**Initially, I advocate for a utilitarianism standard for 2 reasons:**

1. **Policy makers must use utilitarianism**

**Robert Goodin, a philosophy professor for Australian National University, writes in his 1995 book *“Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy”*:** [Robert E, Professor of Philosophy at the Research School of the Social Sciences at the Australian National University, Professor of Government at the University of Essex, “Utilitarianism As a Public Philosophy”, Cambridge University Press, pg 63]

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more plausible for them (or, more precisely, makes them adopt a form of utilitarianism that we would find more acceptable) than private individuals. Before proceeding with that larger argument, I must therefore say what it is that is so special about public officials and their situations that makes it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism.  Consider, first the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices-public and private alike- are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course.  But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, [they] are relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know [is] what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all. That is enough to allow public policy makers to use the utilitarian calculus – if they want to use it at all – to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule. But they cannot be sure what the payoff will be to any given individual or on any particular occasion.

1. **Affirmative Framework Still Assumes Utilitarianism .**

**If the alternative is harming the very people the affirmative seeks to protect, you would reject the resolution. The affirmative doesn’t justify taking an action that would be on balance harmful to more people.**

**Contention \_\_\_\_\_\_\_: Recognizing Right to Strike Wrecks Economy**

**The Affirmative Will Kill the Economy in Four Separate Ways:**

1. **Strikes Will Cause Ripple Effect Which Harms GDP**

**Coon, 2000**

Korey Harlyn Coon 2000 Illinois Wesleyan University https://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1165&context=parkplace

The United Auto Workers (UAW) strike at General Motors in the summer of 1998 had a large impact on both the microeconomy and the macroeconomy of the United States. GM’s total sales, profits, and market share all have declined because of the strike. Not only did the strike have an adverse effect on GM’s financial status, but [it also impacted] the nation’s total output, sales, price level, consumer spending, trade deficit, and employment were all affected. [also] Many satellite businesses depend on GM for sales, service, products, and supplies. The combination of the losses GM incurred, the losses of satellite businesses, along with other adverse ripple effects accounts for a significant part of the decline in U.S. GDP growth.”

1. **Small Business:**
2. **Strikes Empirically Wreck Small Business**

**CNN, 1997**

CNN, August 13, 1997,<http://edition.cnn.com/US/9708/13/ups.impact/index.html>, Accessed 10/27/2021

With the United Parcel Service and striking Teamsters digging in for a potentially long standoff, small businesses with small profit margins say their very survival is on the line. "I've had many phone calls and letters from customers, particularly our smaller customers," UPS Chairman James Kelly told CNN in a live interview on Wednesday. "Small businesses are really being hurt because of this strike."

1. **Small Business Key to Entire World Economy**

**Arnold, 2019**

Christopher Arnold, International Federation of Accountants,<https://www.ifac.org/knowledge-gateway/contributing-global-economy/discussion/foundation-economies-worldwide-small-business-0,June> 26, 2019

Most organizations worldwide are small by size, but their importance to both developed and developing economies and societies is indisputable. According to the World Trade Organization, small-and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) represent over 90 per cent of the business population, 60-70% of employment and 55% of GDP in developed economies. SMEs therefore do not just significantly contribute to the economy – they ARE the economy.

1. **Global Supply Chain**
2. **Strikes Disrupt Global Supply Chain**

**Castellan, 2021**

<https://castellanbc.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Supply-Chain-Continuity-Castellan-Solutions.pdf>, Accessd 10/28/21

Prior to the pandemic, one of the most far-reaching, and sometimes unpredictable, catalysts for supply chain disruption was a negative labor force climate, including controversial working conditions and labor strikes. Often when people think of labor strikes that affect supply chains, they think of workers directly involved in product manufacturing or other direct company labor. But work stoppages in utility plants, fuel chains, and transportation networks—any organization involved in providing power, communications, and movement of goods—are also potential disruptors.

