# 1NC Glenbrooks R6

## 1

#### Interp - The letter “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “just government” – the aff must defend all just governments.

#### “A” implies a nonspecific or generic reading of the word “government”.

Walden 20 Walden University [The Writing Center provides a broad range of writing instruction and editing services for students at Walden University, including writing assistance for undergraduates, graduate students, and doctoral capstone writers], “"A" or "An"” last modified July 14 2020, <https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/writingcenter/grammar/articles> SM

When to Use "A" or "An" "A" and "an" are used with singular countable nouns when the noun is nonspecific or generic. I do not own a car. In this sentence, "car" is a singular countable noun that is not specific. It could be any car. She would like to go to a university that specializes in teaching. "University" is a singular countable noun. Although it begins with a vowel, the first sound of the word is /j/ or “y.” Thus, "a" instead of "an" is used. In this sentence, it is also generic (it could be any university with this specialization, not a specific one). I would like to eat an apple. In this sentence, "apple" is a singular countable noun that is not specific. It could be any apple.

#### “Just government” is a generic indefinite singular.

Leslie 12 Leslie, Sarah-Jane. “Generics.” In Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Language, edited by Gillian Russell and Delia Fara, 355–366. Routledge, 2012. <https://www.princeton.edu/~sjleslie/RoutledgeHandbookEntryGenerics.pdf> SM

GENERICS VS. EXISTENTIALS The interpretation of sentences containing bare plurals, indefinite singulars, or definite singulars can be either generic as in (1) respectively or existential/specific as in (2): (1) Tigers are striped A tiger is striped The tiger is striped. (2) Tigers are on the front lawn A tiger is on the front lawn The tiger is on the front lawn. The subjects in (1) are prima facie the same as in (2), yet their interpretations in (1) are intuitively quite different from those in (2). In (2) we are talking about some particular tigers, while in (1) we are saying something about tigers in general. There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. For example, if it is true that tigers are on the lawn, then it will also be true that animals are on the lawn. This is not so if the sentence is interpreted generically. For example, it is true that tigers are striped, but it does not follow that animals are striped (Lawler 1973 Laca 1990; Krifka et al 1995). Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification (in the sense of Lewis 1975) with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in (1) (e.g. “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in (2) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g. “tigers are usually on the front lawn). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually”.)

#### This applies to the res – 1] Upward entailment test – “a just government ought to recognize an unconditional right to strike” doesn’t imply that “in a society, governments ought to recognize this right” because an authoritarian regime might not recognize it 2] Adverb test -- “just governments usually ought to recognize a right to strike” doesn’t substantially change the meaning of the res.

Precision ow –

#### Violation – They spec EU Countries

#### Standards:

#### 1] **Limits – You can pick any government and find a flimsy definition of it being “just”. Just is super vague and it’s easy to prove any government as just. That’s over 123 countries – there are solid affs for China, US, India, South Africa, and Russia - that explodes neg prep burdens and kills clash. Generics don’t solve- infinite pre-round prep and encourages reading the same arguments which kills education.**

ITUC 20**,** (International Trade Union Confederation, “World’s Worst Countries for Workers”), ITUC, 2020, https://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/ituc\_globalrightsindex\_2020\_en.pdf // MNHS NL recut DD AG

In 2020, strikes have been severely restricted or banned in 123 out of 144 countries. In a significant number of these countries, industrial actions were brutally repressed by the authorities and workers exercising their right to strike often faced criminal prosecution and summary dismissals.

#### 2] TVA solves – just read your aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff – we don’t stop them from reading new FWs, mechanisms or advantages. a] it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff being non-T b] There’s only a small number of pics on this topic c] PICs incentivize them to write better affs that can generate solvency deficits to PICs

#### Drop the debater bc you can’t drop the arg on their advocacy

#### No rvis – you are either topical or not, there is not in between, 1AR can go all in which deems the 2NR since they get 4 min on a short 1 min shell.

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbtirary and causes race to the bottom and intervention which ow , collapses since we have an offense defense debater over a brightline.

#### 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, 3] T first

## 2

#### Ethics must began a priori. Permissibility negates since the word ought in the resolution indicates an obligation so its their burden to prove the existence of one.

#### 1] Is/Ought Gap – experience in the phenomenal world only tells us what is since we can only perceive 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.

