# A Wholesome Policy 1NC 😊

## 1

#### Interp – the aff must not defend an unjust government

#### A just government protects minorities rights

W. West Allen, 6-2-2021, (West Allen is an intellectual property litigator and counselor who represents a wide variety of international clients in U.S. Federal Courts.) "President’s Message: The Constitution Guarantees Us," Federal Bar Association, <https://www.fedbar.org/blog/presidents-message-the-constitution-guarantees-us/> CHO

The U.S. Constitution is built upon the chief foundational cornerstone of popular sovereignty—the fundamental principle that the source of all government power is the people. Sovereign power does not arise from the divine right of kings, political parties of a state, or might of the military. The authority of any commonwealth, rather, is originally vested in and derived from its citizens. This verity exists among every nation of the world—precisely as America’s Founders declared it from the Pennsylvania State House in 1776—because all human beings are by nature equal, free, and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, including life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. A just government exists only as charted by the people in order to protect the fundamental rights of the people. These rights can never be surrendered to government under any circumstances. To ensure a correct understanding of this proper relationship between people and their charted government, America fixed within its U.S. Constitution, as ordained and established by the people, an unambiguous enumeration of certain inherent rights that are to be held inviolate by government. These rights are guaranteed and rendered sacrosanct by their explicit incorporation directly into America’s written governmental charter. The people’s first 10 amendments to their Constitution comprise the fourth fundamental principle of the U.S. Constitution—the Bill of Rights. 1 The ideas of liberty and equality expressed by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence and thereafter by James Madison and others in the U.S. Constitution were not new. The American colonies had been granted charters that included represented assemblies and even basic rights recognized since the Magna Carta that no “freeman could be imprisoned or destroyed except by lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land.”2 George Mason’s Virginia Declaration of Rights of 1776 had declared that all are by nature equally free and independent and have certain inherent rights. The bill or declaration of rights of Pennsylvania, from the committee led by Benjamin Franklin, did likewise. But never before had such a promissory note of freedom been written so expressly and directly into a nation’s founding documents, and never had the natural rights of individual citizens been enumerated and guaranteed so unequivocally in a written constitution. The American experiment of government was unique: a free people chartered a government and conditioned their government’s power on its ability to guarantee and safeguard the natural rights of every citizen. Government would no longer dictate the rights of the people. The people, rather, would dictate to their chartered government its limited authority and declare certain inherent, or natural, rights inviolate. This was the new American standard. And to improve and repair it, the wise would include a statement of particular individual liberties and limits on government—a bill of rights. Madison, the principal author of the U.S. Constitution and its Bill of Rights, originally opposed making inclusion of a bill of rights a precondition for ratification of the Constitution. He, along with Alexander Hamilton and others, did not think a separate bill of rights was necessary. They believed that since the Constitution “is itself, in every rational sense, and to every useful purpose, A BILL OF RIGHTS,” no further amendments were required.3 “For why declare that things shall not be done which there is no power to do?”4 In other words, since the Constitution expressly separated the powers of government and only gave government express limited powers, what need was there to restrict what was never given? Some believed, further, that attempting to enumerate certain rights was not just unnecessary, but dangerous. If the Constitution contained various exceptions to powers not granted by the people, such language could afford a colorable pretext to the unscrupulous, who might seek more power than the people granted in the first place. Following four months of debate in the summer of 1787, the Philadelphia delegates produced a constitution that did not contain an explicit bill of rights.5 It may have been Jefferson, far from the cacophony of heated constitutional debates in Philadelphia in 1787, who ultimately helped his brethren hear reason and see the light. While serving as U.S. minister to France at the time, Jefferson received a copy of the proposed U.S. Constitution. He approved, generally, but wrote to Madison voicing concern that the Constitution did not contain an express bill of rights. Jefferson understood the principle of a bill of rights and why an unequivocal guarantee of unalienable individual liberties and limits on government was imperative to the success of the new nation. Without such a guarantee, a new government, and certainly those eager to wield its national power, could readily abuse that power, usurp the people’s authority and, in time, destroy individual liberties. Jefferson admonished Madison of this critical omission when he famously wrote his friend in December 1787: “A bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth … and what no just government should refuse, or rest on inference.”6 Thanks to Jefferson and a popular groundswell of the people in many state ratifying conventions who understood the significance of a bill of rights, Madison and his congressional colleagues listened. Madison eventually proposed a series of 19 constitutional amendments to the First Congress on June 