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### Contention 1: Squid Game

(Contention 1 is Inequality)

#### 1. Capitalism has produced shocking global inequality-the public is ready for action

Abdelmahmoud 21 10-1-21

(Elamin, https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/elaminabdelmahmoud/squid-game-netflix-review-lupin-international)

The dizzying success of Squid Game and the triumph of other non-English shows may finally kill the unfounded idea that North American viewers — the largest share of Netflix’s audience — are not interested in watching foreign shows. That is significant by itself. But these shows also share a common throughline: They all deal with inequality, capture the despair of poverty, and dissect class anxiety. Regardless of the country or language, capitalism is the shared villain in Netflix’s global successes. It’s a villain viewers everywhere can identify. In case you’re among the eight people who have yet to watch Squid Game, the premise is simple: Hundreds of people living with oppressive debt are approached to take part in a series of games — all variations of childhood favorites like Red Light, Green Light, but with, uh, deadly modifications — with the promise of a cash prize that might change their lives. It’s like if the playground games you played as a kid suddenly turned into the Hunger Games. Squid Game is effective at pulling you in. By the middle of the first episode, viewers are plunged into a world that’s as repulsive as it is gripping, complete with masked villains and hapless antiheroes who do not know what’s in store for them. The “game” sequences are breathtaking — in creator Hwang Dong-hyuk’s hands, a game as familiar as tug of war is transformed into an exhilarating, high-stakes contest. At the center of it all is Seong Gi-hun, a chauffeur addicted to gambling and self-sabotage, played brilliantly by Lee Jung-jae. In Lee’s performance, we see all the big and small humiliations of capitalism: the feeling of your worth being tethered to your productivity; the magical thinking that once you’re rich, you’ll be a different person; the embarrassments we are willing to endure to afford what we think we deserve. As we become invested in Gi-hun, we watch him as he lets us down over and over again. He steals from his mother and forgets his daughter’s birthday. When he is handed a financial lifeline, he gambles it away. The first episode sets up the tension by slowly luring you into its shocking climax, when players discover the true cost of playing. No matter how much you read about it, you will not be ready for the rules of the game. But Squid Game is at its most effective in the second episode, where the contestants briefly find themselves back in their regular lives. Here, the show cycles through the horrors they all exist in: the pickpocket desperate to secure enough money to rescue her little brother; the business graduate who can’t confront the ways he has let down his mother; the young migrant worker who cannot provide for his wife and his newborn. And in the case of Gi-hun, the reality that his debt has not only driven his daughter away, but also put him in a position where he is unable to help his sick mother. Through the course of the episode — aptly entitled “Hell” — we learn of the various chokeholds these characters are in, which are cruel enough that they might even prefer to go back to wagering with their lives. Their debts — and circumstances — are treated with tenderness and compassion. These are desperate people, willing to do anything to get out of their own personal hells. Their desperation may be familiar to viewers in Korea, where household debts are snowballing, but it is universal, too: in the US, Americans have more debt than ever before. In Canada, household debts are at worrying levels. Beyond the indignities of working only to keep your head above water, debt has devastating health consequences like depression and anxiety. Forty percent of Americans would struggle to handle an unexpected $400 expense because of debt. Meanwhile, even though inequality was already high, the pandemic made it even worse. Hell, that cuts both ways, and inequality made the pandemic worse, too. That growing wealth gap is not an accidental outcome of capitalism — it is rather predictable. The games are made up, the pot of money is fictional, and Squid Game is a drama, but its honest exploration of the weight of debt and inequality could not be more timely. Squid Game fully understands the crushing consequences of being in debt, and it’s easy for viewers to see themselves in it. “We are simply here to give you a chance,” the masked villains say, and you understand their meaning to be more sinister than that. Squid Game deals with these themes explicitly, but it is hardly the only Netflix property to dive into the horrors of capitalism. In Lupin, Assane Diop, the noble thief, is struggling to pay the bills and is forced to rely on loan sharks in order to pull off an elaborate heist. We see Tokyo, the protagonist of Money Heist, begin from a place of desperation too as she is left shattered after a botched robbery before she’s taken in by the mysterious Professor. Even the Spanish-language hit Elite takes on class anxiety, as three lower-income students begin life at a wealthy school and struggle to fit in with their new classmates. In all of these shows, the poverty and precariousness of the protagonists are the entry points for viewers, the vectors of relatability. We cheer for them because we understand that they are up against the same forces as the rest of us. All of these shows are thrilling and well paced, with impeccable writing. But more to the point, the fact that it is these shows that Netflix viewers have gravitated to suggests a universal center of gravity. No matter the language or location, capitalism makes us all desperate. ●

#### 2. Income inequality undermines democracy making action on existential problems like climate change impossible- it’s the biggest global risk and the US is the worst example

Lingis, PhD, 21 9-29-21

(Alphonso Lingis, a professor emeritus of philosophy at Pennsylvania State University, https://www.tehrantimes.com/news/465571/Inequality-of-wealth-is-greater-in-the-U-S-than-in-any-other)

“Inequality of wealth is greater by far in the United States than in any other developed country and increasing,” Lingis tells the Tehran Times. “One percent of the population in the United States holds 42.5 percent of the national wealth. Just three men—Amazon founder Jeff Bezos, Microsoft founder Bill Gates, and investor Warren Buffett—hold combined fortunes worth more than the total wealth of the poorest half of Americans.” Since wealth means political power in the United States, the gap between tycoons and ordinary people reflects a defect in the political system. Critics say capitalism in the U.S. is going to marginalize democracy. Mass media plays a key role in this regard. “As wealth becomes increasingly concentrated in an ever smaller number of individuals and corporations, so does the potential political power of the wealthiest,” Lingis notes. Meanwhile “the median White family has 10 times more wealth than the median Black family and 7.5 times more wealth than the median Latino family. This increasing economic inequality is damaging to the health, education, job opportunities, and home ownerless possibilities of a growing number of people in the nation,” the professor of philosophy adds. Following is the text of the interview: Q: How do you see the political fallout of Trump's presidency in America and its impact on U.S. democracy? A: Lawyers for President Trump identified 62 incidences of alleged voter fraud in the 2020 election, which the courts individually examined and rejected. Nonetheless, Trump continues to claim that massive voter fraud invalidated the election, a claim shared by more than half of Republican voters. This does undermine public trust in the essential institutions of democracy in the country. Q: U.S. officials claim to defend democratic values, but apparently giant corporations, lobbies, and money have a big influence on U.S. democracy. Is American democracy in favor of the majority or just a tool in the hands of the elites? A: As wealth becomes increasingly concentrated in an ever-smaller number of individuals and corporations, so does the potential political power of the wealthiest. In 2020 candidates for the U.S. Congress spent $8,703,050,547 on their campaigns. Individual candidates spent up to $270 million on a campaign. The greater part of the money spent was donated by a small number of very rich individuals and corporations. One-fifth of the money spent on campaigns was donated by just 2635 individuals. Their influence makes President Trump’s numerous actions against climate change control, environmental protection, and his massive tax reduction for the rich difficult to reverse. Q: What is your comment on Republicans' efforts to restrict voting rights in some states? Do you think the American establishment can protect democracy? A: Since the 2020 election, nine Republican-dominated states have passed new laws that restrict access to voting for poorer people and minorities. Seventeen states have passed laws to expand access to voting for their citizens. A national voting rights law is presently being blocked by Republicans in Congress. Q: Is there any correlation between defending democracy at home and supporting democracy abroad? Apparently, the U.S. has failed to realize this goal in foreign policy. For example, America is a great sponsor of tyrannical regimes in the Persian Gulf. A: President Trump openly admired authoritarian regimes, and leaders such as Bolsonaro in Brazil, Duterte in the Philippines, and Orban in Hungary copied Trump’s rhetoric and domestic policies. President Biden, addressing the United Nations General Assembly, affirmed that his government will exercise “relentless diplomacy” in favor of democratic regimes. He called for international cooperation to address the coronavirus pandemic, global climate change, and cyber threats. He said the United States will double its financial commitment to climate aid and spend $10 billion to fight hunger. He also announced a donation of 1.1 billion doses of the Covid vaccine to poor countries, “for everyone shot we’ve administered to date in America we have now committed to doing three shots to the rest of the world.” Q: Some critics like Bernie Sanders believe that capitalism may push the U.S. and its democracy towards an abyss. What is your comment? A: Inequality of wealth is greater by far in the United States than in any other developed country and increasing. One percent of the population in the United States holds 42.5 percent of the national wealth. Just three men—Amazon founder Jeff Bezos, Microsoft founder Bill Gates, and investor Warren Buffett—hold combined fortunes worth more than the total wealth of the poorest half of Americans. The median White family has 10 times more wealth than the median Black family and 7.5 times more wealth than the median Latino family. This increasing economic inequality is damaging to the health, education, job opportunities, and home ownerless possibilities of a growing number of people in the nation. In 2014, The World Economic Forum based in Davos, Switzerland released its “Global Risks 2014” report, listing income disparity first of the most likely five global risks, followed by extreme weather events, unemployment and underemployment, climate change, and cyber-attacks. Noted economist Thomas Piketty and others have argued that the growing economic inequality is also economically unsustainable.

#### 3. *Striketober* has seen a massive increase in labor activity but it’s not sustainable

Greenhouse 21 10-23-21

(Steven, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2021/oct/23/striketober-unions-strikes-workers-lasting-change)

US labor unions have been on the defensive for decades but this October there has been a surprising burst of worker militancy and strikes as workers have gone on the offensive to demand more. Experts are predicting more actions to come but whether “Striketober” can lead to permanent change remains an open question. The scale of industrial action is truly remarkable. Ten thousand John Deere workers have gone on strike, 1,400 Kellogg workers have walked out, as well as a walkout threatened by more than 30,000 Kaiser Permanente workers, all inflamed by a profound disconnect between labor and management. Many frontline workers – after working so hard and risking their lives during the pandemic – say they deserve substantial raises along with lots of gratitude. With this in mind and with myriad employers complaining of a labor shortage, many workers believe it’s an opportune time to demand more and go on strike. It doesn’t hurt that there’s a strongly pro-union president in the White House and there’s more public support for unions than in decades. But some corporations are acting as if nothing has changed and they can continue corporate America’s decades-long practice of squeezing workers and demanding concessions, even after corporate profits have soared. This attitude doesn’t sit well with Chris Laursen, who earns $20.82 an hour after 19 years at Deere’s farm equipment factory in Ottumwa, Iowa. Laursen is upset that Deere is offering just a one-dollar-an-hour raise and wants to eliminate pensions for future hires even when Deere anticipates a record $5.7bn in profits this year, more than double last year’s earnings. “We were deemed essential workers right out of the gate,” Laursen said, noting that many workers racked up lots of overtime during the pandemic. “But then they came with an offer that was appallingly low. It was a slap in the face of the workers who created all the wealth for them.” Many Deere workers complain that the company offered only a 12% raise over six years, which they say won’t keep pace with inflation, even as the CEO’s pay rose 160% last year to $16m and dividends were raised 17%. Deere’s workers voted down the company’s offer by 90% before they went on strike at 14 factories on 14 October, their first walkout in 35 years. “We really showed up during the pandemic and kept building equipment for them,” Laursen said. “Now we want something back. The stars are finally lined up for us, and we had to bring the fight.” Thomas Kochan, an MIT professor of industrial relations, agreed that it was a favorable time for workers – many corporations have substantially increased pay in response to the labor shortage. “It’s clear that workers are much more empowered,” he said. “They’re empowered because of the labor shortage.” Kochan added: “These strikes could easily trigger more strike activity if several are successful or perceived to be successful.” Robert Bruno, a labor relations professor at the University of Illinois, said workers have built up a lot of grievances and anger during the pandemic, after years of seeing scant improvement in pay and benefits. Bruno pointed to a big reason for the growing worker frustration: “You can definitely see that American capitalism has reigned supreme over workers, and as a result, the incentive for companies is to continue to do what’s been working for them. It’s likely that an arrogance sets in where companies think that’s going to last for ever, and maybe they don’t read the times properly.” Kevin Bradshaw, a striker at Kellogg’s factory in Memphis, said the cereal maker was being arrogant and unappreciative. During the pandemic, he said, Kellogg employees often worked 30 days in a row, often in 12-hour or 16-hour shifts. In light of this hard work, he derided Kellogg’s contract offer, which calls for a far lower scale for new hires. “Kellogg is offering a $13 cut in top pay for new workers,” Bradshaw said. “They want a permanent two-tier. New employees will no longer receive the same amount of money and benefits we do.” That, he said, is bad for the next generation of workers. Bradshaw, vice-president of the Bakery, Confectionery, Tobacco Workers and Grain Millers union local, noted that it made painful concessions to Kellogg in 2015. “We gave so many concessions, and now they’re saying they need more,” he said. “This is a real smack in the face during the pandemic. Everyone knows that they’re greedy and not needy.” Kellogg said its compensation is among the industry’s best and its offer will help the company meet competitive challenges. Deere said it was determined to reach an agreement and continue to make its workers “the highest paid employees in the agriculture industry”. There are many strikes beyond Deere and Kellogg. More than 400 workers at the Heaven Hill bourbon distillery in Kentucky have been on strike for six weeks, while roughly 1,000 Warrior Met coalminers in Alabama have been on strike since April. Hundreds of nurses at Mercy hospital in Buffalo went on strike on 1 October, and 450 steelworkers at Special Metals in Huntington, West Virginia, also walked out that day. More than 30,000 nurses and other healthcare professionals at Kaiser Permanente on the west coast have voted to authorize a strike. Sixty thousand Hollywood production employees threatened to go on strike last Monday, unhappy that film and TV companies were not taking their concerns about overwork and exhaustion seriously. But seeing that the union was serious about staging its first-ever strike, Hollywood producers flinched, agreed to compromises, and the two sides reached a settlement. Noting that Kaiser Permanente, a non-profit, had amassed $45bn in reserves, Belinda Redding, a Kaiser nurse in Woodland Hills, California, said, “We’ve been going all out during the pandemic. We’ve been working extra shifts. Our lives have been turned upside down. The signs were up all over saying, ‘Heroes Work Here’. And the pandemic isn’t even over for us, and then for them to offer us a 1% raise, it’s almost a slap in the face.” Redding is also fuming that management has proposed hiring new nurses at 26% less pay than current ones earn – which she said would ensure a shortage of nurses. “It’s hard to imagine a nurse giving her all when she’s paid far less than other nurses,” Redding said. Kaiser said that its employees earn 26% more than average market wages and that its services would become unaffordable unless it restrains labor costs. On a smaller scale but in an industry in increasing demand, striking workers at one of the world’s largest bourbon producers were scheduled to vote on a new contract on Saturday, a day after announcing a tentative agreement with Heaven Hill, the producer of Evan Williams bourbon. About 420 members of United Food and Commercial Workers Local 23D went on strike about six weeks ago, forming picket lines at the company’s operations in Bardstown, Kentucky, with the dispute revolving around healthcare and scheduling. Meanwhile, many non-union workers – frequently dismayed with low pay, volatile schedules and poor treatment – have quit their jobs or refused to return to their old ones after being laid off during the pandemic. In August, 4.2 million workers quit their jobs, part of what has been called the Great Resignation. Some economists have suggested this is a quiet general strike with workers demanding better pay and conditions. “People are using exit from their jobs as a source of power,” Kochan said. As for unionized workers, some labor experts see parallels between today’s burst of strikes and the much larger wave of strikes after the first and second world wars. As with the pandemic, those catastrophic wars caused many Americans to reassess their lives and jobs and ask: after what we’ve been through, don’t we deserve better pay and conditions? Professor Bruno said that in light of today’s increased worker militancy, unionized employers would have to rethink their approach to bargaining “and take the rank and file pretty seriously”. They can no longer expect workers to roll over or to strong-arm them into swallowing concessions, often by threatening to move operations overseas. Bruno questioned whether the surge in strikes will be long-lasting. He predicts that the improvements in pay and job quality will be long-lasting, adding that that was more likely than unions substantially increasing their membership. He said that if workers see others winning better wages and conditions through strikes, that will raise unions’ visibility and lead to more workers voting to join unions. Despite the recent turbulence, Ruth Milkman, a sociologist of labor at City University of New York, foresees a return to the status quo. “I think things will go back to where they were once things settle down,” she said. “The labor shortage is not necessarily going to last.” She sees the number of strikes declining once the labor shortage ends. In her view, union membership isn’t likely to increase markedly because “they’re not doing that much organizing. “There’s a little” – like the unionization efforts at Starbucks in Buffalo and at Amazon – “but it’s not as if there’s some big push.” A big question, Milkman said, was how can today’s labor momentum be sustained? She said it would help if Congress passed the Protecting the Right to Organize Act, which would make it easier to unionize workers. That law would spur unions to do more organizing and increase their chances of winning union drives. “That would be a real shot in the arm,” Milkman said.

