**“I am glad to see that a system of labor prevails under which laborers can strike when they want to.”**

**Because I agree with Abraham Lincoln that the just treatment of workers and their labor is only possible when workers are free to strike at any time, I AFFIRM the resolution Resolved: A just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike.**

**There are THREE key concepts that I will DEFINE for the round:**

**FIRST, the Merriam Webster Dictionary defines UNCONDITIONAL as:**

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/absolute

**not conditional** or limited **:**[**ABSOLUTE**](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/absolute), [UNQUALIFIED](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/unqualified) *unconditional* surrender **[as in] *unconditional* love**

**SECOND, according to Oxford English Dictionary a STRIKE is:**

https://languages.oup.com/dictionaries/

**a refusal to work organized by a body of employees as a form of protest**, typically in an attempt to gain a concession or concessions from their employer.

**THIRD, governments restrict the right to strike in at least three ways.  If an employee violates any one of these restrictions, they risk discipline or dismissal from their employer.  National Labor Relations Board explains:**

National Labor Relations Board. no date. “The Right to Strike” https://www.nlrb.gov/strikes

**[First ]Strikes [can be ]unlawful because of purpose. A strike may be unlawful because an object, or purpose, of the strike is unlawful. A strike in support of a union unfair labor practice, or one that would cause an employer to commit an unfair labor practice, may be a strike for an unlawful object.** For example, it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge an employee for failure to make certain lawful payments to the union when there is no union-security agreement in effect (Section 8(a)(3). **A strike to compel an employer to do this would be a strike for an unlawful object and, therefore, an unlawful strike**. Strikes of this nature will be discussed in connection with the various unfair labor practices in a later section of this guide.  **Furthermore, Section 8(b)(4) of the Act [the law] prohibits strikes for certain objects even though the objects are not necessarily unlawful if achieved by other means. An example of this would be a strike to compel Employer A to cease doing business with Employer B. It is not unlawful for Employer A voluntarily to stop doing business with Employer B, nor is it unlawful for a union merely to request that it do so. It is, however, unlawful for the union to strike with an object of forcing the employer to do so. These points will be covered in more detail in the explanation of Section 8(b)(4). In any event, employees who participate in an unlawful strike may be discharged and are not entitled to reinstatement.**

**[Second] Strikes [can be ]unlawful because of timing—Effect of no-strike contract.  A strike that violates a no-strike provision of a contract is not protected by the Act, and the striking employees can be discharged or otherwise disciplined, unless the strike is called to protest certain kinds of unfair labor practices committed by the employer.** It should be noted that not all refusals to work are considered strikes and thus violations of no-strike provisions. A walkout because of conditions abnormally dangerous to health, such as a defective ventilation system in a spray-painting shop, has been held not to violate a no-strike provision. Same—Strikes at end of contract period.Section 8(d) provides that when either party desires to terminate or change an existing contract, it must comply with certain conditions. If these requirements are not met, **a strike to terminate or change a contract is unlawful and participating strikers lose their status as employees of the employer engaged in the labor dispute.** If the strike was caused by the unfair labor practice of the employer, however, the strikers are classified as unfair labor practice strikers and their status is not affected by failure to follow the required procedure. Strikes unlawful because of misconduct of strikers. Strikers who engage in serious misconduct in the course of a strike may be refused reinstatement to their former jobs. This applies to both economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers. Serious misconduct has been held to include, among other things, violence and threats of violence. **The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that [Fourth] a “sitdown” strike, when employees simply stay in the plant and refuse to work, thus depriving the owner of property, is not protected by the law.** Examples of serious misconduct that could cause the employees involved to lose their right to reinstatement are:Strikers physically blocking persons from entering or leaving a struck plant. Strikers threatening violence against nonstriking employees. Strikers attacking management representatives.  **[Third] Section 8(g)—Striking or Picketing a Health Care Institution Without Notice. Section 8(g)[the law] prohibits a labor organization from engaging in a strike, picketing, or other concerted refusal to work at any health care institution without first giving at least 10 days’ notice in writing to the institution and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.**For more information please see the  [Basic Guide to the National Labor Relations Act](https://www.nlrb.gov/sites/default/files/attachments/pages/node-235/basicguide.pdf).

