

I negate

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

Unconditional is defined as “not subject to any conditions” by Oxford Dictionary

My single standard is Utilitarianism

Prefer Utilitarianism for two reason

First, all consequentialist moral theories devolve to life utilitarianism because they all seek to maximize the best consequences, which cannot occur without life.

Second, governments must use utilitarianism to make their decisions because they are collective rather than individual agents. Prefer my standard -- it is specific to the agent of the resolution.

Goodin 90:Robert E. Goodin, 1995 Goodin is a Professor of Philosophy at the Research School of the Social Sciences at the Australian National University. Cambridge University Press, “Utilitarianism As a Public Philosophy” 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, at 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 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. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that.

End quote. The resolution calls for policy action so util is the only framework in which we can achieve that. The government is only obligated to do what’s best for its people

On to the Contention Level

Contention 1: Unconditionality harms innocents

A: Essential Workers

An unconditional right for essential workers such as doctors to strike would put innocent lives at risk

Graham 63 James Graham (A.B., Fordham University; LL.B., St. John's University). "A Reconsideration of the Right to Strike." The Catholic Lawyer, Volume 9, Number 2, Spring 1963. JDN.
<https://scholarship.law.stjohns.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1434&context=tcl>

In September 1962, a strike by the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists (AFTRA) blacked out New York City's first educational television station on its opening night. Whatever the merits of the dispute, AFTRA's conduct in this case constituted at best a brutal and unnecessary demonstration of economic strength which certainly made no friends for organized labor. It is only fair to add, however, that a double standard seems to prevail on the question of strikes. **Last summer,**

we witnessed instances of direct action by the medical profession which, in the opinion of this writer, were more outrageous than anything ever contemplated by organized labor. Some doctors in New Jersey threatened to strike against the medicare plan of the Kennedy administration; most of the doctors in the Saskatchewan Province of Canada did in fact strike, obviously for other reasons. Yet criticism of either group in responsible publications, when compared with the usual reactions to a strike of milk deliverers, for example, was surprisingly mild.

Even adverse criticism of the conduct of the Canadian doctors was often tempered with the curious assurance to readers that "emergency" care was being provided during the strike. Statistics may never be made available but the fallacy here becomes evident when we consider the not-so-remote possibility that a citizen or citizens of Saskatchewan might have died from cancer discovered two weeks too late because at the time of the first complaint, the patient's doctor was exercising his common-law right to strike. Though not an "emergency" case ab initio, the hypothetical patient died all the same.

B: Violent Strikes

If unrestricted, strikes can lead to violence against innocent people

Tenza 20 Mlungisi Tenza (Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal). "The effects of violent strikes on the economy of a developing country: a case of South Africa." Obiter vol.41n.3 Port Elizabeth 2020. JDN.
http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004

Even though the right to strike and the right to participate in the activities of a trade union that often flow from a strike 17 are guaranteed in the Constitution and specifically regulated by the LRA, it sometimes happens that the right to strike is exercised for purposes not intended by the Constitution and the LRA, generally.18 For example, it was not the intention of the Constitutional Assembly and the legislature that violence should be used during strikes or pickets. As the Constitution provides,

pickets are meant to be peaceful.¹⁹ **Contrary to section 17 of the Constitution, the conduct of workers participating in a strike or picket has changed in recent years with workers trying to emphasise their grievances by causing disharmony and chaos in public.** A media report by the South African Institute of Race Relations pointed out that **between the years 1999 and 2012 there were 181 strike-related deaths, 313 injuries and 3,058 people were arrested for public violence associated with strikes.**²⁰ The question is whether employers succumb easily to workers' demands if a strike is accompanied by violence? In response to this question, one worker remarked as follows: "[T]here is no sweet strike, there is no Christian strike ... A strike is a strike. [Y]ou want to get back what belongs to you ... you won't win a strike with a Bible. You do not wear high heels and carry an umbrella and say '1992 was under apartheid, 2007 is under ANC'. You won't win a strike like that."²¹ **The use of violence during industrial action affects not only the strikers or picketers, the employer and his or her business but it also affects innocent members of the public, non-striking employees, the environment and the economy at large. In addition, striking workers visit non-striking workers' homes, often at night, threaten them and in some cases, assault or even murder workers who are acting as replacement labour.**²² This points to the fact that for many workers and

their families' living conditions remain unsafe and vulnerable to damage due to violence. In Security Services Employers Organisation v SA Transport & Allied Workers Union (SATAWU),²³ it was reported that about 20 people were thrown out of moving trains in the Gauteng province; most of them were security guards who were not on strike and who were believed to be targeted by their striking colleagues. Two of them died, while others were admitted to hospitals with serious injuries.²⁴ In SA Chemical Catering & Allied Workers Union v Check One (Pty) Ltd,²⁵ striking employees were carrying various weapons ranging from sticks, pipes, planks and bottles. One of the strikers Mr Ngoko was alleged to have threatened to cut the throats of those employees who had been brought from other branches of the employer's business to help in the branch where employees were on strike. Such conduct was held not to be in line with good conduct of striking.²⁶

Contention 2: Economic

A: Strikes are harmful to the economy creating structural weakness, decreasing productivity, creating market vulnerability, and weakening capital.

