### 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative debater must specify the type of strike in a delineated text in the 1AC.

#### Violation:

#### Standards –

#### 1] Topic lit – strikes are the core question of the topic and there’s no consensus on normal means so you must spec.

Law Library

[“Strike”, N.D., <https://law.jrank.org/pages/10554/Strike-Status.html>, Law Library, This law and legal reference library provides free access to thousands of legal articles, covering important court cases, historical legal documents, state laws & statutes, and general legal information. Popular articles include Landlord and Tenant Relationship, Health Insurance Law and Employment Law. The legal reference database also covers historically important court cases such as the Ulysses obscenity trial, Plessy vs. Ferguson, Roe vs. Wade and many others. All of the legal information on this website was professionally written and researched, and each law article has been carefully selected -- all to create the most comprehensive legal information site on the web. Read more: Law Library - American Law and Legal Information - JRank Articles <https://law.jrank.org/#ixzz6yOIvCHj7>] [SS]

**Strikes can be divided into** two basic types: **economic and unfair labor practice**. An economic strike seeks to obtain some type of economic benefit for the workers, such as improved wages and hours, or to force recognition of their union. An unfair labor practice strike is called to protest some act of the employer that the employees regard as unfair. A Lexicon of Labor Strikes Over the years different types of labor strikes have acquired distinctive labels. **The following are the** most common **types of strikes, some of which are illegal**: **Wildcat strike** A strike that is not authorized by the union that represents the employees. Although not illegal under law, wildcat strikes ordinarily constitute a violation of an existing collective bargaining agreement. **Walkout** An unannounced refusal to perform work. A walkout may be spontaneous or planned in advance and kept secret. If the employees' conduct is an irresponsible or indefensible method of accomplishing their goals, a walkout is illegal. In other situations courts may rule that the employees have a good reason to strike. **Slowdown** An intermittent work stoppage by employees who remain on the job. Slowdowns are illegal because they give the employees an unfair bargaining advantage by making it impossible for the employer to plan for production by the workforce. An employer may discharge an employee for a work slowdown. **Sitdown strike** A strike in which employees stop working and refuse to leave the employer's premises. Sitdown strikes helped unions organize workers in the automobile industry in the 1930s but are now rare. They are illegal under most circumstances. **Whipsaw strike** A work stoppage against a single member of a bargaining unit composed of several employers. Whipsaw strikes are legal and are used by unions to bring added pressure against the employer who experiences not only the strike but also competition from the employers who have not been struck. Employers may respond by locking out employees of all facilities that belong to members of the bargaining unit. Whipsaw strikes have commonly been used in the automobile industry. **Sympathy strike** A work stoppage designed to provide AID AND COMFORT to a related union engaged in an employment dispute. Although sympathy strikes are not illegal, unions can relinquish the right to use this tactic in a COLLECTIVE BARGAINING agreement. **Jurisdictional strike** A strike that arises from a dispute over which LABOR UNION is entitled to represent the employees. Jurisdictional strikes are unlawful under federal LABOR LAWS because the argument is between unions and not between a union and the employer.

#### **This acts as a resolvability standard. Debate has to make sense and be comparable for the judge to make a decision which means it’s an independent voter and outweighs.**

#### Implications:

#### [1] Stable advocacy – 1AR clarification delinks neg positions that prove why strikes in a certain instance is bad by saying it isn’t their method of strikes– wrecks neg ballot access and kills in depth clash – CX doesn’t check since it kills 1NC construction pre-round and debaters are shifty

#### [2] Prep skew – I don’t know what they will be willing to clarify until CX which means I could go 6 minutes planning to read a disad and then get screwed over in CX when they spec a different strike. This means that CX can’t check because the time when im waiting until then is the abuse. Key fairness because I won’t be able to use the strat I formulated if you skewed my prep and will have a time disadvantage

#### D. Voter

**Fairness is a voter—debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation. Education is a voter – it is the terminal impact of debate. Drop the debater—the abuse has already occurred and my time allocation has shifted—also the shell indicts your whole aff—justifies severance which skews my strat. Use competing interps—leads to a race to the top since we figure out the best possible norm and avoids judge intervention since there’s a clear briteline. No RVIs—**

**a. Baiting—they’ll just bait theory and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse and results in a chilling effect**

**b. its not logical—you don’t reward them for meeting the burden of being fair, especially on T debate where definitions are objective while your interp is subjective. Logic is a meta constraint on all args because it definitionally determines whether an argument is valid.**

### 2

#### Counterplan text – [Insert aff actor] ought to

#### ---enter a prior, binding, and genuine consultation with the International Court of Justice to issue a binding ruling to [recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike]

#### ICJ says yes and creates a culture of *acculturation* that socializes acceptance of international law – the aff shreds that.

