

## 1

#### Interpretation: At all TOC bid distributing tournaments debating the November December 2021 LD topic, debaters must have their contact info on the NDCA LD wiki. The disclosure must occur within 30 minutes of the round.

#### Violation – you didn’t – I have screenshots



#### [1] Content warnings – disclosing contact info ensures debaters don’t run positions or use pronouns that make their opponent feel unsafe or uncomfortable. That o/w since debate should be accessible to everyone which is an independent voter: we cannot have any debate without the ability to participate.

#### [2] Pre round prep – it would be impossible to contact you before round, since I don’t know who to or your preferred contact – destroys preround prep because you could be breaking new, or making changes to your aff and I wouldn’t even know. Outweighs, since preround prep is a gateway issue to engagement.

#### [3] Clash – I could know more about your neg if I asked questions about it preround, which is key to indepth clash in round, otherwise you can get away with sneaky pivots.

#### Education is a voter – terminal impact of debate. Fairness is a voter—debate is a competitive activity that requires objective evaluation. Drop the debater—the abuse has already occurred and my time allocation has shifted – also to deter future abuse and set better norms. Use competing interps—leads to a race to the top since we figure out the best possible norm and avoids judge intervention since there’s a clear brightline. No RVIs—

#### a. Baiting—they’ll just bait theory and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse and results in a chilling effect and b) ) illogical – you don’t win because you’re fair

## 2

#### The standard is maximizing expected well-being—to clarify, saving lives.

#### Prefer:

#### 1] Death is bad and o/w it ontologically destroys the subject.

Paterson 1 – Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island. (Craig, “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics, <http://sce.sagepub.com>)

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81  In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

#### 2] Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet up for lunch, that is not as bad as breaking a promise to not kill. Only the consequences of breaking the promise explain why the second one is much worse than the first which is the most intuitive. Outweighs—a) parsimony—metaphysics relies on long chains of questionable claims that make conclusions less likely b) hijacks—intuitions are inevitable since even every framework must take some unjustified assumption as a starting point.

#### 3] TJFs- ethical frameworks must be theoretically legitimate

#### A] Ground: Both debaters are guaranteed access to ground to engage under util – the aff gets advantages while neg gets DA/CP. Additionally, anything can function as a util impact as long as a benefit is articulated, so all your offense applies. Other frameworks deny the ability to engage the other

#### B] Weighing: consequences lets us weigh scenarios, risk, scope, severity, etc. O/w on resolvability because if there is framing mechanism that we don’t know what offense matters. That’s a voter: because the judge literally cannot make a decision

#### C] Util is the only framework that makes sense for collective bargaining topics: means other FWs never engage with the rez and deck predictability.

Saylor n.d. “Unions.” The Business Ethics Worksho, saylordotorg.github.io/text\_the-business-ethics-workshop/s19-04-unions.html.

On the compensation side, one challenge unions face is melding the distinct interests of diverse members into a single bargaining strategy. If you check the WGA website, you’ll find union involvement on issues ranging from direct pay for work to health-care benefits and pensions. A twenty-five-year-old just breaking in is going to be more concerned, possibly, about getting as much cash now as possible for work done, while an older writer will begin asking about paying medical bills and living decently in retirement. In translating these diverse situations into a collective set of negotiating points, simple market forces will play a role (a union active in a field heavily stocked with younger workers will have to take account of that, or people will stop participating), but other structures may be erected to resolve problems also. A utilitarian structure, for example, may provide a way for union leaders to justify decisions making some members unhappy.

#### Impact calc –

#### 1] Extinction outweighs:

#### A] Structural violence- death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities

#### B] Objectivity- body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical

#### C] Mathematically outweighs.

MacAskill 14 [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.

#### 2] Calc indicts fail:

#### A] Ethics- it would indict everything cuz they use events to understand how ethics have worked

#### B] Reciprocity- they are NIBs that create a 2:1 skew where I have to answer them to access offense while they only have to win one

#### C] Internalism- asking why we value life is nonsensical since it’s intrinsic and we just do.

## 3

#### The stock market is trending upwards but it’s uncertain – blips aren’t enough to disprove the general trend and recent developments prove.

