## 1NC -- T -- FW

#### The text of the resolution calls for debate on hypothetical government action

**Ericson 3** (Jon M., Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4)

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb should—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow should in the should-verb combination. For example, should adopt here means to put a program or policy into action though governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase free trade, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the affirmative side in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### Vote Neg --

#### Procedural Fairness -- post facto topic change alters balance of prep, which structurally favors the aff because they speak last and get perms. Debate is a competition that necessitates boundaries and limits that ensure one side doesn’t win by default. *All of our specific strategies, link to disads, and specific actor and mechanisms are moot* – This isn’t conductive to a fair, educational debate.

#### all 2AC defense to this claim will rely on concessionary ground which isn’t a stable basis for a year of debate while all the aff has to do is find evidence supporting an ideological orientation towards the world.

#### Clash —any alternative to our model of the topic as a baseline discussion wrecks the point of having a predictable stasis point which is the resolution. Their model of debate turns into a monologue that means their args are presumptively false because they haven’t been tested by a well-researched opponent and encourages overly broad and not specific research to create policies that counter oppression which also reinforces dogmatism and precludes the refining of those strategies.

#### Intellectual humility- Putting our positions up for debate and studying their flaws best breaks down our neural bias towards intellectual arrogance, and fosters a culture of better scholarship---our brains are terrible at knowing when we’re wrong and updating our beliefs. The impact is intellectual humility---rewards bluster instead of thoroughness that trends us and society towards extreme, unvetted positions where we criticize without accepting criticism (Having a neg to argue against is essential to foster well thought out ideas and policies)

#### 4] Limits: their model has no resolutional bound and creates the possibility for literally an infinite number of 1ACs. Not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months. Cutting negs to every possible aff is a commitment even large squads can’t handle, let alone small schools like us. Counter-interpretations are arbitrary, unpredictable, and don’t solve the world of neg prep because there’s no grounding in the resolution

#### 

#### Fairness is an impact –

#### [1] it’s an intrinsic good – some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity – if it didn’t exist, then there wouldn’t be value to the game since judges could literally vote whatever way they wanted regardless of the competing arguments made

#### [2] probability – your ballot can’t solve their impacts but it can solve mine – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but can rectify skews

#### [3] internal link turns every impact – a limited topic promotes in-depth research and engagement which is necessary to access all of their education

#### [4] comes before substance – deciding any other argument in this debate cannot be disentangled from our inability to prepare for it – any argument you think they’re winning is a link, not a reason to vote for them, since it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it. This means they don’t get to weigh the aff.

#### Second, switch-side debate –

#### A] It forces debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives. Non-T affs allow individuals to establish their own metrics for what they want to debate leading to ideological dogmatism. Even if they prove the topic is bad, our argument is that the process of preparing and defending proposals is an educational benefit of engaging it. That’s good – cross was clear that having engagement is key to recognition and spreading literature

#### TVA – Utilize the K and read as a part of a whole res aff. No reason why talking about micro workers is central within a K.

## T

#### Interp – the affirmative may not specify workers.

#### Workers is a generic bare plural.

**Nebel 20** [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Indefinite Singular Generics in Debate” Victory Briefs, 19 August 2020. no url AG

I agree that if “a democracy” in the resolution just meant “one or more democracy,” then a country-specific affirmative could be topical. But, as I will explain in this topic analysis, that isn’t what “a democracy” means in the resolution. To see why, we first need to back up a bit and review (or learn) the idea of generic generalizations.

The most common way of expressing a generic in English is through a *bare plural*. **A bare plural is a plural noun phrase, like “dogs” and “cats,” that lacks an overt determiner**. (A determiner is **a word that tells us which or how many**: determiners include quantifier words like “all,” “some,” and “most,” demonstratives like “this” and “those,” posses- sives like “mine” and “its,” and so on.) LD resolutions often contain bare plurals, and **that is the most common clue to their genericity**.

We have already seen some examples of generics that are not bare plurals: “A whale is a mammal,” “A beaver builds dams,” and “The woolly mammoth is extinct.” The first two examples use indefinite singulars—singular nouns preceded by the indefinite article “a”—and the third is a definite singular since it is preceded by the definite article “the.” Generics can also be expressed with bare singulars (“Syrup is viscous”) and even verbs (as we’ll see later on). The resolution’s “a democracy” is an indefinite singular, and so it very well might be—and, as we’ll soon see, is—generic.

But it is also important to keep in mind that, just as not all generics are bare plurals, not all bare plurals are generic. “Dogs are barking” is true as long as some dogs are barking. Bare plurals can be used in particular ways to express existential statements. The key question for any given debate resolution that contains a bare plural is whether that occurrence of the bare plural is generic or existential.

The same is true of indefinite singulars. As debaters will be quick to point out, some uses of the indefinite singular really do mean “some” or “one or more”: “A cat is on the mat” is clearly not a generic generalization about cats; it’s true as long as some cat is on the mat. The question is whether the indefinite singular “a democracy” is existential or generic in the resolution.

Now, my own view is that, if we understand the difference between existential and generic statements, and if we approach the question impartially, without any invest- ment in one side of the debate, we can almost always just tell which reading is correct just by thinking about it. **It is clear that “In a democracy, voting ought to be compul- sory” doesn’t mean “There is one or more democracy in which voting ought to be com- pulsory.”** I don’t think a fancy argument should be required to show this any more than a fancy argument should be required to show that “A duck doesn’t lay eggs” is a generic—a false one because ducks do lay eggs, even though some ducks (namely males) don’t. And if a debater contests this by insisting that “a democracy” is existen- tial, the judge should be willing to resolve competing claims by, well, judging—that is, by using her judgment. Contesting a claim by insisting on its negation or demanding justification doesn’t put any obligation on the judge to be neutral about it. (Otherwise the negative could make every debate irresolvable by just insisting on the negation of every statement in the affirmative speeches.) Even if the insistence is backed by some sort of argument, we can reasonably reject an argument if we know its conclusion to be false, even if we are not in a position to know exactly where the argument goes wrong. Particularly in matters of logic and language, speakers have more direct knowledge of particular cases (e.g., that some specific inference is invalid or some specific sentence is infelicitious) than of the underlying explanations.

