### 1

#### The 1AC epistemologically and methodologically falls into the trap of linear time- they analyze the past, present and the future as independent to one another. What they fail to realize is that the narrative of linear time is a tool used by the state and dominant powers to nullify revolution and reinforce the idea that structural violence can be changed by appeals to legislation. The portrayal of the future as better than what we are constantly working towards is used by structures to rewrite history and over look past oppression, even though oppression exists cyclically and re-interprets itself in new ways.
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Stephen Dillon. “It’s here, it’s that time:” Race, queer futurity, and the temporality of violence in Born in Flames. University of Minnesota. Women and Performance: A journal of feminist theory, 2013.

Progress is named as a time that is cyclical and forcefully forgetful (Söderbäck 2012, 303). Indeed, progress, patience, and reform are the temporalities used by the state to justify and erase the violence that continues under the names of justice, equality, and democracy. The state describes the future as a space of safety and security in order to maintain the violence of the present, and to temper the rage of those who refuse to wait for the future’s warm embrace to arrive. According to the state media, the Women’s Army is not “interested in the progress of all of us” because their actions and demands contradict the teleology of state development and reform.5 The state declares change will come, to be patient, to trust in the progress of time. Critically, this narrative is not just produced by the state, but also by the white feminist editors of the Socialist Youth Review. When asked about the actions of the Women’s Army, and more specifically about the continuation of sexual violence in the revolution, they respond: Well, I think statistics will show you that the percentage of rape and prostitution at this point is lower than it was in pre-revolutionary society and that obviously it’s an advancement, it’s a step forward. It’s impossible to talk about the complete, you know, abolition [of sexual violence], because this is not the nature of this government, they don’t abolish … it’s a question of a gradual move toward something, and I think everything is leading up to the point where those things will no longer exist.6 Here, white feminism aligns itself with the state through its adherence to liberal Western notions of time and history. This is a notion of history where the passage of time washes away the violence of then and now so that the future is free from the horrors of the past. In this way, the past is constructed as a space of radical alterity, an aberration to the progress of the future. Sexual violence will be left behind by the progress of the revolution. Time will temper terror. Yet, the very ability of the editors to believe in the progress of time is tied to the immunity of whiteness from structural forms of racial violence, regulation, and social death. For instance, when Adelaide Norris, the black lesbian leader of the Women’s Army, goes to the editors of the Socialist Youth Review to ask for their support, their conversation highlights the divergent temporalities of black feminism and white feminism. When Norris tells the editors, “You’re oppressed too and it’s pathetic that you can’t even see it!” they respond, “There are problems, we know. But things are so much better than they were before. Things are not going to happen overnight. It’s important that the party remains strong so progress can be made.”7 Norris’s response sutures gender and race to a different theorization of time: You know the way my mom brought us up; there were eight of us and she took care of the domestic work all by herself. And abortions; she couldn’t even think of abortions. And daycare – hmph – we took care of ourselves, no one took care of us. And there are plenty of women who are living now in the same manner: Black women, Latin women, young women living in that same lifestyle.8 For the editors, the future of the revolution will be free from state and non-state forms of racialized and gendered violence because the reforms sutured to time’s progression will undo the horrors of the present. But for Norris, gendered racism built into the banality of everyday life undoes the imagined progress of time, so that time’s passage is merely the modification and intensification of older modes of subjection and subjugation. For those bearing the brunt of white supremacy and heteropatriarchy, the past, present, and future are not distinct temporal spaces. In other words, Born in Flames documents the amplification, modification, and protraction of the past in the present, where the past is not an isolated aberration of what is here, but, rather, is an anticipation of the present and future. The past is an image of the future because the future will be a repetition of the past. In this way, the film critiques normative notions of time and a liberal conception of history. In Specters of the Atlantic: Finance Capital, Slavery, and the Philosophy of History, Ian Baucom argues for a conception of history that undoes liberal notions of progress, change, and time. Baucom’s theory of history centers on the massacre of 132 slaves aboard the slave ship The Zong in 1781. Over three days, the slaves were handcuffed and thrown overboard in order to collect the insurance money that sealed their value even in death. For Baucom, the massacre is the paradigmatic event of modernity. It encompasses the racial, financial, and epistemological regimes that have not only failed to dissolve with the passage of time, but instead, have intensified so that our current moment finds itself anticipated and enveloped by this event. As Baucom argues: “Time does not pass, it accumulates” (Baucom 2005, 24). Time does not erase what has happened, dissolving terror and violence into the progress of the future, nor is the past passively sedimented in the present. Rather, the past returns to the present in expanded form so that the present “finds stored and accumulated within itself a nonsynchronous array of past times” (29). The present is possessed by the logics and protocols of racial capitalism’s past – by a perfectly routine massacre that was and is repeated endlessly across space and time in the (post)colony, prison, frontier, torture room, plantation, reservation, riot zone, and on and on. Racial terror returns from a past that is not an end to take hold (of bodies, institutions, infrastructure, discourse, and libidinal life) and does not let go.

#### Police don’t reform because they want to change, they do so in order convince society to let them remain facets of the state’s control. Police reform aims to build biopolitical power by convincing people that they are solving violence by changing the system when in reality that change is just done so that people grow to accept the power relations that constitute the police state

**Summerhays**J.J. Summerhays, Political Thesis Paper, American Police Reform - An Alternative Perspective 1979  
https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications/abstract.aspx?ID=66749

To explain why **efforts** since the 1960's **to increase police effectiveness** through education **have failed, the relationship between the state and the police and the history of police reform** are examined. The goals of police reform begun [**began**] in the 1960's are **to** increase their crime fighting effectiveness and ability to **keep order** through better training and education. However, police education does not prepare police for the field**,** and better training and education have not increased police effectiveness as crime rates continue to mount. federal assistance to local law enforcement efforts over the past 8 years are discussed, but these have not affected the crime rate. **the reason** why **police reform continues** to be popular **despite** its **failure can be understood** only **through examining the relationship between police and** the **state.** moreover, the force behind the 1960's **police reform was not** concern **about crime but about** the then growing civil **disorder** and instability, since **the** primary **goal of** all **policing is to protect** society's integrity against threats. two theories of **the** formation of states are discussed. in a **capitalistic society**, **policing helps** preserve wealth and its **accumulation and existing class structure. the police are not crime fighters** **so much** **as agents of social control**. a history of the police establishment in england and america during and after the industrial revolution reveals that **police reform accompanied societal reform as conflicts** engendered by the industrial revolution became unmanageable. police reform was attempted for the first time during the progressive era, late 1800's to early 1900's as societal reform became the release valve for social conflicts. however, as social conflicts ceased, so did interest in police reform. similar patterns can be seen during the 1930's and 1960's. thus, **changes in the police have occurred** primarily **as a result of the state's needs and not** necessarily **those** **of** **the** **people**. the effect of this on police education is discussed, and it is contended that **the primary purpose of** better education for **police is to improve the** **police image in a time of conflict,** rather than improve policing.

#### The promise of a future free of racialized violence prevents a full confrontation with temporality as accumulation. There is no relief to come in some mystical future. Only understanding violence as accumulation and captivity allows us to understand the existing conditions of violence and come up with solutions.
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According to Spillers, the anti-blackness inaugurated under chattel slavery is a death sentence enacted across generations, one that changes name and shape across time and space even as its continuity endures. Yet, for Spillers, time not only accumulates, it also captures. Her conception of temporality means that time is a form of captivity: one that makes her a “marked woman” (65). She is marked by a history of violence, trauma, and terror that alters normative conceptions of temporality. In other words, anti-blackness and racial terror are epistemological and bodily forces, but they are also temporal intensities that structure subjectivity and life chances. Baucom and Spillers’s theorizations of time as accumulation and capture have profound implications for how we understand the future. Traditionally, the future is a space and time we do not know, a place of possibility and hope. The emptiness of the future is imagined as a space of seamless progress: a myth of Marxist teleology; a capitalist dream; a fantasy of nationalism and colonialism. When we imagine the future as the outcome of the passage of time, the past falls away and the present disappears so that the future becomes relief from the devastating weight of everything that has come before. For example, José Esteban Muñoz argues that the way out of the crushing weight of today is to hold on to the future because now is not enough. According to Muñoz, the future is the domain of queer- ness, a “warm illumination of a horizon imbued with potentiality” that allows us to think “then and there” when here and now is not enough (2009, 1). For Muñoz, the call for no future is only available to those who have a future to deny. He worries that abandoning the future to a heteronormative white world will only lead to the deaths of more queer people of color. Yet, if time does not pass but accumulates, then the future is not the triumph of a tendency inscribed in the present. It is not the dissolution of the past or the undoing of the present. If time does not pass but accumulates, then the future is not liberated from the constraints of yesterday, but, rather, is the place where the wreckage of then and now lives on. When we think of time against the temporal regimes of the state, 42 S. Dillon heteronormativity, the nation, and capital, time drags, reverses, compresses, and accumulates. Engaging queerness as a force that distorts and undermines normative logics of sequence is to know that the conditions of possibility for the atrocities of the past have not faded, but, rather, have intensified (Freeman 2010, 27). It is to deploy what Jasbir Puar calls an “antecedent temporality” where one can see, feel, and engage the ghosts that are not yet here, but will be tomorrow and the next day and the next (Puar 2007, xx). Muñoz writes that the past tells us something about the present: “It tells us that some- thing is missing, or something is not yet here” (2009, 86). Baucom and Spillers extend this assertion by arguing that past forms of racial terror are a lesson about the present, but also a vision of what is to come. If time does not pass but accumulates, then the past is where the future is anticipated, recollected, and demonstrated (Baucom 2005, 213). If there is no pro- gress, but instead repetition, modification, intensification, reversals, and suspensions, then we know what the future will be. The future will be what was before. (…) Franz Fanon’s concept of “historicity” is instructive here. For Fanon, the past is ontologically sutured to race so that when “I discovered my blackness … I was battered down by tom-toms, cannibalism, intellectual deficiency, slave-ships, and above all else, above all: ‘Sho’ good eatin’” (Fanon 1967, 112). For Fanon, white supremacy functions as a type of temporal prison where black liberation is delayed and destroyed by the capacity of past traumas, rooted in colonization and slavery, to affect, shape, and possess the present. Fanon looks to the past of European colonization and sees a mirror of the future, an “endless past/present of colonial domination” (Scott 2010, 76). In other words, white supremacy is not just a spatial technology that inhabits infrastructure and institution- ality; it is also a temporal regime that refuses to abide by the progress of the law, language, or the passage of time. As Kara Keeling writes: “The past constricts the present so that the present is simply the reappearance of the past” (2007, 26). And as Isabel makes clear, state Women & Performance: a journal of feminist theory 43 violence limits the possibilities of the present and future by binding both in a closed circuit of reverberation and magnification. When time accumulates, it possesses, detains, and immobilizes: this is time as a form of capture. In short, Isabel knows what is coming because it has already happened – in the past that is the future that has already arrived. There is not relief from knowing the past is gone because the past is a warning of what is coming. It’s going to happen again.

