### 1

#### Interpretation—the aff must disclose the plan text and framework standard, 20 mins before the round when asked. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation—they didn’tGraphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message Description automatically generated

#### Vote neg for prep and clash—two internal links—a) neg prep—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply and cut and research their applications to the affirmative b) aff quality—plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, it should lose—this will answer the 1ar’s claim about innovation—with 30 minutes of prep, there’s still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can’t check against the broader literature.

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – a) reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter, b) collapses to competing interps – we justify 2 brightlines under an offense defense paradigm just like 2 interps.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) chilling effect – forces you to split your 2AR so you can’t collapse and misconstrue the 2NR, d) topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory

#### Evaluate T before 1AR theory – a) norms – we only have a couple months to set T norms but can set 1AR theory norms anytime, b) magnitude – T affects a larger portion of the debate since the aff advocacy determines every speech after it

#### No impact turns to T—T is a procedural that determines case’s validity and every argument says the aff is bad

### 2

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc and exacerbates the fact that they get infinite pre-round prep since I should be able to compensate by choosing – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Most educational since otherwise we wouldn’t use math or logic to approach topics. Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### a priori’s 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means it’s constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I’ve met my burden.

### 3

#### Presumption and permissibility negates – a) statements are more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted c) the aff has to prove an obligation which means lack of that obligation negates.

#### I negate: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### The resolution specifies that the right to strike must be unconditional—this means it cannot be contingent on any authority or have any exceptions.

Magnell 11 [Thomas Magnell, Quals: Philosopher, Department of Philosophy, Drew University, Madison, NJ, The Correlativity of Rights and Duties, J Value Inquiry (2011) 45:1–12]//BA PB

Unconditional rights may be either absolutely unconditional or relatively unconditional. An absolutely unconditional right is a right which every right-holder enjoys as something capable of having rights. These are the most fundamental of all rights. As rights which all right-holders have simply as right-holders, they are common to all people, institutions, corporations, societies, and at least some nonhuman animals. They do not need to be acquired. Because they are held unconditionally, they cannot be overruled. For the same reason, they are as minimal as can be. To draw anything more than the most minimal rights from right-holders as such is almost surely a mistake. The flights of fancy of natural rights theorists led Bentham to shout: ‘‘Natural Rights is simple nonsense: natural and imprescriptible rights, rhetorical nonsense,—nonsense upon stilts.’’12 Still, notwithstanding Bentham’s finest flourish of phrasing, there may be some, for example, the right of a right-holder not to be subject to a wanton disregard of its interests. This would seem to be a right that at least some animals have as well as people taken individually or in groups. It is not a particularly robust right. An awful lot of harm can be inflicted upon a right-holder without showing a wanton disregard for the right holder’s interests. Even so, as minimal as it is, it is not a right that is always respected, as National Socialists and International Socialists showed in concentration camps and the Gulag. A relatively unconditional right is a right which all right-holders of a certain kind enjoy without qualification. This gives a clear sense to the much abused term ‘‘human rights,’’ though there may be others. In the strictest sense, human rights are relatively unconditional rights. They are rights which human beings have simply as human beings, or perhaps more precisely as persons, if not all human beings are accounted persons, whatever their role or situation within or apart from a society. A better term for them would be ‘‘person rights,’’ but here the common term is unlikely to be allowed to give way. Human rights are not acquired, though if personhood is a characteristic that human beings can come to have and come to lose, human rights may be gained or lost along with it. Some other right-holders may have the same rights unconditionally, but not all. Narrower on the one hand than absolutely unconditional rights, broader on the other than conditional rights, human rights cannot be conferred by declarations or political manifestos on non-human animals or people: not on non-human animals because non-human animals cannot have them, and not on people because people already have them. In the strictest sense, many of the rights that have come to be labeled as human rights in the fairly recent past, such as the supposed rights to a certain level of income or to a certain level of education are not human rights at all, however politically popular it may be to say that they are. If they are rights in any sense, they are civil rights, acquired rights that are conferred by some civil authority. Human rights in the strictest sense have a more philosophical tone. One notable human right is that of entering into obligations, the right, odd as it sounds, to bear duties. Another is the human right to freedom, the relatively unconditional right that people who are capable of acting autonomously have as such beings. We have a right to liberty without the need for the right to be conferred, while other beings, such as non-human animals that may have the broader absolutely unconditional rights, lack this relatively unconditional right. This is why liberty is intimately tied with human dignity, even as it is demonstrably allied with human prosperity. All other rights that have correlative duties are conditional rights, rights of only some right-holders. They are acquired rights. Their acquisition is conditional on meeting certain qualifications. Someone has a right to have a promise kept only if he meets the qualifications of being the promisee. Someone has a right to receive charity only if he meets the qualification of being in need. From this it should be evident that conditional rights may be either conditioned-rights or unconditionedrights. What makes a right conditioned is a condition of the right itself, that of the correlative duty, an imperfect duty, not being conferred on other qualified rightholders. What makes a right conditional is a condition for acquiring the right in the first place.

