**Presumption Negates**

**1. We presume things false, this is why people don’t believe things like conspiracy theories.**

**2. There are an infinite number of ways to prove something false and only one way to prove it true.**

**3. The neg burden is to deny the evidence of truth so if there’s no offense as to why the resolution is true the neg has fulfilled their burden.**

**Permissibility Negates**

**1. The aff must prove an obligation because ought indicates a moral obligation. If an action is permissible, definitionally, no obligation is present and you negate.**

**The standard is consistency with the categorical imperative. This is the idea that maxims must be universalizable without contradiction.**

**The meta ethics is practical reason, the ability to set and pursue ends, because practical reason is inescapable, since its constitutive of action and escaping practical reason is an action. This means practical reason is the most binding and determines morality.**

**Practical reason shows us morality must respect the equality of individuals.**

1. **All individuals are agents with practical reason. Even if people have different capacities for setting and pursuing ends, practical reason is still binding since every agent has some sort of action, even if this just means thinking etc. Because all people are agents it means there can’t be any morally relevant distinction between people.**
2. **History: Things like racism are objectively bad, because traits of someone's identity don’t affect how ethical someone is.**

**This means when you say something is obligatory you’re saying all practical reasoners have that obligation because you can’t arbitrarily exclude someone from ethics.**

**And, things can’t be both true and false.**

**Gahringer**, Robert. “Moral law.” *Ethics,* Vol. 63, No. 4, July 1953, pp. 300-304. // (N8)

“Within any deductive system the basic principle of criticism is self-consistency. **To show a deductive system inconsistent is to disqualify it.** If it is asked why be consistent, it will be answered that it is a basic condition of having a system. And if we ask why this, it will be answered that **[Without this] a system would not be an intelligible unity in any other way.** The demand for **consistency** rests ultimately on intelligibility; it **is a condition of intelligibility. Consistency may appear as a principle of the bare absence of contradiction,** and this may be only a matter of the independence of elements. But consistency may go much deeper. If someone suggests that we dispose of the principles of consistency, we can ask the consistency of such a suggestion. **If the principle of consistency is the condition of intelligibility, the denial of it** (which must be an intelligible denial) **denies in principle what it assumes**: it is *transcendentally inconsistent.* **The proposal to abandon the principle of consistency** (the law of noncontradiction) **cannot be made within any system, since every system presupposes it**; **and it cannot be made outside, since every proposal assumes it.** This is, of course, a material consideration belonging to logic in the larger sense.”

**Thus our actions must be able to be universalized because all people are equal, and still be possible when universalized since an action can’t be possible and not possible, I.e. an action must still be possible to take when everyone takes that action.**

**This is a side constraint: even if you prove some other ethical theory is good, it can’t provide obligations or prohibitions that lead to contradictions because it can’t say everyone is obligated to do something and not do something.**

**Prefer additionally:**

**1. Regress: Any framework allows you to infinitely ask why, only my framework stops the regress because once you get to the point of practical reason, questioning it doesn’t make sense, since to question practical reason concedes its validity.**

**2. Performativity: We need freedom to make any arguments in debate, this means answers to my framework prove it true because you exercise your practical reason to try and contest it.**

**Contention 1)**

**Strikes use others as a mere means to achieve the end of the strikers.**

**Fourie 17 Johan Fourie 11-30-2017 "Ethicality of Labor-Strike Demonstrates by Social Workers"** [**https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html**](https://www.otherpapers.com/essay/Ethicality-of-Labor-Strike-Demonstrates-by-Social-Workers/62694.html) **(Johan Fourie is professor of Economics and History at Stellenbosch University.) JG**

**A** further **formula of the Categorical Imperative is** "so, act as to **treat humanity,** whether in your own person or in that of any other context, **never solely as a means to an end but always as an end within itself'** (Parrott, 2006, p. 51). By this Kant meant people should be valued and respected as an individual and not used for the benefit of others. **Participating in a labor-strike** demonstration/action **is a direct violation of this** categorical perspective as it would not be ethically permissible because **the severe dependence and well-being of clients, the effective functioning of the employer organization, and society is used to** duly and unduly **influence the bargaining process for better working conditions.** In participating in the labor strike demonstration, the humanity, and well-being of **clients and society is** not seen as crucial and as an 'end', but rather **used to demonstrate the** undeniable **need for the skills and expertise of social workers.** Furthermore, through withholding services, social worker professionals demonstrate that the well-being and welfare of society have lost its inherent importance/value. Though the value of overall well-being is taught throughout the social work training process and is enshrined in the professional ethical codes.

**This impacts back to my framework because using others as a means to an end isn’t universalizable without contradiction since in order to use others as a means you must be an end in yourself, but if everyone is used as a means, no one can take the action of using others as means to ends.**

**Contention 2)**

**Workers agree in contracts not to strike, these contracts grant employers the right to fire people if they strike and has been upheld by the state. This means strikes break these promises.**

"Employer Sanctions for Violation of No-Strike Clause: Union Busting through Mass Discharge and Rescission." ***Yale Law Journal*,** digitalcommons.law.yale.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=8323&context=ylj. Accessed 23 June 2021.

**EMPLOYERS often secure no-strike clauses** 1 **in collective bargaining contracts** 2 with their employees' unions, 3 in order to ensure greater union responsibility for the maintenance of stable production schedules.4 **Under such clauses, the union promises not to authorize or sanction any strike during the term of its contract.' The employer is** usually **given power to discipline or discharge all the individual union members who strike in violation of the no-strike clause.0**

When confronted with a union-sponsored strike in violation of a no-strike clause, the employer may be forced to accede to the union's demands because of production requirements or the scarcity of replacement workers. 7 Alternatively, he may shut down his plant and wait out the strike, disciplining the strikers when they return to work, subject to an arbitrator's review.8 However, if he believes his bargaining position to be strong, he may discharge all the strikers, rescind the contract, and refuse thereafter to deal with the union.0 **The National Labor Relations Board has upheld such employer actions on the grounds that they are justified by the union's prior material breach of the contract,'** ° and that strikers in violation of contract are not protected by the National Labor Relations Act."1

**This impacts back to my framework because promise breaking isn’t universalizable without contradiction since if everyone breaks promises they have no bearing, but in order to break promises they must be valid for you to go against them.**

**Interpretation: Debaters may not claim extinction comes first under any framework.**

**Violation: \_\_\_\_**

**Standards:**

**1. Strat Skew: This structurally skews the framework debate because you can win either util is true or that extinction comes first but I have to beat back both and win my framework. This is uniquely abusive because I could beat every warrant for util and destroy your framework and still lose the framework debate.**

**2. Phil Ed: Extinction first doesn’t require you to normatively justify or understand your framework, it just requires you to read an extinction impact. Instead of having nuanced clash on the framework debate, every round comes down to the lbl on Pummer ‘15.**

**Voters:**

**Fairness is a voter because the ballot makes debate a game and without fairness you’re voting for the better cheater not the better debater.**

**Education is a voter because its the only out of round impact and the reason schools fund debate.**

**Drop the debater to deter future abuse, and because if I prove abuse it means substance has already been skewed.**

**Competing interps because a) reasonability has broad and bidirectional brightlines that allow you to just keep shifting them to justify any abuse. b) competing interps sets the best norms because you have to justify your actual practice, so bad practices will lose.**

**No RVIs**

**a) an RVI would mean any time theory is introduced the entire debate comes down to it which kills substance eduation and all strategy because in a world where there’s an RVI the debate would just be is this theory shell true mooting everything else.**

**b) you don’t win for just being fair or educational.**