Brudney 21 [James; 2/8/21; Joseph Crowley Chair in Labor and Employment Law, Fordham Law School; “The Right to Strike as Customary International Law,” THE YALE JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, Vol 46, <https://digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1710&context=yjil>] Justin \*\* Brackets in original

C. FOA and the Right to Strike as Opinio Juris There is also considerable support for the proposition that the general practice of states on FOA and the right to strike stems from acceptance as a matter of legal obligation. Admittedly, while the existence of opinio juris may be inferred from a general practice, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) has at times noted the insufficiency or inconclusiveness of such practice, instead seeking confirmation that "[states'] conduct is 'evidence of a belief that this practice is rendered obligatory by the existence of a rule of law requiring it. ",149 Trade agreements, for instance, may represent treaty law and may qualify as evidence of general practice, but they are typically entered into by States that have specific economic or political objectives rather than from a desire to embrace obligations arising under international law.15° Further, it is possible that even with respect to ILO conventions, widespread ratification is in part a function of acculturation, insofar as endorsements across a region contribute to socialized acceptance of norms on FOA, reassuring peer countries that protecting rights to association including the right to strike will not place them in an inferior competitive position. 151 That said, the ICJ often does infer the existence of opinio juris from a general practice and/or from determinations by national or international tribunals.152 And there are ample reasons to draw such an inference here. To start, FOA is consciously accepted as an obligation by ILO member states not simply through ratification of Convention 87 (covering more than 80 percent of them) but by virtue of membership itself. The ILO Constitution expressly requires support for FOA principles, and these principles are further imbedded through a tripartite governance structure that allocates power-sharing roles to worker organizations alongside governments and employers. 153 Thus, ILO members understand there is an underlying obligation to respect FOA in law and practice.154 A second reason is that domestic law can provide relevant evidence regarding the presence of opinio juris among states. Commitments to FOA expressed in national constitutions, statutes, and court decisions are not necessarily evidence of a state's belief that the principle is international as opposed to domestic law. Nonetheless, the International Law Commission has made clear that evidence of acceptance as law (opinio juris) "may take a wide range of forms," including but not limited to "official publications; government legal opinions; [and] decisions of national courts." 155 In this regard, the CEACR in 2012 identified 92 countries where "the right to strike is explicitly recognized, including at the constitutional level"; the list includes six countries that have not ratified Convention 87.156 Recognition in domestic law of a right to strike alongside a conscious decision not to ratify Convention 87 could give rise to an inference that these six countries are rejecting the right as a principle of international law. However, as explained earlier, national courts for two of the six non-ratifying countries (Brazil and Kenya) expressly invoke ILO membership and/or principles as guidance in their domestic law decisions.157 In addition, Canada—a country not listed among the 92 endorsing the right to strike in the 2012 General Survey—has since recognized a constitutional right to strike under national law, relying in part on international law principles including CEACR and CFA determinations.158 The Canadian Supreme Court had previously been explicit in invoking Convention 87, ICESCR, and ICCPR as "documents [that] reflect not only international consensus but also principles that Canada has committed itself to uphold." 159 Further, a third country in the group of six—South Korea—has affirmed in its trade agreements with the United States and the EU its obligation to "adopt and maintain in its statutes and regulations, and practices" FOA in accordance with the ILO Declaration.16° And in various CFA complaints against South Korea for violating FOA principles, including the right to strike, the Government has disputed the facts of the complaints while at the same time recognizing that such rights are embedded in international law.161 Accordingly, a more relevant reference point in this setting may be that "when States act in conformity with a treaty provision by which they are not bound . . . this may evidence the existence of acceptance as law (opinio juris) in the absence of any explanation to the contrary.3 3162 Stepping back, domestic law on FOA and the right to strike, which for many countries developed after Convention 87 and its initial applications by the CEACR and CFA, may be viewed in part as a window into countries' sense of obligation in law and practice. A state may at times adopt labor provisions of a trade agreement for reasons of comity or relative competitive advantage. These reasons may play a more modest role with respect to adoption of certain human rights treaties or ILO conventions. 163 But evidence of practice and obligation in the domestic law sphere—especially when informed by regard for international instruments—seems almost by definition to be a function of acceptance as law rather than susceptibility to strategic motivations. In this regard, there are numerous instances in recent years where governments have expanded their legislative protections for the right to strike following a period of dialogue with the CEACR, and that committee has recognized and applauded the changes in law. 164 Of particular relevance to the U.S. setting, these expansions have included assuring the right to strike for public sector employees and prohibiting the hiring of replacements for strikers. 165 A third reason to infer opinio juris (in addition to the centrality of FOA principles within the ILO Constitution and the strong evidence of FOA and right-to-strike practice and obligation under domestic law) involves recent statements from high officials in the United Nations indicating that the right to strike is understood by its leaders as CIL. In his 2016 report to the U.N. General Assembly, the U.N. Special Rapporteur on the rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and association explained, "The right to strike has been established in international law for decades, in global and regional instruments, and is also enshrined in the constitutions of at least 90 countries. The right to strike has, in fact, become customary international law.'5166 In 2018, responding to a press briefing on a strike by U.N. employees following announced pay cuts, the Deputy Spokesman for the U.N. Secretary-General reiterated the U.N. view that the right to strike is indeed CIL and did so in the context of the right being asserted by public employees not involved in the administration of the state: Question: Does the Secretary-General believe that U.N. staff have a right to take part in industrial action? Deputy Spokesman: We believe the right to strike is part of customary international law. 167 These statements did not simply materialize in recent times. Two major U.N. Human Rights treaties—the ICESCR and the ICCPR—have been interpreted by their relevant treaty bodies to include a right to strike; these bodies have reaffirmed their joint commitment to the right to strike as part of FOA, and they regularly monitor governments' record of compliance with this right. 168 And as noted earlier, the two treaties—each ratified by over 80 percent of U.N members—include a clause explicitly identifying respect for ILO Convention 87. In sum, the principles of FOA including the right to strike would appear to satisfy both prongs of the CIL test. The widely recognized general practice on strikes has sufficient shape and contours: a basic right, three substantive exceptions (public servants involved in administration of the state, essential services in the strict sense of the term, and acute national emergencies), a recognition that strikers retain their employment relationship during the strike itself, and certain procedural prerequisites or attached conditions.169 There are variations in national practice and also disagreements at the margins about what the right to strike protects, but these aspects are not different in kind from diversity and contests regarding international rights prohibiting child labor, or for that matter domestic constitutional rights involving freedom of expression or the right to bear arms. As for opinio juris, a broad range of sources combine to establish that the general practice stems from a sense of acceptance and obligation: ILO foundation and structure; two widely endorsed United Nations human rights treaties; national constitutions; government representations; domestic legislative and judicial decisions that expressly refer to or impliedly accept international standards and practices; and contemporary U.N. leadership.

