

Because everyone deserves access to an equitable and inclusive workplace, I affirm: Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

**My value for today's round is justice. Justice entails giving each person their due.**

**First, in order to create a society that is just, we must recognize our biases and actively strive to ensure all people are morally included.**

**Winter & Leighton 99** [Deborah DuNann Winter and Dana C. Leighton, Winter is a Professor at Whitman College and Leighton is a Professor at Texas A&M University, "Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Century" 1999, <http://sites.saumag.edu/danaleighton/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2015/09/SVintro-2.pdf>

Finally, to recognize the operation of structural violence forces us to ask questions about how and why we tolerate it, questions which often have painful answers for the privileged elite who unconsciously support it. A final question of this section is how and why we allow ourselves to be so oblivious to structural violence. Susan Opatow offers an intriguing set of answers, in her article Social Injustice. She argues that **our normal perceptual/cognitive processes divide people into in-groups and out-groups. Those outside our group lie outside our scope of justice.** Injustice that would be instantaneously confronted if it occurred to someone we love or know is barely noticed if it occurs to strangers or those who are invisible or irrelevant. We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone, so **we draw conceptual lines between those who are in and out of our moral circle. Those who fall outside are morally excluded, and become either invisible, or demeaned in some way so that we do not have to acknowledge the injustice they suffer.** Moral exclusion is a human failing, but Opatow argues convincingly that it is an outcome of everyday social cognition. **To reduce its nefarious effects, we must be vigilant in noticing and listening to oppressed, invisible, outsiders.** Inclusionary thinking can be fostered by relationships, communication, and appreciation of diversity. Like Opatow, all the authors in this section point out that **structural violence is not inevitable if we become aware of its operation, and build systematic ways to mitigate its effects.** Learning about structural violence may be discouraging, overwhelming, or maddening, but these papers encourage us to step beyond guilt and anger, and begin to think about how to reduce structural violence. All the authors in this section note that the same structures (such as global communication and normal social cognition) which feed structural violence, can also be used to empower citizens to reduce it. In the long run, reducing structural violence by reclaiming neighborhoods, demanding social justice and living wages, providing prenatal care, alleviating sexism, and celebrating local cultures, will be our most surefooted path to building lasting peace.

**Second, Structural violence occurs when people are systematically excluded and harmed for arbitrary factors.**

**Opotow 01** [Susan Opotow, Opotow is a social psychologist and researcher at the City University of New York (CUNY). Additionally, Opotow has written/edited for *Peace & Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology* and Past President of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, Peace, Conflict, and Violence: Peace Psychology for the 21st Centuryl Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 2001,  
<https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/u.osu.edu/dist/b/7538/files/2014/10/Chapter-8-Social-Injustice-Opotow-1jaya7m.pdf>

Both structural and direct violence result from moral justifications and rationalizations. Morals are the norms, rights, entitlements, obligations, responsibilities, and duties that shape our sense of justice and guide our behavior with others (Deutsch, 1985). Morals operationalize our sense of justice by identifying what we owe to whom, whose needs, views, and well-being count, and whose do not. **Our morals apply to people we value, which define who is inside our scope of justice** (or “moral community”), such as family members, friends, compatriots, and coreligionists (Deutsch, 1974, 1985; Opotow, 1990; Staub, 1989). **We extend considerations of fairness to them, share community resources with them, and make sacrifices for them that foster their well-being** (Opotow, 1987, 1993). **We see other kinds of people such as enemies or strangers outside our scope of justice; they are morally excluded. Gender, ethnicity, religious identity, age, mental capacity, sexual orientation, and political affiliation are some criteria used to define moral exclusion. Excluded people can be hated and** viewed as “vermin” or “plague” **or they can be seen as expendable non-entities.** In either case, disadvantage, hardship, and **exploitation inflicted on them seems normal, acceptable, and just—as “the way things are” or the way they “ought to be.”** Fairness and deserving seem irrelevant when applied to them and harm befalling them elicits neither remorse, outrage, nor demands for restitution; instead, harm inflicted on them can inspire celebration. Many social issues and controversies, such as aid to school drop-outs, illegal immigrants, “welfare moms,” people who are homeless, substance abusers, and those infected with HIV are essentially moral debates about who deserves public resources, and thus, ultimately, about moral inclusion. When we see other people’s circumstances to be a result of their moral failings, moral exclusion seems warranted. But **when we see others’ circumstances as a result of structural violence, moral exclusion seems unwarranted and unjust.** While it is psychologically more comfortable to perceive harm-doers to be evil or demented, we each have boundaries for justice.

