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## 1

**Interp: The affirmative must only defend the hypothetical enactment of the resolution “Resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike ”**

**Resolved means a policy**

**Find Law Legal Dictionary** <https://dictionary.findlaw.com/definition/resolve.html> //SR

2 : a legal or official determination

**A worker is an employee that works under a contract for employment.**

**Quest n.d.** [(Quest, based in Leicestershire, but covering the whole of the UK, is a specialist and training solutions, delivering bespoke professional services with resounding results. With over two decades of experience, Quest make it their responsibility to fully understand your specific needs before personalising a tailored solution to ensure that your HR, Health and Safety and training solution complements your business plan and achieves your goals.) “Employees & Workers: The Difference Between a Worker and an Employee” Quest. N.d.] AW

A worker is defined as either an employee working under a Contract for Employment or someone who works under a contract other than a Contract of Employment and is offering his personal service in return for remuneration to the employer who is not his/her client or customer. These contracts are commonly called Contracts for Services and such workers are often referred to as non-employee workers.

**Strike**

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/strike>

: a period of time when workers stop work in order to force an employer to agree to their demands

**Violation: extra t–they MAY get offense and shift a nomadic mindset shift–hold em to cx no shiftiness yk this is non t**

**Vote neg for limits: their model has no resolutional bound and creates the possibility for literally an infinite number of 1ACs. Not debating the topic allows someone to specialize in one area of the library for 4 years giving them a huge edge over people who switch research focus ever 2 months. Cutting negs to every possible aff wrecks small schools, which has a disparate impact on under-resourced and minority debaters. Counter-interpretations are arbitrary, unpredictable, and don’t solve the world of neg prep because there’s no grounding in the resolution**

**Fairness outweighs –**

**[1] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is a game that requires rules to evaluate it--it ensures a structure to make their aff heard and to deny fairness’s value is a performative contradiction since you obviously cared about other rules such as speech times. If fairness didn’t matter, you should just hack against them and evaluate their arguments unfairly, making responses circular**

**[2] Link turns their education offense – getting to the third and fourth level of tactical engagement is only possible with refined and well-researched positions connected to the resolutional mechanism. Repeated debates over core issues incentivize innovative argument production and improved advocacy based on feedback and nuanced responses from opponents.**

**[3] Probability – The role of individual debate rounds on broader subject formation is white noise – can you remember what happened in (this round)? – individual rounds don’t affect our subjectivity, so fairness is the only impact your ballot can resolve. You should presume all their truth claims false because they have not been properly tested**

**Terminal defense to their model –**

**[1] TVA solves - just don’t read the performative stuff for the ballot. Disads to the TVA prove it true since it proves there is neg ground**

**[2] SSD solves - read it when you negate for the same content education**

**[3] Discuss your aff out of round when people are willing to listen and not make bad arguments for the W**

**Drop the debater for deterrence since the round has already been skewed. Competing interps--reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom. Even if their aff is answerable, the ones they incentivize are not which means you presume the worst possible affs because people inevitably want to be as abusive as possible for the win and they create a model of self care. No rvi’s or impact turns -**

**[1] they’d purposefully be abusive to bait us into reading bad arguments and can drill it a lot chilling us from checking abuse**

**[2] You shouldn’t win for being T - if you win T is a bad thing then its at most just a reason we should drop it to let us learn from our mistakes**

**[3] Only reason we read T is because we were pigeonholed and had nothing else to read**

## 2

**Counterplan: A just government ought to recognize the rights of its people to strike by adopting a deterritorialized form of possession and a nomadic property model to create a commons, where Daoist models of creativity and ownership can thrive except in the instance that strikes directly demand discrimination towards certain groups or individuals**

**BPSC** [Unfair Labor Practices by Union, http://bpscllc.com/unfair-labor-practices-by-unions.html, N.D., Business & People Strategy Consulting Group, California's trusted source for workplace human resources and employment law] [SS]

Causing or Attempting to Cause Discrimination: Section 8(b)(2) makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee in violation of Section 8(a)(3). The section is violated by agreements or arrangements with employers, other than lawful union-security agreements, that condition employment or job benefits on union membership, on the performance of union membership obligations or on arbitrary grounds. But union action that causes detriment to an individual employee does not violate Section 8(b)(2) if it is consistent with nondiscriminatory provisions of a bargaining contract negotiated for the benefit of the total bargaining unit, or if the action is based on some other legitimate purpose. A union’s conduct, accompanied by statements advising or suggesting that action is expected of an employer, may be enough to find a violation of this section if the union’s action can be shown to be a causal factor in the employer’s discrimination. Contracts or informal arrangements with a union under which an employer gives preferential treatment to union members also violate Section 8(b)(2). However, an employer and a union may agree that the employer will hire new employees exclusively through the union hiring hall if there is no discrimination against nonunion members on the basis of union membership obligations. In setting referral standards, a union may consider legitimate aims such as sharing available work and easing the impact of local unemployment. The union may also charge referral fees if the amount of the fee is reasonably related to the cost of operating the referral service. A union that attempts to force an employer to enter into an illegal union-security agreement, or that enters into and keeps in effect such an agreement, also violates Section 8(b)(2), as does a union that attempts to enforce such an illegal agreement by bringing about an employee’s discharge. Even when a union-security provision of a bargaining contract meets all statutory requirements, a union may not lawfully require the discharge of employees under the provision unless they were informed of the union-security agreement and their specific obligation under it. A union violates Section 8(b)(2) if it tries to use the union-security provisions of a contract to collect payments other than those lawfully required, such as assessments, fines and penalties. Other examples of Section 8(b)(2) violations include: Causing an employer to discharge employees because they circulated a petition urging a change in the union’s method of selecting shop stewards Causing an employer to discharge employees because they made speeches against a contract proposed by the union Making a contract that requires an employer to hire only members of the union or employees “satisfactory” to the union Causing an employer to reduce employees’ seniority because they engaged in anti-union acts Refusing referral or giving preference on the basis of race or union activities when making job referrals to units represented by the union Seeking the discharge of an employee under a union-security agreement for failure to pay a fine levied by the union

**Racist union strikes have happened before and limit the creativity of those oppressed**

Allison **Keyes**, JUNE 30, **2017**, "The East St. Louis Race Riot Left Dozens Dead, Devastating a Community on the Rise," Smithsonian Magazine, https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/east-st-louis-race-riot-left-dozens-dead-devastating-community-on-the-rise-180963885/ //SR

Racial tensions began simmering in East St. Louis—a city where thousands of blacks had moved from the South to work in war factories—as early as February 1917. The African-American population was 6,000 in 1910 and nearly double that by 1917. In the spring, the largely white workforce at the Aluminum Ore Company went on strike. Hundreds of blacks were hired. After a City Council meeting on May 28, angry white workers lodged formal complaints against black migrants. When word of an attempted robbery of a white man by an armed black man spread through the city, mobs started beating any African-Americans they found, even pulling individuals off of streetcars and trolleys. The National Guard was called in but dispersed in June.

