## Journalism

### AT: Circumvention---2AC

### EXT---Mocatta

### EXT---Localities

### EXT----extremism

## Models

## T---Trumping Power

### T---Scope---2AC

#### 1. We meet. The plan doesn’t provide new rights. They are already covered. It’s only giving scope of their rights

Brown and Agarwal 23 – Researcher in the Information Policy Lab at the University of California, Los Angeles; Researcher in the Information Policy Lab at the University of California, Los Angeles, LLM from the University of California, Los Angeles.

Zoë Brown and Akshat Agarwal, “Copyright, Licensing and Collective Bargaining Approaches towards News Sustainability,” Sustaining Journalism, Sustaining Democracy: A Policy Guide on Platforms and the Press, 04/2023, https://itlp.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/UCLA\_ITLP\_PlatformsPress\_Final.pdf

Australia has been a global leader in enacting this kind of collective bargaining policy. In 2021, Australia passed the News Media and Digital Platforms Mandatory Bargaining Code (“the bargaining code”) following a report by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACC) detailing how digital platforms were benefiting from news publishers’ content.71 The bargaining code does not grant new rights to journalism, and because of this, the bargaining code applies to headlines and snippets as well as material protected by already existing copyright law.72

#### 2. We meet. “All workers” have CBRs, some just aren’t protected by the NLRA.

Read 4 – General Counsel, Friends of Farmworkers; J.D., NYU Law

Arthur N. Read, “Let the Flowers Bloom and Protect the Workers Too – A Strategic Approach toward Addressing the Marginalization of Agricultural Workers,” 6 U. PA. J. LAB. & EMP. L. 525 (Spring 2004)

III.EXPANDING PROTECTIONS FOR THE RIGHT OF AGRICULTURAL LABORERS CURRENTLY EXCLUDED FROM THE NLRA TO ORGANIZE

It is critical to note as a threshold matter that the right of all workers, including agricultural and domestic workers excluded from NLRA protection, to collectively withhold their services or otherwise engage in collective activity exists independently of whether or not that right is specifically protected under the NLRA. This right has foundations under the Thirteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution." The right to engage in collective activity also has foundations under the First Amendment.52

#### That’s most precise.

Allison, Hart, & Pratt 22 – Professors of Education, University of Saskatchewan

Derek S. Allison, B. Glen Hart, and Deani Van Pelt Pratt, “4.6 The Meaning of ‘Rights,’” in *Understanding Canadian Schools: An Introduction to Educational Administration* (6th ed.), University of Saskatchewan Open Press, 2022, https://www.saskoer.ca/understandingcanadianschools/chapter/4-6-the-meaning-of-rights/.

Having a normative right does not necessarily mean that one is able to exercise it. Exercising a right requires three conditions: (1) that the right has been officially recognized through a law or rule; (2) that there is a process for settling disagreements over rights; and (3) that there is a way for people to enforce the particular right. To take the example of free speech for students, there must be some law, rule, or policy that specifies this right. There must be a forum for determining when a particular case is one of free speech or not. Finally, there must be a way for students to have that right enforced when it is violated.

#### 3. Otherwise, counterinterp: only scope Affs are topical.

Shah 23 – J.D., Harvard Law School; B.A.S., Stanford University

Emily S. Shah, “Illuminating Surveillance: Updating Rights of Access for Electronic Searches,” Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 216–279, Fall 2023, https://jolt.law.harvard.edu/assets/articlePDFs/v37/5-Shah-Illuminating-Surveillance.pdf.

The court interpreted an understanding that the First Amendment right is stronger to imply that it is also broader, writing that "[c]ommon law rights provide the press and the public with less access than First Amendment rights."156 Given its First Amendment holding, the court of appeals found that the trial court could not have abused its discretion and rejected a common law right of access.157

### T---NLRA

#### Counter-interp. CBR includes rights beyond the NLRA. It doesn’t have to be employees.

Almoro 21 – Instructor, Department of Social Sciences, University of the Philippines Los Baños

Jewel D. Almoro, “Trade Unionism in the Philippines: Developments and Prospects,” Bedan Research Journal, Vol. 6, 2021, http://bedanjournal.org/index.php/berj/article/view/66.

Social Dialogue:This entails that the stakeholders in the production process should have the right to form and join independent associations to represent their interests, engage in collective bargaining, and discuss work-related issues with employers and government authorities. This gives them a voice and representation in the production process, allowing them to articulate their concerns and priorities, and negotiate with other actors in the production system and public authorities on social and economic policies. Social dialogue can help to empower the weaker partners in the economy and bring about a better balance of bargaining power in the marketplace, making it a vital element in a representative and participatory democracy.

Decent Work Practices Incorporated in the CBA ...................87Collective Bargaining Collective bargaining originated during the Industrial Revolution, which led to a new kind of relationship between employers and workers -the employment relationship. Through collective bargaining, employers and workers, represented by their respective representatives, work together to achieve their objectives, which require mutual respect, cooperation, and sometimes conflict. The ILO recognized in 2006 that the original purpose of collective bargaining remains valid, as the employment relationship continues to be the primary framework for work. One of the most significant benefits of collective bargaining is its adaptability to different situations and changing economic circumstances.The ILO’s definition of "collective bargaining" and the ILO's supervisory machinery's jurisprudence offer a framework that can be tailored to various national situations. Over the past two decades, industrial relations development has demonstrated many examples of how collective bargaining can cope with new challenges. In other words, collective bargaining is a governance method that is well-suited to the demands of the modern world. (ILO, 2008).The international reference points for freedom of association and collective bargaining are ILO Conventions Nos. 87 and 98. Collective bargaining between free associations of workers and employers, as well as other forms of social dialogue, are descriptions of democratic societies (ILO, 2006). In many countries, the historical process in which the state agreed and supported the right to freedom of association often showed a turning point in the advent of democracy (ILO, 2006, p. 55). As proof, millionsof working men and women have won higher pay, better health care and retirement benefits, stronger health and safety protections on the job, and other important improvements through forming unions and using their collective strength in bargaining with their employers (Bivens et al., 2017).In the context of the Decent Work Agenda of ILO (2007), collective bargaining is an important means for securing rights and representation at work, promoting employment, improving working conditions, and extending social protection to all workers. Collective bargaining as a right of workers is intertwined with freedom of association and is a tool for labor market governance as well as a form of social dialogue (ILO, 2007). According to Article 2 of the Collective Bargaining Convention, 1981 (No. 154) collective bargaining is “all negotiations which take place between an employer, a group of employers or one or more employers’ organizations, on the one hand, and one or more workers organizations, on the other, for

D. Edralin & R. Pastrana88(a) determining working conditions and terms of employment; and/or (b) regulating relations between employers and workers; and/or (c) regulating relations between employers or their organizations and a workers’ organization or workers’ organizations” (as cited in ILO (2007, p.2-3)

## T---Negotiations

### T-Negotiations---2AC

#### 2. Counter-interp – CBR includes outcomes, provisions, scope.

Jha et al. 20 – Professor of Political Science at Valdosta State University.

Nandan K. Jha, Neena Banerjee, Department of Political Science at Valdosta State University, Stephanie Moller, Department of Sociology at University of North Carolina at Charlotte, “Assessing the Role of Teachers’ Unions in the Adoption of Accountability Policies in Public Education,” The Urban Review, Vol. 52, June 2020, pp. 299-330, 10.1007/s11256-019-00529-y

The index of the strength of collective bargaining rights captures eight different groups of states (Farber 2006; Freeman and Valletta 1988) in which bargaining:

1. Is legally prohibited;

2. Is not legally prohibited but with absence of provisions;

3. Is permitted but do not require employers to negotiate with unionized workers;

4. Is permitted; unions are allowed to meet and present offers to their employers, but employers retain the discretion to take unilateral decision;

5. Is considered a duty but without specific dispute resolution mechanism;

6. Is considered a duty and dispute resolution occurs through fact finding mechanisms that entail the intervention of a neutral third party that is not empowered to implement a settlement;

7. Is considered a duty, and unions are allowed to strike to make their case;

8. Is considered a duty with compulsory interest arbitration, which empowers the neutral third party to determine the terms of the agreement and guarantee closure of the process.

