I negate. Brackets for clarity.

To negate[[1]](#footnote-0) means to deny the existence or truth of. This has two implications: First, that you presume neg because there are more reasons why a statement might not be true than ones that directly prove the statement true. Second, permissibility flows neg because the aff has the burden to prove some sort of moral obligation since that is what “ought” entails. Thus, proving permissibility, which is distinct from obligation would negate.

Just is defined as morally correct [Cambridge Dictionary]. Thus I defend that a morally correct government ought not to recognize an unconditional right for workers to strike.

Motivation must be the starting point of any ethic since they implicitly assume people will follow it. Any form of externalism collapses to internalism. **Joyce**:

Back to the external reason[s]. Suppose it were claimed, instead, that I have a reason to refrain from drinking the coffee because it is tapu and must not be touched. This reason claim will be urged regardless of what I may say about my indifference to tapu, or my citing of nihilistic desires to tempt the hand of fate. [r]egardless of my desires (it is claimed) I ought not drink - l have a reason not to drink. But **how could** that reason ever explain any action of mine? Could the **external reason** even **explain** my **[action]** from drinking**?** Clearly, in order to explain it **the** external **reason must have some causal**ly efficacious **role [in]** among the antecedents of **the action** (in this case, an omission) — l must have. in some manner. "internalized" it. The only possibility, it would seem, consistent with its being an external reason, is that I believe the external reason claim [but] : I believe that the coffee is tapu. There's no doubting that such a belief can play a role in explaining actions - including my refraining from drinking the coffee. The question is whether the **belief alone can[not] produce action**, to which the correct answer is “No.” A very familiar and eminently sensible view says that **in order to explain** an **action** the **belief must couple with desire**s (such that those same desires had in the absence of the belief would not have resulted in the action). And this seems correct: if I believe that the coffee is [bad] tapu but really just don’t care about that, then I will not refrain from drinking it. So in order for the belief to explain action it must couple with [desire] elements - but in that case the putative **external reason collapses into** an **internal** one.3

Joyce, Richard (Professor of Philosophy at Victoria University Wellington, New Zealand). The Myth of Morality. 2001. ***[Bracketed for grammatical clarity]***

Only a contractarian system that derives principles of mutual restraint from individuals’ self-interest accounts for internal desire because contractarian principles are in the interest of all parties involved **Gauthier 86**:

**Moral principles are** introduced as the **objects of** full voluntary ex ante **agreement among** rational **persons. Such agreement is hypothetical,** in supposing a pre-moral context for the adoption of moral rules and practices. **But the parties to agreement are real,** determinate individuals, **distinguished by their** capacities, **situations, and concerns.** In so far as **[Since] they** would **agree** **to constrain**ts **on their choices**,restraining their pursuit of their own interests, **they acknowledge a distinction between what they may and may not do. As rational persons** understanding the structure of their interaction, **they recognize [the need] for mutual constraint**, and so for a moral dimension in their affairs.

Gauthier, David P. *Morals by Agreement*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1986. Print. [bracketed for grammatical clarity]

Thus, the standard is **consistency with** **contractarian principles of mutual restraint,** defined as those principles by which individuals would constrain their actions with the belief that doing so would serve their self-interest.

Additionally, self-interest is determined at the time of the original decision to rise to a norm of mutual self-restraint.

Prefer the standard:

**1. Consent-** Contractarianism is based on consent—implicit in acceptance of a contract—which ultimately determines what qualifies as a net good or harm. O/w their justifications since actions can’t be determined without consent.

**2. Infinite Regress-** Asking external authorities begs the question of why their conception of the good is correct and should be preferred. Contractarianism avoids this by allowing individuals to construct conceptions of the good based on a rational restriction of their future actions. O/w their framework since no other theory is derived from a morally neutral base.

**3. Performativity** – You agree to 4 minutes of prep and if you tried to go over the judges would down you or tell the tournament to DQ you. Their very performance justifies the NC framework and proves the AC collapses to the NC.

