### DA – Reconciliation

#### Reconciliation passes now without further cuts – Holdouts tentatively say yes and our ev assumes every aff non-uq warrant

Reklaitis 12/02 [Victor, MarketWatch's Money & Politics reporter and is based in Washington, D.C. Prior to joining MarketWatch, he served as an assistant editor and reporter at Investor's Business Daily, “Biden’s big social-spending bill probably will pass Senate this month without many cuts to it, analysts say”, 12-02-2021, https://www.marketwatch.com/story/bidens-big-social-spending-bill-probably-will-pass-senate-this-month-without-many-cuts-to-it-analysts-say-11638466738]//pranav

Will President Joe Biden’s $2 trillion social-spending and climate package actually get the Senate’s OK this month, as that chamber’s leader has promised? Two analysts from opposite ends of the political spectrum said that looks likely, as they spoke on Wednesday with MarketWatch for a Barron’s Live episode. “I think the chances are very, very good that this bill will pass, and I wouldn’t bet the mortgage on it, but I would predict that it’s going to happen by this month,” said Seth Hanlon, a senior fellow at the liberal Center for American Progress. Kyle Pomerleau, a senior fellow at the conservative American Enterprise Institute, concurred with Hanlon, as the analysts assessed Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer’s stated goal of passage by Christmas. The legislation already got the House’s approval last month, so Biden can sign it into law if the Senate acts and the two chambers reconcile their versions of the measure. “I think that the Build Back Better Act ultimately passes. I think before Christmas seems like a reasonable timeline,” Pomerleau said. “There are other political challenges involved, if this bleeds over into next year, and I think that the Democrats want to avoid that.” Democrats also could be motivated by not wanting a lapse in monthly child tax credit payments, according to Hanlon. Those payouts, which began over the summer and provide up to $300 per child to families, would get extended for another year in the current version of the Build Back Better Act. “The child tax credit payments — the last one would be done on Dec. 15, and so I think the Democrats are going to want to continue those into January and not have them cut off suddenly,” the Center for American Progress expert said. Hanlon and Pomerleau said they don’t expect huge changes to the Build Back Better Act’s overall price tag, even as moderate Democratic Sen. Joe Manchin of West Virginia has expressed opposition to some items in the House version of the bill, including a plan for paid leave and a $4,500 tax credit for electric vehicles made in unionized U.S. factories. Another issue that’s dividing Democratic lawmakers is a proposed lift to the SALT cap, which refers to a limit on deductions from federal income tax for state and local taxes. “I think that $2 trillion in spending, including the tax credits, is a reasonable place that they will end up,” Pomerleau said, referring to what’s a likely final price tag. Meanwhile, Hanlon noted that a lot of negotiating has happened this year to get to the current state of affairs, after Sen. Bernie Sanders, the Vermont independent who usually votes with Democrats and chairs his chamber’s budget committee, proposed a much larger spending package. “If you back up to where we started with President Biden’s agenda and Sen. Sanders’s budget, we’re down to a relatively narrow, limited set of issues and a pretty narrow band of a total price tag,” he said. “I might expect that to shrink somewhat because of Sen. Manchin, but not that much. I think 90% of the bill will stay the same.” Democrats can’t afford to lose the support of any senator who typically votes with them, as they advance the bill through a process known as budget reconciliation. That’s because the Senate is split 50-50, with the party in control only because Vice President Kamala Harris can break ties.

#### Biden PC is key to getting democratic skeptics on board, but it’s tentative

Cochrane & Weisman 11/05 [Emily Cochrane - correspondent based in Washington. She has covered Congress since late 2018, focusing on the annual debate over government funding and economic legislation, ranging from emergency pandemic relief to infrastructure, Jonathan Weisman - congressional correspondent, veteran Washington journalist and author of the novel “No. 4 Imperial Lane” and the nonfiction book “(((Semitism))): Being Jewish in America in the Age of Trump.” His career in journalism stretches back 30 years, “Live Updates: House Democrats Push Toward Votes on Biden’s Agenda”, 11-05-2021, https://www.nytimes.com/live/2021/11/05/us/biden-spending-infrastructure-bill]//pranav

At the White House, Mr. Biden called on lawmakers to pass the legislation. “I’m asking every House member, member of the House of Representatives, to vote yes on both these bills right now,” the president said. Spooked by Tuesday’s electoral drubbing, Democrats labored to overcome concerns among moderates about the cost and details of a rapidly evolving, $1.85 trillion social safety net and climate plan and push it through over unified Republican opposition. They also hoped to clear a Senate-passed $1 trillion bipartisan infrastructure bill — the largest investment in the nation’s aging public works in a decade — for Mr. Biden’s signature. Top Democratic officials said they were confident they could complete both measures by day’s end, but Speaker Nancy Pelosi of California and her team continued to haggle with holdouts. Several moderates were pushing for more information about the cost of the sprawling plan, including a nonpartisan analysis from the Congressional Budget Office, the official scorekeeper responsible for calculating the fiscal impact of the 2,135-page legislation. “I think everyone’s waiting for the C.B.O. to do their job,” said Representative Jared Golden, Democrat of Maine, speaking to reporters on Friday morning as he left Ms. Pelosi’s office, where White House officials were also meeting on next steps. But Representative Steny H. Hoyer of Maryland, the majority leader, said the cost estimate would not be ready by the end of the day, and a person familiar with the discussions said a score from the budget office was weeks away from completion. “We’re working on it,” Mr. Hoyer said. Ms. Pelosi spent much of the day on Thursday buttonholing lawmakers on the House floor to try to corral support for the social policy bill, which includes monthly payments to families with children, universal prekindergarten, a four-week paid family and medical leave program, health care subsidies and a broad array of climate change initiatives. Mr. Biden and members of his cabinet worked the phones to win over Democratic skeptics. With Republicans united in opposition, Democrats could afford to lose as few as three votes from their side. As Democrats labored to unite their members behind the bill, Republicans sought to wreak procedural havoc on the House floor, forcing a vote to adjourn the chamber that leaders held open for hours to buy time for their negotiations. While the Senate approved the $1 trillion infrastructure bill in August, the measure has stalled as progressives have repeatedly refused to supply their votes for it until there is agreement on the other bill.

#### Business lobbying backlash ensures Sinema flips – empirics prove she doesn’t like similar bills

Duda ’21 [Jeremy, Prior to joining the Arizona Mirror, he worked at the Arizona Capitol Times, where he spent eight years covering the Governor's Office and two years as editor of the Yellow Sheet Report, “Business groups urge Kelly, Sinema to oppose pro-union PRO Act”, 08-30-2021, https://www.azmirror.com/2021/08/30/business-groups-urge-kelly-sinema-to-oppose-pro-union-pro-act/]//pranav

Business groups publicly called on Democratic U.S. Sens. Mark Kelly and Kyrsten Sinema to oppose a sweeping piece of pro-organized labor legislation that would wipe out Arizona’s “right-to-work” law that prohibits mandatory union membership. At a press conference at the office of the Arizona chapter of the Associated General Contractors near the state Capitol on Monday, leaders of several business groups warned that the Protecting the Right to Organize Act — or PRO Act, as it’s more commonly known — would undermine Arizona’s recovery from the economic slump it faced last year due to the COVID-19 pandemic, undermine the “gig economy,” jeopardize secret ballots in union organization votes, give unions access to confidential employee information and strip Arizonans of their right not to join a union. The bill would allow unions to override right-to-work laws and collect union dues from non-members who still benefit from collective bargaining. It would also prohibit company-sponsored meetings to urge employees against unionizing, define most independent contractors as employees, protect employees who are attempting to unionize from being fired and allow unions to engage in secondary strikes in support of other striking workers, among other provisions. “We want to thank and tell Senator Sinema and Senator Kelly that we appreciate them for not signing on as co-sponsors to the PRO Act, because if they were to change their opinions, New York Sen. Chuck Schumer will put this up for a vote,” said Danny Seiden, president and CEO of the Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry. Kelly and Sinema are two of only three Senate Democrats, along with Virginia’s Mark Warner, who haven’t co-sponsored the bill or thrown their public support behind it. Kelly last month told the Huffington Post that he opposes the independent contractor provision, but that he supports the “overall goals” of the legislation. Sinema is widely known as a holdout on the Democratic side and hasn’t supported the PRO Act, but spokesman Pablo Sierra-Carmona indicated that she hasn’t made up her mind, and that she won’t do so unless and until it comes up for a vote in the Senate.

