#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best proves the truth or falsity of the Resolution; the affirmative must prove it true and the negative must prove it false. Prefer:

#### A) Text: Five dictionaries define negate as to deny the truth of and affirm as to prove true which means the sole judge obligation is to vote on the resolution’s truth or falsity. Constitutivism outweighs because you don’t have the jurisdiction not to truth test. Jurisdiction is a meta constraint since every argument you make concedes the authority of the judge fulfilling their jurisdiction to vote aff if they affirm better and neg the contrary

#### B) Logic: Any counter role of the ballot collapses to truth testing because every property assumes truth of the property i.e. if I say, “I am awake” it is the same as “it is true that I am awake” which means they are also a question of truth claims because it’s inherent.

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>

*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*

#### People own their own bodies and as a result have rights to use their bodies.

**Feser,** Edward. "Robert Nozick." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, iep.utm.edu/nozick/. Accessed 12 June 2021. ICW NW

Nozick takes his position to follow from a basic moral principle associated with Immanuel Kant and enshrined in Kant’s second formulation of his famous Categorical Imperative: “Act so that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of another, always as an end and never as a means only.” The idea here is that **a human being, as a rational agent endowed with self-awareness, free will, and the possibility of formulating a plan of life, has an inherent dignity and cannot** properly **be treated as a mere *thing*, or *used* against his will** as an instrument or resource in the way an inanimate object might be. In line with this, Nozick also describes individual human beings as *self-owners* (though it isn’t clear whether he regards this as a restatement of Kant’s principle, a consequence of it, or an entirely independent idea). The thesis of self-ownership, a notion that goes back in political philosophy at least to John Locke, is just the claim that **individuals own themselves – their bodies, talents and abilities, labor, and by extension the** fruits or **products of their exercise of their talents, abilities and labor.** They have all the prerogatives with respect to themselves that a slaveholder claims with respect to his slaves. But the thesis of self-ownership would in fact rule out slavery as illegitimate, since each individual, as a self-owner, cannot properly be owned by anyone else. (Indeed, many libertarians would argue that unless one accepts the thesis of self-ownership, one has no way of explaining *why* slavery is evil. After all, it cannot be merely because slaveholders often treat their slaves badly, since a kind-hearted slaveholder would still be a slaveholder, and thus morally blameworthy, for that. The reason slavery is immoral must be because it involves a kind of stealing – the stealing of a person from himself.) But **if individuals are inviolable ends-in-themselves** (as Kant describes them) **and self-owners, it follows**, Nozick says, **that they have certain *rights*, in particular** (and here again following Locke) **rights to their lives, liberty, and the fruits of their labor. To own something,** after all, just **is to have a right to it,** or, more accurately, to possess the bundle of rights – **rights to possess something, to dispose of it, to determine what may be done with it,** etc. – that constitute ownership; and **thus to own oneself is to have such rights to the various elements that make up one’s self. These rights function, Nozick says, as *side-constraints* on the actions of others; they set limits on how others may, morally speaking, treat a person.** So, for example, **since you** own yourself, and thus **have a right to yourself, others are constrained morally not to kill or maim you** (since this would involve destroying or damaging your property), or to kidnap you or forcibly remove one of your bodily organs for transplantation in someone else (since this would involve stealing your property). They are also constrained not to force you against your will to work for another’s purposes, even if those purposes are good ones. For **if you own yourself, it follows that you have a right to determine whether and how you will use your self-owned body and its powers,** e.g. either to work or to refrain from working.

#### Thus, the state ought not interfere with people since that would violate their rights.

**Feser 2,** Edward. "Robert Nozick." *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, iep.utm.edu/nozick/. Accessed 12 June 2021.