These eight categories are ranked in order of increasing favorableness for union activities (Farber 2006, p. 42). Although the index of collective bargaining power of teachers’ unions is an ordinal measure with eight distinct values, the general practice in the literature that examines the influence of teachers’ unions in education policy is to treat this index as a continuous measure (Frandsen 2011; Hartney and Flavin 2011; Hirsch et al. 2011). Sociological and psychometric methodologists state that when there are five or more categories, there is relatively little harm in treating ordinal scales as continuous variables (Johnson and Creech 1983; Zumbo and Zimmerman 1993).

#### Dippel is convoluted rubbish. It concludes aff and says the 6 categories are part of Freeman-Valletta’s measure of CBR. NEVER says the other 5 categories are excluded.

Christian Dippel & Zachary Sauers 22, Dippel is affiliated with University of California, Los Angeles, CCPR, and NBER; Sauers is affiliated with University of California, Los Angeles, "Does Increased Union Power Cause Pension Under-Funding in the Public Sector?" Working Paper, 03/12/2022, https://drive.google.com/file/d/1-Aon3GrEKSNtEJ8F95MO7zmFbCL88c8\_/view

Appendix B.1 NBER Public Sector Collective Bargaining Law Data Set

The first category of legal measures is contract negotiation provisions (Online Appendix Table 1), which includes collective bargaining rights (Freeman-Valletta numerical coding scheme and Reuben condensed coding scheme) and scope of bargaining. Collective bargaining rights defines the extent to which public sector employers are allowed to negotiate with employee unions. For some groups and states, collective bargaining is outright prohibited, while in most states and for most groups, collective bargaining is allowed and employers have an obligation to negotiate in good faith with union representatives. With the Freeman-Valletta methodology, this measure is finely divided up among six levels. Reuben condenses this scale down to three levels, as detailed in Online Appendix Table 1. The other legal measure regarding contract negotiation provisions is the scope of bargaining. This variable details the extent to which employers and union members are allowed to negotiate on compensation.

The second legal category is union recognition provisions (Online Appendix Table 2), which includes representation and election and term of recognition. Representation and election details how union employees are represented in employment negotiations and how unions are formed. In some states, union leaders are exclusive representatives of employees, while in others this relationship is not exclusive. This variable also captures the extent to which the procedure for forming a public sector union is specified in the laws. Clearly-defined procedures are conducive to union formation. Specified election procedures typically include provisions for the following: initial peti- tion for union certification (percentage necessary for acceptance), posted notices, timing of election, place of election, restrictions on who can vote, employer or employee organization noninterference, and runoff elections procedures. Term of recognition further details union formation by capturing the minimum period of time that a union is guaranteed to represent the employees before another union election can be called.

The third legal category is union security provisions (Online Appendix Table 3), which includes agency shop, union members’ dues checkoff, union shop, and “Right-to-Work” law. The variables in this category capture the amount of power unions have in dues collection, union membership obligations, and employer hiring practices. Agency shop details the extent to which state law allows agreements between unions and employers requiring employees who do not join the union to pay union dues and fees. Union members dues’ checkoff details whether union dues and fees can be regular deductions from paychecks rather than separate payments to the union by employees. Union shop regards agreements between unions and employers allowing employers to hire non-union members, but requiring these new employees to join the union within a certain amount of time. Finally, “Right-to-Work” law measures the presence of a state law prohibiting union shop and agency shop agreements.

The fourth legal category is impasse procedures (Online Appendix Table 4), which includes mediation availability, fact-finding availability, arbitration availability, arbitration scope, and arbitration type. The variables in this category pertain to the procedures in place to resolve negotiation impasses. When collective bargaining negotiations break down, there is a typical route for resolution, but how far down this route the law allows or requires differs by state and occupational group. The first step after an impasse is reached is mediation where a third-party mediator is hired to assist in reaching a compromise. If mediation fails, a third-party fact-finder can be hired to analyze the facts of the impasse and construct a recommendation for a compromise agreement. If fact-finding does not result in a solution, the process may enter arbitration where a third-party agent similar to a fact-finder is hired and makes a recommendation, but this recommendation is binding. Arbitration scope and arbitration type detail the types of recommendations that the arbitrator issues.

The fifth legal category details laws pertaining to public sector employee strikes (Online Appendix Table 5) and includes strike policy (Freeman-Valletta coding scheme and Reuben condensed coding scheme). For most states and groups, laws are in place that prohibit public sector employees from striking; however, the extent of the penalties for strikes varies by state and group. In some instances, public sector employee strikes are permitted.

Online Appendix Table 1 through Online Appendix Table 5 also illustrate the coverage of previous datasets on this information. As we detail further in section 3, we reference two ad- ditional publications to aid in extending the NBER PSCBLD. The first is an extension of three Freeman-Valletta legal variables (collective bargaining rights, “Right-to-Work” law, and strike pol- icy) through 1996 by Kim Reuben. 28 She also generates two new legal measures by condensing the coding scheme for collective bargaining rights and strike policy.

Sanes et al. (2014) provide another resource to aid in our extension by providing a cross-sectional snapshot of the legal environment in 2014. Their report, reviewing legal rights and limitations in the public sector, is easily mapped to the Freeman-Valletta and Reuben categorical coding schemes for all fifty states and the five main public sector occupational groups. The variables covered in their report are collective bargaining rights, scope of bargaining, and strike policy. The exact data availability for each legal measure from previous sources is detailed in the third column of Online Appendix Table 1 through Online Appendix Table 5 along with the source (FV is Freeman-Valletta, R is Reuben, and SS is Sanes-Schmitt).

A table of legal legislation

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

## Rights PIC

### AT: Rights PIC---Core---2AC

#### Perm do the CP –

#### [The plan makes a normative right into a legal right, that was on T]---That purely means that employees are allowed to bargain and employers are not allowed to stop them.

Richa Goel 19. Of Banasthali Vidyapith; Associate at ALC Law Firm in India. "Concept of Rights and Duties Under Jurisprudence". iPleaders. 6-19-2019. <https://blog.ipleaders.in/concept-of-rights-and-duties-under-jurisprudence/>

Introduction

The law protects the legal right of every citizen. By being a citizen of the country, the people are given the legal right. It is the duty of every individual to protect the rights of each individual.

Meaning

In general word, it means that the action which is permitted by the law is called legal right or the act which is recognized or protected by the state is called legal right. The definition is given by the number of jurists like Holland, Austin, Pollock.

According to Salmond:

A legal right is an “interest which is protected and recognized by the rule of law. It is an interest which has its duty and disregard of which is wrong”.

According to Gray:

A legal right is “that power which the man has, to make a person or persons to do or restrains from doing a certain act or acts so far as the power arises from society imposing a legal duty upon the person or persons. He states that the “right is not the interest itself, it is the means to enjoy the interest secured”.

In the case of State of Rajasthan vs Union of India[1], the Supreme Court stated that “Legal rights in the strict sense are correlatives of legal duties and legal rights are defined as the interests which the law protects by imposing duties on other persons. But the legal right in the strict sense means right is the immunity from the legal power of another. Immunity is no subjection at all”.

#### Anything else is arbitrary.

Allison, Hart, & Pratt 22 – Professors of Education, University of Saskatchewan

Derek S. Allison, B. Glen Hart, and Deani Van Pelt Pratt, “4.6 The Meaning of ‘Rights,’” in *Understanding Canadian Schools: An Introduction to Educational Administration* (6th ed.), University of Saskatchewan Open Press, 2022, https://www.saskoer.ca/understandingcanadianschools/chapter/4-6-the-meaning-of-rights/.

