# 1NC

## 1

### Truth Testing

#### 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 – 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.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### Negate because either the aff is true meaning its bad for us to clash w/ it because it turns us into Fake News people OR it’s not and it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

#### no 1ar arguments bc they require intervention to evaluate them against the nc

#### 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 so it's constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

#### 8] Good Samaritan Paradox -- affirming negates because in order to say you want to fix x problem, that assumes x problem exists in the first place, thus eliminating nukes presupposes nukes exist which means negation is a prior question

#### 9] Zeno’s Paradox – motion is impossible, because moving half way causes half more and half more which is infinitely regressive and means elimination of arsenals is logically impossible

#### **10] The holographic principle is the most reasonable conclusion**

Stromberg 15[Joseph Stromberg- “Some physicists believe we're living in a giant hologram — and it's not that far-fetched” <https://www.vox.com/2015/6/29/8847863/holographic-principle-universe-theory-physics> Vox. June 29th 2015] War Room Debate AI

Some physicists actually believe that the universe we live in might be a hologram. The idea isn't that the universe is some sort of fake simulation out of The Matrix, but rather that even though we appear to live in a three-dimensional universe, it might only have two dimensions. It's called the holographic principle. The thinking goes like this: Some distant two-dimensional surface contains all the data needed to fully describe our world — and much like in a hologram, this data is projected to appear in three dimensions. Like the characters on a TV screen, we live on a flat surface that happens to look like it has depth. It might sound absurd. But when physicists assume it's true in their calculations, all sorts of big physics problems — such as the nature of black holes and the reconciling of gravity and quantum mechanics — become much simpler to solve. In short, the laws of physics seem to make more sense when written in two dimensions than in three. "It's not considered some wild speculation among most theoretical physicists," says Leonard Susskind, the Stanford physicist who first formally defined the idea decades ago. "It's become a working, everyday tool to solve problems in physics." But there's an important distinction to be made here. There's no direct evidence that our universe actually is a two-dimensional hologram. These calculations aren't the same as a mathematical proof. Rather, they're intriguing suggestions that our universe could be a hologram. And as of yet, not all physicists believe we have a good way of testing the idea experimentally.

#### 11] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to the aff which means it’s impossible to have complete tolerance for an idea since that tolerance relies on excluding a perspective.

#### 12] Decision Making Paradox- in order to decide to do the affirmative we need a decision-making procedure to enact it, vote for it, and to determine it is a good decision. But to chose a decision-making procedure requires another meta level decision making procedure leading to infinite regress since every decision requires another decision to chose how to make a decision.

## 2

### Theory

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must specify what their favorite car movie is. If they haven’t watched it then they should lose. Mine is Cars 3

#### Watching *Cars* fosters prosocial behavior – that solves friendship, happiness, and education which solves the aff Leeuw and der Laan 17:

Rebecca N. H. de Leeuw, [(PhD cum laude, 2011) is an Assistant Professor of Communication Science, Behavioural Science Institute, Radboud University. She devotes her research to the role of parenting and media in relation to character strengths and well-being in children and adolescents. Her research belongs to the field of positive media psychology.] and Christa A. van der Laan, [(MsC, 2016) is an Alumna of Communication Science, Behavioural Science Institute, Radboud University. She did her Master thesis on Disney and helping behavior in children, and after graduating she collaborated on the present study.] December 1, 2017, “Helping behavior in Disney animated movies and children’s helping behavior in the Netherlands” <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17482798.2017.1409245> //LHP AV

