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### Framing

#### The value is justice.

The resolution asks us what a just society would do. This means that according to the words of the resolution, the highest value is justice.

#### 

#### The value criterion is mitigating structural violence. The way society is structured, who it includes and excludes determines whether or not justice is possible. A pre-requisite to having a just society is the mitigation of structural violence.

#### The value criterion is mitigating structural violence.

#### Structural violence is based in moral exclusion, which is fundamentally flawed because exclusion is not based on dessert but rather on arbitrarily perceived differences — the only way to mitigate structural violence is through knowledge of how it works.

**Winter and Leighton 99** |Deborah DuNann Winter and Dana C. Leighton. Winter|[Psychologist that specializes in Social Psych, Counseling Psych, Historical and Contemporary Issues, Peace Psychology. Leighton: PhD graduate student in the Psychology Department at the University of Arkansas. Knowledgeable in the fields of social psychology, peace psychology, and justice and intergroup responses to transgressions of justice] “Peace, conflict, and violence: Peace psychology in the 21st century.” Pg 4-5 ghs//VA

Finally, to recognize the operation of **structural violence forces us to ask questions about how and why we tolerate it, questions which often have painful answers for the privileged elite** who unconsciously support it. A final question of this section is how and why we allow ourselves to be so oblivious to structural violence. Susan Opotow offers an intriguing set of answers, in her article Social Injustice. She argues that **our normal perceptual cognitive processes divide people into in-groups and out-groups. Those outside our group lie outside our scope of justice. Injustice** that would be instantaneously confronted if it occurred to someone we love or know **is barely noticed if it occurs to strangers or those who are invisible or irrelevant**. We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone, so **we draw conceptual lines between those who are in and out of our moral circle. Those who fall outside are morally excluded, and become either invisible,** or demeaned in some way so that we do not have to acknowledge the injustice they suffer. **Moral exclusion is** a human failing, but Opotow argues convincingly that it is **an outcome of everyday social cognition**. To reduce its nefarious effects, **we must be vigilant in noticing and listening to oppressed, invisible, outsiders.** Inclusionary thinking can be fostered by relationships, communication, and appreciation of diversity. Like Opotow, all the authors in this section point out that **structural violence is not inevitable if we become aware of its operation, and build systematic ways to mitigate its effects.** Learning about structural violence may be discouraging, overwhelming, or maddening, but these papers encourage us to step beyond guilt and anger, and begin to think about how to reduce structural violence. All the authors in this section note that the same structures (such as global communication and normal social cognition) which feed structural violence, can also be used to empower citizens to reduce it. In the long run, reducing structural violence by reclaiming neighborhoods, demanding social justice and living wages, providing prenatal care, alleviating sexism, and celebrating local cultures, will be our most surefooted path to building lasting peace.

#### Contention I Public Workers being given the right to strike can help mitigate structural violence.

#### Public workers aren’t allowed to strike now

**Murphy 21** (Matt, Senior political columnist at a variety of companies/”Public Employees Press Right-To-Strike Legislation”/July 14, 2021/Accessed 11-1-21/

<https://amp.wbur.org/news/2021/07/14/massachusetts-public-employee-strike-bill>)(SPHS, SO)