#### If the future is the accumulated past, then the only way to destroy the future is the break the present as we know it. The Alternative is to embrace the incoherence of multiplicity and difference in contrast to the state’s focus on coherence and linear temporality.
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The temporal break between those without a future who demand this is “our time” and the time of the state that declares your time is the future, is most striking in the final scenes of Born in Flames. Towards the end of the film, the president of the United States delivers a national televised address to announce a new reform that will pay women for housework. Simultaneous with the announcement, a cadre of the Women’s Army storms the state-run TV station and interrupts the president’s address with a video that exposes the imprisonment and murder of their leader, Adelaide Norris. Norris was murdered, in part, because of how she understood the relationship between time and violence. This is evident in internal discussions within the Women’s Army concerning the use of violence. When Hilary Hurst and Norris, the two leaders of the Women’s Army (according to the FBI), discuss the role of violence in the actions of the Women’s Army, they have competing visions of the relationship between time and violence. When Hurst tells Norris, “The reality of having to deal with taking up arms, Adelaide, is really heavy, I mean whether we can accept or be responsible for the potential violence thrust upon us, from our own violence thrust out ...” Norris simply replies, “I’m telling you it’s already happening. It’s here. It’s that time.”12 Norris’s response invokes two forms of violence. First, she implies that the state violence Hurst is concerned will come if they take up arms has already arrived (indeed Norris will be imprisoned and murdered within a few days of this conversation). She also indicates that the time is right to intensify their efforts through the deployment of violence. The time is right for counter-violence, because state violence is already the past, present, and future. Norris mobilizes a black feminist analytic where there is no outside to the forms of violence, terror, and subjugation produced by white supremacy, anti-blackness, and heteropatriarchy. As a queer black woman, Norris does not encounter violence in isolated moments of exceptional transgression. Space nor time will bring relief because there is no contingent relationship between blackness and violence (Wilderson 2010, 88). This fact leads to a politics of impatience, immediacy, and spontaneity by theWomen’s Army. When the future is not relief, but intensification and accumulation, then the present is all that is left. “Our time” is a time of the present, an anticipatory time that sees the no future of the future as it is. This anticipatory urgency is described beautifully by James Baldwin in his 1970 letter to the then-imprisoned Davis, “An Open Letter to My Sister, Angela Davis.” When Baldwin wrote to Davis, “For, if they take you in the morning, they will be coming for us that night,” he argued that the present was a sign of what was to come (1971, 23). The dawn of a new day did not mean things would be better. Time’s passage was not relief from the violence of yesterday; rather, what was happening to Davis was a promise of what the future would bring. If Davis had been taken, then no one was safe. Baldwin argued that the past and present were lessons about the future. He began his letter with a example of temporality’s repetition and stasis: “Dear Sister: One might have hoped that, by this hour, the very sight of chains on Black flesh, or the very sight of chains, would be so intolerable a sight for the American people, and so unbearable a memory, that they would themselves spontaneously rise up and strike off the manacles. But, no, they appear to glory in their chains; now, more than ever, they appear to measure their safety in chains and corpses” (19). For Baldwin, hope that the United States had progressed beyond the time of slavery was only a fantasy. The present told a different story. The horrors of slavery were not an “intolerable sight” nor an “unbearable memory” to the American people; instead, slavery’s visual economy and policing technologies composed a lesson about what was happening to Davis and countless others. The stillness of time meant the present and past were not aberrations to the radical alterity of the future, but, rather, were anticipatory reflections of what lay ahead. After the murder of Norris, Isabel declares on the now underground Radio Regazza: Wake up! We’re being murdered out there in the streets. And if you’re going to sit back and watch it happen, Sister, you better get it together and wake up. Because all your babies and yourself, you’re going to be cleaned out, we ain’t gonna be around no more, there ain’t gonna be nothing, a wasteland, a wasteland sister, now get it together, it’s time to fight.13 In the dystopian future of Born in Flames, the violence of the past will endlessly repeat so that the future will be death and nothingness. Isabel knows there is no brighter future to hope for or better day to move towards. She understands the future (and the present) as what Denise Desilva calls a “horizon of death” (De Silva 2007). Yet, she also implies that the murder of Norris indicates something about the relationship between anti-blackness and the future. In “People of Color Blindness: Notes on the Afterlife of Slavery,” Jared Sexton writes, “Black existence does not represent the total reality of racial formation – it is not the beginning and the end of the story – but it does relate to the totality; it indicates the repressed truth of the political and economic system” (2010, 48). For Sexton, to understand anti-blackness is to understand power in its totality; it is to confront the truth of our present moment and the (no) future that is already here. It is to see the paradigm even as we also confront “the example, the incident, the antidote” (2011, 34). Norris’s death is the paradigmatic event of the film (and of the social order represented in the film). It is an event that speaks the truth of the revolutionary state – a truth that drives the Women’s Army deeper into the “wasteland,” towards the impossibility of “no more,” closer to the unthinkablity of “nothing.”14 Like Baldwin’s plea that Davis’s imprisonment was a sign of what the night would bring, Isabel warns that Norris’s death is the future’s promise: it is all that the future holds. The Women’s Army not only understood themselves as inhabiting their future deaths – expecting to be killed or captured at any moment – they also argued that if the present had a future, the future would never come. A future under the colluding rule of anti-blackness, white supremacy, and heteropatriarchy was a future the Women’s Army attempted undo by trying to bring an end to the present. If there was to be a future there could be no present. And so, they pursued the destruction of the present in order to usher in the future. Born in Flames argues for a confrontation with the future as a horizon of death through a politics of urgency and presentism, but it deploys multiplicity and difference to challenge time as accumulation and capture

#### Only the alternative has the capacity to change the way violence operates- certain bodies are denied personhood by definition. Legal reformulations and the state’s demarcations mean that we need a method to articulate subjectivity and personhood outside of the traditional western order.

**Weheliye**  
Weheliye HABEAS VISCUS Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human ALEXANDER G. WEHELIYE Duke University Press Durham and London 2014.p. 48-49

We are in dire need of alternatives to the legal conception of personhood that dominates our world, and, in addition, to not lose sight of what remains outside the law, what the law cannot capture, what it cannot magically transform into the fantastic form of property ownership. Writing about the connections between transgender politics and other forms of identity- based activism that respond to structural inequalities, legal scholar Dean Spade shows how the focus on inclusion, recognition, and equality based on a narrow legal framework (especially as it pertains to antidiscrimination and hate crime laws) not only hinders the eradication of violence against trans people and other vulnerable populations but actually creates the condition of possibility for the continued unequal “distribution of life chances.”22 If demanding recognition and inclusion remains at the center of minority politics, it will lead only to a delimited notion of personhood as property that zeroes in comparatively on only one form of subjugation at the expense of others, thus allowing for the continued existence of hierarchical differences between full humans, not-quite-humans, and nonhumans. This can be gleaned from the “successes” of the mainstream feminist, civil rights, and lesbian-gay rights movements, which facilitate the incorporation of a privileged minority into the ethnoclass of Man at the cost of the still and/or newly criminalized and disposable populations (women of color, the black poor, trans people, the incarcerated, etc.).23 To make claims for inclusion and humanity via the U.S. juridical assemblage removes from view that the law itself has been thoroughly violent in its endorsement of racial slavery, indigenous genocide, Jim Crow, the prison-industrial complex, domestic and international warfare, and so on, and that it continues to be one of the chief instruments in creating and maintaining the racializing assemblages in the world of Man. Instead of appealing to legal recognition, Julia Oparah suggests counteracting the “racialized (trans)gender entrapment” within the prison-industrial complex and beyond with practices of “maroon abo- lition” (in reference to the long history of escaped slave contraband settle- ments in the Americas) to “foreground the ways in which often overlooked African diasporic cultural and political legacies inform and undergird anti- prison work,” while also providing strategies and life worlds not exclusively centered on reforming the law.24 Relatedly, Spade calls for a radical politics articulated from the “‘impossible’ worldview of trans political existence,” which redefines “the insistence of government agencies, social service pro- viders, media, and many nontrans activists and nonprofiteers that the ex- istence of trans people is impossible.”25 A relational maroon abolitionism beholden to the practices of black radicalism and that arises from the in- compatibility of black trans existence with the world of Man serves as one example of how putatively abject modes of being need not be redeployed within hegemonic frameworks but can be operationalized as variable liminal territories or articulated assemblages in movements to abolish the grounds upon which all forms of subjugation are administered.

#### The ROB is to be the intellectual thinker- you and an inqirant looking into the power relations that have formulated oppression over time and affirming a methodology that is capable of resisting them. Rabinow explains Foucault Rabinow, Paul, “Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics, 202”University of Chicago Press

Hence, we must return again, one last time, to the problem of the analyst. For surely these dramatically new characterizations of **power relations**must**put the analyst ina different position from**that of**the traditional intellectual**or philosopher. **Foucault**has provided some indications of how he sees the problem. He has systematically**criticized the self-proclaimed** master of truth and justice, the **intellectual who claimed to**speak truth to power and thereby**resist power**’s supposed repressive effect. The “speaker’s benefit”was revealed as a component in the advance of bio-power. Foucault generalizes this point. He advises intellectuals to abandon their universal prophetic voice. He urges them to drop their pretensions about predicting the future and, even more, their self-proclaimed legislative role. “The Greek wise man, the Jewish prophet, the Roman legislator are still models that haunt those, who today, practice the profession of speaking and writing.”In more recent times, our model of the intellectuals has been the writer-jurist who claims to be outside of partisan interest, to speak in the universal voice, to represent either God’s law or that of the state, to make known the universal dictates of reason. The exemplary figure in the Classical Age was perhaps Voltaire-proclaiming the rights of humanity, unveiling deceit and hypocrisy, attacking despotism and false hierarchies, combating injustices and inequalities. **The function of the modern intellectual is to bring**the**truth to articulate clarity.**Today the supposedly free subject, the universal intellectual, can offer us little guidance. But **this does not mean that those who seek to understand**human beings**and**to**change society are**either outside of power or**powerless**. Rather, as Foucault’s account of the rise and spread of bio-power makes clear, knowledge is one of the defining components for the operation of power in the modern world.**Knowledge**is not in a superstructural relationship to power; it**is an essential condition for the formation and**further**growth of**industrial, technological **society**. To take only the example we most recently discussed, that of the prisons, the categorizing and individualizing of prisoners was an essential component for the operation of this field of power; this disciplinary technology could not have taken the form it had, achieved the spread it did, or produced delinquents in the way it did, if power and knowledge were merely external to one another. But power and knowledge are not identical with each other either. **Foucault does not seek to reduce knowledge to a hypothetical base in power [but]**nor to conceptualize power as an always coherent strategy. He attempts **to show the specificity and materiality of their interconnections.** They have a correlative, not a causal relationship, which must be determined in its historical specificity. This mutual production of power and knowledge is one of Foucault’s major contributions. The universal intellectual plays power’s game because he fails to see this point. Foucault is not claiming to be outside of these practices of power; at the same time, he is not identical to them. First, when he shows that the practices of our culture have produced both objectification and subjectification, he has already loosened the grip, the seeming naturalness and necessity these practices have. The**force**of bio-power**lies in defining reality as well as producing it. This reality takes the world to be composed of subjects and objects and their totalizing normalization.**Any solution that takes these terms for granted-even if it is to oppose them-will contribute to the hold of bio-power. Through interpretive analytics, Foucault has been able to reveal the concrete, material mechanisms which have been producing this reality, while he describes with minute detail the transparent masks behind which these mechanisms are hidden.

