# 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 agree to value util.

#### 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. Nurse strikes devastate hospitals Wright 10:

Sarah H. Wright July 2010 "Evidence on the Effects of Nurses' Strikes" https://www.nber.org/digest/jul10/evidence-effects-nurses-strikes (Researcher at National Bureau of Economic Research)

U.S. hospitals were excluded from collective bargaining laws for three decades longer than other sectors because of fears that strikes by nurses might imperil patients' health. Today, while unionization has been declining in general, it is growing rapidly in hospitals, with the number of unionized workers rising from 679,000 in 1990 to nearly one million in 2008. In Do Strikes Kill? Evidence from New York State (NBER Working Paper No. 15855), co-authors Jonathan Gruber and Samuel Kleiner carefully examine the effects of nursing strikes on patient care and outcomes. The researchers match data on nurses' strikes in New York State from 1984 to 2004 to data on hospital discharges, including information on treatment intensity, patient mortality, and hospital readmission. They conclude that nurses' strikes were costly to hospital patients: in-hospital mortality increased by 19.4 percent and hospital readmissions increased by 6.5 percent for patients admitted during a strike. Among their sample of 38,228 such patients, an estimated 138 more individuals died than would have without a strike, and 344 more patients were readmitted to the hospital than if there had been no strike. "Hospitals functioning during nurses' strikes do so at a lower quality of patient care,"they write. Still, at hospitals experiencing strikes, the measures of treatment intensity -- that is, the length of hospital stay and the number of procedures performed during the patient's stay -- show no significant differences between striking and non-striking periods. Patients appear to receive the same intensity of care during union work stoppages as during normal hospital operations. Thus, the poor outcomes associated with strikes suggest that they might reduce hospital productivity. These poor health outcomes increased for both emergency and non-emergency hospital patients, even as admissions of both groups decreased by about 28 percent at hospitals with strikes. The poor health outcomes were not apparent either before or after the strike in the striking hospitals, suggesting that they are attributable to the strike itself. And, the poor health outcomes do not appear to do be due to different types of patients being admitted during strike periods, because patients admitted during a strike are very similar to those admitted during other periods. Hiring replacement workers apparently does not help: hospitals that hired replacement workers performed no better during strikes than those that did not hire substitute employees. In each case, patients with conditions that required intensive nursing were more likely to fare worse in the presence of nurses' strikes.

#### Police strikes are used to expand police power and combat racial progress. Making them legal only makes progress much harder.

Andrew Grim 2020 What is the ‘blue flu’ and how has it increased police power? https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/07/01/what-is-blue-flu-how-has-it-increased-police-power/