I contend that no contractarian principle exists that wills us to affirm. Now negate:

**An employee voluntarily enters into a contract when they agree to work at a company. Morrissey:**

So, for example, **an employee of a corporation** strikes a bargain—i.e. **enters a contract—with the corporation when both parties agree to certain terms of employment**. Creditors likewise enter into certain agreements with a corporation to provide financing in accord with certain contractual terms. And shareholders should understand that they are getting a bundle of rights with respect to that corporation in exchange for the money they invest.300

Contractarians would argue that **all of these parties should strike the bargain they find acceptable and live within the terms of that bargain**, or else they will find themselves in breach and possibly subject to legal recourse from their counterparties. Again, the traditional contractarian argument is that **there is no compelling need for government regulation or oversight beyond the policing and enforcement of the contractual bargains**.301

Morrissey, Joseph F. "A Contractarian Critique of Citizens United." U. Pa. J. Const. L. 15 (2012): 765.

**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 contracts.**

"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 N**ational **L**abor **R**elations **B**oard **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

**A strike is a breach of contract, Foster:**

‘**Suppose that a trade union officer gives a strike notice**. He says to an employer : ‘ We are going to call a strike on Monday week unless you increase the men’s wages by €1 a week.’ . . . Such a notice is not to be construed as if it were a week’s notice on behalf of the men to terminate their employment; for that is the last thing any of the men would desire. They do not want to lose pension rights and so forth by giving up their jobs. **The strike notice is nothing more or less than a notice that the men will not come to work**. In short, that **they will break their contracts**.”

This view was adopted by Widgery J. at first instance in Morgan v. Fry where he said that **there was “ nothing in the authorities to support the view that strike action, whether after notice or not, is other than a breach of the contract**.” 31 It must be presumed that he was using “ strike action ” in the sense that Donovan L.J. had used it and excluding category A notices.

Foster, Ken. "Strikes and Employment Contracts." The Modern Law Review 34.3 (1971): 275-287.

Any breach of contract is immoral as it was arrived from two parties mutually agreeing on a contract, thus any strike is immoral and should not be recognized by a just government.

And, given that the purpose of a government is to uphold contracts, a government recognizing a right to breach contracts destroys the constitutive nature of government and doesn’t qualify.

#### **Strikes inhibit the ability to create contracts, create power imbalances, and violate individual contracts.**

Levine 01, Peter. "The Libertarian Critique of Labor Unions." Philosophy and Public Policy Quarterly 21.4 (2001): 17-24. (Peter Levine is the Associate Dean for Research and Lincoln Filene Professor of Citizenship & Public Affairs in Tufts University’s Jonathan Tisch College of Civic Life. He has secondary appointments in the Tufts Philosophy Department and the Tufts Clinical and Translational Sciences Institute. He was the founding deputy director (2001-6) and then the second director (2006-15) of Tisch College’s CIRCLE, The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, which he continues to oversee as an associate dean.) JG

Libertarians strongly defend freedom of choice and association. Thus, when workers choose to act collectively, negotiate together, or voluntarily walk off the job, libertarians have no reasonable complaint--even if other people are harmed--because they support the right to make and exit voluntary partnerships. But unions gain strength **by overriding private rights.** They routinely block anyone from working **under a non-union contract**, and they prevent employers from making offers--even advantageous ones--to individual workers unless the union is informed and consents. Unions declare strikes and establish picket lines to prevent **customers and workers** from **entering company property**; they may **fine employees who cross these lines.** They also extract fees from all workers who are covered by their contracts. Although covered workers may avoid paying for certain union functions (such as lobbying) that are not germane to contract issues, they must pay for strikes and other activities that some of them oppose. The great libertarian theorist Friedrich Hayek concluded that unions “are the one institution where government has signally failed in its first task, that of preventing coercion of men by other men--and by coercion I do not mean primarily the coercion of employers but the coercion of workers by their fellow workers.” Hayek may have been thinking mainly of corrupt and unaccountable union leaders. But even a completely democratic union sometimes supplants private rights. As libertarians like Morgan O. Reynolds point out, majorities within a union are able to ignore minorities’ preferences.