### 2

#### **Interp: Debaters must not defend the hypothetical implementation of an explicit actor or action**

#### Is means is Definition of is (Entry 1 of 4) present tense third-person singular of BE **dialectal present tense** first-person and third-person singular **of BE** dialectal present tense plural of BE

Webster ND Definition of IS," Merriam Webster, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/is> IS

#### Dialectical present tense means logical coherence which implies no implementation

Your Dictionary ND, "Dialectical Meaning," No Publication, <https://www.yourdictionary.com/dialectical> Cho

The definition of dialectical is a discussion that includes logical reasoning and dialogue, or something having the sounds, vocabulary and grammar of a specific way of speaking. An example of something dialectical is a Lincoln Douglass style of debate, where both parties argue a point in a logical order. Of, or pertaining to dialectic; logically reasoned through the exchange of opposing ideas.

#### “BE” is a linking verb, not an action verb so implementation is incoherent

Grammar Monster ND "Linking Verbs," Grammar Monster, <https://www.grammar-monster.com/glossary/linking_verbs.htm> CHO

What Are Linking Verbs? (with Examples) A linking verb is used to re-identify or to describe its subject. A linking verb is called a linking verb because it links the subject to a subject complement (see graphic below). Infographic Explaining Linking Verb A linking verb tells us what the subject is, not what the subject is doing. Easy Examples of Linking Verbs In each example, the linking verb is highlighted and the subject is bold. Alan is a vampire. (Here, the subject is re-identified as a vampire.) Alan is thirsty. (Here, the subject is described as thirsty.)
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#### Unjust means unjust adjective US /ʌnˈdʒʌst/ **not morally right; not fair**: New laws will protect employees against unjust dismissals. (Definition of unjust from the Cambridge Academic Content Dictionary © Cambridge University Press)

That’s Cambridge Dictionary ND [“Meaning of unjust in English” Cambridge Dictionary, [https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unjust]](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/unjust%5d)

#### Violation: They cannot defend hypothetical implementation and use the state – or they are Extra-T

#### Voter for limits and ground - imprecisely includes thousands of affs that expand appropriation and deprives us of the public regs counterplan - makes it impossible to be neg

#### Grammar - very idea of a topic rests on the assumption that words have stable meanings and relationships - precision internal link turns every piece of aff offense

#### Phil Ed – creates better ethical subjectivity and critical thinking that o/ws on uniqueness to LD.
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#### Latinidad are situated within a “subjugated position of expendability” where militarization at the Border sustains Western Legal Modernity – the pulverization of Latinx bodies is necessary for the survival of the White Man Thus the Roll of the Ballot is to vote for the debater that best performatively and methodologically ruptures whiteness

Márquez 12, John D. "Latinos as the “living dead”: Raciality, expendability, and border militarization." Latino Studies 10.4 (2012): 473-498. (Associate Professor of African American and Latino/a Studies. Ph.D. in Ethnic Studies, University of California-San Diego)//DH+EY

Mbembe’s and Gilroy’s critiques were an essential step toward de-provincializing Foucault’s concepts regarding the non-economic interface between power and knowledge. A precise definition of race, however, remains illusive in their critiques. Ferreira da Silva (2009) adds some clarity in this regard and in a way that clarifies the relationship between race, violence, law enforcement and the sovereign state. Similar to Fitzpatrick’s (1992) claim that law emerged as a mythology and primarily within the context of colonialism and **the discovery of a pre-modern or savage “other**,” Ferreira da Silva (2009, 213) argues that the very impetus for **modern legal and law enforcement institutions** are derived from a productive strategy of power or a power/ knowledge interface that she describes as “**raciality**” and defines as “the ontoepistemological arsenal constituted by the concepts of the racial and the cultural, and their signifiers, those which produce persons (ethical–juridical) entities not comprehended by universality, the chosen moral descriptor of postEnlightenment political configurations.” Similar to Hesse’s (2007) argument that race is a defining attribute of European modernity and not only a socially constructed category of difference identifiable in phenotypes and that is deployed to justify forms of economic exclusion, Ferreira da Silva explains that the philosophical origins of European modernity (as evident within the works of Enlightenment thinkers), and its promises of universality, were derived from a representation of humanity that was wed to what Rousseau described as the “bon sauvage” or **the noble savage**. The bon sauvage represented the domain of self-determination or the modern human subject with the capacity for rationality and, hence, who was prequalified for inclusion and/or equality within modern, civil and liberal social formations. The **bon sauvage was laden with this ethical and moral qualification via its contrast to the bloody savage, that is, those who were imagined and produced as being primordially incapable of rationality and unfit for citizenship**, as persons who inhabited an often literal and yet always figurative domain of necessity and deficiency that Ferreira da Silva (2009, 213–214) describes as the “scene of nature.” In sum, the modern human subject in Europe emerged via relational configurations of social knowledge regarding the essence of humanity. These configurations were central to the philosophical and structural development of modern nation states. According to Ferreira da Silva (2009), raciality was the primary socio-logic or knowledge form deployed within and by this desired/requisite distinction. As a result, Blackness and indigenousness emerged as visible racial signifiers, along with semi-visible ethno-racial signifiers such as **Latinidad**, to highlight those scenes of nature that made the modern **state’s legal and military apparatuses** **necessary** as methods to quarantine or obliterate the threat of bloody savagery to the domain of the bon sauvage or the body politic. These philosophical origins of the law, she argues, have been manifest within recent crime fighting campaigns that blur the boundaries between police and military protocols, and in ways similar to border militarization. As she explains in her discussion of joint police/military maneuvers in Rio de Janeiro’s favelas, “raciality immediately justifies the **state’s decision to kill certain persons** – mostly (but not only) young men and women of colour – **in the name of self preservation**. Such killings do not unleash an ethical crisis because these persons’ bodies and the territories they inhabit always-already signify violence” (213). According to Ferreira da Silva, therefore, the capacity for acts of state sanctioned violence toward racial others and with legal impunity is not derived from a need to egitimate conspiracies for economic exploitation. It resides within the very socio-logical architectures of sovereignty and **the law**. Manifest Raciality I propose the racial state of expendability as a concept to mark the base effect of raciality, **the capacity for obliteration with legal impunity**, and that I situate directly within the borderlands and its history. This section builds upon Goldberg’s (1993, 41) call (in response to Gilroy’s critique of generalizations) for a “general but open ended theory” or what he describes as a theoretical method that allows for us to critically consider (i) a more general architecture of racial domination that is situated within critiques of European modernity, and (ii) “alterations and discontinuities” that have resulted in race being politicized in variant ways according to time and space. The United States is not a European nation such as those that Foucault theorized. It is, however, an anchor of the “first world” and/or the global north along with Europe. The United States originated, in part, as a colony of England. However, it was not the kind of colonial formation in the “third world” and/or global south that Gilroy and Mbembe discussed. The United States is a settler colony state more worthy of comparison with Australia and Israel in how it has been imposed and sustained upon a native population through violence. This settler colonialism, according to Smith (2010), is a major reason for how/why white supremacy has been so central to its formation and why racial violence has been so pervasive in US history. White supremacy in the United States, she argues, has been structured by three “primary logics [or pillars]y(i) slaveability/anti-black racism, which anchors capitalism, (ii) genocide, which anchors colonialism, and (iii) orientalism, which anchors war” (2). A critical reading of borderlands history suggests that there are overlapping dimensions between logic (ii) and logic (iii) of Smith’s schema that are structuring border militarization and its consequences. Regarding logic (iii), **the border was established as an act of imperial aggression or conquest** against a population (Mexicanos) that was “**orientalized**” as a foreign other that obstructed the nation’s **expansion** or “manifest destiny.” Regarding logic (ii), the foreign other was, largely, a part of the native population of that region and thus experienced the kind of genocidal conditions that all indigenous peoples have been exposed to in US history and that has been foundational to the experiences of all non-White groups. While the subaltern populations of many regions of the global south have engaged in successful anti-colonial campaigns during the mid to late twentieth century (although these are also campaigns that have reconfigured their plight within a more recent and post-colonial paradox), the settler has remained in the United States and has designed a complex network of militarized violence to ensure that. There has been very little, if any, alteration of the structural components of the existing racial order. Such components have been merely disguised by postracial discourse. The state sanctioned violence toward groups like Blacks and Latinos and that characterized previous historical eras has remained quite prolific and has been manifest in a barbaric continuum across US history. The United States, Smith argues, “**must always be at war**” (1). The violence inherent to the settler colony is its defining attribute and is, hence, irreconcilable. It is how its sovereignty is legitimated. As Wolfe (2006, 388) argues, “settler colonialism destroys to replace” and “invasionyis a structure not an event.” **These characteristics of US sovereignty, I argue, are uniquely pronounced in the US–Mexico borderlands. This is evident beyond acts and/or moments of systemic violence.** It is also evident in how violence is glorified within mythologies of US nationalism. As Slotkin (1998, 2000) has explained in his critical reading of frontier mythology, the western and southwestern borderlands represent the spaces within which American nationalism has been most effectively and pervasively “regenerated through violence,” literally and figuratively, as the borderlands were mythologized to have been rescued from the “scene of nature” and hence civilized by white frontiersmen fulfilling their “manifest destiny.” As part of this settler colonial enterprise and as first theorized by Paredes (1958) in his scrutiny of the Texas Rangers (Los Rinches), white gunmen and outlaws have been discursively recuperated as symbols of America’s frontier ethos, noble savages and, hence, foundations through which US sovereignty and geopolitical borders have been established. Relationally linked to that representation was the scene of nature, the domain of necessity, of a **Latinidad deserving of police and military vigilance to control**, subdue, and enforce borders both literal and figurative. Michalowski (2008) has theorized a more direct relationship to the violent ethos of American nationalism and its relationship to “migrant suffering,” a condition that he argues marks the extent to which the rule of law is often suspended in policing “illegal” immigration at the border. A fourth logic (iv) can be added to Smith’s pillars. It is the logic of geopolitics or a more critical attention to how the US–Mexico border signifies a geopolitical division intended to buttress the United States’ **placement as a center for the “first world**” or “global north,” that always already legitimates a blurring between law enforcement protocols and military apparatuses/strategies, and that renders Latinos uniquely susceptible to state sanctioned violence inflicted **in defense of sovereignty**. This omni-susceptibility seems evident within the historical, ethnographic, linguistic and theoretical works of Paredes (1958), De Leo´n (1983), Anzaldu´ a (1987), Horsman (1981), Garcia (1980), Montejano (1987), Carrigan and Webb (2003), Go´mez (2008), Gonzales-Day (2008), Dunn (1999), Andreas (2009) and Nevins (2002); Santa Ana (2002), Cha´vez (2008) and Juffer (2009). Collectively, that body of literature demonstrates that, from the outset, **Latinos have been produced as a primary threat to US sovereignty; that US sovereignty has been produced in rather direct and sustained opposition to Latinos, to Latinidad, and to Latin America; that the current geo-political border is a physical manifestation of that; and that this perception of Latinos as a perpetual foreign nemesis or foil has been deployed as justification for an assortment of anti-Latino policies and conditions across the United States for over a century now, many of which have been operationalized via the threat or practice of state sanctioned and systemic violence.** Anzaldu´ a’s theorization of the border as dividing the “first” and “third” worlds is, perhaps, the most famous of this group for how it illuminates the haunting presence of expendability. She narrates the border as a wound cut from violence that is unhealable due to the particular kind of violence that created it. The wound is then **not a result of a particular event**. **It is part of the border’s structure**, a wound that is continuously pricked and agitated, that hemorrhages routinely, and therein lies the expendability that has characterized Latino lives from the outset. The border still bleeds by design. As Montejano (1999, 256) and Palafox (2000, 1) have also explained, “in a historical sense, the US–Mexico borderyhas always been militarized.” Despite significant political economic shifts over time and despite the racial diversity within the Latino population, the aforementioned literature demonstrates that **Latinidad has always been associated with a degree of expendability**, that is, the scene of nature/deficiency/illegality, deserving of sustained subjugation. Cha´vez’s and Santa Ana’s work demonstrates how this expendability has **been discursively enhanced by a post-1980 s Latino population boom and a corollary growing anxiety among the US polity about a Latino “invasion**.” Cha´vez describes this as a “Latinos as threat narrative.” **The end result of this has been not only the border death toll, but also an over 40 per cent rise in antiLatino hate crimes (MALDEF, 2008), an exploding Latino prison population, state legislative bills that mandate the racial profiling of all Latinos as a method of enforcing immigration law** and the criminalization of Latino Studies programs.

