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## Setcol

#### Land acknowledgement – I acknowledge that right now I currently occupy the land belonging to Akokisa, Karankawa, and Sana tribes who occupied Houston for thousands of years prior to Settlers taking over. The Karankawa people were eliminated by Settlers and considered to be extinct. And the Akokisa and Sana tribes were forcefully removed from the land to Kansas where they lived with the Tonkawa tribe. I acknowledge that right now as a settler I live and stand on stolen land.

#### And – this functions as pre-fiat performative offense that comes first and outweighs since a) acknowledgement is the first step towards decolonization and b) recognizing my position as a settler in the round provides a unique opportunity for not only be to learn and feel complicit but everyone else too – this education comes before everything else in the round since it’s the only thing we can walk out of the room with.

#### Settler colonialism is a structure of elimination, not an event, upheld by legal moves by settlers.

**Rifkin 14** (Settler Common Sense Mark Rifkin Published by University of Minnesota Press Rifkin, M.. Settler Common Sense: Queerness and Everyday Colonialism in the American Renaissance. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014. Project MUSE., https://muse.jhu.edu/.)

If nineteenth-century American literary studies tends to focus on the ways Indians enter the narrative frame and the kinds of meanings and associations they bear, recent attempts to theorize settler colonialism have sought to shift attention from its effects on Indigenous subjects to its implications for nonnative political attachments, forms of inhabitance, and modes of being, illuminating and tracking the pervasive operation of settlement as a system. In Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology, Patrick Wolfe argues, “Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay—invasion is a structure not an event” (2).6 He suggests that a “logic of elimination” drives settler governance and sociality, describing “the settler-colonial will” as “a historical force that ultimately derives from the primal drive to expansion that is generally glossed as capitalism” (167), and in “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” he observes that “elimination is an organizing principle of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superceded) occurrence” (388). Rather than being superseded after an initial moment/ period of conquest, colonization persists since “the logic of elimination marks a return whereby the native repressed continues to structure settlercolonial society” (390). In Aileen Moreton-Robinson’s work, whiteness func - tions as the central way of understanding the domination and displacement of Indigenous peoples by nonnatives.7 In “Writing Off Indigenous Sovereignty,” she argues, “As a regime of power, patriarchal white sovereignty operates ideologically, materially and discursively to reproduce and maintain its investment in the nation as a white possession” (88), and in “Writing Off Treaties,” she suggests, “At an ontological level the structure of subjective possession occurs through the imposition of one’s will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will, thus it is open to being possessed,” such that “possession . . . forms part of the ontological structure of white subjectivity” (83–84). For Jodi Byrd, the deployment of Indianness as a mobile figure works as the principal mode of U.S. settler colonialism. She observes that “colonization and racialization . . . have often been conflated,” in ways that “tend to be sited along the axis of inclusion/exclusion” and that “misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism” (xxiii, xvii). She argues that settlement works through the translation of indigeneity as Indianness, casting place-based political collectivities as (racialized) populations subject to U.S. jurisdiction and management: “the Indian is left nowhere and everywhere within the ontological premises through which U.S. empire orients, imagines, and critiques itself ”; “ideas of Indians and Indianness have served as the ontological ground through which U.S. settler colonialism enacts itself ” (xix). These accounts are differently configured, but in all of them, the contours of settlement appear analytically as clear and coherent from the start, as a virtual totality. What, though, might be lost in an analytical investment in tracing settlement as a structure or ontology—a somewhat self-generating, uniform whole? The ongoing processes by which settler dominance actively is reconstituted as an embodied set of actions, occupations, deferrals, and potentials can slide from view, deferring discussion of how the regularities of settler colonialism are materialized in and through quotidian nonnative sensations, dispositions, and lived trajectories. Holland notes of discussions of antiblack racism that “when we return to [racist] practice, we can only see something produced by the machinations of large systems like the university or the state. We often only have eyes for the spectacularity of racist practice, not its everyday machinations” (27), later observing, “[W]e might come to think differently about the historical—we might find a grounding for racist practice that acknowledges both systemic practices and quotidian effects that far exceed our patterned understanding of how history has happened to us” (52). When and how do projects of elimination, replacement, and possession become geographies of everyday nonnative occupancy that do not understand themselves as predicated on colonial occupation or on a history of settler–Indigenous relation (even though they are), and what are the contours and effects of such experiences of inhabitance and belonging? Quotidian forms of sensation—processes of routine happening—fade from view in the move away from the “everyday” and toward the “systemic.” In Reassembling the Social, Bruno Latour argues against kinds of analysis in which “the social” functions as an explanatory tool that exceeds and precedes the particular sets and sites of relations under discussion: “every activity—law, science, technology, religion, organization, politics, management, etc.—could be related to and explained by the same social aggregates behind all of them” (8).8 Doing so short-circuits the investigation by a priori positing an integrated set of connections that is then treated as a sufficient cause for the “activity” in question, which itself functions in the analysis as merely a bearer of that self-same “social aggregate”—not doing anything on its own. The dynamics by which legislative and administrative agendas come to function as an animating part of daily life, the differences such realization and localization make in the terms and trajectories of those explicit projects, and the possibilities for forms of disjuncture between the state apparatus and everyday experience are bracketed by the positing of a clear, direct, and inevitable relation characterized as “ontological.” Raymond Williams observes, “A lived hegemony is always a process. It is not, except analytically, a system or a structure. . . . In practice, that is, hegemony can never be singular,” instead needing “continually to be renewed, recreated, defended, and modified” (112), and he describes the tendency to speak and think in terms of systems as a “procedural mode” that emphasizes “formed wholes rather than forming and formative processes” (128). Following this line of thought, accounts of settlement as always-already a “formed whole” leave aside the ways the institutions of the settler-state become “actively involved” in the daily life of nonnatives, serving as “formative” but in ways that cannot be understood as always taking the same shape and thus known beforehand. Moreover, this processual approach leans away from the tendency to look to a limited set of federal laws, cases, and policy determinations as the means of defining the legal terms (the structure) of settlement, particularly given the unevenness of the application of federal norms generally, the development of divergent patterns in states and territories, and the fact that states in the Northeast sought to present themselves as not bound by the terms of federal Indian affairs.9 The notion of settler common sense seeks to address how the varied legalities, administrative structures, and concrete effects of settler governance get “renewed” and “recreated” in ordinary phenomena by nonnative, nonstate actors, in ways that do not necessarily affirm settlement as an explicit, conscious set of imperatives/initiatives or coordinate with each other as a self-identical program. As a project of reading, then, it looks for the textual traces of quotidian ways of (re)producing the givenness of settler jurisdiction, placemaking, and personhood, attending to the means by which writings that feature neither Indians nor the expropriation of Native lands register the impression of everyday modes of colonial occupation.

