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#### Interpretation: Topical affirmatives must specify the purpose of the strike

Chicktay 12, Mohamed Alli Chicktay BProc LLB LLM PhD Senior Lecturer in Law University of the Witwatersrand, “DEFINING THE RIGHT TO STRIKE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANIZATION STANDARDS AND SOUTH AFRICAN LAW”, Published Online:1 Jan 2012, <https://hdl.handle.net/10520/EJC128566>, Accessed 11/4/21, sb

2 1 The purpose of the strike All strikes must have a purpose.5 A mere stoppage of work would not amount to a strike.6 The stoppage must be for a particular reason or demand.7 In Floraline v SASTU8 and FAWU v Rainbow Chicken Farms9 the Labour Court held that there was no strike, since, although there was a stoppage of work, there was no purpose or demand. This is both a requirement for the ILO and the LRA. Both recognize that strikes could exist for three different types of purposes. These include employment interests, protest action and secondary strikes.

#### Violation – affirmative doesn’t specify the purpose of the strike

#### Ground – we lose PICs out of different types of strikes – 3 types of different strikes – key to education, learn more about strikes which is key to the topic because “a just government” doesn’t exist

#### Presumption – if aff didn’t specify a purpose, it by definition isn’t a strike and gets struck down by courts and circumvented – evidence proves – Vote Neg on Presumption

#### Drop the Debater on fairness and education

## 2

#### Criminal justice reform reaffirms and reinforces the carceral state---abolition is the only ethical option.

Dylan Rodríguez 19, Professor and Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside, 4/10/2019, “Abolition as Praxis of Human Being: A Foreword,” *Harvard Law Review*, Number 132, pp. 1567-1568, <https://harvardlawreview.org/2019/04/abolition-as-praxis-of-human-being-a-foreword/>, DOA: 7/1/2020, SIR

Contemporary reformist approaches to addressing the apparent overreach and scandalous excesses of the carceral state — characterized by calls to end “police brutality” and “mass incarceration” — fail to recognize that the very logics of the overlapping criminal justice and policing regimes systemically perpetuate racial, sexual, gender, colonial, and class violence through carceral power. Thus, in addition to being ineffective at achieving their generally stated goals of alleviating vulnerable peoples’ subjection to legitimated state violence, reformist approaches ultimately reinforce a violent system that is fundamentally asymmetrical in its production and organization of normalized misery, social surveillance, vulnerability to state terror, and incarceration.

It is within this irreconcilable reformist contradiction that an abolitionist historical mandate provides a useful and necessary departure from the liberal assumption that either the carceral state or carceral power is an inevitable and permanent feature of the social formation. This historical mandate animates abolition as a creative, imaginative, and speculative collective labor: while liberal-to-progressive reformism attempts to protect and sustain the institutional and cultural-political coherence of an existing system by adjusting and/or refurbishing it, abolitionism addresses the historical roots of that system in relations of oppressive, continuous, and asymmetrical violence and raises the radical question of whether those relations must be uprooted and transformed (rather than reformed or “fixed”) for the sake of particular peoples’ existence and survival as such.

Consider abolition as both a long accumulation and future planning of acts, performed by and in the name of peoples and communities relentlessly laboring for their own physiological and cultural integrity as such. Embrace the obligation that accompanies the term abolition — a complex, dynamic, and deeply historical shorthand, if you will — in the work of constantly remaking sociality, politics, ecology, place, and (human) being against the duress that some call dehumanization, others name colonialism, and still others identify as slavery and incarceration. Abolition, then, is constituted by so many acts long overlapping, dispersed across geographies and historical moments, that reveal the underside of the New World and its descendant forms — the police, jail, prison, criminal court, detention center, reservation, plantation, and “border.”

No longer limited by canonized narratives of late nineteenth-century (and disproportionately white) abolitionists seeking redemption of the American project against its own constitutional racial-colonial-chattel carcerality, or even by recent articulations of early twenty-first-century abolition across a spectrum of progressive-to-radical rejoinders to gendered racist state violence, another conceptualization of the term becomes possible. Now and long before, abolition is and was a practice, an analytical method, a present-tense visioning, an infrastructure in the making, a creative project, a performance, a counterwar, an ideological struggle, a pedagogy and curriculum, an alleged impossibility that is furtively present, pulsing, produced in the persistent insurgencies of human being that undermine the totalizing logics of empire, chattel, occupation, heteropatriarchy, racial-colonial genocide, and Civilization as a juridical-narrative epoch.

