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**I strongly affirm that A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.**

**Definitions**

Before I begin, I would like to provide some definitions:

**Unconditional** - As defined by Merriam Webster means: “not conditional or limited”

But there is one quick observation to make, to clarify it in terms of the right to strike specifically. According to

**NLRB 85** [National Labor Relations Board; “Legislative History of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947: Volume 1,” Jan 1985; <https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=7o1tA__v4xwC&rdid=book-7o1tA__v4xwC&rdot=1>] Justin

\*\*Edited for gendered language

As for the so-called absolute or **unconditional right to strike**—there are no absolute rights that do not **have** their **corresponding** **responsibilities**. Under our American Anglo-Saxon system, **each individual is entitled** to the maximum of freedom, **provided** however (and this provision is of first importance), his **[their] freedom has due regard for** the **rights and freedoms of others.** The very **safeguard** of our freedoms is the recognition of this fundamental principle. **I take issue** very definitely **with** the **suggestion that there is** an absolute and **unconditional right to** concerted action (which after all is what the **strike** is) **which endangers** the **health** and **welfare of our people** in order to attain a **selfish** **end**.

**Framework**

Now onto framework

The value is **morality** due to the use of the word ought in the resolution implying a moral obligation

and the value criterion is **minimizing suffering**. Prefer this framework for 3 reasons:

**1. Minimizing suffering is a prerequisite to other frameworks**

You can’t evaluate philosophy if you're dead or suffering, we must minimize suffering before we consider other framings.

**2. Pleasure is intrinsically good and pain is intrinsically bad,**

**As Philosopher Martin Moen states in 2015 ,**

(Ole Martin Moen: Post-Doctoral Fellow in Philosophy at Centre for the Study of Mind in Nature, University of Oslo. “An Argument for Hedonism” [[http://www.olemartinmoen.com/wp-content/uploads/AnArgumentForHedonism.pdf](https://slack-redir.net/link?url=http%253A%252F%252Fwww.olemartinmoen.com%252Fwp-content%252Fuploads%252FAnArgumentForHedonism.pdf)] )

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that **pleasure is** intrinsically **valuable** and **pain is** intrinsically **disvaluable**. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. **This inclusion makes intuitive sense,** moreover, for there is **something undeniably [is] good about** the way **pleasure** feels and something **[and] undeniably [is] bad about** the way **pain** feels, and **neither** the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be **[are]exhausted by the further effects** that these experiences might have. ‘‘Pleasure’’ and ‘‘pain’’ are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: ‘‘What for?’’ This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: ‘‘To buy soda.’’ This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: ‘‘What is buying the soda good for?’’ This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: ‘‘Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.’’ If I then proceed by asking ‘‘But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?’’ the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes: ‘‘We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.’’4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says ‘‘This is painful!’’ we never respond by asking: ‘‘And why is that a problem?’’ We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.He continues

**3. All questions of value depend upon consequences.**

**Harris 2010**

Sam Harris (CEO Project Reason; PHD UCLA Neuroscience; BA Stanford Philosophy). “The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values.” 2010.

Here is my (consequentialist) starting point: **all questions of value** (right and wrong, good and evil, etc.) **depend[s] upon the possibility of experiencing [it] such value. Without potential consequences at the level of experience**—happiness, suffering, joy, despair, etc.—**all talk of value is empty.** Therefore, to say that an act is morally necessary, or evil, or blameless, is to make (tacit) claims about its consequences in the lives of conscious creatures (whether actual or potential). I am unaware of any interesting exception to this rule. Needless to say, [For example,] if one is worried about pleasing God or His angels, this assumes that such invisible entities are conscious (in some sense) and cognizant of human behavior. It also generally assumes [and] that it is possible to suffer their [his] wrath or enjoy their approval, either in this world or the world to come. Even within religion, therefore, consequences and conscious states remain the foundation of all value