#### **Focus on social issues other than colonialism, not only ignores the root cause of the issue, but reproduces the US’s ability to be an oppressor in the first place - which turns the aff**

**Byrd 11** (Byrd, Jodi A. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. NED - New edition ed., University of Minnesota Press, 2011. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttv97j.)

There is more than one way to frame the concerns of The Transit of Empire and more than one way to enter into the possibilities that transit might allow for comparative studies. On the one hand, I am seeking to join ongoing conversations about sovereignty, power, and indigeneity—and the epistemological debates that each of these terms engender—within and across disparate and at times incommensurable disciplines and geographies. American studies, queer studies, postcolonial studies, American Indian studies, and area studies have all attempted to apprehend injury and redress, melancholy and grief that exist in the distances and sutures of state recognitions and belongings. Those distances and sutures of recognitions and belongings, melancholy and grief, take this book from the worlds of Southeastern Indians to Hawai‘i, from the Poston War Relocation Center to Jonestown, Guyana, in order to consider how ideas of “Indianness” have created conditions of possibility for U. S. empire to manifest its intent. As liberal multicultural settler colonialism attempts to flex the exceptions and exclusions that first constituted the United States to now provisionally include those people othered and abjected from the nation-state’s origins, it instead creates a cacophony of moral claims that help to deflect progressive and transformative activism from dismantling the ongoing conditions of colonialism that continue to make the United States a desired state formation within which to be included. That cacophony of competing struggles for hegemony within and outside institutions of power, no matter how those struggles might challenge the state through loci of race, class, gender, and sexuality, serves to misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism that made the United States possible as oppressor in the first place. As a result, the cacophony produced through U.S. colonialism and imperialism domestically and abroad often coerces struggles for social justice for queers, racial minorities, and immigrants into complicity with settler colonialism.