Two of the leading progressive Democrats in the House joined with union officials, teachers and other public employees on Tuesday to push for the repeal of a state law that bans public sector workers from going on strike. Rep. Mike Connolly and Rep. Erika Uyterhoeven testified to the Joint Committee on Labor about legislation they filed that would lift the ban on work stoppages for all public employees, including teachers, police and firefighters. Uyterhoeven, of Somerville, called the withholding of labor a "fundamental human right," and Connolly, of Cambridge, said strikes, or even the threat of going on strike, are an "indispensable part of the collective bargaining process." **Supporters of the bill (H 1946), which has five co-sponsors, said 11 or 12 other states have eliminated their bans on public employee work stoppages. While the law against public employee strikes was meant to guard against the disruption of critical services, Connolly said the COVID-19 pandemic has proven that many workers in the private sector with the right to strike also perform indispensable roles in communities. "It's not fair to turn to a public educator or a firefighter and say to that worker they shouldn't be afforded the same fundamental rights in the workplace as all workers," Connolly said. Dozens of labor leaders, teachers and other union workers turned up to testify remotely in support of the bill on Tuesday at a hearing focused on employee rights and benefits. State law stipulates that "no public employee or employee organization shall engage in a strike, and no public employee or employee organization shall induce, encourage or condone any strike, work stoppage, slowdown or withholding of services by such public employees."**Massachusetts Teachers Association President Merrie Najimy said repealing that law would "provide equilibrium and fairness to our collective bargaining process.""With the onset of COVID, health and safety of educators, students and families is an unfortunate and an additional reason we must have the right to strike," Najimy said. During the COVID-19 pandemic, teachers in Andover were determined by the Commonwealth Employee Relations Board to have gone on an illegal strike when they refused to enter the school building for professional development ahead of the start of the 2020 school year. Instead, the teachers set up with laptops in the parking lot of the school to protest what they considered to be poor and unsafe ventilation in the school and attempted to participate in the training from outside. Gov. Charlie Baker at the time said he supported the decision to force teachers to return to work inside the school building, and Najimy said the episode highlighted the importance of the Connolly-Uyterhoeven bill. "Last year in too many districts educators and students were compelled to put their health, safety, and, yes, even their lives on the line by being forced to return to their schools in spite of poor ventilation and other safety concerns," Najimy said. "This was something that was never expected. They had no recourse." Many who testified noted the gains made by workers over centuries through the use of strikes, including the famous "Bread and Roses" strike by women and immigrant workers at a textile mill in Lawrence. Others said that teachers in other states have been able to use work stoppages to win concessions for students in their contracts, such as more green spaces. Sen. Becca Rausch, a Needham Democrat, testified in support of allowing teachers to strike, but offered up her own bill as a potential compromise.Rausch's bill would amend state law to allow public sector workers to strike under what she described as "limited circumstances," including a failure by management to bargain in good faith, and it would not apply to police, fire protection employees or jail, prison or other correctional facility workers.

#### Public unions with strike power are a way to combat workplace inequities

#### Myall 19 (James is MECEP’s lead on the inclusive economy, including research on labor issues, gender and racial equity, and health care policy. James conducts research and impact analyses, writes educational materials, and collaborates with partners. He is skilled in data collection, research, and statistical and policy analysis. He studied public policy and management at the University of Southern Maine and holds a master’s degree in ancient history and archaeology from the University of St. Andrews in Scotland. /“Right to strike would level the playing field for public workers, with benefits for all of us”/April 17, 2019/Accesed: 11-1-21/<https://www.mecep.org/blog/right-to-strike-would-level-the-playing-field-for-public-workers-with-benefits-for-all-of-us/> )(SPHS,SO)

The right of workers to organize and bargain with their employer benefits all Mainers. **Collective bargaining leads to better wages, safer workplaces, and a fairer and more robust economy for everyone — not just union members. The right to strike is critical to collective organizing and bargaining.** Without it, Maine’s public employees are unable to negotiate on a level playing field. Maine’s Legislature is considering a bill that would give public-sector workers the right to strike. MECEP supports the legislation, and is urging legislators to enact it. **The right to strike would enable fairer negotiations between public workers and the government. All of us have reason to support that outcome.** Research shows that union negotiations set the bar for working conditions with other employers. And as the largest employer in Maine, the state’s treatment of its workers has a big impact on working conditions in the private sector. Unions support a fairer economy. Periods of high union membership are associated with lower levels of income inequality, both nationally and in Maine. **Strong unions, including public-sector unions, have a critical role to play in rebuilding a strong middle class. Unions help combat inequities within work places. Women and people of color in unions face less wage discrimination than those in nonunion workplaces.** On average, wages for nonunionized white women in Maine are 18 percent less than of those of white men. Among unionized workers, that inequality shrinks to just 9 percent. **Similarly, women of color earn 26 percent less than men in nonunionized jobs; for unionized women of color, the wage gap shrinks to 17 percent.[i**] All of us have a stake in the success of collective bargaining. **But a union without the right to strike loses much of its negotiating power. The right to withdraw your labor is the foundation of collective worker action. When state employees or teachers are sitting across the negotiating table from their employers, how much leverage do they really have when they can be made to work without a contract? It’s like negotiating the price of a car when the salesman knows you’re going to have to buy it — whatever the final price is. Research confirms that public-sector unions are less effective without the right to strike**. Public employees with a right to strike earn between 2 percent and 5 percent more than those without it.[ii] While that’s a meaningful increase for those workers, it also should assuage any fears that a right to strike would lead to excessive pay increases or employees abusing their new right. LD 900, “An Act to Expand the Rights of Public Employees Under the Maine Labor Laws,” ensures that Maine’s public-sector workers will have the same collective bargaining rights as other employees in Maine. The bill would strengthen the ability of Maine’s public-sector workers to negotiate, resulting in higher wagers, a more level playing field, and a fairer economy for all of us.

