## 1- Disclosure

#### A] Interpretation: Debaters must, on the page with their name and the school they attend, disclose all taglines, full citations, and the first and last three words of the pieces of evidence read in their cases at bid tournaments on the NDCA wiki if they have read that case before at least 1 day after breaking the case.

#### B] Violation: My opponent hasn’t posted anything on the wiki despite having an entry and competing in bid divisions of bid tournaments on this topic in the past (FBK)

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated with medium confidence

#### C] Net Benefits:

#### 1] Evidence ethics

Let’s be realistic: disclosure is the only way to prevent evidence distortion before it occurs. Without transparency and publicity, competitors have no way to check their opponents' evidence until after the debate, after the wrong has occurred, and decisions disclosed. At a fast-paced national tournament, the window of opportunity to redress such wrongs is slim to none.

**2] Clash** – Disclosure is the best method for increasing clash in debates because it allows debaters to substantively engage positions rather than relying on sketchy tricks to avoid the discussion. It also allows for more specific clash because debaters can see specific arguments disclosed instead of trying to link generic arguments in.

#### 3] Argument Quality

1] Disclosure prevents the **element of surprise**. A world without disclosure rewards debaters for running arguments not because they are good, but because their opponents won't know how to respond. Disclosure forces debaters to commit to quality; under my interpretation, debaters would have to write cases knowing that their opponents will have the opportunity for thoughtful preparation.

## 2- FW

#### I affirm resolved “A just government ought to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike”

#### I value morality as the word ought which insinuates a moral obligation.

#### In order to create a society that is moral, we must recognize our biases and actively strive to ensure all people are morally included.

Winter and Leighton 99 --- A member of the faculty since 1974, Deborah Winter received the 1997 Robert Y. Fluno Award for Distinguished Teaching in the Social Sciences. She has been involved intensively with students, not only through her classes, but also as adviser to the Global Awareness House and as cochair of the college conservation committee. Dana Leighton is a social psychologist, teaching, researching, and writing about the psychology of intergroup conflict and peace. Proponent and practitioner of Open Science methods. “Structural Violence Section Introduction,” New York: Prentice Hall, 6/1/1999, [http://sites.saumag.edu/danaleighton/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2015/09/SVintro-2.pdf //](http://sites.saumag.edu/danaleighton/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2015/09/SVintro-2.pdf%20//) SM

Structural violence, however, is almost always invisible, embedded in ubiquitous social structures, normalized by stable institutions and regular experience. Structural violence occurs whenever people are disadvantaged by political, legal, economic or cultural traditions. Because they are longstanding, structural inequities usually seem ordinary, the way things are and always have been. The chapters in this section teach us about some important but invisible forms of structural violence, and alert us to the powerful cultural mechanisms that create and maintain them over generations. Structured inequities produce suffering and death as often as direct violence does, though the damage is slower, more subtle, more common, and more difficult to repair. Globally, poverty is correlated with infant mortality, infectious disease, and shortened lifespans. Whenever people are denied access to societys resources, physical and psychological violence exists.

#### Thus, my criterion is minimizing structural violence.

#### Prefer additionally:

#### Structural violence is a product from unprecedented biases that exclude certain people from our moral circle, making it morally unjustifiable.

Winter and Leighton 99 --- A member of the faculty since 1974, Deborah Winter received the 1997 Robert Y. Fluno Award for Distinguished Teaching in the Social Sciences. She has been involved intensively with students, not only through her classes, but also as adviser to the Global Awareness House and as cochair of the college conservation committee. Dana Leighton is a social psychologist, teaching, researching, and writing about the psychology of intergroup conflict and peace. Proponent and practitioner of Open Science methods. “Structural Violence Section Introduction,” New York: Prentice Hall, 6/1/1999, [http://sites.saumag.edu/danaleighton/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2015/09/SVintro-2.pdf //](http://sites.saumag.edu/danaleighton/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2015/09/SVintro-2.pdf%20//) SM

