# 1NC vs Isidore Newman EE

## 1

### 1nc – fw

#### Interp: Affirmatives must defend that a just government ought to recognize the unconditional right to strike.

#### This does not require the use of any particular style, type of evidence, or assumption about the role of the judge — only that the *topic* should determine the debate’s subject matter.

#### The right to strike prohibits interfering, impeding, or diminishing the ability to engage in concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining.

NLRB ND [National Labor Relatons Board. "NLRA and the Right to Strike." https://www.nlrb.gov/about-nlrb/rights-we-protect/your-rights/nlra-and-the-right-to-strike]

NLRA and the Right to Strike

The Right to Strike. Section 7 of the Act states in part, “Employees shall have the right. . . to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.” Strikes are included among the concerted activities protected for employees by this section. Section 13 also concerns the right to strike. It reads as follows:

Nothing in this Act, except as specifically provided for herein, shall be construed so as either to interfere with or impede or diminish in any way the right to strike, or to affect the limitations or qualifications on that right.

It is clear from a reading of these two provisions that: the law not only guarantees the right of employees to strike, but also places limitations and qualifications on the exercise of that right.

#### Violation: They defend “a ghostly revolutionary tactic”

**Vote Neg for predictable limits –**

**The resolution is the only common stasis point that anchors negative preparation. Allowing any aff deviation from the resolution is a moral hazard which justifies an infinite number of unpredictable arguments with thin ties to the resolution. That outweighs for fairness –**

#### A. Non topical advocacies mean they can defend anything outside the resolution which is unpredictable, and also defend uncontestable offense like racism bad. This kills NEG ground and thus equal access to the ballot.=

#### B. Debate is a game: forced winner/loser, competitive norms, and the tournament invite prove. This is true if the judge can make a decision between two sides who have had a relatively equal chance to prepare for a common point of debate. This makes fairness the most important impact

#### If they claim they meet, they literally don’t. the aff claims “epistemology comes first” which means they attempt to generate offense other than the implementation of the plan, but even if they claim that they are T this proves that their advocacy is extra-T which still links into all our offense.

#### Voter: Drop the debater on T – the round is already skewed from the beginning because their advocacy excluded by ability to generate NC offense– letting them sever doesn’t solve any of the abuse

#### Theory is an issue of competing interpretations because reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters will exploit a judge’s tolerance for questionable argumentation. T comes before all other args – controls the IL to whether we can engage

#### RVIs and impact turns encourage all in on theory which decks substance and incentivize baiting theory with abusive practices.

## 2

### 1nc – k

#### Settler colonialism is the permeating structure of the nation-state which requires the elimination of indigenous life and land via the occupation of settlers. The appropriation of land exterminates Natives and turns chattel slaves into excess labor.

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)

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 aff’s spectacle of a progressive policy that rectifies working conditions is cruel optimism – it grounds settler workers’ politics in a defense of indigenous dispossession and necessitates settler expansion – independently decks equality and turns the case.

Englert 20 (Sai Englert (lecturer @ Universiteit Leiden), 2020, “Settlers, Workers, and the Logic of Accumulation by Dispossession,” Antipode, Vol. 0, No. 0, doi:10.1111/anti.12659, rc HKR-RM

