## 1NC

### 1

#### Permissibility and presumption negates: a) lack of obligation proves the res false – it says you have to prove obligation, but you cannot be obligated and lack obligation simultaneously b) statements are more often false then true – infinite ways to prove a statement false only 1 way to prove it true.

#### First, prefer a meta-ethic of constitutivism – only a theory describing what is constitutive of the agent can guide action insofar as one cannot opt-out of what makes them an agent.

#### Second, both reason and affect are constitutive to the subject – we are rational agents in that we exercise our capacity to justify judgements to will maxims, but also sensible creatures in that we respond affectively the world around us. For example, when I touch a hot stove, I first affectively feel pain, then rationally search for the cause, the stove.

#### Third, the tension between reason and sensibility creates the possibility for evil because our desires can affect the maxims we will as principle such that they become anti-rational. The solution is the ethical community, which critiques particularized evils. Practical reasoners in the ethical community mutually recognize other agents as self-legislators – our status as reasoning agents necessitates that we recognize other agents as such and respect their ability to act on their maxims.

Gobsch 14 [Wolfram Gobsch, "The Idea of an Ethical Community: Kant and Hegel on the Necessity of Human Evil and the Love to Overcome It," Philosophical Topics, Vol. 42, No. (2014), p. 177-200.  Gobsch is research assistant at the Chair for Practical Philosophy at Universität Leibzig, studied Philosophy and Logic & Philosophy of Science in Leipzig, St Andrews and Basel, ssistant and senior assistant at the Chair for Theoretical Philosophy at the University of Basel, research stay at the University of Chicago.]

Because the highest good is the complete end of the activity of pure reason, the unconditioned, it is necessarily possible.20 The unity of the highest good is the unity thought in the concept of a human being. It is the unity of reason, as of itself practical, with sensibility. It is the unity of pure reason and free choice, of moral law and maxim, through pure reason alone, unconditioned by anything else. Therefore, the idea of this unity, the idea of the highest good, is none other than the idea of ethical life, the idea of a reality in which the internality that is thought in the idea of the moral law as the principle from consciousness of which alone human beings act, if all goes well, and the relationality that is thought in the idea of the power of free choice in its dependence on sensible matter coincide with necessity, and that is: through pure reason. The idea of the highest good is the idea of ethical life: it is the idea of the actuality of a community constituted by the practical law as not only the principle from consciousness of which alone its constituents act, if all goes well, but in and only in so acting from which alone they are related to one another as persons. To identify the idea of ethical life with the idea of the highest good is to conceive of pure reason as the sole ground of the satisfaction of all the conditions of its actuality, or as Hegel puts it, referring to freedom and self-consciousness, the hallmarks of rational activity: Ethical life is the concept of freedom which has become the existing world and the nature of self-consciousness.21 One of the conditions of the actuality of the idea of ethical life is the very multiplicity of the human beings who constitute an ethical community. Satisfaction of this condition, too, must eventually come to be conceived—not as a brute fact, but—as the work of nothing but pure reason. And this is to say, among other things, that the actuality of an ethical community cannot be explained within the scope of methodological individualism. Ethical life, that is, cannot be explained as the result of a contract, for example.22 This reflects back on the content of the idea of ethical life. To act from one’s consciousness of nothing but the moral law is to act autonomously, it is to give this law to oneself: it is to act in such a way as to therein also constitute and preserve oneself as a being who is acting from nothing but one’s consciousness of this law. So for me to be related to you as one person to another in my acting from such respect for the moral law is for me to give the law to both of us and to therein receive it from you who is equally giving it to both of us. So as members of our ethical community, each of us acts in such a way as to constitute and preserve herself and therein the other as a person who acts from nothing but her consciousness of the moral law. In this sense, an act from respect for the moral law, conceived as the principle of an ethical community, is a joint or general act of the will. So in ethical life, the willing itself is relational.23 In our ethical community, that is, my willing is our willing, only from my perspective, oriented toward you; and your willing is our willing, only from your perspective, oriented toward me.24 And because our willing is our acting from nothing but our consciousness of the moral law, I am, in my willing, conscious of myself as related to you in this manner, and you are, in your willing, conscious of yourself as related to me in this manner: we share the same—relational—self-consciousness. In ethical life, the willing itself is relational in its very internality, in its very character as self-consciousness.25 In ethical life, we are conscious of one another as one at heart: as one in the consciousness of the principle from which we act; we are practically conscious of one another’s hearts. Through this consciousness we constitute a sense of “we” in which “validity for every human being (universitas vel omnitudo distributiva), i.e. communality of insight” and “universal union (omnitudo collectiva)”26 coincide with necessity. This implies that for me to act merely in accordance with the moral law, conceived as the principle of our ethical community, but not from my consciousness of it alone, is to break this law and to therein wrong you. But if I do act from nothing but my consciousness of the moral law, thus conceived, I am moved by reason and, therein, by you. That is to say that ethical life is the activity of unconditionally approving of one another’s individuality in such a way as to therein constitute and preserve one another as engaged in this very activity, and that is: love. It is the rational love we know as אהב) ahābā), ἀγάπη, caritas, and solidarity.27