Finally, to recognize the operation of structural violence forces us to ask questions about how and why we tolerate it, questions which often have painful answers for the privileged elite who unconsciously support it. A final question of this section is how and why we allow ourselves to be so oblivious to structural violence. Susan Opotow offers an intriguing set of answers, in her article Social Injustice. She argues that our normal perceptual/cognitive processes divide people into in-groups and out-groups. Those outside our group lie outside our scope of justice. Injustice that would be instantaneously confronted if it occurred to someone we love or know is barely noticed if it occurs to strangers or those who are invisible or irrelevant. We do not seem to be able to open our minds and our hearts to everyone, so we draw conceptual lines between those who are in and out of our moral circle. Those who fall outside are morally excluded, and become either invisible, or demeaned in some way so that we do not have to acknowledge the injustice they suffer. Moral exclusion is a human failing, but Opotow argues convincingly that it is an outcome of everyday social cognition. To reduce its nefarious efWInter & Leighton Structural Violence Page 4 fects, we must be vigilant in noticing and listening to oppressed, invisible, outsiders. Inclusionary thinking can be fostered by relationships, communication, and appreciation of diversity.

#### Structural violence is systemic, so governments must address it before going beyond to other issues.

#### It’s a clear weighing mechanism. Whoever proves they minimize structural violence more wins the round. By looking at structural violence, we move away from vague frameworks or ideal moral theories that don’t actually examine the real world.

## 3- Agricultural Workers

#### For agricultural laborers, the National Labor Relations Act and its interpretation by the courts has not protected their right to strike

Reilly n.d.-- Jaclyn Reilly; JD from Penn State University; Agricultural Laborers: Their Inability to Unionize Under the National Labor Relations Act; Penn State Law Review; <https://pennstatelaw.psu.edu/_file/aglaw/Publications_Library/Agricultural_Laborers.pdf>. (AG DebateDrills)

The broad definition of “agriculture” under the FLSA would seem to exclude from the NLRA any worker who is employed by any agricultural entity. This is not the case, however, because the Supreme Court has adopted a two-part test to determine if an employee is in fact an agricultural laborer excluded from the NLRA.23 An agricultural employee will be excluded from the right to organize if he or she is engaged in either primary or secondary farming. The Supreme Court has taken the FLSA definition of agriculture and essentially limited its application based on a strict application of the statutory language. Primary farming are those tasks specifically referred to in the statutory definition of “agriculture” such as “cultivation and tillage of the soil [and] dairying.”24 The rest of the definition is considered secondary farming, and therefore a worker is an agricultural laborer if the work performed is of the type that would be performed “by a farmer or on a farm as an incident to or in conjunction with such farming operations.” In one of the more recent cases to address the question of who is considered an agricultural employee, the Supreme Court in Holly Farms Corp. v. N.L.R.B. upheld the determination made by the NLRB that workers on live-haul chicken crews do not engage in agricultural labor and therefore are not subject to the agricultural exception from the NLRA.26 The responsibility of the live-haul crew is to enter the farms of independent contractors who raise chickens supplied by Holly Farms; the chickens are then caught and caged by nine chicken catchers, moved by a forklift operator onto a truck to be transported by a truck driver to the processing plant.27 These live-haul crews were not engaged in primary farming because primary farming would have been the actual raising of the poultry, which was the responsibility of the independent contractors, not the livehaul crews.28 The court then focused on whether these live-haul crews were engaged in secondary farming. In doing so, the court immediately found that that the work performed by the live-haul crews were not of the kind “performed by a farmer” because Holly Farms gave up its farmer status as soon as the chicks were delivered to independent contractors for raising.29 As a result of this determination, the truck drivers were not considered agricultural laborers and were therefore not part of the agricultural exception to the NLRA and were able to unionize.

#### The agricultural laborer exception is no accident. It was intended to exclude black employees—Southern Democrats knew that exploitation of black labor was only possible in an environment where they didn’t have adequate worker protections. Other industries prove that the existence of a right to strike solve exploitation.

