

## **TRIGGER WARNING: NONGRAPHIC DEPICTIONS OF QUEER VIOLENCE AND BRIEF MENTIONS OF MENTAL ILLNESS AND SUICIDE**

### **I affirm**

#### **First I offer the following definitions to clarify the round**

Strike is defined as a “work stoppage by a body of workers to enforce compliance with demands made on an employer” by Merriam Webster

Just is defined as guided by truth, reason, justice, and fairness by Dictionary.com

### **The single standard is Reducing Structural Violence**

#### **Prefer for 2 reasons**

#### **1. The only way to do something Just like the resolution implies is through Reducing Structural Violence.**

#### **Violence inherently is oppressive and dehumanizing thus unjust**

**Suttner 17** [Raymond Suttner, Suttner holds a BA from the University of Cape Town and PhD from the University of the Witwatersrand. Suttner is published in over 85 journals. “Non-violence is essential to respect human dignity”, Polity, 2017, <https://www.polity.org.za/article/non-violence-is-essential-to-respect-human-dignity-2017-11-13>]

This set in motion a trend whereby problems in South Africa have come to be addressed or underpinned traditionally through the use of force, rather than reasoning. He (and seldom she) who has the power has been able to “resolve” a problem or make decisions that bind others through deploying force. Under apartheid, force determined the location of black people in inferior, arid and restricted areas and in the case of whites extensive and fertile areas of the country. Force underpinned the allocation of rights, found in most western democracies, to the whites of the country and denial of rights or rightlessness, found in most colonies, to black people. The containment of black people within the allocated areas and bearing the condition of rightlessness depended on periodic “exemplary” force, force that signified who was “entitled” to power and who had no such entitlement. What does violence

towards another human being signify? **When an act of violence is perpetrated against another the human quality of that person is extinguished. The person is reified, becomes a thing.** At a macro level

when an army fires on the “enemy”, no matter how just its cause may be it immediately extinguishes the human qualities of those on the other side. **They are no**

**longer of significance as human beings with various personal traits. Their**

**significance resides in the numbers they represent** and the power they constitute through the weaponry they command.

Both the weaponry and the human components of “the enemy” need to be extinguished or neutralized for warfare to be successful waged. This is as true of wars of aggression as it is of what are called just wars, in our case the war of liberation. The new democratic order inaugurated in 1994 was intended to honour human dignity and respect the qualities of all human beings. Such a pledge found in various formulations in both the Freedom Charter and the Constitution is incompatible with resort to violence, except on an exceptional and limited basis in relation to definite threats. Post-apartheid South Africa has never unqualifiedly endorsed non-violence, despite the provisions of the constitution entrenching peace. The prevalence of militaristic struggle songs has helped the culture of violence to persist, as demonstrated by Zuma’s use of the song “umshini wam”, meaning bring me my machine gun, in his rape trial and subsequently, the threat of Julius Malema, Zwelinzima Vavi and others to “kill for Zuma” prior to the ANC’s Polokwane conference. This was a marked contrast to Nelson Mandela’s saying he was, if necessary, prepared to die –not for any human being, but for the freedom of the people of South Africa and the values then embodied in the ANC. Mandela understood that the use of force had to be carefully justified, as he carefully explained in his statement from the dock in the Rivonia Trial. We need to discuss and agree how we treat the principle of non-violence. My view is that it is, like peace, a principle with universal application. That does not mean that there are no circumstances when the use of force or warfare is justifiable. There are exceptions, as with the use of force in self-defence or a just war against colonial occupation. But these departures from the non-use of force, are

exceptions. They do not become norms, but remain deviations, more or less justifiable from what exists as a universal principle of peace and non-violence. **Non-violence is intrinsically linked to respect for all human beings.** This is one of the fundamental distinctions between apartheid and

the democratic order that was intended to be inaugurated. **Violence, by its nature, even if for a noble cause is**

**disrespectful of the quality of human personhood in its effects.** If that is the case there can be no toleration of the Minister of Police exhorting police to use force that goes beyond what is necessary in order to contain a danger that they may face. There can be no celebration of toughness and machoism, because these are the routes taken in celebrating violence itself.