Wisniewski et. al. 19:

(Tomasz Wisniewski, the Open University. Brendan Lambe, De Montfort University. Alexandra Dias, New York University. "The Influence of General Strikes against Government on Stock Market Behavior. 2019. Scottish Journal of Political Economy. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjpe.12224>) Zein Saleh

While some clarity may have emerged with respect to the outcomes encountered by workers and governments, the literature remains silent with regards to the ramifications faced by employers. It is this void in the body of knowledge that our paper intends to fill. **Even if the general strikes are not strictly directed against companies, their value may be adversely affected for several reasons. First, the unproductive periods impose costs in terms of lower levels of output and profits. Although general strikes are typically short in duration, the large number of employees involved has a bearing on the total number of days not worked** (Gall, 2013). **Second, such manifestations of popular dissent signal to the market the workforce's frustration with the government**

and its policies. In the case where policy-makers are responsive to the demands being made, a general strike may also signal the weakening position of capital providers and other sources of power within the productive process. Corporations may also be forced into a position of carrying the burden of government concessions and the costs of social pacts that are agreed in the aftermath of a general strike. **Third, in instances where the future response of the government is not known with certainty, additional investment risk is created. Such risk will raise the time-varying discount rates leading to lower stock valuations and increased market volatility. Fourth, conceding to workers' demands may lead to a deterioration in a government's financial position, which will exert upward pressure on bond yields and discount rates.** This, in turn, would further aggravate the falls in stock prices. Our findings in this study reflect the above mentioned considerations. Through investigating a large sample spanning an array of countries, we demonstrate a valuation impact that is both statistically and economically significant. Since the magnitude of the fall in stock prices coinciding with the occurrence of a general strike is substantial, investors should pay particular attention to this type of event. Furthermore, we record significant increases in stock index return volatility and Value-at-Risk¹ in the year of the event, which could be indicative of the policy uncertainty that arises alongside mass strike action. Such findings should be brought into consideration by those on both sides of the divide who are engaged in the collective bargaining process. Market vulnerability around times of mass strike action could be particularly distressing to shareholders who are not internationally diversified. The problem is of concern not only to frontline investors but extends to a wider swathe of the population invested in the market through pension funds. It is neither in the interest of trade unions nor governments to adversely affect the value of retirement portfolios. **For this reason, both parties should seek alternative resolutions that do not involve walkouts. This means that in order to avoid costly economic frictions, governments should be wary of situations which may inflame worker indignation.** Similarly, trade unions should consider the full welfare implications for their members before staging a mass protest.

B: Economic growth key to check every world crisis — disease, food shortages, pollution, poverty, military readiness

(Ferrara 14) Ferrara 14 ***edited for ableist language*** 2014, January 14th. Peter Ferrara:

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/peterferrara/2014/01/14/why-economic-growth-is-exponentially-more-important-than-income-inequality/#4b4f36b91483> SW