The history of settler colonialism underscores the conspicuous absence of involvement by settler working classes (as opposed to individuals or limited networks) in mass, sustained challenges against the process of settlement and indigenous dispossession.3 In fact, more often than not, settler labour movements fought for the intensification of settler expansion and racial segregation (see “An Alternative Reading: Settler Colonies and the Exploitation of the Native” above), through colour bars, boycott campaigns and demands for expulsion. In the process, bitter confrontations emerged between settler labour and capital, when the latter attempted to increase its profit margins through the exploitation of indigenous labour—for example in the context of the white labour movements in Australia and South Africa.4 Yet these conflicts can be resolved, especially while the settler colony continues to expand, by intensifying the dispossession of indigenous populations in order to improve the material conditions of settler workers (see “Case Studies” below). Here, the question of accumulation by dispossession returns to the fore. If settler workers are exploited as workers within the settler colony, they remain settlers. As such they participate in the processes of accumulation by dispossession through the occupation of lands, the elimination or exploitation of indigenous peoples, and the extraction of expropriated resources. For example, at a very basic level, their houses, workplaces, and basic infrastructure such as roads, railways, etc., are all premised on the capture and control of indigenous land. Settler workers are both exploited by settler bosses and their co-conspirators in the dispossession of indigenous peoples. As such, class struggle within a settler society has a dual character: it is waged over the distribution of wealth extracted from their labour as well as over the colonial booty. In the case of Zionism in Palestine, the current associated with the publication Matzpen (“Compass”) developed a class analysis of Israeli society. They came to the conclusion that because the Israeli economy was heavily subsidised from the outside (first primarily by Britain, then by the US) and that this subsidy was not simply going into private hands but was used by the Labour Zionist bureaucracy to organise the development of the Israeli economy and infrastructure, class antagonisms were diverted within its society. Hangebi et al. (2012:83) wrote: The Jewish worker in Israel does not receive his share in cash, but he gets it in terms of new and relatively inexpensive housing, which could not have been constructed by raising capital locally; he gets it in industrial employment, which could not have been started or kept going without external subsidies; and he gets it in terms of a general standard of living, which does not correspond to the output of that society ... In this way the struggle between the Israeli working class and its employers, both bureaucrats and capitalists, is fought not only over the surplus value produced by the worker but also over the share each group receives from this external source of subsidies. If this analysis was essentially correct, it underplayed, however, the consequences of an important aspect of Israeli wealth creation (which Matzpen otherwise recognised): the Israeli state, its infrastructure, and its economy were made possible by colonial expansion, land confiscation, the expulsion of Palestinians and the expropriation of their wealth and property. Affordable housing, for example, an issue discussed further below, was not only possible because of the subsidies the Israeli state received from abroad. It was possible because the land on which new houses were built, as well as existing Palestinian houses, had been confiscated by the Israeli army, Palestinians had been expelled in their hundreds of thousands, and the spoils were re-distributed amongst settlers. It was—and remains—the collective dispossession of the indigenous population by the Israeli population as a whole, which ties the settler community together, despite internal class, ethnic, and political divisions. The settler class struggle is fought over the distribution of wealth extracted from settler labour power as well as over the share each group receives from the process of accumulation by dispossession. This dual class and colonial relationship helps explain the relative absence of settler workers’ resistance against settler colonial expansion or alliances with Indigenous peoples.5 This tendency can be understood as “settler quietism”: even if working-class settlers are exploited by their ruling classes, overthrowing the settler state would mean overthrowing a system in which they share, however unequally, in the distribution of the colonial loot. Participating in the process of dispossession and fighting for a greater share of the pie leads to more important and immediate material gains. It also follows, as many anti-colonial thinkers and activists, not least among them Fanon (2001) in the Wretched of the Earth, have argued that indigenous people face the settler population as a whole in their struggle for de-colonisation. This is not to say that individual settlers or specific settler organisations cannot or have not supported struggles for decolonisation. It is however to point out that this is not the case for the majority of the settler working class, while it continues to depend on the continued dispossession of the natives for the quality of its living standards. Whether the settler colony is organised on the basis of an eliminatory or an exploitative model, what remains constant is that the entirety of the settler polity will participate in the process of accumulation by dispossession, and that the different settler classes will struggle both against the natives to impose and maintain this dispossession, as well as amongst themselves in order to determine the nature of its internal distribution. More than that, the specific structural forms of settler rule over the indigenous population is best understood as the outcome of struggle, both between settler classes and between settlers and indigenous populations. This paper now turns to two brief case studies demonstrating this process in the context of Zionism in Palestine.

#### Haunting is a deadly trope. When liberals in debate vote for a phenomenology of “haunting,” they perform an intellectual dance whereby they play and replay their complicity in settler colonialism. That means the aff’s inevitable perm fails

Emilie Cameron ‘8, Doctoral candidate in the Department of Geography at Queen’s University, Kingston, Canada, “Indigenous spectrality and the politics of postcolonial ghost stories,” Cultural Geographies 2008, 15: 383–393, http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1474474008091334