4.6The Meaning of “Rights”

Many educational issues are framed as questions of rights. We say that teachers have (or do not have, depending on our opinion) a right to voice their opinion about school policies. Parents have (or do not have) a right to see their child’s school records. Children have a right to be protected from harm. But what are rights? Where do they come from? These questions have been of interest to people for thousands of years. There is no agreement on the answers, but over that time some useful ways of thinking about rights have arisen. Rights can be classified as

normative and legal;

procedural and substantive;

negative and positive;

individual and collective; and

personal and property.

#### AND, allowing this PIC to compete is bad---

#### Makes it impossible to be aff. None of these advocates are ‘rights key’ in the sense they mean because that’s not a thing in this context.

#### Anti-educational and eliminates research incentives. Grow up and do topic work.

#### They definitely don’t need it---T, states, state-level advantage CPs, employment law CP, cap K, core labor DA, politics, etc.

### Weird Process Bad---2AC

#### The CP dooms journalism --- it makes journalists uncertain about whether they’ll be liable for violating antitrust law, which chills their speech.

Kendrick 13 – Professor of Law at the University of Virginia School of Law.

Leslie Kendrick, “Speech, Intent, and the Chilling Effect,” William & Mary Law Review, 04/2013, https://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3481&context=wmlr

2. How Chilling Works

The question arises why legal rules not directed at protected speech might nevertheless chill such speech. Chilling may arise from different sources, foremost among which is uncertainty in the legal process.91 Uncertainty may stem from ambiguous rules or erroneous applications. Either of these may make a speaker fear that he will be held liable for speech that should properly be protected. The closer his speech is to the line between protected and unprotected, the more pronounced this uncertainty will be.92 Given the existence of both ambiguity and error, would-be speakers of marginal statements might well decide that they would prefer not to speak rather than to risk liability. Speech that is actually protected will therefore be chilled.93

It is worthwhile to examine this description in more detail. The mechanisms of chilling are diverse, and some so distinct as to have their own labels. The most prominent examples are vagueness and overbreadth.94 The doctrine of void-for-vagueness is partly explained on chilling grounds.95 A vague law creates uncertainty as to its scope; speakers who would otherwise engage in protected speech accordingly self-censor. Although vagueness is a general due process issue, its special significance in the First Amendment area is consistent with the conception of free speech as an affirmative value.96

Similarly, one chief explanation for the First Amendment doctrine of overbreadth rests on the chilling effect. An overbroad law is invalid not because it incidentally chills protected expression but because it directly reaches protected expression: hence the term “overbroad.” The chilling effect comes in as one explanation for why unprotected speakers—those who would have been reached by a properly drawn law—nevertheless may challenge the overbroad law.97 They may do so, according to this account, because the law is chilling would-be speakers of protected expression who stay silent to avoid prosecution but thereby lose the opportunity to challenge the law.98 The overbroad law essentially exerts a chilling effect on its own appropriate judicial review, the remedy to which is a special standing rule.99

But chilling also arises outside the context of these doctrines. A law that is not void for vagueness may still contain ambiguities, and even the clearest rule may be applied in error. These circumstances may make speakers uncertain of a law’s application. This uncertainty may translate into a variety of risks, any of which may cause a speaker to remain silent. For example, a speaker may be deterred • by the risk of wrongful criminal conviction and sanction;100 • by the risk of wrongful liability in tort for damages or other civil remedies;101 • by the risk of losing benefits to which he is entitled;102 • by the litigation costs of defending himself in criminal, civil, or administrative procedures, regardless of their outcomes;103 • by the personal and reputational costs of defending against a criminal, civil, or administrative proceeding, regardless of its outcome;104 • by the costs of obtaining legal advice prior to speaking;105 or • by the threat of investigation or surveillance, whether or not it results in legal proceedings.106

### NB

## Waivers

### Waivers CP---2AC

#### A. First Amendment.

Garden 24 – Julius E. Davis Professor of Law at the University of Minnesota Law School, J.D. from New York University, LLM from Georgetown University.

Charlotte Garden, “Platform Unions” Minnesota Law Review, 04/2024, https://schoarship.law.umn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1056&context=minnlrev

My goal in this Article is to explore the idea of unionization and collective bargaining as a response to problems endemic to social media platforms. In order to fully engage with that idea, I do not confront various practical and legal barriers to implementation. Readers may already be wondering: are platform unions politically feasible? Not today. And if the government enacted a platform collective-bargaining law, would First Amendment objections follow? Absolutely. These are important objections (and there are likely others as well), but they come after questions about whether unionization and collective bargaining could usefully be deployed in the platform-user context. To put it another way: a platform unionization and collective-bargaining law that has a viable path through a divided Congress and the current Supreme Court probably does not exist; if it did, it would likely be so watered-down as to be worthless. Putting forward this vision of platform bargaining would be tantamount to giving up before reaching the starting line. Thus, my goal in this Article is to attempt to identify and discuss some key questions about how platform unions could work; if the idea gains traction, it would then become necessary to confront (and perhaps work to change) political and legal conditions.

#### B. Section 230.

Chemerinsky 23 – J.D. from Harvard University; Dean and Jesse H. Choper Distinguished Professor of Law, University of California, Berkeley School of Law.

Alex Chemerinsky and Erwin Chemerinsky, “Misguided Federalism: State Regulation of the Internet and Social Media, December, https://scholarship.law.unc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=6949&context=nclr.

This Article argues that state efforts to regulate content moderation are undesirable. The internet and social media transcend state and national boundaries. A proliferation of state laws risks exacerbating chaos and undermining freedom of speech over enormously important platforms for expression. For all of their flaws, these media are the most significant developments in freedom of speech since the invention of the printing press. They have democratized the ability of people to reach a mass audience and have made infinite information instantly available.10 Congress and the courts realized early on that it made no sense to let states impose their own restrictions on the broadcast media. It likewise would be undesirable to allow states—whether progressive or conservative—to regulate the internet and social media. Simply put, we believe that most of these state efforts to regulate the internet and social media should be struck down by the courts.11 Some aspects of these laws should be invalidated for violating the First Amendment. Most other provisions should be found to be preempted by Section 230. Even if the state content-moderation laws are not unconstitutional, and we think they are, they are bad policy because they impose burdens that platforms struggle to accommodate. Individually, the laws are unwieldy. As the laws multiply, it will become impossible for internet platforms to comply. The result will seriously impair free speech online.

#### 4. Waivers fail --- lobbying ruins solvency.

Brewster 24 – Journalist at The Lever.

Freddy Brewster, “Big Tech Is Lobbying to Keep Its Stranglehold on Local News,” Jacobin, 09-12-2024, https://jacobin.com/2024/09/google-journalism-fees-california-lobbying

California legislators were considering bills that would have forced Google, Meta, and other tech firms to pay ongoing fees for earning billions from using news outlets’ content. Big Tech’s lobbying and strong-arm tactics helped kill the legislation.

#### 7. State Control DA --- the CP is perceived as too much government intervention in journalism --- that kills trust and public confidence.

Radsch and Karanicolas 23 – Director of the Center for Journalism at the Open Markets Institute, Senior Fellow at the Centre for International Governance Innovation, PhD in International Relations from American University, M.S. in International Relations from Georgetown University; Professor of Law and James S. Palmer Chair in Public Policy & Law at Dalhousie University, J.D. from Dalhousie University, LLM from the University of Toronto.