#### The State works to repatriate Migrant bodies viewing them solely in terms of labor and not humanity. Ruses of opportunity are merely the forced choice of being for or against the State – reducing Latinadad to bare life and absolute annihilation

Baumann 20, Natalie. Necro-rhetorical Constructions of the Migrant: An Image of Death on the Border. Diss. Arizona State University, 2020. (Degree Master of Arts at Arizona State University)//Elmer

In the two months following the tragic deaths of Oscar and Valeria, which the Trump administration claimed to abhor, they rolled out programs that threatened to separate families, limit credibility of asylum claims, turn away claims due to procedural issues, rescind current protected statuses, and further militarize the border. Though their deaths did not by any means cause these changes to be made, the changes nevertheless communicate a certain pointed ambivalence to the lives that were lost. These programs, among many that were implemented in the months before and the months since, do little to dissuade migrants from taking risks similar to the one taken by the Martinez family when they elected to cross the Rio Grande. **The law invokes consent when it attempts to dodge responsibility**, often claiming that migrants choose to endure harsh conditions when subjecting themselves to geography of questionable safety, but the unnavigable legal terrain before them is designed to be far less porous than the physical border. Reflecting again on the statement made by former Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) Commissioner, Doris Messner, in which she explains that major border gateways can be controlled and migrants can be directed to cross at areas of the border that do not place them on a direct trajectory to populated areas, her casual remark that “geography will do the rest” incriminates the legal system that encourages these crossings. The legal measures taken in the months following their deaths confirm that the fate of Oscar and his nearly two-year-old daughter fulfilled administrative goals, and that those who died before them did as well. Conclusion The complicated network of socio-political factors that **allows the lives that exist on the border to be stripped of their dignity** is Gordian. It is the **result of biological impulses that drive us to protect** that which is important to us **coupled with the myth of the enemy** and a needless and inaccurate fictionalization of the lives south of the border. The management of borders takes place alongside volatile political, social, and colonial historical backgrounds. Many of the people crossing the borders have been **valued for their labo**r **but not as human beings**, which, among other things, makes them particularly good candidates for being **reduced to bare life.** Migrants fleeing their home countries are often escaping conditions of extreme inhumanity. Central American and Mexican families are seeking a safer life away from the dangerous living conditions of their hometowns, which often suffer at the hand of the cartel or face extreme poverty and lack of work opportunities. They travel long distances and endure severe difficulties reaching the United States, only to find themselves face to face with a different kind of threat: American sovereignty. The human in itself has no place in the sphere of American political action and, as a result, the lives **that belong to no nation** **can be reduced to the inhuman**. In a nation such as the United States that wields sovereign power, a person must either serve the purpose of the state, **or stand against it**. The Federal government approaches migrants **with an explicit goal of repatriation**. The border separates those who have accomplished this goal and those who have not. Thus, a border is placed in order to solve a “problem of excess of presence.” **In other words, the border wall is put in place for the purpose of dividing those who belong and those who do not.** Achille Mbembe discusses this divide, asserting that the border wall itself expresses a desire for separation. The sovereign nation, dependent on its continued ability to define itself by those it rejects, accepts by way of division that there is nothing in common between the citizen and the noncitizen and uses this division and enclaving as a method of categorizing the noncitizen as excess. As Achille Mbembe aptly notes, then, “to regain the feeling of existing henceforth depends on breaking with that excess presence, whose absence (or indeed disappearance pure and simple) will no longer be felt as a loss…The anxiety of annihilation thus goes to the core of contemporary projects of separation” (Necropolitics, 43). This annihilation **is procedural, meticulous, and brutal**, but as a self-affirming process, its brutality becomes less apparent as its processes **become increasingly socially acceptable**. Oscar and Valeria Martinez were victims when they were turned away at the border bridge, and they were victims again when their lungs finally filled with water. **Their victimhood did not stop at death though**. It is impossible to determine how many times we subjected the circumstance of their deaths to undignified and ruthless **appropriation** in the service of creating headlines or intimidating the American people into supporting inhumane border policies. What is possible to affirm, though, is that each migrant death thereafter proves the willful and methodological American **indifference to life.**

#### The Alternative is to affirm a Politic of Unthinkability – refuse their cruel hope of a “future-not-yet-realized”

Cacho 12, Lisa Marie. Social death: Racialized rightlessness and the criminalization of the unprotected. Vol. 7. NYU Press, 2012. (Associate Professor of Latina/o Studies at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign and will be joining the American Studies Department at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville)//Elmer

