**I affirm the resolution: “A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.”**

**Trigger warning: I mention sexual assualt in my first contention.**

**The standard is mitigating oppression**

**Reasons to prefer:**

**1.Recognizing structural inequalities is a prerequisite to any institutional reforms.**

**Laxer 14**

Laxer, Michael. “Part of the Problem: Talking about Systemic Oppression.” Feminist Current, 10 Nov. 2014, https://www.feministcurrent.com/2014/11/10/part-of-the-problem-talking-about-systemic-oppression/. recut- KH

**Systemic oppressions result in**very real**violence and**human**degradation**. Systemic misogyny, patriarchy, colonialism and racism have horrific consequences that we witness daily in our streets, communities and on the news. **Unless we,**especially those of  us like myself who are white men,**are willing** to acknowledge the fact ofour colonialist civilization, are willing **to confront**the fact of**our**legacy and **continuation of systemic racism**, are willing to acknowledge the role men play, collectively and individually, in the creation of a culture of misogyny, then **how can we seek to be allies to**those**communities**and movements that are **fighting to end the long and terrible history of institutionalized brutality** that directly benefited us and whose continuing, daily and pervasive manifestations still do? This is why talking about, **seeking to understand** and seeking to acknowledge **our collective role in systemic oppression is an absolute necessity**. **Without doing so, it is very difficult to see** how **our society**and civilization can ever begin to**move past it.**

**2. Since justice requires rectifying actual mistreatment, we should address material conditions of violence first.**

**Pappas 16**

Pappas, Gregory Fernando. [Texas A&M University] “The Pragmatists’ Approach to Injustice.” The Pluralist, Volume 11, Number 1, Spring 2016. BE

In Experience and Nature, Dewey names the empirical way of doing philosophy the “denotative method” (LW 1:371).18 What Dewey means by “denotation” is simply the phase of an empirical inquiry where we are con- cerned with designatin

as free from theoretical presuppositions as possible, the concrete problem (subject matter) for which we can provide different and even competing descriptions and theories. Thus an **empirical inquiry about** an **injustice must begin with** a rough and tentative **designation of where**the **injustices** from within the broader context of our everyday life and activities **are.** Once we designate the subject matter, we then engage in the inquiry itself, including diagnosis, possibly even constructing theories and developing concepts. Of course, that is not the end of the inquiry. We must then take the results of that inquiry “as a path pointing and leading back to something in primary experience” (LW 1:17). This looping back is essential, and it neverends as long as there are new experiences of injustice that may require a revi- sion of our theories. **Injustices are**events **suffered by** **concrete people** at a particular time and in a situation. **We need to start by pointing out and describing these problematic experiences instead of starting with a theoretical account** or diagnosis of them. Dewey is concerned with the consequences of not following the methodological advice to distinguish designation from diagnosis. Definitions, theoretical criteria, and diagnosis can be useful; they have their proper place and function once inquiry is on its way, but if stressed too much at the start of inquiry, they can blind us to aspects of concrete problems that escape our theoretical lenses. We must attempt to pretheoretically designate the subject matter, that is, to “point” in a certain direction, even with a vague or crude description of the problem**.**He adds: Just as with the doctor, empirical inquirers about injustice must return to the concrete problem for testing, and should never forget that their conceptual abstractions and general knowledge are just means to ameliorate what is particular, context-bound, and unique. In reaching a diagnosis, the doc- tor, of course, relies on all of his background knowledge about diseases and evidence, but a good doctor never forgets the individuality of the particular problem (patient and illness). The physician in diagnosing a case of disease deals with something in- dividualized. He draws upon a store of general principles of physiology, etc., already at his command. Without this store of conceptual material he is helpless. But he does not attempt to reduce the case to an exact specimen of certain laws of physiology and pathology, or do away with its unique individuality. Rather he uses general statements as aids to direct his observation of the particular case, so as to discover what it is like. They function as intellectual tools or instrumentalities. (LW 4:166) Dewey uses the example of the doctor to emphasize the radical contex- tualism and particularism of his view. The good doctor never forgets that this patient and “this ill is just the specific ill that it is. It never is an exact duplicate of anything else.”22 Similarly, the empirical philosopher in her in- quiry about an injustice brings forth general knowledge or expertise to an inquiry into the causes of an injustice. She relies on sociology and history as well as knowledge of different forms of injustice, but it is all in the service of inquiry about the singularity of each injustice suffered in a situation. The correction or refinement that I am making to Anderson’s character- ization of the pragmatists’ approach is not a minor terminological or scholarly point; it has methodological and practical consequences in how we approach an injustice. The distinction between the diagnosis and the problem (the ill- ness, the injustice) is an important functional distinction that must be kept in inquiry because it keeps us alert to the provisional and hypothetical aspect of any diagnosis. **To rectify or improve any diagnosis, we must return to the concrete problem;** as with the patient, this may require attending as much as possible to the uniqueness of the problem. This is in the same spirit as Anderson’s preference for an empirical inquiry that tries to “capture all of the expressive harms” in situations of injustice. But this requires that we begin with and return to concrete experiences of injustice and not by starting with a diagnosis of the causes of injustice provided by studies in the social sciences, as in (5) above. For instance, a diagnosis of causes that are due to systematic, structural features of society or the world disregards aspects of the concrete experiences of injustice that are not systematic and structural. Making problematic situations of injustice our explicit methodological commitment as a starting point rather than a diagnosis of the problem is an important and useful imperative for nonideal theories. It functions as a directive to inquirers toward the problem, to locate it, and designate it before venturing into descriptions, diagnosis, analysis, clarifications, hypotheses, and reasoning about the problem. These operations are instrumental to its ame- lioration and must ultimately return (be tested) by the problem that sparked the inquiry. The directive can make inquirers more attentive to the complex ways in which such differences as race, culture, class, or gender intersect in a problem of injustice. Sensitivity to complexity and difference in matters of injustice is not easy; it is a very demanding methodological prescription because it means that no matter how confident we may feel about applying solutions designed to ameliorate systematic evil, our cures should try to address as much as possible the unique circumstances of each injustice**.** The analogy with medical inquiry and practice is useful in making this point, since the hope is that someday we will improve our tools of inquiry to prac- tice a much more personalized medicine than we do today, that is, provide a diagnosis and a solution specific to each patient.

