# Blue Key R4

#### Counterinterp: I can contest the aff framework.

#### [1] Phil ed – contesting the framework is k2 getting phil ed because that’s the only way we can examine the warrants and justifications of your framing – o/w because you can get topic ed in other forms of debate like policy but phil ed is uq to LD

#### [2] Reciprocity – a) you can contest my framing and my offense if you wanted to which solves. If I can uplayer that just proves it’s inevitable because I could always read millions of blippy disads on your case so afc doesn’t solve b) you could always read frameworks that auto-affirm like polls or testimony which would make negating impossible – I wouldn’t be able to generate any offense

#### [3] Strat Skew – forces me to uplayer using friv theory if I can’t find offense against their framing which kills education since we don’t talk about their framing or their offense – kills my strat since I’ll have to rely on args that are less true and harder to win.

# cp

**\*\*Content Warning: Mentions of Police Violence in the Card\*\***

**CP: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike except for police officers.**

Samantha **Michaels**, Sept/Oct-**2020**, *Samantha Michaels is a reporter at Mother Jones,* "If you want to defund the police, start with their unions," Mother Jones, https://www.motherjones.com/crime-justice/2020/08/police-unions-minneapolis/ //SR

As the year 1990 came to an end, a fight broke out during a New Year’s Eve celebration at the Juke Box Saturday Night bar in downtown Minneapolis. A 21-year-old white student grabbed Michael Sauro from behind. Sauro, an off-duty white police officer working as a bouncer, handcuffed the man, dragged him to the kitchen, and then repeatedly drove his steel-toed paratrooper boots into his groin and head. Sauro had been a cop for 15 years and had a long record of citizen complaints against him, most of them about excessive force. “I was dealing with animals,” he would later tell a reporter when asked about the people he’d beaten. “I mean, my dog is more human than them.” But he had never been disciplined. Four years after the bar fight, a court found that Sauro had used excessive force against the student, and it awarded $700,000 to him, then the largest civil award settlement in the city’s history. By then, Sauro had racked up 32 citizen complaints, though none had been sustained. The mayor finally fired him. But his absence from the police department was short-lived. With the help of his union, the Police Officers’ Federation of Minneapolis, Sauro appealed to an arbitrator, who soon forced the city to rehire him with back pay. “These arbitrators always rule in favor of the police. It’s absolute and utter BS,” says Robert Bennett, an attorney who represented the victim and has sued the department dozens of times. A few months later, the police chief fired Sauro a second time for punching a Black student in the face near the Juke Box Saturday Night bar after the same New Year’s Eve party. Again, an arbitrator forced the department to rehire him. Then-Mayor Sharon Sayles Belton expressed her disappointment. “Allegations of abuse around Mike Sauro do not help create a climate of trust and respect,” she said. Sauro was rehired in 1997 and stayed on the force for nearly two more decades. Eventually, his bosses put him in charge of the sex crimes unit, where women accused his team of failing to investigate some of their rape cases. In 2018, Amber Mansfield said he ignored her complaint that a man she knew had choked and raped her. “Sometimes victims have to take some responsibility for their decisions and their actions,” he told a reporter at the time. In 2019, after Sauro retired, an internal review found 1,700 untested rape kits at the department dating back to the 1990s. (Sauro disputes this finding.) Three decades after Sauro beat the man at the bar, the Minneapolis police union is fighting to protect another set of officers accused of violence. On Memorial Day, Derek Chauvin knelt on the neck of George Floyd for nearly nine minutes, even after Floyd said he couldn’t breathe and went unconscious. Three officers who were with Chauvin never intervened. As Floyd’s death thrust the nation into protest, Mayor Jacob Frey described the city’s police union as a “nearly impenetrable barrier” to disciplining officers for racism and other misconduct, partly because of the legal protections it bargained for. “We do not have the ability to get rid of many of these officers that we know have done wrong in the past,” Frey told the podcast the Daily in June. Police unions are at the center of questions about what will happen to Chauvin and the three officers who watched as Floyd was suffocated. And they are also key to understanding why officers across the country escape discipline time and again after beating or killing people. As other labor unions have shrunk in recent years, membership in police unions has remained high. While the Black Lives Matter movement encouraged people to document police brutality on camera and demand accountability, police unions, which now have hundreds of thousands of members, have pushed back in almost every way imaginable—by overturning firings, opposing the use of body cameras, and lobbying to keep their members’ disciplinary histories sealed. All of which can make officers feel invincible when they commit acts of violence. A forthcoming research paper from the University of Victoria in Canada found that after police officers formed unions—generally between the 1950s and the 1980s—there was a “substantial” increase in police killings of Black and Brown people in the United States. Within a decade of gaining collective bargaining rights, officers killed an additional 60 to 70 civilians of all races per year collectively, compared with previous years, an increase that researchers say may be linked to officers’ belief that their unions would protect them from prosecution. A working paper from the University of Chicago found that complaints of violent misconduct by Florida sheriffs’ offices jumped 40 percent after deputies there won collective bargaining rights in 2003. Police unions, like all unions, were designed to protect their own. But unlike other labor unions, they represent workers with the state-sanctioned power to use deadly force. And they have successfully bargained for more job security than what’s afforded to most workers, security they can often rely on even after committing acts of violence that would likely get anyone else fired or locked up. And yet, in the broader push to reform the criminal justice system, police unions have remained largely untouchable, both by the broader labor movement, which has avoided criticizing their bargaining process, and by politicians on both sides of the aisle, who have accepted millions of dollars in campaign donations from them. Democrats don’t want to come down against unions, and Republicans, who are normally happy to attack unions, don’t want to mess with the police. When former Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker destroyed collective bargaining rights for his state’s public sector unions in 2011, he left police unions mostly unscathed. The AFL-CIO, the country’s largest labor coalition, has referred to police unions as rightful beneficiaries in the movement for workers’ rights.

