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### FWK

**I value morality. Ethical Internalism is true:**

**[1] Epistemology – A) Equality – Externalism incorrectly assumes certain individuals have stronger epistemic access to moral truths which justifies the exclusion of those individuals from the creation of ethics and B) Inaccessibility – There is no universal character of moral judgements that is epistemically accessible since every argument for its existence presumes the correct normative starting point. Externalism claims that some individuals have better ability to access the truth but that doesn’t explain how we deliberate between who is motivated correctly.**

**2. Motivation – A) Externalist notions of ethics collapse to internal since the only reason agents follow external demands is those demands are consistent with their internal account of the good. Motivation is a necessary feature for ethics since normativity only matters insofar as agents follow through on the ethic that’s generated from it B) Empirics – there is no factual account of the good since each agents’ motivations are unique and there has been no conversion of differing beliefs into a unified ethic.**

**Thus, agents justify their actions based on individual moral preferences and deal with ethical dilemmas by prioritizing certain beliefs. It’s a constitutive feature of humanity to rationally maximize value under a particular index of the good. Gauthier 98,** Essay by David Gauthier, Canadian-American philosopher best known for his neo-Hobbesian social contract theory of morality, “Why Contractarianism”, within the book Contractarianism and Rational Choice: Essays on David Gauthier’s Morals By Agreement. Book written by Peter Vallentyne [https://b-ok.cc/book/975363/60f3f7] 1998, ///AHS PB //Recut by Scopa

Fortunately, **I do not have to defend normative foundationalism**. One problem with accepting moral justification as part of our ongoing practice is that, as I have suggested, we no longer accept the world view on which it depends. But perhaps a more immediately pressing problem is that **we have**, ready to hand, **an alternative mode for justifying our choices and actions**. In its more austere and, in my view, more defensible form, this is to show that **choices and actions maximize the agent ’s expected utility, where utility is a measure of considered preference**. In its less austere version, this is to show that choices and actions satisfy, not a subjectively defined requirement such as utility, but meet the agent ’ s objective interests. **Since I do not believe that we have objective interests**, I shall ignore this latter. But it will not matter. For the idea is clear; **we have a mode of justification that does not require the introduction of moral considerations**. 11 Let me call this alternative nonmoral mode of justification, neutrally, deliberative justification. Now moral and deliberative justification are directed at the same objects – our choices and actions. What if they conflict? And what do we say to the person who offers a deliberative justification of his choices and actions and refuses to offer any other? **We can say**, of course, that his **behavior lacks moral justification, but this seems to lack any hold, unless he chooses to enter the moral framework**. And such entry, he may insist, lacks any deliberative justification, at least for him. **If morality perishes, the justificatory enterprise, in relation to choice and action, does not perish with it. Rather**, one mode of justification perishes, a mode that, it may seem, now hangs unsupported. But not only unsupported, for it is difficult to deny that deliberative justification is more clearly basic, that it cannot be avoided insofar as we are rational agents, so that if moral justification conflicts with it, morality seems not only unsupported but opposed by what is rationally more fundamental. **Deliberative justification relates to our deep sense of self. What distinguishes human beings from other animals, and provides the basis for rationality, is the capacity for semantic representation. You can, as your dog on the whole cannot, represent a state of affairs to yourself, and consider in particular whether or not it is the case, and whether or not you would want it to be the case. You can represent to yourself the contents of your beliefs, and your desires or preferences. But in representing them, you bring them into relation with one another**. You represent to yourself that the Blue Jays will win the World Series, and that a National League team will win the World Series, and that the Blue Jays are not a National League team. And in recognizing a conflict among those beliefs, you find  rationality thrust upon you. Note that the first two beliefs could be replaced by preferences, with the same effect. Since **in representing our preferences we become aware of conflict among them, the step from representation to choice becomes complicated. We must, somehow, bring our conflicting desires and preferences into some sort of coherence. And** there is only one plausible candidate for a principle of coherence – a maximizing principle. **We order our preferences, in relation to decision and action, so that we may choose in a way that maximizes our expectation of preference fulfillment. And in so doing, we show ourselves to be rational agents, engaged in deliberation and deliberative justification.** There is simply nothing else for practical rationality to be. The foundational crisis of morality thus cannot be avoided by pointing to the existence of a practice of justification within the moral framework, and denying that any extramoral foundation is relevant. For **an extramoral mode of justification is already present**, existing not side by side with moral justification, **but in a manner tied to the way in which we unify our beliefs and preferences and so acquire our deep sense of self**. We need not suppose that this deliberative justification is itself to be understood foundationally. All that we need suppose is that **moral justification does not plausibly survive conflict with it.**