**This study is the first to examine whether Disney animated characters can inspire children to help others** immediately upon exposure. This experiment involved 113 Dutch children (M = 9.03; SD = .738) and their friends. Children in the experimental condition were exposed to a Disney clip in which the main character helped a friend, while children in the control condition watched a clip without helping behavior. Afterward, children’s helping behavior toward their friends was assessed during a puzzle challenge. **A regression analysis revealed that children exposed to the helping Disney character were more likely to help their friends than children who did not watch this.** The findings indicate a short-term effect of watching a helping Disney animated character on children’s helping behavior. Keywords: Positive media psychologyDisney animated movieschildrenprosocial behaviorand helping Previous article View issue table of contents Next article Introduction “Finishing first isn’t as important as finishing like a winner.” - Amber Whitener (2012) about the Disney • Pixar movie Cars After the dawn of positive psychology (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), media psychologists started to devote increased attention to examining how media content, particularly movies, can be meaningful and help humans flourish (Oliver, Hartmann, & Woolley, 2012; Oliver & Raney, 2011; Wirth, Hofer, & Schramm, 2012). **One quality found to be associated with flourishing is prosocial behavior** (Lyubomirsky, King, & Diener, 2005; Peterson & Seligman, 2004), which is defined as voluntary behavior meant to benefit another (Eisenberg, Fabes, & Spinrad, 2007; Padilla-Walker, Coyne, Fraser, & Stockdale, 2013). **Among children, prosocial behavior has already been found to be related to thriving. For instance, prosocial children are liked more, have more close friends, and are happier than less social children** (Cillessen & Rose, 2005; Clark & Ladd, 2000; Hastings, Utendale, & Sullivan, 2007; Holder & Coleman, 2008; Östberg, 2003). **Prosocial behavior is even a forerunner of later academic achievement, probably by fostering supportive social and intellectual relationships** (Caprara, Barbaranelli, Pastorelli, Bandura, & Zimbardo, 2000; Moore & Allen, 1996). Evidence has revealed that prosocial behavior in children can also be enhanced by watching television (Mares & Woodard, 2005, 2012). As television still dominates children’s media lives (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2010), this might be a promising way to contribute to their well-being. In the current study, **it was examined whether Disney movies can encourage children to help others, which is important because (I) Disney movies are extremely popular** (Brand Finance, 2016; Brode, 2005; Buckingham, 1997; Fischer, Schwartz, Richards, Goldstein, & Rojas, 1991; Forgacs, 1992) and (II) contain a vast amount of prosocial messages (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013; Ward, 1996, 2002). Theoretical background The world of Disney The popularity of Disney can be well illustrated by the fact that young children between three and six years old are already able to recognize Disney based on its brand logo (Fischer et al., 1991). Especially **Disney’s animated movies are popular, and children do often watch these movies repeatedly** (Dreier, 2007). In addition, most parents studied adore Disney and accept it as quality family entertainment (Brode, 2005; Buckingham, 1997; Forgacs, 1992). In popular culture research, Disney has been identified as an important storyteller as its movies are among the first stories young viewers use to learn about the world. Ward (1996, 2002) argued that **Disney movies are an important moral educator with (mythic) narratives promoting moral values**. According to Giroux (1994), **Disney movies inspire at least as much cultural authority and legitimacy for educating specific roles, values, and ideals as other important socialization sources, such as the family and schools.** Yet existing studies on Disney movies have focused predominantly on the presence of negative content. For instance, Disney movies have been repeatedly criticized for containing aggression (Coyne & Whitehead, 2008), depicting romantic relationships as being created simply from “love at first sight” and easily maintained (Tanner, Haddock, Zimmerman, & Lund, 2003), portraying women in gender-typed roles (England, Descartes, & Collier-Meek, 2011; Tanner et al., 2003; Ward, 2002), marginalizing mothers (Tanner et al., 2003; Worthington, 2009), portraying the elderly in a negative way (Robinson, Callister, Magoffin, & Moore, 2007), delivering the what-is-beautiful-is-good stereotype (Bazzini, Curtin, Joslin, Regan, & Martz, 2010), demonizing bad behaviors (Fouts, Callan, Piasentin, & Lawson, 2006), and containing high levels of negative verbalizations about mental illness (Lawson & Fouts, 2004). In sum, most existing research puts Disney movies in a rather negative light. Nevertheless, some studies have demonstrated that Disney movies depict large numbers of prosocial behaviors—mostly altruistic acts motivated predominantly by others’ needs and welfare (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013; Ward, 1996, 2002). Ward (1996, 2002) described how Disney’s narratives can promote moral values such as honesty and openness that help truth win out. Moreover, Brode (2005) argued that Disney promotes multiculturalism with a prophetic vision of a world in which the uniqueness of all others is respected while simultaneously celebrating a shared human core. **And a content analysis revealed that Disney animated movies are overwhelmingly prosocial in nature** (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). More specifically, this study demonstrated that Disney movies depict on average approximately one prosocial act per minute. Compared to children’s television programming, the amount of prosocial behavior in Disney movies is nearly seven times higher (cf. Smith et al., 2006). Furthermore, most prosocial acts depicted in Disney movies are not accompanied by aggression (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). Notably, compared to the quantity of violence in children’s television programs, aggression in Disney movies is quite low (Coyne & Whitehead, 2008). Another study revealed that Disney movies also contain strong messages about the meaning of family relationships and that family members in Disney movies are found to make huge sacrifices for each other, putting the family’s well-being before their own (Tanner et al., 2003). Related to this, it is important to note that an in-depth study by Coyne and Whitehead (2008) demonstrated that, although Disney movies contain relational aggression, not only is the amount comparably low compared to the extent of violence in children’s television programs, but these aggressive behaviors are also often committed by “bad” characters, which would reduce the chance of facilitating imitation. Disney movies and children’s prosocial behavior Not only has research focused merely on the negative content of Disney movies, the number of empirical studies on the effects of Disney movies on children is also scarce, especially concerning possible favorable effects. To our knowledge, only one study examined the potential beneficial effect of Disney on children empirically. In this longitudinal study, it was examined whether engagement with Disney princess media and products were related to prosocial behavior