### Long- 2 condo

**Condo – we get two**

**1. Offense –**

**A. Risk Averse – Negs are scared to try new things because if they guess wrong they lose in the 1NC – that means allowing for a fallback strategy via conditionality is key to incentivize negs to do research and find new ways to engage the aff – its key to fairness because otherwise the aff has a structural advantage of knowing their aff better and speaking first and last, and is key to education by bolstering research and improving the process of clash – turns their flex arguments because two condo doesn’t skew the aff irrevocably, but does give fallbacks to the neg which is the perfect balance**

**B. Multiple Worlds Good – deciding how to effectively respond to large amounts of information is a critical portable skill to confront information overload – only condo solves - When you’re on Facebook and consecutive posts defend trump and then communist revolution, your response shouldn’t be “that’s not fair” it should be to find the truth through processing through available information – DAs and T don’t solve because they operate in one world**

**C. Hard Debate is good Debate – it forces the aff to find ways out of tough debates, improves efficiency, and increase quality of debates – no condo sends us back to PF**

**2. Defense**

**A. Perms check – they’re condo and solve their impacts**

**B. Skew and depth inevitable – we’re talking at 300wpm**

**C. Diminishing Utility after 2 means no slippery slope**

**D. Err neg on this question because of the aff bias in debate**

**E. Judge is a referee – if we haven’t done anything uniquely bad IN THIS ROUND then don’t vote us down**

## NR

### Overview

#### Extend the counterplan. It turns all firms into self-directed enterprises where the employees decide how to run the company, divide labor, and distribute revenue.

#### The aff fundamentally misdiagnoses the problem – the issue is not the strength of the right to strike, it’s the structure of the businesses. Companies are owned by shareholders, which means firms are driven by the need to maximize shareholder profits which will inevitably lead to exploitation as workers are forgotten in the rush to increase profit margins. Post CP, the company is owned by workers, which means that the management is intrinsically motivated to maximize employees’ well-being. This is also just a massive solvency deficit to the aff because they can’t solve the root cause of their impacts – the corporate organizing structure.

#### The CP solves for literally all of the aff –

#### Creates democ within corporations. We solve at least as well as the aff. All their cards are about

#### Logic – worker-run enterprises ensures that there’s less wage exploitation or bad working conditions because the workers themselves can regulate those things

#### Empirics – firms that adopt this model have much higher employee satisfaction than their competitors, which means that a chance of the NB outweighs.

### AT: Perm Do Both

#### Sufficiency framing – since the CP solves at least the vast majority of the AC, all we need to win is a slight risk of the perm linking

#### No NB to striking – democratic modes of corporate governance solve exploitation

#### Perm decks CP solvency – the state allowing a “right to strike” just as we transition to worker-owned companies is but another attempt to maintain the squo corporate structure – it’d destroy the company + economy by encouraging people to resort to striking rather than democratic modes of showing dissent like voting and fracture worker unity.

#### Perm links to NB – \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ {NB SHOULD PROBABLY BE STRIKING BAD W/ ECON DA}

## NR

### NR OV

#### The economy is recovering right now but is still fragile due to COVID. Increased striking will devastate the economy – two internal links:

#### Wage losses – this was McElroy and EPI – striking causes workers to lose out on crucial wages, which leads to the reduced employment, healthcare, and stable housing that permanently increases poverty rates for generations to come. Link turns all of the AC’s structural violence claims

#### Supply chain disruption – this was Pettypiece and Tonnesson – work stoppages drive up prices and lead to food shortages, thereby destroying the economic interdependence already teetering on the brink. This incentivizes nuclear war by decreasing the aggressor’s risk and undercutting the social and cultural links that happen as a result of exchange, which causes extinction and easily outweighs the AC on magnitude.

Uniqness goes neg, slowly recover

#### coop doesn’t check.
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Concluding thoughts¶ Sino-Japanese relations have entered a critical period of mutual suspicion¶ and hostility. Following the escalation of the territorial dispute in 2010,¶ both governments, and the public in both countries, have been trapped in a¶ power-conflict discourse dominated by claims to political authority and to¶ the control of territory. As with other territorial disputes, the Sino¶ Japanese territorial dispute has a power-political dimension. As its influence¶ and economic power within the Asia-Pacific region grow, China reinforces¶ its military power and demonstrates its preparedness to defend its¶ territory. In response, Japan strengthens its surveillance capabilities and its¶ security ties with the United States to prepare for any military conflict and¶ intimidation around the disputed islands. With the increasing perception¶ of a power transition, economic interdependence seems to apply only limited¶ constraints on the escalation of the dispute. Now that China has developed¶ its trade partnerships and increasingly become its own provider of investment across the world, its considerable economic relations with Japan have not deterred it from confronting the former ODA provider.¶ Meanwhile, Japan continues to demonstrate its determination to make no compromise over the territorial issue. As both parties seek protective and¶ expressive power, they are responsible for the increase in the threat perceptions.¶ Thus, the escalation of the Sino-Japanese territorial dispute is an aspect of power transition between challenging and status quo states.¶ The Sino-Japanese territorial dispute is also shaped by argument over¶ the character and moral purposes of the participants. Japan designates the¶ Senkaku Islands as a no man’s land that it acquired in accordance with¶ international law. Any Chinese intrusion into this area is described as invasive,¶ without consideration of the possibility that China has legitimate concerns¶ about its own security. China fundamentally challenges Japanese¶ conceptions of justice associated with borders by insisting that the Diaoyu¶ Islands have belonged to China since ancient times and that Japan stole¶ the Chinese territory at the height of Japanese imperialism. For China,¶ there was no international law that legitimized this action of invasion, and¶ hence the territory should revert to China. Such a division in normative¶ consciousness existed prior to 2012, but is now spread widely across Japan¶ and China, and even beyond. The race to construct a valid claim for justice¶ and for just treatment in the international arena adds a further complication¶ to the dispute, and makes it more difficult to resolve the issue.¶ While the escalation of the territorial dispute raises the immediate possibility of armed conflict between Japan and China, the long-term consequences¶ of aspects of the dispute are most alarming. Faced with antiJapanese¶ demonstrations and Chinese official actions to claim the islands,¶ many Japanese who were originally not particularly passionate about the¶ defense of the territory now perceive China as a real threat and believe¶ that China always uses history to claim the moral high ground against¶ Japan. Although Japan’s wartime history is indeed an ethical issue, in that¶ it involves reflection on the lives and deaths of people during war, Japanese¶ people are increasingly treating it not as an ethical issue but as a political¶ one. The Chinese perception of Japan has been consolidated around the¶ image that Japan has not repented its aggression of the late nineteenth century.¶ The normative rift between the Japanese and Chinese nations is,¶ regrettably, now much wider than before despite 40 years of interaction¶ and negotiation. Whether Japan and China can revive links between¶ them that are sufficient to halt the downward spiral in their relations is yet¶ to be seen.