#### Since agents take their own ability to act as intrinsically valuable, permissibility is avoided through a system of mutual self restraint where agents refrain from impeding upon the actions of other agents, under the expectation that others will do the same out of rational self interest. This is achieved through a system of contracts which both parties’ consent to in order to regulate behavior.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with Contractarianism. And, the framework outweighs on actor specificity: States are not physical actors, but derive authority from contracts that allow them to constrain action.

#### Prefer additionally –

#### 1. Flexibility – Contracts are key to a) Encompassing all other ethical calculus into our decision since we process the consistency of those frameworks with our self interest and b) Value pluralism – recognizing a singular ethic fails to account for the complexity of moral problems and genuine moral disagreement. My framework solves since we can recognize multiple legitimate values while allowing individuals to exclude ones that are bad.

#### 2. Bindingness – A) Arising of Ethics – Every interaction with another agent is mediated by consent to participate in that interaction since otherwise agents could simply leave, which means there is an implicit social contract formed in every ethical interaction and B) Culpability – Only contracts can ensure agents are held to their agreements since there is a verifiable basis for judging their action as wrong as well as a pre-established punishment for breaking it.

#### 3. Regress – A) Reason – Only my framework answers the question “why be moral”, since agents have a reason to restrain their conflict due to self-interest rather than some non-existent transcendental principle B) Debates – When we compare between frameworks we suppose a higher evaluative mechanism, which presupposes a higher one, which means only self-contained rules in contracts are coherent.

### Offense

#### I negate the resolution- A just government ought to not recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### 1] Contracts recognize the right to strike as conditional. Your NLRB card shows that there is a contract that recognizes for a conditional right to strike in the squo. You cant change existing contracts if they were created fairly- otherwise it causes permissibility as anyone can break a contract and claim that they changed the contract.

#### 2] Striking violates the contract to work for a company a] you are not working if you are striking b] you agree to certain work conditions and wages in your contract and striking against those conditions violates the contract c] since companies must compete for the labor force, people have the capacity to weigh between companies that are incentivized to increase benefits for workers—means striking goes against the inherent nature of attaining a job in the first place

#### 3] Strikes inhibit the ability to create contracts, create power imbalances, and violate individual contracts.

**Levine 1** [Peter. "The Libertarian Critique of Labor Unions." Philosophy and Public Policy Quarterly 21.4 (2001): 17-24. (Peter Levine is the Associate Dean for Research and Lincoln Filene Professor of Citizenship & Public Affairs in Tufts University’s Jonathan Tisch College of Civic Life. He has secondary appointments in the Tufts Philosophy Department and the Tufts Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute. He was the founding deputy director (2001-6) and then the second director (2006-15) of Tisch College’s CIRCLE, The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, which he continues to oversee as an associate dean]