**With that, let’s move to the case.**

**(1:20)**

**Contention 1- Unconditional Strikes are Key for Workers**

**My first contention will prove that an unconditional right to strike is a generally good thing for workers.**

**Limits on the right to strike impede its effectiveness**

**Reddy 21**

Diana S. Reddy (Doctoral Fellow at the Law, Economics, and Politics Center at UC Berkeley Law). “ ‘There Is No Such Thing as an Illegal Strike’: Reconceptualizing the Strike in Law and Political Economy.” Yale Law Journal. 6 January 2021. JDN. [Victory] [https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there‑is‑no‑such‑thing‑as‑an‑illegal‑strike‑reconceptualizing‑the‑strike‑in‑law‑and‑political‑economy](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there%E2%80%91is%E2%80%91no%E2%80%91such%E2%80%91thing%E2%80%91as%E2%80%91an%E2%80%91illegal%E2%80%91strike%E2%80%91reconceptualizing%E2%80%91the%E2%80%91strike%E2%80%91in%E2%80%91law%E2%80%91and%E2%80%91political%E2%80%91economy)

The National Labor Relations Board—the institution charged with enforcing the policies of the Act—summarizes these “qualifications and limitations” on the right to strike on its website in the following way: **The lawfulness of a strike may depend on the object**, or **purpose,** of the strike, on its **[or] timing**, or on the conduct **of the strike**rs. The object, or objects, of a strike and whether the objects are lawful are matters that are not always easy to determine. Such issues often have to be decided by the National Labor Relations Board. The consequences can be severe to striking employees and struck employers, involving as they do questions of reinstatement and backpay.93 **The “right” to strike**, it seems, **is filled with uncertainty and peril**. Collectively, **these rules prohibit many of the strikes which helped build the labor movement** in its current form. Ahmed White accordingly argues that **law prohibits** effective **strikes**, strikes **which could actually change employer behavior**: “Their inherent affronts to property and public order place them well beyond the purview of what could ever constitute a viable legal right in liberal society; and they have been treated accordingly by courts, Congress, and other elite authorities.”94

**With these more effective strikes, workers can fight oppression:**

**Lim 19**

Woojin Lim (Editor for the Harvard Crimson). “The Right to Strike.” The Harvard Crimson. 11 December 2019. JDN. https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2019/12/11/lim‐ right‐to‐strike/

**The right to strike is a right to resist oppression. The strike** (and the credible threat of a strike) is an indispensable part of the collective bargaining procedure. Collective bargaining (or “agreement‐making”) **provides workers** and employees **with the opportunity to** **influence** the establishment of **workplace rules that govern a large portion of their lives.** The concerted withdrawal of labor allows workers to promote and de‐ fend their unprotected economic and social interests from employers’ unilateral deci‐ sions, and provide employers with pressure and incentives to make reasonable conces‐ sions. Functionally, **strikes provide workers with the bargaining power to drive fair and meaningful negotiations, offsetting the inherent inequalities of bargaining power in the employer‐employee relationship.** The right to strike is essential in preserving and winning rights. **Any curtailment of this right involves the risk of weakening the very basis of collective bargaining.**

**Thus my first contention links into my framework because more effective strikes will stop oppressive practices by employers which lead to unnecessary suffering.**

2:15

**Contention 2- Teachers**

**The second contention will prove that allowing for an unconditional right to strike, especially for teachers, will be vital in combating many threats.**

**Currently there is a major teacher shortage**

**Buttner 21**

Buttner, Annie (April 19, 2021), "The Teacher Shortage, 2021 Edition", Frontline Education, Frontline Technologies Group, https://www.frontlineeducation.com/blog/teacher-shortage-2021/. Accessed on October 24, 2021.

This past year, K-12 has tackled a mind-boggling number of new challenges as COVID-19 threw a wrench into nearly every aspect of our lives. However, one obstacle that **many districts continue to face** has posed **a** problem for years: the **teacher shortage.** And as you can expect, the pandemic certainly did not make the shortage any easier. We **[a] survey**ed [**of] almost 1,200 school and district leaders** across the country about their experiences with the teacher shortage, and the results paint[s] a grim picture. The Landscape of the Teacher Shortage Like many issues in education, the pain of the teacher shortage is not experienced equally by all districts — but it is certainly becoming more prevalent. **[finds that] Two-thirds** of survey respondents **report teacher shortages, a record high** since we launched our first teacher shortage survey in 2015. [Image ommited] While many rural school systems cited their location as a major factor behind their teacher shortage, districts in all settings are struggling. Teacher shortages are most common in urban school systems, with 75% of districts in cities of any size reporting shortages. In comparison, 65% of rural districts reported shortages, along with 60% of suburban districts. Across all settings, 44% of districts with shortages reported having difficulty filling vacancies across grade levels and subjects, while the remaining 56% reported only having shortages for specific positions.  This suggests that the teacher shortage has worsened noticeably overall: in previous years, only about 34% of districts with shortages struggled to find applicants across different subjects and grade levels.

