# 1NC

## Theory

**Interpretation: all affirmative pre-emptive theory arguments must be placed at the top of the 1AC.**

**Violation: They’re not at the top**

**Standards:**

1. **Prep Skew – spikes on the bottom force me to create my 1NC strategy while reading the doc pre-round then totally alter it once I see the spikes – destroys a huge portion of my prep time. Saying “spikes on bottom” at the top doesn’t solve because I don’t know if you’ll get through all the spikes, which forces me to form multiple 1NCs that each counter different spikes, further skewing prep. Fair prep time is k2 fairness because the aff will have an unfair advantage if I haven’t had sufficient time to prep out their case.**
2. **Substance education – spikes on top mean I can plan out a better 1NC strategy that has more clash, leading to increased education on the topic.**

**Voters:**

**Fairness is a voter because**

1. **The only way a judge can determine who’s better is if we enter the debate on an even playing field.**
2. **People quit if they lose to unfair arguments so fairness is a prereq to debate’s existence.**

**Education is voter because:**

1. **It’s the only portable benefit of debate.**
2. **It’s the only reason we get funding.**

**Theory is drop the debater:**

1. **Only DTD enables theory to deter bad behavior and be a tool for norm setting. Drop the Arg just lets them dodge whatever they did wrong with barley any consequences.**
2. **Dropping the arg can’t rectify past abuse because the 1AC was uniquely bad, so there should be a consequence.**

**No RVI’s:**

1. **they’re illogical – it doesn’t make sense to reward someone for not doing anything bad. People need to do good things to win.**
2. **RVI’s chill legitimate theory, justifying even more abuse.**

**Competing Interps:**

1. **Reasonability usually lacks a brightline and favors unnecessary judge intervention.**
2. **Reasonability lets them arbitrarily choose a brightline that favors their arguments – skews fairness.**

## K

#### **The color line structures modernity – drawn discursively to separate classes/genders/races, it necessitates the political sacrifice of those who are not within our conception of human. Thus, the role of the ballot is to deconstruct the color line.**

Wynter 03 Sylvia Wynter, “Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation--An Argument,” CR: The New Centennial Review, Volume 3, Number 3, Fall 2003, pp. 257-337, https://doi.org/10.1353/ncr.2004.0015

The Argument proposes that the new master code of the bourgeoisie and of its ethnoclass conception of the human—that is, the code of selected by Evolution/dysselected by Evolution—was now to be mapped and anchored on the only available “objective set of facts” that remained. This was the set of environmentally, climatically determined phenotypical dif- ferences between human hereditary variations as these had developed in the wake of the human diaspora both across and out of the continent of Africa; that is, as a set of (so to speak) totemic differences, which were now harnessed to the task of projecting the Color Line drawn institutionally and discursively between whites/nonwhites—and at its most extreme between the Caucasoid physiognomy (as symbolic life, the name of what is good, the idea that some humans can be selected by Evolution) and the Negroid phys- iognomy (as symbolic death, the “name of what is evil,” the idea that some humans can be dysselected by Evolution)—as the new extrahuman line, or projection of genetic nonhomogeneity that would now be made to function, analogically, as the status-ordering principle based upon ostensibly differential degrees of evolutionary selectedness/eugenicity and/or dysselected- ness/dysgenicity. Differential degrees, as between the classes (middle and lower and, by extrapolation, between capital and labor) as well as between men and women, and between the heterosexual and homosexual erotic preference—and, even more centrally, as between Breadwinner (job- holding middle and working classes) and the jobless and criminalized Poor, with this rearticulated at the global level as between Sartre’s “Men” and Natives (see his guide-quote), before the end of politico-military colonial- ism, then postcolonially as between the “developed” First World, on the one hand, and the “underdeveloped” Third and Fourth Worlds on the other. The Color Line was now projected as the new “space of Otherness” principle of nonhomogeneity, made to reoccupy the earlier places of the motion-filled heavens/non-moving Earth, rational humans/irrational animal lines, and to recode in new terms their ostensible extra-humanly determined differences of ontological substance. While, if the earlier two had been indispen- sable to the production and reproduction of their respective genres of being human, of their descriptive statements (i.e., as Christian and as Man1), and of the overall order in whose field of interrelationships, social hierarchies, system of role allocations, and divisions of labors each such genre of the human could alone realize itself—and with each such descriptive state- ment therefore being rigorously conserved by the “learning system” and order of knowledge as articulated in the institutional structure of each order—this was to be no less the case with respect to the projected “space of Otherness” of the Color Line. With respect, that is, to its indispensability to the production and reproduction of our present genre of the human Man2, together with the overall global/national bourgeois order of things and its specific mode of economic production, alone able to provide the material conditions of existence for the production and reproduction of the ethnoclass or Western-bourgeois answer that we now give to the question of the who and what we are. It is in this context that the Negro, the Native, the Colonial Questions, and postcolonially the “Underdeveloped” or Third/Fourth-Worlds Question can be clearly seen to be the issue, not of our present mode of economic pro- duction, but rather of the ongoing production and reproduction of this answer—that is, our present biocentric ethnoclass genre of the human, of which our present techno-industrial, capitalist mode of production is an indispensable and irreplaceable, but only a proximate function. With this genre of the human being one in the terms of whose dually biogenetic and economic notions of freedom both the peoples of African hereditary descent and the peoples who comprise the damned archipelagoes of the Poor, the jobless the homeless, the “underdeveloped” must lawlikely be sacrificed as a function of our continuing to project our collective authorship of our con- temporary order onto the imagined agency of Evolution and Natural Selection and, by extrapolation, onto the “Invisible Hand” of the “Free Market” (both being cultural and class-specific constructs).

