# 1NC Cap v Marlborough

## T

#### INTERPRETATION - the aff can't defend that one country ought to recognize a right to strike. The article “a” implies a nonspecific or generic reading of “a just government”

Walden 20 Walden University [The Writing Center provides a broad range of writing instruction and editing services for students at Walden University, including writing assistance for undergraduates, graduate students, and doctoral capstone writers], “"A" or "An"” last modified July 14 2020, <https://academicguides.waldenu.edu/writingcenter/grammar/articles> SM

When to Use "A" or "An" "A" and "an" are used with singular countable nouns when the noun is nonspecific or generic. I do not own a car. In this sentence, "car" is a singular countable noun that is not specific. It could be any car. She would like to go to a university that specializes in teaching. "University" is a singular countable noun. Although it begins with a vowel, the first sound of the word is /j/ or “y.” Thus, "a" instead of "an" is used. In this sentence, it is also generic (it could be any university with this specialization, not a specific one). I would like to eat an apple. In this sentence, "apple" is a singular countable noun that is not specific. It could be any apple.

#### Violation – they only defend the US

#### Vote neg—

#### 1] Semantics outweigh:

#### a] Topicality is a constitutive rule of the activity and a basic aff burden, they agreed to debate the topic when they came to the tournament

#### b] Jurisdiction -- you can’t vote affirmative if they haven’t affirmed

#### c] It’s the only stasis point we know before the round so it controls the internal link to engagement, and there’s no way to use ground if debaters aren’t prepared to defend it.

#### 2] Limits:

#### a] Education – they overexplode the topic – skirts from core to fringes of lit which kills education

#### b] Fairness – we would have to prep for infinite affs it’s literally impossible to prep for everything

#### 3] TVA solves – read the aff as advantage

#### Topicality is a voting issue for predictable limits – the debate is irreparably skewed. It should be evaluated through competing interpretations- it’s not what you do it’s what you justify.

## K

#### The aff’s strike-focused politics privatizes and atomizes worker struggle – it channels it towards specific employers rather than class domination as a whole while ensuring the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by privileging alternative modes of settlement outside and in spite of the specifics of the law itself.

Feldman, 94

[George, Assistant Prof. @ Wayne State Law: “Unions, Solidarity, and Class: The Limits of Liberal Labor Law,” Berkeley Journal of Employment and Labor Law, Volume 15, No. 2, 1994. https://heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/berkjemp15&div=14&g\_sent=1&casa\_token=&collection=journals#]//AD

In other ways, however, the liberal vision of labor law that Justice Brennan exemplified has been severely limited. 19 One obvious limitation, for instance, has been the Court's preference for arbitration.20 \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 20 STARTS HERE\*\*\* 20. The Court's tendency to privilege arbitration has led it to impose legal limitations on the right to strike that are unsupported by the language, policy, or history of the labor laws. See Boys Mkts., Inc. v. Retail Clerks Union, Local 770, 398 U.S. 235 (1970); Gateway Coal Co. v. United Mine Workers of Am., 414 U.S. 368 (1974), discussed infra at part III.C. For criticism of the Court's weakening of the right to strike, see Matthew W. Finkin, Labor Policy and the Enervation of the Economic Strike, 1990 U. ILL. L. REV. 547, 548-49; JAMES B. ATLESON, VALUES & AssuMiPTIONS IN AMERICAN LABOR LAW \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 20 ENDS HERE\*\*\* (1983). Yet a different kind of limit also has been present in the labor jurisprudence of the Court's liberal wing-a limit that is less obvious, usually has less immediate impact, but that is perhaps more deeply seated. The Court's privileging of arbitration restricts the means by which unions legally may act in response to concerns that are concededly legitimate. The limits discussed here, by contrast, define the legitimate boundaries of collective actions and collective concerns. The cases discussed here reflect the liberal doctrine that labor law protects unions only insofar as they limit their role to that of representative of the employees of an individual employer, and that the law will resist any union attempt to move beyond this limitation. That doctrine rejects protection when the underlying issue implicates the proper role of unions in American society. That question emerges in a variety of contexts. In some, a broad definition of unions' societal function may require, or may seem to require, limiting individual rights;21 in others, the Court's conclusion, or something very similar to it, is so clearly required by statute that the conclusion cannot be ascribed to the conscious or unconscious ideological views of the Justices.22 \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 21 STARTS HERE\*\*\* 21. When such a conflict is actually present, the proper place to draw the line is fairly subject to debate; a judge determined to protect both strong unions and individual employee rights might resolve apparent conflicts between the two in different ways without forfeiting a claim of taking each seriously. See infra notes 237-41; cf Emporium Capwell Co. v. Western Addition Community Org., 420 U.S. 50 (1975). \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 21 ENDS HERE\*\*\* At other times, however, liberal members of the Court have narrowed the range of permissible union concerns and therefore of unions' social role in contexts in which the law would have allowed a broader understanding, and in which the danger of conflict with individual rights was either absent or too attenuated to serve as a reasonable justification. In some cases this desire to narrow the sphere of union activity is central to the Court's reasoning; in others, it is a subsidiary theme, or is present only as an underlying assumption, unstated and perhaps unconscious, whose presence helps account for the result reached. This article examines what the members of the Supreme Court who have been identified with its liberal wing have said explicitly or by necessary implication about what is the legitimate sphere of union activity in American life. This vision of the role that unions should play in society has both practical and ideological consequences. Modern labor law, faithful to the Wagner Act's premises, aims to particularize rather than generalize workers' struggles; it directs them towards their specific relationship to their employer, rather than to the larger relationship of their class to employers and to work; it privatizes and depoliticizes those struggles.23 \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 23 STARTS HERE\*\*\* 23. It is in this sense that I think the frequently voiced point of authors associated with the Critical Legal Studies movement is correct. It is not that workers' struggles are channeled to arbitration rather than to a public body like the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), see Katherine Van Wezel Stone, The Post-War Paradigm in American Labor Law, 90 YALE L.J. 1509 (1981). but rather that whatever method workers employ-even including a strike or other collective job actions-the locus of the struggle remains the particular workplace or employer. It is in this sense that workers' struggles are channeled away from "political" dimensions. \*\*\*FOOTNOTE 23 ENDS HERE\*\*\* Given the contextual limitations mentioned, this analysis necessarily must be cautious. It must take account of the constraints of statutory language and congressional intent and, where applicable, of judicial deference to the decisions of the NLRB. 24 This analysis also must recognize the presence of other policy or ideological considerations that are unrelated to the theme of limiting the breadth of union concerns. Nonetheless, this theme is demonstrably present in a wide variety of legal settings, transecting the doctrinal categorizations that abound in labor law.

