## 1

**Permissibility negates- Lack of obligation proves the resolution false- the res specifically says you have to prove obligation because ought is defined as a moral obligation, you cannot be obligated and lack an obligation simultaneously.**

**Presume neg- A. We assume statements to be false until proven true takes out all of there presumption and permissibility claims. That is why we don’t believe in alternate realities or conspiracy theories. The lack of a reason something is false does not me it is assumed to be true. B. Statements are more often false then true . If I say this pen is red, I can only prove it true in one way by demonstrating that it is indeed red, where I can prove it false in an infinite amount of ways.**

## 2

#### 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.

#### In the State of Nature, every action is considered a threat. The brutality of the State of nature is a result of our own egoistic desires to be the dominate meaning creator

Parrish 3, Rick. "Derrida's Economy of Violence in Hobbes' Social Contract." Theory & Event, vol. 7 no. 4, 2005. Project MUSE muse.jhu.edu/article/244119.

Elaborating on this, Hobbes writes that “the nature, disposition, and interest of the speaker, such as are the names of virtues and vices; for one man calleth wisdom, what another calleth fear; and one cruelty what another justice.”29 A more simplistic understanding of the brutality of the state of nature, which David Gauthier calls the “simple rationality account,”30 has it that mere materialistic competition for goods is the cause of the war of all against all, but such rivalry is a secondary manifestation of the more fundamental competition among all persons to be the dominant creator of meaning. Certainly, Hobbes writes that persons most frequently “desire to hurt each other” because “many men at the same time have an appetite to the same thing; which yet very often they can neither enjoy in common, nor yet divide it; whence it follows that **the strongest must have it, and who is strongest must be decided by the sword**.”31 But this competition for goods only arises as the result of the more primary struggle that is inherent in the nature of persons of meaning creators. **In the state of nature, “where every man is his own judge**,”32 persons will “mete good and evil by diverse measures,”33 creating labels for things as they see fit, based on individual appetites. One of the most significant objects that receives diverse labels in the state of nature is ‘threat’. Even if most people happen to construe threat similarly, there will be serious disagreement regarding whether or not a specific situation fits a commonly-held definition. This is of course the key to the famous Security Dilemma that international relations theorists spend so much time trying to overcome34 — certain perfectly **innocent actions by one person**(or state) can easily be construed, and rationally **must be construed, as a threat**. Furthermore, any attempt by one person to allay another’s fears about the threatening nature of actions must be taken as strategic disinformation, rather than as genuine explanation. Even if “I agree with you in principle about your right to preserve yourself,” this agreement is useless “if I disagree about whether this is the moment for you to implement that right.”35 Given that **persons “are individual in experience**, they are individual in **their conceptions and in their speech**. Their power of reasoning with words . . . dissociates them and provokes violent competition”36 specifically because concepts that seem simple invoke very different interpretations. **If there were some universally objective** and knowable set of circumstances that constituted Threat as such, **the rationally self-interested persons** of the state of nature **would not have to seek control** over all things **for their own protection**. **All persons could both avoid actions** that would be defined as threat **and shed the overbearing suspicion that**, taken **together**, **make the** Hobbesian **state of nature so** unbearably **brutish**.

#### Only the sovereign can create moral truths; our ethical obligation is to the state. Otherwise, morality is infinitely regressive and impossible to determine.– Absent the sovereign, ethics fail, since everyone has competing conceptions of the good.

Parrish 4 (Rick Parrish. "Derrida's Economy of Violence in Hobbes' Social Contract." Theory & Event 7, no. 4 (2005) <https://muse.jhu.edu/>)