#### 4. The right to strike is crucial to stop decline of labor unions, the vital internal link to economic inequality

Pope et al. 17

(James Gray Pope Professor of Law and Sidney Reitman Scholar at Rutgers University.Ed Bruno is the former director of the United Electrical Radio and Machine Workers of America, Peter Kellman is past president of the Southern Maine Labor Council and is currently working with the Movement Building/Education Committee of the Maine AFL-CIO https://bostonreview.net/forum/james-gray-pope-ed-bruno-peter-kellman-right-strike , 5-22)

In December 2005 more than 30,000 New York City transit workers walked out over economic issues despite the state of New York’s Taylor Law, which prohibits all public sector strikes. Not only did the workers face the loss of two days’ pay for each day on strike, but a court ordered that the union be fined $1 million per day. Union president Roger Toussaint held firm, likening the strikers to Rosa Parks. “There is a higher calling than the law,” he declared. “That is justice and equality.” The transit strike exemplified labor civil disobedience at its most effective. The workers were not staging a symbolic event; they brought the city’s transit system to a halt. They claimed their fundamental right to collective action despite a statute that outlawed it. For a precious moment, public attention was riveted on the drama of workers defying a draconian strike ban. How did national labor leaders react? AFL-CIO president John Sweeney issued a routine statement of support, while most others did nothing at all. To anybody watching the drama unfold, the message was clear: there is no right to strike, even in the House of Labor. About a decade earlier in 1996, Stephen Lerner, fresh from a successful campaign to organize Los Angeles janitors, had warned in Boston Review that private sector unions faced an existential crisis: density could soon drop from 10.3 percent to 5 percent if unions did not expand their activity beyond the limits imposed by American law. He called for unions to develop broad organizing strategies—industry-wide and regional—and to engage in civil disobedience. Few embraced these radical strategies. Today private sector union density is about 6.5 percent, not quite as low as Lerner predicted, but down from a high of over 30 percent in the mid-1950s. Union decline matters. For half a century, it has moved in lock step with the increase in income inequality. According to an International Monetary Fund study of twenty advanced economies, . In the heyday of American unionism, CEOs made about 25 times the annual compensation of the average worker; today, the multiple is more than 350. Meanwhile, as Thomas Edsell and others have warned for decades, the decline of unions has deprived the Democratic Party of its strongest link to white workers. The overwhelming majority of unions continue to endorse Democratic candidates (including Hillary Clinton in the 2016 election), but with ever-diminishing effect. Until two decades ago it was possible to blame union decline on backward labor leaders, such as George Meany, who were so steeped in business unionism that they could not see the need to organize broadly, much less to ally with other social movements across lines of race, gender, and immigration status. Since then, however, we have seen continued shrinkage under leaders who are, for the most part, well intentioned and savvy. The problem is structural. National union officials are not well positioned to lead a challenge to corporate power. Institutions with big treasuries and tit-for-tat relations with establishment politicians cannot be expected to undertake risky and polarizing actions. Although leaders might see the need to build working-class power, the immediate incentives all point toward the narrow needs of their particular union’s members. This constraint is rooted in the American system of exclusive representation, which divides workers into thousands of bargaining unit boxes, gives unions property interests in particular boxes, and penalizes unions for doing anything other than defending existing boxes and acquiring new ones. The prospects for union revival may seem bleaker than ever during the Trump administration, even as the triumph of right-wing populism makes more urgent what was already apparent: the need to build a labor movement that can fight for the interests of the working class in the face of corporate power. But prospects are not as grim as they appear. Over the past decade, there has been an undeniable shift toward class politics, most visibly evidenced by Occupy Wall Street, the Bernie Sanders campaign, the Fight for Fifteen, and the rise of a Black Lives Matter movement that supports economic justice demands, including the right to organize. Building the labor movement in this period of danger and opportunity will require not only heeding Lerner’s call for a strategic shift and extralegal action; labor must also reclaim the right to strike and confront the deep structural disabilities that impede unions from challenging corporate power.

#### 5. Statistically economic inequality outweighs war

Richter, PhD/EMT, 15

(Roxane, *Disaster Types and their Consequences for Women* in Medical Outcasts: Gendered and Institutionalized Xenophobia in Undocumented Forced Migrant’s Emergency Health Care)

As we see above in Galtung’s “Typology of Violence" from 1969 (Table 2.1), the “need groups” may be disadvantaged to such an extent that they starve, become terminally ill from the result of illness or disease, or die. The second category. Exploitation B, leaves the underprivileged in a constant involuntary state of poverty, usually comprising malnutrition and illness. These effects all occur within and at the culmination of multifaceted social and economic structures, and obscured legislative cycles. A noted successor of Galtung’s benchmark work in structural violence, James Gilligan began a quest to look closely at the ties between structural violence and its effects on individuals' health, violent behavior, and society. As a prison psychiatrist and director of the Center for the Study of Violence at Harvard Medical School. Gilligan observed that structural violence differs from behavioral violence in three major respects: In addition to its virtual invisibility, structural violence functions more or less independently of individual behaviors: further, its problematic effects operate continuously, not just sporadically (1996). In his book Violence: Reflections on a National Epidemic. James Gilligan defines structural violence as “the increased rates of death and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted with the relatively lower death rates experienced by those who are above them” (1996, 192). Gilligan largely describes these “excess deaths” as “non-natural" and attributes them to the stress, shame, discrimination, and denigration that results from lower status. Gilligan paralleled the worldwide summations of structural violence to direct (armed conflict, military or political wars) violence thusly: Every fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would he killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths: and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is. in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war. or genocide on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world. .. . The question as to which of the two forms of violence—structural or behavioral—is more important, dangerous, or lethal is moot, for they are inextricably related to each other, as cause to effect. (Gilligan 1996. 195-96) When we fix and focus our view on structural violence through the lens of healthcare, we see that every country is marked by suffering, illnesses, and death, to one extent of another. But it is the distribution of the preventable and manageable illnesses and diseases in underprivileged countries that tip the scales of parity in suffering. It is these “social conditions"—these imbalances of influence—if you will, that affect and influence social justice in healthcare, and creates a poverty of lifesaving access to medication, supplies, treatment, training, and equipment to stave off human suffering from avoidable and unnecessary illness and disease. Didier Fassin in his book Humanitarian Reason quotes Margaret Lock concerning social sentiment on human suffering: “Efforts to reduce suffering have habitually focused on control and repair of individual bodies. The social origins of suffering and distress, including poverty and discrimination, even if fleetingly recognized, are set aside” (2012, 21). (24-5)

#### 6. Economic inequality causes US civil war- this card answers every 1NC response

Aldhous 10-24-20

(Peter, https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/peteraldhous/political-violence-inequality-us-election)4r