What does it mean, then, to be ‘haunted’ in a decolonizing settler colony like British Columbia? Who is haunted in these stories, and who or what is doing the haunting? What kind of future might these hauntings demand? Do they signal, as Derrida intended, a recognition of the always unfinished and unfinishable in our relation to the present and past and, by extension, a sense of generosity and hospitality towards ghosts? Or do they, as Sarah Ahmed55 has argued in relation to white guilt in postcolonial Australia, constitute yet another self-referential engagement with the colonial past, in which the experiences and desires of the settler occlude consideration of other desires and possibilities? This is the reason for my wariness in the face of haunting tropes, for I fear that postcolonial ghost stories risk perpetuating a kind of endless ‘dancing around a wound’56 that Daniel David Moses identifies among liberal, left-leaning Canadians, anxiously replaying their complicity in an ugly colonial past while neglecting to mobilize effectively for change in the present. The ghosts of the 389 390 cultural geographies 15(3) Stein do not seem to me to represent the Nlaka’pamux with very much dignity or agency, and surely any postcolonial trope we might mobilize ought at the very least to figure Indigenous peoples with dignity. In Haraway’s terms, it seems to me that ‘haunting’ has the potential to function as a particularly ‘deadly’ trope, one that requires the death and immateriality of Indigenous peoples to make an e/affective claim on non-Indigenous British Columbians.

#### The 1AC’s haunting is not revolutionary, but reflects a settler desire to vanish indigenous peoples. Their application of haunting the topic, and their inevitable ‘shout-out’ in the 1AR seeks to fold Natives into their theoretical frame by using indigeneity as a ghostly trope to cohere the 1AC.
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(DANIKA MEDAK-SALTZMAN is assistant professor of ethnic studies at the University of Colorado, Boulder, and author of Specters of Colonialism: Native Peoples, Visual Cultures, and Colonial Projects in the United States and Japan (1860–1904), Empire's Haunted Logics: Comparative Colonialisms and the Challenges of Incorporating Indigeneity, Critical Ethnic Studies , Vol. 1, No. 2 (Fall 2015), pp. 11-32 Published by: University of Minnesota Press, JKS)

Theories of postcolonial haunting and the trace—although recuperative and valuable to analyzing the experiences and complexities of histories faced by other minoritized groups in North America—provide a perfect example of how the application and utility of popular theoretical frames for examining the experiences of marginalized groups, even in a strictly U.S. context, often does not work when simply extended to the situations faced by Indigenous populations. We cannot simply expect that theoretical frames that are useful in making sense of the experiences of other racialized groups will be equally relevant when applied to Indigenous peoples and contexts. Surely there are cases where this wholesale application works, but it is far more common to see such “inclusion” of Indigeneity as more of an attempt to fit an Indigenous round peg into an all-other-racialized-groups square hole, while avoiding actual engagement with how and why the Indigenous case complicates such theoretical frames. However, the desire to “make” a given theoretical frame “fit” rather than to engage with Indigeneity and all of its attendant complexities represents a settler colonial desire that functions to render the value of, and need for, complex engagement with Indigenous difference inconsequential and irrelevant. This is a line of thinking that relies on the false assumption that Native peoples are simply another minority group in North America—a belief that is not only inaccurate but also serves to blind non-Native peoples to how their presence (even as minoritized groups) on stolen Indigenous territories makes a delicate and complex engagement with questions about collective complicity in the continued dispossession of Indigenous peoples necessary. For this is a complicity that a reckoning with the very fact of that theft, and working toward manifesting the decolonial goals outlined by Indigenous communities and our allies, might go a long way toward addressing. It seems that due, at least in part, to the general recognition of the shameful history of slavery in the United States—a basic level of visibility denied to Native peoples—it has become possible for scholars, historians, and novelists, among others, to employ ghosts and haunting as theoretically compelling and socially empowering tools for historical examination. From Ralph Ellison’s illustration of how that which is hypervisible is also an invisible ghostly presence in Invisible Man to Toni Morrison’s haunted Sethe, who comes face-to-face with the ghost of the daughter she murdered to save her from slavery, this trope is used far beyond these celebrated literary examples, both within and far afield from African American studies. Yet the very nature of haunting has been useful precisely because, as Avery Gordon tells us, “to be haunted is to be tied to historical and social effects,”9 even when, or perhaps especially when, these social effects of the past are dismissed as irrelevant and ahistorical or attributed to bitterness that ought to be “gotten over.” Indeed, the notion of haunting, often appearing as immutable “traces,” has proven a useful device for many groups in North America as they have sought to reveal long-hidden and silenced histories. However, wholesale applications of postcolonial and cultural studies notions of haunting and the trace to the specificity of Native American and Indigenous peoples’ experiences presents a distinct problem: precisely because the “fact” of Native vanishing has become part of a “common-sense” belief that renders Indigenous peoples always already ghostly presences, postcolonial notions of haunting and the trace simply cannot serve as recuperative, or decolonial, strategies for Indigenous peoples. Instead, indiscriminate application of these theories to Indigenous contexts manages to reinforce, rather than dismantle, settler colonial logics that mandate, carry out, and insist upon Indigenous absence. Indian ghosts have been and remain an indelible trope in North American narratives and national mythologies: we see Indigenous “absence” taught in schools, supported by media, and reinforced by statistics that encourage seeing Native peoples and contexts as unworthy of inclusion in studies because our populations are so small. Blaming this absence, neglect, and perceived statistical inconsequence on our small numbers—instead of recognizing the significance of teaching about, reporting on, and including populations that have been intentionally reduced to single-digit percentages of national populations (on our own lands)—shifts responsibility for this continued ignorance away from those who have benefited from settler colonialism and onto the shoulders of the victims and survivors of great violence and invasion. This orchestrated absence and insisted-upon irrelevance is also often unquestioningly reproduced in scholarship—even when the scholarly subject at hand seems to otherwise have little to nothing to do with Indigenous subjects. This pervasive, public, scholarly, and media supported and encouraged manner of thinking about—or more tellingly not thinking about—Native peoples is part of the unseen fabric that binds settler colonial societies together, legitimating the presence of all non-Native peoples on stolen land, whether they arrived by choice or by force. For these reasons, any attempt to simply extend notions of postcolonial haunting to Native peoples is neither empowering nor generative; instead, it further entrenches settler colonial fantasies of Indigenous absence that operate to absolve non-Native peoples, living on stolen Native lands, of this original sin.