#### **2. Prefer slow violence impacts, they are exponential and multiply every other threat meaning they are a priority**

**Nixon 11** (Rob Nixon, Professor of English at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, “Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor” 2011. Pages 2-3)

Three primary concerns animate this book, chief among them my conviction that we urgently need to rethink-politically, imaginatively, and theoretically-what I call "slow violence." By **slow violence** I mean a violence that **occurs gradually and out of sight**, a violence of delayed destruction that is **dispersed across time and space**, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all. **Violence is customarily conceived as** an event or action that is **immediate** in time, explosive and spectacular in space, and as erupting into instant sensational visibility. **We need**, I believe, **to engage** a different kind of violence, a violence that is neither spectacular nor instantaneous, but rather **incremental** and accretive, its calamitous repercussions playing out across a range of **temporal scales**. In so doing, we also need to engage the representational, narrative, and strategic challenges **posed by** the relative invisibility of **slow violence**. Climate change, the thawing cryosphere, toxic drift, biomagnification, deforestation, the radioactive aftermaths of wars, acidifying oceans, and a host of other slowly unfolding environmental catastrophes present formidable representational obstacles that can hinder our efforts to mobilize and act decisively. The long dyings—the staggered and staggeringly discounted casualties, both human and ecological that result from war's toxic aftermaths or climate change—are underrepresented in strategic planning as well as in human memory. Had Summers advocated invading Africa with weapons of mass destruction, his proposal would have fallen under conventional definitions of violence and been perceived as a military or even an imperial invasion. Advocating invading countries with mass forms of slow-motion toxicity, however, requires rethinking our accepted assumptions of violence to include slow violence. Such a rethinking requires that we complicate conventional assumptions about violence as a highly visible act that is newsworthy because it is event focused, time bound, and body bound. We need to account for how the temporal dispersion of slow violence affects the way we perceive and respond to a variety of social afflictions—from domestic abuse to posttraumatic stress and, in particular, environmental calamities. A major challenge is representational: how to devise arresting stories, images, and symbols adequate to the pervasive but elusive violence of delayed effects. Crucially, **slow violence is often** not just attritional but also **exponential, operating as a major threat multiplier**; it can fuel long-term, proliferating conflicts in situations where the **conditions** for sustaining life **become increasingly** but gradually **degraded**.

## On to the Contention Level

### Contention 1: Anti-Queer violence and striking

#### A: Anti-Queer Violence in the workplace

#### Anti-Queer violence is found all over the world in the workplace

Reina **Gattsuo 2021** June 1 2021 Although society has made many strides in queer acceptance and visibility, coming out at work is still a monumental – and sometimes risky – task for many LGBTQ workers November 9, 2021 <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20210526-the-risks-of-coming-out-at-work> Wrench

In popular imagination, coming out is one grand gesture: a queer person stepping out of the proverbial closet, into a celebratory spotlight of visibility. In reality, many queer people and researchers agree that coming out is more of a long-term negotiation between how we understand our identity and how we present those identities to other people. Nearly 6% of US adults now identify as LGBTQ, more than ever recorded. Yet persistent discrimination, and the fluidity of many people's experiences of gender and sexuality, often make coming out a continuous process of navigating in what spaces, and to what degree, we can be open about our identities. The workplace is one of the most delicate and high-stakes places queer people negotiate this relationship. Although regions and countries including the European Union, and – as of 2020 – the US prohibit employment discrimination based on gender and sexual identity, **anti-LGBTQ employment bias remains rampant across the world.** As of 2019, 21% of all LGBTQ Europeans reported experiencing workplace discrimination; among transgender people specifically, that rate jumped to 36%. **In the US, 36% of all LGBTQ people reported workplace discrimination, and 46% reported being closeted at work.** In China, meanwhile, only 5% of LGBTQ employees reported being completely open about their identities at work. **Reasons vary for why people stay silent about their sexual and gender identities, but workplace stigma and potential repercussions are among them.** Sexist, racist and anti-LGBTQ microaggressions were a constant presence in Benton's previous jobs. "I was struggling to find a place in this white, male industry, where women and people of colour are shut out. There was no way I would have come out working in that former life." Most LGBTQ people navigate a similarly delicate path around disclosure. For those who can "pass" as heterosexual or cisgender, coming out can often mean choosing between paying a psychological price for the relative safety of invisibility, and paying a potential social and economic price for being open about one's

