## Shell

**Interpretation: the affirmative may not defend the United States of America recognizing a right to strike.**

**Violation: Just governments respect liberties**

**Dorn 12** James A. Dorn, Quals: James A. Dorn is Vice President for Monetary Studies, Editor of the Cato Journal, Senior Fellow, and Director of Cato's annual monetary conference. He has written widely on Federal Reserve policy and monetary reform, and is an expert on China's economic liberalization. Cato Journal, "The Scope of Government in a Free Society", Fall 2012, https://www.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/cato-journal/2012/12/v32n3-10.pdf

If laws are just, liberty and property are secure. The most certain test of justice is negative—that is, justice occurs when injustice (the violation of natural rights to life, liberty, and property) is prevented. The emphasis here is on what Hayek (1967) called “just rules of conduct,” not on the fairness of outcomes. No one has stated the negative concept of justice better than the 19th century French classical liberal Frederic Bastiat ([1850] 1964: 65): When law and force confine a man within the bounds of justice, they do not impose anything on him but a mere negation. They impose on him only the obligation to refrain from injuring others. They do not infringe on his personality, or his liberty or his property. They merely safeguard the personality, the liberty, and the property of others. They stand on the defensive; they defend the equal rights of all. They fulfill a mission whose harmlessness is evident, whose utility is palpable, and whose legitimacy is uncontested. In short, the purpose of a just government is not to do good with other people’s money, but to prevent injustice by protecting property and securing liberty.

**1. The US enslaved black people in the 1800s.**

**2. They colonized indigenous peoples and pillaged them.**

**3. Aff is in a double bind either it is the case that denying a rts is unjust in which case the US is unjust and non topical or they do recognize a RTS which proves no inherency.**

**4. It is impossible for a condition to be presently just because prior to the decision nothing allows us to call the decision just, and after, the decision has followed a rule that isn’t guaranteed.**

**Derrida 16** [Derrida, Jacques. "Force of Law: The 'Mystical Foundation of Authority.'" Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice, edited by Drucilla Cornell et al., by Derrida, Reprint ed., New York City, Routledge, 2016, pp. 3-68. Quals: Derrida was an Algerian-born French philosopher best known for developing a form of semiotic analysis known as deconstruction, which he analyzed in numerous texts, and developed in the context of phenomenology. He is one of the major figures associated with post-structuralism and postmodern philosophy. During his career Derrida published more than 40 books, together with hundreds of essays and public presentations. He had a significant influence on the humanities and social sciences, including philosophy, literature, law, anthropology, historiography, applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, psychoanalysis, architecture, and political theory.] //Lex VM

The undecidable, a theme often associated with deconstruction, is not merely the oscillation between two significations or two contradictory and very determinate rules, each equally imperative (for example respect for equity and universal right but also for the always heterogeneous and unique singularity of the unsubsumable example). The undecidable is not merely the oscillation or the tension between two decisions; it is the experience of that which, though heterogeneous, foreign to the order of the calculable and the rule, is still obliged—it is of obligation that we must speak—to give itself up to the impossible decision, while taking account of law and rules. A decision that didn’t go through the ordeal of the undecidable would not be a free decision, it would only be the programmable application or unfolding of a calculable process. It might be legal; it would not be just. But in **the moment of suspense of the undecidable,**it**is not just**either,**for only a decision is just. And once the ordeal of the undecidable is past, the decision has again followed a rule**or given itself a rule, invented it or reinvented, reaffirmed it, it **is no longer *presently*just,**fully just.There is apparently no moment in which a decision can be called presently and fully just:**either** it**has not yet been made according to a rule, and nothing allows us to call it just, or it has already followed a rule,**whether received, confirmed, conserved or reinvented,**which in its turn is not absolutely guaranteed by anything; and,**moreover, **if it were guaranteed, the decision would be reduced to a calculation, and we couldn’t call it just.**That is why the ordeal of the undecidable that I just said must be gone through by any decision worthy of the name is never past or passed, it is not a surmounted or sublated {aufgehoben) moment in the decision. The undecidable remains caught, lodged, at least as a ghost—but an essential ghost—in every decision, in every event of decision. Its ghostliness deconstructs from within any assurance of vertigo threatens to seize us the moment we see nothing but examples and some of us no longer feel engaged in it; another way of saying that from this point on we always run the risk (speaking for myself, at least) of no longer being, as they say, “in the running” {dans la course). But not to be “in the running” on the inside track, does not mean that we can stay at the starting-line or simply be spectators— far from it. It may be the very thing that “keeps us moving,” {fait courir) with renewed strength and speed, for example, deconstruction.

