## 1

#### Interp: The affirmative debater may not claim that each subject’s ethicality arises from their own affective relations indexed to themselves. To clarify, indexicals is bad.

#### Violation – their framework says that in impact calc 2

#### Negate:

#### ~1~ infinite abuse – there are infinite potential indexes that could affirm including descriptive standards that are impossible to turn and allowing them to win if they affirm under any index makes it impossible to negate –strongest internal link to fairness since one side wins every round.

#### ~2~ accessibility – indexicals justifies horrible things, i.e. if the resolution was "slavery ought to be reinstated," under a certain index, that would affirm such as "consistency with reinstating slavery," which means they can justify literally any reprehensible action. That’s an independent voter since they make debate unsafe and accessibility is a prior question to being able to debate. It’s also false – a~ generation an obligation requires an absolute obligation that justifies following it b~ we can have indexes that negate which nonuniques their offense since you need to prove it 100 true.

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation.

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

#### CA- CI from the aff

#### No RVIs –

#### a~ illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument,

#### b~ norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms,

#### c~ baiting – incentivizes good debaters to be abusive, bait theory, then collapse to the 1AR RVI,

#### d~ topic ed – prevents 1AR blipstorm scripts and allows us to get back to substance after resolving theory.

#### E~ flex overcompensates on the RVI since there’s no brightline to how much is enough – 1AR theory solves rather than an RVI

#### F~ aff has unique routes like condo – also didn’t read T.

## 2

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may not claim 1AR theory is legit, its DTD, CI, no RVIs, no 2nr paradigm issues, and outweighs any other argument

#### Violation: UV

#### Infinite Abuse - their norm justifies the affirmative auto winning every round since they can read 500 risk free 1AR shells with DTD and competing interps making it impossible for me to deflate or answer all of them. I can’t uplayer because it’s the highest layer of the round. I cant deflate because I don’t have 2nr paradigm issues. Answering the argument doesn’t solve because you can read infinite of these paradigm issues in the 1ac making it impossible.

#### Norming o/w: A] It’s the constitutive purpose of theory debating B] it’s a pre-requisite to actualizing any other voter like fairness or education

## 3

#### Interpretation: Debaters must not read theoretical justifications for their framework. To clarify, TJFs are bad

#### Violation: they read phil ed, resolvability, real world ed, resource disparities

#### [1]Phil-ed: kills phil ed by forcing a theory debate in framework when we are supposed to be learning about and debating philosophy.

#### [2]Strat skew: TJFs force me to win on both theory and framework to win framework while you may only debate one, extending the other. Kills fairness since I have to engage on different layers with minimal time.

#### [3] Logic – theoertical justifications are bad bc regardless of whether or not the fw is philosopohically coherent tjfs ensure we apply illogical args for debates which kills education because its bad to learn about untrue things and fairness because disregarding rules of logic make it so that we’re unable to come up with argumentation – independently logic outweighs because it’s a litmus test for what counts as an argument in the first place

## 4

#### 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- we can only tell what is from experiences not what ought to be

#### 3] Neg definition choice – the aff should have defined ought in the 1ac because it was in the rez so it’s predictable contestation, by not doing so they have forfeited their right to read a new definition – kills 1NC strategy since I premised my engagement 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 going to happen.

#### 2] A guarantee for all workers won’t happen. Even if the private sector gets the right to strike, public workers will be excluded

Nolan 4/13 Hamilton Nolan, 4-13-2020, "Public Sector's Right to Strike Is Left Behind in Biden-Bernie Task Force," Truthout, <https://truthout.org/articles/public-sectors-right-to-strike-is-left-behind-in-biden-bernie-task-force/>, SJLW

The task force, made up of 49 surrogates from both Sanders and Biden, produced a report of more than 100 pages, intended to influence both the Democratic Party’s platform and Biden’s own policy priorities. The eight members of the economy section of the task force included two labor leaders: Lee Saunders, head of the 1.6 million-member public sector union AFSCME, a Biden delegate; and Sara Nelson, head of the Association of Flight Attendants, a Sanders delegate. Their experiences crafting the labor policy recommendations are a microcosm of the larger divide between the more establishment and radical wings of American unions. The task force’s labor and worker rights platform includes several items that are standard on most unions’ political wish list: a repeal of “right to work” laws that make it more difficult to organize; “card check” recognition that makes it easier to put new unions in place; a ban on anti-union “captive audience meetings” and harsher penalties for employers that violate labor laws; and passage of the PRO Act, a strong pro-labor bill that passed the House earlier this year. Perhaps the most notable part of the platform, however, is an omission. It asks to “ensure that all private-sector workers’ right to strike… is vigorously protected.” But for public sector workers, it asks only to “Provide a federal guarantee for public sector employees to bargain for better pay and benefits and the working conditions they deserve.” In other words, despite the fact that the public sector is much more heavily unionized than the private sector, and has been under legal attack from the right for decades, there is no demand that public sector workers be granted the right to strike—the single most potent weapon in any union’s toolbox.

