### 1

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose the plan text and standard text to their new affirmative to their opponent 30 minutes before the round.

#### Violation: SS in the docGraphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message Description automatically generated

#### ~1~ Limits – unbroken standard and plan text are infinitely unpredictable – they’ll always win with cheap shot affs that we can’t prep. Giving only plan and standard text preserves sufficient affirmative flexibility by allowing your warrant to be new, but also allows the 1nc a chance of engaging.

#### ~2~ Argument quality: standard text text disclosure discourages cheap shot aff’s with frings authors and shoddy solvency. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, the case should lose. They had a month to prep – the neg is entitled to some research time to make sure the AFF is inherent, topical, and controversial. Outweighs on argument quality and innovation – kills education only portable impact and encourages unfairness

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation. Education’s a voter – terminal impact of debate

#### Drop the debater – a~ deter future abuse and b~ set better norms for debate.

#### Competing interps – ~a~ reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, ~b~ it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices C] encourages making the whole round theory which detracts from substance education D] they are the logic of criminalization over punishing people of color trying to create productive discourse

### 2

Interpretation: debaters may not read 1ar theory first, Drop the debater, competing interps, and no 2nr I meets

Standard is infinate abuse

#### NC theory Ows- the 1nc only read theory because the AC was abusive, 2) lexicality- it indicts practices that occur earlier in the round 3) reciprocity- we each have two speeches to debate other speeches have unequal response abilities

#### Meta theory ows- it indicts the initial reading of their shell

### 3

### 3

#### Permissibility and presumption negate – a. the resolution indicates the affirmative is proactive, and permissibility would deny the existence of an obligation b. Statements are more often false than true because any part can be false. This means you negate if there is no offense because the resolution is probably false.

#### The neg burden is to prove that the aff won’t logically happen in the status quo, and the aff burden is to prove that it will.

Top of Form

Bottom of Form

#### Prefer:

#### 1] Text –

#### A] Ought is “used to express logical consequence” as defined by Merriam-Webster

(<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>) //Massa

#### B] Oxford Dictionary defines ought as “used to indicate something that is probable.”

<https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/ought> //Massa

#### 2] Debatability – a) it focuses debates on empirics about squo trends rather than irresolvable abstract principles that’ve been argued for years B] moral framework debate is impossible.

Joyce 02 Joyce, Richard. Myth of Morality. Port Chester, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2002. p 45-47.

This distinction between what is accepted from within an institution, and “stepping out” of that institution and appraising it from an exterior perspective, is close to Carnap’s distinction between internal and external questions. 15 Certain **“linguistic frameworks”** (as Carnap calls them) **bring** with them **new** terms and **ways of talking: accepting the language of “things” licenses making assertions** like “The shirt is in the cupboard”; **accepting mathematics allows one to say “There is a prime number greater than one hundred”;** accepting the language of propositions permits saying “Chicago is large is a true proposition,” etc. Internal to the framework in question, confirming or disconfirming the truth of these propositions is a trivial matter. But traditionally **philosophers have interest**ed themselves **in** the external question – **the issue of the adequacy of the framework itself:** “Do objects exist?”, “Does the world exist?”, “**Are there numbers?”,** “Are the propositions?”, etc. Carnap’s argument is that **the** external **question,** as it has been typically construed, **does not make sense. From a perspective that accepts mathematics, the answer to the question “Do numbers exist?” is just** trivially **“Yes.”** From a perspective which has not accepted mathematics, Carnap thinks, the only sensible way of construing the question is not as a theoretical question, but as a practical one: “Shall I accept the framework of mathematics?”, and this pragmatic question is to be answered by consideration of the efficiency, the fruitfulness, the usefulness,etc., of the adoption. But the (traditional) **philosopher’s questions** – “But is mathematics true?”, “Are there really numbers?” – **are pseudo-questions.** By turning traditional philosophical questions into practical questions of the form “Shall I adopt...?”, Carnap is offering a noncognitive analysis of metaphysics. Since I am claiming that we can critically inspect morality from an external perspective – that we can ask whether there are any non-institutional reasons accompanying moral injunctions – and that such questioning would not amount to a “Shall we adopt...?” query, Carnap’s position represents a threat. What arguments does Carnap offer to his conclusion? He starts with the example of the “thing language,” which involves reference to objects that exist in time and space. **To** step out of the thing language and **ask “But does the world exist?” is a mistake,** Carnap thinks, **because the very notion of “existence” is a term which belongs to the thing language, and can be understood only within that framework, “hence this concept cannot be meaningfully applied to the system itself.”** 16 Moving on to the external question “Do numbers exist?” Carnap cannot use the same argument – he cannot say that “existence” is internal to the number language and thus cannot be applied to the system as a whole. Instead he says that philosophers who ask the question do not mean material existence, but have no clear understanding of what other kind of existence might be involved, thus such questions have no cognitive content. It appears that this is the form of argument which he is willing to generalize to all further cases: **persons who dispute** whether propositions exist, **whether properties exist,** etc., do not know what they are arguing over, thus they **are not arguing over the truth of a proposition,** but over the practical value of their respective positions. Carnap adds that this is so because there is nothing that both parties would possibly count as evidence that would sway the debate one way or the other.

