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#### Settler colonialism structures the world in a settler-native-slave relationship, erasing indigenous peoples, causing constant ontological violence.
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Our intention in this descriptive exercise is not be exhaustive, or even inarguable; instead, we wish to emphasize that (a) decolonization will take a different shape in each of these contexts - though they can overlap - and that (b) neither external nor internal colonialism adequately describe the form of colonialism which operates in the United States or other nation-states in which the colonizer comes to stay. Settler colonialism operates through internal/external colonial modes simultaneously because there is no spatial separation between metropole and colony. For example, in the United States, many Indigenous peoples have been forcibly removed from their homelands onto reservations, indentured, and abducted into state custody, signaling the form of colonization as simultaneously internal (via boarding schools and other biopolitical modes of control) and external (via uranium mining on Indigenous land in the US Southwest and oil extraction on Indigenous land in Alaska) with a frontier (the US military still nicknames all enemy territory “Indian Country”). The horizons of the settler colonial nation-state are total and require a mode of total appropriation of Indigenous life and land, rather than the selective expropriation of profit-producing fragments. Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain. Thus, relying solely on postcolonial literatures or theories of coloniality that ignore settler colonialism will not help to envision the shape that decolonization must take in settler colonial contexts. Within settler colonialism, the most important concern is land/water/air/subterranean earth (land, for shorthand, in this article.) Land is what is most valuable, contested, required. This is both because the settlers make Indigenous land their new home and source of capital, and also because the disruption of Indigenous relationships to land represents a profound **epistemic, ontological, cosmological violence**. This violence is not temporally contained in the arrival of the settler but is reasserted each day of occupation. This is why Patrick Wolfe (1999) emphasizes that **settler colonialism is a structure and not an event.** In the process of settler colonialism, land is remade into property and human relationships to land are restricted to the relationship of the owner to his property. Epistemological, ontological, and cosmological relationships to land are interred, indeed made pre-modern and backward. Made savage. In order for **the settlers** to make a place their home, they must **destroy and disappear the Indigenous peoples that live there.** **Indigenous peoples are those who have creation stories, not colonization stories, about how we/they came to be in a particular place - indeed how we/they came to be a place**. Our/their relationships to land comprise our/their epistemologies, ontologies, and cosmologies. For **the settlers, Indigenous peoples are in the way and, in the destruction of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous communities, and over time and through law and policy, Indigenous peoples’ claims to land under settler regimes, land is recast as property and as a resource.** Indigenous peoples must be erased, must be made into ghosts (Tuck and Ree, forthcoming). At the same time, settler colonialism involves the subjugation and forced labor of chattel slaves, whose bodies and lives become the property, and who are kept landless. Slavery in settler colonial contexts is distinct from other forms of indenture whereby excess labor is extracted from persons. First, chattels are commodities of labor and therefore it is the slave’s person that is the excess. Second, unlike workers who may aspire to own land, the slave’s very presence on the land is already an excess that must be dis-located. Thus, the slave is a desirable commodity but the person underneath is imprisonable, punishable, and murderable. The violence of keeping/killing the chattel slave makes them deathlike monsters in the settler imagination; they are reconfigured/disfigured as the threat, the razor’s edge of safety and terror. The settler, if known by his actions and how he justifies them, sees himself as holding dominion over the earth and its flora and fauna, as the anthropocentric normal, and as more developed, more human, more deserving than other groups or species. **The settler is making a new "home" and that home is rooted in a homesteading worldview where the wild land and wild people were made for his benefit**. He can only make his identity as a settler by making the land produce, and produce excessively, because "civilization" is defined as production in excess of the "natural" world (i.e. in excess of the sustainable production already present in the Indigenous world). In order for excess production, he needs excess labor, which he cannot provide himself. The chattel slave serves as that excess labor, labor that can never be paid because payment would have to be in the form of property (land). The settler's wealth is land, or a fungible version of it, and so payment for labor is impossible.6 The settler positions himself as both superior and normal; the settler is natural, whereas the Indigenous inhabitant and the chattel slave are unnatural, even supernatural. **Settlers are not immigrants**. Immigrants are beholden to the Indigenous laws and epistemologies of the lands they migrate to. Settlers become the law, supplanting Indigenous laws and epistemologies. Therefore, settler nations are not immigrant nations (See also A.J. Barker, 2009). Not unique, the United States, as a settler colonial nation-state, also operates as an empire - utilizing external forms and internal forms of colonization simultaneous to the settler colonial project. This means, and this is perplexing to some, that dispossessed people are brought onto seized Indigenous land through other colonial projects. Other colonial projects include enslavement, as discussed, but also military recruitment, low-wage and high-wage labor recruitment (such as agricultural workers and overseas-trained engineers), and displacement/migration (such as the coerced immigration from nations torn by U.S. wars or devastated by U.S. economic policy). In this set of settler colonial relations, colonial subjects who are displaced by external colonialism, as well as racialized and minoritized by internal colonialism, still occupy and settle stolen Indigenous land. Settlers are diverse, not just of white **European descent, and include people of color, even from other colonial contexts**. This tightly wound set of conditions and racialized, globalized relations exponentially complicates what is meant by decolonization, and by solidarity, against settler colonial forces. Decolonization in exploitative colonial situations could involve the seizing of imperial wealth by the postcolonial subject. In settler colonial situations, seizing imperial wealth is inextricably tied to settlement and re-invasion. Likewise, the promise of integration and civil rights is predicated on securing a share of a settler-appropriated wealth (as well as expropriated ‘third-world’ wealth). Decolonization in a settler context is fraught because empire, settlement, and internal colony have no spatial separation. Each of these features of settler colonialism in the US context - empire, settlement, and internal colony - make it a site of contradictory decolonial desires7. Decolonization as metaphor allows people to equivocate these contradictory decolonial desires because it turns decolonization into an empty signifier to be filled by any track towards liberation. In reality, the tracks walk all over land/people in settler contexts. Though the details are not fixed or agreed upon, in our view, decolonization in the settler colonial context must involve the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted; that is, all of the land, and not just symbolically. This is precisely why decolonization is necessarily unsettling, especially across lines of solidarity. “Decolonization never takes place unnoticed” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36). Settler colonialism and its decolonization implicates and unsettles everyone.

#### The 1AC imposes itself on indigenous businesses which decks indigenous sovereignty --- their pro-Union arguments are used to reify indigenous violence

Harvard Law Review 21 “Tribal Power, Worker Power: Organizing Unions in the Context of Native Sovereignty.” Harvardlawreview.org, 11 Jan. 2021, harvardlawreview.org/2021/01/tribal-power-worker-power-organizing-unions-in-the-context-of-native-sovereignty/. Accessed 7 Nov. 2021.

Since 1990, employees of businesses owned and operated by Native nations have increasingly sought to amplify their voices in the workplace through union representation. Many of these (primarily non-Native ) workers have invoked the protections of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). The protections of federal labor law have been crucial to building worker power in private-sector enterprises. But to many tribal governments, this invocation of a federal statute is an affront to the inherent sovereignty of Native nations. Labor organizing in tribal enterprises uncovers a seemingly intractable tension between two classes of power-building institutions: unions and tribes. Unionizing workers, often members of non-Native minority groups, feel disenfranchised in their workplaces, while Native governments perceive intervention into their internal affairs as threatening their inherent sovereignty — sovereignty that has been weakened through congressional action and Supreme Court decisions. 7 This tension is especially acute in the ideological context of the modern labor movement, which casts unionism as rooted in values of progressivism and social justice.