#### Unions are just another colonial institution used to dominate indigenous workers.

**Fernandez 17 (**Fernandez, Lynne, and Jim Silver. *Indigenous People, Wage Labour and Trade Unions*. Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 2017. //aw)

As George Lithman (1984: 79–81) observed, those Indigenous workers inside the mill were “practically all located in the dirtiest and lowest paid positions,” and racism was common. By the 1970s Jeremy Hull (1991: 89) argues that “the union was an organization protecting the interests of the white workers, and excluding the Indian workers.” Similar outcomes occurred elsewhere because of deliberate union actions, often of a systemic character. Andy Parnaby (2006: 77), for example, describes how the “implementation of stringent seniority and leave of absence rules for its [the union’s] members in 1953” pushed Indigenous workers off the BC docks. This occurred despite the fact that Indigenous longshoremen had previously monopolized the loading and unloading of logs and lumber on the BC docks and were described as “the greatest men that ever worked the lumber” (Parnaby 2006: 64). Unions have, in general, been slow to reach out to workers who are not white, male or heterosexual. Gerald Hunt and David Rayside (2000: 402–3) found that “through much of their history most unions have been at the very least skeptical of racial minority members and women, regarding them as threatening to higher wages, job security and union solidarity.” Julie White (1993) and Ronnie Leah (1993) have documented cases of blatant racism on the part of unions directed at racialized minorities. Maureen Morrison (1991) described the intense struggles that female trade unionists in Manitoba waged against sexism in union ranks. Progress for women in unions has been “agonizingly slow” (Briskin and McDermott 1993). The same is the case for workers of colour (Hunt and Rayside 2000: 234–5). But the changing demographics of the labour force have forced unions to begin to respond differently. “A labour movement that was once largely white, male, and believed to be largely heterosexual has had to begin adapting to a labour force with very different demographics, attitudes and forms of activism.” (Hunt & Rayside 2000: 403) In Manitoba, a dominant demographic trend is the rapid growth and the younger than average age of the Indigenous population (Bond and Spence 2016: 29–30), and the resultant dramatic growth in the proportion of labour market entrants who are, and even more in future will be, people of Indigenous descent (Lezubski 2014). To date, however, Indigenous peoples’ relations with unions and non-Indigenous union members have been mixed, but most often negative. For example, Julie Guard’s analysis of women on strike at Lanark Manufacturing in southern Ontario found that while white women “claimed for themselves an identity as real workers,” they simultaneously “marked out the boundaries of that identity by excluding Native women.” She hypothesized that “non-Natives did not see Native women as authentic workers, regardless of whether or not they were actually engaged in waged work” (Guard 2004: 118–9). Suzanne Mills (2007) found similarly that Indigenous women working at a mill in northern Canada felt a close bond among themselves, but felt excluded by the union and by non-Indigenous workers, including non-Indigenous women. As Leslie Spillett—an Indigenous leader in Winnipeg and former trade union leader—confirmed in a 2016 interview, in some cases Indigenous people see unions as just another colonial institution, engaged in practices at odds with and likely to undermine Indigenous cultures. It is true that unions have historically been—and in too many cases still are—colonial institutions, acting narrowly in the interests of non-Indigenous workers and not only failing to adequately represent the particular interests of Indigenous workers, but in some cases working actively to exclude them from paid employment.

#### Settler workers are still settlers – the 1ac grounds their politics in a defense of indigenous dispossession and necessitates settler expansion.