**Contention 1 is Essential Workers**:

**Subpoint A: Essential workers are the most vulnerable to poverty and food scarcity, especially people of color**

**Hammonds, Kerrisssey, and Devey ‘20**

The majority of **[60% of] essential workers do not feel safe at work** (60%), [71%] are unable to practice social distancing (71%), **and [86%] experience increased stress** (86%).Many employers do not provide proper safety gear. Some [15%] essential workers do not have access to masks (15%), [15%] hand sanitizer (15%), [10%]  regular hand washing (10%), and roughly one in three have not received training on preventing COVID-19 transmission (31%). Grocery and retail workers face an additional problem: belligerent customers. Workers report rudeness and aggression from some customers when trying to implement social distancing and other COVID-19 store policies. **43% of essential workers are low wage,** earning less than $20/hour, **and these workers are worse off** in all dimensions **than higher wage essential workers. Low wage workers are 2 to 3 times less likely to have safety gear, paid sick days, or health insurance.** African American and Latino low wage workers are the most at risk. **Low wage workers are** also unable to consistently meet basic needs, including being **4 times more likely to face food insecurities** and to have used a food bank in the past week. **These disturbing patterns are consistently worse for African American and Latino workers.**

**Trigger warning: Sexual assault-**

**Subpoint B: Healthcare workers face inadequate support, attacks, and sexual assault - this harms them and their patients. Striking solves.  
Chima 20,** Associate Professor & Head: Programme of Bio &research ethics and Medical Law, College o Health Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Nata <https://journals.lww.com/co-anesthesiology/Abstract/2020/04000/Doctor_and_healthcare_workers_strike__are_they.13.aspx>

Deficiency in basic healthcare infrastructure was mostly reported by doctors/HCWs working in LDCs like Uganda, Zimbabwe, Haiti, Sudan, and so on [1&&,23,37,38,44], and HCWs in LMICs with high population density like India and Nigeria [29,40–44]. **Infrastructural constraints included inadequate manpower, or too many patients for available healthcare resources, which impacted** on **the capacity** of HCWs **to carry out their jobs effectively. Thus, putting patients’ safety at risk, inducing doctors to embark on strikes in the best interests of their patients..** HCWs in certain countries such as India and South Africa complained about attacks on doctors/HCWs as reasons for strikes. In some cases, HCWs were attacked by dissatisfied patients or next of kin [29,46]. Sometimes, HCWs were unable to carry out their duties effectively due to disruption of work environments by other striking public service employees as reported from South Africa [9,12,58]. In other instances, **doctors and nurses have been attacked or raped at work because of poor safety and security as reported from some South African hospitals** [59,60].