## 3

#### Pleasure and pain are intrinsic value and disvalue – everything else regresses.

**Blum et al. 18** [Kenneth Blum, 1Department of Psychiatry, Boonshoft School of Medicine, Dayton VA Medical Center, Wright State University, Dayton, OH, USA 2Department of Psychiatry, McKnight Brain Institute, University of Florida College of Medicine, Gainesville, FL, USA 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA 5Department of Precision Medicine, Geneus Health LLC, San Antonio, TX, USA 6Department of Addiction Research & Therapy, Nupathways Inc., Innsbrook, MO, USA 7Department of Clinical Neurology, Path Foundation, New York, NY, USA 8Division of Neuroscience-Based Addiction Therapy, The Shores Treatment & Recovery Center, Port Saint Lucie, FL, USA 9Institute of Psychology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary 10Division of Addiction Research, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC. North Kingston, RI, USA 11Victory Nutrition International, Lederach, PA., USA 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA, Marjorie Gondré-Lewis, 12National Human Genome Center at Howard University, Washington, DC., USA 13Departments of Anatomy and Psychiatry, Howard University College of Medicine, Washington, DC US, Bruce Steinberg, 4Division of Applied Clinical Research & Education, Dominion Diagnostics, LLC, North Kingstown, RI, USA, Igor Elman, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, David Baron, 3Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Keck Medicine University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, USA, Edward J Modestino, 14Department of Psychology, Curry College, Milton, MA, USA, Rajendra D Badgaiyan, 15Department Psychiatry, Cooper University School of Medicine, Camden, NJ, USA, Mark S Gold 16Department of Psychiatry, Washington University, St. Louis, MO, USA, “Our evolved unique pleasure circuit makes humans different from apes: Reconsideration of data derived from animal studies”, U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 28 February 2018, accessed: 19 August 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6446569/>] R.S.