#### They lash out against Reconciliation – it will includes similar provisions

FURCHTGOTT-ROTH 10/09 [Diana, former acting assistant secretary for economic policy at the U.S. Department of the Treasury, is adjunct professor of economics at George Washington University, “Democrats can't pass the PRO Act, so it's buried in the reconciliation bill”, 10-09-2021, https://thehill.com/opinion/white-house/575992-dems-cant-pass-the-pro-act-so-its-buried-in-the-reconciliation-bill]//pranav

Union membership has been declining for decades as workers find better uses than union dues for their hard-earned dollars. But union bosses and their supporters are trying to change the law to force hard-working Americans into unions. How? Through the Protecting the Right to Organize Act (PRO Act), a bill that would expand the power of union leaders at the expense of workers. After sailing through the House, the PRO Act now appears stalled in the Senate and Democrats are trying to slip some PRO Act provisions into a massive reconciliation bill. American workers are wise to turn down union membership. Union pension plans are in trouble. In 2020, the Labor Department listed 121 union plans in critical status, defined as less than 65 percent funded, and 61 in endangered status, with less than 80 percent funded. Unions desperately need new workers to join, because they pay contributions for many years without withdrawing money. Most recently, Amazon workers in Alabama resoundingly rejected efforts by the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store International Union to organize their plant, with more than 70 percent of workers voting against the union. The union’s plan was in critical status between 2015 and 2019, and the Labor Department informed the plan’s administrators that it had to be reorganized by reducing benefits and increasing contributions. Union leaders and their allies on Capitol Hill believe the way to increase membership after decades of decline is to pass elements of the PRO Act through reconciliation. Unlike the PRO Act, which needs 60 votes in the Senate to enable it to move to President Biden’s desk for signature, the reconciliation bill, which deals with taxes and spending, needs only a simple majority. So via a massive reconciliation bill, congressional Democrats are trying to move some labor union provisions of the PRO Act by arguing they are actually revenue raisers.

#### Reconciliation is k2 stopping existential climate change – warming is incremental and every change in temperature is vital

Higgins 8/16 [Trevor, Senior Director, Domestic Climate and Energy, “Budget Reconciliation Is the Key to Stopping Climate Change”, 08-16-2021, https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2021/08/16/502681/budget-reconciliation-key-stopping-climate-change/]//pranav

The United States is suffering acutely from the chaotic changes in climate that scientists now directly attribute to the burning of fossil fuels and other human activity. The drought, fires, extreme heat, and floods that have already killed hundreds this summer across the continent and around the world are a tragedy—and a warning of worsening instability yet to come. However, this week, the Senate initiated an extraordinary legislative response that would set the world on a different path. Enacting the full scope of President Joe Biden’s Build Back Better agenda would put the American economy to work leading a global transition to clean energy and stabilizing the climate. A look at what’s coming next through the budget reconciliation process reveals a ray of hope that is easy to miss amid the fitful negotiations of recent months: At long last, Congress is on the verge of major legislation that would build a more equitable, just, and inclusive clean energy economy. This is our shot to stop climate change. Building a clean energy future must start now Until the global economy stops polluting the air and instead starts to draw down the emissions of years past, the world will continue to heat up, blundering past perilous tipping points that threaten irreversible and catastrophic consequences. Stemming the extent of warming at 1.5 degrees Celsius rather 2 degrees or worse will reduce the risk of crossing such tipping points or otherwise exceeding the adaptive capacity of human society. Every degree matters. Stabilizing global warming at 1.5 degrees Celsius starts with cutting annual greenhouse gas emissions in the United States to half of peak levels by 2030. This isn’t about temporary offsets or incremental gains in efficiency—it’s about the rapid adoption of scalable solutions that will work throughout the world to eliminate global net emissions by 2050 and sustain net-negative emissions thereafter. Building this better future will tackle climate change, deliver on environmental justice, and create good jobs. It will give us a shot to stop the planet from continuously warming. It will alleviate the concentrated burdens of fossil fuel pollution, which are concentrated in systemically disadvantaged, often majority Black and brown communities. It will empower American workers to compete in the global clean energy economy of the 21st century. There is no time to lose

### PIC – Police

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

#### Police Strikes are used to combat racial progress and attempts to limit police union power. Making them legal and easier only make progress much harder.

Grim 2020 Andrew Grim What is the ‘blue flu’ and how has it increased police power? <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/07/01/what-is-blue-flu-how-has-it-increased-police-power/>SJKS

But the result of such protests matter deeply as we consider police reform today. Historically, blue flu strikes have helped expand police power, ultimately limiting the ability of city governments to reform, constrain or conduct oversight over the police. They allow the police to leverage public fear of crime to extract concessions from municipalities. This became clear in Detroit more than 50 years ago. In June 1967, tensions arose between Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanagh and the Detroit Police Officers Association (DPOA), which represented the city’s 3,300 patrol officers. The two were at odds primarily over police demands for a pay increase. Cavanagh showed no signs of caving to the DPOA’s demands and had, in fact, proposed to cut the police department’s budget. On June 15, the DPOA escalated the dispute with a walkout: 323 officers called in sick. The number grew over the next several days as the blue flu spread, reaching a height of 800 absences on June 17. In tandem with the walkout, the DPOA launched a fearmongering media campaign to win over the public. They took out ads in local newspapers warning Detroit residents, “How does it feel to be held up? Stick around and find out!” This campaign took place at a time of rising urban crime rates and uprisings, and only a month before the 1967 Detroit riot, making it especially potent. The DPOA understood this climate and used it to its advantage. With locals already afraid of crime and displeased at Cavanagh’s failure to rein it in, they would be more likely to demand the return of the police than to demand retribution against officers for an illegal strike. The DPOA’s strategy paid off. The walkout left Detroit Police Commissioner Ray Girardin feeling “practically helpless.” “I couldn’t force them to work,” he later told The Washington Post. Rather than risk public ire by allowing the blue flu to continue, Cavanagh relented. Ultimately, the DPOA got the raises it sought, making Detroit officers the highest paid in the nation. This was far from the end of the fight between Cavanagh and the DPOA. In the ensuing months and years, they continued to tussle over wages, pensions, the budget, the integration of squad cars and the hiring of black officers. The threat of another blue flu loomed over all these disputes, helping the union to win many of them. And Detroit was not an outlier. Throughout the 1960s, ’70s and ’80s, the blue flu was a [ubiquitous and highly effective](https://www.akpress.org/our-enemies-in-blue.html) tactic in Baltimore, Memphis, New Orleans, Chicago, Newark, New York and many other cities. In most cases, as author Kristian Williams writes, “When faced with a walkout or slowdown, the authorities usually decided that the pragmatic need to get the cops back to work trumped the city government’s long term interest in diminishing the rank and file’s power.” But each time a city relented to this pressure, they ceded more and more power to police unions, which would turn to the strategy repeatedly to defend officers’ interests — particularly when it came to efforts to address systemic racism in police policies and practices. In 1970, black residents of Pittsburgh’s North Side neighborhood raised an outcry over the “hostile sadistic treatment” they experienced at the hands of white police officers. They lobbied Mayor Peter F. Flaherty to assign more black officers to their neighborhood. The mayor agreed, transferring several white officers out of the North Side and replacing them with black officers. While residents cheered this decision, white officers and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), which represented them, were furious. They slammed the transfer as “discrimination” against whites. About 425 of the Pittsburgh Police Department’s 1,600 police officers called out sick in protest. Notably, black police officers broke with their white colleagues and refused to join the walkout. They praised the transfer as a “long overdue action” and viewed the walkout as a betrayal of officers’ oath to protect the public. Nonetheless, the tactic paid off. After several days, Flaherty caved to the “open revolt” of white officers, agreeing to halt the transfers and instead submit the dispute to binding arbitration between the city and the police union. Black officers, though, continued to speak out against their union’s support of racist practices, and many of them later resigned from the union in protest. Similar scenarios played out in Detroit, Chicago and other cities in the 1960s and ’70s, as white officers continually staged walkouts to preserve the segregated status quo in their departments. These blue flu strikes amounted to an authoritarian power grab by police officers bent on avoiding oversight, rejecting reforms and shoring up their own authority. In the aftermath of the 1967 Detroit walkout, a police commissioner’s aide strongly criticized the police union’s strong-arm tactics, saying “it smacks of a police state.” The clash left one newspaper editor wondering, “Who’s the Boss of the Detroit Police?” But in the “law and order” climate of the late 1960s, such criticism did not resonate enough to stir a groundswell of public opinion against the blue flu. And police unions dismissed critics by arguing that officers had “no alternative” but to engage in walkouts to get city officials to make concessions. Crucially, the very effectiveness of the blue flu may be premised on a myth. While police unions use public fear of crime skyrocketing without police on duty, in many cases, the absence of police did not lead to a rise in crime. In New York City in 1971, [for example](https://untappedcities.com/2020/06/12/the-week-without-police-what-we-can-learn-from-the-1971-police-strike/), 20,000 officers called out sick for five days over a pay dispute without any apparent increase in crime. The most striking aspect of the walkout, as one observer noted, “might be just how unimportant it seemed.” Today, municipalities are under immense pressure from activists who have taken to the streets to protest the police killings of black men and women. Some have already responded by enacting new policies and cutting police budgets. As it continues, more blue flus are likely to follow as officers seek to wrest back control of the public debate on policing and reassert their independence.

