## 1

#### Interpretation—the affirmative debater must disclose the plan text and framework 30 minutes before the round. To clarify, disclosure can occur on the wiki or over message.

#### Violation—they didn't

#### Graphical user interface, text Description automatically generated

#### Vote neg for prep and clash—two internal links—

#### a) neg prep—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply and cut and research their applications to the affirmative. Skews neg prep since I don’t know what the ac offense are until the end of the 1AC while I disclosed my past 2nrs and you have infintie prep time before the round to work on the aff.

#### b) aff quality—plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn't inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, it should lose—this will answer the 1ar's claim about innovation—with 30 minutes of prep, there's still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can't check against the broader literature.

#### Fairness – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation

#### Education – it’s the only reason school fund debate

#### Drop the debater – a] deter future abuse and b] set better norms for debate.

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices.

## 2

### Link

#### The usage of state to overcode subject’s desires replicates machinic enslavement which arises when the desires of subjects are directed towards the elevated signifier of striking at an attempt at uniformity. The state encodes life in a way that forces individuals to gain recognition under a model built to exclude them, suppressing deviance. This turns case but also explains why the methodology and orientation of using the state as a starting point produces violence.

Robinson 10 [Andrew. Andrew Robinson is a political theorist and activist based in the UK. His book Power, Resistance and Conflict in the Contemporary World: Social Movements, Networks and Hierarchies (co-authored with Athina Karatzogianni) was published in Sep 2009 by Routledge. “In Theory Why Deleuze (still) matters: States, war-machines and radical transformation”. Ceasefire. September 10th] RL

In this article, I have chosen to concentrate on **the conceptual pairing of states and war-machines as a way of understanding the differences between autonomous social networks and hierarchical**, repressive **formations**. **Deleuze and Guattari view the ‘state’ as a particular** kind of institutional **regime derived** **from a set of social relations** **which can be** traced to **a way of seeing** focused on **the construction** of **fixities** and representation. There is thus a basic form of the state (a “state-form”) in spite of the differences among specific states. Since Deleuze and Guattari’s theory is primarily relational and processual, **the state exists** primarily **as a process rather than a thing**. The state-form is defined by the processes or practices of ‘overcoding’, ‘despotic signification’ and ‘machinic enslavement’. These attributes can be explained one at a time. The concept of despotic signification, derived from Lacan’s idea of the master-signifier, suggests that, in statist thought, a particular signifier is elevated to the status of standing for the whole, and the other of this signifier (remembering that signification is necessarily differential) is defined as radically excluded. ‘**Overcoding’ consists in the imposition of the regime of meanings arising from this fixing of representations on the** **various processes** **through which** **social life** **and desire operate**. In contrast to the deep penetration which occurs in capitalism, states often do this fairly lightly, but with brutality around the edges. Hence for instance, in historical despotic states, the inclusion of peripheral areas only required their symbolic subordination, and not any real impact on everyday life in these areas. **Overcoding** **also**, however, e**ntails the destruction of anything which cannot be represented or encoded.¶ ‘Machinic enslavement’ occurs when assembled groups of social relations and desires, known in Deleuzian theory as ‘machines’, are rendered subordinate to the regulatory function of the despotic signifier and hence incorporated in an overarching totality.** This process identifies Deleuze and Guattari’s view of the state-form with Mumford’s idea of the megamachine, with the state operating as a kind of absorbing and enclosing totality, a bit like the Borg in Star Trek, eating up and assimilating the social networks with which it comes into contact. Crucially, while these relations it absorbs often start out as horizontal, or as hierarchical only at a local level, their absorption rearranges them as vertical and hierarchical aggregates. **It tends to destroy** or reduce **the intensity of horizontal connections, instead increasing the intensity of vertical subordination**. Take, **for instance, the formation of the colonial state** **in Africa: loose social identities were rigidly reclassified as exclusive ethnicities**, **and these ethnicities were arranged in hierarchies** (for instance, **Tutsi as superior to Hutu**) in ways **which created rigid** **boundaries** **and oppressive relations** culminating in today’s conflicts.¶ According to this theory of the state-form, states are at once ‘isomorphic’, sharing a basic structure and function, and heterogeneous, differing in how they express this structure. In particular, states vary in terms of the relative balance between ‘adding’ and ‘subtracting axioms’ (capitalism is also seen as performing these two operations). An axiom here refers to the inclusion of a particular group or social logic or set of desires as something recognised by a state: examples of addition of axioms would be the recognition of minority rights (e.g. gay rights), the recognition and systematic inclusion of minority groups in formal multiculturalism (e.g. Indian ‘scheduled castes’), the creation of niche markets for particular groups (e.g. ‘ethnic food’ sections in supermarkets), and the provision of inclusive services (e.g. support for independent living for people with disabilities). It is most marked in social-democratic kinds of states. The subtraction of axioms consists in the encoding of differences as problems to be suppressed, for example in the classification of differences as crimes, the institutionalisation of unwanted minorities (e.g. ‘sectioning’ people who are psychologically different), or the restriction of services to members of an in-group (excluding ‘disruptive’ children, denying council housing to migrants). This process reaches its culmination in totalitarian states. It is important to realise that in both cases, the state is expressing the logic of the state-form, finding ways to encode and represent differences; but that the effects of the two strategies on the freedom and social power of marginalised groups are very different.¶ **The state** **is** also **viewed** as a force of ‘antiproduction’. This term is defined **against** the ‘productive’ or creative power Deleuze and Guattari believe resides in processes of **desiring-production** (the process through which desires are formed and connected to objects or others) and social production (the process of constructing social ‘assemblages’ or networks). **Desiring-production** tends to **proliferate** **differences**, **because desire operates through fluxes and breaks**, **overflowing particular boundaries**. **The** **state** as machine of antiproduction **operates to restrict**, prevent or channel **these flows of creative** **energy so as to preserve fixed social** **forms and restrict the extent** of **difference which is able to exist**, or the connections it is able to form. Hence, **states try to restrict** and break down **the coming-together of** **social networks by prohibiting** or making difficult **the formation of** hierarchical **assemblages**; it operates to block ‘subject-formation’ in terms of social groups, or the emergence of subjectivities which are not already encoded in dominant terms. Take for instance the laws on ‘dispersal’, in which the British state allows police to break up groups (often of young people) congregating in public spaces. Absurdly, the state defines the social act of coming-together as anti-social, because it creates a space in which different kinds of social relations can be formed. **The state wishes to have a monopoly on how people interrelate, and so acts to prevent people from associating horizontally**. Another example of antiproduction is the way that participation in imposed activities such as the requirement to work and the unpaid reproductive labour involved in families, leaves little time for other kinds of relationships – people don’t have time to form other assemblages either with other people or with other objects of desire. Hakim Bey has argued that this pressure to restrict connections is so strong that simply finding time and space for other forms of belonging – regardless of the goal of these other connections – is already a victory against the system.