Pleasure is not only one of the three primary reward functions but it also defines reward. As homeostasis explains the functions of only a limited number of rewards, the principal reason why particular stimuli, objects, events, situations, and activities are rewarding may be due to pleasure. This applies first of all to sex and to the primary homeostatic rewards of food and liquid and extends to money, taste, beauty, social encounters and nonmaterial, internally set, and intrinsic rewards. Pleasure, as the primary effect of rewards, drives the prime reward functions of learning, approach behavior, and decision making and provides the basis for hedonic theories of reward function. We are attracted by most rewards and exert intense efforts to obtain them, just because they are enjoyable [10].  Pleasure is a passive reaction that derives from the experience or prediction of reward and may lead to a long-lasting state of happiness. The word happiness is difficult to define. In fact, just obtaining physical pleasure may not be enough. One key to happiness involves a network of good friends. However, it is not obvious how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to an ice cream cone, or to your team winning a sporting event. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure [14].  Pleasure as a hallmark of reward is sufficient for defining a reward, but it may not be necessary. A reward may generate positive learning and approach behavior simply because it contains substances that are essential for body function. When we are hungry, we may eat bad and unpleasant meals. A monkey who receives hundreds of small drops of water every morning in the laboratory is unlikely to feel a rush of pleasure every time it gets the 0.1 ml. Nevertheless, with these precautions in mind, we may define any stimulus, object, event, activity, or situation that has the potential to produce pleasure as a reward. In the context of reward deficiency or for disorders of addiction, homeostasis pursues pharmacological treatments: drugs to treat drug addiction, obesity, and other compulsive behaviors. The theory of allostasis suggests broader approaches - such as re-expanding the range of possible pleasures and providing opportunities to expend effort in their pursuit. [15]. It is noteworthy, the first animal studies eliciting approach behavior by electrical brain stimulation interpreted their findings as a discovery of the brain’s pleasure centers [16] which were later partly associated with midbrain dopamine neurons [17–19] despite the notorious difficulties of identifying emotions in animals.  Evolutionary theories of pleasure: The love connection BO:D  Charles Darwin and other biological scientists that have examined the biological evolution and its basic principles found various mechanisms that steer behavior and biological development. Besides their theory on natural selection, it was particularly the sexual selection process that gained significance in the latter context over the last century, especially when it comes to the question of what makes us “what we are,” i.e., human. However, the capacity to sexually select and evolve is not at all a human accomplishment alone or a sign of our uniqueness; yet, we humans, as it seems, are ingenious in fooling ourselves and others–when we are in love or desperately search for it.  It is well established that modern biological theory conjectures that organisms are the result of evolutionary competition. In fact, Richard Dawkins stresses gene survival and propagation as the basic mechanism of life [20]. Only genes that lead to the fittest phenotype will make it. It is noteworthy that the phenotype is selected based on behavior that maximizes gene propagation. To do so, the phenotype must survive and generate offspring, and be better at it than its competitors. Thus, the ultimate, distal function of rewards is to increase evolutionary fitness by ensuring the survival of the organism and reproduction. It is agreed that learning, approach, economic decisions, and positive emotions are the proximal functions through which phenotypes obtain other necessary nutrients for survival, mating, and care for offspring.  Behavioral reward functions have evolved to help individuals to survive and propagate their genes. Apparently, people need to live well and long enough to reproduce. Most would agree that homo-sapiens do so by ingesting the substances that make their bodies function properly. For this reason, foods and drinks are rewards. Additional rewards, including those used for economic exchanges, ensure sufficient palatable food and drink supply. Mating and gene propagation is supported by powerful sexual attraction. Additional properties, like body form, augment the chance to mate and nourish and defend offspring and are therefore also rewards. Care for offspring until they can reproduce themselves helps gene propagation and is rewarding; otherwise, many believe mating is useless. According to David E Comings, as any small edge will ultimately result in evolutionary advantage [21], additional reward mechanisms like novelty seeking and exploration widen the spectrum of available rewards and thus enhance the chance for survival, reproduction, and ultimate gene propagation. These functions may help us to obtain the benefits of distant rewards that are determined by our own interests and not immediately available in the environment. Thus the distal reward function in gene propagation and evolutionary fitness defines the proximal reward functions that we see in everyday behavior. That is why foods, drinks, mates, and offspring are rewarding. There have been theories linking pleasure as a required component of health benefits salutogenesis, (salugenesis). In essence, under these terms, pleasure is described as a state or feeling of happiness and satisfaction resulting from an experience that one enjoys. Regarding pleasure, it is a double-edged sword, on the one hand, it promotes positive feelings (like mindfulness) and even better cognition, possibly through the release of dopamine [22]. But on the other hand, pleasure simultaneously encourages addiction and other negative behaviors, i.e., motivational toxicity. It is a complex neurobiological phenomenon, relying on reward circuitry or limbic activity. It is important to realize that through the “Brain Reward Cascade” (BRC) endorphin and endogenous morphinergic mechanisms may play a role [23]. While natural rewards are essential for survival and appetitive motivation leading to beneficial biological behaviors like eating, sex, and reproduction, crucial social interactions seem to further facilitate the positive effects exerted by pleasurable experiences. Indeed, experimentation with addictive drugs is capable of directly acting on reward pathways and causing deterioration of these systems promoting hypodopaminergia [24]. Most would agree that pleasurable activities can stimulate personal growth and may help to induce healthy behavioral changes, including stress management [25]. The work of Esch and Stefano [26] concerning the link between compassion and love implicate the brain reward system, and pleasure induction suggests that social contact in general, i.e., love, attachment, and compassion, can be highly effective in stress reduction, survival, and overall health.  Understanding the role of neurotransmission and pleasurable states both positive and negative have been adequately studied over many decades [26–37], but comparative anatomical and neurobiological function between animals and homo sapiens appear to be required and seem to be in an infancy stage.  Finding happiness is different between apes and humans  As stated earlier in this expert opinion one key to happiness involves a network of good friends [38]. However, it is not entirely clear exactly how the higher forms of satisfaction and pleasure are related to a sugar rush, winning a sports event or even sky diving, all of which augment dopamine release at the reward brain site. Recent multidisciplinary research, using both humans and detailed invasive brain analysis of animals has discovered some critical ways that the brain processes pleasure.  Remarkably, there are pathways for ordinary liking and pleasure, which are limited in scope as described above in this commentary. However, there are many brain regions, often termed hot and cold spots, that significantly modulate (increase or decrease) our pleasure or even produce the opposite of pleasure— that is disgust and fear [39]. One specific region of the nucleus accumbens is organized like a computer keyboard, with particular stimulus triggers in rows— producing an increase and decrease of pleasure and disgust. Moreover, the cortex has unique roles in the cognitive evaluation of our feelings of pleasure [40]. Importantly, the interplay of these multiple triggers and the higher brain centers in the prefrontal cortex are very intricate and are just being uncovered.  Desire and reward centers  It is surprising that many different sources of pleasure activate the same circuits between the mesocorticolimbic regions (Figure 1). Reward and desire are two aspects pleasure induction and have a very widespread, large circuit. Some part of this circuit distinguishes between desire and dread. The so-called pleasure circuitry called “REWARD” involves a well-known dopamine pathway in the mesolimbic system that can influence both pleasure and motivation.  