#### These strikes strengthen unions that contribute to increased violence, and protection of misconduct

Serwer 6/24 Serwer, Adam. “Bust the Police Unions.” The Atlantic, Atlantic Media Company, 24 June 2021, www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2021/07/bust-the-police-unions/619006/SJKS

Police unions found that they had new leverage at the bargaining table. In contract negotiations with cities, they sought not merely higher pay or better benefits, but protections for officers accused of misconduct. At this, they proved remarkably successful. Reviewing 82 active police-union contracts in major American cities, a 2017 Reuters investigation found that a majority “call for departments to erase disciplinary records, some after just six months.” Many contracts allow officers to access investigative information about complaints or charges against them before being interrogated, so they can get their stories straight. Some require the officer’s approval before making information regarding misconduct public; others set time limits on when citizens can file complaints. A 2017 Washington Post investigation found that since 2006, of the 1,881 officers fired for misconduct at the nation’s largest departments, 451 had been reinstated because of requirements in union contracts. For many police unions, enacting and enforcing barriers to accountability became a primary concern. In 2014, in San Antonio, the local police union was willing to accept caps on pay and benefits as long as the then–city manager abandoned her efforts to, among other reforms, prevent police from erasing past misconduct records. The damage that these types of provisions have done is hard to overstate. In one recent study, the economist Rob Gillezeau of the University of Victoria found that after departments unionized, there was a “substantial increase” in police killings of civilians. Neither crime rates nor the safety of officers themselves was affected. The provisions do more than simply protect bad actors. They cultivate an unhealthy and secretive culture within police departments, strengthening a phenomenon known as the code of silence. In a 2000 survey of police officers by the National Institute of Justice, only 39 percent of respondents agreed with the statement “Police officers always report serious criminal violations involving abuse of authority by fellow officers.”

#### That leads to endless amounts of racist violence and the bolstering of the prison industrial complex.

Chaney and Ray 13, Cassandra (Has a PhD and is a professor at LSU. Also has a strong focus in the structure of Black families) , and Ray V. Robertson (Also has a PhD and is a criminal justice professor at LSU). "Racism and police brutality in America." *Journal of African American Studies* 17.4 (2013): 480-505. SM//do I really need a card for this

Racism and Discrimination According to Marger (2012), “racism is an ideology, or belief system, designed to justify and rationalize racial and ethnic inequality” (p. 25) and “discrimination, most basically, is behavior aimed at denying members of particular ethnic groups’ equal access to societal rewards” (p. 57). Defining both of these concepts from the onset is important for they provide the lens through which our focus on the racist and discriminatory practices of law enforcement can occur. Since the time that Africans [African Americans] were forcibly brought to America, they have been the victims of racist and discriminatory practices that have been spurred and/or substantiated by those who create and enforce the law. For example, The Watts Riots of 1965, the widespread assaults against Blacks in Harlem during the 1920s (King 2011), law enforcement violence against Black women (i.e., Malaika Brooks, Jaisha Akins, Frankie Perkins, Dr. Mae Jemison, Linda Billups, Clementine Applewhite) and other ethnic women of color (Ritchie 2006), the beating of Rodney King, and the deaths of Amadou Diallo in the 1990s and Trayvon Martin more recently are just a few public examples of the historical and contemporaneous ways in which Blacks in America have been assaulted by members of the police system (King 2011; Loyd 2012; Murch 2012; Rafail et al. 2012). In Punishing Race (2011), law professor Michael Tonry’s research findings point to the fact that Whites tend to excuse police brutality against Blacks because of the racial animus that they hold against Blacks. Thus, to Whites, Blacks are viewed as deserving of harsh treatment in the criminal justice system (Peffley and Hurwitz 2013). At first glance, such an assertion may seem to be unfathomable, buy that there is an extensive body of literature which suggests that Black males are viewed as the “prototypical criminal,” and this notion is buttressed in the media, by the general public, and via disparate sentencing outcomes (Blair et al. 2004; Eberhardt et al. 2006; Gabiddon 2010; Maddox and Gray 2004; Oliver and Fonash 2002; Staples 2011). For instance, Blair et al. (2004) revealed that Black males with more Afrocentric features (e.g., dark skin, broad noses, full lips) may receive longer sentences than Blacks with less Afrocentric features, i.e., lighter skin and straighter hair (Eberhardt et al. 2006). Shaun Gabiddon in Criminological Theories on Race and Crime (2010) discussed the concept of “Negrophobia” which was more extensively examined by Armour (1997). Negrophobia can be surmised as an irrational of Blacks, which includes a fear of being victimized by Black, that can result in Whites shooting or harming an AfricanAmerican based on criminal/racial stereotypes (Armour 1997). The aforementioned racialized stereotypical assumptions can be deleterious because they can be used by Whites to justify shooting a Black person on the slightest of pretense (Gabiddon 2010). Finally, African-American males represent a group that has been much maligned in the larger society (Tonry 2011). Further, as victims of the burgeoning prison industrial complex, mass incarceration, and enduring racism, the barriers to truly independent Black male agency are ubiquitous and firmly entrenched (Alexander 2010; Chaney 2009; Baker 1996; Blackmon 2008; Dottolo and Stewart 2008; Karenga 2010; Martin et al. 2001; Smith and Hattery 2009). Thus, racism and discrimination heightens the psychological distress experienced by Blacks (Robertson 2011; Pieterse et al. 2012), as well as their decreased mortality in the USA (Muennig and Murphy 2011). Police Brutality Against Black Males According to Walker (2011), police brutality is defined as “the use of excessive physical force or verbal assault and psychological intimidation” (p. 579). Although one recent study suggests that the NYPD has become better behaved due to greater race and gender diversity (Kane and White 2009), Blacks are more likely to be the victims of police brutality. A growing body of scholarly research related to police brutality has revealed that Blacks are more likely than Whites to make complaints regarding police brutality (Smith and Holmes 2003), to be accosted while operating [driving] a motorized vehicle (“Driving While Black”), and to underreport how often they are stopped due to higher social desirability factors (TomaskovicDevey et al. 2006). Interestingly, data obtained from the General Social Survey (GSS), a representative sample conducted biennially by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago for the years 1994 through 2004, provide further proof regarding the acceptance of force against Blacks. In particular, the GSS found Whites to be significantly (29.5 %) more accepting of police use of force when a citizen was attempting to escape custody than Blacks when analyzed using the chi-squared statistical test (p The average Southern policeman is a promoted poor White with a legal sanction to use a weapon. His social heritage has taught him to despise the Negroes, and he has had little education which could have changed him….The result is that probably no group of Whites in America have a lower opinion of the Negro people and are more fixed in their views than Southern policeman. (Myrdal 1944, pp. 540–541) Myrdal (1944) was writing on results from a massive study that he undertook in the late 1930s. He was writing at a time that even the most conservative among us would have to admit was not a colorblind society (if one even believes in such things). But current research does corroborate his observations that less educated police officers tend to be the most aggressive and have the most formal complaints filed against them when compared to their more educated counterparts (Hassell and Archbold 2010; Jefferis et al. 2011). Tonry (2011) delineates some interesting findings from the 2001 Race, Crime, and Public Opinion Survey that can be applied to understanding why the larger society tolerates police misconduct when it comes to Black males. The survey, which involved approximately 978 non-Hispanic Whites and 1,010 Blacks, revealed a divergence in attitudes between Blacks and Whites concerning the criminal justice system (Tonry 2011). For instance, 38 % of Whites and 89 % of Blacks viewed the criminal justice system as biased against Blacks (Tonry 2011). Additionally, 8 % of Blacks and 56 % of Whites saw the criminal justice system as treating Blacks fairly (Tonry 2011). Perhaps most revealing when it comes to facilitating an environment ripe for police brutality against Black males, 68 % of Whites and only 18 % of Whites expressed confidence in law enforcement (Tonry 2011). Is a society wherein the dominant group overwhelming approves of police performance willing to do anything substantive to curtail police brutality against Black males? Police brutality is not a new phenomenon. The Department of Justice (DOJ) office of Civil Rights (OCR) has investigated more than a dozen police departments in major cities across the USA on allegations of either racial discrimination or police brutality (Gabbidon and Greene 2013). To make the aforementioned even more clear, according to Gabbidon and Greene (2013), “In 2010, the OCR was investigating 17 police departments across the country and monitoring five settlements regarding four police agencies” (pp. 119–120). Plant and Peruche (2005) provide some useful information into why police officers view Black males as potential perpetrators and could lead to acts of brutality. In their research, the authors suggest that since Black people in general, and Black males in particular, are caricatured as aggressive and criminal, police are more likely to view Black men as a threat which justifies the disproportionate use of deadly force. Therefore, it is not beyond the realm of possibility that police officers’ decisions to act aggressively may, to some extent, be influenced by race (Jefferis et al. 2011). The media’s portrayals of Black men are often less than sanguine. Bryson’s (1998) work in this area provides empirical evidence that the mass media that has been instrumental in portraying Black men as studs, super detectives, or imitation White men and has a general negative effect on how these men are regarded by others. Such characterizations can be so visceral in nature that “prototypes” of criminal suspects are more likely to be African-American (Oliver et al. 2004). Not surprisingly, the more Afrocentric the African-American’s facial features, the more prone he or she is expected to be deviant (Eberhardt et al. 2006). Interestingly, it is probable that less than flattering depictions of Black males on television and in news stories are activating pre-existing stereotypes possessed by Whites as opposed to facilitating their creation. According to Oliver et al. (2004), “it is important to keep in mind that media consumption is an active process, with viewers’ existing attitudes and beliefs playing a larger role in how images are attended to, interpreted, and remembered” (p. 89). Moreover, it is reductionist to presuppose that individual is powerless in constructing a palatable version of reality and is solely under the control of the media and exercises no agency. Lastly, Peffley and Hurwitz (2013) describe what can be perceived as one of the more deleterious results of negative media caricatures of Black males. More specifically, the authors posit that most Whites believe that Blacks are disproportionately inclined to engage in criminal behavior and are the deserving on harsh treatment by the criminal justice system. On the other hand, such an observation is curious because most urban areas are moderate to highly segregated residentially which would preclude the frequent and significant interaction needed to make such scathing indictments (Bonilla-Silva 2009). Consequently, the aforementioned racial animus has the effect of increased White support for capital punishment if questions regarding its legitimacy around if capital punishment is too frequently applied to Blacks (Peffley and Hurwitz 2013; Tonry 2011). Ultimately, erroneous (negative) portrayals of crime and community, community race and class identities, and concerns over neighborhood change all contribute to place-specific framing of “the crime problem.” These frames, in turn, shape both intergroup dynamics and support for criminal justice policy (Leverentz 2012).

