## \*\*\*NC\*\*\*

### T—FW (Workers)

#### A topical affirmative would defend that workers, in general, deserve an unconditional right to strike

#### The missing modifier means it’s a generic term. Linguistics, logic, and common usage prove.
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Bile, Jeff (Former head coach of Southern Illinois University, where he coached 4 consecutive national championship). "When the Whole is Greater than the sum of the Parts: The Implications of Holistic Resolutional Focus". In CEDA Yearbook. Vol. 8, Edt., Brenda Logue. JDN. 1987.

The second rationale for holistic focus is that generic interpretation is **most compatible** with “rules" of interpretation in light of a "missing modifier." Most of us would consider the proposition “birds can fly" as true even though we are aware of some that can’t, because we intuitively insert the generic modifier "most” in front of birds" or "typically/ generally" in front of "fly." This intuition is semantically “correct." Linguist John Lyons (1981) argues: What is meant by 'generic' may be seen by considering such sets of sentences as the following: 1) The lion is a friendly beast. 2) A lion is a friendly beast. 3) Lions are friendly beasts. Each of these sentences may be used to assert a generic proposition: i.e. a proposition which says something, not about this or that group of lions or about any particular individual lion, but about the class of lions as such . . .' (p. 193). Lyons continues by indicating that the "kind of adverbal modifier that suggests itself for insertion" is one "that approximates in meaning to ‘generally,’ 'typically,’ ‘characteristically,’ or ‘normally’" (p. 195). While semantic rules support generic interpretation, the field of logic provides additional supportive “rules." Logicians tend to interpret "indesignate form" propositions with missing quantification modifiers as universal or as expressing "group tendency" (Barnstable. 1975). Van Der Auwera (1985. p. 188) argues that when choosing "between the generic or the non-generic or particular" reading of the statement “A whale lives in the sea," that **in "most contexts," the "preferred interpretation" is generic.** He further argues that while interpretation should be guided by context that **there "are some cases**, however, **where the choice is independent of context**." He gives the statement “Kangaroos have no tails” as a statement which “is **always generic**.” Logical conventions would certainly reject a particularized topic rendering.

#### Independently, “Resolved” implies a general principle
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Another reason why it would be logically correct to consider the resolution as the focus of the debate is the presence of alternative phrasing possibilities.9 The term "resolved" has appeared in all contemporary policy debate resolutions and a **review of the literature** indicates that the term implies a firmness or determination in reference to the claim which is being upheld.10 This interpretation **would** seem to **render atypical examples irrelevant** because no firmness or determination could be demonstrated in reference to the statement to which "resolved" applies. At an absolute minimum, there is **no linguistic reason** to believe that the resolution is meant as a boundary from which the affirmative is free to pick any example. Indeed, the authority of the topic selection committee to phrase the topic any way it wishes would seem to indicate that they at least have the option to permit the possibility of resolutionally-focused debate. The committee could have phrased the resolution as: Resolved: That a plan of the affirmative's choosing should be adopted by the United States government which would substantially change its foreign policy toward the People's Republic of China.

#### Vote neg for precision. The neg interp is the one with the best explanatory power for why the topic has precisely the wording that it does. “Workers” was used without a modifier because the Bile evidence indicates that’s the most common way to express a generic generalization. By contrast, the aff interp can’t explain why if the topic is about plans it isn’t worded as “the right of some workers to strike” or “that there are workers with the right to strike” which would mean the same as the aff’s interp but less ambiguously.

#### Precision is a ceiling, not a floor. You should vote for the most intuitive and straightforward reading, not just any one that is minimally plausible, because the fundamental function of the topic is to keep everyone on the exact same page when coordinating research expectations, and that breaks down if each person has their own pet interp they think is most pragmatic.

#### Second is Limits. The economy is massive and has dozens of sectors, compounded by the fact that there are hundreds of governments where those economic conditions change. The neg interp solves by reciprocally limiting both sides to core topic principles. That also solves PICs, because my interp doesn’t mandate that the aff defend workers categorically, just generically, so isolated exceptions wouldn’t negate. Any tiny PIC loses to “perm do the CP” in the neg interp because it still affirms on balance

#### Third is Topic Education—the fundamental question of the topic is broader moral questions about the orientation of the economy as a whole, not isolated laws
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Instead of saying anything more about those questions, I wish to conclude here with some reflections on **the interest of my argument for political science.** From a conceptual and normative point of view, I have suggested that there are interesting normative results if we shift our question from what is a fair distribution to who can do what to whom, but this is also a way of reorienting empirical research. For instance, there is a great deal of interest in the study of ‘varieties of capitalism,’ an interest given renewed importance by the new politics of inequality and by ongoing debates about the fate of the welfare state, corporate regulation, and international finance. 78 The standard approach to thinking about variation has been some version of the distributive and institutional questions regarding what distributions are achieved; how do they vary; and how are they explained by/constitutive of different political coalitions. However, **the right to strike** and the wider question of labor rights points us to variations in powers of action. Instead of comparing, first and foremost, different welfare-state regimes, we might ask about different labor regimes, **not just in the sense of** the comparison among varieties of **labor law** but also the different powers and practices of organized workers. Moreover, since **the right to strike is a moral right**, one that would have to be given substance by a kind of culture or movement sub-culture, it is interesting to think about how the institutional and cultural conditions under which thinking about labor rights emerge in that self-assertive and conflictual way, as compared with the more cooperative and institutional practices of something like German works councils.

#### Fourth is the TVA double-bind—Either the aff thinks their sector is a representative example in which case it could still be used under the neg interp to prove a general rule, OR the fact it isn’t proves the impact of T because the aff will choose atypical examples to sidestep neg generics

#### Drop the debater on T—the damage was done and I can’t regive the 1NC after a 1AR shift. Use competing interps; it avoids arbitrariness and judge intervention.

#### The neg interp is that I get PICs out of conditions explicitly outlined in the 1AC. That sets a finite limit on allowable PICS, and it’s predictable because it’s set by the aff themselves. It’s better for ground and clash because it allows us to go in detail on the specific previsions the 1AC discusses.

**They also concede to BP in cx**

### CP

#### CP Text- A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of healthcare workers to strike except in the event of a national emergency