## 1

**Interpretation: “workers” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend that a just government recognizes a specific group of workers unconditional right to strike**

Nebel 19. [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.] “Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution.” Vbriefly. August 12, 2019. <https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/?fbclid=IwAR0hUkKdDzHWrNeqEVI7m59pwsnmqLl490n4uRLQTe7bWmWDO_avWCNzi14> TG

Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions. Bare plurals are typically used to express generic generalizations. But there are two important things to keep in mind. First, generic generalizations are also often expressed via other means (e.g., definite singulars, indefinite singulars, and bare singulars). Second, and more importantly for present purposes, bare plurals can also be used to express existential generalizations. For example, “Birds are singing outside my window” is true just in case there are some birds singing outside my window; it doesn’t require birds in general to be singing outside my window. So, what about “colleges and universities,” “standardized tests,” and “undergraduate admissions decisions”? Are they generic or existential bare plurals? On other topics I have taken great pains to point out that their bare plurals are generic—because, well, they are. On this topic, though, I think the answer is a bit more nuanced. Let’s see why. “Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons. First, ask yourself, honestly, whether the following speech sounds good to you: “Eight colleges and universities—namely, those in the Ivy League—ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions. Maybe other colleges and universities ought to consider them, but not the Ivies. Therefore, in the United States, colleges and universities ought not consider standardized tests in undergraduate admissions decisions.” That is obviously not a valid argument: the conclusion does not follow. Anyone who sincerely believes that it is valid argument is, to be charitable, deeply confused. But the inference above would be good if “colleges and universities” in the resolution were existential. By way of contrast: “Eight birds are singing outside my window. Maybe lots of birds aren’t singing outside my window, but eight birds are. Therefore, birds are singing outside my window.” Since the bare plural “birds” in the conclusion gets an existential reading, the conclusion follows from the premise that eight birds are singing outside my window: “eight” entails “some.” If the resolution were existential with respect to “colleges and universities,” then the Ivy League argument above would be a valid inference. Since it’s not a valid inference, “colleges and universities” must be a generic bare plural. Second, “colleges and universities” fails the [upward-entailment test](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#IsolGeneInte) for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals. Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universitiesz generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution.

**It applies to “workers” – 1] upward entailment test – “a just government ought to recognize workers unconditional right to strike” doesn’t entail that a just government ought to recognize peoples unconditional right to strike because it doesn’t prove that all people should strike, 2] adverb test – adding “always” to the res doesn’t substantially change its meaning because recognition is unconditional.**

**Violation: They spec prison workers**

**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 and ground – their model allows affs to defend anything from teachers to doctors to the police— there's no universal DA since each has different functions and political implications — that explodes neg prep and leads to random worker of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible — limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep and it takes out ground like DAs to certain occupations which are some of the few neg generics when affs spec occupations.**

**[3] TVA solves – you could’ve read your plan as an advantage under a whole res advocacy.**

## 2

#### Interpretation: the affirmative must defend an unconditional right to strike for workers

#### Violation: Prisoners aren’t included under workers definition – Hurst 20

https://uclawreview.org/2020/11/24/prisoners-are-not-for-sale-incarcerated-workers-deserve-employee-status/