## Case

### Framework

#### 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] Even the most conservative estimates prove reducing existential risk outweighs all other impacts, regardless of probability – actively prioritize our calculus since you are cognitively biased against it

Whittlestone 17 – (Jess Whittlestone, PhD in Behavioural Science and has worked as a policy consultant for government, specialising in security and foreign policy. She also has experience as a freelance journalist for a number of online magazines, including Quartz, Vox, and Aeon. Before her PhD, she studied Maths and Philosophy at Oxford, and played a key role in developing 80,000 Hours' coaching process and research. Currently, Jess is a Postdoctoral Research Associate at the Leverhulme Centre for the Future of Intelligence at Cambridge, “The Long-Term Future”, Effective Altruism, 11-16-17, Available Online at <https://www.effectivealtruism.org/articles/cause-profile-long-run-future/>, accessed 12-4-18, HKR-AM)

The number of people alive today pales in comparison to the number who could exist in the future. It may therefore be extremely important to ensure that human civilization flourishes far into the future, enjoying fulfilling lives free of suffering. There are a number of ways we might work to ensure a positive future for humanity. We could work to better understand and prevent extinction risks - catastrophic events that have the potential to destroy all life on this planet.[1] We may want to focus on the broader category of existential risks- events that could dramatically and irreversibly curtail humanity’s potential.[2] Or we might focus on increasing the chance that the lives of our descendants are positive in other ways: for example, improving democracy or the ability of institutions to make good decisions. Attempts to shape the long-term future seem highly neglected relative to the problems we face today. There are fewer incentives to address longer-term problems, and they can also be harder for us to take seriously. It is, of course, hard to be certain about the impact of our actions on the very long-term future. However, it does seem that there are things we can do - and given the vast scale we are talking about, these actions could therefore have an enormous impact in expectation. This profile sets out why you might want to focus your altruistic efforts on the long-term future - and why you might not. You may be particularly inclined to focus on this if you think we face serious existential threats in the next century, and if you’re comfortable accepting a reasonable amount of uncertainty about the impact you are having, especially in the short-term. The case for the long-term future as a target of altruism The case for focusing on the long-term future can be summarised as follows: The long-term future has enormous potential for good or evil: our descendants could live for billions or trillions of years, and have very high-quality lives; It seems likely there are things we can do today that will affect the long-term future in non-negligible ways; Possible ways of shaping the long-term future are currently highly neglected by individuals and society; Given points 1 to 3 above, actions aimed at shaping the long-term future seem to have extremely high expected value, higher than any actions aiming for more near-term benefits. Below we discuss each part of this argument in more detail. The long-term future has enormous potential Civilisation could continue for a billion years, until the Earth becomes uninhabitable.[3] It’s hard to say how likely this is, but it certainly seems plausible - and putting less than, say, a 1% chance on this possibility seems overconfident.[4] You may disagree that 1% is a reasonable lower bound here, but changing the figure by an order of magnitude or two would still yield an extremely impressive result. And even if civilisation only survives for another million years, that still amounts to another ~50,000 generations of people, i.e. trillions of future lives.[5] If our descendants survive for long enough, then they are likely to advance in ways we cannot currently imagine - even someone living a few hundred years ago could not possibly have imagined the technological advances we’ve made today. It is possible they might even develop technology enabling them to reach and colonise planets outside our solar system, and survive well beyond a billion years.[6] Let’s say that if we survive until the end of the Earth’s lifespan, there is a 1% chance of space colonisation. This would make the overall probability of survival beyond Earth 1 in 10,000 (1% chance of surviving to a billion years, multiplied by a 1% chance of surviving further given that). This sounds incredibly low, but suppose that space colonisation could allow our descendants to survive up to 100 trillion years[7]. This suggests we could have up to 1/10,000 x 100 trillion years = 10 billion expected years of civilisation ahead of us. If we expect life in the future to be, on average, about as good as the present, then this would make the whole of the future about 100 million times more important than everything that has happened in the last 100 years. In fact, it seems like there could be more people in the future with better lives than those living today: economic, social, and technological progress could enable us to cure diseases, lift people out of poverty, and better solve other problems. It also seems possible that people in the future will be more altruistic than people alive today[8] - which also makes it more likely that they will be motivated to create a happy and valuable world. However, it’s precisely because of this enormous potential that it’s so important to ensure that things go as well as possible. The loss of potential would be enormous if we end up on a negative trajectory. It could result in a great deal of suffering or the end of life.[9] And just as the potential to solve many of the world’s problems is growing, threats seem to be growing too. In particular, advanced technologies and increasing interconnectedness pose great risks.[10] There are things we can do today that could affect the long-term future There are a number of things we could work on today that seem likely to influence the long-term future: Reducing extinction risks: We could reduce the risk of catastrophic climate change by putting in place laws and regulations to cut carbon emissions. We could reduce the risks from new technologies by investing in research to ensure their safety. Alternatively, we could work to improve global cooperation so that we are better able to deal with unforeseen risks that might arise. Changing the values of a civilisation: Values tend to be stable in societies,[11] so attempts to shift values, whilst difficult, could have long-lasting effects. Some forms of value change, like increasing altruism, seem robustly good, and may be a way of realizing the very best possible futures. However, spreading poorly considered values could be harmful. Reducing suffering risks: Historically, technological advances have enabled great welfare improvements (e.g. through modern agriculture and medicine), but also some of the greatest sources of present-day suffering (e.g. factory farming). To prevent the worst risks from new technologies, we could improve global cooperation and work on specific problems like preventing worst-case outcomes from artificial intelligence. “Speeding up” development: Boosting technological innovation or scientific progress could have a lasting “speed up” effect on the entire future, making all future benefits happen slightly earlier than they otherwise would have. Curing a disease just a few years earlier could save millions of lives, for example. (That said, it’s not clear whether speeding up development is good or bad for existential risk - developing new technologies faster might help us to mitigate certain threats, but pose new risks of their own.) Ripple effects of our ordinary actions: Improvements in health not only benefit individuals directly but allow them to be more economically successful, meaning that society and other individuals have to invest less in supporting them. In aggregate, this could easily have substantial knock-on effects on the productivity of society, which could affect the future. Other ways we might create positive trajectory changes: These include improving education, science, and political systems. Paul Christiano also points out that even if opportunities to shape the long-term future with any degree of certainty do not exist today, they may well exist in the future. Investing in our own current capacity could have an indirect but large impact by improving our ability to take such opportunities when they do arise. Similarly, we can do research today to learn more about how we might be able to impact the long-term future. The long-term future is