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with mutual recognition in the ethical community.

#### Prefer Additionally-

#### 1] **Actor Specificity: only the NC framework explains the legitimacy of the state since the citizens must recognize its authority for it to coerce them—this also implies the NC is a side constraint on state action since it’s necessary for a state to be constituted**

#### Max **Pensky** is Assistant Professor of Philosophy at Binghamton University. "Universalism And The Situated Critic" In S. White (Ed.), The Cambridge Companion To Habermas (Cambridge Companions To Philosophy, Pp. 67-94), **1995**, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/cambridge-companion-to-habermas/3B448B1C9FEC698C747242C8E3618D84, DOA:3-1-2019

The universalist kernel of Habermas's moral and political writing has been the object of more criticism than any other aspect of his work. The central claim that there is always a preexistent intersubjective context for any morally relevant question translates the moment of universality in collective political life to the basic attributions and expectations of reasonableness that speakers and hearers in modern, rationalized societies can make of each other's discursive conduct, in situations when needs and problems have to be collectively settled. "Universalism" is itself not so much a concrete political value as it is a collectively shared mentality; a sense of solidarity inhabiting a public space that is distinct from political or economic institutions. It is a locationless network of competencies; the ability to approach one's own situated needs and interests reflectively; to take the position of the other at least to the extent that one is willing to recognize that the other's needs are at least potentially legitimate; that one attributes value and comprehensibility to the other's needs and interest. A universalistic mentality cannot adjudicate questions of the good life, for such questions are inextricably particular. But a collectively shared universalist mentality does enforce the principle that norms are only just insofar as they can meet with the considered approval of all those who will be affected by their implementation. For Habermas, universalism is the only formal criterion of the rightness or justice of collective norms that is available, and hence the only recourse that modem societies have for opening up a sphere in which particular questions of the good life can even be addressed. In this sense, "universalism" means something like the basic shared mentality that allows individuals to conceive of themselves as citizens of a democratic state, one in which citizenship consists of a constellation of interlocking duties and rights that together form an abstract level of popular sovereignty subsisting below - and making possible - the spectrum of particularistic kinds of identity operating within a diverse society. In democratic societies, the capacity for mutual recognition and the generalization of norms must install itself as an attitude that can reflectively separate from the particular fabric of their own interests.

#### 2] Value Pluralism- Delineating one moral truth to resolve all issues would be unthinkable because criteria and external factors are constantly in flux, ethical communities resolve this by allowing multiple perspectives and criteria in the decision making process for a communal decisions rather than a static one.

#### 3] Performativity- Debate specifically can be described as an ethical community because as debaters we contest particularized evils when we contest theories through mutual recognition, which contests the form of the activity and institution as a whole rather than just the arguments we debate about because an ethical community engages in a process of self-criticism to overcome and inhibit evils which explains any critical structure.

#### 4] Bindingness – my framework is the only non-arbitrary basis for ethics – making a normative claim requires others in the ethical community to recognize it as such, or else it is meaningless. Robert E. **Brandom**, “Some Pragmatist Themes In Hegel's Idealism: Negotiation And Administration In Hegel's Account Of The Structure And Content Of Conceptual Norms,” European Journal Of Philosophy, Vol. 7, No. 2 (**1999**), pp. 164–189. Brandom is professor of philosophy at University of Pittsburgh, Won 2003 Mellon Distinguished Achievement Award, B.A. from Yale University, Ph.D. from Princeton University, under Richard Rorty and David Kellogg Lewis.

