# Neg

## Theory

### DISCLOSURE

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose tags, citations, and first and last three words of evidence of all broken positions on the NDCA 2020-21 LD Wiki.

#### Violation: They don’t disclose anything from this tournament– screenshots in the doc

#### Standards

#### 1] Preparation – disclosure leads to more in depth round where debaters can research and engage with their opponents’ positions pre-round. Absent disclosure, debaters are incentivized to break sketchy and bad arguments that could be easily defeated with a little research and win with the element of surprise. Impacts a] clash – disclosure leads to debates with better clash of arguments which is the unique educational benefit of debate – that outweighs, opponent will argue that they sent me the whole case but that only happened because I reached out to them – this shouldn’t be reliant on me

#### 2] Small Schools – disclosure is key to equal access to intel – absent disclosure, flow-sharing and large school entries favor well-connected and established programs. Disclosure levels the playing field since everyone gets access to everyone else’s arguments. That’s key to fairness to level out arbitrary differences within the debate community.

**3]** **Level Playing Field (round reports) – big schools can go around and scout and collect flows but independents are left in the dark so round reports are key to prep- they give you an idea of overall what layers debaters like going for so you can best prepare your strategy when you hit them. Accessibility first and independent voter – it’s an impact multiplier**

**4] Strategy Education – round reports help novices understand the context in which positions are read by good debaters and help with brainstorming potential 1NCs vs affs – helps compensate for kids who can’t afford coaches to prep out affs.**

#### Voters

#### 1] Fairness – it’s inherent to debate – arguing against fairness presumes that your arguments will be evaluated fairly in the first place

#### 2] Education – it’s the only lasting skill we get from debate, which is the internal link to why schools fund it – debate loses value if it doesn’t teach us skills

#### Drop the debater for norm-setting – that’s key to spreading the disclosure norm – they will be more likely to disclose in the future if they lose ballots on it

#### No RVIs – a] they deter people from reading theory on abusive positions in fear of losing the theory debate on technicalities b] illogical, it’s your burden to be fair and educational so you don’t win on it

### MUST INCLUDE URL

#### Interpretation: debaters must include the URL in citations for their evidence.

#### Violation: they didn’t – examples include their Otteson card.

#### Standards:

#### [1] NSDA rules – the unified manual says to include the URL.

NSDA 21 **National Speech and Debate Association, “High School Unified Manual,” 1 September 2021, National Speech and Debate Association, accessed 11 September 2021, pg. 30,** [**https://www.speechanddebate.org/wp-content/uploads/High-School-Unified-Manual-2021-2022.pdf**](https://www.speechanddebate.org/wp-content/uploads/High-School-Unified-Manual-2021-2022.pdf) **~ST~**

**Written source citation. To the extent provided by the original source, a written source citation must include:**

**1. Full name of primary author and/or editor**

**2. Publication date**

**3. Source**

**4. Title of article**

**5. Date accessed for digital evidence**

**6. Full URL, if applicable**

**7. Author qualifications**

**8. Page number(s)**

#### That’s a voter – if we can choose what rules to break, I can make speeches however long I want, which is a side constraint to substance. Also proves the shell is reasonable and predictable because it’s by far the most common standard.

#### [2] Evidence ethics – no way to check whether their quote exists because we can’t find it on the internet – they can just make up whatever “evidence” they want, and there’s not enough time for us to verify that it is actually legit evidence. Pasting into a search engine doesn’t solve – a) many texts have weird formatting that prevents it from functioning, and b) difficult to find the correct version or one without a paywall. That’s a voter – a) debate is meaningless if we’re academically dishonest and have no argument credibility, b) uncredible evidence means we don’t know if their claims are true, which also serves as a substantive indict, and c) debate should prepare for the real world, in which small ev ethics violations are punished severely – large repercussions control internal link to other impacts.

#### Also links to inclusion – small school debaters tend to use cards from the wiki. Bad citations negatively impact their research. That’s a voter because inclusion is a prereq to debate.