#### The 1AC’s legal recognition of workers rights focuses incompletely on one form of subjugation – their attempt at inclusion only reinforces the color line and defines workers as “Men” in contrast to those considered subhuman. This reifies continued violence against those not recognized as fully human by the state. Kantian ethics are premised on every man having inherent agency but ignores those are aren’t considered human – even if they’re theoretically inclusive their method is linked to violence.
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Paradoxically, the particular biological material in question remains the property, at least nominally, of all humanity and is not proper to Moore the individual person: “Lymphokines, unlike a name or a face, have the same molecular structure in every human being and the same, important functions in every human being's immune system. Moreover, the particular genetic material which is responsible for the natural production of lymphokines, and which defendants use to manufacture lymphokines in the laboratory, is also the same in every person; it is no more unique to Moore than the number of vertebrae in the spine or the chemical formula of hemoglobin.”20 So, while the court grants personhood to human subjects in an individualized fashion that is based on comparatively distinguishing between different humans, when biological material clashes with the interests of capital, the court appeals to the indivisible biological sameness of the Homo sapiens species. Since the court's ruling does not place this slice of human flesh in the commons for all humans to share, it tacitly grants corporations the capability of legally possessing this material with the express aim of generating monetary profit. Considering that corporations enjoy the benefits of limited personhood and the ability to live forever under U.S. law, corporate entities are entrusted with securing the immortal life of biological matter, while human persons are denied ownership of their supposed essence.21 My interest here lies not in claiming inalienable ownership rights for cells derived from human bodies such as Lacks's and Moore's but to draw attention to how thoroughly the very core of pure biological matter is framed by neoliberal market logics and by liberal ideas of personhood as property. We are in dire need of alternatives to the legal conception of personhood that dominates our world, and, in addition, to not lose sight of what remains outside the law, what the law cannot capture, what it cannot magically transform into the fantastic form of property ownership. Writing about the connections between transgender politics and other forms of identity-based activism that respond to structural inequalities, legal scholar Dean Spade shows how **the focus on** inclusion, **recognition**, and equality **based on a** narrow **legal framework** (especially as it pertains to antidiscrimination and hate crime laws) not only **hinders the eradication of violence against** trans people and other **vulnerable populations** but actually creates the condition of possibility for the continued unequal “distribution of life chances.”22 If demanding recognition and **inclusion** remains at the center of minority **politics**, it **will lead only to** a delimited notion of **personhood as property that zeroes in comparatively on only one form of subjugation at the expense of others, thus allowing for the continued existence of hierarchical differences between full humans, not-quite-humans, and nonhumans.** **This can be gleaned from the “successes” of** the **mainstream** feminist, **civil rights**, and lesbian-gay rights **movements**, **which facilitate the incorporation of a privileged minority into the ethnoclass of Man at the cost of the** still and/or newly criminalized and **disposable populations** (women of color, the black poor, trans people, the incarcerated, etc.).23 **To make claims for inclusion and humanity via the U.S. juridical assemblage removes from view that the law itself has been thoroughly violent** in its endorsement of racial slavery, indigenous genocide, Jim Crow, the prison-industrial complex, domestic and international warfare, and so on, **and** that it **continues to be one of the chief instruments in creating and maintaining the racializing assemblages in the world of Man**. Instead of appealing to legal recognition, Julia Oparah suggests counteracting the “racialized (trans)gender entrapment” within the prison-industrial complex and beyond with practices of “maroon abolition” (in reference to the long history of escaped slave contraband settlements in the Americas) to “foreground the ways in which often overlooked African diasporic cultural and political legacies inform and undergird anti-prison work,” while also providing strategies and life worlds not exclusively centered on reforming the law.24 Relatedly, Spade calls for a radical politics articulated from the “ ‘impossible’ worldview of trans political existence,” which redefines “the insistence of government agencies, social service providers, media, and many nontrans activists and nonprofiteers that the existence of trans people is impossible.”25 A relational maroon abolitionism beholden to the practices of black radicalism and that arises from the incompatibility of black trans existence with the world of Man serves as one example of how putatively abject modes of being need not be redeployed within hegemonic frameworks but can be operationalized as variable liminal territories or articulated assemblages in movements to abolish the grounds upon which all forms of subjugation are administered.