Many Americans are clinging to the idea that if Joe Biden wins the presidential election, calm can return to a nation riven by protests and rattled by President Donald Trump’s authoritarian rhetoric. Not so fast, caution two academics who claim they have devised a measure of political instability that shows that the nation will still be a powder keg that is waiting to blow, even if a Biden landslide means that Trump has little choice but to step aside. “The tendency is to blame Trump, but I don’t really agree with that,” Peter Turchin, an evolutionary anthropologist at the University of Connecticut who studies the forces that drive political instability, told BuzzFeed News. “Trump is really not the deep structural cause.” The most dangerous element in the mix, argue Turchin and George Mason University sociologist Jack Goldstone, is the corrosive effect of inequality on society. They believe they have a model that explains how inequality escalates and leads to political instability: Worsened by elites who monopolize economic gains, narrow the path to social mobility, and resist taxation, inequality ends up undermining state institutions while fomenting distrust and resentment. Building on Goldstone’s work showing that revolutions tend to follow periods of population growth and urbanization, Turchin has developed a statistic called the political stress indicator, or PSI. It incorporates measures of wage stagnation, national debt, competition between elites, distrust in government, urbanization, and the age structure of the population. Turchin raised warning signs of a coming storm a decade ago, predicting that instability would peak in the years around 2020. “In the United States, we have stagnating or declining real wages, a growing gap between rich and poor, overproduction of young graduates with advanced degrees, and exploding public debt,” he wrote, in a letter to the journal Nature. “Historically, such developments have served as leading indicators of looming political instability.” Today, with the nation in turmoil, Turchin’s prediction seems remarkably prescient. We live in a pandemic hellscape that has disproportionately harmed Black and brown Americans and those living in poverty. We have widespread civil unrest over racial injustice. And we are hurtling toward an election in which Trump is stoking unfounded fears of voter fraud and refusing to commit to a peaceful transition of power. In August, Turchin gave himself a pat on the back for his predictive ability with an analysis showing a significant rise in political demonstrations and violent riots over the last 10 years. But he and Goldstone fear that much worse is to come. The political stress indicator for the US is rising rapidly, much like it did before the Civil War. Charts show a similar rise in the political stress indicator in the buildup to the Civil War and today When Goldstone talks about America’s darkest days in the 1860s, he provocatively calls it the “First Civil War.” He fears that we may be on the way to a second one, with the 2020 election serving as a potential “fire-starter” event. Goldstone has some credentials in predicting conflict. In 1994, shortly after the US military’s ill-fated efforts to support UN intervention in Somalia’s civil war, which led to the downing of two Black Hawk helicopters and the gruesome spectacle of a dead US soldier being dragged through the streets, Goldstone was tapped by the CIA to help lead the State Failure Task Force. This group of academic social scientists was asked to identify factors that predict when a nation is likely to spiral into chaos. The task force’s initial report, published in 1995, identified three risk factors that seemed to predict whether a state would fail within the next two years in about two-thirds of cases: high infant mortality, low openness to international trade, and level of democracy. On the last measure, partial democracies were more vulnerable to collapse than fully democratic states or autocratic regimes. Goldstone continued to work on the project, later renamed the Political Instability Task Force, until 2012, tweaking its statistical model to predict both civil wars and democratic collapses with about 80% accuracy over the same two-year lead time. He didn’t think of applying a similar approach to assess the risk of political conflict in the US until Turchin got in touch in 2015. “I didn’t expect political violence because I believed the US was a strong and flexible democracy,” Goldstone said. But he is now convinced that Turchin’s PSI heralds a disturbing future for the US that won’t be solved by politics as usual after the 2020 election, even if Trump is defeated and goes quietly. “If those trends continue after Trump departs, then the risks and the occurrence of violence will likely continue,” Goldstone told BuzzFeed News. “I’m worried about that no matter who wins,” he added. “The social problems are the gasoline. Trump is throwing matches.” The PSI doesn’t explicitly address America’s deep divisions over racial justice. “Race has been an enduring faultline, ever since the founding of the Republic,” Turchin said. But he argued that it’s the additional dynamics captured by the PSI that explain why tensions are boiling over right now. One key concern, according to Goldstone, is that people across the political spectrum have lost faith in government and political institutions. “In short, given the accumulated grievances, anger and distrust fanned for the last two decades, almost any election scenario this fall is likely to lead to popular protests on a scale we have not seen this century,” he and Turchin wrote in a recent article published by the Berggruen Institute, a think tank based in Los Angeles. This would hurtle the US into a period of political instability the researchers dubbed “the turbulent twenties.” “Given the Black Lives Matter protests and cascading clashes between competing armed factions in cities across the United States, from Portland, Oregon, to Kenosha, Wisconsin, we are already well on our way there,” the article said. “But worse likely lies ahead.” “The social problems are the gasoline. Trump is throwing matches.” Turchin said people who rule out the possibility of serious political violence in the US based on “the strength of American institutions” are being “unduly optimistic.” “The social system that we live in is extremely fragile, Turchin said. Other social scientists consulted by BuzzFeed News were skeptical that the US is on the brink of a civil war. But they were concerned about the trends highlighted by Goldstone and Turchin, and worried about the potential for violence around the coming election — especially from right-wing militia groups if Trump loses and contests the result. “No matter what the outcome is, it is going to be disputed by some components of the other side,” Craig Jenkins, a sociologist at Ohio State University who studies political violence, told BuzzFeed News. “The difference is that the Trump forces have militia that have some capacity for violence and mayhem.” One reason that most experts in conflict studies don’t predict an outright civil war as a consequence of the US’s gap between rich and poor is that inequality hasn’t emerged as a major driving factor in studies of such conflicts in the modern era. “Civil war has been predominantly a phenomenon in low-income countries,” James Fearon, a political scientist at Stanford University and coauthor of a 2003 paper that identified national poverty as an important condition that can lead to violent insurgency, told BuzzFeed News. Another influential study, published in 2000 by the economists Paul Collier of the University of Oxford and Anke Hoeffler, now at the University of Konstanz in Germany, suggested that an armed group’s ability to seize control over significant economic resources — such as diamonds in several conflict-prone African nations and drug crops in Colombia — was a key driver of modern civil wars. As a rich nation with a diverse and robust economy, the US should have a fairly low chance of falling into civil war according to these theories. And if push comes to shove and order needs to be restored by force, few experts in political conflict expect even a well-armed militia to be a match for federal law enforcement or the National Guard. The circumstances in the 19th century that led the US into the bloodiest conflict in its history were also unusual. The young nation was growing, adding states that either opposed or supported slavery, creating a fundamental economic and moral divide that couldn’t easily be resolved. “That was an irreconcilable dynamic,” Jenkins said. “I think you need the accumulation of irresolvable conflicts to get a true civil war.” But recent events, notably the plot by a group of right-wing militants to kidnap and potentially kill the Democratic governor of Michigan, Gretchen Whitmer, over her policies to limit the spread of the coronavirus, have shocked even skeptics of the idea that the US is teetering on the brink of civil conflict. “This is really concerning,” Fearon said. The PSI isn’t the only indicator that has set alarm bells ringing about the stability of the US. The Fund for Peace, a nonprofit based in Washington, DC, has developed a measure called the Fragile States Index (FSI) that, like the work of the State Failure Task Force, seeks to identify nations that are at risk of violence and instability from a range of underlying pressures including economic distress, refugee flows, and their record on human rights. Overall, the US looks reasonably healthy on the FSI, ranked 149th out of 178 countries for its potential for instability. But there are worrying signs for the US on a component of the FSI labeled “cohesion,” according to Fund for Peace programs manager Natalie Fiertz. “Over the past decade-plus, we’ve seen very rapid worsening of the score for those dimensions,” she told BuzzFeed News. The Fragile States Index shows that the US is becoming a less cohesive society. Chart showing how the cohesion component of the Fragile States Index for the US rose from the second best in the G7 in 2005 to the worst in 2019 Peter Aldhous / BuzzFeed News / Via fragilestatesindex.org ADVERTISEMENT This chart shows change in the average score across the three cohesion components of the FSI for the members of the G7 group of rich democracies. These measure security threats including terrorism and organized crime, factionalization of a nation’s elites, and schisms between different groups in society. Not surprisingly, given the intense and growing political polarization in the US, it is the last two measures that explain why the nation’s cohesion score has gone from the second best among the G7 to the worst in just 15 years. (In recent years, the UK has closely followed the US on this measure, driven by its own political divisions over Brexit.) But political polarization may be just another consequence of the economic inequality that Goldstone and Turchin argue lies at the heart of the US’s current vulnerability to political violence. Political scientists have put a great deal of energy into identifying why polarization in the US is escalating. But factors including the influence of partisan cable TV news and congressional redistricting don’t seem to provide the answer — the latter, for instance, can’t explain why the Senate has become increasingly divided. What is clear is that polarization in Congress has historically tracked closely with income inequality. And recent studies have shown that states with greater income inequality tend to have more polarized state legislatures — supporting the idea that inequality is a fundamental cause of America’s deep political divisions. “The social system that we live in is extremely fragile.” Even the International Monetary Fund has weighed in, warning nations of the corrosive effects of inequality in a 2017 publication: “While some inequality is inevitable in a market-based economic system, excessive inequality can erode social cohesion, lead to political polarization, and ultimately lower economic growth.” Inequality can also damage public health. In their 2009 book The Spirit Level, the British epidemiologists Kate Pickett of the University of York and Richard Wilkinson of the University of Nottingham looked at differences across rich nations for an index of health and social outcomes including infant mortality, life expectancy, mental illness, incarceration, and literacy. They could find no correlation with gross national income per person, but found a strong relationship between poor outcomes and inequality, measured by the gap in incomes between the top and bottom 20% of a country’s earners. “Inequality is a social stressor,” Wilkinson told BuzzFeed News. “One of the big changes in our understanding of social determinants of health is the role of chronic stress.” The pandemic has made inequality much worse — but it may also be a catalyst for change. Given all of the evidence linking inequality to a raft of bad outcomes, it should come as no surprise that unrest has surged during the coronavirus pandemic. Americans living in poverty and people of color have not only been disproportionately sickened and killed by the virus, but they have also been hit harder by the recession it has caused — which has further widened the gulf between rich and poor. “What we need is a new social contract that will enable us to get past extreme polarization to find consensus, tip the shares of economic growth back toward workers and improve government funding for public health, education and infrastructure,” Goldstone and Turchin wrote in their Berggruen Institute article. Can that really happen in today’s combat zone of weaponized social media, in which even modest proposals to ratchet back inequality are framed as “communism”? One hopeful sign is that the US has pulled back from the brink of chaos before through similar reforms, within the lifetime of its oldest citizens. In the 1930s, as parts of Europe slid into fascism, the US went in a different direction, electing Franklin D. Roosevelt to drag the nation out of the Great Depression by ushering in the New Deal. At least some social scientists think the US could pull off a similar feat again. “You can reform your way out of dramatically polarized societies,” said George Lawson of the Australian National University in Canberra, who has studied societal transformations including the peaceful transition to majority rule in South Africa. Even given Trump’s flouting of democratic norms and the current upsurge in civil unrest, Lawson believes the US, by and large, has withstood a political “stress test.” “I would err on the side that the system has shown to be more robust than fragile,” Lawson said. “One thing to come out of the past few years is an energization of political engagement that is healthy.”

#### 7. Civil war causes outweighs on magnitude – other powers get drawn in and cause WWIII.

Michael Laitman, PhD, 8-25-17 [Professor of Ontology and Theory of Knowledge, PhD in Philosophy, MSc in Medical Bio-Cybernetics] "There Will Be No Winners in the Second Civil War," Newsmax, https://www.newsmax.com/MichaelLaitman/america-civil-war-newt-gingrich-don-lemon/2017/08/25/id/809867/

Earlier this week, CNN news anchor Don Lemon stated that the president “is clearly trying to ignite a civil war in this country.” In response to Lemon’s words, historian and former House Speaker Newt Gingrich said in an interview on "Tucker Carlson Tonight": “I think we should take the threat of civil war very seriously.” Referencing Dennis Prager’s piece, “America's Second Civil War,” Gingrich added, “What you’re seeing with Antifa, what you’re seeing on college campuses, what you’re seeing, to some extent, in the bureaucracy, is a real division of the country. …I wish we could all sing Kumbaya and come together but I don’t think that’s what’s gonna happen. …As a historian, my view is pretty straightforward: one side or the other wins.” America is already so rife with extremists on both sides of the political aisle that many people see war not only as imminent, but as virtually inevitable. If that’s the case, we’d better get busy digging ourselves bunkers… and graves. And not just in the U.S. A civil war in America will not end in America. If the country plunges into battle, many will be vying for the loot. China, Russia, North Korea, Iran, and others will destroy whatever the war doesn’t, the American empire will become history, and a third world war, with multiple nuclear powers, will follow. There will be no winners because, to quote Machiavelli, “Wars begin when you will, but they do not end when you please.” Is there really no alternative? I think there is, or I wouldn’t be writing here. In my previous column, I noted that President Trump needs to take a more appeasing tone in order to start building national cohesion. It’s great to state, “No matter our color, creed, religion or political party, we are ALL AMERICANS FIRST,” but doing so right after the Charlottesville murderous car ramming is the epitome of poor timing. Such statements should be part of the president’s routine, not rare occasions. Trump excels in using social media. If he uses it to broadcast a constant stream of unifying messages, notwithstanding the cynicism of the press, he will win over the American people’s hearts regardless of their political affiliation. I wholly agree that America requires massive infrastructure projects. But the real infrastructure of the country is its people, not its asphalt roads or railroads. The administration needs to implement ASAP solidarity programs that will create a uniform American identity. People need to learn that an ideology that undermines freedom of speech, freedom of religious practice, and freedom of the press, cannot use the First Amendment to legitimize itself. Even more importantly, people need to learn that plurality of views is not a recipe for war; it is precisely what has made America great in the first place. When people of different approaches and views strive for the same goal, they are far more likely to achieve it. If the goal is the well-being of all Americans, the entire country will benefit from it, and this goal should top the priority list of every American. It might not seem possible to patch up the divided United States, but 1) no one has ever sincerely tried, and 2) the other option is war. With my students, I have developed simple and easily applicable techniques that create a sense of unity and connection even among the most unlikely populations, such as Israeli Jews and Palestinian Arabs, ultra-Orthodox and devout agnostics, and affluent and needy. These techniques work wonders wherever we have tried them: North America, Western and Eastern Europe, and in Israel. Today’s world is pushing toward connection. The interconnectedness of reality requires that we learn how to work in a world where everyone is dependent on everyone else. When we think in terms of “one side or the other wins,” we cannot succeed because we are perpetuating a mindset of separation. This will inevitably create unions of extremists that will feed on hatred of the other side, which in turn will lead to war. The only way to avoid this route is to make unity mainstream. If this seems unrealistic, think of your own body. Without the unity of radically different organs all working in unison for the common cause of sustaining you and keeping you healthy, you would not exist. Therefore, unity is not unrealistic; it is the only realistic option for society. The sooner we make American solidarity the prime value of America, the better it is for the entire country. Any decision that Trump’s administration and Congress make from here on should first and foremost promote unity and solidarity because this is truly the only realistic option.