#### Thus, the only alternative is decolonization, rejecting any instance of settler futurity and embraces native futurity. The role of the ballot is to center indigenous resistance-- Any ethical commitment requires that the aff place themselves in the center of Native demands.
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(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.

## Case

### Advantage

#### Ronconi just says that labor could be paradoxical but doesn’t substantiate that it’s necessary that the right to strike happens/no uq

#### Mishel is vague and doesn’t say anything about ghosts – literally just says pace of workers interests

#### Papastephanou only means that nationalist violence ought to be rejected but doesn’t substantiate that it resolves the right to strike

#### Farquhar – We agree oppressive regimes are bad but the K turns that if they claim somehow they get to weigh the aff bc settlerism is the total oppressive regime

#### Their offense on hauntology good is a massive double turn with their reading plan, hauntology is about openness but their telos forecloses openness because it says we should only redirect action towards one thing.

#### Can’t solve authoritarianism

#### 1] have ev about struc violence and militarism they cant solve that they only isolate one instance and don’t have evidence that justifies RTS as uniquely key

#### 2] cant make military leaders analyze their ghosts from the past so they don’t spill up to authoritarianism writ large which turns their offense.

#### 3] only get to weigh offense from the RTS, plan consistent with hauntology DOES NOT equate to plan creates the conditions to solve miltiarism. The aff is based on its material consequences so only their method is a defense of its epistemology. We are conceding epistemology comes first which means the plan’s irrelevant

#### Unions are vulnerable to right-wing populism – the plan doesn’t solve democracy

Gruenberg 21 [Mark Gruenberg is head of the Washington, D.C., bureau of People's World. He is also the editor of Press Associates Inc. (PAI), a union news service in Washington, D.C. that he has headed since 1999. Previously, he worked as Washington correspondent for the Ottaway News Service, as Port Jervis bureau chief for the Middletown, NY Times Herald Record, and as a researcher and writer for Congressional Quarterly. Mark obtained his BA in public policy from the University of Chicago and worked as the University of Chicago correspondent for the Chicago Daily News. "Worldwide, union leaders grapple with members backing right-wing ‘populists’." https://peoplesworld.org/article/worldwide-union-leaders-grapple-with-members-backing-right-wing-populists/]

WASHINGTON—For years, union leaders on both sides of “The Pond”—also known as the Atlantic Ocean—have faced a problem: Right-wing ideologues’ “populist” rhetoric sways millions of their members to vote against their own interests.

And then once those putative plutocrats achieve public office, they show their true colors, by enacting and enforcing repressive pro-corporate anti-worker laws.