**This is largely because current policies make the opportunity cost for teacher strikes too high**

**Casey 20**

Leo Casey, 12-2-2020, "The Teacher Strike: Conditions for Success," Dissent Magazine,<https://www.dissentmagazine.org/online_articles/the-teacher-strike-conditions-for-success>

The **most essential organizational task is winning and keeping the allegiance of teachers to the strike**. Teachers are knowledgeable and discerning political actors. They understand full well that **strikes are a high-intensity and high-risk tactic, with the potential both to deliver** advances and victories that could not be otherwise obtained and to end in **major setbacks and defeats**. The risk side of this equation is particularly acute **in the three-quarters of** all **states** **where teacher strikes are illegal**; in these states, **striking** becomes an act of civil disobedience and **can result in severe penalties** to teachers and their unions. **To** be willing to go on **strike** and stay out until a settlement is won, therefore, **teachers** **need to be convinced on a** **number of different counts:** first, that they are fighting for important, worthwhile objective [with strong support]s; second, that those objectives cannot be achieved through other means that are not as high-intensity and high-risk as a strike; third, that the strike has reasonable prospects of success; fourth, that the strike objectives have strong support in the community; and fifth, that the solidarity among teachers, which is essential to a strike’s success, is strong and will hold. In significant measure, the last of these points is dependent not simply on the organization and mobilization of the strike, but also on the four antecedent conditions. **If teachers become doubtful** on any of these points, **it will** **be**come **difficult** **to** **mount** or sustain **a** **successful strike.**

**Thus teachers quit because of dissatisfactory conditions.**

**Carpenter 21**

Jennifer Carpenter., 05-17-21, "Opinion: Protect local control for schools," Burlington Free Press, https://www.burlingtonfreepress.com/story/opinion/my-turn/2017/05/17/opinion-protect-local-control-schools/101726614/

**The** most crucial part of the **proposal put forward** by House Speaker Mitzi Johnson and President Pro Tem Tim Ashe is that it protects local control of schools. Statewide health insurance negotiations for teachers is the first step towards a statewide teachers’ contract, kneecapping school boards and paving the way towards a single, statewide school district. That is unacceptable, but it is the hill Gov. Scott and his Republican allies have decided to make their stand on. It is telling that Sen. Degree, one of Gov. Scott’s strongest supporters, included in his proposed amendment a clause that **would have removed teachers’ right to strike**. That shows their true intentions. **When teachers’ needs are not met, students’ needs will not be met**, and **we will be unable to retain and attract a workforce** of young families which is critical to the revitalization of our state’s economy. **There will be no incentive for** the teaching profession to attract and retain **new teachers** to the field **if our** state **government teaches** our community **that teachers have no say over their working conditions** and therefore are not valued. Schools need teachers and we need enrollment of students. **Teachers and families** of school age children **will** simply **uproot** **and** **go** **elsewhere** to have their needs met, jeopardizing our educational system, our school-age population and workforce. A “**one-size-fits-all”** approach from our state government **cannot possibly work across the board for every school**. Having worked in four different school districts in the state, I have been exposed to potential consequences of centralized control. I recall an emergency meeting at one of those districts in 2016 between administration and teachers where there were very tense discussions on what the initial proposal of Act 46 per-pupil spending cap would have meant for the school. **Had the administration and teachers not** pulled together to discuss and **demand more for their programs and allowed** a **reckless** centralized **decision to go forth**, to paraphrase one of the teachers present at this meeting, the initial **Act 46** proposal **would** have **destroyed the institution**, as it would have meant dismantling most aspects of the curriculum that would render the students to be competitive for college and in the workforce, as the cuts were too severe of an impact on the school programs to justify sending anyone there. As a result, **several teachers** said they **would** have been prepared to **pull their own children from the school** and move out of the area. This is only one example of how allowing **the state to have centralized control**, which has proved to be an approach lacking in carefully frontloaded research and detailed examination of impact on programs and teachers, would **have devastating consequences on local communities**.

