## Steven J Bartowski NC

I negate and value morality. Only practical rationality binds all agents to morality. Other frameworks, like realism, exempt people from morality on the basis of ignorance. Realists believe that moral facts just exist out there. But just as you would not hold me accountable if I didn’t tell you happy birthday because I did not know when your birthday was, it is impossible to hold agents accountable if they never learned certain moral facts in the first place. Under practical reason, however, morality is non-optional because rationality is closed under reflection. When one asks the question “why should I be rational?” he has already submitted himself to reflection. Thus, moral claims are only logically coherent if they are derived from reason. Thus, any form of ethics that finds its basis in physical phenomena cannot establish a source of morality because it denies the existence of freedom. Moreover, This generates a duty to respect universal law. The conditions of rational agency are that all agents have cognitive access to whether actions are logically consistent, else it depends on empirical concerns, as our shared rationality makes us agents, every agent can recognize a rule like two plus two equals four. This also means I control the strongest internal link to actor-specificity since governments are composed individual collectively reason together to formulate decisions. This commits us to the formula of universal law.

A. There is no reason to reject a maxim for one person while making it sufficient to guide the actions of another thus rendering a contradiction. If ethics are based in reason, any state of affairs or actor specific concern is irrelevant because they don’t appeal to the practical reason of humans.

B. In order to be willable a reason must be universalizable. When I act towards a good I do so using my practical reason, which is realized in many people.  So if I can judge that doing X is good, it must be possible for anyone else to judge that my doing X would be good, since they also possess practical reason. This would also entail that I can recognizes practical reason and act in mutual constraint.

#### The standard is consistency with the ability to will universalizable maxims. Impact Calc:

A. The formula of universal law outweighs the formulation of humanity. Palikkathayil

Pallikkathayil, Japa. Consent and the Formula of Humanity (n.d.): n. pag. Northwestern University. Web. 27 Nov. 2014. PH

Korsgaard’s proposed solution involves what she calls a ‘double-level’ theory. On this view, the Formula of Universal Law [Universalizability] sets a minimum standard for the [of] permissibility of our actions that must never be violated – we must never act on a maxim that cannot be universalized. The [FOH] Formula of Humanity gives us more robust standards for our actions. When, however, the point of the Formula of Humanity is not effectively realizable, the prohibition against treating others in ways that eliminate the possibility of [possible] consent gives way. In these non-ideal situations, we must work toward[s] a situation in which the point of the Formula can be effectively realiz[tion]ed even [if it] though that may involve[s] doing something that [violating] the Formula itself forbids. In other words, the Formula represents a goal that guides us rather than a norm that constrains us.

B. Under universalizability, contradiction of conception outweighs contradiction of will b/c possibility precludes normativity. For example, an agent can’t determine whether ‘stealing’ is good or bad if there’s no such thing as ‘stealing’. This means I coopt reasons to prefer the aff standard since impacts back to their framework are just imperfect duties b/c we can conceive of world where the aff impacts happens i.e. decrease in utility or denial to help the least advantaged even if they’re undesirable.

I contend Living wage is non-universalizable.

#### First, living wage isn’t universalizable since it precludes the concept of setting wages since it prevents employers for setting a rate they find sufficient for a job. Phillips

Phillips, Brian. [Author of Individual Rights and Government Wrongs] "The Fallacy of "Living Wage"" Capitalism Magazine. Capitalism Magazine, 06 Mar. 2013. Web. 27 Dec. 2014. PH

If someone wants to offer a job with a pay of $2 an hour, [t]he[y] should be free to do so. If he cannot attract enough workers at that wage, he will need to offer more or go out of business. If a worker is willing to work for $2 an hour, why should anyone prevent [them] him from doing so? If the business owner judges that a job is only worth $2 an hour, he should be free to act on his own judgment. If a worker judges that a job paying $2 an hour is his best opportunity, he should be free to act on his own judgment. Government intervention in the employer/employee relationship prohibits each from acting as he thinks best for his own life. Like all advocates of government intervention, the advocates of a “living wage” believe that they know what is best for other individuals. They are willing to use government coercion to dictate how others may live their lives. Ironically, and sadly, while advocating a “living wage” they simultaneously seek to prohibit others from actually living.