Miao and Macheel 10/21 [Tanaya and Hannah; 10/21/21; Reporter at CNBC, Associate Markets Reporter, graduated summa cum laude from Duke University with a degree in public policy; “S&P 500 slips from record, but heads for winning week on strong earnings,” CNBC, <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/10/21/stock-market-futures-open-to-close-news.html>] Justin

The S&P 500 edged lower a day after the benchmark closed at a record. The broad market index fell 0.3% while the Dow Jones Industrial Average added 12 points, or 0.03%, helped by a 4% rise in shares of American Express, which reported strong quarterly earnings Thursday. Meanwhile, the Nasdaq Composite shed 1% after poor results from two technology companies. Shares of Intel retreated more than 10% following a weaker-than-expected sales report. The semiconductor company blamed an industry-wide chip shortage for its revenue miss. Social media stocks also dropped after Snap said its advertising business declined due to Apple’s privacy changes. Snap shares sunk more than 23%. Facebook and Twitter pulled back 4% and 3%, respectively. However, several tech stocks rose to all-time highs. Tesla shares extended their rally, rising 1% after hitting a new intraday high earlier in the morning. The stock closed 3% higher Thursday after posting record profit and revenue, along with strong margins. Netflix, Ebay and Microsoft also climbed to new all-time highs. Despite the blips in the tech sector, overall earnings season has been terrific so far, boosting the broader market back to an all-time high following a two-month lull. So far for the third quarter earnings season, 84% of the 117 companies that have reported have beat analysts’ earnings estimates, according to Refinitiv. Profits are on pace in the quarter to increase 34.8%, according to Refinitiv. “After a 5% rally on seven green days in a row for the S&P it makes some sense for the market to consolidate,” said Cliff Hodge, Cornerstone Wealth’s chief investment officer, adding that disappointing results from Intel and IBM and hawkish comments from Federal Reserve chair Jerome Powell on inflation and policy tightening “are adding some jitters.” “The setup into year-end looks great given the liquidity dynamics on corporate buybacks,” Hodge said, “but longer term there are still the unresolved headwinds of valuation, the transition to mid-cycle in the economy, and a tightening Fed that may prove challenging now that we’re back at all-time highs.” S&P 500 posts new record Stephen Kolano, CIO for BNY Mellon Investor Solutions, added that although the S&P 500 is up 20% for the year, things may still seem a little uncertain for investors looking toward the end of the year due to cost pressures, labor shortages and commentary from company management on earnings calls and comments from Fed chair Jerome Powell and other policymakers. “You’re starting to see some profit taking as a result of that,” Kolano told CNBC. “Where investors are going first and foremost is the companies that have run the fastest, which is a lot of the tech.” In Thursday’s regular session, the S&P 500 notched both a fresh intraday high and new record close. The broad index rose 0.3% for its seventh consecutive positive session. The Nasdaq Composite rose 0.6%, while the Dow shed 6.26 points, or 0.02%. All three major averages are on track to close the week higher for three straight weeks of gains. The Dow touched an intraday record earlier in the week. On the month, the Dow and S&P are up 5% while the Nasdaq is up 4%. “In a quarter where we thought things would slow down and there was concern about what profit margins were going to look like, these companies are still doing well,” said Victoria Fernandez, chief market strategist at Crossmark Global Investments. Strong jobs data also added to the positive market sentiment on Thursday. Initial jobless claims fell to a new pandemic low of 290,000 last week, the Labor Department reported Thursday — down 6,000 from the previous week and lower than the 300,000 expected from economists surveyed by Dow Jones. One of investors’ fears during the market’s recent struggles was a China property crisis. However, investors got good news on that front overnight with China’s Evergrande reportedly paying a key interest payment that was due to foreign bondholders, staving off a default for the property developer.