Unthinkable? Defining subjugation as the state’s refusal to protect rights already recognized by law supports and **sanctions the state’s monopoly on violence**. As Dylan Rodríguez explained for us earlier in the chapter, the state **acquires legitimacy and authority through sanctioning violence and formalizing disempowerment**. This makes the state an ineffective and ill-chosen ally in the fight for human rights. As a result, “human rights” loses its potential for mobilizing populations to demand structural changes. As state-enforced and administered, human rights cannot adequately address injustice. This is because, Randall Williams argues, the concept of human rights has been limited to law, which means it “can be posed only within the question of the improper/proper application of law.”117 Complying with the “rule of law” will always legitimate the state’s authority to create and enforce law; doing so, however, will not ensure that justice, empowerment, or equality will be the result. Moreover, we also expect **less of struggle, especially political struggle**, if a movement’s legitimacy hinges on its constituents’ deservingness as rightsbearing, law-abiding subjects because this focus pressures community leaders and committed activists to concentrate their efforts on lobbying the state to enforce its unfulfilled promises of privilege and protection. For this reason, it would be productive to follow the example of RAM activists to search beyond U.S. law and U.S. borders for alternatives to racialized “rights-based” and U.S.-centric struggles. Inspirational, though not perfect, movements have arisen worldwide in response to neoliberal reforms, and they often **originate from spaces criminalize**d by the United States. For instance, in cyber-space, the hacker group known as “Anonymous” uncovers evidence of the abuse of corporate and state power. More of a global collective than an identifiable group of individuals, Anonymous uses the Internet to publish corporate crime as well as corporate and state officials’ efforts around the world to impede social activism through censorship. **In Argentina**, workers displaced by **privatization, structural adjustment, and capital flight took control of abandoned factorie**s and created worker-run cooperatives.118 Under Hugo Chávez, Venezuela threw out its constitution and created a new one. These actions are unthinkable in the United States because they **are largely criminalized and to some degree even categorized as “terrorist” or akin to treason**. Furthermore, confronting the state is not without consequences. For instance, RAM’s incisive protests resulted not only in their being named one of the lead “extremist groups” but also in their members being targeted by Counter Intelligence Programs (COINTELPRO).119 Targeted members’ homes were raided, and they were framed for allegedly planning to commit crimes. The unthinkability of direct confrontation with the state also hindered RAM’s ability to build a solid community base. This does not mean that contemporary rights-based movements in United States are devoid of hope and potential. Oftentimes activists have to negotiate uncomfortable contradictions inherent to struggles over rights and recognition, but these contradictions are not always evident when buried beneath media master scripts of racial conflict and competition. For instance, when the black-Latina/o master narrative is imposed on representations of contemporary social movements, not only are the international tenets of African American social activism in the 1950s– 1970s erased, so, too, is the work of young undocumented adults. The focus on family rights and civil rights draws attention to Arellano and Mitchell, and because the black-Latina/o divide is often spoken about and naturalized in terms of uneducated citizens competing with undocumented immigrants for low-wage, unskilled work, people who don’t fit these identity and status categories are largely left out. U.S. immigration policy has also created a U.S.-educated and socially (but not economically or politically) integrated undocumented population for whom legal status is not as easily connected to nationality as most coverage of immigrant rights demonstrations lead us to believe. Each year that the Development, Relief, and Education for Minors Act (known as the DREAM Act) fails to get through Congress, the promise of citizenship is **foreclosed to countless young adults**, producing a highly educated population of people we might consider “undocumented Americans.” These youth and young adults are relegated to the realms of **social death,** perhaps permanently so. Social relations influenced by race and legal status expressed themselves differently for young DREAM activists, whose countries of origin can be traced to Latin America, Asia, the Caribbean, the Middle East, and Africa. Young undocumented activists have been organizing protests around the nation for years. When engaged in acts of civil disobedience, these activists publicly disclose their undocumented status, unsettling witnesses’ perceptions and prejudices of undocumented immigrants. Like RAM members in the 1960s, today’s young undocumented activists who engage in unthinkable politics are all too aware that there is much at stake in daring to critique the state. The state targets their families for deportation when their voices become too loud, their criticisms too astute, their whispers too influential. What these youth have learned is that unthinkability is not merely synonymous with impracticality but that state violence, whether enacted or inherited, makes certain ways of knowing and methods **for mobilizing unthinkable**. Upon voicing the injustices undocumented people must live with in the United States, many young activists find themselves and/or their family members in deportation proceedings. These young adults are not reckless; rather, they risk so much because they realize that there are few alternatives if they want meaningful change. One statement, which circulated briefly and locally in 2011 during the Georgia 7 sit-in, explained why these young activists do what for many would be unthinkable.120 In this sit-in, seven undocumented high school and college activists from around the country went to Georgia to protest the state’s new anti-undocumented immigrant act, which denied undocumented students admission to the top public colleges in Georgia. These activists, like others around the nation, knowingly and willingly risked deportation to make these issues public. Connecting their actions not to civil rights struggles per se but to a history of activism that demanded and desired more than political incorporation and national belonging, the activists saw themselves not as drawing upon but as continuing the legacy of those who dared to demand not only a new world but a new way of perceiving and interacting with the world. We recognize that throughout history the only time things have changed is when those affected have stood up and **put themselves at risk**. I am doing this action to stand up and say I am no longer afraid of being undocumented. We are here putting our futures at risk to ask if you will make a choice to stand with us? We are making a choice to stand up for our communities and we will not back down until they are no longer suffering. Laws that do nothing but damage our communities are wrong. As undocumented youth we will not tolerate the most vulnerable in our communities being attacked. It is our responsibility to protect them.121 Although these national actions have occurred in response to the increasing attacks on undocumented youths’ access to higher education, the statement reflects the activists’ commitment to much more than education and political incorporation. In fact, despite being racialized and rightless, these undocumented youth activists still see themselves as **empowered agents of social change** who have a responsibility to protect “the most vulnerable in [their] communities,” including those for whom the DREAM act cannot even be a dream. **Decentering the state as sole authority over legitimate power and recognized personhood** requires being willing to be critical of what makes us vulnerable to state violences and what makes us susceptible to the **state’s seductions**, what makes most avenues for social change not only **unthinkable but criminal**. For most, this is the assurance that when democracy prevails, political membership ensues, but in the **spaces of social death**, the state makes no attempt to offer such promises. Without the expectation of rights and recognition, we start from the reality of social death **rather than the promise of a better life**. As I demonstrated in this chapter, the space of social death is not a location of pure politics free from racism and heteropatriarchy. On the contrary, the space of **social death is a desperate space**, overwrought with and overdetermined by the ideological contradictions of ineligible personhood. The alternative actions, politics, and ways of knowing that emerge from or are inspired by social death are not without fault. They do, however, have a different relationship to fear and failure because they have a different relationship to rights and personhood. As Derrick Bell argues, a racial realist approach realizes that victory is not connected to **winning but to struggling despite guaranteed** failure. When guaranteed failure is the predicted result of struggle, an aggrieved group’s allies and adversaries will seem to want the same course of action — to put the struggle on hold, to wait, to give up. In the spaces of social death, any and every option is unthinkable, not because of impracticality or the U.S. public’s reluctance to change but because of the threat and promise of state violence. **We are disciplined to not think the unthinkable** when we learn about the risk of incarceration or deportation or when our families are held hostage. And yet the space of social death is always **graced with hope**, courage, and/ or youthful idealism, where those who decide to take responsibility for the unprotected are always looking for and stepping on the pressure points that can barely manage the contradictions that their very presence, their very being inspires.

#### Debate and its Communicative Forms are overcoded by Whiteness – their desire to affirm the objectivity of Western knowledge are a ruse of neutrality that smoothens violence within this space

Mirra 20, Nicole, and Debate Liberation League. "Without borders: youth debaters reimagining the nature and purpose of public dialogue." English Teaching: Practice & Critique (2020). (Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick)//DH+EY

In his memoir, White Like Me, writer and activist Wise (2005/2011) describes his experience as a policy debater in these terms: [...] **the activity is very white**, not merely in terms of its demographic, but also in terms of its style, its form, and its content at the most competitive levels. **Debate literally exudes whiteness**, and privileges white participants in a number of ways. (p. 63) While on the surface it may appear that the rules and structures of debate do not advantage any particular group of students, Wise suggests that both material access to the activity and its fundamental communicative **structures privilege whiteness.** At its most basic level, participation in debate depends upon the availability of a local league, time and resources to participate in extracurricular activities and a dedicated coach, all of which are extracurricular **resources that are inequitably distributed** and more available to white and high-income students (Snellman et al., 2015). Success often requires more, including access to informational resources about the resolution and summer debate camps, both of which are often purchased by well-resourced teams in more affluent communities for thousands of dollars. While NAUDL attempts to offset these advantages, students of color remain a small percentage of the debate community; furthermore, their participation is often framed in terms of “at-risk” youth **beating the odds** to succeed in a mainstream academic activity despite their identities and backgrounds. As researcher and former UDL debater, ReidBrinkley, (2012) explains in her discourse analysis of news articles about students like her: The repetition of the dangerous urban youth of color character as the most used representation of UDL students suggests an inability of news media to tell the success stories of inner-city students of color outside this frame. The texture and complexity of the lives of UDL students is lost within the constraints of **a pre-determined frame that restricts these students** to the scripts made available to them in a society bound **by the ontological standard of whiteness** at the intersection of the material privileges associated with economic wealth. (pp. 78-79) Critical race theorists highlight the ways that seemingly neutral institutions grounded in epistemological claims of objectivity and meritocracy **structurally privilege whiteness** and maintain systemic inequity (Crenshaw et al., 1995). In the realm of education, Critical Race Theory scholars have explored how policies and practices that use colorblind narratives of academic achievement silence the racialized experiences and oppression of students of color in the school system (Yosso, 2005). As applied to debate, the resource advantages that allow white students to participate in debate at higher levels feed into and foster literacy **practices that situate white ways of being as the norm** to which all other students must conform to enter the space (Johnson, 2018). These ways of being extend to the communicative structures that ground policy debate, which include framing of the US federal **government as a benevolent actor**, situating policy as a way to address social problems and valuing only published articles written by traditional credentialed “experts” as valid evidence. If debaters step outside these norms, **judges can dismiss their arguments** as off-topic and give the win to their opponents, which has the practical consequence of policing the debate space and the metaphorical consequence of narrowing what counts as appropriate or relevant public discourse about civic challenges. Feminist standpoint theorists argue that all knowledge claims emerge from particular social contexts and that perspectives are considered valid when they conform to the worldview of a particular community (Harding, 2004). In US society, the knowledge validation process privileges white male perspectives, in the process rejecting the embodied ways of knowing of communities of color – what Patricia Hill Collins deems “subjugated knowledge” (Hill Collins, 1990/1999). Black and Chicana feminists assert the need to center the experiences and expressive forms of marginalized groups; as Delgado Bernal (1998, p. 560) explains: [Chicana feminist epistemology] questions objectivity, a universal foundation of knowledge, and the Western dichotomies of mind versus body, subject versus object, objective truth versus subjective emotion, and male versus female.

### 4

#### Interp: If the affirmative defends anything other than “The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust”, they must provide a counter solvency advocate.

#### Violation

#### Prefer

#### 1. Limits – there are infinite things you could which pushes you to uncontestable arguments. Even if your interp, the only way to verify if it’s fair is proof of counter-arguments.

#### 2. Shiftiness- CSA conceptualizes what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Ambiguous affs we don’t know about can’t delink if they delineate these things.

#### 3. Research – Forces the aff to go to the other side of the library and contest their own view points and encourages more in-depth answers since I can find responses.

### 5

#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement – anything else moots 7 minutes of the nc – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that a world is better than another before you adopt it.

#### They justify substantive skews since there will always be a more correct side of the issue but we compensate for flaws in the lit.

#### Scalar methods like comparison increases intervention – the persuasion of certain DA or advantages sway decisions – T/F binary is descriptive and technical.

#### a priori’s 1st – even worlds framing requires ethics that begin from a priori principles like reason or pleasure so we control the internal link to functional debates.

#### The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means it’s constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I’ve met my burden.

#### Negate –

#### A private entity is “There are a few groups that can be considered a private entity in the business world. A partnership, corporation, individual, nonprofit organization, company, or any organized group that is not government-affiliated can be considered a private entity.”

That’s QT Company 20 [“What Are Private Entities?”. Quest Trust Company (custodian of self-directed IRAs located in Houston, Austin, and Dallas, Texas with clients Nationwide. Quest Trust Company, is the leading provider of self-directed retirement account administration services. Quest Trust Company has been in business since 2003 with over $2 Billion in assets under management. As a neutral party, Quest Trust Company does not offer any investments and therefore has no conflicts of interest with what our clients want to do with their IRAs). September 28, 2020. Accessed 12/17/21. <https://www.questtrustcompany.com/2020/09/28/what-are-private-entities/> //Xu]

#### Doesn’t exist with outer space appropriation –

FRANKOWSKI 17 [Paweł FRANKOWSKI (Assistant Professor at the Chair of International Relations and Foreign Policy, Institute of Political Science and International Relations of the Jagiellonian University). “OUTER SPACE AND PRIVATE COMPANIES: CONSEQUENCES FOR GLOBAL SECURITY”. Politeja. No. 50/5, GLOBAL AND REGIONAL SECURITY CHALLENGES (2017), pp. 131-148 (18 pages). Accessed 12/17/21. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26564288?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents> //Xu]

As mentioned earlier, when some space assets and services, like telecommunication services, from the very beginning of space exploration, have been in private hands, for other sector like space imagery or synchronizing services it was not an easy path. However, strategies geared towards more private involvement are intrinsically similar to strategies and justifications in other public services. John Donahue referring to the privatization of public services argues that the political choice between public and private services basically has two dimensions. The first concerns finance, and focuses on the questions whether or not individuals should pay for services individually, or maybe the same services should be provided by the state, with funds raised from taxation. Apart from financing, the second dimension focuses on performance, flexibility, and ability to adapt to changing circumstances. In general, this dimension should be analysed if services should be delivered from governmental level or provided by nonstate entity, with lesser attachment to procedures, red tape and managerial style of governing.4 Nevertheless, privatization of security and military services follows a slightly different logic, because after private companies acquired contracts to provide security services, provisions of such services will be still financed by public money. Therefore individuals’ rights, transferred to the state, who is main security provider, have been shifted back to private entities, able and willing to provide such services. Already it should be obvious that the main source of income for private space industry are public actors, and space companies hardly can find other clients. For example 66% of European space industry is coming from public sector,5 and only in 2015 European companies provided goods worth as much as 534 mln EUR for military customers EUR.6

#### 1] the[[3]](#footnote-3) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but appropriation isn’t a disease

#### 2] appropriation[[4]](#footnote-4) is “a sum of money or total of assets devoted to a special purpose” but the rez doesn’t spec a purpose.

