# Offs

## T – no spec

#### Interpretation: The affirmative may not specify a just government.

#### “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “just government” in the res – means that you have to prove the resolution true in a vacuum, not a particular instance

CCC (“Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles, Capital Community College Foundation, a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation) LHSLA JC/SJ

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class

#### The article “a” implies a nonspecific or generic reading of the word “just government”.

Walden 20 Walden University [The Writing Center provides a broad range of writing instruction and editing services for students at Walden University, including writing assistance for undergraduates, graduate students, and doctoral capstone writers], “"A" or "An"” last modified July 14 2020, <https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/writingcenter/grammar/articles> SM

When to Use "A" or "An" "A" and "an" are used with singular countable nouns when the noun is nonspecific or generic. I do not own a car. In this sentence, "car" is a singular countable noun that is not specific. It could be any car. She would like to go to a university that specializes in teaching. "University" is a singular countable noun. Although it begins with a vowel, the first sound of the word is /j/ or “y.” Thus, "a" instead of "an" is used. In this sentence, it is also generic (it could be any university with this specialization, not a specific one). I would like to eat an apple. In this sentence, "apple" is a singular countable noun that is not specific. It could be any apple.

#### Violation: they spec India

#### Standards:

#### 1] Precision – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Independent voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### 2] Limits – there are infinite governments that could be just – explodes limits since there are tons of independent affs plus functionally infinite combinations, all with different advantages in different political situations. Kills neg prep and debatability since there are no DAs that apply to every aff – i.e. laws about the right to strike in the US are different than in New Zealand – means the aff is always more prepared and wins just for speccing.

#### 3] TVA – just read your aff as an advantage under a whole adv, solves your offense

#### Paradigm issues

#### 1] DTD, it’s the 1AC & abuse has already occurred

#### 2] Competing interps—you were either topical or you weren’t.

#### 3] NO RVIs a] you don’t win by meeting a prima facie burden b] going for RVIs prove the 1AC is non-T; if you were T you could just beat back the shell with a legit competing interp and then win on case offense

#### 4] Fairness is a voter and comes first— a] debate is fundamentally a game – if it’s not fair, people won’t play; that controls the internal link to education. b] that O/Ws because every argument implicitly concedes to the validity of fairness, meaning if they win fairness bad vote neg because you have no obligation to fairly evaluate their arguments.

## K

### Cap K

#### The right to strike presupposes a capital-controlled model of corporate governance against which workers strike. Vote neg for economic bicameralism. Only full incorporation of workers into the firm structure itself can give true control over the means of production. Labor organization has failed.

Ferreras 17

Isabelle Ferreras (professor at the University de Louvain, a tenured fellow of the Belgian National Science Foundation, and a senior research associate of the Labor and Worklife Program at Harvard Law School). Response to “The Right to Strike.” Boston Review, Spring 2017. JDN. <https://bostonreview.net/forum/right-strike/isabelle-ferreras-ferreras-responds-pope>

To me, two words are holding them back: “acting like.” There can be no “acting like” for organized labor, for in today’s world of global finance capitalism, labor is the new frontier in the historic struggle for rights—which is in fact a phase in the struggle for emancipation. For anyone concerned with nurturing the democratic project, the state of disenfranchisement faced by workers the minute they enter the workplace is cause for alarm. This disenfranchisement is alarming because of the dramatic consequences it has for the health of workers to the state and the credibility of our democratic politics. The distress it causes can engender disastrous responses, as the election of Donald Trump has shown. Such responses are a menace to our democracies. Yet, the institution from which democracy is most lacking today—the firm—has managed to stay off our political radar. We should all—rights and labor activists, unions, progressive thinkers, citizens of the world—be adopting the same refrain: “It’s the corporation, stupid!”

The term emancipate comes from the Latin emancipare: “to free a slave,” derived from e-manu-capare: to cease to hold by the hand. In the Roman Forum, slaveowners signaled their intent to purchase a slave by taking him by the hand. The word thus implies release from slavery, guardianship, domination, alienation—from constraint in general, be it physical, moral, intellectual, or otherwise. In concrete terms, it is used to describe a situation in which a given category of the population is granted the same rights that others have already secured. Today, in the wake of struggles to emancipate colonies, enslaved peoples, ethnic groups, and women, the time has come to emancipate workers. Why? Because workers are no less equal than others, i.e., the capital investors. They indeed invest at least as much in firms as capital investors do. Capital investors, organizing their capital through the corporation, have the right to govern firms. Workers, on the other hand, **although their labor has been organized to varying degrees** over the centuries, have no fitting institutional mechanism by which they might contribute to the government of their firms. It is high time to recognize workers’ right to organize in this complete sense—that is, through an institutional mechanism that gives them the same rights as capital investors to participate in governing the firm. While corporation and firm are two terms often conflated, corporations are actually only the organizing vehicle for capital investors—that is, only a part of the broader entity of the firm. Firms, strangely enough, have no real existence yet in law. They require proper institutionalization, with appropriate, equally shared sets of rights between capital and labor.