identity. **For others, especially those who are gender nonconforming, being closeted at work isn't an option. This can have significant detrimental effects: people who are perceived as falling outside of conventional gender norms are at higher risk of career-disrupting workplace harassment and discrimination.** At the same time, coming out at work can have huge benefits. LGBTQ people who are more open about their identities experience have increased physical and emotional wellbeing. And, for trans people, gender affirmation can be lifesaving. In the workplace, research has found that increased authenticity around sexual orientation reduces psychological stress. Yet these benefits hinge on having a supportive professional environment, as being perceived as queer can also increase workers' risk of experiencing bias. "All of those elements come together for an intersection of risk," says Josh Miller, co-founder of Empathy Paradigm, a Dallas, Texas-based LGBTQ mental-health consultancy that offers coming out and allyship coaching. "There are so many good consequences to coming out, but are you prepared for the bad ones?" Despite the massive strides in global LGBTQ visibility throughout the past few decades, there is still relatively little research on sexual-orientation and gender-identity discrimination at work. What we do know, however, indicates that queer workers pay a heavy price for defying gender and sexual norms. Discrimination begins at the job application itself. In the US, employers are more likely to view resumes from visibly gay or lesbian applicants unfavourably. **In the European Union, 11% of LGBTQ job applicants reported experiencing discrimination in their job search.** Those candidates who are hired then must contend with workplace harassment, isolation and colleagues' ignorance, all of which heighten rates of anxiety and depression. Systemic discrimination can lead to "brain drains" of LGBTQ people from particular fields; researchers estimate that current STEM industries have lost up to 120,000 viable candidates due to the cumulative effects of anti-LGBTQ bias. That was the experience of Harris Eddie Hill, a UK-based pansexual, demisexual and non-binary podcaster and public speaking coach. At one of Hill's former workplaces, they felt there "was not room for anybody different – it was very much a boys' club". Hill's colleagues didn't use their correct pronouns, and the company didn't have an LGBTQ equality policy, under which Hill could appeal for support.

## **Anti-Queer violence in the workplace increase damages to queer folks mental and physical health**

**Sears and Mallory 2011** Brad Sears and Christy Mallory July 2011 Documented Evidence of Employment Discrimination & Its Effects on LGBT People November 9, 2021

<https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/Effects-LGBT-Employ-Discrim-Jul-2011.pdf> Wrench

Research shows that experiencing discrimination can affect an individual's mental and physical health.<sup>81</sup> The minority stress model suggests that prejudice, stigma, and discrimination create a social environment characterized by excess exposure to stress, which, in turn, results in health disparities for sexual minorities compared with heterosexuals.<sup>82</sup> In considering experiences both in and outside of the workplace, studies of LGB populations show that LGB people suffer psychological and physical harm from the prejudice, stigma, and discrimination that they experience. Research demonstrating the ill effects of a homophobic social environment has been recognized by public health authorities including the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in Healthy People 2010 and Healthy People 2020, which set goals and objectives designed to improve the health of people in the United States, through health promotion and disease prevention.<sup>83</sup> Healthy People 2010 identified the gay and lesbian population, among groups targeted to reduce health disparities in the United States.<sup>84</sup> In explaining the reason for the inclusion of the gay and lesbian population as one of the groups requiring special public health attention, the Department of Health and Human Services noted, "The issues surrounding personal, family, and social acceptance of sexual orientation can place a significant burden on mental health and personal safety." This conclusion was reiterated by the Institute of Medicine of the National Academies, an independent body of scientists that advises the federal government on health and health policy matters, in its recent report on The Health of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender People, where it said **"LGBT people ...**