among toddlers (Coyne, Linder, Rasmussen, Nelson, & Birkbeck, 2016). Findings of this study demonstrated that engagement with Disney princesses predicted future prosocial behaviors, but only for boys with high levels of parental active mediation. The current study extends this earlier work by examining children’s observed helping behavior immediately upon exposure to Disney, which is important as both short-term and long-term media effects are found with each having different underlying mechanisms explaining the effects (Bushman & Huesmann, 2006). Short-term effects are found mostly due to the priming of existing scripts, schemas, or beliefs, while long-term effects require the learning of these scripts, schemas, or beliefs. The current study aims to extend the literature by examining whether Disney can inspire helping behavior in children on the short-term. Previous exposure to Disney might play a role in the short-term effects of Disney movies as well. An often-applied theory for explaining the impact of prosocial television on children’s prosocial behavior is social cognitive theory (Bandura, 2001, 2004; Padilla-Walker et al., 2013), which explains that human behavior is learned directly not only by experience, but also from observing role models, which can also be Disney characters. In light of social cognitive theory, and in line with the long-term effects described by Bushman and Huesmann (2006), Disney movies are an interesting phenomenon to examine. Given that Disney movies are often watched repeatedly (Dreier, 2007), it is likely that children may come to understand the messages better (Bandura, 2001, 2004; Mares & Woodard, 2012; Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). Therefore, in the present study, it is examined if the short-term effects of Disney are stronger for children with higher previous exposure. To evoke moral reasoning upon exposure, it is important not to focus on low-cost helping behaviors because these are often trivial behaviors by habit (Eisenberg, 1992). On the contrary, high-cost actions are clearly inconvenient to the initiator and may result in punishment or loss. Although Padilla-Walker et al.’s (2013) content analysis demonstrated that most depicted prosocial acts in Disney were of low cost, the number of acts high of cost is substantial (29%, compared to 71% for low cost). Moreover, these high-cost acts are more likely to involve behaviors as helping and sharing instead of verbal forms of prosocial behavior, such as complimenting and encouraging. More specifically, helping and sharing are often visible upon a clear instrumental need (Dunfield, 2014) and visibly inconvenient for the Disney character (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). In short, helping and sharing are interesting to examine as these behaviors are high of cost and often portrayed in Disney movies. Developmental challenges of children in middle childhood In this study, **children in middle childhood were included because this is an age group that is largely understudied concerning the effects of prosocial television** (Mares & Woodard, 2005; Strasburger, Wilson, & Jordan, 2009). During middle childhood, children become more concerned about the welfare of others. Considering Lawrence Kohlberg’s stages of moral development, middle childhood is an important phase of life as most children then move from the first level—the preconventional level—to the next level—the conventional level. An individual at the conventional level is living up to what is expected by others, for whom “being good” is important (Kohlberg, 1976). This milestone was also acknowledged in the work about prosocial reasoning and behavior by Eisenberg (1992). Her findings indicated that, during middle childhood, children not only become increasingly altruistic toward others, but this behavior is also more often grounded in genuine feelings of empathy. In conclusion, the moral development during middle childhood is characterized by increases in concern for others and actual prosocial behavior toward others, which are exactly the values depicted in Disney movies (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013; Tanner et al., 2003; Ward, 1996, 2002). Bandura (2004) argued that media can help people prepare for the challenges they will encounter in life by modeling such situations and effective ways of overcoming them. Considering the developmental challenges that children face during middle childhood (Eisenberg, 1992; Kohlberg, 1976), Disney movies, with their rich content of depictions of characters acting altruistically (Brode, 2005; Padilla-Walker et al., 2013; Ward, 1996, 2002), may function as such a source of inspiration. Measuring actual helping behavior In previous studies on prosocial television, helping behaviors were typically measured by bringing children into a laboratory and inviting them to play a game after watching a video. During the game, children’s behaviors were observed to determine if they were altruistic or selfish (Mares & Woodard, 2005). Strikingly, among children in middle childhood, a few studies examined actual helping behavior. In two notable exceptions (i.e., Poulos, Rubinstein, & Liebert, 1975; Sprafkin, Liebert, & Poulos, 1975), children were invited to watch a television program. In the experimental condition of these classic studies, children watched a boy risking his life to save a puppy while children in the control conditions were not exposed to altruistic behaviors. Afterwards, the children were challenged to play a game while simultaneously taking care of a dog kennel a few miles away. If the children heard the dogs barking, indicating they were in distress, they could press a button; however, this would give them less time to play the game. Children who saw the boy rescuing the dog pushed the help button nearly twice as often as children who did not see this. In Disney movies, prosocial acts most often occur between friends (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). People are also more likely to help friends in real life (Padilla-Walker & Christensen, 2011; van Rijsewijk, Dijkstra, Pattiselanno, Steglich, & Veenstra, 2016). Therefore, in the present experimental study, children were challenged to play a game, during which help was warranted from a friend. To create a naturalistic setting, this friend was sitting next to them. In sum, we examined whether exposure to a prosocial Disney clip predicts children’s helping behavior toward their friends. Children in the experimental condition were invited to watch a clip from the Disney • Pixar movie Cars, in which the main character, Lightning McQueen, helps Strip “The King” Weathers finish the race after he broke down. This clip was chosen for the relatively high costs of helping, as Lightning McQueen loses the championship due to his efforts to help Weathers (Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). Nevertheless, when pushing Weathers over the finish line, the crowd is cheering to him, which can be seen as a reward for his helping efforts, which may further increase the likelihood of modeling (Bandura, 2001, 2004; Padilla-Walker et al., 2013). The movie Cars was also chosen because of its high popularity (Box Office Mojo, 2006; IMBd, 2016). Children in the control condition were also exposed to a clip from Cars, although without prosocial content. Afterwards, children were observed on their actual helping behavior during a puzzle challenge. This setup was inspired by previous experimental studies on the impact