**Role of the Ballot**

**Dominant epistemologies prevent cost benefit analysis of policies**

**Jackson 15 - Richard Jackson, professor of peace studies at The National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, in Critical Studies on Terrorism, Published online: 09 Apr 2015** “The epistemological crisis of counterterrorism” [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2015.1009762, Vol. 8, No. 1, 33–54] Accessed 11/12/21 SAO

The significance of the epistemological crisis lies primarily in its consequences for counterterrorism thought and practice – which are inextricably bound together and inseparable, in any case. That is, the epistemological crisis can be understood as generative of certain kinds of thinking, actions and practices. As Daase and Kessler (2007, 412) describe the process by which contemporary understandings of terrorism construct the basis for action: “It is the relationship between what we know, what we do not know, what we cannot know and what we do not like to know that determines the cognitive frame for political practice.” Or, as Zulaika (2012, 58) quoting Merton notes: “If men (sic) define situations as real, they are real in their consequences” (1968, 475). Once the premises of the epistemological crisis have been accepted as true, and especially once they have been institutionalised and internalised, they then form the logic or cognitive frame for action. From another perspective, it can be argued that, once accepted and institutionalised, the epistemological crisis acts as a kind of policy paradigm, forming a central part of the “elite assumptions that constrain the cognitive range of useful solutions available to policy makers” (Campbell 1998b, 385). Crucially, the epistemological crisis is not about individual or collective negligence or the personal failures of counterterrorist officials; those in charge of preventing terrorism are likely to be genuinely concerned, responsible individuals acting in what they perceive to be the best interests of society (Zulaika 2012, 52). Rather, counterterrorist failings and abuses are the result of the broader epistemic structures and conditions – the policy paradigm – **under which officials are forced to think and act**. Apart from the trillions of dollars and millions of people in the “security-industrial complex” who are currently invested in preventing the coming terror (see Zulaika 2012, 51; Baker-Beall and Robinson 2014), the first and most obvious consequences of the epistemological crisis of counterterrorism are all the **fantasy-infused security practices and** postures discussed earlier, as well as the extensive programmes of **security theatre** enacted at airports and elsewhere, the **institutionalisation of the state of exception, and socially disciplinary practices** such as mass surveillance, control orders, counter-radicalisation programmes, resilience initiatives and the like. Zulaika (2009, 18) argues that contemporary counterterrorism represents a form of thinking that resembles “the mental world of medieval witchcraft and inquisitorial nonsense”. Considering some of the magical realist thinking inherent in contemporary counter-radicalisation programmes (see also HeathKelly 2012a), including the official expression of notions of pre-crime, the concept of “risky citizens”, efforts to control words and images considered to be capable of infection, and more, such an assessment is entirely apposite. Another obvious and related consequence of the epistemological crisis of counterterrorism is the institutionalisation and sedimentation of a politics of fear (see Jackson 2013, 2007). In an atmosphere of permanently “waiting for terror” and moral panic, threat levels are raised and lowered by officials, often on the basis of fantastical projection rather than hard evidence, and public fear is manipulated for electoral gain and the promotion of non-terrorism-related political projects. In the process, the interplay of knowledge and ignorance transforms a public fear of terrorism into a general and **permanent epistemic fear** (Zulaika and Douglass 1996), one **which can be easily manipulated for political gain**. From this perspective, the epistemological crisis of counterterrorism is functional to political elites who can manipulate uncertainty and the underlying logic of the crisis for direct political and material gain. A third predictable consequence of the epistemological crisis in terms of risk management and preemption are the well-documented and highly destructive counterterrorist practices of preemptive war, the use of drones to kill terrorist suspects, torture and rendition, control orders and mass surveillance. For example, given that we cannot know for certain who the terrorist is, only that they certainly exist and are plotting mass destruction, and that we cannot take the risk that inaction will allow them to complete their mission, it makes perfect sense to include as many people as possible on any terrorist watch list. It is now known that in the United States, “More than one million names are included on secret lists of suspected terrorists maintained by the Obama administration”. While “people on the list are likely to be subject to enhanced surveillance”, not surprisingly in the context of the epistemological crisis, “almost half of the people on a key government list don’t have known ties to any specific terrorist organisation” (Lee 2014; emphasis added). Given the way that uncertainty and the unknown nevertheless create an imperative to act preemptively, it is perhaps surprising that many more people are not on the secret list. Of course, the reason for this is likely to be that virtually everyone is under surveillance anyway, as the Edward Snowden revelations demonstrate. A fourth consequence of the epistemological crisis is the many “false positives” (Heath-Kelly 2012a) produced by the moral imperative to act, even if “it turns out to be wrong”. Here we can note the hundreds of thousands of people killed in the invasion of Iraq aimed at preempting the “world’s most dangerous regimes… [from] threaten[ing] us with the world’s most destructive weapons”, as George Bush famously argued. Similarly, thousands of others have been rendered, detained, imprisoned, tortured, assassinated in drone strikes, or like Jean Charles de Menezes, shot to death in domestic counterterrorist operations. In each case, the moral imperative to act preemptively overwhelmed any caution which might have been engendered by uncertainty or lack of knowledge. Official calculations under the conditions of the epistemological crisis state that it is better to act than not act, even if it turns out to be wrong and leaves innocent people dead or injured. Similar logic applies to the greatly enhanced security measures across society, mass surveillance, de-radicalisation programmes, control orders, and the like, as well as efforts to curtail opposition and dissent in all forms, in case it proves to be the work of terrorists. Knowing that there are terrorists in our midst, but not knowing who they are or what they are planning, we are bound to watch everyone, detain anyone, secure everything, preempt attacks and prevent terrorist intentions from emerging in the first place. Another consequence of the epistemological crisis is that the symptoms – or the “signs of future threat”, as Martin (2014) puts it – rather than the deeper roots or causes of terrorism become the primary focus of action.6 That is, preventing the inevitable coming attacks becomes the main objective of counterterrorism, rather than the prevention of the circumstances and conditions that lead to terrorism in the first instance (Frank 2014, 333). This is both a consequence and cause of the taboo which prevents direct knowledge of terrorist subjectivity. It is also the result of rendering previous knowledge about terrorist behaviour obsolete, the fatalism of accepting that terrorism will occur whatever actions are taken, and the processes of knowledge subjugation about the kind of policies and circumstances which give rise to terrorism in the first place. In any case, counterterrorism efforts have become fixated on the anticipation of imagined future plots, rather than focused on the current actual threat and its causes (Mueller 2006). Finally, **the epistemological crisis precludes the possibility of the rational evaluation or cost-benefit analysis and assessment**, of counterterrorist policies (Mueller and Stewart 2011), and acts to pacify dissent and opposition to state security programmes. Instead, in a context bound by anti-knowledge and the unknown, speculation, imagination and counter-factual, unprovable knowledge becomes a substitute form of assessment, and the (non)victims of terrorist attacks that never occurred (but could have) are counted as evidence of success: Fighting terror is like fighting car accidents: one can count the casualties but not those whose lives were spared by prevention. Hundreds, if not thousands, of Israelis go about their lives without knowing that they are unhurt because their murderers met their fate before they got the chance to carry out their diabolical missions. This silent multitude is the testament to the policy’s success. (Luft 2003, 3)