1. **Supply Chain on Brink – Any Disruption Wrecks World Recovery**

**Egan, October 13, 2021**

Matt Egan, Reporter, CNN

Computer chip shortages. Epic port congestion. And a serious lack of truck drivers. The world's delicate supply chains are under extreme stress. The supply chain nightmare is jacking up prices for consumers and slowing the global economic recovery.

1. **Inflation**
2. **Strikes Now Will Cause Wage-Price Spiral and Long-Term Inflation**

**Peekj, October 22, 2021**

Liz Peek, Economist, the Hill

We are now entering a new phase of inflation pressures. A rising cost of living is pushing workers to demand higher wages, which in turn prompts companies to raise prices even more, igniting an unholy cycle that penalizes everyone. Unions, cheered on by Biden’s White House, have decided to take advantage of this moment. Labor strikes are on the increase, which will lead to higher wages, take workers offline and make it even harder to get goods to customers. Those bare shelves popping up around the country may just be a teaser for what comes next. A wage-price spiral is the phenomenon that causes inflation to become “persistent” and not “transitory.”.

1. **More Inflation Causes Hyperinflation & Total Economic Collapse**

**Kimani, October 13, 2021**

Alex Kimani, Yahoo FinanceN

More alarmingly, economic experts chimed in with even more dire warnings of "hyperinflation". For instance, last year, the New York Times bestselling author and founder of 'The Bear Traps Report' Lawrence 'Larry' McDonald warned of the 'cobra effect' whereby the stimuli designed to save the economy will instead "...cause a hyperinflationary economic collapse".

1. **Impact: Economic Collapse Wrecks Society & Causes Conflict Sundaram** **and Popov 2019**

[Jomo Kwame Sundaram, a former economics professor, Vladimir Popov, Research Director at the Dialogue of Civilizations Research Institute in Berlin. Economic Crisis Can Trigger World War. February 12, 2019. www.ipsnews.net/2019/**02**/economic-crisis-can-trigger-world-war/]

**As fears rise of** yet **another** international **financial crisis, there are** growing **concerns about** the increased possibility of large-scale military **conflict**. More worryingly, **in the current political landscape**, prolonged **economic crisis,** **combined with** rising economic inequality, chauvinistic ethno-**populism as well as** aggressive **jingoist** rhetoric, including **threats, could** easily **spin out of control** and ‘morph’ **into** military **conflict**, and worse, world war.

1. **Economic Collapse Causes Worldwide Nuclear War**

**Tønnesson 15** [Tønnesson is a research professor at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO) in Norway and the leader of the East Asia Peace program at Uppsala University in Sweden.] “Deterrence, interdependence and Sino–US peace.” International Area Studies Review, volume 18, number 3, pgs. 297-311. 2015.

. If leaders on either side of the Atlantic begin to seriously fear or anticipate their own nation’s decline then they may blame this on external dependence, appeal to anti-foreign sentiments, contemplate the use of force to gain respect or credibility, adopt protectionist policies, and ultimately **refuse to be deterred by** either **nuclear arms** or prospects of socioeconomic calamities. Such a dangerous shift could happen abruptly, i.e. under the instigation of actions by a third party – or against a third party. Yet as long as there is both nuclear deterrence and interdependence, the tensions in East Asia are unlikely to escalate to war. As Chan (2013) says, all states in the region are aware that they cannot count on support from either China or the US if they make provocative moves. the greatest risk is not that a territorial dispute leads to war under present circumstances but that changes in the world economy alter those circumstances in ways that render inter-state peace more precarious.

