# NC

## Definitions

#### The right to strike is defined by Gourevitch 16:

Alex Gourevitch (Assistant Professor of Political Science at Brown University). “Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike.” American Political Science Association Vol. 14, No. 2. June 2016. JDN. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/perspectives-on-politics/article/abs/quitting-work-but-not-the-job-liberty-and-the-right-to-strike/27B690FEDDBCF002FB20FB50E852D6A3>

The right to strike is peculiar. It is not a right to quit. The right to quit is part of freedom of contract and the mirror of employment-at-will. Workers may quit when they no longer wish to work for an employer; employers may fire their employees when they no longer want to employ them. Either of those acts severs the contractual relationship and the two parties are no longer assumed to be in any relationship at all. The right to strike, however, assumes the continuity of the very relationship that is suspended. Workers on strike refuse to work but do not claim to have left the job. After all, the whole point of a strike is that it is a collective work stoppage, not a collective quitting of the job. This is the feature of the strike that has marked it out from other forms of social action.

#### Unconditional is defined by Merriam-Webster as:

“Unconditional.” Merriam-Webster Dictionary. No Date. URL: https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/unconditional

un·​con·​di·​tion·​al | \ ˌən-kən-ˈdish-nəl  , -ˈdi-shə-nᵊl \ Definition of unconditional: 1: not conditional or limited : ABSOLUTE, UNQUALIFIED unconditional surrender unconditional love; 2: UNCONDITIONED sense 2

## Framing

#### I value upholding governmental obligations. A just government has several obligations to its citizens, Wenar 21:

Wenar, Leif, "John Rawls", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2021 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2021/entries/rawls/>.

Because there are many reasonable interpretations of “free,” “equal” and “fair,” there will be many liberal political conceptions of justice. Since all the members of this family interpret the same three fundamental ideas, however, all liberal political conceptions of justice will share certain basic features: 1. A liberal political conception of justice will ascribe to all citizens familiar individual rights and liberties, such as rights of free expression, liberty of conscience, and free choice of occupation; 2. A political conception will give special priority to these rights and liberties, especially over demands to further the general good (e.g., to increase national wealth) or perfectionist values (e.g., to promote a particular view of human flourishing); 3. A political conception will assure for all citizens sufficient all-purpose means to make effective use of their freedoms. These abstract features must, Rawls says, be realized in certain kinds of institutions. He mentions several demands that all liberal conceptions of justice will make on institutions: a decent distribution of income and wealth; fair opportunities for all citizens, especially in education and training; government as the employer of last resort; basic health care for all citizens; and public financing of elections.

#### To best satisfy governmental obligations, governments must look to consequences that best promote the common good. Tuckness 2020::

Tuckness, Alex, "Locke’s Political Philosophy", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Winter 2020 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2020/entries/locke-political/>.

A second part of the debate focuses on ends rather than institutions. Locke states in the Two Treatises that the power of the Government is limited to the public good. It is a power “that hath no other end but preservation” and therefore cannot justify killing, enslaving, or plundering the citizens (2.135). Libertarians like Nozick (1974) read this as stating that governments exist only to protect people from infringements on their rights. An alternate interpretation, advanced by Tuckness (2002b, 2008a), draws attention to the fact that in the following sentences the formulation of natural law that Locke focuses on is a positive one, that “as much as possible” mankind is to be preserved. On this second reading, government is limited to fulfilling the purposes of natural law, but these include positive goals as well as negative rights. On this view, the power to promote the common good extends to actions designed to increase population, improve the military, strengthen the economy and infrastructure, and so on, provided these steps are indirectly useful to the goal of preserving the society. This would explain why Locke, in the *Letter*, describes government promotion of “arms, riches, and multitude of citizens” as the proper remedy for the danger of foreign attack (*Works* 6: 42).

#### Thus, my criterion is maximized societal welfare.

#### I have 2 observations:

#### Rights inherently cannot be unconditional. All rights in a just society are conditioned on whether the right contributes to societal welfare. For example, one’s right to free speech is limited when that free speech has dangerous consequences for others, such as shouting fire in a crowded theater, or hate speech. The same is true of ALL rights – they must at some point trade off with each other.

#### There are no empirical examples of the aff because there is no nation in the world that currently recognizes an unconditional right to strike. Thus, you should be skeptical of any empirical claims made by the aff because they are unlikely to be grounded in solid, experimental research.

