**Presumption Negates**

**1. We presume things false, this is why people don’t believe things like conspiracy theories.**

**2. There are an infinite number of ways to prove something false and only one way to prove it true.**

**Permissibility Negates**

**1. The aff must prove an obligation because ought indicates a moral obligation. If an action is permissible, definitionally, no obligation is present and you negate.**

**The standard is consistency with the categorical imperative. This is the idea that maxims must be universalizable without contradiction.**

**The meta ethics is practical reason, the ability to set and pursue ends, because practical reason is inescapable, since its constitutive of action and escaping practical reason is an action. This means practical reason is the most binding and determines morality.**

**Practical reason shows us morality must respect the equality of individuals.**

**1.** **All individuals are agents with practical reason. Even if people have different capacities for setting and pursuing ends, practical reason is still binding since every agent has some sort of action, even if this just means thinking etc. Because all people are agents it means there can’t be any morally relevant distinction between people.**

**2.** **History: Things like racism are objectively bad, because traits of someone's identity don’t affect how ethical someone is.**

**This means when you say something is obligatory you’re saying all practical reasoners have that obligation because you can’t arbitrarily exclude someone from ethics. Additionally,**

**a) It doesn’t make sense to say something’s a rule for you but not others, I.e. 2+2=4 to me but not other people.**

**b) Anything else means ethics is non binding since if certain people are in certain positions they don't have to follow rules, you can just put yourself in those positions whenever you don’t want to follow rules.**

**c) Identification of an obligation for oneself comes from our understanding that I as an agent have certain obligations, this means we must recognize this obligation for other agents too.**

**And, things can’t be both true and false.**

**Gahringer**, Robert. “Moral law.” *Ethics,* Vol. 63, No. 4, July 1953, pp. 300-304. // (N8)

“Within any deductive system the basic principle of criticism is self-consistency. **To show a deductive system inconsistent is to disqualify it.** If it is asked why be consistent, it will be answered that it is a basic condition of having a system. And if we ask why this, it will be answered that **[Without this] a system would not be an intelligible unity in any other way.** The demand for **consistency** rests ultimately on intelligibility; it **is a condition of intelligibility. Consistency may appear as a principle of the bare absence of contradiction,** and this may be only a matter of the independence of elements. But consistency may go much deeper. If someone suggests that we dispose of the principles of consistency, we can ask the consistency of such a suggestion. **If the principle of consistency is the condition of intelligibility, the denial of it** (which must be an intelligible denial) **denies in principle what it assumes**: it is *transcendentally inconsistent.* **The proposal to abandon the principle of consistency** (the law of noncontradiction) **cannot be made within any system, since every system presupposes it**; **and it cannot be made outside, since every proposal assumes it.** This is, of course, a material consideration belonging to logic in the larger sense.”

**Thus our actions must be able to be universalized because all people are equal, and still be possible when universalized since an action can’t be possible and not possible, I.e. an action must still be possible to take when everyone takes that action.**

**This is a side constraint: even if you prove some other ethical theory is good, it can’t provide obligations that lead to contradictions because it can’t say everyone is obligated to do something and not do something.**

**Prefer additionally:**

**1. Regress: Any framework allows you to infinitely ask why, only my framework stops the regress because once you get to the point of practical reason, questioning it doesn’t make sense, since to question practical reason concedes its validity.**

**2. Performativity: We need freedom to make any arguments in debate, this means answers to my framework prove it true because you exercise your practical reason to try and contest it.**

**Contention 1)**

#### **Strikes use others as a mere means to achieve the end of the strikers.**

**Fourie 17 Johan Fourie 11-30-2017 "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers"** [**https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html**](https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html) **(Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG**

