### 1

#### Interpretation and Violation: The affirmative must defend the desirability of the hypothetical implementation of a just government recognizing an unconditional worker’s right to strike. This doesn’t entail a specific method of engaging in the topic, just that the affirmative must derive offense from a legal recognition of it. They don’t.

#### Resolved requires policy action

Louisiana State Legislature (<https://www.legis.la.gov/legis/Glossary.aspx>) Ngong

**Resolution**

**A legislative instrument** that generally is **used for** making declarations, **stating policies**, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution **uses the term "resolved".** Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

#### Violation:

#### Standards

#### [1] Fairness – their interp explodes limits and allows affs to monopolize the moral high ground. The lack of a stable mechanism lets them radically re-contextualize their aff and erase neg ground via perms. Fairness is good and prior – [A] Violating the fairness of disabled folk is worse since it uses their disabilities to your advantage [B] disabled folk will always be behind within systems of fluency which means our weighing claims are key to accommodation [C] . Cutting negs to every possible aff wrecks small school debaters, which has a disparate impact on under-resourced and disabled debaters. Anything else lets you defend ableism bad for 6 means and disabled debaters have to say ableism good or else they loose leading to self hate and ressentiment – turns under your ROTB

#### They don’t get to weigh the aff – it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it.

#### [2] Switch Side Debate – read your stuff on the neg which non-uniques your offense and is net better since a Kritik on the neg has to be tailored to the aff– otherwise your discussion starts and ends at the 1AC.=

#### [3] Refinement – a well-defined resolution is critical to allow the neg to refute the aff in an in-depth fashion. This process of negation produces iterative testing and improvement. Only a resolution with ground on both sides allows for the most clash which controls the internal link to education. Committees outweigh because they discuss the best topic for a stasis point – even if some resolutions are bad it is net better for a group to create a topic rather than an individual.

#### [3] Ableism –

#### [A] Autism DA – Students with autism need rules to engage in the space

NASDN 16 (Nebraska Autism Spectrum Disorders Network, 8-29-2016, "Rules and Routines," University Of Nebraska–Lincoln, <https://www.unl.edu/asdnetwork/virtual-strategies/rules-and-routines> Jwala )

Many **students with autism rely on rules** and routines to **keep their environment predictable and, therefore, feel safer.** Educational professionals and parents must understand the importance of rules and routines for individuals with autism and apply them in various settings and situations. **Application of rules** and routines in school and home **helps students with autism engage more successfully in activities** and prevents problem behavior. Routines help create an efficient environment – they save time. When students know routines, they can perform daily activities more quickly.

#### [B] Anxiety – refusing to disclose the aff hurts those with severe anxiety who need predictable advocacies and need to know about the future to avoid triggering attacks

#### [4] TVA – read the aff on my wiki – the bray aff is a semiocap aff that uses disabled folk to turn capitalism against itself

#### Framing:

#### Theory before the aff – A] Prior question. My theory argument calls into question the ability to run the argument in the first place. They can’t say the same even if they criticize theory because theory makes rules of the game not just normative statements about what debaters should say. B] Fair testing. Judge their arguments knowing I wasn’t given a fair shot to answer them. Prefer theory takes out K because they could answer my arguments, but I couldn’t answer theirs. Without testing their args, we don’t know if they’re valid, so you prefer fairness impacts on strength of link. Impact turns any critical education since a marketplace of ideas where we innovate, and test ideas presumes equal access.

#### Paradigm Issues:

#### Use competing interps – topicality is question of models of debate which they should have to proactively justify and we’ll win reasonability links to our offense.

#### Drop the debater because dropping the arg is severance which moots 7 minutes of 1nc offense

#### No rvis—it’s your burden to be fair and T—same reason you don’t win for answering inherency or putting defense on a disad.

