# NC

## 1

### Framing

#### Ethical projects starting from a derivation of truth always fail. 2 warrants:

#### 1] There are no overarching moral doctrines to guide morality – only those we impose in the state of nature.

Parrish 1 1. Rick Parrish 2. 2004 3.  The Johns Hopkins University Press  4. Derrida's Economy of Violence in Hobbes' Social Contract 5. 1/5/16 6. Pg 4-7. 7. Rick Parrish teaches at Loyola University New Orleans. His current research is focused on the play of violence and respect within justice. He can be reached at [parrish@loyno.edu](mailto:parrish@loyno.edu) <http://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/theory_and_event/v007/7.4parrish.html>

Perhaps the single most telling quote from Hobbes on this point comes from *The Philosophical Rudiments Concerning Government and Society* (usually known by its Latin name, *De Cive*), in which he states that "to *know truth*, is the same thing as to *remember* that it was made by ourselves by the very usurpation of the words."24 "For Hobbes truth is a function of logic and language, not of the relation between language and some extralinguistic reality,"25 so the"connections between names and objects are not natural."26 They are artificially constructed by persons, based on individual psychologies and desires. These individual desires are for Hobbes the only measure of good and bad, because value terms "are ever used with relation to the person that useth them, there being nothing simply and absolutely so, nor any common rule of good and evil to be taken from the nature of the objects themselves."27 Since "there are no authentical doctrines concerning right and wrong, good and evil,"28 these labels are placed upon things by humans in acts of creation rather than discovered as extrinsic facts.”

#### 2] It is impossible to compare between normative claims since those claims start from functionally different claims, making it impossible to rationally debate between frameworks.

Joyce Joyce, Richard. Myth of Morality. Port Chester, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2002. p 45-47.

This distinction between what is accepted from within an institution, and “stepping out” of that institution and appraising it from an exterior perspective, is close to Carnap’s distinction between internal and external questions. 15 Certain **“linguistic frameworks”** (as Carnap calls them) **bring** with them **new** terms and **ways of talking**: accepting the language of “things” licenses making assertions like “The shirt is in the cupboard”; **accepting mathematics allows one to say “There is a prime number greater than one hundred”**; accepting the language of propositions permits saying “Chicago is large is a true proposition,” etc. Internal to the framework in question, confirming or disconfirming the truth of these propositions is a trivial matter. But traditionally **philosophers have interest**ed themselves **in** the external question – **the** issue of the adequacy of **[from] the framework itself:** “Do objects exist?”, “Does the world exist?”, “A**re there numbers?**”, “Are the propositions?”, etc. Carnap’s argument is that **the** external **question,** as it has been typically construed, **does not make sense.** From a perspective that accepts mathematics, the answer to the question “Do numbers exist?” is just trivially “Yes.”From a perspective which has not accepted mathematics, Carnap thinks, the only sensible way of construing the question is not as a theoretical question, but as a practical one: “Shall I accept the framework of mathematics?”, and this pragmatic question is to be answered by consideration of the efficiency, the fruitfulness, the usefulness,etc., of the adoption. But the (traditional) **philosopher’s questions** – “But is mathematics true?”, “Are there really numbers?” – **are pseudo-questions.** By turning traditional philosophical questions into practical questions of the form “Shall I adopt...?”, Carnap is offering a noncognitive analysis of metaphysics. Since I am claiming that we can critically inspect morality from an external perspective – that we can ask whether there are any non-institutional reasons accompanying moral injunctions – and that such questioning would not amount to a “Shall we adopt...?” query, Carnap’s position represents a threat. What arguments does Carnap offer to his conclusion? He starts with the example of the “thing language,” which involves reference to objects that exist in time and space. **To** step out of the thing language and **ask “But does the world exist?” is a mistake,** Carnap thinks, **because the very notion of “existence”** is a term which belongs to the thing language, and **can be understood only within that framework**, “hence this concept cannot be meaningfully applied to the system itself.” 16 Moving on to the external question “Do numbers exist?” Carnap cannot use the same argument – he cannot say that “existence” is internal to the number language and thus cannot be applied to the system as a whole. Instead he says that philosophers who ask the question do not mean material existence, but have no clear understanding of what other kind of existence might be involved, thus such questions have no cognitive content. It appears that this is the form of argument which he is willing to generalize to all further cases: **persons who dispute** whether propositions exist, **whether properties exist,** etc., do not know what they are arguing over, thus they **are not arguing over the truth of a proposition, but over the practical value of their** respective **positions.** Carnap adds that this is so because there is nothing that both parties would possibly count as evidence that would sway the debate one way or the other.

