**I affirm the resolution Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike. I will spec any definitions or anything else in CX when asked within reason.**

**The value premise is morality because ought indicates a moral obligation.**

**The standard is consistency with the veil of ignorance. The veil of ignorance is where when we make decisions we forget who we are and the aspects of our lives like our social position in order to non-arbitrarily evaluate things.**

**Contention 1)**

**Behind the veil of ignorance people choose to help the least well off in society.**

1. **Egoism-Altruism Paradox: If people are altruistic they help the least well off behind the veil because their altruistic. If they’re self interested they would still help the least well off behind the veil because they don’t know their social status. This means they help the least well off because if society is on average doing better it benefits them.**
2. **Lottery of Birth: People behind the veil don’t know if they’re well off or not which means they would choose to help the least fortunate because there’s a chance they could be the least fortunate.**
3. **Logic: The only people who would prefer the most well off to benefit the most are the well off. However, behind the veil no one knows if they’re the well off which means no one is choosing to benefit the well off.**

**The right to strike helps resist oppression and protect their rights, and provide a more equal society. Lim:**

**The right to strike is a right to resist oppression. The strike** (and the credible threat of a strike) **is an indispensable part of the collective bargaining procedure. Collective bargaining** (or “agreement-making”) **provides workers** and employees **with the opportunity to influence the establishment of workplace rules** that govern a large portion of their lives. **The concerted withdrawal of labor allows workers to promote and defend their unprotected economic and social interests from employers’ unilateral decisions, and provide employers with pressure and incentives to make reasonable concessions.** Functionally, **strikes provide workers with the bargaining power to drive fair and meaningful negotiations, offsetting the inherent inequalities of bargaining power in the employer-employee relationship. The right to strike is essential in preserving and winning rights. Any curtailment of this right involves** the risk of **weakening the very basis of collective bargaining. Strikes are not only a means of demanding and achieving an adequate provision of basic liberties but also are** themselves **intrinsic, self-determined expressions of freedom and human rights. The exercise of the power to strike affirms a quintessential corpus of values** akin to liberal democracies, **notably those of dignity, liberty, and autonomy.** In acts of collective defiance, strikers assert their freedoms of speech, association, and assembly. Acts of striking, marching, and picketing command the attention of the media and prompt public forums of discussion and dialogue.

*“The Right to Strike | Opinion | the Harvard Crimson.” Thecrimson.com, 2019, www.thecrimson.com/article/2019/12/11/lim-right-to-strike/. Accessed 13 Oct. 2021.*
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**Behind the veil of ignorance we value self-respect. Rawls 2:**

Rawls, John [James Bryant Conant University Professor of Philosophy, Harvard University]. *A Theory of Justice*. Belknap, 1971. | MU // (N8)

Furthermore, the public recognition of the two principles gives greater support to men’s self-respect and this in turn increases the effectiveness of social cooperation. Both effects are reasons for agreeing to these principles. **It is clearly rational for [people]** men **to secure their self-respect. A sense of their own worth is necessary if they are to pursue their conception of the good with satisfaction** and to take pleasure in its fulfillment. Self-respect is not so much a part of any rational plan of life as the sense that one’s plan is worth carrying out. Now our self-respect normally depends upon the respect of others. **Unless we feel** that **our endeavors are respected** by them, **it is difficult** if not impossible for us **to maintain the conviction that our ends are worth advancing** (§67). **Hence** for this reason the **parties would accept the natural duty of mutual respect which asks them to** treat one another civilly and to **be willing to explain the grounds of their actions,** especially when the claims of others are overruled (§51). More-over, one may assume that those who respect themselves are more likely to respect each other and conversely. Self-contempt leads to contempt of others and threatens their good as much as envy does. Self-respect is reciprocally self-supporting. Thus a desirable feature of a conception of justice is that it should publicly express men’s respect for one another. In this way they insure a sense of their own value. Now the two principles achieve this end. For when society follows these principles, everyone’s good is included in a scheme of mutual benefit and this public affirmation in institutions of each man’s endeavors supports men’s self-esteem. The establishment of equal liberty and the operation of the difference principle are bound to have this effect. The two principles are equivalent, as I have remarked, to an undertaking to regard the distribution of natural abilities in some respects as a collective asset so that [Because] the more fortunate are to benefit only in ways that help those who have lost out (§17). I do not say that the parties are moved by the ethical propriety of this idea. But there are reasons for them to accept this principle. For by arranging inequalities for reciprocal advantage and by abstaining from the exploitation of the contingencies of nature and social circumstance within a framework of equal liberties, **persons express their respect for one another in the very constitution of their society.** In this way they insure their self-respect as it is rational for them to do.