Libertarians strongly defend freedom of choice and association. Thus, when workers choose to act collectively, negotiate together, or voluntarily walk off the job, libertarians have no reasonable complaint--even if other people are harmed--because they support the right to make and exit voluntary partnerships. But unions gain strength **by overriding private rights.** They routinely block anyone from working **under a non-union contract**, and they prevent employers from making offers--even advantageous ones--to individual workers unless the union is informed and consents. Unions declare strikes and establish picket lines to prevent **customers and workers** from **entering company property**; they may **fine employees who cross these lines.** They also extract fees from all workers who are covered by their contracts. Although covered workers may avoid paying for certain union functions (such as lobbying) that are not germane to contract issues, they must pay for strikes and other activities that some of them oppose. The great libertarian theorist Friedrich Hayek concluded that unions “are the one institution where government has signally failed in its first task, that of preventing coercion of men by other men--and by coercion I do not mean primarily the coercion of employers but the coercion of workers by their fellow workers.” Hayek may have been thinking mainly of corrupt and unaccountable union leaders. But even a completely democratic union sometimes supplants private rights. As libertarians like Morgan O. Reynolds point out, majorities within a union are able to ignore minorities’ preferences.
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**CP Text: A just government ought to recognize the right of workers to strike except for healthcare workers during a public health emergency.**

**The counterplan is key to pandemic containment**

**Damery et al 10** S Damery, H Draper, S Wilson, S Greenfield, J Ives, J Parry, J Petts and T Sorell, Journal of Medical Ethics Vol. 36, No. 1 (January 2010), pp. 12-18 (7 pages), "Healthcare workers' perceptions of the duty to work during an influenza pandemic on JSTOR," <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20696709#metadata_info_tab_contents>

The duty to work is presently under scrutiny because of the current swine flu pandemic. Pandemic influenza is, according to the National Risk Register, the potential emergency that is likely to have the greatest impact in the UK,6 and the serious nature of the threat is widely recognised internationally.710 Health services in the UK are already strained, and the situation is set to worsen as winter?the traditional influenza season? approaches. HCWs are at the forefront of both pandemic response and exposure to infection. An effective public health response that ensures that appropriate standards of conventional and critical patient care can be maintained depends on the majority of uninfected HCWs continuing to attend work, despite the risks they might face in doing so. We recently published research suggesting that absenteeism during an influenza pandemic may be significant, depending on the severity of the pandemic and the combination of adverse circum stances that arise as a result.11 In common with others, we have found that there are barriers to both the willingness and the ability to work.11-15 Pandemic preparedness plans typically focus on reducing barriers to ability (such as employers providing HCWs with transport to and from work if they are redeployed to an alternative site, or allowing greater flexibility of working hours).16 These plans assume that ability and willingness are discrete and complementary, such that addressing barriers to ability to work will have a corresponding positive influence on will ingness to do so. However, willingness may not necessarily be increased by the implementation of practical or pragmatic solutions but may be instead more deeply rooted in a number of factors, such as the extent to which HCWs feel included in preparedness planning, or various sociodemo graphic and family issues. These are likely to influence HCWs; willingness to work during a pandemic or other emergency.15 1718 The main findings of a large-scale survey of professional and non-professional HCWs in the West Midlands, which aimed to investigate the factors associated with willingness to work during an influenza pandemic, have been published elsewhere.11

**Pandemics cause extinction**

**Millet and Snyder-Beattie 17** Piers Millett and Andrew Snyder-Beattie, Health Security Volume 15, Number 4, 2017, https://www.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/hs.2017.0028