1. **Nuclear War Results in Extinction**

**Larry Ross, founder of the New Zealand Nuclear-Free Peacemaking Association, writes for the organization in 2003**, New Zealand Nuclear-Free Peacemaking Association Founder, 3 [Larry, 12-10-03, Nuclear-Free Peacemaker New Zealand, “Racing Toward Extinction,” http://www.nuclearfree.org.nz/archives/42\_Larry-Ross-Articles/2003/racing.htm, accessed 01-16-20]

Here is a chart with 6,000 dots divided into 100 squares. The one dot in the centre represents all the explosive power of allied bombs dropped in WWII - equal to 3,000,000 tons of TNT or 3 megatons. Millions were killed. We have enough [nuclear firepower] for about 6,000 WWII's. The dots in just one of the 100 squares represent the firepower to kill all life on earth. We have made enough weapons to [and can] kill everyone on earth many times over. That is our dire situation today. We are not adapting to change our behaviour, but reinforcing old behaviour that leads to war? The nuclear arms race, accelerated by the vested interests of the military-industrial-political complex, and the phantom threats we invent to sustain it, is the major occupation of many top brains and huge resources today. It has huge momentum and power. It is embedded in U.S. society and some others. It is an accepted part of the culture. This weapons culture and the new doctrines mean that nuclear weapons are no longer treated as a last resort. They can be used in addition to conventional weapons to achieve military goals. The culture has programmed itself for self-destruction and now has the ideology to continue until they precipitate a nuclear holocaust which kills all life. The quantum leap in destructive power has now been matched by this new will, or self-permission, to use these weapons. Laws, fears and reservations have been swept aside. Humanity seems to have accepted the new doctrines. Few seem concerned that any usage can kill millions, and quickly expand beyond any countries control, leading to a global nuclear war which [and] ends humanity. We have radically altered our environment in so many other ways as well, that also threaten our existence in the longer term. Population growth and our economic growth ideology augment the trends of climate change - global warming - pollution - dwindling natural resources - deforestation etc. To emphasize again, the biggest change we have made in our environment is the quantum leap in our ability to destroy ourselves. Our psychological and social climate makes it more probable. Most people are not aware of this huge change in our environment. Others just accept it. We have learned to live with and treat nuclear weapons as a normal part of the environment. Many feel that to question or oppose this situation is silly, disloyal or threatens the security we think nuclear weapons give us. Nine countries are dedicated to constantly developing their nuclear arsenals. That makes accidental or intentional usage more likely. That the U.S. has said the nuclear barriers are down adds to the likelihood of nuclear weapons use by some other state. A probable escalation would follow.

**Contention \_\_\_\_\_\_: Unconditional Right To Strike Invites Racism & Discrimination**

1. **Strikes promote racial discrimination throughout the world**

**Paul Moreno, 10**

Paul Moreno is Associate Professor of History at Hilsdale College where he holds the William and Berniece Grewcock Chair in Constitutional History https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2010/1/cj30n1-4.pdf

The Illinois UMW was just one example of the fact that **race was much less often used against as by organized labor. Race was a convenient way to do what unions do. Unions** are, in economic terms, cartels. Their goal is to insulate their members from competition, to **increase the price of their product (wages) and lower its output (hours).** Unions do this **by “controlling the labor supply.” And one of the most convenient ways to do this is to exclude easily identified groups like racial minorities** (Becker 1971, Posner 1984, Reynolds 1984). The **South African economist** W. H. **Hutt was among the first to observe this phenomenon.** While racial animus certainly was a factor in labor-market discrimination, “We do not, however, find color prejudice as such the main origin—nor, perhaps, even the most important cause—of most economic color bars. **The chief source of** color **discrimination is,** I suggest, **to be found in the natural determination to defend economic privilege”** (Hutt 1964: 27). **South Africa’s Mines and Works** (Colour Bar) **Act** of 1911 **was passed to appease white union members’ demand to abate black competition. When the owners continued to employ black miners, the “Rand Rebellion”** of 1922 **ensued, “one of the bloodiest labor disputes ever to occur anywhere in the world,” followed by more restrictive legislation to reserve jobs for white unionists** in 1924 (Sowell 1990: 27)