Graphical user interface, chart, line chart

Description automatically generated

#### Best data proves union strike victories statistically cause stock market crash.

Lee and Mas 12 [David; Princeton University and National Bureau of Economic Research; Alexandre; Princeton University and National Bureau of Economic Research; “Long-Run Impacts of Unions on Firms: New Evidence from Financial Markets, 1961–1999,” The Quarterly Journal Of Economics; February 2012; <https://academic.oup.com/qje/article-abstract/127/1/333/1834007?redirectedFrom=fulltext>] Justin

We begin analyzing the stock market reaction to union victories using event-study methodologies. The most distinctive feature of our data—crucial for our research design—is the long panel (up to 48 months before and after the election) of high frequency data on stock market returns for each firm. This feature allows us to use the pre-event data to test the adequacy of the benchmarks used to predict the counterfactual returns in the postevent period. The long panel also allows us to examine returns several months beyond the event, so as to capture the long-run expected effects of new unions, without having to rely heavily on the assumption that the stock price immediately and instantaneously adjusts to capture the expected presence of the unions.9

Our event-study analysis reveals substantial losses in market value following a union election victory—about a 10% decline in market value, equivalent to about $40,500 per unionized worker. According to our calculations, if unionization represented a one-to-one transfer from investors to workers through higher wages, this magnitude would be in line with a union wage premium of 10%. Because the total loss of market value represents the sum of transfers to workers and any other productivity impacts of unionization this implies, for example, that if the true union compensation premium were greater than 10%, there would be positive productivity effects of unions. The evidence supporting our event-study estimates is compelling: we find that these firms’ average returns are quite close to the benchmark returns every month leading up to the election, but precisely at the time of the election, the actual and benchmark returns diverge. The results for these firms are robust to a number of different specifications. In the sample of firms where we know that the union is a small fraction of the workforce, we donot find a similar divergence of returns from the benchmark.

Importantly, we find that the effect takes 15 to 18 months to fully materialize, a somewhat slow market reaction. As we discuss, this short-run mispricing can persist if exploiting the slow reaction is not sufficiently profitable to arbitrageurs. Indeed, our own analysis shows that strategies designed to exploit the mispricing entail a significant degree of fundamental risk. The fact that union victories are sufficiently rare and spread throughout time prevents the necessary diversification that could generate an attractive arbitrage opportunity. For example, our analysis suggests that attempts to exploit the short-lived mispricing would lead to a portfolio that would be dominated by simple buy-and hold strategies

The event-study estimate appears to average a great deal of heterogeneity in the effects. We additionally employ a regression discontinuity (RD) design, implicitly comparing close union victories to close union losses, and consistent with DiNardo and Lee (2004), we find little evidence of a significant discontinuous relationship between the vote share and market returns. If anything, the RD point estimates show a 4% positive (though statistically insignificant) effect of union certification (vis-`a-vis union defeat). The event-study estimates vary systematically by the observed vote share, with the largest negative abnormal returns for cases where the union won the election by a large margin.

#### The next market crash causes economic collapse – conditions are ripe for failure.

Vallejo 10/4 [Justin; 10/4/21; Citing personal finance expert Robert Kiyosaki; “‘Biggest crash in world history’: Personal finance expert Robert Kiyosaki predicts economic crisis in October,” Independent, <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/robert-kiyosaki-market-crash-october-b1930754.html>] Justin

"This is going to be the biggest crash in world history. We have never had this much debt pumped up… the debt to GDP ratio is out of sight," Mr Kiyosaki said. Mr Kiyosaki said the stock market was being artificially inflated by the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve with decisions disconnected from the realities of the current economy in the United States. The reason why Ms Yellen and Mr Powell are "scrambling", he said, is they’ve expanded the volume of money while the velocity of money is plummeting as no one spends and their cash lingers in savings. Mr Kiyosaki said people don’t have to go to Harvard University to understand that "you can’t keep printing fake money … that’s not good". "So they pump all this money in, prices go up," he told Kitco News on Wednesday. "So it is transitory inflation, but we’re stacked with this massive debt and all it’s done is bump up the stock market and real estate market." "The money has not gone into the economy, that’s the sad part. So the rich get richer, but the poor and middle class are getting poorer. It’s tragic what’s happening today." He added earlier that the "house of cards" is coming down and that real estate would crash with the stock market, while the impact from China’s Evergrande Group implosion would spread to the United States. Evergrande, the second-largest developer in China, is on the brink of bankruptcy with more than $300bn in debt – the most indebted company in the world.