#### Plan: The United States ought to recognize an unconditional right to strike

### Contention 2: The Strike is Right

(Contention 2 is Solvency)

#### 1. The right to strike is a political statement that rejects the commodification of human labor- this is the vital internal link

Burns , JD, 11

(Joe, veteran union negotiator and labor lawyer Reviving the Strike: How Working People Can Regain Power and Transform America)

For the traditional labor movement, the notion that human beings were like objects, to be used up during the production process, was highly offensive. As Samuel Gompers melodramatically stated, “You cannot weigh the human soul in the same scales with a piece of pork. You cannot weigh the heart and soul of a child with the same scales upon with you weigh any commodity.”10 Traditional trade unionists believed that workers had rights unrelated to the price they could command on the open market for their labor. This view was supported by the Clayton Act, passed in 1914 after years of agitation by the labor movement, which contained the simple declaration that, “The labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce.”11 When signing the Act into law, then President Woodrow Wilson declared that “a man’s labor is not a commodity but a part of his life, and that, therefore, the courts must treat it as if it were a part of his life. I am sorry that there were any judges in the United States who had to be told that.”12 As James Pope explains, the idea that labor is not a commodity is vital one for the labor movement, as it provides the intellectual justification for successful strike tactics: The treatment of labor as a commodity subject to the rules of the marketplace is a defining feature of capitalism. The claim of a constitutional right to strike—a right to interdict the free competition of individuals in the buying and selling of labor power— obviously imperiled the ideology and practice of commodity labor. The right to strike could not be justified without addressing the question of labor liberty per se.13 Well into the 1950s, labor leaders defended union activity based on the assertion that labor was not a commodity. For example, with employers complaining of national pattern or multi-employer agreements, and conservative members of Congress investigating whether labor unions were a monopoly, Arthur Goldberg, the legal counsel for the CIO and later a Supreme Court Justice, testified in 1955 that The charge that national or regional or pattern bargaining is “monopolistic” and “a restraint of trade” reverts, of course, to the basic fallacy that human labor is to be treated as a commodity, and that organizations of those who have nothing to sell but the use of their minds and bodies constitute restraints of trade.14 Likewise, Walter Reuther, the leader of the United Autoworkers, testifying at a congressional hearing in 1953, bristled at the notion that labor could be considered a commodity: Well, you see, labor is not a commodity which you go and shop for in the free market place. Labor is something different than a commodity, and if you want to give American labor the status of another commodity you can go out and shop for on the free market place, you have missed the whole point.”15 The fiery words of Goldberg and Reuther reveal the belief, held by generations of trade unionists, that treating labor as a commodity would undermine the very foundation of the labor movement, and lead to a number of conclusions favoring management. First, if labor is just like any other commodity, then it logically follows that the “free market” should determine the price of a worker’s labor, just as it does with any other input into the production process. However, one of the main tenets of traditional trade unionism was that workers could not allow the market to determine wages and working conditions, as the market, unrestrained, will continually drive workers toward poverty, injury, and even death. Part of the reason for this attitude was that traditional trade unionists had witnessed firsthand how the courts applied laws intended to regulate commerce to trade union activity. For example, while Congress passed the Sherman Antitrust Act in 1890 to regulate the power of massive corporations, the Courts soon subverted the intent of the Act, using it instead to justify sweeping injunctions against trade unionists, including an injunction in 1894 against Eugene Debs during the great Pullman railroad strike.16 As Samuel Gompers said, “Labor power is a human attribute. … Both the injunction and the anti-trust law were intended to apply only to property. When courts put human labor power and commodities in the same category, they laid the foundation for serious injustice.”17 If a worker’s labor is treated like commerce, than it can be “sold” as with any other commodity, with management becoming the “owner” of that labor. Then, just as management owns a pile of lumber for example, once the purchase of human labor is complete, the employer would theoretically control the mind and body of the worker for the period of time they were on the job. Legal scholar Karl Klare expands on this idea, explaining how a labor contract is “more than a legal relationship” because it …establishes an entire system of social relations in the workplace whereby the employer is entitled to control the worker’s actions and choices during the major portions of his waking hours. Thus, labor contractualism functions as the institutional basis of domination in the workplace.18 To the extent that the labor movement accepts this “wagebargain” as the natural order, the more difficult it becomes to justify the fight for power on the shop floor, as once the commodity (whether oil or pork or human labor) has been used in the production process, management becomes the owner of the final product. Once workers sell their labor, they have no further interest in the enterprise, as the employer now owns the final product and all profits derived from its sale. Ultimately, the notion that human labor is not a commodity brings to the forefront the proposition that the rights of workers must trump market considerations. Whether one is arguing that courts cannot enjoin workers from striking, that bankruptcy law should not apply to labor contracts, or that unions should be able to monopolize labor markets, the phrase “labor is not a commodity” cuts through a host of employer arguments. On a deeper level, if the commodity status of labor is indispensable to a capitalist economy, then to say that human labor is not a commodity is quite radical in its implications. According to Karl Marx, wages were “a commodity which its possessor, the wage worker, sells to the capitalist. Why does he sell it? It is in order to live.”19 Thus, the rejection of the commodity status of human labor is also a rejection of the idea that the market should govern every sphere of human activity.

#### 2. Alternatives short of the right to strike fail- only withholding labor can grind capitalism to a halt

Nolan 21

(Hamilton, Labor Journalist for In These Times, <https://inthesetimes.com/article/no-strike-clause-labor-peace-union-contracts>, 5-4)

In post WWII America, union contracts work more or less like this: The company guarantees workers certain wages and benefits, and the workers agree to give up their right to strike for the term of the contract. This fundamental agreement — material gains in exchange for labor peace — defines modern labor relations. And where has this arrangement gotten the labor movement near death. For decades, union membership has declined, wages have stagnated, and capital has gained more and more power over working people. This devastating collapse in the power of organized labor has coincided with the post ​“Treaty of Detroit” period in which a very dangerous idea was cemented and enshrined as conventional wisdom. That is the idea that employers agree to union contracts in order to purchase labor peace—that the incentive for a company to bargain and sign a contract with its workers is to receive, in turn, a guarantee that those workers will be quiescent. Today, the belief in the necessity of this arrangement prevails among management-side attorneys, labor-side attorneys, and union leaders alike. Indeed, it is embodied very well in this quote that the Sacramento Bee got from labor attorney Tim Yeung when asking about the proposal to get rid of no-strike clauses: ​“It’s all about labor peace,” Yeung said. ​“When we agree to a contract, we’re agreeing that for the next three years or whatever, we’re not going to have a strike. If you can walk out at any time, that defeats much of the purpose of what we’re trying to do.” Let me suggest a different, more reasonable framework for labor relations between an employer and its employees. The employer signs a union contract in order to buy the work the employees do. Labor peace is something that the employer purchases separately, by being a good employer, and not fucking the employees over. The basic act of enshrining a mundane agreement on wages and working conditions in a contract should rightly be seen as a normal part of doing business, not as something that working people have to fight to gain at the expense of their own rights. What a business gets in return for a union contract is a work force. What the workers get is freedom from having the terms of their employment radically upended at any moment. To our jobs, we should be obligated to give our time and our effort, but not our souls. The right to strike is, at the end of the day, the only thing that gives working people power. The only thing! Withholding our labor is the one and only weapon we have that can match the power that capital has  the economic power to render people destitute, a fearsome power that is every bit as threatening as guns and bombs. Any working person individually can be destroyed by that power. Collectively, however, working people can match that power by striking and forcing capital to grind to a halt. No set of laws, regulations, or contractual provisions will ever change the fact that this is the only balance of power that exists in a capitalist workplace. We are fed the illusion that giving up the right to strike in exchange for material gains is an even trade. But that’s not true. For a little bit of money, businesses gain freedom from the one thing that can make them negotiate evenly with their workers. They maintain their own economic weapons over their workers, while we willingly lay down ours and tell ourselves that we have won something.

#### 3. Now is the perfect time for strikes

Mordock 10-14-21

(Jeff, https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2021/oct/14/strikes-increase-poses-political-test-biden/)

But more recent events, including Mr. Biden‘s pro-union stance and the worker shortage caused by COVID-19 shutdowns, have given labor a shot in the arm. “Right now, the stars are aligned in favor of unions,” Mr. Clark said. “They have both low unemployment, and you have a very friendly administration in Washington supportive of unions. Everything is in order for unions to take advantage of the situation right now.”

### Contention 3: Dalgona Cutting

(Contention 3 is Framing)

#### The standard is maximizing expected well being. Prefer –

#### 1] Only pleasure and pain are intrinsically valuable – all other frameworks collapse.

Moen 16 [Ole Martin Moen, Research Fellow in Philosophy at University of Oslo “An Argument for Hedonism” Journal of Value Inquiry (Springer), 50 (2) 2016: 267–281]

Let us start by observing, empirically, that a widely shared judgment about intrinsic value and disvalue is that pleasure is intrinsically valuable and pain is intrinsically disvaluable. On virtually any proposed list of intrinsic values and disvalues (we will look at some of them below), pleasure is included among the intrinsic values and pain among the intrinsic disvalues. This inclusion makes intuitive sense, moreover, for there is something undeniably good about the way pleasure feels and something undeniably bad about the way pain feels, and neither the goodness of pleasure nor the badness of pain seems to be exhausted by the further effects that these experiences might have. “Pleasure” and “pain” are here understood inclusively, as encompassing anything hedonically positive and anything hedonically negative.2 The special value statuses of pleasure and pain are manifested in how we treat these experiences in our everyday reasoning about values. If you tell me that you are heading for the convenience store, I might ask: “What for?” This is a reasonable question, for when you go to the convenience store you usually do so, not merely for the sake of going to the convenience store, but for the sake of achieving something further that you deem to be valuable. You might answer, for example: “To buy soda.” This answer makes sense, for soda is a nice thing and you can get it at the convenience store. I might further inquire, however: “What is buying the soda good for?” This further question can also be a reasonable one, for it need not be obvious why you want the soda. You might answer: “Well, I want it for the pleasure of drinking it.” If I then proceed by asking “But what is the pleasure of drinking the soda good for?” the discussion is likely to reach an awkward end. The reason is that the pleasure is not good for anything further; it is simply that for which going to the convenience store and buying the soda is good.3 As Aristotle observes: “We never ask [a man] what his end is in being pleased, because we assume that pleasure is choice worthy in itself.”4 Presumably, a similar story can be told in the case of pains, for if someone says “This is painful!” we never respond by asking: “And why is that a problem?” We take for granted that if something is painful, we have a sufficient explanation of why it is bad. If we are onto something in our everyday reasoning about values, it seems that pleasure and pain are both places where we reach the end of the line in matters of value.

#### 2] The public nature of policy-making necessitates consequentialism.

Dan W. **Brock** is an American philosopher, bioethicist, and professor emeritus. He is the Frances Glessner Lee Professor Emeritus of Medical Ethics in the Department of Global Health and Social Medicine at Harvard Medical School, the former Director of the Division of Medical Ethics (now the Center for Bioethics) at the Harvard Medical School, and former Director of the Harvard University Program in Ethics and Health (PEH). He has held the Tillinghast Professorship at Brown University and served as a member of the Department of Clinical Bioethics at the National Institutes of Health. Brock earned his B.A. in economics from Cornell University and his Ph.D. in philosophy from Columbia University. “The Role of Philosophers in Policy-Making.” Life and Death: Philosophical Essays in Biomedical Ethics. Cambridge University Press, Jan 29, 19**93**. P. 409-410.

The central point of conflict is that the first concern of those responsible for public policy is, and ought to be, the consequences of their actions for public policy and the persons that those policies affect. This is not to say that they should not be concerned with the moral evaluation of those consequences-they should; nor that they must be moral consequentialists in the evaluation of the policy, and in turn human, consequences of their actions-whether some form of consequentialism is an adequate moral theory is another matter. But it is to say that persons who directly participate in the formation of public policy would be irresponsible if they did not focus their concern on how their actions will affect policy and how that policy will in turn affect people. The virtues of academic research and scholarship that consist in an unconstrained search for truth, whatever the consequences, reflect not only the different goals of scholarly work but also the fact that the effects of the scholarly endeavor on the public are less direct, and are mediated more by other institutions and events, than are those of the public policy process. It is in part the very impotence in terms of major, direct effects on people's lives of most academic scholarship that makes it morally acceptable not to worry much about the social consequences of that scholarship. When philosophers move into the policy domain, they must shift their primary commitment from knowledge and truth to the policy consequences of what they do. And if they are not prepared to do this, why did they enter the policy domain? What are they doing there?

#### 3] Weighability – only consequentialism can explain the ethical difference in breaking a promise to take someone to the hospital and breaking a promise to take someone to lunch

#### A] Resolvability – there’s no way to weigh between competing offense under a deontological fw which means it can’t guide action

#### B] Intuitions outweigh – they’re a necessary side constraint on all ethics – philosophy follows intuitions not the other way around

#### 1NC theory-

#### A] If the aff is consistent with one interpretation of the resolution, don’t vote neg on T

#### B] It’s drop the argument since the 1AC speaks in the dark and violates countless bidirectional interps no matter what so we shouldn’t be punished for it.

#### C] Reasonable aff interps— there are multiple T interps the 1NC can read, like spec good bad, which the aff will always violate — if our interp is okay, you should default to substance

#### D] Reject new 2NR theory arguments and 2NR responses to the underview – forces judge intervention to evaluate after the 2ar and allows them to dump for 6 minutes and sandbag the 3-minute 2ar

#### Underview:

#### 1AR theory –

#### A] AFF gets it because otherwise the neg can engage in infinite abuse, making debate impossible

#### B] Drop the debater – the short 1AR irreparably skewed from abuse on substance and time investment on theory

#### C] Competing interps – 1AR interps aren’t bidirectional and the neg should have to defend their norm since they have more time

#### D] 1AR theory first – it’s a bigger percentage of the 1AR than neg theory is of the 1NC which means the abuse was probably worse and only the 2NR has time to win multiple layers

# 1AR

### OV – Long

#### Capitalism has produced global inequality- this undermines democracy and threatens existential problems- labor activity has been high recently but it is not sustainable- the right to strike ensures labor activity is sustainable and keeps unions alive- unions are key to economic equalitywhich is 1) bad to the extent it kills as many people as an unending thermonuclear war and 2) triggers war itself leading to extinction if we don’t solve- must solve through the aff because alternatives don’t solve the harms of capitalism, the vital internal link is embedded in the fact we must reject the commodification of human labor

#### 1. We’ll straight turn their method – there’s no race war now – violence has decreased – they need comparative evidence

Wexler 16 Stuart Wexler, historian writing for the Washington Post. No, the United States is not headed toward a race war https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2016/07/20/no-the-united-states-is-not-headed-toward-a-race-war/?noredirect=on&utm\_term=.f6122dc19065

Is the United States on the verge of a race war? You might think so if you saw the New York Post’s “Civil War” front page the morning after the killing of five Dallas police officers. Or if you watched the YouTube clip of Baton Rouge shooter Gavin Long declaring, “It’s a time for peace, but it’s a time for war, and most of the times when you want peace, you got to go to war.” Or read the tweet from former congressman Joe Walsh (R-Ill.), warning “This is war. Watch out Obama. Watch out black lives matter punks. Real America is coming after you.” Or if you watched former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani’s speech at the Republican National Convention: “The vast majority of Americans today do not feel safe. They fear for their children. They fear for themselves. They fear for our police officers, who are being targeted, with a target on their back.”