#### The aff sanitizes and obscures the broader system of coloniality – stating that governments have an “obligation” is a settler move to innocence
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The articles constituting this volume of Africanus are diverse but they all emphasize the need for decoloniality as another perspective from which development could be interrogated and understood as discourse. What the majority of authors argue for is decolonization of the discourse of development through indigenization of the concept. An un-decolonized discourse of development presents Africans as objects rather than subjects of development. African people feature in development discourse as a problem to be solved. A humanitarian perspective has always permeated development discourse in the process hiding the structural causes of lack of development in Africa. A decolonial perspective is grounded in world-systems approach. It maintains that the modern world system that emerged in 1492 has remained racially hierarchized, Euro-American-centric, sexist, hetero-normative, Christiancentric, Western-centric, capitalist and colonial in orientation (Grosfoguel 2007). Africa and other parts of the Global South have remained peripheral and subaltern. This is why decolonial thinkers understand development as involving the decolonization of the modern world system. Decoloniality cascades from the context in which the humanity of black people is doubted and their subjectivity is articulated in terms of lacks and deficits (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013a; Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013b). Lacking development is constitutive of a Western articulation of African subjectivity. This point is well articulated by Ramon Grosfoguel, a leading Latin American thinker and theorist who understood the articulation on subjectivity of non-Western people as unfolding in this way: We went from the sixteenth century characterization of ‘people without writing’ to the eighteenth and nineteenth century characterization of ‘people without history,’ to the twentieth century characterization of ‘people without development’ and more recently, to the early twenty first century of ‘people without democracy’ (Grosfoguel 2007: 214). During the same period, those in the ‘Zone of Being’ were systematically gaining more and more fruits of modernity ‘from sixteenth century ‘rights of people,’ to ‘eighteenth century ‘rights of man,’ and to the ‘late twentieth century human rights’ (Grosfoguel 2007: 214). Decoloniality is against all vestiges of colonialism and realities of coloniality. It is a redemptive epistemology which inaugurates and legitimates the telling the story of the modern world from the experiences of colonial difference. Decoloniality materialized at the very moment in which imperialism and colonialism arrived in Africa. Decoloniality ‘struggles to bring into intervening existence an-other interpretation that bring forward, on the one hand, a silenced view of the event and, on the other, shows the limits of imperial ideology disguised as the true (total) interpretation of the events’ in the making of the modern world (Mignolo 1995: 33). Decoloniality is both an epistemic and a political project seeking liberation and freedom for those people who experienced colonialism and who are today subsisting and living under the boulder of global coloniality. Development is linked to liberation and freedom from domination and exploitation. This is why decoloniality is distinguished from the imperial version of history through its push for shifting of a geography of reason from the West as the epistemic locale from which the ‘world is described, conceptualized and ranked’ to the ex-colonised epistemic sites as legitimate points of departure in describing the construction of the modern world order (Mignolo 1995: 35). Decoloniality identifies coloniality as a key hindrance to development in Africa. Nelson Maldonado-Torres, a leading philosopher in decolonial thought, grapples with the meaning of coloniality and this is how he defined it: Coloniality is different from colonialism. Colonialism denotes a political and economic relation in which the sovereignty of a nation or a people rests on the power of another nation, which makes such a nation an empire. **Coloniality**, instead, **refers to** long-standing **patterns of power** thatemerged **as a result of colonialism**, but **that define culture, labour, intersubjectivity relations, and knowledge production well beyond the strict limits of colonial administrations.** Thus, coloniality survives colonialism. It is maintained alive in books, in the criteria for academic performance, in cultural patterns, in common sense, in the self-image of peoples, in aspirations of self, and so many other aspects of our modern experience. In a way, as modern subjects we breathe coloniality all the time and every day (Maldonado- Torres 2007: 243). Decolonial thinkers understand the Global South as that epistemic site that received the negatives of modernity. **Coloniality is a** name for the ‘darker side’ of modernity that needs to be unmasked because it exists as ‘an embedded **logic that enforces control, domination, and exploitation** disguised **in the language of** salvation, **progress**, modernization, **and being good for everyone’** (Mignolo 1995: 6). Walter D. Mignolo argued that ‘Coloniality names the experiences and views of the world and history of those whom Fanon called les damnes de la terre (“the wretched of the earth,” those who have been, and continue to be, subjected to the standard of modernity)’ (Mignolo 1995: 8). He elaborated on the meaning of the wretched of the earth in this way: The wretched are defined by the colonial wound, and the colonial wound, physical and/or psychological, is a consequence of racism, the hegemonic discourse that questions the humanity of all those who do not belong to the locus of enunciation (and the geo-politics of knowledge) of those who assign the standard of classification and assign to themselves the right to classify (Mignolo 1995: 8). Unlike coloniality, decoloniality names a cocktail of insurrectionist-liberatory projects and critical thoughts emerging from the ex-colonised sites such as Latin America, Caribbean, Asia, Middle East, and Africa. It seeks to make sense of the position of ex-colonised peoples within the Euro- America-centric, Christian-centric, patriarchal, capitalist, hetero-normative, racially hierarchized, and modern world-system that came into being in the fifteenth century (Mignolo 2000; Grosfoguel 2007). Decoloniality seeks to unmask, unveil, and reveal coloniality as an underside of modernity that coexisted with the rhetoric of progress, equality, fraternity, and liberty. It is a particular kind of critical intellectual theory as well as political project that seeks to disentangle ex-colonised parts of the world from global coloniality (Mignolo 2011). What distinguishes decoloniality from other existing critical social theories is its locus of enunciations and its genealogy – which is outside Europe. Decoloniality can be best understood as a pluriversal epistemology of the future – a redemptive and liberatory epistemology that seeks to delink from the tyranny of abstract universals (Mignolo 2007: 159). Decoloniality informs the ongoing struggles against inhumanity of the Cartesian subject, ‘the irrationality of the rational, the despotic residues of modernity’ (Mignolo 2011: 93). As a critical social theory, decoloniality is constituted by three main concepts. The first is coloniality of power. It is a useful concept, which delves deeper into the roots of the present asymmetrical global power relations and how the present modern world order was constituted. It boldly enables a correct naming of the current ‘global political present’ as a racially hierarchized, Euro-American-centric, Christian-centric, patriarchal, sexist, capitalist, hetero-normative, hegemonic, and modern power structure that emerged in 1492. At the centre of the construction of this power structure was the bifurcation of the world into ‘Zone of Being’ and ‘Zone of None-Being’ maintained by invisible ‘abyssal lines’ (Gordon 2005; Santos 2007). The Portuguese sociologist and leading decolonial thinker had this to say about the making of the ‘Zone of Being’ and the ‘Zone of Non- Being’: Modern Western thinking is an abyssal thinking. It consists of a system of visible and invisible distinctions, the invisible ones being the foundation of the visible ones. The invisible distinctions are established through radical lines that divide social reality into two realms, the realm of “this side of the line” and the realm of “the other side of the line.” The division is such that the “other side of the line” vanishes as reality, becomes nonexistent, and is indeed produced as nonexistent. Nonexistent means not existing in any relevant or comprehensive way of being. Whatever is produced as nonexistent is radically excluded because it lies beyond the realm of what the accepted conception of inclusion considers to be its other. What most fundamentally characterizes abyssal thinking is thus the impossibility of the copresence of the two sides of the line (Santos 2007: 45). To the ‘Zone of Being’ (Euro-American world) modernity deposited its fruits of progress, civilization, modernization, industrialization, development, democracy and human rights while at the same time imposing the slave trade, imperialism, colonialism and apartheid into Africa (the Zone of None-Being). The second concept is that of coloniality of knowledge. Epistemology and methodology are inextricably intertwined with imperial power. This is why Claude Ake wrote about ‘social science as imperialism’ that enabled development in Europe and America while disabling development in Africa (Ake 1979). Research into development cannot ignore delving into epistemological issues, into the politics of knowledge generation, and the fundamental question of who generates which knowledge and for what purposes. How knowledge has been used to assist imperialism and colonialism and to inscribe Euro- American-centric epistemology that consistently appropriated what was considered progressive, and displacing what was considered repugnant aspects of endogenous and indigenous knowledges remains a fertile area of research. The same is true of the important question of relevance and irrelevance of knowledge, particularly how some knowledges disempowered communities and peoples, and how others empowered individuals and communities. The point that emerges poignantly from decoloniality is that current knowledges, epistemologies and methodologies are for equilibrium rather than transformation. They are for the status quo rather than for change. The fundamental challenge facing Africa is how knowledges, epistemologies and methodologies of equilibrium can be expected to enable development in Africa. Decoloniality speaks to this quandary. The third concept is that of coloniality of being, which was articulated by Nelson Maldonado-Torres (2007). This concepts enables us to delve deeper into the pertinent questions of the making of modern subjectivities, into issues of humanism, and into questions of the role played by philosophers such as Rene Descartes and the long-term implications of his motto, ‘Cogito ergo sum/I think, therefore, I am’) on conceptions of subjectivity. What is evident is that modernity endowed whiteness with ontological density far above blackness as identities. This happened as the notions of ‘I think, therefore, I am’ were mutating into ‘I conquer, therefore, I am’ and its production of ‘colonizer and colonized’ articulation of subjectivity and being (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013a). From these imperial and colonial articulations of African humanity, there was a permanent questioning of the humanity of black people and this attitude and practice culminated in processes of ‘objectification’ / ‘thingification’ / ‘commodification’ of Africans as slaves (Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013b). Therefore, the