of prosocial behavior on television (Mares & Woodard, 2005; Poulos et al., 1975; Sprafkin et al., 1975). The hypotheses of the present study **In this study, it was hypothesized that children exposed to the prosocial Disney clip (H1) would help their friends more often and (H2) would spend a longer amount of time helping others than children who watched the clip without prosocial behavior**. Moreover, **it was expected that (H3) the effects of the prosocial Disney clip on children’s helping behavior would be stronger for children with higher levels of prior exposure to Disney movies and the movie Cars in particular**. In the analyses, **we controlled for children’s sex, age, initial levels of prosocial behavior** (Eisenberg, 1992; Eisenberg et al., 2007), **and appreciation of the movie clip** (Clifford & Gunter, 1995). Methods Sample characteristics The study was conducted at five primary schools in the eastern and southeastern region of the Netherlands. The final sample consisted of 113 children between 7 and 11 years of age (M = 9.03; SD = .738), 46.0% of whom were boys. The majority of the children had been born in the Netherlands (94.7%). These 113 children were paired with 113 other children who were not analyzed as part of the study. Design and procedure After gaining consent to participate from the headmaster of the schools, a letter was sent to the parents of the 243 children in the fifth and sixth year. This letter included a description of the study along with the request to give passive consent for their children to participate. Parents could return the forms within two weeks if they refused to agree to the participation of their children. The letter emphasized that all information would be treated as confidential. Only one parent did not give permission. Before the experiment, teachers were asked to form pairs of children who were friends as humans are more inclined to help friends (Eisenberg, 1992; Padilla-Walker & Christensen, 2011; van Rijsewijk et al., 2016). Previous findings indicated that teacher nominations can be a good alternative to peer nominations for social preference and popularity (van den Berg, Lansu, & Cillessen, 2015). Of the 242 children, four were not able to participate because they were not present. Moreover, six pairs were excluded because one of the children had to go to the bathroom during the experiment or were ad hoc paired to a classmate who was not their friend. Children were excited about participating in the study, and ad hoc paring enabled all children to participate. Pairs were randomly assigned to either the experimental or control condition. Data collection took place in April and May 2016. Children participated at their schools during school hours. As a cover story, children were told that the study was about Disney movies and participants’ opinions about them. The first questionnaire captured children’s demographic characteristics, initial levels of prosocial behavior, and prior exposure to Disney animated movies; it was filled out by the children individually in the classroom. Afterward, children were, in pairs, invited to come to a separate room. Once in the other room, the pairs watched a clip from the Disney movie Cars. In the experimental condition, **the clip showed the protagonist Lightning McQueen in the middle of a car race with Chick Hicks and Strip “The King” Weathers**. **At one point, Hicks sideswipes Weathers and sends him into a dangerous spin, triggering his breakdown. Upon seeing this, McQueen stops just short of the finish line, allowing Hicks to win, and drives back to push Weathers over the finish line**. In the control condition, the clip showed the beginning of the race, where nothing special happens; a part of a race was also shown in this condition, because a race itself may trigger thoughts of competition, which subsequently might affect children’s helping behavior. In this way, children in both conditions were exposed to competition. Both clips included the same three characters and were both 99 s in length. When the clip ended, **the children were challenged to complete a puzzle assignment**. Both children received 20 find-the-difference puzzles. Each puzzle consisted of two almost identical pictures from the movie Cars with only one difference. **The children had to try to find the difference between the pictures, circle it, and then move on to the next puzzle**. Children were told that they had to complete as many puzzles as possible within the timeframe of three minutes. This situation was created to suggest that the task was a competition, in order to keep the outcome measure equivalent to the depicted behavior (Mares & Woodard, 2005; Strasburger et al., 2009). However, the instructions did not include anything about competition, nor was there a prize for the winner. **They were also told that both children received different puzzles and that all puzzles had different levels of difficulty. If they could not find the difference, they were allowed to ask their friend to help.** An important rule was that the children could not start a new puzzle without finishing the previous one. After the rules were clear, the experimenters counted from three to zero before the children could start working on the puzzles. The differences between the pictures in the first two puzzles were so easy to find that none of the children had to ask for help. However, **to create a situation in which helping was warranted, puzzle number three in the stack of one child had no difference in it**. To continue, children with this unsolvable puzzle had to ask for help. **If the child still did not ask for help after searching for 30 s, the experimenters repeated the message that asking for help was allowed**. The other children in the pairs had only easy puzzles, so for them there was no need for assistance. Only the helping behavior from the children who had the solvable puzzles was observed, and the focus of the observation was whether these children would choose to continue to play the game or try to help their friends. More specifically, the measures for helping included how many times a child helped the other child in the pair and the total amount of time spent on helping (in seconds). After the puzzle assignment was finished, **the children had to fill out the last questionnaire individually. In line with the cover story, the questionnaire contained questions about the movie clip and the character**s. Upon completing the questionnaire, children received a sheet of stickers or a tiny notebook from Disney and were accompanied back to the classroom. Children were debriefed after all pairs were tested. After the data collection and analyses were complete, children and parents were informed about the results of the study. Measures Helping behavior outcomes Inspired by previous experimental studies on the impact of prosocial behavior on television, children’s helping behavior was assessed by inviting children to play a game and observing what happens if help is warranted (Mares & Woodard, 2005; Poulos et al., 1975; Sprafkin et al., 1975). Specifically, helping behavior was captured with (i) the number of times they helped and (ii) the total time they spent on helping their friend in seconds. Because the variable concerning the amount of time on helping was not normally distributed, with a skewness of 1.446 and a kurtosis of 3.287, quartiles were made for the analysis. Prior exposure to Disney animated movies Children’s exposure to Disney movies was assessed by presenting all of