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### 1NC Shell:

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting on the 2020-2021 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them.

#### Violation – they don’t for any round at this tournament aff or neg. They’ve debated 4 rounds at this tournament, and they had the entire day to disclose. Don’t let them say they’ll do it in the future unverifiable

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated

#### 1] Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs who can’t bypass paywalled articles.

Louden 10 – Allan D. Louden, professor of Communication at Wake Forest (“Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century” Wake Forest National Debate Conference. IDEA, 2010)

Groups interested in engaging in competitive National Debate Tournament (NDT)-Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA)-style policy debate are entering an exciting time in the debate community where **digital resources are making research and networking increasingly accessible**. Those developing programs should be encouraged to choose their own topics and resolutions, but they should also make use of the massive resources available by focusing on the official NDT-CEDA resolution. **New initiatives in the field of open-source debate make evidence sharing, such as the Open Caselist, a powerful tool for new programs to engage and compete against established teams**. It is no coincidence that **the winners of the NDT tend to be the schools with the largest coaching staffs, but the increased distribution and free sharing of evidence and resources have made smaller debate programs increasingly capable of competing against larger institutions**. We are now seeing the beginnings of **increased resource sharing**, with multiple initiatives focusing on regional evidence sharing for groups of developing debate programs. This **is one example of dramatic changes occurring in the community that are capable of opening the doors for new participation in debate**. Regardless of outside influence, such as an organized campaign by preexisting debate organizations to increase resource distribution, students are independently capable of establishing the foundations for a larger competitive program. The following suggestions are a nonlinear set of options available to students who wish to establish a struc-tured and coached debate program, and eventually developing the capability to maintain multiple professional teaching positions, such as those discussed earlier in the chapter.

#### 2] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify pre-round that cards aren’t miscut or highlighted or bracketed unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical evidence practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

#### 3] Depth of clash – it allows debaters to have nuanced researched objections to their opponents evidence before the round at a much faster rate, which leads to higher quality evidence comparison – outweighs cause thinking on your feet is NUQ but the best quality responses come from full access to a case.

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

#### [2] Reject RVIs, impact turns, and case cross applications – a) disclosure is a procedural that questions whether I should be debating this aff b) justifies infinite abuse through baiting theory and winning off a prepped out counterinterp

#### [4] CI – 1] reasonability is arbitrary – impossible to know what is reasonable until you establish a brightline 2] reasonability collapses cuz u use offense defense to evaluate offense under the BL

#### [5] Fairness is a voter because debate is a game governed by rules and you can’t tell who actually won if the layer was skewed – procedural fairness is a meta constraint on competitive activities

### 2

### Framework

#### The meta ethic is practical reason-

#### Ethics must be derived a priori

#### 1] Is/Ought Gap – experience in the phenomenal world only tells us what is, not what ought to be. But it’s impossible to derive an ought from descriptive premises, so there needs to be additional a priori premises within the noumenal world to make a moral theory.

#### Practical reason is inescapable - Any moral rule faces the problem of regress – I can keep asking “why should I follow this.” Regress collapses to skep since no one can generate obligations absent grounds for accepting them. Only reason solves since asking “why reason?” requires reason to do in the first place which concedes its authority.

#### Morality means we must treat others as ends in themselves.

Korsgaard ’83 (Christine M., “Two Distinctions in Goodness,” The Philosophical Review Vol. 92, No. 2 (Apr., 1983), pp. 169-195, JSTOR) // LEX JB [brackets for gendered language]

The argument shows how Kant's idea of justification works. It can be read as a kind of regress upon the conditions, starting from an important assumption. The assumption is that **when a rational being makes a choice or undertakes an action, [they] supposes the object to be good, and its pursuit to be justified**. At least, if there is a categorical imperative there must be objectively good ends, for then there are necessary actions and so necessary ends (G 45-46/427-428 and Doctrine of Virtue 43-44/384-385). **In order for there to be any objectively good ends, however, there must be something that is unconditionally good and so can serve as a sufficient condition of their goodness**. Kant considers what this might be**: it cannot be an object of inclination**, for those have only a conditional worth, "**for if the inclinations and the needs founded on them did not exist, their object would be without worth**" (G 46/428). It cannot be the inclinations themselves because a rational being would rather be free from them. Nor can it be external things, which serve only as means. So, Kant asserts, **the unconditionally valuable thing must be "humanity"** or "rational nature," which he defines as "the power set to an end" (G 56/437 and DV 51/392). Kant explains that **regarding your existence as a rational being as an end in itself is a "subjective principle of human action."** By this I understand him to mean that **we must regard ourselves as capable of** conferring **value upon the objects of our choice, the ends that we set, because we must regard our ends as good**. But since "every other rational being thinks of his existence by the same rational ground which holds also for myself' (G 47/429), **we must regard others as capable of conferring value by reason of their rational choices and so also as ends in themselves**. Treating another as an end in itself thus involves making that person's ends as far as possible your own (G 49/430). The ends that are chosen by any rational being, possessed of the humanity or rational nature that is fully realized in a good will, take on the status of objective goods. They are not intrinsically valuable, but they are objectively valuable in the sense that every rational being has a reason to promote or realize t hem. For this reason it is our duty to promote the happiness of others-the ends that they choose-and, in general, to make the highest good our end.

