### 1NC – Hobbes

#### Presumption and permissibility negate –

#### 1] Probability – there are an infinite number of ways for something to be false and only one way for it to be true bc If one part of a statement is false the whole statement is

#### 2] intuition – That’s why we don’t immediately believe conspiracy theories or flat earth.

#### 3] logic –

#### A] You can’t assume that P and ~P are both true.

#### B] Ought means to prove a moral obligation – if there is no offense the aff hasn’t met their burden so you negate

#### 4] Negating is harder –

#### A] Judge psychology – the 2ar gets a persuasive spin on the 2nr which makes judges more likely to affirm bc they can shift the focus away from the 2nr which ows bc I can’t change judge psychology, so the only recourse Is to give p&p to the neg

#### B] Time skew – the aff gets a 7-6 rebuttal time skew and I don’t have a 3nr which means a 2ar dump on 1 2nr mistake makes it impossible for the neg to win

#### C] Aff gets Infinite prep for the AC means they can always frontline whatever negs put together.

#### D] 1ARs can be abusive and most judges don’t vote on 2N theory.

#### Humans act within in their own interests and to maximize their own pleasures, because there are finite resources in the world, and a biological drive to survive. Without a government to unify all meanings of ethics, individuals would fall into a violent state of nature where individuals would force meaning upon one another

Parrish 05 (Rick Parrish; 2005; John Hopkins University Press; *“Derrida's Economy of Violence in Hobbes' Social Contract”*; accessed 7/15/19; Theory and Event, Volume 7, Issue 4; <http://citation.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/6/3/6/1/pages63614/p63614-11.php>; Rick Parrish professor of political science at Loyola University New Orleans and West Texas A&M University) RC/HB \*Bracketed for clarity\*

All of the foregoing points to the conclusion that in the commonwealth the sovereign's first and most fundamental job is to be the ultimate definer. Several other commentators have also reached this conclusion. By way of elaborating upon the importance of the moderation of individuality in Hobbes' theory of government, Richard Flathman claims that peace ‘is possible only if the ambiguity and disagreement that pervade general thinking and acting [is] eliminated by the stipulations of a sovereign.’57 Pursuant to debunking the perennial misinterpretation of Hobbes' mention of people as wolves, Paul Johnson argues that ‘one of the primary functions of the sovereign is to provide the necessary unity of meaning and reference for the primary terms in which men try to conduct their social lives.’58 ‘The whole raison d'être of sovereign helmsmanship lies squarely in the chronic defus[es]ing of interpretive clashes,’59 without which humans would ‘fly off in all directions’60 and fall inevitably into the violence of the natural condition.

#### This leads to the creation of the sovereign, the creation of the sovereign is when subjects limit their own freedom and give it to a single subject to have absolute control over the population. Creation of the sovereign is good for three reasons –

#### Necessity – if we don’t have an absolute power – then productivity, innovation, and well-being is destroyed, because there is no incentive to create, because someone else will destroy your work for their own benefit.

#### Impacts – if we don’t have a power to allow for creation, innovation, and protection of well-being, then we would never be able to improve quality of life, develop medicine, create agriculture, or have any positive thing come, because we would be too preoccupied with fighting amongst ourselves without any order.

#### This requires giving legitimate and ultimate moral power to the government

Parrish 05 (Rick Parrish; 2005; John Hopkins University Press; *“Derrida's Economy of Violence in Hobbes' Social Contract”*; accessed 7/15/19; Theory and Event, Volume 7, Issue 4; <http://citation.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/6/3/6/1/pages63614/p63614-11.php>; Rick Parrish professor of political science at Loyola University New Orleans and West Texas A&M University) RC/HB \*Bracketed for clarity\*

