I take a NEGATIVE stance on today’s topic:

**Resolved:  A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.**

To uphold the negative side, I value **Societal Good**

**Barnes, Philosophy in Practice, 1996**

Eric Barnes, Philosophy in Practice: Understanding Value Debate, Clark Pub., 1996 0931054419, 9780931054419

**The basic idea is that groups (societies) are evaluated by different standards than are the parts**

**(citizens), even though a society is composed of citizens. By analogy, although a house may be entirely**

**composed of bricks, the house may be a total structural disaster, even if all of the individual bricks are**

**of the finest quality.**

Our resolution today asks us to evaluate whether there are conditions that a just government would limit the right of workers to strike. Because governments should be evaluated on the societies they govern, societal good should be the value you prioritize in today’s round. I support worker solidarity and agree that the right to strike in *most cases* is critical to societal good, but the affirmative side has the burden today to prove that there are *no conditions* that a just government would limit the right of workers to strike.

Societal good is best achieved through the value criterion of **Mill’s Harm Principle**

**Barnes, Philosophy in Practice, 1996**

Eric Barnes, Philosophy in Practice: Understanding Value Debate, Clark Pub., 1996 0931054419, 9780931054419

Mill’s theory begins with the observation that**tyranny of the majority**is a dangerous and bad thing that **must be guarded against**. Merely having a democracy is no protection against this danger, so some other measures must be taken. **What is needed is a means of keeping the government from legislating in an oppressive manner**against minorities **while allowing government enough power to provide the benefits of civil society,** e.g., protection from crime, protection from external attack, enforcement of contracts, etc. What is needed is **a principle that restricts government.** Mill point out that there are two types of actions. First are actions that involve a harm to people other than the agent of the action, and second are those actions that do not involve harm to other people. Mill contends that it is obvious that **the government must be able to legislate** concerning **actions causing harm to others** in order to maintain the existence of a civil society to pass laws regarding actions not involving harms to others. Further, Mill claims that there is good reason to believe that **it is beneficial to society for the government to** have a strict policy of **never pass**ing **laws which restrict actions which do not involve harm to others.**

Mill knew that the benefits of a just government provides to society must be protected by both restricting government’s power but at the same time obligating the government to intervene when individuals may take actions that harm others. As I will show in the negative case, to best uphold societal good, even just government would limit worker strikes that would cause harm to others. Mill’s Harm Principle is the preferred criterion for achieving this balance.

# I lost the cards for this point !-!

I talked about how patients and consumers are harmed by striking