenda by force. This was repressive, positing power — the kind that often proves violent and differs from system-preserving power, which manages to pass itself off as freedom. According to Naomi Klein, the state of social shock following catastrophes such as the financial crisis in South Korea — or the current crisis in Greece — offers the chance to radically reprogram society by force. Today, there is hardly any resistance in South Korea. Quite the opposite: a vast consensus prevails — as well as depression and burnout. South Korea now has the world’s highest suicide rate. People enact violence on themselves instead of seeking to change society. Aggression directed outward, which would entail revolution, has yielded to aggression directed inward, against oneself. Today, no collaborative, networked multitude exists that might rise up in a global mass of protest and revolution. Instead, the prevailing mode of production is based on lonesome and isolated self-entrepreneurs, who are also estranged from themselves. Companies used to compete with each other. Within each enterprise, however, solidarity could occur. Today, everyone is competing against everyone else — and within the same enterprise, too. Even though such competition heightens productivity by leaps and bounds, it destroys solidarity and communal spirit. No revolutionary mass can arise from exhausted, depressive, and isolated individuals. Neoliberalism cannot be explained in Marxist terms. The famous “alienation” of labor does not even occur. Today, we dive eagerly into work — until we burn out. The first stage of burnout syndrome, after all, is euphoria. Burnout and revolution are mutually exclusive. Accordingly, it is mistaken to believe that the Multitude will cast off the parasitic Empire to inaugurate a communist society.