#### Public workers are uniquely key — they’re the most effective at creating social change because they often fight for the people they serve as well as themeslves

#### 

**Beckett 18** (Ben Beckett is a union steward in New York City and a member of New York City DSA./“Public Sector Workers Should Have the Right to Strike”/08/18/Accessed: 11-01-21 /<https://jacobinmag.com/2018/08/taylor-law-strike-nixon-public-sector>) (SPHS,SO)

New York gubernatorial candidate Cynthia Nixon released her labor platform last week. It contains support for a safe-staffing law, a perennial demand of nurses unions that mandates nurse-to-patient ratios that are high enough to ensure nurses aren’t run ragged and patient safety is strong, as well as provisions for increased safety and apprenticeship programs in the building trades —a group of workers Nixon previously upset with remarks suggesting they would have to take pay cuts to help lower the cost of subway construction. Arguably more important are the broader, more ambitious, and more difficult proposals: support for universal just-cause protections, which would shield all workers from arbitrary firings and discipline (standard in union contracts), and a $15 minimum wage across the whole state, not just the New York City metropolitan area. Especially important, though, is Nixon’s call to establish the legal right to strike for public sector workers in New York state. While New York is legally favorable to worker organizing in many ways, it has some of the most draconian anti-public sector labor laws in the country, most of which are compiled in the Public Employees Fair Employment Act, commonly known as the Taylor Law or the Taylor Act. **Public sector worker strikes have been critical in raising class consciousness in the United States, both in 2018 and historically. They can reveal the anti-working-class outlook of the Democratic Party — and even some union officials. Even if the law doesn’t change any time soon, simply raising the issue, as Nixon has, could raise the level of worker militancy in New York and around the country.** The Left should make public sector right-to-strike laws the next “litmus test” for progressive candidates, similar to current demands like supporting Medicare for All and rejecting corporate campaign donations. Kale Chips and Pinkertons The media and the Right immediately seized on Nixon’s right to strike proposal. “That would be really bad for all New Yorkers, especially poor New Yorkers. The more you depend on public services, the more you’ll have at risk if public employees are allowed to strike,” E.J. McMahon, of the anti-union Empire Center For Public Policy told the New York Daily News. No one should be surprised that anti-union hacks would pit elements of the working class against each other. But it was more surprising to watch union-endorsed Democrats like Andrew Cuomo and Bill de Blasio publicly declare their opposition to Nixon’s proposal. “I don’t agree with changing the Taylor Law. The Taylor Law serves an important public purpose and at the same time there are lots of ways for workers’ rights to be acknowledged and their voices to be heard. I think we have the right law now,” the New York City mayor said. Even more disturbing was watching union officials attack Nixon for saying their members should have the right to strike. Civil Service Employee Association president Danny Donohue said, “It is incredibly naïve for Cynthia Nixon to propose that all public sector workers be able to strike. Clearly, she does not have the experience needed to be governor of New York.” CSEA represents more than 300,000 New York state workers and local government workers outside New York City. John Samuelsen, the international president of the Transport Workers Union (TWU), went even further, entering the realm of self-parody by telling the Chief-Leader, “I am extremely skeptical of her newfound support of striking. I believe that she will cut and run when we shut the subway down. As soon as her hipster Williamsburg supporters can’t take public transit to non-union Wegman’s to buy their kale chips, she will call in the National Guard and the Pinkertons.” Samuelsen’s statement was especially out of touch (and not just because there are no Wegmans grocery stores in New York City). TWU’s largest local, which represents transit-system workers in New York City, faced severe penalties under the Taylor Law as a result of the union’s 2005 strike. The union as a whole and individual workers faced heavy fines; the union was forbidden from collecting dues by automatic checkoff for six months, and local president Roger Touissant was sentenced to prison. As recently as 2011, TWU issued press releases declaring New York’s blanket ban on public sector strikes a human-rights violation. One struggles to find a motivation for Samuelsen’s acerbic comments toward Nixon for suggesting the state do away with the ban, other than shortsighted support for Governor Cuomo’s reelection. Ironically, the ban on public sector strikes makes this sort of calculation rational, if craven. Most unions would not dream of cozying up to the boss this way. But with public sector workers denied some of the most powerful tools other workers have, being on the boss’s good side is seen by many union leaders as the easiest way to settle a contract. A Demand Worth Making **After decades with very few strikes in the public sector, 2018 has seen public school teacher strikes in Arizona, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and West Virginia, all states where it is illegal for public workers to strike.** Teachers also struck in Colorado, where public workers may legally strike. And in California, where public strikes are also legal, 24,000 University of California workers represented by AFSCME 3299 recently went on strike. **The other two major public sector strikes of the last two decades were the Chicago Teachers Union strike in 2011 — legal — and the New York City Metropolitan Transit Authority strike of 2005 — illegal, with severe consequences for the union.