I affirm. My value is morality, defined as moral obligation.

Pure reason is constitutive of agents. **Gobsch 1:**

**In** us **human beings**, however, **pure reason is of itself practical, if all goes well:** ideally, **the laws from the representation of which we act are therein known by us to be the laws that explain why we act at all. 6 They are practical laws**. Thus **defined**, a practical law is **[as] a self-applying law**: its application in the activity that constitutes a human being’s existence does not, if all goes well, have conditions the satifaction of which could possibly remain to be explained by other laws. So it cannot be hypothetical, **it will be categorical: it will be law in virtue of no other law. As law, however, it will govern belonging in the totality that has no outside, the world. So there can only be one such law.** 7 In its necessary singularity, this law, then, is lawness itself, reason; or **as Kant puts it: “pure reason, practical of itself, is here immediately lawgiving**
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But we are not reasoning robots, reason is coupled with sensibility. **Gobsch 2:**

To act as a human being is to actualize pure reason, if all goes well. But **no human being is pure reason. Human beings are rational** animals. **So they are** animals, **sensible** organisms, **too. Sensibility is a** receptive capacity of representation: a **capacity to represent objects through being affected by them**. Affection happens at a time and a place. So sensible organisms are spatiotemporal beings. And **affection depends on the existence of its object**. So sensibility is a capacity whose actualization has conditions the satisfaction of which cannot be the work of this capacity itself. Therefore, sensibility is limited by whatever else satisfies these conditions. And so it is a particular capacity, a capacity with a specific form. But if a capacity of representation is limited and particular, then its object—the content of its act in general—must be limited and particular, too: its object cannot be that which is, simply as such. It is for this reason that **sensibility differs infinitely from reason**, the unconditioned capacity, and that **no sensible organism can be pure reason**, so that the definition of a human being unites reason and sensibility as two distinct determinations.

To exist as an animal is, typically, to be engaged in sensible activity.11 So although human beings exist, if all goes well, through actualizing pure reason, **sensibility will have to play a role in their rational practical activity. A merely prudentially rational animal**, should such a thing be possible at all, **would be determined to act by sensible desire**. Reason would merely serve to direct it toward happiness. In a human being, however, reason is, if all goes well, of itself practical. And so the role of sensible desire cannot be that of the determinant, the motor, of human practical activity. As the activity of a rational animal, human activity, too, is oriented toward happiness. But **the subjective principles of a human being’s practical activity**, principles which, as such, determine the manner in which its orientation toward happiness becomes practical, are acts of free choice: **acts of a capacity to “be determined to actions by pure will**,”12 maxims, as Kant calls them. As conditioned by the moral law, **such maxims presuppose their subject’s acknowledgment of her own happiness as prima facie good: as to be pursued at all in the activity of pure reason.**13 In this acknowledgment, a human being constitutes herself as a person: as individualized pure reason, as a particular manifestation of the moral law. Through her maxims, a person, a human being as a particular manifestation of pure reason, determines the character of her pursuit of happiness. And so it is **in her maxims**, her acts of free choice, **a human being rationally displays her sensible nature: the individuality and finitude that make her an animal.**
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The ethical community is the solution. **Gobsch 3:**

**To act from one’s consciousness of nothing but the moral law is to act autonomously,** it is to give this law to oneself: it is to act in such a way as to therein also constitute and preserve oneself as a being who is acting from nothing but one’s consciousness of this law. So **for me to be related to you** as one person to another 185 **in my acting from such respect for the moral law is for me to give the law to both of us and to** therein **receive it from you who is equally giving it to both of us.** So **as members of our ethical community, each of us acts in such a way as to constitute and preserve herself and therein the other as a person who acts from nothing but her consciousness of the moral law.** In this sense, **an act from respect for the moral law, conceived as the principle of an ethical community, is a** joint or **general act of the will.** So **in ethical life, the willing itself is relational.**
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Thus, the standard is consistency with the ethical community. Prefer additionally,

1. Bindingness: any system of ethics must be applicable to the nature of the subject which takes action under the framework. For example, imposing a set of premises on a dog that would guide them towards action, one of which involved speaking English, wouldn’t be a valid syllogism for the dog to follow because the syllogism is not applicable to its characteristics and nature. Because the ethical community is founded on the basis of reason and sensibility, the two constitutive characteristics of the subject, it is thus applicable to the nature of the subject, which other frameworks fail to account for.
2. Performativity: our ability to debate in this round is reliant on our ability to self-legislate, which the ethical community ensures. We are using reason to make arguments while also being affected by our surroundings because we’re not debating in a vacuum.
3. Evil is seen as misrecognition and immersion in vanity. **Gobsch 4:**