**Thus, the criterion is mitigating structural violence.** Moral inclusion is a necessary precondition to all other ethical theories as we can't form those moral theories until all those who are affected are included.

**My sole contention is that recognizing a universal right to strike is key to removing systemic, structurally violent mechanisms inherent in the labor market.**

**First, Without unions, bosses can retaliate against individual workers including firing them for making demands or striking.**

**McNicholas, J.D., Villanova University School of Law, and Director of Policy and Government Affairs General Counsel at Economic Policy Institute, et al., 2020.**

Celine McNicholas, Lynn Rhinehart, Margaret Poydock, Heidi Shierholz, and Daniel Perez, "Economic Policy Institute," August 25, 2020. [Why unions are good for workers—especially in a crisis like Covid-19, last accessed on October 18, 2021, Accessed at: <https://www.epi.org/publication/why-unions-are-good-for-workers-especially-in-a-crisis-like-covid-19-12-policies-that-would-boost-worker-rights-safety-and-wages/>] MD

**Without unions, many workers are forced to work without personal protective equipment or access to paid leave or premium pay. And when nonunion workers have advocated for health and safety protections or wage increases, they have often been retaliated against or even fired for doing so** (Paul 2020; Davenport, Bhattacharai, and McGregor 2020; Kruzel 2020; Eidelson 2020; Miller 2020). The lack of these basic protections has led to thousands of essential workers becoming infected with the coronavirus, and many are dying as a result (Bhattacharai 2020; Kaplan and Kent 2020; Jewett, Bailey, and Renwick 2020).

**Second, Therefore, the right to strike is key muscle for unions to gain concessions from employers.**

**Henwood, edits "Left Business Observer," and host of "Behind the News," 2021.**

Doug Henwood, "Jacobin," February 21, 2021. [American workers aren't striking, last accessed on October 18, 2021, Accessed at: <https://jacobinmag.com/2021/02/us-workers-strike-data-2020>] MD

I don't want to come across as somebody sitting in a comfy desk chair lecturing, Spartacist-style, about what labor should do. US law and business practice have made it very difficult to mount strikes. **Bosses and their politicians understand that without the option to withhold labor, workers are nearly powerless**, and they've mounted innumerable obstacles to walkouts. **But for those of us who think you can't have a better society without stronger unions, these symptoms are dire.**

Jane McAlevey's mentor at 1199 New England, Jerry Brown, says that **the strike is labor's muscle** and if you don't exercise it regularly it atrophies. Strike just for practice, even if you don't really need to, he says. The strike muscle is looking very atrophied.

**Third, Unions disproportionately help those most in need, and therefore are a tool to help close the racial wealth gap.**

**Weller & Madland, '18** [Christian E Weller is a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress and a Professor of Public Policy at the University of Massachusetts, David Madland is a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, Published: 9/4/18, "Union Membership Narrows the Racial Wealth

Gap for Families of Color”, Center for American Progress,  
<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/reports/2018/09/04/454781/union-membership-narrows-racial-wealth-gap-families-color/> ] /Triumph Debate

**Being a union member creates a number of venues for workers to build more wealth than would be available for nonunion members.**