#### Their focus on prison labor as a part of the prison industrial complex is a diversionary tactic that normalizes broader forms of population control utilized by neoliberal governments. This is not a semantic point – this mindset informs of how they view non-prison labor and replicates class based racism.

Ertel 15 - JACOB ERTEL Jacob Ertel is a graduate of Oberlin College (Oberlin), where he studied Political Economy. Ertel was an organizer for Students for a Free Palestine (SFP), an affiliate of Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP), on the Oberlin campus. AUGUST 10, 2015 https://www.counterpunch.org/2015/08/10/do-we-need-to-rethink-the-prison-industrial-complex/

As a rhetorical tool, the notion of the PIC has been central in galvanizing public interest in the country’s astounding incarceration boom—and the 2.2 million people enveloped by it, over 60 percent of who are people of color—since the 1980s. In self-referentially positioning itself in relation to the more widely known ‘military-industrial complex,’ moreover, the PIC effectively calls attention to the state’s capacity to reproduce itself through a range of disciplinary institutions crucial to capitalism’s functioning. Though the PIC is useful in its ability to accessibly demonstrate the conjoined interests of capital and the state, some have argued that the term glosses over key historical, theoretical, and material conditions that can negatively affect our ability to understand the prison system and ultimately act against it. French sociologist Loïc Wacquant is among the most brazen of the term’s critics. Though Wacquant obnoxiously dismisses the PIC as an “activist myth,” various elements of his critique should merit our attention, if for no other reason than their provocatively counterintuitive framing. First and perhaps most surprisingly, Wacquant explains that only a miniscule percentage of incarcerated people actually work for private firms. In 2009, for example, only 0.3 percent of inmates nation-wide were employed by such companies. Even if this trend were to develop exponentially in the coming years, it would still fail to account for the fundamental features of the prison system, as no single economic sector relies principally or even significantly on prison labor, however disturbing this dynamic may be. Prisons likewise do not actually constitute a significant boon to the United States’ economy; in fact, inmates are generally employed at a net loss to the government (though their activity is heavily subsidized and regulated), and US corrections-based spending at local, municipal, and federal levels constitutes only a small fraction of the GDP. None of this is to discount the disturbing reality of private prisons. And the private prison industry is growing: Corrections Corporation of America’s profits alone have increased by 500 percent in the past twenty years, and the three largest private prison corporations have spent over $45 million combined in lobbying efforts, giving some credence to Critical Resistance’s explication of the PIC. Yet despite increasing profit margins and appalling moral bankruptcy, private prisons are hardly the norm, and they likely won’t be anytime soon. One must also wonder whether the specific demonization of the private prison industry implicitly naturalizes the much larger and much more encompassing public prison nexus in the United States, one which has grown 790 percent since 1980 and which is not immune from the grave abuses (sexualized violence, correctional officer misconduct, food rationing, etc.) frequently cited as byproducts of the private prison industry. Such an analysis can tend towards a conspiratorial view of history that, regardless of whether or not it ultimately rings true, misses the central dynamic undergirding state involvement vis-à-vis both institutions of social welfare and institutions of imprisonment, detention, and poverty under neoliberalism. Wacquant identifies such a dynamic in Punishing the Poor as a “paradox of neoliberal rationality” in which “the state stridently reasserts its responsibility, potency, and efficiency in the narrow register of crime management at the very moment when it proclaims and organizes its own impotence on the economic front, thereby revitalizing the twin historical-cum-scholarly myths of the efficient police and the free market.” This trend is illustrated by dramatically changing state expenses—for instance, by 1995 US corrections budget appropriations exceeded funding for public housing by a factor of three, resembling the inverse relationship of 1980 funding allocations. In other words, explains Wacquant, the prison system has over time become the United States’ largest public housing initiative for the poor. This reframing of the PIC thus positions the state in a slightly different light, portraying the heightened capacity for incarceration within a frankly more grotesque functionality. If, as opposed to the traditional PIC framing in which labor done in both private and public prisons is conceived as a major economic boon, Black labor (which alone disproportionally constitutes roughly 36 percent of the prison population) is even more ineluctably characterized as surplus labor under post-Fordism, then the state can simply endow itself with the power to hyper-criminalize without