#### Strikes empower unions.

Erin **Corbett**, 6-23-**2020**, *Freelance journalist and writer on politics, feminism, and social justice. Seen in MSN, Yahoo, VICE, Fortune, People Magazine, Bustle, The Daily Dot, Alternet, Money, The Trace, Rewire.News, Daily Hampshire Gazette, and more*. "Police Are Going On Strike. Should Anyone Care?," https://www.refinery29.com/en-us/2020/06/9874441/police-going-on-strike-walkout-reason //SR

Atlanta police officers across the city last week staged a “sick-out” in protest after the Fulton County district attorney brought charges against the two officers who shot and killed Rayshard Brooks. The Atlanta police department did not confirm how many people called in sick, but “confirmed a larger-than-usual number of absent officers.” In three of the police department’s six zones, officers were not responding to calls, and many refused to leave their stations unless another officer required backup. A similar scene played out in Buffalo, New York where 57 officers quit an elite police unit in protest after two officers were suspended for pushing an elderly man during an anti-police brutality protest. Likewise, in Philadelphia and New York City police are rumored to start calling in sick during protests, and organizing work slowdowns. As protests continue nationwide against racist policing, with calls now to defund and abolish policing — and as officers face punishment for using lethal force against civilians and brutalizing protesters — more and more of them are in talks to walk off the job. In effect, the cops are protesting the protests against them. But what’s the point of protests led by police officers, and what do they actually accomplish, especially amid ongoing national calls to abolish policing altogether? Police have organized work slowdowns in the past in response to institutional action being taken against them. As The Daily Beast reports, when local governments take action against police over misconduct, particularly when these incidents are caught on video and go viral, “cops can feel like they’re being punished for carrying out orders in a way their superiors secretly condoned.” In other words, they feel like scapegoats for following orders and then being met with public pressure to be held accountable. Work slowdowns are generally organized to sway public opinion of the police force. But in a moment of national unrest in response to police brutality, a police-led protest may not be the best tactic to gain public support. “It doesn’t seem to be a particularly well thought through strategy,” Dennis Kenney, a professor of criminal justice at John Jay College told Refinery29. “The idea behind it is to express dissatisfaction with the way they perceive they are being treated. It seems a bit of a misplaced activity this time.” Kenney further explained that police-organized protests at this moment is a “very different ballgame from the perspective of their unions” because they aren’t focused around a labor dispute. Instead, the entire country is engaging in a conversation about the very existence of these agencies. “It seems self-defeating,” said Kenney. Police have historically organized strikes for a variety of reasons and with different results. Perhaps the most famous police protest was the Boston police strike in 1919 when 80 percent of the city’s police protested to organize a union. During the work stoppage the city experienced more robberies.