**Next, I have ONE observation about the resolution:**

**The word UNCONDITIONAL means the removal of restrictions that directly limit striking. In other words, strikes that break a law separate from striking, for example, if a strike threatens security from violence or violates protections for property, the right to strike in that case won’t be recognized Instead, the affirmative ONLY removes ALL of the restrictions for the actual right to strike. For this reason, ignore any arguments of my opponent that bring up violent strikes or strikes that break property; those are put down because they violate other laws.**

**Now, my FRAMEWORK.**

**I VALUE JUSTICE because it is the constitutive obligation of a just government.**

**Justice is best realized behind the VEIL OF IGNORANCE.  The veil of ignorance simply means that true justice can only be determined if people are UNAWARE of their social position. PhD professor John Rawls further explains in 1971:**

[John Rawls, “A Theory of Justice” 1971]

Now the reasons for the veil of ignorance go beyond mere simplicity. We want to define the original position so that we get the desired solution**. If** a **knowledge of particulars is allowed, then the outcome is biased by arbitrary contingencies**. As already observed, to each according to his threat advantage is not a principle of justice. **If the original position is to yield[s] agreements that are just, the parties must be[are] fairly situated and treated equally as moral persons**. **The arbitrariness of the world must be corrected for by adjusting the circumstances of the initial contractual situation**. Moreover, if in choosing principles we required unanimity even when there is full information, only a few rather obvious cases could be decided. A conception of justice based on unanimity in these circumstances would indeed be weak and trivial. **But once knowledge[ of ones position in society is] excluded, the requirement of unanimity is not out of place and the fact that it can be satisfied is of great importance. It enables us to say of the preferred conception of justice that it represents[ is] a genuine reconciliation of interests.**

**The Rawls analysis explains two ethical truths:**

**1. Justice requires IMPARTIALITY. Ethical norms that only apply to certain social positions cannot be just. The veil of ignorance requires we choose norms acceptable to ANY social position.**

**2. A just government exists only on the WILL of its citizens. Therefore, that government must enact policies that take into account the needs of groups that are frequently discounted based on race, gender, and social position.**

**Thus, the best STANDARD is consistency with the VEIL OF IGNORANCE.**

**My first contention is that the unconditional right to strike protects both a worker’s ownership of their own labor and protects the worker’s freedom from forced or uncompensated labor and dangerous conditions.**

**PhD professor Richard Croucher et al. explains in 2012:**

Croucher, Richard ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9617-734X, Kelly, Mark G. E. and Miles, Lilian ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7224-757X (2012) A Rawlsian basis for core labour rights. Comparative Labor Law and Policy Journal, 33 (2) . pp. 297-320. ISSN 1095-6654

**The right to strike** appears as a special and controversial case, then, but we argue that from a rights perspective it **is a simple, fundamental freedom. The right to conduct industrial action is in effect that to withdraw their labour in some way (quitting, striking, going slow) unless collective demands are met**. **As individuals, every worker**, if they are not a slave (and slavery is explicitly not permitted under Rawls’s first principle) **has a right to withdraw their own labour,** and might of course threaten this in individual negotiations with their employer. Effectively, what occurs in **industrial action is a pooling of individual rights into collective rights, via the individual freedom to**

**associate with our peers,** and in this respect we may still discuss these collective rights qua individual rights under Rawls’s first principle of justice. That is, **individuals may be said to have an individual right to join in collective industrial action to improve**

**their conditions.** Of course, it will be argued that there is no right to strike if it involves a breach of contract. However, **no contract can literally force labour – if it did that, it would breach the right to freedom from slavery.** Rather, it can only schedule penalties, typically financial, where labour is not performed.In effect, **as long as the freedom to contract is limited by the right to freedom from slavery, there is an implied freedom to strike.** Thus, it is because of the very lack of complete freedom to make contracts that prevents us having a primary right to bargain that we do have a primary freedom to strike. **We cannot, according to Rawls, sign away our basic freedom to refuse to do any particular job.40**

#### Workers across the world are using strikes to protect against unpaid labor. Scholars at the Georgetown University Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor write in 2018

John Russo, Sarah Attfield, Sherry Linkon [visiting scholars at the Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor] <https://lwp.georgetown.edu/visitingscholars/wcp-the-global-working-class-fights-back/> WCP: The Global Working Class Fights Back

Across the globe, 2018 was a year marked by worker strikes and protests. This week in Working-Class Perspectives, Sarah Attfield reminds us that there is still power in collective action. May 2019 bring us even greater global solidarity!