**Impacts –**

**A] accessibility – they try to justify the US as just which is exclusionary towards minorities and people of color who feel this violence everyday. This is supercharged by their reps and performance – they literally try to hide violence in spite of this systematic oppression. Hold the line – accessibility is an antecedent question to any other judge obligation because it’s a prereq to debate and a jurisdictional obligation of educators.**

**B] they’re not a just government in any way which side constrains any pragmatics offense and proves limits explosion**

**Prefer –**

**Vote neg –**

**1] Precision –**

**A] stasis point – the topic is the only reasonable focal point for debate – anything else destroys the possibility of debate because we will be two ships passing**

**B] internal link turn – violating semantics justifies the aff talking about whatever with zero neg prep or prediction which is the most unfair and uneducational**

**C] Jurisdiction – you can’t vote for them because the ballot and the tournament invitation say to vote for the better debater in the context of the resolution**

**2] Limits – there are almost 200 national governments in the world which is an unmanageable burden, especially for a 3 week camp. Only imposing restrictions via the word just can ensure debates are limited and full of clash**

#### F

#### E

#### DTD

#### CI

#### No rvis

## NC

**I negate: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.**

**The resolution specifies that the right to strike must be unconditional—this means it cannot be contingent on any authority or have any exceptions.**

Thomas Magnell, Philosopher, The Correlativity of Rights and Duties, J Value Inquiry (2011) 45:1–12//BA PB

Unconditional rights may be either absolutely unconditional or relatively unconditional. An absolutely unconditional right is a right which every right-holder enjoys as something capable of having rights. These are the most fundamental of all rights. As rights which all right-holders have simply as right-holders, they are common to all people, institutions, corporations, societies, and at least some nonhuman animals. They do not need to be acquired. Because they are held unconditionally, they cannot be overruled. For the same reason, they are as minimal as can be. To draw anything more than the most minimal rights from right-holders as such is almost surely a mistake. The flights of fancy of natural rights theorists led Bentham to shout: ‘‘Natural Rights is simple nonsense: natural and imprescriptible rights, rhetorical nonsense,—nonsense upon stilts.’’12 Still, notwithstanding Bentham’s finest flourish of phrasing, there may be some, for example, the right of a right-holder not to be subject to a wanton disregard of its interests. This would seem to be a right that at least some animals have as well as people taken individually or in groups. It is not a particularly robust right. An awful lot of harm can be inflicted upon a right-holder without showing a wanton disregard for the right holder’s interests. Even so, as minimal as it is, it is not a right that is always respected, as National Socialists and International Socialists showed in concentration camps and the Gulag. A relatively unconditional right is a right which all right-holders of a certain kind enjoy without qualification. This gives a clear sense to the much abused term ‘‘human rights,’’ though there may be others. In the strictest sense, human rights are relatively unconditional rights. They are rights which human beings have simply as human beings, or perhaps more precisely as persons, if not all human beings are accounted persons, whatever their role or situation within or apart from a society. A better term for them would be ‘‘person rights,’’ but here the common term is unlikely to be allowed to give way. Human rights are not acquired, though if personhood is a characteristic that human beings can come to have and come to lose, human rights may be gained or lost along with it. Some other right-holders may have the same rights unconditionally, but not all. Narrower on the one hand than absolutely unconditional rights, broader on the other than conditional rights, human rights cannot be conferred by declarations or political manifestos on non-human animals or people: not on non-human animals because non-human animals cannot have them, and not on people because people already have them. In the strictest sense, many of the rights that have come to be labeled as human rights in the fairly recent past, such as the supposed rights to a certain level of income or to a certain level of education are not human rights at all, however politically popular it may be to say that they are. If they are rights in any sense, they are civil rights, acquired rights that are conferred by some civil authority. Human rights in the strictest sense have a more philosophical tone. One notable human right is that of entering into obligations, the right, odd as it sounds, to bear duties. Another is the human right to freedom, the relatively unconditional right that people who are capable of acting autonomously have as such beings. We have a right to liberty without the need for the right to be conferred, while other beings, such as non-human animals that may have the broader absolutely unconditional rights, lack this relatively unconditional right. This is why liberty is intimately tied with human dignity, even as it is demonstrably allied with human prosperity. All other rights that have correlative duties are conditional rights, rights of only some right-holders. They are acquired rights. Their acquisition is conditional on meeting certain qualifications. Someone has a right to have a promise kept only if he meets the qualifications of being the promisee. Someone has a right to receive charity only if he meets the qualification of being in need. From this it should be evident that conditional rights may be either conditioned-rights or unconditionedrights. What makes a right conditioned is a condition of the right itself, that of the correlative duty, an imperfect duty, not being conferred on other qualified rightholders. What makes a right conditional is a condition for acquiring the right in the first place.