In simplest terms, the well-established mesolimbic system is a dopamine circuit for reward. It starts in the ventral tegmental area (VTA) of the midbrain and travels to the nucleus accumbens (Figure 2). It is the cornerstone target to all addictions. The VTA is encompassed with neurons using glutamate, GABA, and dopamine. The nucleus accumbens (NAc) is located within the ventral striatum and is divided into two sub-regions—the motor and limbic regions associated with its core and shell, respectively. The NAc has spiny neurons that receive dopamine from the VTA and glutamate (a dopamine driver) from the hippocampus, amygdala and medial prefrontal cortex. Subsequently, the NAc projects GABA signals to an area termed the ventral pallidum (VP). The region is a relay station in the limbic loop of the basal ganglia, critical for motivation, behavior, emotions and the “Feel Good” response. This defined system of the brain is involved in all addictions –substance, and non –substance related. In 1995, our laboratory coined the term “Reward Deficiency Syndrome” (RDS) to describe genetic and epigenetic induced hypodopaminergia in the “Brain Reward Cascade” that contribute to addiction and compulsive behaviors [3,6,41].  Furthermore, ordinary “liking” of something, or pure pleasure, is represented by small regions mainly in the limbic system (old reptilian part of the brain). These may be part of larger neural circuits. In Latin, hedus is the term for “sweet”; and in Greek, hodone is the term for “pleasure.” Thus, the word Hedonic is now referring to various subcomponents of pleasure: some associated with purely sensory and others with more complex emotions involving morals, aesthetics, and social interactions. The capacity to have pleasure is part of being healthy and may even extend life, especially if linked to optimism as a dopaminergic response [42].  Psychiatric illness often includes symptoms of an abnormal inability to experience pleasure, referred to as anhedonia. A negative feeling state is called dysphoria, which can consist of many emotions such as pain, depression, anxiety, fear, and disgust. Previously many scientists used animal research to uncover the complex mechanisms of pleasure, liking, motivation and even emotions like panic and fear, as discussed above [43]. However, as a significant amount of related research about the specific brain regions of pleasure/reward circuitry has been derived from invasive studies of animals, these cannot be directly compared with subjective states experienced by humans.  In an attempt to resolve the controversy regarding the causal contributions of mesolimbic dopamine systems to reward, we have previously evaluated the three-main competing explanatory categories: “liking,” “learning,” and “wanting” [3]. That is, dopamine may mediate (a) liking: the hedonic impact of reward, (b) learning: learned predictions about rewarding effects, or (c) wanting: the pursuit of rewards by attributing incentive salience to reward-related stimuli [44]. We have evaluated these hypotheses, especially as they relate to the RDS, and we find that the incentive salience or “wanting” hypothesis of dopaminergic functioning is supported by a majority of the scientific evidence. Various neuroimaging studies have shown that anticipated behaviors such as sex and gaming, delicious foods and drugs of abuse all affect brain regions associated with reward networks, and may not be unidirectional. Drugs of abuse enhance dopamine signaling which sensitizes mesolimbic brain mechanisms that apparently evolved explicitly to attribute incentive salience to various rewards [45].  Addictive substances are voluntarily self-administered, and they enhance (directly or indirectly) dopaminergic synaptic function in the NAc. This activation of the brain reward networks (producing the ecstatic “high” that users seek). Although these circuits were initially thought to encode a set point of hedonic tone, it is now being considered to be far more complicated in function, also encoding attention, reward expectancy, disconfirmation of reward expectancy, and incentive motivation [46]. The argument about addiction as a disease may be confused with a predisposition to substance and nonsubstance rewards relative to the extreme effect of drugs of abuse on brain neurochemistry. The former sets up an individual to be at high risk through both genetic polymorphisms in reward genes as well as harmful epigenetic insult. Some Psychologists, even with all the data, still infer that addiction is not a disease [47]. Elevated stress levels, together with polymorphisms (genetic variations) of various dopaminergic genes and the genes related to other neurotransmitters (and their genetic variants), and may have an additive effect on vulnerability to various addictions [48]. In this regard, Vanyukov, et al. [48] suggested based on review that whereas the gateway hypothesis does not specify mechanistic connections between “stages,” and does not extend to the risks for addictions the concept of common liability to addictions may be more parsimonious. The latter theory is grounded in genetic theory and supported by data identifying common sources of variation in the risk for specific addictions (e.g., RDS). This commonality has identifiable neurobiological substrate and plausible evolutionary explanations.  Over many years the controversy of dopamine involvement in especially “pleasure” has led to confusion concerning separating motivation from actual pleasure (wanting versus liking) [49]. We take the position that animal studies cannot provide real clinical information as described by self-reports in humans. As mentioned earlier and in the abstract, on November 23rd, 2017, evidence for our concerns was discovered [50]  In essence, although nonhuman primate brains are similar to our own, the disparity between other primates and those of human cognitive abilities tells us that surface similarity is not the whole story. Sousa et al. [50] small case found various differentially expressed genes, to associate with pleasure related systems. Furthermore, the dopaminergic interneurons located in the human neocortex were absent from the neocortex of nonhuman African apes. Such differences in neuronal transcriptional programs may underlie a variety of neurodevelopmental disorders.  In simpler terms, the system controls the production of dopamine, a chemical messenger that plays a significant role in pleasure and rewards. The senior author, Dr. Nenad Sestan from Yale, stated: “Humans have evolved a dopamine system that is different than the one in chimpanzees.” This may explain why the behavior of humans is so unique from that of non-human primates, even though our brains are so surprisingly similar, Sestan said: “It might also shed light on why people are vulnerable to mental disorders such as autism (possibly even addiction).” Remarkably, this research finding emerged from an extensive, multicenter collaboration to compare the brains across several species. These researchers examined 247 specimens of neural tissue from six humans, five chimpanzees, and five macaque monkeys. Moreover, these investigators analyzed which genes were turned on or off in 16 regions of the brain. While the differences among species were subtle, there was a remarkable contrast in the neocortices, specifically in an area of the brain that is much more developed in humans than in chimpanzees. In fact, these researchers found that a gene called tyrosine hydroxylase (TH) for the enzyme, responsible for the production of dopamine, was expressed in the neocortex of humans, but not chimpanzees. As discussed earlier, dopamine is best known for its essential role within the brain’s reward system; the very system that responds to everything from sex, to gambling, to food, and to addictive drugs. However, dopamine also assists in regulating emotional responses, memory, and movement. Notably, abnormal dopamine levels have been linked to disorders including Parkinson’s, schizophrenia and spectrum disorders such as autism and addiction or RDS.  Nora Volkow, the director of NIDA, pointed out that one alluring possibility is that the neurotransmitter dopamine plays a substantial role in humans’ ability to pursue various rewards that are perhaps months or even years away in the future. This same idea has been suggested by Dr. Robert Sapolsky, a professor of biology and neurology at Stanford University. Dr. Sapolsky cited evidence that dopamine levels rise dramatically in humans when we anticipate potential rewards that are uncertain and even far off in our futures, such as retirement or even the possible alterlife. This may explain what often motivates people to work for things that have no apparent short-term benefit [51]. In similar work, Volkow and Bale [52] proposed a model in which dopamine can favor NOW processes through phasic signaling in reward circuits or LATER processes through tonic signaling in control circuits. Specifically, they suggest that through its modulation of the orbitofrontal cortex, which processes salience attribution, dopamine also enables shilting from NOW to LATER, while its modulation of the insula, which processes interoceptive information, influences the probability of selecting NOW versus LATER actions based on an individual’s physiological state. This hypothesis further supports the concept that disruptions along these circuits contribute to diverse pathologies, including obesity and addiction or RDS.