#### Ruling on the right to strike secures the legitimacy of the ICJ as an international mediation body.

Hofmann and Schuster 16 [Claudia and Norbert; February 2016; Dr. Claudia Hofmann works as a research associate at the Chair for Public Law and Policy at the University of Regensburg. She specializes in public international law (in particular the field of socio-economic human rights and equality-oriented policies), social law, constitutional and administrative law. Norbert Schuster works as a lawyer in Berlin and teaches at the University of Bremen. He specialises in labour law; “It ain’t over ‘til it’s over: the right to strike and the mandate of the ILO Committee of Experts revisited,” <https://global-labour-university.org/fileadmin/GLU_Working_Papers/GLU_WP_No.40.pdf>] Justin

BASES FOR A POTENTIAL RULING BY THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE The question of whether the Committee has left the area of interpretation and entered the sphere of standard-setting can only be answered on a case by case basis. As has been indicated before, the primary question for an advisory opinion of the ICJ is whether Convention No. 87 contains a right to strike (see Section IV). What follows is, therefore, a cursory glance at the legal bases for an ICJ opinion, so as to sketch the broad outlines of a possible decision. Under Art 37.1 of the ILO Constitution, taken together with Art 36 of the ICJ Statute, the International Court of Justice is responsible for questions or differences of opinion about the interpretation of the ILO Constitution and the ILO Conventions. This reflects the function of the ICJ as an international mediation body inasmuch as cases are to be referred to the ICJ when the parties to a treaty disagree about the interpretation of a norm within the treaty. Let us assume that such a disagreement exists here as to whether, in particular, Art 3 of ILO Convention No. 87 also accords trade unions a right to strike.85 The Committee of Experts and the Committee on Freedom of Association have expressed a legal opinion on this. In the current legal situation, i.e. in the absence of concrete rules explicitly granting the Committee of Experts a corresponding interpretative competence, the competence to decide on this issue rests with the ICJ. Upon what sources of law and which principles will the ICJ base its decision? Two provisions are particularly relevant here. One is Art 38 of the ICJ Statute and the other is Art 31 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (VCLT).

#### ICJ legitimacy is key to global multilateralism and crisis stability – it’s declining now.

Kornelios Korneliou 18 [Permanent Representative of Cyprus and Vice-President of the 73rd Session of the UN General assembly, "Report of the International Court of Justice," United Nations, 10-25-2018 <https://www.un.org/pga/73/2018/10/25/report-of-the-international-court-of-justice/>] Recut Justin

In the face of the headwinds against the multilateral system and global institutions, including direct attacks on their legitimacy, the International Court of Justice stands as testament to the principles of peace and justice in a multilateral world. Today’s debate builds on fifty years of exchange between the Court and the General Assembly, allowing Member States the opportunity to debate the work of the Court. This historic exchange is particularly pertinent to the 73rd Session of the General Assembly, which aims to ‘make the UN relevant to all’. The court system serves as a bulwark against arbitrariness and provides the mechanism for peaceful settlement of disputes, guaranteeing the stability so necessary for international cooperation. For the peoples of the world, the court may be far away but its impact is real. Excellencies, I am encouraged by the continued and enhanced confidence in the International Court of Justice. Not only has the Court’s workload increased over the last 20-years but this trend has continued into the period under review, demonstrating unequivocally that there remains a need and desire for a multilateral mechanism to address legal challenges of international concern. The variety of cases addressed by the court, and the fact that these cases stem from four continents, is also testament to the universality of the Court. In fact, as of today a total of 73 Member States have accepted, as compulsory, the jurisdiction of the Court. In addition to the Court’s role in advancing multilateralism, its judgements and advisory opinion directly influence the development and strengthening of the rule of law in countries the world over. As stated by the report: “everything the court does is aimed at promoting and reinforcing the rule of law, through its judgement and advisory opinions, it contributes to developing and clarifying international law.” Finally, at a time when human rights abuses and conflict devastate the lives of millions, and when tensions simmer in regions throughout the world, the adjudication of disputes between states remains an essential role of the Court in preserving peace and security. We welcome the continued readiness by the Court to intervene when other diplomatic or political means have proven unsuccessful. For Member States, respect for the decisions, judgements, advice, and orders of the Court remains critical for the efficacy and longevity of the international Justice System. The General Assembly has thus called upon States that have not yet done so to consider accepting the jurisdiction of the Court in accordance with its Statute. In closing, allow me to reiterate: if we are to preserve the international multilateral system, then adherence and respect for international law remains key.