**This impacts back to my framework because a) strikes give the worker control over their workplace, which gives them the power to make decisions for themselves, and not leaving it up to others and b) it helps protect the rights of the worker, without these rights it wouldn’t be possible for a worker to have any self-respect**

**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.**

**C) Ground: Any offense can function under truth testing whereas your specific role of the ballot excludes all strategies but yours. This is bad for education because me engaging in a debate I know nothing about doesn’t help anyone.**

**D) Truth Testing is a prerequisite to other role of the ballots because without truth we’re operating off of lies which is what fuels propaganda and oppression.**

**1. The aff just has to prove an obligation under one locus of duty.**

**a) Every index is equally true since there is no non-arbitrary way to weigh between them since that would require a way to weigh but we need to weigh between the ways to weigh etc. and it’s infinitely regressive. Meaning we can’t say one index is better or worse.**

**b) Semantics: An obligation can come from infinite sources, they don’t have to be the correct ones. An obligation is still present even if it’s from an incorrect source. A bad obligation is still an existent one. I just have to prove an obligation from somewhere since I just have to prove the resolution true by some obligation.**

**2. Resolved is defined as to come to a definite or earnest decision about in the past tense therefore the resolution’s already determined to be true and you auto affirm.**

**3. Curry’s Paradox: “If this sentence is true, then the resolution is true.” This sentence is true because a conditional is true when every time the condition is fulfilled the conclusion is produced, this is what happens with this statement since when we assume if p then q is true while assuming p, q will always be produced. Therefore because this sentence is true we can assume the conclusion that the resolution is true.**

**4. Principle of explosion: According to the laws of logic inconsistent premises always lead to a valid conclusion. Because a conclusion is valid if there are no times when the premises are true and the conclusion is false. Premise 1: It’s Monday, Premise 2: It’s not Monday. Valid Conclusion: The resolution is true.**

**5. Condo Logic:**

**The resolution makes implicit assumptions, e.g. that nations exist which means it’s equivalent to a conditional with those assumptions as the antecedent.**

**Denying the antecedent proves a conditional true. Stanford Philosophy:**

*Stanford Philosophy. "Abbreviated Dictionary of Philosophical Terminology." Stanford Philosophy, Stanford, web.stanford.edu/~bobonich/dictionary/dictionary.html. Accessed 31 July 2020.// (N8)*

an “if p, then q” compound statement (ex. If I throw this ball into the air, it will come down); p is called the antecedent, and q is the consequent.  **A conditional asserts that if its antecedent is true, its consequent is** also **true;** **any conditional with a true antecedent and** a **false consequent must be false. For** any other combination of true and **false antecedents** and consequents, **the conditional statement is true.**

**a) This means neg a prioris affirm because they deny the antecedent. b) The resolution assumes that it’s logically coherent and since the laws of logic say things are identical to themselves, e.g. A=A, it is equivalent to. So if they contest the resolution they prove it true.**

**7. Physics shows there are infinite universes. Main:**

*Main quotes Green.[Douglas Main(Senior writer) quotes Brian Greene(professor of physics and mathematics at Columbia University). “THERE MAY BE INFINITE UNIVERSES—AND INFINITE VERSIONS OF YOU.” News Week. 7/9/15. Accessed 12/20/19. https://www.newsweek.com/there-may-be-infinite-universes-and-infinite-versions-you-351675// Houston Memorial SC]// (N8)*