The problem is visible in the U.S., where 40% of union members and their families backed former GOP Oval Office occupant Donald Trump in 2020. But it’s not just Trump.

Over the years, millions supported other right-wing Republicans such as Sens. Mitch McConnell (Ky.), Ted Cruz (Texas), various U.S. representatives, Gov. Greg Abbott (Texas), and former Govs. Bruce Rauner (Ill.) and Scott Walker (Wis.).

All of them, especially Trump and Cruz, spout populist bombast and claim to represent workers—and then enact edicts benefiting the corporate class.

“Trump’s policies favored the rich and the well-connected. But four in ten union voters wanted to give him a second term” last November, said Knut Pankin, moderator of a late-March panel discussion on Right-Wing Populism As An Anti-Worker Agenda. “Why?”

The dilemma exists in other democracies, too. Some unionists heeded anti-immigrant screeds from Germany’s extreme right Alternative for Deutschland, Marine LePen’s French National Rally (formerly the National Front), Norbert Hofer’s Austrian Freedom Party, Hungarian Prime Minister/strongman Viktor Orban of Fidesz, and Poland’s Law and Justice Party, panelists said.

Once those blocs won power in Austria, Poland, and Hungary, or influenced elections in France, mainstream politicians followed their lead, cracking down on workers as well as targeting migrants. The pols feared they would otherwise lose more votes to the right.

The panel, sponsored by Georgetown University’s Kalmanovitz Initiative for Labor and the Working Poor, and the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, a foundation set up to foster U.S.- German relations, tried to figure out why workers vote that way—and how to reorient them.

That’s not to say panelists Vonda McDaniel, president of the Nashville, Tenn., Central Labor Council, Prof. Federico Finchelstein, an expert on East European politics at New York’s New School for Social Research, and Prof. Thomas Greven of the Free University of Berlin reached a conclusion. They offered some reasons for the rightward shift and some solutions.

All those parties, including the GOP, “started as bourgeois, middle-class, shopkeeper-oriented” organizations, but have since pivoted to right-wing populism, Greven explained.

“Cruz at the Conservative Political Action Conference was trying to be the inheritor of the white working class who supported Trump,” he contended. The Texan proclaimed the GOP “the party of steelworkers, construction workers, police officers, firefighters, and waitresses.”

Nationalism, protectionism, and racism

“But one common denominator” is the GOP and the other right-wing parties, plus the workers they appeal to, “have a radicalized response” that “is nationalist, protectionist and nativist…to all facets of globalization,” he said. Those facets include corporate export of workers’ jobs to low-wage nations and resentment of refugees and migrants, often people of color whom white nativists in Europe and the U.S. view as a threat.

“’Us versus them’ is much easier to sell to working-class constituents. Union status doesn’t inoculate people versus right-wing populism,” Greven said. While populists’ pro-worker rhetoric is “a charade,” and progressives’ answer, “tax the rich,” is not enough, he added.

#### Unions crush democracy and forward authoritarianism

Daniel DiSalvo is a senior fellow at the Manhattan Institute’s Center for State and Local Leadership and an assistant professor of political science in the Colin L. Powell School at The City College of New York. Ph.D. in politics from the University of Virginia. “ARE UNIONS DEMOCRATIC? The Internal Politics of Labor Unions and Their Implications” Civic Report No. 91 September 2014 http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/cr\_91.htm#.VOyiXPnF98E

Unfortunately, much evidence suggests that unions are, in the vast majority of cases, only superficially democratic. A review of the existing literature shows that:¶ Very few members vote in standard union-leadership elections (turnout is often below 20 percent; in one recent New York City public-sector union election, turnout was 4 percent).¶ Those who do vote are not representative of the membership as a whole (with older workers voting at higher rates, thus skewing, for example, union policies on the importance of pensions relative to wages).¶ Incumbent leaders often go unchallenged for long periods, sometimes “anointing” chosen successors (who then anoint another generation) instead of fostering genuine contests.¶ Unions, especially at the state and national level, often take political positions with which a substantial number of members disagree (thus forcing those members to pay, with their dues, for the advocacy of policies that they do not support).¶ All these factors are signs of a gap between union democracy as a theory and its actual practice. This paper examines that gap and locates its cause in the incentives that union leaders face.¶ Indeed, those incentives push leaders toward the maintenance of an effective organization and toward keen attention to the overall satisfaction of a majority of their members—but away from the potentially boat-rocking effects of real debate, truly contested elections, and widespread participation by members in choosing leaders and policies for their organization. In short, leaders’ incentives, combined with widespread apathy about union politics among the rank and file, conspire to keep democracy at bay in most unions.