So far this all might seem fairly uncontroversial. But what follows from it, in Nozick’s view, is the surprising and radical conclusion that ***taxation*,** of the redistributive sort in which modern states engage in order to fund the various programs of the bureaucratic welfare state, **is morally illegitimate. It amounts to a kind of *forced labor*, for the state so structures the tax system that any time you labor at all, a certain amount of your labor time – the amount that produces the wealth taken away from you forcibly via taxation – is time you involuntarily work, in effect, for the state.** Indeed, such taxation amounts to partial *slavery*, for in giving every citizen an entitlement to certain benefits (welfare, social security, or whatever), the state in effect gives them an entitlement, a *right*, to a part of the proceeds of your labor, which produces the taxes that fund the benefits; every citizen, that is, becomes in such a system *a partial owner of you* (since they have a partial property right in part of you, i.e. in your labor). But **this is** flatly **inconsistent with the principle of self-ownership.**

The various programs of the modern liberal welfare state are thus immoral, not only because they are inefficient and incompetently administered, but because they make slaves of the citizens of such a state. Indeed, **the only sort of state that can be morally justified is** what Nozick calls **a *minimal state***or “night-watchman” state, **a government which protects individuals**, via police and military forces, **from force, fraud, and theft, and administers courts of law, but does nothing else.** In particular, **such a state cannot regulate what citizens eat, drink, or smoke** (**since this would interfere with their right to use their self-owned bodies as they see fit), cannot control what they publish or read** (since this would interfere with their right to use the property they’ve acquired with their self-owned labor – e.g. printing presses and paper – as they wish), cannot administer mandatory social insurance schemes or public education (since this would interfere with citizens’ rights to use the fruits of their labor as they desire, in that some citizens might decide that they would rather put their money into private education and private retirement plans), and cannot regulate economic life in general via minimum wage and rent control laws and the like (since such actions are not only economically suspect – tending to produce bad unintended consequences like unemployment and housing shortages – but violate citizens’ rights to charge whatever they want to for the use of their own property).

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with libertarianism. This is the idea that the only moral state is one that protects people’s rights but is *never* morally justified in coercing its citizens.

#### Prefer:

#### 1. People are unconditionally valuable given that they can place value on other things. E.g. a water bottle has no feelings about other objects, but we have the ability to say things like murder is bad, and freedom is good. This means we are unconditionally valuable because we’re the source of value, and as a result shouldn’t be used as a means to an end.

#### 2. Contesting my framework concedes the validity of freedom because you have to use your freedom to contest the value of freedom.

#### 3. A-Spec: Without a government we exist in a state of nature where anyone can do whatever they want. This is not ideal so people form a government, and in doing so give up their positive right to do whatever they want but gain negative rights to not have others violate their freedom. Thus, the government's only job is to protect negative rights, not promote positive rights. And if it prioritizes positive rights the people can just abolish the government and go to a state of nature where they have all the positive rights they want.

#### 4. Freedom is a prerequisite to the use of other frameworks. This means I hijack ev

#### Consequences Fail

#### 1. We can’t predict the future which means we can’t predict the consequences of an action since things can happen during our actions that cause a completely different consequence.

#### 2. Calculation freezes action: We have to calculate the results of every action yet calculation is itself an action, which means once we calculate we just keeping adding actions to calculate, and just spend our entire life calculating.

#### I defend the whole resolution, I’ll clarify anything about my advocacy in cross, and change within reason if asked.

#### Contention 1) The right to strike is key to freedom, because otherwise workers are subject to arbitrary domination.

**Gourevitch**, Alex. "Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike." *SSRN*, poseidon01.ssrn.com/delivery.php?ID=365086110124000106031080013073119029031084070081044092070068064070126102105090068113057037031013031061114093094020084102066070015055013006080118011001088102116096095024042036093117121114001069085102071008005007070024088127103077000089001031121123026001&EXT=pdf&INDEX=TRUE. Accessed 12 Nov. 2021.