It’s easy to understand why, according to new polling, Americans say race relations are getting worse. But despite real fears and frustrations, and those who are trying to capitalize on those fears and frustrations, the United States is unlikely to return to the widespread, violent civil disorder of the 1960s. Improvements in policing and community relations, along with the fragmentation of extremist groups, provide a bulwark against anything approximating a race war.

The United States was a powder keg in the mid ’60s — and there are indeed some parallels to social conditions today. The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were momentous for blacks in the South, but the laws did little to address the grievances of blacks in northern and western cities, where people of color could already vote and where discrimination was less overt. Blacks everywhere grew frustrated with the realities of de facto economic injustice. Then, as now, the black unemployment rate was approximately double that for whites, and median income was approximately 40 percent lower. Racial disparities persisted in housing, education and political influence. And racial targeting by the police increased the perception of powerlessness within black communities. Even still, as now, there was anxiety among some whites that they were losing out to people of color. When campaigning in 1965 to become the first big-city black mayor, Cleveland’s Carl Stokes (D) felt the need to pledge: “My election would not mean a Negro takeover, it would not mean the establishment of a Negro cabinet. My election would mean the mayor just happened to come from the Negro group.”

But the parallels shouldn’t be overstated. The tensions of the ’60s erupted into racial violence on a level that dwarfs anything seen today by several orders of magnitude. According to calculations by economists William Collins and Robert Margo, from the beginning of 1965 through the end of 1968, there were 533 urban riots resulting in 195 deaths, 9,760 injuries and 14,486 instances of arson. The atmosphere was such that a false rumor that a black cab driver had died in police custody in Newark, N.J., prompted violence that left 26 people dead and 750 injured, while causing more than $10 million in property damage (more than $70 million in today’s dollars).

Compare that to the overwhelmingly peaceful protests in the four years since George Zimmerman was indicted for the murder of Trayvon Martin. Even the most chaotic episodes have been relatively mild. In Baltimore, for instance, riots after the death of Freddie Gray resulted in injuries to more than 150 police officers, 144 vehicles set on fire and property damage estimated at nearly $13 million; no protesters or police were killed. As The Washington Post’s Radley Balko has written, the rate of killings of police officers has been declining since the ’70s, with 2015 being the second safest year for police in decades.

One reason the protests have remained relatively contained has to do with police-community relations. Yes, too many people — and a disproportionate number of black people — are shot by police. Yes, there is still institutionalized racism in the criminal justice system. And yes, many blacks, especially, say they can’t trust law enforcement officials.

But present-day interactions between police and protesters have ranged from tense (in Ferguson, Mo.) to friendly (in Dallas). That’s a world away from the 1960s, when police forces allowed Ku Klux Klan members to savagely beat non-violent protesters on those occasions when they themselves were not delivering the beat-downs. Outside the South, such interactions were less profound and violent, but still routine. It was a presidential commission — the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders led by then-Illinois Gov. Otto Kerner — not the Black Panthers, that, in 1968, affirmed the widespread belief among blacks that police “symbolize white power, white racism, and white oppression.”

In response to the Kerner report, police departments raised their standards of professionalism and increased the diversity of their forces. While urban police forces still disproportionately employ white officers relative to the demographics of the communities they serve, the overall number of blacks in law enforcement roughly approximates their presence in the overall U.S. population. Some of the sites of the worst police abuses in the 1960s, including Birmingham, Ala., now have black police chiefs. And some of those chiefs, like Dallas’s David Brown, have implemented community policing policies that have reduced citizen complaints and sought to counter the idea that police are racist oppressors.

The reality that Black Lives Matter activists are willing to deliberate with Brown and other police commissioners, that BLM consistently condemns acts of violence against officers, also works against the narrative that there is some kind “war on police.” The Black Panthers favored retaliatory violence for alleged police misconduct, and did so in armed street battles — they surely never praised a police chief.

Extremist groups today also hold much less sway. By the end of the ’60s, federal law enforcement was becoming quite adept at infiltrating and disrupting white supremacist groups. Experts say there are approximately 8,000 active Ku Klux Klan members in the United States today; in contrast, the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan of Mississippi, at its peak membership under the leadership of Grand Wizard Sam Bowers in 1965, had close to 10,000 members. Organized group violence, of the kind perpetrated by Bowers, is all but unknown.

#### Taking the race war as a given fuels white retaliation – we must be against the race war as an analytic

Saletan 16 William Saletan, writer for Slate, Harvard Grad, There Is a War Over Race in America: But it’s not whites vs. blacks. https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2016/07/there-is-a-war-over-race-in-america-but-its-not-whites-vs-blacks.html

Hours after a sniper gunned down five law enforcement officers in Dallas—claiming, according to police, that “he wanted to kill white people, especially white officers”—no one was crowing louder than David Duke. “All I warned about, sorry to say, is now happening,” the former Klansman tweeted. “There is war against Whites in America. A war of hate, racism, and violence against us!” Duke circulated tweets by people who used the phrase “black lives matter” and celebrated the shootings. In a pitch to Donald Trump supporters, he added the hashtags #WarOnWhites, #ThanksObama, and #MakeAmericaGreatAgain.

This is the central thing to understand about what happened in Dallas: Black people who target whites are fundamentally allied with white people who target blacks. They’re on the same team: the race war team. It’s a lot like the global struggle over jihadism, in which Muslims who hate Christians collaborate, in effect, with Christians who hate Muslims. In the case of jihadism, the real struggle isn’t between two religions. It’s between people who want religious war and people who don’t. The same is true of race: Either you’re on the race war team, or you’re against it.

The attack in Dallas—allegedly committed by Micah Johnson, a black man—comes barely a year after a white man, Dylann Roof, allegedly shot nine black people to death in a church in Charleston, South Carolina. Roof told friends, and later police, that he wanted “to start a race war.” “He wanted it to be white with white, and black with black,” said a friend.

Roof’s manifesto echoed the ideas of Anders Behring Breivik, a white Christian nationalist who massacred 77 people in Norway five years ago. Breivik claimed to be defending “our people, our culture, Christendom and our nation.” He declared, “It is every European’s duty to defend their people and country against the ideology of genocide, conquest and destruction known as Islam.”

Nothing helps Roof, Breivik, Duke, and other white nationalists more than hate crimes by the people they vilify—blacks and Muslims—against whites, Christians, and police officers. No crime justifies such collective vilification. But as a social dynamic, haters and killers on all sides work together, by stoking feelings of group victimization and group vengeance.

## Case

#### 1] we do have evidence on inequality “moving in lock step with union decline”- that’s our Pope et al card, reject their claims they did not read the card carefully enough

#### 2] kick the civil war impact, we still have impacts of capitalism and inequality which they don’t solve, we have a card that says inequality outweighs

### Long (0:25)

#### Condo is a voting issue- several reasons to prefer

#### Strat skew – multiple routes to the ballot gives the neg an unfair advantage and aff must use speech AND prep time to cover all routes or else neg just goes for the one off that was covered the least, the time-crunched 1AR has no chance

#### Decks clash – the 2NR just goes for the least covered off which doesn’t encourage clash and creates non-competitive debates

#### Dispo solves – they can kick if the aff makes a perm

#### Paradigm issues-

#### Drop the debater because it deters against future violations of the neg

#### Prefer competing interps because it minimizes judge intervention

## AT: Generic DA

#### Reject the premise of their disad, our aff thumps it almost immediately- extend Greenhouse 21, it explains how Striketober has seen a massive increase in labor activity but without a right to strike, this cannot be sustained and triggers all our impacts- this errs aff because it thumps their disads and none of them technically apply anymore- we aren’t seeing [impacts of DA] despite strikes happening now- however without a ritght to strike we still trigger all our impacts

They don’t have a threshold on what large strikes are- this means that

#### Best science proves no warming impact.

Idso et al, PhDs, 18

(Craig, Geography@ArizonaState, David Legates, Climatology@Delaware, ProfClimatology@Deleware, Fred Singer, Physics@Princeton, ProfEnviroScience@Virginia, Climate Change Reconsidered II: Fossil Fuels, NIPCC, Ch.2, p. 108-109, Chapter Contributors: Joseph Bast, FormerPresident@HeartlandInstitute, Patrick Frank, PhD Chemistry@Stanford, Kenneth Haapala, MS Econ, President@Science+EnvironmentalPolicyProject, Jay Lehr, PhD Hyrdrology@Arizona, Patrick Moore, Co-Founder@Greenpeace, PhD Ecology@UniversityBrittishColumbia, Willie Soon, PhD AerospaceEngineering@USC, Chapter Reviewers: Charles Anderson, PhD Biology@Stanford, AssocProfBiolofy@PennState, Dennis Avery, DirectorFoodSecurity@Hudson, FormerUSDeptAg, Timothy Ball, PhD Climatology@QueenMary, FormerProfGeography@Winnipeg, David Bowen, PhD Geology@UCBoulder, ProfGeology@MontanaState, David Burton, MA CompSci@UTAustin, Mark Campbell, PhD Chemistry@JohnsHopkins, ProfChemistry@USNavalAcademy, David Deming, PhD PublicPolicy@Harvard, ProfPublicPolicy@Harvard, Rex Fleming, PhD AtmosphericScience@Michigan, Lee Gerhard, PhD Geology@Kansas, François Gervais, PhD Physics@UniversityNewOreleans, ProfPhysics@FrançoisRabelaisUniversity, Laurence Gould, ProfPhysics@UniversityHatford, PhD Physics@Temple, Kesten Green, PhD Managment@VictoriaManagmentSchool, Hermann Harde, PhD Engineering@UniversityOfKaiserslautern, Howard Hayden, PhD Physics@DenverUniversity, Ole Humlum, PhD GlacialGeomorphology@UniversityCopenhagen, ProfGeography@Oslo, Richard Keen, PhD Climatology@Colorado, ProfAtmosphericScience@Colorado, William Kininmonth, MSc@Colorado, FormerHead@AustralianBureauOfMeteorologyNationalClimateCenter, Anthony Lupo, PhD AtmosphericScience@Purdue, ProfAtmosphericScience@Missouri, Robert Murphy, PhD Chemistry@MIT, ProfPharmacology@Colorado, David Nebert, MD@UniversityOregon, ProfEnvironmentalHealth@Cincinati, Norman Page, PhD Geology@Illinois, Frederick Palmer, JD@Arizona, Gath Paltridge, PhD AtmosphericPhysics@UniversityMelbourne, ChiefResearchScientist@CSIRODivisionAtmosphericResearch, Jim Petch, PhD Geography@KingsCollegeLondon, Jan-Erik Solheim, MA PoliSci@Oslo, FormerExecDirectorUNEnvironmentProgram, Peter Stilbs, PhD Chemistry@RoyalInstituteTechnology, Roger Tattersol, BA History+PhilosophyOfScience@Leeds, Frank Tipler, PhD Physics@Maryland, ProfPhysics@Tulane, Ftitz Vahrenholt, PhD Chemistry@Munster, Art Viterito, PhD Climatology@Denver, ProfGeography@Maryland, Lance Wallace, PhD Physics@CUNY)

Methodology The Scientific Method is a series of requirements imposed on scientists to ensure the integrity of their work. The IPCC has not followed established rules that guide scientific research. Appealing to consensus may have a place in science, but not as a means of shutting down debate. Uncertainty in science is unavoidable but must be acknowledged. Many declaratory and predictive statements about the global climate are not warranted by science. Observations Surface air temperature is governed by energy flow from the Sun to Earth and from Earth back into space. Whatever diminishes or intensifies this energy flow can change air temperature. Levels of carbon dioxide and methane in the atmosphere are governed by processes of the carbon cycle. Exchange rates and other climatological processes are poorly understood. The geological record shows temperatures and CO2 levels in the atmosphere have not been stable, making untenable the IPCC’s assumption that they would be stable in the future in the absence of human emissions. Water vapor is the dominant greenhouse gas owing to its abundance in the atmosphere and the wide range of spectra in which it absorbs radiation. Carbon dioxide (CO2) absorbs energy only in a very narrow range of the longwave infrared spectrum. Controversies Reconstructions of average global surface temperature differ depending on the methodology used. The warming of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has not been shown to be beyond the bounds of natural variability. General circulation models (GCMs) are unable to accurately depict complex climate processes. They do not accurately hindcast or forecast the climate effects of human-related greenhouse gas emissions. Estimates of equilibrium climate sensitivity (the amount of warming that would occur following a doubling of atmospheric CO2 level) range widely. The IPCC’s estimate is higher than many recent estimates. Solar irradiance, magnetic fields, UV fluxes, and cosmic rays are poorly understood and may have greater influence on climate than general circulation models currently assume. Climate Impacts There is little evidence that the warming of the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has caused a general increase in severe weather events. Meteorological science suggests a warmer world will see milder weather patterns. Arctic ice is losing mass, but melting commenced before there was a human impact on climate and is not unprecedented. Antarctica is either gaining ice mass or is unchanged. Best available data show sea-level rise is not accelerating. Local and regional sea levels continue to exhibit typical natural variability. The link between warming and drought is weak, and by some measures drought decreased over the twentieth century. Changes in the hydrosphere of this type are regionally highly variable and show a closer correlation with multidecadal climate rhythmicity than they do with global temperature. Plants have responded positively to rising temperatures and carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere, a trend that is likely to continue beyond the twenty-first century. Why Scientists Disagree Climate is an interdisciplinary subject requiring insights from many fields of study. Very few scholars have mastery of more than one or two of these disciplines. Fundamental uncertainties arise from insufficient observational evidence and disagreements over how to interpret data and how to set the parameters of models. Many scientists trust the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to objectively report the latest scientific findings on climate change, but it has failed to produce balanced reports and has allowed its findings to be misrepresented to the public. Climate scientists, like all humans, can have tunnel vision. Bias, even or especially if unconscious, can be especially pernicious when data are equivocal and allow multiple interpretations, as in climatology. Appeals to Consensus Surveys and abstract-counting exercises that are said to show a “scientific consensus” on the causes and consequences of climate change invariably ask the wrong questions or the wrong people. No survey data exist that support claims of consensus on important scientific questions. Some survey data, petitions, and peer-reviewed research show deep disagreement among scientists on issues that must be resolved before the man-made global warming hypothesis can be accepted. Some 31,000 scientists have signed a petition saying “there is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth’s atmosphere and disruption of the Earth’s climate.” Prominent climate scientists have said repeatedly that there is no consensus on the most important issues in climate science.