**A** further **formula of the Categorical Imperative is** "so, act as to **treat humanity,** whether in your own person or in that of any other context, **never solely as a means to an end but always as an end within itself'** (Parrott, 2006, p. 51). By this Kant meant people should be valued and respected as an individual and not used for the benefit of others. **Participating in a labor-strike** demonstration/action **is a direct violation of this** categorical perspective as it would not be ethically permissible because **the severe dependence and well-being of clients, the effective functioning of the employer organization, and society is used to** duly and unduly **influence the bargaining process for better working conditions.** In participating in the labor strike demonstration, the humanity, and well-being of **clients and society is** not seen as crucial and as an 'end', but rather **used to demonstrate the** undeniable **need for the skills and expertise of social workers.** Furthermore, through withholding services, social worker professionals demonstrate that the well-being and welfare of society have lost its inherent importance/value. Though the value of overall well-being is taught throughout the social work training process and is enshrined in the professional ethical codes.

**This impacts back to my framework because using others as a means to an end isn’t universalizable without contradiction since in order to use others as a means you must be an end in yourself, but if everyone is used as a means, no one can take the action of using others as means to ends.**

**Contention 2)**

**Workers agree in contracts not to strike, these contracts grant employers the right to fire people if they strike and has been upheld by the state. This means strikes break these promises.**

"Employer Sanctions for Violation of No-Strike Clause: Union Busting through Mass Discharge and Rescission." ***Yale Law Journal*,** digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=8323&context=ylj. Accessed 23 June 2021.

**EMPLOYERS often secure no-strike clauses** 1 **in collective bargaining contracts** 2 with their employees' unions, 3 in order to ensure greater union responsibility for the maintenance of stable production schedules.4 **Under such clauses, the union promises not to authorize or sanction any strike during the term of its contract.' The employer is** usually **given power to discipline or discharge all the individual union members who strike in violation of the no-strike clause.0**

When confronted with a union-sponsored strike in violation of a no-strike clause, the employer may be forced to accede to the union's demands because of production requirements or the scarcity of replacement workers. 7 Alternatively, he may shut down his plant and wait out the strike, disciplining the strikers when they return to work, subject to an arbitrator's review.8 However, if he believes his bargaining position to be strong, he may discharge all the strikers, rescind the contract, and refuse thereafter to deal with the union.0 **The National Labor Relations Board has upheld such employer actions on the grounds that they are justified by the union's prior material breach of the contract,'** ° and that strikers in violation of contract are not protected by the National Labor Relations Act."1

**This impacts back to my framework because promise breaking isn’t universalizable without contradiction since if everyone breaks promises they have no bearing, but in order to break promises they must be valid for you to go against them.**

**Interpretation: The affirmative may not specify that only the United States ought to recognize the right to strike.**

**Violation: They did.**

**Just is defined as :acting or being in conformity with what is morally upright or good.**

[**https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/just**](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/just)

**The U.S. is not a just government.**

**a) The aff argues not recognizing a right to strike leads to terrible impacts, however the aff is inherent. This means the U.S. government is doing terrible things and isn’t just.**

**b) The United States has an unjust government that has committed many immoral actions, and has been trending downwards.**

**Bryant**, Nick. "The Time When America Stopped Being Great." *BBC*, 3 Nov. 20**17**, www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-41826022. Accessed 20 June 2021.

Shattered confidence The national story changed dramatically and unexpectedly soon after. While doomsday predictions of a Y2K bug failed to materialise, it nonetheless felt as if the United States had been infected with a virus. 2000 saw the dot-com bubble explode. In November, **the disputed presidential election between George W Bush and Al Gore badly damaged the reputation of US democracy.** Why, a Zimbabwean diplomat even suggested Africa send international observers to oversee the Florida recount. Beyond America's borders came harbingers of trouble. In Russia, 31 December 1999, as those fireworks were being primed, Vladimir Putin took over from Boris Yeltsin. The year 2001 brought the horror of September 11th, an event more traumatic than Pearl Harbor. Post-9/11 America became less welcoming and more suspicious. **The Bush administration's "war on terror" - open-ended conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq - drained the country of blood and treasure.** The collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008, and the Great Recession that followed, arguably had a more lasting impact on the American psyche than the destruction of the Twin Towers. Just as 9/11 had undermined confidence in the country's national security, the financial collapse shattered confidence in its economic security.