**The right to strike is a right of human liberty. It is justified as a way of resisting** two interconnected forms of unfreedom: **structural and personal domination.** Sympathetic critics might wonder why not argue for the elimination of these forms of domination altogether, perhaps by arguing for an egalitarian distribution of property and workplace democracy. The reason is that this is not an exercise in ideal theory. I am trying to explain what the conditions are under which the right to strike is justifiable. These are decidedly non-ideal conditions of deep inequality and unfreedom. The right to strike is not derived by establishing first principles in an ideal regime and then following a series of deductions to the right to strike. **It is justified against the background of radically imperfect conditions, and many of the right’s imperfections are a reflection of these conditions**. It is worth recalling at least two of the most interesting features of the foregoing analysis. The first is that the analysis of domination explains **the right to strike**’s peculiar structure: it **is a right to refuse to do work while maintaining a right to the job. This** conceptual structure **makes sense if we see the strike as a way of reversing the structural domination of workers at the most immediate,** concrete **point at which they experience** that **domination:** the threat of losing, or never acquiring, a job. The second interesting result is that the analysis explains the right to strike’s scope: **strikes may legitimately aim at a wide range of arbitrary exercises** of managerial prerogatives, rather than so-called ‘bread and butter’ issues. That is because **it is a form resistance to the domination created by the commodification of labor-power,** domination that shows up not just in the threat of being fired, but in the organization of work itself. I have not here said much about the distinction between primary strikes, sympathy strikes, general strikes, and the like. Another essay would be required, but I can say that the argument clearly points in the direction of saying that sympathy strikes and general strikes are justified because they are ways that workers protest and resist their subjection. Indeed, in certain ways, these solidaristic actions might be superior to workplace strikes because they are ways of holding not just an individual employer but a whole class of owners and even the state itself responsible. That is to say, they are way of getting at the background structure, of which any given employer is a relatively small part.

#### This impacts back to my framework because domination is coercive, and a libertarian state owes you a right to not be coerced.

#### Contention 2) A right to strike arises from a right to private property, workers own their labor and as a result have a right to withdraw it.

#### Andelson 71, Robert. "The Strike in a Laissez-Faire Society: A Libertarian View of Labor's Ultimate Strategy." American Journal of Economics and Sociology. Jstor, [www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3485383.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Ae95e4ea248ee1b5f3668fffde40ff2a8](http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3485383.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Ae95e4ea248ee1b5f3668fffde40ff2a8). Accessed 12 Nov. 2021.

