# 1

#### Interpretation: If a debater proposes a role of the ballot, they must indicate what advocacies are acceptable under the role of the ballot in a delineated text in the 1ac.

#### Violation: You don’t specify

#### Standards: 1. Resolvability: Absent specification, it’s impossible to debate and adjudicate especially when debaters derive offense under the role of the ballot using separate methods or the same method in different ways. Since these arguments are incomparable, the judge is forced to intervene. Resolvability is an independent voter since every round needs a winner, which means that this shell is a prior question.

#### 2. Strat Skew: By not meeting these conditions, they make it impossible to formulate a strategy because I don’t know what links to their evaluative mechanism. Strategy is key to formulating arguments and engaging in positions. If I go for a policy action and then you say the ROB is about speech acts then I lose any ability to engage in that new framing. Fairness is a voter because it’s a gateway issue to evaluate substance – if its skewed then there’s no way to know who is winning

DTD abuse

No RVIs – logic – baiting

Competing interps – reason arbitrary

# 2

#### The role of the ballot is to endorse the debater who proves the truth or falsity of the resolution – Text – five dictionaries define negate as to deny the truth of[[1]](#footnote-1). Text first – Text comes first – a) Controls the internal link to fairness since it’s the basis of things like predictability and prep b) Key to jurisdiction since the judge can only endorse what is within their burden c) Even if another role of the ballot is better for debate, that is not a reason it ought to be the role of the ballot, just a reason we ought to discuss it.

# 3

#### Ethics must solve the internalism-externalism paradox—either reasons for action are based on an agent’s internal motivation, or on a priori objective reasons. However, both of these accounts fail since internal motivations are contingent and arbitrary, while external reasons beg the question of a source for these reasons. The solution is constitutivism, or the idea that ethics must be based on the nature of agency. Only this can solve the paradox—concerns derived from the nature of agents are objective and non-optional, yet are motivational for all agents.

#### Thus, the metaethic is constitutivism.

#### Prefer:

#### [1] Agency is the only non-optional enterprise—everything is part of it. Every action part of an optional enterprise is part of agency. This round is part of my identity as a debater, but it’s also engagement in agency.

#### [2] Regress—trying to escape agency necessitates using rational reflection about what I ought to do, which is part of agency.

**And, practical reason is constitutive of agents.**

#### [1] Regress – every moral theory can be infinitely questioned which proves its base nonbinding since any agent can opt out of it. Reason sovles since asking for a reason concedes its authority. Bindingness matters since otherwise morality would be optional and cannot explain goodness.

#### [2] Hijacks – All actions concede reason since to obtain goodness, you need to be able to take action and set and pursue ends meaning reason is the source of all value.

#### [3] Is/Ought Gap – experience just describes how the world is but doesn’t indicate how it ought to be which means there must be an a priori conception of good

#### [4] Agency is inescapable – we can shift between different identities over time but that shift is an instance of agency, and it also takes practical reason to see which enterprises are most desirable.

#### Thus, we share a unified perspective – everyone around me must arrive at the same conclusions through the use of reason. It’s incoherent to say 2+2=4 for me but not you. Willing a violation of freedom results in a contradiction because it presupposes you have your own freedom to do so in the first place.

#### And, All agents must accept the state as necessary to enforce rights claims.

Ripstein 04 [Arthur Ripstein, (University Professor of Law and Philosophy, [University of Toronto](https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_org&hl=en&org=8515235176732148308)) "Authority and Coercion" Philosophy & Public Affairs, 32: 2–35, 2004, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2004.00003.x/abstract, DOA:12-16-2017 // WWBW//recut]

Kant explains **the need for** the three branches of **government** in Rousseau’s vocabulary **of the “general will.” Kant finds this concept helpful, since it manages to capture the way in which the specificity of the law and the monopoly on [the law’s] its enforcement do not thereby make it the unilateral imposition of one person’s will upon another. Instead, it is what Kant calls an “omnilateral” will, since all must agree to set up procedures that will make right possible**. All must agree, because **without such procedures, equal freedom is impossible**, and so the external freedom of each is impossible. But the sense in which they must agree is not just that they should agree**; it is that they cannot object to being forced to accept those procedures, because any objection would be nothing more than an assertion of the right to use force against others unilaterally.** Once the concept of the General Will is introduced, it provides further constraints on the possibility of a rightful condition, and even explains the ways in which a state can legitimately coerce its citizens for reasons other than the redress of private wrongs. Kant’s treatment of these issues of “Public Right” has struck many readers as somewhat perfunctory, especially after his meticulously detailed, if not always transparent, treatment of private right. He treats these issues as he does because he takes them to follow directly from the institution of a social contract. The details of his arguments need not concern us here, because he does not claim that these exhaust the further powers of the state. Instead, he puts them forward as additional powers a state must have if it is to create a rightful condition, and it is the structure of that argument that is of concern here.