#### Practical reason means we must be able to universalize our maxims—our judgements are authoritative and can’t only apply to ourselves any more than 2+2=4 can be true only for me. The only constraint is noncontradiction.

**The standard is consistency with the categorical imperative.**

### Offense

#### [1] The process of strike uses patients or beneficiaries of work as a means to an end

**Howard 20** [Danielle Howard,, Mar 2020, "What Should Physicians Consider Prior to Unionizing?," Journal of Ethics | American Medical Association, [https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/what-should-physicians-consider-prior-unionizing/2020-03 //](https://journalofethics.ama-assn.org/article/what-should-physicians-consider-prior-unionizing/2020-03%20//) LEX JB]

* Written in the context of doctors, warrant can be used for all jobs

**The** possible **disadvantage to** patients highlights the crux **of** the moral issue of physician **strikes. In** Immanuel **Kant’s** *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*, one formulation of **the categorical imperative is to “Act in such a way as to treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of anyone else, always as an end and never merely as a means**.”24 **When patient care is leveraged** by physicians during strikes, **patients serve as a means to the union’s ends**. Unless physicians act to improve *everyone’s*care, union action—if **it jeopardizes** the **care of some hospitalized patients**, for example—cannot be ethical. It is for this reason that, in the case of **physicians looking to form a new union**, the argument can be made that unionization should be used only as a last resort. Physician union **members must be prepared to utilize collective action and accept its risks to patient care, but every effort should be made to avoid actions that risk harm to patients.**

#### [2] Going on strike isn’t universalizable – a) if everyone leaves work then there will be no concept of a job b) everyone means the employer even leaves which is a contradiction in contraception

#### [3] No aff offense – no unique obligation of the state to give ability to strike – if a workplace is coercive you can use legal means or just find another job

### 3

#### Counter Plan Text: China ought to recognize the right of workers to strike except for healthcare workers responding to pandemics.

#### Nurse strikes devastate hospitals

Wright 10 Sarah H. Wright July 2010 "Evidence on the Effects of Nurses' Strikes" <https://www.nber.org/digest/jul10/evidence-effects-nurses-strikes> (Researcher at National Bureau of Economic Research)

U.S. hospitals were excluded from collective bargaining laws for three decades longer than other sectors because of fears **that strikes by nurses might imperil patients' health**. Today, while unionization has been declining in general, it is growing rapidly in hospitals, with the number of unionized workers rising from 679,000 in 1990 to nearly one million in 2008. In Do Strikes Kill? Evidence from New York State (NBER Working Paper No. 15855), co-authors Jonathan Gruber and Samuel Kleiner carefully examine the effects of nursing strikes on patient care and outcomes. The researchers match data on nurses' strikes in New York State from 1984 to 2004 to data on hospital discharges, including information on treatment intensity, patient mortality, and hospital readmission. They conclude that nurses' strikes were **costly to hospital patients**: in-hospital mortality **increased by 19.4 percent** and hospital readmissions **increased by 6.5 percen**t for patients admitted during a strike. Among their sample of 38,228 such patients, an estimated **138 more individuals died than would have without a stri**ke, and 344 more patients were readmitted to the hospital than if there had been no strike. "Hospitals functioning during nurses' strikes **do so at a lower quality of patient care,"** they write. Still, at hospitals experiencing strikes, the measures of treatment intensity -- that is, the length of hospital stay and the number of procedures performed during the patient's stay -- show no significant differences between striking and non-striking periods. Patients appear to receive the same intensity of care during union work stoppages as during normal hospital operations. Thus, the poor outcomes associated with strikes suggest that they might reduce hospital productivity. These poor health outcomes increased for both emergency and non-emergency hospital patients, even as admissions of both groups decreased by about 28 percent at hospitals with strikes. The poor health outcomes were not apparent either before or after the strike in the striking hospitals, suggesting that they are attributable to the strike itself. And, the poor health outcomes do not appear to do be due to different types of patients being admitted during strike periods, because patients admitted during a strike are very similar to those admitted during other periods. Hiring replacement workers apparently does not help: hospitals that hired replacement workers **performed no better** during strikes than those that did not hire substitute employees. In each case, patients with conditions that required intensive nursing were more likely to fare worse in the presence of nurses' strikes.