response to the question of why decoloniality in the 21stcentury, the answer is simply **that coloniality is still operative and active and needs to be decolonized**. The post-1945 juridical decolonization did not succeed to decolonize the modern world order that was formed since 1492. This is why Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni argued that: What Africans must be vigilant against is the trap of ending up normalizing and universalizing coloniality as a natural state of the world. It must be unmasked, resisted and destroyed because it produced a world order that can only be sustained through a combination of violence, deceit, hypocrisy and lies (Ndlovu- Gatsheni 2013b: 10). It is a question that Ramon Grosfoguel gave a more comprehensive response: One of **the most powerful myth**s of the twentieth century was the notion that the elimination of colonial administrations amounted to the decolonization of the world. This led to the myth of a “postcolonial” world. The heterogeneous and multiple global structures put in place over a period of 450 years did not evaporate with the juridical-political decolonization of the periphery over the past 50 years. We continue to **live under the same “colonial power matrix**.” With juridical-political decolonization we moved from a period of ‘global **colonialism’** to the current period of “global **coloniality**.” Although “colonial administrations” have been almost entirely eradicated and the majority of the periphery is politically organized into independent states, non-European people are still living under crude European/Euro- American exploitation and domination. The old colonial hierarchies of European versus non-Europeans remain in place and are entangled with the “international division of labour” and accumulation of capital at a world-scale (Grosfoguel 2007: 219). The celebration of ‘juridical-political’ decolonization obscures the continuities between the colonial past and coloniality – it leads to illusions of possibilities of enjoyment of ‘independence’ and ‘freedom’, ‘national sovereignty’ and ‘national identity’, as well as ‘national development’ and ‘progress’. Decoloniality pushes for transcendence over narrow conceptions of being decolonized and consistently gestures towards liberation from coloniality as a complex matrix of knowledge, power, and being. Decoloniality consistently reminds decolonial thinkers of ‘the unfinished and incomplete twentieth century dream of decolonization’ (Grosfoguel 2007: 221). Decoloniality announces the ‘the decolonial turn’ as a long existing ‘turn’ standing in opposition to the ‘colonizing turn’ underpinning Western thought (Maldonado-Torres 2011: 1). Decoloniality announces the broad ‘decolonial turn’ that involves the ‘task of the very decolonization of knowledge, power and being, including institutions such as the university’ (Maldonado-Torres 2011: 1). Maldonado-Torres elaborated on the essence of ‘decolonial turn’: The decolonial turn (different from the linguistic or the pragmatic turns) refers to the decisive recognition and propagation of decolonization as an ethical, political, and epistemic project in the twentieth century. The project reflects changes in historical consciousness, agency, and knowledge, and it also involves a method or series of methods that facilitate the task of decolonization at the material and epistemic levels (Maldonado-Torres 2006: 114). For Maldonado, ‘By decoloniality it is meant here the dismantling of relations of power and conceptions of knowledge that foment the reproduction of racial, gender, and geo-political hierarchies that came into being or found new and more powerful forms of expression in the modern/colonial world’ (Maldonado-Torres 2006: 117). Like all critical social theories of society, the decolonial epistemic perspective aims to critique and possibly overcome the epistemological injustices put in place by imperial global designs, and questions and challenges the longstanding claims of Euro-American epistemology to be universal, neutral, objective, disembodied, as well as being the only mode of knowing. It is ‘an-other thought’ that seeks to inaugurate ‘an-other logic,’ ‘an-other language,’ and ‘an-other thinking’ that has the potential to liberate ex-colonised people’s minds from Euro-American hegemony (Mignolo 2005: 56). Decoloniality helps in unveiling epistemic silences, conspiracies, and epistemic violence hidden within Euro-American epistemology and affirms the epistemic rights of the African people that enable them to transcend global imperial designs. **Decoloniality is re-emerging during the current** age of ‘**epistemic break’**. The term ‘epistemic break’ is drawn from the French theorist Michel Foucault. It refers to **a ‘historical rupture which occurs when one epistemic system breaks down and another** begins **to take its place’** (Mills 1997: 145). It is a very relevant concept that captures the epistemic crisis haunting the modern world order today and encapsulates the enormity of the crisis of Euro-American epistemologies unleashed on the world by modernity. This epistemic rupture is well captured by Immanuel Wallerstein who argued that: It is quite normal for scholars and scientists to rethink issues. When important new evidence undermines old theories and predictions do not hold, we are pressed to rethink our premises. In that sense, much of nineteenth-century social science, in the form of specific hypotheses, is constantly being rethought. But, in addition to rethinking, which is “normal,” I believe we need to “unthink” nineteenth-century social science, because many of its presumptions—which, in my view, are misleading and constrictive – still have far too strong a hold on our mentalities. These presumptions, once considered liberating of the spirit, serve today as the central intellectual barrier to useful analysis of the social world (Wallerstein 1991: 1). The key point is that Euro-American epistemologies predicated on fundamentalist rationalism are in a deep crisis. In his recent book titled The end of conceit: western rationality after postcolonialism, Patrick Chabal admitted that whenever Europeans try to make sense of the current problems facing Europe it becomes clear that ‘the instruments we use are no longer fit for the job. The instruments – that is, the social sciences we employ to explain what is happening domestically and overseas – are both historically and conceptually out of date’ (Chabal 2012: viii). **The whole world is at an epistemological crossroads** characterised by the end of Euro-American conceit that created some form of epistemological certainty. As argued by Chabal (2012: 3), ‘**Western societies are no longer sure of how to see themselves.’ This uncertainty opens the way for projection of decoloniality** as the first humanistic-oriented philosophy of liberation gesturing towards another world that is pluriversal, another logic that is freed from racism and the birth of a new humanism. This volume of Africanus is inspired by this new utopic-decolonial momentum gesturing towards deeper structural decolonization and pluriversalism freed from racial hierarchization of human beings. The first article is by the language specialist Finex Ndhlovu and is focused on the important question of African regional integration and pan-African unity. He deploys decoloniality to argue the crossborder languages that have been promoted as vehicles for African economic and political integration are actually carrying dominant ideologies of Westphalian statism and the Berlin consensus that are not easily amenable to regional integration. He challenges the conventional view of the African Academy of Languages (Acalan) of projecting vehicular cross-border languages as a means by which such problems as disunity could be resolved. Ndhlovu argues that ‘One of the biggest challenges that come with these developments is that of cultivating intercultural communication, cross-linguistic understanding and social cohesion among the hitherto linguistically and culturally multiverse peoples of the African continent.’ He goes further to note that vehicular cross-border languages (those languages that are common to two or more states and domains straddling various usages) suffer from the same limitations as those currently besetting national languages because they are ‘conceived as isomorphic, monolithic and countable entities that do not accommodate other language forms’ and their ‘cross-border status is defined in terms of existing nation-state boundaries that they purport to transcend’. Ndhlovu’s intervention begins to reveal coloniality hidden in some of the celebrated mechanism chosen as levers for achieving regional integration and pan-African unity. This critical thinking is very important as it enable Africans to avoid another false start that is not informed by genuine decoloniality. What epistemologies and knowledges underpin mainstream development discourse? This question is directly addressed by Seth Opong from Ghana who argues for indigenizing knowledges as the first step towards attainment of endogenous development. He defines endogenous knowledge ‘as knowledge about the people, by the people and for the people’. This definition is important as it distinguishes those knowledges imposed on Africa from outside those knowledges generated by Africans. Opong’s contribution proposes that ‘the African scholar should adopt a problem-oriented approach in conducting research as opposed to the current method-oriented approach that prevent the African from examining pertinent African problems’. Opong correctly notes that ‘contextually relevant knowledge is the basis for national development’. His article is therefore a most relevant intervention on the level of epistemology, pedagogy and methodology as they impinge on the question of development in Africa. Morgan Ndlovu’s article on the pertinent theme of production and consumption of cultural villages in South Africa addresses the question of coloniality that is hidden within the tourism industry. He begins with questioning whether those who fought against colonialism really understood the complexity of the structure of power they were fighting against and the character of the modern world system that enabled colonialism. This becomes a pertinent question when one considers that today decolonization exists as myth and an illusion. The reality is that of coloniality on a global scale. His core argument is the concept of cultural villages in South Africa cannot be understood outside the broader global experiences of ‘museumification’ of identity and ‘culturalization’ of politics’. Morgan Ndlovu’s article takes us to the tourist industry as a component of development in Africa and consistently reveals how staging culture is shot through by coloniality, which makes it impossible for Africans to reap any tangible developmental dividends. This is why he concludes that ‘The manner in which the establishment of cultural village is produced and consumed in South Africa microcosmically represents the general picture of how cultural identity and the political economy are hierarchical ordered in the non-existent post-apartheid dispensation.’ Sarah Chiumbu’s contribution targets the media as another domain of coloniality that needs decolonization. When decolonial thinkers use the term decolonization they do not confine it to decolonial issues of juridical-political independence. They extend it to issues of power, knowledge and being. This is why Chiumbu’s specific focus is no media reform in southern Africa that continues to generate animated debates between agents of neo-liberalism and those of African liberation is very important. Coloniality of power is causing a lot of confusion in the debates on media reform and democracy, with the neo-liberal paradigm continuing to work towards obscuring the workings of power and disguising its ideological underpinnings. Chiumbu correctly notes that ‘This masking does not leave room to problematize global structures directing knowledge production and media policy reforms.’