**Further, quality of education sharply decreases through these teacher shortages**

**Boyce 19**

Paul Boyce, 9-17-2019, "The Teacher Shortage Is Real and about to Get Much Worse. Here's Why," No Publication, https://fee.org/articles/the-teacher-shortage-is-real-and-about-to-get-much-worse-heres-why/

Teacher Shortage According to research by the Economic Policy Institute (EPI), the teacher shortage could reach 200,000 by 2025, up from 110,000 in 2018. This shortage of workers is due to a number of factors. Among them are pay, working conditions, lack of support, lack of autonomy, and the changing curriculum. The shortage of teachers will inevitably cause a decline in educational standards. **The** **shortage is** **crucial**ly important **to educational outcomes.** Class sizes are rising, causing a detrimental effect on these outcomes. As the number of available teachers declines, class sizes have to increase to compensate. Having more kids in a class can also affect teacher performance—more books to mark, more children to monitor, more children's behavior that needs managing. The pressure on teachers to obtain high test scores amps up stress further. It creates a vicious cycle, and it is starting to snowball. The shortage is only set to increase unless something changes. Impact on Quality **The shortage** of teachers **will** inevitably **cause a decline in educational standards**. Principals face a shortage of highly qualified teachers. The natural response for them is to hire less qualified teachers, hire teachers trained in another field or grade, or make use of unqualified substitute teachers. This means students are being taught by teachers who lack sufficient skills and knowledge. According to the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future: Studies discover again and again that teacher expertise is one of the most important factors in determining student achievement, followed by the smaller but generally positive influences of small schools and small class sizes. That is, teachers who know a lot about teaching and learning who work in environments that allow them to know students well are the critical elements of successful learning. **Teachers matter more** to student achievement **than any other factor**. In fact, research by Chlotfelter, Ladd, & Vigdor states that teacher qualifications predict more of the difference in educational gains than race and parent education combined.

**Thus, allowing for an unconditional right to strike would solve this issue as teachers would not leave their jobs as they have a voice in their workplace.**

**The impact of teachers leaving their jobs is climate change:**

**Quality of education is key for innovation to stop climate change**

**Kwauk et al 21**

[Christina Kwauk and Rebecca Winthrop, 3-26-2021, "Unleashing the creativity of teachers and students to combat climate change: An opportunity for global leadership," Brookings,<https://www.brookings.edu/research/unleashing-the-creativity-of-teachers-and-students-to-combat-climate-change-an-opportunity-for-global-leadership/>]

Recent research shows that **if** **only** **16 percent of high school students** in high- and middle-income countries were to **receive climate change education**, **we** could **see a** nearly **19 gigaton reduction of** **carbon dioxide by 2050.** When **education helps students develop** a **strong** personal **connection to climate solutions**, as well as a sense of personal agency and empowerment, it can have consequential impact on students’ daily behaviors and decisionmaking that reduces their overall lifetime carbon footprint. Imagine if 100 percent of students in the world received such an education. New evidence also shows that the combination of women’s empowerment and education that includes everyone—especially the 132 million out-of-school girls across the developing world—could result in an 85 gigaton reduction of carbon dioxide by 2050. By these estimates, leveraging the power of **education is** potentially **more powerful than** solely increasing **investments in onshore wind** **turbines** (47 gigaton reduction) **or** concentrated **solar power (**19 gigaton reduction) alone. When we say that all climate solutions are needed to draw down greenhouse gases, we must also mean education solutions, too. When we say that all climate solutions are needed to draw down greenhouse gases, we must also mean education solutions, too. But beyond education’s potential impact on reducing carbon emissions, education—especially for girls—can save lives in the context of natural disasters exacerbated by climate change by reducing climate risk vulnerability. In a study of 125 countries, researchers found that the death toll caused by floods, droughts, wildfires, extreme temperature events, and extreme weather events could be 60 percent lower by 2050 if 70 percent of women were able to achieve a lower-secondary-school education. Imagine if 100 percent of women were to achieve a full 12 years of education. An equally important outcome of **education** is its potential to **increase[s] young people’s capacity to adapt** **to** the harsh impacts of **climate change by building** important knowledge and a breadth of “**green skills.”** For example, young people need both a strong knowledge base around the causes of a warming climate but also a strong set of skills that will allow them to apply their knowledge in the real world, including problem-solving, critical thinking, teamwork, coping with uncertainty, empathy, and negotiation. Indeed these very “transferable skills” are needed equally to thrive in the world of work and to be constructive citizens. Today it is those communities that have historically contributed the least to present-day carbon emissions—such as minority and indigenous communities in the U.S. and many low- and middle-income countries and small island developing states