**The right to strike is an conditional right, so viewing it as unconditional is impossible. Fiat doesn’t solve because its intrinsic to the nature of the principle and the aff is a binding policy, not just view X as Y.**

**[1] The right to strike is conditional on the government existing and enforcing it: A] The Sqou proves that without the state, the right doesn’t exist, which means turning the NC non-uniques the aff B] State of nature would just mean people could take the action, not that they have a guaranteed right to do so.**

**[2] The right is conditional on the existence of certain social institutions: IE a workplace and employer to strike against, and a job to stop doing. This doesn’t apply to unconditional rights like freedom or life, since they are intrinsic to human nature not social constructs.**

**[3] Unconditional rights cannot conflict with each other, as otherwise neither would be absolute, but the right to strike conflicts with 1] The right to life of those deprived of stuff like medicine, which is fundamental to every human action, and 2] is intrinsically violent as when enforcing it you must know everything about a particular situation, and you must act immediately in the face of a violation, otherwise you allow injustice to occur. But these are simultaneously impossible since a) we cannot know everything about a particular situation and b) there is not infinite time to make an ethical decision. Given that there must be deliberation over any moral decision to ensure its correctness in relation to the situation, the very act of deliberation is violence, as you allow the injustice to continue, but if you were to act immediately you would act without proper knowledge to correctly address the injustice.**

**[4] Weighing: A] Even if the aff proves that an unconditional right such the right to life or right to freedom entails the right to strike, this doesn’t prove that it is unconditional since it is contingent on another right, and is therefore not sufficient to affirm B] Unconditional rights are unconditionally good and lack exceptions, so one instance where the right is wrong is sufficient to prove it is conditional too that particular circumstance.**

## DA

**Uniqueness: Full-scale automation of the work force is decades away with current market incentives**

**Carey 21 - Kevin Carey, vice president for education policy and knowledge management at New America, Slate, March 31st, 2021** “Do Not Be Alarmed by Wild Predictions of Robots Taking Everyone’s Jobs” [https://slate.com/technology/2021/03/job-loss-automation-robots-predictions.html] Accessed 12/1/21 SAO