I**n 1938, the FLSA was adopted to protect employees by establishing “minimum wage, overtime pay, recordkeeping, and child labor standards affecting full-time and part-time workers in the private sector and in Federal, State, and local governments.”**[[9]](https://uclawreview.org/2020/11/24/prisoners-are-not-for-sale-incarcerated-workers-deserve-employee-status/#_ftn9) **The FLSA defines an employees as “any individual employed by an employer,”**[**[10]**](https://uclawreview.org/2020/11/24/prisoners-are-not-for-sale-incarcerated-workers-deserve-employee-status/#_ftn10)**while also providing exceptions for persons not considered employees, such as family farm workers, volunteers for public agencies, and volunteers for purely humanitarian purposes**.[[11]](https://uclawreview.org/2020/11/24/prisoners-are-not-for-sale-incarcerated-workers-deserve-employee-status/#_ftn11) Notably, the exceptions defined in the FLSA do not specify that prisoners are not considered employees. However, **court precedents have established that prisoners are not considered “employees” under the intended meaning in the FLSA**.[[12]](https://uclawreview.org/2020/11/24/prisoners-are-not-for-sale-incarcerated-workers-deserve-employee-status/#_ftn12)  An important case from the **Fourth District Court of Appeals in Maryland, Harker v. State Use Industries, highlights this reasoning.**[**[13]**](https://uclawreview.org/2020/11/24/prisoners-are-not-for-sale-incarcerated-workers-deserve-employee-status/#_ftn13)**In Harker, Maryland state prisoners sued the entity responsible for the prison labor industries alleging that the FLSA was violated because they were not being compensated at the rate of the federal minimum wage**.[[14]](https://uclawreview.org/2020/11/24/prisoners-are-not-for-sale-incarcerated-workers-deserve-employee-status/#_ftn14) **The court rejected the prisoners’ argument by distinguishing the custodial relationship of prisoners from the employee-employer relationship covered in the FLSA.**[**[15]**](https://uclawreview.org/2020/11/24/prisoners-are-not-for-sale-incarcerated-workers-deserve-employee-status/#_ftn15) Moreover, the court noted that the **FLSA was intended to maintain a “standard of living” for workers and not wards of the state whom are provided “standard of living” care by the state while incarcerated**.[[16]](https://uclawreview.org/2020/11/24/prisoners-are-not-for-sale-incarcerated-workers-deserve-employee-status/#_ftn16) Finally, **the court concluded that “if the FLSA’s coverage is to extend within prison walls, Congress must says so, not the courts**.”[[17]](https://uclawreview.org/2020/11/24/prisoners-are-not-for-sale-incarcerated-workers-deserve-employee-status/#_ftn17) **Other court cases have relied on similar reasoning to reject extending FLSA coverage to prisoners.**[**[18]**](https://uclawreview.org/2020/11/24/prisoners-are-not-for-sale-incarcerated-workers-deserve-employee-status/#_ftn18)**Additionally, courts have also rejected inmates’ employment discrimination claims on the same basis.**[**[19]**](https://uclawreview.org/2020/11/24/prisoners-are-not-for-sale-incarcerated-workers-deserve-employee-status/#_ftn19)

#### Vote neg –

#### 1] Precision –

#### A] stasis point – the topic is the only reasonable focal point for debate – anything else destroys the possibility of debate because we will be two ships passing

#### B] internal link turn – violating semantics justifies the aff talking about whatever with zero neg prep or prediction which is the most unfair and uneducational

#### C] Jurisdiction – you can’t vote for them because the ballot and the tournament invitation say to vote for the better debater in the context of the resolution

#### E] objectivity – only semantics are objective whereas pragmatics are subjective which means intervention

#### 2] Limits – allowing the aff to pick any ground for the debate makes neg engagement impossibly by skirting a predictable starting point, allowing for infinite affs and invalidating prep. Caselists are concessionary, unpredictable, beaten by perms, and don’t justify their model.

#### 3] TVA – discuss racism in context of actual workers- your rob just says discussing racism is good, not the unique discussion of prison labor is good.

## 2

#### ink 1: The carceral state expands its capacity to deploy sophisticated violence by coopting incremental reform.

Christopher McMichael, University of the Witwatersrand, published in the Journal Capital & Class, 2016“Pacification and police: A critique of the police militarization thesis” [http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0309816816678569, DOI: 10.1177/0309816816678569, accessed 1/25/17] SAO