# NC

#### Permissibility negates:

#### [1] Semantics – Ought is defined as expressing obligation[[1]](#footnote-1) which means absent a proactive obligation you vote neg since there’s a trichotomy between prohibition, obligation, and permissibility and proving one disproves the other two. Semantics outweighs – A. it’s key to predictability since we prep based on the wording of the res B. It’s constitutive to the rules of debate since the judge is obligated to vote on the resolutional text.

#### [2] Safety – It’s ethically safer to presume the squo since we know what the squo is but we can’t know whether the aff will be good or not if ethics are incoherent.

#### [3] Logic – Propositions require positive justification before being accepted, otherwise one would be forced to accept the validity of logically contradictory propositions regarding subjects one knows nothing about, i.e if one knew nothing about P one would have to presume that both the “P” and “~P” are true.

Yes pmerisisbilitly – the arg that permissiblity is bad requires a normative fw to prove why these thigns are bad but if they lose on permissiiblity then this is imposislb

Just another moral arguemnt as to why we can’t do it – no diff tha nsaying that the aff is bad

Alltheir justifications are presumption

#### The metaethic is perspectivism – truth is not absolute but rather created by individuals based on their own individual perspective. Prefer it

#### [1] Opacity – we can never access another person’s perspective because we can never fully understand who someone else is or what they think. Every truth I create cannot be universalized because I can’t guarantee that they will create the same truth because they do what they want.

#### [2] Linguistics – Truth is constructed by language, which is completely arbitrary. Nothing tells me that a chair is a chair; I only assign it that name arbitrarily because I want to. Meaning can’t be contained within language if we make it up ourselves, and truth doesn’t exist absent language.

#### But, the state of nature leads to infinite violence – competing truth claims means conflicts cannot be resolved. Two warrants:

#### [1] Ambiguity – everyone can assert their own claims to be true and refuse contestation – this means we always fight over who is correct. This is irresolvable because there is no mediator to adjudicate the dispute and tell who is correct – we just fight forever

#### [2] Self-Interest – everyone wants their truth claims to be true because it benefits them – this leads to conflict because we can’t divide limited resources and must compete with each other – terminates in death because neither of us want to concede to the other

#### This state of nature is brutish and has no conception of morality because we don’t have any unified truth to guide us, and thus outweighs on magnitude. The solution is the creation of the sovereign to mediate what is true and enforce the law; they are the ultimate ruler and arbitrator. It must eliminate all conflicts to bring peace to our violent natures. Thus, the standard is consistency with the will of the sovereign. Prefer it because it outweighs on bindingness: Only the sovereign can get everyone to follow their rule and enforce the law, it creates motivations for any moral rules we create. Otherwise, the framework collapses and truth becomes impossible.

## Offense

#### Negate –

#### [1] The sovereign has absolute authority; strikes contest the rule of the authority of the sovereign which leads to infinite regress and freezes action.

Lloyd and Sreedhar (Sharon A. Lloyd and Susanne Sreedhar, Sharon Lloyd is Professor of Philosophy, Law, and Political Science at the University of Southern California. She co-founded the USC Center for Law and Philosophy, and directs the USC Levan Institute's Conversations in Practical Ethics Program., Susanne Sreedhar is an Associate Professor of Philosophy at Boston University. Sreedhar's work on social contract theory has been influential, and has mostly been aimed at the nature and scope of obligation within political systems, and the possibility of ethical civil disobedience within a Hobbesian system., 2-12-2002, accessed on 6-29-2021, The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2020 Edition), "Hobbes’s Moral and Political Philosophy (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)", <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hobbes-moral/)//st>