#### The existence of extrinsic goodness requires unconditional human worth—that 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) OS/Recut Lex AKu \*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] he or she 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 them. 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 resolves regress - I can keep asking “why should I follow this” but asking “why reason” requires reason so its inescapable. Regress collapses to skep since no one can generate obligations absent grounds for accepting them.

Ethics must be universal – 2+2 = 4 can’t be true for me but not for you. That’s incoherent.

There is an act omission distinction otherwise we are infinitely culpable for anything like, me being responsible for the the war in Yemen which is illogical – negate, omitting is a morally permissible action to avoid culpability, which means the squo is ok and theres no moral obligation to do the aff

Now negate

#### 1] Strikes violate rights.

**Gourevitch, 16** **(Alex Gourevitch, associate professor of political science at Brown University, 6-13-2016, accessed on 10-12-2021, *Perspectives on Politics*, "Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike", https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/S1537592716000049) //D.Ying**

Yet there is more. The standard strike potentially threatens the fundamental freedoms of three specific groups. • Freedom of contract. It conflicts with the freedom of contract of those replacement workers who would be willing to take the job on terms that strikers will not. Note that this is not a possible conflict but a necessary one. Strikers claim the job is theirs, which means replacements have no right to it. But replacements claim everyone should have the equal freedom to contract with an employer for a job. • Property rights. A strike seriously interferes with the employer’s property rights. The point of a strike is to stop production. But the point of a property right is that, at least in the owner’s core area of activity, nobody else has the right to interfere with his use of that property. The strikers, by claiming that the employer has no right to hire replacements and thus no way of employing his property profitably, effectively render the employer unfree to use his property as he sees fit. To be clear, strikers claim the right not just to block replacement workers, but to prevent the employer from putting his property to work without their permission. For instance, New Deal “sit-down” strikes made it impossible to operate factories, which was one reason why the courts claimed it violated employer property rights. 24 Similarly, during the Seattle general strike in 1919, the General Strike Committee forced owners to ask permission to engage in certain productive activities—permission it often denied. 25 • Freedom of association. Though the conceptual issues here are complicated, a strike can seriously constrain a worker’s freedom of association. It does so most seriously when the strike is a group right, in which only authorized representatives of the union may call a strike. In this case, the right to strike is not the individual’s right in the same way that, say, the freedom to join a church or volunteer organization is. Moreover, the strike can be coercively imposed even on dissenting members, especially when the dissenters work in closed or union shops. That is because refusal to follow the strike leads to dismissal from the union, which would mean loss of the job in union or closed shops. The threat of losing a job is usually considered a coercive threat. So not only might workers be forced to join unions—depending on the law—but also they might be forced to go along with one of the union’s riskiest collective actions. Note that each one of these concerns follows directly from the nature of the right to strike itself. Interference with freedom of contract, property rights, and the freedom of association are all part and parcel of defending the right that striking workers claim to “their” jobs. These are difficult forms of coercive interference to justify on their own terms and they appear to rest on a claim without foundation. Just what right do workers have to jobs that they refuse to perform?

#### Strike means to cause suffering – upholding a right to impose bodily harm is bad under any framework.

**Cambridge Dictionary (Cambridge Dictionary, dictionary from the University of Cambridge, No Date, accessed on 10-11-2021, *Cambridge Dictionary*, "strike", https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/strike) \*brackets in original //D.Ying**

strike verb (CAUSE SUFFERING) C2 [ I or T ] to cause a person or place to suffer severely from the effects of something very unpleasant that happens suddenly: I have a life insurance policy that will take care of my family if disaster strikes. The disease has struck the whole community, sometimes wiping out whole families. They predict that a large earthquake will strike the west coast before the end of the decade.

#### 2] Violates the commitment to not cause harm

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> (Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG

In addition to the above, engaging in a labor strike demonstration is a gross violation of the **prima facie duty of the social worker**, nonmaleficence: **to not cause harm**, and display a commitment to the well-being of the client, organization as well as society. As Social Workers withdraw their labor, services are ceased, and automatic disruption occurs which can inflict serious harm on clients, organizational functioning as well as society. According to Mehta and Swell (2014), examples of the harm caused to clients and organizational functioning include severe and fatal delays in executing or developing timeous interventions **for at-risk clients,** miscommunication, and no service delivery. Moreover, by withdrawing their labor in a strike demonstration, ethical principles such as beneficence and social justice are also not adhered to as no acts of kindness, empathy is shown, and the most vulnerable members of society **will be impacted the most**.