** Public sector workers have shown a recent willingness to go on strike even when it’s illegal. So why should the Left make legalizing public strikes a core demand? **First, by pushing candidates to back this demand, the Left can isolate them from the Democratic establishment, who make up a large portion of bosses in the public sector and are therefore unlikely to support giving their workers the right to strike. We saw this theory play out in real time last week. Cynthia Nixon and Julia Salazar, who is running for New York State Senate, have made this plank a central demand and have shown a willingness to confront the party’s centrist leadership. But by pushing candidates to make the legalization of public sector strikes a central part of their labor platform, the Left can force more candidates to develop power from the grassroots to make up for whatever funding and other means of support they lose from the party. Second, the prohibition on strikes contributes to the sad state of many public sector unions — especially in New York.** There are many reasons for the decline of militancy and workplace organizing in public sector unions, and many of those factors are beyond unions’ control. But if job action is off the table, one of the few ways public sector unions can defend their interests is to make political deals with officeholders. Such unions are then put in a position where they are afraid to anger the boss, the incumbent politician, by supporting challengers who often advocate more pro-worker policies. Again, we saw this dynamic play out with Samuelsen’s and Donohue’s comments, as well as less colorful comments to the same effect by other union officials. Because their unions are in such precarious positions, these leaders are terrified to get on Cuomo’s bad side. A union that’s afraid to piss off the employer is already fighting with both hands behind its back. By raising this issue, the Left create a clarifying situation where union officials are forced to explain to their members why they support politicians who want to deny them rights. In New York, this situation is exacerbated by the Triborough Amendment, a provision in the Taylor Law mandating that when public sector collective-bargaining agreements expire without a new contract settled, the terms of the previous contract continue. This disincentivizes both sides from conducting difficult and potentially unpopular negotiations and gives union officials little incentive to organize their membership during a contract campaign. This, in part, explains officials like Donohue’s hostility to the idea of giving their members the right to strike. If members could conduct a strike without severe legal repercussions, union officials might have to organize one — or be exposed as unable to do so. However, the Triborough Amendment also gives workers the protections of a union contract during bargaining impasses and prevents the boss from unilaterally dictating new terms. In New York and states with similar provisions, we should be clear that we are demanding the right to strike in addition to and not in lieu of the Triborough Amendment. Even if there is little hope of changing the law in the short term, simply seeing politicians and the media raise the issue may give workers more confidence to break the law and strike anyway. Ultimately what makes a strike successful is not the degree to which it follows the law. Much more important is workers’ enthusiasm, unity, and confidence in their actions. And there is evidence that political campaigns can make a real difference. When Public Workers Strike Politicians have plenty to fear from striking public workers. The public sector remains a comparative bastion of union strength, with unions representing about 38 percent of public sector workers nationwide, compared to about 7 percent of workers in the private sector. In New York state, about 72 percent of public sector workers are in unions, versus 15 percent in the private sector. This year alone, in Arizona, Oklahoma, and West Virginia, striking teachers won major concessions from hostile, right-wing state governments. Reactionary politicians and capitalists from Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker to the forces behind the Janus case understand the potential power of public unions to advance progressive causes — that is precisely why they have attacked them so viciously. **Public sector workers *occupy a strategic place in the labor market because so many of their jobs are critical to society’s functioning.* That means *the potential power of withdrawing their labor is magnified beyond their immediate job site*. The recent teachers’ strikes were so effective because school closures forced thousands of parents to significantly alter their routines. The New York City transit strike of 2005 lasted only three days, but because it made transportation across the city extremely difficult, it was estimated to cost the city and businesses hundreds of millions of dollars in lost fares and revenue. And while conditions vary, public sector strikes generally have a lot of public support. One reason for that is from nurses to teachers to welfare workers, better conditions for the people they serve are often among public workers’ core demands. Even when strikes are not linked directly to social demands, a majority of Americans do not support weakening public sector unions.** However, for unions, a comparison between the West Virginia teachers’ strike and the New York City transit strike is instructive. West Virginia teachers organized parents and community members for months ahead of the strike. They tied their working conditions to children’s learning conditions, making clear how their demands would benefit virtually everyone. Transit workers did not make such arguments, and support for their strike was nowhere near as high as that of the teachers. **Public sector unions have to make clear that when they walk off the job, *they are striking to benefit the people they serve as much as themselves*. When schools are closed, when buses don’t run, when trash goes uncollected and mail undelivered, it affects not just the employer, but nearly everyone. The pressure on government bosses to settle is therefore extremely high. And when public sector workers strike, *they have the power to win transformative victories.*** From both elected officials’ and union heads’ reaction to Nixon’s right-to-strike proposal, we can see that neither side wants to face this prospect. We should make them.