#### Legal recognition of rights and personhood exclude those outside legal definitions of humanity and erase those who become human. Just as limited and genocidal court recognition of indigenous sovereignty justified the Dred Scott decision, the 1AC recreates violence against vulnerable flesh and divides the oppressed into distinct groups. Legal personhood and *Habeas Corpus* are constructed in relation to “Man,” a white, male, propertied, liberal subject who reinforces the color line.
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Suffering, especially when caused by political violence, has long functioned as the hallmark of both humane sentience and of inhuman brutality. Frequently, suffering becomes the defining feature of those subjects excluded from the law, the national community, humanity, and so on due to the political violence inflicted upon them even as it, paradoxically, grants them access to inclusion and equality. In western human rights discourse, for instance, the physical and psychic residues of political violence enable victims to be recognized as belonging to the “brotherhood of Man.” Too often, this tendency not only leaves intact hegemonic ideas of humanity as indistinguishable from western Man but demands comparing different forms of subjugation in order to adjudicate who warrants recognition and belonging. As W. E. B. Du Bois asked in 1944, if the Universal Declaration of Human Rights did not offer provisions for ending world colonialism or legal segregation in the United States, “Why then call it the Declaration of Human Rights?”2 Wendy Brown maintains, “politicized identity” operates “only by entrenching, restating, dramatizing, and inscribing its pain in politics; it can hold out no future...that triumphs over this pain.”3 Brown suggests replacing the identitarian declaration “I am,” which merely confirms and solidifies what already exists, with the desiring proclamation “I want,” which offers a Nietzschean politics of overcoming pain instead of clinging to suffering as an immutable feature of identity politics. While I recognize Brown's effort to formulate a form of minority politics not beholden to the aura of wounded attachments and fixated almost fetishistically on the state as the site of change, we do well to recall that many of the political agendas based on identity (the suffragette movement, the movement for the equality of same-sex marriages, or the various movements for the full civil rights of racialized minority subjects, for instance) are less concerned with claiming their suffering per se (I am) than they are with using wounding as a stepping stone in the quest (I want) for rights equal to those of full citizens. Liberal governing bodies, whether in the form of nation-states or supranational entities such as the United Nations or the International Criminal Court make particular forms of wounding the precondition for entry into the hallowed halls of full personhood, only acknowledging certain types of physical violence. For instance, while the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees passed a resolution in 2008 that includes rape and other forms of sexual violence in the category of war crimes, there are many forms of sexual violence that do not fall into this purview, and thus bar victims from claiming legal injury and/or personhood.4Even more generally, the acknowledgment and granting of full personhood of those excluded from its precincts requires the overcoming of physical violence, while epistemic and economic brutalities remain outside the scope of the law. Congruently, much of the politics constructed around the effects of political violence, especially within the context of international human rights but also with regard to minority politics in the United States, is constructed from the shaky foundation of surmounting or desiring to leave behind physical suffering so as to take on the ghostly semblance of possessing one's personhood. Then and only then will previously minoritized subjects be granted their humanity as a legal status. Hence, the glitch Brown diagnoses in identity politics is less a product of the minority subject's desire to desperately cling to his or her pain but a consequence of the state's dogged insistence on suffering as the only price of entry to proper personhood, what Samera Esmeir has referred to as a “juridical humanity” that bestows and rescinds humanity as an individualized legal status in the vein of property.5 **Apportioning personhood** in this way **maintains the world of Man and its** attendant **racializing assemblages**, which means in essence that **the entry fee for legal recognition is the acceptance of categories based on white supremacy and colonialism, as well as normative genders and sexualities.** We need only to consult the history of habeas corpus, the “great” writ of liberty, which is anchored in the U.S. Constitution (Article 1, Section 9), to see that this type of reasoning leads to reducing inclusion and personhood to ownership.6 The Latin phrase habeas corpus means “You shall have the body,” and a writ thereof requires the government to present prisoners before a judge so as to provide a lawful justification for their continued imprisonment. This writ has been considered a pivotal safeguard against the misuse of political power in the modern west. Even though the Military Commissions Act of 2006, which denied habeas corpus to “unlawful enemy combatants” imprisoned in Guantanamo Bay, remains noteworthy and alarming, habeas corpus has been used both by and frequently against racialized groups throughout U.S. history, as was the case when habeas corpus was suspended during World War