In February, McKinsey Global Institute predicted that 45 million Americans—one-quarter of the workforce—would lose their jobs to automation by 2030. That was up from its 2017 estimate that 39 million would be automated out of work, due to the economic dislocation of COVID-19. Historically, firms tend to replace some of the workers they fire during recessions with machines. Fear of robot-driven mass unemployment has become increasingly mainstream. Andrew Yang, who is currently leading the polls for the Democratic nomination to be the next mayor of New York City, made it a pillar of his unorthodox 2020 presidential campaign. The coming lack of jobs, Yang said, justified giving all Americans a $1,000 monthly government income. But look closely at the studies predicting automation-driven job loss, and you’ll find less reason for alarm (though there are still reasons to consider a universal basic income). The robots are mostly not coming—at least, not soon. To start, there’s a huge difference between “robots” and “automation.” Once, many elevators were operated by people. An office building in D.C. still had elevator operators in the 2010s. They weren’t replaced by humanoid robots that listen to rider requests and manipulate a lever with mechanical fingers. They were replaced by a row of buttons riders press themselves. A lot of automation works this way. The distinction matters because automation happens all the time. Over the past 150 years, we’ve gone from a nation of farmers to a nation of factory workers to a nation of white collar and service employees, with much of that momentous change driven by automation. But while regional economies have been disrupted and recessions have created periodic unemployment crises, there has never been a chronic, structural shortage of jobs nationwide. New inventions create new markets and jobs to go with them. The robot job apocalypse scenario is based on the assumption that the next wave of automation technology will be fundamentally different. Artificial intelligence in particular is thought to be advancing so quickly that replacement jobs won’t keep pace. People wonder whether our fragile, imperfect species will be necessary much longer. But that’s not what the forecasters are saying. The robot job loss prediction boom was kicked into high gear in 2013, when a pair of Oxford University researchers estimated that 47 percent of American jobs are “at risk” of computerization. The report was widely cited, including in official White House reports. To arrive at that estimate, a team of machine learning experts examined 70 occupations, each of which had been analyzed by the U.S. Department of Labor and broken down into dozens of discrete tasks and competencies. The experts looked at each task and made an informed guess as to whether it could be automated, assuming state-of-the-art technology, the enormous data sets that fuel modern A.I., and future engineering breakthroughs that have not yet occurred. They used those estimates to write an algorithm that automatically analyzed hundreds of other jobs. “At risk” of automation does not, in that analysis, mean “likely to be automated.” It means, “could theoretically be automated if someone had unlimited time, money, and access to the latest A.I.” That’s an enormous difference. Perhaps the engineers at Boston Dynamics, which makes those viral videos of disturbingly humanoid robots, could spend millions of dollars building a robot version of the guy who stands on the street corner twirling the big pointy sign that says “Going Out of Business Sale!!!” But they won’t, because nobody would buy that robot, because they can just hire the guy for $10 an hour. The recent McKinsey report takes this into account, estimating the cost of developing new automation technology, the price of the labor it would be replacing, and the time it would take for widespread adoption. That’s why its estimate is 27 percent of jobs, not 47 percent. But here, too, definitions matter. McKinsey predicts that of the 49.1 million who will have their jobs displaced by automation, 32 million will stay in the same occupation, and another 2.2 million will stay in the same occupational category. The number of people who will lose their jobs in the “have to find a new line of work” sense is only 14.9 million. Not 27 percent, but 9 percent. That’s because automation is more likely to change jobs than destroy them. Machines will perform an increasing share of boring, rote tasks, and people will move to more human work. When hundreds of thousands of ATMs were deployed in the 1980s and 1990s, the number of bank tellers went up, not down, because reduced labor costs allowed banks to open more branches. Now machines count the money, and people sell you auto loans. Automation works especially well when workers are partners in designing their new relationships to machines. Nine percent of jobs is still a lot. But the optimal number isn’t zero. The White House automation report notes that about 6 percent of jobs in the American economy are eliminated every three months through the normal process of some businesses shrinking or shutting down as others start up and expand. Automation-driven job loss definitely exists. In 2020, economists Daron Acemoglu and Pascual Restrepo found that each new industrial robot deployed in the United States between 1990 and 2007 replaced 3.3 workers, even after accounting for the positive economic effects of more productive firms. It was a small impact—one worker in 1,000—but very real. The question of who gets replaced is also fraught. Nineteenth-century automation often replaced higher-paid skilled craftsmen. Twenty-first-century automation hits lower-paid, less-skilled workers the hardest. Recent recessions have been brutal for working-class families, who often never regain lost economic ground. The American unemployment insurance system is creaky, inadequate, and in dire need of reform. The wilder robot dystopia scenarios often proceed from failures of metaphor. Many powerful new A.I. systems use methods called “neural networks,” which people assume means, “like a human brain.” They are not like human brains. A.I. is pattern recognition. Alexa knows that certain spoken sounds correspond to the sequence of letters “peanut butter,” which is remarkable. But Alexa has no idea what “peanut butter” means or why it tastes good with jelly. The soberest predictions of automation job loss still rely on a lattice of interlocking predictions that may not come true. Five years ago, it seemed like we were on the cusp of robot taxis and freight trucks becoming widespread. Today, we’re stuck on the cusp. The last mile between “almost good enough” and “good enough” can be very long. Even the simple, routine tasks that are the heart of most job loss scenarios can be fiendishly difficult to automate. Amazon uses hundreds of thousands of cutting-edge robots in its warehouses. But they’re not androids that pick items off of shelves. The robots are the shelves, which move to humans, who still do the picking. Those simple, deft movements of eye and hand, recognizing and grasping myriad shapes in three dimensions, are the products of millions of years of evolution. Scientists and engineers are working hard to catch up. But they’re not going to fully solve those problems all at once, or in the next nine years, or for a long time after that.