<sup>4</sup> Union members bargain collectively for wages, benefits, and procedures that affect their employment, such as when and how an employer can fire an employee. As a result of being covered by a collective bargaining agreement—the contract that employers and unions regularly sign and that governs these employment-related issues—**union members have higher wages, on average; more benefits; and more stable employment than is the case for nonunion members.** Higher wages then translate into more savings in absolute terms, as well as more tax incentives to save.<sup>5</sup>

Furthermore, more **job-related benefits—such as health insurance, defined benefit plans, and life insurance—mean that union members need to spend less money than do nonunion members to protect their families against future income losses.** Therefore, they can save more money to pursue their own goals, such as paying for their children’s college education.<sup>6</sup> Lastly, **union membership leads to greater employment stability and job protections that translate into longer tenures with one employer.**<sup>7</sup> This employment stability translates into more savings, as union members are more likely to be eligible for key benefits such as retirement savings and can better plan for their futures.<sup>8</sup> This issue brief considers the relevant data broken down by union membership separately for whites and nonwhites. The data show that:

**Union members have greater wealth than nonmembers, and the difference is much larger for nonwhites than whites. From 2010 to 2016, nonwhite families who were also union members had a median wealth that was almost five times—485.1 percent, to be exact—as large as the median wealth of nonunion, nonwhite families.**<sup>9</sup>

The difference between union and nonunion white families was much smaller, with the former having a median wealth that was only 139 percent that of the latter during that period. (see Table 1) Union members have higher earnings, more benefits, and more employment stability than nonunion members. Union members’ **total annual earnings are between 20 percent and 50 percent greater than those of nonunion members.** (see Table 2) The gap in income, benefits, and

employment stability by union membership is larger for nonwhite families than for white families. **The chance of having a 401(k) plan, for instance, is about 50 percent greater for nonwhite union members compared with their nonunion counterparts, but the gap among whites is only 21.7 percent.** (see Table 1) The data suggest that nonwhite union members receive a particular boost in their wealth because they see larger increases in pay, benefits, and employment stability than white union members. **This is primarily a result of the fact that nonwhite workers work more frequently than whites in low-paying jobs with few benefits, so they often have much more to gain.**<sup>10</sup> This disparity in working conditions is due to a wide array of factors, including but not limited to unequal access to education, occupational segregation, and discrimination.<sup>11</sup> **Unions help all workers, and they do the most for those with less advantages. As a result, union membership can help shrink that racial gap in labor market outcomes. And this partial equalization translates into a boost in median wealth for nonwhite union families.**

**Fourth, Union leaders have both ideological and pragmatic reasons to support across racial lines. Increasing union power allows for them to better influence the workplace to protect all members. Frymer & Grumbach, ‘21** [Paul Frymer is a professor in the

Department of Politics at Princeton University, Jacob M. Grumbach is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Washington, Published: January 2021, “Labor Unions and White Racial Politics”, American Journal of Political Science, <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/VJUOOV> ] /Triumph Debate

