

Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

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 3 reasons

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

A. 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 successfully 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.

B. 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**.

2. Structural violence preconditions high magnitude crises. Resolving impacts of the 1AC is a prior question to any other impacts

Charlesworth 02: (Hilary Charlesworth, Australian National University. Director, Centre for International Governance and Justice, Professor & ARC Laureate Fellow. "International Law: A Discipline of Crisis" Modern Law Review 65:3. Pages: 391-392. 2002)

A concern with crises skews the discipline of international law. Through regarding **'crises'** as its bread and butter and the engine of progressive development of international law, international law **becomes** simply **a** source of **justification for the status quo**. The framework of crisis condemns international lawyers, as David Kennedy puts it, to 'a sort of disciplinary hamster wheel'.⁷⁶ **One way forward is to refocus** international law **on issues of structural justice that underpin everyday life**. What might an international law of every day life look like? At the same time that the much-analysed events in Kosovo were taking place, 1.2 billion people lived on less than a dollar a day.⁷⁷ We know that 2.4 billion people in the developing world do not have access to basic sanitation, and that half of this number are chronically malnourished; we know that the developed world holds one quarter of the world's population, but holds 4/5 of the world's income; we know that military spending worldwide is over \$1 billion a day and that alternative uses of tiny fractions could generate real change in education, health care and nutrition; we know that almost 34 million people worldwide live with HIV/AIDS;⁷⁸ we know that violence against women is at epidemic levels the world over. Why are these phenomena not widely studied by international lawyers? Why are they at the margins of the international law world? An international law of everyday life would require **a methodology to consider the perspectives of non-elite groups**. For example, we should be able to study 'humanitarian intervention' from the perspective of the people on whose behalf the intervention took place. International lawyers' accounts of humanitarian intervention prompted by Kosovo do not take the views of the objects of intervention into account. If they did so, we would be likely to end up with a much more contradictory, complex and confusing account of humanitarian intervention than international lawyers have thus far produced. We should also enlarge our inquiries. For example, with respect to the idea of collective security, how can we think about the global security more broadly? Johan Galtung **has developed the notion of structural violence that highlights** causes other than warfare, for example poverty, as the major cause of death and suffering.⁷⁹ Other scholars have identified **the interconnections of poverty**, environmental degradation, discrimination, exploitation, militarisation **and violence as the causes of insecurity**.⁸⁰ Feminist scholars have drawn attention to the threats posed, to women not by foreign states, but by more local actors, including the men in their families. On this analysis security would mean the absence of violence and economic and social justice. If the idea of security is understood more broadly, the futility of the standard form of international collective action becomes clear. Military intervention is an inappropriate mechanism if the causes of insecurity are poverty, discrimination and

violence protected by structures within the state. What if we were to change the type of questions we ask? For example, David Kennedy has pointed out that the work of international lawyers typically focuses on humanitarian objectives (such as environmental protection or protection of human rights). We could begin from the opposite end and examine what international law has to offer to the person who wants to pollute the environment or violate human rights. I imagine this as an international lawyer's version of C.S. Lewis' *Screwtape Letters* in which cheery letters from the Devil mock the ease of corrupting humans. Such a technique would destabilise the idea that international lawyers have a stable and common set of values.⁸¹ Kennedy proposes 'extraventricular projects', slowing the emergence of a disciplinary middle (or third) way and encouraging dissent and disagreement.⁸² For example, how often have 'reforms' in international law obscured deep injustices? How are spatial and conceptual boundaries we take for granted made real by the law? Finally, we should consider our own personal and professional investment in crises. We need to analyse the way we exercise power, and who wins and who loses in this operation. In asking this question, we will undermine that pleasurable sense of internationalist virtue that comes with being an international lawyer, but perhaps in the end contribute something to countering the injustices of everyday life.

3. We get better education by talking about the high probability impacts rather than low potential, high magnitude impacts. Prefer this argument because it is specific to the debate space.