## AT: Hospital/Medical CP

### Med – No UQ

#### Strikes now and no impact triggered

Semuels 10-8-21

(Alana, https://time.com/6105109/workers-strike-unemployment/)

Jess Deyo is one of nearly 700 nurses who have been on strike as part of the longest healthcare strike in Massachusetts history. For the past seven months, Deyo has reported for duty at the hospital in Worcester, Mass. where she worked as a nurse for more than 15 years, sometimes bringing her daughters, and standing outside through the chills of spring and the heat of summer. The nurses are demanding higher nurse-to-patient ratios after a harrowing 19 months of working during a pandemic. “There’s no choice to give up on the strike,” she says. “It’s bigger than us—it’s for everyone.”

### PICs - Theory

#### PICS are a voting issue-

#### 1] Strat skew- moots the aff and forces a complete restart in the time-crunched 1AR- the aff must come up with new offense which kills clash and doesn’t create good debates

#### 2] Topic lit- the aff has to shift focus to debating against a variety of fringe issues and gets screwed in prep because we have to allocate time to arguments that the case would outweigh

#### 3] Disads solve content education but allow us to weigh the case fairly

#### Paradigm issues-

#### 1] Drop the debater because the debate is irreparably skewed already and it deters against future cases like this

#### 2] Competing interps because it minimizes judge intervention

### PICs - Solvency Deficit

#### Their PIC sounds fine at first but dive deeper and we still link to all our impacts- several reasons to prefer

#### 1] They only pic out of [medical workers – they have to prove that their impact outweighs all of [medical workers] being in poverty

#### 2] Weigh the aff’s impacts over theirs because 1) poverty outweighs all under our framework because it is the biggest contributer to not maximizing wellbeing and 2) medical workers being in poverty leads to industry collapse so err aff- we ensure they have the right to strike which means they aren’t in poverty

## 1AR – AT T Body PTX

#### I meet – [explain how you relate to the res]

#### We meet- we embody state based activism, we aren’t role playing. Our model of debate has students research and prepare strategies for mobilizing political power. The 1AC advantage/framing are equivalent to a think tank appear. Repeated debates allow us to test and refine our ideas before taking them to the real world.

#### Counterinterp: The aff doesn’t have to tie their advocacy to the bodies and voices of the speakers. To clarify they can solely defend a hypothetical enactment of the resolution.

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits –Their interp justifies an infinite amount of affs since everybody has their own personal experience and relation to the topic. The topic provides a stable point of clash but making debate personal destroys that since the aff is about a person.

#### Turns exclusion – imagine a novice hitting an aff that was calling a local senator they would have no idea what to do.

#### 2] Violence – when the aff becomes personal it encourages debaters to attack each other’s experiences and identities to win a ballot, which causes bullying and psychological violence. Out of round discussion solves their impact and is better since their isn’t a ballot attached to our identity – they turn the judge into a gatekeeper of who is and isn’t a good activist

#### 3] Appeals to personal experience replace analysis of group oppression with personal testimony. This devastates structural change, and turns the framework. Scott 92

Joan SCOTT Harold F. Linder Professor at the School of Social Science in the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton 92 [“Multiculturalism and the Politics of Identity” October Summer p. 16-19]

The logic of individualism has structured the approach to multiculturalism in many ways. The call for tolerance of difference is framed in terms of respect for individual characteristics and attitudes; group differences are conceived categorically and not relationally, as distinct entities rather than interconnected structures or systems created through repeated processes of the enunciation of difference. Administrators have hired psychological consulting firms to hold diversity workshops which teach that conflict resolution is a negotation between dissatisfied individuals. Disciplinary codes that punish "hate-speech" justify prohibitions in terms of the protection of individuals from abuse by other individuals, not in terms of the protection of members of historically mistreated groups from discrimination, nor in terms of the ways language is used to construct and reproduce asymmetries of power. The language of protection, moreover, is conceptualized in terms of victimization; the way to make a claim or to justify one's protest against perceived mistrecatment these days is to take on the mantle of the victim. (The so-called Men's Movement is the latest comer to this scene.) Everyone-whether an insulted minority or the perpetrator of the insult who feels he is being unjustly accused-now claims to be an equal victim before the law. Here we have not only an extreme form of individualizing, but a conception of individuals without agency. There is nothing wrong, on the face of it, with teaching individuals about how to behave decently in relation to others and about how to empathize with each other's pain. The problem is that difficult analyses of how history and social standing, privilege, and subordination are involved in personal behavior entirely drop out. Chandra Mohanty puts it this way: There has been an erosion of the politics of collectivity through the reformulation of race and difference in individualistic terms. The 1960s and '70s slogan "the personal is political" has been recrafted in the 1980s as "the political is personal." In other words, all politics is collapsed into the personal, and questions of individual behaviors, attitudes, and life-styles stand in for political analysis of the social. Individual political struggles are seen as the only relevant and legitimate form of political struggle.5 Paradoxically, individuals then generalize their perceptions and claim to speak for a whole group, but the groups are also conceived as unitary and autonomous. This individualizing, personalizing conception has also been be- hind some of the recent identity politics of minorities; indeed it gave rise to the intolerant, doctrinaire behavior that was dubbed, initially by its internal critics, "political correctness." It is particularly in the notion of "experience" that one sees this operating. In much current usage of "experience," references to structure and history are implied but not made explicit; instead, personal testimony of oppression replaces analysis, and this testimony comes to stand for the experience of the whole group. The fact of belonging to an identity group is taken as authority enough for one's speech; the direct experience of a group or culture-that is, membership in it-becomes the only test of true knowledge. The exclusionary implications of this are twofold: all those not of the group are denied even intellectual access to it, and those within the group whose experiences or interpretations do not conform to the established terms of identity must either suppress their views or drop out. An appeal to "experience" of this kind forecloses discussion and criticism and turns politics into a policing operation: the borders of identity are patrolled for signs of nonconformity; the test of membership in a group becomes less one's willingness to endorse certain principles and engage in specific political actions, less one's positioning in specific relationships of power, than one's ability to use the prescribed languages that are taken as signs that one is inherently “of” the group. That all of this isn't recognized as a highly political process that produces identities is troubling indeed, especially because it so closely mimics the politics of the powerful, naturalizing and deeming as discernably objective facts the prerequisites for inclusion in any group. Indeed, I would argue more generally that separatism, with its strong insistence on an exclusive relationship between group identity and access to specialized knowledge (the argument that only women can teach women's literature or only African-Americans can teach African-American history, for example), is a simultaneous refusal and imitation of the powerful in the present ideological context. At least in universities, the relationship between identity- group membership and access to specialized knowledge has been framed as an objection to the control by the disciplines of the terms that establish what counts as (important, mainstream, useful, collective) knowledge and what does not. This has had an enormously important critical impact, exposing the exclusions that have structured claims to universal or comprehensive knowledge. When one asks not only where the women or African-Americans are in the history curriculum (for example), but why they have been left out and what are the effects of their exclusion, one exposes the process by which difference is enunciated. But one of the complicated and contradictory effects of the implementation of programs in women's studies, African-American studies, Chicano studies, and now gay and lesbian studies is to totalize the identity that is the object of study, reiterating its binary opposition as minority (or subaltern) in relation to whatever is taken as majority or dominant.

#### 4] Turn – the logic of the shell is the logic of Trumpism – insistence on tying politics to experience kills empathetic connections that encourage us to care about politics that don’t affect us

#### 5] Youth participatory action research (YPAR) enables *transformative resistance* by giving students the tools they need to mobilize collective social change. Research and testing of ideas is crucial to make activism work

Cammarota, PhD, and Fine, PhD, 08

(Julio, Education@Arizona, Michelle, UrbanEducation@TheGraduateCenterNYU, *Youth Participatory Action Research*

In the Matrix, Morpheus, played by Laurence Fishburne, places Keanu Reeves’ character Neo in a chair to tell him face to face about the real truth of his experience. Morpheus shows Neo a red pill in one hand and a blue one in the other, describing that the red pill will lead him “down the rabbit hole” to the truth while the blue pill will make him forget about their conversation and return everything back to “normal.” Neo looks confused and worried, hesitates for a moment, and then reaches to grab and then swallow the red pill. " e “blue and red pill” scene in ! e Matrix serves as an excellent metaphor for the relationships some educators/activists have with their students, and the kinds of choices we ask them to make. The critical educational experience offered might lead the student “down the rabbit hole” past the layers of lies to the truths of systematic exploitation and oppression as well as possibilities for resistance. A$ er he ingests the red pill, Neo ends up in the place of truth, awakening to the reality that his entire world is a lie constructed to make him believe that he lives a “normal” life, when in reality he is fully exploited day in and day out. What is “normal” is really a mirage, and what is true is the complete structural domination of people, all people. " is book, Revolutionizing Education, literally connects to the metaphorical play on chimera and veracity forwarded by the narrative in ! e Matrix. Examples are presented throughout in which young people resist the 1 normalization of systematic oppression by undertaking their own engaged praxis—critical and collective inquiry, re% ection and action focused on “reading” and speaking back to the reality of the world, their world (Freire, 1993). The praxis highlighted in the book—youth participatory action research (YPAR)—provides young people with opportunities to study social problems affecting their lives and then determine actions to rectify these problems. YPAR, and thus Revolutionizing Education, may extend the kinds of questions posed by critical youth studies (Bourgois, 1995; Fine and Weis, 1998; Giroux, 1983; Kelley, 1994; Macleod, 1987; McRobbie, 1991; Oakes et al., 2006; Rasmussen et al., 2004; Sullivan, 1989; Willis, 1977). How do youth learn the skills of critical inquiry and resistances within formal youth development, research collectives, and/or educational settings? How is it possible for their critical inquiries to evolve into formalized challenges to the “normal” practices of systematic oppression? Under what conditions can critical research be a tool of youth development and social justice work? The Matrix infers revolution by showing how Neo learns to see the reality of his experiences while understanding his capabilities for resistance. " e YPAR cases presented in this book also follow a similar pattern: young people learn through research about complex power relations, histories of struggle, and the consequences of oppression. They begin to re- vision and denaturalize the realities of their social worlds and then undertake forms of collective challenge based on the knowledge garnered through their critical inquiries. As you will read in this volume, the youth, with adult allies, have written policy briefs, engaged sticker campaigns, performed critical productions, coordinated public testimonials—all dedicated to speaking back and challenging conditions of injustice. What perhaps distinguishes young people engaged in YPAR from the standard representations in critical youth studies is that their research is designed to contest and transform systems and institutions to produce greater justice—distributive justice, procedural justice, and what Iris Marion Young calls a justice of recognition, or respect. In short, YPAR is a formal resistance that leads to transformation—systematic and institutional change to promote social justice. YPAR teaches young people that conditions of injustice are produced, not natural; are designed to privilege and oppress; but are ultimately challengeable and thus changeable. In each of these projects, young people and adult allies experience the vitality of a multi- generational collective analysis of power; we learn that sites of critical inquiry and resistance can be fortifying and nourishing to the soul, and at the same time that these projects provoke ripples of social change. YPAR shows young people how they are consistently subject to the impositions and manipulations of domi-nant exigencies. These controlling interests may take on the form of white supremacy, capitalism, sexism, homophobia, or xenophobia—all of which is meant to provide certain people with power at the expense of subordinating others, many others. Within this matrix or grid of power, the possibilities of true liberation for young people become limited. Similar to the film the Matrix, the individual, like Neo, may be unaware of the infections of power fostering oppression. The dawning of awareness emerges from a critical study of social institutions and processes in influencing one’s life course, and his/her capacity to see differently, to act anew, to provoke change. Critical youth studies demonstrate that the revolutionary lesson is not always apprehended in schools; sometimes, young people gain critical awareness through their own endogenous cultural practices. Such is the case of Willis’ (1977) Lads in Learning to Labor. Working- class youth attain insights about the reproductive function of schools through their own street cultural sensibilities. However, they use these insights to resist education en masse by forgoing school for jobs in factories. Scholars (Fine, 1991; Solórzano and Delgado- Bernal, 2001) identify this form of resistance as “self- defeating,” because the students’ choice to forgo school for manual labor contributes to reproducing them as working class. Although the Lads resist the school’s purpose of engendering uneven class relations, their resistance contributes to this engendering process by undermining any chance they had for social mobility. Young people also engage in forms of resistance that avoid self- defeating outcomes while striving for social advancement. Scholars (Fordham, 1996) identify this next level of resistance as “conformist”—in the sense that young people embrace the education system with the intention of seeking personal gains, although not necessarily agreeing with all the ideological ! ligree espoused by educational institutions. " ey use schooling for their own purposes: educational achievements that garner individual gains with social implications beyond the classroom, such as economic mobility, gender equality, and racial parity. Solórzano and Delgado- Bernal (2001: 319–20) contend that students may attain another, yet more conscious form of resistance, which they call “transformational resistance.” A transformational approach to resistance moves the student to a “deeper level of understanding and a social justice orientation.” Those engaged in transformational resistance address problems of systematic injustice and seek actions that foster “the greatest possibility for social change” (ibid.). Although Solórzano and Delgado- Bernal (2001) provide a useful typology (self- defeating, conformist, and transformational) that acknowledges the complexities of resistance, the education and development processes leading to resistances are somewhat under- discussed. Apparently, the production of cultural subjectivities (Bourgois, 1995; Levinson et al., 1996; Willis, 1977) is related to resisting ideological oppressions. However, these cultural productions tend to occur in more informal settings (non- institutional, non- organizational) such as peer groups, families, and street corners. The work presented in this volume agitates toward another framework— where youth are engaged in multi- generational collectives for critical inquiry and action, and these collectives are housed in youth development settings, schools, and/or research sites. With this series of cases, we challenge scholars, educators, and activists to consider how to create such settings in which research for resistance can be mobilized toward justice. A key question is whether resistance can develop within formal proces ses (pedagogical structures or youth development practices). If this question is left $ unattended, we risk perceiving youth resistances as “orientations” as opposed to processes. In other words, the kinds of resistances, whether self- defeating, conformist, or transformational, will be identified as emerging from some inherent fixxed, cultural sensibility. This perspective of young people sustains the ridged essentialization trap that has plagued studies of youth for years (Anderson, 1990; Newman, 1999; Ogbu, 1978). The traditional essentialized view maintains that any problem (poverty, educational failure, drug and alcohol abuse, etc.) faced by youth results of their own volition, thereby blaming the victim for the victim’s problems. Critical youth studies goes beyond the traditional pathological or patronizing view by asserting that young people have the capacity and agency to analyze their social context, to engage critical research collectively, and to challenge and resist the forces impeding their possibilities for liberation. However, another step is needed to further distance critical youth studies from essentialized perspectives by acknowledging that resistances can be attained through formal processes in “real” settings, through multi- generational collectives, and sometimes among youth alone. YPAR represents not only a formal pedagogy of resistance but also the means by which young people engage transformational resistance. (1-4)