But the result of such protests matter deeply as we consider police reform today. **Historically,** blue flu strikes have helped expand police power, ultimately limiting the ability of city governments to reform, constrain or conduct oversight over the police. They allow the police to leverage public fear of crime to extract concessions from municipalities. This became clear in Detroit more than 50 years ago. In June 1967, tensions arose between Detroit Mayor Jerome Cavanagh and the Detroit Police Officers Association (DPOA), which represented the city’s 3,300 patrol officers. The two were at odds primarily over police demands for a pay increase. Cavanagh showed no signs of caving to the DPOA’s demands and had, in fact, proposed to cut the police department’s budget. On June 15, the DPOA escalated the dispute with a walkout: 323 officers called in sick. The number grew over the next several days as the blue flu spread, reaching a height of 800 absences on June 17. In tandem with the walkout, the DPOA launched a fearmongering media campaign to win over the public. They took out ads in local newspapers warning Detroit residents, “How does it feel to be held up? Stick around and find out!” This campaign took place at a time of rising urban crime rates and uprisings, and only a month before the 1967 Detroit riot, making it especially potent. The DPOA understood this climate and used it to its advantage. With locals already afraid of crime and displeased at Cavanagh’s failure to rein it in, they would be more likely to demand the return of the police than to demand retribution against officers for an illegal strike. The DPOA’s strategy paid off. The walkout left Detroit Police Commissioner Ray Girardin feeling “practically helpless.” “I couldn’t force them to work,” he later told The Washington Post. Rather than risk public ire by allowing the blue flu to continue, Cavanagh relented. Ultimately, the DPOA got the raises it sought, making Detroit officers the highest paid in the nation. This was far from the end of the fight between Cavanagh and the DPOA. In the ensuing months and years, they continued to tussle over wages, pensions, the budget, the integration of squad cars and the hiring of black officers. The threat of another blue flu loomed over all these disputes, helping the union to win many of them. And Detroit was not an outlier. Throughout the 1960s, ’70s and ’80s, the blue flu was a [ubiquitous and highly effective](https://www.akpress.org/our-enemies-in-blue.html) tactic in Baltimore, Memphis, New Orleans, Chicago, Newark, New York and many other cities. In most cases, as author Kristian Williams writes, “When faced with a walkout or slowdown, the authorities usually decided that the pragmatic need to get the cops back to work trumped the city government’s long term interest in diminishing the rank and file’s power.” But each time a city relented to this pressure, they ceded more and more power to police unions, which would turn to the strategy repeatedly to defend officers’ interests — particularly when it came to efforts to address systemic racism in police policies and practices. In 1970, black residents of Pittsburgh’s North Side neighborhood raised an outcry over the “hostile sadistic treatment” they experienced at the hands of white police officers. They lobbied Mayor Peter F. Flaherty to assign more black officers to their neighborhood. The mayor agreed, transferring several white officers out of the North Side and replacing them with black officers. While residents cheered this decision, white officers and the Fraternal Order of Police (FOP), which represented them, were furious. They slammed the transfer as “discrimination” against whites. About 425 of the Pittsburgh Police Department’s 1,600 police officers called out sick in protest. Notably, black police officers broke with their white colleagues and refused to join the walkout. They praised the transfer as a “long overdue action” and viewed the walkout as a betrayal of officers’ oath to protect the public. Nonetheless, the tactic paid off. After several days, Flaherty caved to the “open revolt” of white officers, agreeing to halt the transfers and instead submit the dispute to binding arbitration between the city and the police union. Black officers, though, continued to speak out against their union’s support of racist practices, and many of them later resigned from the union in protest. Similar scenarios played out in Detroit, Chicago and other cities in the 1960s and ’70s, as white officers continually staged walkouts to preserve the segregated status quo in their departments. These blue flu strikes amounted to an authoritarian power grab by police officers bent on avoiding oversight, rejecting reforms and shoring up their own authority. In the aftermath of the 1967 Detroit walkout, a police commissioner’s aide strongly criticized the police union’s strong-arm tactics, saying “it smacks of a police state.” The clash left one newspaper editor wondering, “Who’s the Boss of the Detroit Police?” But in the “law and order” climate of the late 1960s, such criticism did not resonate enough to stir a groundswell of public opinion against the blue flu. And police unions dismissed critics by arguing that officers had “no alternative” but to engage in walkouts to get city officials to make concessions. Crucially, the very effectiveness of the blue flu may be premised on a myth. While police unions use public fear of crime skyrocketing without police on duty, in many cases, the absence of police did not lead to a rise in crime. In New York City in 1971, [for example](https://untappedcities.com/2020/06/12/the-week-without-police-what-we-can-learn-from-the-1971-police-strike/), 20,000 officers called out sick for five days over a pay dispute without any apparent increase in crime. The most striking aspect of the walkout, as one observer noted, “might be just how unimportant it seemed.” Today, municipalities are under immense pressure from activists who have taken to the streets to protest the police killings of black men and women. Some have already responded by enacting new policies and cutting police budgets. As it continues, more **blue** flus are likely to follow as officers seek to wrest back control of the public debate on policing and reassert their independence.

#### 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 the right to strike. This has historically been the case - the Smith Connally Anti-Strike Act outlawed strikes during wartime, since the obligations of the government at the time were to protect people in time of war and 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; thus it cannot be unconditional.**

**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.

#### Strikes are financially harmful to workers because they are forced to go without pay. Refresh Financial 21:

2021. “What Happens To Your Pay When Your Workplace Goes On Strike?” *Refresh Financial.* URL: <https://refreshfinancial.ca/blog/financial-news-and-advice/happens-pay-workplace-goes-on-strike/> accessed on 11/5/21 by bws kat

