### Healthcare/Military NC

Today I negate the **Resolved: Just governments ought to recognize an unconditional right to strike.** Because the word ought in the resolution implies a moral obligation or duty, I value morality, which according to the stanford encyclopedia of philosophy is used normatively to refer to a code of conduct that, given specified conditions, would be put forward by all rational people. Given the value of morality the criterion through which we ought to achieve that value is Minimizing Suffering. As Popper in 52 notes, there is, from the ethical point of view, no symmetry between suffering and happiness, or between pain and pleasure. Both the greatest happiness principle of the Utilitarians and Kant's principle are fundamentally wrong in this point. Human suffering makes a direct moral appeal for help, while there is no similar call to increase the happiness of a man who is doing well anyway."

<https://www.utilitarianism.com/karl-popper.html#:~:text=%22I%20believe%20that%20there%20is,or%20between%20pain%20and%20pleasure.&text=human%20suffering%20makes%20a%20direct,who%20is%20doing%20well%20anyway.%22>

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/morality-definition/>

I offer the following definitions, to be used in the round. First, Merriam Webster defines a strike as a work stoppage by a body of workers to enforce compliance with demands made on an employer. Secondly Merriam Webster goes on to define unconditional as “without conditions or limits.” I’ll provide other definitions upon request. Thus, observe that it is the burden of the affirmative to defend strikes and the right to strike unconditionally. As long as I can simply prove that an unconditional right to strike causes great suffering that could be easily averted by any number of rational and reasonable conditions I ought to win today's round. My sole contention is thus

**Contention One: Unconditionality of a RTS is Bad.**

**Subpoint a) Healthcare Disadvantage**

Waithaka et al., ‘20 [Dennis Waithaka is currently doing a Postgraduate Diploma in Research Methodology at KEMRI-Wellcome Trust, Published: 2/10/20, “Prolonged health worker strikes in Kenya- perspectives and experiences of frontline health managers and local communities in Kilifi County” International Journal for Equity in Health, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12939-020-1131-y>

Beyond impoverishment, interviewees talked in dramatic terms about negative health-outcomes linked to the strikes, including deaths, with the poor again being the worst affected. A recent analysis of the effects of six previous nation- wide Kenyan strikes on mortality data in Kilifi County (before the 100 days doctors and the 150 days nurses strike) found a 75% increase in mortality among children aged 12–59months during the strike period, but no change in overall mortality [24]. The authors noted that the lack of change in overall mortality could have been because the strikes between 2010 and 2016 were relatively short, with only one lasting for more than a month (42 days). Evidence from other settings suggests that the effects of strikes on health outcomes are increased where emergency services are not available or the affected populations are not able to

access viable (available and affordable) alternate healthcare services [1, 3, 19, 67, 68]. In Kenya, the Irimu et al (2018) study reviewing admissions in 13 public hospitals during the 2017 doctors’ and nurses strikes noted that ‘preventable deaths likely occurred on a massive scale’, particularly for the poor [27]. We identified similar perceptions in our study, but this may be in contrast with the more modest effects reported for prior strikes [24] . Given that the Kenyan public health system has faced a series of shocks and stressors over the decades, additional research that can provide more detailed data on the impact of the prolonged strikes on mortality over time is important. An ‘everyday resilience’ lens is relevant for analyzing the strategies adopted by managers in response to strikes, and for considering the impact of the prolonged strikes on the Kenyan health system. Everyday resilience can be defined as the ability of the system to maintain positive adjustment in the context of chronic shocks and stressors in ways that allow the organization to emerge from those conditions strengthened and more resourceful [43]. Whether everyday resilience is observed and built in the face of chronic and acute stressors depends on the nature of the strategies enacted by health system actors, and the capacities that they can draw upon. Absorptive strategies buffer the system from shocks and return the system to its state with little or no change in structure; adaptive strategies result in some limited adjustments in the system structure or processes; while transformative strategies result in significant functional or structural changes[43, 69]. During the nurses’ strike in Kenya, we observed that middle level managers enacted a range of absorptive strategies in their efforts to keep services open, including mobilizing financial, infrastructural and human resources to support continuity of some essential services. Adaptive strategies included some reorganization of staff and services offered, but more significant functional or structural changes - transformative strategies - were not observed during the strike. Across all the strategies observed, managers drew on their social networks and alliances to persuade and negotiate with various actors across the public health system to assist. They also demonstrated creativity in ways of working with others such as the local private facilities and NGOs. To keep key services running, managers drew on a long