#### 2] Paradox of tolerance- to be completely open to the aff we must exclude perspectives that wouldn’t be open to it which makes complete tolerance impossible.

#### 3] Decision Making Paradox- We need a decision-making procedure to enact the aff, but to choose a procedure requires another meta level decision-making procedure and so forth leading to infinite regress.

#### 7] Bonini’s Paradox- As a model of a complex system becomes more complete, it becomes less understandable and vice versa; therefore, no model can be useful.

#### 12] The rules of logic claim that the only time a statement is invalid is if the antecedent is true, but the consequent is false.

SEP [Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.] “An Introduction to Philosophy.” Stanford University. <https://web.stanford.edu/~bobonich/dictionary/dictionary.html> TG Massa

Conditional statement: an “if p, then q” compound statement (ex. If I throw this ball into the air, it will come down); p is called the antecedent, and q is the consequent. A conditional asserts that if its antecedent is true, its consequent is also true; any conditional with a true antecedent and a false consequent must be false.  For any other combination of true and false antecedents and consequents, the conditional statement is true.

#### If the neg is winning, they get the ballot is a tacit ballot conditional which means denying the premise proves the conclusion that I should get the ballot.

#### 13] Dogmatism Paradox – disregard the 1AR

Sorensen Sorensen, Roy, Professor of Philosophy at Washington University in St. Louis. "Epistemic Paradoxes.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 21 June 2006. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epistemic-paradoxes/>. PeteZ

Saul Kripke’s ruminations on the surprise test paradox led him to a paradox about dogmatism. He lectured on both paradoxes at Cambridge University to the Moral Sciences Club in 1972. (A descendent of this lecture now appears as Kripke 2011). Gilbert Harman transmitted Kripke’s new paradox as follows:

If I know that h is true, I know that any evidence against h is evidence against something that is true; I know that such evidence is misleading. But I should disregard evidence that I know is misleading. So, once I know that h is true, I am in a position to disregard any future evidence that seems to tell against h. (1973, 148)

#### 14] Principle of explosion is true which proves the resolution false

**Wikiwand**. “Principle of Explosion.” Wikiwand, 0AD, [www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle\_of\_explosion](http://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion). //Massa

A screenshot of a cell phone

Description automatically generated

The principle of explosion (Latin: ex falso (sequitur) quodlibet (EFQ), "from falsehood, anything (follows)", or ex contradictione (sequitur) quodlibet (ECQ), **"from contradiction, anything (follows)"), or the principle of**[**Pseudo-Scotus**](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Pseudo-Scotus), is the law of [classical logic](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Classical_logic), [intuitionistic logic](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Intuitionistic_logic) and similar logical systems, according to which any statement can be proven from a contradiction.[[1]](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion#citenote1) That is, once a contradiction has been asserted, any proposition (including their negations) can be inferred from it. This is known as **deductive explosion**.[[2]](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion#citenote2)[[3]](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion#citenote3) The proof of this principle was first given by 12th century French philosopher [William of Soissons](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/William_of_Soissons).[[4]](https://www.wikiwand.com/en/Principle_of_explosion#citenote4)

As a demonstration of the principle, **consider two contradictory statements – "All lemons are yellow" and "Not all lemons are yellow"**, and suppose that both are true. If that is the case, **anything can be proven**, e.g., **the assertion that "unicorns exist", by using the following argument:**

1. We know that **"All lemons are yellow"**, as it **has been assumed to be true.**
2. **Therefore**, the two-part statement **"All lemons are yellow OR unicorns exist” must also be true**, since the first part is true.
3. However, **since we know that "Not all lemons are yellow"** (as this has been assumed), **the first part is false, and hence the second part must be true, i.e., unicorns exist.**

#### 15] Vote neg because it’s simple – evaluating responses to this is complicated so don’t

Baker 04’ [Baker, Alan, 10-29-2004, "Simplicity (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)," <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/simplicity/>]

With respect to question (ii), there is an important distinction to be made between two sorts of simplicity principle. Occam's Razor may be formulated as an epistemic principle: if theory T is simpler than theory T\*, then it is rational (other things being equal) to believe T rather than T\*. Or it may be formulated as a methodological principle: if T is simpler than T\* then it is rational to adopt T as one's working theory for scientific purposes. These two conceptions of Occam's Razor require different sorts of justification in answer to question (iii). In analyzing simplicity, it can be difficult to keep its two facets—elegance and parsimony—apart. Principles such as Occam's Razor are frequently stated in a way which is ambiguous between the two notions, for example, “Don't multiply postulations beyond necessity.” Here it is unclear whether ‘postulation’ refers to the entities being postulated, or the hypotheses which are doing the postulating, or both. The first reading corresponds to parsimony, the second to elegance. Examples of both sorts of simplicity principle can be found in the quotations given earlier in this section.

#### 16] Negate because either the aff is true meaning its bad for us to clash w/ it because it turns us into Fake News people OR it’s not meaning it’s a lie that you can’t vote on for ethics

### 6

#### Interpretation: The aff must defend a legal justness instead of a moral one.

#### ‘Resolved’ preceding a colon indicates a legislative forum.

Blanche Ellsworth 81, English professor at SFSU and M.A. in English from UC Berkeley, 1/1/1981, *English Simplified*, 4th Edition, cc

A colon is also used to separate 3. THE SALUTATION OF A BUSINESS LETTER FROM THE BODY, Dear Sir Dear Ms. Weiner NOTE: In an informal letter, a comma follows the salutation: Dear Mary, Dear Uncle Jack 4. PARTS OF TITLES, REFERENCES, AND NUMERALS. TITLE: Principles of Mathematics: An Introduction REFERENCE: Luke 3:4—13 NUMERALS: 8:15 PM 5. PLACE OF PUBLICATION FROM PUBLISHER Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill 6. THE WORD RESOLVED FROM THE STATEMENT OF THE RESOLUTION. Resolved: That this committee go on record as favoring new legislation.

#### That entails a law

LII n.d. [(Legal Information Institute, non-profit, public service of Cornell Law School that provides no-cost access to current American and international legal research sources) “Legislation”] JL

Legislation refers to the preparation and enactment of laws by a legislative body through its lawmaking process. The legislative process includes evaluating, amending, and voting on proposed laws and is concerned with the words used in the bill to communicate the values, judgments, and purposes of the proposal. An idea becomes an item of legislative business when it is written as a bill. A bill is a draft, or tentative version, of what might become part of the written law. A bill that is enacted is called an act or statute.

#### Justice implies legal action

Merriam Webster ND [(Mesrriam Webster) “Justice” https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/justice] BC

Essential Meaning of justice

1: the process or result of using laws to fairly judge and punish crimes and criminals

#### Vote neg on jurisdiction – we don’t expect states to act out of moral righteousness since they have jobs to prioritize, but we expect them to follow and be consistent with laws they set since that is their job. Legal expectation is constitutive of a governing body.

#### Violation:

#### Prefer-

#### 1] Topical Stasis Point – Legality is more contextual to discussion of state action because laws are constitutive of entities. If the morals of the US changed, it would still be the US, but if all the laws and institutions changed, it would be a different country.

#### 2] Ground – Moral claims are paradoxical

**Derrida,** Jacques Derrida, “Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority” //Massa But **justice,** however unpresentable it may be, doesn't wait.· It **is that which must not wait.** To be direct, simple and brief, let us say this: **a just decision is always required immediately, "right away." It cannot furnish itself with** infinite information and the **unlimited knowledge of conditions,** rules or hypothetical imperatives **that could justify it.** And **even if it did** have all that at its disposal, even if it did give itself the time, all the time and all the necessary facts about the matter, **the moment of decision,** as such, **always remains a finite moment of urgency** and precipitation, since it must not be the consequence or the effectof this theoretical or historical knowledge, of this reflection or this deliberation, **since it always marks the interruption of the** juridico- or ethico- or politico-**cognitive deliberation that precedes it,** that must precede it. The instant of decision is a madness, says Kierkegaard. This is particularly true of the instant of the just decision that must rend time and defy dialectics. It is a madness. **Even if time** and prudence,the patience of knowledge and the mastery of conditions **were** hypothetically **unlimited, the decision would be structurally finite,** however late it came, decision of urgency and precipitation, **acting in** the night of **non-knowledge and non-rule**

#### 3] Real World – Teaches students portable skills applicable to a variety of fields.

Graham **Virgo**, Why Study Law at University if I don't want to become a lawyer, University of Cambridge, Faculty of Law //Massa

A lot of people who study Law at University do so because they want to become practising lawyers, whether barristers or solicitors. But it is not necessary to read Law at University to become a practising lawyer. Equally, studying Law at University is a legitimate subject for academic study even if you definitely do not want to become a lawyer or think that you may not become a practising lawyer. This is because the study of Law at University is not a vocational subject; it is an academic subject and an intellectual discipline. Even those students who study Law at University intending to become practising lawyers are required to do additional vocational training to prepare them for working as a barrister or a solicitor; the study of Law at University by itself is not sufficient to train them to become lawyers. So why do such students study law at University and why do others study Law even if they don’t want to become a lawyer? The answer is fairly similar in both cases, namely that studying Law at University trains the student to think and write logically and clearly; enables the student to engage in the critical analysis of the law; enables the student to engage in a wide variety of different academic disciplines; and is interesting and intellectually stimulating. **Students who study law** at Cambridge **end up doing a wide variety of jobs**, other than being a practising lawyer or a teacher or researcher of law. **The study of Law enables students to acquire and develop skills and knowledge which will be of relevance to business, politics, the civil service, charitable organisations, international non-governmental organisations, banking, finance, journalism and much, much more.** So what are the advantages of studying Law at University generally and studying Law at Cambridge specifically? 1. Breadth and depth of knowledge At Cambridge most Law students study 14 papers over three years. Seven of these are the foundation papers which must be taken if a student wishes to practice law, but, even if not, they are papers in subjects which are fundamental to English law, such as crime, contract and constitutional law, and which ought to be studied to get a good idea of what the law is about. All students also study Roman Law in the first year which is an excellent introduction to legal principles and legal thinking. Law students then have a choice of 6 other subjects from a very long list. This enables them to specialise or to study subjects which may relate to other academic disciplines, such as history, philosophy, sociology, psychology, government and politics, international relations and economics. Students with an expertise and interest in modern languages can also apply to go to one of four European countries between the second and third year of their legal students and study law in that foreign country, either in France, Germany, Spain or Holland. 2. Learning to think like a lawyer **Law is an academic discipline which enables students to think like lawyers. This means that they need to develop skills in thinking logically; in identifying issues in practical problems; in assessing evidence and in reaching judgments. These are all skills which are of significance to a wide variety of different jobs and professions.** The advantage of the small group teaching system at Cambridge means that students get a great deal of support from their teachers in being able to think and analyse the law. You also get a great deal of support in developing legal writing skills, which emphasises clarity of expression, conciseness and precision in the use of language; again, skills which are of real benefit to many careers.

