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T-Workers

#### Interpretation: The aff can’t specify a type of worker or subset of workers.

#### The upward entailment test and adverb test determine the genericity of a bare plural

Leslie and Lerner 16 [Sarah-Jane Leslie, Ph.D., Princeton, 2007. Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. 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. Adam Lerner, PhD Philosophy, Postgraduate Research Associate, Princeton 2018. From 2018, Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow in the Center for Bioethics at New York University. Member of the [Princeton Social Neuroscience Lab](http://psnlab.princeton.edu/).] “Generic Generalizations.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. April 24, 2016. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/> TG

Generics and Logical Form In English, generics can be expressed using a variety of syntactic forms: bare plurals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), indefinite singulars (e.g., “a tiger is striped”), and definite singulars (“the tiger is striped”). However, none of these syntactic forms is dedicated to expressing generic claims; each can also be used to express existential and/or specific claims. Further, some generics express what appear to be generalizations over individuals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), while others appear to predicate properties directly of the kind (e.g., “dodos are extinct”). These facts and others give rise to a number of questions concerning the logical forms of generic statements. 1.1 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](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), some individual tiger in ([2b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex2b)), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in ([3b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex3b))—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](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) 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](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) does not entail that animals are striped, but ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) 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](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) 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.)

#### It applies to “workers” – 1] upward entailment test – “governments ought to recognize the right of workers to strike” doesn’t entail that governments ought to recognize the right of everybody to strike since it doesn’t make sense for unemployed people to strike, 2] adverb test – adding “usually” to the res doesn’t change the meaning because “unconditionally" means no matter what

#### Standards:

#### Semantics --- anything other than strict adherence to the resolution means they can arbitrarily jettison any word in the resolution which kills topic stasis. Semantics k2 fairness because they determine prep, otherwise one side has an imbalance. O/w pragmatics --- A) All pragmatic arguments concede the authority of semantics in order to convey pragmatic messages B) Key to predictability- the topic is the only thing that we have beforehand. Explodes neg prep burden and outweighs every other pragmatic consideration C) Jurisdiction – it’s not in the judge’s jurisdiction to vote for an illegitimate aff. Independent voter -- even if they prove pragmatics they lose for not defending the resolution.

#### Limits --- there’s hundreds of AFFs, letting them specify from farmworkers to carpenters to watchmakers --- there’s no unifying DA and leveraging the specificity of the 1AC lets tiny AFFs spike out of offense

#### Limits controls the I/L to predictability --- topic constraints guide pre-round prep. Predictability key to fairness because it ensures reciprocal prep burdens.

#### Limits are key to clash --- pre-round prep is necessary for well-researched clash. Clash key to education because engagement is how we learn in a debate round.

#### Voters:

#### Education is a voter because it’s the only portable impact to debate.

#### Fairness is a voter because it’s necessary to have in-round competitive equity to ensure that both debaters an equal chance to win.

#### T is DTD ---

#### The round is unfair --- the abuse skewed the round from the start

#### Norm creation --- deterrence, you’ll change your strategy if you lose for it

#### Use CI on T ---

#### T is binary --- either you’re topical or you’re not

#### CI is better for norm creation --- it figures out the best model of debate.

#### Reasonability causes a race to bottom by incentivizing more and more abusive arguments.

#### No RVIs on T ---

#### T is k2 to check AFF abuse

#### Encourages baiting which destroys clash --- outweighs because if the shell is frivolous it’s easy to beat

#### Illogical --- T is an expected burden, you shouldn’t win just for proving you’re fair.

### 1NC - OFF

Abolition K

#### The aff’s superficial tweaks to the criminal justice system preserve its legitimacy and coopts potential for liberation.