8, 1789, just over one month after George Washington was inaugurated as the first president of the United States. Madison’s proposals, many incorporated directly from proposals by state ratifying conventions and state constitutions, were duly considered and debated by the new legislature. In the end, 12 of Madison’s amendments survived the congressional approval process and went to the states for ratification on Sept. 25, 1789.7 Of those congressionally approved 12 amendments, just 10 were ratified and incorporated into the Constitution, when, more than two years later, on Dec. 15, 1791, Jefferson’s home state of Virginia ratified 10 of the proposed 12 amendments.8 In time, these original amendments to the U.S. Constitution became known as the Bill of Rights. According to its preamble, the Bill of Rights is the result of the “Conventions of a number of the States, having at the time of their adopting the Constitution, expressed a desire, in order to prevent misconstruction or abuse of its powers, that further declaratory and restrictive clauses should be added … [to extend] the ground of public confidence in the Government[.]”9 The original Bill of Rights was mostly forged from ideas already expressed within revolutionary-era state constitutions, which included vital guarantees of individual rights and specific limits on government authority. These principles were understood as maxims by which “every wise and enlightened people will regulate their conduct,” and as Patrick Henry explained, “which no free people ought ever to abandon … [and] of which the observance is essential to the security of happiness.”10 Sadly, the protections of these first 10 amendments were largely ignored by the courts and the states for the first 100 years after the Bill of Rights was ratified in 1791, just as Madison had predicted. But in time, the wise and honest within America began to repair the standard raised by our founding generation. By the 20th century, with the leadership of citizens like Abraham Lincoln, Frederick Douglass, and Martin Luther King Jr., our nation began to vigorously enforce the Bill of Rights against the states. Americans began to understand and see what our Founders had hoped they would—that these vital guarantees of individual rights and limits on government could be more than bulwarks of mere parchment, but “a promissory note to which every American was to fall heir” and see fulfilled.11 The Bill of Rights, as declared by the American people in the U.S. Constitution, has providential and inspired purpose. It constitutes the preeminent declaration of freedoms of human dignity based on principles of moral agency and liberty. It transcends politics, party, and government. As with all truth, it prevails. Consequently, as nations and citizens honor the constitutional principles of the Bill of Rights, they prosper; as nations and citizens ignore them, they falter. What are the unalienable rights that are recognized and guaranteed by the world’s most successful nations? They bear repeating and demand careful individual study: the freedom of religion, the freedom to exercise one’s faith and conscience,12 the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press,13 the right to peaceably assemble, and the right to petition government for a redress of grievances. They include the people’s inherent civil liberties that prohibit the housing of soldiers in residential homes, unreasonable government searches and seizures, self-incrimination, and double jeopardy. They encompass and protect the right to due process of law, the right to a fair and speedy jury trial, the right to bear arms to maintain the people’s defense of their liberties, and the right to be free from excessive bails, fines, and unusual punishments. To further protect against the concern that a new federal government might claim rights not listed in the Bill of Rights, Madison drafted what became the Ninth Amendment, which says that that “the enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.” To ensure that Congress would be viewed as a government of limited rather than unlimited powers, Madison included the Tenth Amendment, which says the “powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” We would do well to understand these amendments with the earnestness that Madison and his generation intended. Together, the Constitution’s first 10 amendments defend not only majorities of the people against an overreaching federal government but also minorities against overreaching state government. The Bill of Rights proscribes as law the proper limits of government and prohibits the state from abridging the fundamental freedoms and civil liberties that all individuals possess on the basis of their humanity. It is unique among the political writings of the world in that it unambiguously sets forth the most critical and vital civil liberties that simultaneously engender strong and successful nations. Honoring the Bill of Rights ennobles and advances governments that justly derive their power from the consent of the governed. It increases civil accord, security, and happiness among a nation’s citizens. No action by any government or person acting under color of law should therefore ever subvert these unalienable rights.14 And never are these rights more important, subject to greater danger, and in more need of defense than in times of national crisis. It is now the work of this generation to uphold and repair this standard that was wrought and raised by the architects of the American Republic. The Bill of Rights, along with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, remains a promissory note of liberty to its heirs. The enduring principles of these documents should be studied and advocated by all. It is the responsibility of every citizen of our nation—but especially its judges and lawyers as guardians of the Constitution—to honor, uphold, and defend the liberties guaranteed in the Bill of Rights. We are they who will honor and fulfill the promises of liberty made over two centuries ago.