With parents no longer certain their children would come to enjoy more abundant lives than they did, the American Dream felt like a chimera. The American compact, the bargain that if you worked hard and played by the rules your family would succeed, was no longer assumed. Between 2000 and 2011, the overall net wealth of US households fell. By 2014, the richest 1% of Americans had accrued more wealth than the bottom 90%.

To many in the watching world, and most of the 69 million Americans who voted for him, the election of the country's first black president again demonstrated America's capacity for regeneration. "*Yes we can." "The audacity of hope"*. Barack Hussein **Obama.** His improbable success story seemed uniquely American. Although his presidency did much to rescue the economy, he **couldn't repair a fractured country. The creation of a post-partisan nation, which Obama outlined in his breakthrough speech at the 2004 Democratic convention, proved just as illusory as the emergence of a post-racial society,** which he always knew was beyond him.

During the Obama years, Washington descended into a level of dysfunction unprecedented in post-war America. "My number one priority is making sure President Obama's a one-term president," declared then-Senate Minority leader Mitch McConnell, summing up the obstructionist mood of his Republican colleagues. It led to a crisis of governance, including the shutdown of 2013 and the repeated battles over raising the debt ceiling. The political map of America, rather than taking on a more purple hue, came to be rendered in deeper shades of red and blue.

Beyond Capitol Hill, there was a whitelash to the first black president, seen in the rise of the Birther movement and in elements of the Tea Party movement. On the right, movement conservatives challenged establishment Republicans. On the left, identity politics displaced a more class-oriented politics as union influence waned. Both parties seemed to vacate the middle ground, relying instead on maximising support from their respective bases - African-Americans, evangelicals, the LGBT community, gun-owners - to win elections.

Throughout his presidency, Barack **Obama continued to talk about moving towards a more perfect union.** But r**eality made a mockery of these** lofty **words.** Sandy Hook. Orlando. **The spate of police shootings.** The **gang-related mayhem in** his adopted home of **Chicago. The mess in Washington. The opioid crisis.** The health indices even pointed to a sick nation, in which the death rate was rising. By 2016, life expectancy fell for the first time since 1993.

This was the backdrop against which the 2016 election was fought, one of the most dispiriting campaigns in US political history. A battle between the two most unpopular major party candidates since polling began, ended with a victor who had higher negative ratings than his opponent and in the end, three million fewer votes.

Just as I had been on the National Mall to ring in the new millennium in 2000, I was there again on 20 January 2017, for Donald Trump's inaugural celebrations. They included some Reagan-era flourishes. At the eve of the inauguration concert, Lee Greenwood reprised his Reaganite anthem God Bless the USA, albeit with a frailer voice.

There were chants of "USA, USA," a staple of the billionaire's campaign rallies - usually triggered by his riff on building a wall along the Mexican border. There was also an 80s vibe about the telegenic first family, who looked fresh from a set of a primetime soap, like Dynasty or Falcon Crest.

The spectacle brought to mind what Norman Mailer once said of Reagan, that the 40th president understood "the President of the United States was the leading soap opera figure in the great American drama, and one had better possess star value". Trump understood this, and it explained much of his success, even if his star power came from reality TV rather than Hollywood B-movies. Yet Trump is not Reagan. His politics of grievance, and the fist-shaking anger it fed off, struck a different tone than the Gipper's more positive pitch. It played on a shared sense of personal and national victimhood that would have been alien to Reagan.

In the space of just three decades, then, the United States had gone from "It's morning in America again" to something much darker: "American Carnage", the most memorable phrase from Trump's inaugural address.