neglected, especially relative to its importance Attempts to shape the long-term future are neglected by individuals, organisations and governments. One reason is that there is little incentive to focus on far-off, uncertain issues compared to more certain, immediate ones. As 80,000 Hours put it, “Future generations matter, but they can’t vote, they can’t buy things, they can’t stand up for their interests.” Problems faced by future generations are also more uncertain and more abstract, making it harder for us to care about them. There is a well-established phenomenon called temporal discounting, which means that we tend to give less weight to outcomes that are far in the future. This may explain our tendency to neglect long-term risks and problems. For example, it’s a large part of why we seem to have such difficulty tackling climate change. Generally, there are diminishing returns to additional work in an area. This means that the neglectedness of the long-term future makes it more likely to be high impact. Efforts to shape the long-term future could be extremely high in expected value Even if the chance of our actions influencing the long-term trajectory of humanity is relatively low, there are extremely large potential benefits, which mean that these actions could still have a very high expected value. For example, decreasing the probability of human extinction by just one in a million could result in an additional 1,000 to 10,000 expected years of civilisation (using earlier assumptions).[12] Compare this to actions we could take to improve the lives of people alive today, without looking at longer-run effects. A dramatic victory such as curing the most common and deadly diseases, or ending all war, might only make the current time period (~100 years) about twice as good as otherwise.[13] Though this seems like an enormous success, given the calculations above, decreasing the probability of human extinction would be 10 or 100 times better in expectation. We might want to adjust this naive estimate downwards slightly, however, given uncertainty about some of the assumptions that go into it - we could be wrong about the probability of humanity surviving far into the future, or about the value of the future (if we think that future flourishing might have diminishing value, for example.) However, even if we think these estimates should be adjusted downwards substantially, we might very conservatively imagine that reducing the likelihood of existential risk by one in a million only equates to 100 expected years of civilization. This still suggests that the value of working to reduce existential risk is comparable to the value of the biggest victories we could imagine in the current time period - and so well worth taking seriously.

#### [3] War worsens structural inequalities – a] takes away valuable resources to combat issues like economic and social injustice b] war falls the hardest on those who can’t protect themselves – especially nuclear war c] those who fight war are more likely to be worse off socially d] war kills everyone – death means we literally cannot fight injustice

### Democracy

#### Government unions turn advantage: they dictate and fuel anti-democratic politics

Sheffield 15 (Carrie Sheffield Contributor Sep 29, 2015, Government Unions Hurt Upward Mobility: What We Can Do About It?, Forbes, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/carriesheffield/2015/09/29/government-unions-hurt-upward-mobility-what-we-can-do-about-it/?sh=10cdcd631b0b)//ww> pbj

We all want to help society’s most disadvantaged. Yet there’s a persistent myth in America that today’s labor unions just fight for the little guy, the lunch pail-toting everyman. However true that may have been a generation ago, today’s face of organized labor is drastically different. Unions of yesteryear were predominantly in the private sector. But since 2009, government union membership surpassed private membership, and their membership looks very different from when it comprised Joe Sixpack and his pals. Government unions, on average, represent skilled, white-collar workers who enjoy generous benefits, sans accountability, courtesy of the hardworking taxpayer. This has profound implications for the upward mobility and fiscal solvency of future generations. It also presents troubling challenges to democracy and sovereignty at all levels of government. My new paper released by the Competitive Enterprise Institute, How Government Unions Undermine Upward Mobility, And What Can Be Done about It, highlights this problem. Today’s government sector workers are generally materially better off and have higher levels of formal education than private sector union members of years past. For example, in 1960, more than 35 percent of all union members had not finished high school and only 2 percent had college degrees. Flash forward to 2013, when 53.6 percent of public sector workers had a bachelor’s, advanced, or professional degree, compared to 34.9 percent of private sector workers, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service (CRS). Blue-collar union guys? Among government employees, think again. A larger share of government workers are employed in “management, professional, and related occupations,” some 56.2 percent in 2013. Compare that to just 37.8 percent of private sector workers, CRS also reports. And even at the same education levels, the Congressional Budget Office found that government workers at high school, bachelor and master's degree levels have higher compensation packages than private sector workers. More talented workers deserve better pay and perks, certainly. But the problem is that government unions wield power over elected officials and the public through collective bargaining and the threat of strikes. This can cripple government services, from schools to transportation to garbage collection. Such a setup ensures that staffing decisions are based on tenure and connections rather than merit, discouraging innovative, aspiring young public servants and, sadly, too often protecting ineffective teachers at the expense of students from the most disadvantaged socioeconomic backgrounds. Even old-school liberals like New York Mayor Fiorello LaGuardia and AFL-CIO President George Meany opposed public sector unions, while strongly supporting unionization in the private sector. That sentiment was shared by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the famously liberal president who ushered in massive government expansion. “Meticulous attention should be paid to the special relations and obligations of public servants to the public itself and to the Government,” he cautioned. “The process of collective bargaining, as usually understood, cannot be transplanted into the public service.” Yet unfortunately for taxpayers, government unions donate huge amounts to elected officials who then vote on those expanding benefit packages – much to the detriment of cities like Detroit and Stockton, California, and states like Illinois and New Jersey that are on the brink of fiscal insolvency. This negative feedback loop, along with threat of strikes, undermines the foundations of democracy: how can a sovereign government imperil its own functioning? How can unelected union bosses dictate outcomes to publicly-elected officials? While union political payments skew heavily toward one political party, we have seen some courageous action from both sides of the aisle to tackle these troubling trends, including by Democrats Gina Raimondo in Rhode Island and Rahm Emanuel in Chicago as well as Republicans Scott Walker in Wisconsin and Carl DeMaio in San Diego. Fortunately, there are solutions to help mitigate the power asymmetry between the public and the people hired to serve them. This includes removing pensions, health care benefits, and raises from the collective bargaining table and instead indexing them to inflation. Other reforms include increasing the retirement age for public sector benefits and restricting use of government-collected union dues for collective bargaining only, not politics. With inequality a topic du jour among influential figures, from Janet Yellen to Hillary Clinton and Jeb Bush, government unions play their part in widening the wealth gap between well-connected government workers and the rest of America. As the percentage of government union members increased between 1971 and 2004, the fraction of government union members in the top third of the nation’s income distribution increased by 24 percent, while the proportion of unionists in the bottom third of the distribution declined by 45 percent, according to political scientists Jan Leighley and Jonathan Nagle. Well-meaning thought leaders can no longer ignore the true nature of a unionized government workforce. They can stand up to ensure that students, young public servants, and taxpayers are protected for generations to come.