**Link: Mass strikes flip public opinion and market incentives on automation**

**Cokelaere 20 - HANNE COKELAERE, Politico, January 15, 2020** “Robot scab! How automation is threatening striking French workers” [https://www.politico.eu/article/robot-scab-automation-threatening-striking-french-workers/] Accessed 12/1/21 SAO

PARIS — A national strike has brought most public transport in the French capital to a halt for 42 days and counting, but two Metro lines have been operating as if nothing is amiss. The secret? They run without drivers. Unions have long been worried that automating public transport could cost jobs, but the ongoing standoff between workers and the government over pension reform is highlighting the potential advantages of replacing humans with machines. During the Christmas break, strike action saw hundreds of dazed tourists and exasperated Parisians hoping to travel across the city jammed into a hallway at the Saint-Lazare station — a hub where trains, suburban rail and Metro lines intersect. But only one of the four Metro lines usually servicing the second-busiest station on the Paris Metro system was operating. “The No. 14 is the only one running,” an employee of the Paris public transport operator told the seething crowd. Paris has two automated lines: The No. 14 connecting Saint-Lazare with stops across the Seine River was the first to be opened in 1998. The No. 1, the capital’s busiest link from East to West, went driverless in 2012 to allow trains to run at a higher frequency than would be possible with human operators. Work to upgrade a third Metro connection — a key link crossing the city north to south — is due to be completed in 2022, and Paris public transport operator RATP is mulling a fourth automated line. Redundant humans The strikes have made driverless trains a political issue, and it's being seized on by candidates for the Paris mayoral election in March. Benjamin Griveaux, a candidate to replace Anne Hidalgo in the town hall, pledged in December to work with regional authorities to speed up the automation of the Metro network to “make the lives of Parisians easier — even during strikes.” His competitor, a rebel candidate from Griveaux's own La République En Marche party, echoed the plan. “An automated Metro is a more punctual Metro — [a Metro] that can continue to operate in times of strikes,” he said in an LCI interview. That's dismaying unions. Frédéric Delebarre, a representative of the CGT union at the RATP, complained that advocating the automation of public transport to soften the blow of the strikes “is cutting corners left and right.” Delebarre said automation would take years and would be very expensive, so it makes sense for the government to negotiate an end to the strikes instead. “To prevent conflicts ... it's easier for the government to abandon its reform program than to automate the [Metro] lines. That's less costly,” he said. But so far the government isn't backing down on reforming the pension system, although it is showing signs of movement on the actual retirement age. It wants to introduce a universal points system to save up a pension, and do away with France's more than 42 industry-specific systems. Among the unions' concerns are an increase of the retirement age, exceptions for taxing jobs and a decrease of pension payments. **As the strikes drag on, public opinion is shifting against workers while enthusiasm grows for driverless trains**. Some fed-up Parisians have launched an online petition calling for a full automation of the Metro network, which has gathered over 10,000 signatures.

**Internal Link: Full-scale automation terminally disempowers workers – high skill jobs can’t fill the gap. Turns case.**

**Comstock 17 - Craig K. Comstock, Huffington Post, October 22nd, 2017** “Let Them Eat Basic Incomes” [https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/let-them-eat-basic-incomes\_us\_59ebbc5ce4b02c6e3c609b87] accessed 4/14/18 SAO