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing. To clarify, hedonistic act util

#### [1] Actor Spec - Governments must aggregate since every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action and states don’t have intents

#### [2] Extinction outweighs

**MacAskill 14** [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.

#### [3] Epistemic modesty--45 minutes isn’t enough to reach a conclusion about thousands of years of debate--EM is most realistic and gives each theory the credence it deserves

## 4

**We endorse the 1ac minus their defense of the topic**

**Transportation Strikes are low now due to Federal Strike Bans.**

**Bauernschuster et Al 17**, Stefan, Timo Hener, and Helmut Rainer. "When labor disputes bring cities to a standstill: The impact of public transit strikes on traffic, accidents, air pollution, and health." American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 9.1 (2017): 1-37. (Faculty of Business Administration and Economics, University of Passau, Innstra)//Elmer

New York City's Taylor Law, which was put into effect in response to a transit strike in 1966, represents an example of a particularly draconian measure. Under Section 210, the law prohibits any strike or other concerted stoppage 01 worn or slowdown by public employees (Division of Local Government Services 2009). Instead, it prescribes binding arbitration by a state agency to resolve bargaining deadlocks between unions and employers. Violations against the prohibition on strikes are punishable with hefty penalties. The fine for an individual worker is twice the striking employee's salary for each day the strike lasts. In addition, union leaders face imprisonment. Since its inception in 1967, the Taylor Law has generated a lot of controversy. To proponents, it was successful in averting several potential transit strikes that would have imposed significant costs on the city and its inhabitants (OECD 2007). Indeed, New York City has only seen two transit strikes over the past four decades—in 1980 and in 2005. In both cases, harsh monetary penalties were imposed on workers and unions. The 2005 transit strike additionally led to the imprisonment of a union leader, and saw the Transport Workers Union (TWU) filing a formal complaint with the ILO. Since then, the ILO has urged the United States government to restore the right of transit workers to strike, arguing that they do not provide essential services justifying a strike ban (Committee on Freedom of Association 2011, 775). So far, the Taylor Law has not been amended in this direction.

