## Shell

**A. Interpretation: Debaters must disclose their contact information on the 2021-2022 NDCA LD wiki page under their own name.**

**B. Violation: You don’t have contact info**

**Graphical user interface, text

Description automatically generated**

**C. Standards:**

#### Standards:

#### 1] Safety – contact info's the only way to check trigger warnings before the round for what debaters are comfortable reading, anything else creates a hostile environment – for example, checking about scenes of violence authors may mention. Safety is a voting issue – we can't debate unless we feel safe to do so.

#### 2] Disclosure – Contact info is necessary to contact the other debater before the round – that's good – creates more nuanced argumentation since we have time to research and rigorously test arguments – even if disclosure is bad – we should have the opportunity to debate that in round.

#### 3] Novice Inclusion – gives novices a way to contact you about your positions and learn from them and debaters would tell you before round about triggering positions that you’ve read before. Independent voter because inclusion is a gateway issue for debate to occur in the first place F,E

## Framework

**Volition, or the structure of the will, is a pre-condition for ethics and has intrinsic value – A) Proceduralism – the will is the mechanism by which every agent engages in any activity, which means regardless of the content of any ethical theory, the ability to will that theory is an intrinsic good B) Motivation – the structure of the will is the primary source of all our desires, reasons, and beliefs since it generates what counts as motivational to the subject C) Identity – the nature of the will is most constitutive to the creation of the subject since it determines what each subject considers intrinsic to its identity and what exists externally as an façade.**

**However, ethical theories to evaluate the will face a dilemma – they are either paternally objectivist to the extent they restrict the will, or they are weakened by subjectivism to the extent that it’s impossible to make true moral claims. The only solution is a concept of alienation that understands the will in a functional capacity to relate to itself and the world – a criterion that is concerned with how one wills, rather than what one wills. Understanding the functionality of the will is impossible in a vacuum. This culminates in the act of appropriation – the ability to view yourself as a practical agent capable of taking up a project that actively changes your own subject and the role itself.**

**Thus, the standard is consistency with non-alienated relations. Only this coheres the nature of who you are and prevents psychological violence.**

**Prefer additionally –**

**1. Debatability – Every exercise you engage in is an instance of using your volition to establish some relation to the world and only non-alienation can establish that relationship as normatively legitimate.**

**2. Action theory – Only viewing an agent as an active body capable of generating intentions can hold agents culpable and decipher the difference between actions and wishes. That’s a necessary feature of ethics since we must be able to warrant a coherent conception of what motivates our actions in order to provide a method to actually implement ethical principles.**

**3. Epistemology – Only an understanding of appropriation can unify the distinction between theoretical and practical knowledge. Theoretical abstract concepts like 2+2=4 are true and necessary, but can only become useful once explained in context of how they actualize in the world through our intentions. That means absent an explanation of how that knowledge mixes with the world around us, it becomes useless.**

## Offense

**Contention – I defend a just government ought to recognize worker’s right to strike. Ill defend normal means for implementation.**

#### 1] Right to strike is necessary to not be alienated – multiple warrants

#### Brian Kohler, “The fifth day of the COP25 conference” , February 16, 2015, [http://www.industriall-union.org/5-reasons-why-we-need-the-right-to-strike] // swickle

16 February, 2015 The fundamental right to strike is under attack from employers and governments at the International Labour Organization (ILO), which sets global standards on labour rights. Eliminating this human right would have serious repercussions on us all. Here are five key reasons why we need the right to strike: Striking is a last resort but sometimes the only tool for workers to protect themselves. To avoid being at the complete mercy of employers. To give more of a balance between worker and employer power. Without it, more and more governments will ban industrial action and punish people who dare to strike. Most strikes are over pay and better working conditions. Without the threat of strike action, corporations will be able to make bigger profits, while working conditions will get worse. Making a stand On 18 February, ahead of a key ILO meeting on the right to strike from 23-25 February, unions and workers around the world will be protesting to safeguard this fundamental right. Employers’ groups and certain governments are challenging the long-accepted belief that ILO Convention 87 on Freedom of Association, which is ratified by 153 countries, up-holds the right to strike.