#### Reformist approaches to mass incarceration naturalize the logics of incarceration and policing.

Dylan Rodríguez 18, Professor and Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside, 3/8/2018, “Dylan Rodriguez: “Mass Incarceration” Reform as Police Endorsement,” <http://scholarsforsocialjustice.com/ssj-blog-to-define-incarceration-against-mass-incarceration-by-dylan-rodriguez/>, DOA: 5/18/2020, SIR

It is the moment in which the organic intellectuals and figureheads of the racist state—even and especially in its post-racialist and multiculturalist forms—begin to use the ostensibly critical language of “mass incarceration” that we must admit to ourselves that the term may have reached its point of explanatory and analytical obsolescence (that is, if it ever adequately explained and analyzed anything to begin with). The reformist narrative of mass incarceration endorses a statecraft of policing that skillfully links liberal post-Civil Rights racial sympathy and the long historical fact of racist (anti-Black) state repression to adamant demands for carceral downsizing and a kinder, gentler, expanded cultural and martial infrastructure of law-and-order policing. As a consequence, the logic of mass incarceration reform is generally symbiotic with demands for more and better policing, sometimes issued by ostensible spokespeople of police-occupied communities themselves. Consider a different critical activist task, undertaken for the sake of offering an insurgent, radical story against the reformist rhetoric of “mass incarceration”: to define “incarceration” against its juridical-cultural normalization as such. Defining “Incarceration” Incarceration is legitimated state violence, mobilizing the power of law, policing, and (gendered racial) common sense to produce, fortify, and/or militarize the geographic isolation and (collective) bodily immobilization of targeted human groups. A strategic focus on the particular US carceral formation of jails, prisons, and detention centers in the late-20th and early-21st centuries enables a historically supple and geographically dynamic understanding of incarceration that can be utilized across different historical conditions and sociopolitical/cultural contexts. By any historical measure, the institutional formation of incarceration within the specific purviews of US criminal justice statecraft has produced a social logic, jurisprudence, cultural structure, and militarized policing apparatus that naturalizes the condition of state captivity for criminalized people, populations, and geographies.[[ii]](http://scholarsforsocialjustice.com/ssj-blog-to-define-incarceration-against-mass-incarceration-by-dylan-rodriguez/" \l "_edn2) All available empirical and archival accounts affirm that the institutional capacity, racialized asymmetry, geographic scale, multi-generational impact, and sheer longevity of US incarcerating technologies stand alone in recorded human history, particularly in the realm of jails and prisons. Further, the astronomical growth of this carceral regime since the 1970s cannot be attributed to any growth in “crime rates” (which have in fact declined over the period in question).[[iii]](http://scholarsforsocialjustice.com/ssj-blog-to-define-incarceration-against-mass-incarceration-by-dylan-rodriguez/" \l "_edn3) A vast archive of criminological data consistently demonstrates that this institutional form of incarceration is structured in gendered racist state violence,[[iv]](http://scholarsforsocialjustice.com/ssj-blog-to-define-incarceration-against-mass-incarceration-by-dylan-rodriguez/" \l "_edn4) suggesting that there is a much longer story to be told. Modern US incarceration is structured by a long, overlapping history of complex interactions between gendered racist chattel and colonial power. The roots of the US carceral regime are global, emerging through two fundamental relations of dominance: 1) the historical technologies of captivity that structured the Transatlantic Middle Passage and the hemispheric racial chattel enslavement of African-descended peoples; and 2) the geographic-ecological production of the Western Civilizational project via the Treaty of Tordesillas, Manifest Destiny, and the manifold forms of conquest that have produced the (continuing and continuous) carceral subjection of Indigenous and Aboriginal peoples via reservations, nation-state borders, notions of “the frontier,” and other incarcerating measures. Thus, “incarceration” is not a self-contained or historically isolated practice of legitimated state violence. Incarceration is not reducible to the particular institutional forms of jails, prisons, detention centers, and other such brick-and-mortar incarcerating facilities (and their corresponding juridical protocols). Rather, incarceration is best understood as a systemic logic and institutional methodology that produces and coheres spatial, cultural, and juridical structures of human dominance within specific social and state formations:[[v]](http://scholarsforsocialjustice.com/ssj-blog-to-define-incarceration-against-mass-incarceration-by-dylan-rodriguez/" \l "_edn5) incarceration takes the form of narrative, juridical, spatial, and sociopolitical processes through which criminalized or otherwise (ontologically and socio-culturally) pathologized populations are rendered collective targets of state-sanctioned social liquidation and political neutralization. This may or may not involve premature physiological death and militarized killing. Crucially, the immediate and accumulated individual and collective experiences of incarceration, however, are consistently articulated by (formerly) incarcerated people in the vernaculars of domestic war, survival, and involuntary intimacy with constant bodily and spiritual vulnerabilities to violence and degradation.[[vi]](http://scholarsforsocialjustice.com/ssj-blog-to-define-incarceration-against-mass-incarceration-by-dylan-rodriguez/" \l "_edn6) Contrary to being a scandalous excess of the racial/racist state in the post-civil rights period, incarceration is thus more accurately understood as a form of normalized warfare against those (human) beings that embody the gendered-racial symbolic orders of death, pathology, and unassimilability into the order of Civilization, an order that thrives in the long historical disordering, immobilization, and/or (attempted) destruction of other human societies. Any attempt to conceptualize the ongoing formation and geographic metastasizing of incarcerating regimes requires that the labors of dynamic critical theorization and conceptual reflection be situated in the radical possibility that the historical targets of incarceration are also the complex embodiment of its imminent undoing, hence its abolition as such.