#### 6] No brightline- how do you determine what we embody- and who polices this? They’ll say its something we can “perform” but this doesn’t add any clarity because they say all speech is performance which means they’ve arbitrarily gatekeeped who is and isn’t performing which leads to authenticity testing

#### 7] They kill switch side debate because I wouldn’t want to embody something I don’t agree with – arguing for positions we don’t personally believe in is good cuz it encourages self reflexivity and argumentative diversity that allows us to break dogmatism and effectively persuade others

#### 8] Use reasonability – there’s always something marginally better the aff could’ve done so competing interps results in moving goalposts that crowds out substance – intervention is inevitable so you should intervene for substance

#### 9] Their understanding of embodiment denies the entangled nature of humanity

Murphy, PhD, 17

(Michelle, History&Women/GenderStudies@Toronto, “What Can’t a Body Do?,” Catalyst: Feminism, Theory, and Technoscience Volume 3)

Our topic here tonight is “embodied knowledge by other means.” But what is embodiment anyway? The body does not exist as a detached and sovereign unit, despite what liberal political structures tell us. Why do we think we know what a body is, or what it can do? Where does it end and begin? What relations compose it? In 1985, Donna Haraway (Haraway, 1985) posed the question, “why should our bodies end at the skin?” I want to stay with this unsettling query. As researchers, we might look to acknowledging differently situated bodies in order to correct the exercise of power in knowledge making. This is especially pressing in institutional conditions where embodiment is denied, but also because mobilizing embodiment can be a DIY practice that you can do without a lot of institutional support. Yet, the demarcation of the singular, discrete body is non-innocent, even when described in a fine resolution of particulars. It is caught up in infrastructures of individual property, wage labor, citizenship, and even whiteness, infrastructures that, for researchers working in relatively elite settings, tend to operate by obscuring the support systems—the transportation networks and service labor for example—that allow particular kinds of normative bodies to appear as it if they are operating as solo units. Yet, non-innocent bodies are caught up in each others conditions of life support and diminishment. From the epidermal schema of anti-black racism to the heteropartriarchy of gender, bodies are already caught in painful and contradictory matrixes of support and negation. My livelihood requires me to take in an injury. Drinking water, I am exposed. Your gas is linked to the destruction of this territory, and hence the fish and our bodies. Embodiment is a collective binding of profoundly uneven relations of porosity to exposure: my vulnerability to injury is entangled with your comfort. The side effect accompanies the treatment. I am kept live even as I am being killed. At the material metabolic and chemical level, embodiment is already altered, already non-innocently embroiled in uneven violent relations of being and doing. If we accept as a starting point that embodiment does not provide a respite or escape from history, from infrastructures, from relations of power, if we accept that bodies cannot get you out of entanglements, then we might want to find alternative genealogies for grappling with “embodiment by other means” for STS. Taking Frantz Fanon as a starting point for a decolonial STS, for example, we might begin by noticing how he navigated, and refused to disavow, the contradictions making up embodiment, how Fanon theorized within a set of tensions or toggles: for example, the toggle between the hopeful care for embodied difference, and the pessimistic ways bodies are already materialized in colonial and racist worlds, the toggle between medicine’s racist apprehension of pathological bodies, and the ways that bodies also exceeded those materializations (Fanon, 1963, 1965, 1967). Fanon held these tensions together beautifully in his theorizations of blackness, but also in his work theorizing how medicine and science might break with their colonial complicities. Learning from and making kin with the decolonial projects of Frantz Fanon, as well as other fields like black studies, Indigenous studies, and queer studies, a decolonial sense of embodiment might embrace Fanon’s anti-colonial call to become a new humanity, or a new life form, one which requires destroying the version of the human that histories of deep violence have created. It is in this bundle of tension that we might fashion a politics of decolonial STS both with and against “the body.” Rerouting STS through Fanon also requires that we consider the question of what has to be seized, rebuilt, and dismantled to make room for decolonial potentials. White supremacy? Petrochemical extraction? I am sure you have other things to nominate for destruction! The individualized body, as given to us by Western liberal political structures, as a container for rights, labor, risks, capital, and biological processes, will not do. The singularized body alone cannot dismantle the disturbing entanglements of knowledge-making within violent infrastructures. Moreover, “the body” itself is in need of dismantling, if we are to stay in the toggle of recognizing violence and becoming something else. What materializations of life and embodiment might we think with and against to confront the 21st century condition of industrial chemical enfleshment? How to conjure decolonial futures, and not just accounts of bodily damage, along with the industrial chemicals that are part of us and at the same time remaking the planet? At stake in conjuring alter-embodiments is the very sense of what constitutes life and its relations. Within the biological sciences, there is no unified theory of life, even as the units of gene, body, species, and ecosystem have become so commonplace that they may appear to exist in the world itself, and not as historically particular materializations of it. Making decolonial possibilities requires retheorizing life with and against technoscientific framings. A politics of embodiment by other means might learn from and propagate politics and concepts in the toggles between violences that have already happened and the need to undo them nonetheless, between the condition of being already altered and the struggle to become otherwise in the aftermath. We might, I suggest, call this alter-embodiment alterlife—a state of already having been altered by environmental violence that is nonetheless a capacity to become something else. The concept of alterlife is forged in recognition of the realities of large-scale and everyday environmental violence. Alterlife is not waiting for the apocalypse –apocalypses of many kinds have already happened, livable worlds keep being snatched away. Alterlife resides in what Frantz Fanon called “an atmosphere of certain uncertainty” (Frantz Fanon, 1967, p. 109). It is a condition that is shared, but unevenly so; it divides us as much as binds us. I have come to alterlife while studying chemical violence on the Great Lakes, as industrial chemicals deliver concentrated injury and premature death to Indigenous, black and poor communities already living in hostile conditions. The Great Lakes were the portal to the colonial conquest of Canada, and in the twentieth century the lower Great Lakes became rimmed by the industrial exuberance of car manufacture and petrochemical refining, more recently giving way to histories of deindustrialization and abandonment. The Great Lakes are a jurisdictional patchwork, cut up by two settler nations, over one-hundred-forty-five Indigenous territories, two provinces, and eight states. Overwhelmingly the Great Lakes are governed by a permission to pollute regulatory regime and our data about emissions are self-reported by industry. A legacy of persistent industrial chemicals has spread ubiquitously across the region. In the aftermath, environmental researchers gather the evidence of the damage in bodies. Alterlife has become a political concern for me as I live in Toronto, on Lake Ontario, on Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee territories, and in Canada, a settler colonial and petro-extraction state. The question of alterlife is shaped by a sense of political and personal responsibilities, to the Great Lakes region, to its water and land, to histories, and to my own position as a white skinned Métis person originally from Winnipeg with responsibilities to my complicities in settler colonialism and whiteness as well as to histories and current activations of Indigeneity. So I recognize that alterlife for me is partially biographical and emplaced in North American particularities. Alterlife is a concern as my neighbors are bodies of water that hold 21% of the worlds fresh surface water, and 84% of North America’s.2 While what you might mostly see in the media about Canada these days are photos of handsome Justin Trudeau, on the ground a Canadian neoliberal managerial governance combined with capitalist settler colonial extraction have formed a potent environmentally violent and even genocidal mix which expresses itself in the pollution of the Great Lakes. Around my home is a surge of environmental, reproductive justice and anti-colonial activism focused on the water that my sense of alter-embodiment learns from and aspires to collaborate with. I want to pause here and point out a shift in the way I have posed the research question of alter-embodiment. In the past, I have typically approached histories of environmental and reproductive practices by asking: how do activist practices mobilize bodies in order to create alternative materializations of bodies. Or put more simply: how do particular practices materialize particular modes of being? How does doing materialize being? Tonight, I want to play with the question of embodied knowledge from the opposite direction, going from being to doing. I want to start with creating alter-embodiments, alter-objects of care–even if only conjecturally –that call in our complicities, that require less-violent practices, that require different worlds. I want to think with you about tactically moving from being to doing–calling forth alter-embodiments, alter-being, or what I am calling here alter-life. Calling forth new life forms is a work in progress, and from the start has been made with students and friends, activists and artists.3 Alterlife is just one attempt at conjuring alter-embodiment with a particular STS inflection and in solidarity with the vast labors of reproductive and environmental justice, especially on the Great Lakes. With alterlife, and thinking back to Fanon as a guide, I want to draw out for you three of the political dimensions toggling within alterlife. First, Alterlife is about a politics of entanglement, kinship, and responsibility.4 The entanglements making up alterlife are not just the symbiosis of multispecies being, but the material enmeshments with chemical exposures: these exposures include pollution as we might habitually think of it, but also the molecular manifestations of stress from living in assaulting racist conditions, and the inhalation of war dusts that extend the violence of bombing into the very act of breathing. No single person on this planet escapes enfleshments with exposures, even as their violent effects are profoundly concentrated in hotspots of hostility, and even as many of us here live in conditions of dense privilege that encourage a willful ignoring of these tentacles of violence. Alterlife, as a becoming with exposures, exists in the profoundly uneven and interdependent distribution of life chances. Those of us who benefit from whiteness have much work to do in calling forth alterlife, not least of which is the responsibility to dismantle the work of whiteness in the sciences and in the institutions that we inhabit that are often densely enriched by capitalist, colonial, and racist systems. No matter who you are –even if you’re just trying to get by –quotidian and humble complicities are entangled with the very acts of sheltering, eating, cleaning, and surviving that are in turn knotted to a cacophony of consumption and harms within supply chain capitalism, and tied to discard systems built into objects, tethering ordinary survival to the continual spewing of injury. Our relations are not just supportive. They can also be injurious and toxic to each other. Vanessa Agard-Jones calls this “chemical kinship” (Agard-Jones, 2013; Vanessa Agard-Jones, 2014).Thus, a crucial aspect of calling forth alterlife is that it is about an understanding of oneself, the researcher, in kinships with beings “of politics and care” (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2011). Attention to alterlife asks, not for a politics of fixing the other, but in the words of Fred Moten, “your recognition that it’s fucked up for you, in the same way that we’ve already recognized that it’s fucked up for us. I don’t need your help. I just need you to recognize that this shit is killing you too, however much more softly” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 140-1). Within the condition of alterlife the potential for political kinship and alter-relations comes out of the recognition of your imbrications in the tangle supports and harms. Second, with alterlife I am trying to think with and against technoscientific materializations of embodiment and chemical exposures. I want to push back against the framings of injured, disturbed, or “abnormal” life in scientific fields such as ecology, toxicology, and epigenetics –what we might call damaged-based research. With alterlife, I want to push back on the eugenic residual that calculates lives worth living, deviant lives, risky lives, unproductive lives, and killable lives. The work of Carla Hustak has brought home to me just how deeply entwined eugenics has been in the history of progressive and even feminist scientific projects (Hustak, 2010). Thus, in materializing alterlife, I am collaborating with and pushing back against scientific understandings of damaged lives in environmental violence. Let me give you one example. Epigenetic ways of investigating chemical exposures render legible (and erase) environmental violence by tracking damage in bodies, with a tight focus on biochemical micrological processes. In environmental epigenetic, which focuses in excruciating detail how, in mice and rats, Endocrine Disruptive Chemicals like PCBs can substitute in for molecules like estrogen or thyroid that act as transcription factors modulating the expression of target genes during critical developmental periods (such as the prenatally) when DNA methylation patterns are being established, thereby altering the neurological, metabolic, and sexual development of bodies. Such findings in rats and mice are compared with epidemiological studies in humans that show associations between the presence of metabolites of toxic chemicals, epigenetic biomarkers, and findings on cognitive tests, or diagnoses of autism, asthma, diabetes or obesity. Focused on collecting the data of damage, such studies often focus on communities who have experienced intensive environmental violence often shaped by environmental racism and who live in conditions of persistent multi-generational exposure. Thus, studies of environmental epigenetic can end up describing the bodily effects of racism as a community pathology, labeling communities as perpetually diminished by racism. Such technoscientific materializations of the already-altered body help to give substance to alterlife, but need to be challenged with critical knowledges from fields like black studies, Indigenous studies, and queer studies, that have many lessons for how to craft existences that rise from the ashes of structural violence. To this end, I find inspiration in the work of Indigenous feminist scholar Eve Tuck (Tuck, 2009) who has called for “suspending damage” as a refusal to participate in “damage based research” that concentrates the scope of attention on the dissection of bodies and biologies that are then reductively constituted as pathological and devalued. Invasive organisms are to be removed, bird damaged in oil spills culled, disturbed land becomes a terra nullius–land and life coded by a colonial gaze as empty, unproductive, and in need of capitalist possession. Designations of damage feed circuits that amplify damage, where to be altered and unfixable is held as a diminished state, perhaps better not to exist at all. A refusal to re-enact damage based research is a challenge to environmental justice habits, and at the same time an invitation to create new kinds of research questions that are about building decolonial supportive worlds now, without waiting for a better moment to arrive. This brings me to my final political toggle within alterlife: the capacity to become otherwise. Embodiment has not just been altered, it is more generally open to alteration. Alterlife is already recomposed, pained, and damaged, but potentiality nonetheless. Alterlife, as potential, challenges us to learn with a thick archive and dense present of projects of resistance and resurgence. It is also an invitation to consider what infrastructures and concepts have to be dismantled to make room for another way of being and knowing to emerge. It is an invitation to begin inhabiting alter-embodiments now. A core teaching of Indigenous reproductive and environmental activism is that bodies are not separable from the land, waters, airs, and other beings (Native Youth Sexual Health Network & Women’s Earth Alliance, 2016). For Indigenous women, two-spirit, and young people on the front lines of pipeline blockades, water walks, fasting, and land defense actions, whose lives are ongoingly violated by extractive industries, this teaching is unavoidable. What happens to the water, is a part of what happens to its relations. Violence on the Land is violence on bodies. This includes you too. I share this image with you (Figure 1) with the permission of their creator, the Métis activist and artist Erin Konsmo, who is a coordinator at the Native Youth Sexual Health Network, and member of the Onaman Collective, an amazing group of Anishinaabe and Métis artists who combine land-based art creation with reactivations of Indigenous knowledge. Terra nullius is a legal term, or better yet a legal fiction, meaning empty territory, which is used to support a state’s claim of sovereignty over land they “find.” In Canada, terra nullius has been crucial to the state’s claim to ownership of Indigenous territories that it then leases to multi-national petrochemical and mining companies, from Suncor to Debeers, thereby resulting in not only the theft of territory, but the concentration of environmental violence in Indigenous communities. We see this history in this image in the way both colonial vessels and extractive industries are inscribed onto the body. “Our Bodies are not Terra Nullius” is thus a declaration of land defense and prior Indigenous presence in territory. Yet, this image, captures a second sense of “Our Bodies are not Terra Nullius.” Colonial and environmental violence has already happened, and here we can see [observe] the body in trauma, as already surrounded by and formed through toxic violence. Yet the very creation of this image, in a social justice collectivity, with people on the frontlines of blockades, in spaces that welcome queer and gender-nonbinary Indigenous being, toggle the making of the image into an activation of decolonial embodiment, a laying claim to sovereignty and care of body/land entanglements in the aftermath. Bodies are not Terra Nullius. Our Bodies are the land. They are of toxic chemicals, and they are something more. They are a manifestation of something bigger, that stretches outward to water, air, ancestors, and other beings, that stretches backwards to messy histories, and forwards to a something else. In this image we find an alter-embodiment of survival-as-resistance –what indigenous scholar GeraldVizenor calls “survivance” (Vizenor, 2000; Dillon, 2012). Survivance is not just about making newness, it is also about what has to end, what has to come apart, to make less violent worlds. The responsibility is not just to build alter-relations, but to dismantle violent infrastructures. To shut it down. #ShutItDown Alterlife is life damaged, life persistent, and life otherwise; life materialized in other ways and life exceeding our materializations I can almost imagine a politics of alter-embodiments, or better yet, altercollectivities, that need new kinds of solidarities, interdisciplines, practices, and pedagogies, and does not reproduce the same. Almost. #AlterlifeintheAftermath. (3-12)