In granting the necessity of human evil the same objectivity as the necessity of the possibility of the highest good, **Hegel** goes even further: he **conceives of the activ-ity whose end is the highest good, the activity of pure reason, as an activity that is**, objectively speaking, **nothing but the activity of overcoming evil. “Evil,”** Hegel writes, **“retention of the finite,” “vanity,” is “the ultimate immersion into [spirit’s] own subjectivity and [its] innermost contradiction and therefore [its] turning- Point, ”** which is to say that spirit, rational activity, “is itself nothing but this: the act of the nullification of nullity, **the frustrating of vanity** [das Vereiteln des Eitlen] within itself.” 54To say that rational activity is itself nothing but the frustration of vanity within itself is not to say, as Kant would have it, that the activity of pure reason, should it find itself confronted with vanity, as something alien to its objective nature, would consist in the activity of frustrating it. Rather, it is to say that **rational activity is in itself nothing but the activity of overcoming evil.** Therefore, **to acknowledge the objectivity of the necessity of human evil is to attribute to the human being the capacity to** actually **know that pure reason is** of itself **practical in** her **activity, which is** the activity of **overcoming evil.** 55
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**OFFENSE**

**In the ethical community, individuals recognize themselves and the others around them as self-legislators; capable of setting and pursuing their own ends. Misrecognition is the ultimate form of evil, where individuals begin to immerse themselves in vanity and see themselves as superior compared to the others in their community, thus failing to recognize their equal ability to self-legislate. Absent recognizing the unconditional right to strike, a government doesn’t recognize workers as self-legislators. They do not recognize the right as legitimate or necessary, and do not recognize workers’ grievances as sufficient enough for the right to strike. This is a form of misrecognition.**

**The right to strike, which is a fundamental human right, is consistent with the ethical community. UE:**

**The right of workers to** withhold their labor — to **strike** — **is among the most important of human rights. No society can truly claim to respect liberty and deny workers the right to strike. International law recognizes the right to strike as a fundamental human right.** Rank-and-file control and anti-discrimination are foundational UE principles. Equally important is the call in the preamble to the UE Constitution to “pursue at all times a policy of aggressive struggle to improve our conditions.” **The growth of the labor movement beginning in the 1930s,** including UE, was **accomplished by** significant **worker militancy, sit downs, and strikes,** which **resulted in unprecedented progress for working people.** Ronald Reagan's busting of the air traffic controllers’ union in 1981 accelerated the modern-day assault on the right to strike. Following the president’s lead, bosses began to “permanently replace” economic strikers. The threat of permanent replacement, high unemployment and the shrinking number of unionized jobs led to a precipitous decline in the number of strikes. Fortunately over the past two years an increasing number of workers have begun to take strike action against their employers, including massive, largely successful, statewide teachers strikes. Long-time labor activist Joe Burns did a valuable service to the labor movement when he wrote *Reviving the Strike: How Working People Can Regain Power and Transform America* (2011), in which he documents the decline of the strike and weakening of the labor movement. He argues many unions have forgotten what an effective strike is. A picket line, for example, is not meant to be “a weak form of moral witness,” but a blockade of the workplace to keep out strikebreakers and prevent the employer from operating. Burns offers useful ideas for beginning to rebuild labor’s power. His follow-up book on the public sector, *Strike Back: Using the Militant Tactics of Labor's Past to Reignite Public Sector Unionism Today* (2014) is equally important and useful. **The right to strike is vital to maintain and improve our wages, benefits, and working conditions, and to resist the attack on democracy by anti-working class elements. When Wabtec** took over GE Transportation in February 2019 and **attempted to impose unreasonable** terms and **conditions on the members of UE Locals** 506 and 618 in Erie, PA, **the[y]** locals **struck for nine days** (which, under Pennsylvania law, was ruled a lockout due to the imposition of terms and conditions). Although members of Locals 506 and 618 have held walkouts, this was the first full-fledged strike since the national GE strike in 1969-70, which lasted 102 days**. Strike action forced the company back to the negotiating table, resulting eventually in a new, fair contract** which preserved most of the conditions UE members had worked under at GE**, including the right to strike over grievances.** Shortly after UE’s last convention, an eight-day strike by members of UE Local 234 in St. Johnsbury, VT backed the company off of draconian concession demands. A one-day strike in March of 2019 was crucial to winning a first contract for Local 1018 at Lanterman Regional Center in Los Angeles, and credible strike threats by many UE locals, including Local 121, Local 243, Local 329, Local 610, and Local 1135, also helped to achieve excellent results at the bargaining table. In the public sector, workers in 39 states lack the legal right to strike. As UE’s public-employee members can attest, mandatory arbitration disempowers the rank and file in the negotiation of their own contract. Recent legislative attacks on public workers included rollbacks of the right to strike where it existed. As was the case with the public-sector labor upsurge in the 1970s, just because a strike action is nominally “illegal” doesn’t mean it can’t be successful. The wave of strikes that began when West Virginia teachers walked off the job in February 2018 inspired workers throughout the nation. **Teachers have held statewide strikes**, sickouts, and other job actions in North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, Kentucky, and Colorado **to demand not only long overdue** and substantive **improvements to their pay and conditions, but also greater investment in public education — which benefits all working people.** Recent large-scale strikes by hotel and grocery store workers have also captured the public imagination, and the threat of job actions by federal and airline workers helped end the government shutdown in early 2019. The strike is far from dead. **A broad grassroots campaign by labor and its allies is necessary to reestablish our right to strike without limitation, and without the threat of being replaced. This includes the right to strike over grievances.**
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**And, strikes, being a form of protest, foster greater consideration regarding how society should treat workers by allowing unions to push for greater rights. This bolsters a society’s ability to enter the ethical community.**