**Subpoint C: Teachers are facing bad working conditions and underpay, causing teacher shortages and harming education   
Brett Henebery 06 Oct 2021,**Published on the The Educator, Australia, ‘Teachers overworked, underpaid, and undervalued – global report”<https://www.theeducatoronline.com/k12/news/teachers-overworked-underpaid-and-undervalued--global-report/278841>

**A new global report points to** [**system wide conditions**](https://www.theeducatoronline.com/k12/news/a-system-in-crisis-gallop-report-recommends-seismic-change/275578) **which are failing to attract a new generation of educators** to the profession. The 2021 Education International report on the Global Status of Teachers and the Teaching Profession, authored by Professor Greg Thompson, Queensland University of Technology, surveyed 128 education union leaders and officials in 94 countries and across all levels of education. More than 42% of respondents stated that **there had been a deterioration in teachers’ working conditions** over the last three years. A significant 84% indicated that [**salaries had decreased** during the COVID-19 pandemic](https://www.theeducatoronline.com/k12/news/why-teacher-pay-has-been-dwindling-for-30-years/273290). Teachers also expressed concerns about intensifying workloads, with **over 55% of respondents stated that workloads were “unmanageable”**. Over 66% of respondents felt that [and] “administrivia” requirements were contributing to the excessive workload pressures for education professionals.Teacher attrition was reported as an issue at all academic levels, with primary education (33.1%) the highest and higher education (17.3%) the lowest. Almost half (48%) of respondents think the teaching profession is not an attractive profession for young people. “Teachers are skilled professionals doing increasingly complex and challenging work. If we aren’t properly supporting them, we aren’t properly supporting students,” [NSW Teachers Federation](https://www.theeducatoronline.com/k12/companies/nsw-teachers-federation/231909/) president, Angelo Gavrielatos, told *The Educator.* “Societal expectations about what teachers do everyday have never been higher but their pay compared to other professions has never been lower.” Gavrielatos said the “deliberate undervaluing” of teachers by government is the root cause of the teacher shortage currently being experienced in NSW. “This shortage will get much worse in years to come unless there is a significant policy reset. We are at start of a boom in enrolments that will require up to 25 per cent more teachers in the next 10 years alone,” he said. “We have to make the profession more attractive through competitive salaries and realistic workloads if we are to fix the shortages and recruit a minimum of 11,000 more teachers required just to meet enrollment growth over the next decade.” David Edwards, General Secretary of Education International, said the report’s findings are “a clear indication” that governments need to make an urgent investment in teachers and the students they educate.“**Increasing teacher salaries and reducing workload is essential to recruit the best people into the profession and ensure quality education for all,**” Edwards said.“Recent policy moves tend to shift responsibility, and blame, onto teachers for issues that systems should be providing support for. An intelligent professional agenda requires a collective, joint negotiated plan with the profession.”

**Contention 2  is Income Inequality**

**Subpoint A: Strikes are key to decreasing economic inequality**

**Bahn**, 8-29-**2019**

*Kate, (Director of Labor Market Policy and Interim Chief Economist Equitable Growth, "The once and future role of strikes in ensuring U.S. worker power," Equitable Growth, https://equitablegrowth.org/the-once-and-future-role-of-strikes-in-ensuring-u-s-worker-power/, Published 8-29-2019 Accessed 10-7-2021 Wally)*