1. **Strikes Used to promote segregation**

**Erik Loomis, 18**

associate professor of history at the University of Rhode Island, works have been published in NYT, WP etc.. https://books.google.com/books?id=kUNGDwAAQBAJ&pg=PT119&lpg=PT119&dq=packard+company+promotion+black+workers+white+worker+strike&source=bl&ots=Hu3lHA7shm&sig=ACfU3U05kUlnNa3W6DVQ3KJ6MZ5slnne9A&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi06q6G5tfzAhWWLc0KHeRCAIgQ6AF6BAgPEAM#v=onepage&q&f=false

**Grassroots worker power develops when workers identify any issue that outrages them. That could include oppressing other workers to keep the factories lily-white.** On June 3, 1943, **25,000 white workers went on strike** at a Detroit Packard plant **when the company promoted three black workers.** Packard's personnel director, C.E Weiss, had bragged about being the first executive to bring blacks north to bust unions when he worked for Chrysler in 1917. He used this old trick to divide the United Auto Workers. UAW leadership ordered its members back to work the next day, but thousands remained on the racist picket line. The government sent out the message that it would fire anyone who did not go back to work. Thirty of the strike ringleaders were suspended on June 6, and the strike ended the next day. **Several similar incidents took place in Detroit and other cities** during the war. Miners in Butte, Montana, refused to work when their employer tried to import black workers to make up for laborers lost to the military, even though the union, the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, was a leader in fighting for racial equality. **Race trumped class for many white workers. Contention \_\_\_\_\_\_: Unconditional Right To Strike Causes Health Care Crisis**

1. **Healthcare Strikes Will Kill Millions Worldwide, Disproportionately Hurting the Poor, & Breaking Trust with Medical Institutions**

**Aacharya and Varghese 16**

[Ramesh P Aacharya, Department of Emergency and General Practice, Tribhuvan University Teaching Hospital, Institute of Medicine, and Sibichan Varghese, Department of Higher Secondary Education, Omanoor P.O. Malappuram, 2016, “Medical Doctors’ Strike: An Ethical Overview with Reference to the Indian Context,” Journal of Clinical Research & Bioethics,<https://www.longdom.org/open-access/medical-doctors-strike-an-ethical-overview-with-reference-tothe-indiancontext-2155-9627-1000272.pdf>]