#### The only ethical response is decolonization.

Tuck and Yang 12

(Eve Tuck, Unangax, State University of New York at New Paltz K. Wayne Yang University of California, San Diego, Decolonization is not a metaphor, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 1, No. 1, 2012, pp. 1-40, JKS)

An ethic of incommensurability, which guides moves that unsettle innocence, stands in contrast to aims of reconciliation, which motivate settler moves to innocence. Reconciliation is about rescuing settler normalcy, about rescuing a settler future. Reconciliation is concerned with questions of what will decolonization look like? What will happen after abolition? What will be the consequences of decolonization for the settler? Incommensurability acknowledges that these questions need not, and perhaps cannot, be answered in order for decolonization to exist as a framework.

We want to say, first, that decolonization is not obliged to answer those questions - decolonization is not accountable to settlers, or settler futurity. Decolonization is accountable to Indigenous sovereignty and futurity. Still, we acknowledge the questions of those wary participants in Occupy Oakland and other settlers who want to know what decolonization will require of them. The answers are not fully in view and can’t be as long as decolonization remains punctuated by metaphor. The answers will not emerge from friendly understanding, and indeed require a dangerous understanding of uncommonality that un-coalesces coalition politics - moves that may feel very unfriendly. But we will find out the answers as we get there, “in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give [decolonization] historical form and content” (Fanon, 1963, p. 36).

To fully enact an ethic of incommensurability means relinquishing settler futurity, abandoning the hope that settlers may one day be commensurable to Native peoples. It means removing the asterisks, periods, commas, apostrophes, the whereas’s, buts, and conditional clauses that punctuate decolonization and underwrite settler innocence. The Native futures, the lives to be lived once the settler nation is gone - these are the unwritten possibilities made possible by an ethic of incommensurability.

*when you take away the punctuation*

*he says of*

*lines lifted from the documents about military-occupied land*

*its acreage and location*

*you take away its finality*

*opening the possibility of other futures*

-Craig Santos Perez, Chamoru scholar and poet (as quoted by Voeltz, 2012)

Decolonization offers a different perspective to human and civil rights based approaches to justice, an unsettling one, rather than a complementary one. Decolonization is not an “and”. It is an elsewhere.

#### The ROB is to center indigenous knowledge production -- Our epistemology is a pre-requisite – they don’t get to weigh the case or their framing if we win their starting point is flawed

Ballantyne 14 [Erin Freeland, Dechinta Bush U, *Dechinta Bush University: Mobilizing a knowledge economy of reciprocity, resurgence and decolonization*, Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society Vol. 3, No. 3, 2014, pgs 67-85,]

As the conversation of Dechinta grew, the ugly politics of education on a broad political scale quickly surfaced. It became clear that education is a domain of power and privilege that is fiercely protected. Questions relating to control over its content, production and process were, apparently, not open for discussion. Curricula were deeply homogenized, deterritorialized and standardized. Post-secondary in the territory was overtly geared toward training people for industry and the endless promise of mining, pipeline and oil and gas booms (and busts). People were either emphatically supportive of the notion of ‘Elders as professors’ being recognized as equals and collaborating with university professors, or incensed by its disruption of typical academic power. The creation of Dechinta was polarizing, and reactions were telling of the deeply embedded sense of entitlement and power that the state, and existing institutions, had over determining what did and did not count as ‘education’. Rather than support spaces where academic and Indigenous knowledge would overlap, Indigenous knowledge was viewed as curriculum that should be relegated to ‘culture camps’. That processes like hunting and moose-hide tanning could draw parallels, or even inform governance, consensus building and self-determination, continue to elude most mainstream reporters, critics and institutions. Coming back to the land is a battle. ‘Education’ on the land is a direct hit to the exoskeleton of continued colonial power. By specifically disrupting education as a domain of settler colonial control to be deconstructed and re-imagined, Dechinta has challenged the most comprehensive, yet skilfully cloaked machine of settler colonial capitalism - the prescriptive education process, which produces more settler colonial bodies, thinkers, and believers. Building strong relationships of reciprocity with the land results in the crumbling of settler capitalism because it fundamentally shifts the relationships people experience and what they believe about who they|||people||| are, how they are in relation to and with land, and what they believe to be true. Being together on the land, learning with the land, and having a strong relationship with the land is antithetical to settler capitalism itself. The power of settler colonization relies on the total deterritorialization of people’s relationship with land. Deleuze and Guattari’s (1972) work on deterritorialization, ‘the process whereby colonization leads not just to the loss of territory but also to the destruction of the ontological conditions of the colonized culture’s territoriality,’ is a fitting philosophical conjecture to Dene expressions of how they are dislocated from their relationships with land due to process of nation-building and capitalism, and how this deterritorialization separates people from practices with the land that keeps them healthy, even if they still live on the land (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987, p. 192; Hipwell, 2004, p. 304). As Said (1993) has stated: land, in the final instance, is what empire is about. In this way, our relationships with land are central to the great unsettling. Reconnection, and the exchange of skills, knowledge and practice with land, thus directly threaten the settler colonial project. It removes bodies from the forces designed to encode the body as capital. The foremost space of enclosure, of encoding, is the ‘school’. The ongoing trend in Indigenous and Northern settler education since its earliest colonial intrusion has been to train Indigenous bodies to serve the needs of industry. Education has happened in Denendeh since time immemorial. It has been the settler prerogative to dismantle Indigenous ways of knowing and being, of education. Returning learning to an intergenerational exchange, on the land - which has at its very core the fundamental teachings that, if we take care of the land, the land takes care of us - will shake the foundation of settler colonization by breaking the dependency that has been created on capitalism through deterritorialization. Transformational learning supports intergenerational learners and teachers to think critically and re-imagine what the purpose of learning is. Learning on the land is healing and being in community on the land is challenging, pulling our attention to the hard work of decolonization. The year after our initial gathering, Dechinta launched a pilot semester with three courses nested within an interdisciplinary approach. Student evaluations of the program indicated it was profoundly ‘transformative’, and was for some the first ‘safe space’ of education that they had encountered (Luig et al, 2011). Interdisciplinary and collaborative, the pilot set the stage for the following four years. Dechinta now has 8 original courses, and a two semester-long program growing into a full degree that operates from -50 winters to the steamy height of summer. The challenges have been substantial. Conflict between academics and Indigenous students have made real the tensions of working on decolonization in concert, even with those who identify, or who are identified as allies. Solving conflict and difficulties through shared governance circles, while combating ingrained reactions of lateral violence and other social expressions codified in settler colonization are truly challenging, but deeply rewarding. Through the building of relationships we have a growing cohort of faculty dedicated to not just teaching but sharing in the creation of safe spaces, where the hard mental work of decolonizing in theory is met with the even harder work of decolonizing as practice. When students and faculty create a community where their relationships are ordered through their relationships with land, the work of decolonization move from a discussion in theory to practice of being and becoming a source of decolonial power. At Dechinta we debate this, and experiment with its meaning in tangible ways. Here, skills categorized as ‘subsistence’ or ‘arts and crafts’ are fundamental in forming and understanding theory. Such practices are themselves theory in action.

## CP

#### CP Text: A just government will recognize a worker right to strike except

* When a strike is for an unlawful purpose
* When strikes engage in misconduct as specified by the US National Labor Rights Act
* For strikes that violate a non-strike provision of a contract
* For strikes that support union unfair practices
* Strikes on indigenous lands

#### NLRA’s conditions are key – unconditional right to strike devolves into chaos

NLRB 12 National Labor Relations Board No Date “The Right to Strike | National Labor Relations Board.” Nlrb.gov, [www.nlrb.gov/strikes. Accessed 7 Nov. 2021](http://www.nlrb.gov/strikes.%20Accessed%207%20Nov.%202021). //AA

