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**Interpretation: The affirmative debater may not specify the type of worker. “Workers” is a generic bare plural**

Leslie 16 Leslie, Sarah-Jane [Sarah-Jane Leslie (Ph.D., Princeton, 2007) is the dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. She has previously served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University. She is also affiliated faculty in the Department of Psychology, the University Center for Human Values, the Program in Gender and Sexuality Studies, and the Kahneman-Treisman Center for Behavioral Science and Public Policy], 4-24-2016, "Generic Generalizations (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/> SM

Isolating the Generic Interpretation Consider the following pairs of sentences: (1) a. Tigers are striped. b. Tigers are on the front lawn. (2) a. A tiger is striped. b. A tiger is on the front lawn. (3) a. The tiger is striped. b. The tiger is on the front lawn. The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in (1b), some individual tiger in (2b), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in (3b)—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about. The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with “some” with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology “existential reading”. The application of the term “existential interpretation” is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a kind. There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In (1b), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in (1a) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, “tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. (1a) does not entail that animals are striped, but (1b) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995). Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in (1a) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in (1b) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.) 1.2 Stage Level and Individual Level Predicates Having distinguished two quite different meanings of these seemingly similar sentence pairs, the question arises: what is the basis of these two interpretations? This is of course a matter of debate, but one important thesis is that it is the predicate that determines which of the two readings the subject will receive, particularly in the case of bare plural generics. In his 1977 dissertation, Greg Carlson argued that the distinction between “stage level” and “individual level” predicates is key here, and proposed that stage level predications give rise to existential readings of bare plurals and indefinite singulars, while individual level ones give rise to generic readings. The distinction between the two types of predicates can be drawn intuitively, and also on the basis of linguistic patterns (Milsark 1974; Carlson 1977; Stump 1985). Semantically, individual level predicates express properties that normally are had by items for quite extended periods, often comprising the items’ whole existence. Stage-level predicates, on the other hand, express properties normally had by items for relatively short time intervals. Some examples of both types are as follows: Individual level predicates “is tall”; “is intelligent”; “knows French”; “is a mammal”; “is female”; “is a singer”; “loves Bob”; “hates Bob” Stage level predicates “is drunk”; “is barking”; “is speaking French”; “is taking an exam”; “is sober”; “is sick”, “is sitting”; “is on the lawn”, “is in the room”. Clearly the semantic distinction is not hard and fast: a teetotaler may be sober for the entire course of his existence, and the chronically ill may be sick for the entire course of theirs, and Alice in Wonderland is tall at some times but short at others. In the normal course of affairs, individual level predicates express more stable and less temporally intermittent properties than stage level ones do. The distinction also manifests itself linguistically. Stage level predicates are permissible in the following constructions, while individual level ones are not: (4) John saw Bill drunk/sober/sick/naked. (5) John saw Bill speaking French/taking an exam/smoking cigarettes. (6) John saw Bill on the lawn/in the room. (7) \*John saw Bill intelligent/tall/a mammal/male. (8) \*John saw Bill knowing French/hating Bob. There-insertion constructions behave similarly: (9) There are men drunk/sober/sick/naked. (10) There are men speaking French/taking an exam/smoking cigarettes. (11) There are men on the lawn/in the room. (12) \*There are men intelligent/tall/mammals/male. (13) \*There are men knowing French/hating Bob. Stage level predicates can be modified by locatives, while individual level ones cannot: (14) John is drunk/speaking French/smoking in 1879 Hall. (15) \*John is a mammal/intelligent/male in 1879 Hall. (16) \*John knows French/hates Bob in 1879 Hall. Carlson noted the difference in syntactic behavior between individual and stage level predicates, and proposed that the distinction between the classes of predicates underlies the distinction between existential and generic readings of bare plurals: (17) Students are drunk/speaking French/on the lawn. (existential) (18) Students are intelligent/mammals/tall/male. (generic) (19) Students know French/hate Bob. (generic) Stage level predicates appear to give rise to the existential reading of bare plurals, while individual level ones give rise to generic readings. Carlson also took the distinction to underwrite the difference between existential and generic readings of the indefinite singular:

**Violation: They did – they specified incarcerated workers.**

**Standards:**

1. **Limits – the aff could specify any worker which makes it impossible for the neg to prepare**
2. **Ground – it delinks neg DAs**
3. **Education – it lets the affirmative debater only research a subset of the topic instead of the whole thing.**

**Fairness is a voter – debate is a game and the judge has to pick a winner. Education is a voter – it is the only thing we take away from debate.**

**Semantics outweigh – it’s the only stasis point for clash and stable ground.**

**It must be competing interps for topicality – you can’t be reasonably topical.**

**Drop the debater – they can’t drop their advocacy.**

**No RVIs**

1. **They shouldn’t win for proving they were fair**
2. **It lets the aff be abusive and then bait theory to win on it – sets bad norms**

**T comes before 1AR theory because if I was abusive, it was because I had to be to respond to their plan.**

# The Right to Strike Hurts Workers

#### Strikes fail and spark countermobilization.

Grant and Wallace 91 [Don Sherman Grant; Ohio State University; Michael Wallace; Indiana University; “Why Do Strikes Turn Violent?” University of Chicago Press; March 1991; <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2781338.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aca3144a9ae9e4ac65e285f2c67451ffb>] Justin

\*\*RM = Resource-Mobilization, or Strikes

3. Violent tactics.-Violent tactics are viewed by RM theorists exclu- sively as purposeful strategies by challengers for inciting social change with little recognition of how countermobilization strategies of elites also create violence. The role of elite counterstrategies has been virtually ig- nored in research on collective violence. Of course, history is replete with examples of elites' inflicting violence

#### Illegal strikes solve better and aff strikes become water downed and negotiated out by the state- TURNS CASE

Reddy 21 Reddy, Diana (Doctoral Researcher in the Jurisprudence and Social Policy Program at UC Berkeley) “" There Is No Such Thing as an Illegal Strike": Reconceptualizing the Strike in Law and Political Economy." Yale LJF 130 (2021): 421. <https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy>

In recent years, consistent with this vision, there has been a shift in the kinds of strikes workers and their organizations engage in—increasingly public-facing, engaged with the community, and capacious in their concerns.[178](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref178) They have transcended the ostensible apoliticism of their forebearers in two ways, less voluntaristic and less economistic. They are less voluntaristic in that they seek to engage and mobilize the broader community in support of labor’s goals, and those goals often include community, if not state, action. They are less economistic in that they draw through lines between workplace-based economic issues and other forms of exploitation and subjugation that have been constructed as “political.” These strikes do not necessarily look like what strikes looked like fifty years ago, and they often skirt—or at times, flatly defy—legal rules. Yet, they have often been successful. Since 2012, tens of thousands of workers in the Fight for $15 movement have engaged in discourse-changing, public law-building strikes. They do not shut down production, and their primary targets are not direct employers. For these reasons, they push the boundaries of exiting labor law.[179](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref179) Still, the risks appear to have been worth it. A 2018 report by the National Employment Law Center found that these strikes had helped twenty-two million low-wage workers win $68 billion in raises, a redistribution of wealth fourteen times greater than the value of the last federal minimum wage increase in 2007.[180](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref180) They have demonstrated the power of strikes to do more than challenge employer behavior. As Kate Andrias has argued: [T]he Fight for $15 . . . reject[s] the notion that unions’ primary role is to negotiate traditional private collective bargaining agreements, with the state playing a neutral mediating and enforcing role. Instead, the movements are seeking to bargain in the public arena: they are engaging in social bargaining with the state on behalf of all workers.”[181](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref181) In the so-called “red state” teacher strikes of 2018, more than a hundred thousand educators in West Virginia, Oklahoma, Arizona, and other states struck to challenge post-Great Recession austerity measures, which they argued hurt teachers and students, alike.[182](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref182) These strikes were illegal; yet, no penalties were imposed.[183](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref183) Rather, the strikes grew workers’ unions, won meaningful concessions from state governments, and built public support. As noted above, public-sector work stoppages are easier to conceive of as political, even under existing jurisprudential categories.[184](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref184) But these strikes were political in the broader sense as well. Educators worked with parents and students to cultivate support, and they explained how their struggles were connected to the needs of those communities.[185](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref185) Their power was not only in depriving schools of their labor power, but in making normative claims about the value of that labor to the community. Most recently, 2020 saw a flurry of work stoppages in support of the Black Lives Matter movement.[186](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref186) These ranged from Minneapolis bus drivers’ refusal to transport protesters to jail, to Service Employees International Union’s Strike for Black Lives, to the NBA players’ wildcat strike.[187](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref187) Some of these protests violated legal restrictions. The NBA players’ strike for instance, was inconsistent with a “no-strike” clause in their collective-bargaining agreement with the NBA.[188](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref188) And it remains an open question in each case whether workers sought goals that were sufficiently job-related as to constitute protected activity.[189](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref189) Whatever the conclusion under current law, however, striking workers demonstrated in fact the relationship between their workplaces and broader political concerns. The NBA players’ strike was resolved in part through an agreement that NBA arenas would be used as polling places and sites of civic engagement.[190](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref190) Workers withheld their labor in order to insist that private capital be used for public, democratic purposes. And in refusing to transport arrested protestors to jail, Minneapolis bus drivers made claims about their vision for public transport. Collectively, all of these strikes have prompted debates within the labor movement about what a strike is, and what its role should be. These strikes are so outside the bounds of institutionalized categories that public data sources do not always reflect them.[191](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref191) And there is, reportedly, a concern by some union leaders that these strikes do not look like the strikes of the mid-twentieth century. There has been a tendency to dismiss them.[192](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref192) In response, Bill Fletcher Jr., the AFL-CIO’s first Black Education Director, has argued, “People, who wouldn’t call them strikes, aren’t looking at history.”[193](https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/there-is-no-such-thing-as-an-illegal-strike-reconceptualizing-the-strike-in-law-and-political-economy#_ftnref193) Fletcher, Jr. analogizes these strikes to the tactics of the civil-rights movement.