Courtney Radsch and Michael Karanicolas, “Introduction: Best of Frenemies,” Sustaining Journalism, Sustaining Democracy: A Policy Guide on Platforms and the Press, 04/2023, https://itlp.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/UCLA\_ITLP\_PlatformsPress\_Final.pdf

These initiatives have faced a range of challenges and criticisms. In Australia, Facebook infamously shut down news in the country for four days in response to the new Code, though they reversed course on this after public outcry, and early results from that country appear promising.3 Subsidy or tax credit schemes create challenges related to determining who is or is not worthy of support, or the even more fraught question or who even qualifies as a “journalist”. There are concerns that whoever controls these levers of funding, whether it is a government or a company, may abuse this power to punish disfavored perspectives or to silence critical reporting. But if the threshold for qualifying is too low, it could result in channeling resources to the worst purveyors of misinformation and hate, further degrading the political discourse. Some journalists have also raised concerns that these programs, even if administered fairly, could further erode public confidence in their reporting, by creating a perception that they are beholden to their government or Big Tech paymasters.4

## Counter-Cyclical CP

### Deficit

### AI CP

## Wage Price Spiral

### No Link---2AC

### AT: Inflation DA---2AC

#### Inflation’s up.

Rugaber 8/29 – Economics Reporter at the Associated Press.

Christopher Rugaber, “Key US inflation gauge holds mostly steady though core inflation ticks higher,” ABC News, 8/29/25, https://abcnews.go.com/Business/wireStory/key-us-inflation-gauge-holds-steady-core-inflation-125092322

WASHINGTON -- The Federal Reserve’s preferred inflation gauge mostly held steady last month despite President Donald Trump’s broad-based tariffs, but a measure of underlying inflation increased.

Prices rose 2.6% in July compared with a year ago, the Commerce Department said Friday, the same annual increase as in June. Excluding the volatile food and energy categories, prices rose 2.9% from a year earlier, up from 2.8% in the previous month and the highest since February.

The figures illustrate why many officials at the Federal Reserve have been reluctant to cut their key interest rate. While inflation is much lower than the roughly 7% peak it reached three years ago, it is still running noticeably above the Fed’s 2% target.

On a monthly basis, consumer prices rose 0.2% from June to July, down from 0.3% the previous month, while core prices increased 0.3% for the second month in a row.

Separately, the Friday report showed that consumer spending jumped 0.5% in July, the biggest increase since March and a sign that many Americans are still willing to open their wallets despite high interest rates and uncertainty surrounding the direction of the economy. Spending jumped sharply for long-lasting goods such as cars, appliances and furniture, many of which are imported.

#### And its inevitable. structural factors are driving inflation BUT turn: collective bargaining empirically doesn’t AND it cushions the impact.

Molina Romo 23 – Research Contractor, European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (Eurofound)

Oscar Molina Romo, “Collective bargaining in a climate of high inflation: The role of indexation mechanisms,” Eurofound Working Paper WPEF23032, June 2023, https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/system/files/2023-06/wpef23032.pdf#page12.

EU economies have been facing since 2021 growing inflation as a consequence of the strain on value chains caused by the pandemic crisis and the increase in energy and food prices following the war in Ukraine. In most countries, this constitutes a major shift in the environment for negotiating wages, as low inflation has been the norm since the late 1990s. This inflationary context creates pressures for collective bargaining actors to adapt and respond to its double impact on wages. First, inflation leads to a decline in the purchasing power of wages and thus private consumption. Secondly, it affects to a larger extent those workers and households with lower incomes, since they have to dedicate a proportionately larger part of their wages to pay for energy bills, food etc (ILO 2022).

Cross-country differences in inflation rates constitute a first element to explain the differential impact on real wages. These differences may arise because of different degrees of dependence on imported gas or the capacity to replace fossil fuels with renewable energy sources. However, the translation into losses in purchasing power of wages as well as its distributional impact depends crucially on the institutional context for setting wages (collective bargaining coverage and structure, among others) and those policies implemented by governments that may reduce the need to set higher wages (Cantero and Aumayr-Pintar, 2023). See related articles:

In order to analyse the role of collective bargaining in the cost-of-living crisis, two aspects need to be brought into consideration. First, the current inflation crisis hasn’t been driven by expansionary wage-setting or rigidities in collective bargaining institutions (ILO 2022). Indeed, real wages have experienced in many countries sustained losses over the last fifteen years or at best, limited increases. Secondly, collective bargaining in many countries has been decentralised, coverage rates declined and many studies have showed a limited role for indexation mechanisms in collective agreements (de Spiegalaere 2023, Koester and Grapow 2021). As a consequence, negotiated wage increases over the last two years have in most countries remained far below price increases (Lübker and Janssen 2022). We can thus expect that in 2023 collective bargaining and social dialogue could play a key role in helping to mitigate the negative impacts of the cost-of-living crisis on workers and help to achieve inclusive responses to protect low paid groups, whilst avoiding wage-price spirals.

This Working Paper explores how has collective bargaining adapted to the new inflationary scenario in the EU-27. It relies on information provided by the Network of Eurofound Correspondents. The analysis pays particular attention to those mechanisms shaping wage-setting practices and negotiated wages and the differences across groups of workers and sectors. The working paper shows growing tensions in collective bargaining as a consequence of inflation, but a limited increase in conflict levels during 2022. Moreover, there are few experiences of peak-level incomes policies agreements providing coordinated responses to the cost-of-living crisis, though prevailing mechanisms of bipartite coordination have remained key in in some countries. The analysis also confirms a limited role for indexation mechanisms, that contrasts with many countries where inflation has a formal role in setting negotiated wages. Finally, the analysis suggests a stronger recovery of purchasing power through negotiated wages for lower wage groups and low pay sectors.

#### Increasing labor supply solves inflation---eases supply bottlenecks, drives productivity growth, AND creates economic sustainability in the long run.

Khattar 23 – Lionel Murphy Master’s Scholar at Harvard Kennedy School; Professor of Public Policy at UMass Boston McCormack Graduate School; Writer for Center for American Progress

Rose Khattar, Bachelor of Economics, Laws from University of New South Whales, Christian Weller, PhD in Economics from UMass Amherst, David Correra, “Investing in Workers Can Further Ease Inflation and Boost Economic Growth,” Center for American Progress, August 30, 2023, https://www.americanprogress.org/article/investing-in-workers-can-further-ease-inflation-and-boost-economic-growth/

A growing labor supply has several economic benefits. First, it can help bring down inflation over the medium term without causing an economic downturn.**9** Greater employment opportunities at a time when employers need more workers would help ease supply-side bottlenecks caused by workforce shortages.**10** Furthermore, growing the labor supply today is critical for addressing the potential future challenges that result from demographic changes, particularly an aging population.**11** According to the Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta, the number of U.S. people between the ages of 25 and 54 has remained flat since 2019, while the number of Americans older than 65 has increased by nearly 5 million.**12** By increasing labor supply, policymakers can help reduce inflationary pressures over the longer term.

Second, growing the labor supply can expand the economy’s productive capacity. Faster productivity growth means that workers achieve more in the same amount of time as they did in the past. This not only reduces inflationary pressures but also makes it easier to address looming challenges such as climate change, aging infrastructure, and the health care needs of an aging population.**13** Research has shown that more diverse perspectives make it easier to address complex problems in business and the economy.**14** Therefore, a diverse pool of employed people can generate faster productivity growth. For example, one study found that among 700 people working in groups of up to five, those groups with more women were better able to solve tasks, signaling the importance of gender diversity in the workforce.**15**

## Realignment

### AT: MAGA DA---2AC

#### GoP realignment and wins are locked in---Democrats are too internally divided on ideology AND alienate working-class voters due to non-labor reasons.

DeVore 25 – Chief National Initiatives Officer at the Texas Public Policy Foundation, Former Republican Member of California State Assembly

Chuck DeVore, “2028 looks like trouble for Democrats — and Republicans are poised to capitalize,” FoxNews, August 29th, 2025, https://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2028-looks-like-trouble-democrats-republicans-poised-capitalize

On the Democratic side, the picture is murkier. The list of potential nominees reads like a progressive wish list: California Gov. Gavin Newsom, former Transportation Secretary Pete Buttigieg, Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, D-N.Y., Minnesota Gov. Tim Walz, former Vice President Kamala Harris, Sen. Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., Kentucky Gov. Andy Beshear, Pennsylvania Gov. Josh Shapiro, Sen. Cory Booker, D-N.J., Illinois Gov. J.B. Pritzker, Rep. Ro Khanna, D-Calif.., and Sen. Mark Kelly, D-Ariz.