### Link

#### Any legal conception of personhood is intrinsically normative --- people are identified under the law i.e people used to be considered property. This means the state attempts to make us legible --- this generates unending exclusion through hierarchal difference. Weheliye 14:

[Weheliye, Alexander G. “Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human.” Duke University Press. 2014. // LHP MK]

**We are in** dire **need of alternatives to the legal conception of personhood** that dominates our world, **and**, in addition, **to not lose sight of what remains outside the law**, what the law cannot capture, what it cannot magi- cally transform into the fantastic form of property ownership. Writing about the connections between transgender politics and other forms of identity- based activism that respond to structural inequalities, legal scholar Dean Spade shows how the focus on inclusion, recognition, and equality based on **a** narrow **legal framework** (especially as it pertains to antidiscrimination and hate crime laws) not only hinders the eradication of violence against trans people and other vulnerable populations but actually **creates the condition of possibility for the continued unequal “distribution of life chances.”**22 If **demanding recognition and inclusion** remains at the center of minority politics, it **will lead** only **to a delimited notion of personhood as property that zeroes in comparatively on only one form of subjugation at the expense of others**, thus **allowing for the continued existence of hierarchical differences between full humans, not-quite-humans, and nonhumans. This can be gleaned from the “successes” of** the **mainstream** feminist, civil rights, and lesbian-gay rights **movements, which facilitate** the incorporation of **a privileged minority into the ethnoclass of Man at the cost of the still and/or newly criminalized and disposable populations** (women of color, the black poor, trans people, the incarcerated, etc.).23 **To make claims for inclusion and humanity via the U.S. juridical assemblage removes from view that the law** itself **has been thoroughly violent** in its endorsement of racial slavery, indigenous genocide, Jim Crow, the prison-industrial complex, domestic and international warfare, and so on, and that it continues to be one of the chief instruments in creating and maintaining the racializing assemblages in the world of Man. **Instead of appealing to legal recognition**, Julia Oparah suggests counteracting the “racialized (trans)gender entrapment” within the prison-industrial complex and beyond with **practices of “maroon abolition”** (in reference to the long history of escaped slave contraband settle- ments in the Americas) **to “foreground the ways in which often overlooked African diasporic cultural and political legacies inform and undergird anti- prison work**,” while **also providing strategies and life worlds not exclusively centered on reforming the law**.24 Relatedly, Spade calls for **a radical politics** articulated from the “‘impossible’ worldview of trans political existence,” which **redefines “the insistence of government agencies, social service providers, media, and many nontrans activists and nonprotesters that the existence of trans people is impossible.”**25 A relational maroon abolitionism beholden to the practices of black radicalism and that arises from the in- compatibility of black trans existence with the world of Man serves as one example of how putatively abject modes of being need not be redeployed within hegemonic frameworks but can be operationalized as variable lim- inal territories or articulated assemblages in movements to abolish the grounds upon which all forms of subjugation are administered. The idea of bare life as espoused by Giorgio Agamben and his followers discursively duplicates the very violence it describes without offering any compelling theoretical or political alternatives to our current order. Paradoxically, **by insisting on a limited notion of the law at the cost of neglecting so many other facets that flow into the creation of bare life**, Agamben pre- empts a rigorous and imaginative **thinking of the political imaginary that rests in the tradition of the oppressed**. Agamben’s impoverished conception of the political comes into view most clearly in the lack of current or past alternatives it offers to our current order and when we consult the eshly testimonies of and about subjects that inhabit the sphere of mere life (the enslaved, political prisoners, concentration camp detainees, for instance). Still, **these voices should not be construed as fountains of suffering authenticity but as instantiations of a radically different political imaginary, which refuses to only see, feel, hear, smell, and taste bare life in the subjectivity of the oppressed.**

### Impact

#### They force the subject to be graded against a majoritarian worldview that always leaves it empty --- any degree of deviancy leads the subject incomplete, causing it to desire its own oppression. DELEUZE AND GUATTARI:

[Deleuze and Guattari. Deleuze and Guattari. “Anti-Oedipus.” Pg. 26-29. 1977. LHP MK]

In point of fact**, if desire is the lack of the real object, its very nature as a real entity depends upon an "essence of lack" that produces the fantasized object. Desire thus conceived of as** production, though merely the **production of fantasies, has been explained perfectly by psychoanalysis.** On the very lowest level of interpretation, **this means that the real object that desire lacks is related to an extrinsic natural or social production**, whereas desire intrinsically produces an imaginary object that functions as a double of reality, as though there were a "dreamed-of object behind every real object," or a mental production behind all real productions. This conception does not necessarily compel psychoanalysis to engage in a study of gadgets and markets, in the form of an utterly dreary and dull psychoanalysis of the object: psychoanalytic studies of packages of noodles, cars, or "thingumajigs**." But even when the fantasy is interpreted in depth, not simply as an object, but as a specific machine that brings desire itself front and center, this machine is merely theatrical, and the complementarity of what it sets apart still remains: it is now need that is defined in terms of a relative lack and determined by its own object, whereas desire is regarded as what produces the fantasy and produces itself by detaching itself from the object, though at the same time it intensifies the lack by making it absolute: an "incurable insufficiency of being," an "inability-to-be that is life itself."** Hence the presentation of desire as something supported by needs, while these needs, and their relationship to the object as something that is lacking or missing, continue to be the basis of the productivity of desire (theory of an underlying support). In a word, when the theoretician reduces desiring-production to a production of fantasy, he is content to exploit to the fullest the idealist principle that defines desire as a lack, rather than a process of production, of "industrial" production. Clement Rosset puts it very well: **every time the emphasis is put on a lack that desire supposedly suffers from as a way of defining its object, "the world acquires as its double some other sort of world, in accordance with the following line of argument: there is an object that desire feels the lack of; hence the world does not contain each and every object that exists; there is at least one object missing, the one that desire feels the lack of; hence there exists some other place that contains the key to desire** (missing in this world)."29 If desire produces, its product is real. If desire is productive, it can be productive only in the real world and can produce only reality. Desire is the set of passive syntheses that engineer partial objects, flows, and bodies, and that function as units of production. The real is the end product, the result of the passive syntheses of desire as autoproduction of the unconscious. Desire does not lack anything; it does not lack its object. **It is, rather, the subject that is missing in desire,** or desire that lacks a fixed subject; there is no fixed subject unless there is **repression**. Desire and its object are one and the same thing: the machine, as a machine of a machine. Desire is a machine, and the object of desire is another machine connected to it. Hence the product is something removed or deducted from the process of producing: between the act of producing and the product, something becomes detached, thus giving the vagabond, nomad subject a residuum. The objective being of desire is the Real in and of itself.\* There is no particular form of existence that can be labeled "psychic reality." As Marx notes, what exists in fact is not lack, but passion, as a "natural and sensuous object." **Desire is not bolstered by needs, but rather the contrary; needs are derived from desire: they are counter-products within the real that desire produces. Lack is a counter-effect of desire; it is deposited, distributed, vacuolized within a real that is natural and social. Desire always remains in close touch with the conditions of objective existence; it embraces them and follows them, shifts when they shift, and does not outlive them.** For that reason it so often becomes the desire to die, whereas need is a measure of the withdrawal of a subject that has lost its desire at the same time that it loses the passive syntheses of these conditions. This is precisely the significance of need as a search in a void: hunting about, trying to capture or become a parasite of passive syntheses in whatever vague world they may happen to exist in. It is no use saying: We are not green plants; we have long since been unable to synthesize chlorophyll, so it's necessary to eat. . .. Desire then becomes this abject fear of lacking something. But it should be noted that this is not a phrase uttered by the poor or the dispossessed. On the contrary, such people know that they are close to grass, almost akin to it, and that desire "needs" very few things-not those leftovers that chance to come their way, but the very things that are continually taken from them-and that what is missing is not things a subject feels the lack of somewhere deep down inside himself, but rather the objectivity of man, the objective being of man, for whom to desire is to produce, to produce within the realm of the real. The real is not impossible; on the contrary, within the real everything is possible, everything becomes possible. Desire does not express a molar lack within the subject; rather, the molar organization deprives desire of its objective being. Revolutionaries, artists, and seers are content to be objective, merely objective: they know that desire clasps life in its powerfully productive embrace, and reproduces it in a way that is all the more intense because it has few needs. And never mind those who believe that this is very easy to say, or that it is the sort of idea to be found in books. "From the little reading I had done I had observed that the men who were most in life, who were moulding life, who were life itself, ate little, slept little, owned little or nothing. They had no illusions about duty, or the perpetuation of their kith and kin, or the preservation of the State.... The phantasmal world is the world which has never been fully conquered over. It is the world of the past, never of the future. To move forward clinging to the past is like dragging a ball and chain."30 The true visionary is a Spinoza in the garb of a Neapolitan revolutionary. We know very well where lack-and its subjective correlative-come from. **Lack (manque)\* is created, planned, and organized in and through social production. It is counterproduced as a result of the pressure of antiproduction;** the latter falls back on (se rabat sur) the forces of production and appropriates them. It is never primary; production is never organized on the basis of a pre-existing need or lack (manque). **It is lack that infiltrates itself, creates empty spaces or vacuoles, and propagates itself in accordance with the organization of an already existing organization of production. The deliberate creation of lack as a function of market economy is the art of a dominant class. This involves deliberately organizing wants and needs (**manque**) amid an abundance of production; making all of desire teeter and fall victim to the great** fear of not having one's needs satisfied; and making the object dependent upon a real production that is supposedly exterior to desire (the demands of rationality), while at the same time the production of desire is categorized as fantasy and nothing but fantasy. There is no such thing as the social production of reality on the one hand, and a desiring-production that is mere fantasy on the other. The only connections that could be established between these two productions would be secondary ones of introjection and projection, as though all social practices had their precise counterpart in introjected or internal mental practices, or as though mental practices were projected upon social systems, without either of the two sets of practices ever having any real or concrete effect upon the other. As long as we are content to establish a perfect parallel between money, gold, capital, and the capitalist triangle on the one hand, and the libido, the anus, the phallus, and the family triangle on the other, we are engaging in an enjoyable pastime, but the mechanisms of money remain totally unaffected by the anal projections of those who manipulate money. The Marx-Freud parallelism between the two remains utterly sterile and insignificant as long as it is expressed in terms that make them introjections or projections of each other without ceasing to be utterly alien to each other, as in the famous equation money = shit. The truth of the matter is that social production is purely and simply desiring-production itself under determinate conditions. We maintain that the social field is immediately invested by desire, that it is the historically determined product **of desire, and that libido has no need of any mediation or sublimation, any psychic operation, any transformation, in order to invade and invest the productive forces and the relations of production.** There is only desire and the social, and nothing else. **Even the most repressive and the most deadly forms of social reproduction are produced by desire within the organization that is the consequence of such production under various conditions that we must analyze. That is why the fundamental problem of political philosophy is still precisely the one that Spinoza saw so clearly, and that Wilhelm Reich rediscovered: "Why do men [people] fight for their servitude as stubbornly as though it were their salvation?" How can people possibly reach the point of shouting: "More taxes! Less bread!"? As Reich remarks, the astonishing thing is not that some people steal or that others occasionally go out on strike, but rather that all those who are starving do not steal as a regular practice, and all those who are exploited are not continually out on strike: after centuries of exploitation, why do people still tolerate being humiliated and enslaved, to such a point, indeed, that they actually want humiliation and slavery not only for others but for themselves? Reich is at his profoundest as a thinker when he refuses to accept ignorance or illusion on the part of the masses as an explanation of fascism, and demands an explanation that will take their desires into account, an explanation formulated in terms of desire: no, the masses** were not innocent dupes; at a certain point, under a certain set of conditions, they **wanted fascism, and it is this perversion of the desire of the masses that needs to be accounted for.**