These meanings are usually created and promulgated by the sovereign in the form of laws, another of the tasks with which Hobbes charges it. In one of his clearest explanations of the law, Hobbes writes that ‘it belongs to the same chief power to make some common rules for all men, and to declare them publicly, by which [all] every man may know what may be called his, what another's, what just, what unjust, what honest, what dishonest, what good, what evil; that is summarily, what is to be done, what to be avoided in our common course of life.’66 The civil law is the set of the sovereign's definitions for ownership, justice, good, evil, and all other concepts that are important for the maintenance of peace in the commonwealth. When everyone follows the law (that is, when everyone follows the sovereign's definitions) there are far fewer conflicts among persons because everyone appeals to the same meanings. This means that people know what meanings others will use to evaluate the actions of themselves and others, so the state of nature's security dilemmas and attempts to force one's own meanings upon others are overcome. 29. There is to be no question of the truth or falsity of the sovereign's definitions because ‘there are no authentical doctrines concerning right and wrong, good and evil, besides the constituted laws in each realm and government.’67 In fact, Hobbes specifically says that one of the ‘diseases of a commonwealth’ is that ‘every private man is judge of good and evil actions.’68 Only when individual persons agree to follow the meanings promulgated by the sovereign, which of course includes refraining from trying to impose their own meanings on others, can persons live together in peace—when they take it upon themselves to impose meaning on situations of public import, they descend into violence again.

#### Thus, the Standard is Consistency with the will of the sovereign ---

#### It’s a Pre-requisite- **Ethics can’t be achieved without avoiding the state of nature because differing interpretations of ethics requires unity which is only founded within the sovereign.**

#### This doesn’t mean absolute subjugation – this model of government maximized individual liberty, and provides protection for the commonwealth

Li 19 [Chenyang Li, July 2019, “Liberty in Leviathan” The University Of British Coloumbia, Accessed 5-1-2021 <https://artsone.arts.ubc.ca/2019/08/02/liberty-in-leviathan/> ww

