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## 1

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives must defend the desirability of the consequences of the implementation of a hypothetical policy action by a government

#### Resolved means the affirmative must defend the implementation of a policy action by a government

Parcher 1 (Jeff, Fmr. Debate Coach at Georgetown University, February, http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html)

Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constituent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision. (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statemnt of a deciion, as by a legislature. (3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconcievable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues like ground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not. (5) The very terms 'affirmative' and 'negative' support my view. One affirms a resolution. Affirmative and negative are the equivalents of 'yes' or 'no' - which, of course, are answers to a question.

#### First is Procedural fairness – Frame debate as a game---we’re both here to winFirst their interpretation explodes limits and creates incentives for affirmatives to race to the margins and monopolize on the moral high ground by not defending a stable mechanism or actor which allows them to radically re-contextualize the 1AC, and use competition standards like perms to erase neg ground.

#### Fairness is an intrinsic good ¬–it guarantees stasis such that both teams have an equal opportunity to adapt to the arguments made by the other side. The external impact to our form of second order testing is critical thinking, since underprepared negs cant properly test affs; debate becomes meaningless without substantive constraints ---Education matters---it provides portable skills

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for whoever does the better debating over the resolutional question. Any 2AC framework must explain why we switch sides, why there has to be a winner and a loser, and why there are structural rules. T as a rule of the game may resemble the aff’s impacts, but the only thing that makes the two materially equivalent is the ideological investment in T’s ability to do violence that they espouse.

#### Second is deliberation: The shifted balance of research that inevitably occurs under their interpretation annihilates effective dialogue regarding the topic – this shuts down the internal deliberation that is resolved by our focus on a common ground for debate. Only our inauguration of deliberation into the debate space allows for contested debate and clash which causes individuals to alter the presupposed world views—this does not limit particular styles, but only tying those to topical advocacy ensures clash

#### Third is mechanism education---Successful movement organizing is analogous to mainstream politics -- it requires skilled organization, strategic flexibility, effective management, and proto-institutionalism -- sacrificing debate as training in favor of being a revolutionary for a weekend ensures failure.

Heller 17 [Nathan Heller began contributing to The New Yorker in 2011, and joined the magazine as a staff writer in 2013. He has written on a range of subjects, including online education and the TED Conference. He is also a film and television critic, and a contributing editor, at Vogue. Previously, he was a columnist for Slate, where he was a finalist for a National Magazine Award for essays and criticism. Is There Any Point to Protesting? August 21, 2017. https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2017/08/21/is-there-any-point-to-protesting]

Tufekci’s conclusions about the civil-rights movement are unsettling because of what they imply. People such as Kauffman portray direct democracy as a scrappy, passionate enterprise: the underrepresented, the oppressed, and the dissatisfied get together and, strengthened by numbers, force change. Tufekci suggests that the movements that succeed are actually proto-institutional: highly organized; strategically flexible, due to sinewy management structures; and chummy with the sorts of people we now call élites. The Montgomery N.A.A.C.P. worked with Clifford Durr, a patrician lawyer whom Franklin Roosevelt had appointed to the F.C.C., and whose brother-in-law Hugo Black was a Supreme Court Justice when Browder v. Gayle was heard. The organizers of the March on Washington turned to Bobby Kennedy—the U.S. Attorney General and the brother of the sitting President—when Rustin’s prized sound system was sabotaged the day before the protest. Kennedy enlisted the Army Signal Corps to fix it. You can’t get much cozier with the Man than that. Far from speaking truth to power, successful protests seem to speak truth through power. (The principle holds for such successful post-sixties movements as ACT UP, with its structure of caucuses and expert working groups. And it forces one to reassess the rise of well-funded “Astroturf” movements such as the Tea Party: successful grassroots lawns, it turns out, have a bit of plastic in them, too.) Democratizing technology may now give the voiceless a means to cry in the streets, but real results come to those with the same old privileges—time, money, infrastructure, an ability to call in favors—that shape mainline politics.

Unsurprisingly, this realization irks the Jacobins. Hardt and Negri, as well as Srnicek and Williams, rail at length against “neoliberalism”: a fashionable bugaboo on the left, and thus, unfortunately, a term more often flaunted than defined. (Neoliberalism can broadly refer to any program that involves market-liberal policies—privatization, deregulation, etc.—and so includes everything from Thatcher’s social-expenditure reductions to Obama’s global-trade policies. A moratorium on its use would help solidify a lot of gaseous debate.) According to them, neoliberalism lurks everywhere that power resides, beckoning friendly passersby into its drippy gingerbread house. Hardt and Negri dismiss “participating in government, respecting capitalist discipline, and creating structures for labor and business to collaborate,” because, they say, “reformism in this form has proven to be impossible and the social benefits it promises are an illusion.” They favor antagonistic pressure, leading to a revolution with no central authority (a plan perhaps more promising in theory than in practice). Srnicek and Williams don’t reject working with politicians, though they think that real transformation comes from shifts in social expectation, in school curricula, and in the sorts of things that reasonable people discuss on TV (the so-called Overton window). It’s an ambitious approach but not an outlandish one: Bernie Sanders ran a popular campaign, and suddenly socialist projects were on the prime-time docket. Change does arrive through mainstream power, but this just means that your movement should be threaded through the culture’s institutional eye.

The question, then, is what protest is for. Srnicek and Williams, even after all their criticism, aren’t ready to let it go—they describe it as “necessary but insufficient.” Yet they strain to say just how it fits with the idea of class struggle in a postindustrial, smartphone-linked world. “If there is no workplace to disrupt, what can be done?” they wonder. Possibly their telescope is pointing the wrong way round. Much of their book attempts to match the challenges of current life—a shrinking manufacturing sphere, a global labor surplus, a mire of race-inflected socioeconomic traps—with Marx’s quite specific precepts about the nineteenth-century European economy. They define the proletariat as “that group of people who must sell their labor powers to live.” It must be noted that this group—now comprising Olive Garden waiters, coders based in Bangalore, janitors, YouTube stars, twenty-two-year-olds at Goldman Sachs—is really very broad. A truly modern left, one cannot help but think, would be at liberty to shed a manufacturing-era, deterministic framework like Marxism, allegorized and hyperextended far beyond its time. Still, to date no better paradigm for labor economics and uprising has emerged.

What comes undone here is the dream of protest as an expression of personal politics. Those of us whose days are filled with chores and meetings may be deluding ourselves to think that we can rise as “revolutionaries-for-a-weekend”—Norman Mailer’s phrase for his own bizarre foray, in 1967, as described in “The Armies of the Night.” Yet that’s not to say the twenty-four-year-old who quits his job and sleeps in a tent to affirm his commitment does more. The recent studies make it clear that protest results don’t follow the laws of life: eighty per cent isn’t just showing up. Instead, logistics reign and then constrain. Outcomes rely on how you coördinate your efforts, and on the skill with which you use existing influence as help.

