**I negate the resolution** resolved: **A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.**

**I value Life.**

**Thus, the criterion is utilitarianism.**

**Prefer for the following reason**

**Policy-makers must aggregate the effects of their actions since they cannot know what effects their actions will have on individuals.**

**Goodin’ 90**

Goodin, Robert, *fellow in philosophy, Australian National Defense University*, THE UTILITARIAN RESPONSE, 1990, p. 141-2

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more probable for them than private individuals. Before proceeding with the large argument, I must therefore say what it is that makes it so special about public officials and their situations that make 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, **[they] are** 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[s] public policy-makers to use the utilitarian calculus – assuming they want to use it at all – to chose general rules or conduct.

**Thus, utilitarianism is the only moral system available to policy-makers.**

1. **Death outweighs**
2. Agents can’t act if they fear for their bodily security—my framework constrains the neg attempt.
3. It’s the worst form of evil.

**Paterson ‘03**

Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island (Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”).

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81  In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

**Observation: Since the res specifies UNCONDITIONAL right to strike, the affirmative is required to defend that unconditionality for all types and kinds of strikes.**

**Contention 1: Certain groups should not be allowed to strike**

**Subpoint A**

**Healthcare workers on strikes will cause an increase in mortality rates and readmissions to the hospital.**

Jonathan **Gruber** and Samuel A. **Kleiner**, February 20**14**

**Our results are striking: there is a meaningful increase in both in-hospital mortal- ity and hospital readmission among patients admitted during a hospital strike**. Our central estimates suggest that **the rate of in-hospital mortality is 18.3 percent higher, and rates of hospital readmission are 5.7 percent higher, among those admitted during a strike than among patients in nearby hospitals at the same time.** We show that this deterioration in outcomes occurs only for those patients admitted during a strike, and not for those admitted to the same hospitals before or after a strike. And we find that these changes in outcomes are not associated with any meaningful change in the composition of, or the treatment intensity for, patients admitted during a strike. We also find evidence of **[There is] a more severe impact of these strikes on patients whose conditions require more intensive nursing inputs, and that outcomes are no better for patients admitted to striking hospitals who employ replacement workers. Overall, our findings suggest that strikes lead to lower quality medical care in hospitals.**

**Subpoint B**

**The Long-run Effects of Teacher Strikes:**

David **Jaume** and Alexander **Willén** September 20**17**

[doc\_cedlas217.pdf (unlp.edu.ar)](https://www.cedlas.econo.unlp.edu.ar/wp/wp-content/uploads/doc_cedlas217.pdf)

This suggests that **ten days of exposure to teacher strikes during primary school increases the number of people that do not  graduate from high school by 28 out of every 1,000 and increases the number of people that do not finish tertiary education by 15 out of every 1,000. These effects represent declines of 0.48 percent, 0.68 percent and 0.21 percent relative to the respective means**, which is shown directly below the estimates in the table. A comparison of Panel B and Panel C [The study] reveals that males are more affected by teacher strikes, though the effects are statistically and economically significant among individuals of both genders. That the effects are stronger for men is consistent with the large literature that shows boys to be more sensitive than girls to educational interventions and adverse shocks during childhood (Krueger 1999; Autor and Wasserman 2013; Bertrand and Pan 2013; Fan et al. 2015; Lovenheim and Willén 2016; Autor et al. 2016). The average individual in our sample experienced a total of 88 days of teacher strikes during primary school. Scaling the point estimates to account for the mean level of exposure (multiplying the point estimates by 8.8) suggests that the average cohort in our sample suffered adverse educational attainment effects with respect to the proportion of people obtaining a high school diploma, a college degree and years of education equivalent to 4.18, 6.38 and 1.84 percent respectively, relative to the means. **Taken together, the results** in Table 5 **suggest that exposure to teacher strikes not only has adverse short-term educational attainment effects (as measured by the reduction in the proportion that obtain a high school diploma), but that these effects persist as individuals move through the various stages of the education system** (as measured by the proportion that obtain a college degree and the average number of years of education). 26 This is an important finding that has not been documented before. **The results show that a teacher’s decision to strike results in permanent harm to his or her students’ average educational outcomes.**

**Contention 2: Economy**

**Subpoint A-**

**LONG STRIKES IMPACT THE ECONOMY NEGATIVELY**

**Tenza ’20** (Mlungisi, senior lecturer @ Univ. of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, Obiter, <http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S1682-58532020000300004>)

**The issue of** violent and **lengthy strikes has been a feature of South Africa's industrial relations for a while now.** There are no mechanisms in place to curb violent strikes even though their effects are visible in all corners of the Republic. Violent and **lengthy strikes have devastating effects on the economy, cause injury to members of the community and non-striking workers, and more particularly poverty as employers would retrench workers if their businesses do not make profit as a result of prolonged non-production. In the mining sector where strikes are a common feature, it has been reported that employers have lost billions of rands through lengthy and violent strikes.** The article acknowledges the developments brought about by amendments in the Labour Relations Act, which appears to be short of addressing the situation. The article proposes that if interest arbitration can be introduced into the Labour Relations Act, the situation may change for the better as employers and unions will be compelled to resolve their dispute(s) within a short space of time. It further submits that a strike should be allowed to proceed only if it is lawful and does not involve violence. In addition, the Labour Court should be empowered to intervene in instances where violence has developed and force the parties to arbitration.

**Subpoint B:**

**More Strikes Will Happen Because of A Poor Economy, Which Causes a Downwards Spiral.**

**Britannica**

**Strikes arise for a number of reasons, though principally in response to economic conditions** (defined as an *economic strike* and meant to improve wages and benefits) **or labour practices** (intended to improve work conditions). Other strikes can stem from sympathy with other striking unions or from jurisdictional disputes between two unions. Illegal strikes include [sit-down strikes](https://www.britannica.com/topic/sit-down-strike), [wildcat strikes](https://www.britannica.com/topic/wildcat-strike), and partial strikes (such as slowdowns or sick-ins). Strikes may also be called for purely political reasons (as in the [general strike](https://www.britannica.com/topic/general-strike)).