**And Stopping climate change is vital as climate change leads to 5 million deaths a year, and these numbers will only escalate.**

**Lombrana 21**

Lombrana, Laura Millan (July 8, 2021), "Climate Change Linked To 5 Million Deaths A Year, New Study Shows” Bloomberg, https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-07-07/climate-change-linked-to-5-million-deaths-a-year-new-study-shows. Accessed on October 29, 2021.

**The** **extraordinarily hot and cold temperatures that are becoming more common as climate change accelerates are responsible for 5 million deaths globally every year.** Extreme weather accounted for 9.4% of all deaths globally between 2000 and 2019, according to researchers who on Wednesday published the first study linking changes in temperatures to annual increases in mortality. While most deaths have been caused by exposure to the cold, the trend is likely to reverse as the planet warms, they said.  “**[and] In the long-term**, climate change is **expected to increase** the mortality burden” as heat-related deaths rise, said Yuming Guo, one of the report’s authors and a professor at Monash University. **Hundreds** of people **have already died from** [**heatwaves**](https://archive.fo/o/BZL7v/https:/www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2021-07-01/summer-is-already-off-to-a-wild-start-because-of-climate-change?sref=GBEdnt3o) sweeping across the Northern Hemisphere **this summer.**  The last two decades were the hottest since the pre-industrial era with the 10 warmest years on record occurring during the period. Global warming continues to accelerate, with the planet on track to warming around 3 degrees Celsius above the pre-industrial average, according to [estimates](https://archive.fo/o/BZL7v/https:/climateactiontracker.org/global/temperatures/%23:~:text=Current%20policies%20presently%20in%20place,warming%20above%20pre-industrial%20levels.&text=Under%20the%20optimistic%20assumption%20that,likely%20below%202.2%C2%B0C.) by nonprofit Climate Action Tracker. Scientists forecast that a **warming** of more than 2°C would be **[is] catastrophic for life on Earth.** Climate Mortality Researchers at Monash in Australia and China’s Shandong University estimated that there were 74 excess deaths from abnormally cold or hot temperatures for every 100,000 people. The paper, published in The Lancet Planetary Health, analyzed mortality in 43 countries across all continents. It also concluded that cold-related deaths fell 0.5% from 2000 to 2019, while heat-related deaths rose 0.2%.  Europe had the highest excess death rates per 100,000 people due to heat exposure, the research found. Sub-Saharan Africa registered the highest death rates per 100,000 people due to exposure to cold. The largest decline of net mortality happened in Southeast Asia.

**The second contention thus links into minimizing suffering because education is vital in stopping climate change, which leads to a lot of preventable death.**

4:35

**Contention 3 - Democracy**

**My third contention will prove that an unconditional right to strike would strengthen democracy.**

**This is for two main reasons:**

**1. Civic Engagement – strikes increase democratic participation which reinvigorates democracy.**

**McElwee 15**

[Sean; Research Associate at Demos; “How Unions Boost Democratic Participation,” The American Prospect; 9/16/15; https://prospect.org/labor/unions-boost-democratic-participation/]