If that seems a deflating idea, it only goes to show how entrenched self-expressive protest has become in political identity. In one survey, half of Occupy Wall Street allies turned out to be fully employed: even that putatively radical economic movement was largely middle class. (Also, as many noted, it was largely white.) That may be because even the privileged echelons of working America are mad as hell and won’t take it anymore. But it may also be because the social threshold for protest-joining is low. A running joke in “The Armies of the Night” is that many of the people who went off to demonstrate were affluent egghead types—unsure, self-obsessed, squeamish, and, in many ways, pretty conservative. “There was an air of Ivy League intimacy to the quiet conversations on this walk—it could not really be called a March,” Mailer says. Writing of himself: “He found a friendly face. It was Gordon Rogoff, an old friend from Actors Studio, now teaching at the Yale Drama School; they talked idly about theatrical matters for a while.” This has been the cultural expectation since the late sixties, even as tactical protest has left mainstream power behind. As citizens, we get two chips—one for the ballot box, the other for the soapbox. Many of us feel compelled to make use of them both.

Would casual activists be better off deploying their best skills toward change (teachers teaching, coders coding, celebrities celebritizing) and leaving direct action in the hands of organizational pros? That seems sad, and a good recipe for lax, unchecked, uncoördinated effort. Should they work indirectly—writing letters, calling senators, and politely nagging congresspeople on Twitter? That involves no cool attire or clever signs, and no friends who’ll cheer at every turn. But there’s reason to believe that it works, because even bad legislators pander to their electorates. In a new book, “The Once and Future Liberal” (Harper), Mark Lilla urges a turn back toward governmental process. “The role of social movements in American history, while important, has been seriously inflated by left-leaning activists and historians,” he writes. “The age of movement politics is over, at least for now. We need no more marchers. We need more mayors.” Folk politics, tracing a fifty-year anti-establishmentarian trend, flatters a certain idea of heroism: the system, we think, must be fought by authentic people. Yet that outlook is so widely held now that it occupies the highest offices of government. Maybe, in the end, the system is the powerless person’s best bet.

Or maybe direct action is something to value independent of its results. No specific demands were made at the Women’s March, in January. The protest produced no concrete outcomes, and it held no legislators to account. And yet the march, which encompassed millions of people on every continent, including Antarctica, cannot be called a failure. At a time when identity is presumed to be clannish and insular, it offered solidarity on a vast scale.

What was the Women’s March about? Empowerment, human rights, discontent—you know. Why did it matter? Because we were there. Self-government remains a messy, fussy, slow, frustrating business. We do well to remind those working its gears and levers that the public—not just the appalled me but the conjoined us whom the elected serve—is watching and aware. More than two centuries after our country took its shaky first steps, the union is miles from perfection. But it is still on its feet, sometimes striding, frequently stumbling. The march goes on, and someday, not just in our dreams, we’ll make it home.

#### Research is the lynchpin of successful movement building----ill-informed protests lose credibility, obviate answering essential questions, and prevent intersectionality

Barber 4/4, (William J. Barber is the architect of the Forward Together Moral Movement that gained national acclaim with its Moral Monday protests at the North Carolina General Assembly in 2013. These weekly actions drew tens of thousands of North Carolinians to the state legsialture. He has served as president of the North Carolina NAACP, the largest state conference in the South, since 2006 and sits on the National NAACP Board of Directors. Bishop Barber is regularly featured in media outlets including MSNBC, CNN, The New York Times, The Washington Post and The Nation Magazine, among others. He is the 2015 recipient of the Puffin Award and the Franklin D. Roosevelt Four Freedoms Award. His two most recent books include Forward Together (Chalice Press) and The Third Reconstruction (Beacon Press). The recipient of numerous awards, in 2018 Barber was named a MacArthur Fellow for “building broad-based fusion coalitions as part of a moral movement to confront racial and economic inequality.” Reverend Dr. Barber received a Master of Divinity from Duke University; and a doctorate from Drew University with a concentration in Public Policy and Pastoral Care.) “Research Is Vital to the Moral Integrity of Social Movements.” Economic Policy Institute, 4 Apr. 2019, www.epi.org/blog/research-is-vital-to-the-moral-integrity-of-social-movements/.//KK

