## 1 – Theory

#### Interpretation: debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source on the page with their name and school on the 2021-2022 NCDA LD wiki with highlighting, tags, and cites after the round in which they read them.

#### Violation: they’ve gone to tournaments but haven’t disclosed anything on their wiki – see screenshots

#### Graphical user interface, text, application, email Description automatically generated Graphical user interface, application Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### [1] Resource disparities – stealing cards is good because it’s the only way to level the playing field for students such as people in under-privileged programs.

Louden 10 – Allan D. Louden, professor of Communication at Wake Forest (“Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century” Wake Forest National Debate Conference. IDEA, 2010) https://www.americanforensicsassoc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Navigating-Opportunity-Book.pdf

Groups interested in engaging in competitive National Debate Tournament (NDT)-Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA)-style policy debate are entering an exciting time in the debate community where **digital resources are making research and networking increasingly accessible**. Those developing programs should be encouraged to choose their own topics and resolutions, but they should also make use of the massive resources available by focusing on the official NDT-CEDA resolution. **New initiatives in the field of open-source debate make evidence sharing, such as the Open Caselist, a powerful tool for new programs to engage and compete against established teams**. It is no coincidence that **the winners of the NDT tend to be the schools with the largest coaching staffs, but the increased distribution and free sharing of evidence and resources have made smaller debate programs increasingly capable of competing against larger institutions**. We are now seeing the beginnings of **increased resource sharing**, with multiple initiatives focusing on regional evidence sharing for groups of developing debate programs. This **is one example of dramatic changes occurring in the community that are capable of opening the doors for new participation in debate**. Regardless of outside influence, such as an organized campaign by preexisting debate organizations to increase resource distribution, students are independently capable of establishing the foundations for a larger competitive program. The following suggestions are a nonlinear set of options available to students who wish to establish a structured and coached debate program, and eventually developing the capability to maintain multiple professional teaching positions, such as those discussed earlier in the chapter.

#### [2] Ev ethics – open source is the only way to verify pre-round that cards aren’t miscut or highlighted/bracketed unethically. That’s a voter – ethical ev practices are key to academics and we should be able to verify they didn’t cheat.

#### [3] Depth of clash – allows debaters to have nuanced objections at a faster rate, which leads to higher quality debates – outweighs because thinking on your feet is nonunique but the best quality responses come from full access to a case.

#### Voters:

#### Fairness: debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation – side constraint to substantive debate.

#### Education: a) it’s the reason schools fund debate and b) it’s the only long-term benefit.

#### Paradigm issues:

#### DTD to deter future abuse and rectify time skew from reading theory.

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you don’t win for being fair, and logic is a meta-constraint, b) good theory debaters will bait theory to win on the RVI, which causes abuse, c) chilling effect – makes debaters scared to call out real abuse because they’ll be out-teched on the RVI.

#### Competing interps – a) reasonability is arbitrary and requires judge intervention, b) collapses because brightlines concede an offense-defense paradigm.

#### CX checks arg N/A bc it’s not about giving us info but rather abt disclosing smth on wiki

## 2 – Korsgaard

### Framework

#### First, morality must begin from our ability to reason. When you take an action, you can always ask why you should take the action. When a reason for the action is formulated, however, you can ask again why we should consider this reason. These justifications continue on into infinity because you can always keep asking “why.” The only way to solve this problem and get to the root of morality is to base ethics in reason itself, because asking for a reason to use reason concedes that it is important. Another justification for this basis is that the ability to reason to take action is what defines a moral agent. For example, a rock may roll down a hill, but because it lacks to ability to reason to make that decision, we would not say that morality applies to it.

#### That means that all actions must be universalizable, making the standard of the debate consistency with universal maxims. Just like how 2 + 2 = 4 is universally true for all reasoners, morality must be universally true as well. Taking an action means you imply that others should be able to take the action because morality must apply the same way to both of you. That means certain actions are restricted. For example, theft is non-universalizable because it depends on the existence of property; however, if everyone were to steal, objects would be passed around with no consideration of their owners, destroying any conception of property in the first place.

#### For clarification, morality is derived from whether it would logically contradict itself, not from adding up the consequences of certain actions. Adding 2 circles doesn’t make anything more circular than it was before, just like how 2 actions aren’t more universalizable than 1. Therefore, consequence-based arguments that do not pertain to the universalizability of actions, such as policy advantages, do not matter if I win the framework debate.

#### Prefer additionally:

**[1] Performativity – freedom is key to argumentation. Abiding by their ethical theory presupposes we have agency, making it incoherent to justify a standard without willing ours.**

#### [2] Resource disparities – focus on evidence puts small school debaters without huge files at a disadvantage, but my framework can be won without prep, which means it’s theoretically preferable.

### Offense

#### [1] Striking violates the contracts that workers agree to because they enforce the employer’s obligation to uphold the contract by continuing to employ the worker but allows workers to neglect their end of the contract.