In Leviathan, Thomas Hobbes presents a world in which people make contracts with each other to create a sovereign, who has absolute authority over them and is responsible for their lives. This paper argues that although Hobbes advocates for authoritarian government, parts of his argument still tilt towards liberty. This paper then attempts to show that Hobbes’ creation of the sovereign is to keep people alive, and despite his complete authority over subjects, the Hobbesian state still presents a maximized individual liberty under the monarch’s rule, and Hobbes reveals his preference for liberty even in times of war.¶ Hobbes believes that pure liberty only turns people against each other, and he introduces the creation of sovereign to keep people alive. As long as “every man [has natural right] to everything,” Hobbes states, “there can be no security to any man,” because “competition” and self-interest are in the “nature of man,” and during their continuous competition for “honour and dignity, …envy, hatred, and…war” rise to the surface (Chap. xiv. [4], xiii. [7], xvii. [7]). With this unsentimental portrait of the negative sides of human nature, Hobbes suggests that competitiveness and self-interest in human nature can negatively impact the society, especially when pure liberty is exercised and people’s actions are driven by impulse. When all have absolute liberty, all is vulnerable. To stop men from competing with each other and to prevent “discord and civil war” that will tear the nation apart, Hobbes thus proposes the creation of a “common power to keep [men] in awe” (Chap. xviii. [9], xxi. [8]). Since a contract without enforcement for execution or hurtful consequences for violation is just a paper, a sovereign’s state can easily fall apart too if he has no real power. Hobbes therefore would like people to voluntarily transfer their civil rights to create the sovereign, who will then be “superior” and have “[un]limited” authority (Chap. xix. [12]). Still, however powerful the sovereign is, he is created to provide peace and defense for his subjects, as Hobbes mentions that the “obligation of subjects to the sovereign” ends when the sovereign’s protection towards them ends, showing that although the creation of sovereign takes away some liberty of its subjects, the goal is to make more subjects stay alive to enjoy their liberty at hand (Chap. xxi. [21]).¶ Hobbes introduces the sovereign and uses it to restrict the subjects’ liberty, but also balances everyone’s well-being with each one’s freedom, considerably maximizes people’s liberty under the monarch’s rule. To secure the position of the sovereign, Hobbes gives the monarch absolute authority over everything, and reiterates that people make covenant to each other, not to the sovereign; therefore, “none of [the sovereign’s] subjects… can be freed from [the sovereign’s] subjection” (Chap. xviii. [4]). Hobbes is not asking for complete subjection, for people do not covenant to hurt themselves, but besides that, people are to surrender all of their civil rights to the sovereign, and obey the latter in all times, which threatens the subjects’ liberty. Hobbes is not advocating for arbitrary and unjust rule, however, despite the fact that he gives the sovereign complete authority. Hobbes appoints the sovereign to be the “supreme judge of controversies…of all times,” but also states that if a subject has conflicts with his sovereign on the ground of “precedent law,” the subject has the “same liberty to sue for his right as if it were against a subject” (Chap. xx. [3], xxi. [19]). Such a statement seems unlikely and controversial within the context of authoritarian state, where the monarch should have the final say in all cases, but Hobbes chooses to limit the power of monarch for corporal liberty, an action presenting a tilt towards subjects’ freedom. Hobbes then reveals that he gives the ruler absolute authority to maximize the subjects’ liberty, an idea displayed with the provision of his line, “no king can be rich, nor glorious, nor secure, whose subjects are either poor, or contemptible, or too weak” (Chap. xix. [4]). Following his logic, the ruler only lives a happy life if his subjects are living happily, and the ruler only has liberty when his subjects have it, too. Hobbes believes that the ruler is more likely to grant his subjects more freedom when he himself is almost at absolute liberty, which he is in the Hobbesian state with unlimited authority. When the sovereign feels assured with his position, he then can afford the clemency to assure his subjects with the same security, by giving them liberty. Hobbes uses the authoritarian government to give people the most liberty that they can have, within the limit of not hurting themselves or others with it.¶ Hobbes also restricts people’s liberty with natural laws, as his persistence in placing preserving people’s life before preserving their liberty can sometimes push his argument too much towards liberty. Hobbes firmly believes that “all men equally are by nature free,” but to keep the majority alive and well to enjoy this freedom, he proposes the second natural law as “quod tibi fieri non vis, alteri ne ferceris [do not do to others what you do not want done to yourself]” (Chap. xxi. [10], xiv. [5]). Hobbes is ultimately suggesting that he acknowledges the equality and freedom of everyone, but since absolute liberty only results in everyone’s right to life being jeopardized, he proposes for everyone to surrender a part of their liberty to avoid placing their lives at risk. Parts of his argument, however, show that by advocating for preserving lives first, Hobbes is tilting the balance of his text too much towards granting subjects’ liberty. He states that when “a soldier [is asked] to fight against the enemy…his sovereign has right…to punish his refusal with death, [but this is] nevertheless in many cases refuse[d] without injustice,” and a deserter’s action of “avoid[ing] battle is not injustice, but cowardice” (Chap. xxi. [16]). With such argument, Hobbes almost undermines the sovereign’s power with his insisting in keeping people alive. One has to choose between liberty and efficiency in wartime, and some generals would order that if anyone dares to leave the battlefield, his comrades at the back are obliged to kill the deserter to ensure that the army has one uniting force and one uniting will of winning against their opponent, thus preserving the efficiency though greatly restricting liberty. Hobbes, however, does not think that deserters are wrong in avoiding wars, or that soldiers cannot disobey the sovereign when they are asked to participate in war, for it is in human nature to fear sudden and violent death, and “covenants not to defend [one’s] body are void,” thus presenting his arguments as in advocating liberty and valuing people’s lives over efficiency (Chap. xxi. [11]).¶ Thomas Hobbes is almost universally seen as an advocate for authoritarian government with his hypothetical world in Leviathan, where people surrender their civil rights to create a sovereign, and Hobbes uses the monarch to protect people’s lives and to prevent civil wars. This paper has attempted to argue that sometimes his argument tends to lean towards liberty. This paper also has attempted to show that while Hobbes creates the sovereign to preserve people’s lives, he also maximizes individual’s liberty under such rule, and reveals his favoring of liberty and valuing of human lives in parts of his argument.

#### Now negate – Unconditional strikes allow for the state of nature bc workers can overrule the sovereigns will and stop working for any reason which means people will do it for selfish reasons and have no regulation on why or when they strike

### 1NC --- CP

#### Counterplan Text: Just governments should recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike, with the exception of police officers.

