# 1AC – Nietzsche

## Framework

**Permissibility and presumption affirm:**

**[a] Epistemics – we wouldn’t be able to start a strand of reasoning since we’d have to question that reason – means that presuming neg is incoherent because it relies on some presumptive truths about ethics and the world in general**

**[b] Logic – Otherwise we could not take morally neutral actions like drinking water cuz everything has to be justified as good which freezes action and creates a contradiction because we are always naturally doing something**

**[c] Probability - Logically safer since it’s better to be supererogatory than fail to meet an obligation**

**[d] Textuality - If everything is permissible so is the aff since nothing prevents us from doing it**

**[e] Intuition - we naturally believe statements true e.g. if I told you my name is Shrey, you’d believe me**

**Being is always a prior question—to make any claim about the subject we must first understand how the subject functions.**

**Manzi ‘13**, Yvonne (University of Kent). “Jean-Paul Sartre: Existential “Freedom” and the Political.” E-International Relations Students. January 23rd, 2013. <http://www.e-ir.info/2013/01/23/jean-paul-sartre-existential-freedom-and-the-political/> RCT//SR

Philosophers have been pondering the notion of freedom for thousands of years. From Thucydides, through to Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, John Stuart Mill and Jean Jacques Rousseau, the concept of freedom has continually been dealt with to some degree in political thought. This is an important concept because we must decide whether individuals are free, whether they should be free, what this means and what kinds of institutions we are to build around these ideas. In political thought, the notion of freedom can be looked at through the lens of Isaiah Berlin’s renowned essay “Two Concepts of Liberty”. He begins with stating that in political philosophy, the dominant issue is the question of obedience and coercion. Why should an individual obey anyone else? May individuals be coerced? Why should we all not live as we like? These are all questions of freedom. In a long and detailed discussion, Berlin then makes the distinction between positive and negative freedom.1 Carter clearly and concisely explains the distinction; “negative liberty is the absence of obstacles, barriers or constraints… Positive liberty is the possibility of acting … in such a way as to take control of one’s life” (2008). Key to negative freedom2 is the notion of non-interference. One only lacks political liberty if he/she is “prevented from attaining a goal by human beings” (Berlin 1969, 122). Simply being incapable of achieving a goal (such as not being able to fly like a bird or not being able to walk because of an injury) does not count as being un-free in this sense. There are numerous political philosophers who fall under this category outlined by Berlin. They agree on the definition of freedom but disagree about how wide it should be. Two of these philosophers are Thomas Hobbes and John Locke.3 Because in the state of nature human goals cannot be harmonised, these classical thinkers assumed that human freedom must be limited by law. However, they also recognised that a minimum area of human freedom should also be protected in order to allow for the basic human capacities/qualities to develop. For Hobbes, individuals must surrender all of their rights to the Leviathan under a social contract, except for one fundamental right – the right to self-preservation (Hobbes 1651). For Locke, the ‘minimal’ area of protected freedom for each individual is a bit broader in that individuals have rights to their property and to the fruits of their labour (Locke 1689). There is infinite debate in that “we cannot remain absolutely free, and must give up some of our liberty to preserve the rest. But total self-surrender is self-defeating” (Berlin 1969, 126). Positive freedom is ‘positive’ in the sense that individuals will want to be their own masters. In Berlin’s words, by virtue of positive freedom, one will “wish to be a subject, not an object” (1969, 131). Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s notion of ‘true liberty’ may be placed under this category. Individuals should pursue an ideal of ‘true liberty’ in which they will be able to achieve their full human potential and live virtuously. True liberty is achieved when individuals can let go of amour propre (the love of oneself) and instead become possessed by amour de soi (the desire for self-preservation and self-mastery) (Rousseau 1762). Positive freedom therefore is less about what individuals are forbidden from doing, and more about what individuals can do to reach their full human potential. Under a state of positive freedom “I wish, above all, to be conscious of myself as a thinking, willing, active being, bearing responsibility for my choices and able to explain them by references to my own ideas and purposes” (Berlin 1969, 131). The point I would like to make is that Berlin’s approach in dealing with the concept of freedom is not enough. All the thinkers I have mentioned relate to something which we can call political freedom as opposed to philosophical freedom.4 Jean-Paul Sartre discusses the latter. In his essay, Berlin claims that “conceptions of freedom directly derive from views of what constitutes a self” (1969, 134). What Sartre does is precisely this; he