**Subpoint b) Potential Military Strikes Cripple the American Military: Impact is Global Instability.**

LII 6 [Cornell Legal Information Institute, 2006, "10 U.S. Code § 976," Cornell Legal Information

Institute, [https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/10/976]/Kankee](https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/10/976%5D/Kankee)

The term “civilian officer or employee” means an employee, as such term is defined in section 2105 of title 5. (b)It shall be unlawful for a member of the armed forces, knowing of the activities or objectives of a particular military labor organization— (1)to join or maintain membership in such organization; or (2)to attempt to enroll any other member of the armed forces as a member of such organization. (c)It shall be unlawful for any person— (1)to enroll in a military labor organization any member of the armed forces or to solicit or accept dues or fees for such an organization from any member of the armed forces; or (2)to negotiate or bargain, or attempt through any coercive act to negotiate or bargain, with any civilian officer or employee, or any member of the armed forces, on behalf of members of the armed forces, concerning the terms or conditions of service of such members; (3)to organize or attempt to organize, or participate in, any strike, picketing, march, demonstration, or other similar form of concerted action involving members of the armed forces that is directed against the Government of the United States and that is intended to induce any civilian officer or employee, or any member of the armed forces, to— be fined not less than $25,000 and not more than $250,000.” 1987—Subsec. (a)(1) to (3). Pub. L. 100–26 inserted “The term” after each par. designation and struck out uppercase letter of first word after first quotation marks in each paragraph and substituted lowercase letter. 1986— Subsec. (a)(1). Pub. L. 99–661 struck out the second of two commas before “(B)”. 1984—Subsec. (a)(1). Pub. L. 98–525 added cl. (B) and redesignated existing cl. (B) as (C). Findings; Purpose Pub. L. 95–610, § 1, Nov. 8, 1978, 92 Stat. 3085, provided that: “(a)The Congress makes the following findings: “(1)Members of the armed forces of the United States must be prepared to fight and, if necessary, to die to protect the welfare, security, and liberty of the United States and of their fellow citizens. “(2)Discipline and prompt obedience to lawful orders of superior officers are essential and time-honored elements of the American military tradition and have been reinforced from the earliest articles of war by laws and regulations prohibiting conduct detrimental to the military chain of command and lawful military authority. “(3)The processes of conventional collective bargaining and labor-management negotiation cannot and should not be applied to the relationships between members of the armed forces and their military and civilian superiors. “(4)Strikes, slowdowns, picketing, and other traditional forms of job action have no place in the armed forces. “(5)Unionization of the armed forces would be incompatible with the military chain of command, would undermine the role, authority, and position of the commander, and would impair the morale and readiness of the armed forces.

As Brooks and Wohlforth in ‘11 note, American Hegemony is key to global stability. They write “the United States’ overseas presence gives it the leverage to restrain partners from taking provocative action. Perhaps more important, its core alliance commitments also deter states with aspirations to regional hegemony from contemplating expansion and make its partners more secure, reducing their incentive to adopt solutions to their security problems that threaten others and thus stoke security dilemmas. The contention that engaged U.S. power dampens the baleful effects of anarchy is consistent with inºuential variants of realist theory. Indeed, arguably the scariest portrayal of the war-prone world that would emerge absent the “American Pacifier” is provided in the works of John Mearsheimer, who forecasts dangerous multipolar regions replete with security competition, arms races, nuclear proliferation and associated preventive war temptations, regional rivalries, and even runs at regional hegemony and full-scale great power war. Thus, Negate.

<https://scholar.princeton.edu/sites/default/files/gji3/files/dont_come_home_america.pdf>