Health is a very important human value and hence health care is a paramount social good. In this context doctors have more responsibility on health of every people [3]. In many countries health care workers including doctors are unsatisfied with factors like payments and with nonmonetary aspects such as healthcare policy issues, security and safety issues, better working conditions and hospital’s physical and administrative infrastructure [4-12]. Doctors argue that they are compelled to action to make their needs or demands met, and that strikes may be chosen as an ultimate choice of action. Such collective actions by practicing doctors are occurring with increasing frequency worldwide [13- 15]. In 2006, Frizelle pointed out that in the past two decades there has been strikes by medical doctors in many countries including Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Korea, Malta, New Zealand, Peru, Serbia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Romania, USA, UK, Zambia and Zimbabwe [14]. Many of these strikes have been harmful to patients as strikes reduce patient’s access to care by eliminating or delaying necessary care, and may, at times interfere with the continuity of such care [16,17]. A doctors’ strike, regardless of the reason for it, receives a lot of media attention and meets a great deal of criticism and resistance from the general public as well as within the healthcare profession [18,19]. In fact, it arouses intense debate on the ethical justification of medical professionals failing to prioritise human life and their needs, and to find less harmful ways of negotiating their own needs without harming patients[20-22]. Many empirical studies and reviews on strikes indicate thatin many instances, medical services are badly affected by doctors’ strikes[7,15]. The objections against medical strikes range from causing harm to patients, deterioration of physician-patient relationship to decrease of public’s respect for the medical profession [23]. In the recent past, a number of such strikes have been reported from many developing countries including India [4-7,10,24]. The impact of such strikes is very destructive in developing countries like India where medical insurance and health care systems are very poor and substandard. Pandya pointed out that “in such a (strike) situation, the paralysis of health care centres by striking doctors runs contrary to the raison d'être of the profession. It also violates the first dictum of medicine - Primum, non nocere” [25]. Although doctors usually put forward reasons to justify their strikes, such strikes need close ethical scrutiny. 6ignificantl\, striking doctors may feel psychological distress and ethical conflict regarding the consequences and impact of their strikes on patients [26]. In such a complex situation, various ethical dilemmas arise, like the legitimacy of doctors’ strikes while patients are harmed [18], which further questions whether a medical doctor has autonomy to engage in what he/she feels to be his/her right. In this context our question is whether doctors’ strikes can be ethically legitimate, especially in the Indian scenario? Do they have the right to strikes or work slowdowns, even if they have a genuine reason, which may put the lives of defenceless patients at serious danger? How can doctors genuinely press for their demands without making untoward eوٴects to human life? Нerefore, in this article we would like to discuss doctors’ strikes and its ethical reflection with special reference to India. Нis ethical debate is literature based for which various databases and online sources including PubMed, Web of Science, Google Scholar, Philosophers index etc. were used. Most of the full texts were accessed through Health Internetwork Access to Research Initiative (HINARI) currently named as HINARI Access to Research in Health Programme. Нe objective of KANKEE BRIEFS 57 this work is to study and describe reasons, modalities and impacts of the doctors’ strikes in India. Further, we try to develop an ethical reflection on doctors’ strikes and to evaluate the doctors’ strikes in India using these ethical reflections. Discussion 1. НH Indian situation with doctors’ strikes In India, strikes of junior as well as senior doctors have been more frequent in recent times which cause harm in diوٴerent dimensions of a patient’s life giving rise to ethical debates [21,22,27,28]. 1a. Reasons for doctors’ strike in India: Considering inadequate Indian public health care system, doctors argue that there are good reasons for carrying out strikes. Нe\ also argue that they deploy such activities when situations are hopeless and helpless, especially when dissatisfaction has become substantially worse. Нe major reasons can be categorised as follows: Low wages: Нe main discontent for majority of doctors relates to a ‘fair wage’ [29]. Нe ‘stipend’ given to resident doctors are very low and they need to work increasingly longer hours and thus junior doctors are exploited by the administration bypassing all labour laws in the name of training. For this reason junior or resident doctors are leading groups to strike all over the world including India. Most of the senior doctors also receive a relatively low salary compared to their time at work, risks and expertise. Failure to fulfil their expectations has contributed to a ‘brain drain’ to the rich and developed countries. Lack of security and safety at work places: Another reason for doctor’s strike is increasing incidents of attacks on doctors [6,7], by relatives of certain unfortunate patients who lost their lives during the course of treatment. Such incidents increase the lack of security and safety in their working environments. Health care policy issues: Another main reason for doctors’ strikes is related with health care policy issues adopted by central or state governments [4,5,10,24], which hamper the opportunity of a majority of talented and committed doctors to further their academic or professional and financial advancement. Upgrading of institutional capacity: A number of strikes were also reported for better working conditions and for hospital infrastructure development [6,7]. Нe infrastructures in hospitals including professional resources are inadequate to accommodate the needs of all patients seeking for public hospital services. Нe number of medical staوٴ is lower in every public hospital than is required. In many hospitals, many posts for medical staوٴ remain vacant, and the attempts to get new recruits are inadequate and ineوٴective. Despite the fact that medical education infrastructure has grown rapidly during the last decade enrolling 46,456 medical students in 2014 [30] which is 64% increment compared to 2005, the doctorpatient ratio is unsatisfactory with one government doctor for every 11,528 people [31]. Нerefore, overcrowded public hospitals are very common in India, putting more pressure on the shoulders of public hospital doctors. 1b. Modes of Strike: Unlike what workers oіen do in other strikes, most striking doctors do not begin by sudden abandoning of patients in critical conditions [32]. Rather, the usual course is starting from simple work slow-down and then, gradual increase in intensity to strong actions. Initially, they may stop indoor admissions, not attend medical boards meetings. Later, they may deny services to out-patients and also exclude surgeries. However, in most cases, emergency departments are attended by some doctors during the strike. Most of such strikes last for one day to a few weeks, and the modes of striking diوٴer from one situation to other. Doctors conduct demonstration [6], sit-in, absenteeism and some of them even undergo hunger strikes [5,29,33]. 1c. Impact of doctors’ strikes: Нe impact of such strikes varies depending on a number of factors such as the duration, cases under treatment and mode of strike [2]. Most patients who come from poor backgrounds and seek for free healthcare, they are harmed greatly because they have neither medical insurance nor social security insurance. According to United Nation's Millennium Development Goal (MGD) programme 21 percent out of India's population of 1.29 billion are living below the poverty line [34]. Further, in India, only less than 10 per cent of people have comprehensive health insurance coverage. This worsens their poor condition ending in sometimes very fatal results because they cannot financially afford to go to private hospitals. Thus outcomes of physicians strikes are likely to affect patients and their vulnerability to illness makes patients relatively powerless in relationship to the health care system, and influencing patients’ attitudes (of trust) towards medical doctors[1,26,35]. In India, there is a system of employing part time or alternative service especially doctors from army during periods of strike. Нe relatively small number of such part-time and/or full-time consultants in most departments is insuٹcient in comparison to the patients’ load of those who are seriously ill requiring hospital care. According to Pandya “…. If doctors in such hospitals go on strike, the only option open to these patients is to turn their faces to the wall, sicken further, and, in some instances, die. These are compounded, avoidable tragedies, all the more terrible as they follow no fault of their” [25]. Нis statement clearly illustrates the depth of the consequences of doctors’ strikes in India, which, in concluding this section, brings us back to our former question of whether it is ethically justifiable for doctors to demand to strike. Нe professional virtues behind such strikes raise moral and ethical questions. 2. Doctors’ strike: a general ethical reflection