begins with an understanding of the subject and of ‘human nature’ that is different from all the aforementioned ones, and he arrives at a conception of freedom that is just as different. I argue that Sartre’s concept of freedom should not have been omitted from debates in political thought. I am not arguing that Sartre’s conception of freedom should be inserted into Berlin’s framework, nor am I arguing that Berlin overlooked him. I am arguing that Berlin’s discussion is not enough. We need a conception of freedom that operates at the level of the political, because it is on top of the political that everything else in politics is built. I take the political to be the field of relations below ‘politics’. This is where the conditions for understanding politics are shaped. Chantal Mouffe makes a similar distinction; she borrows Heidegger’s vocabulary and claims that “politics refers to the ontic level, while ‘the political’ has to do with the ontological one”5 (Mouffe 2005, 8). The ontic generally refers to physical or factual reality, while the ontological refers to ‘being’, or the first-person phenomenological experience (Heidegger 1927). In this case, the two terms are slightly adapted to the theory. Politics is at the ontic level because it has to do with the conventional practices and policies, while the political is at the ontological level because, for Mouffe, it concerns the ‘being’ of society, or in her words “the very way in which society is instituted” (2005, 9). Existentialism and Jean-Paul Sartre Existentialist6 philosophers such as Albert Camus and Jean-Paul Sartre were well-known in their time for being involved in resistance, unforgiving of collaborationism and conformity, and for having an active interest in revolutionary movements7. When coupled with the fact that freedom is one of the most significant themes that are examined by existentialist philosophers, one wonders why this branch of philosophy has not been more appropriately dealt with in political thought. Perhaps it is because existentialism indeed appears to be more of a life-philosophy than a tradition fit for the conception of political theory and policy. I argue that before political theories, policies and institutions can be conceived, one must first be able to appropriately situate the human condition. Existentialism provides a unique and compelling account of what it means to be ‘human’, which allows for Sartre’s conception of freedom to be reasonably developed. What is primarily worth noting is the context in which the existentialist ideas of Jean-Paul Sartre arose. After the world wars, there was a break down in traditional ideas of philosophy. There was no true sense of community, no faith in human nature, and an increasing belief that perhaps the divine did not truly exist if it allowed for atrocities such as the holocaust to happen (Flynn 2006). Philosophy had to return to its origins; ‘what do we know and how do we know it?’ was the question. Existentialists answered ‘all we really know is that we exist’. Existentialism therefore revolves around questions of existence and the human experience. We will start from the same position – notions of existence and subjectivity. Existentialists maintain that we cannot know anything if not from our subjectivity. The first and only real thing we know is that we exist and that we experience everything subjectively. This leads us into questions of being. Hegel distinguished between the being of objects (being-in-itself), and human Being (or Geist) – this provided one of the bases for Sartre’s later distinction (Hegel 1807). Heidegger provided a second contribution, which in a sense defines the core of this philosophical tradition. He claimed that we cannot reflect on the meaning of being in relation to our existence, if we do not first understand it philosophically8 (Heidegger 1927). Heidegger especially critiqued the Cartesian question of existence, claiming that such a question arises from an ontologically inadequate beginning (Ibid, 83). He criticised the notion of substance, and he argued that individuals are Dasein, or ‘beings-in-the-world’. Inherent in the existentialist tradition are also ideas of meaninglessness and angst. Sartre, as an atheist, rejected the idea that there is a divine meaning to one’s life or that there is a purpose for which each individual is born. In The Myth of Sisyphus (2000), Camus introduced the notion of absurdity which arises from the clash between the world’s resounding silence (meaninglessness) and the individual’s expectation of purpose or direction. Heidegger also accepted this, and in Being and Time he maintained that the realisation of this meaninglessness leads to a feeling of Angst (1927, 173).9 “What oppresses us is not this or that, nor is it everything objectively present together as a sum, but the possibility of things at hand in general, that is, the world itself” (Ibid, 175). For Heidegger, Dasein is not only ‘being-in-the-world’, but also ‘potentiality-for-being’. Sartre, in a similar fashion, claims that individuals can surpass themselves and pursue possibilities outside of themselves (Sartre 2007, 66). A last notion which is worth mentioning is primarily a Sartrean one; that of authenticity. “Existence is authentic to the extent that the existent10 has taken possession of himself and… has moulded [themselves] ~~himself~~ [in their] ~~his~~ own image” (Macquarrie 1972, 206).