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

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

#### The alternative is to decolonize

**Tuck and Yang** (Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. "Decolonization is not a metaphor." Decolonization: Indigeneity, education & society 1.1 (2012). //aw)

Alongside this work, we have been thinking about what decolonization means, what it wants and requires. One trend we have noticed, with growing apprehension, is the ease with which the language of decolonization has been superficially adopted into education and other social sciences, supplanting prior ways of talking about social justice, critical methodologies, or approaches which decenter settler perspectives. Decolonization, which we assert is a distinct project from other civil and human rights-based social justice projects, is far too often subsumed into the directives of these projects, with no regard for how decolonization wants something different than those forms of justice. Settler scholars swap out prior civil and human rights based terms, seemingly to signal both an awareness of the significance of Indigenous and decolonizing theorizations of schooling and educational research, and to include Indigenous peoples on the list of considerations - as an additional special (ethnic) group or class. At a conference on educational research, it is not uncommon to hear speakers refer, almost casually, to the need to “decolonize our schools,” or use “decolonizing methods,” or “decolonize student thinking.” Yet, we have observed a startling number of these discussions make no mention of Indigenous peoples, our/their1 struggles for the recognition of our/their sovereignty, or the contributions of Indigenous intellectuals and activists to theories and frameworks of decolonization. Further, there is often little recognition given to the immediate context of settler colonialism on the North American lands where many of these conferences take place. Of course, dressing up in the language of decolonization is not as offensive as “Navajo print” underwear sold at a clothing chain store (Gaynor, 2012) and other appropriations of Indigenous cultures and materials that occur so frequently. Yet, this kind of inclusion is a form of enclosure, dangerous in how it domesticates decolonization. It is also a foreclosure, limiting in how it recapitulates dominant theories of social change. On the occasion of the inaugural issue of Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society, we want to be sure to clarify that decolonization is not a metaphor. When metaphor invades decolonization, it kills the very possibility of decolonization; it recenters whiteness, it resettles theory, it extends innocence to the settler, it entertains a settler future. Decolonize (a verb) and decolonization (a noun) cannot easily be grafted onto pre-existing discourses/frameworks, even if they are critical, even if they are anti-racist, even if they are justice frameworks. The easy absorption, adoption, and transposing of decolonization is yet another form of settler appropriation. When we write about decolonization, we are not offering it as a metaphor; it is not an approximation of other experiences of oppression. Decolonization is not a swappable term for other things we want to do to improve our societies and schools. Decolonization doesn’t have a synonym. Our goal in this essay is to remind readers what is unsettling about decolonization - what is unsettling and what should be unsettling. Clearly, we are advocates for the analysis of settler colonialism within education and education research and we position the work of Indigenous thinkers as central in unlocking the confounding aspects of public schooling. We, at least in part, want others to join us in these efforts, so that settler colonial structuring and Indigenous critiques of that structuring are no longer rendered invisible. Yet, this joining cannot be too easy, too open, too settled. Solidarity is an uneasy, reserved, and unsettled matter that neither reconciles present grievances nor forecloses future conflict. There are parts of the decolonization project that are not easily absorbed by human rights or civil rights based approaches to educational equity. In this essay, we think about what decolonization wants.

#### The ROTB is to vote for the team who best acknowledges their position in the empire and centers indigenous voices into the conversation.

**Byrd 11** (Byrd, Jodi A. *The Transit of Empire: Indigenous Critiques of Colonialism*. NED - New edition ed., University of Minnesota Press, 2011. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttv97j.)

