# 1NC v Strake Loyola R3

## 1

### T-Unconditional

#### 1] Interpretation: The affirmative must defend an unconditional right to strike. This means that the Affirmative must defend that anyone regardless of job or occupation has a fundamental right to strike.

Merriam Webster ND, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/unconditional> //sid

 not conditional or limited : [ABSOLUTE](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/absolute), [UNQUALIFIED](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/unqualified)

#### 2] Violation – They only grant the Right to Strike to Teachers. That by definition is a condition since they condition the right to strike on a particular occupation.

#### 3] Standards –

#### a] Limits – there are endless conditions the aff can place on the right to strike – i.e based on occupation, national holidays, location of strike, etc. That makes the topic untenable since the Aff can just infinitely specify any condition or permutation of conditions which makes predictable preparation and in-depth clash impossible.

#### b] Neg Ground – all of our ground is predicated on the debate between unconditional and conditional – shifting the debate to particular conditions eviscerates core Negative Arguments like Economic Perception or Investment Signaling which only happen as a result of a blanket right to strike.

#### 4] TVA – establish a right to strike and read Teacher Unions as an Advantage.

#### 5] Paradigm Issues –

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

## 2

### Competitiveness DA

#### Teacher Strikes hurt educational achievement – best statistical studies

Matthews 12 Dylan Matthews 9-10-2012 "How teacher strikes hurt student achievement" <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2012/09/10/how-teacher-strikes-hurt-student-achievement/> (Journalist at Washington Post)//SJDH

Talks between the Chicago Public Schools and the Chicago Teachers Union broke down yesterday, and now the city's teachers are on strike, just as class was about to start for the 2012-13 school year. Labor will insist that the strikes lead to contracts that attract good teachers who promote student learning in the long-run, while Emanuel notes that the teachers are striking over his proposed evaluation system, which he argues will help achievement going forward. Leaving that debate aside, what does the strike itself mean for students? **Nothing good**, the **best empirical evidence suggests**. Two of the best recent studies on the effects of teacher work stoppages and strikes concern labor disputes in Ontario schools in the late '90s and early 2000s. One, by the University of Toronto's Michael Baker, compared how standardized test scores rose between grade 3 and grade 6 for students who lost instructional time because of the Ontario strikes, and for students who were unaffected. Baker found that if the strike happened when a student was in grade 2 or 3, their scores rose by slightly less. But if the strike happened when the student was in grade 5 or 6, **their scores rose by a whole lot less**. Scores for strike-affected fifth-graders were a **full 3.8 percent lower** than those for fifth-graders in schools and grades not affected. If that doesn't seem like much, **it's 29 percent of the standard deviation** (or the typical amount by which students differ from their class average). Wilfrid Laurer's David Johnson studied the same Ontario strikes and also found that they hurt student achievement. Like Baker, he found only small effects for students for whom the strike occurred in third grade, but large effects if the student was in sixth grade. In the latter case, the percentage of students getting a passing score on math standardized tests fell by 0.21 percentage points **per day**, and the percentage getting a non-failing score across all tests fell by 0.10 points per day. The effects were much more dramatic in poorer and more socially disadvantaged school districts, where overall passing scores went down by 0.35 points per day. Given that strikes typically last a week or more, these results can add up. A nine-day strike, for instance, reduces passing rates 3.15 percentage points. And it's not just Ontario. Michèle Belot and Dinand Webbink, now of the Universities of Edinburgh and Rotterdam, respectively, found that work stoppages **hurt student achievement**, increased the **number of students repeating grades and reduced** **higher education attainment** in Belgium. What's more, studies dealing with teacher absences for reasons other than strikes bolster these findings.

#### Competitiveness key to solve greater power wars

Baru 9 (Sanjaya Baru Professor at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy and Institute of South Asian Studies “Year of the power shift?,” January 2009, <http://www.india-seminar.com/2009/593/593_sanjaya_baru.htm>)

The management of the economy, and of the treasury, has been a vital aspect of statecraft from time immemorial. Kautilya’s Arthashastra says, ‘From the strength of the treasury the army is born. …men without wealth do not attain their objectives even after hundreds of trials… Only through wealth can material gains be acquired, as elephants (wild) can be captured only by elephants (tamed)… A state with depleted resources, even if acquired, becomes only a liability.’4 Hence, economic policies and performance do have strategic consequences.5 ¶ In the modern era, the idea that strong economic performance is the foundation of power was argued most persuasively by historian Paul Kennedy. 'Victory (in war)', Kennedy claimed, 'has repeatedly gone to the side with more flourishing productive base'.3 Drawing attention to the interrelationships between economic wealth, technological innovation, and the ability of states to efficiently mobilize economic and technological resources for power projection and national defence, Kennedy argued that nations that were able to better combine military and economic strength scored over others. ¶ 'The fact remains', Kennedy argued, 'that all of the major shifts in the world's military-power balance have followed alterations in the productive balances; and further, that the rising and falling of the various empires and states in the international system has been confirmed by the outcomes of the major Great Power wars, where victory has always gone to the side with the greatest material resources'.4 ¶ In Kennedy's view, the geopolitical consequences of an economic crisis, or even decline, would be transmitted through a nation's inability to find adequate financial resources to simultaneously sustain economic growth and military power.