**Our existence is existential—meaning is created internally and externally produced through our will. Rules presumes a higher rule to interpret the previous rule making it infinitely regressive, so the only solution is to become our own person and create our own understandings of the self since there will always be a disconnect between how others interpret us via a norm and how we interpret ourselves.**

**Crowell ‘04**, Steven, 8-23-2004, "Existentialism (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," No Publication, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/existentialism/> RCT//SR

Finally, the self-understanding, or project, thanks to which the world is there for me in a meaningful way, already belongs to that world, derives from it, from the tradition or society in which I find myself. Though it is “me,” it is not me “as my own.” My very engagement in the world alienates me from my authentic possibility. This theme is brought out most clearly by Heidegger: the anti-Cartesian idea that the self is defined first of all by its practical engagement entails that this self is not properly individual but rather indisinguishable from anyone else (das Man) who engages in such practices: such a “they-self” does what “one” does. The idea is something like this: Practices can allow things to show up as meaningful—as hammers, dollar bills, or artworks—because practices involve aims that carry with them norms, satisfaction conditions, for what shows up in them. But norms and rules, as Wittgenstein has shown, are essentially public, and that means that when I engage in practices I must be essentially interchangeable with anyone else who does: I eat as one eats; I drive as one drives; I even protest as one protests. To the extent that my activity is to be an instance of such a practice, I must do it in the normal way. Deviations can be recognized as deviations only against this norm, and if they deviate too far they can't be recognized at all.11 Thus, if who I am is defined through existing, this “who” is normally pre-defined by what is average, by the roles available to me in my culture, and so on. The “I” that gets defined is thereby “anonymous,” or “anyone”; self-making is largely a function of not distinguishing myself from others. If there is nevertheless good sense in talking of the singularity of my existence, it will not be something with which one starts but something that gets achieved in recovering oneself from alienation or lostness in the “crowd.” If the normative is first of all the normal, however, it might seem that talk about a norm for the singularity of existence, a standard for thinking about what is my ownmost just as I myself, would be incoherent. It is here that the idea of “authenticity” must come into focus. 2.3 Authenticity: By what standard are we to think our efforts “to be,” our manner of being a self? If such standards traditionally derive from the essence that a particular thing instantiates—this hammer is a good one if it is instantiates what a hammer is supposed to be—and if there is nothing that a human being is, by its essence, supposed to be, can the meaning of existence at all be thought? Existentialism arises with the collapse of the idea that philosophy can provide substantive norms for existing, ones that specify particular ways of life. Nevertheless, there remains the distinction between what I do “as” myself and as “anyone,” so in this sense existing is something at which I can succeed or fail. Authenticity—in German, Eigentlichkeit—names that attitude in which I engage in my projects as my own (eigen). What this means can perhaps be brought out by considering moral evaluations. In keeping my promise I act in accord with duty; and if I keep it because it is my duty, I also act morally (according to Kant) because I am acting for the sake of duty. But existentially there is still a further evaluation to be made. My moral act is inauthentic if, in keeping my promise for the sake of duty, I do so because that is what “one” does (what “moral people” do). But I can do the same thing authentically if, in keeping my promise for the sake of duty, acting this way is something I choose as my own, something to which, apart from its social sanction, I commit myself. Similarly, doing the right thing from a fixed and stable character—which virtue ethics considers a condition of the good—is not beyond the reach of existential evaluation: such character may simply be a product of my tendency to “do what one does,” including feeling “the right way” about things and betaking myself in appropriate ways as one is expected to do. But such character might also be a reflection of my choice of myself, a commitment I make to be a person of this sort. In both cases I have succeeded in being good; only in the latter case, however, have I succeeded in being myself. 12 Thus the norm of authenticity refers to a kind of “transparency” with regard to my situation, a recognition that I am a being who can be responsible for who I am. In choosing in light of this norm I can be said to recover myself from alienation, from my absorption in the anonymous “one-self” that characterizes me in my everyday engagement in the world. Authenticity thus indicates a certain kind of integrity—not that of a pre-given whole, an identity waiting to be discovered, but that of a project to which I can either commit myself (and thus “become” what it entails) or else simply occupy for a time, inauthentically drifting in and out of various affairs. Some writers have taken this notion a step further, arguing that the measure of an authentic life lies in the integrity of a narrative, that to be a self is to constitute a story in which a kind of wholeness prevails, to be the author of oneself as a unique individual (Nehamas 1998; Ricoeur 1992). In contrast, the inauthentic life would be one without such integrity, one in which I allow my life-story to be dictated by the world. Be that as it may, it is clear that one can commit oneself to a life of chamealeon-like variety, as does Don Juan in Kierkegaard's version of the legend. Even interpreted narratively, then, the norm of authenticity remains a formal one. As with Kierkegaard's Knight of Faith, one cannot tell who is authentic by looking at the content of their lives.13