#### 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, so recognizing a strike 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**

#### 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

## 5

#### CP Text: A just government ought to recognize the right to strike however not unconditionally, intermittent strikes should be illegal, all other types of strikes the AC recognizes should be.

#### Intermittent strikes violate labor peace, Theodore 19

[Mark Theodore, 7-30-2019, "Employer’s Discipline of Employees Engaging In “Intermittent Strikes” Lawful: NLRB Majority", Labor Relations Update, https://www.laborrelationsupdate.com/nlra/employers-discipline-of-employees-engaging-in-intermittent-strikes-lawful-nlrb-majority/, date accessed 10-24-2021] //Lex AT

The Board also explained why intermittent strikes are unprotected: such conduct undermines the purpose of the Act – i.e., to promote overall labor peace – by allowing employees to leave work at times particularly harmful to the employer while still being able to return to work before losing their jobs to permanent replacements.  The Board determined that, unlike a genuine strike, such a tactic was never contemplated or condoned by Congress in crafting the Act and therefore does not warrant protected status.

#### Unconditional means,

https://www.google.com/search?q=unconditional+definition&oq=unconditional+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j0i512l3j0i22i30l6.2119j0j9&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8

**not subject to any conditions.**

#### Takes out general principle bc it means general principle still defends all stirkes since exceptions are ocnditions.

#### That negates under the AC framework –

#### 1] Promise breaking – the original NLRA act that explains the right to strike made them illegal bc they violated the purpose of genuine strikes. ow on perfect duties

#### 2] Solves aff offense none of it is specific to an unconditional right

#### 3] contradiction in conception – if everyone always stirked for no reason stikres would have no purpose

#### Yes CPs negate - Good and bad are attributive adjectives which don’t make sense in a vacuum i.e. you can’t say this burger is really good without comparing it to alternative burgers.

## Case

### UV

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells – 1AR theory is super 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 super 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.

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 1AR being able to spend 20 seconds on a shell and still win forces the 2N to allocate at least 2:30 on the shell which means RVIs check back time skew – ows on quantifiaiblity

#### 1NC theory o/w a) epistemic skew- any reason I was abusive is because the 1AC was b) ca the quantifiablity warrant on rvis

### Case

#### 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] The aff homogenizes all strikes as an unconditional right which is unethical.

Loewy 2K, Erich H. "Of healthcare professionals, ethics, and strikes." Cambridge Q. Healthcare Ethics 9 (2000): 513. (Erich H. Loewy M.D., F.A.C.P., was born in Vienna, Austria in 1927 and was able to escape first to England and then to the U.S. in late 1938. He was initially trained as a cardiologist. He taught at Case Western Reserve and practiced in Cleveland, Ohio. After 14 years he devoted himself fully to Bioethics and taught at the University of Illinois for 12 years. In 1996 he was selected as the first endowed Alumni Association Chair of Bioethics at the University of California Davis School of Medicine and has taught there since.) JG

It would seem then that the ethical considerations for workers striking in an industry such as a shoe factory or a chain grocery store are quite different from the ethical considerations for workers in sanitation, police, or fire departments, or for professionals such as teachers or those involved directly in healthcare. Even in the latter “professional” category, there are subtle but distinct differences of “rights” and obligations. However, one cannot conclude that for workers in essential industries strikes are simply ethically not permissible, whereas they are permissible for workers in less essential industries. Strikes, by necessity, injure another, and injuring another cannot be ethically neutral. Injuring others is prima facie ethically problematic—that is, unless a good and weighty argument for doing so can be made, injuring another is not ethically proper. Striking by a worker, in as much as doing so injures another or others, is only a conditional right. A compelling ethical argument in favor of striking is needed as well as an ethical argument in favor of striking at the time and in the way planned. It remains to delineate the conditions under which strikes, especially strikes by workers in essential industries and even more so by persons who consider themselves to be “professionals,” may legitimately proceed and yet fulfill their basic purpose.

#### 4] Free-riding: strikes are a form of free-riding since those who don’t participate still reap the benefits.

Dolsak and Prakash 19 [Nives and Aseem; We write on environmental issues, climate politics and NGOs; “Climate Strikes: What They Accomplish And How They Could Have More Impact,” 9/14/19; Forbes; <https://www.forbes.com/sites/prakashdolsak/2019/09/14/climate-strikes-what-they-accomplish-and-how-they-could-have-more-impact/?sh=2244a9bd5eed>] Justin

While strikes and protests build solidarity among their supporters, they are susceptible to collective action problems. This is because **the goals that strikers pursue tend to create non-excludable benefits**. That is, benefits such as climate protection can be enjoyed by both strikers and non-strikers. Thus, large participation in climate strikes will reveal that in spite of free-riding problems, a large number of people have a strong preference for climate action.