#### They can’t weigh the case—lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume false—they’re also only winning case because we couldn’t engage with it

#### No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative

### 2

#### **A. Interpretation: If the affirmative reads arguments related to mental health or suicide they must give a content warning before their speech. These conversations are empirically trauma inducing and warnings are a good idea. Carter 15,** [Angela Carter (Ph.D. Candidate in Feminist Studies, University of Minnesota), "Teaching with Trauma: Trigger Warnings, Feminism, and Disability Pedagogy," Disabilities Studies Quarterly, 2015] Similarly, in their original petition, Oberlin students suggested trigger warnings when "issues of privilege and oppression" arise in the classroom (AAUP). Such suggestions also conflate potential discomfort, or personal injury, with the disabling affects of trauma and being triggered. However, an opportunity arises when students make these conflations. As educators, rather than dismissing trigger warnings outright, we could engage students about how systems of oppression work and explain the difference between pedagogically productive discomfort and trigger-induced re-traumatization. As educators, we could use this conversation as an opportunity to discuss the use of trigger warnings before the Internet. Historically, trigger warnings, Andrea Smith reminds us, began as "a part of a complex of practices" within the anti-violence movement working to recognize "that we are not unaffected by the political and intellectual work that we do" and that "the labor of healing has to be shared by all" (Smith).

#### **B. Violation: They didn’t give a content warning – its on my wiki**

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

#### **C. Standard:**

#### **1. Access – Content warnings for those who suffer from trauma or anxiety are excluded from the conversation without content warnings. Carter 15,** [Angela Carter (Ph.D. Candidate in Feminist Studies, University of Minnesota), "Teaching with Trauma: Trigger Warnings, Feminism, and Disability Pedagogy," Disabilities Studies Quarterly, 2015] Given these findings, it is imperative that the debate on trigger warnings focus on the inherent questions of access. However, because of the misuse of "triggered" to reference anything that makes someone uncomfortable, disagreements about the classroom as a "safe space" often divert the conversation away from any real discussion of pedagogy and access in higher education. In his 2012 research, Mark Salzer found that students with mental illness were more likely to withdraw because of the impact of "perceived sigma and discrimination" than because of personal struggles with the symptoms or stresses related to their disability (Salzer 1). Because such students are "often viewed as disruptive, lacking academic skill, prone to violence" they are often socially isolated and left alone to question "how welcome they are on campus" (2). These findings suggest that simply providing information about mental illness and "chiding the audience to treat individuals with mental illness" by noting the available resources, is not an effective approach to decreasing the rate of withdraw for disabled students (6). The false conflations of access with "safety" allow accommodations to be dismissed, and only serve to further marginalize mentally disabled students by telling them they are in fact not welcome because their needs disrupt the processes of learning their peers deserve. In the most basic sense, accommodations are not about "safety," but about access to opportunity for a more livable life. When disability is denied because it is not understood or seen, or when access is denied because it is inconvenient or complicated, humanity is denied. While it is certainly possible to recognize trauma as a mental disability and still be hesitant toward trigger warnings as an accommodation practice,14 the content and tenor of that conversation would be far removed from the outright hostility and rejection that has reverberated most widely. When presented as an access measure, it becomes evident that trigger warnings do not provide a way to "opt out" of anything, nor do they offer protection from the realities of the world. Trigger warnings provide a way to "opt in" by lessening the power of the shock and the unexpectedness, and granting the traumatized individual agency to attend to the affect and effects of their trauma. Traumatized individuals know that trigger warnings will not save us. Such warnings simply allow us to do the work we need to do so that we can participate in the conversation or activity. They allow us to enter the conversation, just like automatic doors allow people who use wheelchairs to more easily enter a building.

#### Voters: Access is an independent voter – a) it’s a prior question to engaging in the space b) it’s a violation of the humanity of the opponent c) we are people before we’re debaters which makes it most intrinsic to the nature of the activity.

### 3

#### 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 speak first and last since I should be able to compensate by choosing – it’s the most logical since you don’t say vote for the player who shoots the most 3 points, the better player wins.

#### Reject their framing on inclusion – they exclude all offense except what follows from their specific fwk which shuts out those without the resources to prepare.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic and 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.

#### Their framing justifies permissibility since it only tells you what to do in face of one problem which means everything outside that instance isn’t condemned.

### 4

#### The meta-ethic is procedural moral realism - substantive realism holds that moral truths exist independently of that in the empirical world. Prefer procedural realism –

#### [1] Uncertainty – our experiences are inaccessible to others which allows people to say they don’t experience the same, however a priori principles are universally applied to all agents.

#### [2] Naturalistic fallacy – experience only tells us what is since we can only perceive what is, not what ought to be, this means experience may be generally useful but should not be the basis for ethical action.