pretext in order to deal with those who both serve no use to the economy and frustrate the largely white middle class whose labor does provide such a benefit. The heightening of aggressive, ‘zero-tolerance’ policing functions associated with gentrification is case in point, as those who are shut out of the deteriorating welfare system and forced to turn to informal economies become even more vulnerable to warehousing or police brutality, thus aiding in the production of ‘renewed’ urban space for the gentrifying middle-class. These critiques of the contemporary framing of the ‘prison-industrial complex’ are not simply a practice in detached pseudo-intellectualization; they are important because they frame the role of Black labor to the US economy in a fundamentally different way, one that can be instructive for current struggles and movements. Rather than assuming that the hyper-exploited production process occurring in prisons is central to the growth of the economy and the private corporations that contribute to it, for example, perhaps it is worthwhile to consider prison labor’s actual relative lack of productivity as symptomatic of a post-Fordist economy that deals with its “relatively redundant population of laborers…of greater extant than suffices for the average needs of the self-expansion of capital” (in the words of Marx) through mass warehousing. Contrary to the popular slogan then, ontologically speaking, Black lives cannot matter under neoliberalism because they have been cast as inessential to the quotidian functioning of the economy. Any critique of the current iteration of the PIC, however, must seriously reckon with the not at all insignificant rise of privatized detention centers. Private prison companies are responsible for 62 percent of the beds used by the Department of Homeland Security’s Immigrations and Customs Enforcement branch, and private firms such as the Corrections Corporation of America and GEO Group operate nine out of ten of the country’s largest immigration detention centers. Both of these companies have lobbied the Department of Homeland Security on immigration policy, and thus constitute a formidable force in shaping the fate of undocumented migrants largely driven to cross the border due to free trade agreements and the drug war. For this reason, the PIC as depicted by Critical Resistance may more accurately describe a ‘security-industrial’ or ‘detention-industrial’ complex. One might incorrectly read this imputation as implying that the recent success of Columbia Prison Divest’s campaign is ultimately inessential or futile. One might also infer that a call to reframe the prison-industrial complex may necessarily entail solely Keynesian or social democratic solutions, as opposed to the explicitly abolitionist stance put forth by radical groups such as Critical Resistance. On the contrary, such a reframing affirms the importance of (for now) symbolic initiatives such as divestment from the private prison industry, and is in fact entirely compatible with the notion of abolition and the prescriptions for restorative and transformative justice platforms often associated with radical adherents to the traditional usage of the PIC. For one, if for no other purpose, the PIC is useful in its function as effective political propaganda that has and should continue to pique a widespread interest in, at the very least, prison expansion. The primary short-term goal of any abolitionist movement must be to call attention to injustice, and there is no reason why the PIC should be abandoned, even if its empirical grounding may be questioned and readjusted. Likewise, the movement to divest from the private prison industry carries not merely symbolic import, but the potential to unify a range of (unfortunately) often-disparate divestment movements. For instance, Group4Securicor (more commonly referred to as G4S), which was targeted by Columbia’s private prison divestment campaign, operates in 125 countries and manages prisons and detention centers in Israel and the occupied West Bank, often in contravention of the Fourth Geneva Convention. One can thus read a refreshingly global and intersectional element into the prison divestment movement, one that makes use of the traditional and incomplete formulation of the PIC. While the success of private prison divestment at Columbia should certainly be seen as a tremendous victory for all divestment movements, reframing the prison-industrial complex as suggested above could prove useful in the seemingly perennial and fraught struggle to build a unified Left in the United States. Such potential exists because this reframing of the prison system cuts across multiple dimensions of neoliberalism to explicitly address the rise of incarceration rates and prison expansion within the context of economic deregulation and the state’s reneging on social protections since the 1980s. It prompts us not to be satisfied when Obama mentions the ‘school-to-prison pipeline’ once every seven years, to strive beyond incomplete iterations of abolition that might inadvertently limit themselves to ultimately reformist paradigms, and above all to form stronger connections between the prison abolition movement and the labor movement, between the immigration movement and the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement.