## Race war

#### 1. We’ll straight turn their method – there’s no race war now – violence has decreased – they need comparative evidence

Wexler 16 Stuart Wexler, historian writing for the Washington Post. No, the United States is not headed toward a race war https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2016/07/20/no-the-united-states-is-not-headed-toward-a-race-war/?noredirect=on&utm\_term=.f6122dc19065

Is the United States on the verge of a race war? You might think so if you saw the New York Post’s “Civil War” front page the morning after the killing of five Dallas police officers. Or if you watched the YouTube clip of Baton Rouge shooter Gavin Long declaring, “It’s a time for peace, but it’s a time for war, and most of the times when you want peace, you got to go to war.” Or read the tweet from former congressman Joe Walsh (R-Ill.), warning “This is war. Watch out Obama. Watch out black lives matter punks. Real America is coming after you.” Or if you watched former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani’s speech at the Republican National Convention: “The vast majority of Americans today do not feel safe. They fear for their children. They fear for themselves. They fear for our police officers, who are being targeted, with a target on their back.”

It’s easy to understand why, according to new polling, Americans say race relations are getting worse. But despite real fears and frustrations, and those who are trying to capitalize on those fears and frustrations, the United States is unlikely to return to the widespread, violent civil disorder of the 1960s. Improvements in policing and community relations, along with the fragmentation of extremist groups, provide a bulwark against anything approximating a race war.

The United States was a powder keg in the mid ’60s — and there are indeed some parallels to social conditions today. The passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were momentous for blacks in the South, but the laws did little to address the grievances of blacks in northern and western cities, where people of color could already vote and where discrimination was less overt. Blacks everywhere grew frustrated with the realities of de facto economic injustice. Then, as now, the black unemployment rate was approximately double that for whites, and median income was approximately 40 percent lower. Racial disparities persisted in housing, education and political influence. And racial targeting by the police increased the perception of powerlessness within black communities. Even still, as now, there was anxiety among some whites that they were losing out to people of color. When campaigning in 1965 to become the first big-city black mayor, Cleveland’s Carl Stokes (D) felt the need to pledge: “My election would not mean a Negro takeover, it would not mean the establishment of a Negro cabinet. My election would mean the mayor just happened to come from the Negro group.”

But the parallels shouldn’t be overstated. The tensions of the ’60s erupted into racial violence on a level that dwarfs anything seen today by several orders of magnitude. According to calculations by economists William Collins and Robert Margo, from the beginning of 1965 through the end of 1968, there were 533 urban riots resulting in 195 deaths, 9,760 injuries and 14,486 instances of arson. The atmosphere was such that a false rumor that a black cab driver had died in police custody in Newark, N.J., prompted violence that left 26 people dead and 750 injured, while causing more than $10 million in property damage (more than $70 million in today’s dollars).

Compare that to the overwhelmingly peaceful protests in the four years since George Zimmerman was indicted for the murder of Trayvon Martin. Even the most chaotic episodes have been relatively mild. In Baltimore, for instance, riots after the death of Freddie Gray resulted in injuries to more than 150 police officers, 144 vehicles set on fire and property damage estimated at nearly $13 million; no protesters or police were killed. As The Washington Post’s Radley Balko has written, the rate of killings of police officers has been declining since the ’70s, with 2015 being the second safest year for police in decades.

One reason the protests have remained relatively contained has to do with police-community relations. Yes, too many people — and a disproportionate number of black people — are shot by police. Yes, there is still institutionalized racism in the criminal justice system. And yes, many blacks, especially, say they can’t trust law enforcement officials.

But present-day interactions between police and protesters have ranged from tense (in Ferguson, Mo.) to friendly (in Dallas). That’s a world away from the 1960s, when police forces allowed Ku Klux Klan members to savagely beat non-violent protesters on those occasions when they themselves were not delivering the beat-downs. Outside the South, such interactions were less profound and violent, but still routine. It was a presidential commission — the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders led by then-Illinois Gov. Otto Kerner — not the Black Panthers, that, in 1968, affirmed the widespread belief among blacks that police “symbolize white power, white racism, and white oppression.”

In response to the Kerner report, police departments raised their standards of professionalism and increased the diversity of their forces. While urban police forces still disproportionately employ white officers relative to the demographics of the communities they serve, the overall number of blacks in law enforcement roughly approximates their presence in the overall U.S. population. Some of the sites of the worst police abuses in the 1960s, including Birmingham, Ala., now have black police chiefs. And some of those chiefs, like Dallas’s David Brown, have implemented community policing policies that have reduced citizen complaints and sought to counter the idea that police are racist oppressors.

The reality that Black Lives Matter activists are willing to deliberate with Brown and other police commissioners, that BLM consistently condemns acts of violence against officers, also works against the narrative that there is some kind “war on police.” The Black Panthers favored retaliatory violence for alleged police misconduct, and did so in armed street battles — they surely never praised a police chief.

Extremist groups today also hold much less sway. By the end of the ’60s, federal law enforcement was becoming quite adept at infiltrating and disrupting white supremacist groups. Experts say there are approximately 8,000 active Ku Klux Klan members in the United States today; in contrast, the White Knights of the Ku Klux Klan of Mississippi, at its peak membership under the leadership of Grand Wizard Sam Bowers in 1965, had close to 10,000 members. Organized group violence, of the kind perpetrated by Bowers, is all but unknown.

#### Taking the race war as a given fuels white retaliation – we must be against the race war as an analytic

Saletan 16 William Saletan, writer for Slate, Harvard Grad, There Is a War Over Race in America: But it’s not whites vs. blacks. https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2016/07/there-is-a-war-over-race-in-america-but-its-not-whites-vs-blacks.html

Hours after a sniper gunned down five law enforcement officers in Dallas—claiming, according to police, that “he wanted to kill white people, especially white officers”—no one was crowing louder than David Duke. “All I warned about, sorry to say, is now happening,” the former Klansman tweeted. “There is war against Whites in America. A war of hate, racism, and violence against us!” Duke circulated tweets by people who used the phrase “black lives matter” and celebrated the shootings. In a pitch to Donald Trump supporters, he added the hashtags #WarOnWhites, #ThanksObama, and #MakeAmericaGreatAgain.

This is the central thing to understand about what happened in Dallas: Black people who target whites are fundamentally allied with white people who target blacks. They’re on the same team: the race war team. It’s a lot like the global struggle over jihadism, in which Muslims who hate Christians collaborate, in effect, with Christians who hate Muslims. In the case of jihadism, the real struggle isn’t between two religions. It’s between people who want religious war and people who don’t. The same is true of race: Either you’re on the race war team, or you’re against it.

The attack in Dallas—allegedly committed by Micah Johnson, a black man—comes barely a year after a white man, Dylann Roof, allegedly shot nine black people to death in a church in Charleston, South Carolina. Roof told friends, and later police, that he wanted “to start a race war.” “He wanted it to be white with white, and black with black,” said a friend.

Roof’s manifesto echoed the ideas of Anders Behring Breivik, a white Christian nationalist who massacred 77 people in Norway five years ago. Breivik claimed to be defending “our people, our culture, Christendom and our nation.” He declared, “It is every European’s duty to defend their people and country against the ideology of genocide, conquest and destruction known as Islam.”

Nothing helps Roof, Breivik, Duke, and other white nationalists more than hate crimes by the people they vilify—blacks and Muslims—against whites, Christians, and police officers. No crime justifies such collective vilification. But as a social dynamic, haters and killers on all sides work together, by stoking feelings of group victimization and group vengeance.

# 2AR

1] First, on the theory shells

#### 2] They conceded all neg positions except the race war so this debate is about weighing the impacts of the race war against ours, they have not responded to any of our case arguments so assume that our impacts are going to happen, however we have responded to the fact the race war is not happening right now-

#### 3] In response to the argument on vviolence being present, this still doesn’t justify people in schools having to debate primarily on this topic- it discourages topic education because we are forced to consolidate all our prep to things on this topic and also other forms of edu solve- we can just