#### Practical Reason is that procedure. To ask for why we should be reasoners concedes its authority since it uses reason – anything else is nonbinding.

#### Moral law must be universal—any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with liberty.

#### Prefer –

#### 1] freedom is the key to the process of justification of arguments. Willing that we should abide by their ethical theory presupposes that we own ourselves in the first place.

#### I contend that recognizing a right to strike violates liberty –

#### 1] Strikes violate fundamental 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 recut Lex VM

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?

#### 2] Promise breaking – employees sign a contract with their employer and promise to work – striking is a unilateral violation of that.

### 5

#### Presumption and permissibility negates – a) statements are more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways o/w on probability 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.

#### Every reason is equally as violent in its creation.

**Derrida,** Jacques Derrida, “Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority” //Massa But **justice,** however unpresentable it may be, doesn't wait.· It **is that which must not wait.** To be direct, simple and brief, let us say this: **a just decision is always required immediately, "right away." It cannot furnish itself with** infinite information and the **unlimited knowledge of conditions,** rules or hypothetical imperatives **that could justify it.** And **even if it did** have all that at its disposal, even if it did give itself the time, all the time and all the necessary facts about the matter, **the moment of decision,** as such, **always remains a finite moment of urgency** and precipitation, since it must not be the consequence or the effectof this theoretical or historical knowledge, of this reflection or this deliberation, **since it always marks the interruption of the** juridico- or ethico- or politico-**cognitive deliberation that precedes it,** that must precede it. The instant of decision is a madness, says Kierkegaard. This is particularly true of the instant of the just decision that must rend time and defy dialectics. It is a madness. **Even if time** and prudence,the patience of knowledge and the mastery of conditions **were** hypothetically **unlimited, the decision would be structurally finite,** however late it came, decision of urgency and precipitation, **acting in** the night of **non-knowledge and non-rule**

#### External world skep is true.

**Neta**, Ram. “External World Skepticism.” The Problem of The External World, **2014**, philosophy.unc.edu/files/2014/06/The-Problem-of-the-External-World.pdf. //Massa

You take yourself to know that you have hands. But notice that, **if you do have hands, then you are not merely a brain floating in a vat of nutrient fluid and being electrochemically stimulated to have the sensory experiences** that you have now: such a brain does not have hands, but you do. So if you know that you do have hands, then you must also be in a position to know that you are not such a brain. **But how could you know that you are not such a brain? If you were such a brain, everything would seem exactly as it does now**; **you would** (by hypothesis) **have all the same sensory experiences that you’re having right now.** Since your **empirical knowledge of the world** around you **must somehow be based upon your sensory experiences, how could these experiences**—the very same experiences that you would have if you were a brain in a vat—**furnish you with knowledge that you’re not such a brain? And if you don’t know that you’re not such a brain, then you cannot know that you have hands.**

### 6

#### Negate –

#### 1] just[[3]](#footnote-3) means “very recently; in the immediate past” so the rez has already passed.

#### 2] of[[4]](#footnote-4) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time.

#### 3] recognize[[5]](#footnote-5) is to “Officially regard (a qualification) as valid or proper” but a right isn’t a qualification.

#### 4] to[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location.

### Case

#### The topic’s call for unionization and strikes might have worked a century ago, but post digital infosphere, the solvency is impossible.

**Berardi 11** [Franco Berardi, Italian communist theorist and activist in the autonomist tradition, whose work mainly focuses on the role of the media and information technology within post-industrial capitalism “Chapter 4 Exhastion and Subjectivity.” After the Future, by Franco Bifo Berardi et al., AK Press, 2011. P. 107-108 // LEX JB]