Labor organizer Helen Marot once observed, "The labor **unions are group efforts in** the **direction of democracy**." What she meant is that more than simply vehicles for the economic interests of workers (which they certainly are), **labor unions** also **foster** **civic participation** for workers. And **nowhere is this clearer than in voter turnout**, which has suffered in recent years along with union membership. Indeed, new data from the Census Bureau and a new analysis of American National Election Studies data support the case that unions' declining influence has also deeply harmed democracy. In 2014, voter turnout was abysmal, even for a midterm. Census data suggest that only 41.9 percent of the citizen population over 18 turned out to vote. However, as I note in my new Demos report Why Voting Matters, there are dispiriting gaps in turnout across class, race, and age. To examine how unions might affect policy, I performed a new analysis of both Census Bureau and American National Election Studies data. The data below, from the 2014 election, show the differences in voter turnout between union and non-union workers (the sample only includes individuals who were employed, and does not include self-employed workers). While only 39 percent of non-union workers voted in 2014, fully 52 percent of union workers did.  As part of ongoing research, James Feigenbaum, an economics PhD candidate at Harvard, ran a regression using American National Election Studies data suggesting that **union members are about 4 percentage points more likely to vote and 3 points more likely to register** (after controlling for demographic factors) and individuals living in a union household are 2.5 points more likely to vote and register. This is largely in line with the earlier estimates of Richard Freeman.  These numbers may appear modest, but in a close national election they could be enough to change the result.  Other research has found an even stronger turnout effect from unions. Daniel Stegmueller and Michael Becher find that after applying numerous demographic controls, union members are 10 points more likely to vote.  What's particularly important is that unions boost turnout among low- and middle-income individuals. In a 2006 study, political scientists Jan Leighley and Jonathan Nagler found that, "the decline in union membership since 1964 has affected the aggregate turnout of both low and middle-income individuals more than the aggregate turnout of high-income individuals." In 2014, the gap between unions and non-union workers shrunk at the highest rung of the income ladder. There was a 15-point gap among those earning less than $25,000 (40 percent turnout for union workers, and 25 percent turnout for non-union workers). Among those earning more than $100,000, the gap was far smaller (49 percent for non-union workers and 52 percent for union workers).  Individuals living in union households are also more progressive than those in non-union households. I examined 2012 ANES data and find that union households aren't largely different from non-union households on many issues regarding government spending, but they are more likely to have voted for Obama, identify as Democratic, and support a robust role for the government in reducing income inequality. When looking at union members specifically, the gaps become slightly larger.  More upscale union members are far more progressive than their non-union counterparts. Non-union households with an income above $60,000 oppose government intervention to reduce inequality by 11 points, with 32.2 percent in favor and 43.4 percent against. But richer union households support government intervention, with 42.5 percent in favor and 29.9 percent opposed. As Richard B. Freeman has pointed out, "union members are more likely to vote for a Democrat for the House or Presidency than demographically comparable nonunion voters." He similarly finds that "unionism moves members to the left of where they would be given their socioeconomic status," in line with the data I examined from 2012. A 2013 study by Jasmine Kerrissey and Evan Schofer finds that union members are not only more likely to vote, but also more likely to belong to other associations, and to protest. They also find that these effects are strongest among people with lower levels of education, suggesting that **unions** may **help mobilize the least politically active** groups. A recent study of European countries finds union members vote more and identifies those aspects of union membership that contribute to the higher turnout. The strongest factor is that **workers who engage in** democratic organizations in the workplace (via **collective bargaining**) **are** **more likely to engage in democracy more broadly** by, for instance, voting. Other studies support the idea that civic participation creates a feedback loop that leads to higher voting rates. Another factor is that union members make more money, and higher income is correlated with voting behavior. Finally, union members are encouraged by peers and the union to engage in politics, which also contributes to higher levels of turnout. It's not entirely surprising that politicians who savage unions often share a similar contempt for the right to vote. **Democracy in the workplace leads to democracy more broadly throughout society**. Workers with more democratic workplaces are more likely to democratically engage in in society. Further, when unions and progressives demonstrate that government can benefit them, Americans are more likely to want to participate in decision-making. For all these reasons, unions play a unique and indispensable role in the progressive project. As Larry Summers, certainly not a leftist, recently argued, "the weakness of unions leaves a broad swath of the middle class largely unrepresented in the political process."

**2. Corruption Reduction – the right to strike fights concentration of power while reducing inequality.**

**IER 17**

 [Institute of Employment Rights. The IER exists to inform the debate around trade union rights and labour law by providing information, critical analysis, and policy ideas through our network of academics, researchers and lawyers. “UN Rights Expert: Right to strike is essential to democracy”. 3-10-2017. . https://www.ier.org.uk/news/un-rights-expert-right-strike-essential-democracy/.]