Gourevitch 16 Alex Gourevitch, assistant professor of political science at Brown University, “Quitting Work but Not the Job: Liberty and the Right to Strike,” 2016, American Political Science Association, accessed 20 October 2021, Pg. 309, <https://sci-hub.do/10.1017/S1537592716000049> ~ST~ Gourevitch does not agree with the terminal conclusion of the aff

The right to strike is peculiar. It is not a right to quit. The right to quit is part of freedom of contract and the mirror of employment-at-will. Workers may quit when they no longer wish to work for an employer; employers may fire their employees when they no longer want to employ them. Either of those acts severs the contractual relationship and the two parties are no longer assumed to be in any relationship at all. The right to strike, however, assumes the continuity of the very relationship that is suspended. Workers on strike refuse to work but do not claim to have left the job. After all, the whole point of a strike is that it is a collective work stoppage, not a collective quitting of the job. This is the feature of the strike that has marked it out from other forms of social action.

If a right to strike is not a right to quit, what is it? It is the right that workers claim to refuse to perform work they have agreed to do while retaining a right to the job. Most of what is peculiar, not to mention fraught, about a strike is contained in that latter clause. Yet, surprisingly, few commentators recognize just how central and yet peculiar this claim is.16 Opponents of the right to strike are sometimes more alive to its distinctive features than defenders. One critic, for instance, makes the distinction between quitting and striking the basis of his entire argument:

#### That’s definitionally non-universalizable – to leverage power for some by breaking contract necessitates that others uphold the contract; otherwise, the contract would be nonexistent.

Lumen no date Lumen Learning, “Kantian Ethics (Main Concepts),” no date, Lumen Learning, accessed 20 October 2021, <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/sanjacinto-philosophy/chapter/kantian-ethics-main-concepts/> ~ST~

When someone acts, it is according to a rule, or maxim. For Kant, an act is only permissible if one is willing for the maxim that allows the action to be a universal law by which everyone acts.[15] Maxims fail this test if they produce either a contradiction in conception or a contradiction in the will when universalized. A contradiction in conception happens when, if a maxim were to be universalized, it ceases to make sense because the “…maxim would necessarily destroy itself as soon as it was made a universal law.”[16] For example, if the maxim ‘It is permissible to break promises’ was universalized, no one would trust any promises made, so the idea of a promise would become meaningless; the maxim would be self-contradictory because, when universalized, promises cease to be meaningful. The maxim is not moral because it is logically impossible to universalize—we could not conceive of a world where this maxim was universalized.[17]A maxim can also be immoral if it creates a contradiction in the will when universalized. This does not mean a logical contradiction, but that universalizing the maxim leads to a state of affairs that no rational being would desire. For example, Driver argues that the maxim ‘I will not give to charity’ produces a contradiction in the will when universalized because a world where no one gives to charity would be undesirable for the person who acts by that maxim.[18]

#### [2] A strike uses the employer and society as a means to an end.

Fourie 17 Johan Fourie, professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University, "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers," 30 November 2017, accessed 19 October 2021, Other Papers, <https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html> JG recut

A further formula of the Categorical Imperative is "so, act as to treat humanity, whether in your own person or in that of any other context, never solely as a means to an end but always as an end within itself' (Parrott, 2006, p. 51). By this Kant meant people should be valued and respected as an individual and not used for the benefit of others. Participating in a labor-strike demonstration/action is a direct violation of this categorical perspective as it would not be ethically permissible because the severe dependence and well-being of clients, the effective functioning of the employer organization, and society is used to duly and unduly influence the bargaining process for better working conditions. In participating in the labor strike demonstration, the humanity, and well-being of clients and society is not seen as crucial and as an 'end', but rather used to demonstrate the undeniable need for the skills and expertise of social workers. Furthermore, through withholding services, social worker professionals demonstrate that the well-being and welfare of society have lost its inherent importance/value. Though the value of overall well-being is taught throughout the social work training process and is enshrined in the professional ethical codes.

#### Next, in medical services, strikes can only function through the intent of actively causing harm to patients.

Loewy 2000 Erich H. Lowey, professor of bioethics at University of California, "Of healthcare professionals, ethics, and strikes," Cambridge Q. Healthcare Ethics 9 (2000): 513. Accessed 19 October 2021, Pg. 516-517, sci-hub.se/10.1017/S0963180100904092 JG recut

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.

#### These violate the test of universalizability – workers coerce their employers and intend to use societal suffering for personal gain, but undermining someone’s freedom by forcing them to do something is non-universalizable because it requires the exercise of your own freedom.

## 3 – CP

#### Counterplan: A just government ought to recognize a right of workers to strike except for strikes that advocate for racism.

#### There has been a history of striking for the purpose of excluding and marginalizing black people

Keyes 17 Allison Keyes, museum correspondent, JUNE 30, 2017, "The East St. Louis Race Riot Left Dozens Dead, Devastating a Community on the Rise," Smithsonian Magazine, accessed 3 December 2021, https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/east-st-louis-race-riot-left-dozens-dead-devastating-community-on-the-rise-180963885/ //SR

Racial tensions began simmering in East St. Louis—a city where thousands of blacks had moved from the South to work in war factories—as early as February 1917. The African-American population was 6,000 in 1910 and nearly double that by 1917. In the spring, the largely white workforce at the Aluminum Ore Company went on strike. Hundreds of blacks were hired. After a City Council meeting on May 28, angry white workers lodged formal complaints against black migrants. When word of an attempted robbery of a white man by an armed black man spread through the city, mobs started beating any African-Americans they found, even pulling individuals off of streetcars and trolleys. The National Guard was called in but dispersed in June.

#### Turns their offense because workers literally strike so that certain groups are excluded from employment, which causes all the oppressive impacts that the affirmative is trying to prevent.