#### O/Ws – Intent to exclude by defining unjust governments as disrespecting minorities

#### Violation – Egypt discriminatisons conssitenly.

**MinorityRights 19** [“Egpytian Government Fails to Uphold Its Constitution, Discrimination Persists for Religious and Ethnic minorities – new report” <https://minorityrights.org/2019/01/24/egyptian-government-fails-to-uphold-its-constitution-discrimination-persists-for-religious-and-ethnic-minorities-new-report/> Samrawit Gougsa, Communications Officer (London, UK)]

With little improvement to the situation of Egypt’s religious and ethnic minorities since the drafting of the 2014 Constitution, hopes that the country would see a more inclusive and secure future for all its citizens – regardless of faith or ethnicity – remain unfulfilled, says Minority Rights Group International (MRG) in a new report. “Egypt’s 2014 Constitution speaks very clearly about issues such as freedom of belief, equality among citizens and the right of Nubians to return to their lands,” says Silvia Quattrini, Middle East and North Africa Programmes Coordinator at MRG. “However, none of this has been respected or implemented in reality so far.” According to [*Justice Denied, Promises Broken: The Situation of Egypt’s Minorities Since 2014*](https://minorityrights.org/publications/justice-denied-promises-broken-the-situation-of-egypts-minorities-since-2014/)*,* Egypt’s government has demonstrated patterns of discrimination and exclusion towards religious and ethnic minorities. The report describes how Christians still struggle for permission to build churches, face communal violence and unfair informal dispute resolution mechanisms that often result in the displacement of community members from their homes. Meanwhile, other minorities such as Bahá’i and non-Sunni Muslim groups including Shi’a, Ahmadis and Quranists continue to be unrecognised, making it difficult for them to practice their religion freely. The report also highlights how progress on Nubian rights has been reversed, with the government halting the development of legislation that would facilitate the resettlement of the community in their ancestral territory and instead opening their land to external development. Meanwhile, Bedouin communities in North Sinai face mass displacement, widespread violence and a growing humanitarian crisis, with little in the way of government protection, compensation or emergency support. “Activists for Nubian rights have also faced several restrictions on their freedom to express concern over these issues, such as the 24 individuals who were arrested and detained while peacefully protesting in Aswan in 2017,” says Silvia Quattrini. “As for Bedouins in North Sinai, the fight against terrorism has often been used as a justification to expel entire communities from their lands. This trend is part of an increasing general crackdown on civil society organisations which has particularly affected the country’s minorities over the past four years.”

#### Vote for Limits—defending governments that aren’t just offers huge explosion in the topic since they can defend any number of just governments. Neg positions Neg positions like the Economy DA, Advantage CPs, etc. are jettisoned when the country that we don’t have specific ev and decks clash.

#### **List of just governments in the doc**

[Ian Burrows (producer, reporter and presenter for digital, radio and TV in the ABC's Asia Pacific Newsroom in Melbourne). “Chart of the day: Europe dominates top of democracy index, North Korea lags in last.” ABC. 9 Jan 2019. Accessed 12/2/21. <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2019-01-10/democracy-index-economist-intelligence-unit-2018/10703184?nw=0&r=HtmlFragment> //Cho]
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## 2

#### Interp: If the affirmative defends anything other than “a just government ought to recognize an unconditional right or workers to strike” then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC.

#### Violation

#### Prefer

#### 1. 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.

#### 2. 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.

## 3

#### Interp – debaters must disclose all theory interpretations. To clarify, summaries don’t solve.

#### Violation – they just say brackets

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

#### 1] norming

#### 2] predictability

## 4

#### Interp – The affirmative may not specify the government enforcing the resolution.

#### Violation – they specify Egypt

#### Rules readings are always generalized – specific instances are not consistent and allow exceptions to morality.

Cohen 01

Ariel Cohen (Ben-Gurion University of the Negev), “On the Generic Use of Indefinite Singulars,” Journal of Semantics 18:3, 2001 https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/188590876.pdf

In general, as, again, already noted by Aristotle, rules and definitions are not relativized to particular individuals; it is rarely the case that a specific individual¶ forms part of the description of a general rule.¶ Even DPs of the form a certain X or a particular X, which usually receive¶ a wide scope interpretation, cannot, in general, receive such an interpretation in the context of a rule or a definition. This holds of definitions in general, not¶ only of definitions with an IS subject. The following examples from the Cobuild¶ dictionary illustrate this point:¶ (74) a. A fanatic is a person who is very enthusiastic about a particular¶ activity, sport, or way of life.¶ b. Something that is record-breaking is better than the previous¶ record for a particular performance or achievement.¶ c. When a computer outputs something it sorts and produces information as the result of a particular program or operation.¶ d. If something sheers in a particular direction, it suddenly changes¶ direction, for example to avoid hitting something.