**Transit Strikes cause mass damage that far outweighs any benefits – specifically causes high Air Pollution by causing shifts to Personal Traffic.**

**Bauernschuster et Al 17**, Stefan, Timo Hener, and Helmut Rainer. "When labor disputes bring cities to a standstill: The impact of public transit strikes on traffic, accidents, air pollution, and health." American Economic Journal: Economic Policy 9.1 (2017): 1-37. (Faculty of Business Administration and Economics, University of Passau, Innstra)//Elmer

This paper aims to answer two questions that are at the heart of the Taylor Law controversy and similar debates elsewhere: Do strikes in the public transportation sector cause disruptions that endanger the safety and health of urban populations? And how large are the costs of transit strikes to noninvolved third parties? To get at these questions, our analysis uses time series and cross-sectional variation in powerful registry data to quantify the effects of public transit strikes in five domains: traffic volumes, travel times, accident risk, pollution emissions, and health (see Figure 1). The context for our study are the five largest cities in Germany, which provides us with an ideal setting. In particular, in contrast to countries that have imposed de jure restrictions on public transit strikes, German courts de facto protect the right to strike in this sector. As a consequence, Germany regularly faces strikes by transit workers. Our analysis exploits 71 one-day strikes in public transportation over the period from 2002 to 2011. We identify the daily effects of these strikes using both time series and cross-sectional variation in our data. In a first step, we estimate the impact on the total length of time that cars are in operation (henceforth, total car hours operated). To do so, we make use of two data sources. First, we use hourly informa tion from official traffic monitors to estimate the effect of transit strikes on traffic volumes. Second, we use congestion data based on GPS speed measurements from TomTom, a global supplier of navigation and location products and services, to esti mate the effect on travel times. Combining the two estimates allows us to compute the effect on total car hours operated. In a second step, we explore likely knock-on consequences by expanding the analysis in three directions. First, we assess the impact of strikes on the incidence and severity of car accidents using detailed regis ter data, which includes all vehicle crashes recorded by the German police. Second, to investigate the effect on atmospheric pollution, we draw on hourly data from official air monitors. Third, we explore the effect on human health using register data, which includes information about all patients admitted to all German hospi tals. Our identification strategy is based on a generalized difference-in-differences approach. It flexibly captures daytime and day-of-week patterns, seasonality effects, and long-run time trends, which are all allowed to vary by city. What emerges is a picture of remarkable consistency. During the morning peak of a strike day, total car hours operated increase by 11 to 13 percent. This increase can be decomposed into two separate effects: a 2.5 to 4.3 percent increase in the number of cars on roads and a 8.4 percent increase in travel times. In addition, our results suggest that transit strikes pose a non-negligible threat to public safety and public health. We find a 14 percent increase in the number of vehicle crashes, which is accompanied by a 20 percent increase in accident-related personal injuries. Moreover, we observe that transit strikes have sizable effects on ambient air pollution. Emissions of particulate matter increase by 14 percent, while nitrogen dioxide concentrations in ambient air increase by 4 percent. Finally, analyzing health out comes related to air pollution, we find that young children are subject to negative health effects. Among this subgroup, hospital admissions for respiratory diseases increase by 11 percent on strike days. The costs of strikes—both to the parties directly involved in a dispute and to the public at large—have been the subject of extensive research since the mid-twentieth century. Until the 1990s, the main conclusion of the literature was that strikes impose significant financial costs on the workers and the firm directly involved in walkouts, but only negligible costs in most cases on non-involved third parties (Kaufmann 1992). Our study firmly rejects this conclusion: based on our estimates, the increase in aggregate travel time caused by a single strike corresponds to 1,550 full-time equivalent work weeks. This translates into third-party congestion costs of €3.2 million per strike or €228.9 million for all 71 strikes in our sample. Our work complements a small but impressive literature in economics analyzing the impact of strikes. Focusing on the hospital sector, Gruber and Kleiner (2012) investigate the effects of nurses' strikes on patient outcomes. After controlling for time and hospital specific heterogeneity, they observe increased mortality and read mission rates, and conclude that strikes in hospitals kill.3 Examining walkouts in the education sector, Belot and Webbink (2010) and Baker (2013) find that teacher strikes had negative effects on student achievement in Belgium and Canada. Finally, there are a few interesting studies of strike impact in the private sector. Krueger and Mas (2004) show that strikes in tire production facilities decreased the quality of tires resulting in an increase of fatal accidents. In a similar vein, Mas (2008) finds that strikes at Caterpillar led to lower product quality. In comparison to other strikes that have been studied in the literature, there is one specific aspect about urban public transport that makes it an intriguing case to study: the population at risk from strikes is potentially very large and likely to be affected along multiple dimensions. This is due to several interrelated facts: (i) in many advanced cities, the two major modes of transportation are private vehicles and public transit; (ii) urban public transport is typically provided under monopoly conditions—either by public sector companies or by operators working under licenses granted by public authorities; (iii) without the availability of a close substitute, public transit strikes are likely to significantly disrupt the normal travel of transit riders and disturb traffic patterns by increasing the use of private vehicles; (iv) two of the main externalities associated with an increase in the usage of private cars are traffic accidents and air pollution, and entire city populations—not just transit users—may be adversely affected in each of these areas when public transport shuts down. Quantifying these potential impacts is not just interesting in itself, but also an important ingredient to meaningful discussions about the regulation of labor relations in sectors providing services regarded as public or essential.4 The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section I provides the institutional setting and discusses how transit strikes might affect cities and their inhabitants. Section II describes the data. Section III outlines the empirical strategy, followed by the results in Section IV. Section V discusses the size of the effects by monetizing the third party costs of transit strikes and comparing them to the private costs of struck employers. Background A. The Role of Public Transit and the Regulation of Labor Relations The five largest German cities, home to roughly 8.2 million people, are characterized by an intensive use of public transportation. In 2013, Berlin, Hamburg, Munich, Cologne, and Frankfurt together accounted for a total number of 3.4 billion public transit users in their metropolitan areas.5 This corresponds to an average 9.3 million passengers a day. In Berlin, the German capital, roughly 43 percent of commuters use public transit, while about 38 percent travel by car (Wingerter 2014). Public transportation networks are extensive in all sample cities. In Hamburg, for example, the transportation network comprises 91 subway stations, 68 suburban train stations (S-Bahn), more than 1,300 bus stops connecting a network of nearly 1,200 km in a city with less than 2 million inhabitants. The importance of public transportation in major German cities is comparable to the role it plays in the largest city in the United States. New York City has a population of roughly 8.4 million people. In 2014, its Metropolitan Transportation Authority moved about 9 million riders per day or 3.3 billion passengers a year on subways, buses, and railroads.6 Approximately 56 percent of commuters in New York City use public transit, while about 27 percent travel by car.7 While the use of mass transit in New York City and major German cities is com parable, the regulation of labor relations in the public transportation sector differs markedly. As mentioned above, New York City's Taylor Law prohibits strikes by transit workers under the threat of harsh penalties. Other cities in the United States with no-transit-strike laws include Chicago, Boston, and Washington, DC. For a German, it must come as a surprise that many countries impose de jure restrictions on strikes in the public transportation sector. Indeed, in Germany, the right to strike is a fundamental right based on the Freedom of Association (Koalitionsfreiheit) as laid out in Article 9(3) of the constitution (Grundgesetz). Only civil servants, judges, and soldiers are excluded from the right to strike. Until the 1990s, the big infra structure industries—i.e., telecommunications, postal, and public transportation ser vices—were state monopolies. Workers in these industries had civil servant status and thus were not allowed to strike. However, when these industries were gradually privatized during the 1990s, newly hired workers were no longer given civil servant status and therefore gained the right to strike. Today, public transit workers, whether employed by Germany's rail operator Deutsche Bahn or local public transport providers, are allowed to engage in industrial action. The only de facto restriction on transit workers' right to strike is that the parties of an industrial conflict are responsible for the provision of a minimum service (Klaß et al. 2008). This is intended to act as a balance of their interests with those of non-involved third parties.8 In Germany, industrial action by transit workers is typically announced one day ahead of a strike. However, at that time, there is still substantial uncertainty as to exactly which services will be affected and to what degree. Thus, the actual extent of a strike cannot be clearly assessed prior to the start of a strike. The strikes we exploit in this study have the following feature in common: they do not shutdown the entire transportation system, but there are significant distortions in terms of service frequency. As a rule of thumb, at least one-third and up to two-thirds of all connections in affected cities are canceled or severely delayed on strike days. After the official end of a strike, it usually takes some hours until service is back to normal. Having described the context and setting of our study, we now go on to discuss how urban populations might be affected by public transit strikes. B. Public Transit Strikes and Car Traffic Given the intensive use of public transportation in major German cities, we expect strikes by transit workers to have profound short-run effects on the mode of transport of commuters. Some might feel forced to use their private car or motorbike or a taxi on strike days. Others might switch to their bike or just walk. Again others might postpone their journey. Van Exel and Rietveld (2001) summarize the existing evidence as follows: public transit strikes induce most public transit users to switch to the car (either as driver or passenger) and as a result traffic density as well as road congestion increases. A similar conclusion is reached by Anderson (2014), who ana lyzes freeway traffic during a 35-day strike by transit workers in Los Angeles. His estimations reveal an increase in delays during peak periods by almost 50 percent due to increased car traffic.9 Finally, Adler and van Ommeren (2015) exploit transit strikes in Rotterdam and also find positive effects of transit shutdowns on congestion. Based on these findings we formulate our first testable prediction. PREDICTION 1: Public transit strikes increase the number of cars on roads, especially during peak periods. Travel times increase due to rising traffic congestion. C. Car Traffic and Accidents The frequency and severity of road accidents depends on several traffic characteristics that may be affected by public transit strikes. Examples we have in mind include the number of cars in road systems, driving skills, driver behavior, and speed. First, an often-used specification by transport economists suggests that the expected number of road accidents rises with the number of potential accidents which, in turn, is an increasing function of the number of cars in the system (Shefer and Rietveld 1997). Edlin and Karaca-Mandic (2006) confirm this prediction by showing that traffic density increases accident costs substantially. Second, the expected number of road accidents is a function of the behavior and skills of drivers. In this regard, we would expect that public transit strikes reduce average driving skills since marginal drivers with less experience appear on road systems. This channel works to increase the frequency of road accidents. In addition, it is well understood that driving in high-density traffic can contribute to stress and therefore lead to behavioral patterns—e.g., tailgating, aggressive driving, braking abruptly—that increase accident risk (Transport Research Center 2007). More accidents are likely to result in additional personal injuries (Shefer and Rietveld 1997). However, the same logic does not necessarily apply to accidents involving severe injuries or fatalities: with an increase in congestion stemming from more cars in the system, average travel speed decreases, thus potentially causing a reduction in the number of severe accidents. Evidence from the United States indeed suggests a substantial reduction in the number of fatal road accidents during morning peak hours, periods in which traffic density is the highest (Farmer and Williams 2005). But there is also evidence, emerging from the United Kingdom, that the picture is more differentiated. In particular, congestion as a mitigator of crash severity is less likely to occur in urban conditions, but may still be a factor on higher speed roads and highways (Noland and Quddus 2005). Our focus will be on accidents in urban conditions. Thus, it remains a priori unclear whether an increase in congestion stemming from public transit strikes affects the incidence of severe accidents, and if so in what direction. Against this background, our second testable prediction is: PREDICTION 2: Public transit strikes increase the frequency of car accidents which, in turn, leads to a rise in accident-related injuries. The effect on accidents involving severe injuries or fatalities is a priori unclear. D. Car Traffic and Air Pollution Car traffic is associated with air pollution mainly due to engine exhaust. The chemical processes in fuel burning thus determine the expected effect of traffic on air pollution. Internal combustion engines powering the vast majority of cars in developed countries emit oxides of nitrogen, carbon monoxide, unburned or partially burned organic compounds, and particulate matter with the amounts depending amongst other things on operating conditions (Heywood 1988). In particular, it is well understood that congested stop-and-go traffic is associated with higher emissions than free-flow traffic. There are three reasons for this. First, the efficiency of internal combustion engines, which depends on revolutions per minute (rpm), is highest at medium speed (Davis and Diegel 2007). Acceleration and deceleration episodes decrease the time operated in the optimal rpm range, which in turn increases emissions per minute driven. Second, congestion increases travel times, and so leads to a rise in fuel consumption and emissions per distance driven. Third, particulate matter emissions not only stem from fuel burning process, but also from brake wear and tire wear on tarmac—both high in congested traffic. From an empirical viewpoint, several studies suggest that high traffic volumes and congestion are causes of ambient air pollution (see, e.g., Currie and Walker 2011; Knittel, Miller, and Sanders 2011). A pollutant that is not caused by car traffic, and therefore can be used for a placebo test, is sulfur dioxide (Lalive, Luechinger, and Schmutzler 2013). Indeed, sulfur dioxide emissions from cars are close to nonexistent since modern gasoline no longer contains significant amounts of sulfur. From these arguments our third testable prediction arises: PREDICTION 3: Public transit strikes increase road-traffic related air pollution. A pollutant expected to be unaffected is sulfur dioxide.

