## **1**

#### The role of the ballot is vote for the debater who best proves the truth or falsity of the resolution.

#### [1] Constitutivism: The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries define affirm[[1]](#footnote-1) as to prove true and negate[[2]](#footnote-2) as to deny the truth of which means it’s constitutive and jurisdictional – that’s a meta constraint on anything since the judge voting aff if they affirm better and neg the contrary proves that it’s an independent voter and means hack against them if they contest it. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I’ve met my burden. Answers collapse to truth testing since they require truth value. Also, if I’m textual I’m fair because the topic is the most predictable, so you could’ve engaged.

#### [2] Inclusivity: Other ROBs open the door for personal lives to factor into decisions to compare who is more oppressed causing violence where people go to escape and shuts out people without the technical skill or resources to prep for. Only we allow anything as long is it proves the res true or false. Specific role of the ballots exclude all offense besides those that follow from their framework and justifies permissibility since it only tells you what to do in face of one problem which means everything outside that instance isn’t condemned.

#### [3] Changing the structure of the activity can’t occur within the round i.e. in the middle of a chess match it’s nonsensical to bring up new rules unless discussed outside of the act of playing the game – out of round rule-setting solves 100% of your offense. Even if there is a higher purpose, it doesn’t change anything, you should just write whatever is important on the ballot and vote for me.

#### Now:

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

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

#### Neg definition choice – the aff should have defined stuff in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable, new ones moot 7 minutes and kills 1NC strategy since I engaged on a lack of your definition.

#### Negate:

#### [1] Inherency – either a) the aff is non-inherent and you vote neg on presumption or b) it is and it isn’t logically going to happen.

#### [2] 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.

#### [3] To go anywhere, you must go halfway first, and then you must go half of the remaining distance ad infinitum – thus, motion is impossible because it necessitates traversing an infinite number of spaces in finite time.

#### [4] you can’t be sure anything besides yourself exists – we could be deceived by a demon, dreaming, or in a simulation so the whole world could be nonexistent

#### [5] Merriam Websters defines right as “having the axis perpendicular to the base” <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/right> But there is no base for strikes to be perpendicular to, so the rez does nothing

#### [6] To means “indicate movement” (Merriam Webster), but that means the resolution is incoherent because the word ought cannot move to the word provide. Means you negate on face because you can’t even know what the resolution looks like and an incoherent claim can’t have truth.

**[7] Merriam websters defines Strike as** “**to delete something”** <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/strike> Which proves the Aff can’t solve since it just deletes everything in the workspace.

#### [7] Merriam 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> But governments don’t communicate to ants so they can’t solve.

## **2**

#### Interpretation: The Affirmative must prove and garner offense from the desirability of a topical plan.

#### Resolved indicates a policy action.

Parcher 1. [Jeff. 2/26/01. “Re: Jeff P--Is the resolution a question?” <https://web.archive.org/web/20050122044927/http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html>] Justin

(1) Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constiutent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision. (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statemnt of a deciion, as by a legislature. (3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconcievable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committtee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not.

#### Definition of unconditional right to strike:

NLRB 85 [National Labor Relations Board; “Legislative History of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947: Volume 1,” Jan 1985; <https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=7o1tA__v4xwC&rdid=book-7o1tA__v4xwC&rdot=1>] Justin

\*\*Edited for gendered language

As for the so-called absolute or unconditional right to strike—there are no absolute rights that do not have their corresponding responsibilities. Under our American Anglo-Saxon system, each individual is entitled to the maximum of freedom, provided however (and this provision is of first importance), his [their] freedom has due regard for the rights and freedoms of others. The very safeguard of our freedoms is the recognition of this fundamental principle. I take issue very definitely with the suggestion that there is an absolute and unconditional right to concerted action (which after all is what the strike is) which endangers the health and welfare of our people in order to attain a selfish end.

#### Violation: Ctrl-f “strikes” in the doc – communicative strikes aren’t the same as worker strikes.

#### Vote neg for limits—no stasis or resolutional limit alters balance of prep making neg prep impossible since you can choose any argument, favoring the aff because they speak last and use perms.

#### Fairness is a voter, debate is a competitive activity. Outweighs because it determines engagement in your ROTB which links turns your method. Presume their arguments false since it wasn’t within the scope of my research burden so I wasn’t ready to contest it.

#### TVA solves – defend why employers contanerize the bodies of employees by denying strikes – DAs are neg ground since they prove opportunity for engagement. At worst SSD solves your offense sicne you can read the aff as a K on the neg.

#### Drop the debater: T indicts the aff.

#### Use Competing Interps: race to the top for the best norm

#### No RVIs on Impact turns: a] Illogical – being topical doesn’t mean you should win, it’s just a burden. b] If T’s bad and you vote on impact turns – you’re voting on T.

## **3**

#### Permissibility and presumption negate –

#### a] the plan indicates the aff has to prove an obligation, 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 they are probably false.

#### *The meta-ethic is bindingness.*

#### Ethics must begin with a re-orientation towards the subject since modernity is created by persons. Ethics must make equal personhood, rights, and freedoms accessible for all.

**Prefer:**

#### [A] Uncertainty – an inability to know others experience and structural positionality makes empiricism an unreliable basis for universal ethics. Outweighs since it would be escapable since people could say they don’t experience the same. Takes out their whole fw since our communicative experience isn’t universal and is thus escapable unlike reason.