Perea 11—Juan Perea [Professor of Law at Loyola University Chicago]; The Echoes of Slavery: Recognizing the Racist Origins of the Agricultural and Domestic Worker Exclusion from the National Labor Relations Act; 72 OHIO ST. L.J. l 95 (2011).; https://lawecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1150&context=facpubs

There is a direct relationship between this modem slavery and contemporary labor law. Advocates for migrant farm workers express that relationship: "Modem-day slavery cases don't happen in a vacuum. They only occur in degraded labor environments, ones that are fundamentally, systematically exploitive. In industries where the labor force is conti[n]gent, day-haul, with subpoverty wages, no benefits, no right to overtime, no fight to organize-that's where you see slavery taking root. ' 13 Slavery does not exist in labor environments that offer adequate worker protections like collective bargaining and other federally protected rights. A huge disparity exists between the exploitation and vulnerability lived by agricultural and domestic workers and the more reasonable and humane labor conditions existing in most other occupations. As I will show, the exploitation and vulnerability faced by these workers is no accident. The New Deal Congress desired and produced exactly this result. Specifically, southern congressmen wanted to exclude black employees from the New Deal to preserve the quasi-plantation style of agriculture that pervaded the still-segregated Jim Crow South. 14 While they supported reforms that would bring more prosperity to their relatively poor region, they rejected those that might upset the existing system of racial segregation and exploitation of blacks. President Roosevelt and his legislative allies recognized that in order to pass any New Deal legislation at all, it was necessary to compromise with Southern Democrats intent on preserving white supremacy. 15 The compromise position was race-neutral language that both accommodated the southern desire to exclude blacks but did not alienate northern liberals nor blacks in the way that an explicit racial exclusion would. An occupational classification like agricultural and domestic employees, excluding most blacks without saying so, was just such race-neutral language

#### Marginalization continues to today--Migrant workers now make up the bulk of farm worker and face extreme treatment in the status quo because of their vulnerable position. That constitutes structural violence the right to strike solves.

LeRoy 99-- LeRoy, Michael H. [Professor, School of Labor and Employment Relations, at University of Illinois], Should 'Agricultural Laborers' Continue to Be Excluded from the National Labor Relations Act?. Emory Law Journal, Vol. 48, No. 3, 1999, U Illinois Law & Economics Research Paper No. LE07-023, Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=992923>

At least part of this labor market competition appears to be coming from 600,000 of farm

workers who currently are illegal [immigrants] aliens.29 By one estimate, 57% of all migrant farm workers in the U.S. are illegal aliens30 A recent report by the Department of Labor’s Inspector General suggests that agricultural producers prefer to hire illegal aliens.31 Thus, many farm workers are in one of two binds: they are legal immigrants who are passed over in favor illegal aliens in an already crowded labor market; or, they are illegal [immigrants] aliens who, because of their unlawful presence in the U.S., are exposed to extraordinary potential for employer over-reaching. Current labor market statistics suggest, therefore, that the slow progress that farm workers experienced over the past two decades is giving way to more exploitation. In recent cases of extreme treatment, migrant farm workers were enslaved by a labor contractor,32 coerced into field work against their will,33 or connected to forced prostitution.34 As these abuses have suggested a growing pattern, the U.S. Attorney General has responded by forming a task force to propose suitable solutions.35 Even if coercion happens only rarely to migrant farm workers, they nevertheless are vulnerable to more mundane forms of employer over-reaching. Their itinerant work, combined with their poverty, often means that they depend on employer-provided housing. Housing for migrants, while improved over a generation ago,36 is still sub-standard.37 Ironically, since migrant housing is regulated by federal38 and state law,39 many producers provide no housing

## 4- Mental Health

#### Today’s workers suffer from alienation and anxiety in many forms—coronavirus only exacerbated these consequences

Bhardwaj 21-- Bhardwaj, Maya [PhD Candidate, University of Pretoria, South Africa]. "Coronavirus and Capitalism: Unveilings, Expansions, and Rupture." Journal of Social dialogues 1.1 (2021). AG