The liberal focus on establishing the correct boundaries between war and policing is also tactically problematic for political activism and organizing, as its shift the critique of police power away from issues of structural oppression and state violence into that of due process. For example, in the wake of the 2015 Baltimore uprisings following the police killing of Freddie Gray, President Obama has promised to restrict the federal transfer of military equipment to local police departments. But while this gives the surface appearance of answering the radical challenges presented by insurgent protest, it clearly does not actually address the racism and everyday brutality which sparks revolt. Unlike more bluntly authoritarian political system, the liberal state can incorporate pressure for reform from below into governance in a manner that appears to be progressive while, maintaining the ruling order. Writing in the wake of the social revolts of the 1960s, Wolfe (1971) observed that political repression in liberal states required a great deal of social consent, won through the agents of the state appearing to be consistent and law abiding, and the incorporation of the discourses and critiques raised by dissenting groups. Thus, policing in the United States since the 1970s has combined the impulse of militarization with community policing, in which the police are trained to be more ‘sensitive’ about racism and sexism (Williams 2007). Such a combination results in a more sophisticated repression, as communities are enlisted to collaborate with the police, while still maintaining an expanded capacity to deploy violence. By failing to address the complex and sophisticated mechanisms of police repression in capitalist democracies, liberal critique ends up focusing on procedures and appearance to the ‘point where ends are irrelevant’ (Wolfe 1971: 34). The idea of militarization takes a legalistic focus on achieving the ‘proper’ form of policing, a discourse which easily be co-opted by the state. At core, it is based on a liberal frame of trying to establish appropriate boundaries between military and police, rather than looking at how war and police overlap and conjoin in the everyday governance of capitalism. It is focused on the apparent danger of liberal democracies becoming more like despotic political systems while obfuscating the fundamental violence of the liberal state. By contrast, thinking on police violence and state repression through the concept of pacification highlights that this is potentially already existent and apparent within liberalism itself. The problem is not that liberal democracies could become dystopic tyrannies through the negative pull of militarization, but rather that there is already a violent social war within capitalist society. And within this conflict, police institutions are central mechanisms for ensuring class and racial dominance already and have been since their founding.

#### Link 2: The deployment of rights based solutions to oppression reifies carceral practices

Michelle Brown, University of Tennessee and Judah Schept, Eastern Kentucky University, Punishment & Society, 2016 “New abolition, criminology and a critical carceral studies” [http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1462474516666281] Accessed 1/1/18 SAO

In American jurisprudence, the subject of the law is only legible as a rights-bearing individual. Notions of individual culpability and responsibility justify the exertion of police and carceral power; notions of a free will compromised through addictions, mental illness, or prior victimizations might mitigate the severity of the state’s response but still create an individualized subject prone to coerced incapacitation and treatment by the state. Groups who have suffered violence at the hands of the state—racial minorities, LGBTQ communities, immigrants, and refugees, as a small sample—do not gain the kind of recognition through law and rights claims that supports structural transformation. Reliance upon the law as a space for claims to dignity (Christie, 1981; Simon, 2014) too often risk reproduction of these liberal formations. The vast majority of policy reform efforts in American criminal justice begin at the compromised locus of law and the individualized neoliberal subject. A critical carceral studies is attuned to the confluence of liberal legal constructs with neoliberal penality’s reliance on responsibilization and governance through risk (Harcourt, 2010). Critical carceral studies increasingly takes up a nuanced approach to law, critically examining reification and even reliance on law in pursuits of social justice while considering the efficacy of legal strategies to secure certain ‘‘non reformist reforms’’ (Gorz, 1967), such as increased environmental justice victories, decriminalization, and decarceration strategies that shrink the carceral net, and minimum wage or guaranteed employment campaigns (Stein, 2014). Non-reformist reforms aim to prevent additional harms such as economic displacement and racialized social control. While the logic of visibility and inclusion is one of the main attractions of rights claims, abolitionists are, in general, wary of legal reforms that have created more insidious ways to entrench carceral practices (Murakawa, 2014). In the colorblind era of contemporary US politics, the persistence of exclusion, discrimination, and inequality alongside the so-called bi-partisan consensus on prison reform reveals the ways in which law normalizes, obscures, and reproduces the sexism, racism, and anti-queer and transgender politics constitutive of racial capitalism. Hate crime, victims’ rights, rape elimination acts, and antidiscrimination laws are avenues that have also served to individualize the production of harm, isolate victim survivors, reproduce the tools of punishment and exclusion, and expand the carceral regime. Expressing a deep skepticism of law’s promises, critical race and queer theorists have long insisted that a political project that seeks inclusion in a framework that sustains state violence and inevitably reproduces other forms of exclusion cannot be transformative (Bell, 1992; Brown 1995; Mun˜oz, 2009; Spade, 2011; Thuma, 2015). Given that abolition has largely been a pursuit of women of color, queer and feminist women and men, and trans and gender-diverse people, their focus has been on the struggles with power that underlie law reforms as the site for transformation. As Meiners (2007: 170) writes, the horizon of abolition in the contemporary US invokes a ‘‘both/and’’ necessity where efforts to pursue administrative and legal reforms and reduce immediate suffering in the confines of the carceral state are everyday work on the one hand, but always in connection to efforts to ‘‘place, understand, and connect this labor to a larger movement’’ and historical struggle for freedom, without which cooptation is imminent.