**Stable Mass Transit solves Transport Emissions which cause Warming.**

**Ionescu 21** Diana Ionescu 11-5-2021 "To Fight Climate Change, Support Public Transit"<https://www.planetizen.com/news/2021/11/115186-fight-climate-change-support-public-transit> (Diana is a contributing editor to Planetizen.)//Elmer

Andrew J. Hawkins argues in favor of boosting public transit as a crucial way to fight climate change, warning against the potential "death spiral" caused by declining ridership which reduces revenue, leading to worse service which discourages riders even further. As Hawkins writes, There’s more at stake than good buses and trains. The recent report from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change confirms that a hotter, wetter, more inhospitable future is all but certain. The transportation sector is responsible for nearly a third of greenhouse gases, most of which come from tailpipe emissions. High-quality mass transit can do a lot to fight climate change, but only if people are willing to use it. Since the start of the pandemic, transit agencies have struggled against a raft of challenges as some riders abandon their systems while essential workers and other transit-dependent commuters rely on public transportation more than ever. Agencies around the country are implementing major service changes and reducing or eliminating fares in an effort to get riders back on board and expand the reach of their systems, with mixed results. These initiatives will create more benefits than just improved transit service for those who use it, transit supporters argue. As Hawkins concludes, "high-quality transit is the only real solution to our vast, seemingly intractable problems with climate change, inequality, land use, and housing."

**Extinction**

**Schultz 16** (Robert Schultz [Retired Professor and Chair of Computer Information Systems at Woodbury University] “Modern Technology and Human Extinction,”<http://proceedings.informingscience.org/InSITE2016/InSITE16p131-145Schultz2307.pdf>) RW

There is consensus that there is a relatively short window to reduce carbon emissions before drastic effects occur. Recent credible projections of the result of lack of rapid drastic action is an average temperature increase of about 10o F by 2050. This change alone will be incredibly disruptive to all life, but will also cause great weather and climate change. For comparison purposes, a 10 degree (Fahrenheit) decrease was enough to cause an ice layer 4000 feet thick over Wisconsin (Co2gether, 2012). Recently relevant information has surfaced about a massive previous extinction. This is the Permian extinction, which happened 252 million years ago, during which 95% of all species on earth, both terrestrial and aquatic, vanished. The ocean temperature after almost all life had disappeared was 15 degrees (Fahrenheit) above current ocean temperatures. Recent information about the Permian extinction indicates it was caused by a rapid increase in land and ocean temperatures, caused by the sudden appearance of stupendous amounts of carbon in the form of greenhouse gases (Kolbert, 2014, pp. 102-144). The origin of the carbon in these enormous quantities is not yet known, but one possibility is the sudden release of methane gases stored in permafrost. This is also a possibility in our current situation. If so, extinction would be a natural side effect of human processes. There is also a real but smaller possibility of what is called “runaway greenhouse,” in which the earth’s temperature becomes like Venus’ surface temperature of 800o The threat of extinction here is not entirely sudden. The threat is, if anything, worse. Changes in the atmosphere--mainly increases in the concentration of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere-- can start processes that can’t be reversed but which take long periods of time to manifest. “Runaway greenhouse” may be the worst. Once again, suggestions of technological solutions to this situation should be treated with some skepticism. These proposals are often made by technophiles ignoring all the evidence that technology is very much subject to unanticipated side effects and unanticipated failures. What has happened concerning the depletion of the ozone layer should be a clear warning against the facile uses of technology through geoengineering to alter the makeup of the entire planet and its atmosphere. The complicating factor in assessing extinction likelihood from climate change is corporations, especially American fossil fuel corporations such as Exxon-Mobil and Shell. Through their contributions, they have been able to delay legislation ameliorating global warming and climate change. As mentioned before, recently released papers from Exxon-Mobil show that the corporation did accept the scientific findings about global warming and climate change. But they concluded that maintaining their profits was more important than acting to ameliorate climate change. Since it is not a matter of getting corporations to appreciate scientific facts, the chances of extinction from climate change are good. To ameliorate climate change, it is important to leave a high percentage of fossil fuel reserves in the ground. But this is exactly what a profit-seeking fossil fuel corporation cannot do. One can still hope that because fossil fuel corporations are made up of individuals, increasingly bad consequences of global warming and climate change will change their minds about profits. But because of the lag in effects, this mind change will probably be too late. So I conclude we will probably see something like the effects of the Permian extinction perhaps some time around 2050. (The Permian extinction was 95% extinction of all species.) This assumes the release of methane from the arctic will take place around then.