#### Their arguments about bringing some measure of relief or change constitute cruel optimism --- they rely on a trick of time that retreats to “could be” or “maybe later” --- refusing the blackmail of “doing politics” is a rejection of this trickery

**Warren 15** [Calvin K., Assistant Professor of American Studies at George Washington University, “Black Nihilism and the Politics of Hope,” *CR: The New Centennial Review*, Volume 15, Number 1, Spring 2015]

**The politics of hope**, then, **constitutes** what Lauren Berlant would call “**cruel optimism**” for blacks (Berlant 2011). **It bundles certain promises about redress, equality, freedom, justice, and progress into a political object that always lies beyond reach**. **The objective of the Political is to keep blacks in a relation to this political object**—**in an unending pursuit of it.** **This pursuit**, however, **is detrimental because it strengthens the very anti-black system that would pulverize black being**. **The pursuit of the object certainly has an “irrational” aspect to it**, as Farred details, but it is not mere means without expectation; instead, it is a means that undermines the attainment of the impossible object desired. In other words, the pursuit marks a cruel attachment to the means of subjugation and the continued widening of the gap between historical reality and fantastical ideal. **Black nihilism is a “demythifying” practice, in the Nietzschean vein**, **that uncovers the subjugating strategies of political hope and de-idealizes its fantastical object. Once we denude political hope of its axiological and ethical veneer**, **we see that it operates through certain strategies**: 1) **positing itself as the only alternative** to the problem of anti-blackness, 2) **shielding this alternative from rigorous** historical/philosophical **critique by placing it in an unknown future**, 3) **delimiting the field of action to include only activity** recognized and **legitimated by the Political, and** 4) **demonizing critiques** or different philosophical perspectives. **The politics of hope masks a particular cruelty under the auspices of “happiness” and “life.” It terrifies with the dread of “no alternative**.” “**Life” itself needs the security of the alternative**, and, through this logic, **life becomes untenable without it**. **Political hope promises to provide this alternative**—a discursive and political organization beyond extant structures of violence and destruction. The construction of the binary “alternative/no-alternative” ensures the hegemony and dominance of political hope within the onto-existential horizon. **The terror of the “no alternative”**—the ultimate space of decay, suffering, and death—**depends on two additional binaries**: “problem/solution” and “action/inaction.” **According to this politics, all problems have solutions**, and hope provides the accessibility and realization of these solutions. **The solution establishes itself as the elimination of “the problem”; the solution**, in fact, **transcends the problem and realizes** Hegel’s aufheben in **its constant attempt to sublate the dirtiness of the “problem” with the pristine being of the solution. No problem is outside the reach of hope’s solution**—every problem is connected to the kernel of its own eradication. **The politics of hope must actively refuse the possibility that the “solution” is**, in fact, **another problem in disguised form; the idea of a “solution” is nothing more than the repetition and disavowal of the problem itself. The solution relies on what we might call the “trick of time” to fortify itself from the deconstruction of its binary**. Because the temporality of hope is a time “not-yet-realized,” **a future tense unmoored from present-tense justifications and pragmatist evidence, the politics of hope cleverly shields its “solutions” from critiques of impossibility or repetition**. **Each insistence that these solutions stand up against the lessons of history or the rigors of analysis is met with the rationale that these solutions are not subject to history or analysis because they do not reside within the horizon of the “past” or “present.”** Put differently, **we can never ascertain the efficacy of the proposed solutions because they escape the temporality of the moment, always retreating to a “not-yet” and “could-be” temporality. This “trick” of time offers a promise of possibility that can only be realized in an indefinite future**, and this promise is a bond of uncertainty that can never be redeemed, only imagined. In this sense, the politics of hope is an instance of the psychoanalytic notion of desire: **its sole purpose is to reproduce its very condition of possibility, never to satiate or bring fulfillment**. **This politics secures its hegemony through time by claiming the future as its unassailable property and excluding (and devaluing) any other conception of time that challenges this temporal ordering. The politics of hope**, then, **depends on the incessant (re)production and proliferation of problems to justify its existence**. **Solutions cannot really exist within the politics of hope, just the illusion of a different order in a future tense.** The “trick” of time and political solution converge on the site of “action.” **In critiquing the politics of hope, one encounters the rejoinder of the dangers of inaction**. **“But we can’t just do nothing! We have to do something.”** **The field of permissible action is delimited and an unrelenting binary between action/inaction silences critical engagement with political hope**. **These exclusionary operations rigorously reinforce the binary between action and inaction and discredit certain forms of engagement, critique, and protest**. **Legitimate action takes place in the political**—the political not only claims futurity but also action as its property**. To “do something” means that this doing must translate into recognizable political activity**; **“something” is a stand-in for the word “politics”—one must “do politics” to address any problem. A refusal to “do politics” is equivalent to “doing nothing”**—th**is nothingness is constructed as the antithesis of life, possibility, time, ethics, and morality** (a “zero-state” as Julia Kristeva [1982] might call it). **Black nihilism rejects this “trick of time”** and the lure of emancipatory solutions**. To refuse to “do politics” and to reject the fantastical object of politics is the only “hope” for blackness in an anti-black world**.