2018 has seen many working-class people around the world standing up for their rights and pushing back against injustice and inequality. Some of these fights have made the mainstream news in western countries, but many have not. As we reflect on the year that is ending, let’s not forget the struggles of working-class people and the successes of collective action and solidarity. Around the world, people have had enough of corporate greed and government inaction to combat inequality.

The spectacular scenes of protests and police responses on the streets of Paris were broadcast around the world. Crowds of people dressed in hi-vis vests ([gilet jaunes](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-46424267)) rallying against the French government have sparked much interest. The left have celebrated the gilets jaunes as a working-class movement – people fed up with austerity and regressive taxes, taking to the streets to demand better treatment and equality from the centrist government (although it should be acknowledged that there has been some coopting of the movement by the far right). In Australia in October, the streets were also awash with hi-vis, worn mostly by construction workers who put tools down to join rallies and [marches](https://www.news.com.au/video/id-5348771529001-5852111731001/raw-thousands-rally-in-sydney-for-new-workplace-laws) in the city centers as part of a union-led campaign to [‘change the rules’](https://changetherules.org.au/) and allow workers more rights to organize and strike.

Australia has also seen a number of more localized strikes and organization of workers throughout the year, including the notable formation of the [First Nations Workers Alliance](https://fnwa.org.au/) (FNWA), set up to fight against the unjust Community Development Program — a ‘work for the dole’ scheme targeting Indigenous people in remote communities. Under the [scheme](https://www.abc.net.au/news/2017-05-29/indigenous-employment-from-community-development-programme-low/8567224), **Indigenous people are expected to work for no pay and** are **penalized if they refuse to do so.** They are **not covered by occupational health and safety laws** and do not receive other work entitlements. The FNWA has been campaigning around the country, creating solidarity with non-Indigenous workers and unions and empowering workers with information about their rights.

Australia’s neighbor, New Zealand, has experienced industrial [action](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jul/09/new-zealand-teachers-and-nurses-to-hold-first-mass-strike-in-a-generation) this year by public servants, nurses, fast food [workers](https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/industries/104584689/global-fast-food-giant-wendys-faces-more-protest-from-nz-workers), bus [drivers](https://www.radionz.co.nz/news/national/357430/auckland-bus-drivers-strike-as-pay-dispute-heats-up), and [cinema](https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/new-zealand/2018/07/hoyts-workers-told-they-will-face-lockout-if-they-strike-for-better-pay.html) workers. For some worker groups, such as the nurses, the strikes are the first to happen in decades.

In the Asia Pacific region workers at South Korean tech giant Oracle have been [**striking**](http://www.theinvestor.co.kr/view.php?ud=20180710000573) since May over unfair conditions, rates of pay, and rights to unionize. Across [**China**](https://www.thenation.com/article/chinas-workers-arent-fighting-a-trade-war-theyre-fighting-a-labor-war/), workers have challenged the state and risked arrest and imprisonment for organizing in workplaces and going on strike. Factory workers (many of whom are migrant workers from rural areas) are demanding an end to unsafe working conditions and forced overtime. Even in Japan, where strikes are very rare, in one town during a dispute over insecure work, bus drivers engaged in industrial [**action**](https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2018/may/11/no-ticket-to-ride-japanese-bus-drivers-strike-by-giving-free-rides-okayama) by refusing to collect fares from passengers. A Philippines branch of business processing outsourcing company [**Alorica**](https://www.nearshoreamericas.com/alorica-labor-strike-philippines-union-allegations/) was notified of strike action in September due to the company’s attempts to strip rights from the workers’ union.

This will be the first strike of call center employees in the Philippines.

South Asia has also seen a series of strikes this year.

Tea [**plantation**](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/aug/07/tea-plantation-workers-in-india-go-on-strike-over-pay-dispute) workers in eastern India staged a strike in August over pay, and in October, Indian [**Uber**](https://www.reuters.com/article/us-uber-ola-strike/uber-ola-drivers-strike-in-india-demanding-higher-fares-idUSKCN1MW1WZ) and Ola drivers struck to demand higher fares to meet their cost of living.