Second off

1. The ROTB is TT -

A) Isomorphism: alternative RTBs aren’t binary win/loss, and thus cannot function in debate

B) Constitutivism: the ballot and tab software presents decisions as aff/neg, not who best achieves some good value. Also, “affirm” is “To state that is true” [1] and negate is “to deny the existence or truth of”, which independently proves truth testing.

C) Key to 1) Ground Parity: The wording committee and topic selection process exist to identify topics with a range of defensible arguments on both sides, “role of the ballot” claims can frame the round in ways that make my ground either absurd or morally abhorrent 2) Predictability: The only face value of a resolution is it’s truth or falsity as a statement – not some inherent other framework

2. Zeno’s paradox. If I want to travel some distance, I must first travel half of that distance, but then I have to travel half of that distance and so on into infinity. This proves motion impossible, so you negate. A strike can’t occur if motion is impossible because a strike requires movement, such as walking out of a factory or passing out fliers about the strike.

3. Good Samaritan paradox. If I want to solve x problem, x problem has to exist first which would mean I want that problem to exist. Means strikers can’t actually solve problems because they subconsciously want them to exist so doing the rez is pointless and you should negate.

4. To is defined as expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location) [EOD]. Strike is not a particular location, so it can’t be moved towards and the resolution is impossible and you auto-negate.

5. Decision making paradox. If I make a decision, I have to make a decision to make that decision, which would be a metadecision. But then I have to make a decision to make that decision, and so on into infinity. This means that decisions are impossible, so the government can’t make the decision to recognize an unconditional right to strike, so you negate. Independently, that means you just negate instead of making a decision

6. To say X ought to do something requires that X has a unified intent; governments are groups and have no unified intent, so the resolution is false

7. Strike is defined as to hit or attack someone or something forcefully or violently [Cambridge Dictionary]. There shouldn’t be an unconditional right to hit people so the resolution is a priori false.

8. Existence is conditional on states of affairs in the world, thus no right can be unconditional because its existence is necessarily conditional so the resolution is a priori false

9. Double bind, either a) an unconditional right to strike is just and the just governments that are the actors of the resolution would have already done it so no need to affirm or b) an unconditional right to strike is not just and you negate

10. Just is defined as morally correct [Cambridge Dictionary] and unconditional is defined as not conditional or limited [Merriam-Webster]. A morally correct government shouldn’t recognize hate strikes as legitimate, so the resolution is a priori false.

11. Neg definition choice – the aff should have defined 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.

**No impact to warming AND it’s irreversible – the math is impossible**

**IBD 18** [Investor’s Business Daily Editorial board, citing data from the UN’s October IPCC report, the US DOE, and reports on current emission levels, October 8, 2018. “Stopping 'Catastrophic' Global Warming Is Impossible, UN Report Shows, So What's The Point?”<https://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/global-warming-un-report/>] Altered for glang