#### The impact is carceral domestic warfare---the gendered racist violence of the carceral state cannot be dealt with through reform.

Dylan Rodríguez 19, Professor and Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside, 4/10/2019, “Abolition as Praxis of Human Being: A Foreword,” *Harvard Law Review*, Number 132, pp. 1594, <https://harvardlawreview.org/2019/04/abolition-as-praxis-of-human-being-a-foreword/>, DOA: 7/11/2020, SIR

What I have begun to characterize as the narrative structure of “mass incarceration” reformist discourse is also an attempt to trace the cultural-political fallout of carceral domestic warfare. The consequences of this marshaling of police power, criminal justice policy, and racialized national culture are transgenerational and have fundamentally deformed the capacities of targeted communities and people to reproduce within a sociality that is constituted by the logics and protocols of gendered racist state violence so incisively demystified by organizations like We Charge Genocide, which we will examine more closely below. Such a fallout cannot be triaged or redressed through liberal promises of futurity, redeemed citizenship, and revalued civil life precisely because these deformations are relatively indelible and are inhabited and carried by their involuntary inheritors. Given the depth of these systemically induced, targeted casualties, it becomes urgently necessary to study the collateral consequences wrought by mass-incarceration-reform discourse in and of itself.

#### The ROB is to endorse the best praxis of abolition – the university is intertwined with the prison-industrial complex and abolishing carcerality is the only ethical demand

Maldonado and Meiners 21, David A. Maldonado is a PhD candidate in the School of Education at the University of California, Berkeley, with a designated emphasis in the Program in Critical Theory. He is a formerly incarcerated student and founding member of the Underground Scholars Initiative. His work focuses on capital, state counterinsurgency, carcerality, and the university from an abolitionist sensibility. Erica R. Meiners is coeditor of the anthology The Long Term: Resisting Life Sentences, Working Towards Freedom (2018), coauthor of The Feminist and the Sex Offender: Confronting Sexual Harm, Ending State Violence (2020), and author of For the Children? Protecting Innocence in a Carceral State (2016). She teaches at Northeastern Illinois University, where she is a member of her labor union, University Professionals of Illinois, and she is involved with a range of ongoing queer abolitionist movements for liberation. “Due Time: Meditations on Abolition at the Site of the University”, March 2021, https://read.dukeupress.edu/social-text/article-abstract/39/1%20(146)/69/173030/Due-TimeMeditations-on-Abolition-at-the-Site-of, apark 10/23/21