#### This brings us to the age old question – why did the masses desire fascism? The transcendent truth of the 1AC forces individuals to adhere to infiltrates the subconscious desire for complexities to be smoothed out, allowing fascism to insert itself.

Evans and Reid 13 [Brad Evans and Julian Reed. “Deleuze & Fascism: Security: War: AestheticsBrad Evans is a senior lecturer in International Relations at the School of Sociology, Politics and International Studies, the University of Bristol. Julian Reid is Professor of International Relations at the University of Lapland, Finland] RL

Reich is at his profoundest as a thinker when he refuses to accept ignorance or illusion on the part of the masses as an expInation of fascism, and demands an explanation that will take their desire into account, an explanation formulated in terms of desire: no, the masses were **not** **innocent** dupes; at a certain point, under a certain set of conditions, they **wanted** **fascism**, and it is this perversion of the desire of the masses that needs to be accounted for. (Deleuze and Guattari 1977: 29) It is the task of this paper to show that the ab ove quote is exactly ha If right. Fascism is a matter of **desire**. Howevel~ it is not only that; it is also a matter of ignorance or illusion. In fact, it arises at the point at which desire and ignorance and/or knowledge arise. In order to show this, we will contra st Deleuze and Guattari's thought with that of a contemporary journalist who, to my knowledge, has not been brought into productive discussion with contemporary French thought. In What's the Matter with Kansas? Thomas Frank argues that it is precisely a matter of ignorance or illusion (and for Frank, specifically, ideology) that is operative in the dominance of conservative thought in America's heartland. It is because the masses have been duped into believing an ideology contrary to their interests that Republicans have come to dominate that part of the country. As with Deleuze and Guattari, this paper will argue that Franks is exactly half right. In order to place these two halves into a proper whole, we will need to appeal to a picture of desire and illusion that roots them in human practice. It is through a conception of practice that we can recognize that, in a sense, people can, under certain conditions, want fascism. This is true even though people rarely tell themselves that it is fascism that they want. Again, it is through a conception of practice that we can understand how people can be duped into endorsing fascism, even when it is against their interest. The conception of practice to be developed here will have affinities with the thought of Michel Foucault. Although Foucault does not offer a theoretical articulation of this conception, it can be said to be operative particularly in his more genealogical work. In order to approach the se ide as, l will start with a short summary of Deleuze and Guattari's treatment of desire and then of Franks's treatment of 14 Todd May illusion. The goal is simply to situa te the key elements of these discussions as a backdrop for the positive conception of practice to be developed here. Then 1 will return to these elements in order to show their proper place in that conception and, one hopes, to show the half-rightedness of each of these treatments. My daim for the alternative conception will not come in the form of an argument. 1 do not try to show that either Deleuze and Guattari or Franks is half-mistaken. Rather, 1 seek to put in place a conception of human practice that is compelling enough that the way 1 situate desire and illusion will also seem compelling. That is to say, in keeping with Deleuze's dictum in Dialogues, rather than arguing at length against the reduction of fascism either to desire or to illusion, 1 will mostly 'go on to something else' (Deleuze and Par-net 1987: 1). For Deleuze and Guattari, fascism, like much el se in human commitment, is not a matter of ignorance or mistaken reflection. This is in keeping particularly with Deleuze's Nietzschean orientation toward human consciousness: that it is secondary or even epiphenomenal. For Deleuze, much of what makes us tick is **unconscious**. Consciousness comes afterwards. The vast majority of human experience and motivation happens **outside our reflective awareness**. 'Underneath the self which acts are little selves which contempla te and which rcnder possible both the action and the active subject. We speak of our "self' only in virtue of these thousands of little witnesses which contemplate within us: it is always a third party who says "me'" (Deleuze 1994: 75). This idea finds expression in Anti-Oedipus' central daim that 'the social field is immediately invested by desire, that it is the historically determined product of desire, and that libido has no need of any mediation or sublimation, any psychic operation ... There is only desire and the social, and nothing else' (Deleuze and Guattari 1977: 29). We must be careful in understanding this citation. It could appear to be more Rousseauian than it is. If we take Deleuze and Guattari to mean that there is only desire on the one hand and the social on the other, it would be only a short step to thinking that the social is an evil that represses desire. This would align their thought with Rousseau's idea (at least in some ofhis moods) that organized society represses the natural goodness of human being. However, this would be to forget the central idea of Anti-Oedipus: that desire is productive. If there is only desire and the social, it is because desire produces the social. Rather than, as with psychoanalytic theory, desire being desire for something, desire directly creates its objects. We can recognize here Deleuze's distinction between the virtual and the actual. The actual is a product of the virtual. The virtual is a field of difference from which aIl actuality arises. The actual, in turn, emerges from the virtual, while still retaining the virtual within it. In the same way, desire produces the social. Now it may be that the social produced by desire in turn represses or transforms or distorts desire, as the authors argue Oedipus does, but this do es not me an that the social is exterior to desire, or that it comes from something or somewhere el se. As Deleuze insists throughout his career, there is no transcendence, only immanence. Deleuze and Guattari note in What is Philosophy? of aIl the illusions of philosophy, 'First of aIl **there is the illusion of transcendence, which**, perhaps, **comes before aIl the others'** (Deleuze and Guattari 1994: 49). To say that there is only desire and the social, then, is to say that there is only desire and what it creates, which includes the social. On this view, if there is a problem of fascism, it is a problem of desire rather than of illusion or ideology. **'It is not a question of ideology**. There is an unconscious libidinal investment of the social field that coexists, but does not necessarily coincide, with preconscious investments, or with what preconscious investments "ought to be." That is why, when subjects, individuals, or groups act manifestly counter to their class interests ... it is not enough to say: they were fooled, the masses have been fooled' (Deleuze and Guattari 1977: 104). The picture Deleuze and Guattari are trying to overcome here is a traditional Marxist one. On this picture, the reason the masses do not immediately seek their own interests - which would necessarily be revolutionary ones - is that they have been ideologically deceived. They have been convinced that their interests are aligned with, rather than contrary to, the interests of the ruling class. If this is right, the political task would be to educate the masses, to get them to recognize their tnle interests. Otherwise put, the first task of political struggle would be to overcome the ideological blinders that have prevented the masses from seeing their true interests. The problem with this picture is, in Deleuze and Guattari's view, that it sees things the wrong way around. It is not that we come to desire fascism rather than revolution because we mistakenly believe that fascism is good for us. Rather, it is because we becorne invested in fascism that we come to believe in it. Desire as a form of unconscious creation and investment cornes first. In fact, from this perspective it does not even matter whether we believe in fascism. We can be entirely cynical and believe in nothing at aIl. Politics is not a matter of belief; it is a matter of what we desire.