## Contention 1 – A Right to Strike Shouldn’t be Unconditional

#### An unconditional right to strike harms societal welfare because it allows workers crucial to public safety to strike, such as health workers. Gruber and Kleiner 12:

(Gruber, Jonathan and Kleiner, Samule A,. February 2012.” Do Strikes Kill? Evidence from New York State.” American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 2012, https://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/71824/Gruber\_Do%20Strikes.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y)

Hospitals now represent one of the largest union sectors of the US economy, and there is particular concern about the impact of strikes on patient welfare. We analyze the effects of nurses’ strikes in hospitals on patient outcomes in New York State. Controlling for hospital specific heterogeneity, the results show that nurses’ strikes increase in-hospital mortality by 18.3 percent and 30-day readmission by 5.7 percent for patients admitted during a strike, with little change in patient demographics, disease severity or treatment intensity. The results suggest that hospitals functioning during nurses’ strikes do so at a lower quality of patient care.

**The impacts of hospital strikes aren’t avoidable on the part of the employer. Gruber and Kleiner 12:**

(Gruber, Jonathan and Kleiner, Samule A,. February 2012.” Do Strikes Kill? Evidence from New York State.” American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 2012, https://dspace.mit.edu/bitstream/handle/1721.1/71824/Gruber\_Do%20Strikes.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y)

We find that patients with particularly nursing-intensive conditions are more susceptible to these strike effects, and that hospitals hiring replacement workers perform no better during these strikes than those that do not hire substitute employees

#### Some conditions on a right to strike are necessary to ensure societal welfare – remember that NO RIGHT is unconditional, and that currently, all rights are conditioned on their benefit to society. Thus, a just government shouldn’t recognize an unconditional right to strike that would endanger essential services. Malebye 14:

Cynthia Dithato Malebye (Department of Mercantile Law, University of Pretoria). “The Right to Strike in Respect of Employment Relationships and Collective Bargaining.” Dissertation. University of Pretoria, April 2014. JDN. <https://repository.up.ac.za/bitstream/handle/2263/43163/Malebye_Right_2014.pdf?sequence=1>

Although the right to strike is enshrined in section 23(2)(c) of the Constitution, that right is not absolute and may be limited in terms of a law of general application to the extent that such limitation may be reasonable and justifiable in an open and democratic society. It is widely recognised, both in this country and abroad, that in certain circumstances, it will be reasonable and justifiable to limit the right to strike, particularly in times of national emergency or in services where a strike is likely to harm the public. In some countries like Canada, France and Italy, limitations on strikes in essential services are confined to the public sector, based on the notion that it is only the government which provides services, whose absence will endanger the community’s safety. The differentiation of workers should be made according to the functions they perform and not according to the nature of their employer’s legal status. This is so because a service provided by a worker in a private sector may be more harmful to the public compared to a service provided by a public sector worker.

#### Exigent circumstances require ceasing the right to strike. This has historically been the case, like the Smith Connally Anti-Strike Act that outlawed strikes during wartime, since the obligations of the government at the time were to protect people in time of war and in ending production of war materials would obstruct that.

**McCloskey 20** (McCloskey, Robert Andrew, Spring 2020, “Seasons Past: Wildcat Strikes and the Smith-Connally Act During World War II” West Virginia University, https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=8670&context=etd)

Sen. Alben Barkley (D-VA) stated that the President’s constitutional role as commander and chief legitimized the action. “The Constitution also places on the President the responsibility and vests in him the powers of Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy. These weapons for the protection of the continued existence of the Nation are placed in his sole command and the implication is clear that he should not allow them to become paralyzed by failure to obtain supplies.” This rationale of war materials falling under the jurisdiction of the Commander in Chief was also used in the mammoth North American Aviation strike of 1941.

**The ethics of a strike is dependent on its circumstances.**

**Mason 18** (Mason, Elinor, 3 April 2018, “On Striking, and the Recognition that Ethics are a Collective Affair” Open Democracy, https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/opendemocracyuk/on-striking-and-recognition-that-ethics-are-collective-affair/)

Obviously, there are various [preconditions that must be met](https://www.opendemocracy.net/uk/kieran-oberman/just-and-unjust-strikes) for a strike to be ethically justified. First, the question of whether what the employers are doing is unfair or not arises. The pensions issue is incredibly complicated, and I do not pretend to understand all the [actuarial details](https://twitter.com/mikeotsuka?lang=en). It seems though, that we have a just cause here, that the offers that have been made are unfair. It is worth pointing out that it is not just a question of how much money there is or will be in the pension fund, there are also ethical questions: a question about how risk should be distributed, and a question about what else the universities are doing with their money. Pensions are a kind of wage, and our wages are not paid out of any particular fund, but out of the universities’ general resources. So we should be wary of accepting frameworks for discussion that attempt to reduce all the issues to financial ones.