Karakatsanis 19 – founder and Executive Director of Civil Rights Corps; former civil rights lawyer and public defender with the Special Litigation Division of the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia; a federal public defender in Alabama, representing impoverished people accused of federal crimes; and co-founder of the non-profit organization Equal Justice Under Law

Alec, 3/28. “The Punishment Bureaucracy: How to Think About “Criminal Justice Reform”.” https://www.yalelawjournal.org/forum/the-punishment-bureaucracy

The emerging “criminal justice reform” consensus is superficial and deceptive. It is superficial because most proposed “reforms” would still leave the United States as the greatest incarcerator in the world. It is deceptive because those who want largely to preserve the current punishment bureaucracy—by making just enough tweaks to protect its perceived legitimacy—must obfuscate the difference between changes that will transform the system and tweaks that will curb only its most grotesque flourishes. Nearly every prominent national politician and the vast majority of state and local officials talking and tweeting about “criminal justice reform” are, with varying levels of awareness and sophistication, furthering this deception. These “reform”-advancing punishment bureaucrats are co-opting a movement toward profound change by convincing the public that the “law enforcement” system as we know it can operate in an objective, effective, and fair way based on “the rule of law.” These punishment bureaucrats are dangerous because, in order to preserve the human caging apparatus that they control, they must disguise at the deepest level its core functions. As a result, they focus public conversation on the margins of the problem without confronting the structural issues at its heart. Theirs is the language that drinks blood. In this Essay, I examine “criminal justice reform” by focusing on the concepts of “law enforcement” and the “rule of law.” Both are invoked as central features of the American criminal system. For many prominent people advocating “reform,” the punishment bureaucracy as we know it is the inevitable result of “law enforcement” responding to people “breaking the law.” To them, the human caging bureaucracy is consistent with, and even required by, the “rule of law.” This world view—that the punishment bureaucracy is an attempt to promote social well-being and human flourishing under a dispassionate system of laws—shapes their ideas about how to “fix” the system. But few ideas have caused more harm in our criminal system than the belief that America is governed by a neutral “rule of law.” The content of our criminal laws—discussed in Part V—and how those laws are carried out—addressed in Part VI—are choices that reflect power. The common understanding of the “rule of law” and the widely accepted use of the term “law enforcement” to describe the process by which those in power accomplish unprecedented human caging are both delusions critical to justifying the punishment bureaucracy. This is why it is important to understand how they distort the truth. I apply these arguments in Part VII, explaining why the current “criminal justice reform” discourse is so dangerous. I focus on several prominent national punishment bureaucrats and a new local wave of supposedly “progressive prosecutors.” Finally, in Part VIII, I discuss the new generation of directly impacted people, organizers, lawyers, faith leaders, and academics on the libertarian left and right who understand the punishment bureaucracy as a tool of power in service of white supremacy and profit. I explain why this growing movement must reject the “criminal justice reform” discourse of punishment bureaucrats and speak clearly about why the legal system looks the way that it does. I urge those interested in changing the punishment bureaucracy to ground every discussion that they have and every proposed reform that they evaluate in a set of guiding principles rooted in this movement’s vision. I sketch some of those principles for their consideration below.

#### Reject their fantasy of legal incorporation and reform that perpetuates racial and trans violence --- the alternative are assemblage practices of liminal territories such as maroon abolition.

Weheliye 14 (Alexander Weheliye, Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University, 2014, “Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human,” pp 81-2) gz