#### The alternative is to proliferate our active desires – promoting the social relations the state seeks to suppress allows us to envision a truly revolutionary praxis, where difference is promoted and desire is no longer misdirected towards fascism.

K&R 13 [Athina Karatzogianni and Andrew Robinson. “Schizorevolutions vs. Microfascisms: A Deleuzo-Neitzschean Perspective on State, Security, and Active/Reactive Networks.” *From the Selected Works of Athina Karatzogianni.* July 2013. Works.bepress.com/athina\_karatzogianni/19] RL

**The impulse to condemn deviance, resistance and insurrection is disturbingly strong in academia**, and doubtless strengthened by revulsion against network terror. Yet **this networked rebellion of the excluded is the key to hopes for a better world**. In the spiral of terror between states and movements, it is important to recognise that **the source is the state and the weak point is in the movements**. In today’s social war, the Other is not even accorded the honour of being an enemy in a fair fight. As long as social conflicts are seen through a statist frame, social war is doomed to continue, because discursive exclusion produces social war as its underside, and renders resistance both necessary and justified. **The cycle of terror starts with the state: its terror at an existential level of losing control and fixity.** This terrified state produces state terror and thereby creates the conditions for movement terror. It is naive to look for a way out from this side of the equation. **State terror can end only when the state, both accepts the proliferation of networks beyond its control, and adopts a more humble role for itself, or when it collapses or is destroyed**. On the other side, **we should find hope in the proliferation of resistance among the excluded. We need to see in movements of the excluded the radical potential and not only the reactive distortions**. To take Tupac Shakur’s metaphor, we need to see the rose that grows from concrete, not merely the thorns. The problem is, rather, that **many of the movements on the network side of the equation are still thinking, seeing and feeling like states. Such movements are potential bearers of the Other of the state-form, of networks as alternatives to states, a**ffinity against hegemony, abundance against scarcity. The question thus becomes how they can learn to valorise what they are -- autonomous affinity-networks -- rather than internalising majoritarian norms. For instance, in terms of the impact of technosocial transformations on agency, the negotiation of ideology, order of dissent in relation to capitalism as a social code, remains hostage to labor processes and to thick identities of local/regional or national interests, which fail to move contemporary movements to an active affinity to a common humanity and a pragmatic solution for an ethical, non exploitative form of production (Karatzogianni and Schandorf, 2012). Here the exception may like in the global justice movements and Occupy, although still here the discourse remains often in reactive mode, due to state crackdowns experienced by the movements. **There is a great need to find ways to energise hope against fear. Hope as an active force can be counterposed to the reactive power of fear.** **People are not in fact powerless, but are made to feel powerless by the pervasiveness of the dominant social fantasy and of separation. This yields a temptation to fall back on the power of ‘the powerful’, those who gain a kind of distorted agency through alienation**. **But powerlessness and constituted power are both effects of alienation, which can be broken down by creating affinity-network forms of life. An emotional shift can thus be enough to revolutionise subjectivities.** Hence, as Vaneigem argues, ‘[t]o work for delight and authentic festivity is barely distinguishable from preparing for a general insurrection’ (Vaneigem 1967: 50-1). It has been argued in utopian studies that fear and hope form part of a continuum, expressing ‘aspects of affective ambivalence’ connected to the indeterminacy of the future (McManus 2005). **The type of hope needed is active and immanent, brought into the present as a propulsive force rather than deferred to the future**. Deleuze and Guattari use the term ‘absolute deterritorialisation’ for this possibility. In his work on conflict transformation, John Paul Lederach emphasises the need to turn negative energies into creative energies and mobilising hope against fear (Lederach and Maiese, n.d.: 2-3; Lederach, 2005). How is this change in vital energies to be accomplished? Deleuze and Guattari invoke a figure of the shaman as a way to overcome reactive energies (1983: 167-8). **They call for a type of revolutionary social movement ‘that follows the lines of escape of desire; breaches the wall and causes flows to move; assembles its machines and its groups-in-fusion in the enclaves or at the periphery’**, countering reactive energies (ibid. 277). In looking at how **this might operate in practice**, let us examine briefly **[like] the Colombian feminist anti-militarist group La Ruta Pacifica de las Mujere**s. In particular, **the aspects of social weaving and collective mourning prominent in their methodology are crucial forms of creative shamanism, which turns fear into hope.** **Their approach involves ‘the deconstruction of the pervasive symbolism of violence and war and the substitution of a new visual and textual language and creative rituals’** (Cockburn, 2005: 14; Brouwer, 2008: 62). **Weaving as a metaphor refers to social recomposition, the reconstruction of affinity**; being ‘bound’ through social weaving is believed to control fear. It is taken as a way to counter everyday violence on the frontlines of the ‘war on terror’. **Rituals of mourning and weaving are believed by participants to disarm the armed and create invisible connections among participants** (Colorado, 2003). La Ruta seek to create new combinations of cognitive and emotional elements strong enough to disrupt dominant monologues (Cockburn, 2005: 14). Weaving reconstructs social connections and life-cycles, and thereby enhances wellbeing (ibid. 15). **Participants recount inner strength and physical recovery as effects of such rituals** (Brouwer, 2008: 85). Hence, **it is in open spaces, safe spaces, and spaces of dialogue that hope can be found to counter the spiral of terror. This opening of space, this creation of autonomous zones, should be viewed as a break with the majoritarian logics of social control.** The coming ‘other worlds’ counterposed to the spaces of terror are not an integrated ‘new order’, but rather, a proliferation of smooth spaces in a horizontality without borders. These ‘other worlds’ are being built unconsciously, wherever networks, affinity and hope counterpose themselves to state terror and the desire for fixed identity be it national, ethnic, religious or cultural. It is in the incommensurable antagonism between the autonomous zones of these ‘other worlds’ and the terror state’s demands for controlled spaces to serve capital, that the nexus of the conflicts of the present and near-future lies. And interestingly, there is also a certain active/reactive difference between state responses in the Turkey and Brazil protests of June 2013.