### PLAN

#### Thus, I affirm A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers strike.

#### The right to strike is political in nature — strikes are key to resisting workplace domination and commodification, making my theory of power a prerequisite

**Gourevitch 16** (Alex Gourevitch is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Brown University. He is author of From Slavery to the Cooperative Commonwealth: Labor and Republican Liberty in the Nineteenth Century (Cambridge University Press, 2015) and writes on public affairs for magazines like Jacobin and Dissent and co-authors a contemporary politics blog The Current Moment./(2016). *Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike. Perspectives on Politics, 14(2), 307–323.* doi:10.1017/S1537592716000049. Accessed 10-31-21 SCIHUB) (<https://scihubtw.hkvisa.net/https://doi.org/10.1017/S1537592716000049> ) (SPHS, AL)

**The right to strike is everywhere recognized but appears unjustifiable. Strikers refuse to work but they claim a right to the job. This sounds like illiberal privilege, or at least it cannot be a coercively enforceable claim. I argue, however, that the right to strike is justified as a way of resisting intertwined forms of structural and personal domination associated with the modern labor market. Workers are structurally dominated insofar as being forced to make a contract with some employer or another leaves them vulnerable to exploitation. They are personally dominated insofar as they are required to submit to the arbitrary authority of managers in the workplace, which deepens their potential exploitation. Strikes contest this domination by reversing the relationship of power. Workers can formally quit the job but they can’t quit work, so strikers quit working but don’t quit the job. During the plebeian secessions in Rome, the plebs retreated from the city but they did not leave it.** According to Livy’s account of the first secession, they gathered at the Sacred Mount (Mons Sacer), created a new religion of the plebs, and swore an oath not to fight the patricians’ war until their demands were met.1 After Menenius Agrippa’s failed arbitration, which included his famous appeal to the organic integrity of the body politic, the plebs won a newfound presence in the political community: the tribunes. They stood not just as parts but as members, as the members they already claimed themselves to be. They had become citizens and had inscribed their status on the public consciousness of Rome through the office of the tribunes. Many of the most characteristic institutions of the Roman republic followed the same course. Plebeian secessions gave birth to the Twelve Tables, the formal legislative supremacy of the plebs, and the abolition of the debt-bondage.2 Livy called the post-secession dictatorial decree that abolished debtbondage the Lex Poetelia (326 BC), “the dawn, as it were, of a new era of liberty for the plebs.” 3 This is one of those instances in which the distance between the ancients and the moderns is not so wide as we might think. The classical past was prologue. **Consider the basic elements of the plebeian secessions: withdrawal from the city while insisting on continued membership; collective demands and a culture, even cult, of solidarity; class conflict and social crisis; economic and political demands folding into each other like a Mobius strip; the birth of a new liberty. These are the elements of a strike narrative.** Think, for instance, of the 1812 “blackface” strikers who, rioting against low wages and high wheat prices, painted their faces black, took sacred oaths of secrecy “under the canopy of Heaven,” armed themselves “with the implements of their trades,” and then “destroyed the property of those who were obnoxious to them.” 4 Or there were the thousands of working class Chartists who, in 1838, took their demands for universal suffrage and higher wages to a hill that Friedrich Engels tellingly referred to as the “Mons Sacer of Manchester.” 