### CP---1NC

#### The United States Congress should

#### Grant collective bargaining rights to workers at educational institutions

#### Boost teacher pay and benefits

#### Install worker councils that enable teachers to make decisions about the workplace.

### K---1NC

K---

#### Collective bargaining rights reify patriarchal hierarchies and coopt labor movements.
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The Wagner Act, modeled on the larger political democratic structure, imports a republican model of representative government into the workplace. Although the drafters of the Wagner Act were concerned primarily with establishing a balance of power between individual employees and employers in order to avoid strikes and the consequent interruption of commerce, they were also interested in empowering workers economically and in promoting workplace democracy, which was thought to enhance political democracy. 92

Like its prototype, republican democracy, the Wagner Act assumed that democracy was best attained through a militaristic, win-lose competition between the interests of the relevant constituencies— here, employers and employees engaged in a struggle for control of the workplace, production and the distribution of profits. With the explicit goal of copying republican, representative democracy, Congress established an adversarial system of rights, rules and processes within which the contest was to be waged, and authorized representatives on each side (managers for the companies, unions for the employees) to conduct the battle. To help even out the economic scales, individual employees were afforded a right to organize against employers "organized in the corporate [form],"" and a right to engage in "concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection." 94

Collective bargaining was chosen by Congress as the preferred means for resolving conflicts between workers and employers. 95 Collective bargaining is directly analogous to the legislative process in the larger political democracy. Its primary goal is the efficient management of the enterprise, which in turn leads to industrial peace and uninterrupted production. The underlying assumption is that the workplace is hierarchically ordered and that workers, who occupy the bottom rungs on the hierarchy, must be controlled.96 The concept is made more palatable through the use of democratic rhetoric: the workplace is a place that must be "governed," and the workers may "choose" their "representative" in the legislative process. 97

Scholars associated with the Critical Legal Studies movement have argued persuasively that collective bargaining law "aims to legitimate and justify unnecessary and destructive hierarchy and domination in the workplace," and that it has "evolved an institutional architecture . . . that reinforces this hierarchy and domination."98 Accordingly, labor law "promises a modicum of democratic participation to encourage worker acceptance of," and consent to, the hierarchical and authoritarian character of the workplace. 99 "Liberal labor theory," as Karl Klare has dubbed the legislative analogy and the assumptions supporting it, thus utilizes collective bargaining law as a means of coopting the labor movement into a "junior partnership" role with management.

#### That’s intrinsically unsustainable and produces existential crisis. The alternative is the care economy.
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More feminists have recently engaged in degrowth discussions, recognising the importance of care work and the care economy (Dengler & Lang, Citation2022; Dengler & Strunk, Citation2018). In a degrowth economy, capital investment would shift from socially and ecologically unsustainable sectors towards more desirable and low-carbon care sectors. The care economy, serving essential human needs, could be designed to operate within planetary boundaries, aligning with sustainability and sufficiency principles (Coote, Citation2012; Folbre, Citation2006, p. 187). Essential resources such as food, water, land and others from the planet are critical to human care work and are fundamental to sustaining and nourishing people. These activities, such as food production, household maintenance, and water management, are considered ‘indirect’ care work, which is an extension of the ‘direct’ care work that involves close and personal interaction (Folbre, Citation2006, p. 187). Both indirect and direct care work rely on human labour and specific material resources, including water, land, seeds, and timber, which can be seen as forms of nature’s care work that enable human care work.

Having care as an intersecting conception within any degrowth analyses can be useful in viewing resource scarcity embedded within political contexts such as neoliberal policies. For example, fracking is often justified in the name of overcoming energy ‘scarcity’ that the global North experiences in terms of a shortage of gas and oil (often framed as ‘energy insecurity’). The reasoning behind justifying fracking is not rooted in enhancing energy access for human and non-human care work, which is an essential need, but rather in the profit-driven oil industries and the global economic order. It is part of neoliberal capitalist attempts to fix the scarcity with future and as yet invented technologies, a defining feature of the unsustainable global (or Western-led) growth paradigm (Barry, Citation2016; Citation2020; Daly, Citation1974). Here, scarcity is imagined as a reason for technological development of the global North. Techno-optimism is dangerous because it produces short-sighted and empirically unsupported measures that overlook their intergenerational impacts (Lorek & Spangenberg, Citation2014, p. 34). In other words, advanced technologies that have yet unknown catastrophic side effects are compromising future times in which future human and non-human peoples live. More importantly, it is not fossil fuels used to produce luxury items that are ‘scarce’, but energy needed to produce food and/or transport and purify water in financially deprived regions that suffer scarcity due to the existing power inequalities and unequal availabilities. The distribution of resources across the globe is uneven, and the notion of scarcity is used to exclude certain populations and future generations from accessing these resources.