The faith community has a long history of involvement in social movements for economic justice, bringing into focus the moral failings of our political and economic systems. I’m always struck when people say to me, “But you’re talking about morality, and we’re talking about money.” I answer, “You really think they’re different? You don’t recognize that a budget is a moral document? That policies are about moral decisions? That morality is not just about inspiration but about information?” I realize that for some, the concept of a preacher writing for an economics blog might seem odd, but the link between what I do—as a pastor, architect of the Moral Monday movement and co-leader of The Poor People’s Campaign—and the research done by EPI is absolutely vital. One of the quickest ways for a movement to lose its integrity is to be loud and wrong. We’ve seen too many movements that have bumper sticker sayings but no stats and no depth. Researchers help to protect the moral integrity of a movement by providing sound analysis of the facts and issues at hand. Armed with this information, we’re able to pull back the cover and force society to see the hurt and the harm of the decisions that people are making. In fact, I believe we find evidence of a relationship between religion, activism, and research that dates back to the prophets of the Bible. The prophets of the Bible were the social activists of their time. I say that because the only time prophets in ancient Israel rose to the fore was when the kings or the politicians and their court chaplains weren’t doing their job. For example, the prophet Isaiah said to those who were rich, powerful and presumed themselves to be morally superior. “Woe unto those who legislate evil and rob the poor of their rights and make women and children their prey.” Isaiah even went as far as saying that religious activity—worship and prayer—was not a cover for their failure to “loose the band of wickedness.” Wickedness in that text is specific to the issue of not paying people what they deserve and trying to cover it over with a lot of religiosity. He goes on to say that the nation will never be able to repair itself until it ends the wickedness of not paying people what they deserve. Because society’s policies had actually insulated destruction, injustice and inequality could never be resolved without a change of policy. These statements reflect more than just a difference of opinion concerning the legislation. Rather, such bold and specific statements suggest an analysis of the society which concluded that the legislation was evil in that it was robbing those who were most vulnerable. In other words, Isaiah’s moral authority to criticize policy could be confirmed and validated by research. Now, let’s consider Jesus, the central figure of the Christian faith, who was also very keen on social policy. The opening line of his first sermon went like this: “The spirit of the Lord is upon me for he hath anointed me to preach good news to the poor.” The researchers would have told Jesus in that day that Rome favored the 1 percent and disregarded the 99 percent. That Rome had distinct classes of people. One group of people were called the humiliadors, the humiliated ones. The others were called the honoristeries, the honored ones. The honored ones controlled politics. They wanted all the tax cuts. They wanted the law to favor them and they expressed their grandeur by flaunting and boasting on their entourages, their dress, and their education. It was into that world that Jesus comes and says, no, this is wrong. This is not the way it should be. This may be Caesar’s way, but Caesar is an egotistical narcissistic builder who loves to put his name on buildings and if he could, would put his face on every coin. Caesar is the one who desires military parades to flaunt and boast about his position of authority. Caesar believed he had the authority to grab any woman any time he wanted to. Caesar only wanted people around him who told him what he wanted to hear. Caesar only cared about money. Everything was about money. If it’s unclear, I’m talking about something that happened 2000 years ago. Into this, Jesus comes and says the spirit of the Lord, which is above Caesar, is focused on the poor. Now, there are three words for poor in Greek. But, the one used to describe this moral movement of Jesus is ptchos, which literally means those who have been made poor by exploitive policies. So Jesus had to have some research around in order to say in his first sermon, “I’m calling out the policies and declaring that they are wrong.” In our contemporary society, researchers protect the integrity of movements in other important ways. When we started the Moral Monday Movement in North Carolina, the first thing we did was create a budget so that we could answer up front the critique that always arises, which is “that would be a nice moral thing to do, but it’ll raise taxes.” As Joseph Stiglitz, the Nobel Prize winning economist has said, we have to deal not just with what it costs to fix inequality, but what inequality is costing us. So, for each issue we wanted to raise, we calculated the cost of doing it, and the cost of not doing it. The research that goes into developing that kind of budget helps us to disarm the obvious critiques of our movement, but also puts us in a position to challenge our critics on the costs of opposing or stifling attempts to find solutions. When we lead public demonstrations, research provides an empirical connection to the anger and legitimate discontent being expressed. Research also provides connections for building unity. Right now in the Poor People’s Campaign, we are saying that there are five potentially fatal diseases that are impacting this democracy: systemic racism, systemic poverty, ecological devastation, the war economy, and the false distorted moral narrative of religious nationalism that gives cover for the four other social diseases. What our movement is saying is that we have to have researchers that can connect all five of them and help people to understand that you cannot talk about economic advancement, living wages, and lifting the poor if you don’t deal with the systemic racism, for instance, of voter suppression. You can’t talk about either of those two without talking about ecological devastation, including the fact that the first people who are going to be impacted will be poor people, and those poor people will disproportionately be people of color. We have to have researchers that can help movements and the larger public to understand these connections. Research and revolutions go hand in hand because you can’t challenge Rome if you are Rome. Revolutionaries have to be re-educated by the research because that’s what helps them think beyond the predominant mindset of the larger society. For example, most people don’t realize that voter suppression in this moment is more of a white issue than a black issue. The research shows that the states that have participated in racialized voter suppression are among the poorest states in the nation. So the people that get elected through racialized voter suppression pass policies that hurt mostly white people because they are still the majority of the population in those states. We’re losing too often on these issues because we work in silos with black folk on one end fighting against voter suppression and then white folk on the other end fighting neo-liberalism. We work in silos because we’ve been conditioned to think they are separate issues when in fact they’re all connected. People are ready for a grown-up, researched movement that can handle dealing with race and poverty, and ecological devastation, and the war economy all in the same space, and can use that kind of power and research to build out a long-term strategy. That is what it takes to register people for the movement who vote. So, where do we start? I believe it starts with changing the South. We do that by building the coalitions of white and black and brown and Latino and Asian and poor folk in the South to raise up this movement and to vote. That’s what it’s going to take to shift the political calculus in this country. For eleven years I’ve been saying we’re in the midst of the birthing pains of a Third Reconstruction. But we cannot wait until election season to do the work. It has to be done year round and every year. I want to give you some numbers to consider—178, 26, 31 percent, 100 million, 40 million. Now, why those numbers? If you calculate the number of electoral votes available from the 13 former Confederate states from Virginia to Texas, you come up with 178 electoral votes. Which means, any candidate that gives away the 178 electoral votes in those 13 states, puts their opponent in the position of only needing 92 electoral votes from the other 37 states. The 13 former Confederate states, which only have about 36 percent of this country’s population, decide 178 electoral votes, 26 United States Senate seats and 35 percent of the seats in the United States House of Representatives. That means all it takes to win control of both houses of Congress is 25 Senate seats and 16 percent of U.S. House of Representatives seats available from the other 37 states. 100 million is the number of people that didn’t vote in the 2016 election. 40 million is the number of poor and low-wealth people in this country. The majority of them are in the South and are the key to the transformation of our politics. All of the close elections we witnessed in the 2018 midterms are a sign that we are right at the tipping point. If there’s ever been a time that we ought to go south and shift the political calculus in this nation for the next 20 to 40 years and beyond, it is in fact right now. Don’t believe the talking heads who haven’t done the research, or just don’t want the public to know that if you registered 30 percent of unregistered black voters in the South and connected with progressive Whites and Latinos you could flip about five Southern states right now: Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Georgia, and Mississippi. Perhaps Texas and maybe even South Carolina. That’s what the research says, even though it’s not what the talking heads are saying. A movement connected to the right researchers can do this, must do this and has to do this. This is our movement and our moment. I believe with everything inside of me that if you give us the data, the research and the analysis we need to create budgets that put “ordinary” people first, we will change this nation.

#### That is the difference between effective movements and ones that cement authoritarianism -- activism is not automatic, but requires learning to defend a proposal against rigorous negation to develop skills for strategy, organizing, problem-solving, using resources, and creating coalitions -- their impact turns aren’t unique because the government will inevitably try to capture public anxiety, the only question is creating alternative incentives for people to organize.

Lakey 13 [George Lakey co-founded Earth Quaker Action Group which just won its five-year campaign to force a major U.S. bank to give up financing mountaintop removal coal mining. Along with college teaching he has led 1,500 workshops on five continents and led activist projects on local, national, and international levels. Among many other books and articles, he is author of “Strategizing for a Living Revolution” in David Solnit’s book Globalize Liberation. 8 skills of a well-trained activist. June 11, 2013. <https://wagingnonviolence.org/feature/8-skills-of-a-well-trained-activist/>]

Why more training now?

The history of training is a history of playing catch-up. Very few movements seem to realize that the pace of change can accelerate so rapidly that it outstrips the movement’s ability to use its opportunities fully. In Istanbul a small group of environmentalists sit down to save a park, and suddenly there are protests in over 60 Turkish cities; the agenda expands, from green space to governance to capitalism; doors open everywhere. It would be a good moment to have tens of thousands of skilled organizers ready to seize the day, supporting smart direct action and building prefigurative institutions. But excitement alone may slacken; as with the Occupy movement, spontaneous creativity has its limits.

With the right skills, movements can sustain themselves for years against punishing, murderous resistance. The mass direct action phase of the civil rights movement pushed on effectively for a decade after 1955. Mass excitement doesn’t need to fizzle in a year. A movement thrives by solving the problems it faces.

Anti-authoritarians don’t want to count on a movement’s top leaders to be the problem-solvers, but instead to develop shared leadership by fostering problem-solving smarts at the grassroots. There’s nothing automatic about grassroots problem-solving. How well people strategize, organize, invent creative tactics, reach effectively to allies, use the full resources of the group and persevere at times of discouragement — all that can be enhanced by training.