#### Legitimizing their right to strike creates power grabs and has historically proven to be rooted in racism

Grim 20 (Andrew Grim; 7/1/20; The Washington Post; *“What is the ‘blue flu’ and how has it increased police power?”*; accessed 10/20/21; <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/07/01/what-is-blue-flu-how-has-it-increased-police-power/>; Andrew Grim, a Ph.D. candidate in history at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, is at work on a dissertation on anti-police brutality activism in post-WWII Newark.) HB

What is the “blue flu,” and why might it strike New York City police? This weekend, officers from the New York City Police Department are rumored to be planning a walkout to protest calls to defund the police. This builds on a similar tactic used by police in Atlanta less than a month ago. On June 16, Fulton County District Attorney, Paul L. Howard Jr. announced that Garrett Rolfe, the Atlanta police officer who fatally shot Rayshard Brooks, would face charges of felony murder and aggravated assault. That night, scores of Atlanta Police Department officers caught the “blue flu,” calling out sick en masse to protest the charges against Rolfe. Such walkouts constitute, in effect, illegal strikes — laws in all 50 states prohibit police strikes. Yet, there is nothing new about the blue flu. It is a strategy long employed by police unions and rank-and-file officers during contract negotiations, disputes over reforms and, like in Atlanta, in response to disciplinary action against individual officers. The intent is to dramatize police disputes with municipal government and rally the citizenry to their side. 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 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, 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. But, with public opinion on the side of reform, the blue flu may prove to be a less effective strategy than in the past. In fact, if the myth of the blue flu proves true and less policing does not result in more crime, such tactics may actually give a boost to the very argument about defunding the police and reining in their power that officers are protesting.

#### Combatting racism in every way possible is a pre-requisite to ethical policy making, means that the counterplan is a prior question

Memmi 2k (Albert, Professor Emeritus of Sociology @ U of Paris, Naiteire, Racism, Translated by Steve Martinot, p. 163-165)

The struggle against racism will be long, difficult, without intermission, without remission, probably never achieved, yet for this very reason, it is a struggle to be undertaken without surcease and without concessions. One cannot be indulgent toward racism. One cannot even let the monster in the house, especially not in a mask. To give it merely a foothold means to augment the bestial part in us and in other people which is to diminish what is human. To accept the racist universe to the slightest degree is to endorse fear, injustice, and violence. It is to accept the persistence of the dark history in which we still largely live. It is to agree that the outsider will always be a possible victim (and which [person] man is not [themself] himself an outsider relative to someone else?). Racism illustrates in sum, the inevitable negativity of the condition of the dominated**;** that is it illuminates in a certain sense the entire human condition. The anti-racist struggle, difficult though it is, and always in question, is nevertheless one of the prologues to the ultimate passage from animality to humanity. In that sense, we cannot fail to rise to the racist challenge. However, it remains true that one’s moral conduct only emerges from a choice: one has to want it. It is a choice among other choices, and always debatable in its foundations and its consequences. Let us say, broadly speaking, that the choice to conduct oneself morally is the condition for the establishment of a human order for which racism is the very negation. This is almost a redundancy. One cannot found a moral order, let alone a legislative order, on racism because racism signifies the exclusion of the other and his or her subjection to violence and domination. From an ethical point of view**,** if one can deploy a little religious language, racism is “the truly capital sin.**”**fn22 It is not an accident that almost all of humanity’s spiritual traditions counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows, or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical counsel respect for the weak, for orphans, widows or strangers. It is not just a question of theoretical morality and disinterested commandments. Such unanimity in the safeguarding of the other suggests the real utility of such sentiments. All things considered, we have an interest in banishing injustice, because injustice engenders violence and death. Of course, this is debatable. There are those who think that if one is strong enough, the assault on and oppression of others is permissible. But no one is ever sure of remaining the strongest. One day, perhaps, the roles will be reversed. All unjust society contains within itself the seeds of its own death. It is probably smarter to treat others with respect so that they treat you with respect. “Recall,” says the bible, “that you were once a stranger in Egypt,” which means both that you ought to respect the stranger because you were a stranger yourself and that you risk becoming once again someday. It is an ethical and a practical appeal – indeed, it is a contract, however implicit it might be. In short, the refusal of racism is the condition for all theoretical and practical morality. Because, in the end, the ethical choice commands the political choice. A just society must be a society accepted by all. If this contractual principle is not accepted, then only conflict, violence, and destruction will be our lot. If it is accepted, we can hope someday to live in peace. True, it is a wager, but the stakes are irresistible.