Unfair labor practice strikers defined.Employees who strike to protest an unfair labor practice committed by their employer are called unfair labor practice strikers. Such strikers can be neither discharged nor permanently replaced. When the strike ends, unfair labor practice strikers, absent serious misconduct on their part, are entitled to have their jobs back even if employees hired to do their work have to be discharged. If the Board finds that economic strikers or unfair labor practice strikers who have made an unconditional request for reinstatement have been unlawfully denied reinstatement by their employer, the Board may award such strikers backpay starting at the time they should have been reinstated. Strikes unlawful because of purpose. A strike may be unlawful because an object, or purpose, of the strike is unlawful. A strike in support of a union unfair labor practice, or one that would cause an employer to commit an unfair labor practice, may be a strike for an unlawful object. For example, it is an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge an employee for failure to make certain lawful payments to the union when there is no union-security agreement in effect (Section 8(a)(3). A strike to compel an employer to do this would be a strike for an unlawful object and, therefore, an unlawful strike. Strikes of this nature will be discussed in connection with the various unfair labor practices in a later section of this guide. Furthermore, Section 8(b)(4) of the Act prohibits strikes for certain objects even though the objects are not necessarily unlawful if achieved by other means. An example of this would be a strike to compel Employer A to cease doing business with Employer B. It is not unlawful for Employer A voluntarily to stop doing business with Employer B, nor is it unlawful for a union merely to request that it do so. It is, however, unlawful for the union to strike with an object of forcing the employer to do so. These points will be covered in more detail in the explanation of Section 8(b)(4). In any event, employees who participate in an unlawful strike may be discharged and are not entitled to reinstatement. Strikes unlawful because of timing—Effect of no-strike contract. A strike that violates a no-strike provision of a contract is not protected by the Act, and the striking employees can be discharged or otherwise disciplined, unless the strike is called to protest certain kinds of unfair labor practices committed by the employer. It should be noted that not all refusals to work are considered strikes and thus violations of no-strike provisions. A walkout because of conditions abnormally dangerous to health, such as a defective ventilation system in a spray-painting shop, has been held not to violate a no-strike provision. Same—Strikes at end of contract period.Section 8(d) provides that when either party desires to terminate or change an existing contract, it must comply with certain conditions. If these requirements are not met, a strike to terminate or change a contract is unlawful and participating strikers lose their status as employees of the employer engaged in the labor dispute. If the strike was caused by the unfair labor practice of the employer, however, the strikers are classified as unfair labor practice strikers and their status is not affected by failure to follow the required procedure. Strikes unlawful because of misconduct of strikers. Strikers who engage in serious misconduct in the course of a strike may be refused reinstatement to their former jobs. This applies to both economic strikers and unfair labor practice strikers. Serious misconduct has been held to include, among other things, violence and threats of violence. The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that a “sitdown” strike, when employees simply stay in the plant and refuse to work, thus depriving the owner of property, is not protected by the law. Examples of serious misconduct that could cause the employees involved to lose their right to reinstatement are: Strikers physically blocking persons from entering or leaving a struck plant. Strikers threatening violence against nonstriking employees. Strikers attacking management representatives. Section 8(g)—Striking or Picketing a Health Care Institution Without Notice. Section 8(g) prohibits a labor organization from engaging in a strike, picketing, or other concerted refusal to work at any health care institution without first giving at least 10 days’ notice in writing to the institution and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

## Case

### Theory stuff
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#### I didn’t lie lol this is blashepmous 1] no norm for NCs to disclose that’s not how things work cuz mine is also NEW so its reicprorocal 2] I said my past 2NRs and set col is on my that list which is what I read so that solves – this is just wastinbg my time don’t let them drop the debater because it sets bad norms forcing negs to always send args which means aff not only have infinite bonus prep but can win every round which has a bigger impact – makes every aff round a free win abnd every neg round a insta loss that’s 3-3 for every tournament makes elims impossible – we ow on keeping tournaments running. Winning tournaments is what keeps small schools in debate otherwise debate just becomes a big school race.

## FW

#### **Ethical calculus should be centered on structural violence – a focus on large-scale threats of suffering or abstract questions of morality justifies infinite material violence towards disposed communities. Our framing is a pre-requisite to any other ethical theory since oppression distorts all moral reasoning**

Olson 15 – prof of geography @ UNC Chapel Hill

(Elizabeth, ‘Geography and Ethics I: Waiting and Urgency,’ *Progress in Human Geography*, vol. 39 no. 4, pp. 517-526)

Though toileting might be thought of as a special case of bodily urgency, geographic research suggests that the body is increasingly set at odds with larger scale ethical concerns, especially large-scale future events of forecasted suffering. Emergency planning is a particularly good example in which the large-scale threats of future suffering can distort moral reasoning. Žižek (2006) lightly develops this point in the context of the war on terror, where in the presence of fictitious and real ticking clocks and warning systems, the urgent body must be bypassed because there are bigger scales to worry about:¶ What does this all-pervasive sense of urgency mean ethically? The pressure of events is so overbearing, the stakes are so high, that they necessitate a suspension of ordinary ethical concerns. After all, displaying moral qualms when the lives of millions are at stake plays into the hands of the enemy. (Žižek, 2006)¶ In the presence of large-scale future emergency, the urgency to secure the state, the citizenry, the economy, or the climate creates new scales and new temporal orders of response (see Anderson, 2010; Baldwtaca rin, 2012; Dalby, 2013; Morrissey, 2012), many of which treat the urgent body as impulsive and thus requiring management. McDonald’s (2013) analysis of three interconnected discourses of ‘climate security’ illustrates how bodily urgency in climate change is also recast as a menacing impulse that might require exclusion from moral reckoning. The logics of climate security, especially those related to national security, ‘can encourage perverse political responses that not only fail to respond effectively to climate change but may present victims of it as a threat’ (McDonald, 2013: 49). Bodies that are currently suffering cannot be urgent, because they are excluded from the potential collectivity that could be suffering everywhere in some future time. Similar bypassing of existing bodily urgency is echoed in writing about violent securitization, such as drone warfare (Shaw and Akhter, 2012), and also in intimate scales like the street and the school, especially in relation to race (Mitchell, 2009; Young et al., 2014).¶ As large-scale urgent concerns are institutionalized, the urgent body is increasingly obscured through technical planning and coordination (Anderson and Adey, 2012). The predominant characteristic of this institutionalization of large-scale emergency is a ‘built-in bias for action’ (Wuthnow, 2010: 212) that circumvents contingencies. The urgent body is at best an assumed eventuality, one that will likely require another state of waiting, such as triage (e.g. Greatbach et al., 2005). Amin (2013) cautions that in much of the West, governmental need to provide evidence of laissez-faire governing on the one hand, and assurance of strength in facing a threatening future on the other, produces ‘just-in-case preparedness’ (Amin, 2013: 151) of neoliberal risk management policies. In the US, ‘personal ingenuity’ is built into emergency response at the expense of the poor and vulnerable for whom ‘[t]he difference between abjection and bearable survival’ (Amin, 2013: 153) will not be determined by emergency planning, but in the material infrastructure of the city.¶ In short, the urgencies of the body provide justifications for social exclusion of the most marginalized based on impulse and perceived threat, while large-scale future emergencies effectively absorb the deliberative power of urgency into the institutions of preparedness and risk avoidance. Žižek references Arendt’s (2006) analysis of the banality of evil to explain the current state of ethical reasoning under the war on terror, noting that people who perform morally reprehensible actions under the conditions of urgency assume a ‘tragic-ethic grandeur’ (Žižek, 2006) by sacrificing their own morality for the good of the state. But his analysis fails to note that bodies are today so rarely legitimate sites for claiming urgency. In the context of the **assumed priority of the large-scale future emergency**, the urgent body becomes **literally nonsense, a non sequitur** within societies, states and worlds that will **always be more urgent**.¶ If the important ethical work of urgency has been to identify that which must not wait, then the capture of the power and persuasiveness of urgency by large-scale future emergencies has consequences for the kinds of normative arguments we can raise on behalf of urgent bodies. How, then, might waiting compare as a normative description and critique in our own urgent time? Waiting can be categorized according to its purpose or outcome (see Corbridge, 2004; Gray, 2011), but it also modifies the place of the individual in society and her importance. As Ramdas (2012: 834) writes, ‘waiting … produces hierarchies which segregate people and places into those which matter and those which do not’. The segregation of waiting might produce effects that counteract suffering, however, and Jeffery (2008: 957) explains that though the ‘politics of waiting’ can be repressive, it can also engender creative political engagement. In his research with educated unemployed Jat youth who spend days and years waiting for desired employment, Jeffery finds that ‘the temporal suffering and sense of ambivalence experienced by young men can generate cultural and political experiments that, in turn, have marked social and spatial effects’ (Jeffery, 2010: 186). Though this is not the same as claiming normative neutrality for waiting, it does suggest that waiting is more ethically ambivalent and open than urgency.¶ In other contexts, however, our descriptions of waiting indicate a strong condemnation of its effects upon the subjects of study. Waiting can demobilize radical reform, depoliticizing ‘the insurrectionary possibilities of the present by delaying the revolutionary imperative to a future moment that is forever drifting towards infinity’ (Springer, 2014: 407). Yonucu’s (2011) analysis of the self-destructive activities of disrespected working-class youth in Istanbul suggests that this sense of infinite waiting can lead not only to depoliticization, but also to a disbelief in the possibility of a future self of any value. Waiting, like urgency, can undermine the possibility of self-care two-fold, first by making people wait for essential needs, and again by reinforcing that waiting is ‘[s]omething to be ashamed of because it may be noted or taken as evidence of indolence or low status, seen as a symptom of rejection or a signal to exclude’ (Bauman, 2004: 109). This is why Auyero (2012) suggests that waiting creates an ideal state subject, providing ‘temporal processes in and through which political subordination is produced’ (Auyero, 2012: loc. 90; see also Secor, 2007). Furthermore, Auyero notes, it is not only political subordination, but the subjective effect of waiting that secures domination, as citizens and non-citizens find themselves ‘waiting hopefully and then frustratedly for others to make decisions, and in effect surrendering to the authority of others’ (Auyero, 2012: loc. 123).¶ Waiting can therefore function as a potentially important spatial technology of the elite and powerful, mobilized not only for the purpose of governing individuals, but also to retain claims over moral urgency. But there is growing resistance to the capture of claims of urgency by the elite, and it is important to note that even in cases where the material conditions of containment are currently impenetrable, arguments based on human value are at the forefront of **reclaiming urgency for the body**. In **detention centers, clandestine prisons, state borders and refugee camps**, geographers point to ongoing struggles against the ethical impossibility of bodily urgency and a rejection of states of waiting (see Conlon, 2011; Darling, 2009, 2011; Garmany, 2012; Mountz et al., 2013; Schuster, 2011). Ramakrishnan’s (2014) analysis of a Delhi resettlement colony and Shewly’s (2013) discussion of the enclave between India and Bangladesh describe people who refuse to give up their own status as legitimately urgent, even in the context of larger scale politics. Similarly, Tyler’s (2013) account of desperate female detainees stripping off their clothes to expose their humanness and suffering in the Yarl’s Wood Immigration Removal Centre in the UK suggests that demands for recognition are not just about politics, but also about the acknowledgement of humanness and the irrevocable possibility of being that which cannot wait. The continued existence of places like Yarl’s Wood and similar institutions in the USA nonetheless points to the challenge of exposing the urgent body as a moral priority when it is so easily hidden from view, and also reminds us that our research can help to explain the relationships between normative dimensions and the political and social conditions of struggle.¶ In closing, geographic depictions of waiting do seem to evocatively describe otherwise obscured suffering (e.g. Bennett, 2011), but it is striking how rarely these descriptions also use the language of urgency. Given the discussion above, what might be accomplished – and risked – by incorporating urgency more overtly and deliberately into our discussions of waiting, surplus and abandoned bodies? Urgency can clarify the implicit but understated ethical consequences and normativity associated with waiting, and encourage explicit discussion about harmful suffering. Waiting can be productive or unproductive for radical praxis, but urgency compels and requires response. Geographers could be instrumental in reclaiming the ethical work of urgency in ways that leave it open for critique, clarifying common spatial misunderstandings and representations. There is good reason to be thoughtful in this process, since moral outrage towards inhumanity can itself obscure differentiated experiences of being human, dividing up ‘those for whom we feel urgent unreasoned concern and those whose lives and deaths simply do not touch us, or do not appear as lives at all’ (Butler, 2009: 50). But when the urgent body is rendered as only waiting, both materially and discursively, it is just as easily cast as impulsive, disgusting, animalistic (see also McKittrick, 2006). Feminist theory insists that the urgent body, whose encounters of violence are ‘usually framed as **private, apolitical and mundane’** (Pain, 2014: 8), are as deeply **political, public, and exceptional** as other forms of violence (Phillips, 2008; Pratt, 2005). Insisting that **a suffering body, now, is that which cannot wait**, has the **ethical effect of drawing it into consideration alongside the political, public and exceptional scope of large-scale futures**. It may help us insist on the body, both as a single unit and a plurality, as a legitimate scale of normative priority and social care.¶ In this report, I have explored old and new reflections on the ethical work of urgency and waiting. Geographic research suggests a contemporary popular bias towards the urgency of large-scale futures, institutionalized in ways that further obscure and discredit the urgencies of the body. This bias also justifies the production of new **waiting places** in our material landscape, **places like the detention center** and the waiting room. In some cases, waiting is normatively neutral, even providing opportunities for alternative politics. In others, the technologies of waiting serve to manage potentially problematic bodies, leading to suspended suffering and even to extermination (e.g. Wright, 2013). One of my aims has been to suggest that moral reasoning is important both because it exposes normative biases against subjugated people, and because it potentially provides routes toward struggle where claims to urgency seem to foreclose the possibilities of alleviation of suffering. Saving the world still should require a debate about whose world is being saved, when, and at what cost – and this requires a debate about what really cannot wait. My next report will extend some of these concerns by reviewing how feelings of urgency, as well as hope, fear, and other emotions, have played a role in geography and ethical reasoning.¶ I conclude, however, by pulling together past and present. In 1972, Gilbert White asked why geographers were not engaging ‘the truly urgent questions’ (1972: 101) such as racial repression, decaying cities, economic inequality, and global environmental destruction. His question highlights just how much the discipline has changed, but it is also unnerving in its echoes of our contemporary problems. Since White’s writing, our moral reasoning has been stretched to consider the future body and the more-than-human, alongside the presently urgent body – topics and concerns that I have not taken up in this review but which will provide their own new possibilities for urgent concerns. My own hope presently is drawn from an acknowledgement that the temporal characteristics of contemporary capitalism can be interrupted in creative ways (Sharma, 2014), with the possibility of squaring the urgent body with our large-scale future concerns. Temporal alternatives already exist in ongoing and emerging revolutions and the disruption of claims of cycles and circular political processes (e.g. Lombard, 2013; Reyes, 2012). Though calls for urgency will certainly be used to obscure evasion of responsibility (e.g. Gilmore, 2008: 56, fn 6), they may also serve as fertile ground for radical critique, a truly fierce urgency for now.