Although the United Nations’ Working Group on Indigenous Peoples and the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples have resisted defining “indigenous peoples” in order to prevent nation-states from policing the category as a site of exception, Jeff Corntassel (Cherokee) and Taiaiake Alfred (Kahnawake Mohawk) provide a useful provisional definition in their essay “Being Indigenous”: Indigenousness is an identity constructed, shaped, and lived in the politicized context of contemporary colonialism. The communities, clans, nations and tribes we call Indigenous peoples are just that: Indigenous to the lands they inhabit, in contrast to and in contention with the colonial societies and states that have spread out from Europe and other centres of empire. It is this oppositional, placebased existence, along with the consciousness of being in struggle against the dispossessing and demeaning fact of colonization by foreign peoples, that fundamentally distinguishes Indigenous peoples from other peoples of the world.³² In their definition there emerges a contentious, oppositional identity and existence to confront imperialism and colonialism. Indigenousness also hinges, in Alfred and Corntassel, on certain Manichean allegories of foreign/native and colonizer/colonized within reclamations of “placebased existence,” and these can, at times, tip into a formulation that does not challenge neoliberalism as much as it mirrors it. But despite these potential pitfalls, indigenous critical theory could be said to exist in its best form when it centers itself within indigenous epistemologies and the specificities of the communities and cultures from which it emerges and then looks outward to engage European philosophical, legal, and cultural traditions in order to build upon all the allied tools available. Steeped in anticolonial consciousness that deconstructs and confronts the colonial logics of settler states carved out of and on top of indigenous usual and accustomed lands, indigenous critical theory has the potential in this mode to offer a transformative accountability. From this vantage, indigenous critical theory might, then, provide a diagnostic way of reading and interpreting the colonial logics that underpin cultural, intellectual, and political discourses. But it asks that settler, native, and arrivant each acknowledge their own positions within empire and then reconceptualize space and history to make visible what imperialism and its resultant settler colonialisms and diasporas have sought to obscure. Within the continental United States, it means imagining an entirely different map and understanding of territory and space: a map constituted by over sovereign indigenous nations, with their own borders and boundaries, that transgress what has been naturalized as contiguous territory divided into states.³³ “There is always,” Aileen Moreton-Robinson writes of indigenous peoples’ incommensurablity within the postcolonizing settler society, “a subject position that can be thought of as fixed in its inalienable relation to land. This subject position cannot be erased by colonizing processes which seek to position the indigenous as object, inferior, other and its origins are not tied to migration.”³⁴

## Spec

#### Interp – the aff must specify what just government they defend in a delineated text in the 1AC.

#### Viol – they don’t

#### Standards

#### 1] Large group of countries can’t strike now and “just government” is arbitary

**Tidey 18** (Alice Tidey, 7-6-2018, "Workers' rights: The worst countries," https://www.euronews.com/2018/06/07/workers-rights-the-worst-and-best-countries)

In its 2018 “Global Rights Index” published on Thursday, the International Trade Union Confederation (ITUC) says that 65% of countries exclude workers from the right to establish or join a trade union while 87% of countries violated the right to strike last year. "The 2018 Global Rights Index saw restrictions on free speech and protests and increasingly violent attacks on the defenders of worker's rights," it writes. The good: European countries topped the ITUC global rights ranking, with 10 EU countries featuring in the top 13 alongside Norway, Uruguay and Iceland. Still, the ITUC notes that the long-lasting negative effects of austerity measures “have all but dismantled existing collective bargaining frameworks” especially in Portugal, Spain and Greece, which were heavily impacted by the 2008 financial crisis. In Spain, the report deplores the use of Franco-era legal provisions to crack down on peaceful strike actions, while in Greece — which was ranked in the bottom 33 countries — the ITUC highlights that the number of occupational-level agreements covering the whole country fell from 65 to 14 between 2010 and 2013 because of austerity measures. The bad: Asia and the Pacific is the second-worst region for workers’ rights according to the ITUC, which flagged how physical violence and intimation of workers are common practices to prevent the establishment of unions, particularly in India and Bangladesh. The report also highlights how in Indonesia, Myanmar and Cambodia, numerous cases of workers exercising their right to strike were dismissed. ITUC also denounces China and Korea for their jailing of labour activists and trade union leaders. The ugly: Algeria, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Colombia, Egypt, Guatemala, Kazakhstan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia and Turkey are listed as the worst 10 countries for workers. In Latin America, an increase in violence towards trade unionists was reported with 19 trade unionists assassinated in Colombia last year and 87 murdered in Guatemala since 2004. The Middle East and North Africa was found to be the worst region in the world, with Gulf countries, especially Saudi Arabia, accused of exposing migrant workers to exploitation and severe physical and psychological abuses “akin to forced labour and slavery.” In Turkey, ITUC says the failed July 2016 coup d’état has led to a crackdown on civil liberties and to trade unionists being "systematically targeted under the guise of the state of emergency". Finally, the absolute worst rating was given to countries, all in the Middle East and Africa, where there is no guarantee of rights due to conflict and the breakdown of the law. These include: Burundi, Central African Republic, Eritrea, Libya, Palestine, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Yemen.