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the better debate that best interrogates the politics of desire, education grounded in majoritarian thought leads to real-world regulation. CARLIN AND WALLIN:

[Carlin, Matthew. Wallin, Jason. “Deleuze & Guattari, Politics and Education.” Bloomsbury. 2014. Pg. 119-121. LHP MK]

As a social machine through which ‘labour power and the socius as a whole is manufactured’, schooling figures in the production of social territories that already anticipate a certain kind of people (Guattari, 2009, p. 47). And what kind of people does orthodox schooling seek to produce but a ‘molar public’, or, rather, a public regulated in the abstract image of segmentary social categories (age, gender, ethnicity, class, rank, achievement) (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987)? Such an aspiration is intimately wed to the territorializing powers of the State, for as Deleuze and Guattari argue (1983), State power first requires a ‘representational subject’ as both an abstract and unconscious model in relation to which one is taught to desire. As Massumi (2002) writes, ‘**the subject is made to be in conformity with the systems that produces it, such that the subject reproduces the system’** (p. 6). Where **education has historically functioned to regulate institutional life according to such segmentary molar codes, its** modes of production have taken as their teleological **goal** the **production of a ‘majoritarian people’**, or, more accurately, a people circuited to their representational self-similarity according to State thought. This is, in part, the threat that Aoki (2005) identifies in the planned curriculum and its projection of an abstract essentialism upon a diversity of concrete educational assemblages (a school, a class, a curriculum, etc.). Apropos Deleuze, Aoki argues that the standardization of education has effectively reduced difference to a matter of difference in degree. That is, in reference to the stratifying power of the planned curriculum, Aoki avers that difference is always-already linked to an abstract image to which pedagogy ought to aspire and in conformity to which its operations become recognizable as ‘education’ per se. Against political action then, orthodox educational thought conceptualizes social life alongside the ‘categories of the Negative’, eschewing difference for conformity, flows for unities, mobile arrangements for totalizing systems (Foucault, 1983, p. xiii). Twisting Deleuze, might we claim that the people are missing in education? That is, where **education aspires to invest desire in the** production of a ‘**majoritarian’** or ‘molar’ **public, the prospect of thinking singularities are stayed**, not only through the paucity of enunciatory **forms and images available for thinking education** in the first place, but further, **through the organization of the school’s enunciatory machines into vehicles of representation that repeat in molarizing forms of self-reflection**, ‘majoritarian’ perspective, and dominant circuits of desiring-investment. Herein, **the impulse of standardization obliterates alternative subject formations and the modes of counter-signifying enunciation that might palpate them. Repelling the** singular, the ‘**majoritarian’** **and standardizing** **impulse of education takes as its ‘fundamental’ mode of production** **the reification of common sense**, or, rather, the territorialization of thought according to that which is given (that which everyone already knows). **Figuring in a mode ‘of identification that brings diversity in general to bear upon the form of the Same’,** common sense functions to stabilize patterns of social production by tethering them to molar orders of meaning and dominant regimes of social signification (Deleuze, 1990, p. 78). As Daignault argues, in so far as it repels the anomalous by reterritorializing it within prior systems of representation, common sense constitutes a significant and lingering problem in contemporary education (Hwu, 2004). Its function, Daignault alludes apropos Serres, is oriented to the annihilation of difference. Hence, **where the conceptualization of ‘public’ education is founded in common sense, potentials for political action through tactics of proliferation, disjunction, and singularization are radically delimited** and captured within prior territorialities of use (Foucault, 1983, p. xiii). The problem of this scenario is clear: **common sense has yet to force us to think in a manner capable of subtracting desire from majoritarian thought in lieu of alternative forms of organization and experimental expression**. In so far as it functions as a vehicle of ‘molarization’, reifying a common universe of reference for enunciation, the school fails to produce conditions for thinking in a manner that is not already anticipated by such referential ‘possibilities’. Hence, **while antithetical to the espoused purpose of schooling, the majoritarian impulse of the school has yet to produce conditions for thinking** – at least in the Deleuzian (2000) sense whereupon thought proceeds from a necessary violence to those habits of repetition with which thought becomes contracted.

## 3

#### Passing PRO will eliminate the filibuster

Jones 4/13/21
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Americans like unions, but very few belong to one, a discrepancy that places the U.S. labor movement in a precarious state. In 2017, only [10.7 percent](https://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/union2_01192018.pdf) of all Americans belonged to a union, but that same year, a PBS NewsHour poll found that [nearly half](https://www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/a-growing-number-of-americans-want-to-join-a-union)of all Americans said they’d join a union if they could. Union membership hasn’t budged much since then, even as overall support for unions reached its highest level in a decade — 65 percent of Americans [polled](https://news.gallup.com/poll/12751/labor-unions.aspx) by Gallup in 2020 said they approved of unions, up from a low of 48 percent in 2010.

A gap this wide indicates a serious problem. If Americans like unions and want to join them but aren’t, it’s likely because they can’t. Fortunately, a possible fix awaits: The Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act would mark the biggest expansion of collective-bargaining rights in decades. President Biden has said he supports the bill, and he may soon be in a position to make good on that support. The bill passed the House with bipartisan support late on Tuesday evening, and is headed now to the Senate.

Below, a brief outline of the PRO Act. What is it, exactly, and why should it matter to the 90 percent of Americans who don’t belong to a union? The answers, supporters say, are key to President Biden’s “build back better” agenda — and to a more equitable country.

What does the PRO Act do?

The act “modernizes and updates a lot of the loopholes and the brokenness of U.S. labor law,” explained Ryan Kekeris, an organizer for the International Union of Painters and Allied Trades, or IUPAT. Since Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the National Labor Relations Act in 1935, business groups and conservative lobbyists have worked with great success to hollow out and weaken its provisions. “Right-to-work” laws in various states require unions to represent all workers on a given jobsite, whether or not those workers choose to pay dues. That harms unions financially, drives down union membership, and, according to a handful of studies, [depresses wages](https://www.americanprogressaction.org/issues/economy/reports/2017/05/18/167539/right-work-harm-americans/) for all.