#### Thus the standard is consistency with a system of equal freedoms.

#### The standard is non consequentialist so the state has no right to try to predict rights violations, it can only punish ongoing ones since it doesn’t understand intent. Prefer for action theory – any action can be split into infinite smaller actions. When I am eating a sandwich it is infinitely small movements of my arm. Only reason unifies those actions. This is necessary for ethics because it requires a judgement of a coherent action.

#### Prefer additionally:

#### [1] Consequentialism fails –

#### A] Induction fails –

#### 1. saying that induction works relies on induction itself because it assumes that past trends will continue, which means it’s circular and unjustified

#### 2. It assumes specific causes of past consequences which can’t be verified as the actual cause

#### B] Butterfly effect - every action has infinite consequences so it is impossible to evaluate an action; one government policy could end up causing nuclear war in a million years.

#### C] Aggregation is impossible – pleasure and pain are subjective – we have no idea how many headaches equal a migraine

#### D] Infinite obligations – I have infinite obligations to maximize pleasure with no way to order them which freezes action.

#### [2] Performativity – any arguments as to why the framework is false presupposes you have the freedom to make those arguments.

#### I defend the squo. Negate:

#### 1] Strikes fail to fulfill duty
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Kantian Ethics Kantian ethics suggest that actions are morally permissible based on **whether it fulfils a person's duty** (Banks, 2006). To further the concept of duty, Kantian ethics held the notion of Categorical Imperatives which is believed to determine the morality of duties as it enforces and commands adherence, complicity and application. The Categorical Imperatives consist of three formulas. Once such a formula is to "act only on the maximum whereby at the same time you can will that it become a universal law" (Parrott, 2006, p. 51). Through this perspective, Kant held that persons are to engage in actions that they are willing to allow others to engage in as well without conditions and exceptions. Applying this formula to the ethicality of social workers **participating in labor strike** demonstrations, it becomes evident that such an action is **not morally permissible or executing its duty**. Arguably, as much as social workers are trained professionals and rendering services that are crucial to the functioning and well-being of society, they remain ordinary citizens who also at some point will **require crucial services**. Examples of these crucial services that may cause significant harm because of its absence due to labor strike action are **medical personnel, suicide watch centers, mental health care professionals, law enforcement, court systems**, municipal service delivery, etc. With these services not available, social workers will experience suffering, frustration, unhappiness, harm as the clients will do with their absence from the office. To this regard, participating and demonstrating labor strike action is not adhering to duty or morally permissible. adhering to duty or morally permissible.

#### 2] Workers promise in contracts not to strike, these contracts grant employers the right to fire people if they strike and has been upheld by the state.

"Employer Sanctions for Violation of No-Strike Clause: Union Busting through Mass Discharge and Rescission." ***Yale Law Journal*, N.d.** digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=8323&context=ylj. Accessed 23 June 2021.

**EMPLOYERS often secure no-strike clauses 1 in collective bargaining contracts** 2 with their employees' unions, 3 in order to ensure greater union responsibility for the maintenance of stable production schedules.4 **Under such clauses, the union promises not to authorize or sanction any strike during the term of its contract.' The employer is** usually **given power to discipline or discharge all the individual union members who strike in violation of the no-strike clause.0**

When confronted with a union-sponsored strike in violation of a no-strike clause, the employer may be forced to accede to the union's demands because of production requirements or the scarcity of replacement workers. 7 Alternatively, he may shut down his plant and wait out the strike, disciplining the strikers when they return to work, subject to an arbitrator's review.8 However, if he believes his bargaining position to be strong, he may discharge all the strikers, rescind the contract, and refuse thereafter to deal with the union.0 **The National Labor Relations Board has upheld such employer actions on the grounds that they are justified by the union's prior material breach of the contract,'** ° and that strikers in violation of contract are not protected by the National Labor Relations Act."1

#### Promise breaking is bad – it’s non universalizable because it gets rid of conceptions of truth.

#### 3] Uses others as a mere means to an end

Fourie 17 Johan Fourie 11-30-2017 "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers" <https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html> (Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG

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.
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