## Case

### 1NC – Short

#### 1] Every action has infinite stemming consequences, because every consequence can cause another consequence. Probability doesn’t solve because a) Probability is improvable, as it relies on inductive knowledge, but induction from past events cant lead to deduction of future events, and b) Probability assumes causation, but we can’t assume every act was the cause of tangible outcomes.

#### 2] An infinite world mathematically contains an infinite amount of pleasure and pain, so moral acts can’t change the amount of happiness.

Bostrom 08Bostrom, Nick [Professor at University of Oxford, director of Oxford’s Future of Humanity Institute, PhD from London School of Economics]. *The Infinitarian Challenge to Aggregative Ethics*. 2008. [http://www.nickbostrom.com/ethics/infinite.pdf](http://www.nickbostrom.com/ethics/infinite.pdf" \o "Click here!) //ACCS JM

Is the world canonically infinite or not? **Recent** cosmological evidence suggests **that** the world is **probably** infinite. **Moreover, if the totality of physical existence is indeed infinite, in the kind of way that modern cosmology suggests it is, then it contains an infinite number of galaxies, stars, and planets.** If there are an infinite number of planets then there is**, with probability one,** an infinite number of people. Infinitely many of these people are happy, infinitely many are unhappy. **Likewise for other local properties that are plausible candidates for having value**, pertaining to person-states, lives, or entire societies, ecosystems,or civilizations—there are infinitely many democratic states, and infinitely many that are ruled by despots, etc. It therefore appears likely that the actual world is canonically infinite.

#### 3] Util is racist – a policy that harms a minority but helps the majority has a net-surplus of utility – independent voter for safety – it’s a pre-req to debate.

#### 4] If you’re held responsible for things other than an intention ethics aren’t binding because there are infinite events occurring over which you have no control, so you can never be moral as you are permitting just action – if ethics arent binding then people can just say no.

## Contentions

### **1NC – Alt Causes – Wealth Inequality and Pandemic**

#### **Alt causes prove their internal links are non-unique, the pandemic and general wealth inequality just keeps unrest among workers going**

Semuels 10/8 (Alana Semuels; 10/8/21; Time Magazine; *“U.S. Workers Are Realizing It's the Perfect Time to Go on Strike”*; accessed 10/19/21; <https://time.com/6105109/workers-strike-unemployment/>; Semuels was a Gerald Loeb Award finalist in 2014 for her series about the diminishing power of employees at the workplace. She was named "Journalist of the Year" at the 2009 Los Angeles Press Club Awards. She also won a feature writing award from the Society of Business Editors and Writers in 2011. She also received an award from the Society of Business Editors and Writers in 2017 for a story, "The Problem With Rolling Back Regulations." Semuels traveled to Japan and Sweden in the summer of 2017 as an Abe Fellow for Journalists, sponsored by the Social Science Research Council.) HB

Greater income inequality, more strikes Part of the support of unions and organizing may come from Americans’ discontent with growing inequality, much as inequality a century ago galvanized a labor movement then, says Tom Kochan, a professor of work and employment research at MIT. There are a growing number of billionaires in America–708 as of August—with a net worth of $4.7 trillion as of August 17. That’s more than the total net worth of the bottom 50% of Americans. “I think the accumulated effects of the loss of good jobs in manufacturing, stagnant wages, growing inequality, and the growing disparity between executives and managers and the workforce—all of that is fueling increases in organizing,” he says. Some of this labor activism was happening before the pandemic, Kochan says, when even the government’s strike tracker showed an uptick in unrest. Teachers in states like Arizona and Oklahoma started striking in 2018 because of low pay and a lack of public funding. In 2020, NBA athletes walked out of a playoff game to protest the shooting of Jacob Blake in Kenosha, Wisc. The year 2019 saw 25 work stoppages involving 1,000 or more workers, the most since 2001. In 2017, 48% of non-unionized workers said they would vote to join a union if given the chance, higher than the share who said that in 1995 (32%) and 1977 (33%), according to Kochan’s research. The pandemic worsened working conditions for thousands of workers like Deyo. Kellogg workers at a plant in Battle Creek, Mich., told the local news that they were lauded as heroes for working 16 hour days, seven days a week during the pandemic, and rather than reward them, the company recently decided to offshore some of their jobs. They went on strike on Oct. 5. Musicians at the San Antonio Symphony say they voluntarily accepted an 80% pay cut last season, and that the symphony then proposed first to permanently cut their pay by 50% and then to cut the number of full-time members from 72 to 42. They went on strike on Sept. 27.