Relatedly, if a strike is to be justified, the cause must be realistic. There is no point in striking for something that cannot be obtained. But again, we should be careful here. What counts as unrealistic depends on the values people hold. There was a time when votes for women seemed unrealistic. Twenty years ago, marriage equality might have seemed an unrealistic goal. But some people pursued those goals anyway. If we take for granted that vice chancellors will be paid a fortune and that wages will be linked to student enrolment, perhaps fair wages for lecturers is not realistic. But why would we take those things for granted?

Finally, of course, less disruptive methods of persuasion should be used first. Striking is a last resort, it is only permissible when negotiation has stalled. We start by trying to persuade the employer on the basis of the reasons: that a policy or proposal is unfair, unnecessary, that there are alternatives. It is only if that fails that we should move to strike action.

## Contention 2 – A Right to Strike Harms Workers

#### Strikes alone do not change worker conditions. Semuels 21:

Semuels, Alana. October 8, 2021. “U.S. Workers Are Realizing It’s the Perfect Time to Go on Strike.” *Time Magazine.* URL: <https://time.com/6105109/workers-strike-unemployment/> accessed on 11/5/21 by bws kat

Carolyn Jackson, the CEO of St. Vincent’s, where Deyo and hundreds of other nurses are striking, says that the nurses are trying to push a 1:4 nurse to patient ratio that Massachusetts voters rejected by a large margin in 2018. The hospital has done research and decided its staffing is appropriate, and that its staffing ratios are in fact better than most other hospitals in the state, she says. Ryan says the hospital announced it was hiring 100 permanent replacement nurses in May during a COVID-19 surge, and that the striking nurses are insisting on getting their old positions back. That the hospital is not budging speaks to the fact that despite this increase in worker activism, workers may not gain much more power in the long run. Over the last 40 years, the government has made it much more difficult for workers to both form unions and to strike, says Heidi Shierholz, the president of the Economic Policy Institute, a progressive think tank. Amazon was able to effectively interfere in a union vote among its workers this spring, she says, preventing the union from succeeding. Of course, a hearing officer at the National Labor Relations Board has recommended that the board throw out the results of the Amazon election and do it over, which speaks to a resurgence of government support for labor. President Joe Biden said he wanted to be “the most pro-union President leading the most pro-union administration in American history.” Labor has support at the state and local levels too: California Gov. Gavin Newsom recently signed a packet of pro-worker bills, including one that prohibits companies from imposing quotas on warehouse workers that prevent them from following health and safety law, and another that prohibits employers from paying workers with disabilities less than the state’s minimum wage. And in January, New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio signed a bill that forbids fast food restaurants from firing workers unless the employer has just cause, making New York City the first jurisdiction in the country that essentially ended at-will employment. But even that support may not be enough to force a widespread change of working conditions in an economy where employees haven’t had much leverage since before the Great Recession, or earlier. Even some of the recent strikes haven’t led to workers’ desired outcomes. A five-week Nabisco strike recently ended with many of workers’ demands met, for instance, but the company still won the ability to pay weekend workers less than they do currently.

#### A just government should not force workers to strike, foregoing pay benefits, for a chance at having better working conditions. Rather, a just government should ensure quality working conditions for all without a requirement to strike. Sonn and Walker 18:

Sonn, Paul and Walker, Naomi. December 3, 2018. “A State Agenda for America’s Workers.” *Economic Policy Institute.* URL: <https://www.epi.org/publication/state-agenda-for-americas-workers/> accessed on 11.5.21 by bws kat

2. Get States Back in the Business of Fighting Wage Theft and Enforcing Other Worker Protections - Every week millions of workers are cheated when employers short their paychecks, force them to work off the clock, fail to pay even the minimum wage, or skirt employment laws by denying that they are employees. This type of wage theft is a national epidemic that robs U.S. workers and our economy of billions of dollars a year and hurts law-abiding employers that can’t compete with wage chiselers. But in many states, the agencies responsible for cracking down on employers that cheat their workers have been neglected and defunded. Governors and legislatures need to get their states back in the business of fighting wage theft and enforcing other worker protections, ranging from combatting independent contractor misclassification to preventing employers from defrauding the workers’ compensation system. Key best practices for restoring effective enforcement include: First and foremost, increasing labor agency budgets to [ensure adequate staffing and enforcement capacity](https://www.politico.com/story/2018/02/18/minimum-wage-not-enforced-investigation-409644); Developing [strategic enforcement](https://www.dol.gov/whd/resources/strategicEnforcement.pdf) priorities, in [partnership](https://s27147.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/Enforcement-of-15-dollar-minimum-wage-in-Minneapolis-requires-strategic-partnerships.pdf) with [worker organizations](https://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1594&context=uclf); Cracking down on [retaliation](https://s27147.pcdn.co/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/WinningWageJustice2011.pdf) against workers who speak up; Reviewing and updating regulations and administrative guidance—for example, to provide clear guidance on business’s responsibilities for contract workers, as detailed below.