Advantage 1:

#### No uniqueness for the advantage. Teacher strikes are rising now: the Erie School District teacher strike, Scranton teacher strike, Co-op academy teacher strike, Pleasanton teacher strike, etc are all examples from within this month and prove that teachers are striking regardless of legality.

#### Strikes hurt students – studies prove.

Smith, M., Shaar, N., **& Divounguy**, O. (20**19**, October 2). *Teacher strikes hurt student outcomes and may worsen income inequality*. Illinois Policy. https://www.illinoispolicy.org/press-releases/teacher-strikes-hurt-student-outcomes-and-may-worsen-income-inequality/. / Sosa Re-Cut Justin

As the Chicago Teachers Union plans to announce this afternoon whether it will walk out on more than 360,000 students, [studies show](https://illinoispolicy.us1.list-manage.com/track/click?u=7fe208d3c85ffa1d03aeaade4&id=5ecc6a508a&e=0b391c8e91) strikes negatively affect student academic outcomes.

Research published in the National Bureau of Economic Research indicates strikes can temper growth in elementary student test scores by 2.2%. Given 90% of Chicago Public School students in 2018 were minority and 83% were classified as low-income, this means a strike will disproportionately harm those most in need and leave them to endure the long term negative consequences.

Experts from the nonpartisan Illinois Policy Institute are available to comment on how a strike would hurt minority and low-income students, potentially worsening income inequality.

How strikes harm student populations:

Test score decline: Expert consensus finds strikes have long-term negative effects on students. One study published by the NBER discovered that long strikes of 10 or more days have a significant negative effect on math test scores. Another published by Columbia University economists found extended disruptions, such as a strike, have negative effects on math and English achievement.

Less instruction: Unless the educational time lost during a strike is made up – such as by extending the school year – students lose the corresponding time in the classroom. In addition, students may require extensive review of material to get back up to speed.

Underperforming state averages: CPS already underperforms state academic achievement benchmarks. Its average SAT scores are 56 points lower than the state average, its four-year graduation rates are 11 percentage points lower and the percentage of CPS teachers rated proficient or excellent is 11 percentage points lower. A strike could exacerbate this.

Quote from Orphe Divounguy, chief economist for the nonpartisan Illinois Policy Institute:

“In the case of a teachers’ strike in Chicago, it is students who will ultimately be left behind. Lost classroom time worsens academic achievement and harms poor and disadvantaged students the most.

“With growing concerns about income inequality, the best way to ensure low-income students succeed is for CTU to accept Mayor Lightfoot’s generous offer and keep students in the classroom.”

#### Group the rest of the quality of education arguments – strikes hurt the underprivileged and destroy educational prospects.

Norton and Hernandez 18 [Hilary and Tracy; BizFed chair and executive director of FAST; CEO of the Los Angeles County Business Federation (BizFed) and president of IMPOWER Inc. BizFed is a grassroots alliance of more than 175 business organizations representing 395,000 businesses with nearly 4 million employees throughout Los Angeles County. BizFed advocates for policies and projects that strengthen the regional economy by exploring all sides of critical issues and takes action on policies to make a difference for business growth, job creation and economic vitality in Southern California; “Commentary: A teachers strike is bad for our students, families and economy,” LA School Report; 10/10/18; <http://laschoolreport.com/commentary-a-teachers-strike-is-bad-for-our-students-families-and-economy/>] Justin

When schools are closed due to strikes, students miss learning opportunities, parents must take days off from work and our region is disrupted. Beyond hurting families, this strike will hurt our businesses and their ability to sustain and create new jobs.