#### The right to strike is a conditional right, so viewing it as unconditional is impossible. Fiat doesn’t solve because its intrinsic to the nature of the principle and the aff is a binding policy, not just view X as Y.

#### [1] The right to strike is conditional on the government existing and enforcing it: A] The Sqou proves that without the state, the right doesn’t exist, which means turning the NC non-uniques the aff B] State of nature would just mean people could take the action, not that they have a guaranteed right to do so.

#### [2] The right is conditional on the existence of certain social institutions: IE a workplace and employer to strike against, and a job to stop doing. This doesn’t apply to unconditional rights like freedom or life, since they are intrinsic to human nature not social constructs.

#### [3] Unconditional rights cannot conflict with each other, as otherwise neither would be absolute, but the right to strike conflicts with 1] The right to life of those deprived of stuff like medicine, which is fundamental to every human action, and 2] is intrinsically violent as when enforcing it you must know everything about a particular situation, and you must act immediately in the face of a violation, otherwise you allow injustice to occur. But these are simultaneously impossible since a) we cannot know everything about a particular situation and b) there is not infinite time to make an ethical decision. Given that there must be deliberation over any moral decision to ensure its correctness in relation to the situation, the very act of deliberation is violence, as you allow the injustice to continue, but if you were to act immediately you would act without proper knowledge to correctly address the injustice.

#### [4] Weighing: A] Even if the aff proves that an unconditional right such the right to life or right to freedom entails the right to strike, this doesn’t prove that it is unconditional since it is contingent on another right, and is therefore not sufficient to affirm B] Unconditional rights are unconditionally good and lack exceptions, so one instance where the right is wrong is sufficient to prove it is conditional too that particular circumstance.

### 4

#### Reject 1AR Theory arguments – a) double bind – either you can put minor ink next to answer of my responses and extend your arguments to auto-win or the judge has to intervene to see if the 2ar answers to the 2n are good enough. That also means reasonability on 1ar theory since some level of intervention is inevitable so it’s net better to focus on things like substance education. b) they have 2 speeches on theory while I have 1 which means they can structurally preempt my answers and respond to them and I can’t do either c) infinite abuse in the context of aff abuse doesn’t make sense since you can read 1ac theory and uplayer with other 1ar offs like Ks d) they have 1 more minute on the theory debate due to a 7-6 skew which o/w since theory is mainly about substance e) evaluate 2n paradigm issues and framing since they have 2 speeches to answer and weigh against 1 argument and I need another speech to compensate f) some judges evaluate 2ar theory arguments when a 2n kicks out of an uncondo CP which means they can generate 3 speeches of theory offense g) If they get 1ar theory, we get 2nr theory to check back against infinite 1ar abuse and k2 reciprocity both get two speeches to read theory h) they can blow up dropped arguments in the next speech and I don’t have the chance to frame them out but they can which means only dropped arguments for them are game over. Also eval every layer in every speech leads to a 2-1 speech skew which is irreciprocal and leads to infinite abuse since the 2nr cant respond.

### Framing

#### 1] Can’t prove an unconditional right under util since if a strike ever leads to pain by hindering others from going to work or turns violent then it would be unjust – negate on presumption

#### 2] There is no IL between recognizing a right to strike and workers actually choosing to exercise that right – insofar as it can threaten job loss only a few activits would do it – proves no solvency.

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> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
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* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)