Monopsony power is a situation in the labor market where individual employers exercise effective control over wage setting rather than wages being set by competitive forces (akin to monopoly power, where a limited number of firms exercise pricing power over their customers.) In a new Equitable Growth working paper by Mark Paul of New College of Florida and Mark Stelzner of Connecticut College, the role of collective action in offsetting employer monopsony power is examined in the context of institutional support for labor. Paul and Stelzner construct an abstract model with the assumption of monopsonistic markets and follow the originator of monopsony theory Joan Robinson’s insight that unions can serve as a countervailing power against employer power. Their model shows that institutional support for unions, such as legislation protecting the right to organize, is necessary for this dynamic process of balancing employers’ monopsony power. In an accompanying column, the two researchers write that they “find that a lack of institutional support will devastate unions’ ability to function as a balance to firms’ monopsony power, potentially with major consequences … In turn, labor market outcomes will be less socially efficient.” In short, **policies and enforcement that support collective action such as strikes not only creates benefits for workers directly but also addresses a larger problem of concentrated market power**. The return of strikes in the U.S. labor market Within the past few years, strikes have been revived as a bargaining tool. **“Red for Ed” became the name referring to teachers strikes that took place across traditionally conservative right-to-work states**. Beginning with the closure of all schools in West Virginia in 2018 following 20,000 teachers across the state walking out, this movement spread to Oklahoma, Kentucky, Arizona, and Colorado, among other places. **These strikes were** led by rank-and-file union members, rather than by union leadership, rendering them **illegal under the Taft-Hartley Act,** which prohibits so-called wildcat strikes. **These strikes led to significant gains for these public-sector workers** through organizing against policymakers rather than direct management. Before Red for Ed, the “Fight for Fifteen” movement starting in 2012 and “OUR Walmart” starting in 2010 exemplified labor organizing in new mediums by conducting worker-led actions against large corporations that directly employ or control the employment (as in the franchisor-franchisee model) of low-wage workers. The efforts of **Fight for Fifteen directly impacted New York state’s minimum wage increase to $15 per hour and has paved the way for a national movement for a higher minimum wage.** OUR Walmart led walkouts and Black Friday protests in the years leading up to Walmart’s decision to increase wages. Many structural changes, such as the fissuring of the workplace, have reduced the ability of private-sector unions to make gains against employers, yet these strikes and labor actions represent an opportunity for growth. With the U.S. labor market increasingly dominated by the services sector, these strikes were conducted by workers whose jobs cannot move elsewhere and whose work we interact with in our daily lives. Ruth Milkman of the City University of New York describes these labor actions as similar to those that existed before the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 protected the right strike (before these rights were subsequently chipped away by the Taft-Hartley Act 20 years later) in order to unionize. With popular and successful strikes in unexpected places, what will the role of strikes be in the future? Will workers continue recognize the strength of the strike and other labor actions, and will policymakers and enforcers make it a successful tool for increasing worker bargaining power? Research by Alex Hertel-Fernandez, Suresh Naidu, and Adam Reich of Columbia University looked at the response to strikes following the Red for Ed movement in conservative states and found that residents of areas affected by the teacher walkouts broadly supported the strikes, with 39 percent saying they strongly supported the walkouts and another 27 percent somewhat in support of the walkouts, including half of self-identified Republicans supporting the strikes. What’s more, the three researchers found that families that learned about them from their teachers or directly from the union had even stronger support for the strikes, compared to those who learned about them from other sources, such as talk radio. First-hand knowledge of strikes increases support for them. In addition to Hertel-Fernandez’s work showing broad support for unions generally and increasing support for bold labor actions, more policymakers and advocates are providing much-needed proposals on how to foster a robust U.S. labor market and strengthen institutions that would make collective action more successful. Emblematic of this is Harvard Law’s Labor and Worklife Program’s Clean Slate Project, led by Sharon Block and Ben Sachs of Harvard University, which gathers academic experts and labor organizers to develop strong proposals that would increase worker bargaining power. Multiple 2020 presidential campaigns have followed suit, with new proposals to boost unions. Conclusion Unions in the United States are at their lowest level of density since they became legal around 80 years ago, with 6.4 percent of private-sector workers in unions today. Yet there is increasing energy for bringing back this crucial force to balance the power of capital and ensure the fruits of economic growth are more broadly shared among everyone who creates it. **Strikes are a compelling tool for dealing with rising U.S. income and wealth inequality—just as they were in an earlier era of economic inequality, when unions first gained their legal stature** in the U.S. labor market.

**Subpoint B: Inequality ruins the economy – closing gaps solves  
Collins 17** *(senior scholar at the Institute for Policy Studies, where he directs the Program on Inequality and coedits Inequality.org. His newest book is Born on Third Base: A One Percenter Makes the Case for Tackling Inequality, Bringing Wealth Home, and Committing to the Common Good (Chelsea Green, 2016). He is coauthor, with Bill Gates Sr., of Wealth and Our Commonwealth: Why America Should Tax Accumulated Fortunes (Beacon, 2004). He is coauthor with Mary Wright of The Moral Measure of the Economy (Orbis, 2008), about Christian ethics and economic life. His previous books include 99 to 1: How Wealth Inequality is Wrecking the World and What We Can Do About It (Berrett-Koehler, 2012). He is also the cofounder of Wealth for the Common Good that has merged with the Patriotic Millionaires, two efforts to organize members of the 1 percent to advocate for fair tax policy. He is coauthor of the August 2016 report, Ever Growing Gap, about the racial wealth divide and author of Gilded Giving: Top Heavy Philanthropy in an Age of Extreme Inequality, a November 2016 report on the impact of inequality on philanthropy, Reversing Inequality: Unleashing the Transformative Potential of an Equitable Economy, https://thenextsystem.org/inequality#inequality-trends)*