So what happens to your income when you go on strike? Well, to put it bluntly, it stops. It stops until the strike is called off, that is. As long as you are away from your workplace for while your union is on strike, you will not be paid by your employer. Now, for many of you working hard at credit building, this can be a scary thing. It's very difficult to continue to learn how to rebuild credit when your income source has dried up. Before you lose any sleep over that, it’s important to note that most union members on strike will not go without having their basic financial needs met. Many unions have “strike funds” or “war funds” into which union members pay their dues. Depending on which union you belong to, you may get a specific strike pay amount per day or per week, or you could simply be allotted emergency funds based on need. Strike pay can be quite low compared to your regular pay with some unions paying between $200-$300 per week. For those at home counting, that’s just $800 - $1200 per month.

#### A just government should not force workers to strike, foregoing pay and benefits, for better working conditions. Rather, a just government should ensure quality working conditions 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

#### No link to war—Scull and Stone talks about manufacturing, but “link” to weaker military in Bloomberg is about the defense industry specifically. Plus, reasons for industrial workforce shortages aren’t related to labor unrest, the card cites retiring workers and COVID as primary reasons for unemployment, not labor unrest. Even if they CAN win that general manufacturing is somehow tied to the military and defense industry, there’s no solvency because increased strikes won’t lead to more people working, just more people striking.

#### No evidence that national security is key to US primacy. Hegemony has many other factors both domestically and abroad, alt causes to primacy are sufficient.

#### Finally, turn—military strikes are what \*cause\* the loss of US heg. Military unions wreck civilian military relations and US hegemony – extinction

Caforio 18 [Giuseppe Caforio, Brigadier General with degrees in law, political science, and strategic studies (FYI, the author died ~2015, but this was republished in 2018 in an anthology book), 5-20-2018, "Unionisation of the Military: Representation of the Interests of Military Personnel," SpringerLink, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-71602-2\_19]/Kankee