We start with a recognition, for us, of the obvious. While the project of what some scholars now call critical university studies might be new, 1 the underlying analysis is not. 2 More recently, a wide body of scholars and organizers have named how the university is intertwined with our prison-industrial complex: Dylan Rodríguez identifies the long arc of the “gendered racist, apartheid, colonialist foundations” of the academy, or what Sandy Grande calls an “arm of the settler state.” 3 Robin D. G. Kel - ley wrote that the university “cannot be radically transformed by ‘simply’ adding darker faces, safer spaces, better training, and a curriculum that acknowledges historical and contemporary oppressions.” 4 Abigail Boggs and Nick Mitchell remind us “that there is no history of the university that is not also a history of capital accumulation and capital expropria - tion.” 5 Feminists, particularly women of color, have consistently identified and challenged the de facto university response to their bodies, scholar - ship, and teaching: “presumed incompetent.” 6 For us, far from a hallowed and romantic space of enlightenment, the university will not stop being racist, sexist, ableist, and heteronormative, nor will it redeem us/help us make good. 7 And yet here we are. Both of our lives were and continue to be altered by the possibilities of study incited through, and in spite of, the university. Yet any illusion of a refuge —the fugitive pauses from the assemblage and its violences —contains a paradox. We may borrow temporal breaks from the machine, but within the academy we are still indebted to it. (And we cannot unknow how our bio/blood/loved networks, the unstudents and the ungraduates, are calculated through a lens of dispossession and defi - ciency.) We use these refuge/moments to organize and to study. Study is not limited to or contained within the university. Study involves planning and moving with other people, or as Stefano Harney and Fred Moten describe, “talking and walking around with other people working, danc - ing, suffering, some irreducible convergence of all three, held under the name of speculative practice.” 8 We also open with a note that the university operates through recu - perative logics to incorporate dissent: writing this article is a clear example of how difference and crises can actually be included in the official proj - ect of the accommodating state and legitimize existing and grotesquely uneven power relations. Critique, even of the university, is folded into the university’s mission of marketing itself, especially to the tuition-paying consumer. And yet it is our collective uneasy feelings, persistent questions, a slow burn, that propel us to write together, to study. At this political moment within the university, “mass incarceration” and its most recognizable constituents, the prisoner and the prison, are at a predictable tipping point: the violence of inclusion.9 Neoliberal multiculturalism appears capacious enough to hold select representations of mass incarceration in its pursuit of new markets and deft enough to deploy this difference to whitewash other forms of institutional violence: a sprinkling of liberal arts through an education program for some deserving prisoners appears just as the university mints new degree programs in counterterrorism studies and homeland security. In some university spaces, programs that claim to create pipelines from prison to university are funded and touted. Subfields, endowed chairs, and tenure-line faculty positions emerge—critical carceral studies, critical prison studies, critical criminology—to further investigate the problem of mass incarceration. Social justice centers and research clusters are funded (through state, tuition, and private donor dollars) to further urgent scholarship on our prison nation, to invoke Beth Richie’s term, and to posit solutions through university-based publications, convenings, and lectures.10 Again, the university deftly positions itself as the unique, meaningful, and necessary answer to the pressing question of the day: the prison.11 And yet, against this backdrop of energetically producing solutions, the university also continues and reproduces our carceral regime. Universities police dissent. Pro-Palestinian Boycott, Divestment, Sanctions groups and speakers on campuses are repeatedly silenced, and affiliated faculty and staff are sanctioned.12 Staff and other resources for departments accountable to community and university political movements—perhaps ethnic studies, Black studies, gender and sexuality studies—shrivel while budgets for campus sports and policing balloon. Labor organizing, particularly by contingent and service workers, who are most often women and/or people of color, is met with swift repression:13 as this article goes to press in the summer of 2020, the University of California continues to exploit, half starve, deport, surveil, evict, fire, and brutalize its striking graduate student instructors.14 Militarized campus police often harass and detain our people for walking while being a racialized and/or queer body. (The formerly incarcerated are especially targeted because of their precarious standing, including conviction histories and often parole and probation restrictions.) With stuffed budgets, criminology continues its algorithmic dystopia, its supposed study of the so-called criminal justice system, that draws nothing intelligible from either crime or justice in its epistemological or practical reasoning. This terrain is rife with contradictions, including the perception of an emergent and pivotal restructuring at the site of the prison and at the university —which themselves form competing hegemonic projects, or what Boggs and Mitchell term a “crisis consensus.”15 We are neither for nor against the university in its current formation, or we risk either repro - ducing the violence of the university or producing further evisceration of the public in late-stage capitalism, for example, fueling silos and devalu - ation through the marking of some forms of education as professional schools, including teacher’s colleges, or boosting the logics that natural - ize the legitimacy of private, restrictive-enrollment, and wealth-hoarding universities.16 We also recognize that during any crisis —engineered or otherwise —the historical bloc aims to reconfigure its balance of power between consent and coercion.17 And the effects, the residuals, of this reconfiguration never settle. Therefore, now, like always, is the queer time to study. As two inhabitants in the undercommons, we travel through and sometimes occupy critical university studies and critical prison studies. We speak on panels that highlight the experience of people impacted by systems. We give social justice lectures. One of us teaches in prison (and wrote about it). One of us is formerly incarcerated at the university (and wrote about it). We inhabit the subjectivities —once disposable, perhaps still slightly toxic —that in some contexts have currency in this political moment: formerly incarcerated graduate student, activist feminist scholar. Yet our allegiance and accountability are to movements that engender material redistributions and to the production and circulation of analysis and labor capable of cracking this political moment, even temporally, to free up more lives. We write from one place we inhabit, the university, not to fix or to solve or to address or to critique (in pursuit of the new) —from one place we inhabit, the university —but to make visible emergent lines and arrangements of power and resistance that inhibit and build abolition. We write in what Barbara Tomlinson and George Lipsitz might consider accompaniment:18 we write to find our people.