A hangover It is tempting to see Trump's victory this time last year as an aberration. A historical mishap. The election all came down, after all, to just 77,744 votes in three key states: Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin. But when you consider the boom-to-bust cycle of the period between 1984 and 2016, the Trump phenomenon doesn't look so accidental.

In many ways **Trump's unexpected victory marked the culmination of a large number of trends in US politics,** society and culture, many of which are rooted in that end-of-century period of American dominion. Consider how the fall of the Berlin Wall changed Washington, and how it ushered in an era of destructive and negative politics. In the post-war years, bipartisanship was routine, partly because of a shared determination to defeat communism. America's two-party system, adversarial though it was, benefited from the existence of a shared enemy. To pass laws, President Eisenhower regularly worked with Democratic chieftains such as House Speaker Sam Rayburn and Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson.

Reforms such as the 1958 National Defense Education Act, which improved science teaching in response to the launch of Sputnik, were framed precisely with defeating communism in mind.

Much of the impetus to pass landmark civil rights legislation in the mid-1960s came from the propaganda gift Jim Crow laws handed to the Soviet Union, especially as Moscow sought to expand its sphere of influence among newly decolonised African nations.

Patriotic bipartisanship frayed and ripped after the end of the Cold War. It was in the 1990s the then-Senate Minority Leader Bob Dole started to use the filibuster more aggressively as a blocking device. Government shutdowns became politically weaponised. In the 1994 congressional mid-terms, the Republican revolution brought a wave of fierce partisans to Washington, with an ideological aversion to government and thus little investment in making it work. House Speaker Newt Gingrich, the first Republican to occupy the post in 40 years, personified the kind of abrasive partisan that came to the fore on Capitol Hill.

Grudging bipartisanship was still possible, as Clinton and Gingrich demonstrated over welfare and criminal justice reform in the mid-1990s. But this period witnessed the acidification of DC politics. The gerrymandering of the House of Representatives encouraged strict partisanship, because the threat to most lawmakers came from within their own parties. Moderates or pragmatists who strayed from the partisan path were punished with a primary challenge from more doctrinaire rivals.

By the 112th Congress in 2011-2012, there was no Democrat in the House more conservative than a Republican and no Republican more liberal than a Democrat. This was new. In the post-war years, there had been considerable ideological overlap between liberal Republicans and conservative Democrats. In this more polarised climate, bipartisanship became a dirty word. One leading conservative thinker and anti-tax campaigner, Grover Norquist, likened it to date rape.

Would Congress have impeached Bill Clinton, ostensibly for having an affair with an intern, had America still been waging the Cold War? I sense not - it would have been seen, in those more serious times, as a frivolous distraction. When Congress moved towards impeaching Richard Nixon it did so because Watergate and its cover-up truly rose to the level of high crimes and misdemeanours. **Clinton's impeachment signalled the emergence of another new political trend: the delegitimisation of sitting presidents.** And **both parties played the game.** The Democrats cast George W Bush as illegitimate because Al Gore won the popular vote and the Supreme Court controversially ruled in the Republican's favour during the Florida recount.

The Birther movement, led by Donald Trump, tried to delegitimise Barack Obama with specious and racist claims that he was not born in Hawaii. Most recently, the Democrats have cast aspersions on Trump's victory, partly because he lost the popular vote and partly because they allege he achieved a Kremlin-assisted victory.

Over this period, the political discourse also became shriller. Rush Limbaugh, after getting his first radio show in 1984, rose to become the king of the right-wing shock jocks. Fox News was launched in 1996, the same year as MSNBC, which became its progressive counterpoint. The internet quickened the metabolism of the news industry and became the home for the kind of hateful commentary traditional news outlets rarely published.