the most recently released animated Disney movies. Along with each title, the cover was presented to help children recognize the movie. For each movie, children were asked whether they had seen each movie, with the response options “never,” “one time,” “two times,” and “more than two times” (see also Sargent, Dalton, Heatherton, & Beach, 2003). Answers were summed, with higher scores indicating higher exposure to Disney movies. Children were also asked whether they had seen the movie Cars before. Potential confounders In the analyses, children’s sex, age, and initial levels of prosocial behavior were taken into account. Initial levels of prosocial behavior were captured using the prosocial scale of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) (Goodman, Meltzer, & Bailey, 1998). This scale contains five questions, such as “I am helpful if someone is hurt, upset or feeling ill,” which could be answered with “not true,” “somewhat true,” or “certainly true.” The Cronbach’s alpha was .57. Finally, appreciation of the clip was included based on children’s indication of whether they liked the clip or not (with five response options ranging from “totally disagree” to “totally agree”). Strategy of analyses After calculating descriptive statistics, t-tests and χ2-tests were conducted to examine whether randomization resulted in a balanced distribution of children’s sex, age, prior exposure to Disney movies, and initial prosocial behavior across conditions. The impact of the prosocial Disney clip on children’s helping behavior was examined using linear regression analyses. In the analyses, children’s sex, age, initial prosocial behavior, prior exposure to Disney movies and appreciation of the clip were included as covariates. Afterwards, the potential moderating effect of exposure to recently released Disney movies was examined. Results Descriptive statistics Descriptive statistics demonstrated that 76.1% of the children had seen at least half of the most recently released Disney movies once or more. The movie Cars had already been watched by 53.9% of the children, most often by boys x2 [df = 3, N = 113] = 23.06, p < .001). Boys also appreciated the movie clip more than girls (t [df = 110.925, N = 113] = 2.540, p = .012). Almost all children helped their friends try to solve the puzzle (98.2%). The number of times the children helped varied between one and seven times (M = 1.95; SD = 1.16). Children spent on average 58.43 (SD = 36.72) seconds on helping efforts. Of the friends, 85.5% asked for explicitly for help, which varied between one and five times (M = 1.12; SD = .75). No differences were found between children in the experimental condition and the control condition in terms of children’s sex (x2 [df = 1, N = 113] = −1.487, p = .223), age (t [df = 111, N = 113] = −1.406, p = .163), exposure to the most recently released Disney movies (t [df = 111, N = 113] = −.186, p = .853), exposure to the movie Cars before the experiment (t [df = 108.73, n = 112] = −1.477, p = .143), or appreciation of the clip (t [df = 111, N = 113] = .581, p = .563). Children in the experimental condition also did not differ in how many times they were asked for help by their friend compared to children in the control condition (t [df = 111, N = 113] = .637, p = .525). However, **a t-test demonstrated a significant difference between children in the experimental condition and children in the control condition on their initial prosocial behavior** (t [df = 111, N = 113] = −2.317, p = .022), **indicating that children in the experimental condition scored higher on their initial levels of prosocial behavior.** Descriptive statistics for all model variables are presented in Table 1; correlations are presented in Table 2. Table 1. Descriptive statistics for children’s characteristics and outcome variables by condition. CSVDisplay Table Table 2. Correlation between the model variables. CSVDisplay Table The impact of prosocial Disney content on children’s helping behavior **Findings from linear regression analyses demonstrated that children in the experimental condition were significantly more likely to help their friends with trying to solve the puzzle than children in the control condition, including when controlling for children’s sex, age, initial prosocial behavior, prior exposure to Disney movies, and appreciation of the clip**. More specifically, children who watched the prosocial Disney clip more often provided help (b = .510, p = .012, one-tailed) and spent more time helping (b = .411 p = .034, one-tailed) than children who watched the Disney clip without the helping behavior. R squares indicated small effects: 5.3% of the total variance in the number of times children spend on helping could be explained by exposure to the helping Disney character and 3.5% of the total variance in the time spent on helping. Strikingly, **no significant association was found between children’s initial levels of prosocial behavior and their helping behavior during the experiment**. In addition, no effects were found for prior exposure to Disney movies and children’s helping. Findings from the regression analyses are presented in Table 3, which also presents the unadjusted associations between the independent variables and outcomes, enabling a comparison of the impact of all predictors on the outcomes with and without the (potential) impact of the others. No moderating effect of prior exposure to Disney movies was found on the relationship between the condition and children’s helping. Table 3. Findings from linear regression analyses on the relation between watching prosocial Disney content and children’s helping behavior. CSVDisplay Table Finally, during the game, children also appeared to spontaneously help, without their friends asking for it. Therefore, we calculated the number of times children helped minus the number of times their friends asked for it explicitly and repeated the analyses. **The findings of this additional analysis indicated that, compared to children in the control condition, children who watched the prosocial Disney clip more often provided help spontaneously** (b = .608, p = .014, one-tailed). For this association, also no moderating effect was found for prior exposure to recently released Disney movies. Discussion The present study is the first to reveal that **exposure to a prosocial Disney clip is related to children’s subsequent helping behavior.** More specifically, the findings demonstrated that watching a Disney clip in which the main character provides help and, as a result, loses a race instead of winning it, increased the likelihood of children’s helping behavior toward a friend compared to children being exposed to a Disney clip from the same movie without helping behavior. Although the effect sizes were small, the effects remained after controlling for children’s sex, age, initial prosocial behavior, exposure to recently released Disney movies, and appreciation of the clip. In line with the hypotheses, children exposed to the helping character helped their friends in need more often (H1) and longer (H2), at the expense of their own chances of completing as many puzzles as possible, compared to children who did not see this character committing this generous deed. Finally, in contrast to the expectations (H3), the effects of the prosocial Disney clip on children’s helping behavior were not stronger for children with higher levels of prior exposure to Disney movies or for children with a high exposure to the movie Cars in particular.