In recent decades, union leaders have had both ideological commitments and strategic reasons for building an interracial coalition. Union leaders are often ideologically committed to egalitarianism, and such a commitment can influence the rank and file. As Ahlquist and Levi (2013, 6) argue, unions politically mobilize their members more effectively when they have "an ideologically motivated founding leadership cohort who devises organizational rules that facilitate both industrial success and coordinated expectations about the leaders' political objectives." This is how some unions, such as the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU), "produce membership willing to self-sacrifice on behalf of a wide range of political and social justice issues" (1). Dependent on context, union leaders' goal of maintaining and expanding their organizations gives them strategic incentives to reduce racial [hostility] among their rank and file. In the pre-civil-rights era, union leaders representing all-white workforces often felt the need to avoid the subject of racial diversity in order to maintain solidarity within their membership, particularly during drives to establish a collective bargaining agreement (Frymer 2005). With frequent racial segregation in employment and larger majorities of white workers, it may have made strategic sense for union leaders to increase the salience of class identity at the expense of racial identity. But even during this time, it was dependent on the context of the specific workforce. In the 1940s, CIO unions in particular saw the activism of African American workers on factory floors in the auto and steel industries, leading union and civil rights leaders alike to embrace the other movements as a way to gain members for their own (Lichtenstein 2001). As the labor movement has become more diverse in recent decades, the incentives for union leaders have increasingly changed with it. Changing demographics led many service industry unions such as AFSCME, UNITE HERE, and SEIU to embrace both racial minority and immigrant workforces. Starting in the 1980s, the AFL-CIO began to endorse pro-immigration legislative policies and agency rules in response to the rising numbers of undocumented Latino workers who were joining union campaigns (Fine and Tichenor 2009). To secure more union election victories and collective bargaining agreements, its leaders increasingly felt a strategic need to embrace interracial solidarity. National union conventions are increasingly multilingual, with large immigrant populations in many service industries now representing just about every part of the world. Starting in the 1990s, the AFL-CIO pushed the National Labor Relations Board [recognized] the solidaristic benefits of racially based union campaigns centered around African American and Latino workforces, and influenced the board to cooperate with immigration officials to protect undocumented workers during union activity (Frymer 2008).

**Fifth, Unions mobilize their members towards supporting their fellow workers, as well as organizing political support for workplace gender and race protections.**

**Frymer & Grumbach 2020** [Paul Frymer is a professor in the Department of Politics at Princeton University, Jacob M. Grumbach is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Washington, Published: January 2021, "Labor Unions and White Racial Politics", American Journal of Political Science, <https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/VJUOOV>] /Triumph Debate

Labor union membership impacts wages (Budd and In- Gang 2000; Bureau of Labor Statistics 2020; Jakubson 1991), workplace

**conditions** (Ravenswood and Markey 2011), **corporate governance** (Aguilera and Jackson 2003), **and, as this study suggests, white racial attitudes**. Yet despite increased scholarly attention to the role of organizational membership, as well as labor's historical role in race and partisan realignment in the New Deal and civil rights periods, there has been surprisingly little research on the relationship between union membership and attitudes in the contemporary period. This study provides the first quantitative study of the relationship between unions and racial attitudes. In both cross-sectional and panel designs, union membership is associated with moderate to substantial reductions in racial resentment among whites. Furthermore, these **white union members are consistently more supportive of affirmative action and other policies designed to benefit African Americans. Taken together, the results suggest that unions play a considerable role in increasing the racial liberalism of their white members**. Our mediation analysis in SI Appendix 11 further suggests that the Democratic Party may be an important conduit in the relationship between union membership and racial resentment. Unions, by increasing Democratic Party identification, may further influence the racial liberalism of white workers. As representatives of an increasingly racially diverse major political party, Democratic Party elites, like union leaders, have strategic and ideological incentives to promote racial solidarity among their base. Although recent research highlights the racial dynamics of the labor movement's relationship with the Democratic Party as far back as the 1930s (Frymer 2008; Schickler 2013, 2016), the role of partisanship as a mediator may be especially consequential in the contemporary era of hyperpolarization. **Our study focuses on the direct connections between individual-level union membership and racial attitudes, but the labor movement plays a broader role in promoting racial progress in the United States. Some unions provide organizer training sessions and classes for aligned activists who are not union members. Union organizers frequently campaign for racially liberal candidates and get out the vote of nonunion members for them. Union political action committees (PACs) spend substantial amounts in support of Democratic candidates, and both these PACs and union organizations more broadly have been critical in fighting for changes to public policy at both the federal level and especially at the state level, where there has been a vigorous move toward new policies that raise the minimum wage, provide greater healthcare benefits, and grant stronger protections for women and minority workers against discrimination and harassment** (Andrias 2017).

Sixth, are the impacts of not allowing universal strike action. Failing to recognize the right to strike will continue to reproduce the structures that cause violence based on race, class, and or/gender and gender identity. Structural violence is equivalent to direct violence like wars and prevents people from improving their well-being.