#### [3] Linguistics – Truth is constructed by language, which is completely arbitrary. Nothing tells me that a chair is a chair; I only assign it that name arbitrarily because I want to. Meaning can’t be contained within language if we make it up ourselves, and truth doesn’t exist absent language.

#### The conclusion is adherence to the sovereign: since the sovereign's role is to provide a common meaning to notions like morality, the question of morality is the SAME question as the nature of the sovereign.

Parrish 2 1. Rick Parrish 2.  2004  3.  The Johns Hopkins University Press  4. Derrida's Economy of Violence in Hobbes' Social Contract  5. 1/5/16 6. Pg 4-7. 7. Rick Parrish teaches at Loyola University New Orleans. His current research is focused on the play of violence and respect within justice. He can be reached at [parrish@loyno.edu](mailto:parrish@loyno.edu) http://muse.jhu.edu/login?auth=0&type=summary&url=/journals/theory\_and\_event/v007/7.4parrish.html

All of the foregoing pints to the conclusion that in **the commonwealth the sovereign’s** first and **most fundamental job is to be the ultimate definer.** Several other commentators have also reached this conclusion. By way of elaborating upon the importance of the moderation of individuality in Hobbes’ theory of government, Richard Flathman claims that **peace “is possible only if the ambiguity and disagreement that pervade general thinking and acting are eliminated by the stipulations of a sovereign.”** Pursuant to debunking the perennial misinterpretation of Hobbes’ mention of people as wolves, Paul Johnson argues that“one of **the primary functions of the sovereign is to provide** the necessary **unity of meaning** and reference **for the‘ primary terms in which [people]** men try to **conduct their social lives.” “The** whole **[purpose]** raison d’entre of sovereign helmsmanship lies squarely in the chronic **[is to] defus[e]**ing of **interpretive clashes,” without which humans would “fly off in all directions” and fall** inevitably **into the violence of the natural condition.**

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the will of the sovereign.

#### Prefer:

#### The sovereign always exists. All persons want to become meaning creators and eventually a sovereign will be formed.

**Parrish 3** [Derrida`s Economy of Violence in Hobbes` Social Contract, Richard Parrish]

But even more significantly for his relationship with Derrida, Hobbes argues **that in the state of nature persons must** not only try to control as many objects as possible -- they must also **try to control as many persons as possible**. "There is no way for any man to secure himself so reasonable as anticipation, that is, **by force** or wiles to master the persons of all men he can, so long till he see no other power great enough to endanger him. And this is no more than his own conservation requireth, and is generally allowed."37 While it is often assumed that by this Hobbes means a person will try to control others with physical force alone, when one approaches Hobbesian persons as meaning creators this control takes on a more discursive, arche-violent character. First," says Hobbes, "among [persons in the state of nature] there is a contestation of honour and preferment,"38 a discursive struggle not over what physical objects each person will possess, but over who or what will be considered valuable. **Persons,** as rationally self-interestedbeings **who** "measure, not only other men, but all other things, by themselves,"39 and **value themselves above all others, attempt to force that valuation on others.** "**The human desire for 'glory'**, which in today's language translates not simply as the desire for prestige, but also the desire to acquire power over others," **is** therefore primarily **about subsuming others beneath one's own personhood, as direct objects** or merely phenomenal substances. As above, the inevitability of this situation is given by the fact that the primarily egoistic nature of all experience renders the other in a "state of empirical alter-ego"41 to oneself. Those who prefer a more directly materialistic reading of Hobbes may attempt to bolster their position by pointing to his comment that "the most frequent reason why men desire to hurt each other, ariseth hence, that many men at the same time have an appetite to the same thing; which yet very often they can neither enjoy in common, nor yet divide it; whence it follows that the strongest must have it, and who is strongest must be decided by the sword."42 This quote also supports my reading of Hobbes, because quite simply the primary thing all persons want but can never have in common is the status of the ultimate creator of meaning, the primary personhood, from which all other goods flow. Everyone, by their natures as creators of meaning whose "desire of power after power . . . ceaseth only in death,"43 tries to subsume others beneath their personhood in order to control these others and glorify themselves. As Piotr Hoffman puts it, "every individual acting under the right of nature views himself as the center of the universe; his aim is, quite simply and quite closely, to become a small "god among men," to use Plato's phrase."Hobbes argues that **this discursive struggle rapidly becomes physical** by writing that "every man thinking well of himself, and hating to see the same in others, they must needs provoke one another by words, and other signs of contempt and hatred, which are incident to all comparison, till at last they must determine the pre-eminence by strength and force of body."45 **The ultimate violence, the surest and most complete way of removing a person's ability to create meaning, is to kill that person, and the escalating contentiousness of the state of nature makes life short in the war of all against all**. But this does not render the fundamental reason for this violence any less discursive, any less based on "one's sense of self-importance in comparison with others"46 or human nature as a creator of meaning.