#### DTD – a) in real life, you don’t get a quote cut out of your essay; you get a 0 on it – it’s best to teach good norms now, and b) deters future abuse.

#### Competing interps – a) reasonability is arbitrary, b) collapses because brightlines concede offense-defense paradigm, c) only CI prevents abuse since it can set norms, not decide rounds on a case-by-case basis.

##### **No RVIs – a) you don’t win for being academically honest, b) people will bait theory to win on the RVI, which causes abuse.**

## Kant

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

1. The meta-ethic is practical reason
   1. Regress - asking the question why is necessary for justifications asking; why is conceding to the authority of reason
   2. Bindingness - moral requirements have to be binding or they cannot dictate people’s actions. We must not use the empirical world for this as it is not reliable. The empirical world is constantly changing and subjective they are not universalizable
2. Meta-ethical standards outweigh - they determine what counts as a warrant for a standard
3. All maxims must be universalizable because all moral requirements must be true for everyone. 2+2 will always equal 4. If not everyone can act on the same maxim, it cannot cause an agency. This test establishes perfect duties for Kant.
4. Freedom - coercing is a perfect duty under Kant since you cannot violate someone’s freedom if u aren’t free. Everyone has a valuable right to freedom.
5. By valuing our own freedom, we end up valuing other goods - ie if you want to drink water from a bottle u need to be free to drink it. Everything else gets its value from humans but humans don’t rely on other things for their value making them unconditionally valuable.

Thus, the standard would be respecting others as an ends in themselves.

1. Workers sign a contract in which terms are clearly highlighted. Signing a contract is binding and so workers, by signing the contract, have an obligation to do what the corporation desires until they are out of the contract.

**Workers are able to negotiate their terms.**

Englert, Irene **Stavrellis**. “What Terms and Conditions of Employment Are an Employer and Union Required to Negotiate and Incorporate into a Collective Bargaining Agreement?” *What Terms and Conditions of Employment Are an Employer and Union Required to Negotiate and Incorporate into a Collective Bargaining Agreement? | FAQs | Tools | XpertHR.com*, www.xperthr.com/faq/what-terms-and-conditions-of-employment-are-an-employer-and-union-required-to-negotiate-and-incorporate-into-a-collective-bargaining-agreement/

<https://www.xperthr.com/faq/what-terms-and-conditions-of-employment-are-an-employer-and-union-required-to-negotiate-and-incorporate-into-a-collective-bargaining-agreement/5323/>

**An employer and** a **union are required to negotiate any subject that is related to wages, benefits or other terms and conditions of employment.** As a result, **both parties must discuss and reach an agreement on each of those terms. If the parties are unable to reach an amicable agreement, then negotiations may reach impasse.**

Workers hence are able to choose who they work for and negotiate terms and thus have an obligation to honor that contract.

1. **Workers in service jobs use patients as a means to an end by striking and relying on their suffering.**

**Wright 10.** Wright, Sarah H. “Evidence on the Effects of Nurses' Strikes.” *NBER*, 2010, [www.nber.org/digest/jul10/evidence-effects-nurses-strikes](http://www.nber.org/digest/jul10/evidence-effects-nurses-strikes).

https://www.nber.org/digest/jul10/evidence-effects-nurses-strikes

The researchers match data on nurses' strikes in New York State from 1984 to 2004 to data on hospital discharges, including information on treatment intensity, patient mortality, and hospital readmission. They conclude that **nurses' strikes** were **costly to hospital patients**: in-**hospital mortality increased by 19.4 percent** and **hospital readmissions increased by 6.5 percent for patients admitted during a strike.** Among their sample of 38,228 such patients, **an estimated 138 more individuals died than would have without a strike**, and **344 more patients were readmitted to the hospital than if there had been no strike.** "Hospitals functioning during nurses' strikes do so at a lower quality of patient care," they write.