THE OPPOSITION TO UNIONIZATION OF THE ARMED FORCES But if a convergence between the military establishment and civil society is in progress and has brought the two areas of life and work much closer together, why is there a unionization issue for the armed forces? Why is there opposition to a collective bargaining system for military personnel? The fundamental reason must be sought in the specificity of the military, which is summarized thusly by David R. Segal: Because of its unique social function—the legitimate management of violence—the military requires of its personnel a degree of commitment that differs from that required by other modern organizations. Military personnel, unlike their civilian counterparts, enter into a contract of unlimited liability with their employer. They cannot unilaterally terminate their employment any time they wish. They are subject to moving and working in any environment where the service decides they are needed. They are required to place the needs of service above the needs of their families, and must frequently endure long periods of separation. They are often called upon to work more than an eight-hour day, for which they receive no additional compensation. And in time of war, they must face prolonged danger, and may even forfeit their lives. Obviously, the man on the firing line is required to make a commitment of a different order from that made by the worker on the assembly line. (D. Segal and Kramer, 1977, p. 28). Bernhard Boene, in a study devoted to a different research topic (Boene, 1990), is both precise and efficacious in differentiating military "work" from civilian work. Military specificity, writes Boene, does not lie only in the area of the risks to which one supposes the combatant is exposed, but also in the limits of application of common rationality in combat and in the situation of habitual transgression of social norms that it entails. This implies a particular type of socialization. Notwithstanding partial analogies, according to Boene, civil emergencies belong to a different reality than military ones do. An officer, in particular, is not an ordinary civil servant: he must respond to a "call," consisting of a particular interest in military things, dedication to the common welfare, acceptance of risking his life, and submission to a series of obligations that are peculiar to the military profession. SOME THEORETICAL POSITIONS ON THE ISSUE Discussing a sample survey, David Segal observes that in the United States, in the absence of a union for military personnel, there is a considerable "misfit" between soldiers' perception of the characteristics of their role and the preferred characteristics, while in an analogous sample of civilian manpower this misfit is much smaller. In examining the attempted remedies, Segal states: "Any change to be achieved through organizational interventions, however, is likely to be incremental, and not to resolve the discrepancy between the characteristics that military personnel would like in their jobs and the characteristics that they perceived their jobs to have" (D. Segal and Kramer, 1977, p. 46). According to Segal, unionization can solve this problem, but it presents two dangers that must be carefully weighed: the first is that it tends to extend its influence also to aspects of management and direction of the military apparatus; the second is that it involves a politicisation of the personnel. Gwyn Harries Jenkins examines the consequences that unionisation would have on the operational efficiency of the armed forces and identifies three fundamental ones: 1. The creation of a dual authority structure: Since there has been a change in the basis of authority and discipline in the military establishment and a shift from authoritarian domination to greater reliance on manipulation, persuasion and group consensus, unionization extends the boundaries of these changes: it brings into armed forces the full effects of the organizational revolution which pervades contemporary society, creating a dual authority structure while modifying the traditional basis of compliance. (H. Jenkins, 1977, p. 70) 2. A much greater resemblance of the style of military command to that of civilian management. The new tasks and the introduction of unionization would require commanders to possess skills and orientations more and more like those of civilian managers. 3. An abdication by the officer of his traditional image. Indeed, if the officer "wishes to retain his self-image and ideas of honor, then the introduction of trade unions into the military creates a conflict situation with substantial dysfunctional consequences" (H.Jenkins, 1977, p. 71). Harries Jenkins concludes, however, by affirming that, as a radical criticism of the existing military system, "the unionization of the armed forces can only result in an improvement to an otherwise defective situation" (H. Jenkins, 1977, p. 69). According to William Taylor and Roger Arango (Taylor et al., 1977b), many reasons offered in the United States for or against the unionization of military personnel appear to be rhetorical and not sufficiently investigated. Those who take a negative critical stance, for example, contend that unionization would lead to a breakdown in discipline; threaten the chain of command; and, especially, undermine the military's ability to carry out its assigned mission. Through a concrete field analysis, these authors believe they can shed light on the advantages and disadvantages of this process. Among the advantages are the acquisition of a greater sense of individual security, a valorization of the dignity of individuals, improved social communication, and greater competitiveness with other occupations and professions in recruiting personnel. The real drawbacks would essentially be reduced to two: a risk of divisiveness within units, due to acquired strife between personnel categories; and an increase in personnel costs. Carlo Jean (Jean, 1981) states that in itself, the creation of unions would inevitably produce increased confrontation; without it, the union representatives would have neither prestige nor credibility. He does not believe, however, that the biggest drawback that would derive from it would be that of undermining the internal cohesiveness of the armed forces and their operational capacity. According to this author military leaders would align themselves with the union's demands out of necessity to avoid internal breakup. An unacceptable corporative force would be produced that sooner or later would inevitably oppose it to the political power. The danger that a union of military personnel involves for civil society is, in his opinion, much greater than its negative implications on the efficiency of the military itself. Along the same line is the fear expressed by Sen. Thurmond (reported by David Cortright, cited essay) that unionization might reinforce the military establishment and increase its influence over society at large, decreasing the capacity for political control. This issue had already been treated by Cortright in another essay (Cortright and Thurmond, 1977b), where on the one hand he argued that unionization in the armed forces would help to prevent any form of separateness from civil society while noting on the other that little attention was given to the possibility that unionization substantially strengthens the military's ability to wield influence. Thurmond, again, judges the European experience negatively and asks himself how unionized troops would respond in battle. However, to remain faithful to his position, Thurmond conceives the armed forces as a separate body from civil society, argues that military personnel are not comparable to other labor force categories, and advances the fear that union representation of the interests of military personnel would bring the defence budget to unacceptable levels. Of the countries included in our study, unions for military personnel exist in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Belgium, and The Netherlands. Unionization is prohibited in England, the United States, Canada, France, Portugal, Turkey, and Greece. Strikes are allowed only in Austria and Sweden. ANALYSIS OF HISTORICAL EXPERIENCES THROUGH THE THOUGHT OF VARIOUS AUTHORS

#### AT framing—extinction first fails, freezes all policy making and sacrifices due rights and happiness in the name of 1% risk. Probability outweighs, there is no guarantee of any of their impacts, but there is a guarantee of ours. There is always a fractional risk of extinction, we cannot act with that solely as our focus

#### Furthermore nowhere in their cards does it necessitate an UNCONDITIONAL right to strike—conditional rights to strike solve all impacts