 OVER THE PAST SEVERAL DECADES, organized labor in the United States has more and more come to reject the voluntaristic approach epitomized (although not consistently) by Samuel Gompers, chiefly because of the conviction that the cards are stacked against the union in an economic melieu not ordered by the State. Despite the demand for free collective bargaining, little faith in its efficacy has been displayed. Instead, labor has increasingly mobilized politically to bring about positive legislat regarded as favorable to its interests. Apologists for this phenomenon cite numerous historical examples to justify their argument that labor was hopelessly outmatched so long as it confined itself to purely economic techniques to gain its ends. The failure of most important American strikes in the years prior to the passage of the Wagner Act would seem, superficially, to validate this contention. Yet what is often overlooked is the fact that these **strikes did not occur in a context of laissez-faire.** They were not, for the most part, broken because of any natural superiority of strength on the part of capital. **They were mainly broken because of government intervention which made for a pat- tern of artificial inequality; especially by the use of the injunction for purposes other than the protection of personal freedom, property rights, and the public peace.'** The Wagner Act merely reversed the tables, substitut- ing one kind of favoritism for another. While this may have been in a sense temporarily justified in order to "even things up," such justification has long since vanished. The Taft-Hartley Law represents a slightly more equitable balance within the structure of intervention, but the justice and necessity of intervention remain unquestioned. Laissez-faire has this, if nothing else, in common with Christianity: both are widely believed to have failed; actually, neither has been given a real try. Would organized labor really be impotent if laissez-faire prevailed? In attempting to answer this question, I begin with a double premise the truth of which many libertarians are reluctant to concede, namely, that **collective bargaining and the strike are not,** in essence**, incompatible with a voluntaristic society.** I shall therefore discuss this premise before pro- ceeding to the question proper. In order to forestall misunderstanding, it might be well for me to emphasize that nothing in this essay should be construed as assuming that the interests of labor and of capital need be viewed as antithetical. What Marxists call the class struggle really is simply a reflection of the all-too- frequent failure of both elements to perceive their mutality of interest: the failure of workers to realize that capital is but "stored-up labor," **the failure of management to realize that it is actually labor which hires cap- ital, and the failure of both to realize that were it not for monopolies traceable to government there would be a larger economic pie for them to share between them.** Properly understood, neither the free labor market nor any other free market can be an arena for the clash of interests, for a market is by definition a mechanism whereby areas of reciprocal satisfac- tion are discovered and given contractual expression. While such expres- sion may not be wholly acceptable to each party to an agreement, it con- stitutes that which is mutually acceptable within a framework of supply and demand. The free market is thus the only mechanism for the ex- change of goods and services which is appropriate to free men who respect one another's freedom. No doubt the foregoing will appear naive to one who has considered that the parties to an exchange not infrequently include vast corporate entities possessing the advantages of pooled resources and sophisticated organization. The superior bargaining position engendered by these ad- vantages creates a presumptive disparity of satisfaction in favor of corpo- rate entities within the area of mutual agreement arrived at when they contract with isolated individuals. Capital, if corporate, can generally be the more readily withheld from those unwilling to hire it on its own terms. In other words, **the corporate entity has a greater market leverage due to its superior ability to control supply.** Therefore **labor may find it neces- sary to become corporate also, so as to achieve an equality of bargaining power** by a capacity for effective refusal to employ capital except on terms more agreeable to itself. The "higgling of the market" is not ob- structed by such factors; it has simply become on both sides a higgling between individuals in combination rather than in isolation. One way of defining a strike is as the concerted withdrawal of demand for capital, used as a bargaining lever by labor. **The collective cessation of work, when it does not occur in violation of contractual agreements honored by the other side, constitutes a perfectly natural and legitimate labor strategy.** From a libertarian standpoint, the use of political means (which inevitably imply ultimate physical coercion) for the attainment of labor's economic objectives is actually nothing other than a subtle (and sometimes not-so-subtle) mode of armed robbery, a predatory interference with the market, an abuse of the police power to implement privilege at the expense of the principle of voluntary contract. The same cannot be said of **the strike**, which **is**, at least in theory, **merely the** organized refusal to employ capital, or, from another frame of reference, the **organized with- holding by the workers of their labor, a commodity which indubitably belongs to them.**2 In short, **the right to strike is an aspect of the right to private property.**

**This impacts back to my framework because a libertarian state has an obligation to protect your property rights.**

**Underview**

**1.** **Presumption affirms. A) we presume things true until proven otherwise, I.e. you believed me when I said my name was Jayden. B) It’s impossible to presume things false because then we presume that presumption is false but that also leads to a falsity, and it’s infinitely regressive.**

**2.** **Permissibility affirms, none of their arguments about the aff having to prove an obligation apply because my argument is permissible actions are obligatory A) it’s better for us to take okay actions than bad ones, and  B) Otherwise we would need a proactive justification to do things like drink water. C) If things aren’t prohibited by a framework it means they’re included under it, and thus good actions if the framework is good.**

## Disclosure

#### Interpretation – debaters must disclose contact info and all affs and neg off-case positions from TOC bid-earning tournaments.

#### Violation – see screenshot, they don’t have anything on the wiki.
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#### [1] Safety – having a wiki is key to understand any accessibility concerns like trigger warnings or potentially sensitive topics. Absent a wiki there’s no way to tell – not having contact information makes it worse because there’s no way to verify it preround which kills 1NC strat construction. Inclusion is a voter – you can’t debate if you can’t participate

#### [2] Disclosure is good – open sourcing and disclosing round reports are a good thing because it levels the playing field – big schools have flows and docs but small schools won’t have access to such resources without things like open source – you don’t do that and our norm necessitates that everyone discloses everything – I didn’t get the aff 30 minutes before the round which means err neg on offense. Fairness is a voter since debate is a game and we’re both here to win.

#### [1] DTD on theory and disclosure – a) disclosure cannot be drop the argument because it would just drop you because you’re the norm b) deterrence