The conventional economic wisdom is that we should tolerate high levels of inequality to foster economic growth. But do policies that increase equality slow economic growth? And do aggressive pro-growth policies worsen inequality? New research reveals the opposite, increasingly showing that **excessive inequality undermines economic stability and slows traditional measures of economic growth while fostering volatility, bubbles, and punishing cycles of booms and busts.** The **strong parallels between 1929, on the eve of the Great Depression, and the 2008 economic meltdown are instructive** here. Both economic recessions came on the heels of a decade when rewards were divvied up extremely inequitably. Before both downturns, private corporations and government encouraged the lower and middle classes to borrow, extending easy access to credit. Also during both, household debt nearly doubled. Wages stagnated for most workers while the wealthiest 1 percent captured a huge percentage of income gains. And then as now, when financial markets experience inequality-induced volatility, investors of capital become cautious. Many understand that rigged rules favor inside actors and politically connected financiers, and, so, if they lack insider information they’ll think better of investing it back into the economy. Our economic history doesn’t have to be our economic destiny. Research by the International Monetary Fund (**IMF**) and the National Bureau of Economic Research **finds** that more **equal societies have stronger rates of growth**, enjoy **longer** economic **expansions, and** **recover** from economic downturns **faster.**33 The flipside: unequal societies are less resistant to both financial crises and political instability—a possible explanation for the sluggish and uneven recovery from the Great Recession of 2008.34Growing inequality’s toll on economic stability and private markets has enormous consequences. According to the IMF, **unequal income trends in the US mean that future economic expansions will be just one third as long** as in the 1960s, before the income divide widened, if we stay on our current path.35

**Contention 3 is Resisting Authoritarianism**

**Subpoint A: Hong Kong National Security Law prohibits strikes without government approval**

**U.S. Department of State 21**

“2021 Hong Kong Policy Act Report - United States Department of State.” U.S. Department of State, U.S. Department of State, 31 Mar. 2021, <https://www.state.gov/2021-hong-kong-policy-act-report/>.

Hong Kong law provides for protection of freedom of assembly, but the Hong Kong government did not respect this right during the reporting period. **Under Hong Kong law, organizers of public meetings and demonstrations are required to apply for a required “letter of no objection” from police, but the police did not issue any such letters during the reporting period, effectively banning all protests.** The government cited COVID-19 restrictions to refuse authorization for assemblies, although **civil rights organizations said the intent of the denials was aimed at preventing political gatherings** rather than promoting public health. In June 2020, police refused to grant approval to an annual vigil to commemorate the victims of the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre for the first time ever, citing COVID-19-related social distancing concerns. **During the reporting period, Hong Kong authorities arrested and prosecuted activists and opposition politicians for allegedly organizing and taking part in unauthorized nonviolent demonstrations.** For example, in December 2020, a Hong Kong court sentenced activists Joshua Wong, Ivan Lam, and Agnes Chow to sentences of between seven and 13.5 months for their involvement in a June 2019 non-violent protest at the Hong Kong police headquarters. As of September 2020, according to media reports, **police arrested more than 10,000 people on various charges in connection with anti-government protests.** Most of those arrested were released on bail. Prosecutors also filed charges against more than 2,200 people in connection with the protests.

**\_\_\_\_Subpoint B: Impacts--authoritarianism crushes human rights and thus liberty**

**Mainland ‘21 CAN WE GET RID OF THIS CARD**

Lindsay Maizland writes about Asia for CFR.org. Before joining CFR, she covered breaking news for TEGNA’s central digital team and reported on world news for Vox. She holds a BA in international relations and journalism from American University. “Hong Kong's Freedoms: What China Promised and How It's Cracking Down.” Council on Foreign Relations, Council on Foreign Relations, <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/hong-kong-freedoms-democracy-protests-china-crackdown>.

**China’s government sees human rights as an existential threat.** Its reaction could pose an existential threat to the rights of people worldwide. At home, the Chinese Communist Party, worried that permitting political freedom would jeopardize its grasp on power, has constructed an Orwellian high-tech surveillance state and a sophisticated internet censorship system to monitor and suppress public criticism. Abroad, **it uses its growing economic clout to** silence critics and to **carry out the most intense attack on the global system for enforcing human rights** since that system began to emerge in the mid-20th century. Beijing was long focused on building a “Great Firewall” to prevent the people of China from being exposed to any criticism of the government from abroad. Now the government is increasingly attacking the critics themselves, whether they represent a foreign government, are part of an overseas company or university, or join real or virtual avenues of public protest. **No other government is simultaneously detaining a million members of an ethnic minority for forced indoctrination and attacking anyone who dares to challenge its repression.** And while other governments commit serious human rights violations, no other government flexes its political muscles with such vigor and determination to undermine the international human rights standards and institutions that could hold it to account. **If not challenged, Beijing’s actions portend a dystopian future in which** no one is beyond the reach of Chinese censors, and **an international human rights system so weakened that it no longer serves as a check on government repression.**

**Subpoint C: General strikes are the key means of protest against the PRC**

**Chiu and Wong ‘19**

Tiffany Wong is a native Hong Konger now based in Berlin. Chiu, Dominic, and Tiffany Wong. “Hong Kong on Strike.” Foreign Policy, Foreign Policy, 3 July 2019, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/07/03/hong-kong-on-strike/>.