Nationally, an Emerson College poll from June 2025 pegs the race as wide open with former V.P. and 2024 Democratic nominee Kamala Harris fading quickly. Early polls for the 2028 nomination reveal a crowded field of far-left contenders, with Newsom emerging as a frontrunner in recent weeks. A Newsweek analysis of state-level polling shows Newsom leading in at least two key states, including his home turf of California as well as Ohio, where he reportedly commands strong support among Democratic voters.

Other polls, such as one from Zeteo and Data for Progress in April 2025, show Buttigieg, Booker and Ocasio-Cortez leading in scenarios without Harris. But Newsom’s name recognition and fundraising prowess give him an edge — especially with Newsom’s high-profile, but likely doomed effort to redistrict California via ballot initiative this November.

In America’s two-party system, winning the presidency hinges on capturing the Electoral College, which rewards candidates who appeal to the center. Candidates typically tack toward the commonsense center in general elections, shedding primary extremism to court swing voters in states like Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin.

But Democrats have struggled with this since 1968, when the Vietnam War radicalized the elite left, pulling the party away from the mainstream.

The result? Four blowout elections out of five contests: 1972, Richard Nixon with 520 Electoral College votes to George McGovern with 17; 1980, Ronald Reagan, 489 to Jimmy Carter, 49; 1984, Ronald Reagan 525 to Walter Mondale, 13; 1988, George H.W. Bush 426 to Mike Dukakis, 111.

Bill Clinton’s two elections in the 1990s were anomalies fueled by George H.W. Bush’s infamous "no new taxes" pledge break, which alienated conservatives, and H. Ross Perot’s third-party run (fueled by personal animus towards Bush), which siphoned votes from Bush.

The Democratic Leadership Council (DLC) played a huge role as well, as it pushed for a moderate and electable nominee. Even so, Bush’s sky-high popularity (the result of the crushing victory against Iraq in 1991 in the Gulf War) caused many popular Democrats not to run for the nomination.

Clinton won two general elections with 43% of the popular vote in 1992 and 49% in 1996. Importantly, Clinton governed with centrist moves like welfare reform and a balanced budget (though largely due to the Republican takeover of Congress in 1994)—policies that today’s Democrats would decry as right-wing.

Fast-forward to today, and the Democratic Party is adrift. The influence of progressives, supercharged during President Barack Obama’s eight years, has made it nearly impossible to nominate someone who can win nationally.

The Democratic Party base demands fealty to identity politics, open borders and climate extremism. This alienates working-class voters who flipped to Trump in 2016 and stayed Republican thereafter. Polls consistently show Americans rejecting these positions: majorities support border walls, favor energy independence over green mandates and oppose defunding the police.

Newsom exemplifies this dilemma. As California’s governor, he’s presided over skyrocketing homelessness, rapidly rising energy prices and a population exodus — policies that play well in San Francisco, but flop in Pennsylvania.

Early in 2025, Newsom made a rare nod to the center, stating during a podcast that allowing biological males to compete in women’s sports is "deeply unfair" and an "issue of fairness." Newsom’s remarks align with public sentiment; surveys show 80% or more of Americans oppose transgender athletes in female competitions, viewing it as a commonsense protection for women’s opportunities.

Newsom quickly backpedaled amid backlash from party activists. By April, he downplayed the remarks as unplanned and in May he supported rule changes allowing more transgender participation in state events — despite controversy.

Newsom’s flip-flop under left-wing pressure reveals the bind: Stray from the left and you risk the nomination. Stick to it and you lose the general.

A few Democrats hint at moderation, like Khanna of California. Khanna, a progressive who co-chaired Sen. Bernie Sanders’ 2020 presidential campaign has carved out bipartisan ground on issues like tech regulation and manufacturing revival. He’s advocated for bringing jobs back to America, echoing Trump-era themes and called for Democratic unity amid ideological excesses.

Khanna critiques "woke" politics as weakening the party, positioning himself as a bridge-builder. Yet even he supports progressive staples like "Medicare for All" and aggressive climate action, limiting his appeal beyond the base.

Barring an economic or foreign crisis, the Democrats’ leftward drift dooms them. Vance, inheriting Trump’s coalition and likely expanding it, starts with advantages in the Rust Belt and Sun Belt.

History shows parties win by claiming the center. Republicans have mastered that under Trump. Democrats? Their left-wing tidal lock leaves them wholly unable to see, much less voice, commonsense policies.

#### Or non-labor issues thump and inevitably break down the GOP coalition.

Laffin 25 – Deputy Editor at the Washington Examiner.

Peter Laffin, “The coming civil war over the soul of the post-Trump GOP,” The Washington Examiner, 08-08-2025, https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/in\_focus/3797346/gop-natcon-post-trump-party-identity-civil-war/

This week’s National Conservatism Conference in Washington, D.C., laid bare the battle for the GOP’s post-Trump soul. As President Donald Trump’s run as the main character of American politics  — extended by four years dominating the spotlight while out of power — nears its end, the Republican Party braces for a clash over free markets, global leadership, and the definition of American identity.

For the past decade, Trump’s unifying presence has held together a fractious GOP coalition made of America First populists, traditional conservatives, social and religious conservatives, free-traders, fair-traders, Elon Musk libertarians, Tucker Carlson isolationists, and Lindsey Graham interventionists. No successor is guaranteed to unite these factions.

Economics The NatCon conference this week spotlighted the ascendant nationalist wing of the GOP, featuring speakers who issued direct rebukes to traditional economic conservatives.

While the latter champion free markets, deregulation, and global trade as the engines of prosperity, the NatCon wing views these policies as the primary cause of America’s economic decline. The nation’s economic identity, they believe, should not be consumer-driven efficiency, but a “production economy” that prioritizes domestic manufacturing, strong supply chains, and good-paying jobs for American workers — even if it means embracing tariffs and industrial policy that would have once been anathema to Republicans.

Ronald Reagan, a hero of traditional conservatives, held that government was not the solution but the problem. NatCons, however, eagerly embrace a muscular state and its power to engineer the economy and shape the culture.

The clash between these camps is not merely over the size of government but over its very purpose: Should the state be a hands-off guardian of free enterprise, or an active shaper of the economy to serve what it considers the national interest?

Trump has embraced elements of both visions, with tax cuts and deregulation on the one hand and tariffs and using the power of his office to force companies into bringing manufacturing jobs back to the U.S. on the other.

Will his successor be able to replicate this delicate balancing act? Will future economic conditions even make this approach viable?

Foreign policy The differences in foreign policy are even more stark. On one end, traditional conservatives advocate an active role in world affairs to blunt China‘s ascendence and stall the breakdown of global order. Meanwhile, NatCon isolationists reject global alliances and advocate strategic disengagement.

Trump has managed to please both camps just enough to fend off revolt. His swift and devastating military strikes in Yemen, Iran, and most recently off the coast of Venezuela, advanced American interests while avoiding prolonged entanglement.

But the fragile GOP foreign policy coalition shows signs of crumbling as Trump’s second term advances. NatCon condemnation of the Iran nuclear facilities strike reached a fever pitch, with many prominent voices accusing Trump of a “bait-and-switch” on foreign policy by aligning with the interventionists after campaigning as an isolationist (though neither accusation is strictly true).

Podcaster Charlie Kirk reflected on the Iran strike’s effects on the GOP on Megyn Kelly’s podcast in June, saying, “There is no greater divide on the American Right than foreign policy. And I was really worried that this was going to bring it to a very unpleasant moment.”