Pakistani [port](https://www.dawn.com/news/1416331) workers have fought back against unfair dismissals and low wages, and [postal](https://www.uniglobalunion.org/news/pakistani-postal-workers-strike-restore-health-and-housing-benefits) worker unions in Pakistan have been protesting employers’ stripping of health benefits.

Various African countries have also seen industrial action in 2018. [Nurses](https://www.the-star.co.ke/news/2018/12/09/nurses-postpone-planned-strike-give-room-for-talks_c1863236) in Kenya have threatened to walk off the job if negotiations over pay are not successful, and [teachers](https://www.standardmedia.co.ke/article/2001293946/knut-puts-looming-teachers-strike-on-hold)in Kenya recently called off a planned strike to allow for talks with employers. Members of both private and public sector unions in Nigeria called a [national strike](http://www.africanews.com/2018/09/27/nigeria-banks-fuel-supply-crippled-as-labour-begins-strike/) in September in their quest for a livable minimum wage. The South African National Union of Mineworkers advised workers at the South Deep gold [mine](https://af.reuters.com/article/investingNews/idAFKCN1N63XA-OZABS) to take industrial action after announcements of mass job losses. The right to strike is entrenched in South Africa’s constitution, but recent amendments to labor laws there will make it more difficult to take strike action. A new national minimum wage has been [criticized](http://saftu.org.za/saftu-rejects-poverty-minimum-wage/) by the South Africa Federation of Trade Unions (SAFTU) as too low – and likely to be used by employers as a maximum wage. South African workers took to the streets in April to demand a higher minimum, and SAFTU has pledged to maintain the [pressure](https://www.cnbc.com/2018/04/27/south-africa-workers-protest-minimum-wage-ramaphosa-reassures.html) on the government with more protests in 2019.

Workers in Middle Eastern countries have also been downing tools. In the United Arab Emirates, where strikes are technically illegal, construction workers in Abu Dhabi [**refused**](https://www.thenational.ae/uae/police-defuse-labourers-strike-on-abu-dhabi-s-reem-island-1.790634) to work **until they were paid wages owed**. In Iran, [**steel workers**](https://en.radiofarda.com/a/iran-ahvaz-steel-workers-protest-strike/29601816.html) striking over unpaid wages and other issues have faced arrest, and Iranian truck drivers, farmers and railway workers have also staged action in 2018.

Employees in Europe have been fighting against Amazon – choosing the [busiest](https://www.businessinsider.com.au/black-friday-amazon-workers-protest-poor-working-conditions-2018-11?r=US&IR=T) days of the year to stage strikes and speaking out publicly against unsafe working conditions in Amazon factories. Greek workers have been [**protesting**](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/jan/14/greece-braced-for-strikes-over-planned-move-to-limit-industrial-action) against government plans to restrict industrial action, and German railway workers have been engaged in a [**national**](https://www.dw.com/en/german-rail-strikes-cause-widespread-delays/a-46648618)strike over pay.

There are many, many inspiring stories of successes and of continuing struggles. Campaigns have been varied as workers have fought for decent pay and conditions, as well as job security, the right to unionize, work safety, and to not be harassed at work (as in McDonald’s worker [**walk outs**](https://www.theguardian.com/business/2018/sep/12/mcdonalds-workers-set-to-strike-over-sexual-harassment) in the US). Working-class people are taking action to improve their own lives and to challenge structures that maintain inequality and injustice, and hearing about the actions and success of others helps build workers movements. Stories from around the world show there is still power in unions and collective action. They also highlight the need for global solidarity. In this season, let’s not forget the many around the world whose work continues throughout the holidays, and let us keep organizing, representing, supporting, and celebrating working-class lives in 2019. Solidarity forever!