#### The alternative is to deploy critical theory as a way of understanding how efforts at pacification are constitutive of liberal order building. Instead of treating the failure of strikes in prison as symptomatic of a failure of policymaking we should view it as part of an intentional cycle of population control aimed at capital accumulation and global domination.

#### Critical carceral studies lay the groundwork for radical personal action against neoliberal capitalism but we must refuse the systematic complacency created by incremental reform. This means no perms.

Michelle Brown, University of Tennessee and Judah Schept, Eastern Kentucky University, Punishment & Society, 2016 “New abolition, criminology and a critical carceral studies” [http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1462474516666281] Accessed 1/1/18 SAO

Critical carceral studies remain distinctive from current arenas of criminological thought in important ways. The empirical record and lived experience of capture and confinement, quite formidably, exceed the frames of what we have historically conceived of as punishment. Prison-like conditions, the criminalization and segregation of everyday life, and the reliance upon exclusion and containment at borders, in urban centers, and across poor and racialized communities and societies, extend beyond traditional treatments of punishment (Beckett and Herbert, 2009; Beckett and Murakawa, 2012; Loyd et al., 2012; Hannah-Moffat and Lynch, 2012; Story, 2015). The carceral subject of a critical carceral studies complicates and exceeds categories of criminality, penality, and victimhood. Instead, this subject is an actor subjected to intersecting contemporary social forces and penal histories, whose identity is produced in the course of navigating dispossession, oppression, and the production of social suffering (Brown, 2014). The carceral subject is distinctive in that they are precisely a mode of surplus life created by forces of governance under global neoliberal capitalism, the inhabitant criminalized precisely because they live in conditions of precarity, included within different forms of carceral confinement. Consequently, studies of the carceral state foreground analyses of late capitalist political economies, racialized regimes of state power and multilevel explications of state violence in examinations of criminalization, political resistance, and crime (Camp, 2016; Gottschalk, 2015; Murakawa, 2014). Work that engages the important structural relations between intimate violence, police violence, and incarceration (Kelly, 2011; Kim, 2009, 2011; Richie, 2012; Smith et al., 2006; Smith, 2015) refuses a singular focus upon any one kind of violence and instead indicts the normative reliance upon police and imprisonment to provide safety and accountability for the individuals, families, and communities most hard hit by interpersonal harm, addiction, and economic despair—an account of interpersonal, state, and structural violence. Critical carceral studies are also distinct from criminology in its epistemological groundings and ontological categories. Committed to trenchant interdisciplinarity across historical, cultural, political, and social study, critical carceral studies foregrounds the operations of settler colonialism, racial capitalism, hetero-patriarchy, and ableism in its understanding of the carceral state. It builds historically from subjugated knowledges and, in the US context, a deep legacy of fugitive abolition studies. Many of its scholars emerge from and self-identify as members of the communities targeted by the carceral state and omitted in the criminological canon, thus creating a tacit imbrication of lived experience and intellectual training in the face of a deep skepticism of criminology’s projects, even in its most leftist forms. Finally, the principles of critical carceral studies are predicated upon an understanding and acknowledgment of how institutional forms of knowledge and their political claims reproduce carceral regimes via frameworks of reform, presumed benevolence, and unchallenged carceral logics. It does this all in an effort to lay the conceptual groundwork for a radical critique of the everyday from the everyday, directed at the transformation of social life and the social order.