#### Multilateralism solves a bunch of impacts – even a tiny net benefit is enough to o/w the AFF

Esther Brimmer 14 [Assistant Secretary for the Bureau of International Organization Affairs at the United States Department of State from April 2009 to June 2013, “Smart Power” and Multilateral Diplomacy, June, <http://transatlantic.sais-jhu.edu/publications/books/Smarter%20Power/Chapter%204%20brimmer.pdf>] Recut Justin

Over the subsequent decade, the variable definitions of Smart Power have evolved to reflect a rapidly changing foreign affairs landscape – a landscape shaped increasingly by transnational issues and what can only be described as truly global challenges. Nations of the world must now calibrate their foreign policy investments to try to leverage new opportunities while protecting their interests from emerging vulnerabilities. Smart Power is no longer an alternative path; it is a four-lane imperative. ¶ The world in 2014 is fundamentally different from previous periods, growing vastly more interconnected, interdependent, networked, and complex. National economies are in many cases inextricably intertwined, with cross-border imports and exports increasing nearly tenfold over the past forty years, and more than doubling over just the past decade. At the same time, we are all connected – and connected immediately – to news and events that in past generations would have been restricted to their local vicinities.¶ Consider, for example, the 2011 tsunami that devastated parts of Japan. Not only did we know in real time of the earthquake that triggered the tsunami, we had live coverage of some of the tsunami’s most devastating impacts and then round-the-clock coverage of the Fukushima nuclear power plant crisis. Communications technology brings such events to us without delay and in high definition. This communications revolution, headlined by the explosion of social media, carries with it the almost unlimited potential to inform and educate. It also provides people and communities with new ability to influence and advance their causes – both benevolent and otherwise, as the dramatic events of recent years in North Africa and the Middle East have made clear. ¶ At the same time, global power is more diffuse today than in centuries. Although predictions of the nation-state’s demise have gone unrealized, non-state actors – including NGOs, corporations, and international organizations - are more influential today than perhaps at any point in human history. The same might be said for transnational criminal networks and other harmful actors. Concurrently, we are witnessing the rise of new centers of influence – the so-called “emerging” nations – that are seeking and gaining positions of global leadership. These emerging powers bring unique histories and new perspectives to the discussion of current challenges and the future of global governance. Several of these countries are democracies and share many of the core values of the United States; others have sharply different political systems and perspectives. All are gauging how to be more active in the global arena. ¶ It is this new, more diffused global system that must now find means of addressing today’s pressing global challenges – challenges that in many cases demand Smart Power ingenuity. From terrorism to nuclear proliferation, climate change to pandemic disease, transnational crime to cyber attacks, violations of fundamental human rights to natural disasters, today’s most urgent security challenges pay no heed to state borders. ¶ So, just as global power is more diffuse, so too are the opposing threats and challenges, and it is in this new reality that the United States must define and employ its Smart Power resources. That reality demands a definition that must now far exceed the origin parameters of hard and soft. Many of these challenges would be unresponsive to traditional Hard tools (coercion, economic sanctions, military force), while the application of Soft tools (norm advancement, cultural influence, public diplomacy) in customary channels is likely to provide unsatisfactory impact. ¶ Ultimately, the other component necessary in today’s Smart Power alchemy is robust, focused, and sustained international cooperation. In effect, in an increasing number of instances, Smart Power must now feature shared power, and in that context foreign policy choices must follow two related but distinct axes. ¶ First, those policy choices must strengthen a state’s overall stature and influence (rather than diminish it), leaving the state undertaking the action in a position of equal or greater global standing. This is easier said than done. The proliferation in challenges facing all states has created a need for multiple, simultaneous diplomatic transactions among a broadening cast of actors. Given the nature of today’s threats facing states both large and small, those transactions have never been more frequent and at times overlapping – a reality that requires new agility and synchronization within foreign policy hierarchies. States that are less capable of responding to this new reality may experience diminished political capital and international standing by acting on contemporary threats in isolation or without a full appreciation of the reigning international sentiment. Many observers have highlighted U.S. decision-making in advance of the 2003 Iraq invasion as indicative of just this phenomenon. ¶ Alternatively, states applying a new Smart Power approach to their foreign policy recognize the overlapping need to maintain global standing and stature while seeking resolution of individual policy challenges. We see considerable effort on the part of emerging powers to find just that balance, and I would argue that the United States has also made great strides in that regard since 2009. ¶ Second, Smart Power policy choices must contribute to the strength and resilience of the international system. As noted above, the globalization of contemporary challenges and security threats has augmented the need for effective cooperation among states and other international actors, and placed even greater demands on the global network of international institutions, conferences, frameworks, and groupings in which these challenges are more and more frequently addressed. Given this heightened need for structures to facilitate international collaboration, states are more rarely undertaking foreign policy courses of action that entirely lack a multilateral component, or that feature no interaction with or demands upon the international architecture. As recent American history shows, even states with unilateral tendencies have found themselves returning to the multilateral fold to address aspects of a threat or challenge that simply cannot be addressed effectively alone.