The United Nations’ Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and of association, Maina Kiai, has reminded member states of the International Labour Organization (ILO) – including the UK – that they have a positive obligation to uphold the right to strike. Speaking at an ILO meeting on Monday 06 March 2017 in Geneva, Kiai argued that **the right to strike is fundamental to** the preservation of **democracy**. “The **concentration of power** in one sector – whether in the hands of government or business – inevitably **leads to** the **erosion of democracy, and an increase in inequalities and marginalization** with all their attendant consequences. The right to strike is a check on this concentration of power,” he explained**. The right to strike has been established** in international law **as a corollary to the right of freedom** of association for decades, and is enshrined in the European Convention on Human Rights as Article 11. As a member state of the ILO and of the EU, the UK is legally obliged to uphold the right to strike, although through the Trades Union Act 2016 and the anti-trade union laws that preceded it, the government is making it harder and harder for trade unions to take industrial action. Kiai criticised such actions, saying government’s have a duty not to impede workers’ ability to take industrial action. “I deplore the various attempts made to erode the right to strike at national and multilateral levels,” the expert said, reminding delegates: “**Protest** action **in relation to** government **social and economic policy**, and against negative corporate practices, **forms part of the basic civil liberties** whose respect is essential for the meaningful exercise of trade union rights. This right enables them to engage with companies and governments on a more equal footing, and Member States have a positive obligation to protect this right, and a negative obligation not to interfere with its exercise.”

**The impact of the democracy decline is democratic backsliding.**

**Democratic backsliding results in war and mass loss of life. Any potential harms from a strike are temporary, but wars last much longer.**

**Alizada & Boese et al. 21**

Nazifa Alizada, Dr. Vanessa Boese, Prof. Staffan Lindberg, Martin Lundstedt, Natalia Natsika, and Shreeya Pillai – University of Gothenburg, Varieties of Democracy Institute: V-Dem Policy Brief, No. 30, May 2021. “Does Democracy Bring International and Domestic Peace and Security?”<https://www.v-dem.net/media/filer_public/1a/98/1a98c2d0-887e-4857-8f0d-3a0f4139f564/pb30.pdf> | BC

A large body of scientific evidence demonstrates that human security, as well as **international and domestic peace are strongly and positively related to democracy.** The democratic peace axiom – that democracies do not fight wars against each other, and that the spread of democracy reduces armed disputes and wars – is **soundly confirmed** by a wealth of rigorous studies (e.g., Altman et al., 2020; Hegre et al., 2020; Hegre, 2014; Hegre, 2008). A recent study using the V-Dem democracy indices shows that **there is no case of a war in any pair of states whose democratic level was above 0.6**1 **on the** V-Dem electoral **democracy index** (Altman et al., 2020). Being part of a region with high levels of democracy also matters. **Two states** located **in a region with low levels of democracy are 70% more likely to have** a fatal **armed conflict** than a pair of states placed in a region with high levels (Altman et al., 2020). Consequently, the current wave of autocratization should be expected to lead to a world with more international conflicts, with devastating consequences for human security. Hegre et al. (2020) demonstrate that vertical (free and fair multiparty elections), horizontal (institutional constraints on the executive), and diagonal (civil society) accountability mechanisms all contribute to lowering the risk of interstate war. For example, this means that after India turned into an electoral autocracy (Alizada et al., 2021), the statistical odds of a militarized dispute with at least one death between India and Pakistan is now 3 times higher than 10 years ago. A series of scientific studies demonstrate that democracies are also less prone to civil war and domestic volatility compared to autocracies, especially long-term, institutionalized democracies. The key is that democracies are better at absorbing and channeling discontent through legal institutional means and accountability mechanisms that in turn lower the risk of domestic conflict (Fjelde et al., 2021; Hegre et al., 2001; Hegre, 2014). Yet, it is vital to recognize that semi-democracies and countries with recent transitions tend to be more volatile with a higher risk of civil and international conflict. Such a regime is around four times more likely to experience domestic unrest compared to a well-established democracy. In addition, the risk of civil war in a regime transitioning from an autocracy to a semi-democracy is nine times higher compared to before the transition (Hegre et al., 2001). That is why long-term strategies toward stabilizing and improving the quality of newly established democracies are critical.

**My third contention links into my framework because we must have an unconditional right to strike to prevent major democratic backsliding which will lead to war and mass loss of life.**