Maybe the Jerry Springerisation of political news coverage can be traced to the moment the Drudge Report first published the name Monica Lewinsky, "scooping" Newsweek which hesitated before publishing such an explosive story. The success of the Drudge Report demonstrated how new outlets, which didn't share the same news values as the mainstream media, could establish brands literally overnight. This lesson was doubtless learnt by Andrew Breitbart, an editor at Drudge who founded the right-wing website Breitbart News.

**The internet** and social media, trumpeted initially as the ultimate tool for bringing people together, actually **became a forum for cynicism, division and various outlandish conspiracy theories. America became more atomised.**

As Robert D Putnam identified in his 1995 seminal essay, Bowling Alone, lower participation rates in organisations such as unions, parent teacher associations, the Boy Scouts and women's clubs had reduced person to person contacts and civil interaction.

Economically, this period saw the continuation of what's been called the "Great Divergence" which produced stark inequalities in wealth and income. Between 1979 and 2007, household income in the top 1% grew by 275% compared to just 18% growth in the bottom fifth of households. The Clinton-era was a period of financial deregulation, including the repeal of the Glass-Steagall Act, the landmark reform passed during the depression, as well as legislation exempting credit default swaps from regulation.

Disruptive technologies changed the workplace and upended the labour market. Automation, more so than globalisation, was the big jobs killer during this phase. Between 1990 and 2007, machines killed off up to 670,000 US manufacturing jobs alone.

The Rust Belt rebellion that propelled Trump to the White House has been described as a revolt against robots, not that his supporters viewed it that way. Encouraged by the billionaire, many blamed increased foreign competition and the influx of foreign workers.

The opioid crisis can be traced back to the early 1990s with the over-prescription of powerful painkillers. Between 1991 and 2011, painkiller prescriptions tripled.

America seemed intoxicated by its own post-Cold War success. Then came the hangover of the past 16 years.

Trump's America Over the past few months, I've followed that same westward flight path to California on a number of occasions, and found myself asking what would an impressionable 16-year-old make of America now. Would she share my adolescent sense of wonder, or would she peer out over the Pacific at twilight and wonder if the sun was setting on America itself?

What would she make of the gun violence, brought into grotesque relief again by the Las Vegas massacre? Multiple shootings are not new, of course. Just days before I arrived in the States in 1984, a gunman had walked into a McDonalds in a suburb of San Diego and shot dead 21 people. It was then the deadliest mass shooting in modern US history.

What's different between now and then, however, is the regularity of these massacres, and how the repetitiveness of the killings has normalised them. What was striking about Las Vegas was the muted nationwide response to a gunman killing 58 people and injuring hundreds more. **Once-shocking massacres no longer arouse intense emotions for those unconnected to the killings.** A month on, and it is almost as if it didn't happen.

What would she make of race relations? Back in 1984, black athletes such as Carl Lewis, Edwin Moses and Michael Jordan were unifying figures as they helped reap that Olympic golden harvest. Now some of America's leading black athletes are vilified by their president for taking a knee to protest, a right enshrined in the First Amendment. These athletes now find themselves combatants in the country's endless culture wars.

What would she make of the confluence of gun violence and race, evident in the spate of police shootings of unarmed black men and in the online auction where the weapon that killed Trayvon Martin fetched more than $100,000?

Charlottesville, with its torch-wielding and hate-spewing neo-Nazis, was another low point. So, too, were the president's remarks afterwards, when he described the crowd as including some "very fine people" and implied a moral equivalence between white supremacists and anti-racist protesters.

I was at the news conference in Trump Tower that day. An African-American cameraman next to me yelled out "What message does this send to our children?" The question went unanswered, but concerned parents ask it everyday about Donald Trump's behaviour.

What about the monuments debate? The last civil war veteran died in 1959, but the conflict rumbles on in various guises and upon various proxy battlefields, as America continues to grapple with the original sin of slavery.

But what if she landed in the American heartland, rather than flying over it? Coastal separateness can sometimes be exaggerated, but it would be a very different experience than Los Angeles. In the Rust Belt, stretches of riverway are crowded again with coal barges, and local business leaders believe in the Trump Bump because they see it in their order books and balance sheets.