How worthwhile is it spending resources to study and mitigate the chance of human extinction from biological risks? The risks of such a catastrophe are presumably low, so a skeptic might argue that addressing such risks would be a waste of scarce resources. In this article, we investigate this position using a cost-effectiveness approach and ultimately conclude that the expected value of reducing these risks is large, especially since such risks jeopardize the existence of **all future human lives.** Historically, disease events have been responsible for the **greatest death tolls** on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world's population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright **human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization**. A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to remote populations, overcome rare genetic resistances, and evade detection, cures, and countermeasures. Even evolution itself may work in humanity's favor: Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off, and so evolutionary pressures could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6 While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they do not rule the possibility out entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of species going extinct due to disease—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include native American tribes exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and the Western Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population).9 In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But many diseases are proof of principle that each worst-case attribute can be realized independently. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, natural evolution would be an unlikely source for pathogens with the highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach. But advances in biotechnology might allow the creation of diseases that combine such traits. Recent controversy has already emerged over a number of scientific experiments that resulted in viruses with enhanced transmissibility, lethality, and/or the ability to overcome therapeutics.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-21 Although these experiments had scientific merit and were not conducted with malicious intent, their implications are still worrying. This is especially true given that there is also a long historical track record of state-run bioweapon research applying cutting-edge science and technology to design agents not previously seen in nature. The Soviet bioweapons program developed agents with traits such as enhanced virulence, resistance to therapies, greater environmental resilience, increased difficulty to diagnose or treat, and which caused unexpected disease presentations and outcomes.22 Delivery capabilities have also been subject to the cutting edge of technical development, with Canadian, US, and UK bioweapon efforts playing a critical role in developing the discipline of aerobiology.23,24 While there is no evidence of state-run bioweapons programs directly attempting to develop or deploy bioweapons that would pose an existential risk, the logic of deterrence and mutually assured destruction could create such incentives in more unstable political environments or following a breakdown of the Biological Weapons Convention.25The possibility of a war between great powers could also increase the pressure to use such weapons—during the World Wars, bioweapons were used across multiple continents, with Germany targeting animals in WWI,26 and Japan using plague to cause an epidemic in China during WWII.27 **Non-state actors** may also pose a risk, especially those with explicitly omnicidal aims. While rare, there are examples. The Aum Shinrikyo cult in Japan sought biological weapons for the express purpose of causing extinction.28 Environmental groups, such as the Gaia Liberation Front, have argued that “we can ensure Gaia's survival only through the extinction of the Humans as a species … we now have the specific technology for doing the job … several different [genetically engineered] viruses could be released”(quoted in ref. 29). Groups such as R.I.S.E. also sought to protect nature by destroying most of humanity with bioweapons.30 Fortunately, to date, non-state actors have lacked the capabilities needed to pose a catastrophic bioweapons threat, but this could **change in future decades** as biotechnology becomes **more accessible** and the pool of experienced users grows.31,32 What is the appropriate response to these speculative extinction threats? A balanced biosecurity portfolio might include investments that reduce a mix of proven and speculative risks, but striking this balance is still difficult given the massive uncertainties around the low-probability, high-consequence risks. In this article, we examine the traditional spectrum of biosecurity risks (ie, biocrimes, bioterrorism, and biowarfare) to categorize biothreats by likelihood and impact, expanding the historical analysis to consider even lower-probability, higher-consequence events (catastrophic risks and existential risks). In order to produce reasoned estimates of the likelihood of different categories of biothreats, we bring together relevant data and theory and produce some first-guess estimates of the likelihood of different categories of biothreat, and we use these initial estimates to compare the cost-effectiveness of reducing existential risks with more traditional biosecurity measures. We emphasize that these models are highly uncertain, and their utility lies more in enabling order-of-magnitude comparisons rather than as a precise measure of the true risk. However, even with the most conservative models, we find that reduction of low-probability, high-consequence risks can be **more cost-effective,** as measured by quality-adjusted life year per dollar, especially when we account for the lives of **future generations.** This suggests that **despite the low probability** of such events, society still ought to invest more in preventing the most extreme possible biosecurity catastrophes.

#### 1 – Forecloses future improvement – we can never improve society because our impact is irreversible

#### 2 – Turns suffering – mass death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities

#### 3 – Moral obligation – allowing people to die is unethical and should be prevented because it creates ethics towards other people

#### 4 – Objectivity – body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical

#### 5 – Moral uncertainty – if we’re unsure about which interpretation of the world is true – we ought to preserve the world to keep debating about it