### Method

#### T/L

#### Vote neg on presumption –

#### [1] Process turn – using debate as a mode of advocacy ensures the failure of hauntology– competition means debaters ally themselves with individuals who vote for them and alienate those who are positioned with the burden of rejoinder and forced to negate – at worst you vote negative on presumption because they don’t use debate as a stepping stone for their advocacy outside the space and don’t have a net benefit to affirming the 1ac

#### [2] Academia turn – the 1ac is a regurgitation of knowledge that already exists within academia which proves they aren’t a departure from the status quo and voting aff is not intrinsic to affirming hauntology

#### [3] Competition turn – competition ensures Newman refines queering pleasure according to what best wins them ballots from judges not according to what actually best resolves violence for individuals outside debate – ensures their method can’t scale up and gets coopted by problematic norms in the debate community

#### Eisner DOES NOT make the reverse causal claim that they think it does, it justifies their analysis BUT dos not say the plan creates the conditions to improve it which is terminal defense.

#### Zembylas doesn’t mean anything – all it says is that coming to terms with specters are good but the K turns that and doesn’t mean that we shouldn’t interrogate these things

#### Auchter doesn’t say that their method is good – just says that in the squo scholars do that so their method is non uq if that’s true

#### Concede heron which means their advantage is irrelevant because it’s not based on its epistemology – we will win that the affs method is bad so vote neg

#### Not reading policy-making args so sin doesn’t apply – we just say you should be topical but we don’t argue insistently that policymaking and and of itself is good

#### Concede util causes genocide, but that applies to you – you read extinction impacts which link to you because you attempt to skirt discussions of real violence

#### Materially, they don’t affirm a right to strike because affirming it assumes that it exists as it’s ghostly – doesn’t assume the kind of

#### Pain narratives are a form of historical double erasure of the victims – furthers colonization.

Tuck**,** Associate Professor of Critical Race and Indigenous Studies at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), University of Toronto, and Yang,Associate Professor at Ethnic studies department at UC San Diego,2014 (Eve and K. Wayne, “R-Words: Refusing Research,” 2014, <http://townsendgroups.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/tuckandyangrwords_refusingresearch.pdf>, accessed July 17, 2016) DDI-BL

CHAPTER 12. R-WORDS: REFUSING RESEARCH 231 Alongside analyses of pain and damage-centered research, Eve (Tuck 2009, 2010) has theorized desire-based research as not the antonym but rather the anti- dote for damage-focused narratives. **Pain narratives are always incomplete**. They bemoan the food deserts, but forget to see the food innovations; they lament the concrete jungles and miss the roses and the tobacco from concrete. Desire- centered research does not deny the experience of tragedy, trauma, and pain, but positions the knowing derived from such experiences as wise. This is not about seeing the bright side of hard times, or even believing that everything happens for a reason. Utilizing a desire-based framework is about working inside a more complex and dynamic understanding of what one, or a community, comes to know in (a) lived life. Logics of pain focus on events, sometimes hiding structure, always adhering to a teleological trajectory of pain, brokenness, repair, or irreparability—from unbroken, to broken, and then to unbroken again. Logics of pain require time to be organized as linear and rigid, in which the **pained body** (or community or people) **is set back or delayed** on some kind of path of humanization, and now must **catch up** (but **never can) to the settler/unpained/abled body** (or community or people or society or philosophy or knowledge system). In this way, the logics of pain has superseded the now outmoded racism of an explicit racial hierarchy with a much more politically tolerable racism of a developmental hierarchy.2 Under a developmental hierarchy, in which some were undeterred by pain and oppression, and others were waylaid by their victimry and subalternity, damage- centered research reifies a settler temporality and helps suppress other under- standings of time. Desire-based frameworks, by contrast, look to the past and the future to situate analyses. Desire is about longing, about a present that is enriched by both the past and the future; it is integral to our humanness. It is not only the painful elements of social and psychic realities, but also the textured acumen and hope. (Tuck, 2010, p. 644) In this way, desire is time-warping. The logics of desire is asynchronous just as it is distemporal, living in the gaps between the ticking machinery of discipli- nary institutions. To be clear, again, we are not making an argument against the existence of pain, or for the erasure of memory, experience, and wisdom that comes with suffering. Rather, we see the collecting of narratives of pain by social scientists to already be a **double erasure**, whereby pain is documented in order to be erased, often by eradicating the communities that are supposedly injured and supplanting them with hopeful stories of progress into a better, Whiter, world. Vizenor talks about such “the consumer notion of a ‘hopeful book,’” and we would add hopeful or feel-good research, as “a denial of tragic wisdom” bent on imagining “a social science paradise of tribal victims” (1993, p. 14). Desire interrupts this metanarrative of damaged communities and White progress.