Ansell 17 [David A. Ansell, Ansell is the Professor of Medicine at Rush University Medical Center and holds an M.D. from the State University of New York Upstate Medical University College of Medicine, "American Roulette, The Death Gap: How Inequality Kills", University of Chicago Press 2017, ISBN 9780226428291]

There are many different kinds of violence. Some are obvious: punches, attacks, gunshots, explosions. These are the kinds of interpersonal violence that we tend to hear about in the news. Other kinds of violence are intimate and emotional. But **the deadliest** and most thoroughgoing **kind of violence** is woven into the fabric of American society. It **exists when some groups have more access to goods, resources, and opportunities than other groups**, including health and life itself. **This violence delivers specific blows against particular bodies in particular neighborhoods. This unequal advantage and violence is built into the very rules that govern our society. In the absence of this violence, large numbers of Americans would be able to live fuller and longer lives.** This kind of violence is called **structural violence, because it is embedded in the very laws, policies, and rules that govern day-to-day**

**life.** It is the cumulative impact of laws and social and economic policies and practices that render some Americans less able to access resources and opportunities than others. This inequity of advantage is not a result of the individual's personal abilities but is built into the systems that govern society. Often it is a product of *racism, gender, and income inequality*. The diseases and premature mortality that Windora and many of my patients experienced were, in the words of Dr. Paul Farmer, "biological reflections of social fault lines."<sup>9</sup> As a result of these fault lines, a disproportional burden of illness, suffering, and premature mortality falls on certain neighborhoods, like Windora's.

**Structural violence can overwhelm an individual's ability to live a free, unfettered, healthy life.** As I ran to evaluate Windora, I knew that her stroke was caused in part by lifelong exposure to suffering, racism, and economic deprivation. Worse, the poverty of West Humboldt Park that contributed to her illness is directly and inextricably related to the massive concentration of wealth and power in other neighborhoods just miles away in Chicago's Gold Coast and suburbs. That concentration of wealth could not have occurred without laws, policies, and practices that favored some at the expense of others. Those laws, policies, and practices could not have been passed or enforced if access to political and economic power had not been concentrated in the hands of a few. Yet these political and economic structures have become so firmly entrenched (in habits, social relations, economic arrangements, institutional practices, law, and policy) that they have become part of the matrix of American society. The rules that govern day-to-day life were written to benefit a small elite at the expense of people like Windora and her family. These rules and structures are powerful destructive forces. **The same**

**structures that render life predictable, secure, comfortable, and pleasant for many destroy the lives of**

**others** like Windora through *suffering, poverty, ill health*, and violence. These structures are neither natural nor neutral. The results of structural violence can be very specific. In Windora's case, stroke precursors like chronic stress, poverty, and uncontrolled hypertension run rampant in neighborhoods like hers. Windora's illness was caused by neither her cultural traits nor the failure of her will. Her stroke was caused in part by inequity. She is one of the lucky ones, though, because even while structural violence ravages her neighborhood, it also abets the concentration of expensive stroke- intervention services in certain wealthy teaching hospitals like mine. If I can get to her in time, we can still help her. Income Inequality and Life Inequality Of course, Windora is not the only person struggling on account of structural violence. **Countless neighborhoods nationwide are suffering from it, and people are dying needlessly**

**young as a result. The magnitude of this excess mortality is mind-boggling.** In 2009 my friend Dr. Steve Whitman asked a simple question, "How many extra black people died in Chicago each year, just because they do not have the same health outcomes as white Chicagoans?" When the Chicago Sun-Times got wind of his results, it ran them on the front page in bold white letters on a black background: "HEALTH CARE GAP KILLS 3200 Black Chicagoans and the Gap is Growing." The paper styled the headline to look like the declaration of war that it should have been. In fact, we did find ourselves at war not long ago, when almost 3,000 Americans were killed. That was September 11, 2001. That tragedy propelled the country to war. Yet when it comes to the premature deaths of urban Americans, no disaster area has been declared. No federal troops have been called up. No acts of Congress have been passed. Yet this disaster is even worse: those 3,200 black people were in Chicago alone, in just one year. **Nationwide each year, more than 60,000 black**