#### Unions alone aren’t enough – too many confounding variables

Alquist 17 (John S. Ahlquist School of Global Policy and Strategy, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093; email: [jahlquist@ucsd.edu](mailto:jahlquist@ucsd.edu), Labor Unions, Political Representation, and Economic Inequality Annual Review of Political Science Vol. 20:409-432 (Volume publication date May 2017) First published online as a Review in Advance on March 9, 2017 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-051215-023225)//ww> pbj

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

#### They say unions decrease right wing populism – turn – conservatives have hijacked pro-union sentiments to promote right-wing populism within unions

Adam D.K. King 21 [Adam King is a union researcher. He earned his PhD in Sociology from York University. "The Left Needs A Coherent Response To Right-Wing Populism," Passage, https://readpassage.com/p/the-left-needs-a-coherent-response-to-right-wing-populism/, accessed 12-2-2021]//anop

Could it be that conservative and right-wing populist appeals to the working class are more than just vulgar opportunism? This past Labour Day, Conservative Party Leader Erin O’Toole released a video blaming “big government,” “corporate elites” and “bad trade deals” for Canada’s ailing manufacturing and resource sectors, pitching his “Canada First” economic strategy as an alternative. This justifiably worried some on the left. O’Toole, like Premier Doug Ford in Ontario before him, is of course partly cribbing from the Donald Trump playbook, perhaps looking to peel off some votes from disgruntled and displaced workers in Ontario’s growing rustbelt. While union leadership will work to defeat right-populist politicians at the polls, the appeals of Trump, O’Toole and other such politicians should be seen as attempts to by-pass union leadership and speak directly to disgruntled workers. *It’s tempting to write this type of right-wing, supposedly ‘pro-worker’ messaging off as nothing more than electoral opportunism.* We can easily point to the list of harmful policies that Conservatives have implemented or pursued across Canada — free trade, corporate tax cuts, attacks on unions, opposition to minimum wage increases, etc. However, poking holes in the new conservative, pro-worker narrative won’t be enough. Insofar as right-wing politicians who are courting workers’ votes are at least speaking to working-class concerns, the left needs a coherent response. There’s also growing evidence that right-wing overtures to the working class are more than just words. Outfits such as American Compass in the United States are pushing their own brand of pro-worker, ‘family-friendly’ conservative policy agenda. The American populist right is seemingly in the process of shedding the buffoonery and boorishness associated with Trump and attempting to cohere a nominally pro-worker platform. To counter this, we need to clearly differentiate left-wing responses to pressing social and economic issues from those offered by the right. Conservatives can only offer reactionary (and ultimately unworkable) answers to the real problems facing workers. Pro-worker and pro-union conservatives seem oxymoronic, but there’s a growing number of right-wingers who claim they’re supportive of unions and collective bargaining. The average union member today is a woman working in the public sector. However, these workers aren’t who right-wingers target with their rhetoric; conservatives remain fundamentally opposed to public sector unions. Instead, their pro-worker message is tailored to current or former private sector union members, in manufacturing, resources and building trades in particular. These industries and the unions in them have historically been dominated by men and are largely white (though less so now). And although we often associate deindustrialization and manufacturing job loss with white workers, these have also been economically harmful to racialized workers in many regions. For the most part, right populist ‘pro-union’ posturing is directed at ‘free trade,’ accompanied by a heavy dose of China bashing. Of course, China isn’t the only target, as Mexico gets its fair share of vitriol as well. On this front, sections of the labour movement haven’t helped matters. Calling for ‘buy American’ campaigns or to ‘boycott’ Mexican-made vehicles only feeds racism and xenophobia. Such nationalist anti-free trade rhetoric misdiagnoses the problem and offers no credible solution. Chinese workers — or any other workers in the Global South, for that matter — didn’t ‘steal’ Canadian jobs; Canadian and American corporate elites wanted access to cheap labour to solve their profitability crises, and their allies in government delivered. Moreover, the pro-worker right imagines that we can turn back the clock on corporate globalization and return outsourced or redundant manufacturing jobs. Whether they genuinely believe this or not is anyone’s guess. They are, however, wrong. So long as profit remains the sole criteria for determining what gets produced and where, there will be no ‘re-shoring’ of lost manufacturing jobs. Only public investment in well-paying jobs can solve the growing crisis of a lack of secure employment. There also seems to be a bit of a disconnect between right populist politicians and the new brand of conservative, pro-worker policy wonk. The Trumpist appeal, while directed broadly at workers harmed by corporate globalization, was also calibrated to capitalize on and stoke racist and sexist resentment. Proponents of this right-wing strategy sought to speak to the visceral pain caused by corporate globalization, while separating themselves from the bipartisan forces behind this neoliberal political project. How this brand of politics would relate to unions in practice was always fraught. On the other hand, conservative thinkers, such as Oren Cass and others associated with American Compass, cast their net more broadly. They imagine trade unions as quintessentially conservative institutions of direct democracy, able to replace many functions of the welfare state. Collective bargaining, for such conservatives, potentially offers a way to achieve a fairer economic distribution for private sector workers with less social spending and public intervention. They want to see more benefits attached to employment and a smaller welfare state. (Loss of employer-provided health insurance during the pandemic should be enough to demonstrate the awfulness of this idea.) How pro-union conservatives plan to convince recalcitrant employers of the virtues of collective bargaining is unclear. The social functions that pro-worker conservatives do propose for the welfare state, however, are also revealing. Recently, Cass was involved in debates around the design and rollout of child benefits in the U.S. His proposal — which writer Matt Bruenig provocatively characterized as intentionally designed to starve the poorest kids — would “only go to working households.” This is the same sexist policy design pushed by conservative and neoliberal thinkers for decades. Raising children, according to this logic, isn’t work — or at least not work deserving of income. Only labour market attachment makes people deserving of benefits, apparently. Exclusionary benefit design fits together with American Compass’ broader ‘pro-worker’ agenda: they’re pushing a conservative nostalgia for the old “gender contract” of an economic system made up of male breadwinners with dependent wives and children. Conservatives want to use social policy to push recipients into marriage through work requirements which punish single parents (mostly women). Or, if they can’t do that, they’ll settle for coercing single mothers into low-wage work. Pro-worker, pro-union conservatism is a mirage. Whether they feign concern for displaced manufacturing workers or offer wonkish (and sexist) policy, the right offers no real solutions. Instead, conservatives push a nationalist, patriarchal, anti-public sector fantasy centred on an impossible return to the past to address the pressing needs of the present. The left should know that right-populist conservatives are selling snake oil. But insofar as right-wing fool’s gold might appeal to sections of the working class, we need to confront it head on. Where conservatives care only about select workers in the private sector, the labour movement and the left must represent all workers against the neoliberal policies of free trade, deregulation and austerity. When the right deploys nationalism to distract from the damage done by corporate globalization, the left’s position should be one of unequivocal international solidarity which resists any attempt to frame workers around the world as in competition with one another. The right would starve the poor through slashing at an already threadbare social safety net. The left’s program must be centred on building the welfare state to provide a solid foundation of universal public services and cash transfer programs for all. We need to offer a credible and visionary alternative to both the false promises of conservatives and the expired consensus of neoliberal capitalism and corporate globalization.