#### Radical personal action is net better than political action for challenging capitalism.

Howard Waitzkin, Monthly Review, University of Illinois, November 1st 2017 “Revolution Now”[https://monthlyreview.org/2017/11/01/revolution-now/] Accessed 12/6/17 SAO

Is there a military route to revolution in the United States? We do see at least one predominantly positive example of a post-capitalist state created through violent revolution: Cuba. Sadly, other countries transitioning from capitalism through military means have wound up implementing systems involving strong elements of a capitalist economy. That said, some of the countries in this group (for instance Nicaragua, China, Vietnam, and Angola) have improved health outcomes, education, housing, and other quality of life indicators for large parts of their populations. Also, taking up arms as a defensive strategy comprises a crucial part of the U.S. experience.[27](https://monthlyreview.org/2017/11/01/revolution-now/#en27) For these and other reasons, a military wing of a revolutionary movement in the United States may arise, as it has in many countries of the global South and some in the global North. For those, including myself, who oppose violence or who cannot bring ourselves to injure or kill other human beings, the non-military wing of revolutionary action opens up exciting possibilities. Surprisingly, research shows that a small proportion of a country’s population, estimated at 3.5 to 5 percent, can achieve revolutionary change through nonviolent resistance, even in countries with dictatorial regimes much more brutal than the neofascist Trump administration.[28](https://monthlyreview.org/2017/11/01/revolution-now/#en28) But these non-violent actions must move far beyond electoral politics to include direct action, whose conscious aim is to shut down the capitalist economic system and the state that protects that system. Mass protests in the United States often involve huge, peaceful demonstrations, carried out with permits from the local police. The tremendous accomplishment of the women’s marches on Washington, D.C., and other cities around the world on the day after Trump’s inauguration, counts as probably the largest single protest action in the world’s history. Coordinated marches against war taxes, for science, and for the environment followed, as will others. Despite their importance, such actions do nothing to threaten, much less shut down, the capitalist system. Neither did the smaller protests on Inauguration Day that destroyed some property and led to felony arrests that will incapacitate key activists with legal proceedings and jail time for months or years to come. And neither did most of the Occupy actions in which many subjected ourselves to police brutality in order to hold a public space. These important non-violent actions reverberate mostly in the realm of symbolic politics. What actions do slow or shut down the capitalist system? The heroic struggle to stop the Dakota Access Pipeline by indigenous communities is one such action. Here the explicit purpose has not been just to demonstrate against a monstrous, last-ditch effort to accumulate massive profits by robbing indigenous lands, polluting water supplies, and worsening climate change by burning oil. The purpose has been to stop the pipeline’s construction and to block transport of oil to refineries and eventually to “consumers.” Similar heroic struggles by indigenous communities to block oil transport have happened in Canada and Latin American countries including Bolivia and Ecuador. So how might Latin American revolutionaries advise revolutionaries in the United States? Focusing on oil transportation, they would explain for starters that the Dakota Access Pipeline, as only one of many petroleum pipelines that traverse North America, lies four to five feet underground along 1,134 miles of geographically isolated territory in North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, and Illinois, vulnerable and largely unprotected from direct actions of many types. The pipeline originates in the Bakken shale oil fields in northwest North Dakota and terminates at the oil storage facility at Patoka Township in southern Illinois.[29](https://monthlyreview.org/2017/11/01/revolution-now/#en29) Patoka probably would interest Latin American revolutionaries eager to shut down sectors of the capitalist economy and to block flow of fossil fuels. Google Maps and other sources show a quaint and sparsely populated agricultural area, with a highly concentrated collection of huge oil tanks that contrast with the surrounding farmlands, schools, shops, eateries, and pristine lakes used by folks who like to fish. The Dakota Access Pipeline and the BNSF rail yards where Bakken oil arrives by train are not the only interesting oil transport facilities that converge here. Patoka also is a main terminus for the Keystone and Keystone XL Pipelines, as well as the hub for existing pipelines used by Exxon Mobil, Marathon, and Shell. Energy Transfer Partners owns much of the storage infrastructure in Patoka, as well as pipelines carrying oil there and then to refineries mainly in Louisiana and Texas.