#### Non-uniques prescriptive education.

Graham **Virgo 2**, Why Study Law at University if I don't want to become a lawyer, University of Cambridge, Faculty of Law //Massa

Finally, **students who study Law** at Universityengage in an academic discipline with a very long pedigree. They **discuss the work of ancient philosophers and modern theorists**; they **examine the meaning of justice;** they consider the operation of financial markets, corporations and commerce; they engage with the operation of law in a European and global arena; they analyse social policy and change. Aristotle said that the ‘Law is reason free from passion.’ He was half right. The law is reason, but it is full of passion.

#### 4] Inclusion- Moral Philosophy allows students to justify and adopt repugnant beliefs.

**Posner** The Problematics of Moral and Legal Theory, Richard A. Posner [Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit; University of Chicago Law School.], Harvard Law Review, Vol. 111, No. 7 (May, 1998), pp. 1637-1717//Massa Third, **academic moralism cannot succeed** in its aim of improving human behavior, for a number of reasons: 1. Knowing the moral thing to do does not furnish a motivation for doing it; the motivation has to come from outside morality. 2. **The analytical tools employed in academic moralism - whether moral casuistry, or reasoning from the canonical texts of moral philosophy, or reflective equilibrium - are too feeble to override either narrow self-interest or moral intuitions**. As a result, academic moral- ism is helpless when moral intuitions clash or self-interest opposes them, and otiose when there is no such conflict. So "right answers" moral realism is hopeless, just like the metaphysical kind. And academic moralists have neither the rhetorical resources nor the detailed knowledge of social reality that might enable them to persuade with- out good methods of inquiry and analysis. 3. **There is so much disagreement** among academic moralists that **the reader can easily find a** persuasive **rationalization for his preferred course of conduct, whatever it is**. 4. The character of a modern academic career in philosophy is not conducive to moral innovation or insight. 5. Exposure to **moral philosophy may** actually **lead people to behave less morally by making them more adept at rationalization.**

### 7

#### CP Text - The aff should enter into prior, binding, and genuine consultation with the Borderlands over whether we should affirm [Resolution]

#### To Clarify – this is not one or a few Latinx people but the Borderlands as a whole

#### Consultation submits Academic procedures to marginalized groups in the Borderlands to re-orient policies to combat Border Imperialism and create possibilities of alternate social futures

Quintanilla 15, Leslie, and Jennifer Mogannam. "Borders Are Obsolete: Relations beyond the" Borderlands" of Palestine and US–Mexico." American Quarterly 67.4 (2015): 1039-1046. (Leslie Quintanilla is a PhD candidate in the Department of Ethnic Studies at the University of California, San Diego. She is involved in grassroots activism and organizes with Colectivo Zapatista and Mujeres en Resistencia. Her academic research focuses on contemporary resistance against neoliberal capitalism and borders in the Mediterranean Sea region in order to think through the decolonization of land and water.)//Elmer

In Undoing Border Imperialism, Harsha Walia explains a process of mobilizing where community organizing against oppression requires the offering of tangible resources by organizers and intellectuals along with direct engagement and involvement **of marginalized communities** whose lives are most affected by systematic oppression.2 She further proposes that “oppressed communities should be within the leadership of our movements precisely because those most impacted by systematic oppression . . . [are] also those who are most impacted by systems of **border imperialism**, capitalism and empire.”3 These steps in the decolonization process are part of what Walia terms grassroots theory. 4 While academics might ponder the relevance of such strategies, these peoples, experiences, and relations are living the very concepts with which the academy is grappling, like racism, classism, sexism, colonialism, and empire. It is because of this that we believe these principles must be assumed as a means of **accountability** and of producing more meaningful and complex interventions that attend to and complement the experiences, articulations, and aims **of communities** subjected most to the oppressive regimes we so often discuss. And likewise, while **written intellectual production is a contribution or tool that can be beneficial for decolonization, this production in and of itself is not sufficient for the project of decolonization.** The role of intellectuals working toward decolonization **requires a questioning of position and relationship** to organizing and movement work before giving it more weight than others or being hastily marked as a form of activism. For Walia, “**Decolonization is, in essence, a subversion of border imperialism as it requires us to reimagine and reconfigure our communities based on shared ideals and** visions.”5 This description suggests that a multitude of processes contribute to decolonization, but **at the heart of decolonization are communities in struggle**. By aiming for an understanding and articulation of grassroots theory and centering its producers and enactors, it is possible to strive **for a community-based praxis** whereby resistance to oppression is facilitated in various strategic ways. Radical relation-building politics are not legible and cannot be understood only through the lens of settler colonialism at the border, because although it is resistance, it is also in **a space beyond the border itself**. When multiple bodies that identify as queer, migrant, Palestinian, Lakota, Mexican, Black, Asian Pacific Islander, Central American, Iranian meet at the site called the US–Mexico borderland through dialogue at the Break Down Borders 5K, **there are multiple temporalities** and geographies, dislocated and connected, that are reacting to the imperial nation-state and how it positions these bodies. There is a necessity to create possibilities of life beyond the settler colonial present of the United States, Israel, Mexico, and others, and while the border is present, it is not centered in these encounters. The energy of the border area is to build and create the spaces that intellectuals and academics can imagine existing only in a linear future, but we know are existing in the present. Danza azteca, dabke, Peace and Dignity Journeys, and the spirit of connectivity existed and intersected at the 5K border run.

### 8

#### I contend that philosophical zombies, entities that have no consciousness but are physically indistinguishable from agents, exist 🧟 –

#### 1] Swampman Objection –

Wikipedia summarizes Davidson ND [Donald Herbert Davidson (Slusser Professor of Philosophy at the University of California, Berkeley). “Donald Davidson (philosopher)”. Wikipedia. No Date. Accessed 1/23/22. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Donald_Davidson_(philosopher)#Swampman> //Xu]

* Induction fails too lol

Swampman is the subject of a philosophical thought experiment introduced by Donald Davidson in his 1987 paper "Knowing One's Own Mind". In the experiment, Davidson is struck by lightning in a swamp and disintegrated; simultaneously, an exact copy of Davidson, the Swampman, is made from a nearby tree and proceeds through life exactly as Davidson would have, indistinguishable from Davidson. The experiment is used by Davidson to claim that thought and meaning cannot exist in a vacuum; they are dependent on their interconnections to the world. Therefore, despite being physically identical to himself, Davidson states that the Swampman does not have thoughts nor meaningful language, as it has no causal history to base them on.[10]

#### 2] Explanatory Gap –

Tye 21 [Michael Tye (Professor of Philosophy at the University of Texas at Austin). “Qualia”. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. First published Wed Aug 20, 1997; substantive revision Thu Aug 12, 2021. Accessed 1/23/22. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qualia/#Explangap> //Xu]

Our grasp of what it is like to undergo phenomenal states is supplied to us by introspection. We also have an admittedly incomplete grasp of what goes on objectively in the brain and the body. But there is, it seems, a vast chasm between the two. It is very hard to see how this chasm in our understanding could ever be bridged. For no matter how deeply we probe into the physical structure of neurons and the chemical transactions which occur when they fire, no matter how much objective information we come to acquire, we still seem to be left with something that we cannot explain, namely, why and how such-and-such objective, physical changes, whatever they might be, generate so-and-so subjective feeling, or any subjective feeling at all.

#### 3] Knowledge Argument –

Wikipedia summarizes Jackson ND [F.C. Jackson (Emeritus Professor in the School of Philosophy (Research School of Social Sciences) at Australian National University). “Qualia.” Wikipedia. No Date. Accessed 1/23/2022. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Qualia> //Xu]

F.C. Jackson offers what he calls the "knowledge argument" for qualia.[19] One example runs as follows:

Mary the color scientist knows all the physical facts about color, including every physical fact about the experience of color in other people, from the behavior a particular color is likely to elicit to the specific sequence of neurological firings that register that a color has been seen. However, she has been confined from birth to a room that is black and white, and is only allowed to observe the outside world through a black and white monitor. When she is allowed to leave the room, it must be admitted that she learns something about the color red the first time she sees it – specifically, she learns what it is like to see that color.

This thought experiment has two purposes. First, it is intended to show that qualia exist. If one accepts the thought experiment, we believe that Mary gains something after she leaves the room – that she acquires knowledge of a particular thing that she did not possess before. That knowledge, Jackson argues, is knowledge of the quale that corresponds to the experience of seeing red, and it must thus be conceded that qualia are real properties, since there is a difference between a person who has access to a particular quale and one who does not.

The second purpose of this argument is to refute the physicalist account of the mind. Specifically, the knowledge argument is an attack on the physicalist claim about the completeness of physical truths. The challenge posed to physicalism by the knowledge argument runs as follows:

1. Before her release, Mary was in possession of all the physical information about color experiences of other people.
2. After her release, Mary learns something about the color experiences of other people.

Therefore,

1. Before her release, Mary was not in possession of all the information about other people's color experiences, even though she was in possession of all the physical information.