We are in dire need of alternatives to the legal conception of personhood that dominates our world, and, in addition, to not lose sight of what remains outside the law, what the law cannot capture, what it cannot magically transform into the fantastic form of property ownership. Writing about the connections between transgender politics and other forms of identity- based activism that respond to structural inequalities, legal scholar Dean Spade shows how the focus on inclusion, recognition, and equality based on a narrow legal framework (especially as it pertains to antidiscrimination and hate crime laws) not only hinders the eradication of violence against trans people and other vulnerable populations but actually creates the condition of possibility for the continued unequal “distribution of life chances.” 22 If demanding recognition and inclusion remains at the center of minority politics, it will lead only to a delimited notion of personhood as property that zeroes in comparatively on only one form of subjugation at the expense of others, thus allowing for the continued existence of hierarchical differences between full humans, not- quite- humans, and nonhumans. This can be gleaned from the “successes” of the mainstream feminist, civil rights, and lesbian- gay rights movements, which facilitate the incorporation of a privileged minority into the ethnoclass of Man at the cost of the still and/or newly criminalized and disposable populations (women of color, the black poor, trans people, the incarcerated, etc.). 23 To make claims for inclusion and humanity via the U.S. juridical assemblage removes from view that the law itself has been thoroughly violent in its endorsement of racial slavery, indigenous genocide, Jim Crow, the prison- industrial complex, domestic and international warfare, and so on, and that it continues to be one of the chief instruments in creating and maintaining the racializing assemblages in the world of Man. Instead of appealing to legal recognition, Julia Oparah suggests counteracting the “racialized (trans)gender entrapment” within the prison- industrial complex and beyond with practices of “maroon abolition” (in reference to the long history of escaped slave contraband settlements in the Americas) to “foreground the ways in which often overlooked African diasporic cultural and political legacies inform and undergird anti- prison work,” while also providing strategies and life worlds not exclusively centered on reforming the law. 24 Relatedly, Spade calls for a radical politics articulated from the “‘impossible’ worldview of trans political existence,” which redefines “the insistence of government agencies, social service providers, media, and many nontrans activists and nonprofiteers that the existence of trans people is impossible.” 25 A relational maroon abolitionism beholden to the practices of black radicalism and that arises from the incompatibility of black trans existence with the world of Man serves as one example of how putatively abject modes of being need not be redeployed within hegemonic frameworks but can be operationalized as variable liminal territories or articulated assemblages in movements to abolish the grounds upon which all forms of subjugation are administered.

#### Human rights are the platform for the destabilization of the resistance against state violence – they are intrinsically tied with security

Goldstein 7 [Daniel M. Goldstein is Professor of Anthropology at Rutgers University, where he has taught since 2005. A political and legal anthropologist, Prof. Goldstein studies the global meanings and practices of security, democracy, and human rights. “Human rights as culprit, human rights as victim: rights and security in the state of exception”]

The discourses of security and human rights, in many ways perceived¶ as inherently at odds with one another, thus share a fundamental¶ principle in the state of exception. At the heart of both of these¶ paradigms – each in a sense seeking to define the permissible at the¶ conjuncture of state and civil society – we find not the rule of law but¶ an exception to the rule, a back door through which limitless state¶ violence and the abrogation of basic rights re-enter supposedly democratic¶ society uncontested. And while ‘‘human rights’’ has received¶ considerably more anthropological attention than ‘‘security,’’ both¶ paradigms constitute a set of practices and discourses that – in an era¶ of global terrorism, preventive war, and the consolidation of neoliberal¶ democracy – are distinctly transnational in scope and effect, transcending¶ the territorial and discursive space of the nation-state and jointly¶ serving to define the landscape of political domination and resistance¶ within and across nation-states today. But, as the ethnographic discussion¶ below suggests, the discourse of rights is vulnerable to critique¶ from the security paradigm: given the state’s practical failures to¶ defend rights equitably across social groups and classes, and the fear¶ and insecurity generated by the permanent state of exception found within neoliberal democracy, rights themselves come under scrutiny,¶ and in the quest for ‘‘security’’ the ability of ‘‘human rights’’ to serve as a¶ platform for resistance against state violence becomes debilitated.

#### The distinction between the aff and the K is important --- their politics relies on an assumption of reformism that justifies the prison industrial complex and prevents true liberation.