#### Our critique independently outweighs the case - neoliberalism causes extinction and massive social inequalities – the affs single issue legalistic solution is the exact kind of politics neolib wants us to engage in so the root cause goes unquestioned. Farbod 15

( Faramarz Farbod , PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College, Monthly Review, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html, 6-2)

Global capitalism is the 800-pound gorilla. The twin ecological and economic crises, militarism, the rise of the surveillance state, and a dysfunctional political system can all be traced to its normal operations. We need a transformative politics from below that can challenge the fundamentals of capitalism instead of today's politics that is content to treat its symptoms. The problems we face are linked to each other and to the way a capitalist society operates. We must make an effort to understand its real character. The fundamental question of our time is whether we can go beyond a system that is ravaging the Earth and secure a future with dignity for life and respect for the planet. What has capitalism done to us lately? The best science tells us that this is a do-or-die moment. We are now in the midst of the 6th mass extinction in the planetary history with 150 to 200 species going extinct every day, a pace 1,000 times greater than the 'natural' extinction rate.1 The Earth has been warming rapidly since the 1970s with the 10 warmest years on record all occurring since 1998.2 The planet has already warmed by 0.85 degree Celsius since the industrial revolution 150 years ago. An increase of 2° Celsius is the limit of what the planet can take before major catastrophic consequences. Limiting global warming to 2°C requires reducing global emissions by 6% per year. However, global carbon emissions from fossil fuels increased by about 1.5 times between 1990 and 2008.3 Capitalism has also led to explosive social inequalities. The global economic landscape is littered with rising concentration of wealth, debt, distress, and immiseration caused by the austerity-pushing elites. Take the US. The richest 20 persons have as much wealth as the bottom 150 million.4 Since 1973, the hourly wages of workers have lagged behind worker productivity rates by more than 800%.5 It now takes the average family 47 years to make what a hedge fund manager makes in one hour.6 Just about a quarter of children under the age of 5 live in poverty.7 A majority of public school students are low-income.8 85% of workers feel stress on the job.9 Soon the only thing left of the American Dream will be a culture of hustling to survive. Take the global society. The world's billionaires control $7 trillion, a sum 77 times the debt owed by Greece to the European banks.10 The richest 80 possess more than the combined wealth of the bottom 50% of the global population (3.5 billion people).11 By 2016 the richest 1% will own a greater share of the global wealth than the rest of us combined.12 The top 200 global corporations wield twice the economic power of the bottom 80% of the global population.13 Instead of a global society capitalism is creating a global apartheid. What's the nature of the beast? Firstly, the "egotistical calculation" of commerce wins the day every time. Capital seeks maximum profitability as a matter of first priority. Evermore "accumulation of capital" is the system's bill of health; it is slowdowns or reversals that usher in crises and set off panic. Cancer-like hunger for endless growth is in the system's DNA and is what has set it on a tragic collision course with Nature, a finite category. Secondly, capitalism treats human labor as a cost. It therefore opposes labor capturing a fair share of the total economic value that it creates. Since labor stands for the majority and capital for a tiny minority, it follows that classism and class warfare are built into its DNA, which explains why the "middle class" is shrinking and its gains are never secure. Thirdly, private interests determine massive investments and make key decisions at the point of production guided by maximization of profits. That's why in the US the truck freight replaced the railroad freight, chemicals were used extensively in agriculture, public transport was gutted in favor of private cars, and big cars replaced small ones. What should political action aim for today? The political class has no good ideas about how to address the crises. One may even wonder whether it has a serious understanding of the system, or at least of ways to ameliorate its consequences. The range of solutions offered tends to be of a technical, legislative, or regulatory nature, promising at best temporary management of the deepening crises. The trajectory of the system, at any rate, precludes a return to its post-WWII regulatory phase. It's left to us as a society to think about what the real character of the system is, where we are going, and how we are going to deal with the trajectory of the system -- and act accordingly. The critical task ahead is to build a transformative politics capable of steering the system away from its destructive path. Given the system's DNA, such a politics from below must include efforts to challenge the system's fundamentals, namely, its private mode of decision-making about investments and about what and how to produce. Furthermore, it behooves us to heed the late environmentalist Barry Commoner's insistence on the efficacy of a strategy of prevention over a failed one of control or capture of pollutants. At a lecture in 1991, Commoner remarked: "Environmental pollution is an incurable disease; it can only be prevented"; and he proceeded to refer to "a law," namely: "if you don't put a pollutant in the environment it won't be there." What is nearly certain now is that without democratic control of wealth and social governance of the means of production, we will all be condemned to the labor of Sisyphus. Only we won't have to suffer for all eternity, as the degradation of life-enhancing natural and social systems will soon reach a point of no return**.**

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

Escalante, Philosophy @ UOregon, 18

[Alyson, M.A., is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/>] rVs

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for holding party members accountable, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions. It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement. Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism. The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

#### Fiat is illusory – K First - There is no material world that we can separate from the lens through which we view it. Deconstructing the AFF scholarship is a prior question that has material effects.