Such **economic growth has produced dramatic improvements in personal health** as well. Throughout most of human history, a typical lifespan was 25 to 30 years, as Moore and Simon report. But "from the mid-18th century to today, life spans in the advanced countries jumped from less than 30 years to about 75 years." Average life expectancy in the U.S. has grown by more than 50% since 1900. Infant mortality declined from 1 in 10 back then to 1 in 150 today. Children under 15 are at least 10 times less likely to die, as one in four did during the 19th century, with their death rate reduced by 95%. The maternal death rate from pregnancy and childbirth was also 100 times greater back then than today. Moore and Simon further recount, "Just three infectious diseases – tuberculosis, pneumonia, and diarrhea – accounted for almost half of all deaths in 1900." Today, **we have virtually eliminated or drastically reduced** these and other **scourges of infectious disease** that have killed or [injured] billions throughout human history, such as typhoid fever, cholera, typhus, plague, smallpox, diphtheria, polio, influenza, bronchitis, whooping cough, malaria, and others. Besides the advances in the development and application of modern health sciences, **this has resulted from the drastic reduction in filthy and unsanitary living conditions that economic growth has made possible** as well. More recently, great progress is being made against heart disease and cancer. Also greatly contributing to the well-being of working people, the middle class, and the poor in America has been the dramatically declining cost of food resulting from economic growth and soaring productivity in agriculture. As Moore and Simon report, "Americans devoted almost 50 percent of their incomes to putting food on the table in the early 1900s compared with 10 percent in the late 1900s." While most of human history has involved a struggle against starvation, today in America the battle is against obesity, even more so among the poor. Moore and Simon quote Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation, "The average consumption of protein, minerals, and vitamins is virtually the same for poor and middle income children, and in most cases is well above recommended norms for all children. Most poor children today are in fact overnourished." That cited data comes from the U.S. Census Bureau. As a result, poor children in America today "grow up to be about 1 inch taller and 10 pounds heavier than the GIs who stormed the beaches of Normandy in World War II." That has resulted from a U.S. agricultural sector that required 75% of all American workers in 1800, 40% in 1900, and just 2.5% today, to "grow more than enough food for the entire nation and then enough to make the United States the world's breadbasket." Indeed, today, "The United States feeds three times as many people with one-third as many total farmers on one-third less farmland than in 1900," in the process producing "almost 25 percent of the world's food." Moreover, it is **economic growth that has provided the resources enabling us to dramatically reduce pollution and improve the environment, without trashing our standard of living** Moore and Simon write that at the beginning of the last century, "Industrial cities typically were enveloped in clouds of black soot and smoke. At this stage of the industrial revolution, factories belched poisons into the air—and this was proudly regarded as a sign of prosperity and progress. Streets were smelly and garbage-filled before the era of modern sewage systems and plumbing." **Not any of these truly dramatic advances for the poor, working people and the middle class could have been achieved by redistribution from "the rich." Only economic growth could achieve these results.** Nor would it have been worth sacrificing any of these world shattering gains for greater economic "equality." And Barack Obama's leftist protestations to the contrary notwithstanding, economists have long recognized the conflict between economic equality and maximizing economic growth. Put most simply,

penalizing investors, successful entrepreneurs, and job creators with higher taxes, to reward the less productive with government handouts, to make everyone more equal, is a sure fire way to get less productivity, fewer jobs, lower wages, and reduced economic growth. The above history, and the future prospects below, are why to most benefit the poor, working people, and the middle class, our nation's overriding goal must be to maximize economic growth. Consider, if total real compensation, wages and benefits, grow at just 1% a year, after 20 years the real incomes of working people would be only 22% greater. After 40 years, a generation, real incomes would be 50% more. But with sustained real compensation growth of 2%, after just 20 years the real incomes and living standards of working people would be nearly 50% greater, and after 40 years they would

be 120% greater, more than doubled. At sustained 3% growth in wages and benefits, after 20 years the living standards of working people will have almost doubled, and after 40 years they will have more than tripled. The U.S. economy sustained a real rate of economic growth of 3.3% from 1945 to 1973, and achieved the same 3.3% sustained real growth from 1982 to 2007. (Note that this 3.3% growth rate for the entire economy includes population growth. Real wages and benefits discussed above is a per worker concept). It was only during the stagflation decade of 1973 to 1982, reflecting the same Keynesian economics that President Obama is pursuing today, that real growth fell to only half long term trends. If we could revive and sustain that same 3.3% real growth for 20 years, our total economic production (GDP) would double in that time. After 30 years, our economic output would grow by 2 and two-thirds. After 40 years, our prosperity bounty would grow by 3 and two-thirds. If we are truly following growth maximizing policies, we could conceivably do even better than we have in the past. At sustained real growth of 4% per year, our economic production would more than double after 20 years. After 30 years, GDP would more than triple. After 40 years, a generation, total U.S.

economic output would nearly quadruple. America would by then have leapfrogged another generation ahead of the rest of the world. **Achieving and sustaining such economic growth should be the central focus of national economic policy, for it would solve every problem that plagues and threatens us today.** Such booming economic growth would produce surging revenues that would make balancing the budget so much more feasible. Surging GDP would reduce the national debt as a percent of GDP relatively quickly, particularly with balanced budgets not adding any

further to the debt. **Sustained, rapid economic growth is also the ultimate solution to poverty,** as after a

couple of decades or so of such growth, the poor would climb to the same living standards as the middle class of today. **With sustained, robust, economic growth, maintaining the most powerful military in the world, and thereby ensuring our nation's security and national defense, will require a smaller and smaller percentage of GDP over time. That security itself will promote capital investment and economic growth in America. The booming economy will produce new technological marvels that will make our defenses all the more advanced. With the economy rapidly advancing, there will be more than enough funds for education. There will also be more than enough to clean up and maintain a healthy environment.**