**Thus, The Role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best adopts an attitude of epistemic disobedience to dominant security paradigms.**

**Jackson 15 - Richard Jackson, professor of peace studies at The National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, in Critical Studies on Terrorism, 2015** “The epistemological crisis of counterterrorism” [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2015.1009762, Vol. 8, No. 1, 33–54] SAO

Given the vast suffering engendered by the global war on terrorism since 2001, the spread of unethical, illegal and counterproductive practices such as torture, rendition, extrajudicial killings, mass surveillance and control orders (among others), and the economic and social costs of contemporary counterterrorism**, there is a clear normative responsibility to try and resist and deconstruct the current epistemological crisis and all its harmful effects**. Notwithstanding the iron logic of the epistemological crisis, its widespread acceptance and its inherently expansionary and self-replicating nature, there are a number of potential avenues for resistance. However, to initiate resistance, it is crucial that we first adopt an attitude of what Walter Mignolo (2009) calls “epistemic disobedience” to the dominant paradigm. Although this term is employed by Mignolo in the context of de-colonial thought, it can readily be applied to the hegemonic counterterrorist paradigm and the urgent need for the “epistemic de-linking” of the unknown and the imperative to act; “the unveiling of epistemic silences” or knowledge de-subjugation (Jackson 2012b) about risk, actors and political violence; the challenging of the “epistemic privilege” held by security experts and officials; and the need to “change the terms of the conversation” regarding how we as a society deal with potential threats of political violence, particularly in terms of the material and legal sacrifices we are prepared to take. More specific suggestions for resisting the epistemological crisis include Zulaika and Douglass’s (1996) suggestion of employing strategies of exorcism to try and rid society of its ontological terror. In this regard, Charlotte Heath-Kelly (2012b) argues for the important role of laughter and humour as a way of creating space within which terrorism fears and obsessions can be exorcised and deconstructed. In a similar vein, Zulaika (2012) suggests a strategy aimed at heightening the contradictions within the epistemological crisis through encouraging more fantasy and cooperating with official activities, particularly those that are obviously bizarre. In this respect, proliferating fantasy scenarios and engaging in constant reporting of “suspicious” activities could overload and overwhelm counterterrorist structures, thereby making the paradigm practically unworkable

**Prefer my ROB**

**[1] Judge Intervention: Dominant paradigms shape subconscious thought**

**Bargh 17 - John Bargh, professor of social psychology at Yale University, The Washington Post, November 22, 2017** “At Yale, we conducted an experiment to turn conservatives into liberals. The results say a lot about our political divisions.” [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/inspired-life/wp/2017/11/22/at-yale-we-conducted-an-experiment-to-turn-conservatives-into-liberals-the-results-say-a-lot-about-our-political-divisions/?utm\_term=.163c4d1d7be6] Accessed 4/24/18 SAO