Johnson 15:

(Paul Elliott Johnson, Ph.D. "Opportunity, not crisis: A Response to Dr. Greenstein" *Rostrum*, Winter 2015.)

On the matter of discomfort, safe spaces, and discussions of broader lines of discrimination in society, Dr. Greenstein has certainly raised valuable points. We should be mindful that there is no such thing as a perfectly comfortable space. Instead, we are differentially aware of the **discomfort** that **pervades our daily lives**. This is especially true in high school, which at best is still a socially difficult space. It follows that I am especially sensitive to the idea that students might raise charges of racism or sexism, but it is always important to remember that **power structures** like racism **have individual and institutional components**. Pointing out that some practices contribute to racial stratification is different than accusing someone of being a racist. Competitors would do well to remember this point. Incidentally, these observations and others are discussed at-length by a number of well-regarded scholars in education and pedagogy. I would argue the bulk of peer-reviewed scholarship on pedagogy and education, especially in the context of race, concludes that posing the question in terms of facilitating comfortable spaces makes more difficult the vital work of raising questions regarding broad, societal inequality. We must understand that the world— especially the one that Dr. Greenstein envisions as the "real" one, riven as it is with competition that is nasty, brutish, and short—imposes itself in an especially harsh manner upon those who do not presumptively fit into its confines. **In a debate** round, one may argue the impertinence of theses about structural racism with regards to a particular case: "no link" arguments continue to be persuasive. But when we explicitly or implicitly suggest such theses have little to no value by deciding in advance that they are inaccurate, **we are forswearing the** hard, argumentative **work of subjecting our** own **beliefs to** rigorous testing and **interrogation**. Many debate competitors—and coaches—do not live and work in diverse environments. Coding certain debate arguments as inappropriate simply because they acknowledge the complexities and difficulties of the world contributes to a confirmation bias where the discomfort of the judge or coach upon hearing the argument indicts the argument's soundness, where it might very well suggest the opposite. **Today we are seeing** debaters raising incredibly **urgent questions about how debate's prioritization of** a certain set of **hyperbolic impact claims might occur at the expense of everyday impacts related to discrimination and exclusion**.

Hearing these arguments out is not tantamount to uncritically accepting ideological proclamations. Frankly, considering such claims

On to the Contention Level

Contention 1: Queer Violence in the workplace

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 <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.

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

<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.⁸¹ 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.⁸² 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.⁸³ Healthy People 2010 identified the gay and lesbian population, among groups targeted to reduce health disparities in the United States.⁸⁴ 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."⁸⁵ Research about mental and physical health outcomes of LGBT people support the minority stress model.⁸⁶ 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.**⁸⁷ **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.**⁸⁸ 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.⁹⁰ **High levels of perceived discrimination or fear of discrimination among LGBT people have been**

linked to higher prevalence of psychiatric disorders, psychological distress,⁹¹ depression, ⁹² loneliness, and low self-esteem.⁹³ And experiences of anti-gay verbal harassment, discrimination, and violence have been associated with lower self-esteem, higher rates of suicidal intention,⁹⁴ anxiety, anger, post-traumatic stress, other symptoms of depression,⁹⁵ psychological distress,⁹⁶ mental disorder, and deliberate self-harm.⁹⁷

Contention 2: Strikes and Queer Rights

A: Strikes fight against oppression

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. <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: Queer rights and labor rights found through workers striking are intrinsically linked

King 2017 Elizabeth King "HOW THE LABOR MOVEMENT AND THE GAY RIGHTS MOVEMENT WORK TOGETHER" <https://psmag.com/economics/gay-rights-are-labor-rights> Wrench

Recent years have seen major triumphs for gay rights, while the labor movement has suffered some big setbacks on state and national levels. In fact, both movements have often defended—and depended upon—the same people. Many gay people are poor and working class, and members of the LGBTQ community have long relied on rights secured by their unions to protect them in the absence of legislative rights. The LGBTQ community has always been part of the broader labor

movement, and advances in LGBTQ rights have often been explicitly related to workplace equality. Still, the significant overlap between gay and transgender rights and the concerns of the working class

has not always led to mutual cooperation—and there's plenty of room for activists at the intersection to work together more closely.