If it becomes law, the PRO Act would also prevent employers from misclassifying workers either as independent contractors or as supervisors, which excludes them from many protections of the National Labor Relations Act. That provision worries some freelancers, who believe they’ll be forced to unionize, or that companies will stop working with them. Those doomsday scenarios aren’t likely to occur, as labor lawyer Brandon Magner recently pointed out in his [newsletter](https://brandonmagner.substack.com/p/no-the-pro-act-wouldnt-kill-freelancing), Labor Law Lite.  The PRO Act concerns itself with a narrow question: “whether certain workers possess rights” under the National Labor Relations Act, including “the right to strike, collectively bargain, and engage in various other ‘concerted activities’ for ‘mutual aid or protection.’” That doesn’t mean a freelancer writer will automatically lose work. Nor would they suddenly find themselves forced into a union overnight; Magner writes that “a demonstrated majority of their freelancing-colleagues at a website” would have to push for it.

Employers would also have a harder time pressuring workers against forming a union, because, as matters stand now, employers “can make you spend more or less all day long sitting in captive audience meetings with an anti-union consultant, or a manager or supervisor, where they never stop telling you how this is a bad decision that could adversely affect the company,” Kekeris said. The PRO Act bans such meetings. It would also prohibit employers from permanently replacing striking workers with non-union labor, thus removing another key source of pressure on unionized labor. Employers that violate existing legal provisions by coercing or retaliating against workers who organize would also face stiffer penalties for doing so.

Can it pass?

The PRO Act passed the House with [bipartisan](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/842/cosponsors?r=1&s=2&q=%7B%22search%22%3A%5B%22protecting+the+right+to+organize%22%5D%2C%22party%22%3A%22Republican%22%7D) support. But it may face a harder road in the Senate, where a virtually certain Republican filibuster could block its passage. Though moderate senators, including Joe Manchin of West Virginia and Kyrsten Sinema of Arizona, have both said they don’t want to abolish the filibuster, some voices within labor are urging them to reconsider.

Kekeris says his union, IUPAT, believes it’s time for the filibuster to go. “The Democratic Party controls the chambers. They control the presidency. If they cannot get the PRO Act passed with a simple majority then it is up to them to figure out how to do it,” he said. “We consider the end of the filibuster to be vital.” IUPAT isn’t alone, either. In a [press release](https://cwa-union.org/news/releases/pro-act-gives-workers-tools-regain-power-in-their-workplaces), the Communication Workers of America urged senators “to stop hiding behind outdated rules and procedures like the filibuster.” The executive council of the AFL-CIO also released [a statement](https://aflcio.org/about/leadership/statements/senate-rules-cannot-be-used-block-workers-first-agenda), saying that if the PRO Act proves impossible to pass with the current Senate rules in place, it will call for “swift and necessary changes.”

Should any of this matter to non-union workers?

If the business of getting the PRO Act passed knocks a hole in the filibuster, it’ll remove a substantial obstacle to the democratization of the Senate. That possibility reveals another, under-considered consequence of the PRO Act: It’s good for democracy. Democracy is an expansive idea, encompassing more than electoral politics or arcane Senate procedure. Unions don’t exist to elect Democrats. They exist so that workers can bargain better conditions for themselves — an act of workplace democracy that reinforces the right to free association and the right to free speech.

“I would say that America’s workplaces, absent a union contract, are probably the least democratic spaces we have in our society,” said Lane Windham, a Georgetown University professor and the author of Knocking on Labor’s Door: Union Organizing in the 1970s and the Roots of a New Economic Divide.

The bill will also have other, far-reaching ramifications. Unions, after all, are simply made up of workers; bills that are good for the former tend to be good for the latter. Workers who face racial and gender discrimination on the job could benefit the most from the PRO Act’s provisions. In unions, said Celine McNicholas of the Economic Policy Institute, “workers of color are not experiencing the same sort of wage suppression that they are in other, non-unionized settings.” Union membership thus correlates to lower racial wealth gaps. “The PRO Act promotes greater racial economic justice because unions allow for collective bargaining, essentially shrinks Black-white wage gaps, and brings greater fairness in terms of hiring opportunities,” she added.

As long as employers have the broad right to wear workers down for trying to organize, the First Amendment might as well stop at the office or factory doors. Employers can even block workers from speaking during anti-union, captive audience meetings. “People think that they have a right to their job and they actually don’t,” Windham said. “Employers, with a few exceptions like discrimination issues, can generally fire people at will and can limit your free speech at any time.”

To date, President Biden hasn’t endorsed calls to end the filibuster. But if he wants to build America back better, as he’s promised, advocates say the PRO Act is nonnegotiable. “In order to build an economy that is more just, that promotes greater equality, working people need a voice. They need access to unions,” said McNicholas.

#### Eliminating the filibuster gives Republicans ground to catalyze anti-democrat mobilization

Burgess + Arkin 3/23/21

Killing the filibuster becomes new ‘litmus test’ for Democratic candidates But that framing of the issue also hands Republicans a potent weapon next fall. <https://www.politico.com/news/2021/03/23/filibuster-democrats-senate-midterms-477573> By [BURGESS EVERETT](https://www.politico.com/staff/burgess-everett) (John Burgess Everett is a congressional reporter for POLITICO. He previously was a transportation reporter for POLITICO Pro, Web producer, helping run POLITICO’s Twitter and Facebook accounts, and a contributor to the On Media blog.) and [JAMES ARKIN](https://www.politico.com/staff/james-arkin) (James Arkin is a reporter for the Campaign Pro team focusing on Senate races. Before joining POLITICO, James was a reporter at RealClearPolitics, where he covered Congress and the 2016 election. James earned a master’s and bachelor’s degree from the Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern University. He hails from Columbus, Ohio, and is a diehard Cleveland sports fan.) 03/23/2021 04:30 AM EDT ////(\*ak)