#### Sonn and Walker continue:

Sonn, Paul and Walker, Naomi. December 3, 2018. “A State Agenda for America’s Workers.” *Economic Policy Institute.* URL: <https://www.epi.org/publication/state-agenda-for-americas-workers/> accessed on 11.5.21 by bws kat

10. Protect Workers’ Health and Safety Nearly 50 years after Congress adopted the Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) requiring employers to provide safe workplaces, more than 5,000 U.S. workers are killed on the job every year, and nearly three million are seriously injured. Many low-wage jobs are dangerous jobs, including jobs in the poultry and meat industries, agriculture, construction, and home care, where workers suffer much higher rates of serious job injuries. Yet the Trump Administration is rolling back workplace health and safety protections, leaving workers even more vulnerable. Adopt Responsible State Health and Safety Contracting. Governors and state legislatures should fight these rollbacks by promoting model protections for workers. For example, Massachusetts is considering a model responsible contracting law for health and safety. It requires contractors and subcontractors bidding on state-funded projects to submit their health and safety violations histories—and bars contracting with companies with poor records. Legislatures and governors using their executive authority over contracting should adopt this model. Stronger State Workplace Protections on Heat Exposure. With climate change, heat exposure is emerging as a very serious workplace health hazard in sectors from agriculture to day labor. But currently there are few standards or protections. Governors and legislatures should adopt new standards and programs to provide stronger protections for workers exposed to dangerous levels of heat, especially farm workers but also workers in construction, manufacturing, and warehousing—all sectors where workers of color and immigrants are concentrated. Strengthen Workers’ Compensation Laws. Over the past two decades, state legislatures have engaged in a race to the bottom by hollowing out their workers’ compensation laws, resulting in unfair, weak, or nonexistent benefits for injured workers. Governors and legislatures should work together to prevent any further weakening of benefits and coverage–especially since workers’ compensation premiums and benefits are now at a 30 year low. Key workers’ compensation reforms that are needed in most states include: (1) strong anti-retaliation protections for injured workers; (2) insurance coverage for prompt medical care in contested cases; (3) extending coverage to all workers, including domestic workers, farm workers, and temporary workers; and (4) ensuring that workers have the right to choose their own doctor.

## AT Case

### T – No Spec State and Workers

#### Interpretation: The aff may not specify any individual state as the actor and specify as a subset of workers

#### Violation: They specify the United States and incarcerated workers

#### Standards:

**1] Limits – Giving them the broadest definition of “just” meaning democratic, there are at least 115 possible affs, and that number increases exponentially when you can specify a subset of workers on top of that. They could not give a substantial limit on what “just” means, meaning that number amy be even higher**

**2] Topic education:** Forces negative to defend hyper-specific positions, moving the debate away from the core of the topic which is about *just governments*, not specific states, and a broad right to strike, no guarantee of good substance on either side nor meaningful debate

**3] Generics:** Workers is a generic bare plural, cherry-picking specific examples of workers is not enough to justify that workers generally should have the unconditional right to strike

**4] Specifying BOTH state and workers is uniquely bad, don’t let them respond just by saying spec state good and spec workers good individually**

**5] Western domination:** Specc’ing a state in this topic specifically asserts that a specific government is just (i.e. the US) inherently implies other governments are not considered just. Pushes harmful narrative of what countries (namely western countries like the US) are better than others and neglects harms of those countries (i.e. slavery, genocide, etc.)

**6] TVA Solves:** run the plan as an advantage to whole res

#### Voters:

**1] Education** is the only terminal impact to debate and the reason the activity exists

**2] Fairness** essential for any competitive activity and makes it impossible to judge the round without intervention

**3] Prefer competing interps**, reasonability invites a race to the bottom

**4] Drop the debater:** dropping the argument drops their entire advocacy + good for setting norms and deterring future abuse

**5] No RVI’s:** Being fair isn’t enough to win a debate, RVI’s incentivize frivolous theory as long as they have a prepped out counterinterp and justifies infinite abuse