#### Moral Discourse: outside of the state there is no authority to ensure that individuals will follow the same moral language. The state clarifies this by being an ultimate arbiter.

#### Infinite Regress: other moral theories inevitably fail as individuals question why we follow them; individuals consent to the state by virtue of engaging in it, therefore we escape this regress.

#### Constitutivism: hypothetically other moral theories may matter but obligations differ based on the nature of agency as different agents have different obligations. Therefore the state has unique obligations that might be inconsistent with morality in general.

#### TJFs

#### Resolvability: util debates end up being a mess of weighing and impact calculation, using Hobbes is resolvable because it’s just a question of what the sovereign believes. Independently indicts util, we can’t act on util if every action requires endless weighing.

#### Political education: politicians have to understand the social contract in order to know what powers they do / do not have, debating Hobbes helps us learn about that.

### Offense

#### 1] Government strikes decrease the power of the state, meaning the unconditional right to strike would further decrease power. This would lead to the state of nature.

#### 2] The aff obligates governments to act – incoherent because it calls on a power higher than the sovereign to make the sovereign act. Only the state has the authority to create moral obligations.

#### 3] Restrictions -- the resolution places an obligation on the sovereign, but that’s impossible because the sovereign creates morality.

## 2

#### Interpretation: the aff may not specify a subset of workers and a “just” government.

#### Governments generic bare plural.

Nebel 20 [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Indefinite Singular Generics in Debate” Victory Briefs, 19 August 2020. no url AG

I agree that if “a democracy” in the resolution just meant “one or more democracy,” then a country-specific affirmative could be topical. But, as I will explain in this topic analysis, that isn’t what “a democracy” means in the resolution. To see why, we first need to back up a bit and review (or learn) the idea of generic generalizations.

The most common way of expressing a generic in English is through a *bare plural*. A bare plural is a plural noun phrase, like “dogs” and “cats,” that lacks an overt determiner. (A determiner is a word that tells us which or how many: determiners include quantifier words like “all,” “some,” and “most,” demonstratives like “this” and “those,” posses- sives like “mine” and “its,” and so on.) LD resolutions often contain bare plurals, and that is the most common clue to their genericity.

We have already seen some examples of generics that are not bare plurals: “A whale is a mammal,” “A beaver builds dams,” and “The woolly mammoth is extinct.” The first two examples use indefinite singulars—singular nouns preceded by the indefinite article “a”—and the third is a definite singular since it is preceded by the definite article “the.” Generics can also be expressed with bare singulars (“Syrup is viscous”) and even verbs (as we’ll see later on). The resolution’s “a democracy” is an indefinite singular, and so it very well might be—and, as we’ll soon see, is—generic.

But it is also important to keep in mind that, just as not all generics are bare plurals, not all bare plurals are generic. “Dogs are barking” is true as long as some dogs are barking. Bare plurals can be used in particular ways to express existential statements. The key question for any given debate resolution that contains a bare plural is whether that occurrence of the bare plural is generic or existential.

The same is true of indefinite singulars. As debaters will be quick to point out, some uses of the indefinite singular really do mean “some” or “one or more”: “A cat is on the mat” is clearly not a generic generalization about cats; it’s true as long as some cat is on the mat. The question is whether the indefinite singular “a democracy” is existential or generic in the resolution.

