# Part One is the Paradigm

The affirmative has the burden to prove the resolution true, and the negative has the burden to prove the resolution not true.

Truth is defined as an accurate correspondence to a state of affairs.

There are two kinds of justifications for an interpretation—semantic and pragmatic. Semantic justifications argue about what the words mean and thus what *interpretation is true*, and pragmatic justifications argue about what would be good or *what effects would be had if we acted within a certain interpretation*. Something can be pragmatically justified based on appeals to ethics, fairness, or education, and standards along those lines. For example, if we were trying to justify whether bachelors are married are not, a semantic justification would look at what the word bachelor means and then from that decide if it were married. A pragmatic justification would look at what would be the effects of whether a bachelor were married or not.

Semantic justifications have logical priority in determining justifications. To use the bachelor example, the semantic approach would say the definition of bachelor is one who is unmarried, thus the statement “bachelors are married” is false. But a pragmatic approach could say “I’ll give you a million dollars if bachelors are married.” Even though you may want the million dollars, all the pragmatic approach offers you is a reason to want the interpretation to be true, not an actual reason for it to be true.

Thus, defer on the topicality debate based on whomever has a semantically correct definition. This is especially true because there is no point to having a resolution if we are allowed to violate the constraint of semantics with some reason that appeals to a pragmatic value of fairness or education. Even if some topics have great reason to be discussed, that is only a reason that we should want to belief we should discuss them to affirm or negate this resolution—they’re not actual reasons to affirm or negate.

However, if we both have contradictory definitions of a semantically correct interpretation, then prefer the aff interp because A) there are many different interps of the topic and the neg is reactive to the aff, so they can prepared to debate under it and B) as long as there ability for neg to win under an interpretation then it is reasonable.

As a result the neg can always call for more or less specification, depending on the 1AC advocacy. This kills topic discussion because negs are incentivized to always layer the case debate with T and skews time because 1AR’s are always forced to restart. And the debate-ability standard under my FW proves you could have engaged in substance but rather chose to avoid clash

# Part Two is the Interpretation

Just is defined by Google to mean “only.” I will accept any neg definitions that allow me to affirm. Thus the resolution “just governments ought to require employers pay a living wage” as semantically expressed is “only governments ought to require governments pay a living wage”

This is semantically valid, as the resolution grammatically functions under the interpretation of “just” meaning “only,” even if it is unusual. “*Just* governments ought to require employers pay a living wage.”

The AC interp meets the reasonability threshold laid out in the paradigm. The condition of debate-ability is met by the negative’s ability to a) argue that there exists another actor that ought to require a living wage or b) that if an actor ought to require a living wage, it should not be the government or c) arguing skepticism and then why skep negates or d) kritiks of my advocacy or framework. Thus the neg has ample ground and the aff interp is reasonable.

# Part Three is the Syllogism

#### P1 --If no actor ought to do anything, then no actor ought to require employers pay a living wage.

#### P2 is Skepticism. This is my framework, wherein no actor has any obligations, which is equivalent to expressing the statement that no actor ought to do anything. This is true for five reasons

1. Philosophical reductions are a ruse. Words and phrases derive meaning through their ordinary usage and terms like "moral obligation" are no exception. To expect a single reductive theory to account for all such use-cases is to be fundamentally confused about the nature of language and the analytical methods available to philosophy.

Wittgenstein[[1]](#footnote-1):

**Our craving for generality has another main source: our preoccupation with** the method of science. I mean **the method of recuing the explanation of natural phenomena to the smallest possible number of primitive natural laws**; and, in mathematics, **[or] of unifying the treatment of different topics by using a generalization.** **Philosophers constantly see the method of science before their eyes, and are irresistibly tempted to ask and answer questions in the way science does.** **This tendency is the real source of metaphysics, and leads the philosopher into complete darkness. I want to say here that it can never be our job to reduce anything to anything, or to explain anything. Philosophy really *is* 'purely descriptive'.** (Think of such questions as "Are there sense data?" and ask: What method is there of determining this? Introspection?) 18

1. Attempts to support or defend an entire ethical or metaethical theory independent of some more holistic worldview are nonsensical—they fundamentally misconstrue the nature of such investigative enterprises.

Quine:

**The totality of our so-called knowledge or beliefs**, from the most casual matters of geography and history to the profoundest laws of atomic physics or even of pure mathematics and logic, **is a man-made fabric which impinges on experience only along the edges.** Or, to change the figure, total science is like a field of force whose boundary conditions are experience. **A conflict with experience at the periphery occasions readjustments in the interior of the field.** Truth values have to be redistributed over some of our statements. Re-evaluation of some statements entails re-evaluation of others, because of their logical interconnections -- the logical laws being in turn simply certain further statements of the system, certain further elements of the field. Having re-evaluated one statement we must re-evaluate some others, whether they be statements logically connected with the first or whether they be the statements of logical connections themselves. **But the total field is so undetermined by its boundary conditions**, experience, **that there is much latitude of choice as to what statements to re-evaluate in the light of any single contrary experience.** **No particular experiences are linked with any particular statements in the interior of the field, except indirectly through considerations of equilibrium affecting the field as a whole.** // **If this view is right, it is misleading to speak of the empirical content of an individual statement** -- especially if it be a statement at all remote from the experiential periphery of the field. Furthermore it becomes folly to seek a boundary between synthetic statements, which hold contingently on experience, and analytic statements which hold come what may. ***Any statement can be held true come what may, if we make drastic enough adjustments elsewhere in the system.*** Even a statement very close to the periphery can be held true in the face of recalcitrant experience by pleading hallucination or by amending certain statements of the kind called logical laws. Conversely, by the same token, no statement is immune to revision. Revision even of the logical law of the excluded middle has been proposed as a means of simplifying quantum mechanics; and what difference is there in principle between such a shift and the shift whereby Kepler superseded Ptolemy, or Einstein Newton, or Darwin Aristotle?

