# T

#### Interpretation: the affirmative debater must support that a just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of all workers to strike

#### Violation: they don’t.

#### The difference between existential bare plurals and generic bare plurals is that existential bare plurals can be true if the statement is true in a single instance, but generic bare plurals necessitate proving the statement in all instances.

#### And, workers is a generic bare plural:

#### [1] The Contradiction Test: existential nouns allow for contradictions like “tigers are on the lawn, and tigers aren’t on the lawn”, but saying “a just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike, and a just government ought not recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike” is nonsensical so it must be generic

#### [2] Counterfactual Implications: a generic statement like “dogs have four legs” implies that if Fido is a dog, then he has four legs. Saying “a just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike” implies that if I am a worker, then a just government ought to recognize my right to strike, proving that it’s generic

#### Standards:

#### [1] Limits: Specifying any subset of workers allows for a functionally infinite number of affs, there are nearly infinite jobs and every one has different implications when strikes happen which explodes neg prep burden.

#### [2] Ground: Specifying a tiny subset of workers means the aff is too small to link into disads related to things like the economy or infrastructure, cuts off access to an entire subset of offense I can gain. Also lets you pick a subset that’s super advantageous which makes it impossible for me to gain ground

#### [3] Arg Quality: Small affs are written and run for a single round to be as unpredictable as possible. Whole res affs are more predictable which incentivizes creative, nuanced argumentation.

#### [4] TVA: read a whole-res aff and run your offense as an advantage, allows topic research but grants me core disads.

#### Voters:

#### Semantics first:

#### 1 Resolvability: Pragmatics debates depend on tons of weighing that’s difficult to resolve but semantics debates just question what the resolution means

#### 2 Jurisdiction – the ballot says to vote on the resolution and so if the aff doesn’t defend the resolution, the judge can’t vote on it.

#### 3 Semantics key to pragmatics: Semantics defines what we debate around and what topic lit we research, meaning it’s key to fairness and education

#### Fairness is a voter: all argumentation assumes it’ll be evaluated fairly

#### Education is a voter: it’s the only portable impact to debate

#### Drop the debater– DTA is incoherent as there’s no argument to drop.

#### Use competing interps – reasonability invites a race to the bottom where debaters set lower brightlines to defend abuse.

#### No RVIs – [A] Illogical – fairness is a burden – they can’t win for following the rules. [B] Chilling effect—chills theory because I’ll be scared that they’ll win off the RVI [C] Incentivizes good theory debaters to run abusive strategies, bait theory, and win off the RVI

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier. Norming outweighs A] Constutivism- It’s the constitutive purpose of theory debating B] Sequencing- it’s a pre-requisite to actualizing any other voter like fairness or education

# Hobbes NC

#### To negate means “to deny the truth of” (Merriam Webster) so presumption and permissibility semantically negate. (https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate)

#### The metaethic is constructivism – 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 how someone else thinks. 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.

#### But, the state of nature leads to infinite violence – competing truth claims means conflicts cannot be resolved. Two warrants:

#### [1] Ambiguity – everyone can assert their own claims to be true and refuse contestation – this means we always fight over who is correct. This is irresolvable because there is no mediator to adjudicate the dispute and tell who is correct – we just fight forever

#### [2] Self-Interest – everyone wants their truth claims to be true because it benefits them – this leads to conflict because we can’t divide limited resources and have to compete with each other – terminates in death because neither of us want to concede to the other

#### The solution is the creation of the sovereign to mediate what is true and enforce the law; she is the ultimate ruler and arbitrator. It must eliminate all conflicts to bring peace to our violent natures.

#### Therefore, the standard is adhering to the state’s perspective.

#### Reject consequentialism: A) Normativity, moral theories that hold agents responsible for all consequences of their actions destroy motivation to be ethical because moral intentions can still lead to immoral consequences B) Infinite Regress, every consequence leads to another consequence ad infinitum which means under consequences every action has the same infinite impact and triggers permissibility.

#### Impact Calculus: 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 my standard additionally

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

#### 2. 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 negate –

#### 1: the state’s perspective determines what is just so if the state decides not to recognize the unconditional right of workers to strike that’s what the state has decided is just

#### 2: worker strikes actively defy the state in order to reach a personal goal which moves closer to the state of nature