#### 2] Ground – a] you can delink out of pics and disads we read about certain governments not guaranteeing the right to strike. Means that we never have stable ground when constructing the 1NC and you can shift out of any core ground we read b] ptx disads are predicated on us knowing the political climate of a country – you not specing a government means we either 1) lose access to politics or b) you can just shift and delink out of it if we read it

#### 3] Clash – a] workers strikes in different countries are fighting for different things means absent you specing we are never able to clash on case and can both discuss separate impacts of strikes.

#### Voter for fairness – it’s a constitutive part of debate and education 1] portable skill 2] why schools fund

#### Competing interps on spec – 1] its either there or its not, cant reasonably specific

#### Dtd 1] k2 deter future abuse bc they learn 2] substance is already skewed

#### No rvi 1] Rvis just encourage the whole debate to become a theory debate and we never get back to substance

#### 2] logic- you shouldn’t win just because you were fair and didn’t break a rule

## Case

### FW

**Strikes alienate the worker by homogenizing interests and sparking countermobilization.**

**Grant and Wallace 91** [Don Sherman Grant; Ohio State University; Michael Wallace; Indiana University; “Why Do Strikes Turn Violent?” University of Chicago Press; March 1991; <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2781338.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Aca3144a9ae9e4ac65e285f2c67451ffb>] Justin

\*\*RM = Resource-Mobilization, or Strikes

3. Violent tactics.-Violent tactics are viewed by RM theorists **exclu- sively** as purposeful strategies by challengers for inciting social change with **little recognition** of how **countermobilization** strategies of elites also **create violence**. The role of elite counterstrategies has been **virtually ig- nored in research on collective violence**. Of course, history is **replete** with examples of elites' inflicting violence on challenging groups with the full sanction of the state. Typically, elite-sponsored violence occurs when the power resources and legal apparatus are so one-sidedly in the elites' favor that the outcome is never in doubt. In conflicts with weak insiders, elites may not act so openly unless weak insiders flaunt the law. Typically, elite strategies **do not** overtly promote violence but rather **provoke violence by the other side in hopes of eliciting public condemnation** or more vigorous state repression of challenger initiatives. This is a critical dynamic in struggles involving weak insiders such as unions. In these cases, worker violence, even when it appears justified, erodes **public support for the workers' cause and damages the union's insider status**.

4. Homogeneity and similarity.-Many RM theorists **incorrectly** as- sume that members of aggrieved groups are **homogeneous** in their inter- ests and share similar positions in the social structure. This (assumed) homogeneity of interests is rare for members of outsider groups and even more suspect for members of weak-insider groups. Indeed, groups are **rarely uniform** and often include relatively advantaged persons who have other, more peaceful channels in which to **pursue their goals**. Internal stratification processes mean that different persons have **varying invest- ments** in current structural arrangements, in addition to their collective interest in affecting social change. Again, these forces are especially prev- alent for weak insiders: even the group's lowest-status members are likely to have a marginal stake in the system; high-status members are likely to have a larger stake and, therefore, less commitment to dramatic change in the status quo.

Internal differences may lead to **fragmentation of interests** and **lack of consensus about tactics**, especially tactics suggesting violent confronta- tion. While group members share common grievances, individual mem- bers may be **differentially aggrieved by the current state of affairs** or differentially exposed to elite repression. White's (1989) research on the violent tactics of the Irish Republican Army shows that working-class members and student activists, when compared with middle-class partici- pants, are more vulnerable to **state-sponsored repression**, more likely to be available for protest activities, and reap more benefits from political violence. When we apply them to our study of strike violence, we find that differences in skill levels are known to coincide with major intraclass 1120 Strikes divisions in material interests (Form 1985) and are likely to coincide with the tendency for violent action. For instance, skilled-craft workers, who are more socially and politically conservative than unskilled workers, are less likely to view relations with employers as inherently antagonistic and are prone to separate themselves from unskilled workers, factors that should decrease their participation in violence.

#### FW flows neg because natives are dominated just by being on the land so either a) there’s two conflicting pieces of offense and their mechanism has no way to weigh between the offense since its both obligatory and prohibited and k proves that and we should default to the k rotb since you can actually weigh or b) k should come first anyway bc needing to read a land acknowledgment and realize complicity is spec to we as an actor versus the broader claim “states ought to do something”