“If we allow the filibuster to take down major priority items like civil rights legislation, then it would be a major drag on 2022,” Jackson said. It’s still a year before even the earliest primary contests, and Democratic primaries will grow more crowded. But the anti-filibuster positioning from early candidates cements once-obscure Senate rules as a front-and-center issue for primary voters. And running in a Democratic primary field without opposing the filibuster could prove difficult. “Democrats ought to be for getting shit done for people. And if somebody is still talking about how much they love the filibuster, then I want to hear their argument how we get things done for people,” Kenyatta said. Democrats’ big goals often clash with the simple math problem presented by the filibuster. The Green New Deal and Medicare for All dominated the party’s presidential primary last year. Yet even after Democrats emerged with a sweep of Washington, they're short of votes in the Senate to pass even relatively modest immigration bills. “That’s where I think a lot of voter frustration is. Democrats are running on, ‘Hey, we’re going to do all these things,’” Lasry said. “We get all three branches of government and we can’t do anything because of this supermajority rule that the Constitution doesn’t even have." The issue may be more resonant in Democratic primaries than in general elections in some swing states. Rep. Stephanie Murphy (D-Fla.), who is exploring a challenge to GOP Sen. Marco Rubio, declined to comment and said the filibuster was a Senate matter. But the two Senate Democrats in next year's toughest reelection races notably are entertaining efforts to change the filibuster. Sen. Mark Kelly (D-Ariz.) said he would weigh any changes to the Senate rules against “how this affects my constituents in Arizona, and is this good for our country or not?” Sen. Raphael Warnock (D-Ga.) put it this way: “I’m really focused on passing these voting rights bills. We’ve got to pass them, whether we get rid of the filibuster or not.” Filibuster talk has captivated the Senate for weeks, a fixation that will only heighten if Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer puts up House-passed bills on guns, immigration, voting rights and LGBTQ protections only to see them sunk for lack of 60 votes. The resulting focus on the filibuster will only make the issue more politically resonant. Steven Law, the president of Senate Leadership Fund, a McConnell-aligned super PAC, said he expected to see paid advertising on the issue next year regardless of what happens to the filibuster this Congress. “Every day that the news is filled with discussions about Democrats getting rid of the filibuster and talking about what they might pass if they could do it, it just makes it a much stronger issue going into this next cycle,” Law said. “It’s political malpractice for Democrats to think about scrapping the filibuster when they’ve got a 50-50 Senate.” Even with the odds stacked against them in a 50-50 Senate, the “battle for the filibuster is right now,” said Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.). “Big, core Democratic issues like access to the vote, corruption, gun safety, climate change — we can’t address those things unless we use a majority vote.” Candidates said the issue is already coming up on the trail. Voters are “hostile” to the filibuster, Jackson said. He did not outright endorse getting rid of the 60-vote threshold but said it should not be a roadblock to passing legislation on voting rights. Democratic contenders running against the filibuster see their position as a no-brainer because the need to win 60 votes is barring the party from achieving longtime goals that are objectively more possible with a simple majority ruling the day in the Senate. But that framing of the issue also hands Republicans a potent weapon next fall. They can argue that, in the midterms, even a single Senate seat can make the difference between a historic change to the fabric of the U.S. government and a system where the minority party still has the power to stop legislation it finds objectionable. Chris Hartline, a spokesperson for the National Republican Senatorial Committee, said Democrats are campaigning on “eliminating the filibuster so they can enact the most radical legislative agenda in history.” “The Democrat agenda which they could accomplish at 51 is an agenda that is very out of the mainstream where most Americans are,” said Senate Minority Whip John Thune (R-S.D.). “I do think that’s something that would resonate with voters.” Still, Democrats don’t see the downside to their position. Asked about GOP efforts to run as a check on the Democrats and as protectors of the filibuster, Fetterman replied: “promise?” Though both Sinema and Manchin have said they can’t be swayed on the filibuster, it’s also technically possible that they could change their mind if Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell builds a wall of opposition for the next 20 months. Even if Democrats were to get rid of the 60-vote requirement unilaterally, via “the nuclear option,” the midterms would still be a referendum on the wisdom of changing the Senate’s rules to pass party-line legislation. Fetterman and state Rep. Malcolm Kenyatta, the first official candidates in what’s likely to be a crowded primary in Pennsylvania, both support abolishing the filibuster. Among North Carolina Democratic Senate hopefuls, former state Sen. Erica Smith [supports abolishing the filibuster](https://twitter.com/EricaforUSSen/status/1365106998220627971?s=20), while state Sen. Jeff Jackson referred to himself in an interview as “filibuster-skeptical.” Both of the announced Senate candidates in Wisconsin, Milwaukee Bucks executive Alex Lasry and Outagamie County Executive Tom Nelson, are running on an anti-filibuster platform. Lasry said it’s a “relic of the past.” “I will make it an issue [in the primary] and I will make it an issue in the general so that the Republican nominee, whether it’s Ron Johnson or someone else, defends it. There’s absolutely no defense,” Nelson said. Senate Democrats lack the votes right now to scrap the filibuster. The midterms may change that. In three of the most competitive Senate races, Democratic candidates are already campaigning on killing the Senate’s 60-vote requirement for most bills, placing the chamber’s arcane rules at the forefront of the nascent 2022 midterms. Those reform-minded Democrats are running on voting rights legislation, a minimum wage increase and background checks for gun purchases, arguing that they're only possible through a simple majority vote in the Senate. If Democrats can expand their 50-seat majority by two or three seats, moderate Sens. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) and Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.) will no longer hold so much sway in a caucus increasingly interested in gutting the chamber’s supermajority threshold once and for all. “I would be surprised if there’s anyone in any of these [competitive] states... that would support maintaining the filibuster,” said Democratic Pennsylvania Lt. Gov. John Fetterman, who is pursuing his party’s nomination for a Senate seat up for grabs next year. “Getting rid of the filibuster is as close to a litmus test for our party as I can describe.” It’s basically impossible in 2022 for Democrats to pick up 10 seats and secure a filibuster-proof majority, given the Senate's current 50-50 split and their limited number of pick-up opportunities across the country. But snatching open seats in Pennsylvania, Wisconsin or North Carolina next fall while holding on elsewhere is a plausible way for Democrats to squash the legislative filibuster in 2023, provided they hold their House majority as well.

#### The brink is now--- Dem victory in Post-Trump era spikes violence spirals- capitol riots prove

Jones et al. 10/22
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A growing number of U.S. federal and state threat assessments have concluded that domestic terrorism could persist in the United States for the foreseeable future, including in 2021 and beyond. For example, the New Jersey Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness projected that “domestic extremists—primarily anarchist, anti-government, and racially motivated—will continue to manipulate national incidents” and remain a threat at least through 2021.40 Looking toward the future, there are several issues worth monitoring.

First, there are various scenarios for a continuation—and even a rise—of violence after the November 2020 elections, which could persist into 2021 and beyond. Rising political polarization, growing economic challenges, the persistence of Covid-19, and growing concerns about immigration could lead to a rise in domestic terrorism.

The actions of far-left and far-right extremists are likely to be interlinked as various sides respond to others during protests, riots, demonstrations, and online activity. There appears to be an assumption by some extremists that others are prepared to use force, which heightens the possibility of violence. All sides have access to firearms, incendiaries, crude explosives, and other weapons, and are willing to bring them to demonstrations. This situation is a classic security dilemma.41 Each side’s efforts to increase its own security and acquire weapons inadvertently threaten the other side. Since it may be difficult for individuals to distinguish between offensive and defensive arms, even efforts by one side to protect itself may motivate others to arm, creating a spiral of actions that leads to violence.42 As Figure 6 highlights, domestic terrorism incidents have not been isolated to specific geographic locations, suggesting that a rise in terrorism would likely be a national problem, not a regional one. The broad scope of domestic terrorism also makes it difficult to predict where future incidents will occur.

[FIGURE OMITTED]

In the event of a Democratic presidential victory, the threat could involve specific attacks by radicalized white supremacists, militias, and other related individuals. In these incidents, the primary weapons—particularly for fatal attacks—are likely to be firearms and explosives, as highlighted in the 2020 militia plots against the governors of Michigan and Virginia. Based on data from the National Instant Criminal Background Check System (NICS), the number of firearm background checks for gun purchases spiked to its highest level ever in 2020—which doubled over the past decade.43 The pervasiveness of guns—including automatic weapons—is particularly concerning in the United States’ ultra-polarized political climate. Based on our data, the targets are likely to be demonstrators, politicians, or individuals based on their race, ethnicity, or religion—such as African Americans, Latinos, Muslims, and Jews.