#### The alternative is to reject the aff in favor of an anticarcerative astronomical projects of dreaming – that’s necessary to imagine a world of collective flourishing past ongoing violence

Wang 18 [Jackie, writer, poet, musician, and academic whose writing has been published by Lies Journal, HTML Giant, and BOMBlog, PhD African-American Studies @ Harvard, “Carceral Capitalism”]// gcd

In the cracks of the prison, something bloomed. A field of wildflowers imposed on a night sky. Blood was coming. Joy and dread mingled there, infusing the air with a powerful sense of rapture and uncertainty What exalted frequency was discovered that night, then lost, when Governor Nelson Rockefeller ordered the police to put down the uprising? Blood was coming. The new world never arrived. How terrible it must have been for W. E. B. Du Bois to realize he had mistaken dusk for dawn, that darkness would follow and not the radiance of a new day—his people’s strivings rendered crepuscular. The dream of liberation collapsed in a heap of bloodstained rubble. Blood was coming. The drumming would not last. The prisoners would be punished for daring to glimpse the stars. Will those who have constructed this Hell ever wonder—What was it all for? The subordination of all life to these systems that hem us in. Why cover the sky? \* The Atacama Desert in Chile is so dry that dead bodies are preserved for posterity, and traces of ancient human communities remain unscathed, as though immortalized in amber. Because of its high elevation and lack of moisture, the skies above the Atacama Desert are completely clear, allowing for an unobstructed view of the stars. Over the years, scientists and astronomers have converged on this region to build powerful telescopes to observe the cosmos. Years after Attica, on another continent, political prisoners banished to the Atacama Desert by the U.S.-sponsored dictator Augusto Pinochet were observing the same stars from the confines of a prison camp. Patricio Guzmán [documentary director]: What did you feel watching the stars whilst in prison? Luís Henríquez [Chacabuco concentration camp survivor]: We all had a feeling ... … of great freedom. Observing the sky and the stars, marveling at the constellations, ... we felt completely free. The military banned the astronomy lessons. They were convinced that the prisoners could escape ... ... guided by the constellations. Guzmán: Luis’s dignity lies in his memory. He wasn’t able to escape, but, by communicating with the stars, he managed to preserve his inner freedom. —Nostalgia for the Light, 2010 return to the stars— to the question of why people feel free when looking up at the stars. Is it because, when we are communing with the stars, we become part of the Whole? The whole of Life— we feel ourselves as recycled matter and energy congealed in a temporary form a form that will not hold that will one day fall apart. What did they feel when they looked up at the night sky? Did the vastness produce a feeling of freedom? Did they remember—there is a world beyond the walls of this prison. Were they transported to their childhoods, to the mystery, to the first time they contemplated their place in the Whole? In his autobiography Dusk of Dawn, Du Bois wrote about race as a prison—one that could only be abolished through a material and spiritual revolution. Anticipating the arc of my book, he wrote that the immediate problem of his people was “the question of securing existence, of labor and income, of food and home, of spiritual independence and democratic control of the industrial process” but that it would not do to “concenter all effort on economic well-being”—that his people “must live and eat and strive, and still hold unfaltering commerce with the stars.” THE DEATH THAT IS NOT DEATH, BUT THE BIRTH OF EVERYTHING POSSIBLE What is prison? It is immobility. “Free man, you will always cherish the sea!” (Baudelaire). It is becoming more and more obvious that mobility is one of the signs of our times. To restrict a man for eleven years to surveying the same four or five square meters—which in the end become several thousand meters within the same four walls opened up by the imagination—would justify a young man if he wanted to go … where, for example? To China perhaps, and perhaps on foot. Jackson was this man and this imagination, and the space he traversed was quite real, a space from which he brought back observations and conclusions that strike a death blow to white America (by “America” I mean Europe too, and the world that strips all the rest, reduces it to the status of a disrespected labor force—yesterday’s colonies, today’s neocolonies). Jackson said this. He said it several thousand times and throughout the entire world. It still remained for him to say truths unbearable for our consciences. The better to silence him, the California police …. But what am I saying? Jackson’s book goes far beyond the reach of this police. —Jean Genet on George Jackson10 I can only be executed once. —George Jackson, Blood in My Eye11 Language has no body. The