That is, to be a self – a locus of conceptual commitment and responsibility – is to be taken or treated as one by those one takes or treats as one: to be recognized by those one recognizes. Merely biological beings, subjects and objects of desires, become spiritual beings, undertakers (and attributors) of commitments, by being at once the subjects and the objects of recognitive attitudes. At the same time and by the same means that selves, in this normative sense, are synthesized, so are communities, as structured wholes of selves all of whom recognize and are recognized by each other.17 Both selves and communities are normative structures instituted by reciprocal recognition. This is a social theory of selves in the sense that selves and communities are products of the same process, aspects of the same structure. But it is a social theory in a stronger sense as well. For being a self in this sense is not something one can achieve all on one’s own. Only part of what is needed is within the power of the candidate self. It is up to the individual who to recognize. But it is not up to the individual whether those individuals then in turn recognize the original recognizer. Only when this ‘movement’ is completed is a self constituted. I think the structure is clearest when one considers specific recognition – that is, attribution of some specific normative status, not just treating someone as having some normative status or other (as the subject of some responsibilities, or entitlements, commitments, or authority, which is recognition in general). For instance, it is up to me whom I recognize as a good chess player. I can settle for recognizing any old woodpusher who can play a legal game, or I can set my standards so high that only Grand Masters qualify. But it is not then up to me (certainly not up to me in the same sense) whether those I recognize as good players recognize me as a good player. If I’ve set my sights low enough, it will be easy to qualify. But if my aspirations for the sort of self I want to be, and so to be recognized as, are higher, it will be correspondingly more difficult for me to earn the recognition of those I recognize. This account of what it is to be a good chess player, in the various senses that term can take – and more generally, what it is to have some specific normative status – gives the candidate a certain sort of authority: the authority to constitute a community by recognizing individuals as members of it. But doing that is also ceding another sort of authority to those one recognizes: the authority to determine whether or not the candidate qualifies as a member of the community so constituted by the standards to which I have subjected myself. Having a normative status in this sense is an essentially social achievement, in which both the individual self and the community must participate. And both the self and the community achieve their status as such only as the result of successful reciprocal recognition. So when we talk about the structure and unity of the ‘I’ or of self-conscious selves according to Hegel, we are talking about the structure and unity produced by this process of reciprocal recognition, by which normative communities and community members are simultaneously instituted. This is what the idealist thesis proposes to use as a model for understanding the structure and unity of concepts. Here is a hint, to be followed up below. In recognizing others, I in effect institute a community – a kind of universal common to those others, and if all goes well, to me too. If they re cognize me in turn, they constitute me as something more than just the particular I started out as – a kind of individual (self), which is that particular (organism) as a member of the community, as characterized by that universal. The (recognizing) particular accordingly exercises a certain sort of authority over the universal, and the universal then exercises a certain sort of authority over the individual. It is at something like this level of abstraction that we will find a common structure between the social institution of selves and communities by reciprocal recognition, and the relation between concepts, as universals, and the particulars that fall under them, yielding the characterized individuals (particulars as falling under universals) that are presented by judgements.

#### Negate

#### The security of the ethical community is dependent upon protection from those external to it, but violence is intrinsic to strikes and they are uniquely unethical

Mlungisi 16, Ernest Tenza. The liability of trade unions for conduct of their members during industrial action. Diss. 2016. (lecturer in the field of Labour Law at the School of Law. He holds a LLM Degree) JG

When expressing themselves through one or more of these forms of expression, they are expected to be peaceful.20 However, over the past few years, workers attempted to heighten the impact of their industrial action by using various tactics during industrial action, tactics which have a negative impact on the **lives and property of other people**. These include the **trashing of cities, vandalising property**, forming picket lines **at supermarkets**, and preventing shoppers from doing business with their chosen businesses.21 There have been strike-related disruptions in almost every sector of the economy.22 There have been several incidents where industrial action resulted in violence and disruption of the public peace.23 Other examples include the torching of employers’ property, intimidation and even the killing **of non-striking workers**.24 During the truck drivers’ strike which took place in September 2012, a number of drivers were attacked and killed during violent demonstrations.25 During security workers’ strikes in 2006 and 2013, shops were looted and damage was caused to the property of innocent bystanders, street vendors, spaza-shop owners and employers.26 The Business Times reported that violent strikes in the country’s platinum sector resulted in the death of more than 50 people.27 In April 2016 SATAWU members on strike torched trains in Cape Town.28 These strikes are counter-productive and destructive not only because they are violent but the parties, namely the employer and employees take long to resolve their dispute(s) or reach settlement. This **create health hazards**. For example, a strike by municipal workers could lead to the non-collection of waste and this poses a serious health risk.29 The burning of tyres by demonstrators also leads to pollution and resultant health risks. The harmful conduct resulting from industrial action affects not only the strikers or picketers, but also innocent members of the public, non-striking employees, employers and the economy at large.30 In Garvis & Others v SATAWU & others, 31 it was held that the majority of the population was subjected to the tyranny of the state in the past and such practices should no longer be tolerated.