Nothing is more predictable than that there will be increased turbulence in the United States and many other societies. Activists cause some of the turbulence by rising up; other turbulence results from things like climate change, the 1 percent’s austerity programs and other forces outside activists’ immediate control.

Increased turbulence scares a lot of people. It’s only natural that people will look around for reassurance. The ruling class will offer one kind of reassurance. The big question is: What reassurance will the movement offer?

When students in Paris in May 1968 launched a campaign that quickly moved into nationwide turbulence, with 11 million workers striking and occupying, there was a momentary chance for the middle class to side with the students and workers instead of siding with the 1 percent. The movement, though, didn’t understand enough about the basic human need for security and failed to use its opportunity. That was a strategic error, but to choose a different path the movement would have required participants with more skills. Training would have been necessary. We can learn from this, inventory the skills needed and train ourselves accordingly.

What is training ready to do for us?

Here are a few of the key benefits that we should expect to gain from one another through training:

1. Increase the creativity of direct action strategy and tactics. The Yes Men and the Center for Story-Based Strategy lead workshops in which activist groups break out of the lockstep of “marches-and-rallies.” We need to have a broad array of tactics at our disposal, and we have to be ready to invent new ones when necessary.

2. Prepare participants psychologically for the struggle. The Pinochet regime in Chile depended, as dictatorships usually do, on fear to maintain its control. In the 1980s a group committed to nonviolent struggle encouraged people to face their fears directly in a three-step process: small group training sessions in living rooms, followed by “hit-and-run” nonviolent actions, followed by debriefing sessions. By teaching people to control their fear, trainers were building a movement to overthrow the dictator.

3. Develop group morale and solidarity for more effective action. In 1991 members of ACT UP — a militant group protesting U.S. AIDS policy — were beaten up by Philadelphia police during a demonstration. The police were found guilty of using unnecessary force and the city paid damages, but ACT UP members realized they could reduce the chance of future brutality by working in a more united and nonviolent way. Before their next major action they invited a trainer to conduct a workshop where they clarified the strategic question of nonviolence and then role-played possible scenarios. The result: a high-spirited, unified and effective action.

4. Deepen participants’ understanding of the issues. The War Resisters League’s Handbook for Nonviolent Action is an example of the approach that takes even a civil disobedience training as an opportunity to assist participants to take a next step regarding racism, sexism and the like. When we understand how seemingly separate struggles are connected, it helps us create a broader, stronger, more interconnected movement.

5. Build skills for applying nonviolent action in situations of threat and turbulence. In Haiti a hit squad abducted a young man just outside the house where a trained peace team was staying; the team immediately intervened and, although surrounded by twice their number of guards with weapons, succeeded in saving the man from being hung. Through training, we can learn how to react to emergencies like this in disciplined, effective ways.

6. Build alliances across movement lines. In Seattle in the 1980s, a workshop drew striking workers from the Greyhound bus company and members of ACT UP. The workshop reduced the prejudice each group had about the other, and it led some participants to support each other’s struggle. Trainings are a valuable opportunity to bring people from different walks of life together and help them work toward their common goals.

7. Create activist organizations that don’t burn people out. The Action Mill, Spirit in Action, and the Stone House all offer workshops to help activists to stay active in the long run. I’ve seen a lot of accumulated skill lost to movements over the years because people didn’t have the support or endurance to stay in the fight.

8. Increase democracy within the movement. In the 1970s the Movement for a New Society developed a pool of training tools and designs that it shared with the grassroots movement against nuclear power. The anti-nuclear movement went up against some of the largest corporations in America and won. The movement delayed construction, which raised costs, and planted so many seeds of doubt in the public mind about safety that the eventual meltdown of the Three Mile Island plant brought millions of people to the movement’s point of view. The industry’s goal of building 1,000 nuclear plants evaporated. Significantly, the campaign succeeded without needing to create a national structure around a charismatic leader. Activists learned the skills of shared leadership and democratic decision-making through workshops, practice and feedback. In my book Facilitating Group Learning, I share many lessons that have evolved from Freire’s day to ours.

I hope that readers of this column will add to the list of training providers in the comments, since I’ve only named some. My intention is to remind us that this could be the right moment, before the next wave of turbulence has all of us in crisis-mode again, to increase training capacity for grassroots skill-building. We’ll be very glad we did.

#### You should also filter their impacts through predictable testability and model comparison -- debate inherently judges relative truth value by whether or not it gets answered -- a combination of a less predictable case neg, the burden of rejoinder, and them starting a speech ahead will always inflate the value of their impacts, which makes non-arbitrarily weighing whether they should have read the 1ac in the first place impossible within the structure of a debate round so even if we lose framework, vote neg on presumption. They also create a moral hazard that leads to affs only about individual self-care so even if you think this aff is answerable, the ones they incentivize are not, so assume the worst possible affirmative when weighing our impacts.

#### Here’s some terminal Defense to their education – we can attain the same education by being topical

#### 1. They can read their critical theory arguments as a framework for their impacts but defend government action. Even if government action alone is insufficient, changing the government is part of a strategy to combat multiple forms of oppression.

#### 2. Being Neg solves their offense. All their offense for why the topic is bad are arguments the negative can read against topical affs, which fosters the same discussion.

#### 3. A topical version of the aff solves their offense and any solvency deficits they can identify with the TVA are just pieces of negative ground---perfect Affirmatives don’t allow for testing

#### [ TVA: The just government ought to mandate unconditional worker strikes for Asian-American workers. ]

**Interpretation—the neg must prove the status quo or a competitive policy is more desirable than the aff advocacy. “Ought” is a modal verb that implies probability.**

**Cambridge Dictionary no date** [Merriam Webster Dictionary, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ought>]

**Ought to: used to show when it is necessary or would be a good thing to perform the activity** referred to by the following verb: EXAMPLE: “**If there's any doubt about the rocket's engines, we ought to cancel the launch.** I'm surprised at you behaving so badly - you ought to know better.

**Our interp doesn’t deny truth-testing entirely, but limits it to arguments that test truth *by competing with the plan*, which excludes skep and a prioris. Those limits make ground more balanced. This takes out arguments that our interp collapses to or assumes truth-testing.**

**This also answers skep because ought includes non-moral reasons, which the aff provides and skep doesn’t answer.**

**A. Research – proving the converse means they have to research the plan itself. Their model allows them to recycle generic objections to moral truth statements and avoid learning about the topic.**

**B. Strat skew – the negative can challenge the truth of the statement from many angles that aren’t offense for the aff. Moral skepticism, error theory, epistemological skepticism, and circumvention are each necessary but insufficient burdens and the 1AC can’t equip itself to answer all of them.**

## 2

#### The 1ac is just an infoshop—an organization where radicals meet to discuss ideals in the abstract—this disconnection from society precludes any possibility or revolutionary change. True politics must occur at a level of class consciousness and organizing, they just recreate new elitism and maintain the status quo.