### 3

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being, or hedonistic act utilitarianism.

#### 1] Neuroscience- pleasure and pain *are* intrinsic value and disvalue – everything else regresses.

Blum et al. 18 [Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>] R.S.

**Pleasure** is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also **defines reward.** As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the **basis for hedonic theories** of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10].

Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14].

Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals.

Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D

Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it.

It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that **organisms are** the **result of evolutionary competition.** In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring.

Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding.

There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health.

Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage.

Finding happiness is different between apes and humans

As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure.

Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are **many brain regions**, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly **modulate** (increase or decrease) our **pleasure or** even produce **the opposite** of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered.

Desire and reward centers

It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation.

In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41].

Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42].

Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans.

In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45].

Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations.

Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50]

In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders.

In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, **there was** a **remarkable contrast in** the **neocortices**, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS.

Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### 2] Actor spec—governments must use util because they don’t have intentions and are constantly dealing with tradeoffs—outweighs since different agents have different obligations—takes out calc indicts since they are empirically denied. Deleuze’s theory of individual desire can’t spill up to influencing macropolitical structures.

cc

#### 4] TJFs- Util is key to debates about strikes because they inevitably devolve into consequential impacts.

Munyaradzi 10 [Mawere; Universidade Pedagogica, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Humanities, CP49, Xai-xai, Mozambique; “Are physicians’ strikes ever morally justifiable? A call for a return to tradition,” PAMC; 8/21/10; <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3063499/>] Justin

Utilitarianism is a doctrine which states that the rightness or wrongn"ess of an action is determined by the goodness or badness of its consequences [19]. This means that utilitarianism is a consequentialist theory in so far as it calls for the assessment of actions in terms of their ends and consequences, their contribution to happiness and prevention of suffering. In fact, according to utilitarianism, an action is good or right when it achieves the greatest happiness for the greatest number, otherwise it is bad. Kantian ethics, based on the concept of duty, holds that an action is good if it is based on good intention. For utilitarians, an action in itself has no moral worth and takes moral value only when it is considered in conjunction with its effects. To the contrary, Kantians argue that what makes an action right is not its consequence(s) but the fact that it conforms to the moral law [20]. Thus unlike deontological theories which look at the action itself, utilitarianism assess the rightness or wrongness of an individual or group’s action directly by its consequences and nothing else. De George offers some clarification of consequentialist and deontological ethics:

“One approach argues on the basis of consequences (consequentialist); it states that whether an action is right or wrong depends on the consequences of that action. The second basic approach is called the deontological approach. It states that duty is the basic moral category, and that duty is independent of consequences. An action is right if it has certain characteristics or is of a certain kind, and wrong if it has other characteristics or is of a certain kind” [21].

Utilitarianism and Kantian ethics are examples of consequentialist and deontological ethics, respectively. For Kant (the representative of Kantian ethics) the moral law or the highest principle of morality is based on human reason.

This work does not seek to undertake a comprehensive discussion of consequentialist and deontological ethics, but to demonstrate the usefulness and plausibility of utilitarianism in criticizing physicians strike. However, any ethical theory that begins from some external demands and consequences faces the challenge of legitimacy. The challenge is that what ought to be done remains foreign to who ought to do it. Such an approach to ethics largely ignores the personality of the individual that guarantees the actions. Transposing the utilitarianism to physicians’ strike, it is undoubtedly true that strike by physicians result in unbearable suffering of not only the patients in hospitals, but also of the public in general and the nation at large. During physicians’ strike, unnecessary and premature deaths-deaths that could have been prevented are inevitable. According to IRINnews [22], during a 2008 strike by Zimbabwean physicians, Jestina Moyo of Bulawayo, expressed disappointment on arriving at Mpilo central hospital in Bulawayo, with her seriously ill son only to be told that doctors were on strike. She laments:

“This is painful to watch my son waste away like this. The hospital says the doctors are on strike, demanding high salaries, and there is nothing I can do for my son, as I have no money to take him to a private doctor. As it is, my son will die a painful death unless I find money to take him to a private doctor”.

According to the same source, since the strike started several death were registered which doctors could have dealt with if they were not on strike. The same consequences have been felt in other countries the world-over. In Malawi, for example, Kelita Kamoto, director of the Queen Elizabeth Central Hospital in Malawi’s largest city Blantyre reported that between 15 and 20 deaths are recorded daily......deaths were registered as the strike entered its third week [23]. In another report by Ecumenical News International (ENI), Nigeria:

“Constant strikes by Nigerian doctors this year are said to have claimed the lives of more than 20000 patients and have placed a massive burden on Christian hospitals across the country which have been overwhelmed with patients. And other 6000 accident victims died from lack of medical attention as a result of the doctors’ strike” [24].

In Zambia, The Post Newspaper reported that:

“Last month, nurses and doctors went on a month-long strike, forcing one Zambian mother to give birth on the sidewalk outside the University Teaching Hospital, the country’s biggest. Her traumatized family took a picture of the ill-fated childbirth, showing the infant’s legs stretching out of the mother, struggling for life -the hospital and potential medical help tantalizingly nearby but completely out of reach. She gave birth without aid from doctors and the newborn died” [25].