#### [B] Constitutivism – Morality faces regress where we can continue asking “why.” Practical reason is the only unescapable and binding authority because to ask why I should be a reasoner concedes it’s authority since you’re actively reasoning.

#### That justifies universality – a] any non-universalizable norm justifies someone’s ability to impede on your ends b] Only universalizable reason can effectively explain the perspectives of agents – that’s the best method for combatting oppression.

Farr 02 Arnold Farr (prof of phil @ UKentucky, focusing on German idealism, philosophy of race, postmodernism, psychoanalysis, and liberation philosophy). “Can a Philosophy of Race Afford to Abandon the Kantian Categorical Imperative?” JOURNAL of SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY, Vol. 33 No. 1, Spring 2002, 17–32.

**One** of the most popular **criticism**s **of Kant’s moral philosophy is that it is too formalistic.**13 That is, the universal nature of the categorical imperative leaves it devoid of content. Such a principle is useless since moral decisions are made by concrete individuals in a concrete, historical, and social situation. This type of criticism lies behind Lewis Gordon’s rejection of any attempt to ground an antiracist position on Kantian principles. The rejection of universal principles for the sake of emphasizing the historical embeddedness of the human agent is widespread in recent philosophy and social theory. I will argue here on Kantian grounds that **although a distinction between the universal and the concrete is** a **valid** distinction, **the unity of the two is required for** an understanding of human **agency.** The attack on Kantian formalism began with Hegel’s criticism of the Kantian philosophy.14 The list of contemporary theorists who follow Hegel’s line of criticism is far too long to deal with in the scope of this paper. Although these theorists may approach the problem of Kantian formalism from a variety of angles, the spirit of their criticism is basically the same: The universality of the categorical imperative is an abstraction from one’s empirical conditions. **Kant is** often **accused of making the moral agent an abstract, empty**, noumenal **subject. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Kantian subject is** an embodied, empirical, concrete subject. However, this concrete subject has a dual nature. Kant claims in the Critique of Pure Reason as well as in the Grounding that human beings have an intelligible and empirical character.15 It is impossible to understand and do justice to Kant’s moral theory without taking seriously the relation between these two characters. The very concept of morality is impossible without the tension between the two. By “empirical character” Kant simply means that we have a sensual nature. We are physical creatures with physical drives or desires. **The** very **fact that I cannot simply satisfy my desires without considering the rightness** or wrongness **of my actions suggests that my empirical character must be held in check** by something, or else I behave like a Freudian id. My empiri- cal character must be held in check **by my intelligible character**, which is the legislative activity of practical reason. It is through our intelligible character that **we formulate principles that keep our** empirical **impulses in check.** The categorical imperative is the supreme principle of morality that is constructed by the moral agent in his/her moment of self-transcendence. What I have called self-transcendence may be best explained in the following passage by Onora O’Neill: In restricting our maxims to those that meet the test of the categorical imperative we refuse to base our lives on maxims that necessarily make our own case an exception. The reason why a universilizability criterion is morally signiﬁcant is that it makes our own case no special exception (G, IV, 404). In accepting the Categorical Imperative we accept the moral reality of other selves, and hence the possibility (not, note, the reality) of a moral community. **The Formula of Universal Law enjoins no more than that we act only on maxims that are open to others also.**16 O’Neill’s description of the universalizability criterion includes the notion of self-transcendence that I am working to explicate here to the extent that like self-transcendence, universalizable moral principles require that the individ- ual think beyond his or her own particular desires. The individual is not allowed to exclude others **as** rational **moral agents** who have the right to act as he acts in a given situation. For example, if I decide to use another person merely as a means for my own end I must recognize the other person’s right to do the same to me. I cannot consistently will that I use another as a means only and will that I not be used in the same manner by another. **Hence,** the **universalizability** criterion **is a principle of consistency and** a principle of **inclusion.** That is, in choosing my maxims **I** attempt to **include the perspective of other moral agents.**

#### Prefer:

#### [1] Normativity outweighs: a] Obligations – lack of it doesn’t generate stable ethics so it permits anything except the one thing it condemns b] Collapses – injustices need universal ideal principles to ground them and explain why they are wrong which otherwise justifies skep since no external reason to follow ethics c] Necessity – every arg presupposes ability to set and pursue ends which collapses to my framework d] Is/Ought Gap – description of injustices only tells us what exists, not how to properly fix it or act with it which leaves all harms unresolved.

#### [2] Consequences Fail: a] Every action has infinite stemming consequences, because every consequence can cause another consequence so we can’t predict. b] Induction is circular because it relies on the assumption that nature will hold uniform and we could only reach that conclusion through inductive reasoning based on observation of past events.

#### Thus, the standard and counter-revolutionary strategy is consistency with the categorical imperative.

#### Negate:

#### 1] Strikes violate individual autonomy by exercising coercion.

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.

#### 2] Means to an end: employees ignore their duty to help their patients in favor of higher wages which treats them as a means to an end.

#### 3] Not defending the topic is non-universalizable b/c if nobody defended the topic than a topic wouldn’t have even been created in the first place which is a contradiction in conception. That outweighs – their indicts are reliant on empiricism but that relies on some conception of coherence.

## Case

1. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-2)