**This requires the will to power, or the ability to be yourself absent power structures attempting to define you. Other frameworks collapse - the very assertion and interpretation of them is a form of our will to power and desire to master ethics.**

**Grimm 1**, Ruediger Hermann (1977). \_Nietzsche’s Theory of Knowledge\_. W. De Gruyter // sosa RCT//SR

Western logic and metaphysics have been traditionally founded upon a handful of principles which were regarded as being self-evidently true, and therefore neither requiring nor admitting of any further proof40 . One of these principles we have already dealt with at some length, the notion that truth must be unchanging. Rather than further belabor the whole question of truth, we shall now turn to Nietzsche's analysis of why it is that truth should be regarded as necessarily unchanging in the first place. Nietzsche's view of reality (the will to power) is such that all that exists is an ever-changing chaos of power-quanta, continually struggling with one another for hegemony. Nothing remains the same from one instant to the next. Consequently there are no stable objects, no "identical cases," no facts, and no order. Whatever order we see in the world, we ourselves have projected into it. By itself, the world has no order: there is no intrinsically stable "world order," no "nature." Yet metaphysics, logic, and language — indeed, our whole conceptual scheme — is grounded in the assumption that there is such a stable order. Why? This can perhaps be best clarified by anticipating our discussion of Nietzsche's perspectivism. Even if reality is a chaos of power-quanta, about which any statement is already an interpretation and "falsification," we nevertheless must assume some sort of order and continuity in order to function at all. But the assumption of order and continuity — even if it is a necessary assumption — is certainly not any sort of proof. We ourselves, as will to power, gain control over our environment by "interpreting" it, by simplifying and adapting it to our requirements. Life itself is an ongoing process of interpretation, a process of imposing a superficial order upon a chaotic reality. Thus we create for ourselves a world in which we can live and function and further enhance and increase our will to power. Even our perceptual apparatus is not geared to gleaning "truth" from the objects of our experience. Rather, it arranges, structures, and interprets these objects so that we can gain control over them and utilize them for our own ends. The "truth" about things is something we ourselves have projected onto them purely for the purpose of furthering our own power. Thus the "truth" about reality is simply a variety of error, a convenient fiction which is nevertheless necessary for our maintenance. In the last analysis it is not a question of "truth" at all, but rather, a matter of which "fiction," which interpretation of reality best enables me to survive and increase my power.