Apart from Zimbabwe, Malawi, Nigeria and Zambia, in the past 20 years there has been strikes by medical doctors in Australia, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Korea, Malta, New Zealand, Peru, Serbia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Romania, USA and UK to name but a few. Many of these strikes have caused lasting damage from which health systems have struggled to get over; have been very costly (both in the short and long term); and have not achieved what the management appear to have wanted.

It can also be argued on the basis of utilitarianism that physicians strike like that of the army, police and prison officers has far reaching consequences to the country in question; may result in violation of human rights and looting of public ‘goods’. One can imagine what may happen if the army, police officers and the prison officers go on strike? If prison officers, for example, go on strike criminals, some with recorded history of mass killing will be free and obviously disturb the harmony of the innocent people. I believe physicians strike causes the same blow to the country involved. It is therefore the contention of this work that just like soldiers, prison officers and police officers who in many countries are not allowed to go on strike, physicians should likewise take no part in any form of strike action.

In view of cases of unnecessary deaths and sufferings of both the patients and the public spelled out in this work, it is undeniable on the basis of utilitarianism that physicians strike has far reaching consequences not only to the patients, but to the public and the national government in question (to the majority). It has been exhibited that the happiness that physician strike brings is clearly overwhelmed by the suffering and sadness it causes to the majority (the patients, public and the government in question). From this understanding the paper contends that physicians strike can never be morally justifiable. Strike fails to achieve a greater happiness to the greatest number of people affected by it.

#### Outweighs – A. Most articles about strikes are written through util – means other frameworks can never engage with core questions of the lit and decks predictability.

#### 2) util is the baseline introduction to debate and the most accessible, other fw’s require coaches to learn which are expensive B. TJFs first – substance begs the question of a framework being good for debate – fairness is a gateway issue to deciding the better debater and education is the reason schools fund debate

#### Impact calc – extinction outweighs

#### A] Reversibility- it forecloses the alternative because we can’t improve society if we are all dead and precludes our ability to practically reason

#### B] Structural violence- death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities

#### C] Objectivity- body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical

#### D] Uncertainty- if we’re unsure about which interpretation of the world is true, we should preserve the world to keep debating about it

### Case

#### NC theory over aff theory and Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is biased since the 2AR respond to the 2NR with new answers means they autowin, flips infinite abuse so reject it – reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging and preventing super abusive 1NCs. b] Structural skew: 7-6 time 2-1 speech skew for offense favors the Aff who speaks first and last and set the stage with a persuasive advantage so [c] No infinite abuse: 1NC is 7 minutes and 1AC spikes check

#### RVIs on 1AR theory –they are 20 seconds long shells but forces the 2N overallocate so they’re key for timeskew

#### No 2ar weighing- causes sandbagging where I don’t have a speeh to answer it

#### [1] No internal link—just because I have to value my own freedom does not mean I have to value everyones

#### [2] Tailoring objection—I can tailor my maxims to become specific enough to be universal. For example, I can will the maxim of lying in a specific circumstance only, as when universalized that would not create a contradiction in willing since not everyone would lie constantly.

#### [3] Schmagency Objection – we can refuse to act on our agency and be schmagents, meaning Kant isn’t binding.

#### [4] No a priori reason—evidence proves.

**Schwartz** “A Defense of Naïve Empiricism: It is Neither Self-Refuting Nor Dogmatic.” Stephen P. Schwartz. Ithaca College. pp.1-14.

The empirical support for the fundamental principle of empiricism is diffuse but salient. Our common empirical experience and experimental psychology offer evidence that humans do not have any capacity to garner knowledge except by empirical sources. The fact is that we believe that there is no source of knowledge, information, or evidence apart from observation, empirical scientific investigations, and our sensory experience of the world, and we believe this on the basis of our empirical a posteriori experiences and our general empirical view of how things work. For example, we believe on empirical evidence that humans are continuous with the rest of nature and that we rely like other animals on our senses to tell us how things are. If humans are more successful than other animals, it is not because we possess special non-experiential ways of knowing, but because we are better at cooperating, collating, and inferring. In particular we do not have any capacity for substantive a priori knowledge. There is no known mechanism by which such knowledge would be made possible. This is an empirical claim.

#### [5] Everyone’s ultimate ends are to seek avoid material violence so prefer consequentialism since acting on “legitimate” reasons just means acting on those desires

#### [8] Can’t weigh violations under your framework---- minimal rights violations are just as bad as murder under your framework even though one is clearly worse.

#### [9] Actor Specificity- Your FW is inapplicable as a principle for state action since policymakers cant rely on individual intents to evaluate morally pressing issues

#### – extinctions outweighs under Kantianism – it’s a mandate under any theory of agency

Moynihan 19 — (Thomas Moynihan, completed his PhD at the University of Oxford. His first book, Spinal Catastrophism (2019), is forthcoming., “The end of us”, Aeon, 8-7-19, Available Online at <https://aeon.co/essays/to-imagine-our-own-extinction-is-to-be-able-to-answer-for-it>, accessed 4-2-20, HKR-AM)

And so, given new awareness of the vicissitude of Earth history, of our precarious position within it as a biological species, and of our wider placement within a cosmic backdrop of roaming hazards, we were finally in a position to become receptive to the prospect of human extinction. Yet none of this could truly matter until ‘fact’ was fully separated from ‘value’. Only through full acceptance that the Universe is not itself inherently imbued with value could ‘human extinction’ gain the unique moral stakes that pick it out as a distinctive concept. Alongside descriptions of empirical fact, the discovery of human extinction demanded in-step self-reflections upon the proprieties (and precarities) of axiological value.