The financial cycle is bleeding the social environment dry: sucking energies, resources, and the future. And giving nothing back. Recovery of the financial process of valorization of capital is totally separated from the cycle of material production and social demand. Financial capitalism has obtained autonomy from social life. Let’s consider the political side of the same problem: once upon a time when society was suffering the blows of recession, workers reacted with strikes, struggle and political organization, and forced state intervention in order to increase demand. Industrial growth needed mass consumption and social stability. What is impressive in the ongoing crisis, on the contrary, is the widespread passivity of the workers, their inability to unionize. The political trend in Europe is the meltdown of leftist parties and the labor movement. In the US, Obama is daily attacked by racist and populist mobs, but no progressive social movement is emerging. 1.2 million people have had their mortgages foreclosed upon and lost their houses following the sub-prime swindle, but no organized reaction has surfaced. People suffer and cry alone. In the old time of industrial capitalism, the working class could fight against a target that was precisely identified: the boss, the entrepreneur who was the owner of material things like the factory, and of the product of his laborers. Nowadays the boss has vanished. He is fragmented into billions of financial segments, and disseminated into millions of financial agents scattered all around the world. The workers themselves are part of recombinant financial capital. They are expecting future revenues from their pension fund investments. They own stock options in the enterprise exploiting their labor. They are hooked up, like a fly in a spider web, and if they move, they get strangled, but if they don’t move, the spider will suck their life from them. Society may rot, fall apart, agonize. It is not going to affect the political and economic stability of capitalism. What is called economic recovery is a new round of social devastation. So the recession is over, capitalism is recovering. Nonetheless, unemployment is rising and misery is spreading. This means that financial capitalism is autonomous from society. Capitalism doesn’t need workers: it just needs cellular fractals of labor, underpaid, precarious, de-personalised. Fragments of impersonal nervous energy, recombined by the network. The crisis is going to push forward technological change, and the substitution of human labor with machines. The employment rate is not going to rise in the future, and productivity will increase. A shrinking number of workers will be forced to produce more and more, and to work overtime. The real bubble is the work bubble. We have been working too much; we are still working too much. The human race does not need more goods, it needs a redistribution of existing goods, an intelligent application of technology and a worldwide cut in the lifetime dedicated to labor. Social energies have to be freed from labor dependence, and returned to the field of social affection, education, and therapy. We should take seriously the concept of autonomy. In the present condition autonomy means exodus from the domain of economic law: Out-onomy, abandonment of the field of economic exchange, self-organization of knowledge and of production in a sphere of social life which is no longer dependent on economic culture and expectations – barter, free exchange of time and of competence, food self reliance, occupation of territories in the cities, organization of self-defense.

#### Semiocap misdiagnoses the problem—the problem is not the inability of the individual to be truly individual, it is the individual as a form of subjectivity itself.

Dean, Jodi. October 10, 2016. “**Collective Desire And The Pathology Of The Individual, Part 1 (Jodi Dean).”**  https://jcrt.org/religioustheory/2016/10/10/collective-desire-and-the-pathology-of-the-individual-jodi-dean/