### 2

#### CP: A just democracy ought to recognize the unconditional right to strike on the condition that the strike is not violent

### 3

#### Global tech innovation high now.

Mercury News et al 6/4 [Mercury News and East Bay Times Editorial Boards, June 4, 2021, “Editorial: How America can Win the Global Tech War” <https://www.mercurynews.com/2021/06/04/editorial-why-silicon-valley-needs-endless-frontier-bill/> //gord0]

The nation that wins the global tech race will dominate the 21st century. This has been true since the 1800s. Given the rapid pace of innovation and tech’s impact on our economy and defense capabilities in the last decade, there is ample evidence to suggest that the need for investment in tech research and development has never been greater. China has been closing the tech gap in recent years by making bold investments in tech with the intent of overtaking the United States. This is a tech war we cannot afford to lose. It’s imperative that Congress pass the Endless Frontier Act and authorize the biggest R&D tech investment in the United States since the Apollo years. Rep. Ro Khanna, D-Santa Clara, made a massive increase in science and technology investment a major part of his platform while campaigning for a seat in Congress in 2016. Now the co-author of the 600-page legislation is on the cusp of pushing through a bipartisan effort that has been years in the making. Khanna and his co-authors, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., Sen. Todd Young, R-Ind., and Rep. Mike Gallagher, R-Wisc., are shepherding the bill through the Senate, which is expected to approve it sometime later this month. That would set up a reconciliation debate between the House and Senate that would determine the bill’s final language. The ultimate size of the investment is still very much up in the air. Khanna would like Congress to authorize $100 billion over a five-year period for critical advancements in artificial intelligence, biotechnology, cybersecurity, semiconductors and other cutting-edge technologies. The Senate is talking of knocking that number down to $50 billion or $75 billion. They should be reminded of China Premier Li Keqiang’s March announcement that China would increase its research and development spending by an additional 7% per year between 2021 and 2025. The United States still outspends China in R&D, spending $612 billion on research and development in 2019, compared to China’s $514 billion. But the gap is narrowing. At the turn of the century, China was only spending $33 billion a year on R&D, while the United States was spending nearly 10 times that amount. The bill would authorize 10 technology hubs throughout the nation designed to help build the infrastructure, manufacturing facilities and workforce needed to help meet the nation’s tech goals. Building tech centers throughout the United States should also create more support for the industry across the country. Tech’s image has taken a beating in recent years — the emergence of the term “Big Tech” is hardly a positive development — and the industry will need all the support it can muster in Congress. The United States continues to have a crucial tech edge over its competitors, most notably China. The only way we can hope to win the 21st century is to make significant investments in research and development that will spark the next wave of innovation.

#### Violent strike efforts are increasing – they slow innovation, specifically in the tech sector.

Hanasoge 16 [Chaithra; Senior Research Analyst, Market Researcher, Consumer Insights, Strategy Consulting; “The Union Strikes: The Good, the Bad and the Ugly,” Supply Wisdom; April/June 2016 (Doesn’t specifically say but this is the most recent event is cites); https://www.supplywisdom.com/resources/the-union-strikes-the-good-the-bad-and-the-ugly/]//SJWen

The result: Verizon conceded to several of the workers’ demands including hiring union workers, protection against outsourcing of call-center jobs, and employee benefits such as salary hikes and higher pension contributions, among others and thus bringing an end to the strike in June.

The repercussion: The strike witnessed several instances of social disorder, violence and clashes, ultimately calling for third party intervention (Secretary of Labor – Thomas Perez) to initiate negotiations between the parties. Also, as a result of the strike, Verizon reported lower than expected revenues in the second quarter of 2016.