This final piece of the puzzle, therefore, came not from empirical science but from critical philosophy. It came from the revolution in philosophy initiated, in the 1780s, by Kant.

Kant realised that moral values are a question of self-legislation. They are maxims that we elect to bind ourselves by, and are accordingly constitutively dependent upon this election. Thus, they should not at all be considered part of the furniture of the natural world independently of our championship and upholding of them. And insofar as such values would not therefore be persistent features of the natural world independently of our ongoing stewardship, they thereby also demand our vigilant guardianship. In other words, ‘mind’ is entirely the responsibility of ‘minded agents’. We first realised that what we think and do matters, existentially so. It was this master idea of the Enlightenment that led us to appreciate the stakes involved in thinking.

Kant himself became increasingly preoccupied with the prospect of human extinction as he matured. Having once proclaimed that we ought ‘not lament’ the perishing of a world ‘as a real loss of Nature’, due to the age-old assumption that the Universe is maximally populated with moral worth and creatures like us, he slowly came to appreciate the precarity, and preciousness, of sapient values within the Universe. In his late works, the spectre of human extinction appears several times. During an essay on futurology, or what he calls ‘predictive history’, Kant’s projections upon humanity’s perfectibility are interrupted by the plausibility of an ‘epoch of natural revolution which will push aside the human race’. And this should come as no surprise, because Kant himself characteristically defined enlightening as humanity’s undertaking of self-responsibility: and human rationality assumes culpability for itself only to the exact extent that it progressively spells out the stakes involved in its precarious project, and stands steadfast in the face of them. This means that predicting increasingly severe threats is part and parcel of our progressive and historical assumption of accountability to ourselves. Only by articulating the stakes involved in our ignorance were we motivated to reason ever better, inasmuch as we realised that, should we not, we might never reason again.

### Offense

#### 1] Strikes violate individual autonomy by exercising coercion.

Gourevitch 18 [Alex; Brown University; “The Right to Strike: A Radical View,” American Political Science Review; 2018; [https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321]](https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321%5d//SJWen) Justin

\*\*Edited for ableist language

Every liberal democracy recognizes that workers have a right to strike. That right is protected in law, sometimes in the constitution itself. Yet strikes pose serious problems for liberal societies. They involve violence and coercion, they often violate some basic liberal liberties, they appear to involve group rights having priority over individual ones, and they can threaten public order itself. Strikes are also one of the most common forms of disruptive collective protest in modern history. Even given the dramatic decline in strike activity since its peak in the 1970s, they can play significant roles in our lives. For instance, just over the past few years in the United States, large illegal strikes by teachers ~~paralyzed~~ froze major school districts in Chicago and Seattle, as well as statewide in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and Colorado; a strike by taxi drivers played a major role in debates and court decisions regarding immigration; and strikes by retail and foodservice workers were instrumental in getting new minimum wage and other legislation passed in states like California, New York, and North Carolina. Yet, despite their significance, there is almost no political philosophy written about strikes.1 This despite the enormous literature on neighboring forms of protest like nonviolence, civil disobedience, conscientious refusal, and social movements.

The right to strike raises far more issues than a single essay can handle. In what follows, I address a particularly significant problem regarding the right to strike and its relation to coercive strike tactics. I argue that strikes present a dilemma for liberal societies because for most workers to have a reasonable chance of success they need to use some coercive strike tactics. But these coercive strike tactics both violate the law and infringe upon what are widely held to be basic liberal rights. To resolve this dilemma, we have to know why workers have the right to strike in the first place. I argue that the best way of understanding the right to strike is as a right to resist the oppression that workers face in the standard liberal capitalist economy. This way of understanding the right explains why the use of coercive strike tactics is not morally constrained by the requirement to respect the basic liberties nor the related laws that strikers violate when using certain coercive tactics.

#### 2] Means to an end: employees ignore their duty to help their patients in favor of higher wages which treats them as a means to an end.

#### 3] The aff homogenizes all strikes as an unconditional right which is unethical.

Loewy 2K, Erich H. "Of healthcare professionals, ethics, and strikes." Cambridge Q. Healthcare Ethics 9 (2000): 513. (Erich H. Loewy M.D., F.A.C.P., was born in Vienna, Austria in 1927 and was able to escape first to England and then to the U.S. in late 1938. He was initially trained as a cardiologist. He taught at Case Western Reserve and practiced in Cleveland, Ohio. After 14 years he devoted himself fully to Bioethics and taught at the University of Illinois for 12 years. In 1996 he was selected as the first endowed Alumni Association Chair of Bioethics at the University of California Davis School of Medicine and has taught there since.) JG