**Subpoint C: Bad Economy causes genocide and extinction**

**Resource scarcity from a bad Econ causes global war and genocide**

**Klare,** professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, **2006**

(Michael, Mar 6 2006, “The coming resource wars” http://www.energybulletin.net/node/13605)

It's official: **the era of resource wars is upon us.** In a major London address, British Defense Secretary John Reid warned that global climate change and **dwindling natural resources are combining to increase the likelihood of violent conflict over land, water and energy.** Climate change, he indicated, “will make scarce resources, clean water, viable agricultural land even scarcer”**—and this will “make the emergence of violent conflict more** rather than less **likely.”** Although not unprecedented, Reid’s prediction of an upsurge in resource conflict is significant both because of his senior rank and the vehemence of his remarks. **“The blunt truth is that the lack of water and agricultural land is a significant contributory factor to the tragic conflict we see unfolding in Darfur,”** he declared. “**We should see this as a warning sign.”** Resource conflicts of this type are most likely to arise in the developing world, Reid indicated, but the **more advanced and affluent countries are not likely to be spared the damaging and destabilizing effects** of global climate change. With sea levels rising, water and energy becoming increasingly scarce and prime agricultural lands turning into deserts, internecine **warfare over access to vital resources will become a global phenomenon.** Reid’s speech, delivered at the prestigious Chatham House in London (Britain’s equivalent of the Council on Foreign Relations), is but the most recent expression of a growing trend in strategic circles to view environmental and **resource effects—rather than political orientation and ideology—as the most potent source of armed conflict in the decades to come. With the world population rising, global consumption rates soaring, energy supplies rapidly disappearing and climate change eradicating valuable farmland, the stage is being set for persistent and worldwide struggles over vital resources. Religious and political strife will not disappear in this scenario, but rather will be channeled into contests over valuable sources o**f water, food and energy.

**Resource wars lead to extinction**

**Moore, member of many ornithological organizations, 2008**

(Stan, March 29, “Peak Oil and Economic Growth: Where Do We Go From Here?” http://www.theoildrum.com/node/3759)

The other consideration that is NEVER mentioned in this regard is the highly disproportionate DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH amongst all of humanity among and between nations. **There is plenty** of wealth to **go around if there was equitable distribution** of wealth. **If mankind does not change its perception of greed as ecologically and economically unhealthy then not only will the earth's planetary life support system ultimately fail,** but violence, wars, (especially **resource wars) threaten all of humanity, but the end result** is tragedy or even **extinction of the human species itself as an unsustainable disruptive species with infinite resource "needs" on a finite planet.**

**Weighing analysis**

**National leaders don’t have the Luxury of ignoring large impacts**

**Zeihan**, IR expert for Stratfor, **08**

Peter Zeihan, expert on international relations and Asian Politics, Vice President of global analysis for Stratfor April 23, 2008

**Fear is a powerful motivator**, **even getting results when the threat is exceedingly remote**. It makes us cross at crosswalks even when traffic is thin, pay more over time for fire insurance than our homes are worth, and shy away from snakes even when signs clearly inform us they are not poisonous. Humans instinctively take steps to prevent negative outcomes, oftentimes regardless of how likely — or more to the point, unlikely — those unpleasant outcomes are. **As with individuals, the same is true for countries.**  **Anyone can blithely say** Cuba or **Serbia would not dare ignore the will of their more powerful neighbors** **or that**Brazil’s or **Egypt’s nuclear programs are** so **inconsequential** as not to impact the international balance of power**. But such opinions — even if they truly are near-certainties — cannot form the foundation of state power**. **National leaders do not have the luxury of ignoring the plethora of coulds, mights and maybes that pepper their radar screens every day.** An analyst can dismiss a dark possibility as dubious, but **a national leader cannot gamble with the lives of his countrymen and the existence of his state. They must evaluate even improbable threats against the potential damage to their respective national interests. Many of the standing policies we take for granted have grown from such evaluations**. While the likelihood of Israel bombing the Aswan High Dam is rather remote, Egypt cannot afford to risk the possibility, which contributed to Cairo’s burying-of-the-hatchet with Israel. Worrying about continental European countries sublimating their national differences, uniting into a federated super state and invading the United Kingdom may seem to flirt with lunacy, but within that lingering concern lies the root of the Anglo-American alliance. Similarly, worrying about China using the archipelagos of Southeast Asia as a staging point for an invasion of Australia may seem ludicrous, but that fear dominates military planning in Canberra.

**Resource wars lead to extinction**

**Moore, member of many ornithological organizations, 2008**

(Stan, March 29, “Peak Oil and Economic Growth: Where Do We Go From Here?” http://www.theoildrum.com/node/3759)

The other consideration that is NEVER mentioned in this regard is the highly disproportionate DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH amongst all of humanity among and between nations. There is plenty of wealth to go around if there was equitable distribution of wealth. If mankind does not change its perception of greed as ecologically and economically unhealthy then not only will the earth's planetary life support system ultimately fail, but violence, wars, (especially resource wars) threaten all of humanity, but the end result is tragedy or even extinction of the human species itself as an unsustainable irruptive species with infinite resource "needs" on a finite planet.

**NO LINK- crepon and bez 19**

**To the state all strikes are either legal or illegal, aff says can only solve if we engage in illegal strike activity, but to affirm, you advocate for unconditionality, thus cant engage in an illegal strike. This prevents your workers revolt and overthrow of a governemnt**