#### The resolution is incoherent-

#### 1] Merrian websters defines to as

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/to

to preposition Save Word To save this word, you'll need to log in. Log In \ tə, tu̇, ˈtü \ Definition of to (Entry 1 of 3) 1a—used as a function word to **indicate movement** or an action or condition suggestive of movement toward a place, person, or thing reached

#### But just governments can’t move to an obligations so rez is incoherent

#### 2] Merrian Websters defines right as

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/right

**having** the **axis perpendicular to** the **base**

#### But there is no base for strikes to be perpendicular to, so the rez does nothing

**3] Merrian websters defines Strike as** **to delete something**

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/strike

#### 4] Merrian Websters defines workers as

any of the sexually underdeveloped and usually **sterile members of a colony of social ants**, bees, wasps, or termites that perform most of the labor and protective duties of the colony

https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/worker

#### 3] Zeno’s Paradox – to go anywhere, you must go halfway first, and then you must go half of the remaining distance, and half of the remaining distance, and so forth to infinity – thus, motion is impossible because it necessitates traversing an infinite number of spaces in a finite amount of time. If movement is impossible, banning LAWs isn’t a logical consequence of the rez.

**Additionally, in order to say I want to fix x problem, you must say that you want x problem to exist, since it requires the problem exist to solve, which makes any moral attempt inherently immoral. Also, either it’s the case we can predict the outcome of a situation, or we cannot. We cannot, insofar as no situation is ever replicated exactly, and even if it can, there’s no guarantee the outcome will be the same. If we can predict situations, that means everyone can, which means we will always predict each other, making a paradox of action insofar as we always attempt to predict the outcomes of each other’s actions, and will cancel out the obligations.**

### Case

#### Reject 1AR theory- A] 7-6 time skew means it’s endlessly aff biased B] I don’t have a 3nr which allows for endless extrapolation C] 1AR theory is skewed to the aff because they have a 2ar judge psychology warrant which is also a reason why they shouldn’t get 2ar weighing

#### Infinite abuse claims are wrong- A] Spikes solve-you can just preempt paradigms in the 1AC B] Functional limits- 1nc is only 7 minutes long

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is very aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line every 2NR standard with new answers that never get responded to– reasonability checks 2AR sandbagging by preventing really abusive 1NCs while still giving the 2N a chance.

#### DTA on 1AR shells - They can blow up a blippy 20 second shell to 3 min of the 2AR while I have to split my time and can’t preempt 2AR spin which necessitates judge intervention and means 1AR theory is irresolvable so you shouldn’t stake the round on it.

Underview did not have a warrant- just asserted a short 1AR = those paradigm

#### 1] The unconditional right to strike totalizes the right to strike.

#### 2] Strikes fail to meet our obligation to the other.

Gourevitch 18 [Alex; Brown University; “The Right to Strike: A Radical View,” American Political Science Review; 2018; [https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321]](https://sci-hub.se/10.1017/s0003055418000321%5d//SJWen) Justin

\*\*Edited for ableist language

Every liberal democracy recognizes that workers have a right to strike. That right is protected in law, sometimes in the constitution itself. Yet strikes pose serious problems for liberal societies. They involve violence and coercion, they often violate some basic liberal liberties, they appear to involve group rights having priority over individual ones, and they can threaten public order itself. Strikes are also one of the most common forms of disruptive collective protest in modern history. Even given the dramatic decline in strike activity since its peak in the 1970s, they can play significant roles in our lives. For instance, just over the past few years in the United States, large illegal strikes by teachers ~~paralyzed~~ froze major school districts in Chicago and Seattle, as well as statewide in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and Colorado; a strike by taxi drivers played a major role in debates and court decisions regarding immigration; and strikes by retail and foodservice workers were instrumental in getting new minimum wage and other legislation passed in states like California, New York, and North Carolina. Yet, despite their significance, there is almost no political philosophy written about strikes.1 This despite the enormous literature on neighboring forms of protest like nonviolence, civil disobedience, conscientious refusal, and social movements.