II, allowing for the internment of Japanese Americans. The writ has also led to gains for minoritized subjects as, for instance, in the well-known Amistad case (1839), in which abolitionists used a habeas corpus petition to free the “illegally” captured Africans who had staged a mutiny against their abductors. Likewise, when Ponca tribal leader Standing Bear was jailed as a result of protesting the forcible removal of his people to Indian Territory in 1879, the writ of habeas corpus affected his release from incarceration as well as the judge's recognition that, as a general rule, Indians were persons before U.S. law, even though Native Americans were not considered full U.S. citizens until 1924.7Nevertheless, the benefits accrued through the **juridical acknowledgment** of racialized subjects **as** fully **human** often exacts a steep entry price, because inclusion **hinges on accepting the codification of personhood as property**, which is, in turn, **based on** the comparative **distinction between groups**, as in one of the best-known court cases in U.S. history: the Dred Scott case. In 1857, the Supreme Court invalidated Dred Scott's habeas corpus, since, as an escaped slave, Scott could not be a legal person. According to Chief Justice Taney: “Dred Scott is not a citizen of the State of Missouri, as alleged in his declaration, because he is a ~~negro~~ [black] of African descent; his ancestors were of pure African blood, and were brought into this country and sold as negro slaves.”8 In order to justify withdrawing Dred Scott's legal right to ownership of self, Chief Justice Taney's opinion in the decision contrasts the status of black subjects with the legal position of Native Americans vis-à-vis the possibility of U.S. citizenship and personhood: “The situation of [the ~~negro~~ {black} ] population was altogether unlike that of the Indian race. These Indian Governments were regarded and treated as foreign Governments.... [Indians] may, without doubt, like the subjects of any other foreign Government, be naturalized...and become citizens of a State, and of the United States; and if an individual should leave his nation or tribe, and take up his abode among the white population, he would be entitled to all the rights and privileges which would belong to an emigrant from any other foreign people.”9 While slaves were not accorded the status of being humans that belonged to a different nation, Indians could theoretically overcome their lawful foreignness, but only if they renounced previous forms of personhood and citizenship. Hence, the tabula rasa of **whiteness**—which all groups but blacks can access—**serves as the prerequisite for the law's** magical **transubstantiation** **of a thing** to be possessed **into a** property-owning **subject**.10The judge's comparison underscores the dangers of ceding definitions of personhood to the law and of comparing different forms of political subjugation, since **hypothetical** ~~Indian~~ **[indigenous] personhood in the law rests on attaining whiteness and the violent denial of said status to black subjects.** Additionally, while the court conceded limited capabilities of personhood to indigenous subjects if they chose to convert to whiteness, it did not prevent the U.S. government from instituting various genocidal measures to ensure that American Indians would become white and therefore no longer exist as Indians. In other words, the legal conception of personhood comes with a steep price, as in this instance where being seemingly granted rights laid the groundwork for the U.S. government's genocidal policies against Native Americans, since the “racialization of indigenous peoples, especially through the use of blood quantum classification, in particular follows...‘genocidal logic,’ rather than simply a logic of subordination or discrimination,” and as a result “**whiteness constitutes a project of disappearance for Native peoples** rather than signifying privilege.”11 Beginning in the nineteenth century the U.S. government instituted a program in which Native American children were forcibly removed from their families and placed in Christian day and boarding schools, and which sought to civilize children by “killing the Indian to save the man,” representing one of the most significant examples of the violent and legal enforced assimilation of Native Americans into U.S. whiteness.12 Though there is no clear causal relationship between Taney's arguments in the Scott decision and the boarding school initiative, both establish that **legal personhood is available to indigenous subjects only if the Indian can be killed**—either literally or figuratively—**in order to save the world of Man** (in this case settler colonialism and white supremacy). Furthermore, the denial of personhood qua whiteness to African American subjects does not stand in opposition to the genocidal wages of whiteness bequeathed to indigenous subjects but rather represents different properties of the same racializing juridical assemblage that differentially produces both black and native subjects as aberrations from Man and thus not-quite-human. The writ of **habeas corpus**—**and the law** more generally—anoints those individualized subjects who are deemed deserving with bodies even while this assemblage continually enlists new and/or different groups to exclude, banish, or exterminate from the world of Man. In the end, the law, whether bound by national borders or spanning the globe, **establish**es **an international division of humanity, which grants previously excluded subjects limited access to personhood as property at the same time as it fortifies the supremacy of Man**.13