1. **Health Care Strikes Also Harm The Workers and Medical Institutions**

**Li et al. 15**

[Su-Ting T. Li, MD, MPH Department of Pediatrics, University of California Davis, School of Medicine, Malathi Srinivasan, MD Department of Internal Medicine, University of California Davis, School of Medicine, Richard L. Kravitz, MD, MSPH Department of Internal Medicine, University of California Davis, School of Medicine, and Michael S. Wilkes, MD, MPH, PhD Department of Internal Medicine, University of California Davis, School of Medicine, 2015, “Ethics of Physician Strikes in Health Care,” INTERNATIONAL ANESTHESIOLOGY CLINICS, [https://scihub.se/10.1097/AIA.0000000000000054]/](https://scihub.se/10.1097/AIA.0000000000000054%255D/)

Modern History of Physician Strikes—Have Physician Strikes Been Successful? Withdrawal or cessation of clinical services (striking) is the most extreme form of collective action. Physician strikes over the past 20 years have varied in purpose and success (Table 1). Health care provider strikes may have a negative impact on health care providers overall, if the public does not support the rationale surrounding the strike or if patient harm results from the strike. This negative public view increases if the strike is considered primarily physician welfare–centered rather than patient welfarecentered.2,25,36 Physicians, even when employed, are usually high wage earners, relative to the average wage earner. Yet, the practice of medicine is tightly regulated. Professionals in less tightly regulated fields have the ability to increase or decrease their professional fees more easily. A strong negative reaction was seen during the Ontario, Canada strike in 1986. In this strike, physicians went on a 23-day strike to try to prevent a federal ban on “extra-billing” (charging more than the amount payable by the Ontario Health Insurance Plan for providing an insured service). The strike failed to prevent the ban from going into law, and it also alienated the public