Trump’s continued support of Israel and, to a lesser extent, Ukraine further alienates the NatCon faction. Speaking at the conference this week, Curt Mills, editor and executive director of The American Conservative, asked, “Why are Israel’s endless problems America’s liabilities? Why are we in the national conservative bloc, broadly speaking, why do we laugh out of the room this argument when it’s advanced by Volodymyr Zelensky, but are slavish hypocrites for Benjamin Netanyahu? Why should we accept America First — asterisk Israel? And the answer is, we shouldn’t.”

He went on to advance Steve Bannon’s proposition that “regime change” in Israel might be necessary.

Harsh sentiments among NatCons toward Israel are common these days, especially from the younger generation. A recent Pew Research poll found that 50% of Republicans under 50 had a negative view of Israel, while only 23% of Republicans over 50 had a negative view of the Jewish state. The generation gap was on full display at the conference this week, with younger participants in “question and answer” sessions showing a disdain for Israel, while older Republicans showed support.

Meanwhile, the traditional conservative bloc remains as united behind Israel as ever. In particular, Republican leaders in the Senate show no signs of wavering as the war in Gaza lurches into its second year. Sen. Tim Scott (R-SC), chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee, often says that the U.S. must “stand shoulder to shoulder, back to back, with no daylight with Israel,” posting in June that “the United States will always stand with Israel.” Sen. Ted Cruz (R-TX), likewise, believes that “American policy should be to provide unequivocal military and diplomatic support to our Israeli allies to fully ensure their security.”

The pro-Israel faction represented by these and other Republican congressional leaders, including House Speaker Mike Johnson (R-LA), remains the dominant force within the GOP. A July Gallup poll finds that a full 71% of Republican voters support Israel’s military action in Gaza, while 67% hold a favorable view of Netanyahu. But the NatCon disdain for foreign entanglements, especially concerning Israel, appears to be crescendoing.

What is an American? If economics and foreign policy threaten to divide the post-Trump Republican coalition, the NatCon’s rejection of America as a “creedal nation” has the potential to cleave it in two. Vice President JD Vance, the party’s presumed presidential favorite for 2028, regularly defines America as “not just an idea, but a particular place, with a particular people, and a particular set of beliefs and way of life.”

And while this sounds innocuous and true enough, the practical implications of this definition of American identity carry the potential to reshape the GOP’s core identity in ways that are difficult to predict and possibly at sharp odds with the broader American electorate

The notion that America is fundamentally a “creedal nation,” favored by traditional conservatives, is rooted in the Declaration of Independence and its universal principles: that all are “endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights,” and that the nation is bound together by these ideas. In this view, the American ideal is open to anyone regardless of background — so long as they subscribe to the nation’s core tenets of liberty and self-governance.

This view was supported robustly by both Reagan and the original Republican president, Abraham Lincoln, who, while speaking to a group of immigrants in 1858, said, “If they look back through this history to trace their connection with those days by blood, they find they have none … but when they look through that old Declaration of Independence … and then they feel that moral sentiment … they have a right to claim it as though they were blood of the blood, and flesh of the flesh, of the men who wrote that declaration, and so they are.”

Lincoln’s conception has long been the dominant view of American identity across the political spectrum

But Vance and the NatCons, motivated by the belief that the cultural bonds that once held America together — the family, communities, religion, and shared norms — are in a state of decay, seek to upend this. They argue that the “creedal nation” has proven insufficiently unifying, leading to a fragmented society where different groups have little in common. This decline, in their view, must be restored through a reassertion of a shared identity and a common culture with an emphasis on heritage.

Speaking at the Claremont Institute in early July, Vance gave a nod to the notion that ancestry plays a role in this new vision of American identity, saying of liberals who are American citizens, “I think the people whose ancestors fought in the Civil War have a hell of a lot more claim over America.”

The line was scrubbed out of the speech transcript in the Claremont Institute’s publication, The American Mind.

But it’s easy enough to find the notion echoed throughout the NatCon sphere. Yoram Hazony, chairman of the Edmund Burke Foundation and considered a founder of the NatCon movement, explicitly endorses Vance’s contention that ancestry is key to American identity.

“By a nation,” he writes in a recent book, “we mean a number of tribes with a shared heritage, usually including a common language, law, or religious tradition, and a past history of joining together.”

In recent weeks, key NatCon thinkers and social media influencers, from Matt Walsh to Sen. Eric Schmitt (RMO) to Claremont President Ryan P. Williams, have simultaneously posed the question “What is an American” to their audiences. Responses from self-identified “heritage Americans” range from outwardly ethnonationalist to more subtle but still fringe ideas about what makes a “real” American.

The GOP’s internal debate over American identity reveals a party beginning to redefine itself as its unifying figure departs. Its outcome will not simply determine the party’s policy platform but its fundamental character.

Will a leader emerge who can inspire enough loyalty from each faction to maintain the party’s national strength? Will it shed its past devotion to free markets and Israel? Will it prioritize “heritage” over shared values?

At present, these are all open questions.

#### AND no one knows about the plan. If you go outside the room and ask people what a joint negotiating entity is, they’re going to look at you crazily.

Flanders 16 – Professor of Law at St. Louis University, PhD and M.A. from the University of Chicago, J.D. from Yale Law School.

Chad Flanders, “Voter Ignorance and Deliberative Democracy,” Saint Louis University, https://scholarship.law.slu.edu/faculty/477/

American voters are shockingly ignorant about politics. Not only do they not know basic facts about the structure of American government (what the three branches are, etc.) or the views of the major political parties, they do not really know in many cases even what they believe about politics, because what they believe can be manipulated depending on how pollsters ask the questions. People may oppose welfare, for instance, but favor increasing money transfers to the poor-which is pretty much what welfare is.2 Even worse, when voters are motivated to seek out more information, and do seek out that information, they tend to do so in a biased way by gathering information from those sources which tend to confirm their existing opinions.3 So even intelligent voters tend to be ignorant about what the other side thinks. Now, one would think that such massive and pervasive ignorance would matter not just to the effective running of our democracy, but also matter to the normative desirability of democracy itself. And one would think philosophers who defend democracy would spend a lot of time worrying and obsessing about the problem of voter ignorance, and how to fix it.

#### All of that is especially true post-Kirk shooting --- normal means is most Dems and many Republicans --- means that Republican infighting over the plan is inevitable.

Mak and Lippman 09/15 – Technology Journalist at Politico, J.D. from Yale Law School; White House Journalist at Politico.

Aaron Mak and Daniel Lippman, “Republicans put tech firms in a vise on Kirk social-media posts,” Politico, 09-15-2025, https://www.politico.com/news/2025/09/15/kirk-social-media-gop-trump-tiktok-meta-x-censorship-00564655

Mak and Lippman 09/15 – Technology Journalist at Politico, J.D. from Yale Law School; White House Journalist at Politico.

Aaron Mak and Daniel Lippman, “Republicans put tech firms in a vise on Kirk social-media posts,” Politico, 09-15-2025, https://www.politico.com/news/2025/09/15/kirk-social-media-gop-trump-tiktok-meta-x-censorship-00564655

The Republican backlash against social media platforms after Charlie Kirk’s assassination is throwing big tech companies into uncertainty, as they address conservative anger about the killing while also heeding calls for freer online speech.

Tech platforms including Meta, TikTok and X quickly came under pressure from some Republican lawmakers to pull down the graphic videos circulating after Kirk’s death on Wednesday, and by Thursday had mostly taken them offline.

Since then, the argument about social-media’s role has pivoted into anger over users posting negative views of Kirk online — speech that is legally allowed, and largely within the platforms’ rules, but strikes critics as indecent gloating.