Conservatives, it turns out, react more strongly to physical threat than liberals do. In fact, their greater concern with physical safety seems to be determined early in life: In one University of California study, the more fear a 4-year-old showed in a laboratory situation, the more conservative his or her political attitudes were found to be 20 years later. Brain imaging studies have even shown that the fear center of the brain, the amygdala, is actually larger in conservatives than in liberals. And many other laboratory studies have found that when adult liberals experienced physical threat, their political and social attitudes became more conservative (temporarily, of course). But no one had ever turned conservatives into liberals. Until we did. In a new study to appear in a forthcoming issue of the European Journal of Social Psychology, my colleagues Jaime Napier, Julie Huang and Andy Vonasch and I asked 300 U.S. residents in an online survey their opinions on several contemporary issues such as gay rights, abortion, feminism and immigration, as well as social change in general. The group was two-thirds female, about three-quarters white, with an average age of 35. Thirty-percent of the participants self-identified as Republican, and the rest as Democrat. But before they answered the survey questions, we had them engage in an intense imagination exercise. They were asked to close their eyes and richly imagine being visited by a genie who granted them a superpower. For half of our participants, this superpower was to be able to fly, under one’s own power. For the other half, it was to be completely physically safe, invulnerable to any harm. If they had just imagined being able to fly, their responses to the social attitude survey showed the usual clear difference between Republicans and Democrats — the former endorsed more conservative positions on social issues and were also more resistant to social change in general. But if they had instead just imagined being completely physically safe, the Republicans became significantly more liberal — their positions on social attitudes were much more like the Democratic respondents. And on the issue of social change in general, the Republicans’ attitudes were now indistinguishable from the Democrats. Imagining being completely safe from physical harm had done what no experiment had done before — it had turned conservatives into liberals. In both instances, we had manipulated a deeper underlying reason for political attitudes, the strength of the basic motivation of safety and survival. The boiling water of our social and political attitudes, it seems, can be turned up or down by changing how physically safe we feel. This is why it makes sense that liberal politicians intuitively portray danger as manageable — recall FDR’s famous Great Depression era reassurance of “nothing to fear but fear itself,” echoed decades later in Barack Obama’s final State of the Union address — and why President Trump and other Republican politicians are instead likely to emphasize the dangers of terrorism and immigration, relying on fear as a motivator to gain votes. In fact, anti-immigration attitudes are also linked directly to the underlying basic drive for physical safety. For centuries, arch-conservative leaders have often referred to scapegoated minority groups as “germs” or “bacteria” that seek to invade and destroy their country from within. President Trump is an acknowledged germaphobe, and he has a penchant for describing people — not only immigrants but political opponents and former Miss Universe contestants — as “disgusting.” “Immigrants are like viruses” is a powerful metaphor, because in comparing immigrants entering a country to germs entering a human body, it speaks directly to our powerful innate motivation to avoid contamination and disease. Until very recently in human history, not only did we not have antibiotics, we did not even know how infections occurred or diseases transmitted, and cuts and open wounds were quite dangerous. (In the American Civil War, for example, 60 out of every 1,000 soldiers died not by bullets or bayonets, but by infections.) Therefore, we reasoned, making people feel safer about a dangerous flu virus should serve to calm their fears about immigrants — and making them feel more threatened by the flu virus should cause them to be more against immigration than they were before. In a 2011 study, my colleagues and I showed just that. First, we reminded our nationwide sample of liberals and conservatives about the threat of the flu virus (during the H1N1 epidemic), and then measured their attitudes toward immigration. Afterward we simply asked them if they’d already gotten their flu shot or not. It turned out that those who had not gotten a flu shot (feeling threatened) expressed more negative attitudes toward immigration, while those who had received the vaccination (feeling safe) had more positive attitudes about immigration. In another study, using hand sanitizer after being warned about the flu virus had the same effect on immigration attitudes as had being vaccinated. A simple squirt of Purell after we had raised the threat of the flu had changed their minds. It made them feel safe from the dangerous virus, and this made them feel socially safe from immigrants as well. Our study findings may have a silver lining. Here’s how: All of us believe that our social and political attitudes are based on good reasons and reflect our important values. But we also need to recognize how much they can be influenced subconsciously by our most basic, powerful motivations for safety and survival. Politicians on both sides of the aisle know this already and attempt to manipulate our votes and party allegiances by appealing to these potent feelings of fear and of safety. Instead of allowing our strings to be pulled so easily by others, we can become more conscious of what drives us and work harder to base our opinions on factual knowledge about the issues, including information from outside our media echo chambers. Yes, our views can harden given the right environment, but our work shows that they are actually easier to change than we might think.

**[2] Ethics: A focus on the contemporary effects of policymaking is a prerequisite to normative analysis**

**Holleman 15 - Hannah Holleman, assistant professor of sociology at Amherst College, The Monthly Review, October 2015** “Method in Ecological Marxism” [http://monthlyreview.org/2015/10/01/method-in-ecological-marxism/, accessed 10/12/16] SAO

A final feature of Marx’s methodology uniting the approaches of many third stage ecological Marxists is the commitment to living the eleventh thesis, or keeping at the forefront that the goal is not merely to interpret the world, but to change it. This means our work, including our theoretical development, must link philosophy, ethics, and critical social analysis. In Biology Under the Influence, Lewontin and Levins wrote that “any theory of society has to undergo a test, What does it do to Children?”33 This was in the context of a discussion of methodology, specifically “Strategies for Abstraction”—the title of the chapter in which the topic appears. Raising the question of the implications for children of our work in developing social theory illustrated the impossibility of separating questions of reality from questions of ethics. The impossibility arises because “theories support practices that serve some and harm others.” While “philosophers go through great contortions to separate questions of reality from questions of ethics, the historic process unites them…. Ethicists may debate, [for example], over dinner, the rational reasons for feeding the hungry, but for people in poverty food is not a philosophical problem.”34 For ecological Marxists, “**even the most committed investigation of ethics cannot be a substitute for a radical critique of politics** in its frustrating and alienating contemporary reality.”35 “For Marx,” as Cornel West wrote, “an adequate theoretic account of ethical notions, e.g., ‘just’ or ‘right,’ must understand them as human conventional attempts to regulate social practices in accordance with the requirements of a specific system of production.”36 In the end, István Mészáros suggests, the measure of the **success of our ethics in practice “can only be” their “ability to constantly maintain awareness of and reanimate practical criticism towards the real target of socialist transformation:** to go beyond capital in all its actually existing and feasible forms through the redefinition and practically viable rearticulation of the labor process.”37