[30](https://monthlyreview.org/2017/11/01/revolution-now/#en30) In direct actions that target transport of fossil fuels, toxic chemicals, conventional and nuclear weapons, military equipment, precious metals, timber, and other items that keep the capitalist system afloat, revolutionaries may focus on pipelines, roads, waterways, air facilities, and so forth, many of them far from existing population centers and their associated security operations. The geographical distances and wide variety of potential targets means that activists need not restrict themselves to a small number of locations, where gatherings over periods of time increase vulnerability. Instead, fast actions that avoid what the U.S. military calls collateral damage to living beings and that move from place to place quickly interrupt the system’s smooth flow more than demonstrations that risk arrest and injuries for the sake of non-disruptive symbolism.[31](https://monthlyreview.org/2017/11/01/revolution-now/#en31) Tactically, experiences in Latin America lead to the realization that actions can disrupt business as usual, even if disrupters disperse when they receive warnings that they are about to be arrested. Despite right-wing efforts to restrict demonstrations in several states, U.S. legalities do require warnings by police and military forces before arrests or physical attacks begin. Latin American revolutionaries have shown that blocking a highway, railway, port, or airport for quite a long time does not necessarily imply the need to block it until arrest or injury. One misconception about non-violent resistance involves the vision that one ethically needs to hang around until incarcerated, injured, or both. Besides direct action, revolutionaries can change what we do with our money, especially in the realms of taxes, investments, and local economic activities. Such changes can disrupt, undermine, and create space for further revolutionary actions. We in the 99 percent persist as the main funders of the capitalist state, which passes our money on to corporations that exploit workers, destroy nature, raise the earth’s temperature, and keep us in permanent war and perpetual inequality. We need to change our habits of giving up our money, and if enough of us do so, the capitalist state no longer will be able to prop up the capitalist economy for the benefit of the ultra-rich. Tax resistance can take several forms. For more than a century, pacifists in the United States have resisted taxes that pay for war, some eventually going to prison but the vast majority, like me, suffering no substantial harm as a result. As a card-carrying conscientious objector, I openly resisted half of my income taxes for more than a decade during and after the Vietnam War. If one honestly declares one’s income, there is nothing illegal about claiming a war deduction of 50 percent, which is the approximate percentage of the federal budget that pays for past, present, and future wars. Later, with a young daughter, I was starting to feel inconvenienced and a little bored by appeal procedures inside and outside the Internal Revenue Service because of open tax resistance. So I reluctantly made the same decision that Trump and his ilk make, to avoid taxes through loopholes rather than resistance of conscience. The problem with either explicit or implicit tax resistance is that we number in the thousands rather than millions. “Death and taxes,” the two inevitabilities, as we are taught, seem hard to resist, but corporations and rich individuals understand very well that at least taxes actually are not inevitable. In Latin America, tax resistance usually proceeds according to the Trump model for corporations and the rich, but ordinary people can succeed in massive tax resistance through non-reporting or under-reporting of income. During the dictatorships in the Southern Cone, the autocratic governments had trouble raising sufficient tax revenues, despite extensive attempts through bureaucratic and police surveillance, and tax resistance became one of many tactics to bring down those regimes. Ironically, a major motivation in Cuba for allowing expansion of private small businesses involves a perception that private-sector business activities were expanding anyway, along with rampant tax evasion; if permitted officially, small