Understanding alienation also helps us understand psychological reactions to late-stage capitalism, heightened under lockdown. In a manifesto aptly titled “We are All Very Anxious,” anti-capitalist organizing group Plan C detail the rise of anxiety and depression under late-stage capitalism. While misery was the dominant affect (or collective feeling) during the Industrial Revolution, Fordism’s transmutation of full jobs into assembly-line tasks centered boredom as workers’ dominant affect. Modern-day capitalism, however, with work, social pressures, and commodity fetishism expanded through technology and the internet, has made anxiety the dominant affect. Society as a whole has become the factory, with surveillance normalized in all venues (Plan C 2020). Under Coronavirus, the factory has even expanded to the home, and anxiety has increased in turn, with usage of online mental health service spiking during lockdown, and work from home guides proliferating on how to combat anxiety while maintaining productivity. These guides frame narcissism and consumption as self-care, with mandates like frequent exercise, organic food, and 9+ hours of sleep that are unattainable to most workers. Failing to meet these unrealistic goals becomes another yet source of anxiety around consumption (Woods 2020, Bloom 2015). Treating anxiety individually allows companies to market individualized cures like food and drink, medication, and sex toys (spiking in online sales during lockdown) to supplant our connections to other humans, masking our real needs for collective care and societal shift. But individual cures for anxiety mask its triggers from capitalism and lost social connections under lockdown. This anxiety is collective, inevitably manifesting in a society severed from the land, from community, and the usefulness of our bodies (Thompson 2020, Mellor 2020). Protests against lockdowns in the US also can be read as psychological responses to alienation under capitalism, heightened by Coronavirus. Given America’s obsessions with privatization, consumption culture, hyper-individualism, and fake news, the country’s antisocial approach to COVID- 19 is unsurprising. But the recent armed uprisings against lockdowns display a society that ignores science and community to anxiously prioritize consumption and production as identity. When (white) Americans invoke freedom from lockdown, they don’t mean freedom from harm - they mean freedom to consume, to access (POC) service workers, and to earn money for further consumption. This invokes Marx’s theory of false consciousness, where due to alienation, these workers believe their freedom derives from capitalism and consumption (Eyerman 81). These are not precarious workers protesting to return to work in order to feed their families - they are workers protesting for more consumption, encapsulating a country created around the alienated individual who prioritizes objects over community and health (Mudde 2020).

#### Workers are being exploited, quickened production rhythms and excessive overtime cause anxiety, fear, and intimidation—however we systematically ignore the detrimental mental health impacts because of our narrow focus on physical safety.

Neve and Prentice 17-- Neve, Geert De [Professor of Social Anthropology and South Asian Studies at University of Sussex] and Prentice, Rebecca. "Introduction: Rethinking Garment Workers’ Health and Safety". Unmaking the Global Sweatshop: Health and Safety of the World's Garment Workers, edited by Rebecca Prentice and Geert De Neve, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017, pp. 1-26. <https://doi.org/10.9783/9780812294316-002>. AG

Health—while sometimes mentioned indirectly as part of assessments of working conditions and production pressures—has rarely been studied as a direct entry into garment workers’ lives. And, yet, most of the issues around working conditions listed above have an immediate effect on workers’ health and on their well-being more generally. Overtime pressures and the lack of a living wage, for example, are largely experienced through bodily and embodied processes. They often translate directly into poor physical health or manifest themselves as mental health issues experienced through anxiety, fear, intimidation, stigma, or exhaustion (Lynch 2007; Prentice 2015, chapter 6; Ashraf this volume; Hewamanne this volume). The absence of a public debate on workers’ health is all the more remarkable given the widespread adoption of corporate codes of conduct in supplier factories, including codes dealing explicitly with health and safety. Designed to make labor practices more transparent across complex global supply chains, such codes, however, tend to focus rather narrowly on safe and hygienic working environments (including sanitation and food storage), occupational health issues, and the prevention of accidents and injuries at work (see, for example, ETI Base Code 2014; CCC Code of Labour Practices 1998; Barrientos and Smith 2007; Ruwanpura 2013, 2014), ignoring the ways in which garment work affects workers’ health and well-being more broadly. Workers’ overall well-being can be unsettled by a range of health concerns caused by long hours, physically taxing work, poor equipment, an intense pace of work, harassment under disciplinary regimes, and a lack of labor voice. Many of these health impacts, moreover, are not just technical or bureaucratic shortcomings of work organization, but systemic outcomes of the ways in which garment production regimes operate globally (Bair et al. this volume; Neveling this volume). The main features of this global regime are the complex networks through which garments are now produced and sold across continents. Big brands like H&M and Gap do not own their factories but instead subcontract production to suppliers in low-wage countries. These countries depend on the garment trade for export earnings and employment. As consumers have grown accustomed to cheap clothing and endless variety, suppliers have been forced to contend with rising expectations of quality and speed at ever lower prices (Barrientos 2012; Plank et al. 2014; Taplin 2014). The pressures of global competition in a quickly changing market are exerted upon workers in the form of insecure employment, unpredictable working hours, quickened production rhythms, and excessive overtime. This volume seeks to place garment workers’ health and safety at the very heart of a critical exploration of their lives and well-being. The long neglect of health and safety has manifested itself in at least two alarming ways, each of which is equally disturbing: major one-off disasters causing injuries and deaths on the one hand, and routine violations of workers’ everyday health rights and needs on the other. A string of disasters in Bangladesh and throughout Asia, including factory fires and building collapses, are a telling outcome of the persistent neglect of worker safety. The shocking frequency with which such disasters are occurring reveals how even the basic safety of garment workers has not yet been secured.