**Solvency**

**The Plan: A Just United States ought to recognize that prison workers in the US have the unconditional right to strike. The criminal justice system is inherently marginalizing**

**Loubriel 16 - Jennifer Loubriel, Everyday Feminism, May 17, 2016** “Why Our Punitive Justice System Doesn’t Work – And 3 Alternatives to Prisons” [https://everydayfeminism.com/2016/05/punitive-justice-alternatives/] Accessed 2/11/18 SAO

Like most people, I grew up believing that prisons equaled safety. According to the majority of cop shows all over television when I was a kid, only “bad guys” went to prison. The good detectives always put away the violent criminals. Sometimes it was for a few years, and sometimes it was for a lifetime. The message was always clear: criminals did this to themselves. They deserved to be locked up. Prison walls protected the rest of us – the good, the upstanding, the lawful – from them. But as I got older, I realized how wrong these shows were. Because everything that I was witnessing in my neighborhood, everything I was hearing from loved ones, and everything I read from activists just didn’t match up to what I had always been taught about punitive justice. Instead of the simple narrative of good cop vs. really bad, violent criminal, the story got way more complicated. What Is Punitive Justice And Why Is It Oppressive? Prisons are part of a larger system called punitive (or retributive) justice. Under this system, if someone breaks the law, they’re punished for that wrongdoing. The punishment is supposed to be proportionate to the crime and should accomplish two things: rehabilitate the original law-breaker and stop others from committing the same crime. On paper, that looks pretty simple, and it looks fair. In reality though, punitive justice in the United States is far from being simple or being fair. Our punitive justice system is inherently antiblack, racist, and classist. Historically, the prison system and the police force in the United States were both used as tools of white supremacy. Michelle Alexander’s The New Jim Crow is one of many resources that go into details about how our so-called justice system disproportionately attacks Black people. Nothing much has changed since these things were created. Today, the justice system relies heavily on prejudices we’ve been socialized to see as truths for generations. These prejudices, when internalized, are called “implicit biases.” Implicit biases work against marginalized folks because we are seen as inherently dangerous — whether or not we have committed a crime, we are assumed to be guilty simply by existing. This means that Black, Native, Latinx, LGBTQIA+, and low-income people – many of whom have more than one of these identities – are all overrepresented in the punitive justice system. Because we’re automatically seen as criminal, law enforcement can basically do anything to us without consequence. This is why rates of police brutality, rape, and abuse are extremely high against People of Color. This is especially true for folks who are further marginalized in our communities. For example, 58% of fatal police shootings involve a person with a mental illness. This means that the death of Tanisha Anderson – a Black woman with schizophrenia who was murdered by police – is not an isolated event. Unfortunately, it’s all too common. But more than that, when a crime has been committed, the punishments we receive are disproportionately harsh, particularly for non-violent crimes like drug related offenses. Wealthy white people, however, are often protected or get lesser sentencing for crimes they commit. For example, both Jaime Arellano and Ethan Couch were Texas teenagers who killed people while driving drunk. They were charged with the same crimes. Yet while Jamie Arellano was charged as an adult and spent 20 years in prison, Ethan Couch stayed in the juvenile justice system and was only sentenced to 10 years probation and 2 years of jail time. The punitive justice system definitely doesn’t treat everyone equitably. And a lot of times this happens because the punitive justice system just seeks to punish someone for breaking a law, rather than looking at the reason why it was done. This kind of system doesn’t look at how oppression and systemic violence can cause someone to break the law — nor does it look at how some laws were created to target certain people. Many women – especially queer and trans Black women – are punished simply for protecting themselves. Often, these are women who are protecting themselves from abusive partners. In New York’s prison system alone, 67% of women incarcerated for killing a significant other had been abused by that person. It’s not only that our punitive justice system is racist, classist, and homophobic. It’s that this system doesn’t even do what folks claim it’s supposed to do. Going to jail just doesn’t rehabilitate people. There’s no proof that incarceration prevents crime. And once they go to jail, so many marginalized folks continue to experience trauma. The American Civil Liberties Union has many pages explaining how the prison system often violates human rights. Abuses such as lack of medical resources, solitary confinement, debriefing policies, and rape happen too often within the system. The Attica Prison Revolt of 1971 is one of the most famous examples of incarcerated folks protesting these abuses. In short: the United States punitive criminal justice system is inherently violent and it just doesn’t work. INCITE!’s Critical Resistance Statement speaks to all of this.