# Work to Rule CP

**CP Text: A just government ought to guarantee a right to “Work to Rule.”**

**Work to rule** **protests serve as a viable threat that does not require strike measures to succeed.**

**Engler, ‘18** [Mark Engler is a writer based in Philadelphia, an editorial board member at Dissent, Published: 6/19/18, “There’s More Than One Way to Strike the Boss”, Jacobin, <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2018/06/strike-collective-action-work-to-rule> ] /Triumph Debate

**In late April, 130 staffers in the London office of Al-Jazeera English voted to hold a one-day walkout, planned for May 9. After the walkout, they** [**vowed**](https://www.theguardian.com/media/2018/apr/28/london-based-al-jazeera-english-staff-to-strike-over-pay) **to continue with another type of work action. Until management agreed to negotiate, the reporters, editors, and producers would continue to do their jobs, but would only do the minimum stipulated by their contract.** No responding to emails at 2 AM. No meeting sources at odd hours. No skipping breaks. **“Work to rule,” as the tactic is known, has a long history in the labor movement, but it is not commonly associated with reporters.** (“Journalists don’t take lunch breaks,” said one union member at Al-Jazeera English. “We’ll be taking lunch breaks.”) There were precedents to which the Al-Jazeera staff could look, however. **News Guild members at Reuters in New York and Washington, D.C.** [**successfully**](http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/thomson-reuters-union-journalists-land-new-contract-article-1.3701876)[**deployed**](http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/thomson-reuters-work-to-rule-action-workers-longer-breaks-article-1.3647092) **the tactic at the end of 2017, promptly clocking out at the end of shifts. In the case of Al-Jazeera English, the mere threat of the labor actions** [**brought management to the table**](http://www.ifj.org/nc/news-single-view/backpid/1/article/union-victory-al-jazeera-english-staff-wins-ground-breaking-pay-deal/)**.** In the past year, prominent work-to-rule actions have been launched by teachers in [California](http://www.kpbs.org/news/2018/mar/13/san-diego-unified-teachers-plan-work-rule-action-p/), [Maryland](https://wtop.com/prince-georges-county/2018/03/work-rule-protest-prince-georges-schools/), [Massachusetts](http://www.masslive.com/news/index.ssf/2017/10/chicopee_teachers_will_work-to.html), and [Ohio](http://www.wdtn.com/news/bethel-township-teachers-on-work-to-rule_20180302072951434/1003112522), with educators foregoing late-night grading, after-school meetings, and extracurricular activities in pursuit of better working conditions. **As one teacher in San Diego** [**explained**](http://www.kpbs.org/news/2018/mar/13/san-diego-unified-teachers-plan-work-rule-action-p/)**, “This is a way to show the district what our schools actually look like when educators don’t volunteer their time and give up all the extra time that they do.” Meticulously following the guidelines of the contract or the employee handbook in a workplace can end up making a lasting statement. In a factory, work-to-rule slowdowns can demonstrate how many mandated safety precautions routinely go by the wayside as management pushes for ever-greater production. In a white-collar setting, the tactic can be a means of resisting a work culture that expects employees to always be on call — holding up the radical notion that we are, in fact, entitled to a break.**