Climate Change: Assume for the sake of argument that everything environmentalists say about **global warming** is true. If that's the case, then **there is no chance of stopping it. That's what the latest UN report on global warming clearly demonstrates.** The headlines in stories reporting on the UN's latest climate change report all say something along the lines of: "Urgent changed is needed to prevent global catastrophe." **If global temperatures climb more than 1.5 degrees Celsius — compared with preindustrial temperatures — all hell will break loose, the UN says**. There will be catastrophic flooding, drought, more weather extremes. Hundreds of millions will be susceptible to poverty by midcentury. Even at 1.5 degrees, terrible things will happen. To **be** clear, we are **highly skeptical** **of these doom-and-gloom scenarios**. **Past predictions** **of global** **warming catastrophes** **have failed to emerge**. In the U.S., for example, **there's been no trend toward more extreme weather, drought or flooding, even though the planet has already warmed 1 degree Celsius**. This year's tornado season, in fact, has been the mildest on record. What's more, **environmentalists have issued** these ["**point of no return" warnings** **for** **decades**](https://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/al-gore-runs-global-warming-racket/), **only to revise them once the supposed deadline passes**. **Global Warming Is Inevitable** **But even if the alarmist predictions are true**, **there's** **nothing that can plausibly be done at this point to stop it. That's** **the** real **message** **of the** annual **UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change** [**IPCC**] **report**. The chart contained in the ["Summery for Policymakers"](http://report.ipcc.ch/sr15/pdf/sr15_spm_final.pdf) shows projected changes in global temperatures over the next 100 years. It also shows that **temperatures will top** **the** supposed **1.5-degree limit by** around **2040**, **even if the world makes drastic reductions** **in CO2 and other greenhouse gas emissions within the next two decades. How drastic?** **The UN's forecasts all assume that the entire world become entirely carbon free by 2055** … at the latest. **That's just 37 years from now.** It also assumes that the world makes massive reductions in other greenhouse gases, such as methane. **Here's an example of what the UN says would have to happen within the next 12 years to meet that goal**. Keep in mind, **this is the low end of the UN's proposed changes**. **60%** **of the world's energy** would have to come **from renewable** sources **by** **2030**, **and 77% by 2050**. (**The** **Department of Energy** **forecasts that renewables will** **account for** just **27%** **of the U.S.'s** electric power generation **by 2050**.) **Coal use** **would** **have to drop** **78%, oil 37% and natural gas 25%** — **compared with 2010 levels** — **within** **12 years**. (**Last year**, **global coal demand increased**, **and** use of natural **gas has** **massively climbed** in the U.S.) **There'd have to be a** 59% **increase in nuclear power by** 2030, and a **150% increase by 2050**. (**Good luck** getting environmentalist to buy into that). **Farmers** **would have to** figure out how to **cut methane** emissions **by** **24% by 2030**, (and still feed a growing worldwide population). **Even those massive reductions won't produce enough CO2 reductions it.** So, the UN assumes the world will also remove massive amounts of CO2 from the atmosphere. That's despite the fact that nobody knows how to do that today. **Unprecedented, Or Wishful Thinking?** **The UN itself admits that achieving anything like these levels of greenhouse gas reductions "would require rapid and far-reaching transitions in energy, land, urban and infrastructure, and industrial systems**." It goes on to say that such an undertaking would be "unprecedented in terms of scale." And **it would require a "significant upscaling of investments." In other words**, **massive amounts of money**. **To say that changes of this magnitude within that time frame are unrealistic would be putting it mildly**. **The last big attempt to get the world to cut CO2 emissions turned out to be a farce**. As the UN itself admitted, the CO2 reduction pledges made by the 195 countries that signed on to the **Paris** Accords [**won't come anywhere close the level of CO2 reductions it says are needed**](https://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/the-un-admits-that-the-paris-climate-deal-was-a-fraud/) **to avoid "catastrophe."** And **countries aren't even living up to those pledges**. **In the EU,** **carbon emissions started** **climbing** again last year. **Germany is way off its carbon reduction goals, despite plans to spend $580 billion to overhaul its energy system**. A recent report showed that only nine of 195 countries have submitted their CO2 reduction plans to the UN. **Does anyone honestly believe that these countries will suddenly decide to entirely decarbonize their economies in three decades?** **Adapting To Global Warming** So, if **the chances of avoiding a climate "catastrophe" are gone**, what should be done? Sure, we can research carbon removal technology. And, as the U.S. has shown, a free-market economy — simply by encouraging cost cutting and efficiency — can generate CO2 reductions without the heavy hand of government. But in our view, **the most prudent course of action isn't to wreck the global economy in hopes that it might make a small difference in the climate 100 years from now**. The more reasonable approach is to adapt to whatever changes do occur. **Even if the horror stories** **told by environmentalists** **come to pass**, **[humans] can and will adjust**. After all, **the human race has shown the ability to survive in the most extreme climates**. And it's done so **with** **far less technological sophistication**. **We've learned to live in deserts. And in the Arctic. In hurricane alleys and earthquake zones**. **The idea that we won't be able to handle changes caused by a slightly warmer planet over the next millennium is ludicrous**. Meanwhile, if the environmentalists' horror stories don't come true, we won't have wasted trillions upon trillions of dollars tilting at windmills.

1. "negate." Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. 2010. Merriam-Webster Online. 18 August 2010. <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-0)