**Contradicting official justifications for the erosion of rights affirms under my role of the ballot.**

**Jackson 15 - Richard Jackson, professor of peace studies at The National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, in Critical Studies on Terrorism, 2015** “The epistemological crisis of counterterrorism” [http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2015.1009762, Vol. 8, No. 1, 33–54] SAO

Other more traditional modes of resistance include the employment of academic research and counter-evidence to contradict official statements and justifications, fill purported knowledge gaps and demonstrate alternative policy options (see Mueller and Stewart 2011, 2012). While providing an evidentiary base cannot break down the epistemological crisis on its own (due to the built-in rejection of evidence and knowledge), it is nonetheless crucial in the broader struggle to win legitimacy for change in the dominant policy paradigm. Related to this, there is an important role for activist groups and individuals, as well as investigative journalists such as Glenn Greenwald, WikiLeaks, Edward Snowden and others, to publicise the nature and extent of counterterrorist activities, particularly when they involve secret wrong-doing and social harm such as mass surveillance, torture, rendition, shoot-to-kill policies and the like. Other groups like Cageprisoners can then use this information to provide legal support for victims and challenge government programmes

**Prison strikes align prisoners with radical Black movements to test revolutionary political strategies against the state’s necropolitics.**

**Fox ‘20** [Taylor Fox; a fourth-year in the College studying Political Science and Human Rights; 05-01-2020; “Freedom, Caged: A Foucauldian Inquiry into the National Prison Strike”; Bachelor’s Thesis, University of Chicago; Advisor: Professor Reuben Miller; Preceptor: Alex Haskins; http://pozen.s3.amazonaws.com/system/ckeditor/attachments/435/Fox\_\_Taylor\_BA\_Thesis\_copy.pdf; Accessed 10-09-2021] AK Recut SAO

The National Prison Strike follows a long tradition of prison strikes in the U.S., beginning with insurrections in late 18th-century prisons. Incarceration was a popular form of criminal punishment, compared to the death penalty in England and elsewhere, and often required hard labor. In Philadelphia’s Walnut Prison, America’s first prison, incarcerated people regularly mounted work stoppages to protest brutal labor conditions. In turn, common features of today’s prison struggles can be traced to the founding of the U.S. prison system itself.67 Following the Civil War, Black convict laborers struggled in response to brutal labor practices demanded by the growing Southern plantation economy. In order to enforce social control over recently freed Black men and disincentivize poor whites from unionizing, these punitive labor regimes escalated in cruelty and violence.68 As this problem of incarceration grew in size and brutality, prisoners responded with over a dozen major riots and strikes between 1879 and 1892.69 Though quickly suppressed, these **strikes “symbolically empowered inmates**, who could no longer be considered ‘powerless, broken men who could do nothing but toil obediently for their masters.’”70 This “symbolic” register re-emerges throughout prison strike history, apparent in uprisings that failed to secure material gains but garnered significant outside attention. Yet scholars also consider the public outrage and media attention that ensued from these late-19th century strikes to be significant in their own right, contributing to the demise of contract prison labor and chain gangs.71 Moving to the 20th century, the period between 1968 and 1972 saw a significant uptick in **prison struggles, providing a testing ground for political** questions of unionism and revolutionary action that continue to beset prison strikes today. During this era, a broad coalition of prisoners’ rights groups, academics, lawyers, journalists, and incarcerated activists emerged in support of the growing prison movement. In particular, the 1970 Folsom Prison Strike was a major inflection point for the U.S. prison movement.72 While no demands were met, prisoners claimed the right to unionize for the first time in U.S. history, along with economic, labor, and general human rights. The early 70s saw other major prison uprisings, with San Quentin and Attica among the most notorious. Folsom was made possible by the rise of Black Power and its ideological import on political prisoners across the U.S. and beyond. Black Power organizers positioned themselves as a revolutionary alternative to NAACP-style legal change and proffered a distinct form of Black political consciousness that was embraced by prison radicals. Incarcerated Black Power organizers saw their task as a revolutionary challenge against the state and its necropolitics, which incarceration embodied. They claimed that white racism necessarily relied on Black captivity, which manifested in the prison being used “as,” and not “for,” punishment.73 For Black Power revolutionaries, criminalization was a racialized project designed to punish Blackness itself. In turn, Black prisoners were de facto political prisoners. Black Power’s redefinition of crime as something beyond moral failure – as a political act, and as a form of survival – exposed the indefensible logics of incarceration to a new generation of prison radicals.74 Beyond appealing to Black prisoners, Black radicalism attracted whites through its message that all incarcerated people belonged to a distinctly exploited underclass.75 The possibilities for **multiracial solidarity** presented by Black radicals **threatened the prison’s hegemony** over the socio- political order. During prison uprisings in Walla Walla and Walpole, for instance, Black Power organizers and prisoner unions fought and temporarily won self-governance.76 Though this demand for self-governance is largely absent from today’s prison struggles, the instinct toward self- determination remains visible in hunger strike campaigns that assert prisoners’ subjectivity.

**Advantage**

**US carceral practices fuel global capitalism. Methodological pluralism is key to combat it.**

**Sudbury 4 - Julia Sudbury, Canada Research Council Chair in Social Justice, Equity and Diversity in social work at the University of Toronto, in the Journal Social Justice, 2004** “A World Without Prisons: Resisting Militarism, Globalized Punishment, and Empire” [http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/29768237.pdf] Accessed 1/10/18 SAO