Therefore,

1. There are truths about other people's color experience that are not physical.

Therefore,

1. Physicalism is false.

### 9

#### I contend that monism – or the idea that only one thing exists, as opposed to multiple objects – is true –

#### 1] The Multiple Worlds Interpretation is cosmological consensus and best explains the wave function.

Gribbin 20 [John Gribbin (described by the Spectator as “one of the finest and most prolific writers of popular science around,” is the author of, among other books, “In Search of Schrödinger’s Cat,” “The Universe: A Biography,” and “Six Impossible Things,” from which this article is excerpted. He is a Visiting Fellow in Astronomy at the University of Sussex, UK). “The Many-Worlds Theory, Explained”. The MIT Press. May 20, 2020. Accessed 12/11/21. <https://thereader.mitpress.mit.edu/the-many-worlds-theory/> //Xu]

Most quantum computer scientists prefer not to think about these implications. But there is one group of scientists who are used to thinking of even more than six impossible things before breakfast — the cosmologists. Some of them have espoused the Many Worlds Interpretation as the best way to explain the existence of the Universe itself. Their jumping-off point is the fact, noted by Schrödinger, that there is nothing in the equations referring to a collapse of the wave function. And they do mean the wave function; just one, which describes the entire world as a superposition of states — a Multiverse made up of a superposition of universes. The first version of Everett’s PhD thesis (later modified and shortened on the advice of Wheeler) was actually titled “The Theory of the Universal Wave Function.” And by “universal” he meant literally that, saying: Since the universal validity of the state function description is asserted, one can regard the state functions themselves as the fundamental entities, and one can even consider the state function of the whole universe. In this sense this theory can be called the theory of the “universal wave function,” since all of physics is presumed to follow from this function alone. … where for the present purpose “state function” is another name for “wave function.” “All of physics” means everything, including us — the “observers” in physics jargon. Cosmologists are excited by this, not because they are included in the wave function, but because this idea of a single, uncollapsed wave function is the only way in which the entire Universe can be described in quantum mechanical terms while still being compatible with the general theory of relativity. In the short version of his thesis published in 1957, Everett concluded that his formulation of quantum mechanics “may therefore prove a fruitful framework for the quantization of general relativity.” Although that dream has not yet been fulfilled, it has encouraged a great deal of work by cosmologists since the mid-1980s, when they latched on to the idea. But it does bring with it a lot of baggage. The universal wave function describes the position of every particle in the Universe at a particular moment in time. But it also describes every possible location of those particles at that instant. And it also describes every possible location of every particle at any other instant of time, although the number of possibilities is restricted by the quantum graininess of space and time. Out of this myriad of possible universes, there will be many versions in which stable stars and planets, and people to live on those planets, cannot exist. But there will be at least some universes resembling our own, more or less accurately, in the way often portrayed in science fiction stories. Or, indeed, in other fiction. Deutsch has pointed out that according to the MWI, any world described in a work of fiction, provided it obeys the laws of physics, really does exist somewhere in the Multiverse. There really is, for example, a “Wuthering Heights” world (but not a “Harry Potter” world). That isn’t the end of it. The single wave function describes all possible universes at all possible times. But it doesn’t say anything about changing from one state to another. Time does not flow. Sticking close to home, Everett’s parameter, called a state vector, includes a description of a world in which we exist, and all the records of that world’s history, from our memories, to fossils, to light reaching us from distant galaxies, exist. There will also be another universe exactly the same except that the “time step” has been advanced by, say, one second (or one hour, or one year). But there is no suggestion that any universe moves along from one time step to another. There will be a “me” in this second universe, described by the universal wave function, who has all the memories I have at the first instant, plus those corresponding to a further second (or hour, or year, or whatever). But it is impossible to say that these versions of “me” are the same person. Different time states can be ordered in terms of the events they describe, defining the difference between past and future, but they do not change from one state to another. All the states just exist. Time, in the way we are used to thinking of it, does not “flow” in Everett’s MWI.

#### Implications –

#### A] predictions fail – the multiverse of all different possibilities illustrates the impossibility of predicting consequences – Newtonian and linear interpretations fail since every possibility occurs.

#### B] aggregation fails – a literal infinite number of universes with infinite life-forms and hedonic experiences renders aggregation nonsensical when calculating ethical implications.

#### Quantum Monism solves and is verifiable.

Päs 19 [Heinrich Päs (Professor of Theoretical Physics at TU Dortmund University). “Quantum Monism Could Save the Soul of Physics”. Scientific American. March 5, 2019. Accessed 12/10/21. <https://blogs.scientificamerican.com/observations/quantum-monism-could-save-the-soul-of-physics/> //Xu]

This is where “quantum monism,” as championed by Rutgers University philosopher Jonathan Schaffer, enters the stage. Schaffer has mused over the question of what the universe is made of. According to quantum monism, the fundamental layer of reality is not made of particles or strings but the universe itself—understood not as the sum of things making it up but rather as a single, entangled quantum state. Similar thoughts have been expressed earlier, for example by the physicist and philosopher Carl Friedrich von Weizsäcker. Taking quantum mechanics seriously predicts a unique, single quantum reality underlying the multiverse. The homogeneity and the tiny temperature fluctuations of the cosmic microwave background, which indicate that our observable universe can be traced back to a single quantum state, usually identified with the quantum field that fuels primordial inflation, support this view. Moreover, this conclusion extends to other multiverse concepts such as different laws of physics in the various valleys of the “string theory landscape” or other “baby universes” popping up in eternal cosmological inflation. Since entanglement is universal, it doesn’t stop at the boundary of our cosmic patch. Whatever multiverse you have, when you adopt quantum monism they are all part of an integrated whole. There always is a more fundamental layer of reality underlying the many universes within the multiverse, and that layer is unique.

#### 2] The litmus test is non-arbitrariness – blurry guidelines allows agents to inconsistently understand morality which renders ethics useless since it can’t serve as a guide to action.

#### A priori rationality comes first –

#### A] Cartesian Skepticism – I could be dreaming, hallucinating, or controlled by a demon so empirical knowledge is unreliable. The only thing I know is that I am doubting and reasoning.

#### B] Causal Determinism – the physical world removes culpability from the agent – agential action occurs because of an antecedent NOT their will – only the a priori world assumes a rational agent not subject to physical side constraints.

#### C] Hume’s Guillotine – descriptive claims cannot prescribe action – “arsenic is poison” doesn’t mean “one ought not drink arsenic” because it doesn’t ought to be that way. Only the a priori can form ought statements.

#### Space must exist between things to distinguish between them as multiple since otherwise, objects aren’t separate but A] the a priori world isn’t subject to empirical contingencies like spatial separation B] all minds must be fundamentally identical given the mind is not a spatial entity.

#### Monism negates –

#### 1] by means

Lexico. Oxford Dictionary. By. https://www.lexico.com/en/definition/by

Identifying the agent performing an action.

#### 1AC Of – “indicating an association between two entities, typically one of belonging”.

Google<https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60.1494j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>

#### Per the 1AC but monism proves agents and groups cannot exist

#### That o/w – the rez cant prescribe value statements if the object of an obligation is incoherent

#### 2] ethics requires conduct between agents ie private entities to outer space– even if one has a duty for them self, it assumes a difference between the self and the mind; otherwise it’s not a duty since its just self-imposed

### 10

#### Revolution is closer than ever but requires communist organization.

Basanta ‘20

[Comrade Basanta, polit-bureau member of the CPN-Maoist. 06/14/2020. “On American Crisis — 2,” <https://www.bannedthought.net/Nepal/CPN-Maoist/2020/OnAmericanCrisis-2-Basanta-Eng.pdf>] pat

Nowadays, the United States of America is undergoing a serious crisis. As a consequence of the health crisis brought in by the mishandling of the Covid-19, the unemployment and the economic crisis caused by lockdown, the Black Lives Matter movement created by the white racist supremacy on the part of ruling class, the US now has been trapped in a vicious circle of crisis after crisis. The former defence secretary Collin Powel and the former state secretary of the US James Mattis, who were strong pillars and confidants of Donald Trump, have turned sharp critics due to his mishandling of the on-going movement. President Trump has stopped talking with Dr. Anthony Fauci, the health advisor of the President as their row in the handling of pandemic sharpened. President Donald Trump has now been isolated almost from all quarters. Moreover, the political tussle in the upcoming presidential election is going to divide and polarise the US society further and he seems to get trapped in an awful crisis and further isolation causing insanity. No one can deny that the obstinate president can deploy military to cleanse racial opposition in the name of containing the 'anarchists' and 'terrorists'. The present crisis in the US seems like a wakeup call for a bigger crisis in the days ahead.

I feel to offer a red salute to the declaration of the autonomous region made recently in the Capitol Hill of Seattle, America. However, emotion is not decisive. The autonomous region established within the framework of the reactionary state power provokes the enemy more than it safeguards the liberation of the oppressed people in CHAZ. This kind of tactical move can be supportive if it is made a part of the overall strategy of revolution. The on-going movement seems to be spontaneous, and it does not have any stated destination. Reform in police does not solve the problem the proletariat and the oppressed black people have been confronting in the US. The solution to the on-going crisis in America is scientific socialism guided by Marxism-Leninism-Maoism and led by a party of the proletariat. Worth noting is that, the spontaneous movement cannot bring about any revolutionary change in society but it creates a situation from the womb of which a correct ideological and political line and the leadership gestate. The present situation in the US shows that the objective condition is getting favourable for the success of the socialist revolution. But as Che Guevara has said the revolution is not like a mango which automatically falls from the mango tree when it is ripe. What is necessary to develop for the American proletariat at present is the armoury of weapons that help make the revolution a success when they act upon the favourably developing situation.

The first weapon for the success of the socialist revolution in the US is the formation of a genuine Communist Party guided by MLM. And the second weapon is a united front led by the party. In the particular situation of America the strong ideological and political unity mainly between the proletariats of white and black colours along with other oppressed people is a must. The reactionary cultural makeup of the US society based on white racist supremacy has made this task more challenging. The third weapon is the fighting force. All of these weapons are unlikely to get realised in a single attempt now in America. Nevertheless, the sharpening of contradictions in the US society and the objective necessity of revolution to solve them is creating an objective condition to realise it.

In the given situation, the communist revolutionaries in the US have to make a conscious effort to build up an ideologically and politically strong communist party and unite in it several groups and individuals scattered all across the US. Once the political party and its ideological and political line are built up, then the others will come on its way. The revolutionaries have to take up this task sooner than later for the emancipation of the entire oppressed people in America, including the blacks.

#### Debate is a site of revolutionary subjectivity and they have refused to align with the Party – interp and violation –

#### Revolutionary Subjectivity is a voter – it’s the only exportable skill from debate that models the organization of the revolution – ignoring procedural barriers decimates method testing and is an internal link to any benefit of their discourse.

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.1976j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://www.google.com/search?q=appropriation+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=appr&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i57j69i59l2j69i60l3.1218j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-4)