## 5

**Text – हिंदी में करो अफीम**

**To Clarify, aff in hindi. The text does not mean only hindi is accepted, rather there should be a diversity in language usage that’s not just english**

**The normalization of normative English leads to an in-group/out-group that drive racial violence**

**Rosa et al 17** Rosa, Jonathan, and Nelson Flores. "Unsettling race and language: Toward a raciolinguistic perspective." Language in society 46.5 (2017): 621-647. (Assistant Professor of Anthropology and Linguistics and Associate Professor in the Educational Linguistics Division)//Elmer

Similar to Bucholtz & Hall's (2005) approach to identity and interaction, we are interested in how processes of raciolinguistic enregisterment emblematize particular linguistic features as authentic signs of racialized models of personhood. This is found not only in sociolinguistic accounts of the features that compose categories such as ‘African American English’ (Green 2002) or ‘Chicano English’ (Fought 2003), but also popular stereotypes and modes of linguistic appropriation such as ‘Mock Spanish’ (Hill 2008), ‘Mock Asian’ (Chun 2004), ‘Hollywood Injun English’ (Meek 2006), and ‘linguistic minstrelsy’ (Bucholtz & Lopez 2011). In each of these cases, minute features of language, including grammatical forms, prosodic patterns, and morphological particles, are emblematized as sets of signs that correspond to racial categories. Crucially, as Meek (2006) demonstrates, these forms need not correspond to empirically verifiable linguistic practices in order to undergo racial emblematization. Moreover, as Lo & Reyes (2009) point out, the imagination of groups such as Asian Americans as lacking a distinctive racialized variety of English analogous to African American English or Chicano English, must be interrogated based on the racial logics that organize stereotypes about and societal positions of different racial groups on the one hand, and perceptions of their language practices on the other. Specifically, Lo & Reyes argue that racial ideologies constructing Asian Americans as model minorities who approximate whiteness are linked to language ideologies constructing Asian Americans as lacking a racially distinctive variety of English. In related work, Chun (2016:81) shows how emblematized Mock Asian forms such as ‘ching-chong’ are located across ‘the important boundary between ‘Oriental talk’ and English’, which sustains Asian Americans alternately as model minorities and forever foreigners. Thus, we must carefully reconsider seemingly ‘distinctive’ and ‘nondistinctive’ language varieties alike, by analyzing the logics that position particular racial groups and linguistic forms in relation to one another. That is, no language variety is objectively distinctive or nondistinctive, but rather comes to be enregistered as such in particular historical, political, and economic circumstances.

**The performance of the 1NC is a form of Code Switching that disrupts English-centered discourses**

**Duan**, Carlina. " The Space Between: An analysis of code-switching within Asian American poetry as strategic poetic device"(English Honors) AND" Here I Go, Torching"(Creative Writing Honors). Diss. 2015. (BA in Honors English from the University of Michigan)//Elmer

In an interview with Women’s Review of Books literary magazine, Hong further discussed the strategic role of translation as a form of linguistic activism within her poetic work. When asked why she does not include translations from Korean to English within her own poetry, Hong said: “I wanted to open up these schisms, to emphasize that memory, the filtering of human experience into poetry, is often fractured and not transparent, especially experiences which have always been bisected and undercut by two languages.” She added, “I think I want to debunk the idea of easy translation—whether it be the idea of literal translation or, as I said before, the translating of one’s experience into poetry” (Hong 2002a, 15). Hong’s intentional decision to leave out English translations in her poetry creates a power dynamic between speaker and reader of the poem. Not only are “easy” translations dismantled and withheld from the reader, but, according to Hong, codeswitching — without translation — also more accurately reflects her personal experiences of cultural and linguistic movement. Hong points out that human experiences and the world of memory, especially for bilingual speakers, are “not transparent” — not captured neatly by one language, but rather, “bisected” by the complexities of belonging to two (or more) languages, implying a movement between multiple spaces. Scholars describe poetic code-switching in this way as a navigation of power. Literary scholar Benzi Zhang argues that code-switching makes apparent different levels of cultural knowledge for speaker and reader: “[T]he insertion of […] foreign words effectively renders Asian sensibilities into English and signifies different positions of cultural agency” (Zhang 131). Building upon this idea of cultural agency, I argue that Hong uses Korean to consciously expose themes of exoticism and racial stereotyping that readers themselves may be (consciously or unconsciously) participating in. As a result, Hong creates agency for her speaker through critiquing culturally appropriative behavior, in addition to an agency in knowledge; Hong’s speaker can access cultural understanding that her readers do not have. Yet, Hong does more than negotiate questions of audience access; she uses code-switching to reflect her speaker’s lived experiences of Korean-American identity, grappling with multiple languages and cultural codes. In “An Introduction to Chinese-American and Japanese American Literatures,” Jeffrey Chan et al. writes, “The minority experience does not yield itself to accurate or complete expression on the white man’s language” (qtd. Zhang 137). As Chang et al. suggest, code-switching embeds itself as a natural part of the “minority experience,” and is documented as such in Hong’s poems. Thus, the poems not only act as social critique of exoticization, but further inhabit the embodied experiences of Korean-American female identities living in the U.S. — which, as Hong reveals, are complicated experiences of rage, agency, celebration, and shifting power dynamics. Critics who have reviewed Hong’s work, such as Jan Clausen, have raised questions about the effect of Hong’s play with translation. Clausen, in a review titled “The poetics of estrangement,” published through the Women’s Review of Books, writes of Hong’s collection Translating Mo’um: “Hong deftly dismantles the romance of language as homeland, with results especially unnerving for the non-Korean-speaking reader” (Clausen 15). According to Clausen, Hong’s work with code-switching subverts traditional notions of the ‘native tongue’ as representative of “homeland,” dismantling what a reader may expect of a Korean American author: that she use Korean language to specifically discuss her ethnic culture as a hyphenated American. In other words, Hong’s code-switches function as intentional poetic protest against the reader’s expectations of the relationship between multilingual text and ethnic identity. As Clausen points out, such readings may anticipate that mother tongue is only introduced to speak about cultural difference or history, rather than used additionally as formal poetic device. In this chapter, I reveal Hong’s awareness of Korean language and code-switching as tools in identity-construction. Rather than allow others to shape her identity for her, she remains dominant in shaping her identity — and her agency — for herself.