Olson 2013 (Joel, associate professor at Northern Arizona University, “The problem with infoshops and insurrection US anarchism, movement building, and the racial order”, ‘Contemporary Anarchist Studies’, published in 2013)

An infoshop is a space where people can learn about radical ideas, where radicals can meet other radicals, and where political work (such as meetings, public forums, fundraisers, etc.) can get done. In the infoshop strategy, infoshops and other “autonomous zones” model the free society (Bey 1985). Building “free spaces” inspires others to spontaneously create their own, spreading “counterinstitutions” throughout society to the point where they become so numerous that they overwhelm the powers that be. The very creation of anarchist free spaces has revolutionary implications, then, because it can lead to the “organic” (i.e. spontaneous, undirected, nonhierarchical) spreading of such spaces throughout society in a way that eventually challenges the state. An insurrection, meanwhile, is the armed uprising of the people. According to the insurrection strategy, anarchists acting in affinity groups or other small informal organizations engage in actions that encourage spontaneous uprisings in various sectors of society. As localized insurrections grow and spread, they combine into a full-scale revolution that overthrows the state and capital and makes possible the creation of a free society.3 Infoshops serve very important functions and any movement needs such spaces. Likewise, insurrection is a central event in any revolution, for it turns the patient organizing of the movement and the boiling anger of the people into an explosive confrontation with the state. The problem is when infoshops and insurrection are seen as revolutionary strategies in themselves rather than as part of a broader revolutionary movement. In the infoshop model, autonomous spaces become the movement for radical change rather than serving it. The insurrection model tries to replace movement building with spontaneous upheaval rather than seeing upheaval as an outcome of social movements. The infoshops and insurrection models, in other words, both misunderstand the process of social transformation. Radical change may be initiated by spontaneous revolts that are supported by subterranean free spaces, but these revolts are almost always the product of prior political movement building, and their gains must be consolidated by political organizations, not the spaces such organizations use. Social movements, then, are central to radical change. The classical anarchists understood this well, for they were very concerned to build working-class movements, such as Bakunin’s participation in the International Working Men’s Association, Berkman and Goldman’s support for striking workers, Lucy Parson’s work in the International Working People’s Association, and the Wobblies’ call for “One Big Union.” (To be sure, there were also practices of building free spaces and engaging in “propaganda by the deed” in classical anarchism, but these were not the sole or even dominant approaches.) Yet surprisingly much of the contemporary anarchist milieu has abandoned movement building. In fact, the infoshops and insurrection models both seem to be designed, at least in part, to avoid the slow, difficult, but absolutely necessary work of building mass movements. Indeed, anarchist publications like Green Anarchy are explicit about this, deriding movement building as inherently authoritarian (for example Morefus n.d.). The anarchist emphasis on hierarchy contributes to this impatience with movement building because the kind of political work it encourages are occasional protests or “actions” against myriad forms of domination rather than sustained organizing based on a coherent strategy to win political space in a protracted struggle. A revolution is not an infoshop, or an insurrection, or creating a temporary autonomous zone, or engaging in sabotage; it cannot be so easy, so evolutionary, so “organic,” so absent of difficult political struggle. A revolution is an actual historical event whereby one class overthrows another and – in the anarchist ideal – thereby makes it possible to abolish all forms of oppression. Such revolutions are the product of mass movements: a large group of people organized in struggle against the state and/or other institutions of power to achieve their demands. When movements become powerful enough, when they sufficiently weaken elites, and when fortune is on their side, they lead to an insurrection, and then perhaps a revolution. Yet in much of the anarchist milieu today, building free spaces and/or creating disorder are regarded as the movement itself rather than components of one. Neither the infoshops nor insurrection models build movements that can express the organized power of the working class. Thus, the necessary, difficult, slow, and inspiring process of building movements falls through the cracks between sabotage and the autonomous zone. Ironically, this leads many anarchists to take an elitist approach to political work. Divorced from a social movement, the strategy of building autonomous zones or engaging in direct action with small affinity groups assumes that radicals can start the revolution. But revolutionaries don’t make revolutions. Millions of ordinary and oppressed people do. Anarchist theory and practice today provides little sense of how these people are going to be part of the process, other than to create their own “free spaces” or to spontaneously join the festivals of upheaval. This is an idealistic, ahistorical, and, ironically, an elitist approach to politics, one that is curiously separated from the struggles of the oppressed themselves. C.L.R. James argues that the task of the revolutionary is to recognize, record, and engage: recognize in the struggles of the working class the effort to build a new society within the shell of the old; record those struggles and show the working class this record so they can see for themselves what they are doing and how it fits into a bigger picture; engage in these struggles with the working class, participating rather than dominating, earning leadership rather than assuming it, and applying lessons learned from previous struggles (James et al. 1974).4 This is a much more modest role for revolutionaries than germinating the revolution or sparking it, and one that is clearly consistent with anarchist politics. Yet the infoshops and insurrectionary models reject this approach for a top-down one in which anarchists “show the way” for the people to follow, never realizing that throughout history, revolutionaries (including anarchist ones) have always been trying to follow and catch up to the masses, not the other way around.

#### The impact is racial capitalism: the global system that is recognized by war, colonialism, slavery, genocide, fascism, and dispossession – it deploys liberalist ideals of individualism that corrupts movements and undermines any and all social change.

Jodi Melamed, 2015, is associate professor of English and Africana Studies at Marquette University. She is the author of Represent and Destroy: Rationalizing Violence in the New Racial Capitalism (University of Minnesota Press, 2011) and has published many articles and chapters in a wide array of journals and editions “Racial Capitalism” published in Critical Ethnic Studies , Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 2015), pp. 76-85. https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/jcritethnstud.1.1.0076

This contribution to the inaugural volume of the Critical Ethnic Studies seeks to strengthen the activist hermeneutic “**racial capitalism” to respond to three conditions** with which critical ethnic studies must reckon in the present. The first is that so-called **primitive accumulation—where capital is accrued through transparently violent means (war, land-grabbing, dispossession, neo/colonialism)—has become everywhere interlinked and continuous** with accumulation through expanded reproduction, which we used to think of as requiring only “the silent compulsion of economic relations.”1 **With the top 10 percent taking 50 percent of total U.S. income** in 2012, and the top 1 percent taking a striking 95 percent of all post-Recession income gains, it has become increasingly plain that **accumulation for financial asset owning classes requires violence toward others and seeks to expropriate for capital the entire field of social provision (land, work, education, health).**2 The second condition is the **degree to which ideologies of individualism, liberalism, and democracy, shaped by and shaping market economies and capitalist rationality from their mutual inception, monopolize the terms of sociality,** despite their increasing hollowness in the face of neoliberalism’s predations. The third condition is the emergence of new horizons of activism that challenge the interpretative limits of ethnic studies in that they exceed the antimonies of political/economic activism, bust up old terms and geographies of solidarity, and are often Indigenous-led, requiring a rethinking of activist scholarship in light of the importance of Indigenous activism and critical theory. Our dominant critical understanding of the term racial capitalism stays close to the usage of its originator, Cedric Robinson, in his seminal Black Marxism: The Making of a Black Radical Tradition. 3 Robinson develops the term to correct the developmentalism and racism that led Marx and Engels to believe mistakenly that European bourgeois society would rationalize social relations. Instead, Robinson explains, the obverse occurred: “**The development, organization, and expansion of capitalist society pursued essentially racial directions, so too did social ideology. As a material force . . . racialism would inevitably permeate the social structures emergent from capitalism**. I have used the term ‘racial capitalism’ to refer . . . to the subsequent structure as a historical agency.”4 Thus the term “racial capitalism” requires its users to recognize that capitalism is racial capitalism. **Capital can only be capital when it is accumulating, and it can only accumulate by producing and moving through relations of severe inequality among human groups**—c

#### The alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only the vertical dual power organizing can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct unproductive tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for international liberation.