All of the foregoing points to the conclusion that in the commonwealth the sovereign's first and most fundamental job is to be the ultimate definer. Several other commentators have also reached this conclusion. By way of elaborating upon the importance of the moderation of individuality in Hobbes' theory of government, Richard Flathman claims that peace "is possible only if the ambiguity and disagreement that pervade general thinking and acting are eliminated by the stipulations of a sovereign. Pursuant to debunking the perennial misinterpretation of Hobbes' mention of people as wolves, PaulJohnson argues that "one of the primary functions of the sovereign is to provide the necessary unity of meaning and reference for the primary terms in which men try to conduct their social lives." 58 "The whole raison d'être of sovereign helmsmanship lies squarely in the chronic defusing of interpretive clashes," 59 without which humans would "fly off in all directions" 60 and fall inevitably into the violence of the natural condition. 26. It is not surprising that so many noted students of Hobbes have reached this conclusion, given how prominently he himself makes this claim. According to Hobbes, "in the state of nature, where every man is his own judge, and differeth from others concerning the names and appellations of things, and from those differences arise quarrels and breach of peace, it was necessary there should be a common measure of all things, that might fall in controversy." 61 The main categories of the sovereign's tasks are "to make and abrogate laws, to determine war and peace, [and] to know and judge of all controversies," 62 but each of these duties is a subspecies of its ultimate duty to be the sole and ultimate definer in matters of public importance. It is only through the sovereign's effective continued accomplishment of this duty that the people of a commonwealth avoid the definitional problems that typify the state of nature. 27. Judging controversies, which Hobbes lists as the third main task of the sovereign, is the duty most obviously about being the ultimate definer. In fact, Hobbes declares it a law of nature that "in every controversy, the parties thereto ought mutually to agree upon an arbitrator, whom they both trust; and mutually to covenant to stand to the sentence he shall give therein." 63 As I repeatedly alluded to above, this agreement to abide by the decision of a third party arbitrator, a sovereign in the commonwealth, is necessary because of the fundamentally perspectival and relative nature of persons' imputations of meaning and value into the situations they construct. Hobbes understands this problem, as evidenced by his claim that "seeing right reason is not existent, the reason ofsome man or men must supply the place thereof; and that man or men, is he or they, that have the sovereign power" 64 to dictate meanings that will be followed by all. The sovereign is even protected from potential democratic impulses, by which a 'true' meaning would be that agreed upon by the greatest number of people. Because "no one man's reason, nor the reason of any one number of men, makes the certainty," they willstill "come to blows . . . for want of a right reason constituted by nature" 65 unless both the majority and the minority agree to abide by the meanings promulgated by the sovereign. 28. These meanings are usually created and promulgated by the sovereign in the form of laws, another of the tasks with which 7/29/13 RickParrish | Derrida's Economyof Violence in Hobbes' Social Contract | Theory& Event 7:4 https://muse.jhu.edu/journals/theory\_and\_event/v007/7.4parrish.html 13/42 Hobbes charges it. In one of his clearest explanations of the law, Hobbes writes that "it belongs to the same chief power to make some common rules for all men, and to declare them publicly, by which every man may know what may be called his, what another's, what just, what unjust, what honest, what dishonest, what good, what evil; that is summarily, what is to be done, what to be avoided in our common course of life." 66 The civil law is the set of the sovereign's definitions for ownership, justice, good, evil, and all other concepts that are important for the maintenance of peace in the commonwealth. When everyone follows the law (that is, when everyone follows the sovereign's definitions) there are far fewer conflicts among persons because everyone appeals to the same meanings. This means that people know what meanings others will use to evaluate the actions of themselves and others, so the state of nature's security dilemmas and attempts to force one's own meanings upon others are overcome.

#### Thus, the standard is consistency with the will of the sovereign. Prefer it because it outweighs on bindingness: Only the sovereign is able to get everyone to follow their rule and enforce the law, it creates motivations for any moral rules we create. Impact Calc: Only evaluate impacts to structural purpose –what you justify through doing the action. We can control what we justify but we can’t control what we cause.

#### Prefer additionally:

#### [1] Moral Discourse- outside of the state there is no regulative authority to ensure that individuals are capable of engaging in the same moral language. For example, one party can think good means x and another thinks that good means y. The state clarifies this dispute by being an ultimate arbiter and declaring what is good and bad. This means that absent my standard, moral language makes no sense.

#### [2] Infinite Regress- other moral theories inevitably fail because individuals can question why they follow them, but state based morality escapes this because individuals consent to the state by virtue of engaging in it.

#### [3] Constitutivism– other moral theories might matter in the abstract but obligations differ based on the nature of agency. For example, a janitor has different obligations than teachers, in the same vein the state has unique obligations that might be inconsistent with morality in general.

#### Now, I negate the resolution: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike:

#### Now negate:

#### [1] Necessities- the right to strike is not a basic necessity, thus the government does not have an obligation to provide the unconditional right.

Natural Rights, <https://courses.lumenlearning.com/suny-hccc-worldhistory2/chapter/natural-rights/>

Thomas Hobbes’ conception of natural rights extended from his conception of man in a “state of nature.” He argued that the essential natural (human) right was “to use his own power, as he will himself, for the preservation of his own Nature; that is to say, of his own Life.” Hobbes sharply distinguished this natural “liberty” from natural “laws.” In his natural state, according to Hobbes, man’s life consisted entirely of liberties, and not at all of laws. He objected to the attempt to derive rights from “natural law,” arguing that law (“lex”) and right (“jus”) though often confused, signify opposites, with law referring to obligations, while rights refer to the absence of obligations. Since by our (human) nature, we seek to maximize our well being, rights are prior to law, natural or institutional, and people will not follow the laws of nature without first being subjected to a sovereign power, without which all ideas of right and wrong are meaningless.

#### [2] the unconditional right would allow government workers to go on strike. However, them government workers strikes are a contradiction to upholding the power of the government. For example, the military or police going on strike removes capabilities of the sovereign. Since the sovereign would never limit its power, its impossible to affirm

#### [3] The aff obligates states to act – this is incoherent because it implies an authority higher than the state to constrain the sovereign. Only sovereign entities can create moral obligations, so the state can’t have an obligation to act.

## 3

#### Interp: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting and underlining on the 2021-22 NDCA LD wiki 30 minutes or less after the round in which they read them.