Studying **the history of political revolutions since Roman antiquity**, when the Tribunes of the plebs held veto rights over all decisions made by the Patricians, we learn that the prosperity of Western societies was made possible through moments of emancipation, in which a dominated—and often more numerous—group in a given society acceded to the same rights as the minority, and began to participate in its government. In each of these moments, a single institutional innovation was put in place, that of **bicameral politics**, engineered to produce productive compromise between two divergent sets of interests.

Today’s employees feel a constant strain between their own aspiration to more justice in the workplace and the domestic regime imposed on them by the power structure of the corporate firm. Although its name connotes a “private home”—from oikos-nomos in Greek: the rules of the household—the economy (particularly the service economy) has become more and more part of the public space. Employees work in constant contact with or under the constant gaze of customers—the public, in other words. This gaze transforms work into a political experience grounded in the expectation of democratic justice that underpins the culture of our civic life. Outside the workplace, workers are enjoined to behave as responsible citizens, as voters capable of taking a stance on major “political” questions (for example, who should govern the country). Arriving at their jobs—the very place where they are best qualified to assess situations and make decisions, they become not citizens but instruments, a workforce, subject to the unilateral decisions of a firm government structured entirely around capital. Capitalism and the democratic ideal coexist in burning contradiction, and employees today are experiencing its heat firsthand. For the sake of both efficiency and justice, it is the moment to recognize that **firms are political entities in need of democratization.** Placing firms in the context of the political history of Western societies makes it clear that we should set our sights at democratizing their government. To unlock the democratization process, history teaches us the importance of what I call “bicameral moments” as being key to enabling moments of institutional innovation.

We find ourselves in the throes of economic and democratic crisis: inequalities keep on rising, some firms are closing or some low-skilled jobs are lost because of automation; outsourcing, subcontracting, and offshoring are everyday realities; workers and citizens are losing both their motivation and their trust. These problems will not be solved from the outside. Firms require governments worthy of that name, legitimate, reasonable, and intelligent. Our challenge today is to help them—and the societies in which they function—to evolve toward this goal, to create a stable and vibrant economic fabric while remaining open to the world. A new political compromise struck within an appropriate legal framework would foster everyone’s capacity to innovate—labor investors and capital investors alike.

The people investing their labor in our economy’s firms want to be fully involved in the creation of the norms governing their workplaces. The most innovative businesses have already figured this out: business school courses in participatory management and methods for “liberating the firm” abound. Capitalism, as always, has seen and recycled the political critique of the restraints on worker productivity—its ability to do so should not be underestimated. Once again, as Pope, Bruno, and Kellman write, “The problem is structural.” In some European countries, such as Germany, France, and Belgium, labor representatives are present but underrepresented in the government of firms; in the UK or the United States, they are almost entirely absent. How can our economy advance if the firms that drive it are governed in such a lopsided, unicameral, and outmoded fashion? To overcome this weakness, the institutional model of bicameral politics should be expanded to include firms. Today it hardly needs to be explained that England could not be governed by the House of Lords alone—why should the contemporary capitalist firm be governed by the Board alone? **“Economic bicameralism”** would change that. Two houses, a “Capital Investors’ House of Representatives”—the current Board—and a “Labor Investors’ House of Representatives” would work together to govern the firm in the interests of all its stakeholders. They would do so as an elected, representative government, in the form of the firm’s top management, which, to set the rules governing the existence of the firm, would have to receive a majority vote in both houses.

Corporate social responsibility is a failed strategy; **asking capital to respect workers’ rights to organize is futile.** This is clear in the United States, where the consequences have been dire. Capital investors hold the real power; organized labor has little more than the crumbs. But the long history of human emancipation shows us that there is another way forward. **Institutions matter.** Capital has the institution of the Board; labor does not —yet. To truly organize labor would mean obtaining for it the same sets of rights that capital holds through the corporation. Workers need actual equal rights—which means equivalent institutional channels within a bicameral firm. The capitalist corporate firm as we know it should become as obsolete and preposterous as patricians ruling Rome without representatives of the plebs (a bicameral moment that took place in 494 BCE). If they really want to further workers’ interests and dignity, unions must fully embrace a rights agenda. And, as Pope, Bruno, and Kellman so rightly point out, this requires relinquishing a system of exclusive representation, which does not fit with a renewed, fuller understanding of democratic citizenship broad enough to embrace the economic as well as what is currently institutionally recognized as the political. The future of organized labor depends on it—as does the future of our democracies. Firms are the new frontier in the democratic experiment, where it is time for citizens—whether they are partners, collaborators, employees, or workers—to truly become equals.

## CP

#### Analytic CP - Text: India ought to repeal the farm bill.

#### Their OWN IU 20 tagline says:

#### “The process of passing the farm bills were horrible undemocratic. Reversing course is key to preserving democracy”

IU [Industrial Union] | 9-23 September, 2020 | Modi government’s anti-worker laws met with union protests | Industriall Union | https://www.industriall-union.org/modi-governments-anti-worker-laws-met-with-union-protests

#### Solves all your offense.