**Remember these examples, the unconditional right to strike is being threatened by company layoffs and unjust arrests of workers peacefully striking. The right to strike protects a workers ownership of their labor, as shown in the examples in Abu Dhabi and Australia where workers were not being paid at all.**

**My second contention is that the unconditional right to strike is necessary to prevent the structural domination of the working class. PhD professor Alexander Gourevitch explains in 2016:**

Gourevitch, A.. “Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike.” Perspectives on

Politics 14 (2016): 307 - 323. //L

**The commodification of labor I: structural domination and exploitation So long as we view the labor market as a series of voluntary agreements, to which workers and employers freely consent, we cannot make adequate sense of the right to strike.** There are two interconnected forms of compulsion to which workers are subject that undermine any such view. The first is a form of structural domination that renders workers vulnerable to exploitation,the second is a form of legal authority that gives employers arbitrary power in the workplace itself. I**f we recognize these as ineliminable features of the market for labor, then the right to strike [is]makes sense not as a relic of feudal guild privileges nor just as an economically rational effort by some to maximize wages, but as a form of resistance to the modern labor market itself. Let us begin with structural domination and the problem of exploitation. Though most closely associated with the Marxian tradition, thethought that desperate workers are exploited is a familiar one**. Even those not so sympathetic to the complaints of modern wage-laborers can be found saying, as David Hume famously did, that “the fear of punishment will never draw so much labour from a slave, as the dread of being turned off and not getting another service, will from a freeman” (Hume [1742] 1987, II.XI.16fn39). Adam Smith gave this fact a turn in favor of workers: It is not, however, difficult to foresee which of the two parties must, upon all ordinary occasions, have the advantage in the dispute, and force the other into a compliance with their terms… In all such disputes the masters can hold out much longer… Many workmen could not subsist a week, few could subsist a month, and scarce any a year without employment. In the long-run the workman may be as necessary to his master as his master is to him, but the necessity is not so immediate. (Smith [1776] 1982, I.8.12) On top of which, as Smith noted, “Masters are always and every where in a sort of tacit, but constant and uniform combination.” **In a world in which economic necessity couples with employer collusion, workers have little choice**: “Such combinations [by employers], however, are frequently resisted by a contrary defensive combination of the workmen; who sometimes too, without any provocation of this kind, combine of their own accord to raise the price of their labour” (Smith [1776] 1982, I.8.12). For this reason Smith thought it was wrong to treat trade unions as criminal conspiracies.9 **The view of unions and strikes as defensive, aimed at lessening employers’ ability to take advantage of workers’ need, persisted throughout the industrial age. By the time Hobhouse wrote Liberalism, it was possible for a liberal to argue that strikes might even be connected to human freedom**: The emancipation of trade unions, however, extending over the period from 1824 to 1906, and perhaps not yet complete, was in the main a liberating movement, because combination was necessary to place the workman on something approaching terms of equality with the employer, and because tacit combinations of employers could never, in fact, be prevented by law. (Hobhouse 1944, 18) We must note, however, that nearly all of these arguments remain within a form of social theory that attempts to make capitalist practice more like its theoretical selfimage. **These thinkers tended to defend unions and their right to strike as a way of achieving ‘real freedom of contract’ in the face of economic necessity.** Hobhouse was updating Smith and Mill when arguing, “In the matter of contract true freedom postulates substantial equality between the parties. In proportion as on party is in a position of vantage, he is able to dictate his terms. In proportion as the other party is in a weak position, he must accept unfavourable terms” (Hobhouse 1944, 37). On this account, **the right to strike** is defensible only insofar as it helps maintain a position of relative equality among bargaining parties. It thereby **secures contracts that are not just voluntary but truly free** - Mill’s “necessary instrumentality of that free market.” **This basic idea reappears in any number of twentieth century acts of labor legislation and jurisprudence, perhaps most notably in the 1935 law granting American workers the right to strike**.10 The problem with the ‘real freedom of contract’ view is that it is based on faulty social analysis. The labor market is not justanother commodity market in which property-owners are, or can be made, free to participate or not participate. Here some Marxist social theory is inescapable.**Workers who have no other consistent source of income than a wage [and]have no reasonable alternative to selling their labor-power.** That is because, at least in highly capitalist societies where most goods are only legally accessible if you can buy them, thereis no other way of reliably acquiring necessary goods. The only way for most workers to get enoughmoney to buy what they need is by selling their labor-power. Their only alternatives are to steal, hope for charity, or rely on inadequate welfareprovision. These are generally speaking unreasonable alternatives to seeking income through wages. If workers have no reasonable alternative to selling theirlabor-power they are therefore forced to sell that labor-power to some employer or another (Ezorsky 2007; Cohen 1988,239-254, 255-285). This forcing exists even when workers earn relatively high wages, since they still lack reasonablealternatives, though the forcing is more immediate the closer one gets to poverty wages. The key feature of this forcing is that it is consistent with voluntary exchange but it is not someoccasional or accidental feature of this or that worker’s circumstances. It is a product of the distribution of property in society. People are forced to selltheir labor when, on the one hand, **everyone has property rights in their own capacity to labor and, on the other hand,some group of individuals monopolize all or nearly all of the productive assets** in that society. These are the necessary conditions to create a labormarket sufficiently robust to organize production. That is to say, a society in which the primary way of organizing production is through labor market is one in which most people are forced into that labor market. Or, put another way, a society in which most people were truly free to enter or not enter the labor market would be one in which labor is so radically de-commodified that the mere formal possibility of a labor market could not serve, on its own, to guarantee social reproduction. Relations among workers and employers would be truly free and thus truly contingent. It is only when there is a sufficiently large population of individuals who have nothing but their labor-power to sell that the mechanism ofsocial forcing guarantees a constant supply of labor through the labor market itself. But this means that, in a society based on the commodification of labor, the conditions that would make the buying and selling of labor-powera truly free set of exchanges would require utterly transforming that market-based production relationship itself. It would require giving workers areasonable alternative to selling their labor – say through a sizable, unconditional basic income and universal public goods, or through giving all workers the possibility ofowning or cooperatively owning their own enterprise. Such measures would amount to a radical de-commodification oflabor-power, an overcoming of the very social conditions that give rise to the labor market’s self-imageas a site of free exchange. As Ira Steward, a nineteenth century American labor reformer, once said, “if laborers were sufficiently free to make contracts…they would be too free to need contracts”(quoted in Stanley 1998, 96). The foregoing social analysis is familiar enough, but its implications for the right to strike are rarely considered. The right to strike begins to make more sense if we reflect upon the fact tha workers who are forced to sell their labor are vulnerable to exploitation. Exploitation just is the word for structural domination in thedomain of economic production (Vrousalis 2013; Roberts, n.d., Chap. three). Some workers will accept jobs at going wage rates and hours, others will beunable to bargain for what they need, and most can be made to work longer hours, at lower pay, under worseconditions than they would otherwise accept. Many employers know this and will take advantage of it (Greenhouse 2009; Krugman, New York Times, December 23, 2013).Even if employers do not intentionally take advantage of it, they do so tacitly by making numerous economic decisions about hiring, firing, wages and hours that assume this steady supply of economically dependent labor. So itis not just the force of necessity, but the fact that this forcing leaves workers vulnerable to exploitation and the further fact that this is a class condition that is relevant to our thinking. It explains whyworkers might seek collective solutions to their structural domination and why they might refuse to believe that they can overcome their exploitation through purely individual efforts.

