**1AR – T – ‘A’ - SHort**

**Counterinterp: The affirmative may specify a just government that recognizes workers’ unconditional right to strike .**

**Subsets prove a generic**

Cimpian et al 10(PhDs – Andrei, Amanda C. Brandone, Susan A. Gelman, Generic statements require little evidence for acceptance but have powerful implications, Cogn Sci. 2010 Nov 1; 34(8): 1452–1482)

Generic statements (e.g., “Birds lay eggs”) express generalizations about categories. In this paper, we hypothesized that there is a paradoxical asymmetry at the core of generic meaning, such that these sentences have extremely strong implications but **require little evidence to be judged true**. Four experiments confirmed the hypothesized asymmetry: Participants interpreted novel generics such as “Lorches have purple feathers” as referring to nearly all lorches, but they judged the same novel generics to be true given a wide range of prevalence levels (e.g., even when **only 10% or 30%** of lorches had purple feathers). A second hypothesis, also confirmed by the results, was that novel generic sentences about dangerous or distinctive properties would be more acceptable than generic sentences that were similar but did not have these connotations. In addition to clarifying important aspects of generics’ meaning, these findings are applicable to a range of real-world processes such as stereotyping and political discourse. Keywords: generic language, concepts, truth conditions, prevalence implications, quantifiers, semantics Go to: 1. Introduction A statement is generic if it expresses a generalization about the members of a kind, as in “Mosquitoes carry the West Nile virus” or “Birds lay eggs” (e.g., Carlson, 1977; Carlson & Pelletier, 1995; Leslie, 2008). Such generalizations are commonplace in everyday conversation and child-directed speech (Gelman, Coley, Rosengren, Hartman, & Pappas, 1998; Gelman, Taylor, & Nguyen, 2004; Gelman, Goetz, Sarnecka, & Flukes, 2008), and are likely to foster the growth of children’s conceptual knowledge (Cimpian & Markman, 2009; Gelman, 2004, 2009). Here, however, we explore the semantics of generic sentences—and, in particular, the relationship between generic meaning and the statistical prevalence of the relevant properties (e.g., what proportion of birds lay eggs). Consider, first, generics’ truth conditions: Generic sentences are often judged true despite weak statistical evidence. Few people would dispute the truth of “Mosquitoes carry the West Nile virus”, yet **only about 1%** of mosquitoes are actually carriers (Cox, 2004). Similarly, only a minority of birds lays eggs (the healthy, mature females), but “Birds lay eggs” is **uncontroversial**. This loose, almost negligible relationship between the prevalence of a property within a category and the acceptance of the corresponding generic sentence has long puzzled linguists and philosophers, and has led to many attempts to describe the truth conditions of generic statements (for reviews, see Carlson, 1995; Leslie, 2008). Though generics’ truth conditions may be unrelated to property prevalence (cf. Prasada & Dillingham, 2006), the same cannot be said about the implications of generic statements. When provided with a novel generic sentence, one often has the impression that the property talked about is widespread. For example, if we were unfamiliar with the West Nile virus and were told (generically) that mosquitoes carry it, it would not be unreasonable to assume that all, or at least a majority of, mosquitoes are carriers (Gelman, Star, & Flukes, 2002). It is this paradoxical combination of flexible, almost prevalence-independent truth conditions, on the one hand, and widespread prevalence implications, on the other, that is the main focus of this article. We will attempt to demonstrate empirically that the prevalence level that is sufficient to judge a generic sentence as true is indeed **significantly lower** than the prevalence level implied by that very same sentence. If told that, say, “Lorches have purple feathers,” people might expect almost all lorches to have these feathers (illustrating generics’ high implied prevalence), but they may still agree that the sentence is true even if the actual prevalence of purple feathers among lorches turned out to be much lower (illustrating generics’ flexible truth conditions). Additionally, we propose that this asymmetry is peculiar to generic statements and does not extend to sentences with quantified noun phrases as subjects. That is, the prevalence implied by a sentence such as “Most lorches have purple feathers” may be more closely aligned with the prevalence that would be needed to judge it as true. Before describing our studies, we provide a brief overview of previous research on the truth conditions and the prevalence implications of generic statements. 1.1. Generics’ truth conditions Some of the first experimental evidence for the idea that the truth of a generic statement does not depend on the underlying statistics was provided by Gilson and Abelson (1965; Abelson & Kanouse, 1966) in their studies of “the psychology of audience reaction” to “persuasive communication” in the form of generic assertions (Abelson & Kanouse, 1966, p. 171). Participants were presented with novel items such as the following: Altogether there are three kinds of tribes—Southern, Northern, Central. Southern tribes have sports magazines. Northern tribes do not have sports magazines. Central tribes do not have sports magazines. Do tribes have sports magazines? All items had the same critical feature: only one third of the target category possessed the relevant property. Despite the low prevalence, participants answered “yes” approximately 70% of the time to “Do tribes have sports magazines?” and other generic questions similar to it. Thus, people’s acceptance of the generics did not seem contingent on strong statistical evidence, leaving the door open for persuasion, and perhaps manipulation, by ill-intentioned communicators. A similar conclusion about the relationship between statistical prevalence and generics’ truth conditions emerged from the linguistics literature on this topic (e.g., Carlson, 1977; Carlson & Pelletier, 1995; Dahl, 1975; Declerck, 1986, 1991; Lawler, 1973). For example, Carlson (1977) writes that “there are many cases where […] less than half of the individuals under consideration have some certain property, yet we still can truly predicate that property of the appropriate bare plural” (p. 67), as is the case with “Birds lay eggs” and “Mosquitoes carry the West Nile virus” but also with “Lions have manes” (only males do), “Cardinals are red” (only males are), and others. He points out, moreover, that there are many properties that, although present in a majority of a kind, nevertheless cannot be predicated truthfully of that kind (e.g., more than 50% of books are paperbacks but “Books are paperbacks” is false). Thus, acceptance of a generic sentence is doubly dissociated from the prevalence of the property it refers to—not only can true generics refer to low-prevalence properties, but high-prevalence properties are also not guaranteed to be true in generic form.