**Thus, the standard and role of the ballot is to engage in a self-affirming will to power, allowing for a process of becoming ones’ true self regardless of the norms imposed on us. Other frameworks constrain our thought rather than letting us explore new modes of ethics, meaning we’d never find the best ethical solutions**

**Higgs ‘02**, Philip. “Deconstruction and Re-Thinking Education.” South African Journal of Education, Education Association of South Africa, 2002, [www.ajol.info/index.php/saje/article/view/24866](http://www.ajol.info/index.php/saje/article/view/24866). RCT//SR

Much of present day educational discourse is vulnerable to an ideologically driven educational practice which emphasises that persons be educated for the maintenance and development of environ- mentally and sociologically determined functions, as well as for the promotion of the economy (Higgs:1998). In such a context, education becomes the handmaiden of the state, and, at the same time, serves the state’s programmes of political intent. Educational discourse which poses fundamental questions, has, as Aronowitz (2001:ii) notes, vir- tually disappeared from the mainstream literature. Present day educa- tional discourse, no longer sees the need to interrogate the givens of education, or the social and political contexts in which education functions. As a result, nearly all educational discourse is reduced to what Aronowitz (2001:xvi-xvii) describes as the application of “ ... technologies of managing consent, where teaching is increasingly a function of training for test taking.” All this can be regarded as an aberration of education, as the mystification of education in the service of dominant ideologies that see education as a process of information transfer (mainly of a scientific, technical and legislative kind), and which, in turn, aim to ensure conformity to political and economically acceptable norms. ¶ In the light of this, it can be concluded that, what is needed today, is an awakening of the educational or a return to education. In short, present day educational discourse must re-think itself.

**To clarify, the AC is not consequentialist--offense comes from the intrinsic nature of the action. Consequentialism fails--**

1. **Induction fails – no guarantee the past is the same as the future and to justify that is based on past inductions which is circular**
2. **Aggregation fails – there’s no way to weigh between different forms of pain and pleasure e.g. 5 headaches vs a migraine**
3. **Butterfly effect – each consequence has a future consequence and so on so we never know if it really did net good**

**Prefer the role of the ballot additionally because:**

1. **Constitutivism - every argument is an act of self becoming because we channel our creativity to express ourselves through our choice to read different arguments, which means only my fw allows arguments to be made. That means my ROB is inescapable and other ROBs collapse to some function of the will to power**
2. **Its the only way to orient pedagogical spaces to generate real value. That outweighs - a) we cultivate traits to gain value out of and revise other pedagogical strategies and b) best for material change through creating a sense of empowerment and alleviating dogmatism through new ideas**

**Bingham 2001**(Charles, Professor of Education at DePaul, WHAT FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE CANNOT STAND ABOUT EDUCATION: TOWARD A PEDAGOGY OF SELF-REFORMULATION. Educational Theory, 00132004, Summer 2001, Vol. 51, Issue 3, pp. 345-6)

Nietzsche's self-radicalizing project should thus be understood as a re-description of learning that turns upside-down prevalent educational assumptions about the self. For example, commonsense notions of the self hold that there is a self that arrives at school and educational experience is negotiated by that self. The student may negotiate educational experience by different means -- by means of reasoning, narrative, or emotions, for example -- but in any case, the self is always there during this process. According to this commonsense view of education, there is a lack of education when the self cannot negotiate (by whatever means) the educational experience that is to be obtained at school. But as Nietzsche points out, a model of education that treats such a self as pre-given is already a lack of education from the very start. If we begin by assuming that there is some self that is being educated, then we have already bracketed much educational work. As he puts it, such a steadfast understanding of self is part of our "great stupidity."[17] When we assume that forms of selves are pre-given, we inoculate conceptions of self from being the subject of education. Yet that is what most education does: It treats the self as if it is not something that needs to be taught as a set of forms, and thus it naturalizes the self as inviolable by the very act of not teaching multiple forms of self. As Nietzsche reminds us, education so conceived is actually based on a moral paradigm of steadfast self-hood. When it comes to moral convictions, a person is usually praised for being steadfast and immovable. For example, a person who has a steadfast commitment to social justice or to religious principles is called exemplary, not uneducable. For Nietzsche, any such understanding of education is confused at a very deep level. For education to be educative, it cannot be grounded in the primary assumption that there is someone who is at a very deep level (say, at the level where we hold our most cherished beliefs) unchangeable. To be so grounded is to consider human beings educable and expect the self to stay steadfast. Educational aims claim to be comprehensive, yet they are predicated upon a moral understanding of steadfastness that is incompatible with profound self-learning. Nietzsche explains this predicament: At times we find certain solutions of problems that inspire strong faith in us; some call them henceforth their "convictions." Later -- we see them only as steps to self-knowledge, signposts to the problem we are -- rather to the great stupidity we are, to our spiritual fatum, to what is unteachable very "deep down."[18] For Nietzsche, self-integrity is premised upon a certain unteachable-ness. Teachable-ness, in contrast, cannot be an attribute of self-same selves. Learning must be an assault on "the problem of who we are." For, who we are is fundamentally a "great stupidity." Following Nietszche, our "convictions," our "self-knowledge," and our "faiths" are matters that go against learning. These steadfast parts of self that are now considered the rock upon which learning takes place are, instead, the subjective elements that are most in need of education. It is the decentering of these self-stabilities that must be at the heart of learning for Nietzsche. Education worthy of its name cannot take calm harbor among self-same assumptions that guide moral paradigms. Education must instead assail self-integrity. Pedagogy must make overt efforts to make teachable "the great stupidity we are."