Philosophy cannot get at some fundamental or true account of the nature of moral properties because *there is no such thing*. Unless the affirmative can prove that philosophy may plausibly provide a unifying reductive account of the nature of moral properties that exists independently of the particulars of one's holistic worldview then we have good reason to doubt the enterprise of normative philosophy in its entirety.

1. Emergent properties describe how qualities of an object may arise based on quantity or differences in experience or application. For example, the ocean has many properties that small groups of water molecules don’t have, and the macroeconomy obeys trends not found in several people. This means even if morality does exist, as we know it we cannot justify normative decision making because ethical emergent properties could potentially render any action permissible upon enough scale. Because the action is arbitrarily chosen, skep is true.
2. There’s no meaningful enforcement of morality so even if neg wins morality exists, then that doesn’t disprove skep because it is still consistent with there not being morality if there is no alternate recourse of being immoral. It’s like if we had a law that says no stealing that was never enforced, stealing would be permissible
3. There’s no way to verify morality exists—there aren’t quanitifable units of morality floating somewhere in the universe that we can compare. Verifiability is a meta-constraint on moral theories because insofar as philosophy is an attempt to determine truth, without recourse to check their truth it’d be pointless.

Thus no actor ought to require employers pay a living wage.

#### P3—by the interpretation in part 2, the resolution reads “only governments ought to require a living wage.” Because of the word “only”, it is equivalent to the statement “there does not exist an actor that is not a government who ought to require employers pay a living wage, thus if there is an actor that must ensure it, then that actor must be a government.

This means the truth condition of the resolution is equivalent to the truth condition of that if-then statement. If-then statements operate under conditional logic wherein the statement can be truth even if the then-statement is false, in the case that the if-statement is also false. For example, for the statement “if I am a bunny, then the world will explode” even though the conclusion of “then the world will explode” is not true, because the if-statement “if I am a bunny” is also false, then the statement is trivially true, even though it has no pragmatic or real world correspondence. This is an axiom of logic which cannot be disputed.

#### Conclusion—because P2 justifies the statement “no actor ought to require employers pay a living wage,” that renders false the if-statement of the statement “if there is an actor that must erquire employers pay a living wage, then that actor must be the government.” By P3, thus the resolution is true.

Because the resolution is true, you affirm.

# Underview

( ) Presume aff in the absence of clear offense because 7% side bias shows it’s easier to negate. IF there’s no clear resolution it means aff did the better job.

( ) Re-evaluate the debate under negs interps on both theory and T:

A) key to checking neg flex—bidirectional interps means you can always shift the debate to a preclusive layer. This skews 1AR time because I’m forced to win both theory and case debate and you can go for either in the 2N.

B) key to reciprocity—I speak first so I must commit to a framing of the debate. I can’t read T against the neg so it’s a strategy that only the neg gets access too—making it game over allows neg to abuse that power.

C) maximizes topical education since reject debater ends the debate on theory and encourages 1ar to collapse to RVI. Rejecting arg ensures we can continue discussing the topic. Biggest impact to education since the topic is the only thing that changes from tournament to tournament. Also key to fairness because the topic is what we are both most ready and most expected to debate. Deciding the debate on non-substantive issues advantages the debater who has less prep on the topic and is technically stronger.

( ) Don’t vote on norm setting or potential abuse

A) Empirically denied as people read contradictory theory arguments all the time. Many people read RVI or no RVI depending on which side of the theory debate they're on. So double bind- either a) norms don't exist and are just a disingenuous tool used by debaters, or b) norms can exist but are too weak to be followed

B) No solvency - nobody is likely to care about one individual round, or even hear about it in the first place. There are thousands of rounds on any given topic, so at best the impact is mooted.

C) Every argument is potentially abusive in its extremes. And because it’s always to neg’s advantage to claim abuse, if the punishment for actual and potential abuse are the same, the purpose of theory to act as a check is destroyed

#### ( ) Implementing a living wage reduces nonviolent crimes. Only the government can have an obligation to stop crime because other actors don’t have the ability or contract to stop it. Fernandez et al ‘14[[2]](#footnote-2)

Discussion of results. To summarize our primary findings, we observe that living wages have a modest negative effect on property-related crimes. The Model 5 estimated elasticities on property crimes suggest that a 1 percentage- point increase in living wage relative to the effective minimum wage results in a 0.05 to 0.15 percent drop in property-related crime. Likewise, the results found when using a simple living-wage-indicator variable in our most restrictive Model 5 suggests that a policy that caused a roughly 50 percent increase in the wages for some fraction of low-wage workers is associated with a 8 per- cent reduction in burglaries, a 6 percent reduction in car thefts, a 4 percent reduction in robberies, and a 3 percent reduction in larceny. At the same time, we find that the living wage has no discernable effect on crimes with weak pecuniary motives including murder, rape, and assault.

1. *The Blue and Brown Books* (BB), 1958, Oxford: Blackwell. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS, Vol. 53, No. 3 (July 2014). © 2014 Regents of the University of California Published by Wiley Periodicals, Inc., 350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148, USA, and 9600 Garsington Road, Oxford, OX4 2DQ, UK. The Impact of Living-Wage Ordinances on Urban Crime\*

   JOSE FERNANDEZ, THOMAS HOLMAN, and JOHN V. PEPPER [↑](#footnote-ref-2)