#### The alternative is to embrace habeas viscus, a definition of human based on the flesh rather than constructs of the body defined in relation to whiteness. Habeas viscus opens avenues for guerrilla warfare as it removes politics from the realm of the Man, instead opting for a collective consciousness of the oppressed.
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**The** poetics and **politics** that I have been discussing under the heading **of habeas viscus** or the flesh **are concerned** not **with** inclusion in reigning precincts of the status quo but, in Cedric Robinson's apt phrasing, “**the** continuing **development of a collective consciousness informed by the historical struggles for liberation and motivated by the shared sense of obligation to preserve [and** I would add also to **reimagine] the collective being**, the ontological totality.”31 Though the laws of Man place the flesh outside the ferocious and ravenous perimeters of the legal body, habeas viscus defies domestication both on the basis of particularized personhood as a result of suffering, as in human rights discourse, and on the grounds of the universalized version of western Man. Rather, **habeas viscus points to the terrain of humanity as a relational assemblage exterior to the jurisdiction of law** given **that** the law can bequeath or rescind ownership of the body so that it becomes the property of proper persons but **does not possess the authority to nullify the politics and poetics of the flesh found in the traditions of the oppressed**. As a way of conceptualizing politics, then, habeas viscus diverges from the discourses and institutions that yoke the flesh to political violence in the modus of deviance. Instead, it translates the hieroglyphics of the flesh into a potentiality in any and all things, an originating leap in the imagining of future anterior freedoms and new genres of humanity. To envisage habeas viscus as a forceful assemblage of humanity entails leaving behind the world of Man and some of its attendant humanist pieties. As opposed to depositing the flesh outside politics, the normal, the human, and so on, we need a better understanding of its varied workings in order to disrobe the cloak of Man, which gives the human a long-overdue extreme makeover; or, in the words of Sylvia Wynter, “the struggle of our new millennium will be one between the ongoing imperative of securing the well-being of our present ethnoclass (i.e. western bourgeois) conception of the human, Man, which overrepresents itself as if it were the human itself, and that of securing the well-being, and therefore the full cognitive and behavioral autonomy of the human species itself/ourselves.”32 Claiming and **dwelling in the** monstrosity of **the flesh present** some of the **weapons in** the **guerrilla warfare to “secure the full** cognitive and behavioral **autonomy of the human species,” since these liberate from captivity assemblages of life, thought, and politics from the tradition of the oppressed and, as a result, disfigure the centrality of Man as the sign for the human.** As an assemblage of humanity, **habeas viscus** animates the elsewheres of Man and **emancipates the true potentiality that rests in those subjects who live behind the veil of the permanent state of exception**: freedom**; assemblages of freedom** that **sway to the** temporality of new syncopated **beginnings for the human beyond the world** and continent **of Man.**