Although Hobbes offered some mild pragmatic grounds for preferring monarchy to other forms of government, his main concern was to argue that **effective government—whatever its form—must have absolute authority.** Its powers must be neither divided nor limited. **The powers of legislation, adjudication, enforcement, taxation, war-making (and the less familiar right of control of normative doctrine) are connected in such a way that a loss of one may thwart effective exercise of the rest;** for example, **legislation without interpretation and enforcement will not serve to regulate conduct. Only a government that possesses all of what Hobbes terms the “essential rights of sovereignty” can be reliably effective**, since **where partial sets of these rights are held by different bodies that disagree** in their judgments as to what is to be done, **paralysis of effective government, or degeneration into a civil war to settle their dispute, may occur.** Similarly, **to impose limitation on the authority of the government is to invite irresoluble disputes over whether it has overstepped those limits. If each person is to decide for herself whether the government should be obeyed**, factional disagreement—**and war to settle the issue, or at least paralysis of effective government—are [is] quite possible**. **To refer resolution of the question to some further authority, itself also limited and so open to challenge for overstepping its bounds, would be to initiate an infinite regress of non-authoritative ‘authorities’** (where the buck never stops). To refer it to a further authority itself unlimited, would be just to relocate the seat of absolute sovereignty, a position entirely consistent with Hobbes’s insistence on absolutism. **To avoid the horrible prospect of governmental collapse and return to the state of nature, people should treat their sovereign as having absolute authority.**

#### [2] The sovereign hasn’t granted the unconditional right to strike in the squo - proves that it doesn’t want it. Passing the res blocks the sovereign’s will.

# Hijack

#### Consequentialism collapses to particularism – we can never find an absolute norm because rules are indeterminate and always changing:

#### The practice of ethical life is complicated and multifaceted – different moral features are relevant in different moral cases. This isn’t deducing justifications for them but reflecting on the way we practice.

James Griffin 5, Rhodes Scholar, American-born philosopher, who was White's Professor of Moral Philosophy at the University of Oxford from 1996 to 2000., Corpus Christi College, 2005, "Human Rights: Whose Duties?," Human Rights And The Moral Responsibilities Of Corporate And Public Sector Organisations Volume 20 Of The Series Issues In Business Ethics Pp 31-43, http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F1-4020-2361-8\_3

I said a moment ago that mere ability is one reason-generating consideration in cases of aid. But **moral life is more complicated** than that. **Many other considerations also shape moral norms,** for instance, the one I glanced at earlier: that **a good life is a life of deep commitments to particular persons, causes, careers, and institutions; that deep commitments limit our wills in major ways; and that our powers of large-scale calculation about what maximises good outcomes are also limited.** Unless one stresses these other reason-generating considerations, my proposal that ability can fix who should give aid might look odd. **A [Bill] Gates or a Getty has a great ability to help the needy. That ability, no doubt, means that they have above-average obligations to help. But the obligation upon them does not go on until their marginal loss equals the marginal gain of the needy; nor does it with us.** The ethical story is far more complicated than that. That Gateses and the Gettys - and **we - are allowed substantially to honour our own commitments and follow our own interests, and these permissions limit our obligations.** All that I wish to claim is that mere ability is one consideration in fixing where to place the duty to help. As with identifying the content of a human right, so also with identifying the related duty-ower: my remarks are only a start on the job. It is characteristic of the Work involved in identifying duty-owers that it too can be long, hard, and contentious. I think that sometimes **it will prove impossible to make a clearly successful case for holding anyone** in particular **the** appropriate **duty-ower.** Sometimes the **identification will have elements of arbitrariness and convention in it. Sometimes it will be subject to negotiation** in a particular place or time. We can know that there is a moral burden, without yet knowing who should shoulder it.

#### Negate - the AC is an absolute principle which is inconsistent with the call for particularity - it says that unconditional means all rights to strike -

Merriam Webster, (https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/unconditional)//st

: not conditional or limited : ABSOLUTE, UNQUALIFIED

#### unconditional rights are bad - it’s terrible for ethics bc it means that under no conditions can we question things, which doesn’t account for particular situations i.e. it may be bad to strike while blocking the entrance to the emergency room which proves there are bad conditions to strike on

1. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)