**people die prematurely because of inequality.** While blacks suffer the most from this, it is not just an issue of racism, though racism has been a unique and powerful transmitter of violence in America for over four hundred years. Beyond racism, poverty and income inequality perpetuated by exploitative market capitalism are singular agents of transmission of disease and early death. As a result, there is a new and alarming pattern of declining life expectancy among white Americans as well. Deaths from drug overdoses in young white Americans ages 25 to 34 have exploded to levels not seen since the AIDS epidemic. This generation is the first since the Vietnam War era to experience higher death rates than the prior generation.<sup>12</sup> White Americans ages 45 to 54 have experienced skyrocketing premature death rates as well, something not seen in any other developed nation.<sup>13</sup> White men in some Appalachian towns live on average twenty years less than white men a half-day's drive away in the suburbs of Washington, DC. Men in McDowell County, West Virginia, can look forward to a life expectancy only slightly better than that of Haitians.<sup>14</sup> **But those statistics reflect averages, and every death from**

**structural violence is a person.** When **these illnesses and deaths are occurring one at a time in neighborhoods that society has decided not to care about—those populated by poor,,,,, black or brown people**—they seem easy to overlook, especially if you are among the fortunate few who are doing incredibly well. The tide of prosperity in America has lifted some boats while others have swamped. Paul Farmer, the physician-anthropologist who founded Partners in Health, an international human rights agency, reflects on the juxtaposition of "unprecedented bounty and untold penury": "It stands to reason that as beneficiaries of growing inequality, we do not like to be reminded of misery of squalor and failure. Our popular culture provides us with no shortage of anesthesia."<sup>15</sup> **That people suffer and die prematurely because of inequality is**

**wrong. It is wrong from an *ethical* perspective. It is wrong from a *fairness* perspective. And it is wrong because *we have the means to fix it.***



My case is clear i am not defending the actions i am defending the ability to strike

I have operationally defined all the words from the case

First i only have to defend that there is an un conditions right to strike. I don't have to defend their restrictions on how they carry out the strike.

Right now there is a restriction for auto workers to go on strike, now they can do on strike, the worker has the right to strike (they can't beat people up or prevent people to go into work)

Cx checked the abuse, if they didn't understand they should have asked

Ong'ayo, Ooko, Wang'ondou, Bottomley, Nyaguara 2019 Tsofa Gerald Ong'ayo, MBChB Michael Ooko, MSc

Ruth Wang'ondou, PhD Christian Bottomley, PhD Amek Nyaguara, PhD Benjamin K Tsofa, PhD et al

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X\(19\)30188-3/fulltext#seccestitle130](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/langlo/article/PIIS2214-109X(19)30188-3/fulltext#seccestitle130)

.In our community-based analysis of the effect of six country-wide strikes by health workers on mortality in Kilifi county in Kenya, we

recorded no change in overall mortality during strike periods compared with non-strike periods, and no

changes were seen in cause-specific mortality. Weak evidence was found for increased mortality during strike periods among

children aged 12–59 months, but this finding could be attributable to chance. Our findings of no change in overall mortality between strike and

non-strike periods have also been noted in several regions after strikes by doctors or nurses, including in Alberta

(Canada),<sup>15</sup> Croatia,<sup>16</sup> England,<sup>14</sup> New Zealand,<sup>27</sup> and Spain.<sup>17</sup> However, differences between these studies and ours make it difficult to

compare results. For example, some analyses were limited by age distribution or focused on selected units in a hospital,<sup>15, 17</sup> whereas others



did not report age-stratified results.<sup>14, 27</sup> Furthermore, very few reports of the effects of strikes by health workers have