## Offense

**I defend the res as a general principle, which means specific instances that the aff is wrong don’t disprove our general thesis, just as penguins don’t disprove birds fly. Cx and before round check all interps to deter frivolous theory and maximize substance. The aff is a method of self affirmation in the debate space to cultivate new forms of subjectivity--the very assertion of the resolution for the ballot as true is integral to the process of becoming**

**Grimm 2**, Ruediger Hermann (1977). \_Nietzsche’s Theory of Knowledge\_. W. De Gruyter // sosa

In an absolute sense, the traditional standard of unchanging truth is no more true or false than Nietzsche's own. But on the basis of Nietzsche's criterion for truth we can make a vital distinction. All statements about the truth or falsity of our experiential world are functions of the will to power, and in this sense, all equally true (or false). The difference lies in the degree to which any particular interpretation increases or decreases our power. The notion that truth is unchanging is the interpretation of a comparatively weak will to power, which demands that the world be simple, reliable, predictable, i. e. "true." Constant change, ambiguity, contradiction, paradox, etc. are much more difficult to cope with, and require a comparatively high degree of will to power to be organized (i. e. interpreted) into a manageable environment. The ambiguous and contradictory — the unknown — is frightening and threatening. Therefore we have constructed for ourselves a model of reality which is eminently "knowable," and consequently subject to our control. Pain and suffering have traditionally been held to stem from "ignorance" about the way the world "really" is: the more predictable and reliable the world is, the less our chances are of suffering through error, of being unpleasantly surprised.

**Only engagement with active power, ie my own independent willing is productive--my specific reading of the resolution as true through my own lens is a form of self-transformation that could only ever be generated by the aff, as the negative’s will will structurally be reactive to mine**

**Newman 2k**, Saul. "Anarchism and the Politics of Ressentiment." Theory & Event, vol. 4 no. 3, 2000. Project MUSE muse.jhu.edu/article/32594. //sosa RCT//SR

Furthermore, perhaps one could envisage a form of political community or collective identity that did not restrict difference. The question of community is central to radical politics, including anarchism. One cannot talk about collective action without at least posing the question of community. For Nietzsche, most modern radical aspirations towards community were a manifestation of the ‘herd’ mentality. However it may be possible to construct a ressentiment-free notion of community from Nietzsche’s own concept of power. For Nietzsche, active power is the individual’s instinctive discharge of his forces and capacities which produces in him an enhanced sensation of power, while reactive power, as we have seen, needs an external object to act on and define itself in opposition to.[66] Perhaps one could imagine a form of community based on active power. For Nietzsche this enhanced feeling of power may be derived from assistance and benevolence towards others, from enhancing the feeling of power of others.[67] Like the ethics of mutual aid, a community based on will to power may be composed of a series of inter-subjective relations that involve helping and caring for people without dominating them and denying difference. This openness to difference and self-transformation, and the ethic of care, may be the defining characteristics of the post-anarchist democratic community. This would be a community of active power — a community of ‘masters’ rather than ‘slaves’.[68] It would be a community that sought to overcome itself — continually transforming itself and revelling in the knowledge of its power to do so.