#### Orientation DA - past-oriented approaches towards whiteness neglect the way future discourse affects the present – futurity is key to full awareness (and contests social death)

Baldwin, 11 (Andrew, Co-Director of the Institute of Hazard at the University of Durham’s Department of Geography, “Whiteness and futurity: Towards a research agenda,” Progress in Human Geography 2012, originally published August 3, 2011, <http://phg.sagepub.com/content/36/2/172>, AW)

My argument is that a past-oriented approach to accounting for geographies of whiteness often neglects to consider how various forms of whiteness are shaped by discourses of futurity. This is not to argue that a historicist approach to conceptualizing white geographies is wrongheaded; the past continues to be a crucial time-space through which to understand whiteness. It is, however, to argue that such a past-focused orientation obscures the way the category of the future is invoked in the articulation of whiteness. As such, any analysis that seeks to understand how whitenesses of all kinds shape contemporary (and indeed past) racisms operates with only a partial understanding of the time-spaces of whiteness. My argument is that we can learn much about whitenesses and their corresponding forms of racism by paying special attention to the ways in which such whitenesses are constituted by futurity. I have offered some preliminary remarks on how we might conceptualize geographies of whiteness qua futurity, but these should only be taken as starting points. Much more pragmatically, what seems to be required is a fulsome investigation into the way the future shapes white geographies. What might such a project entail? For one, geographers would do well to identify whether and how the practice of governing through the future inaugurates new and repeats old forms of whiteness. It would also be worth comparing and contrasting how the future is made present in various dialectical accounts of whiteness. For instance, what becomes of whiteness when understood through the binary actual-possible as opposed to an actual-virtual binary, which has been my main concern? Alternatively, what becomes of the category of whiteness if it is shown to be constituted by a future that has no ontology except as a virtual presence? And, perhaps more pressing, how might whiteness be newly politicized? Futurity provides a productive vocabulary for thinking about and challenging whiteness. It does not offer a means of overcoming white supremacy, nor does it provide white people with a normative prescription for living with their whiteness guilt- or worry-free. Futurity is, however, a lacuna in the study of whiteness both in geography and outside the discipline, and this alone suggests the need to take it seriously. But equally, and perhaps more urgently, there is the need to study whiteness and futurity given how central the future is to contemporary governance and politics. Indeed, at a moment when the future features prominently in both political rhetoric – in his inaugural speech, Obama implores America to carry ‘forth that great gift of freedom and [deliver] it safely to future generations’ – and everyday life, how people orient themselves towards the future is indelibly political. The future impels action. For Mann (2007), it is central to interest. For Thrift (2008), ‘value increasingly arises not from what is but from what is not yet but can potentially become, that is fromthe pull of the future’. Attention to whiteness and futurity may at minimum enable us to see more clearly the extent to which the pull of whiteness into the future reconfigures what is to be valued in the decades ahead.

#### Focus on the past undermines the future – and shift the focus on curatives that undermines critical engagement

Hartman, 02 (Saidiya, professor of African American literature and history at Columbia University, “The Time of Slavery,” The South Atlantic Quarterly, 101, 4, Fall 2002, Duke University Press, EBSCO Publishing, AW)