### 1NC – Squo Solves – Strikes Happen Now and People Approve

#### **Squo solves – increasing approval by the general population and a large proliferation of strikes across the US prove**

Semuels 10/8 (Alana Semuels; 10/8/21; Time Magazine; *“U.S. Workers Are Realizing It's the Perfect Time to Go on Strike”*; accessed 10/19/21; <https://time.com/6105109/workers-strike-unemployment/>; Semuels was a Gerald Loeb Award finalist in 2014 for her series about the diminishing power of employees at the workplace. She was named "Journalist of the Year" at the 2009 Los Angeles Press Club Awards. She also won a feature writing award from the Society of Business Editors and Writers in 2011. She also received an award from the Society of Business Editors and Writers in 2017 for a story, "The Problem With Rolling Back Regulations." Semuels traveled to Japan and Sweden in the summer of 2017 as an Abe Fellow for Journalists, sponsored by the Social Science Research Council.) HB

Thousands of workers have gone on strike across the country, showing their growing power in a tightening economy. The leverage U.S. employees have over the people signing their paychecks was amplified in Friday’s jobs report, which showed that employers added workers at a much slower-than-expected pace in September. The unemployment rate fell 0.4 percentage points during the month, to 4.8 percent, the government said Friday, and wages are continuing to tick up across industries as employers become more desperate to hire and retain workers. In the first five days of October alone, there were 10 strikes in the U.S., including workers at Kellogg plants in Nebraska, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee; school bus drivers in Annapolis, Md.; and janitors at the Denver airport. That doesn’t include the nearly 60,000 union members in film and television production who nearly unanimously voted to grant their union’s president the authority to call a strike. Jess Deyo is one of nearly 700 nurses who have been on strike as part of the longest healthcare strike in Massachusetts history. For the past seven months, Deyo has reported for duty at the hospital in Worcester, Mass. where she worked as a nurse for more than 15 years, sometimes bringing her daughters, and standing outside through the chills of spring and the heat of summer. The nurses are demanding higher nurse-to-patient ratios after a harrowing 19 months of working during a pandemic. “There’s no choice to give up on the strike,” she says. “It’s bigger than us—it’s for everyone.” Most of these strikes aren’t counted by the federal government, which in the 1980s started only tracking strikes that involved 1,000 or more workers and that lasted one full shift or longer. There have only been 11 of those so far this year, according to government data, at places like Volvo Trucks and Nabisco. But academics at Cornell University launched a strike database on May 1 that uses social media and Google alerts to keep track of all the strikes and protests happening in the U.S., even if they involve just a few workers. The database shows a picture of growing worker activism, of small actions that tell a story of how people at workplaces small and large are feeling after 19 months of a global pandemic, says Johnnie Kallas, a PhD student who is the director of Cornell’s Labor Action Tracker. It has documented 169 strikes so far in 2021. “Workers are fed up with low pay and understaffing, and they have more labor market leverage with employers needing to hire right now,” he says. “You are seeing a little bit more labor unrest.” Of course, compared to half a century ago, there still aren’t many strikes in the U.S. There were 5,716 strikes in 1971 alone, according to government data from when the government tracked smaller strikes. And the share of unionized workers in the U.S. is near an all-time low, with just 12.1% of workers represented by unions last year. But the activism comes at a time when approval of labor unions—even among Republicans—is trending upwards—and when a low unemployment rate is giving leverage to workers who have long put up with poor conditions and pay. A Gallup poll released in the beginning of July showed that 68% of Americans approve of labor unions, higher than it had been in years and up significantly from the 48% approval in 2009 during the throes of the Great Recession. The poll also showed that 47% of Republicans said they approved of unions—the highest share since 2003—and that 90% of Democrats did.