**For spec: An unconditional right to strike is:**

**NLRB 85** [National Labor Relations Board; “Legislative History of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947: Volume 1,” Jan 1985; <https://play.google.com/store/books/details?id=7o1tA__v4xwC&rdid=book-7o1tA__v4xwC&rdot=1>]

\*\*Edited for gendered language

As for the so-called absolute or unconditional right to strike—there are no absolute rights that do not have their corresponding responsibilities. Under our American Anglo-Saxon system, each individual is entitled to the maximum of freedom, provided however (and this provision is of first importance), his [their] freedom has due regard for the rights and freedoms of others. The very safeguard of our freedoms is the recognition of this fundamental principle. I take issue very definitely with the suggestion that there is an absolute and unconditional right to concerted action (which after all is what the strike is) which endangers the health and welfare of our people in order to attain a selfish end.

**The right to strike is an instance of self expression and a demand for power and self determination--that creates an obligation for governments to recognize it in order to cultivate conditions of self-becoming for workers**

**Gourevitch**, A. (**2018**). The Right to Strike: A Radical View. American Political Science Review, 1–13. doi:10.1017/s0003055418000321 //SR

There is more than one way to justify the right to strike and, in so doing, to explain the shape that right ought to have. As we shall see, there is the liberal, the socialdemocratic, and the radical account. Any justification of a right must give an account not just of the interest it protects but of how that right is shaped to protect that interest. In the case of the radical argument for the right to strike, which I will defend against the other two conceptions, the relevant human interest is liberty. Workers have an interest in resisting the oppression of class society by using their collective power to reduce that oppression. Their interest is a liberty interest in a double sense. First, it is an interest in not being oppressed, or in not facing certain kinds of forcing, coercion, and subjection to authority that they shouldn’t have to.Any resistance to those kinds of unjustified limitations of freedom carries with it, at least implicitly, a demand for liberties not yet enjoyed.19 That is a demand for a control over portions of one’s life that one does not yet enjoy. Second, and consequently, the right to strike is grounded in an interest in using one’s own individual and collective agency to resist—or even overcome— that oppression. The interest in using one’s own agency to resist oppression flows naturally from the demand for liberties not yet enjoyed. After all, that demand for control is in the name of giving proper space to workers’ capacity for self-determination, which is the same capacity that expresses itself in the activity of striking for greater freedom. On this radical view, the right to strike has both an intrinsic and instrumental relation to liberty. It has intrinsic value as an (at least implicit) demand for self emancipation or the winning of greater liberty through one’s own efforts. It has instrumental value insofar as the strike is on the whole an effective means for resisting the oppressiveness of a class society. For the right to strike to enjoy its proper connection to liberty, workers must have a reasonable chance of carrying out an effective strike, otherwise it would lose its instrumental value as a way of resisting oppression. If prevented from using a reasonable array of effective means, exercising the right to strike would not be a means of reducing oppression and, therefore, strikes would also be of very limited value as acts of self-emancipation. It would not be an instance of workers attempting to use their own capacity for self-determination to increase the control they ought to have over the terms of their daily activity.

## Disclosure

Interp: Debaters must disclose round reports on the 2021-2022 NDCA LD wiki for every round they have debated this season. Round reports disclose which positions (AC, NC, K, T, Theory, etc.) were read/gone for in every speech



The standard is strategy education--knowing what people go for in later speeches like the 1ar and 2nr are necessary to prepare a robust and well thought out strategy that adapts to the specific debater. Otherwise, you could just go for 2nr theory or an RVI every round and we would never know which 1] gives you a huge pre-round prep advantage since you know our strategy 2] worsens the quality of debates since strategies are less adaptive so you can stick to the same old boring restarts and 3] worsens accessibility because a] big schools can go around and scout/collect flows while independents are left in the dark, so only round reports can level the playing field and b] round reports help novices understand how good debaters strategically deploy certain positions which helps to better understand their strategic value. Accessibility outweighs--all arguments presume we can access them

Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and it teaches portable skills that we use lifelong. Drop the debater--there’s no in round argument to drop so anything else is non verifiable and the abuse already happened. No RVI--they would have 7 minutes to answer a minute-long shell and the debate would end right there. They have the whole year to defend a wiki interp meaning they’d just bait a shell and have robust answers which also chills us from checking abuse. Competing interps--they had a ton of time to justify their norm with their pre round prep advantage and everyone’s wiki is different, case by case bases are too arbitrary

## Underview

**[1] 1AR Theory:**

**[a] AFF gets it to check infinite neg abuse**

**[b] Drop the debater – the short 1AR irreparably skewed from abuse on substance and time investment on theory.**

**[c] No RVI – 6 minute 2n can just dump on a 20 second 1ar shell and win on sheer brute force**

**[d] Competing Interps--6 minutes on a 20 second shell is more than enough to justify their interp**

**[2] Reasonability w/ a bl of sufficient defense on aff counter interps**

**[a] Time-crunched 1ar can’t generate offense, weigh, and cover all standards - reasonable interps allow for leeway and time for topic ed**

**[b] 6 minute 2n brute force lets them hyper-inflate the abuse - reasonability counteracts that bias**

**[c] Affs speak in the dark and can’t predict their bidirectional shells - means we need leeway since negs always have generics to engage in but we don’t**

**[3] Drop the Arg on neg shells**

**[a] 7 minute NC to spam theory means our time crunched speeches can’t win every layer - dropping the abusive parts of the aff while still letting us win on other layers gives substance ed and resolves the skew**

**[b] They have infinite ways to negate with counter-advocacies while we only have the res - letting us kick abuse gives us infinite routes to affirm that you have to disprove as well, which is key to reciprocity**

**[4] No 2nr theory, paradigm issues, weighing, or new responses to the 1ac--they have 6 mins to go for them while I only have a 3 min 2AR to respond so I get crushed on time skew which incentivizes them to save all of it for the end**

**[5] If I win one layer vote aff**

**[a] Time skew--neg has 7 minutes to uplayer and makes the round impossible to win**

**[b] It forces you to engage with the aff creating substantive discussion on something we both had time to prep for**

**[6] The neg may only make one response to each argument in the aff and must answer them all**

**[a] Makes sure we have an equal number of arguments for reciprocity**

**[b] Solves flooding the 1ar since you choose the best answers**

**[7] The neg must extend all arguments twice in either the 1nc or 2nr – aff has to waste time extending twice in the 1ar and 2ar so its reciprocal**

**[8] No neg analytics – I don’t have time to cover 100 blippy arguments in the NC since you can read 7 min of analytics and extend any of them to win.**

**[9] The neg may not read meta-theory**

**[a] Both their and my shell directly indict each other but prefer mine cuz they come lexically prior**

**[b] They have 2 speeches for non preemptive violations but I only have the 1ar, means 1nc uplayering ensures we can never set the 1ar’s norms**

**[10] Neg interps are counterinterps since the AC takes a stance and came lexically prior - means you re-evaluate the AC under their interp and evaluate the theory debate after the 1ar so both of us get one rebuttal**

**[11] Neg may not take prep time--they already have 30 minutes of pre round prep which should compensate--no prep is key to reciprocity**

**[12] No 2NR “I meets” -- skews theory ground because they’re each a NIB for me to winning theory which kills my ability to check abuse**

**[13] No 1NC contestation of paradigm issues because I would need to win 2 things, which is irreciprocal**

**[14] Reject neg overview responses--they can read 7 minutes of an overview that the 4 minute 1ar can’t make strategic choices to concede certain parts and trades off with in depth specific line by line which is bad for clash**

**[15] Allow new 2ar responses to nc arguments but not new 2n responses for reciprocity - the NC has 7 minutes of rebuttal time while I only have 4 minutes, the 2ar makes it 7-7**

**[16] Neg must only defend the converse of the res**

**[a] Prep Skew--I disclosed the plan but you didn’t disclose the counter advocacy text meaning you’ll always be more ready for the debate than me**

**[b] Strat Skew- the aff can only indict the squo, which means alternative advocacies moot all aff offense forcing a 1ar restart and creating a 13-7 skew**