**“a” means referring to a particular person or thing**

**Dictionary.com** https://www.dictionary.com/browse/a

**one (used before plural nouns that are preceded by a quantifier singular in form):**

**Debate solves arbitrary linguistic intuitions—we all interpret the rez to allow spec and determine the most predictable interp based on pragmatic checks like clash and limits. Floor not a ceiling—a sufficiently predictable interp of the topic means division of ground is more important.**

**\*\*Jurisdiction is nonsense since judges vote for non-T affs without any consequences**

**1] Clash – forces in-depth research which leads to nuanced debates about the implications of right to strike in various governments – Egypt is obviously distinct from New Zealand.**

**2] Aff Ground and no TVA – no advantage applies to all PICs cuz each government has different circumstances – PICs moot TVAs and are worse than plans cuz negs have generics like NCs and Ks but affs have none vs PICs**

**3] Terminal defense – Egypt is top 10 worst for workers – if you can’t prep those out, you should lose**

**ITUC ’20** [International Trade Union Confederation, world's largest trade union federation, “2020 ITUC Global Rights Index”, 2020, <https://www.ituc-csi.org/ituc-global-rights-index-2020>, you have to download it, but it’s the report not the infographic]//pranav

**The ten worst countries for workers in 2020 are the following: Bangladesh, Brazil, Colombia, Egypt, Honduras, India, Kazakhstan, the Philippines, Turkey and Zimbabwe.** Egypt, Honduras and India are new entries in 2020. Honduras has joined this group for the first time, while India’s repressive labour legislation has seen it re-enter since it first appeared in 2016. **Egypt was one of the ten worst countries in 2015, 2017, 2018 and makes a return in 2020.**

**4] Functional limits and generics – solvency advocates, inherency requires squo lack of right to strike, and small affs lose to Ks, NCs, or econ disad**

**\*\*Aff RVIs for skew – A] time crunched 1AR needs to split the 2N and protect the 2AR from a 6 minute collapse, B] deters reading friv shells to split the 1ar which reduces time for topic ed**

**\*\*Reasonability—voting neg requires sacrificing substance which means abuse on T has to outweigh the abuse of voting on T.**

**1AR – Case Extension – Civil War**

**Egyptian laws silence workers and crackdown on strikes which kills al-Sisi’s popularity, destroys state legitimacy, and shuts down protests about injustice – that’s good bc sustained repression fuels terrorism and is a form of genocide that causes civil war which destroys middle eastern stability and causes Israel-Iran nuclear war.**

**The plan solves – puts economic strain on the government which incentivizes resignation and materializes anti-state sentiment into movements which ends rights abuses.**

**1AR – Case Extension – Aid**

**USAid is being conditioned now bc of Egyptian worker rights abuses which causes a pivot to Russia and increases Russian spheres of influence in the Middle East which causes multipolarity and nuclear great power war culminating in extinction.**

**Condo Bad v2**

**Multiple condo is a voter – they’ll go for least undercovered position and overload few relevant aff args so 2AR is *impossible* – destroys fairness bolstered by time skew – that’s a voter – fairness is constitutive to you deciding the better debater – drop them, dropping arg is same as kicking condo.**

### 1AR – AT :K – Postwork

#### [1] Framework – the CROTB is to determine if the aff is a good policy option.

#### [a] fairness –weighing consequences is vital to fair and predictable engagement. They can criticize an infinite number of assumptions, which makes the plan a necessary stasis point anything else moots 6 min of the ac.