An **interesting strand of contemporary theory designates the specificity of capitalism with the qualifier “cognitive**.”[[1]](http://jcrt.org/religioustheory/2016/10/10/collective-desire-and-the-pathology-of-the-individual-jodi-dean/" \l "_edn1) I do not write under this term, although I am influenced by theorists who do insofar as they also highlight communication. Franco **Berardi, for example, observes that “cognitive labor is essentially a labor communication**, that is to say communication put to work.”[[2]](http://jcrt.org/religioustheory/2016/10/10/collective-desire-and-the-pathology-of-the-individual-jodi-dean/" \l "_edn2) While communication encompasses a wide array of waged and non-waged activities expropriated for and exploited by contemporary capitalism, **the term “cognitive capitalism” feels to me like an academic version of the hacker dream of leaving the meat. It gives away too much**. **The term accepts the neoliberal claim for a knowledge society wherein workers are primarily** creative workers or a kind of “**cognitariat**.” It’s not surprising, then, to find those interested in contemporary knowledge management emphasizing the convergence between capitalist management gurus like Peter Drucker and Marxists Antonio Negri and Paulo Virno.[[3]](http://jcrt.org/religioustheory/2016/10/10/collective-desire-and-the-pathology-of-the-individual-jodi-dean/" \l "_edn3) In a way**, the term “cognitive capitalism” makes the world appear smarter than it is**, **as if intelligence replaced manufacturing when in fact manufacturing was pushed out of some countries and onto others in the search for ever cheaper labor**, **when factory work was becoming all the more brutal and massified even if less visible**.[[4]](http://jcrt.org/religioustheory/2016/10/10/collective-desire-and-the-pathology-of-the-individual-jodi-dean/" \l "_edn4) **Further, the term cognitive capitalism implies that affective labor is something new. This obscures rather than acknowledges the long histories of women’s affective labor and the struggles around attempts to enclose it in the home and harness it for capital**.[[5]](http://jcrt.org/religioustheory/2016/10/10/collective-desire-and-the-pathology-of-the-individual-jodi-dean/" \l "_edn5) **Finally, “cognitive capitalism” overplays immateriality even as it brings materiality, meat, bones, and blood back in via the emphasis on brains.** And here **especially I am reluctant to embrace the term because of the ways its diagnoses, the pathologies it identifies, can be rendered functional for capita**l**: they can tell capital what it needs to fix. Workers too depressed? Try Zoloft!** Working so many hours that focus is impossible? Try Adderall! **Or, in a more recent configuration, one that is sinister in its playfulness: bored by your screen of spreadsheets and memos? Watch some cute kitty videos – these improve worker efficiency**![[6]](http://jcrt.org/religioustheory/2016/10/10/collective-desire-and-the-pathology-of-the-individual-jodi-dean/" \l "_edn6) **Rather than viewing contemporary capitalism as cognitive, I view it as communicative**.[[7]](http://jcrt.org/religioustheory/2016/10/10/collective-desire-and-the-pathology-of-the-individual-jodi-dean/" \l "_edn7) As Hardt and Negri write, “Communication is the form of capitalist production in which capital has succeeded in submitting society entirely and globally to its regime, suppressing all alternative paths.”[[8]](http://jcrt.org/religioustheory/2016/10/10/collective-desire-and-the-pathology-of-the-individual-jodi-dean/" \l "_edn8) Whether of affects, images, anxieties, or ideas, communication is the means of capitalist subsumption, the vehicle for its intensification and expansion. **My focus here is on one pathology associated with the capture and instrumentalization of our communicative capacities, that it to say, on what happens when our basic sociality serves as a primary means of capitalist expropriation, which it has since capitalism began. This pathology is the individual form of subjectivity**, **a form that emerges historically and is today the site of opposing dynamics, of pressures that simultaneously disperse, concentrate, and overburden individuality as personal singularity**. My discussion might be particular to the hyper-individualistic culture of the United States. In an overview of histories of the individual, the political theorist Steven Lukes describes differences among nineteenth century French, German, English, and American concepts of the individual, noting how the American version implied capitalism, liberal democracy, and the American Dream.[[9]](http://jcrt.org/religioustheory/2016/10/10/collective-desire-and-the-pathology-of-the-individual-jodi-dean/" \l "_edn9) I do not attend to these differences (and so may over generalize from an American situation, which may still be beneficial insofar as it sets out a kind of imperialist individuating). Rather, **I focus on the individual as a form like the commodity is a form. The commodity is a form for value. The individual is a form for subjectivity, indeed, a form endeavoring to abolish collective subjectivity by separating it into and containing it within individuated bodies and psych**es. C.B. MacPherson locates a “possessive individual” at the heart of the liberal theory of the seventeenth century which conceived the individual “as essentially the proprietor of his own person or capacities, owing nothing to society for them.”[[10]](http://jcrt.org/religioustheory/2016/10/10/collective-desire-and-the-pathology-of-the-individual-jodi-dean/" \l "_edn10) **For liberals like Thomas Hobbes and John Locke**, MacPherson argues, “**The human essence is freedom from dependence on the wills of others, and freedom is a function of possession**.”[[11]](http://jcrt.org/religioustheory/2016/10/10/collective-desire-and-the-pathology-of-the-individual-jodi-dean/" \l "_edn11) **This individual is not understood as part of something larger, as fundamentally interconnected with others, as dependent on relations to others human and nonhuman. Rather, it is a proprietor of capacities engaging other proprietors. This necessarily and unavoidably capitalistic orientation, fundamental not only to liberal understandings of property but also to the market and to contract**s, is crucial to MacPherson’s critique of liberalism. We should note its fundamental reflexivity: proprietorship relies on a series of separations and enclosures. **Capacities are separate from others as well as separate from the self or ego, which can thus enclose these capacities within its person**. Training, whether moral or technical, is then work on and for the self rather than part of collective reproduction for the common good. **Enclosed within the individual, capacities become so many objects available for exchange, and, as capitalism evolves and expands, for investment, stylization, and self-branding**. **Even as I treat the individual as pathology, I also consider how we are moving beyond the pathology of the individual form.**
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