This potential strike by LAUSD teachers will be the first in nearly three decades. The strike in 1989 lasted nine days; the most recent teachers strike in West Virginia lasted seven days. For a family living paycheck to paycheck, over a week of unpaid time off to watch their children should not be the deciding factor between paying the rent and putting food on the table; the entire family’s livelihood is threatened. Imagine a single mom who is a nurse and has no one to watch her children. She must choose between leaving her children at home or missing a shift. That money cannot be paid back.

Every day that a student is not in the classroom, they lose learning opportunities. Students fall behind the content standards set by the California State Board of Education, and teachers have to add those lost days into their curriculum. Students lose daily social interactions with their peers, which helps build character and good citizenship. Think of a student who has the dream of being a doctor. They miss school and now are discouraged and lose the aspiration of being a doctor.

At-risk youth are the most vulnerable when there are school closures. If parents don’t have the ability to skip work during a teacher strike, can’t afford childcare or don’t have family that can help out, that means students are left unsupervised. Anyone who has children knows that the course of their lives can change in an instant. We must avoid putting our children’s health and safety at risk.

In LAUSD, over 84 percent of the students qualify for free or reduced-price meals; the district serves over 700,000 meals each day. For many of these students, this is their only chance to eat a healthy breakfast, lunch and supper after school. A child’s nutrition should not be compromised at the hands of this potential strike.

#### Exclusion turn

**Curtiss**, D. (**2020**, December 8). *What Happens to Vulnerable Students When Teachers Strike? (Opinion)*. Education Week. [https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/opinion-what-happens-to-vulnerable-students-when-teachers-strike/2019/02. //](https://www.edweek.org/teaching-learning/opinion-what-happens-to-vulnerable-students-when-teachers-strike/2019/02.%20/) Sosa Re-Cut Justin

When the Los Angeles Unified School District decided to relight the match of protest last month, teachers across the nation also caught flame. Denver. West Virginia. Oakland, Calif. In the past year, teacher strikes have reemerged as an effective tool to answer the long-standing demands of frustrated educators who need better pay, improved facilities, and more resources for high-need schools. During these strikes, much of the attention has been given to the most visible people in our schools: teachers, parents, and vocal and well-performing students. However, working as a special education paraprofessional for a public elementary school in South Los Angeles, I know that students of color, particularly those with disabilities, hardly ever get consideration when major decisions like these are made.

During the LAUSD strike, just a third of the district’s 600,000 students showed up to school on the strike’s first day. Students and families were forced to find all sorts of creative ways to facilitate learning, including taking advantage of free entry to museums and zoos, teaching classes at home, or rallying with teachers.

For low-income students and students with disabilities at high-need schools, many of those options were not feasible. Instead, non-credentialed school staff such as myself—along with sanitation workers, office personnel, and yard and recreational support—worked tirelessly to keep schools running for students in attendance. I saw the strike’s impact on the day-to-day experience of these students in high-need schools, even well after the strike has ended. Though the strike produced historic wins for teachers, it did not come without significant drawbacks for students whose voices have been historically suppressed in our schools: students of color, particularly black boys, with disabilities.

On January 14, the first day of the strike, droves of 4th, 5th, and 6th graders noisily filled our school’s auditorium for programming. This was standard protocol at many schools, but it was nearly impossible for our administrator to redirect the children’s attention to schoolwork amidst the mass confusion that both students and staff were experiencing. One student with whom I work closely, a boisterous and excitable 11-year-old black boy with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, paced up and down the auditorium floor. As he greeted friends and danced to pass time, a school administrator ferociously snapped at him to leave the auditorium.

Stunned, the student (along with some nervous staff like me) waited for clarification. Where would he go? All classrooms serving this age group at our school remained locked during the strike. It was raining outside. The school administrator told him he could keep himself occupied by walking around the school.

It was clear to me that the administrator, overwhelmed and with little support, made an exceptionally bad call. The student’s entire grade level was inside the auditorium with the only available credentialed staff. But what some might excuse as a temporary lapse in judgment was unfortunately all too common during the strike for students like him.

Although most administrators meant well, a general lack of understanding about the biased ways schools see children of color and students with disabilities created a hostile space for many children during the strike. Since resources were more scarce than usual during the strike, students in our school who were already considered “defiant” were now being chastised for little more than showing up. Many of their key advocates—the teachers who are more skilled in supporting their needs—were on the picket lines.

I watched as students were sent home for arbitrary and vague reasons or assigned mandatory escorts to the bathroom and class. In one case, the police were even called in to deal with a classroom infraction for a kindergarten student. The encounter left a young black boy screaming and crying in our school halls.

Advantage 2:

**No warming and no impact---no temperature increases, energy radiates to space, computer models are flawed, solar radiation is the cause, and crops provide a negative feedback**

**Western Press 11** Europe Intelligence Wire “Facts challenge the climate-change view.” <http://www.accessmylibrary.com/article-1G1-265285996/facts-challenge-climate-change.html> August 25 2011

**\*Notes on qualifications:** Roy Spencer is a Climatologist, author and former NASA scientist; Dr. Lindzen is at the Program in Atmospheres, Oceans, and Climate, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, U. S. A; Choi is at the Department of Environmental Science and Engineering, Ewha Womans University, Seoul, Korea; Henrik Svensmark is a physicist at the Danish National Space Center in Copenhagen who studies the effects of cosmic rays on cloud formation

Clearly they both accept the so-called consensus view of global warming due to man-made carbon dioxide emissions. So would they like to respond to the following points? First, if increased concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere is causing a dangerous increase in global temperature, why has global temperature not increased since 1998 when CO2concentrations in the atmosphere have increased by10 per cent? **There must be something more powerful than atmospheric CO2 concentrations cooling the planet** and overcoming recovery from the Little Ice Age. Second, the latest paper by Roy Spencer of NASA gives empirical evidence that far from being trapped in the atmosphere, most of the energy is being radiated to space, **debunking the idea of positive feedback. It may even be negative**. Third, the latest paper by Lindzen and Choi, again gives empirical evidence that climate sensitivity is much less than that assumed by IPCC in computer modelling and in consequence manmade CO2 emissions are not dangerously warming the planet. In fact they are "undetectable with current technology," according to Richard Lindzen. Fourth, according to the work of Henrik Svensmark (Danish National Space Centre) and the soon to be published paper on the CERN Cloud Project, **the real forcing of global temperature is solar activity**. There is a much closer correlation to global temperature anomalies with sunspot cycles than CO2 concentrations. Svensmark and the cloud project demonstrate the vital role of clouds. Fifth, increased levels of atmospheric CO2 enhance plant growth and so increase crop yields and capture more CO2. Science by its nature is never "settled" and all theories should be subjected to the test of empirical measurement. Hypothesis: increased concentrations of CO2 in the atmosphere caused by man are dangerously increasing global temperatures. Test: global temperature remained constant since 1998 while CO2 concentrations have increased by 10 per cent. **Hypothesis failed.**

**Warming’s been moving at a glacial speed---even with feedbacks century-long temperature gains are negligible---prefer our evidence because it uses actual temperature models**

**Taylor 2/1** James M. Taylor, J.D., is managing editor of Environment & Climate News“Japanese Data Cast Doubt on Alarmist Temperature Claims” 2013 http://news.heartland.org/newspaper-article/2013/02/01/japanese-data-cast-doubt-alarmist-temperature-claims

Global temperatures are warming **much more slowly than claimed** by British and U.S. government agencies that produce temperature data reports, according to data compiled by the Japanese Meteorological Agency.

According to meteorologist Anthony Watts, Japan is reporting that global temperatures during the past decade are approximately 0.25 degrees Celsius cooler than reported by the U.K. Met Office, the NASA Goddard Institute, and the NOAA National Climatic Data Center. The 0.25 degree difference is **staggering** considering the Earth **warmed merely 0.6 degrees** Celsius during the **entirety of the twentieth century**.

Japanese scientists appear to be giving more weight to real-world temperature data than the U.K. and U.S. government agencies do, Watts reports. NASA, NOAA, and the Met Office make several adjustments to real-world temperature data that have the effect of **inflating recent temperature readings** and **reducing the temperatures** that were reported several decades ago. By contrast, the Japanese scientists give more weight to **real-world data** than to government agency adjustments that always seem to add more warming than appears in the raw temperature data.