**Escalante 18**  
(Alyson Escalante, you should totally read her work for non-debate reasons, Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/> rvs)

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: **in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party.** It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for **holding party members accountable**,

## Case

trix

#### 你不知道你在说什么- Robust social psychology evidence verifies our approach – political transformations like the aff intervene in social norms can prevent the formation of implicit biases

**Matthew 15.**Dayna Bowen Matthew, William L. Matheson and Robert M. Morgenthau Distinguished Professor of Law at UVA School of Law, F. Palmer Weber Research Professor of Civil Liberties and Human Rights, previously served on the University of Colorado law faculty as a professor, vice dean and associate dean of academic affairs, J.D. from the University of Virginia (*Just Medicine: A Cure for Racial Inequality in American Health Care*, “From Inequity to Intervention,” New York University Press, pages 155-158

Evidence that **Implicit Biases Are Malleable** **Social scientists have developed a body of empirical evidence that shows implicit biases are malleable** over the past quarter century.2 **The empirical record is now well established** **and offers strong evidence that implicit attitudes are neither inaccessible nor inescapable**; **they are not impossible to control**; they are not out of reach. In fact, **implicit associations can be influenced both by the individual who unconsciously holds these stereotypes and prejudices and by external factors**. Researchers have reported and reviewed numerous studies3 that put two important misconceptions about implicit biases to rest. First, **the evidence demonstrates that unconscious implicit attitudes are responsive to the deliberate choices and influences of an individual even though that person is not consciously experiencing the bias**. Second, implicit biases are not impervious to relatively short-term change even though they arise from social knowledge that was acquired slowly, and over a lifetime. In fact, the evidence reveals that **learning can continue to take place and alter social group knowledge**, after initial attitudes and associations are formed. Take, for example, a person who developed bad driving habits over time and subconsciously incorporated those habits into driving behavior for many years. If this person chooses to be mindful of improving his or her driving, either out of a conscious decision to do so or in response to external influences, those bad habits can be altered. External authorities may incentivize improvement through a media campaign, new rules of the road, prosecution for reckless driving, or a driver’s education class. Thus, **malleability describes an ongoing learning process in which people with old, objectionable implicit biases learn to respond to newer, more appropriate attitudes and beliefs**. Put another way, **longstanding and unconscious thinking can change**. This understanding of malleability is called the “connectionist” model of implicit bias. **Unlike the prior notion that implicit associations are static and inaccessibly fixed, the empirical record reveals that stereotypes and prejudicial beliefs to which we may adhere at any given time are “states” of thinking** that form based on past experiences and current inputs. **Biases can be reviseddepending upon current informational inputs gathered and weighed with each new encounter**. **This flexible view of stereotyping replaces an outdated rigid one** and allows for the evidence that individuals can constantly update the stored group knowledge that produces implicit biases. The connectionist model explains that a stereotype is merely a pattern of activation that, at a given point in time, is jointly determined by current input (i.e., the context) and the weight of the new information’s connection to existing and underlying beliefs.4 Psychologists now conclude that “**stereotypes are quite elastic and thus any individual could hold and even change an infinite number of representations of social category’s members, when viewed across time and place**.”5 The connectionist model contrasts with **early theories of implicit bias**, which **focused on their automaticity**. “Automaticity” refers generally to the way that individuals make associations without any awareness, without intentionality, and without responsibility for the influence the associations have in directing their conduct and choices.6 **Early researchers concluded that automaticity meant inevitability**. For example, one researcher said, “a crucial component of automatic processes is their inescapability; they occur despite deliberate attempts to bypass or ignore them.”7 **This view is no longer correct**. Over the past twenty years, **researchers have collected a strong record to contradict this notion that implicit attitudes change slowly**, if at all, **simply because they develop slowly over time**. This idea has been replaced by what Dr. Irene Blair has called “the now-bountiful evidence that automatic attitudes—like self-reported attitudes—are sensitive to personal, social, and situational pressures.”8 Blair points out that “**the conclusion that automatic stereotypes and prejudice are not as inflexible as previously assumed is strengthened by the number and variety of demonstrations**. . . . The fact that the tests were conducted in the service of many different goals, and by the similarity of findings across different measures.”9 The importance of understanding that implicit biases are malleable cannot be overstated. First, **malleability means that interventions may be strategically introduced to provide current inputs that alter implicit biases**. Thus, **we can expect that implicit biases can be reduced**. To say that biased attitudes may be “reduced” is to say that current informational inputs can be adjusted so that the resulting stereotype patterns no longer conform to traditional, discriminatory, or inequitable stereotypes, but instead lead individuals and institutions to more equitable judgments and more equitable conduct. Furthermore, **malleability also means that the discriminatory impacts that result from implicit biases also may be reduced**. The research that gave rise to the connectionist model has provided important insights concerning the several methods available to individuals and institutions wishing to ameliorate the discriminatory impact of decisions and conduct informed by implicit biases, stereotyping, and prejudice. Finally, **by demonstrating that even subconscious racial biases are within reach and control, researchers have provided a sound basis for holding individuals and institutions responsible for reducing implicit racial and ethnic biases** **and for reducing the discriminatoryharms** caused by unconscious racism.

### A2 Permutation

* Movements unsuccessful
* no perms – limits disad is serparate offense

#### Permutation is key – movements are stronger when coalitions are formed and there’s the net benefit of using solidarity to defy the divisiveness of the model minority.