### **1NC – No Solvency – Empirics and Replacement Workers**

#### **Strikes barely move the needle in terms of worker power – companies just hire fill-in workers which decks strikes ability to change anything**

Semuels 10/8 (Alana Semuels; 10/8/21; Time Magazine; *“U.S. Workers Are Realizing It's the Perfect Time to Go on Strike”*; accessed 10/19/21; <https://time.com/6105109/workers-strike-unemployment/>; Semuels was a Gerald Loeb Award finalist in 2014 for her series about the diminishing power of employees at the workplace. She was named "Journalist of the Year" at the 2009 Los Angeles Press Club Awards. She also won a feature writing award from the Society of Business Editors and Writers in 2011. She also received an award from the Society of Business Editors and Writers in 2017 for a story, "The Problem With Rolling Back Regulations." Semuels traveled to Japan and Sweden in the summer of 2017 as an Abe Fellow for Journalists, sponsored by the Social Science Research Council.) HB

Do strikes work? For their part, employers say that they’re being fair, and that workers are being unreasonable. Kellogg provides workers with benefits and compensation that are among the industry’s best, a company spokesman, Kris Bahner, said in a statement. The company says it has not proposed moving any jobs from the Ready to Eat Cereal plants, which are the plants where the workers are striking, as part of negotiations. The San Antonio Symphony said, in a statement, that the union and the symphony agreed to a 25% reduction in weekly salary for the 2020-2021 season, but that because there were fewer performances and because fewer musicians could fit on stage because of social distancing guidelines, some musicians did make 80% less than they would have made in a normal season. The symphony needs to make “fundamental changes,” a spokesperson said, and it cannot afford to spend more than it makes through ticket sales and donations. Carolyn Jackson, the CEO of St. Vincent’s, where Deyo and hundreds of other nurses are striking, says that the nurses are trying to push a 1:4 nurse to patient ratio that Massachusetts voters rejected by a large margin in 2018. The hospital has done research and decided its staffing is appropriate, and that its staffing ratios are in fact better than most other hospitals in the state, she says. Ryan says the hospital announced it was hiring 100 permanent replacement nurses in May during a COVID-19 surge, and that the striking nurses are insisting on getting their old positions back. That the hospital is not budging speaks to the fact that despite this increase in worker activism, workers may not gain much more power in the long run. Over the last 40 years, the government has made it much more difficult for workers to both form unions and to strike, says Heidi Shierholz, the president of the Economic Policy Institute, a progressive think tank. Amazon was able to effectively interfere in a union vote among its workers this spring, she says, preventing the union from succeeding. Of course, a hearing officer at the National Labor Relations Board has recommended that the board throw out the results of the Amazon election and do it over, which speaks to a resurgence of government support for labor. President Joe Biden said he wanted to be “the most pro-union President leading the most pro-union administration in American history.” Labor has support at the state and local levels too: California Gov. Gavin Newsom recently signed a packet of pro-worker bills, including one that prohibits companies from imposing quotas on warehouse workers that prevent them from following health and safety law, and another that prohibits employers from paying workers with disabilities less than the state’s minimum wage. And in January, New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio signed a bill that forbids fast food restaurants from firing workers unless the employer has just cause, making New York City the first jurisdiction in the country that essentially ended at-will employment. But even that support may not be enough to force a widespread change of working conditions in an economy where employees haven’t had much leverage since before the Great Recession, or earlier. Even some of the recent strikes haven’t led to workers’ desired outcomes. A five-week Nabisco strike recently ended with many of workers’ demands met, for instance, but the company still won the ability to pay weekend workers less than they do currently. As for Jess Deyo and the Worcester nurses, many have been forced to move on. After Deyo’s unemployment benefits ended and her health insurance premiums spiked, she decided she needed to find another job so that she could support her family. She’s a single mother. She found a job working as a nurse at a doctor’s office, where she says she feels more appreciated than she’s ever felt at work. The hours are better and she finally feels respected. But she makes $13 less an hour.