## Case

### OV

**Reject Kantian ethics:**

1. **Tailoring Objection: I can tailor maxims to be specific and universalizable. For example, I can say “Only people named Noam can lie, but not to each other.” It’s universalizable, but still bad. Universalizability doesn’t prevent immoral action.**
2. **Shmagency Objection: Kantianism requires all people to be active moral agents. However, one can merely choose to act out of self-interest rather than moral reasoning. That takes out Kant because it relies on everyone being a moral actor.**
3. **Contradiction: Situations where one must violate the categorical imperative no matter what they choose to do. For example, one is given a choice where they can either lie or be pressured into hurting someone. Kant gives no solution, as one can’t weigh between maxims. That makes Kant non-action binding in many situations.**

### A2 Reason

#### Reason isn’t a priori:

1. **Some people can’t reason: young children and individuals with intellectual disabilities can’t use formal logic to make ethical choices,**
2. **Peoples’ reasoning is influenced by their experiences and values. Parents teach their children how to think, peoples’ experiences lead them to make different decisions, and cultural differences lead to differing moral compasses. If reason was objective, a priori, and constitutive to humanity, then everybody would agree on ethics.**
3. **Cross apply the shmagency objection – not everybody chooses to reason**

#### A2 Regress:

1. **“A reason” isn’t the same as “reason.” reason is rationality, while “A reason” is a justification. Justification doesn’t ceded the authority of rationality. Justification can also be empirical rather than rational.**
2. **The argument is circular. “Reason is good because it is reasonable” just assumes that reason has authority. Using reason to justify reason doesn’t make reason inherently true.**

**On Ferrero – we can use other methods to change our identity – things without setting concrete ends change who we are**

#### A2 Action Theory

1. **Intent unifies our actions, which isn’t necessarily defined by reason. We can take actions unified by intuition or emotion.**
2. **No warrant for why explaining unified action justifies their framework.**
3. **Non-unified action is fine: each miniscule movement of your arm can have moral content.**

### A2 Prefer Additionaly

#### A2 Performativity:

1. **Frameworks other than kant also justify defending an ethic (insert why yours does)**
2. **The performance of debate undermines Kantian epistemology: the fact that we need to discuss ethics proves that morality can’t be conceived of solely by rationality.**

### Turns

#### [1] Strikes fail to fulfill duty

Fourie 17 Johan Fourie 11-30-2017 "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers" <https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html> (Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG

Kantian Ethics Kantian ethics suggest that actions are morally permissible based on **whether it fulfils a person's duty** (Banks, 2006). To further the concept of duty, Kantian ethics held the notion of Categorical Imperatives which is believed to determine the morality of duties as it enforces and commands adherence, complicity and application. The Categorical Imperatives consist of three formulas. Once such a formula is to "act only on the maximum whereby at the same time you can will that it become a universal law" (Parrott, 2006, p. 51). Through this perspective, Kant held that persons are to engage in actions that they are willing to allow others to engage in as well without conditions and exceptions. Applying this formula to the ethicality of social workers **participating in labor strike** demonstrations, it becomes evident that such an action is **not morally permissible or executing its duty**. Arguably, as much as social workers are trained professionals and rendering services that are crucial to the functioning and well-being of society, they remain ordinary citizens who also at some point will **require crucial services**. Examples of these crucial services that may cause significant harm because of its absence due to labor strike action are **medical personnel, suicide watch centers, mental health care professionals, law enforcement, court systems**, municipal service delivery, etc. With these services not available, social workers will experience suffering, frustration, unhappiness, harm as the clients will do with their absence from the office. To this regard, participating and demonstrating labor strike action is not adhering to duty or morally permissible.

#### [2] Uses others as a mere means to an end

Fourie 17 Johan Fourie 11-30-2017 "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers" <https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html> (Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG

A further formula of the Categorical Imperative is "so, act as to treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of any other context, never solely as a means to an end but always as an end within itself' (Parrott, 2006, p. 51). By this Kant meant people should be valued and respected as an individual and not used for the benefit of others. Participating in a labor-strike demonstration/action is **a direct violation of this** categorical perspective as it would not be ethically permissible because the severe dependence and well-being of clients, the effective functioning of the employer organization, and society **is used to duly and unduly influence the bargaining process for better working conditions**. In participating in the labor strike demonstration, the humanity, and well-being of clients and society **is not seen as crucial** **and as an 'end'**, but rather used to demonstrate the undeniable need for the skills and expertise of social workers. Furthermore, through withholding services, social worker professionals demonstrate that the well-being and welfare of society have lost its inherent importance/value. Though the value of overall well-being is taught throughout the social work training process and is enshrined in the professional ethical codes.

#### [3] Violence is intrinsic to certain strikes and are uniquely unethical

Mlungisi 16, Ernest Tenza. The liability of trade unions for conduct of their members during industrial action. Diss. 2016. (lecturer in the field of Labour Law at the School of Law. He holds a LLM Degree) JG

When expressing themselves through one or more of these forms of expression, they are expected to be peaceful.20 However, over the past few years, workers attempted to heighten the impact of their industrial action by using various tactics during industrial action, tactics which have a negative impact on the **lives and property of other people**. These include the **trashing of cities, vandalising property**, forming picket lines **at supermarkets**, and preventing shoppers from doing business with their chosen businesses.21 There have been strike-related disruptions in almost every sector of the economy.22 There have been several incidents where industrial action resulted in violence and disruption of the public peace.23 Other examples include the torching of employers’ property, intimidation and even the killing **of non-striking workers**.24 During the truck drivers’ strike which took place in September 2012, a number of drivers were attacked and killed during violent demonstrations.25 During security workers’ strikes in 2006 and 2013, shops were looted and damage was caused to the property of innocent bystanders, street vendors, spaza-shop owners and employers.26 The Business Times reported that violent strikes in the country’s platinum sector resulted in the death of more than 50 people.27 In April 2016 SATAWU members on strike torched trains in Cape Town.28 These strikes are counter-productive and destructive not only because they are violent but the parties, namely the employer and employees take long to resolve their dispute(s) or reach settlement. This **create health hazards**. For example, a strike by municipal workers could lead to the non-collection of waste and this poses a serious health risk.29 The burning of tyres by demonstrators also leads to pollution and resultant health risks. The harmful conduct resulting from industrial action affects not only the strikers or picketers, but also innocent members of the public, non-striking employees, employers and the economy at large.30 In Garvis & Others v SATAWU & others, 31 it was held that the majority of the population was subjected to the tyranny of the state in the past and such practices should no longer be tolerated.