The Japanese data add weight to global temperature readings compiled by NASA satellite instruments. NASA satellite instruments show substantially less recent warming than is claimed by global warming alarmists and government agencies that adjust the real-world temperature readings. Because the NASA satellite instruments uniformly measure global temperatures, the **temperature readings do not require any adjustments to weed out asserted temperature anomalies.**

**United States not key to solve warming---they can’t solve internationally**

Advantage 3:

#### Growth is sustainable and inevitable – unparalleled data proves tech solves, but transition doesn’t.

Bailey ’16 (Ronald; 12/16/16; B.A. in Philosophy and B.A. Economics from the University of Virginia, member of the Society of Environmental Journalists and the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, citing a compilation of interdisciplinary research; Reason, “Is Economic Growth Environmentally Sustainable?” <http://reason.com/archives/2016/12/16/is-economic-growth-environmentally-sust1)>

Is economic growth environmentally sustainable? No, say a group of prominent ecological economists led by the Australian hydrologist James Ward. In a new PLoS ONE article—"Is Decoupling GDP Growth from Environmental Impact Possible?"—they offer an analysis inspired by the 1972 neo-Malthusian classic The Limits to Growth. They even suggest that The Limits to Growth's projections with regard to population, food production, pollution, and the depletion of nonrenewable resources are still on track. In other words, they think we're still heading for a collapse. I think **they're wrong**. But they're wrong in an instructive way. The authors describe two types of "decoupling," relative and absolute. Relative decoupling means that economic growth increases faster than rates of growth in material and energy **consumption** and **environmental impact**. Between 1990 and 2012, for example, China's **GDP rose 20-fold** while its energy use increased by a factor of four and its material use by a factor of five. Basically this entails increases in efficiency that result in using fewer resources to produce more value. Absolute decoupling is what happens when continued economic growth actually **lessens resource use** and impacts on the natural environment, that is, creating more value while using less stuff. Essentially humanity becomes richer while withdrawing from nature. To demonstrate that continued economic growth is unsustainable, the authors recycle the hoary I=PAT model devised in 1972 by the Stanford entomologist and population alarmist Paul Ehrlich and the Harvard environmental policy professor (and chief Obama science adviser) John Holdren. Human Impact on the environment is supposed to equal to Population x Affluence/consumption x Technology. All of these are presumed to intensify and worsen humanity's impact on the natural world. In Ward and company's updated version of I=PAT, the sustainability of economic growth largely depends on Technology trends. Absolute decoupling from resource consumption or pollutant emissions requires technological intensity of use and emissions to decrease by at least the same annual percentage as the economy is growing. For example, if the economy is growing at three percent per year, technological intensity must reduce 20-fold over 100 years to maintain steady levels of resource consumption or emissions. If technological intensity is faster then resource use and emissions will decline over time, which would result in greater wealth creation with ever lessening resource consumption and environmental spillovers. Once they've set up their I=PAT analysis, Ward and his colleagues assert that "for non-substitutable resources such as land, water, raw materials and energy, we argue that whilst efficiency gains may be possible, there are minimum requirements for these resources that are ultimately governed by physical realities." Among the "physical realities" they mention are limits on plant photosynthesis, the conversion efficiencies of plants into meat, the amount of water needed to grow crops, that all supposedly determine the amount of agricultural land required to feed humanity. They also cite "the upper limits to energy and material efficiencies govern minimum resource throughput required for economic production." To illustrate the operation of their version of the I=PAT equation, they apply it to a recent study that projected it would be possible for Australia's economy to grow 7-fold while simultaneously reducing resource and energy use and lowering environmental pressures through 2050. They **crank the notion** that there are nonsubstitutable physical limits on material and energy resources through their equations until 2100, and they find that eventually consumption of both rise at the same rate as economic growth. QED: Economic growth is unsustainable. Or as they report, "Permanent decoupling (absolute or relative) is impossible for essential, non-substitutable resources because the efficiency gains are ultimately governed by physical limits." **Malthus wins again!** Or does he? GDP growth—increases in the monetary value of all finished goods and services—is a crude measure for improvements in human well-being. Nevertheless, rising incomes (GDP per capita) correlate with lots of good things that nearly everybody wants, including access to more and better **food**, longer and **healthier lives**, more educational **opportunities**, and greater scope for life choices. Ward and his colleagues are clearly right that there is only so much physical stuff on the Earth, but even they know that wealth is not created simply by using more stuff. Where they go wrong (as so many Malthusians do) is by implicitly assuming that there are limits to human creativity. Interestingly, Ward and his colleagues, like Malthus before them, focus on the supposed limits to **agricultural productivity**. For example, they cite the limits to photosynthesis, which will limit the amount of food that humanity can produce. But as they acknowledge, human population may not continue to increase. In fact, **global fertility rates** have been **decelerating** for many decades now, and demographer Wolfgang Lutz calculates that world population will peak after the middle of this century and begin falling. Since the number of mouths to feed will stabilize and people can eat only so much, it is unlikely that the **biophysical limits** of agriculture on Earth will be exceeded. But it gets even better. Agricultural **productivity is improving**. Consider the biophysical limit on photosynthesis cited by the study. In fact, researchers are already making progress on installing more efficient C-4 photosynthesis into rice and wheat, which would **boost yields by** as much as **50 percent**. British researchers just announced that they had figured out how to boost photosynthetic efficiency to create a super-wheat would increase yields by 20 percent. In a 2015 article for the Breakthrough Journal, "The Return of Nature: How Technology Liberates the Environment," Jesse H. Ausubel of Rockefeller University reviews how humanity is **already decoupling** in many ways from the natural world. "A series of 'decouplings' is occurring, so that our economy no longer advances in tandem with exploitation of land, forests, water, and minerals," he writes. "American use of almost everything except information **seems to be peaking**." He notes that agricultural applications of fertilizer and water in the U.S. peaked in the 1980s while yields continued to increase. Thanks to increasing agricultural productivity, humanity is already at **"peak farmland"**; as a result, "an area the size of India or of the United States east of the Mississippi could be released globally from agriculture over the next 50 years or so." Ward is worried about biophysical limits on water use. But as Ausubel notes, U.S. **water use has peaked** and has declined **below the level of 1970**. What about meat? Ausubel notes the **greater efficiency** with which chickens and cultivated fish turn grains and plant matter into meat. In any event, the future of farming is not fields but factories. Innovators are already seeking to replace the entire dairy industry with milk, yogurt, and cheeses made by genetically modified bacteria grown in tanks. Others are figuring how to culture meat in vat. Ausubel also notes that many countries have already been through or are about to enter the "forest transition," in which forests begin to expand. Roger Sedjo, a forest economist at Resources of the Future, has projected that by the middle of this century most of world's **industrial wood** will be produced from planted forests covering a remarkably small land area, perhaps **only 5 to 10 percent** of the extent of today's global forest. Shrinking farms and ranches and expanding forests will do a lot toward turning around the alarming global reduction in wildlife. How about unsubstitutable stuff? Are we running out of that? Ausubel notes that the U.S. has apparently already achieved **absolute decoupling** —call it peak stuff—for a lot of materials, including plastics, paper, timber, phosphate, aluminum, steel, and copper. And he reports relative decoupling for **53** other **commodities**, all of which are likely heading toward absolute decoupling. Additive manufacturing is also known as 3-D printing, in which machines build up new items one layer at a time. The Advanced Manufacturing Office suggested that additive manufacturing can reduce material needs and costs by up to **90 percent**. And instead of the replacement of worn-out items, their material can **simply be recycled** through a printer to return it to good-as-new condition using only 2 to 25 percent of the energy required to make new parts. 3-D printing on demand will also eliminate storage and inventory costs, and will significantly cut transportation costs. Nanomanufacturing—building atom-by-atom—will likely engender a **fourth industrial revolution** by spurring exponential economic growth while reducing human demands for material resources. Ward and company project that Australians will be using 250 percent more energy by 2100. Is there an upper limit to energy production that implies unsustainability? In their analysis, the ecological economists apparently assume that energy supplies are limited. Why this is not clear, unless their model **implicitly assumes** a growing **consumption** of fossil fuels (and even then, the world is not close to running out of those). But there is a source of energy that, for all practical purposes, is limitless and has few deleterious environmental effects: **nuclear power**. If demand for primary energy were to double by 2050, a back-of-the-envelope calculation finds that the **entire world's energy needs** could be supplied by 6,000 conventional nuclear power plants. The deployment of fast reactors would supply "renewable" energy for thousands of years. The development of thorium reactors could also supply **thousands of years** of energy. And both could do so without harming the environment. (Waste heat at that scale would not be much of a problem.) Such power sources are in any relevant sense "decoupled" from the natural world, since their fuel cycles produce **little pollution**. Recall that GDP measures the monetary value of all finished goods and services. Finished goods will become a shrinking part of the world's economy as more people gain access to food, clothing, housing, transportation, and so forth. Already, services account for 80 percent of U.S. GDP and 80 percent of civilian employment. Instead of stuff, people will want to spend time creating and enjoying themselves. As technological progress enables economic growth, people will consume more pixels and less petroleum, more massages and less mortar, more handicrafts and less hardwood. Ultimately, Ward and his colleagues make the **same mistake as Malthus** and the Limits to Growth folks: They **extrapolate trends** without taking adequate account of human **ingenuity**. Will it be possible to grow the economy 7-fold over this century while reducing resource consumption and restoring the natural world? Yes.