**2] The right to strike increases mutual recognition**

Richard D. **Kahlenberg**, January 6, **2016**, “How Defunding Public Sector Unions Will Diminish Our Democracy” [tcf.org/content/report/how-defunding-public-sector-unions-will-diminish-our-democracy/?session=1.] // swickle

Strong unions helped build the middle class in America after the Great Depression, and continue to have a positive effect on ameliorating extreme inequalities of wealth. By bargaining for fair wages and benefits, unions in the public and private sector help foster broadly shared prosperity. Research finds, for example, that unions compress wage differences between management and labor. According to one study, “controlling for variation in human resource practices, unionized establishments have an average of 23.2 percentage point lower management-to-worker pay ratio relative to non-union workplaces.”26 By the same token, as the Center for American Progress’s David Madland has vividly illustrated, the decline in union density in the United States between 1969 and 2009 has been accompanied by a strikingly similar decline in the share of income going to the middle class (the middle three-fifths of the income distribution; see Figure 1). &nbsp;The middle class is hollowing out: in 1971, 61 percent of Americans were middle class, but a December 2015 Pew Research Center report found that a slight majority of Americans now live in low- or upper-income households.27 Although there are many reasons for middle-class wage stagnation—including globalization and the rise in technology—Lawrence Mishel of the Economic Policy Institute finds that the decline in union bargaining power is “the single largest factor suppressing wage growth for middle-wage workers over the last few decades.” The International Monetary Fund, likewise, has linked decline in unions worldwide with rises in income inequality.28 Figure 1. chartDOWNLOAD International studies also connect the relatively low levels of U.S. union density (when compared with other nations) and the higher level of economic inequality found in the United States. According to a 2011 analysis by the Center for Economic and Policy Research looking at twenty-one wealthy nations, nine countries had more than 80 percent of their workers covered by collective bargaining agreements; nine had between 30 and 80 percent covered; and just three—the United States, Japan, and New Zealand—had coverage rates below 20 percent. Using data from the Central Intelligence Agency’s World Factbook on levels of income inequality, my colleague Moshe Marvit and I demonstrate in Why Labor Organizing Should Be a Civil Right that the three nations with the lowest collective bargaining coverage also were among the four countries with the highest degrees of income inequality, as measured by the Gini coefficient.29 Defunding public sector unions will only accelerate the extreme economic inequality that threatens our political democracy. Unions Are Needed to Serve as Schools for Democracy Civic organizations that are run democratically can be an important mechanism for acculturating citizens to the inner workings of democracy. Unions are among the most important of these organizations, bringing together rank and file workers from a variety of ethnic, racial, and religious backgrounds, and serving as what Harvard sociologist Robert Putnam calls “schools for democracy.” Union members learn skills that are essential to a well-functioning democracy: how to run meetings, debate one another, and organize for political action.30 Labor unions can also help create a culture of participation among workers. Being involved in workplace decisions and the give and take of collective bargaining, voting on union contracts, and voting for union leadership have all been called important drivers of “democratic acculturation.”

#### 3] The aff rectifies conditions of alienation – A) Standardization – voting neg is standardization because the aff provides the option to participate if they will to do so whereas the neg prevents individuals without access in the squo from engaging in a job B) Fixation – absent a right to strike, we can never foster the development of an agent or company in the workplace C) Over-identification – absent a right to strike we are overidentified in the workplace with no leverage to push for individualized approaches to labor subjectivity. D) objectification – companies can objectify/ exploit workers if they cant strike

#### 4] Ethical theories are insular – they define the good and language to describe it in their own terms. Joyce 02, Joyce, Richard. Myth of Morality. Port Chester, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2002. p 45-47. //Scopa 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 interested themselves in the external question – the issue of the adequacy of the framework itself: “Do objects exist?”, “Does the world exist?”, “Are 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.