**Since the aff has to prove that any worker striking is bad, they essentially cannot affirm unless they would like to justify murder which under either Util or Kant is not justified.**

## On Case

Util Counters:

1. There is no warrant for valuing pleasure and pain. Just because humans seek pleasure does not make it good and certainly does not give it a value. (ex. Human lives → overpopulation)
   1. Binding
2. Pleasure and pain is subjective - people may disagree on if a certain thing gives them pleasure (ie. reading a book does not give everyone pleasure)

They say experience is the only way to eval but experience is subjective.

1. They also say you can’t weigh between breaking a promise – but link argument solves.
2. There is no true way to measure pleasure and pain - again, reading a book may give people different amounts of pleasure
3. **Induction fails - there’s no necessary basis for natural laws like cause and effect or the gravitational constant which means they can’t guide moral action. It also relies on induction and the fact that things will stay the same which is circular.**
4. **Not acting under util is either immoral or moral - creating infinite contradictory obligations which means it can’t guide action**
5. The state does not use util because of certain laws (ie. you can’t kill someone simply to save five lives) Furthermore - why should we be copying policy makers? There is no reason to do this unless governments are highest moral standard - which they aren’t
6. Actor Specificity can be countered with the is/ought fallacy. Just because governments do mainly use it does not mean that we should - governments are not moral by any standard
7. The butterfly effect - if throwing a pen out of the window causes a nuclear war that person would be responsible for causing a nuclear war
8. We are not even able to calculate all the consequences of one single action - making it impossible to apply
9. People aren’t motivated to increase pleasure for others (ie no one wants to push the fat man off the bridge)
10. People aren’t internally motivated to increase pleasure if their emotions overrule (ie. people would rather save 1 mother and kill 5 people)
11. Humans simply cannot make predictions
    1. Menand 05, Louis Menand (the Anne T. and Robert M. Bass Professor of English at Harvard University) “Everybody’s An Expert” The New Yorker 2005 [http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2005/12/05/everybodys-an-expert//](http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2005/12/05/everybodys-an-expert/) FSU SS “Expert Political Judgment” is not a work of media criticism.

Tetlock is a psychologist—he teaches at Berkeley—and his conclusions are based on a long-term study that he began twenty years ago. He picked two hundred and eighty-four people who made their living “commenting or offering advice on political and economic trends,” and he started asking them to assess the probability that various things would or would not come to pass, both in the areas of the world in which they specialized and in areas about which they were not expert. Would there be a nonviolent end to apartheid in South Africa? Would Gorbachev be ousted in a coup? Would the United States go to war in the Persian Gulf? Would Canada disintegrate? (Many experts believed that it would, on the ground that Quebec would succeed in seceding.) And so on. By the end of the study, in 2003, the experts had made 82,361 forecasts. Tetlock also asked questions designed to determine how they reached their judgments, how they reacted when their predictions proved to be wrong, how they evaluated new information that did not support their views, and how they assessed the probability that rival theories and predictions were accurate. Tetlock got a statistical handle on his task by putting most of the forecasting questions into a “three possible futures” form. The respondents were asked to rate the probability of three alternative outcomes: the persistence of the status quo, more of something (political freedom, [e.g.] economic growth), or less of something (repression, [e.g.] recession). And he measured his experts on two dimensions: how good they were at guessing probabilities (did all the things they said had an x per cent chance of happening happen x per cent of the time?), and how accurate they were at predicting specific outcomes. The results were unimpressive. On the first scale, the experts performed worse than they would have if they had simply assigned an equal probability to all three outcomes—if they had given each possible future a thirty-three-per-cent chance of occurring. Human beings who spend their lives studying the state of the world, in other words, are poorer forecasters than dart-throwing monkeys, who would have distributed their picks evenly over the three choices.

#### Thus, their fw fails 🡪 their ads depend upon consequentialism – can’t eval if impacts don’t even happen.