Miriam Frank, a recently retired professor of cultural history at New York University and author of the book Out in the Union: A Labor History of Queer America, tells Pacific Standard that LGBTQ people have always been a part of the labor

community, and that the two movements have provided mutual support. Though evidence of trans and gay people pushing for inclusion and protections at work dates back to the very beginning of the labor movement, Frank says the close relationship began in earnest in the 1970s and '80s. At this point, Frank says, LGBTQ people started coming out at work and in their unions in greater numbers. From that point onward, LGBTQ rights became integral to many unions, not just in the United States but

also globally. In 1984 and '85, when British coal miners went on strike, gay people formed an alliance of solidarity, Lesbians and Gays Support Miners, and raised £11,000 (the equivalent of about \$44,173 today) in support of the strikers. Gay people also joined black, Latino, and feminist communities for a 10-year-long American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations strike at Coors, a company which the New York Times described at the time as "ferociously anti-union." The strike began in 1977 and had a major effect on the company: The Times reported that Coors' annual profits dropped by \$23 million (from \$67.7 million to \$44.7 million) between 1977 and 1984 alone. The company simply couldn't function as it needed to without minority employees, and the strike ended after Coors agreed to a number of concessions, including a vote on union leadership at the flagship brewery. Of course, the labor movement is a big tent, and its constituents have not always been supportive of trans and queer labor concerns. In 1972, George Meany, the president of the AFL-CIO and a key figure in the labor rights movement, ridiculed efforts to secure a gay rights plank in the Democratic party platform. Just last year, a gay police officer in Honolulu, Hawaii, spoke out against his union president for saying, in 2013, that "you'd have to kill me" before he would agree to enforce gay marriage laws. These divisions notwithstanding, **the labor movement and the fight for gay rights have proven to be mutually beneficial. After all, many of the rights that queer people were long denied are centered on their ability to work without discrimination, and receive full benefits for their families. This set of overlapping issues can be found in two major recent policies. Consider first the 2016 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ruling that set the precedent for non-discrimination against gay employees. This ruling was imperative for ensuring workplace legal protections for gay people, a win for labor and gay rights. Legalizing gay marriage on the federal level, arguably one of the most significant civil rights rulings in recent years, also gained support from several major labor unions.** In 2012, Joe Hansen, then the president of the United Food & Commercial Workers International Union, said in a statement that "Marriage equality is an economic justice issue, and a social justice issue—and that makes it a union issue." Several other unions, including the AFL-CIO and Service Employees International Union, released similar statements. And the Supreme Court's 2015 decision to legalize gay marriage was of major import to queer members of the working class. With legal gay marriage came not only the opportunity for gay people to marry, but also the ability to buy employer-provided health insurance for their spouses. Though the legalization of gay marriage allows same-sex couples access to more workplace benefits, the working class was largely absent from the mainstream narrative on marriage equality. The Human Rights Campaign, which was instrumental in advancing marriage equality, has been criticized for neglecting the concerns of working-class queer people. After the HRC awarded Goldman Sachs with its Corporate Equality Award in 2012, an op-ed in the Harvard Crimson criticized the choice, noting that the firm had contributed to conservatives including Mitt Romney, who opposed gay marriage and adoption. The fight for gay rights, alas, has not always meant a strict allegiance to working-class queer people. Further, none of these landmark protections necessarily extend to trans people, many of whom are union members, and are three times more likely than cis people to be unemployed and four times more likely to live in poverty, according to Pride at Work, a non-profit that represents LGBTQ union members.