Now, my own view is that, if we understand the difference between existential and generic statements, and if we approach the question impartially, without any invest- ment in one side of the debate, we can almost always just tell which reading is correct just by thinking about it. It is clear that “In a democracy, voting ought to be compul- sory” doesn’t mean “There is one or more democracy in which voting ought to be com- pulsory.” I don’t think a fancy argument should be required to show this any more than a fancy argument should be required to show that “A duck doesn’t lay eggs” is a generic—a false one because ducks do lay eggs, even though some ducks (namely males) don’t. And if a debater contests this by insisting that “a democracy” is existen- tial, the judge should be willing to resolve competing claims by, well, judging—that is, by using her judgment. Contesting a claim by insisting on its negation or demanding justification doesn’t put any obligation on the judge to be neutral about it. (Otherwise the negative could make every debate irresolvable by just insisting on the negation of every statement in the affirmative speeches.) Even if the insistence is backed by some sort of argument, we can reasonably reject an argument if we know its conclusion to be false, even if we are not in a position to know exactly where the argument goes wrong. Particularly in matters of logic and language, speakers have more direct knowledge of particular cases (e.g., that some specific inference is invalid or some specific sentence is infelicitious) than of the underlying explanations.

But that is just my view, and not every judge agrees with me, so it will be helpful to consider some arguments for the conclusion that we already know to be true: that, even if the United States is a democracy and ought to have compulsory voting, that doesn’t suffice to show that, in a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory—in other words, that “a democracy” in the resolution is generic, not existential.

Second, existential uses of the indefinite, such as “A cat is on the mat,” are upward- entailing.3 This means that if you replace the noun with a more general one, such as “An animal is on the mat,” the sentence will still be true. So let’s do that with “a democracy.” Does the resolution entail “In a society, voting ought to be compulsory”? Intuitively not, because you could think that voting ought to be compulsory in democracies but not in other sorts of societies. This suggests that “a democracy” in the resolution is not existential.

#### Workers is a bare plural

**Nebel 19**[studies Philosophy at Oxford on a Marshall Scholarship. As a coach, his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin., Victory Briefs, “Existential Bare Plurals and Quantifier Scope by Jake Nebel”, January 2, 2019, <https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/01/02/existential-bare-plurals-and-quantifier-scope-by-jake-nebel/>] DD MN

Let’s start with some background. “Authoritarian regimes” is **a bare plural: it’s a plural noun phrase without an explicit determiner (e.g., “five,” “some,” “all,” “the,” “most”).** **Bare plurals are typically** **used to express generic generalizations**, as in “Ravens are black.” Unlike universally quantified statements, generics tolerate exceptions. For example, **“Ravens are black” is true even though “All ravens are black” is false.** In addition to generic readings, bare plurals can also sometimes have existential readings, as if they were preceded by “some.” For example, “Ravens are outside” is true just in case there are some ravens—i.e., more than one—outside. Unlike existential statements, **generic generalizations are not entailed by specific instances**. For example, **the generic “Ravens are white” is false even though some ravens are indeed white**; white ravens are white not because they are ravens but because they have leucism

#### Standards:

#### 1] Predictability-allowing the aff to set various conditions and limitations to a right to strike turns the topic into generic debates about whether or not strikes are good. All the aff has to do is find a single reason why is bad, which will then explode neg prep and allow them to avoid valuable clash over the specifics. This kills off fairness and education

#### 2] Limits – there’s so many just workers they could specify, coupled with various governments. Kills neg burdens – it’s impossible for me to research every possible worker AND different permutations of those workers.

#### 3] TVA Solves – just read your aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff. We aren’t stopping them from reading new FWs, mechanisms, or advantages. PICs don’t solve – it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff making it impossible for me to win

# 1NR

## A2 Util

#### [1] Calc indicts matter – if util can’t be applied in the real world, there’s no reason to accept it as a moral framework.

#### [2] Counterexamples disprove the framework: any framework that contradicts our baseline intuitions like slavery bad is probably false.

#### [3] Induction fails—it assumes that things will always happen the same way in the future as they have in the past. But this begs the question of how we know what happened in the past will happen in the future. Also means no predictions

#### [4] Infinite regress – every consequence causes another consequence ad infinitum, so any arbitrary action causes infinite pain and infinite pleasure, which triggers presumption.

#### [5] Incommensurability objection – can’t compare different forms of happiness like friendship v ice cream – means aggregation impossible

#### [6] Util could justify horrific conclusions, which must be grounds to reject it since it challenges assumptions about intrinsic, unconditional badness. No action could be intrinsically bad from this standpoint, even genocide or gruesome torture – this makes debate unsafe by claiming any action is potentially permissible or even obligatory if performing it led to better consequences.