message is a virus. The message cannot be killed. A REMIX OF A STATEMENT BY HUEY P. NEWTON, SERVANT OF THE PEOPLE, BLACK PANTHER PARTY AT THE REVOLUTIONARY MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR GEORGE JACKSON: A revolutionary example cannot be killed The soldier and his spirit a living thing His spirit says, George’s body goes Although fallen See His ideas live In young bodies Our children are saying It’s true There will be revolution And on he will go to the next legacy We believe George’s immortality As generation upon generation advance We know the people We believe the people Into immortality we win Go on No matter how still How wrongly done The love no matter how wrongly This is pain giving up No pain in giving up And why he felt his life For his people Violence sorts spurs and contracts Every alive state costs someone the death course If it could give itself the semblance of executioners —We don’t We don’t have the kind of violence the police have We deliver to them the struggle of everything possible The audacity to accept the right to do everything To preserve George I see George growing in our suffering In thirty seconds there will be pain The prison order killing our stories won’t make our suffering die We say there will be pain But in all of us a strength growing For us An incredible will living in the pain we know I see two kinds of death One death is not death The other is death George died in a way not-death For in all of us there is George In our suffering there is George I see us die the not-death The day George fell is not his death The future will now know the way we will die Revolutionary death The way his mind determined the people’s name To change them wholly or else be a feather We’ll name people THE PEOPLE We’ll support the name In the name of the people, ALL POWER TO THE PEOPLE ALL POWER IMAGINATIONS HELD CAPTIVE First of all, I would say that prison is an accurate name for our contemporary culture, and prison as culture presumes a certain set of problems and reinforces a dominant reaction in our imaginations. Sylvia Wynter talks about reservation—which is also an accurate name for our contemporary culture—meaning that at the same moment indigenous people are confined to reservations by the state, our imaginations are also confined. All of us. And, I would also say that the moments in which prisons became a dominant feature of the U.S., our imaginations (for all, not just those of us disproportionately imprisoned) also became imprisoned. The way we imagine work, our relationships, the future, family, everything, is locked down. —Alexis Pauline Gumbs12 Everywhere I look I see sleepwalkers under the spell of the prison. What counter-spell is powerful enough to break the prison’s stranglehold on our imaginations? But the spell is never total. The intensification of the desire for life undermines the prison’s capacity to structure our mental lives. Imagination is excess, is that which could never be contained by the prison, that which will always exceed it. What night endeavors must we embrace to enter that hidden frequency—that special vibration, the one Sun Ra believed would set us free. THE DIALECTIC OF DREAMING The imagination is constitutive ... It’s not just unworldly, detached from the world spinning off the refusal of things, rather it’s constitutive in the sense that the imagination becomes so intense and embedded that it becomes real through its intensification and articulation. That puts theory in the realm of prophecy, but not prophecy in the realm of saying what’s going to happen. Instead, it’s the fostering of the imagination, the encouraging of that power to recognize that life can be, and in some ways already is, different. —Michael Hardt13 Dreams and reality are opposites. Action synthesizes them. —Assata Shakur14 Before Assata Shakur was liberated from prison, her grandmother and family came to visit her, bearing a dream: “You’re coming home soon,” her grandmother said. “I don’t know when it will be, but you’re coming home. You’re getting out of here. It won’t be too long, though.” She went on: “I dreamed we were in our old house in Jamaica … i was dressing you … putting your clothes on.” Assata’s grandmother was known for her prophetic dreams—they came when they were needed, but it was ultimately the responsibility of the recipients of the visions to make them real, not only by believing in the veracity of the prophecies, but by acting so as to give them flesh. When Assata returned to her prison cell, she could not help but dance and sing. She writes, “No amount of scientific, rational thinking could diminish the high that i felt. A tingly, giddy excitement had caught hold of me. I had gotten drunk on my family’s arrogant, carefree optimism. I literally danced in my cell, singing, ‘Feet, don’t fail me now.’ I sang the ‘feet’ part real low, so i guess the guards must have thought i was bugging out, stomping around my cage singing ‘feet,’ ‘feet.’” When we act in accordance with the prophetic dream, the dream comes to directly constitute reality.