The platforms “are all facing this problem where the right wing has been on them repeatedly about content moderation and how they [shouldn’t] control any content,” said an outside lobbyist for Meta, who was granted anonymity because they weren’t authorized to speak for the company. “And now the tables are turned in some fashion, and people are all over them, saying you can’t allow this kind of content and that kind of content.”

“A lot of [the companies] are going to be whipsawed,” the Meta lobbyist said.

Another tech lobbyist said the anger over Kirk content was a topic of frequent conversation in the tech lobbying world over the weekend.

Even some Democrats say they’re worried about harmful posts. Rep. Alexandria Ocasio Cortez (D-N.Y.) told POLITICO that “whether it’s in a political rhetoric context or not, tech platforms know that conflict and increasing conflict increases engagement, and I think that we have to ensure that they’re responsible as well.”

But it’s not clear what, if anything, Congress has an appetite to do.

Speaker Mike Johnson told reporters last week that “social media has been a toxin in politics” and it’s “added to this vitriol,” but stopped short of proposing any legislative steps.

Since the widespread deplatforming of conservatives in the wake of the Jan. 6 Capitol riot and the Covid outbreak, the political right has framed itself as the victim of speech restrictions, and pushed hard to take the brakes off what’s allowed in online chatter. Elon Musk bought Twitter and remade it into the more freewheeling, conservative-friendly platform X, and House Judiciary Chair Jim Jordan has held a series of hearings to highlight alleged collusion between Democratic politicians and social-media content restrictions.

Spokespeople for X and TikTok did not respond to requests for comment.

Now, the Kirk killing is widening a split in the Republican coalition, in which some leaders want to moderate the free-speech push by pulling back on published content for various reasons — whether it’s harmful to children, or deceptively advertising pharmaceuticals. Apart from hardline libertarians like Rep. Thomas Massie (R-Ky.), who have rejected any notions of regulating content on platforms, the lines are hard to pin down.

“There’s a lot of overlapping categories,” said Ari Cohn, lead tech policy counsel at the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression, a group that defends First Amendment rights. “I’m not sure there are clear factions, and I think this is a result of the fact that this is so ad hoc.”

President Donald Trump himself has embodied both sides of this conflict — making it harder for both elected Republicans looking for a steady direction for the party, and companies looking for a politically safe approach.

Trump appeared to draw a clear line on his first day returning to the White House, issuing an executive order that read: “Government censorship of speech is intolerable in a free society.”

And yet, in the wake of Kirk’s killing, Trump on Saturday shared a video on Truth Social of a person imploring him to wield the law in part to hound “content creators who consistently spread lies and propaganda and half-truths across the internet.”

Asked about the apparent contradiction, White House spokesperson Abigail Jackson said: “President Trump is a champion for free speech — like many Republicans, he has been a victim of left-wing censorship and knows firsthand the dangers that censorship poses. And President Trump is right to call out the radical leftists that have, for years, slandered their political opponents as Nazis and Fascists, inspiring left-wing violence against conservatives.”

Other intra-GOP exchanges have brought the conflict into similarly sharp relief.

When Rep. Clay Higgins (R-La.) posted on X and said he’d force “tech platforms to mandate immediate ban for life of every post or commenter that belittled the assassination of Charlie Kirk,” he got an immediate clapback from Republican personality Robby Starbuck: “Charlie died fighting for free speech. He would not agree with lifetime social media bans.”

### !---AT: 1NC Harper 24---2AC

#### 1NC Harper says Dems’ progressive social stances make the link inevitable, AND that ‘realignment’ would entail moderating the GOP---solves the impact.

Tyler Austin Harper 24, Staff Writer at The Atlantic, Ph.D. in Comparative Literature from NYU, Former Assistant Professor of Environmental Studies at Bates College, Co-host of Time to Say Goodbye podcast, "Is This How Democrats Win Back the Working Class?" The Atlantic, 12/12/2024, https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2024/12/political-parties-populist-policies/680951/

Is This How Democrats Win Back the Working Class?

Embracing populism could help the party build a lasting political coalition—if the Republicans don’t do it first.

A week after Donald Trump won the presidency again, I sat across from Chris Murphy in his minimalist but well-appointed D.C. office. The Connecticut senator sounded like a man who had done a speedrun through all five stages of grief and was ready to talk about what comes next: how his party could learn from its loss and win over—or win back—voters in 2026 and 2028. “I have thought for a long time that there’s a race between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party,” Murphy told me. “And the question is: Does the Republican Party become more economically populist in a genuine way before the Democratic Party opens itself up to people who don’t agree with us on 100 percent of our social and cultural issues?”

Murphy is onto something. The politics of the average American are not well represented by either party right now. On economic issues, large majorities of the electorate support progressive positions: They say that making sure everyone has health-care coverage is the government’s responsibility (62 percent), support raising the minimum wage to $15 an hour (62 percent), strongly or somewhat support free public college (63 percent), and are in favor of federal investment in paid family and medical leave (73 percent). They also support more government regulation of a variety of industries including banking (53 percent), social media (60 percent), pharmaceuticals (68 percent), and artificial intelligence (72 percent). Yet large majorities of this same American public also take conservative positions on social issues: They think the Supreme Court was right to overturn affirmative action (68 percent), agree that trans athletes should compete only on teams that match their gender assigned at birth (69 percent), believe that third-trimester abortions should be illegal in most circumstances (70 percent), and are at least somewhat concerned about the number of undocumented immigrants entering the country (79 percent).

These facts are not especially convenient for either Democrats or Republicans, which is no doubt why both sides have failed to put forward platforms that represent these views. But lately, more political insiders from both parties have been willing to acknowledge the problem and admit that it’s time to move on from neoliberalism, the political ideology that champions market solutions, deregulation, the privatization of public services, and a general laissez-faire approach to the economy.

Substantial obstacles confront populists on both the left and right. Democrats must contend with a college-educated base and party establishment that embraces maximalist positions on social issues, while Republicans must contend with substantial libertarian cliques. But whichever party figures out how to advance a meaningful post-neoliberal platform could unlock a winning and durable political coalition.

Murphy is doing his best to make sure that his side of the aisle beats the Republicans, but he seems far from certain that it will. In an MSNBC interview after the election, the senator sketched out something of a road map for Democrats: “We should return to the party we were in the ’70s and ’80s, when we had economics as the tent pole and then we let in people who thought differently than us on other social and cultural issues.” Murphy was quick to add that this reinvention—or rather, reversion—will be challenging to pull off. “That’s a difficult thing for the Democratic Party to do, because we’ve applied a lot of litmus tests over the years,” he observed. “Those litmus tests have added up to a party that is pretty exclusionary and is shrinking, not growing.”

In the days and weeks after the election, I spoke with post-neoliberal economists, academics, and leaders of major political nonprofits on the left and the right. Almost all of those I interviewed shared Murphy’s view that America’s political parties are in an arms race to capture what the senator called, in a 2022 essay for The New Republic, the “silent majority of Americans who want more economic control, more social connection, and more moral markets.”

It is a race that some worry the Republicans are winning. Although few on the populist right view Trump as the genuine article—they tend to politely describe the president-elect as a “transitional figure”—he has nominated post-neoliberal and populist sympathizers to major positions in his second administration: Senator Marco Rubio, an industrial-policy aficionado, for secretary of state; the pro-union Representative Lori Chavez-DeRemer for labor secretary; the Big Tech skeptic Gail Slater to lead the Justice Department’s antitrust division; and, of course, J. D. Vance, whose rise to vice president–elect was greeted with trepidation by Wall Street despite his tech-venture-capital background. Still, most of those I interviewed shared the view that Trump will likely squander his populist goodwill with tax cuts for billionaires and other anti-populist agenda items during his term.

This should produce an opening for the populist left, but there remains a deeper and perhaps more intractable problem: The GOP appears to be locking into place a multiracial coalition of the non-college-educated. These are voters who may prove easier for liberals to lose than to win back. If the Democrats have any hope of once again being the party of the working class, Murphy and others believe, they need to recognize that Americans are desperate for meaning and community.