#### Therefore the ROB is one of deconstruction – vote for the side which best challenges neoliberal scholarship

Springer ‘12

Simon Springer - Department of Geography, University of Otago. “Neoliberalism as discourse: between Foucauldian political economy and Marxian poststructuralism.” Routledge. May 2012. JJN from file \*bracketing in original

Conclusion In arguing for an understanding of neoliberalism as discourse, I do not presume that comprehending neoliberalism separately as a hegemonic ideology, a policy and program, a state form, or as a form of governmentality is wrong or not useful. Rather I have simply attempted to provoke some consideration for the potential reconcilability of the different approaches. My argument should accordingly be read as an effort to destabilize the ostensible incompatibility that some scholars undertaking their separate usage seem keen to assume. Without at least attempting to reconcile the four approaches we risk being deprived of a coherent concept with which to work, and thus concede some measure of credibility to Barnett’s (2005) claim that ‘there is no such thing as neoliberalism’. Such a position renders the entire body of scholarship on neoliberalism questionable, as scholars cannot be sure that they are even discussing the same thing. More perilously, to accept such a claim throws the project of constructing solidarities across space into an uneasy quandary, where the resonant violent geographies of our current moment may go unnoticed, a condition that plays perfectly into the ideological denial maintained by the current capitalist order (Zizek, 2011). In ignoring such relational possibilities for resistance to the contemporary zeitgeist, Barnett (2005) seems keen to engage in disarticulation ad nauseam. Yet deconstruction is meant to be interruptive not debilitating. As Spivak (1996, p. 27) contends, ‘Deconstruction does not say there is no subject, there is no truth, there is no history. ... It is constantly and persistently looking into how truths are formed’. It is about noticing what we inevitably leave out of even the most searching and inclusive accounts of phenomena like neoliberalism, which opens up and allows for discursive understandings. Rather than making nice symmetrical accounts of the ‘real’ at the meeting point of representational performance and structural forces, neoliberalism understood as a discourse is attuned to processual interpretation and ongoing debate. While there are inevitable tensions between the four views of neoliberalism that are not entirely commensurable, their content is not diametrically opposed, and indeed a considered understanding of how power similarly operates in both a Gramscian sense of hegemony and a Foucauldian sense of governmentality points toward a dialectical relationship. Understanding neoliberalism as discourse allows for a much more integral approach to social relations than speech performances alone. This is a discourse that encompasses material forms in state formation through policy and program, and via the subjectivation of individuals on the ground, even if this articulation still takes place through discursive performatives. By formulating discourse in this fashion, we need not revert to a presupposed ‘real-world’ referent to recognize a materiality that is both constituted by and constitutive of discourse. Instead, materiality and discourse become integral, where one cannot exist without the other. It is precisely this understanding of discourse that points to a similitude between poststructuralism and Marxian political economy approaches and their shared concern for power relations. I do not want to conclude that I have worked out all these tensions, my ambition has been much more humble. I have simply sought to open an avenue for dialogue between scholars on either side of the political economy/ poststructuralist divide. The importance of bridging this gap is commensurate with ‘the role of the intellectual ... [in] shaking up habits, ways of acting and thinking, of dispelling commonplace beliefs, of taking a new measure of rules and institutions ... and participating in the formation of a political will’ (Foucault, quoted in Goldstein, 1991, pp. 11– 12). Such reflexivity necessarily involves opening ourselves to the possibility of finding common ground between the epistemic and ontological understandings of political economy and poststructuralism so that together they may assist in disestablishing neoliberalism’s rationalities, deconstructing its strategies, disassembling its technologies, and ultimately destroying its techniques. In changing our minds then, so too might we change the world.