In addition, global capitalism is deeply implicated in U.S. and allied military interventions worldwide, which frequently target strategic economic interests and natural resources. These interventions are not limited to wars using U.S. troops. From Israel to Bolivia, U.S. funds are used to pay for military equipment, training, and troops. Women are particularly at risk in the environment of violence and displacement caused when regimes with poor human rights records deploy armed forces against civilian or insurgent populations. One outcome of this vulnerability is the displacement of poor women from traditional forms of survival and their subsequent engagement in the illicit economies of sex work or the drug trade. Women in militarized situations are also at risk of criminalization and incarceration when they take up insurgent positions against repressive regimes. Militarism and globalization thus generate a web of criminalization that in turn fuels the prison building boom and generates profits for the economic interests served by the transnational prison-industrial complex. **Penal warehouses** for people of African descent, immigrants, indigenous people, and the global poor, as I have outlined, **are central to the new world order**. For that reason, even as "small government" is promoted as a prerequisite for competitiveness in the global market, "corrections" budgets continue to skyrocket. That is also why **prison abolition remains of vital importance in this time of endless war**. What does this mean for our research and praxis as scholars and activists? First, much more work needs to be done to unravel the complex interconnections between mass incarceration, militarism, and the global economy. **As activists in the heart of empire, our priority should be to make connections** between radical social movements. **Bridge-building between the anti-globalization, antiwar, and prison abolitionist movements provides critical opportunities for sharing strategies**. For example, global anti-sweatshop activism against Wal-Mart and Nike can serve as a model of cross-border activism that could be deployed to challenge private prison corporations such as Wackenhutand Sodexho. Such transnational activism might successfully prevent the spread of U.S.-style private superjails from South Africa through the rest of the continent and from Mexico and Chile throughout the rest of Latin America. In addition, cross-fertilization between movements will encourage activists to address wider issues that are not always made visible in issue-based campaigns. For example, intensified analysis of globalization might encourage prison abolitionists to consider the need for anti-capitalist economic models as a prerequisite for a world without prisons. Similarly, an engagement between antiwar activists and analyses of mass incarceration would generate a deeper understanding of the need to simultaneously challenge militarism abroad and racialized surveillance and punishment at home. An effective challenge to the interlocking systems of militarism, incarceration, and globalization demands the establishment of broad-based, cross-movement coalitions, in the U.S. and internationally. The World Social Forum (WSF) is an important venue where critiques of, and alternatives to, free trade, imperialism, and neoliberalism are developed. Prison abolitionists need to infuse the politics of the WSF with an analysis of the role of the prison-industrial complex in bolstering global capitalism. At the same time, the movement to abolish prisons can learn from the successes of popular movements in the global South such as the Movimento Sim Terra in Brazil and the Ruta Pacifica in Colombia. These broad based movements involve organized labor, women, the homeless, the unemployed, students, rural campesinos, and indigenous communities. They have developed a sophisticated intersectional analysis of globalization, imperialism, and militarism, as well as race, gender, class, and nation. Most important, they have been successful in generating mass mobilizations by developing a viable alternative to the Washington Consensus model, prioritizing people and the environment over corporations and profits. These broad-based popular movements pay attention to issues of identity while maintaining a radical analysis of, and opposition to, global capitalism. Activists in the global North have the advantage of witness? ing firsthand the emergence of the transnational prison-industrial complex as important weapon in the armory of global corporate and political elites. Radical prison abolitionists, especially grass-roots activists of color, have a great deal to add to the global movement against imperialism and neoliberal capitalism. Our combined analyses demonstrate that to build un outro mundo (a different world), we must first envision a world without prisons.

**Prison Workers specifically subsidize weapon production**

Noah **Shachtman**, March 8th **2021**, “Prisoners Help Build Patriot Missiles, [https://www.wired.com/2011/03/prisoners-help-build-patriot-missiles/] // swickle

This spring, the United Arab Emirates is expected to close a deal for $7 billion dollars' worth of American arms. Nearly half of the cash will be spent on Patriot missiles, which cost as much as $5.9 million apiece. But what makes those eye-popping sums even more shocking is that some of the workers manufacturing parts for those Patriot missiles are prisoners, earning as little as 23 cents an hour. (Credit Justin Rohrlich with the catch.) The work is done by Unicor, previously known as Federal Prison Industries. It's a government-owned corporation, established during the Depression, that employs about 20,000 inmates in 70 prisons to make everything from clothing to office furniture to solar panels to military electronics. One of the company's high-tech specialties: Patriot missile parts. "UNICOR/FPI supplies numerous electronic components and services for guided missiles, including the Patriot Advanced Capability (PAC-3) missile," Unicor's website explains. "We assemble and distribute the Intermediate Frequency Processor (IFP) for the PAC-3s seeker. The IFP receives and filters radio-frequency signals that guide the missile toward its target." The missiles are then marketed worldwide -- sometimes by Washington's top officials. Last year, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates pitched the Patriots to the Turkish government last year, a diplomatic cable released by WikiLeaks reveals: "SecDef stressed that 'nothing can compete with the PAC-3 when it comes to capabilities.'" Patriot assemblers Raytheon and Lockheed Martin aren't the only defense contractors relying on prison help. As Rohrlich notes, Unicor "inmates also make cable assemblies for the McDonnell Douglas/Boeing F-15, the General Dynamics/Lockheed Martin F-16, Bell/Textron’s Cobra helicopter, as well as electro-optical equipment for the BAE Systems Bradley Fighting Vehicle’s laser rangefinder." Unicor used to make helmets for the military, as well. But that work was suspended when 44,000 helmets were recalled for shoddy quality. Government agencies -- with the exception of the Defense Department and the CIA -- are required to buy goods from Unicor, according to a Congressional Research Service report (.pdf). And no wonder: the labor costs are bordering on zero. "Inmates earn from $0.23 per hour up to a maximum of $1.15 per hour, depending on their proficiency and educational level, among other things," the report notes. Last year, Unicor grossed $772 million, according to its most recent financial report (.pdf). Traditionally, inmate salaries make up about five percent of that total. Unicor insists that the deal is a good one for inmates -- and for the government. The manufacturing work offers a chance for job training, which "improves the likelihood that inmates will remain crime-free upon their release," the company says in its report. (Some reports suggest that Unicor prisoners are as much as 24% less likely to return to crime.) The work also keeps the inmates in check, Unicor insists. "In the face of an escalating inmate population and an increasing percentage of inmates with histories of violence, FPI’s programs have helped ease tension and avert volatile situations, thereby protecting lives and federal property," the company says. "Prisons without meaningful activities for inmates are dangerous prisons, and dangerous prisons are expensive prisons."

