## Contracts

### AT Contracts

#### [1] Fiat solves – passing the aff means that the contracts are amended so nobody’s breaking them.

#### [2] Turn – contracts can’t be legitimate unless they are made on equal grounds; if I were to force you to join a contract under the threat of death it wouldn’t be a contract in the first place because you wouldn’t have been able to set and pursue that end without losing your rights – our offense proves that the right to strike is key to establishing Kantian contracts.

#### [3] Individual rights come first under the categorical imperative – its job is to enforce the rights of each individual and doesn’t care about corporations or entities.

#### [4] Hindering a hindrance – employers as individuals shouldn’t coerce other people, so if employers are coercing their employees, then workers are allowed to strike against them like how I’m allowed to kill someone who’s about to murder me.

### AT Future Contracts

#### [1] C/a the bowie evidence – it indicates that contracts are impossible to make unless we have strikes in the first place – the ac is a prior question of if contracts are possible not whether they can be made in the future.

#### [2] This is silly – anyone who takes a job prevents another person from getting it – the distinction is that strikes aren’t using other potential workers as a means to an end so they don’t disrespect their agencies.

#### [3] It’s consequentialist – we can’t possibly know whether an action will lead to more or less contracts being made.

## Duty

### AT Healthcare Workers

#### Toplevel this is entirely consequentialist – there’s no way of knowing if bad consequences will arise from these actions and their offense isn’t intrinsic to the action so don’t evaluate it.

#### [1] Healthcare disrespects workers and patients by providing unsuitable conditions. Strikes solve – they allow these to be changed.

**Howard,** (Danielle Howard, March 2020, accessed on 10-23-2021, Journal of Ethics | American Medical Association, "What Should Physicians Consider Prior to Unionizing?", [https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/what-should-physicians-consider-prior-unionizing/2020-03)//st](https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/what-should-physicians-consider-prior-unionizing/2020-03%29//st) \*bracketed for grammar\*

When discussing ethics, practicalities, and outcomes of physician unions, the focus is almost always entirely on physicians. Yet to place the weight of responsibility for patient care entirely on unionized clinicians is unjust, as Kant’s reasoning applies to the employing organization as well (hereafter referred to as “the health system”). The health system benefits from physicians providing patient care; if it then creates working conditions that its employed clinicians do not find sustainable, it violates the categorical imperative by using clinicians [them] as a means to its end. The same can be said of patients, who are used as means to an end if the health system places restrictions on patient care for financial gain. When evaluating the ethics of physician unionization, it is important to realize that the health system has its own corporate social responsibility to both patients and physicians that is independent of physicians’ commitment to patient care.26 Physicians are expected to consider the effects that their unionization will have on the patient population because they have a responsibility to patient care. The health system shares equally in this responsibility.

#### [2] Healthcare strikes have always been used to benefit the patient – strikers protest for themselves and their clients so they aren’t being treated as a means to an end.
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There are 2 problems with this thinking, however. The first is that collective action does not necessarily require striking, as physicians have other means of adjusting their workflow to affect their employer without rejecting all clinical duties. Examples of such adjustments include refusing to perform elective surgeries or neglecting documentation to prevent effective billing. Second, studies have found that, historically, physician strikes have not been harmful to patients, with one study finding that the 1976 Los Angeles County physician strike “was responsible for more deaths prevented than lives lost.”21In the same vein, medical resident absences from emergency departments have been shown to improve[d] or not to affect efficiency without increasing mortality.22, 23

#### [3] There is an act-omission distinction – if we were held accountable for everything we didn’t do, we would have infinite obligations which freezes action – workers can’t be held accountable for actions they didn’t do so they can’t be held accountable for deaths that arise from not doing their job.

#### [3] There is an intent-foresight distinction – consequences can’t be intrinsic to the will because people intend the same things all the time but reach different conclusions, so even if we could foresee death from the aff it couldn’t be part of the will of an agent, which is the offense.

#### [4] Induction fails – just because people have died from others not working doesn’t mean it’ll happen in the future

### AT Duty Violations

#### This is just a contracts argument in disguise but if we prove our coercion offense then workers can’t have a contracted duty since it was a contract made on unequal grounds so they can’t be held accountable for not doing a duty that isn’t theirs.

### AT Coercion of Employers (Property Rights)

#### [1] Act-omission distinction – strikers aren’t interfering with the property of their employees because they aren’t doing work so they can’t be held accountable for the things that happen to their property.

#### [2] Hindering a hindrance – if I prove that employees are being coerced by their current contracts then strikes are hindering a hindrance like how you’re allowed to break out of the house of a kidnapper even if it breaks their window.

## Consequences

### AT Bad Consequences

#### Toplevel this is entirely consequentialist – there’s no way of knowing if bad consequences will arise from these actions and their offense isn’t intrinsic to the action so don’t evaluate it.

#### [1] Strikes allow for better working conditions – employers can treat their clients as a means to an end by providing unsafe workplace conditions, treating them as a means to an end – strikes allow workers to protest these conditions.

#### [2] There is an act-omission distinction – if we were held accountable for everything we didn’t do, we would have infinite obligations which freezes action – workers can’t be held accountable for actions they didn’t do so they can’t be held accountable for deaths that arise from not doing their job.

#### [3] There is an intent-foresight distinction – consequences can’t be intrinsic to the will because people intend the same things all the time but reach different conclusions, so even if we could foresee death from the aff it couldn’t be part of the will of an agent, which is the offense.

#### [4] Induction fails – just because people have died from others not working doesn’t mean it’ll happen in the future

## Misc.

### AT Just Quit

#### [1] C/a the bowie cards – workers can’t “just quit” because then corporations are allowed to leverage conditions like homelessness to continue coercing them – this doesn’t answer the intrinsic badness of not doing the aff – murder is still bad even if I could move to a place with less crime because the action itself is immoral.

#### [2] Even if there are other ways of resolving unjust conditions it doesn’t matter – corporations still have a perfect duty to not disrespect agents – if I’m racist to you in round even if you could quit I still shouldn’t be racist in the first place.

### AT Strikes Inherently Bad

#### [1] This just isn’t true – there have been plenty of peaceful strikes like climate change strikes which prove that violence isn’t inherent to strikes – don’t evaluate their offense since it’s entirely consequentialist.

#### [2] This isn’t responsive – some past examples of strikes being bad doesn’t mean they’ll be bad in the future – that was induction fails.

### AT Other Alternatives

#### Even if there are other alternatives, it doesn’t mean workers don’t get this one just like how a law preventing murder doesn’t mean you don’t have a right to self defense

### AT Unconditional Not Necessary

#### Unconditional strikes are necessary – otherwise people could be coerced depending on specific conditions.

### AT Not Universalizable

#### 1 – winning contracts proves there is no legitimate job

#### 2 – no reason why the employer leaving is a contradiction

#### 3 – can have a concept of a job, just that it’s suspended until the strike ends