businesses could generate substantial taxes for social programs. Even in Cuba, tax resistance has interacted with political organizing in Poder Popular and community-based organizations to enhance popular participation. As a revolutionary strategy in the United States, tax resistance must flourish, so millions of us stop functioning as the main financiers for the capitalist state. Our investments also help corporations achieve the goals we despise. What happens to the money we save in our little bank or retirement accounts and pay for our mortgages, car loans, and credit card bills? Off that money goes to big banks that give loans to corporations for the Dakota Access Pipeline, arms manufacturing, privatized prisons and schools, pharmaceutical and for-profit health insurance companies, and more. Even if we invest in “socially conscious” funds, that usually means substituting “clean” drug, insurance, and technology companies for “dirty” tobacco and oil companies in our portfolios. The movement to compel cities, universities, and other institutional investors to divest from banks that support pipelines, companies that sell fossil fuels, Israel, and a host of other destructive entities, while helpful, misses the point that we as millions of individuals and families are actually more important as aggregated investors than any of the institutional investors that we try to influence. Collectively, we need to seize control and move our investments into organizations that protect our planet, help our communities, and nurture non-capitalist economic enterprises. In Latin America, several companies taken over by workers follow these guidelines. And just as capitalists can “offshore” their investments, we can invest some of our earnings in radical organizations that do very well in the global South. We also need to move our money into locally controlled economies not linked to the global capitalist system. Local responses to neoliberal austerity policies in Latin America and southern Europe have led to a clear understanding that communities can produce and consume most of the goods and services that they need through non-capitalist forms of cooperative social organization. Communities can develop markets, bartering procedures, and even currency so that participants create and share with each other on the basis of use value rather than exchange value, while drastically reducing the flow of their earnings into the global capitalist economy. As many affected by austerity already have learned, we really do not need global capitalism. We can live and thrive without the 1 percent easier than they can without us. So what stands in our way? We ourselves stand in our way. Actions like these usually entail very small risk of bodily harm and a somewhat larger risk of inconvenience such as arrest. Reasons for inaction include emotions like fear, especially when we feel a need to protect those who depend on us, including children. Comfort and our illusions also slow us down, especially when believe we can make a big difference by winning the next round of elections in bourgeois democracy, or try to create a single payer health program within the capitalist state, or protect the environment, fight militarism, and so forth, all the while preserving a system whose inherently exploitative structure makes inevitable the weakening or reversal of whatever we accomplish. As usual, it is wonderful to communicate about fear, comfort, and illusions with Latin American revolutionaries. For these comrades, fears about physical safety give way to confidence in the nurturance they receive from others and the pride of a life worth living. Worries about revolution yield to pleasures of the moment—eating and drinking with friends who are also comrades, knowing that on a deep level “mi casa es tu casa,” and dancing late into the night. And about illusions, they understand that a central characteristic of revolution involves counter-hegemonic struggle, in this case rejecting the crippling ideology that reforming small parts of a destructive system without changing the destructive system itself is somehow okay. Such revolutionaries also realize that revolution is good for health and mental health. Growing evidence shows that people who engage in revolutionary struggle enjoy better health and mental health than non-revolutionaries, especially those who constantly fret about how capitalism ruins their lives but do little to change that.[32](https://monthlyreview.org/2017/11/01/revolution-now/#en32) Radical activism is an upper, and despite setbacks it generates a high that comes from living life according to one’s deepest values, with beloved comrades who share “mutual aid.”[33](https://monthlyreview.org/2017/11/01/revolution-now/#en33)