**Prison labor strike action unsettles the carceral state spilling up to larger movements and demystifying the prison.**

**Fox ‘20** [Taylor Fox; a fourth-year in the College studying Political Science and Human Rights; 05-01-2020; “Freedom, Caged: A Foucauldian Inquiry into the National Prison Strike”; Bachelor’s Thesis, University of Chicago; Advisor: Professor Reuben Miller; Preceptor: Alex Haskins; http://pozen.s3.amazonaws.com/system/ckeditor/attachments/435/Fox\_\_Taylor\_BA\_Thesis\_copy.pdf; Accessed 10-09-2021] AK – Recut SAO

By shutting down activity and rejecting the material rhythms of prison life, **strikes unsettle the reproduction of the prison apparatus**. According to Michigan Abolition and Prisoner Solidarity organizer Alejo Stark, these disruptions “intensify the state’s inability to continue to hold prisoners captive,” helping to dismantle the carceral state piece-by-piece.117 One example of disruption can be found in the Crossroads prison uprising, which resulted in the closure of the prison itself through stripping its financial resources. Stark provides another instance of disruption in Michigan’s Kinross prison during the 2016 Strike, during which an uprising forced the state to spend exorbitant financial resources to keep the prison up and running. Because incarcerated kitchen workers were on strike, no one was left to staff the kitchen and “the warden was spotted making peanut butter and jelly sandwiches [for prisoners] with his staff.”118 The point is not that these disruptions will necessarily force the state’s hand in conceding to strikers’ demands, like higher wages, but that the state must devote extra resources to keep prisons alive.119 **A longstanding prison strike tactic, disruption is central to the abolitionist project today**. Like abolition, disruption is processual. In an interview with Shadowproof, a JLS member incarcerated in South Carolina remarked that he thinks about prison organizing as a “a dismantling process. And that gives the opportunity for other people to get in with their reform ideas.”120 Disruption involves mobilizing collective power to chip away at the carceral state, through actions big and small.121 Experiences of freedom emerge through participation in disruption, as protestors refuse to accept the carceral present as a blueprint for the future. Building on the lessons of the 2016 National Prison Strike, 2018 organizers broadened their internal tactics and forms of participation to include sit-ins and commissary boycotts while also re- introducing hunger strikes.122 While work strikes were a central feature of the 2016 Strike, most prisoners don’t actually work, limiting their tactical value. Importantly, disruption does not need to rely on withholding physical labor in order to be successful; work strikes are only one form of doing so. Strikers were influenced by “Redistribute the Pain,” a set of essays by Bennu Hannibal Ra-Sun of the Free Alabama Movement, who called on his fellow prisoners to mobilize their economic power to “boycott, defund, and bankrupt.”123 Ra-Sun urged a commitment to “defund[ing] prison operations budgets” by eliminating spending on commissary, collect phone calls, and incentive packages would shrink a prison’s finances.124 Accordingly, Strike organizers employed a multiplicity of tactics tailored to participants’ levels of access in the prison. For instance, while people on lockdown couldn’t participate in a work stoppage, they could join a boycott or hunger strike. In the year leading up to the Strike, sit-ins notably resurged in popularity across the prison movement. During a sit-in, participants refuse to return to their cells when corrections officers tell them to line up at lunch or yard. Collectively refusing to comply stops the motion of the prison, halting thedailybusinessofcorrectionalstaff.125 Like a boycott, which strips the prison of important financial reserves, sit-ins disrupt the labor power used to fuel the prison’s operations. Florida offers an instructive example of how coordinated tactics on the inside and outside speak to the intersubjective character of freedom, which is constantly in-the-making through struggle. According to the Miami New-Times, work strikes have ballooned over the last few years in response to increasingly poor conditions in Florida’s prisons, such as when prisoners were forced to work for free in clean-up crews after Hurricane Irma in 100-plus-degree conditions.126 Throughout the Strike, hundreds of prisoners in at least five facilities organized work strikes and commissary boycotts.127 Internal participation during these uprisings showed how collective struggles can provide glimpses into alternative ways of organizing power. Returning to Oksala’s reinterpretation of Foucault, these struggles visibilize the “indeterminacy of the present” in their refusal to accept its suffocating terms. Following the prison movement’s long tradition of inside-outside organizing, Strike disruptors understood what happened on the outside to shape the conditions of possibility on the inside.128 For instance, Gainesville’s IWOC chapter coordinated a string of solidarity actions, including an eight-day encampment outside a work release camp.129 In response to a call to escalate strike solidarity over Labor Day weekend, Gainesville IWOC, Fight Toxic Prisons, and Occupy ICE Tampa organized a 24/7 occupation across from the Florida Department of Corrections’ Gainesville Prison Work Camp. The protestors called for an end to “slave labor contractors” between FDOC, the City, County, and University of Florida, in addition to the Strike’s demands.130 Over a hundred people participated in the demonstrations, which included blocking and delaying City vehicles from leaving for work assignments and staging protests at work sites. In an interview with Shadowproof, a JLS prison organizer remarked that “the more people that tend to stand up, demonstrate from the outside, particularly demo[nstration]s at the prisons, what it does is it incites. It incites inside and this is why prisons have a problem against it.”131 In response to the protestors, FDOC officials would frequently usher work crews back into their vans and leave the site in order to eliminate contact with the protestors. On day four, protestors reported that police and prison officials threatened to use prisoner labor to shut down the encampment. In the absence of direct testimony from incarcerated organizers, we can heed Foucault’s dictum of analyzing power (and, by proxy, freedom) through the strategies of its antagonists.132 Returning to FAM’s “Let the Crops Rot in the Fields,” Gainesville protestors collectively “confronted the system at the site of its oppression: the prisons,” centralizing resources and forcing the state’s response.133 By forcefully demanding sets of political alternatives, incarcerated strikers and comrades offered glimpse into what life beyond carcerality could look like. IWOC organizer Nick conceded that “withholding labor” for extended periods of time “as a way of crippling the system is a way’s off,” but also that cases like Gainesville set the pace for larger-scale protests in the future. Gainesville illustrates how the walls of the prison are more porous than any Department of Corrections would have us believe. In other words, the joint protest helped demystify an image of the prison as a self-contained institution impenetrable to outside influence. Most visibly, we can see this through how the occupation disrupted daily life in the work camp, forcing FDOC to rearrange and even suspend production. By refusing to leave for nearly a week, the protestors offered an alternative imaginary of what the work camp could be: a space for music, art, free movement, and collective struggle. But we can also find literal glimpses in reports that, though inside-outside communication was heavily restricted, incarcerated people were seen giving affirmative “nods, smiles and throwing up power fists, even in the face of overseers and guards” to outside protestors.”134 These brief moments gesture toward the kinds of intersubjectivities that uniquely emerge through struggle.