On the contrary, the scope of the depletion of care economy extends beyond the domestic level. The (under)use of resources (i.e. relative scarcity) for care work across societies intersects with the gendered division of labour, following the global South’s history of extraction and exploitation under Western capitalist domination. The colonial model of work has exploited both care work and natural resources of the Global South. One of the most well-known examples is the construction of Bantustans in South Africa. These colonised lands were designated as areas where native African women and children were forced into social reproduction, essentially to raise the ‘next generation of male labourers’ (Miraftab & Huq, Citation2024, p. 239). These men would then work in European-controlled resource extraction industries, such as mining and plantation agriculture. This is precisely what ecofeminist thinkers argue: that capitalism is inextricably colonial and ‘organises humanity reduced to labour, within a global racialised and gendered hierarchy of labour power, with racialised and Indigenous women [and the more-than-human world] at the bottom’ (Giacomini, 2018, p. 101).

Furthermore, colonial capitalism continues to perpetuate by neoliberal economic policies that prioritise export-oriented growth over food sufficiency. For example, these policies often encourage the production of export products such as cocoa, coffee, and tea, whilst neglecting food crops, which exacerbates food insecurity (Tsikata & Torvikey, Citation2021, p. 216). Similar to the Honduran case discussed earlier, environmental degradation resulting from corporate and state violence directly threatens the material survival of rural communities, where ‘care work entails a substantial amount of unpaid reproductive [and provisioning] work dependent on … land and water as inputs’ (İlkkaracan, Citation2017, p. 44). In short, resource scarcity in the global South means a lack of resources for women who bear the burden of direct and indirect care work. This, in turn, negatively impacts not only those living in ‘colonised’ lands, but also undermines the wellbeing of all people, particularly women and future generations.

Reviving the care economy and reducing the market economy are effectively about promoting and revaluing care work, as well as caring for the planet, both of which are currently undervalued. Note that capitalist economies structurally depend on unwaged care work yet systematically devalue and exploit it (Federici, Citation2012). Although unpaid care work does not contribute to GDP growth directly, its exploitation is integral to capitalist economic system. This hidden labour supports the productive economy, enabling the accumulation of surplus value (Bhattacharya, Citation2017). In effect, productive economic activities (both blue-collar and white-collar work) can only be performed when reproductive care work has been done, as workers need to be fed and rested before they can return to work (Bakker, Citation2007, p. 543).

While these critiques primarily focus on economic aspects, some scholars argue for an even broader revaluation of care. Ecofeminists, in particular, contend that revaluing care should extend beyond economics to social and cultural spheres, encouraging a reconsideration of human interconnectedness and our relationship with nature—factors crucial for species survival (Brownhill et al., Citation2012, p. 101). As Kallis (Citation2019, p. 190) argues, this necessitates a shift from ‘valuing material goods to valuing relations’. Such a transformation challenges the very foundations of capitalist logic, calling for a radical reimagining of political economy that does not rely on the hierarchical division and devaluation of waged and unwaged work (Fraser, Citation2016, p. 117). As such, many post-growth, Marxist, ecofeminist, degrowth scholars seek to abolish the growth-oriented orthodox economic system and put an end to capitalism for the sake of both social and ecological sustainability (Luxemburg, Citation1951; Mies, Citation1998; Mies & Bennholdt-Thomsen, Citation2000).

Towards ecofeminist decolonial degrowth

Scarcity thus becomes a tool to perpetuate patriarchal control, justifying the exploitation of women’s labour and bodies under the guise of necessity and efficiency in resource allocation. Simultaneously, it also serves to legitimise neoliberal policies that prioritise market-driven solutions and profit over human and ecological well-being. In response to this injustice, redirecting both labour power and resources towards the care economy could present an ‘emancipatory’ opportunity for working-class people, as the care economy is labour-intensive but generate little capital surplus (Barca, Citation2019, p. 7). The dominance of production over reproduction leads to the accumulation and reinvestment of surplus, leading to the depletion of ‘resources available for the reproduction of life and for the entire biosphere’ (Barca, Citation2019).