### Theory Heg

#### Reject 1ar Theory and independent voting issues as reasons to reject the team,

#### the 1ar by Everest cannot have overview responses because it allows them to avoid line by line engagement, must concede truth testing so we learn the value of debating truth and falsity and come to an objective conclusion

#### a. 7 - 6 time skew means they have a structural advantage

#### b. No 3nr, so 2ar gets to weigh however they want

#### c. Judges are more likely to by 2a arguments as they are the

#### last speech

#### d. Too many theory flows make it impossible to test the aff

#### e. You get a 2-1 speech advantage

#### f. We only get 2 speeches of new arguments to deliberate over your shell which isn’t enough time

#### g. there’s no such thing as infinite abuse as NC only has 7 minutes

#### h. 1ar theory is used as a strategic advantage

#### Even if you don’t buy reject it-it’s a reason why its’ drop the arg and reasonability

### 3

#### I am ye, an Evil Demon from the Nether, and I have one goal: This ballot. I will wreak havoc and stop at nothing until l get this dub, then I will go back to Nether. I have taken over ye’s Body, Fear me and my threat. No rules will constrain me as the application of rules, even when justified, are not inherent.

#### Everest is now under my control, I have hypnotized them during prep time and they are now my Puppet.

#### To demonstrate this, I will make them do a couple of things.

#### In their 1ar, they will make arguments about why you should vote me down and why you should vote them up. But know this: through telepathy, I have learned that their true intention was to lose this round; They planned to forfeit in the 1ar. It appears I didn’t need to hypnotize them in the first place. No amount of evidence can ever prove objective knowledge. Searle,[[1]](#footnote-1)

#### You could have the best possible evidence about other people’s behavior and still be mistaken about their mental states. You could have the best possible evidence about the past and still be mistaken about the future. You could have the best possible evidence about your own perceptual experiences and still be mistaken about the external world. This is so because you could be dreaming,having hallucinations, be a brain in a vat, or be deceieved systematically by an evil demon. Strange situations, yes, but it is impossible to disprove the potentiality for any of thesescenarios.”

#### I have programmed them to think that they are not hypnotized, that they want to win the round, and that they think what I am saying is very silly. But no matter our empirical observations, their intentions are indeterminate. Kant Immanuel, The Critique of Pure Reason. Translated by J.M.D. Meiklejohn. 1781. Under heading “Exposition of the Cosmological Idea of Freedom in Harmony with the Universal Law of Natural Necessity.” available online: <http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/etext03/cprrn10.txt> SJCP//JG The real morality of actions’--their merit or demerit, and even that of our own conduct, is completely unknown to us. Our estimates can relate only to their empirical character. How much is the result of the action of free will, how much is to be ascribed to nature and to blameless error, or to a happy constitution of temperament (merito fortunae), no one can discover, nor, for this reason, determine with perfect justice.

#### Of course, I have no intention of keeping them as my puppet, (I have too many). When they say

#### “I am forfeiting this round, yes this is serious, and this comes before all other arguments. To clarify- I am kicking every single argument I made and asking you to vote for ye” and then stop speaking, then they will wake up and you will know they are no longer under my command. Until then, I am the puppet-master.:

## 4

#### Permissibility and presumption negate

#### 1] Obligations- the resolution indicates the affirmative has to prove an obligation, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation

#### 2] Falsity- Statements are more often false than true because proving one part of the statement false disproves the entire statement. Presuming all statements are true creates contradictions which would be ethically bankrupt.

#### 3] Negating is harder – A] Aff gets first and last speech which control the direction of the debate B] Affirmatives can strategically uplayer in the 1ar giving them a 7-6 time skew advantage, splitting the 2nr C] They get infinite prep time

## 5

**Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than [Insert Topic] then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)***

**Violation:**

**Standards:**

**[1] Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair –**

**[A] Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides. [B] Shiftiness-Having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things.**

**[2] Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points, as well as encouraging in depth-research about their own position. Having one also encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses. Key to education since we definitionally learn more about positions when we contest our own.**

#### [3] Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### [4] Drop the debater – a) the 1AR is too short for theory and covering substance so a ballot implication is key, b) only dropping the debater deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### [5] Use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter and collapses, youy use an offense-defense paradigm\

## 6

### 1NC Shell V1

#### Interpretation: All arguments concerning fairness or education that the negative could violate must be read first in the affirmative speech. To clarify, theory arguments must be read at the top of the affirmative case before all substantive arguments.

#### Violation:

#### Standards:

#### [1] Neg strat – theory spikes and interpretations drastically change negative strategy because they operate on the highest layer of the debate. If the aff reads all their substance and then reads theory arguments, the neg is at a disadvantage because any substantive thinking would be nullified by your theory arguments. The neg should know what they have to meet before planning a strategy.

## Case

1. Searle, John R. Mind, Language, and Society: Philosophy in the Real World. New York: Basic Books; 2000. (27). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)