#### The unconditional right to strike allows workers to reverse the structural domination they face—not only physically but mentally

Gourevitch 16-- Gourevitch, Alex [associate professor of political science at Brown University]. "Quitting work but not the job: Liberty and the right to strike." Perspectives on Politics 14.2 (2016): 307-323. AG

I have argued that the right to strike is a right of human liberty because it is a form of justified resistance to two interconnected forms of unfreedom: structural and personal domination. Sympathetic critics might wonder why not argue for the elimination of these forms of domination altogether, perhaps by arguing for an egalitarian distribution of property and workplace democracy. But that fails to respond to the central question: what explains and justifies the right to strike. Moreover, talking about ideal distributions puts us in a different political register. It is one thing to ask “ideally speaking, what is the best state of affairs” and another to ask “here and now, who can do what to whom.”As mentioned earlier, my argument invites a host of empirical political science questions, especially with respect to the analysis of “varieties of capitalism” and “contentious politics.” Before addressing these questions, it is worth recalling at least two of the most interesting features of the analysis of the right to strike. The first is that the kind of domination experienced in the labor market explains the right to strike’s peculiar structure: it is a right to refuse to do work while maintaining a right to the job. This conceptual structure makes sense if we see the strike as a way of reversing the structural domination of workers at the most immediate, concrete point at which they experience that domination: the threat of losing, or never acquiring, a job. The second interesting result is that the analysis explains the right to strike’s scope. There is no moral reason to restrict strikes to bread-and-butter issues of wages and hours. They may legitimately aim at a wide range of arbitrary exercises of managerial prerogatives and uses of property. That is because the strike can be a form of resistance to the domination that shows up not just in the threat of being fired, but in the organization of work itself. I have not here said much about the distinction among primary strikes, sympathy strikes, secondary strikes, general strikes and political strikes. That is for another essay. But I can say that the argument implies that sympathy and general strikes might be superior to workplace strikes because they are ways of more directly addressing the problem of structural domination. These broader strikes are a way of redressing the background distribution of power, of which any given employer is a relatively small part. I should add, too, that though I have a given a general account of the right to strike, I have not been able to say anything about more fine-grained issues regarding what kinds of things strikers shouldn’t do during a strike and what the reasons are for those constraints. That is also a separate question.

[**https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC6560003/**](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/labs/pmc/articles/PMC6560003/)

**Although it is evident that strikes by health workers reduce provision of and access to medical services,** the reported effect on mortality has been varied. Some **studies have reported no change in mortality,** others an increase in deaths, **yet [and] other studies have shown an unexpected decrease in mortality.  Findings of no change in mortality [is] have been attributed largely to continued access to emergency services, partial involvement of striking staff, and continued service provision by other cadres of medical staff. Reduced mortality has been [Is] ascribed to withdrawal of elective surgical procedures and continued provision of emergency care,** whereas increased mortality has been attributed to poorer quality of care[6](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6560003/#bib6), [18](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6560003/#bib18) and reduced access to emergency services.[11](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6560003/#bib11)