## Case

### Underview

#### Framework – the role of the ballot is deconstruction – their framing of structural violence fits under our ROB – the best way to challenge inequality is by attacking the root of capitalism

#### This turns who did the best debating – epistemology is a prior question, it sets up the context with the round – the harms of capitalism are a fact. This means we need to first deconstruct the capitalist biases, anything else is subjective and their rhetoric pushes us into a skewed-pro-cap world view –

#### UV 1 –

#### 1] off 1ac 1 – our alternative is revolutionary politics through the communist party – a revolution is engagement with politics, not simply a critique through pedagogical spaces

#### 2] off 1ac 2 – their links to strengthening cap means their reforms are a step in the wrong direction – they increase the power of the capital which means they can’t help with the revolution – their incremental state action can’t solve

#### 3] group 1ac 3 and 4 – using the govt as a middle man inevitably causes these impacts to happen again – the idea of the government is the idea of the elite

#### UV 2 –

#### 1] this uv doesn’t apply to us – we aren’t reading a DA

### Solvency

#### Top-level be skeptical of the aff-

#### They give zero uniqueness of why prisoners aren’t striking enough in the squo- in fact, most of their cards cite examples of prisoners literally going on strike. That means all of their impacts should already have triggered. NONE of their ev ever says that we need to give prisoners a right to strike because they currently don’t have that, they just talk about why the prison strikes we literally have right now are good and helpful

#### Double-bind- if they defend only non-violent strikes then they get no solvency because most strikes will turn violent or result in crackback which is proven by their own ev. If they want to defend all prison strikes they still get no solvency because prisoners are already striking

#### No inherency – Congress is already addressing prison labor issues – NAA, LEAP and PIECP programs

Galeano 08-31

(Sergio Galeano, government analyst and public affairs liason, MD international affairs from Columbia University; (08-31-2021) “Bolstering the Prison-Based Apprenticeship and Workforce Training System”; <https://www.thirdway.org/report/bolstering-the-prison-based-apprenticeship-and-workforce-training-system>)//ckd

\*\*WIOA = Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act

The Solution There isn’t a silver bullet to modernize the prison-based workforce training system—an expansive set of solutions is required. Luckily, Congress has started addressing this issue. Earlier this year, for example, the House of Representatives passed the National Apprenticeship Act, a bill that would support the expansion of the registered apprenticeship model, including for the development of apprenticeship and pre-apprenticeship programs across state prison systems. Let’s not stop there. There are several more steps the Federal government can take to create a better designed and well-integrated prison workforce framework with a full range of services for the incarcerated and returning citizens. Increase WIOA funding for prison-based training Congress should increase federal funding to modernize the prison-based apprenticeship and skills system. Without adequate funding, lawmakers will miss an indispensable opportunity to reinvigorate the country’s workforce system and the different demographics that depend on it, including the nation’s men and women behind bars. Last updated in 2014, WIOA is set for reauthorization this year, providing a key opportunity to reinfuse the workforce system, and by extension, state development boards that provide funding for correctional job training and reentry programs. WIOA funds would also help finance the numerous grant programs administered by DOL, including pilot programs that strive to reimagine the suite of supportive services provided by the federal government for justice-involved youth and adults. Create jail-based American Job Centers (AJCs) WIOA authorizes funding for the nation’s network of AJCs, which provide job search services, career counseling, and job training programs.26 Despite providing a valuable service to everyday jobseekers, unemployed individuals, and displaced workers who would otherwise be on their own to navigate the labor market, incarcerated individuals aren’t able to access AJCs. While available to them after their release, the absence of coordinated pre-release job-seeking services is a huge disadvantage that plays an outsized role in their dismal economic conditions. Through increased WIOA funding, Congress can help establish a network of prison-based American Job Centers (AJCs) across the country’s justice system to better connect inmates with prospective employers. Pilot programs, such as the current reentry projects being implemented, use evidence-based research to test interventions that improve employment outcomes, with a focus on high-poverty, crime-stricken communities across urban and rural areas alike. Enacted in 2015, the Linking to Employment Activities Pre-Release (LEAP) program created jail-based AJCs that aimed to increase inmate’s employment readiness for the labor market and to better streamline cooperation between workforce and corrections agencies. Although the program has since ended, it provided evidence of the feasibility and effectiveness of jail-based AJCs. Since the expiration of the program’s funds, 11 of the 20 participating sites planned to maintain the jail-based AJC model they had created, with six sites searching for alternative sources of funding. Overall, the outcomes included greater employment, reduced recidivism, increased earnings, and better opportunities for educational and credential attainment.27 As a pilot program, the LEAP program offers an example of the kinds of broad-sweeping initiatives the Federal government can enact throughout the prison and workforce system with increased funding. Additional examples that can be scaled include the Bureau of Prisons’ “Ready to Work” initiative that seeks to increase connections between employers and recently released workers.28 Pay inmates a living wage The Center for American Progress has proposed that beyond providing inmates with valuable skills and marketable credentials, congressional funding for apprenticeships should be used to pay inmates prevailing wages.29 A grant dedicated for such a purpose or dedicated funding through apprenticeship block grants would provide the necessary financing for this initiative. Along with helping them find jobs after their release, paid apprenticeships would provide returning citizens with needed savings as they readjust to their routine lives, along with any financial constraints they may face. For single individuals, they would rely on these payments to navigate their reentry back to their communities, as well as for married individuals and those with children, as their absence while in prison is often a financial burden on their spouses. The Prison Industry Enhancement Certification Program (PIECP), a limited joint venture between the private sector and prisons and active in over 44 correctional jurisdictions, offers inmates practical jobs that pay at least the federal minimum wage, including allowing deductions for family support.30 As a model, it provides legal precedence to the idea of paying incarcerated apprentices prevailing wages and is a testament to the effectiveness of programs that provide inmates with paid, valuable work.