Hong Kong’s business community is usually a conservative and cautious group. But as **the world’s camera lenses were fixed on a violent clash between protesters and riot police in Hong Kong** on June 12, more than a thousand local businesses participated in the city’s first general strike since the 1960s. Suggestions for a strike began on June 9, when it became clear that the government would refuse to shelve the controversial extradition bill despite huge demonstrations. **A local minivan delivery service became the first company to announce that its employees would go on strike** on June 12, the day that the bill was scheduled for a second reading in the legislature. In the following days, businesses including **restaurants, bookstores, grocery stores, and cafes announced that they would shut their doors to join the protest**. In the short term, the impact of the strike was minor. But **the adoption of a new protest technique** points to how the extradition bill has radicalized Hong Kongers—and could **prove a potent tool of opposition to Beijing.** The result of future general strikes in Hong Kong will depend in part on whether **the movement can rally workers in the four key industries whose ongoing operation is vital to the city’s economy: finance, tourism, logistics, and professional vocations** including legal and accounting services. **These four sectors make up almost 60 percent of the city’s GDP.** A successful strike depends on the participation of workers in these industries and other white-collar professions, including the civil service, where union activity has historically been anemic.

**Contention 4 is Solvency**

**Subpoint A: The right to unconditional strike is key to resisting oppression   
Lim 19  
Woojin Lim ’22, a Crimson Editorial editor, is a Philosophy concentrator in Winthrop House. December 11, 2019** <https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2019/12/11/lim-right-to-strike/>

Fifty years later, the Harvard Graduate Students Union-United Automobile Workers [declared](https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2019/12/3/grad-union-strikes/) a strike, fighting [for](https://www.thecrimson.com/article/2019/11/21/grad-student-strike-proposals/) increased compensation, health benefits, and neutral third-party arbitration for sexual harassment and discrimination. On December 3, over 500 demonstrators, wearing on their shoulders large blue-and-white “UAW on Strike” placards, [marched](https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2019/12/unionized-harvard-students-go-on-strike/) routes throughout the Yard. In the strike of 1969, strikers fought for social justice; in the HGSU-UAW strike of 2019, strikers press on the fight for fair wages and working conditions.

**The right to strike is a** [**right**](https://jacobinmag.com/2018/07/right-to-strike-freedom-civil-liberties-oppression) **to resist oppression.** The strike(and the credible threat of a strike) is an indispensable part of the collective bargaining procedure. Collective bargaining (or “agreement-making”) provides workers and employees with the opportunity to influence the establishment of workplace rules that govern a large portion of their lives. The concerted withdrawal of labor allows workers to promote and defend their unprotected economic and social interestsfrom employers’ unilateral strikes provide workers with the bargaining power to drive fair and decisions, and provide employers with pressure and incentives to make reasonable concessions. Functionally, meaningful negotiations, offsetting the inherent inequalities of bargaining power in the employer-employee relationship. **The right to strike is essential in preserving and winning rights. Any curtailment of this right involves the risk of weakening the very basis of collective bargaining. Strikes** are not only a means of demanding and achieving an adequate provision of basic liberties but also **are** themselves **intrinsic, self-determined expressions of freedom and human rights.** The exercise of the power to strike affirms a quintessential corpus of values akin to liberal democracies, notably those of dignity, liberty, and autonomy. In acts of collective defiance, strikers assert their freedoms of speech, association, and assembly. Acts of striking, marching, and picketing command the attention of the media and prompt public forums of discussion and dialogue.

**Subpoint B: The right to strike is a prerequisite to all human rights; it is the best way to challenge the oppressive social order.**

Jacob Samuel **Bartholomew-Smith**, **2021** (LLM Candidate at University of Oslo. “The Right to Strike In International Human Rights Law” <http://urn.nb.no/URN:NBN:no-88660> Published 2021; Accessed 10-07-2021; Wally)