**face a profound and poorly understood set of . . . health risks due largely to social stigma."**<sup>85</sup> Research about mental and physical health outcomes of LGBT people support the minority stress model.<sup>86</sup> For example, a 2009 survey conducted by the Massachusetts Department of Public Health of state residents found that 83% of heterosexual respondents indicated they were in excellent or very good health compared to 78% of gay men or lesbians, 74% of bisexual respondents, and 67% of transgender respondents.<sup>87</sup> **A number of studies have demonstrated links between minority stress factors and physical health outcomes, such as immune function, AIDS progression, and perceived physical well-being.**<sup>88</sup> For example, studies examined the impact of concealing one's sexual orientation as a stressor. Thus, HIV-positive but healthy gay men were followed up for 9 years to assess factors that contribute to progression of HIV (e.g., moving from asymptomatic HIV infection to a diagnosis with an AIDS defining disease, such as pneumonia). The researchers showed that HIV progressed more rapidly

among men who concealed their gay identity than those who disclosed it. This was true even after the investigators controlled for the effects of other potentially confounding factors, like health practices, sexual behaviors, and medication use. 89 More recent studies, conducted in the context of availability of more effective HIV medications than were available to the men in the 1996 study, found, similarly, that concealment of gay identity was associated with lower CD4 count, a measure of HIV progression.<sup>90</sup> **High levels of perceived discrimination or fear of discrimination among LGBT people have been linked to higher prevalence of psychiatric disorders, psychological distress,<sup>91</sup> depression, <sup>92</sup> loneliness, and low self-esteem.<sup>93</sup> And experiences of anti-gay verbal harassment, discrimination, and violence have been associated with lower self-esteem, higher rates of suicidal intention,<sup>94</sup> anxiety, anger, post-traumatic stress, other symptoms of depression,<sup>95</sup> psychological distress,<sup>96</sup> mental disorder, and deliberate self-harm.<sup>97</sup>**

## **B: Some workers cannot strike now meaning they cannot fight against the oppression they face in the workplace**

**Campbell 19** Campbell, Alexia. “5 Questions About Labor Strikes That You Were Too Embarrassed To Ask.” Vox. September 20, 2019. Web. October 13, 2021. <<https://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2019/9/20/20873867/worker-strike-walkout-stoppage-firing-job>>.

1) Am I allowed to strike? If you work in the private sector, definitely. It doesn't matter if you are part of a labor union or not. For government workers, though, it depends. **The National Labor Relations Act of 1935 enshrined the right to strike into law.** At the time, workers were reeling from the Great Depression and President Franklin D. Roosevelt's pro-labor administration saw collective bargaining as a fundamental right. **But the law only covered workers in the private sector, as they were more at risk of being exploited.** The NLRA reversed years of federal opposition to organized labor and guaranteed the right of employees to organize, form unions, and bargain collectively with their employers. **Striking was considered the most powerful tool in collective bargaining, so it was given special emphasis in the NLRA. “The law protects the right to strike, no question.”** Ruben Garcia, co-director of the Workplace Law Program at the University of Nevada Las Vegas, said to me, regarding employees in the private sector. “You don't have to give any notice or any reason for walking.” **But this doesn't apply to all workers. The NLRA doesn't cover certain transportation workers, agricultural laborers, or public employees. Government employees — state, local, and federal — do not have a right to strike under the federal law. That said, eight states allow most government employees to strike. Illinois and California, for example, allow teachers to strike. Yet it's illegal for police and firefighters to walk off the job in any state.**

## **Prohibiting public sector workers from striking violates their human rights, and public sector workers uniquely can fight for benefits to the entire community**

**Act of Mass No Date** Act On Mass. “End The Prohibition On Strikes For Public Sector Workers.” Act on Mass (No Date). Web. October 13, 2021. <<https://actonmass.org/right2strike>>.

That Massachusetts continues prohibiting public sector strikes is a shameful mark on the Commonwealth. **The right to strike is fundamental. It is only when workers can withhold their labor without the threat of losing their job that they have power in the workplace to win fair wages, fair benefits, and safe working conditions.** Further, **when public sector workers hold the right to strike, the benefits accrue to many more than just public sector workers. Few people are better positioned than public sector workers to fight for what is best for our communities and to hold those in power**

**accountable.** The right to strike is a basic human right that has become customary in international law and has been repeatedly affirmed by the International Labor Organization (ILO) and numerous human rights organizations. The right to strike is a right enjoyed by public employees in a number of other states in the U.S., as well as many other countries around the world. It is time to end this archaic prohibition.