The right to strike raises far more issues than a single essay can handle. In what follows, I address a particularly significant problem regarding the right to strike and its relation to coercive strike tactics. I argue that strikes present a dilemma for liberal societies because for most workers to have a reasonable chance of success they need to use some coercive strike tactics. But these coercive strike tactics both violate the law and infringe upon what are widely held to be basic liberal rights. To resolve this dilemma, we have to know why workers have the right to strike in the first place. I argue that the best way of understanding the right to strike is as a right to resist the oppression that workers face in the standard liberal capitalist economy. This way of understanding the right explains why the use of coercive strike tactics is not morally constrained by the requirement to respect the basic liberties nor the related laws that strikers violate when using certain coercive tactics.

#### 3] Strikes reduce individuality and totalize people into the group of an “employee” and “employer”

**Hunter 99** Robert P. Hunter 8-24-1999 "Disadvantages of Union Representation" <https://www.mackinac.org/2313> (Robert P. Hunter served as the regional director of the Federal Labor Relations Authority in Washington, D.C., and was a senior fellow in labor policy for the Mackinac Center for Public Policy. Hunter was director of labor policy for the Mackinac Center from 1996 to 2003.) JG

**Another disadvantage for unionized workers is the loss of individuality. When a union is certified as the exclusive employee representative in a workplace, employees become members of an overall bargaining unit in which the majority rules. The ruling majority may not be sympathetic with each individual's specific employment needs or aspirations. Individual agreements between employees and management are not allowed because the employer is under an obligation to deal exclusively with the union. The union leaders make decisions for all employees, which many may deem not to be in their best individual interest. Loss of individuality is of prime concern for many employees, as well as the loss of the opportunity to negotiate for themselves an individual arrangement.**

#### 4] Strikes homogenize interests.

Grant and Wallace 91 [Don Sherman Grant; Ohio State University; Michael Wallace; Indiana University; “Why Do Strikes Turn Violent?” University of Chicago Press; March 1991; <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2781338.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aca3144a9ae9e4ac65e285f2c67451ffb>] Justin

\*\*RM = Resource-Mobilization, or Strikes

4. Homogeneity and similarity.-Many RM theorists incorrectly as- sume that members of aggrieved groups are homogeneous in their inter- ests and share similar positions in the social structure. This (assumed) homogeneity of interests is rare for members of outsider groups and even more suspect for members of weak-insider groups. Indeed, groups are rarely uniform and often include relatively advantaged persons who have other, more peaceful channels in which to pursue their goals. Internal stratification processes mean that different persons have varying invest- ments in current structural arrangements, in addition to their collective interest in affecting social change. Again, these forces are especially prev- alent for weak insiders: even the group's lowest-status members are likely to have a marginal stake in the system; high-status members are likely to have a larger stake and, therefore, less commitment to dramatic change in the status quo.

Internal differences may lead to fragmentation of interests and lack of consensus about tactics, especially tactics suggesting violent confronta- tion. While group members share common grievances, individual mem- bers may be differentially aggrieved by the current state of affairs or differentially exposed to elite repression. White's (1989) research on the violent tactics of the Irish Republican Army shows that working-class members and student activists, when compared with middle-class partici- pants, are more vulnerable to state-sponsored repression, more likely to be available for protest activities, and reap more benefits from political violence. When we apply them to our study of strike violence, we find that differences in skill levels are known to coincide with major intraclass 1120 Strikes divisions in material interests (Form 1985) and are likely to coincide with the tendency for violent action. For instance, skilled-craft workers, who are more socially and politically conservative than unskilled workers, are less likely to view relations with employers as inherently antagonistic and are prone to separate themselves from unskilled workers, factors that should decrease their participation in violence.