### Unions

#### Unions fail and exacerbate inequality—

#### [1] Inflation – kills productivity and causes artificial wage growth. They don’t get to leverage wage raises – union demands lead to inflation so real wages remain the same

Reisman 14, George. [George Reisman, Ph.D., is Pepperdine University Professor Emeritus of Economics and the author of Capitalism: A Treatise on Economics (Ottawa, Illinois: Jameson Books, 1996; Kindle Edition, 2012). More articles like these can be found at his blog. "How Labor Unions Hurt Workers." The Free Market 32, no. 6 (June 2014): 1–2, 6.]//anop

Many Americans, perhaps a substantial majority, still believe that, irrespective of any problems they may have caused, labor unions are fundamentally an institution that exists in the vital self-interest of wage earners. Indeed, many believe that it is labor unions that stand between the average wage earner and a life of subsistence wages, exhausting hours of work, and horrific working conditions. Labor unions and the general public almost totally ignore the essential role played by falling prices in achieving rising real wages. They see only the rise in money wages as worthy of consideration. Indeed, in our environment of chronic inflation, prices that actually do fall are relatively rare. Nevertheless, the only thing that can explain a rise in real wages throughout the economic system is a fall in prices relative to wages. And the only thing that achieves this is an increase in production per worker. More production per worker — a higher productivity of labor — serves to increase the supply of goods and services produced relative to the supply of labor that produces them. In this way, it reduces prices relative to wages and thereby raises real wages and the general standard of living. What raises money wages throughout the economic system is not what is responsible for the rise in real wages. Increases in money wages are essentially the result just of the increase in the quantity of money and resulting increase in the overall volume of spending in the economic system. In the absence of a rising productivity of labor, the increase in money and spending would operate to raise prices by as much or more than it raised wages. This outcome is prevented only by the fact that at the same time that the quantity of money and volume of spending are increasing, the output per worker is also increasing, with the result that prices rise by less than wages. A fall in prices is still present in the form of prices being lower than they would have been had only an increase in the quantity of money and volume of spending been operative. With relatively minor exceptions, real wages throughout the economic system simply do not rise from the side of higher money wages. Essentially, they rise only from the side of a greater supply of goods and services relative to the supply of labor and thus from prices being lower relative to wages. The truth is that the means by which the standard of living of the individual wage earner and the individual businessman and capitalist is increased, and the means by which that of the average wage earner in the economic system is increased, are very different. For the individual, it is the earning of more money. For the average wage earner in the economic system, it is the payment of lower prices. What this discussion shows is that the increase in money wages that labor unions seek is not at all the source of rising real wages and that the source of rising real wages is in fact a rising productivity of labor, which always operates from the side of falling prices, not rising money wages. Indeed, the efforts of labor unions to raise money wages are profoundly opposed to the goal of raising real wages and the standard of living. When the unions seek to raise the standard of living of their members by means of raising their money wages, their policy inevitably comes down to an attempt to make the labor of their members artificially scarce. That is their only means of raising the wages of their members. The unions do not have much actual power over the demand for labor. But they often achieve considerable power over the supply of labor. And their actual technique for raising wages is to make the supply of labor, at least in the particular industry or occupation that a given union is concerned with, as scarce as possible. Thus, whenever they can, unions attempt to gain control over entry into the labor market. They seek to impose apprenticeship programs, or to have licensing requirements imposed by the government. Such measures are for the purpose of holding down the supply of labor in the field and thereby enabling those fortunate enough to be admitted to it, to earn higher incomes. Even when the unions do not succeed in directly reducing the supply of labor, the imposition of their above-market wage demands still has the effect of reducing the number of jobs offered in the field and thus the supply of labor in the field that is able to find work. The artificial wage increases imposed by the labor unions result in unemployment when above-market wages are imposed throughout the economic system. This situation exists when it is possible for unions to be formed easily. If, as in the present-day United States, all that is required is for a majority of workers in an establishment to decide that they wish to be represented by a union, then the wages imposed by the unions will be effective even in the nonunion fields. Employers in the nonunion fields will feel compelled to offer their workers wages comparable to what the union workers are receiving — indeed, possibly even still higher wages — in order to ensure that they do not unionize. Widespread wage increases closing large numbers of workers out of numerous occupations put extreme pressure on the wage rates of whatever areas of the economic system may still remain open. These limited areas could absorb the overflow of workers from other lines at low enough wage rates. But minimum-wage laws prevent wage rates in these remaining lines from going low enough to absorb these workers. From the perspective of most of those lucky enough to keep their jobs, the most serious consequence of the unions is the holding down or outright reduction of the productivity of labor. With few exceptions, the labor unions openly combat the rise in the productivity of labor. They do so virtually as a matter of principle. They oppose the introduction of labor-saving machinery on the grounds that it causes unemployment. They oppose competition among workers. As Henry Hazlitt pointed out, they force employers to tolerate featherbedding practices, such as the classic requirement that firemen, whose function was to shovel coal on steam locomotives, be retained on diesel locomotives. They impose make-work schemes, such as requiring that pipe delivered to construction sites with screw thread already on it, have its ends cut off and new screw thread cut on the site. They impose narrow work classifications, and require that specialists be employed at a day’s pay to perform work that others could easily do — for example, requiring the employment of a plasterer to repair the incidental damage done to a wall by an electrician, which the electrician himself could easily repair. To anyone who understands the role of the productivity of labor in raising real wages, it should be obvious that the unions’ policy of combating the rise in the productivity of labor renders them in fact a leading enemy of the rise in real wages. However radical this conclusion may seem, however much at odds it is with the prevailing view of the unions as the leading source of the rise in real wages over the last hundred and fifty years or more, the fact is that in combating the rise in the productivity of labor, the unions actively combat the rise in real wages! Far from being responsible for improvements in the standard of living of the average worker, labor unions operate in more or less total ignorance of what actually raises the average worker’s standard of living. In consequence of their ignorance, they are responsible for artificial inequalities in wage rates, for unemployment, and for holding down real wages and the average worker’s standard of living. All of these destructive, antisocial consequences derive from the fact that while individuals increase the money they earn through increasing production and the overall supply of goods and services, thereby reducing prices and raising real wages throughout the economic system, labor unions increase the money paid to their members by exactly the opposite means. They reduce the supply and productivity of labor and so reduce the supply and raise the prices of the goods and services their members help to produce, thereby reducing real wages throughout the economic system.

#### [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.

#### [5] Circumvention – even if workers have right to unionize, employers use loopholes and propaganda to oppose and block unions

Barry Eidlin 21 [Barry Eidlin is an assistant professor of sociology at McGill University, and the author of "Labor and the Class Idea in the United States and Canada.". "It’s all too easy for employers to interfere in union elections" Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/its-all-too-easy-for-employers-to-interfere-in-union-elections/2021/04/23/f2378ca6-a2d1-11eb-85fc-06664ff4489d\_story.html, accessed 11-30-2021]//anop