#### [b] Legalism – [1] Fiated debate is key to advocacy skills- the ability to defend policy proposals which comes as a pre req to alt solvency because you have to prove why the alt is good

#### [2] Case ow and turn – forecloses future improvement and the alt consents to everyone dying

#### [3]No link – the aff does not make an assumption about labor – our arg is tht the government is cracking down and hurting workers not that work magically solves problems

#### [4]The alt fail– questioning how labor operates in Egypt while openly letting al sissi oppress people precludes radical change

#### [6] Perm do both – the alt is an instance of the aff – strikes allow for the emancipatory information of industrial scoeity by showing egyptian workers what they are turly capable of and what rights they can achieve

#### [7] Hoffman is wrong – we don’t redce anyone to labor capital. The ev is criticizing economic growth in the context of job creation which is not an aff scenario

#### [8] force the 2nr to prove how Egyptian labor specifically hurts the environment and moves to thing slike renenwables like green ergy solve ther impacts

### 1AR – AT : CP – Self Directed Firms

#### [a] perm do both – nb is double the solvency

#### [b] its j not competitive – they ll say it competes through the da but it links to econ. The recenterign of EVERY firm to change workplace organization cause impedimentsi short term production

#### [c] c/a b point it’s a da to the cp

#### [d] solv deficit – cant solve civil war or government employment which 1AC inherency is about

#### [e] c/a the d point not ebign abel to organize governmental employees is a r eason the us would cut aid

#### [f] ashton ev is terrible – its two small unknown companies vs google, amazon, ebay, etc.

### AT – DA – Econ

#### Egyptian “Right to Strike” legitimizes pro-democracy movements which empirically cause political change.

Beinin ’12 [Joel, Donald J. McLachlan Professor of History and Professor of Middle East History at Stanford University. He received his A.B. from Princeton University in 1970, his M.A. from Harvard University in 1974, and his A.M.L.S. and Ph.D. from the University of Michigan in 1978 and 1982. He also studied at the American University of Cairo and and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He lived in Egypt in 1969, 1980-81, 1985, 1986, 1994, 2004-05, and 2006-08 and in Israel in 1965-66, 1970-73, 1987, 1988, 1993, and 1993. He has taught Middle East history at Stanford University since 1983. From 2006 to 2008 he served as Director of Middle East Studies and Professor of History at the American University in Cairo. His research and writing focuses on workers, peasants, and minorities in the modern Middle East and on Israel, Palestine, and the Arab-Israeli conflict. Beinin has written or edited nine books, most recently Social Movements, Mobilization, and Contestation in the Middle East and North Africa; co-edited with Frédéric Vairel (Stanford University Press, forthcoming, May 2011) and The Struggle for Worker Rights in Egypt (Solidarity Center, 2010). His articles have been published in leading scholarly journals as well as The Nation, Middle East Report, The Los Angeles Times, The San Francisco Chronicle, Le Monde Diplomatique, and others. He has appeared on Al-Jazeera TV, BBC radio, National Public Radio, and many other TV and radio programs throughout North America, and in France, Egypt, Singapore, and Australia, and has given frequent interviews to the global media. In 2002 he served as President of the Middle East Studies Association of North America, “The Rise of Egypt’s Workers”, 06-28-2012, https://carnegieendowment.org/2012/06/28/rise-of-egypt-s-workers-pub-48689]//pranav