#### Outweighs

#### 1] Controls internal link – people base prep off the rez – no stasis point for arguments.

#### 2] Jurisdiction – judge is contracted to vote inside the rez and they don’t have the authority to vote on the aff

#### Prefer –

#### 1] Limits – infinite combination of affs from China to Nigeria to India. Explodes aff ground – you cherry-pick affs with no neg ground and I must prep all affs while they prep one which pigeonholes me to generics.

#### Fairness – a) you conceded the judge will fairly evaluate your argument b) its constitutive to debate as competitive activity that requires objective evaluation

#### Education – a) it’s the only reason why schools fund debate b) it’s the only portable impact to debate

#### CI – a) brightlines are arbitrary and self-serving which doesn’t set good norms b) it collapses since weighing between brightlines rely on offense defense

#### Neg theory is drop the debater – a) Prep skew – aff’s infinite prep means they can frontline every shell marginally enough to be efficient at DA and skew substance enough to deflate theory and win b) 1AR Flex – It’s key to check 1ar flexibility since you can moot all 6 min of my offense and restart the debate on unpredictable layers while kicking the arguments that were abusive.

#### No rvi

#### [a] Baiting—they’ll bait the theory debate and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse since they’ll get away with unacceptable practices every time.

#### [b] 1AR all-outs—they’ll collapse entirely to theory which crowds out substance and kills education.

#### [c] Chilling effect—people will be scared to read theory since they can lose off of it, so no one will check abuse.

#### [d] Norm-setting—I shouldn’t be forced to keep advocating for a bad norm if I realize it’s bad in the middle of the round. Then bad norms would be spread.

#### [e] Flex—RVIs make theory uncondo so I always have to go for that route to the ballot, but both debaters should get multiple relevant layers and collapse options.

#### [f] Illogical—doesn’t make sense to win just for being fair.

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier.

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology and 1st and last speech 3] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

## 5

#### Extempt

#### five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of

#### affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true

#### 1] a[[3]](#footnote-3) “used when expressing rates or ratios; in, to, or for each; per” but there are no numbers in the rez

#### 2] just[[4]](#footnote-4) describes what is “(of treatment) deserved or appropriate in the circumstances” but the rez is aspatial

#### 3] government[[5]](#footnote-5) is “direction; control; management; rule” but a direction can’t perform an action

#### 4] to[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### 5] recognize[[7]](#footnote-7) is to “(of a person presiding at a meeting or debate) call on (someone) to speak” but a right can’t speak

#### 6] an[[8]](#footnote-8) “forming names of organic compounds, chiefly polysaccharides” but a right isn’t an organic compound

#### 7] of[[9]](#footnote-9) “expressing an age” but the rez is atemporal

#### 8] a worker[[10]](#footnote-10) “a person who produces or achieves a specified thing” but the rez doesn’t spec

#### 9] strike[[11]](#footnote-11) is to “cause (someone) to be in a specified state” but the rez doesn’t spec

## 6

#### Presumption and permissibility negates – a) more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted – there’s alwahys an institutional DA to going through Congress c) ought[[12]](#footnote-12) means “moral obligation” so the lack of that obligation means the aff hasn’t fulfilled their burden d) resolved[[13]](#footnote-13) indicates “firmly determined” which means they proactively did something, to negate that means that they aren’t resolved

#### The standard is *intending to maximize expected well-being*. Morality must be binding else it can’t be enforced so there’s no reason to follow moral codes and it can’t be called an obligation nor guide action.

#### Next, util relies on intentions to be coherent –

#### 1] Util relies on choosing between predictions, which presupposes the intention to make the world a better place. Proves its inescapable – ignoring it justifies rolling dices to decide actions by flattening the value of predictions.

#### 2] Consequentialist frameworks are contingent on events that are ever-changing, so they can’t be the basis of consistent duty. Outweighs – (a) butterfly effect means unforeseen consequences are inevitable (b) utility monster – you wouldn’t be culpable for making the world a better place if a satanic creature derived infinite pleasure from human suffering (c) Endpoints – Consequences cause infinite other consequences – the decision to stop calculating at some point is an intention.

#### 3] Solipsism paradox – pleasure can only be binding for the person experiencing it – aggregation requires that we care for others which is an intention. Else states only care about themselves so the aff will get rolled back since otherwise self-interested states would’ve already passed the aff, so negate on presumption.