**Work to rule tactics are highly effective, maintain paychecks, and develop public support for the workers.**

**Labor Notes, ‘19** [Labor Notes is a media and organizing project that has been the voice of union activists since 1979, Published: 10/17/19, “Ways to Not Quite Strike”, Labor Notes, https://www.labornotes.org/2019/10/ways-not-quite-strike ] /Triumph Debate

**In 2003, Verizon was ready for a strike. The company was already on the hook for extra security, 30,000 scabs, and eight months of hotel rooms… when the unions decided to work to rule instead of walking out. Work to rule means adhering literally to the rules set out in the contract or the company handbook. It means skipping all the daily shortcuts and extras that you know the boss relies on to get the work done. The union distributed a fact sheet that instructed workers, “Never go by memory, check your reference material” and “Never use your own judgment—ask!” Every morning, technicians delayed the start of their day with the required 20-minute truck safety check that required two people.** They refused to take trucks out without all the cones, signs, and flags required by state and federal regulations. They followed the company protocol requiring “five points of contact” with customers before, during, and after the job—even if that meant driving back and forth between the customer’s home and the location of the problem, to give updates. **They completed their paperwork in detail. They spent extra time looking for legal parking places in busy cities where they typically parked in loading zones. Instead of borrowing a ladder from the customer, they waited for one to be delivered. Instead of making do, they drove back to the garage to pick up the special hammer they were supposed to use for a particular job. They called their managers about anything slightly tricky. The advantages over a strike were obvious. Workers kept getting their paychecks and kept building their public campaign about Verizon’s greed and its threat to “hometown jobs” and quality service. All the while, since the unions could still strike at any moment, Verizon had to keep its expensive strike contingency plan in place.** The danger is that the employer will label the tactic as a partial strike or slowdown, both unprotected by the NLRA. The union must be careful to avoid giving the employer evidence of a coordinated or orchestrated campaign. So the campaign should be conducted covertly, with no mention in union literature. Workers should not refuse direct orders. **Safety is often central to a work-torule campaign. West Coast dockworkers worked safe in the summer of 2003 while they fought a hard-line employer at the bargaining table. The dockworkers’ safety concerns were real. Five members had died on the job in the six months leading up to negotiations. The ports were extra busy that year as shippers, fearing a holiday season strike or lockout, tried to rush the work. Dockworkers pushed back by reminding each other to honor stop signs and the 15 mile-an-hour speed limit, insist on appropriate railings and earplugs, and follow protocols for operating the giant cranes. Productivity dropped dramatically. By the end of November they had a contract settlement with victories on the union’s key issues**. Working to rule has recently become a popular tactic in schools. Teachers reignited it in 2012 at Hawaii’s largest high school, just outside Honolulu. Within two weeks the tactic had spread to 51 schools across the state. On Thursdays the teachers would arrive exactly when school started—no early hours to plan lessons, make photocopies, or prepare for the day—and leave promptly when school got out—no afterschool tutoring, grading papers, lesson planning, supervising clubs, or planning homecoming or proms with students. Instead, before and after school they would gather to wave signs outside their schools, along roads, and over bridges, calling for better pay. After the morning sign-waving session they would march into the school in unison.