### turnz

strikes bad --

#### Prison strikes lead to more violence and worse conditions for prisoners EVEN if they are peaceful

Gerstein 17

(Michael Gerstein; Michigan State University, Journalist for The Detroit News; (05-12-2017) “State report shows ‘riot’ shook control of U.P prison”; <https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/politics/2017/05/12/michigan-prison-upper-peninsula-riot/101582402/>)//ckd

Lansing — An Upper Peninsula prison deputy warden admitted state officials briefly lost control of the facility before the state’s prison director authorized armed squadrons to remove prison protest leaders and quash the inmate rebellion with pepper spray, wrist ties and the threat of live ammunition. The Michigan Department of Corrections previously denied a riot happened in September at the Kinross Correctional Facility in Chippewa County, but a 262-page incident report revealed that senior officials referred to the event as a “riot” and admitted to having lost control of the prison for an unspecified amount of time. The second page of the report plainly marks the incident as a “riot/strike/demonstration” in which more than 240 staff members were involved. Prison officials sent in squads armed with guns, pepper spray and dogs to round up leaders of a peaceful protest after inmates returned to their units, according to the document and Michigan prison spokesman Chris Gautz. Gautz said corrections officers do not typically carry guns or live ammunition in state prisons. But inmates destroyed about $900,000 worth of state property after Michigan Department of Corrections Director Heidi Washington authorized squads of armed officers to round up leaders of what was a peaceful protest in the prison yard, he said. Gautz denied that officials lost control of the entire facility. But he acknowledged they lost control of some housing units while prisoners destroyed windows, barricaded doors and started a fire in one unit as armed officials attempted to capture protest leaders and transport them to other facilities. “It’s a very scary thing to see hundreds of prisoners moving as one body when, already in a prison setting, you are very outnumbered,” Gautz said. “You can’t allow a scenario for prisoners to move as one and act as once voice.” Hundreds of inmates surrounded the prison “control center” after refusing to return to their units, broke windows in the lobby, barricaded doors and destroyed other prison property, the report said. About 150-200 prisoners in the “yard” were circling and chanting “no justice, no peace” as officials urged them to leave and began blaring sirens when they did not, according to the document. “A plan was developed to regain control of the facility,” wrote Kinross Deputy Warden Jerry Harwood in the incident report that was first obtained by the Michigan Information & Information Service under an open records request. The protest and property damage occurred during a national wave of prison protests on the anniversary of the Attica riot of Sept. 9, 1971, when inmates took control of a New York prison and dozens of hostages. At least 39 people were killed after then-New York Gov. Nelson Rockefeller ordered state police to regain control of the Attica Correctional Facility.

#### Prison strikes don’t work – they just give the incarcerated a false sense of hope until they’re met with even more violence

Ade 19

(Mangaaka Ade, also known as Calvin Westerfield, 41, is incarcerated at Central Michigan Correctional Facility, in St. Louis, Michigan, where he is serving a 20-to-60-year sentence for second-degree murder; (06-27-2019) “We Thought Our Prison Strike Was a Success. Then Came the Officers in Riot Gear.”; <https://www.themarshallproject.org/2019/06/27/we-thought-our-prison-strike-was-a-success-then-came-the-officers-in-riot-gear>)//ckd