A study from Oxford University concludes that the percentage of U.S. jobs that are at risk from automation, within 20 years, is no less than nearly half (47%). From the viewpoint of managers, **silicon chips and hydraulic arms** offer some advantages over human workers: they **don’t strike or** even **ask for higher wages**, they don’t need health benefits, they don’t file suits for sexual harassment, they don’t get a higher rate of pay for overtime, they may be faster or otherwise better at some tasks, they don’t require maternity leave, they create jobs for highly skilled technical people, and as capital investments they qualify for tax deductions. What’s not to like? However, the loss of jobs is an impending crisis on the scale of ***a world war***. It is developing in parallel with what climate scientists predict will be a series of disasters. One response to the former problem is said to be a universal basic income; another is some sort of tax on robots. As for the latter problem, global warming, the main solution being discussed is a shift from carbon-emitting technologies, such as gasoline-driven vehicles, to massive development of sustainable energy. However, progress being made on either predicament is strikingly inadequate. With regard to global warming, the general attitude is sluggish, reluctant, minimal action, if not outright denial. With regard to machines taking half of out jobs, we have not even reached the stage of denial. Unemployment above 50% seems unthinkable. Look what’s happened in politics with only a tiny fraction of that disruption. In the middle ages, feudalism was much simpler. The work to be done did not demand high-tech skills. Many could guide a plow. Almost everybody could drop seeds and weed with a hoe. All hands turned out for the harvest. In contrast, machines of the near future will require skills of a relatively small group to make, install, program, and repair them. Strikingly unlike a canvas of fieldworkers by Breughel. From one viewpoint, a universal guaranteed income is a streamlining of welfare: the dole without a means-test. But a basic income given to people who have no jobs and do no work is arguably a formula for trouble. It goes against the American ethic to get paid for doing nothing. It seems unfair, especially to the people who are still working. It deletes whatever meaning a job offers. You become nothing but a “consumer” and, like today’s welfare client, you can’t consume much. Meanwhile, the corporations selling stuff **are in the position of no longer of negotiating with workers** but, in effect, owning them, or at least owning the machines that have replaced them. The issues that will inescapably arise include (a) who pays the taxes to provide the basic income? (b) how do we provide meaningful occupations for those who no longer have jobs? (c) to what extent can people not working be attracted into socially useful volunteer work rather than, say, watching TV and sleeping? (d) how generous would the basic income be? would it only amount to welfare without the case workers? (e) which level of government would be responsible for paying the basic income, and if not the federal, what would stop states from paying so little that people would move to states that were more generous? It may sound simple to design a universal basic income. It is paid to everyone. It would cover the basic expenses of life. However, questions arise as soon as you try to define what is basic, and as soon as you consider the relationship to getting an additional income, as from a job. I live in a town with an unusually high fraction of retired people, some of whom volunteer for such local organizations as the hospital, a food bank, elder care, meals on wheels, theater groups, the public library, hospice, schools (trained teacher’s helpers). Since retirement, almost all of my work as a writer and TV producer has been on a volunteer basis. My wife has volunteered at the library, my sister as leader of a weekly discussion group, my brother’s partner at the food bank. I don’t know to what extent this pattern can be generalized. Basic income is a formula for a two-class society even more extreme than our democratic, exceptional nation has today. Are we going to let the investor class get even richer relative to the average, based on the ownership of high tech machines or are we going to find a way to reach a quite narrow band of inequality, in part as a reward for some people able and willing to hold the remaining jobs? What will be the rate of social mobility between the basic-income-only families and those who have work or investments or both?

**Impact: Full-scale automation causes mass genocide**

**Tarnoff 17 - Ben Tarnoff, writing for the Guardian (In San Francisco) March 2nd 2017** “Robots won't just take our jobs – they'll make the rich even richer”[https://amp.theguardian.com/technology/2017/mar/02/robot-tax-job-elimination-livable-wage] Accessed 1/31/18 SAO

What’s different this time is the possibility that technology will become so sophisticated that there won’t be anything left for humans to do. What if your ATM could not only give you a hundred bucks, but sell you an adjustable-rate mortgage? While the current rhetoric around artificial intelligence is overhyped, there have been meaningful advances over the past several years. And it’s not inconceivable that much bigger breakthroughs are on the horizon. Instead of merely transforming work, technology might begin to eliminate it. Instead of making it possible to create more wealth with less labor, automation might make it possible to create more wealth without labor. What’s so bad about wealth without labor? It depends on who owns the wealth. Under capitalism, wages are how workers receive a portion of what they produce. That portion has always been small, relative to the rewards that flow to the owners of capital. And over the past several decades, it’s gotten smaller: the share of the national income that goes to wages has been steadily [shrinking](https://www.oecd.org/g20/topics/employment-and-social-policy/The-Labour-Share-in-G20-Economies.pdf), while the share that goes to capital has been growing. Technology has made workers more productive, but the profits have trickled up, not down. Productivity [increased](http://www.epi.org/publication/ib330-productivity-vs-compensation/) by 80.4% between 1973 and 2011, but the real hourly compensation of the median worker went up by only 10.7%. As bad as this is, mass automation threatens to make it much worse. If you think inequality is a problem now, imagine a world where the rich can get richer all by themselves. Capital liberated from labor means not merely the end of work, but the end of the wage. And without the wage, workers lose their only access to wealth – not to mention their only means of survival. They also lose their primary source of social power. So long as workers control the point of production, they can shut it down. The strike is still the most effective weapon workers have, even if they rarely use it any more. A fully automated economy would make them not just redundant, but powerless. Meanwhile, robotic capital would enable elites to completely secede from society. From private jets to private islands, the rich already devote a great deal of time and expense to insulating themselves from other people. But even the best fortified luxury bunker is tethered to the outside world, so long as capital needs labor to reproduce itself. Mass automation would make it possible to sever this link. Equipped with an infinite supply of workerless wealth, elites could seal themselves off in a gated paradise, leaving the unemployed masses to rot. If that scenario isn’t bleak enough, consider the possibility that mass automation could lead not only to the impoverishment of working people, but to their annihilation. In his book Four Futures, Peter Frase speculates that the economically redundant hordes outside the gates would only be tolerated for so long. After all, they might get restless – and that’s a lot of possible pitchforks. “What happens if the masses are dangerous but are no longer a working class, and hence of no value to the rulers?” Frase writes. “Someone will eventually get the idea that it **would be better to get rid of them**.” He gives this future an appropriately frightening name: “exterminism”, a world defined by the “**genocidal war of the rich against the poor”.** These dystopias may sound like science fiction, but they’re perfectly plausible given our current trajectory. The technology around robotics and artificial intelligence will continue to improve – but without substantive political change, the outcome will range from bad to apocalyptic for most people. That’s why the recent rumblings about a robot tax are worth taking seriously. They offer[s] an opportunity to develop the political response to mass automation now, before it’s too late.