## 3

#### Counterplan: [Aff actor] ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike except in the instance that strikes directly demand discrimination towards certain groups of individuals

BPSC[Unfair Labor Practices by Union, http://bpscllc.com/unfair-labor-practices-by-unions.html, N.D., Business & People Strategy Consulting Group, California's trusted source for workplace human resources and employment law] [SS]

Causing or Attempting to Cause Discrimination: Section 8(b)(2) makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of Section 8(a)(3). The section is violated by agreements or arrangements with employers, other than lawful union-security agreements, that condition employment or job benefits on union membership, on the performance of union membership obligations or on arbitrary grounds. But union action that causes detriment to an individual employee does not violate Section 8(b)(2) if it is consistent with nondiscriminatory provisions of a bargaining contract negotiated for the benefit of the total bargaining unit, or if the action is based on some other legitimate purpose. A union’s conduct, accompanied by statements advising or suggesting that action is expected of an employer, may be enough to find a violation of this section if the union’s action can be shown to be a causal factor in the employer’s discrimination. Contracts or informal arrangements with a union under which an employer gives preferential treatment to union members also violate Section 8(b)(2). However, an employer and a union may agree that the employer will hire new employees exclusively through the union hiring hall if there is no discrimination against nonunion members on the basis of union membership obligations. In setting referral standards, a union may consider legitimate aims such as sharing available work and easing the impact of local unemployment. The union may also charge referral fees if the amount of the fee is reasonably related to the cost of operating the referral service. A union that attempts to force an employer to enter into an illegal union-security agreement, or that enters into and keeps in effect such an agreement, also violates Section 8(b)(2), as does a union that attempts to enforce such an illegal agreement by bringing about an employee’s discharge. Even when a union-security provision of a bargaining contract meets all statutory requirements, a union may not lawfully require the discharge of employees under the provision unless they were informed of the union-security agreement and their specific obligation under it. A union violates Section 8(b)(2) if it tries to use the union-security provisions of a contract to collect payments other than those lawfully required, such as assessments, fines and penalties. Other examples of Section 8(b)(2) violations include: Causing an employer to discharge employees because they circulated a petition urging a change in the union’s method of selecting shop stewards Causing an employer to discharge employees because they made speeches against a contract proposed by the union Making a contract that requires an employer to hire only members of the union or employees “satisfactory” to the union Causing an employer to reduce employees’ seniority because they engaged in anti-union acts Refusing referral or giving preference on the basis of race or union activities when making job referrals to units represented by the union Seeking the discharge of an employee under a union-security agreement for failure to pay a fine levied by the union

#### Racist union strikes have happened before

Allison Keyes, JUNE 30, **2017**, "The East St. Louis Race Riot Left Dozens Dead, Devastating a Community on the Rise," Smithsonian Magazine, https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/east-st-louis-race-riot-left-dozens-dead-devastating-community-on-the-rise-180963885/ //SR

Racial tensions began simmering in East St. Louis—a city where thousands of blacks had moved from the South to work in war factories—as early as February 1917. The African-American population was 6,000 in 1910 and nearly double that by 1917. In the spring, the largely white workforce at the Aluminum Ore Company went on strike. Hundreds of blacks were hired. After a City Council meeting on May 28, angry white workers lodged formal complaints against black migrants. When word of an attempted robbery of a white man by an armed black man spread through the city, mobs started beating any African-Americans they found, even pulling individuals off of streetcars and trolleys. The National Guard was called in but dispersed in June.

Unconditional” necessitates the absence of narrowing restrictions.

US Legal ‘ND (US Legal; dictionary of legal terms of art; US Legal; “Unconditional Law and Legal Definition”; https://definitions.uslegal.com/u/unconditional/; Accessed: 10-30-2021; AU)

Unconditional means **without conditions**; **without restrictions**; or **absolute**. For instance, unconditional promise is a promise that is unqualified in nature. A party who makes an unconditional promise must perform that promise even though the other party has not performed according to the bargain.

The CP isn’t a pic since we don’t pic out of an unconditional right to strike, since the CP is a conditional right to strike.

#### Reject 1AR theory- A] 7-6 time skew means it’s endlessly aff biased B] I don’t have a 3nr which allows for endless extrapolation C] 1AR theory is skewed to the aff because they have a 2ar judge psychology warrant.

#### Infinite abuse claims are wrong- A] Spikes solve-you can just preempt paradigms in the 1AC B] Functional limits- 1nc is only 7 minutes long

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew – ows on quantifiability

#### 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, 3] T first