But that is just my view, and not every judge agrees with me, so it will be helpful to consider some arguments for the conclusion that we already know to be true: that, even if the United States is a democracy and ought to have compulsory voting, that doesn’t suffice to show that, in a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory—in other words, that “a democracy” in the resolution is generic, not existential.

Second, **existential uses of the indefinite, such as “A cat is on the mat,” are upward- entailing.3 This means that if you replace the noun with a more general one, such as “An animal is on the mat,” the sentence will still be true. So let’s do that with “a democracy.” Does the resolution entail “In a society, voting ought to be compulsory”? Intuitively no**t, because you could think that voting ought to be compulsory in democracies but not in other sorts of societies. This suggests that “**a democracy” in the resolution is not existential**.

#### Violation – Aff specifies microworkers.

#### It applies to this topic – democracy was the subject of SeptOct that year the same way workers are the subject of NovDec.

#### 1] Limits – there’s so many different types of workers they could specify, coupled with various types of countries. Kills neg burdens – it’s impossible for me to research every possible type of job position.

#### 2] TVA – read your aff as an advantage to a whole res aff. We aren’t stopping them from reading new frameworks, mechanisms, or advantages. PICs don’t solve – it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff making it impossible for me to win.

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### Drop the debater – T indicts their entire advocacy

#### No RVIs – illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance,

#### Competing interps – you can’t be reasonably topical

## Oncase

#### First, capitalism is inevitable – their affirmative cannot solve

James Herod “Getting Free 4th Edition” Online. [KevC]) 2004.

Perhaps **the greatest obstacle we face is the enormous capacity capitalists have acquired to shape and control what people think and how they see the world** and events taking place in it. Radio, television, and movies are the greatest weapons ever to fall into the hands of any ruling class. **Add to this all the other instruments of mass communication — books, newspapers, magazines, newsletters, advertising, videos, computers; then add years and years of schooling, ruling class control of all major institutions, propaganda at work, the homogenization of culture, and the destruction of families, neighborhoods, and communities. Given all this it is hard to see how an autonomous, opposition consciousness could ever emerge, or survive the system’s attacks if it did emerge.**

#### Second, homogenization disad – Marxism groups all struggles underneath the umbrella of class struggle which is essentializing and disavows individual struggles relating to race, gender, etc. – that allows white males to take over anti-capitalist movement and push out other movements just like what happened with the Bernie Bros movement.

#### Third, the lack of a concrete alternative to capitalism initiates a counter-revolution to crush the aff method – if their new system isn't economically viable, it will lose its popular mandate and dissolve back into capitalism or authoritarianism

Kliman, Andrew [Prof of Economics at Pace University]. “Not by Politics Alone.” Presentation at Left Forum Conference. March 11, 2006.

There are several different issues that I’m thinking of when I use the term “sustainable.” One is that **it is hard to imagine that a break with capitalism will emerge throughout the world all at once. This presents a very serious problem of sustainability, since history has shown,** I believe, **that socialism in one country is** indeed **impossible. What can be done to defend the break with capitalism in the meantime,** against both the inevitable attempt at counter-revolution *and* capitalism’s totalizing tendency, its tendency to swallow up and incorporate everything within itself? I do not know. I do not know anyone who knows. But I do know that this **is a question that needs to be thought through with extreme care – and now. It cannot be put off until “after the revolution.” To assume that there will be time, at that point, to think it through or time to work it out through experimentation, is wishful thinking** at best. **It is quite hard to believe that there will be any time at all before the counter-revolution and the tentacles of the capitalist system go to work.** In referring to “sustainability,” I **[There are] also** have **several economic problems in mind that must be confronted. If the emergent new society does not “deliver the goods,” and if it does not move towards elimination of alienated labor and reduction of working time, there will be no popular mandate for it – and indeed, no reason for its continued existence. At this point, it could be kept alive only through force, through suppression of mass opposition, so it would turn into its opposite.**

#### Intellectual strikes against capitalism fail.

James Herod “Getting Free 4th Edition” Online. [KevC]) 2004.

General **strikes cannot destroy capitalism. There is an upper limit of about six weeks as to how long they can even last. Beyond that society starts to disintegrate.** But **since the** General **Strikers have not even thought about reconstituting society through alternative social arrangements, let alone created them, they are compelled to go back to their jobs just to survive, to keep from starving. All a government has to do is wait them out, perhaps making a few concessions** to placate the masses. This is what DeGaulle did in France in 1968. A general strike couldn't even last six weeks if it were really general, that is, if everyone stopped working. Under those conditions there would be no water, electricity, heat, or food. The garbage would pile up. We couldn't go anywhere because the gas stations would be closed. We couldn't get medical treatment. Thus we would only be hurting ourselves mostly. And what could our objectives possibly be? By stopping work, we obviously wouldn't be aiming at occupying and seizing our workplaces. If that were our aim we would continue working, but kick the bosses out. So **our main aim would have to be to topple a government, and replace it with another. This might be a legitimate goal if we needed to get rid of a[n]** particularly **oppressive regime. But as for getting rid of capitalism, it gets us nowhere.** I don't think **we should [not] put any energy into agitating for a** General **Strike.**