Rodríguez 10 Professor and Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside (Dylan, “The Disorientation of the Teaching Act: Abolition as Pedagogical Position,” The Radical Teacher, No. 88 (Summer 2010), pp. 7-19, dml)

We might depart from another critical premise: that the prison 4 (jail, detention center, etc.) cannot be conceptualized as a place that is wholly separate or alienated from the normalized intercourses of civil society or “the free world.” Speaking more precisely to the concerns raised by this issue of Radical Teacher, the massive carceral-cultural form of the prison has naturalized a systemic disorientation of the teaching act, so that teaching is no longer separable from the work of policing, juridical discipline, and state-crafted punishment. Thus, I do not think the crucial question in our historical moment is whether or not our teaching ultimately supports or adequately challenges the material arrangements and cultural significations of the prison regime - just as I believe the central question under the rule of apartheid is not whether a curriculum condones or opposes the spatial arrangements of white supremacy and intensified racist state violence. Rather, the primary question is whether and how the act of teaching can effectively and radically displace the normalized misery, everyday suffering, and mundane state violence that are reproduced and/or passively condoned by both hegemonic and critical/counterhegemonic pedagogies. I am arguing that our historical conditions urgently dictate that a strategic distinction must be drawn between liberal, social justice, critical, and even "radical" pedagogies that are capable of even remotely justifying, defending, or tolerating a proto-genocidal prison regime that is without precedent or peer, on the one hand, and those attempts at abolitionist pedagogy that - in an urgent embracing of the historical necessity of innovation, improvisation, and radical rearticulation - are attempting to generate new epistemic and intellectual approaches to meaning, knowledge, learning, and practice for the sake of life, liberation, and new social possibilities. I am concerned with addressing a pedagogical tendency that artificially separates the teacher- student relation and "the school" from "the prison." Such strategic distinctions are useful for delineating the ways that multiple pedagogical epistemes5 (including otherwise critical and radical ones) operate from the a priori notion that prisons and policing serve necessary, peace-and-safety making, and "good" social functions that are somehow separable or recuperable from their historical primacy to socioeconomic/class repression, American apartheid,6 racial slavery,7 indigenous land displacement and cultural genocide,8 and white supremacist colonization.9 In other words, what might happen to the disoriented teaching act if it were re-oriented against the assumptive necessity, integrity, and taken-for-grantedness of prisons, policing, and the normalized state violence they reproduce? Schooling Regime The structural symbiosis between schools and the racist policing/prison state is evident in the administrative, public policy, and pedagogical innovations of the War on Drugs, “Zero Tolerance,” “No Child Left Behind,” and the school-based militarizations of the “school to prison (and military) pipeline.”10 Angela Y. Davis has suggested that “when children attend schools that place a greater value on discipline and security than on knowledge and intellectual development, they are attending prep schools for prison.”11 These punitive iterations of an increasingly carceral schooling industrial complex, however, represent a symptomatic reflection of how the racist state—and white supremacist social formation generally—are producing new categories of social identities (and redefining older ones) that can only be “taught” within a direct relationship to the regulatory mechanisms and imminent (state) violence of the prison industrial complex and the U.S. prison regime. (Even while some are relatively privileged by the institutional logics of relative de-criminalization, their bodily mobility and academic progression are contingent on the state’s capacity to separate and “protect” them from the criminalized.) There are, at first, categories of social subjects that are apprehended and naturalized by the school-as-state—gifted and talented, undocumented, gang affiliated, exceptional, at-risk, average—who are then, by ontological necessity, hierarchically separated through the protocols of pseudo-standardized intelligence quotient, socioeconomic class, race, gender, citizenship, sexuality, neighborhood geography, etc. This seemingly compulsory, school-sited reproduction of the deadly circuits of privilege and alienation is anything but new, and has always been central to the routines of the U.S. schooling regime, particularly in its colonialist and post-emancipationist articulations.12 The idea of the U.S. prison apparatus as a regime, in this context, brings attention to how prisons are not places outside and apart from our everyday lives, but instead shape and deform our identities, communities, and modes of social interaction. I have written elsewhere that the prison regime is an apparatus of power/violence that cannot be reduced to a minor “institution” of the state, but has in fact become an apparatus that possesses and constitutes the state, often as if