Although they received far less attention than middle-class pro-democracy movements like Kifaya, workers were by far the largest component of the burgeoning culture of protest of the 2000s that undermined the legitimacy of the Mubarak regime. But until 2010 only a small minority of workers advanced democratization as a strategic objective. Striking or protesting workers commonly sought to co-opt rather than openly contest the regime’s power by calling on Mubarak or a cabinet minister to visit them and hear their grievances. Only in rare instances, like the September 2007 strike of 22,000 workers at Misr Spinning and Weaving Company (known as Ghazl al-Mahalla), did workers raise overtly political demands. During the strike, Sayyid Habib, a member of the elected strike committee, told Voice of America Radio, “We are challenging the regime” (September 28, 2007). Another strike committee member, Muhammad al-‘Attar, told a mass meeting of workers, “Politics and workers’ rights are inseparable. Work is politics by itself. What we are witnessing here right now, this is as democratic as it gets.”6 Building on this success, the Ghazl al-Mahalla strike committee called a strike for April 6, 2008, to demand a national minimum monthly basic wage of EGP 1,200 (about $200; a huge increase over the prevailing rate of about $23). Security forces thwarted the strike through a combination of co-optation and violent repression. The regime drew a red line at linking local grievances and national policy and temporarily succeeded in maintaining it.7 However, the struggle for a living wage continued. Khalid ‘Ali, the founding director of the Egyptian Center for Economic and Social Rights, was a key personality in linking workers’ economic demands to political demands toward the very end of the Mubarak era. He represented Nagi Rashad, a worker at the South Cairo Grain Mill, in a suit resulting in a March 2010 court order requiring the government to establish a “fair” minimum wage. The National Council on Wages proposed increasing the minimum monthly basic wage to EGP 400 (about $67). Although far from adequate, this would have been a substantial increase if the government had enacted the proposal; but it did not. On May 1, 2010, hundreds of workers and supporters gathered in front of parliament demanding that the government implement the court order and set a minimum basic monthly wage of EGP 1,200—a figure popularized since the aborted 2008 Ghazl al-Mahalla strike. They chanted, “A fair minimum wage, or let this government go home” and “Down with Mubarak and all those who raise prices!” Khalid ‘Ali told the press, “The government represents the marriage between authority and money—and this marriage needs to be broken up. . . . We call for the resignation of Ahmad Nazif’s government because it works only for businessmen and ignores social justice.”8 Due to a combination of repression and the limited capacities of the local networks that enabled collective action at the workplace level, explicitly political demands emerged only episodically late in the 2000s. This prevented the workers’ movement from developing a national leadership or a political program. Because workers typically mistrusted the opposition intelligentsia as outsiders who sought to impose their own agenda, there were only fragile and intermittent linkages between these two forces. Therefore, when Mubarak departed, workers could not provide political leadership for the nation, as the Polish Solidarity union movement did in 1989. Despite their inability to take the lead, workers were quick to mobilize in the early stages of the groundswell that eventually unseated President Hosni Mubarak, and they deserve more credit for his ouster than they are typically given. One of the less noticed events of the popular uprising was the formation of the Egyptian Federation of Independent Trade Unions (EFITU)—the first new institution to emerge from the revolt. Its existence was announced on January 30, 2011, at a press conference in Cairo’s Tahrir Square—the epicenter of the popular movement to depose Mubarak. Because establishing EFITU violated ETUF’s legal monopoly on trade union organization, it was a revolutionary act—one in which a crime becomes the basis for a new legality. IGURETA and the independent unions of health-care technicians and teachers initiated the new federation with support from the Center for Trade Union and Workers’ Services (CTUWS)—a grassroots NGO focused on labor issues established in 1990. They were joined by the recently established 8.5 million member retirees’ association and representatives of textile, pharmaceutical, chemical, iron and steel, and automotive workers from industrial zones in Cairo, Helwan, Mahalla al-Kubra, Tenth of Ramadan City, and Sadat City. Facilitated by the government’s closure of all workplaces in early February, many workers participated in the popular uprising as individuals. On February 6 they returned to their jobs; just two days later, EFITU called for a general strike demanding that Hosni Mubarak relinquish power. Tens of thousands of workers—including those employed at large and strategic workplaces like the Cairo Public Transport Authority, Egyptian State Railways, the subsidiary companies of the Suez Canal Authority, the state electrical company, and Ghazl al-Mahalla—answered the call, engaging in some 60 strikes and protests in the final days before Mubarak’s fall on February 11. As Khalid ‘Ali explained, “The workers did not start the January 25 movement because they have no organizing structure. . . . [But] one of the important steps of this revolution was taken when they began to protest, giving the revolution an economic and social slant besides the political demands.”9 According to the Sons of the Land Center for Human Rights, the economic paralysis created by this strike wave, “was one of the most important factors leading to the rapidity of . . . Mubarak’s decision to leave.”10 The Supreme Council of the Armed Forces (SCAF) pushed Mubarak aside in what was as much a soft military coup as a revolution. This satisfied the majority of demonstrators, at least during the first half of 2011. But workers continued to protest. At least 150,000 participated in 489 strikes and other actions during February 2011. EFITU leaders and labor activists used this momentum to advocate substantive democracy not merely changing the face of the regime. Forty of them met on February 19 and adopted a proclamation of “Demands of the Workers in the Revolution,” including the right to form independent trade unions, the right to strike, and the dissolution of ETUF, “one of the most important symbols of corruption under the defunct regime.” Reflecting a widespread sentiment among workers and the poor, they asserted:

#### No impact – they haven’t read ev why Egypt’s economy is uniquely key to global recession