#### I negate and defned the squo – they say states don’t have intentions during cx becas eof cofclit hgins which makes affirming impssoib

# AC

## FW

### Determinism

#### We’re hijacking utilitarianism - Consequentialism means determinism is true

#### 1] Induction if x action leads to y result then x action must be influenced by prior action which means a causal chain of events structure my action rather than my will

#### 2] Focus on end states necessitates determinism because scientific models assume x will happen if y – anything else means you can’t predict the end point of any actions

#### 3] Psychology - Neuroscience has demonstrated that our internal cognition is deterministic. Make them provide a counterstudy- you shouldn’t trust the word of a high-schooler about neuroscience- they also said

**Butkus** [Matthew A. Butkus(Professor in the department of Philosophy at McNeese State University, PhD - Health Care Ethics Duquesne University, MA – Philosophy Duquesne University). “Free Will and Autonomous Medical Decision-Making.” Journal of Cognition and Neuroethics. Volume 3, Issue 1. Pg 113-114. March 2015. Accessed 4/4/20. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/89a4/924e0111035dbda63d61631a169c654a04fa.pdf> //Recut Houston Memorial DX from BHPE]

**Psychology and neuroscience have demonstrated that consciousness, our day-today perception, our sense of self and identity, judgment, emotions, and intuitions are all predicated upon a number of causal cognitive elements that are outside our awareness— the bulk of our cognition is deterministic and preconscious. This determinism opens up avenues of undue influence into processes we normally assume to be under our control— it should be clear that this assumption is mistaken at best, inhuman and pernicious at worst.** We should not abandon ourselves to blind determinism, however—we possess the ability to reflect upon our motivations, and to engage in dialogic interaction with others, who may bring aspects of ourselves to the fore which would remain otherwise inaccessible. As a result, we can take back a measure of control, but only if we engage in honest dialectic and dialogue with others. In the context of patient autonomy and decision-making, the necessity of this dialogical process is especially evident—patients are already physically compromised, potentially in ways that can exert conscious and unconscious influence over their decision-making processes, above and beyond the normal potential sources of error found in heuristics and biases. Clinicians should be alert for such influences, recognizing that a medical illness can easily mask a deeper psychopathology. Affective disorders are very common, occur more in patients than in the general population, and tend to go unrecognized or dismissed as a normal reaction to their illness. The effect of these disorders, however, is quite pernicious. They fundamentally affect the efficacy of therapeutic interventions, morbidity and mortality, and rate of recovery—ignoring, dismissing, or failing to identify a comorbidity compromises the treatment of the obvious illness. By only treating the surface pathology, we potentially ignore the deeper wound. Many contemporary models of autonomy suffer from similar shortcomings—while ethics seeks to inform itself of philosophical, legal, theological, and medical constructs, it all too easily ignores the psychological, an unfortunate irony in light of the fundamental connection between cognitive and clinical psychology and ethical ideals of autonomous choice. Ethical theories that dismiss or fail to address psychological constructs are groundless; models derived from inhuman absolutes are so much fancy and fiction. What good is it to describe models of cognition that have little resemblance to how we actually think? The present autonomy model suggests that decision-making is a complex construct necessarily containing rational and emotional elements, intuitive judgments, and, as a result, potential sources of error. This seems to gel with day-to-day experience— many decisions are made by gut instinct and intuition, instead of a Cartesian rational process methodically and algorithmically exploring all possible influences, outcomes, and variables. This deterministic model gels with the phenomenon of basing day-to-day decisions upon distal causes—early education and environment, role models, learned behaviors, etc. This model suggests that as the severity of the outcomes increases to terminal, increasing reflection upon the causes and motivations of the decision is required—that a genuinely autonomous choice will explore the agent’s motivations, identifying and judging the appropriateness of each influence, determining if it is congruent with the value system adopted by the agent as a whole.

#### I defend the squo and that negates

#### 1] Actions are predetermined which means we aren’t culpable for actions we don’t take

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.google.com/search?q=a+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=a+definition+&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64l3j69i60l2j69i61.1923j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://www.google.com/search?q=just+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=just+defi&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i57j69i60l3.1304j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/government> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. <https://www.google.com/search?q=to+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=to+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60l3.1415j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <https://www.google.com/search?q=recognize+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=recognize+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57.4104j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <https://www.google.com/search?q=an+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=an+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i60j69i61l2.1776j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i61l3.1473j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <https://www.google.com/search?q=worker+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=worker+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57.3726j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. <https://www.google.com/search?q=strike+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=strike+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57.3064j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. https://www.google.com/search?q=resolved+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF\_enUS877US877&oq=resolved+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57.2078j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 [↑](#footnote-ref-13)