## K

**Justifying util is an independent voter –**

**1. Util justifies atrocities since it justifies allowing us to harm some for the benefit of others – even if they spew some pain quantifiability argument that doesn’t solve since there are still instances some get great benefit from others harm.**

**2. Util can’t justify intrinsic wrongness – We can’t know whether our action was good until we’ve evaluated the states of affairs they’ve produced since it’s based on the outcome of the action. Probability doesn’t solve because that just allows for moral error and freezes action while attempting to calculate the perfect decision.**

**3. Util justifies death good – the absence of pleasure is not bad since there is no life to calculate its lossed value and experience its absence but the lack of pain is actively good even if that good cannot be enjoyed by anyone because it would still have net value.**

**They read morally repugnant arguments. Thus the alternative is to drop the debater, to ensure that debate remains a space safe for all – the judge has a proximal obligation to ensure inaccessible practices don’t proliferate. Accessibility is a voting issue since all aff arguments presuppose that people feel safe in this space to respond to them.**

**shell**

**Interpretation: Affirmative debaters must specify which universe the aff takes place in. The negative takes place in this one**

**There are multiple universes and the aff does not specify.**

**Victor Tangermann, Writer for cybernetics, Futurism This Physicist Believes There Are Countless Parallel Universes, OCTOBER 25TH 2019,** [**https://futurism.com/physicist-convinced-countless-parallel-universes**](https://futurism.com/physicist-convinced-countless-parallel-universes) **///AHS PB**

**“It’s absolutely possible that there are multiple worlds where you made different decisions,” he told the network. “We’re just obeying the laws of physics.” So if there are multiple worlds, how many are there? “We don’t know whether the number of worlds is finite or infinite, but it’s certainly a very large number,” Carroll claimed. “There’s no way it’s, like, five.” And he goes further, into a metaphysical view of the universe in which physical reality has much to do with the observer. “Before you look at an object, whether it’s an electron, or an atom or whatever, it’s not in any definite location,” Carroll told NBC. “It might be more likely that you observe it in one place or another, but it’s not actually located at any particular place.” Carroll isn’t the only one that has examined the possibility of many alternate realities. The likes of** [**Stephen Hawking**](https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-43976977) **and Erwin Schrödinger have suggested that many other parallel worlds exist as well. In his most recent work, Hawking** [**suggested that**](https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-43976977) **thanks to quantum mechanics, the Big Bang supplied us with an endless number of universes, not just one.**

**Violation- you don’t**

**Standards-**

1. **Stable ground- By not specifying which universe the aff takes place in they’re able to completely pivot in the 1ar to exclude all NC offense, which outweighs on infinite abuse**
2. **Resolvability- it becomes impossible to weigh absent knowing what universe the aff takes place in because every universe has different uq issues that I wouldn’t be able to weigh in ur case, which absent weighing invites judge intervention**