#### D] Voter:

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Precision is key – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

#### 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

## 3

#### Interpretation: The affirmative debater must articulate a distinct ROB in the form of a delineated text in the first affirmative speech.

#### Violation:

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Strat Skew – They can read multiple pieces of offense under different ROBs and then read a new one in the 1AR so they never lose under the ROB. it just becomes a 2NR debate about whether the ROB is better than the 1NC’s which moots engagement. That means infinite abuse – All you have to do is dump on the 1N ROB and marginally extend your warrants in the 2AR and the neg can’t do anything about it since there is no 3NR to answer the 2AR weighing or extrapolations

#### 2] Reciprocity – (a) restarting the ROB debate in the 1ar puts you at a 7-6 advantage– putting it in the aff makes it 13-13 (b) you have one more speech to contest my ROB and weigh (c) I can only read a ROB in the 1N so you should read it in your first speech– that’s definitionally an equal burden.

## Case

### UV

#### 1---1AR theory is skewed towards the aff – a] the 2NR must cover substance and over-cover theory, since they get the collapse and persuasive spin advantage of the 3min 2AR, b] their responses to my counter interp will be new, which means 1AR theory necessitates intervention. C] Timeskew---They get 7/6 time advantage D] Implications – a) reject 1AR theory since it can’t be a legitimate check for abuse, b) drop the arg and reasonability to minimize the chance the round is decided unfairly

#### 2---1AR theory shouldn’t have predetermined paradigm issues---A] punishment should be contextual to abuse – don’t give the death penalty for shoplifting that’s illogical – logic outweighs because it’s a metaconstraint on argumentation B] Incentivizes lots of friv shells that trade off with substance and skew the 2nr time allocation

#### 3---Negating is harder---A] Aff gets infinite prep and neg has to prep for each aff B] first and last word means they have a persuasiveness advantage C] Aff chooses the terms of the debate in the 1ac

#### Presumption and permissibility negate—

#### 1) they haven’t proven a moral obligation which is a distinction from an action being permissible—they must prove the res is permissible not the plan is permissible

#### 2) Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

#### 3) the aff is a plan, meaning it is a change from the squo which means no obligation would be negate

#### 4) under a comparative-worlds paradigm it negates since it requires them to prove the statement that “the aff world is more desirable than the neg world”

## Framework

**The standard is consistency with the categorical imperative. To clarify, consequences don’t link to the framework.**

#### Prefer additionally –

#### [1] Kantian theory has the best tools for fighting oppression through combatting ethical egoism and abstraction

Farr 02 [Arnold (prof of phil @ UKentucky, focusing on German idealism, philosophy of race, postmodernism, psychoanalysis, and liberation philosophy). “Can a Philosophy of Race Afford to Abandon the Kantian Categorical Imperative?” JOURNAL of SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, Vol. 33 No. 1, Spring 2002, 17–32 // LEX JB]