The language Murphy used in his New Republic essay—invoking morality, self-worth, and social connection—is omnipresent in post-neoliberal discourse. The movement’s chief exponents believe that neoliberalism has not only created an economic disaster, but its emphasis on ruthless individualism has also created a crisis of political and social meaning. In the view of Murphy and others, any post-neoliberal politics must cultivate a new social ethic rooted in dignified and fairly remunerated labor. Many of these prominent post-neoliberals, some of them affiliated with the same think tanks and nonprofits that once helped establish the neoliberal consensus, seem convinced that there’s a massive voting bloc waiting to be activated: Americans who are moderate or even small-c conservative on social issues, but who also favor a more aggressive, rabble-rousing attack on the country’s existing economic system.

“We have not convinced voters in this country that we are serious about redistributing power from people who have it to people who don’t have it,” Murphy lamented to me. “The solutions we’ve proposed are largely small-ball, largely adjustments to the existing market. We don’t talk about power in the way that Republicans talk about power.” Others agreed.

Although many observed that Joe Biden has been arguably the most pro-labor president in decades and has often broken with neoliberal orthodoxy in areas such as industrial policy, they also felt that he never quite captured the narrative or claimed credit for his substantial accomplishments. In other words: There was a widespread sense among the people I spoke with that Biden had working-class policies without working-class politics. “The Democratic Party didn’t show that it was really backing the concerns of ordinary people strongly enough, and wasn’t identifying well enough with how they saw the world,” Joseph Stiglitz, a Nobel Prize–winning economist and longtime critic of neoliberalism, told me.

For many (though not all) post-neoliberals, the heart of their economic vision is “pre-distribution,” a concept popularized by the political scientist Jacob Hacker. Whereas center-left neoliberals tend to favor redistributive tax-and-transfer policies—allowing an unchained market to generate robust growth, and then blunting resulting economic disparities by taking some of the gains from the system’s winners and redistributing them to the system’s working-class “losers,” reducing inequality after the fact—post-neoliberals generally believe that it is better to avoid generating such inequalities in the first place. “The moral of this story,” Hacker explains in a 2011 paper, “is that progressive reformers need to focus on market reforms that encourage a more equal distribution of economic power and rewards even before government collects taxes or pays out benefits.”

As Hacker (perhaps accidentally) implies with his invocation of the story’s “moral,” pre-distribution advocates often justify this strategy in ethical or even spiritual terms: Empowering workers to secure better pay and working conditions—say, through unions and sectoral bargaining—is about restoring dignity and revitalizing labor-based forms of community.

“Most people don’t want a handout,” Chris Murphy recently posted on social media. “They want the rules unrigged so they can succeed on their own.” Although some on the left (not unreasonably) disliked the way the senator described certain redistributionist policies as “handouts,” these vocabulary complaints distract from Murphy’s deeper point. Honest labor is a source of pride, and populists should want an economy where most Americans are paid fairly for work they feel good about rather than suffering poverty wages and waiting for cash floats that keep them above water.

“Most people need opportunities for meaningful work and social recognition in order to feel that their goals in life are worthwhile,” the philosopher Daniel Chandler observed in his recent book Free and Equal, which received coverage in both mainstream liberal and left-wing media. “By focusing on increasing market incomes, especially from employment, predistribution helps to maintain the healthy connection between contribution and reward that might be lost if we relied too heavily on redistribution. At the same time, it takes seriously the importance of work for people’s sense of self-respect.” As Chandler and others see it, many Democrats’ inability to grasp the fact that it matters to people not only that they have financial resources but how they acquire them has left the party unable to understand why voters don’t reward them for their largesse. Larry Kramer, a former president of the Hewlett Foundation and the current president of the London School of Economics, echoed this view. He insisted to me that reaching the working class is about more than just material conditions: “It’s not economic. It’s political economy.” In his telling, liberals get so wrapped up debating how the economy should be organized that we forget to ask what moral and political ends—that is, what vision of the good life and what kinds of values—markets are supposed to secure in the first place.

Many Democratic insiders believe that post-neoliberal economic policies alone are not sufficient to win back American workers. Social issues will also need to be reconsidered. Stiglitz pointed to immigration as one place where Democrats may need to compromise, a view he shares with others in his post-neoliberal cohort. Murphy helped write a defeated bipartisan border-security bill that would have added Border Patrol officers and made asylum standards more stringent; some critics characterized it as “hard-right.” Last year, a hotly discussed book by the socialist journalist John B. Judis and the liberal political scientist Ruy Teixeira likewise packaged a withering critique of neoliberalism with a call to embrace more conservative positions on immigration. Chandler’s Free and Equal also quietly endorsed claims that increased immigration depresses wages for low earners and strains public resources. As Chandler argues, “High levels of immigration can make it more difficult to create a stable sense of political community and national identity.”

Gun control is another area where flexibility may be prudent in order to be competitive in certain parts of the country. Democrats will have to accommodate people like Dan Osborn, the independent who, though he lost his bid to represent Nebraska in the Senate, outperformed Kamala Harris while combining a vocal defense of the Second Amendment with proudly pro-union politics.

Teixeira and Judis flagged a third topic, gender identity, where Democrats ought to respond to the public’s concerns. That begins by making room for conversations that don’t involve accusations of bigotry, or insisting that the very act of asking questions about terms such as people with the capacity for pregnancy is tantamount to challenging the right of trans Americans to exist or exposing them to harm. For Judis and Teixeira, that requires making more granular distinctions between culture-war battles such as fairness in sports—where good-faith disagreement is possible—and important efforts to provide trans Americans the kind of universalist safeguards won in earlier civil-rights movements. LGBTQ groups’ effort to “protect transgender people from discrimination in housing, employment, and school admission falls well within America’s democratic tradition,” they write. But they also warn that activist demands outside this scope are “attempt[s] to impose a new social conformity based on a dubious notion of gender.”

More than anything, liberals need to understand that many Americans—especially those in the working class—feel unheard. Their trust will be won back not through quick fixes, but by treating those without a college education or with more conservative social views as equal participants in our national dialogue.

“The debate is still alive inside our party. But the post-neoliberals are clearly ascendant,” Murphy told me. He argued that his fellow Democrats need to be more open to dissenting viewpoints, and that expanding the tent will involve a fight: “I am not making an argument that the core Democratic Party do a left turn and reorient our position on choice, climate, or guns. I am arguing that we allow people into the tent … so that we have a little bit more robust conversation, and potentially a little bit more diversity on those issues inside the coalition.”

The soul-searching that is before the Democrats will require liberals to engage with views they find discomfiting, and to reckon with the fact that their social values are out of keeping with the working-class majorities they profess to represent. Democrats must figure out where there is room to compromise. And where compromise is not possible—or truly unjust—they must begin the slow-grinding work of persuasion.

“We cannot successfully engage with people whose inner lives we do not even try to understand,” a recent report from the stalwartly liberal think tank the Roosevelt Institute concludes. Whether left-wing liberals are open to doing this remains to be seen.

“It’s not clear that if we blow it in two or four years time that there’s another shot at this apple for Dems,” Jennifer Harris, a Hewlett Foundation director and former Biden-administration official, suggested, speaking in a personal capacity, when describing the Democratic Party’s need for a post-neoliberal makeover. In her view, the prize for such a transformation may prove to be not just a near-term political victory, but a Franklin D. Roosevelt–style stranglehold on the electorate: “There is potentially a lot of political spoils.”

Spoils indeed. Many on the left and right agree that the stakes are high, the reward prodigious, and the path forward obvious: Whichever party can credibly combine economic populism with moderate social positions will win elections. There is no mystery here. The problem is not the absence of a political solution but a deficit in political willpower. And the next election, and the elections to come, may well hinge on which party can muster the resolve to finally deliver real populism to the people.