#### Healthcare workers are key to saving millions of lives during COVID-19 through treatment and administering vaccines

**Garrett Ilg, 21** - ("Celebrating Healthcare Workers and the Technology that Empowers Them," Oracle APAC, 4-7-2021, https://www.oracle.com/apac/news/announcement/blog/celebrating-healthcare-workers-technology-2021-04-05.html?source=:so:ch:or:awr::::)/AK

As we observe the World Health Organization’s World Health Day on April 7, I want to celebrate the people and institutions on the front lines of healthcare worldwide—especially amid the COVID-19 pandemic. Their steely dedication and relentless innovation have produced multiple, highly effective coronavirus vaccines in record time. They’ve administered close to 460 million doses of those vaccines, according to the WHO, saving countless millions of lives. And they’ve treated a large subset of about 125 million confirmed cases, often at great personal risk and with insufficient resources. Oracle’s National Electronic Health Records Database and the Oracle Public Health Management System, built by a global team that worked round the clock, in partnership with government and non-government institutions, played a critical role in that Herculean effort. In addition to electronically screening hundreds of thousands of volunteers for COVID-19 clinical trials, the system has collected millions of daily health updates from patients and healthcare providers. It was designed from the ground up to scale to the populations of entire nations as COVID-19 vaccines become more widely available.

**New Pandemics are deadlier and faster are coming – COVID is just the beginning**

**Future pandemics cause extinction**

Eleftherios P. **Diamandis 21** (works for the Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Mount Sinai Hospital, Toronto, Canada; Lunenfeld-Tanenbaum Research Institute, Mount Sinai Hospital, Toronto, Canada; Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathobiology, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada. “The Mother of All Battles: Viruses vs. Humans. Can Humans Avoid Extinction in 50-100 Years? 4/13/21 https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202104.0397/v1

The recent SARS-CoV-2 pandemic, which is causing COVID 19 disease, has taught us unexpected lessons about the dangers of human extinction through highly contagious and lethal diseases. As the COVID 19 pandemic is now being controlled by various isolation measures, therapeutics and vaccines, it became clear that our current lifestyle and societal functions may not be sustainable in the long term. We now have to start thinking and planning on how to face the next dangerous pandemic, not just overcoming the one that is upon us now. Is there any evidence that even worse pandemics could strike us in the near future and threaten the existence of the human race? The answer is unequivocally yes. It is not necessary to get infected by viruses of bats, pangolins and other exotic animals that live in remote forests in order to be in danger. Creditable scientific evidence indicates that the human gut microbiota harbor billions of viruses which are capable of affecting the function of vital human organs such as the immune system, lung, brain, liver, kidney, heart etc. It is possible that the development of pathogenic variants in the gut can lead to contagious viruses which can cause pandemics, leading to destruction of vital organs, causing death or various debilitating diseases such as blindness, respiratory, liver, heart and kidney failures. These diseases could result n the complete shutdown of our civilization and probably the extinction of human race. In this essay, I will first provide a few independent pieces of scientific facts and then combine this information to come up with some (but certainly not all) hypothetical scenarios that could cause human race misery, even extinction. I hope that these scary scenarios will trigger preventative measures that could reverse or delay the projected adverse outcomes.

**1NC – Econ Turn**

**Increased strikes sabotage the economy – they cause major disruptions and lower income for workers.**

**Grabianowski 6** [Ed; Author and freelance writer. He’s worked as a contributing writer for io9, HowStuffWorks, and Sweethome. His fiction has appeared in Black Static, Fear Project, and other publications and anthologies, including Fear After Fear; “How Strikes Work,” HSW; 3/24/06; https://money.howstuffworks.com/strike.htm]//SJWen

Labor strikes can cause **major disruptions to industry**, **commerce** and the **lives of many people** who aren't even connected to the strike itself. The Professional Air Traffic Controllers Association strike in 1981 resulted in the firing of thousands of air traffic controllers, and the New York City transit strike in late 2005 affected **millions** of people. The history of strikes and labor unions is a key chapter in the story of the Industrial Revolution.