The point here is not to condemn tourism. but Lo rigorously examine the politics of memory and question whether "working through" is even an appropriate mod el for our relationship with history. In Representing the Holocaust, Dominick LaCapra opts for working th rough as kind of middle road between redemptive totaJiza tion and the im possibility of representa­ tion and suggests that a degree of recovery is possible i n the con text or a responsible working throu gh of the past. He asserts that i n coming to terms with trauma, there is the possibility of retrieving desirable aspects of the past that might be used in rebuilding a new life.23 While LaCapra's argu men ts are persuasive, I wonder to what degree the backward glance can provide us with the vision to build a new life? To what extent need we rely on the past in transforming the present or, as Marx warned , can we on ly draw ou r poetry from the fu ture and not the past? 2• Here I am not advanci ng the impossi­ bil ity of representa tion or declaring theend of history. but wondering aloud whether the image of enslaved ancestors can transform the present. I ask this question in order to discover again the political and ethical relevance of the past. If the goa l is something more than assimilating the terror of the past into our storehouse of memory, the pressing question is, Why need we remember? Does the emphasis on remembering and working through the past expose our insatiable desires for curatives, healing, and anything else that proffers the restoration of some prelapsarian intactness? Or is recollection an avenue for undoing history? Can remembering potentially enable an escape from the regularity of terror and the routine of violence constitutive of black life in the United States? Or is it that remembering has become the only conceivable or viable form of political agency? Usually the injunction to remember insists that memory can prevent atrocity, redeem the dead, and cultivate an understanding of ourselves as both individuals and collective subjects. Yet, too often, the injunction to remember assumes the ease of grappling with terror, representing slavery's crime, and ably standing in the other's shoes. I am not proscribing representations of the Middle Passage, particularly since it is the absence of a public history of slavery rather than the saturation of representa tion that engenders these com pulsive performances, but instead poin ting lo the danger of facile invocations of captivity, sound bites about the millions lost, and simulations of the past that substitute for critical engagement.

#### Endless Remembrance DA - the aff’s attempt at continued re-presentation of the Middle Passage is a futile attempt of remembering that will only eclipse over the place of the dead

Hartman, 02 (Saidiya, professor of African American literature and history at Columbia University, “The Time of Slavery,” The South Atlantic Quarterly, 101, 4, Fall 2002, Duke University Press, EBSCO Publishing, AW)

At the portal that symbolized the finality of departure and the impossibility of reversion, the tensions that reside in mourning the dead are most intensely experienced. Mourning is both an expression of loss that tethers us to the dead and severs that connection or overcomes loss by assuming the place of the dead. The excesses of empathy lead us to mistake our return with the captives'. To the degree that the bereaved attempt to understand this space of death by placing themselves in the position of the captive, loss is attenuated rather than addressed, and the phantom presence of the departed and the dead eclipsed by our simulated captivity."You are back!" We are encouraged to see ou rselves as Lhe vessels for the captive's return; we stand in the ancestor's shoes. We imaginatively wi t­ ness the crimes of the past and cry for those victimized -the enslaved, the ravaged, and the slaughtered . And the obliterative assimilation of empathy enables us to cry for ou rselves, too. As we remember those ancestors held in Lhe dungeons, we can't bul think of our own dishonored and devalued l ives and t he unrealized aspirations and the broken promises of abolition, reconstruction, and the civil rights movemen t. The i n transigence of our seemi ngly eternal second•class status propels us Lo make recou rse to stories of origi n, unshakable explanatory narratives, and sites of inju ry-the land where our blood has been spilt -asif some essen liaJ ingredien t of ourselves can be recovered at the castles and forts tha t dot the western coast of Africa, as if the location of the wound was itself the cure, or as if the weight of dead generations could alone ensure our progress. lronica ll}1 the decla ration "You are back!" undermines the very violence that these memorial s assiduously work to present by claimi ng that the tourist'sexcursion is theancestor'sreturn.Given this, what does the journey back bode for the present? What is surprisi ng is Lhat despite the emphasis placed on remembrance and return, these ceremonies are actually unable to articulate in any decisive fashion , other than the reclamatio n or a true identity, what remembering yields. While the journey back is the vehicle of remedy, recovery, and sel f-reckoni ng. the question begged is what exactly is the redressive work actualized by remembrance. Is not the spectacular abjection of slavery reproduced in facile representations of the horrors of the slave trade? What ends are served by such representations, beyond remedying the failures of memory through the dramatic reenactment of captivity and the incorporation of the dead? The most disturbing aspect of these reenactments is the suggestion that the rupture of the Middle Passage is neither irreparable nor irrevocable but bridged by the tourist who acts as the vessel for the ancestor. Inshort, the captive finds his redemption in the tourist.