#### violation – they have no disclosure novdec.

#### 

#### 1. Academic Integrity – anything else means that you can miscut evidence and there’s no way to check before the round which means that you can garner ridiculous solvency claims and such. They’ll say that I have prep to check, but it isn’t sufficient to check every card in the aff and it would then tradeoff with productive prep on the substance proper. Outweighs – Academic integrity is constitutive to debate as an academic space – just as a teacher would fail a plagiarized paper, you should vote them down for not allowing the verification of adherence to academic rules

#### 2. Engagement – A] disclosing the highlighting and underlining means that I can see the cut warrants of the cards – i.e. if the card has no warrant I should be able to determine it with the highlighting. B] I have no clue what warrants you will go for if the card provides multiple justifications for an argument which hampers pre round prep. Outweighs – you have months to frontline your cases, but I only know what they mean during round which means you get infinite prep compared to 4 minutes of prep time.

#### 3. you’ll say that people will steal cards: 1] they still need to read the articles to have a decent understanding of the arguments 2] it’s a question of who gets the cards – larger schools have much more docs from other schools so there’s an accessibility disad to your interp 3] stealing cards is good – alleviates resource disparities and enables younger debaters to see how to structure cases and cut cards

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)

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 struc-tured and coached debate program, and eventually developing the capability to maintain multiple professional teaching positions, such as those discussed earlier in the chapter.

#### Fairness – Debate is a competition and the better debater should win. Education – only portable skill we take out of round

#### Drop the debater 1] a loss deters future abuse 2] dropping the arg makes no sense since it’s criticizing pre-round behavior.

#### Competing interps 1] Reasonability creates a race to the bottom where debaters are incentivized to be more abusive and just say its reasonable 2] Collapses – offense/defense debate is competing interps 3] Reasonability brightlines are arbitrary since they are based on what you did rather than the best one

#### No RVIs 1] if I realize I’m wrong then I’m forced to advocate for bad norms 2] logic – you shouldn’t win for being fair or educational – outweighs – logic is a litmus test for arguments 3] forces the round to come to theory since it’s the highest layer which reduces time on substance.

## 4

#### Interpretation: the affirmative debater must not specify what just government they defend, e.g. US, Japan, etc. The article “a” implies a nonspecific or generic reading of the word “government”.

Grammar: Articles, Walden University, Feb 8, 2016 <https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/writingcenter/grammar/articles>

What is an article? Articles ("a," "an," and "the") are determiners or noun markers that function to specify if the noun is general or specific in its reference. Often the article chosen depends on if the writer and the reader understand the reference of the noun. The articles "a" and "an" are indefinite articles. They are used with a singular countable noun when the noun referred to is nonspecific or generic. The article "the" is a definite article. It is used to show specific reference and can be used with both singular and plural nouns and with both countable and uncountable nouns. Many languages do not use articles ("a," "an," and "the"), or if they do exist, the way they are used may be different than in English.

#### Textuality – The use of an indefinite article in the resolution means the topic includes all states, not a subset.

#### “Government” is a generic indefinite singular.

Leslie 12 Leslie, Sarah-Jane. “Generics.” In Routledge Handbook of Philosophy of Language, edited by Gillian Russell and Delia Fara 2012. <https://www.princeton.edu/~sjleslie/RoutledgeHandbookEntryGenerics.pdf>

GENERICS VS. EXISTENTIALS The interpretation of sentences containing bare plurals, indefinite singulars, or definite singulars can be either generic as in (1) respectively or existential/specific as in (2): (1) Tigers are striped A tiger is striped The tiger is striped. (2) Tigers are on the front lawn A tiger is on the front lawn The tiger is on the front lawn. The subjects in (1) are prima facie the same as in (2), yet their interpretations in (1) are intuitively quite different from those in (2). In (2) we are talking about some particular tigers, while in (1) we are saying something about tigers in general. There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. For example, if it is true that tigers are on the lawn, then it will also be true that animals are on the lawn. This is not so if the sentence is interpreted generically. For example, it is true that tigers are striped, but it does not follow that animals are striped (Lawler 1973 Laca 1990; Krifka et al 1995). Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification (in the sense of Lewis 1975) with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in (1) (e.g. “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in (2) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g. “tigers are usually on the front lawn). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually”.)

#### This applies to the res – fails upward entailment test – “A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike” doesn’t imply that “A just political organization ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.”

#### Semantics outweigh --

#### A] Topicality is a constitutive rule of the activity and a basic aff burden, they agreed to debate the topic when they came to the tournament

#### B] It’s the only stasis point we know before the round so it controls the internal link to engagement, and there’s no way to use ground if debaters aren’t prepared to defend it.

#### Violation: the aff specified China

#### [1] precision – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Independent voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### [2] limits – the UN says there are 193 governments as of today – explodes limits since there are tons of independent affs plus functionally infinite combinations, all with different advantages in different political situations. Kills neg prep and debatability since there are no DAs that apply to every aff – i.e. reasons why the right to strike is good in Russia differ from that in Pakistan – means the aff is always more prepared and wins just for speccing.

#### [3] TVA solves - you could’ve read your plan as an advantage under a whole res advocacy, that way neg generics would still apply

#### Voters

#### T comes before 1AR theory -- A] If we had to be abusive it’s because it was impossible to engage their aff B] T outweighs on scope because their abuse affected every speech that came after the 1AC C] Topic norms outweigh on urgency – we only have a few months to set them