In another universe you might have become the president of Micronesia. Or a pauper, subsisting on ketchup. Perhaps a different version of you already read this—in which case, read it again, for the first time. All crazy ideas, but all completely plausible given the idea that **there may be**, in fact, **multiple universes. Infinite, even.** I recently sat down with physicist and best-selling author John Green at the 2015 Curiosity Retreat, a weeklong conference featuring scientists and other speakers in southwest Colorado, to talk about string theory, infinite worlds and cosmic bread loaves. Let's cut to the chase. Are there multiple universes? I don't know. But I will say that to me it's provocative at the very least that so many pathways in science naturally bump up against the notion of other universes. **Cosmology**—the science of trying to understanding how our universe began—**suggests our universe may not be unique**, or the only one. **String theory also suggests the possibility of other universes. Quantum physics does too.** That doesn't mean it's right, but means it's worthy of attention. You study string theory. What exactly is it? The basic idea is that the most basic element of a matter is a little vibrating filament, rather than a dot [as is the case in quantum physics or quantum mechanics, which studies the behavior of tiny, subatomic particles]. That move from the old idea of a dot to a new idea of a filament allows us to meld the laws of the large, which are described by the theory of general relativity, with the laws of the small,

or quantum mechanics. ake the origin of our universe, the Big Bang. **There's reason to believe [the big bang]** that **wasn't a onetime event, that there were many Big Bangs each giving rise to many universes.** On the other hand you've got quantum mechanics, which describes the universe being probabilistic, the electron being over here or over there. When you measure the electron, you find it in one location, but what happened to the other possibility? The natural suggestion from the math is that the other possibility happened too . In popular conceptions, many people think of multiple universes with us in it. Are they infinite, and would they contain copies of ourselves, but living in different circumstances? Yeah, in many incarnations of the idea there are ultimately infinite universes. This would also include other copies of ourselves, although that's a little bit of a [anthropocentric] way of thinking about it.

**Infinite universes means the resolution is true because infinite universes means infinite possibilities.**

**8. Liar’s Paradox Disjunction: This sentence is false OR the resolution is true. If the first part is true and false it means the second part of the OR statement is true because the first part is true meaning the OR statement is valid since one part is true but the first part is also false meaning the second part of the OR statement has to be true since that valid OR statement needs one true part. “This sentence is false” is both true and false. If it’s false the statement it is telling the truth since it says it’s false, but if it's true then it’s false since it says it’s false not true. So no matter what “this sentence is false” is true and false.**

**Underview:**

**1. Presumption affirms: a) we presume things true until proven otherwise, I.e. you believed me when I said my name was Spencer. 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: a) It’s worse for us to do something bad than to do something unnecessary so we should take permissible actions. b) It terminates in presumption because if we don’t have a clear obligation one way or another we should presume obligation.**

**3. Contradictions affirm because they’re the negative’s fault. If they want to say an AC argument is wrong it’s their burden to prove why their answers matter more.**

**4. If the resolution is shown to be both true and false vote aff because the negative has to deny the evidence of truth which they haven’t done if it’s equally true and false.**

1. **Paradigm Issues: Drop the debater a) to deter future abuse, b) if I prove abuse it means substance has already been skewed. No RVIs, a) debaters don’t win for just being fair or educational, b) it would encourage good theory debaters to be abusive so they can bait theory and win off an RVI. Competing interps because a) reasonability is arbitrary and requires judge intervention b) it encourages getting as close to the brightline as possible and**
2. **Fairness is a voter because the ballot makes debate a game and without fairness you’re voting for the better cheater not the better debater.**
3. **I get 1ar theory because otherwise the neg can be infinitely abusive which outwieghs everything because that makes it impossible for the aff to win.**
4. **No 2N theory because that allows the neg to just go for 6 minutes of new game over issues which is impossible for a 3 minute 2ar to deal with**
5. **Interpretation: The negative must defend the status quo. Standard:**

**Predictability: There are infinite parts of my aff for the neg to create competition with which makes it impossible to have prep for them. I.e. I can’t prep out every k alt, word pic, process counterplan etc. on every sentence of aff. Predictability controls the internal link to ground and strategy because we can’t do either if we have no prep.**