Ty 17 [Asian] [Eleanor Ty, Professor in the Department of English and Film Studies at Wilfrid Laurier University. She holds a PhD and MA in English from McMaster University, and a BA Hons from the University of Toronto., University Of Illinois Press, "Asian Fail Narratives Of Disenchantment And the Model Minority ", 2017]//lydiaw

In their own ways, the works I have studied in this book contribute to the growing awareness of the need to re-examine the “good life”—its high cost not only to youths but also to older members of the community, and its viability in the twenty-first century. Through inventive narrative and representational strategies that reveal precarious conditions, these works illuminate the critical social, cultural, historical, and political issues that most concern Asian North Americans in the twenty-first century. These issues, ranging from environmental degradation, the loss of stability from the financial crisis of 2007–8 and following, the suspicion and paranoia after 9/11, postwar trauma and memory, racialization and typecasting, and real and imagined cultural and familial expectations, mark the experiences of these artists I have studied. Between 2000 and 2015 the economic conditions in the United States and Canada have worsened due to the increasing neoliberal policies under the governments of Presidents Bill Clinton (1993–2001) and George W. Bush (2001–8) and of Prime Ministers Paul Martin (2003–6) and Stephen Harper (2006–15). **American-model neoliberalism has been criticized because it results in “substantial levels of social exclusion, including high levels of income inequality, high relative and absolute poverty rates, poor and unequal educational outcomes, poor health outcomes, and high rates of crime incarceration” (Schmitt and Zipperer 15). For example, popular stances of both the U.S. and Canadian governments have been that we should be “tough on crime” and wage a “war on drugs.” These notions resulted in an unprecedented rise of blacks and other minorities in U.S. prisons and of Aboriginal peoples in Canadian prisons**. As Bruce Western notes, “Incarceration would be used less for rehabilitation than for incapacitation, deterrence, and punishment. … Tough new sentences were attached to narcotics offenses as the federal government waged first a war on crime, then a war on drugs. Locked facilities proliferated around the country to cope with the burgeoning penal population. Prison construction became an instrument for regional development as small towns lobbied for correctional facilities and resisted prison closure” (2–3). Although these details do not directly relate to Asian North Americans, I argue that the movement from an ethic of care to the politics of the punitive, from rehabilitation to penal discipline, creates an atmosphere of fear, anxiety, and distrust in contemporary society. Only one of the texts in this study features incarceration of an Asian immigrant, but what is important is the institutional change, “shifts in the structure of society and politics” that have “large consequences for the quality of American democracy” (Western 2). If in the 1960s **and early 1970s** Asian **American** movements were formed in solidarity with **and as a response to** the Black Panther and Women’s Liberation **movements**, then in the twenty-first century the criminalization of **large numbers of young** African Americans **and First Nations Canadians** has considerable effects on **American and Canadian racial and** social inequality, on the collective **affective** experiences of p**eople** o**f** c**olor** and minorities. In the works I examined, we see the affect of fear in Vietnamese refugees who do not understand enough English to follow rules in The Gangster We Are All Looking For, or the dire consequences of the misrecognition of a Filipino immigrant in Gilvarry’s From the Memoirs of a Non-Enemy Combatant. The fear of the racial Other in the last decade has been exacerbated by the decline of manufacturing and industry and the dismantling of welfare state. It is not surprising that one of the most popular TV series in the last five or six years has been the American horror show The Walking Dead (2010– ), where the fearful flesh-eating zombie Others turn out to be our own family members and neighbors rather than invaders from an external nation. People now fear contagion from those who are within rather than from strangers from a distant shore. **For this reason,** it is heartening to see Asian **American**s **and Asian Canadians** expressing solidarity with other disenfranchised groups **and working for global environmental causes. The affiliations work** to defy **and counter** the **racially** divisive idealization of **Asian North Americans perpetuated by** the model minority **myth**. For example, #Asians4Blacklives **is a “diverse group of Asian voices coming from the Philippines, Vietnam, India, China, Pakistan, Korea, Burma, Japan, and other nations, based in the Bay Area,” who “**have come together **in response to a call from Black Lives Matter Bay Area”** to show solidarity **with black people. The group recognizes that Asians, like blacks, are subjected to racism, misrecognition, and negative stereotyping**. In her most recent book, Undercurrent, Asian Canadian poet Rita Wong vows to “honour what the flow of water teaches us” (“Declaration of Intent”), to be led by the “healing walkers” of the “Cree and Dene elders and everyday people” and to “reassert human responsibilities to land, water, life” (“Fresh Ancient Ground”). **Wong stresses** the need to form alliances with feminists and First Nations communities, **recognizing that they will protect water and resist corporations that want to use the earth’s resources as commodities. Similarly, the Chinese Canadian Historical Society of BC is making a concerted effort to discover links between Chinese Canadians and First Nations people, producing videos called “Cedar and Bamboo” that highlight stories of marginalization by mixed-race Chinese/First Nations Canadians**. The project goes beyond the history of Chinese immigrants in relationship to the gold rush, the building of the railroad, and Chinatowns to the historical and continuing relationships between the Chinese population and First Nations in British Columbia. Started by Chinese Canadian history professor Henry Yu, the online “Chinese Canadian Stories” feature information about key historical events in Chinese Canadian history as well as short videos made by university students about their background and issues that concern them. The project highlights the multiplicity of identities and ways of expressing these identities in the twenty-first century. One funny video that is a fine example of Asianfail is Jennifer Yip’s “Hybrid Husband.” The short video humorously depicts the pressure Yip feels at twenty-two to find a fiancé. Embarking on her twenty-seventh blind date to find the perfect Chinese/Canadian boyfriend, she meets a young man who seems to pass all the requirements set out by her family and herself. He speaks Cantonese and English, snowboards, skis, is learning to fly a plane, and understands her complicated hybrid culture. But by the end of the video, Yip is shocked and confounded by the discovery from his Facebook page that he already has a girlfriend. The video uses irony, humor, and exaggeration to cut through the tensions between a third-generation Asian Canadian and Old World cultural beliefs. **These instances I have been discussing here** illustrate the increasing diversity of Asian **North American** subjects, and their responses to failure **of various sorts**. The works I have discussed show how Asian Americans and Asian Canadians are negotiating and reconfiguring their desires and aspirations. Although the works document different types of failure and depression, they also present alternatives to the current definitions of success, which center on professional and economic achievement. These novels, films, graphic narratives, and memoirs explore the consequences and rewards of not following or not being able to follow society’s prescribed roads to success. As we have seen, the depicted reasons for failure include mental breakdown, shame, lingering memories of trauma and pain, the refusal to subscribe to capitalism’s notion of success, and the rejection of the heteronormative romance script. Further failures are caused by bullying, misidentification and misrecognition, or the internalization of others’ false assumptions and expectations. It is only through the telling of their stories that we understand the dystopic space in which many of these Asian North American people exist. They illuminate the precarity in the lives of some members of a group that has been perceived to be in a privileged space. An inadvertent positive result of some members’ failure to conform has been the production of an incredible assortment of works that question, in sometimes humorous, witty, ironic, and entertaining ways, our apprehension of our modern world, including our perception of the passing of time, of beauty, happiness, aging, gender, family life, and love. Sometimes, the failure to follow traditional routes leads to a new and unexpected way of finding peace and contentment, or an unexplored career path. In keeping with the motif of finding pleasures in the unpredictable, I deliberately sought to examine works that play with the conventions and forms of genre: the use of poetic prose, postmodern reiterations of Buddhist beliefs, stage performance with an inanimate character, a fake memoir, and a graphic narrative not contained by frames and sequences. This book is one of many efforts to participate in the ongoing and much-needed dialogue about priorities and values for our society, global environment, and political identities in the twenty-first century.