This is a contradiction in conception since we can’t will a maxim that denies choice because that would preclude the ability to choose maxims including ones that deny choice.

#### Second, wage increases is non-universalizable because it incentives misclassification that would undermine the very maxim of increasing wages. Woodfield

**Woodfield, Nicholas. "Employers Skirt Wage Requirements [Commentary]." *Baltimoresun.com*. Baltimore Sun, 07 July 2014. Web. 07 July 2014. GC**

Without extra safeguards, **wage hikes will mainly give employers a huge new incentive to break the law by "misclassifying" more workers in order to stay competitive. Misclassification [it] is** already rampant among employers. It's illegal, and it cheats both employees and taxpayers, but it's also **easy to implement and tough — too tough — for workers to fight.** What is misclassification, exactly? Well, most federal and local wage laws apply only to "employees" — and rules such as overtime pay apply only to "non-exempt employees." To avoid extra costs, about **30 percent of employers [do this] play** brazen (and unlawful) **games with** these **legal definitions.** **Want to hire people without paying them the minimum wage** — or unemployment insurance, or worker's compensation, or Medicare tax, or many other expenses? Just **don't call your new hires "employees,"** even if that's what they are. **Call them "independent contractors,"** and see if anyone notices. **Want to avoid paying your employees time-and-a-half after 40 hours of work?** Just **call them "exempt,"** even if they're not: They probably won't object. **Facing a tight economy, more companies have been shortchanging their workers** — and depriving them of legal rights, and evading taxes — via such wrongdoing. Federal lawsuits for violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act have risen for six straight years now, to more than 8,100 in the year ended March 31. **Most employers never face any consequences for their law-breaking**, however: They have their cake and eat it, too. Misclassification is a norm in industries such as construction; university researchers found last year that **more than 40 percent of Texas construction workers, for instance, are misclassified as independent contractors** — or paid entirely under the table. In such an environment, **even honest employers feel they must break the law simply to compete. Imagine what'll happen to Seattle's construction industry when the cost of honesty jumps by 60 percent — the amount that city plans to raise its minimum wage, to $15 per hour.**

Willing a law into place that would be undermined is non-universalizable since it would destroy the concept and authority of laws in the first place.

#### Third, minimum wage increase violates a perfect duty since companies use it as a tool of deceit to crush weaker competitors. Leef 13

Leef, George. [Contributor at Forbes] "Minimum Wage Alchemy." Forbes. Forbes Magazine, 11 Nov. 2013. Web. 19 Jan. 2015. PH

Ah, but perhaps the business people who want a higher minimum wage don’t advocate it out of kindness and generosity, but instead because they see it as a means of gaining an advantage over competitors. Economist David Henderson argues persuasively that some business owners, whose employees are already above the apparently altruistic higher minimum, would gain from having it imposed because it would wreak havoc with existing lower-wage competitors or because it would deter lower-wage competitors from entering the market. Many existing businesses like to use government regulation to help them fend off the prospect of lower-cost competition, just as many well-paid workers like to use it to shield them against other workers who would try to compete by accepting lower wages. That is the dirty secret behind laws like the Davis-Bacon Act and other “prevailing wage” statutes. Mandating high wages looks “compassionate” but it’s actually just a price-fixing scheme meant to prevent lower wage competitors, as I argued in this article in Cato Journal. Businesses often play rent-seeking games, pushing laws that superficially appear to be public-spirited when they are actually just ways of increasing profits through political machinations.

This violates a perfect duty since if we universalized deceitful intentions there’d be no concept of truth.

#### Fourth, living wage can never be a perfect duty.

1. It’s just benevolent coercion- it creates state regulations to help the poor but they’re not independent since they’re subject to the welfare of the state just like a slave is still subject to a benevolent master.
2. Beneficence is an imperfect duty since we wouldn’t conceive of a world where the state didn’t institute policies to aid those in need but if universalized, it doesn’t undermine our ability to conceptualize a world where people are in poverty.
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