While the reasons behind strikes can be complex, they all boil down to two key elements: money and power. In this article, we'll find out how labor strikes have affected the balance of power between corporations and workers, what laws regulate strikes and learn about some important strikes in history.

It's difficult to say when the first real labor strike occurred. The word "strike" was first used in the 1700s, and probably comes from to notion of dealing a blow to the employer [ref]. In 1786, a group of printers in Philadelphia requested a raise and the company rejected it. They stopped working in protest and eventually received their raise. Other professionals followed suit in the next few decades. Everyone in a city who practiced the same profession agreed to set prices and wages at the same rate. Members would shun anyone who diverged from the agreement, refusing to work in the same shop and forcing employers to fire them. By the 1800s, formal trade societies and guilds began to emerge.

To have a strike today, you must have a union (though not necessarily an official union) -- an organization of workers that bargain collectively with an employer. Workers form unions because an individual worker is powerless compared to an employer, who can set low wages and long working hours as long as it adheres to labor laws. When workers combine to form a union, they collectively have enough power to negotiate with the employer. The main weapon the union has against the employer is the threat of a strike action.

At its most basic level, a strike occurs when all the workers in the union **stop coming to work.** With no workers, the business **shuts down**. The employer **stops making money**, though it is still **spending money on taxes**, **rent**, **electricity** and **maintenance**. The longer the strike lasts, the **more money the employer loses**. Of course, the workers aren't getting paid either, so they're losing money as well. Some unions build up "war chests" -- funds to pay striking workers. But it isn't usually very much, and it's often not enough for a prolonged strike.

Strikes help explain why unions are more powerful than individuals. Imagine if an employer refuses to give a raise to an individual worker. She then decides to stop coming to work in protest. The employer simply fires her for not coming to work. That one worker has no power to influence the employer. However, it can be very costly for an employer to fire every single worker when a union goes on strike (though it has happened).

#### [8] Naturalistic Fallacy –util is morally incoherent – they have no definition of what constitutes a “good” or “bad” besides pain or pleasure BUT then says pleasure is what constitutes goodness which is tautological. Proves it is unwarranted.

#### [9] Subjective Value Objection – States don’t know what citizens “interests” really are. Citizens have different pleasures based on their own experiences – means states can’t guide action.

#### [10] Fake Pleasure Objection – Value theories must give us reasons why certain experiences are better than others – util fails.

**Nozick**. “Robert Nozick The Experience Machine.” **ND**. PDF file. [http://www.uky.edu/~mwa229/RobertNozickTheExperienceMachine.pdf] //Massa

The problem with Bentham’s view is that it does not make sense of our considered moral beliefs. **Any good normative theory of value should make sense of the views we hold.** However, Bentham’s views don’t appear to do that. We can see this in the following way; **consider the following** two possible worlds: **In world 1, you are in love with a person A**, **and A loves you** back. **You have a variety of experiences with A, and these** experiences **make you** extremely **pleased. In world 2, you are in love with A, but A only pretends to love you** back. **In this world;** however, **A hates you.** A puts up with you only because you buy A things. **A cheats on you** on a regular basis, **but you never catch on** to this. **In fact, the experiences you have in this world are identical to the experiences you have in world 1.** **According to Hedonism, you have no reason to pick world 1** as opposed to world2 **since the amount of pleasure experienced with be the by hypothesis. But clearly, world 1 is better than world 2.** This only makes sense if Hedonism is false. **Thus, Hedonism is incoherent with respect to** our considered **moral judgments.**

#### [3] They commit the Fallacy of Origin. Just because extinction precludes moral theorizing, doesn’t meant that extinction is necessarily a good or a bad thing. We could be alive and theorize that life is a bad thing.

#### [2] They conflate postfiat and prefiat. They have justifications for why extinction might happen, but within the context of the debate round. They have 0 effect in solving extinction which means that they dont solve moral uncertainty in the prefiat world.

#### [3] They commit the Fallacy of Origin. Just because extinction precludes moral theorizing, doesn’t meant that extinction is necessarily a good or a bad thing. We could be alive and theorize that life is a bad thing.
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### AT: Small Schools

#### 1] Open source is good for small school debaters - it’s a really great way for small school debaters and younger debaters to make the transition to more circuity style debate-that was the explanation above.

#### 2] Our interp is better since large schools typically all read one affirmative, so smaller school debaters are able to steal case negs from other big schools to answer that affirmative adequately.