#### Extinction.

Liu '18 [Qian; 11/13/18; Managing Director of Greater China for The Economist Group, previously director of the global economics unit and director of Access China for the Economist Intelligence Unit, PhD in economics from Uppsala University; "The next economic crisis could cause a global conflict. Here's why," <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/11/the-next-economic-crisis-could-cause-a-global-conflict-heres-why/>] Justin

The next economic crisis is closer than you think. But what you should really worry about is what comes after: in the current social, political, and technological landscape, a prolonged economic crisis, combined with rising income inequality, could well escalate into a major global military conflict. The 2008-09 global financial crisis almost bankrupted governments and caused systemic collapse. Policymakers managed to pull the global economy back from the brink, using massive monetary stimulus, including quantitative easing and near-zero (or even negative) interest rates. But monetary stimulus is like an adrenaline shot to jump-start an arrested heart; it can revive the patient, but it does nothing to cure the disease. Treating a sick economy requires structural reforms, which can cover everything from financial and labor markets to tax systems, fertility patterns, and education policies. Policymakers have utterly failed to pursue such reforms, despite promising to do so. Instead, they have remained preoccupied with politics. From Italy to Germany, forming and sustaining governments now seems to take more time than actual governing. And Greece, for example, has relied on money from international creditors to keep its head (barely) above water, rather than genuinely reforming its pension system or improving its business environment. The lack of structural reform has meant that the unprecedented excess liquidity that central banks injected into their economies was not allocated to its most efficient uses. Instead, it raised global asset prices to levels even higher than those prevailing before 2008. In the United States, housing prices are now 8% higher than they were at the peak of the property bubble in 2006, according to the property website Zillow. The price-to-earnings (CAPE) ratio, which measures whether stock-market prices are within a reasonable range, is now higher than it was both in 2008 and at the start of the Great Depression in 1929. As monetary tightening reveals the vulnerabilities in the real economy, the collapse of asset-price bubbles will trigger another economic crisis – one that could be even more severe than the last, because we have built up a tolerance to our strongest macroeconomic medications. A decade of regular adrenaline shots, in the form of ultra-low interest rates and unconventional monetary policies, has severely depleted their power to stabilize and stimulate the economy. If history is any guide, the consequences of this mistake could extend far beyond the economy. According to Harvard’s Benjamin Friedman, prolonged periods of economic distress have been characterized also by public antipathy toward minority groups or foreign countries – attitudes that can help to fuel unrest, terrorism, or even war. For example, during the Great Depression, US President Herbert Hoover signed the 1930 Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, intended to protect American workers and farmers from foreign competition. In the subsequent five years, global trade shrank by two-thirds. Within a decade, World War II had begun. To be sure, WWII, like World War I, was caused by a multitude of factors; there is no standard path to war. But there is reason to believe that high levels of inequality can play a significant role in stoking conflict. According to research by the economist Thomas Piketty, a spike in income inequality is often followed by a great crisis. Income inequality then declines for a while, before rising again, until a new peak – and a new disaster. Though causality has yet to be proven, given the limited number of data points, this correlation should not be taken lightly, especially with wealth and income inequality at historically high levels. This is all the more worrying in view of the numerous other factors stoking social unrest and diplomatic tension, including technological disruption, a record-breaking migration crisis, anxiety over globalization, political polarization, and rising nationalism. All are symptoms of failed policies that could turn out to be trigger points for a future crisis. Voters have good reason to be frustrated, but the emotionally appealing populists to whom they are increasingly giving their support are offering ill-advised solutions that will only make matters worse. For example, despite the world’s unprecedented interconnectedness, multilateralism is increasingly being eschewed, as countries – most notably, Donald Trump’s US – pursue unilateral, isolationist policies. Meanwhile, proxy wars are raging in Syria and Yemen. Against this background, we must take seriously the possibility that the next economic crisis could lead to a large-scale military confrontation. By the logic of the political scientist Samuel Huntington , considering such a scenario could help us avoid it, because it would force us to take action. In this case, the key will be for policymakers to pursue the structural reforms that they have long promised, while replacing finger-pointing and antagonism with a sensible and respectful global dialogue. The alternative may well be global conflagration.

## 4

#### 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 strikes since exceptions are conditions.

#### 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 striked for no reason strikes 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.