autonomous of its authority.13 Here, I am interested in how this regime overlaps with and mutually nourishes the multiple “schooling regimes” that make up the U.S. educational system. The U.S. prison, in other words, has become a model and prototype for power relations more generally, in which 1) institutional authority is intertwined with the policing and surveillance capacities (legitimated violence) of the state, 2) the broadly cultural and peculiarly juridical racial/gender criminalization of particular social subjects becomes a primary framework for organizing institutional access, and 3) the practice of systemic bodily immobilization (incarceration) permeates the normal routines of the “free world.” To trace the movements of the prison’s modeling of power relations to the site of the school is to understand that policing/surveillance, criminalization, and immobilization are as much schooling practices as they are imprisonment practices. The teacher is generally being asked to train the foot soldiers, middle managers, administrators, workers, intellectuals, and potential captives of the school/prison confluence, whether the classroom is populated by criminalized Black and Brown youth or white Ph.D. candidates. Two thoughts are worth considering: the teaching act is constituted by the technologies of the prison regime, and the school is inseparable from the prison industrial complex. The “prison industrial complex,” in contrast to the prison regime, names the emergence over the last three decades of multiple symbiotic institutional relationships that dynamically link private business (such as architectural firms, construction companies, and uniform manufacturers) and government/state apparatuses (including police, corrections, and elected officials) in projects of multiply-scaled human immobilization and imprisonment. The national abolitionist organization Critical Resistance elaborates that the prison industrial complex is a “system situated at the intersection of governmental and private interests that uses prisons as a solution to social, political, and economic problems.”14 In fact, as many abolitionist scholars have noted, the rise of the prison industrial complex is in part a direct outcome of the liberal-progressive “prison reform” successes of the 1970s. The political convergence between liberals, progressives, and “law and order” conservatives/reactionaries, located within the accelerating political and geographical displacements of globalization,15 generated a host of material transformations and institutional shifts that facilitated— in fact, necessitated—the large-scale reorganization of the prison into a host of new and/or qualitatively intensified structural relationships with numerous political and economic apparatuses, including public policy and legislative bodies, electoral and lobbying apparatuses, the medical and architectural/construction industries, and various other hegemonic institutional forms. Concretely, the reform of the prison required its own expansion and bureaucratic multiplication: for example, the reform of prison overcrowding came to involve an astronomical growth in new prison construction (rather than decarceration and release), the reformist outrage against preventable deaths and severe physiological suffering from (communicable, congenital, and mental) illnesses yielded the piecemeal incorporation of medical facilities and staff into prison protocols (as opposed to addressing the fact that massive incarceration inherently creates and circulates sickness), and reformist recognition of carceral state violence against emotionally disordered, mentally ill, and disabled captives led to the creation of new prisons and pharmaceutical regimens for the “criminally insane,” and so on. Following the historical trajectory of Angela Y. Davis’ concise and accurate assessment that “during the (American) revolutionary period, the penitentiary was generally viewed as a progressive reform, linked to the larger campaign for the rights of citizens,”16 it is crucial to recognize that the prison industrial complex is one of the most significant “reformist” achievements in U.S. history and is not simply the perverse social project of self-identified reactionaries and conservatives. Its roots and sustenance are fundamentally located in the American liberal-progressive impulse toward reforming institutionalized state violence rather than abolishing it. The absolute banality of the prison regime’s presence in the administrative protocols, curricula, and educational routines of the school is almost omnipresent: aside from the most obvious appearances of the racist policing state on campuses everywhere, it is generally the fundamental epistemological (hence pedagogical) assumption of the school that 1) social order (peace) requires a normalized, culturally legitimated proliferation of state violence (policing, juridical punishment, war); 2) the survival of civil society (schools, citizenship, and individual “freedom”) depends on the capacity of the state to isolate or extinguish the criminal/dangerous; and 3) the U.S. nationbuilding project is endemically decent or (at least) democratic in spirit, and its apparent corruptions, contradictions, and systemic brutalities (including and especially the racial, gender, and class-based violence of the prison industrial complex) are ultimately reformable, redeemable, or (if all else fails) forgivable.