5 Or there was the dramatic 1937 “sit-down” strike in Flint, Michigan, in which workers converted a piece of private property into democratic public space.6 It is true that, since strike activity has declined by nearly 90 percent from its peak in the 1970s, we might think this form of collective action is no longer relevant (see Figure 1). **However, in the past few years, we have seen significant strikes by Chicago teachers and transit workers, nurses and fast food workers, truckers and oil refiners, Verizon and WalMart workers.7 Some of these actions have spilled out into wider campaigns, most significantly the recent “Fight for $15” strikes whose aim is to raise the minimum wage and which have included everyone from food service workers to child care providers.8 These strikes have taken place in those sectors expected to add the largest number of jobs in coming years, like health care, food service, and retail.9 Present and future Supreme Court rulings on topics like public sector union fees and unpaid work have revived interest in labor law generally, after years of relative indifference.10 Moreover, strikes by British postal workers, South African miners, Belgian and Greek anti-austerity activists, and hundreds of thousands of Chinese workers, speak to the global scope of the issue.11 Given the new politics of inequality that has emerged after the last decades of relative labor quiescence, and especially since the Great Recession of 2008 and the Euro-crisis of 2010, there is every reason to think that strikes will be as much a part of our future as our past. For these reasons, it is time to think anew about the strike as a distinct form of collective action.** The reissue ofold classics, like Jeremy Brecher’s labor history Strike!, and the appearance of new reflections, like labor lawyer Joe Burns’ Reviving the Strike or journalist Micah Uetricht’s Strike for America, are signs of renewed interest. But a small group of disparate examples is not a concentrated mass, and none of these pieces are part of political science. It is a strange fact about the right to strike that over the past fifty years English-speaking political philosophers have published only one book-length study and a handful of articles on this subject,12 while neighboring political phenomena—civil disobedience, right of revolution, secession, civil war, social movements—attract vastly more attention. Further, despite ample discussion of the problem of inequality across all fields and subfields, there is relatively little discussion of labor rights. This is especially true among political philosophers, who, with those few aforementioned exceptions, have had much more to say about welfare rights and ideal distributions than about labor rights, especially the right to strike. Though the history of political thought offers many figures who thought about the strike either in systematic or piecemeal ways, the ideas of John Stuart Mill and Karl Marx, L.T. Hobhouse and Rosa Luxemburg, Georges Sorel and Big Bill Haywood seem to have had more influence on union organizers and social theorists, labor lawyers and intellectual historians, than current political philosophers.13 **My basic thought is that the right to strike is a right of human freedom claimed against the social domination that the typical modern worker experiences. Ordinarily, the right to strike is thought to be an economic right whose purpose is to maintain a certain kind of bargaining relationship among self-interested economic actors. However, it is better understood as a political right that individuals claim against an unjust system of law and property in the name of justice and emancipation. It is a political right even when most strikes do not have explicitly political ends. Put another way, one reason strikes are political is the way they threaten the normal distinction between politics and economics itself. They do so by challenging the idea that the logic of commodity exchange and private contracts should govern labor relations. The best justification of the right to strike lies in the way strikers claim their liberty not just as abstract persons but as socially-situated agents, who find themselves in the historically specific relationships of domination associated with the labor market. It is this connection to resisting domination that makes the right to strike political. My central purpose is to develop an argument for the right to strike and in so doing to show how recent developments in political philosophy around concepts like domination and freedom can enrich our thinking about labor rights.**14