#### [7] Util can’t account for the particularity of ethics - pleasure is only good if appropriate – e.g. pleasure from watching someone else be tortured would be bad, meaning the framework fails to be universal

#### [8] Util incorrectly takes an impersonal view of pleasure and pain since goodness and badness of sentiments are always particular -- e.g. a murderer who feels pain because of their guilt should feel worse than an innocent person

#### [9] Util is terrible at handling exceptions – [A] if a utility monster gained infinite pleasure from eating everybody that’s still a bad thing [B] if all of humanity was put into pleasure machines that injected pleasure into our brains yes that maximizes pleasure but it fails to respect value to life [C] things like slavery can never be justified but util justifies one instance of slavery lifting a billion people out of poverty for the rest of their lives

#### [10] Hobbes hijacks: [A] subjective interpretations of everything like pain, pleasure, etc. means your morality fails unless a sovereign can reconcile different understandings of morality [B] Even if util is true, people only follow it to look good to others and feel good about themselves, so it collapses to self-interest anyway [C] The state of nature contains infinite actions that cause pain, so the only way to ensure util is upheld is through the existence of a sovereign.

## Case

#### Turn: Strikes create a stigmatization effect on labor that devastates the economy and worsens inequality.

**Tenza 20**, [Mlungisi. "The effects of violent strikes on the economy of a developing country: a case of South Africa." Obiter 41.3 (2020): 519-537. (Senior Lecturer, University of KwaZulu-Natal)]