This analysis has demonstrated that **the right to strike is an international human right**. However, in Chapter 1 it was shown that there are those who fear that rights discourse would do damage to labour rights by depoliticising the structural causes of workers’ oppression and eroding the basis of solidarity on which the labour movement was built. What has this analysis revealed about these claims? **The right to strike has its roots in workers’ struggle against the injustices of capitalism**. It is premised on the imbalance of power between worker and employer. That the freedom of association has been interpreted to include a right to strike in the supervisory bodies of the ILO, ECHR and to a lesser extent the ICCPR, shows that the struggle between labour and capital has a role to play in shaping the meaning of human rights. To this end, O’Connell’s claims that human rights should not dismissed as an “ideological mask for the status quo” is correct, and **human rights** 326 **can** be deployed in ways which **challenge the logic of capital.** 325 Ibid, 223-224 O’Connell (2018b: 983) 326 48 of 54 Candidate No.7015 Moyn expressed his concern that human rights are a “powerless companion”, rather than a “threatening enemy” which will prompt a new social bargain. It is suggested here that the development of the human right to strike, especially the right to take political strike action discussed in Chapter 4, might contribute to assuaging this concern. As Novitz observes, **the ability to inflict economic damage means that the right to strike “is a more effective form of protest than marching in the streets.” If international human rights law is able to provide a source of protection for such** 328 **action, then workers will find themselves better equipped to seriously challenge the extant social order**. Furthermore, it is a weapon which workers can deploy on their own, without reliance on lawyers and NGOs. Youngdahl and Kumar expressed their concerns that the discourse of human rights would be unable to encompass the most important value of the labour movement, solidarity. In order to eval 329 - uate this concern, Chapter 4 examined the extent to which solidarity strikes are permitted under international human rights law. It is in this area that human rights discourse is found wanting. The RMT judgment shows that courts steeped in the liberal tradition have not provided the right to strike with its fullest expression. Even in the ILO, where the representatives of workers’ join those of States and employers, it is the principle relating to solidarity action that remain the most underdeveloped. Youngdahl and Kumar have good reasons to be concerned and, as the Germanotta recognises,330 developing solidarity will be of fundamental importance in the struggle against globalised capital. However, the convergence of labour law and human rights law remains a promising site for developing transformative practices which challenge the extant social order. Although we should be concerned with what labour law has to lose, we must also pay attention to what human rights stand to gain. **The right to strike has at its core the demand for social justice,** the reduction in disparities of economic power. If the convergence of labour rights and human rights impresses the importance of social justice on the later, then the human rights community would do well to pay close attention to developments in this area. If the convergence of labour law and human rights law is to teach us anything, it must be that **“human rights cannot exist without social justice.”**

**Some blocks**

**A2 Util**

1. **I defend consequentialism; I just argue that mitigating oppression COMES FIRST.**
2. **Policy makers can aggregate under my framework via looking at concrete examples of oppression**
3. **We cannot maximize life/happiness without making sure everyone is equal in the first place**
4. **Extend Laxer 14 - Institutional actions require addressing system oppression first**
5. **Extend Pappas 16: The only way to solve injustices is by looking at CONCRETE examples of injustice first, not hypothetical ones. So -**
   1. **Prefer high probability over low probability impacts**
   2. **Prefer my evidence over hypothetical impacts, like extinction**
   3. **This framework is best for a JUST government because this is the only way to enact justice**

**Subpoint A:** **Extremely low probabilities should count as zero—even if there’s some risk, policy decisions can’t be justified by small probabilities**

**RESCHER 2003** (Nicholas, Prof of Philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh, Sensible Decisions: Issues of Rational Decision in Personal Choice and Public Policy, p. 49-50)

On this issue there is a systemic disagreement between probabilists working on theory-oriented issues in mathematics or natural science and decision theorists who work on practical decision-oriented issues relating to human affairs.  The former takes the line that small number are small numbers and must be taken into account as such—that is, the small quantities they actually are.  The latter tend to take the view that small probabilities represent extremely remote prospect and can be written off.  (De minimis non curat lex, as the old precept has it: in human affairs there is no need to bother with trifles.)  When something is about as probable as a thousand fair dice when tossed a thousand times coming up all sixes, then, so it is held, we can pretty well forget about it as a worthy of concern.  **As a matter of practical policy**, we operate with probabilities on the principle that when x ≤ E, then x = 0.  **We take the line that in our human dealings in real-life situations a sufficiently remote possibility can**—for all sensible purposes—**be viewed as being of probability zero.**  Accordingly, such **remote possibilities can simply be dismissed, and the outcomes with which they are associated can accordingly be set aside.  And in “the real world” people do in fact seem to be prepared to treat certain probabilities as effectively zero, taking certain sufficiently improbable eventualities as no long representing real possibilities.**  Here an extremely improbable event is seen as something we can simply write off as being outside the range of appropriate concern, something we can dismiss for all practical purposes.  As one writer on insurance puts it: [P]eople…refuse to worry about losses whose probability is below some threshold.  Probabilities below the threshold are treated as though they were zero.  No doubt, remote-possibility events having such a minute possibility can happen in some sense of the term, but this “can” functions somewhat figuratively—it is no longer seen as something that presents a reali