**Eliminating the prison industrial complex is critical to challenging global predatory capitalism**

**Martinot 15 - Steve Martinot, Journal of the Research Group on Socialism and Democracy, November 14th 2015** “Toward the Abolition of the Prison System” [http://sdonline.org/66/toward-the-abolition-of-the-prison-system/] Accessed 1/10/18 SAO

The existentiality of prisons involves not only what prison does directly, but how it affects the society that accepts it as normal, and that can have what prisons do as a purpose. This existential aspect is applicable to all societies that use imprisonment as a way of implementing political decisions. It reflects the understanding that crime itself is politically defined. **Imprisonment as punishment of crime exists only within a matrix of political uses (such as class control**, racialization, social militarization, etc.).1 I will deal with the prison system in the US as the world’s extreme case, that for which all other prison systems are lesser forms. And I will argue that in order to get beyond capitalism, the social/cultural framework that sees prisons as normal will have to be transformed. Every society has its own traditions with respect to imprisonment, but the existentiality of prison will have to be addressed in general. Prison is used to punish. Punishment is used to establish the cultural norms of a society. And law is thus deployed for the creation of cultural norms.2 We can see this not only in US history, but also in the history of the birth of capitalism in Europe. As Silvia Federici has shown, a culture that could accept capitalism arose through the criminalization of women, and through the colonial imposition – via the church – of certain laws, in particular, pertaining to witchcraft.3 In England, the previous norms of cooperative production were squelched and replaced through the state’s systematic torture and murder of anyone who took goods without paying for them. The colonialist context for this discussion is threefold, understanding colonialism as the arrival or invasion of an alien power that dominates for its own benefit an indigenous people, which it then reduces to subhuman status by force and through destruction of the indigenous culture. The US dominates most areas of the world financially or militarily. There is also an internal colonialism in the US governed by the corporate structure, white supremacy, and the structures of racialization;

**Capitalism is the root of all impacts. It’s try or die to avoid global extinction**

**Foster 19 - John Bellamy Foster, Monthly Review, February 1st, 2019** “Capitalism Has Failed—What Next?” [https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/] Accessed 11/19/19 SAO

Less than two decades into the twenty-first century, it is evident that capitalism has failed as a social system. The world is mired in economic stagnation, financialization, and the **most extreme inequality in human history**, accompanied by mass unemployment and underemployment, precariousness, poverty, hunger, wasted output and lives, and what at this point can only be called a **planetary ecological “death spiral**.”1 The digital revolution, the greatest technological advance of our time, has rapidly mutated from a promise of free communication and liberated production into new means of surveillance, control, and displacement of the working population. The institutions of liberal democracy are at the point of collapse, while fascism, the rear guard of the capitalist system, is again on the march, along with **patriarchy, racism, imperialism, and war**. To say that capitalism is a failed system is not, of course, to suggest that its breakdown and disintegration is imminent.2 It does, however, mean that it has passed from being a historically necessary and creative system at its inception to being a historically unnecessary and destructive one in the present century. Today, more than ever, the world is faced with the epochal choice between “the revolutionary reconstitution of society at large and the common ruin