When workers at the Kumho Tire plant in Macon, Ga., petitioned for a union election on Sept. 18, 2017, they thought they were in good shape. Nearly 80 percent of them, 250 total, had signed cards showing support for unionizing. In the lead-up to the vote, management made clear where it stood. “My supervisor would stop me every day and say, ‘How you gonna vote, man? You gotta vote no!’ ” one worker, who remained anonymous out of fear of retaliation, told labor scholar Gordon Lafer. “No question I was going to vote yes, but I couldn’t let them know that, ’cause I was in fear for my job security.” One month later, when the ballots were counted, workers voted 164 to 136 against unionization. Earlier this month, we saw a more prominent example of this phenomenon, when workers at the Amazon warehouse in Bessemer, Ala., voted by more than 2 to 1 against joining a union. (Amazon chief executive Jeff Bezos owns The Washington Post.) It followed several other high-profile organizing defeats in recent years, including autoworkers at Volkswagen in Tennessee and Nissan in Mississippi, as well as Boeing employees in South Carolina. Opinions to start the day, in your inbox. Sign up. Employers publicly interpret these results to suggest that workers simply don’t want unions. “Labor bosses should understand that when workers vote against forming a union, it signifies that the arguments made by organizers were not compelling or persuasive,” Kristen Swearingen, chair of the Coalition for a Democratic Workplace, an anti-union lobby group, said after the Amazon defeat. ADVERTISING The evidence suggests otherwise. Current polling data shows that nearly two-thirds of Americans approve of unions, and nearly half of nonunion workers would vote to join one if given the opportunity. But if unions are so popular, why don’t workers vote for them? The problem is that union elections today are nothing like the elections we learned about in civics class. We would rightly question the outcome of an election anywhere else if monitors reported that one side was surveilling and interrogating voters, forcing them to attend propaganda meetings denouncing its opponents, restricting the opposition’s ability to campaign, and threatening voters’ livelihood. But all of this is the normal, largely legal course of events for union elections in the United States, where competing parties do not get equal time to make their cases and voters do not have freedom of expression without retaliation. Even when employers cross the line — as they do in more than 40 percent of elections — the penalties are so trivial that it pays to break the law. Given the obstacles, it’s remarkable that unions win as many elections as they do. Front-line workers in the covid-19 fight need unions Spending millions on anti-union consultants, companies like Amazon, Google and Boeing unleash “union avoidance” campaigns that all follow the same playbook. Even before the election gets underway, employers try to game the outcome in their favor, starting with legal maneuvers to block or delay the vote. They gerrymander the voting district (known as the “bargaining unit”), trying to pack in workers they believe lean anti-union and to carve out those they think are more pro-union. In Amazon’s case, the company insisted that the Bessemer bargaining unit include temporary and seasonal workers, nearly quadrupling its size from 1,500 to 5,800 members. Advertisement Meanwhile, management ramps up its anti-union campaign. Supervisors track and surveil workers to suss out union support, often taking them aside for one-on-one interrogations. Employees are subjected to barrages of anti-union texts and phone calls, while management plasters the workplace with “vote no” propaganda — even the bathroom stalls. Workers are frequently pulled off the job to attend mandatory “captive audience” meetings — a feature of nearly 90 percent of all union elections. As Amazon worker Jennifer Bates testified before the Senate Budget Committee in March about the Bessemer campaign: “We were forced into what they called ‘union education’ meetings. We had no choice but to attend them. They would last for as much as an hour and we’d have to go sometimes several times a week. The company would just hammer on different reasons why the union was bad. And we had to listen. If someone spoke up and disagreed with what the company was saying they would shut the meeting down and told people to go back to work. Then follow up with one-on-one meetings on the floor.” After one meeting where Bates asked managers some pointed questions, an Amazon official asked to photograph her employee badge. “I think it’s to show you’ll get in trouble for bringing up these types of questions,” she said. How two-tier unions turn workers against one another Meanwhile, union supporters have to figure out creative ways to reach workers off the clock to avoid management interference. Union representatives are usually not allowed equal time in captive audience meetings, nor are they typically allowed anywhere on company property. Workers cannot communicate using company email or chat systems. Alternatives include visiting workers at home, although this is more difficult in a pandemic. During the recent Amazon union drive, union supporters tried catching employees driving out of the parking lot at the end of their shifts. In response, Amazon pressured Jefferson County officials to change the timing on the traffic lights, which reduced the time workers had to talk, according to reporting from More Perfect Union. Advertisement Faced with management’s intimidation campaigns, many pro-union workers become wary of expressing their support publicly — and not without reason. Research from the pro-labor think tank Economic Policy Institute shows that workers are fired in 1 out of 5 union election campaigns. Clearly the election process needs to be fixed. But doing so leaves unanswered a more fundamental question: Why are employers allowed to intervene in union elections at all? Employers argue that they must play a role in the election process to ensure that workers make a fully informed decision when it comes to the consequential act of joining a union. They certainly have reasons to oppose unions, which create checks and balances against management’s untrammeled authority in the workplace. But that doesn’t mean they should have a say in whether or how their workers decide to join one — let alone engage in campaigns of threats, intimidation and retribution. Advertisement Joining a union is a federal right, one that employers have no business infringing upon. As with any relationship between parties with competing interests, the way to handle those differences is to negotiate over them. So if employers have a problem with unions, the place to deal with it is at the bargaining table.

#### [6] Small businesses – small business owners depend on franchises but unions destroy the franchise model to better corrale union support – that devastates small business owners.

James Sherk 14 [As a research fellow in labor economics at The Heritage Foundation, James Sherk researches ways to promote competition and mobility in the workforce rather than erect barriers that prevent workers from getting ahead. 8-9-2014, "The Unions' War on Small Businesses," Daily Signal, https://www.dailysignal.com/2014/08/09/the-unions-war-on-small-businesses/]//anop

Would you like to own a small business someday? If so, sorry — the Service Employees International Union would rather you didn’t. The SEIU has convinced the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) to eviscerate the franchising model that many small-business owners rely on. Under the current model, these small-business owners pay for the right to use a corporate brand. The franchising corporation researches appealing products. It also does marketing to promote the brand. In return, the local franchisees agree to produce those products to fit certain price and quality specifications. The local franchisee handles all the hiring and employment. This division of labor cuts the risks of starting a small business, because the franchisee can focus on running the business without having to develop a market niche from scratch. A franchisee opening a new restaurant, for example, doesn’t need to market a new menu. The corporate brand has already done the work. The franchisor similarly does not have to operate thousands of local restaurants remotely. Many businesses, from Burger King to Jiffy Lube to the Hair Cuttery, use franchising. It enables many Americans to run small businesses that would otherwise never get off the ground. However, unions hate this business model. They find it much easier to organize big businesses than small ones. Unions claim they organize most workers today without secret-ballot elections. Instead, they pressure firms into accepting “neutrality” and “card check.” Neutrality means the business stays silent during the organizing drive. Workers hear only the union’s sales pitch — they learn nothing about uncomfortable subjects unions train their organizers to deflect. Card check means workers vote in public, in front of union organizers. Unsurprisingly, under these circumstances unions almost always win. Unions wage negative campaigns against big businesses to damage their reputation and pressure them into accepting card check and neutrality. They find it much harder to vilify small businesses the same way. Consequently, franchising makes union organizing more difficult. The Burger King and Jiffy Lube brands don’t employ the franchisee’s workers. Local small businesses do. Unions would rather the brand do the hiring so they can pressure it into staying silent and forgoing a secret ballot. So an Obama appointee at the NLRB — a former union official — just ruled that the brands “co-employ” workers with local small businesses. McDonald’s the brand now shares responsibility for its franchisees’ employees — workers it had no part in hiring. This happened as part of a larger SEIU strategy to attack the franchise business model. The left-wing In These Times interviewed former SEIU activists and outlined this strategy last year: SEIU also has a comprehensive national plan in the works, centered on the two public demands of $15-an-hour pay and the right to unionize free of intimidation. . . . The first step is to challenge the legal distinction between a corporation and its individual franchises. . . . SEIU aims to hold corporations liable for their franchises’ actions. Second, SEIU is pouring resources into compiling data about wage theft in the fast-food sector . . . The third planned step, organizers say, is for SEIU to use legal liability for wage theft to pressure fast-food companies into accepting “neutrality agreements” that allow employees to unionize without management interference. This would effectively destroy the franchise business model. If the government holds McDonald’s liable for its franchisees’ actions, McDonald’s will need control over those actions. It will have little choice but to replace its local franchises with corporate-owned stores. This would certainly benefit the SEIU. It would make unionizing fast-food brands much simpler — which would become a virtual license to print money. Unions charge new hires an initiation fee in addition to their regular monthly dues. For low-wage workers this initiation fee runs anywhere from $25 to $100. And fast-food restaurants have massive employee turnover. Half of McDonald’s employees leave within three months. In states without right-to-work laws, each replacement worker would pay a new initiation fee. The SEIU would make tens of millions annually just from employee turnover. It is much less clear that unionizing would benefit fast-food workers. They would have to fork over union dues as well as initiation fees. However, a union would have difficulty raising their pay. Americans eat fast food because it is cheap and quick. Until that changes, unions can do little to raise wages — and thus prices — without driving away customers. Furthermore, shutting down the franchise business model would devastate aspiring small-business owners. They would have to take the risk of developing an entire market niche themselves or, more likely, not go into business at all. The federal government would forcibly replace many small businesses with a few big businesses. Big Labor would certainly find that easier to deal with. But that’s not the American Dream.