**Lanza 19:**

**Protest**2 **is a form of individual or collective action aimed at expressing ideas,** views, **or values of** dissent, **opposition,** denunciation, or vindication. **Examples include the expression of** political, **social**, or cultural **opinions,** views, or perspectives; **the vocalization of support or criticism regarding a group**, party, or the government itself; the reaction to a policy or the denunciation of a public problem; the affirmation of identity **or raising awareness about a group’s situation of discrimination and social exclusion.** 2. **The right to freedom of expression is** strongly **interconnected with freedom of assembly and the right to protest. Assemblies**, defined as any intentional and temporary congregation of a group of people in a private or public space for a specific purpose, 3 “**play a vibrant role in mobilizing the population and in formulating grievances and aspirations**, facilitating the celebration of events and, importantly, in influencing States’ public policy.” 4 At the same time, the expression of individual and collective opinions is one of the objectives of any protest. 3. **The right to protest is also strongly associated with human rights activities, including demands for the recognition, protection, or exercise of a right.** In many cases, and in different countries in the region, protests are used to react to specific acts of violence, evictions, labor issues, or other events that have affected rights. **Protests have been a means to achieve both the raising of the threshold to guarantee fundamental rights at the national level and the inclusion of a large number of rights in the progressive development of international human rights law**.5 4. Protest is also closely linked to the promotion and defense of democracy. In particular, the Inter-American Court has recognized that in situations involving a breakdown of the democratic institutional order, **protest should be understood to “[correspond] not only to the exercise of a right, but also to compliance with the obligation to defend democracy.**” 6
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**UNDERVIEW**

1. Aff gets 1AR theory: otherwise a) the 1NC could have an infinite number of off-case positions and the 1AR would have no way of checking back b) the aff is already at a 7-4 time skew, allocating 4 minutes between 10 off case positions and extending the aff without being able to read theory becomes near impossible c) encourages debaters to read a bunch of arguments with zero evidence instead instead of crafting one or two warranted, creative positions, which takes away the educational aspect of debate, outweighs on constitutivism since debate is an educational activity.
2. Prefer competing interpretations: vote for the debater representing the better model for debate to set norms for future rounds a) reasonability brightlines are arbitrary and self-serving c) they create a race to the bottom by seeing how close to the brightline one can get and by constantly shifting it. No RVIs: a) a debater shouldn’t win the round simply proving that they weren’t being unfair b) encourages experienced theory debaters to bait theory and win on the RVI. Theory is drop the debater to deter future unfairness.
3. Aff gets 2AR weighing - a) we both have 6 minutes to weigh b) otherwise I would only be able to just repeat everything I already said in the 1AR in the 2AR without any clear implication of how it relates to the 2NR, key to clash since otherwise the aff wouldn’t have a speech to compare their arguments in the 1AR to those in 2NR.
4. Negative must check aff interpretations in CX: a) there needs to be a time during the round where both debaters can discuss and clarify their positions in front of the judge, otherwise we’re essentially just debating in a vacuum b) CX checks -- it’s 3 minutes where we can discuss what our positions entail and comply or conflict with any interpretations which isn’t possible during actual speeches.
5. The role of the ballot is truth testing because A) Isomorphism: alternative RTBs aren’t binary win/loss, and thus cannot function in debate B) Constitutivism: the ballot and tab software present decision as aff/neg, not who best achieves some good value. Also, “affirm” is “**To state that** (**a proposition**, or part of a proposition) **is true**; to give as an affirmative proposition,”[1] and negate is “**to deny the** existence or **truth of**; to deny.”, which independently proves truth testing C) Coordination, tournaments provide focal points for debaters by announcing a topic, giving it salience. Absent that focal point, debate is impossible since the chance of our being prepared to debate the same thing is literally zero.
6. Presumption affirms: A) Any reason affirming is harder is a reason to vote aff on presumption in the case of a tie a) 7-4-6-3 time skew, b) aff has to extend offense twice, more chances to make mistakes c) neg gets proactive theory in the first speech, aff can only be reactive d) We’re cognitively biased to maintain the squo so err on the side of change to rectify perceptual judge skew e) We presume statements true unless proven false—if I told you my name was Ria you’d believe it until told otherwise. Conspiracy theories don’t respond: f) The resolution isn’t a conspiracy and g) People assume conspiracies are true—the only reason we dismiss them as absurd is if we have prior knowledge that refutes them.