A prisoner strike had been organized to take place on the morning of September 10, 2016. It was to be a peaceful demonstration of solidarity, a statement of opposition to the oppression and the egregious conditions we endure day and night at the Kinross Correctional Facility in Michigan. Here, black mold creeps out from the institutional-white, rust-proof paint intended to contain it. It loiters around the bases of toilets, seeps from under floor tiles and scales the walls of showers. Eight men pack cubicles designed for six. The food tastes indigestible; some staff are verbally abusive. These and a long list of other grievances made the prison we call “Hiawatha” [a ripe atmosphere for resistance.](https://www.detroitnews.com/story/news/politics/2017/05/12/michigan-prison-upper-peninsula-riot/101582402/) There had already been several demonstrations of unity amongst the incarcerated population. For instance, most of us prisoners would line up together in the cellblock for 20 minutes when “yard time” was called, in complete silence, then simultaneously disperse when we decided we felt like going about our usual routines. This was done three times, but the administration just brushed it off. When the 10th of September arrived, staff were clearly expecting us not to show up to our work details, ready to report our non-compliance to their bosses. It was obvious that one of their inmate-pets had informed them of the strike. Breakfast came and instead of hot meals, the staff handed out brown paper bags containing a cold cheese sandwich, milk and six duplex cookies. Clearly their way of showing displeasure in our solidarity. Shortly after returning from chow, I noticed out my cell window a small assemblage of men on the common yard. Within minutes, their numbers started to multiply. When they began to march around the perimeter, I naturally felt compelled to hop off my bunk and join them. Out the doors I went. I stood with the crowd, applauding as more and more men arrived. The throng grew fast, and in an hour, hundreds of Hiawatha's population were out on the yard, chanting in unison, "No justice, no peace!" The Kinross facility had officially lost its treasured “control.” A list of demands, including better food and higher wages, was served on the warden, who had come outside to watch, and a few prisoners vehemently negotiated the terms with him. The prison’s authority had been curbed for several hours now. Through the crowd, though, confused whispers could be heard from men wondering what our end-game was. How long were we going to protest? Guys were tiring and getting edgy. The warden had gone back inside to consider the terms of our negotiation. When he returned an hour later, he spread word that he was reluctantly considering most of our demands. Our negotiators shouted, “We won!” Then we were instructed back into our units to be counted. I was relieved to get back and relax, but my intuition warned me to stay on my toes. I couldn’t escape the question: Were they really going to let us get away with taking control of their facility and making demands? Count was made, followed by an announcement that chow would be brought to the units. When those same detestable sack meals arrived, I sprang to my feet and frantically began packing my property, hoping to keep it safe in the chaos to come. I told my cubies, “Something is about to go down!" I knew the bag meals meant the prison wasn’t really ceding to us. And just as I was saying it, we heard over the officers’ radios the coded instruction, “1019! 1019!” The staff reacted like track runners anticipating a starter pistol. At once, they all abandoned their posts and made a dash for the control center in the administration building. They even had ATV’s suddenly parked and available to rescue the staff who couldn't retreat fast enough. It was comical to watch, but the situation was extremely serious. Within minutes, we were alone without any supervision. Panic ensued as everyone braced for the inevitable attack. Five minutes after the distress code was given, the ERT stormed the compound. They formed groups of about 30 and marched toward each unit in single-line formation. Anyone attempting to exit got riddled with chemical rounds from their anxious rifles. I continued packing as the spray consumed the air. Guys started arming themselves with any material that would cut, stab or be used as a bludgeon. The ERT had us divided and trapped, savoring the revenge in their grasp. Some younger prisoners with appetites for destruction had been rebelling, looting and demolishing as much as humanly possible—their own cells, the bathrooms, public areas, staff offices, everything. Once the surveillance cameras were painted out or papered over, many hold-outs gladly joined in the destruction. My senses were overwhelmed. The smells of gas, paint, smoke and burnt wires mingled to create noxious fumes. Then there was the relentless din: yelling, glass shattering, sinks and urinals being smashed to bits, music blaring, the fire alarm wailing, and steel being rubbed against the concrete as men forged crude weapons. Grasping the degree of chaos around me, I couldn’t recognize the place anymore. Everything that was not bolted down was in ruins. Broken glass shimmered on the ground like precious jewels. Prisoners’ files from the counselor’s office were strewn about the floor. The washing machine and dryer had been relocated through the front window and onto the yard. The ERT entered one unit at a time, targeting specific prisoners for immediate “ride-outs,” where they would be sent to other prisons. Starting with A-Unit, they worked their way back to H-Unit, where I was housed. It was 11:00 p.m. when an angry man's voice barked through a bullhorn, “Get inside your assigned cubes and on your bunks!” This demand was instantly followed by two flash bangs that caused those intending to resist to run for the safety of their cubes. Red beams penetrated the smoke, searching for marks. When the ERT reached the cubicles, they instructed each man to touch the sky and walk backwards down the hallway out the back door where a group of officers were waiting to cuff and identify us. Men were seated on the ground and others were being dragged away. When I informed the officer of my name, she yelled, “This one’s riding!” Two officers promptly snatched my arms and dragged me to the chow hall, now converted into a kind of processing center. There, a stubby officer wearing a sadistic-looking facial expression and holding a Taser looked me in the eye and yelled, “Strip!” No privacy existed in this open space, and male and female staff were everywhere. In no mood to be tased, I complied. Standing there naked as he meticulously searched my clothing, I considered my ancestors on an American auction block. After my personal effects were thrown in a junk pile, and Taser Man was satisfied that I had no contraband up my ass, I was ordered to dress, got chained, and lined up with other prisoners waiting on the next bus out. The restraints served as more razor wire binding me, cutting deep into my ankles and wrist, and I knew it would be a long, miserable ride ahead. I was sent to a maximum-security facility after participating in the “disturbance,” and left there until they decided to relocate me again.