## Case

### UV 1 Proper

#### The Purdy 20 evidence – [1] This isn’t the aff. The aff is not structural reform like this evidence but rather changes one small part of the PIC without questioning the fundamental underpinnings of US democracy – [2] Political debate is ineffective and reinforces the carceral state. It allows for the state to just make small concessions to prisoners while still engaging in mass incarceration.

#### The Delgado 87 evidence – **The idea of incremental piecemeal reform is just another attachment the idea that law enforcement is necessary**

Kolhatkar 21, Sonali Kolhatkar is currently the racial justice editor at YES! Media and a writing fellow with Independent Media Institute. She was previously a weekly columnist for Truthdig.com. “Abolition Through the Ages: Reform Versus Transformation, Then and Now”, 11/15/21, <https://www.yesmagazine.org/social-justice/2021/11/15/abolition-reform-vs-transformation>, apark 10/10/21

Abolitionist movements against modern policing see a split similar to their historic counterparts between reformist and transformational approaches. Campaigns like #8CantWait are pushing for short-term policy changes, such as bans on chokeholds, which organizers believe will immediately reduce police brutality. But, as veterans of abolition movements of prison and policing have noted, reforms have been tried and have simply not worked. Although Rodriguez delights in the fact that more people than ever are embracing abolitionist viewpoints on policing, he worries about expropriation by the “abolition-curious.” Rodriguez says he’s even seen some people take to using the term “**incremental abolitionism**,” which he sees as ultimately “counter-abolitionist.” Rodriguez decries the fact that even among those who have embraced the idea of “defunding the police,” there is a reformist tendency to see law enforcement as a necessary, if less important, part of society. “There is a kind of stubborn loyalty,” he says, to viewing law enforcement and incarceration as among those “forms of power that actually provide social order.” Like their historic counterparts, Rodriguez and other abolitionists want to broaden the currently accepted mainstream definition of justice and security. There are persistent systems of discrimination in access to food, housing, health, and education along racial lines, and yet governments at every level—federal, state, and local—have often invested more heavily in policing and incarceration. Those investments only serve to reproduce the historic power dynamics this nation has seen in centuries past between enslavers and those enslaved. Instead, says Rodriguez, the idea of “security,” which is what we are told policing and the carceral system provides, needs to be redefined to include basic needs such as housing and food security, health and emotional security, and recreational and educational security. “If you look at the long history of abolitionist movements,” he says, “that’s in part what people were struggling for.”