**A rise in worker strikes ushe in better conditions and more importantly a shift in the balance of power from employers to employees.**

**In order to protect the worker’s right, the right to strike must be unconditional.  There are two reasons why this is true:**

1. **Under a veil of ignorance, we would want to live in the best society possible no matter where we are placed in it. By guaranteeing worker’s control of their labor, an unconditional right to strike guarantees them increased freedom, making it justified under the veil of ignorance.**
2. **we want to live in a society where we cannot be enslaved. By guaranteeing worker’s freedom from contract control, an unconditional right to strike guarantees them freedom from enslavement, making it necessary under the veil of ignorance.**

**In order to protect the workers from domination, the right to strike must be unconditional:**

1. **Strikes are the only way to enforce contracts. As Gourevitch explains, strikes are often the only way for workers to secure contracts, ensuring that workers as well as employees uphold their end of the bargain. Without an unconditional right to strike, workers will be unable to ensure fair treatment.**
2. **Strikes reduce exploitation. When workers are exploited, Gourevitch explains that strikes are a means for them to reduce that exploitation by resisting employer control. Without strikes, employers have an increased ability to take advantage of worker need, leading to exploitation.**

#### Contention 3 is the teachers right to strike

#### The unconditional right to strike ensures that teachers continue to work

**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 conditionsand 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 elsewhereto 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.

#### Teachers actually working is good as they would be able to educarte the population.

#### The right being unconditional and available for them ensures that they will continue to work in the long run

#### For all of the reasons I have presented, I urge an affirmative ballot.