In the Coal Belt, there's been delight at the rescinding of Obama's Clean Power Plan. In the Bible Belt, evangelicals behold Trump as a fellow victim of sneering liberal elites. In the Sun Belt, close to the Mexican border, there's wide support for his crackdown on illegal immigration.

In many football stadiums, she would hear the chorus of boos from fans who agree with the president that the take-the-knee protests denigrate the flag. In bars, union branches and American Legion halls, you'll find many who applaud Donald Trump for "telling like it is", refusing to be bound by norms of presidential behaviour or political correctness.

There are pointers of national success elsewhere. The New York Stock Exchange is still reaching record highs. Business confidence is on the up. Unemployment is at a 16-year low. Of the 62 million people who voted for Trump, a large number continue to regard him more as a national saviour than a national embarrassment.

In many red states, "Make America Great Again" echoes just as strongly as it did 12 months ago. Trump has a historically low approval rating of just 35%, but it's 78% among Republicans.

In the international realm, it's plausible foreign adversaries fear the United States more under Trump than Obama, and foreign allies no longer take the country for granted. The so-called Islamic State has been driven from Raqqa. Twenty-five Nato allies have pledged to increase defence spending. Beijing, under pressure from Washington, appears to be exerting more economic leverage over Pyongyang. However, America First increasingly means America alone, most notably on the Paris climate change accord and the Iranian nuclear deal. Trump has also Twitter-shamed longstanding allies, such as Germany and Australia, and infuriated its closest friend Britain, with rash tweets about crime rates and terror attacks.

His labelling of foes such as Kim Jong Un as Little Rocket Man seems juvenile and self-diminishing. It hardly reaches the Reagan standard of "tear down this wall". Indeed, with North Korea, there's the widespread fear that Trump's tweet tirades could spark a nuclear confrontation.

**Few countries look anymore to Trump's America as a global exemplar,** the "city upon a hill" Reagan spoke of in his farewell address to the nation. The German Chancellor Angela Merkel is routinely described as the leader of the free world, the moniker bestowed on the US president since the days of FDR.

The Economist, which trolls Trump almost weekly, has described Chinese President Xi Jinping as the most powerful man in the world. American exceptionalism is now commonly viewed as a negative construct. "Only in America" is a term of derision.

Ronald Reagan used to talk of the 11th commandment - No Republican should speak ill of another Republican. So it is worth noting that some of Trump's most caustic and thoughtful critics have come from within his own party. Senator Jeff Flake called him "a danger to democracy".

**This means the aff doesn’t defend the topic, because the defend that an unjust government ought to recognize a right to strike.**

**Standards:**

**1. Limits: Being able to defend a just or unjust government allows the aff to defend literally any country. This means there could be 273 affs on this topic that the negative has to prep, which goes up exponentially when you account for affs that spec multiple countries. This kills negative strategy because the aff can frontline their specific aff for months but I have to split my time between hundreds of affs.**

**2. Strat Skew: Speccing a country that isn’t a just government gives the aff access to better impacts. E.g. defending that a terrible government ought to try to do something good for its citizens is way easier to defend than defending a right to strike in a vacuum, because it allows you access to advantages about that specific government.**

**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.**

**Drop the debater to deter future abuse, and because if I prove abuse it means substance has already been skewed.**

**Competing interps because a) reasonability has broad and bidirectional brightlines that allow you to just keep shifting them to justify any abuse. b) competing interps sets the best norms because you have to justify your actual practice, so bad practices will lose. c) reasonability’s arbitrary and requires judge intervention.**

**No RVIs**

**a) an RVI would mean any time theory is introduced the entire debate comes down to it which kills substance eduation and all strategy because in a world where there’s an RVI the debate would just be is this theory shell true mooting everything else.**

**b) you don’t win for just being fair or educational.**