Trade unions/ labor unions aren’t just this millennia’s product and has been in vogue since times immemorial. Unions, to ensure fairness to the working class, have gone on strike for better working conditions and employee benefits since the industrial revolution and are as strong today as they were last century. With the advent of technology and advancement in artificial intelligence, machines are grabbing the jobs which were once the bastion of the humans. So, questions that arise here are, what relevance do unions have in today’s work scenario? And, are the strikes organized by them avoidable?

As long as the concept of labor exists and employees feel that they are not receiving their fair share of dues, unions will exist and thrive. Union protests in most cases cause work stoppages, and in certain cases, disruption of law and order. Like in March 2016, public servants at Federal Government departments across Australia went on a series of strikes over failed pay negotiations, disrupting operations of many government departments for a few days.  Besides such direct effects, there are many indirect effects as well such as strained employee relations, slower work processes, lesser productivity and unnecessary legal hassles.

Also, union strikes can never be taken too lightly as they have prompted major overturn of decisions, on a few occasions. Besides the Verizon incident that was a crucial example of this, nationwide strikes were witnessed in India in March and April this year when the national government introduced reforms related to the withdrawal regulations and interest rate of employee provident fund, terming it as ‘anti-working class’. This compelled the government to withhold the reform for further review. In France, strike against labor law reforms in May turned violent, resulting in riots and significant damage to property. The incident prompted the government to consider modifications to the proposed reforms.

However, aside from employee concerns, such incidents are also determined by a number of other factors such as the country’s political scenario, economy, size of the overall workforce and the unions, history of unionization, labor laws, and culture. For example, it is a popular saying that the French are always on strike as per tradition (although recent statistics indicate a decline in frequency). In a communist government like China, strikes have steadily risen in number. In 2015, China Labor Bulletin (CLB), a Hong Kong-based workers’ rights group recorded 2,700 incidents of strikes and protests, compared to 1,300 incidents in 2014. Most of them have stemmed out of failure by the government to respect the basic rights of employees and address labor concerns.

Interestingly, unions have not been able to gain a strong foothold in the IT-BPO industry. While many countries do have a separate union to represent workers from the sector, incidents of strikes like Verizon have been relatively low.  However, workplace regulations, in addition to other factors mentioned could be a trigger for such incidents, even if on a smaller scale. For example, a recent survey that interviewed several BPO employees in India revealed that while forming a union in the BPO sector was difficult, irksome workplace regulations such as constant surveillance, irregular timings and incentives have prompted employees to express their resentment in smaller ways such as corruption of internal servers and so on.  Such risks are further enhanced in a city like Kolkata, which carries a strong trade union culture.

#### Victories like the aff mobilizes unions in the IT sector.

Vynck et al 21 [Gerrit De; Carleton University, BA in Journalism and Global Politics, tech reporter for The Washington Post. He writes about Google and the algorithms that increasingly shape society. He previously covered tech for seven years at Bloomberg News; Nitashu Tiku; Columbia University, BA in English, New York University, MA in Journalism, Washington Post's tech culture reporter based in San Francisco; Macalester College, BA in English, Columbia University, MS in Journalism, reporter for The Washington Post who is focused on technology coverage in the Pacific Northwest; “Six things to know about the latest efforts to bring unions to Big Tech,” The Washington Post; https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/01/26/tech-unions-explainer/]//SJWen

In response to tech company crackdowns and lobbying, gig workers have shifted their strategy to emphasize building worker-led movements and increasing their ranks, rather than focusing on employment status as the primary goal, says Veena Dubal, a law professor at the University of California Hastings College of the Law in San Francisco. The hope is that with President Biden in the White House and an even split in the Senate, legislators will mobilize at the federal level, through the NLRA or bills such as the PRO Act, to recognize gig worker collectives as real unions.

#### Technological innovation solves every existential threat – which outweighs.

Matthews 18 Dylan. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the future. It’s reasonable to suggest that those quadrillions of future people have, accordingly, hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here today do. That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future.” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most literal thing it could mean is preventing human extinction, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly part of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address specific threats to humanity (which he calls “targeted” approaches to the far future) have to complement “broad” approaches, where instead of trying to predict what’s going to kill us all, you just generally try to keep civilization running as best it can, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with potential extinction events in the future, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation; it also means acting on pressing needs now. For example: We’re going to be better prepared to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or global warming if society as a whole makes a lot of scientific progress. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of the best things we can do for the far future is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls “lost Einsteins” (potential innovators who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: improve incentives and norms in academic work to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X ”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.” Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.