**One of the most popular criticisms of Kant’s** moral philosophy is that it is too formalistic.13 That is, the universal nature of the categorical imperative leaves it devoid of content. Such a principle is useless since moral decisions are made by concrete individuals in a concrete, historical, and social situation. This type of criticism lies behind Lewis Gordon’s rejection of any attempt to ground an antiracist position on Kantian principles. The rejection of universal principles for the sake of emphasizing the historical embeddedness of the human agent is widespread in recent philosophy and social theory. I will argue here on Kantian grounds that although a distinction between the **universal and the concrete is a valid distinction, the unity of the two is required** for an understanding of human agency. The attack on Kantian formalism began with Hegel’s criticism of the Kantian philosophy.14 The list of contemporary theorists who follow Hegel’s line of criticism is far too long to deal with in the scope of this paper. Although these theorists may approach the problem of Kantian formalism from a variety of angles, the spirit of their criticism is basically the same: The universality of the categorical imperative is an abstraction from one’s empirical conditions. Kant is often accused of making the moral agent an abstract, empty, noumenal subject. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Kantian subject is an embodied, empirical, concrete subject. However, this concrete subject has a dual nature. Kant claims in the Critique of Pure Reason as well as in the Grounding that human beings have an intelligible and empirical character.15 It is impossible to understand and do justice to Kant’s moral theory without taking seriously the relation between these two characters. The very concept of morality is impossible without the tension between the two. By “empirical character” Kant simply means that we have a sensual nature. We are physical creatures with physical drives or desires. The very fact that **I cannot simply satisfy my desires without considering the rightness or wrongness of my actions suggests that my empirical character must be held in check** by something, or else I behave like a Freudian id. My empiri- cal character must be held in check by my intelligible character, which is the legislative activity of practical reason. **It is through our intelligible character that we formulate principles that keep our empirical impulses in check. The categorical imperative is the supreme principle of morality that is constructed by the moral agent in his/her moment of self-transcendence.** What I have called self-transcendence may be best explained in the following passage by Onora O’Neill: In restricting our maxims to those that meet the test of the categorical imperative we refuse to base our lives on maxims that necessarily make our own case an exception. The reason why a universilizability criterion is morally signiﬁcant is that it makes our own case no special exception (G, IV, 404). In accepting the Categorical Imperative we accept the moral reality of other selves, and hence the possibility (not, note, the reality) of a moral community. **The Formula of Universal Law enjoins no more than that we act only on maxims that are open to others also**.16 O’Neill’s description of the universalizability criterion includes the notion of self-transcendence that I am working to explicate here to the extent that like self-transcendence, universalizable moral principles require that the individ- ual think beyond his or her own particular desires. **The individual is not allowed to exclude others as rational moral agents who have the right to act as he acts in a given situation.** For example, if I decide to use another person merely as a means for my own end I must recognize the other person’s right to do the same to me. I cannot consistently will that I use another as a means only and will that I not be used in the same manner by another. Hence, the universalizability criterion is a principle of consistency and a principle of inclusion. That is, in choosing my maxims I attempt to include the perspective of other moral agents. … Whereas most criticisms are aimed at the formulation of universal law and the formula of autonomy, our analysis here will focus on the formula of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends, since we have already addressed the problem of universality. The latter will be discussed ﬁrst. At issue here is what Kant means by “kingdom of ends.” Kant writes: “By ‘kingdom’ I understand a systematic union of different rational beings through common laws.”32 The above passage indicates that Kant recognizes different, perhaps different kinds, of rational beings; however, the problem for most critics of Kant lies in the assumption that Kant suggests that the “kingdom of ends” requires that we abstract from personal differences and content of private ends. The Kantian conception of rational beings requires such an abstraction. Some feminists and philosophers of race have found this abstract notion of rational beings problematic because they take it to mean that rationality is necessarily white, male, and European.33 Hence, the systematic union of rational beings can mean only the systematic union of white, European males. I ﬁnd this interpretation of Kant’s moral theory quite puzzling. Surely another interpretation is available. That is, the implication that in Kant’s philosophy, rationality can only apply to white, European males does not seem to be the only alternative. The problem seems to lie in the requirement of abstraction. There are two ways of looking at the abstraction requirement that I think are faithful to Kant’s text and that overcome the criticisms of this requirement. **First, the abstraction requirement may be best understood as a demand for intersubjectivity or recognition. Second, it may be understood as an attempt to avoid ethical egoism in determining maxims for our actions.** It is unfortunate that Kant never worked out a theory of intersubjectivity, as did his successors Fichte and Hegel. However, this is not to say that there is not in Kant’s philosophy a tacit theory of intersubjectivity or recognition. The abstraction requirement simply demands that in the midst of our concrete differences we recognize ourselves in the other and the other in ourselves. That is, we recognize in others the humanity that we have in common. Recognition of our common humanity is at the same time recognition of rationality in the other. We recognize in the other the capacity for selfdetermination and the capacity to legislate for a kingdom of ends. This brings us to the second interpretation of the abstraction requirement. **To avoid ethical egoism one must abstract from (think beyond) one’s own personal interest and subjective maxims. That is, the categorical imperative requires that I recognize that I am a member of the realm of rational beings.** Hence, I organize my maxims in consideration of other rational beings. Under such a principle other people cannot be treated merely as a means for my end but must be treated as ends in themselves. **The merit of the categorical imperative for a philosophy of race is that it contravenes racist ideology to the extent that racist ideology is based on the use of persons of a different race as a means to an end rather than as ends in themselves.** Embedded in the formulation of an end in itself and the formula of the kingdom of ends is the recognition of the common hope for humanity. That is, maxims ought to be chosen on the basis of an ideal, a hope for the amelioration of humanity. This ideal or ethical commonwealth (as Kant calls it in the Religion) is the kingdom of ends.34 Although the merits of Kant’s moral theory may be recognizable at this point, we are still in a bit of a bind. It still seems problematic that the moral theory of a racist is essentially an antiracist theory. Further, what shall we do with Henry Louis Gates’s suggestion that we use the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime to deconstruct the Grounding? What I have tried to suggest is that instead of abandoning the categorical imperative we should attempt to deepen our understanding of it and its place in Kant’s critical philosophy. A deeper reading of the Grounding and Kant’s philosophy in general may produce the deconstruction35 suggested by Gates. However, a text is not necessarily deconstructed by reading it against another. Texts often deconstruct themselves if read properly. To be sure, the best way to understand a text is to read it in context. Hence, if the Grounding is read within the context of the critical philosophy, the tools for a deconstruction of the text are provided by its context and the tensions within the text. Gates is right to suggest that the Grounding must be deconstructed. However, this deconstruction requires much more than reading the Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime against the Grounding. It requires a complete engagement with the critical philosophy. Such an engagement discloses some of Kant’s very signiﬁcant claims about humanity and the practical role of reason. With this disclosure, deconstruction of the Grounding can begin. **What deconstruction will reveal is not necessarily the inconsistency of Kant’s moral philosophy or the racist or sexist nature of the categorical imperative, but rather, it will disclose the disunity between Kant’s theory and his own feelings about blacks and women. Although the theory is consistent and emancipatory and should apply to all persons, Kant the man has his own personal and moral problems. Although Kant’s attitude toward people of African descent was deplorable, it would be equally deplorable to reject the categorical imperative without ﬁrst exploring its emancipatory potential.**