## **C: When queer people have no way to fight back they quit their jobs**

### **See trans people in the UK**

**Rodionova 2016** [Zlata Rodionova 14 April 2016 More than one third of trans employees have 'quit their job due to work discrimination' [link](#)]Wrench

More than one third of transgender employees have left their job because of discrimination at the office, a new report has found. **Some 36 per cent of transgender workers have quit their job and as much as 60 per cent have experienced some form of transphobic discrimination in the workplace according to a research** by Totaljobs, a UK jobs website, **which surveyed 450 transgender employees in March 2016. Nearly 40 per cent of trans workers said discrimination was most likely to come from colleagues, while only 25 per cent said it came from management.** This has led to more than one third of trans people leaving a job because the environment was unwelcoming.

## **D: Queer people already face a high rate of poverty, quitting only worsens harms.**

### **Queer people face poverty at a higher rate than cisgender heterosexual counterparts**

**Badgett et al. 2019** [M. V. Lee Badgett Soon Kyu Choi Bianca D.M. Wilson October 2019 "LGBT POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES A study of differences between sexual orientation and gender identity groups" UCLA School of Law Williams Institute <https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/National-LGBT-Poverty-Oct-2019.pdf>]Wrench

**Poverty rates differ by SOGI. We examined poverty rates separately for cisgender straight men and women, cisgender gay men and lesbian women, cisgender bisexual men and women, and transgender people. { LGBT people collectively have a poverty rate of 21.6%, which is much higher than the rate for cisgender straight people of 15.7%. { Among LGBT people, transgender people have especially high rates of poverty—29.4%. { Lesbian (17.9%) and straight (17.8%) cisgender women have higher poverty rates than gay (12.1%) and straight (13.4%) cisgender men. But cisgender lesbian women do not have significantly different poverty rates than cisgender straight women. { Bisexual cisgender women (29.4%) and men (19.5%) had higher poverty rates than cisgender straight women and men, respectively.**

## **Contention 2: Strikes helps oppression**

### **A: The right to strike is a protection against oppressive systems**

**Lim 19** Woojin Lim (Editor for the Harvard Crimson). "The Right to Strike." The Harvard Crimson. 11 December 2019. JDN. October 28, 2021 <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 defend their unprotected economic and social interests from employers’ unilateral decisions, and provide employers with pressure and incentives to make reasonable concessions. 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.

## **B: Even when strikes have supposedly failed they can be used as signaling devices to provide exposure of an issue to the public eye.**

**Peetz 16** David Peetz (Professor of Employment Relations, Griffith Business School). “Industrial action, the right to strike, ballots and the Fair Work Act in international context.” Australian Journal of Labour Law. 2016. JDN. October 28, 2021 <https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au/bitstream/handle/10072/380625/PeetzPUB6698.pdf?sequence=1>

More interesting than industry breakdowns are the types of strikes — their causes (in particular, whether or not they are related to enterprise bargaining, which is the only way in which a strike may be protected) and the way in which they ended (whether they were contingent or unconditional). Table 6 shows the way in which disputes were resolved. We see that from the 1960s, strikes in which work was ‘resumed without negotiation’ (unconditional strikes) clearly outnumbered strikes in which arbitration was the main method by which strikes ended. They became the majority type of strike under the decentralised accord, and have maintained that primacy since that time. Although the move to enterprise bargaining, initially under the accord, was aimed at decreasing the role of tribunals and increasing the role of negotiation in settling disputes, it only appeared to achieve the former objective, at least in terms of the strikes themselves. Rather than settling strikes through negotiation, unions have used strikes as a signalling device in enterprise bargaining and show no signs of moving away from that model. Hence unconditional strikes are more common than contingent strikes. The use of negotiation to end strikes continues to be low, despite the idea that enterprise bargaining would lead to a greater focus on negotiation.