When South Africa obtained democracy in 1994, there was a dream of a better country with a new vision for industrial relations.5 However, the number of violent strikes that have bedevilled this country in recent years seems to have shattered-down the aspirations of a better South Africa. South Africa recorded 114 strikes in 2013 and 88 strikes in 2014, which cost the country about R6.1 billion according to the Department of Labour.6 The impact of these strikes has been hugely felt by the mining sector, particularly the platinum industry. The biggest strike took place in the platinum sector where about 70 000 mineworkers’ downed tools for better wages. Three major platinum producers (Impala, Anglo American and Lonmin Platinum Mines) were affected. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 25 June 2014. Business Day reported that “the five-month-long strike in the platinum sector pushed the economy to the brink of recession”. 7 This strike was closely followed by a four-week strike in the metal and engineering sector. All these strikes (and those not mentioned here) were characterised with violence accompanied by damage to property, intimidation, assault and sometimes the killing of people. Statistics from the metal and engineering sector showed that about 246 cases of intimidation were reported, 50 violent incidents occurred, and 85 cases of vandalism were recorded.8 Large-scale unemployment, soaring poverty levels and the dramatic income inequality that characterise the South African labour market provide a broad explanation for strike violence.9 While participating in a strike, workers’ stress levels leave them feeling frustrated at their seeming powerlessness, which in turn provokes further violent behaviour.10 These strikes are not only violent but take long to resolve. Generally, a lengthy strike has a negative effect on employment, reduces business confidence and increases the risk of economic stagflation. In addition, such strikes have a major setback on the growth of the economy and investment opportunities. It is common knowledge that consumer spending is directly linked to economic growth. At the same time, if the economy is not showing signs of growth, employment opportunities are shed, and poverty becomes the end result. The economy of South Africa is in need of rapid growth to enable it to deal with the high levels of unemployment and resultant poverty. One of the measures that may boost the country’s economic growth is by attracting potential investors to invest in the country. However, this might be difficult as investors would want to invest in a country where there is a likelihood of getting returns for their investments. The wish of getting returns for investment may not materialise if the labour environment is not fertile for such investments as a result of, for example, unstable labour relations. Therefore, investors may be reluctant to invest where there is an unstable or fragile labour relations environment. 3 THE COMMISSION OF VIOLENCE DURING A STRIKE AND CONSEQUENCES The Constitution guarantees every worker the right to join a trade union, participate in the activities and programmes of a trade union, and to strike. 11 The Constitution grants these rights to a “worker” as an individual.12 However, the right to strike and any other conduct in contemplation or furtherance of a strike such as a picket13 can only be exercised by workers acting collectively.14 The right to strike and participation in the activities of a trade union were given more effect through the enactment of the Labour Relations Act 66 of 199515 (LRA). The main purpose of the LRA is to “advance economic development, social justice, labour peace and the democratisation of the workplace”. 16 The advancement of social justice means that the exercise of the right to strike must advance the interests of workers and at the same time workers must refrain from any conduct that can affect those who are not on strike as well members of society. Even though the right to strike and the right to participate in the activities of a trade union that often flow from a strike17 are guaranteed in the Constitution and specifically regulated by the LRA, it sometimes happens that the right to strike is exercised for purposes not intended by the Constitution and the LRA, generally. 18 For example, it was not the intention of the Constitutional Assembly and the legislature that violence should be used during strikes or pickets. As the Constitution provides, pickets are meant to be peaceful. 19 Contrary to section 17 of the Constitution, the conduct of workers participating in a strike or picket has changed in recent years with workers trying to emphasise their grievances by causing disharmony and chaos in public. A media report by the South African Institute of Race Relations pointed out that between the years 1999 and 2012 there were 181 strike-related deaths, 313 injuries and 3,058 people were arrested for public violence associated with strikes.20 The question is whether employers succumb easily to workers’ demands if a strike is accompanied by violence? In response to this question, one worker remarked as follows: “[T]here is no sweet strike, there is no Christian strike … A strike is a strike. [Y]ou want to get back what belongs to you ... you won’t win a strike with a Bible. You do not wear high heels and carry an umbrella and say ‘1992 was under apartheid, 2007 is under ANC’. You won’t win a strike like that.” 21 The use of violence during industrial action affects not only the strikers or picketers, the employer and his or her business but it also affects innocent members of the public, non-striking employees, the environment and the economy at large. In addition, striking workers visit non-striking workers’ homes, often at night, threaten them and in some cases, assault or even murder workers who are acting as replacement labour. 22 This points to the fact that for many workers and their families’ living conditions remain unsafe and vulnerable to damage due to violence. In Security Services Employers Organisation v SA Transport & Allied Workers Union (SATAWU),23 it was reported that about 20 people were thrown out of moving trains in the Gauteng province; most of them were security guards who were not on strike and who were believed to be targeted by their striking colleagues. Two of them died, while others were admitted to hospitals with serious injuries.24 In SA Chemical Catering & Allied Workers Union v Check One (Pty) Ltd,25 striking employees were carrying various weapons ranging from sticks, pipes, planks and bottles. One of the strikers Mr Nqoko was alleged to have threatened to cut the throats of those employees who had been brought from other branches of the employer’s business to help in the branch where employees were on strike. Such conduct was held not to be in line with good conduct of striking.26 These examples from case law show that South Africa is facing a problem that is affecting not only the industrial relations’ sector but also the economy at large. For example, in 2012, during a strike by workers employed by Lonmin in Marikana, the then-new union Association of Mine & Construction Workers Union (AMCU) wanted to exert its presence after it appeared that many workers were not happy with the way the majority union, National Union of Mine Workers (NUM), handled negotiations with the employer (Lonmin Mine). AMCU went on an unprotected strike which was violent and resulted in the loss of lives, damage to property and negative economic consequences including a weakened currency, reduced global investment, declining productivity, and increase unemployment in the affected sectors.27 Further, the unreasonably long time it takes for strikes to get resolved in the Republic has a negative effect on the business of the employer, the economy and employment. 3 1 Effects of violent and long strikes on the economy Generally, South Africa’s economy is on a downward scale. First, it fails to create employment opportunities for its people. The recent statistics on unemployment levels indicate that unemployment has increased from 26.5% to 27.2%. 28 The most prominent strike which nearly brought the platinum industries to its knees was the strike convened by AMCU in 2014. The strike started on 23 January 2014 and ended on 24 June 2014. It affected the three big platinum producers in the Republic, which are the Anglo American Platinum, Lonmin Plc and Impala Platinum. It was the longest strike since the dawn of democracy in 1994. As a result of this strike, the platinum industries lost billions of rands.29 According to the report by Economic Research Southern Africa, the platinum group metals industry is South Africa’s second-largest export earner behind gold and contributes just over 2% of the country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP).30 The overall metal ores in the mining industry which include platinum sells about 70% of its output to the export market while sales to local manufacturers of basic metals, fabricated metal products and various other metal equipment and machinery make up to 20%. 31 The research indicates that the overall impact of the strike in 2014 was driven by a reduction in productive capital in the mining sector, accompanied by a decrease in labour available to the economy. This resulted in a sharp increase in the price of the output by 5.8% with a GDP declined by 0.72 and 0.78%.32