It would seem then that the ethical considerations for workers striking in an industry such as a shoe factory or a chain grocery store are quite different from the ethical considerations for workers in sanitation, police, or fire departments, or for professionals such as teachers or those involved directly in healthcare. Even in the latter “professional” category, there are subtle but distinct differences of “rights” and obligations. However, one cannot conclude that for workers in essential industries strikes are simply ethically not permissible, whereas they are permissible for workers in less essential industries. Strikes, by necessity, injure another, and injuring another cannot be ethically neutral. Injuring others is prima facie ethically problematic—that is, unless a good and weighty argument for doing so can be made, injuring another is not ethically proper. Striking by a worker, in as much as doing so injures another or others, is only a conditional right. A compelling ethical argument in favor of striking is needed as well as an ethical argument in favor of striking at the time and in the way planned. It remains to delineate the conditions under which strikes, especially strikes by workers in essential industries and even more so by persons who consider themselves to be “professionals,” may legitimately proceed and yet fulfill their basic purpose.

#### 4] Free-riding: strikes are a form of free-riding since those who don’t participate still reap the benefits.

Dolsak and Prakash 19 [Nives and Aseem; We write on environmental issues, climate politics and NGOs; “Climate Strikes: What They Accomplish And How They Could Have More Impact,” 9/14/19; Forbes; <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/09/14/climate-strikes-what-they-accomplish-and-how-they-could-have-more-impact/?sh=2244a9bd5eed>] Justin

While strikes and protests build solidarity among their supporters, they are susceptible to collective action problems. This is because **the goals that strikers pursue tend to create non-excludable benefits**. That is, benefits such as climate protection can be enjoyed by both strikers and non-strikers. Thus, large participation in climate strikes will reveal that in spite of free-riding problems, a large number of people have a strong preference for climate action.

### Advantage

#### STRIKES ARE HIGH NOW AND MORE ARE COMING- PROVES NO UNIQUENESS OR REASON WHY THE AFF IS KEY

Romero 10-21 Dani Romero (REPORTER, yahoo finance) 10/21/21, ‘Strikes are contagious’: Wave of labor unrest signals crisis in tight job market, <https://news.yahoo.com/strikes-are-contagious-wave-of-labor-unrest-signals-crisis-in-tight-jobs-market-135052770.html>

As employers of all sizes grapple with an acute worker shortage amid what’s being called the pandemic era’s Great Resignation, it’s become increasingly clear that people with jobs aren’t all that happy, either. At an ever-lengthening list of workplaces around the country, workers this year have been getting loud about the state of wages, working hours and conditions. From healthcare to entertainment, nearly 100,000 U.S. workers are either striking or preparing to strike in a bid to improve working conditions. New data signals that worker unrest is growing: a Cornell Labor Action Tracker shows that more than 180 strikes have been recorded this year, and over 24,000 workers have walked off the job this month. This all plays out against a backdrop of an economy bouncing back from an economic shutdown during the pandemic. More than 10,000 John Deere workers went on strike Thursday, the first major walkout at the agricultural machinery giant in more than three decades. “We have noticed a bit of an uptick in late September into early October, for example, we've already documented 39 strikes on the month of October,” Johnnie Kallas, a Ph.D. student at Cornell University’s School of Industrial and Labor Relations, or ILR, who tracks labor actions across the country, said in an interview. “Those numbers are already the largest of any month in 2021,” he added. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, which records only large work stoppages, has documented 12 strikes involving 1,000 or more workers. That represents a big jump from when the pandemic started over 19 months ago. “What will happen is you'll see more workers going on strike,” Kate Bronfenbrenner, director of labor education research and senior lecturer at Cornell school of industrial and labor relations, told Yahoo Finance. “Each time there's a ripple effect with each one of those, if the John Deere strike isn’t settled, you're going to see another big group go out,” she said. “If companies don't move, you're going to see this spread from one group to another. Strikes are contagious,” Bronfenbrenner added.

#### Concentration of power is good---anything else collapses union leverage---empirics.

Magner 20 [Brandon; Deputy Prosecutor at Marion County Prosecutor's Office; “Labor Law and Corporate Concentration,” 11/22/20; LaborLawLite; <https://brandonmagner.substack.com/p/labor-law-and-corporate-concentration>] Justin

On the side favoring increased centralization in the labor market is usually Matt Bruenig. Bruenig argues that dispersing corporate power also disperses union leverage, as unions can only exert maximum pressure on an industry when strikes affect the core of production. This is harder to do when the labor market is spread out across a series of smaller and less powerful firms. Organizing thus becomes a game of whack-a-mole under the National Labor Relations Act’s model of facility-specific [enterprise bargaining](https://americancompass.org/discussions/the-wagner-acts-original-sin/).

There is a historic attractiveness to Bruenig’s argument. Arguably the most famous concerted job action in American history, the Flint Sit-Down Strike at General Motors, involved a few thousand workers bringing the largest and most powerful employer in the world to a grinding halt by ceasing production in merely one of the company’s several hundred plants. GM eventually capitulated and signed a labor agreement that officially birthed the UAW. (Ironically, this act of union recognition by GM would likely be considered illegal under [today’s interpretations](https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/366/731/) of the NLRA, as there was n ever any showing by the UAW that it actually represented anything close to a majority of GM’s 136,000 workers.)
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