**A2 UBI CP**

1. **Perm do both**
2. **Strikes historically solve low wages best - Cross-apply Bahn 2019 from Contention 2**
3. **UBI does not solve poor working conditions and authoritarianism which are SEVERAL of my impacts which are -**
   1. **Hammonds 17: Essential workers lack safety gear and health insurance**
   2. **Chima 20: Nurses unmanageable workloads and assault**
   3. **Henebery 21: Teachers have bad working conditions**
   4. **Mainland 21: PRC mass oppresses its people**
   5. **Barthmolomew-Smith 21: Strikes key to human rights**
4. **We STILL need essential workers even in the world of UBI, which means we need strikes to improve working conditions.**
5. **UBI Worsens Poverty**

**Greenstein 2019** (Robert Greenstein is the Founder and President Emeritus of of Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. “Commentary: Universal Basic Income May Sound Attractive But, If It Occurred, Would Likelier Increase Poverty Than Reduce It,” <https://www.cbpp.org/research/poverty-and-opportunity/commentary-universal-basic-income-may-sound-attractive-but-if-it>)

UBI’s daunting financing challenges raise fundamental questions about its political feasibility, both now and in coming decades.  Proponents often speak of an emerging left-right coalition to support it.  But consider what **UBI’s supporters** on the right advocate.  They generally **propose UBI as a *replacement* for the current “welfare state.”**  That is,they would finance UBI by eliminating all or most programs for people with low or modest incomes**.** Consider what that would mean.  **If you take the dollars targeted on people in the bottom** fifth or two-fifths **of the population and convert them to universal payments to people** all the way **up the income scale, you’re redistributing income *upward*.  That would increase poverty and inequality rather than reduce them.** Yet that’s the platform on which the (limited) support for UBI on the right largely rests.  **It entails abolishing programs from SNAP** (food stamps) — **which largely eliminated** the **severe child malnutrition** found in parts of the Southern “black belt” and Appalachia in the late 1960s — **to** the Earned Income Tax Credit (**EITC**), Section 8 rental vouchers, **Medicaid, Head Start, child care assistance, and many others.**  **These programs lift tens of millions of people**, including millions of children, **out of poverty each year** and make tens of millions more less poor.

**Taking away welfare is just worsening poverty...redistributing the money of poor people upwards the scale doesn’t help**

**Does Not solve hongkong impacts, we still need to protect their working conditions and UBI does not help those bad working conditions**

**Does Not grant HCW healthcare,**

**POVERTY IS VIOLENCE  
No one can ensure no violence, but majority of strikes are peaceful and the impact of the benefits from strikes outweigh**

**Also if only condition is having to provide a notice then that takes away all the leverage a strike is supposed to have and therefore does not solve and grant the employees their demands**

**Debating a utopia**

**And if neg is defending status quo: then invalid fiat arg**

**If not a utopia is unrealistic and we lose all ground**

**Still covid regulation on strikes is not about health its about political gathering: use blm protests as an example...people who did not care about covid were now acting like they cared because BLM is behind the protests.**

**A2: Any sort of arbitration solves best**

1. **Cross-apply Lim 19 - limiting strikes weakens ALL collective bargaining**
2. **Cross-apply Mainland 21: You cannot arbitrate with an authoritarian regime; striking is key**
3. **If you feel like you need cards, find cards in aff files.**

**Arbitration Counter Response**

**Arbitration is biased towards corporations.**

***Stone*** *, Katherine VW,* ***and Alexander  state in 2015*** *J.S. Colvin. “The Arbitration Epidemic: Mandatory Arbitration Deprives Workers and Consumers of Their Rights.” Economic Policy Institute, 7 Dec. 2015, https://www.epi.org/publication/the-arbitration-epidemic/.*

**In the past three decades, the Supreme Court has engineered a massive shift in the civil justice system that is having dire consequences for consumers and employees. The Court has enabled large corporations to force customers and employees into arbitration to adjudicate practically all types of alleged violations of countless state and federal laws designed to protect citizens against consumer fraud, unsafe products, employment discrimination, nonpayment of wages, and other forms of corporate wrongdoing. By delegating dispute resolution to arbitration, the Court now permits corporations to write the rules that will govern their relationships with their workers and customers and design the procedures used to interpret and apply those rules when disputes arise. Moreover, the Court permits corporations to couple mandatory arbitration with a ban on class actions, thereby preventing consumers or employees from joining together to challenge systemic corporate wrongdoing. As one judge opined, these trends give corporations a “get out of jail free” card for all potential transgressions. These trends are undermining decades of progress in consumer and labor rights.**

* **Perm**

* **Bias**

* **Analytical-**
  + **their evidence doesn’t prove its solves better under the harms under aff case**
  + **Example; “This evidence doesn’t say it solves climate issues.”**

**A2 Econ stuff**

**I would ask in CX how many more strikes need to happen before their econ impacts happen (the “brightline” if strikes have historically not triggered an economic collapse that caused war, extinction, etc.)**