#### Reject Perms Additionally.

#### [1] Idea Testing: Perms shut down comparison of methods which is where all the education is generated. You can’t evaluate the BEST method if you just combine them

#### [2] Structural Abuse: Extend No perms in a method v method debate. There is no plan to test competition with because the whole AFF is a plan. Combining methods meshes speech acts together in an arbitrary way which guarantees an AFF ballot.

#### [3] Perms incentivize negs going for framework against K affs, reject perms to incentives debate about the aff method.

#### [4] New Links: Perms rely on neoclassical economic assumptions of opportunity cost. Their enframing of homo-economicus also attempts to parse pure rationality from ethical representations. Both are link arguments at the level of subject formation.

## 3

#### CP Text: Do the Aff but use the phrase hyper incarceration instead of mass incarceration. Its inaccurate and perpetuates racism

Wacquant 10 - Loïc Wacquant, in the Journal Daedalus, Summer 2010 “Class, race & hyperincarceration in revanchist America” [http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/20749843.pdf] Accessed 1/10/18 SAO

The foregoing indicates that the footprint of the penal state on the national body is much broader and heavier than usually depicted. At the same time, it is also considerably more pointed than conveyed by the current debate. It has become conventional among justice activists, journalists, and analysts of the U.S. carceral scene to designate the unprecedented and unparalleled expansion of the American correctional system at the close of the twentieth century as "mass incarceration."22 The term was (re)introduced in the national prison debate in the late 1990s (until then, it had been used to refer to the internment of Japanese Americans in concentration camps during World War II) and was soon codified by David Gar land at the interdisciplinary conference on "Mass Incarceration: Social Causes and Consequences," held at New York University in 2000, which boosted re search on the topic.23 The designation of mass incarceration is intuitively appealing because it helps spotlight the outlier status of the United States on the world scene, dramatize the condition at hand, and thus draw scholarly and public attention to it. But, much as it has been useful in terms of mobilizing intellectual and civic resources, the notion obscures signal features of the phenomenon. Mass incarceration is a mischaracterization of what is better termed *hyperincarceration*. This is not a mere terminological quibble, for the change in wording points to a different depiction of the punitive turn, which leads to a different causal model and thence to different pol icy prescriptions. Mass incarceration suggests that confinement concerns large swaths of the citizenry (as with the mass media, mass culture, and mass unemployment), implying that the penal net has been flung far and wide across social and physical space. This is triply inaccurate. First, the prevalence of penal confinement in the United States, while extreme by international standards, can hardly be said to concern the masses. Indeed, a rate of 0.75 percent compares quite favorably with the incidence of such woes as latent tuberculosis infection (estimated at 4.2 percent) and severe alcohol dependency (3.81 percent), ailments which no one would seriously contend have reached mass proportions in the United States.24 Next, the expansion and intensification of the activities of the police, courts, and prison over the past quarter-century have been anything but broad and indiscriminate.25 They have been finely targeted, first by class, second by that disguised brand of ethnicity called race, and third by place. This cumulative targeting has led to the hyperincarceration of one particular category, lower-class African American men trapped in the crumbling ghetto, while leaving the rest of society - including, most remarkably, middle- and upper-class African Americans - practically untouched. Third, and more important still, this triple selectivity is a constitutive property of the phenomenon: had the penal state been rolled out indiscriminately by policies resulting in the capture of vast numbers of whites and well-to-do citizens, capsizing their families and decimating their neighborhoods as it has for inner-city African Americans, its growth would have been speedily derailed and eventually stopped by political counteraction. "Mass" incarceration is socially tolerable and therefore workable as public policy only so long as it does not reach the masses: it is a figure of speech, which hides the multiple filters that operate to point the penal dagger.26

## 4

#### The Role of the ballot is to the test if the resolution is true.

#### 1] Inclusion: a) other ROBs open the door for personal lives of debaters to factor into decisions and compare who is more oppressed which causes violence in a space where some people go to escape. b) Anything can function under truth testing insofar as it proves the resolution either true or false. Specific role of the ballots exclude all offense besides those that follow from their framework which shuts out people without the technical skill or resources to prep for it.

#### 2] Constitutivism: The ballot asks you to either vote aff or neg based on the given resolution a) Five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means its intrinsic to the nature of the activity b) the purpose of debate is the acquisition of knowledge in pursuit of truth – a resolutional focus is key to depth of exploration which o/w on specificity. It’s a jurisdictional issue since it questions whether the judge should go outside the scope of the game and can only endorse what is within their burden c) Even if another role of the ballot is better for debate, that is not a reason it ought to be the role of the ballot, just a reason we ought to

#### That negates- an unconditional right to strike is impossible.

#### 1] The right to strike is conditional on the government existing and enforcing it: A] The Sqou proves that without the state, the right doesn’t exist, which means turning the NC non-uniques the aff B] State of nature would just mean people could take the action, not that they have a guaranteed right to do so.

#### 2] The right is conditional on the existence of certain social institutions: IE a workplace and employer to strike against, and a job to stop doing.

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)