#### Disruptive action won’t solve and is counterproductive – people capitulate when arrested and it leads to increased state repression

Taylor, professor of religion and nature, environmental ethics, and environmental studies at the University of Florida, and a fellow of the Rachel Carson Center in Munich, Germany, ‘13

(Bron, “Resistance: Do the Ends Justify the Means?” Chapter 28 of State of the World 2013: Is Sustainability Still Possible)

Modern societies are unduly celebratory of their achievements when they have amnesia about what has been lost and by whom. With an understanding of the tragic aspects of this history and recognition that these very processes are ongoing, it is clear that dramatic actions to halt these processes and engage in restorative justice and healing where possible are morally obligatory.

This does not mean, however, that the revolutionary prescription of the Deep Green Resistance activists — attacking the energetic infrastructure of industrial civilization — is warranted. Indeed, the claim that this could cause the collapse of industrial civilization is fanciful. Natural disasters (including those intensified or worsened by human activities) demonstrate that as long as energy is available, large-scale societies will rebuild. Even if resisters were to disrupt the system significantly, not only would the system’s rulers rebuild, recent history has shown that they would increase their power to suppress resisting sectors.

Moreover, as many radical activists have acknowledged in interviews — even those who have supported sabotage — the more an action risks or intends to hurt people, the more the media and public focus on the tactics rather than the concerns that gave rise to the actions. This means that the most radical tactics tend to be counterproductive to the goal of increasing awareness and concern in the general public.

When accessing the effectiveness of resistance, it is also important to address how effective authorities will be at preventing and repressing it. The record so far does not lead easily to enthusiasm for the most radical of the tactics deployed thus far. Authorities use tactics that are violent or can be framed as such to justify to the public at large spying, infiltration, disruption, and even violence against these movements. Such repression typically succeeds in eviscerating the resistance, in part because as people are arrested and tried, some will cooperate with the prosecution in return for a reduced sentence.

More than half of those arrested did just that during what Federal authorities dubbed “operation backfire,” which led to the arrests and conviction of more than two dozen Earth Liberation Front saboteurs who had been involved in arson cases. One of the leaders, facing life in prison under post-9/11 terrorism laws, committed suicide shortly after his arrest, while several others became fugitives. The individuals convicted drew prison terms ranging from 6 to 22 years. The noncooperating activists, and those for whom terrorism enhancements had been added to the arson charges, drew the longest terms.

As if this were not devastating enough to the resistance, broader radical environmental campaigns that were not using such radical tactics ebbed dramatically in the wake of these arrests. This was because movement activists who were friends and allies of those arrested rallied to provide prison support, which then took their time and resources away from their campaigns. But it was also because the resistance community was divided over whether (and if so, how) to support the defendants who, to various degrees, cooperated with investigators. Given this history, it makes little sense to base strategy and tactics on such an unlikely possibility that communities of resistance will ever be able to mount a sustained campaign to bring down industrial civilization, even if that were a desirable objective.

The envisioned alternative to this objective — creating or, in the view of many activists, returning to small-scale, egalitarian, environmentally friendly lifestyles — would not be able to support the billions of people currently living on Earth, at least not at anything remotely like the levels of materialism that most people aspire to. So the most radical of the resistance prescriptions would quite naturally lead to strong and even violent counter-resistance.13

These ideologies, explicitly or implicitly, make unduly optimistic assumptions about our species, including about our capacity to maintain solidarity in the face of governmental suppression, as well as about the human capacity for cooperation and mutual aid. To expect such behavior to become the norm may be conceivable, and it may be exemplified by some small-scale societies, but it is not something to be expected universally, let alone during times of social stress intensified by increasing environmental scarcity.

So despite the accurate assessment about the ways agricultural and industrial societies have reduced biocultural diversity, there is little reason to think that the most radical resistance tactics would be able to precipitate or hasten the collapse of such societies. Nor is there much evidence that such tactics would contribute to more-pragmatic efforts to transform modern societies. In contrast, there is significant evidence that these sorts of tactics have been and are likely to remain counterproductive.

### fragmentation

#### Fragmentation DA – Radicalism results in endless factionalism and social ordering that ignores continued violence.

Karlberg 03 [Michael Karlberg, Assistant Professor of Communication, Western Washington. PEACE & CHANGE, volume 28, number 3, p. 339-41. July 2003.] JCH-PF

Granted, social activists do "win" occasional “battles” in these adversarial arenas, but the root causes of their concerns largely remain unaddressed and the larger "wars" arguably are not going well. Consider the case of environmental activism. Countless environmental protests, lobbies, and lawsuits mounted in recent generations throughout the Western world. Many small victories have been won. Yet environmental degradation continues to accelerate at a rate that far outpaces the highly circumscribed advances made in these limited battles the most committed environmentalists acknowledge things are not going well. In addition, adversarial strategies of social change embody assumptions that have internal consequences for social movements, such as internal factionalization. For instance, virtually all of the social projects of the "left” throughout the 20th century have suffered from recurrent internal factionalization. The opening decades of the century were marked by political infighting among vanguard communist revolutionaries. The middle decades of the century were marked by theoretical disputes among leftist intellectuals. The century's closing decades have been marked by the fracturing of the a new left\*\* under the centrifugal pressures of identity politics. Underlying this pattern of infighting and factionalization is the tendency to interpret differences—of class, race, gender, perspective, or strategy—as sources of antagonism and conflict. In this regard, the political "left" and "right" both define themselves in terms at a common adversary—the "other"—defined by political differences. Not surprisingly, advocates of both the left and right frequently invoke the need for internal unity in order to prevail over their adversaries on the other side of the alleged political spectrum. However, because the terms left and right axe both artificial and reified categories that do not reflect the complexity of actual social relations, values, or beliefs, there is no way to achieve lasting unity within either camp because there are no actual boundaries between them. In reality, social relations, values, and beliefs are infinitely complex and variable. Yet once an adversarial posture is adopted by assuming that differences are sources at conflict, initial distinctions between the left and the right inevitably are followed by subsequent distinctions within the left and the right. Once this centrifugal process is set in motion, it is difficult, if not impossible, to restrain. For all of these reasons, adversarial strategies have reached a point of diminishing returns even if such strategies were necessary and viable in the past when human populations were less socially and ecologically interdependent those conditions no longer exist. Our reproductive and technological success as a species has led to conditions of unprecedented interdependence, and no group on the planet is isolated any longer. Under these new conditions, new strategies not only are possible but are essential. Humanity has become a single interdependent social body. In order to meet the complex social and environmental challenges now facng us, we must learn to coordinate our collective actions. Yet a body cannot coordinate its actions as long as its "left" and is "right," or its "north" and its "south," or its "east" and its "west" are locked in adversarial relationships.