## Offense

#### [1] Strikes fail to fulfill duty

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

Kantian Ethics Kantian ethics suggest that actions are morally permissible based on **whether it fulfils a person's duty** (Banks, 2006). To further the concept of duty, Kantian ethics held the notion of Categorical Imperatives which is believed to determine the morality of duties as it enforces and commands adherence, complicity and application. The Categorical Imperatives consist of three formulas. Once such a formula is to "act only on the maximum whereby at the same time you can will that it become a universal law" (Parrott, 2006, p. 51). Through this perspective, Kant held that persons are to engage in actions that they are willing to allow others to engage in as well without conditions and exceptions. Applying this formula to the ethicality of social workers **participating in labor strike** demonstrations, it becomes evident that such an action is **not morally permissible or executing its duty**. Arguably, as much as social workers are trained professionals and rendering services that are crucial to the functioning and well-being of society, they remain ordinary citizens who also at some point will **require crucial services**. Examples of these crucial services that may cause significant harm because of its absence due to labor strike action are **medical personnel, suicide watch centers, mental health care professionals, law enforcement, court systems**, municipal service delivery, etc. With these services not available, social workers will experience suffering, frustration, unhappiness, harm as the clients will do with their absence from the office. To this regard, participating and demonstrating labor strike action is not adhering to duty or morally permissible.

#### [2] 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.**

#### [3] 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

#### [4] 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

#### [5] 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**.

#### [6] Strikes in essential services hurt the patient but not the employer which reduces the patient to a mere means to an end.

Loewy 2K, Erich H. "Of healthcare professionals, ethics, and strikes." Cambridge Q. Healthcare Ethics 9 (2000): 513. (Erich H. Loewy M.D., F.A.C.P., was born in Vienna, Austria in 1927 and was able to escape first to England and then to the U.S. in late 1938. He was initially trained as a cardiologist. He taught at Case Western Reserve and practiced in Cleveland, Ohio. After 14 years he devoted himself fully to Bioethics and taught at the University of Illinois for 12 years. In 1996 he was selected as the first endowed Alumni Association Chair of Bioethics at the University of California Davis School of Medicine and has taught there since.) JG

“Essential” Work and Strikes Healthcare professionals, garbage collectors, and other “essential” workers have a responsibility that is considered to be different from, say, the responsibilities of workers in a supermarket chain. There are almost certainly other supermarkets, but there is generally only one municipal garbage collection service**, one police force, and one fire department; and in general, only one healthcare system available to us. In the medical setting, furthermore, workers are much more apt to deal with identified lives**: they know their patients and often have known them for some time. Striking against their employer (even if it is done in part to benefit the patient) is **denying meaningful and often essential services to some of these identified lives**. We tend to relate differently with those lives we know and therefore call “identified” from those whom we consider “unidentified” or statistical lives, in part, because we have obligations as a result of relationships; in part because we fail to recognize that these so-called unidentified lives are not in fact unidentified but are merely not identified by us.4 When strikes are called by healthcare professionals, both types of lives are apt to be injured or, at least, severely inconvenienced. Except in the pocketbook, strikes in the healthcare setting generally do not directly hurt the employer. The employer **is hurt through the** **patient**. The patient thus becomes a **means toward the employees’ ends**, a football being kicked between two contending parties—**even if one of the employees’ goals is to serve the good of patients in general.** Theoretically, patients will then bring pressure on the employer (be it the government or a managed care organization), thus, quite frankly, using the patient as a means toward the ends of the health professionals.5 The dilemma, of course, is that without significantly inconveniencing or even endangering patients, no pressure is likely to be brought and, therefore, no amelioration of working conditions is effected. To be effective, a strike of healthcare professionals has to “hurt” patients and often patients known to the healthcare professionals.

#### [7] Freedom to strike cannot come at the expense of others AND they might not have ethical motivations.

Muñoz 14, Cristian Pérez. "Essential Services, Workers’ Freedom, and Distributive Justice." Social Theory and Practice 40.4 (2014): 649-672. (Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Florida) JG

The second objection suggests that the freedom to strike is a fundamental value for a liberal society. Restrictions or prohibitions on this par ticular freedom are equivalent to interfering with basic freedoms such as the freedom of speech and association. This objection presupposes, of course, that preserving individual freedom **possesses a value of high priority.**

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)