In the event of a Republican presidential victory, for example, the primary threat may come from large-scale demonstrations in cities, some of which become violent. Anarchists, anti-fascists, and other far-left extremists have utilized digital platforms and other publications to argue that Donald Trump is a neo-fascist and that violence is legitimate.44 As the Antifa-aligned journal It’s Going Down argued, “Suddenly, anarchists and antifa, who have been demonized and sidelined by the wider Left have been hearing from liberals and Leftists, ‘you’ve been right all along.’”45 A Baltimore-based Antifa activist explained the use of violence as graduated and escalating: “You fight them with fists so you don’t have to fight them with knives. You fight them with knives so you don’t have to fight them with guns. You fight them with guns so you don’t have to fight them with tanks.”46 Anarchists, anti-fascists, and other far-left individuals and networks have increasingly used firearms—in addition to explosives and incendiary devices—in conducting attacks. In this scenario, the primary targets could be government, military, and police facilities and personnel.

Digital platforms will likely continue to be a major battlefield. Far-left extremists will likely continue to use social media platforms—such as Reddit, Facebook, and Twitter—to release propaganda and instigate violence against political opponents, law enforcement, military, and the government.47 Many adopted slogans, such as ACAB (“all cops are bastards”), that were used in memes as part of their propaganda campaigns. Far-right extremists will likely use a multitude of mainstream platforms (such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, Telegram, and Reddit), lesser-known platforms (such as Gab, Discord, Minds, and Bitchute), forums (such as Stormfront and IronForge), and other online communities to instigate violence against African Americans, Jews, immigrants, and others.48 Extremists from all sides will likely utilize digital platforms to fundraise, communicate, issue propaganda, conduct doxing campaigns (releasing an individual’s personally identifiable information), intimidate targets, and coordinate activity.

Second, the domestic landscape could shift from a decentralized milieu of extremists to more organized and hierarchically structured groups. As one study concluded, Louis Beam’s concept of “leaderless resistance” has been “a near total failure as a method of fomenting widespread armed resistance against the U.S. government.”49 Most effective militant organizations have established centralized organizational structures to enable their leaders to control how violence is orchestrated and how finances are secured and managed.50

In the United States, there are a handful of groups—such as The Base, the Atomwaffen Division (including rebranded versions such as the National Socialist Order), and the Feuerkrieg Division—with some leadership structure and command-and-control arrangements. There are also loose extremist movements that have a limited structure—especially in local areas or online—but lack a clear hierarchy and ideology. Examples include the Three Percenters, Oath Keepers, Boogaloos, QAnon, and some local networks of anarchists, anti-fascists, and militias. There have been some indications of greater organization, including the establishment of online hubs, such as MyMilitia, that provide a venue for individuals to find existing militias in the United States—or even to start their own.51

A shift toward more hierarchical groups could have at least two implications. It could increase the competence and professionalism of these organizations in numerous areas, such as planning attacks, recruiting, training, improving operational security, and fundraising. In the 1960s and 1970s, extremists in the United States established more centralized groups—such as the Order, Mau Mau, and White Knights—to improve their effectiveness.52 But research on terrorist and other militant groups indicates that centralized groups are more vulnerable to penetration by law enforcement and intelligence agencies.53

#### Extremist bases have resources, expertise, and will to use CBRN
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Around the same time, an anti-government extremist seeking to engage in terrorism received much less attention. Jerry Drake Varnell, a follower of the anti-government “Three Percenter” ideology was arrested for plotting to detonate a 1,000-pound vehicle bomb in downtown Oklahoma City. Varnell was reportedly worried that groups like ISIS could steal credit for the attack from him. These are just two examples of the increasing terror threat posed by far-right extremists (understood as an overlapping web of for example neo-Nazis, Ku Klux Klan, white supremacists, white nationalists, Christian Identity, racist skinheads, as well as parts of anti-government militia, sovereign citizen, or armed patriot groups) of which U.S. law enforcement and intelligences agencies have warned months, even years ago. Indeed, right-wing terrorists have killed more Americans since 9/11 than any other form of violent extremism, are overall more active in committing homicides, are perceived to be the no. 1 threat by local law enforcement agencies, and worship one of the deadliest terrorist in American history: Timothy McVeigh.

As the threat from domestic terrorism is clearly increasing, one must ask if violent tactics used by these attackers might develop beyond the use of explosives and guns. The vehicle attack in Charlottesville was an indication of that tactics diversification, even though this was not the first incident of its kind in the United States. As the Oklahoma plot shows, far-right terrorists might see themselves in some kind of competition for public recognition with Jihadist groups like ISIS, which could lead to a further escalation of tactics used for example with the deployment of chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear (CBRN) weapons. In fact, right-wing terrorists have for decades been attempting to develop and use chemical and biological weapons. This article aims to give a short overview on the history of such efforts, the potential for right-wing terrorism to use chemical and biological agents in the future, and how authorities can counter this threat.

A Look at the Cases

Even though no significant cases of successful right-wing CBRN terror attacks in Western countries are known, a number of plots have been uncovered that indicate the motives and tactics of these extremists. In 2009 Ian Davidson, who was the leader of the right-wing terrorist Aryan Strike Force (ASF), became the first British citizen convicted of producing a chemical weapon of mass destruction. When Davidson and his son Nicky were arrested in the United Kingdom, the subsequent trial and conviction made history. His plot aimed to poison water supplies of Muslims in Serbia using the toxin ricin, which he already had produced in a significant amount. Estimations by investigators regarding the lethality of the material varied drastically but some thought the amount produced by Davison could have killed up to 1,000 people.

In the mid-1980s one of the few right-wing terrorist organizations in the United States, “The Covenant, the Sword, and the Arm of the Lord”, acquired large amounts of cyanide, intending to poison water supplies in major U.S. cities, but failed to overcome the technical difficulties of dissemination. In May 1996, a laboratory staff member and white supremacist in Ohio, Larry Wayne Harris, successfully acquired plague bacteria – not illegal at that time. Two years later, Harris and a co-conspirator were arrested for threatening to release anthrax in Las Vegas, even though his strain was a vaccine grade and harmless version. Material to extract ricin was also found at the home of white supremacist James Kenneth Gluck in Tampa, Fla., who was arrested by the FBI in November 1999 after he threatened judges with biological warfare. More serious seems to have been the plot led by neo-Nazi William Krar of Texas, arrested in April 2003. Investigators found more than 500,000 rounds of ammunition, 65 pipe bombs and remote-control briefcase bombs, and almost two pounds of deadly sodium cyanide. Along with white supremacist and anti-government material, components to convert the cyanide into a bomb capable of killing thousands were also secured. In November 2011, a plot to blow up government buildings and kill masses of people using ricin by a group of four men belonging to an anti-government militia in Georgia was uncovered. Especially concerning was the fact that one of the four was working for the federal Department of Agriculture, giving him access to chemicals, technical equipment and ways to disseminate the poison into food and water supplies. In February 2017, 27 year old William Christopher Gibbs, member of the white supremacist Creativity Movement, was arrested after hospitalizing himself for side effects of his experiments with ricin, triggering a large FBI operation.

When looking at these cases, far-right extremists attempting to acquire and use CBRN weapons have very mixed backgrounds, ranging from career criminals to senior biodefense researchers at United States Army institutions. However, the more serious plots came from well-educated individuals with necessary access to equipment and dissemination ways indicating that right-wing terrorists might be quite well embedded in Western societies. In his seminal study about far-right terrorists’ recruitment and radicalization from 2012 for example, Pete Simi found 56% of his sample belonged to middle or upper social class and 53% had some form of college or higher education (with and without degrees). The majority of far-right CBRN plotters were part of groups and networks associated with their ideological and criminal conduct but not all of them. However, every far-right CBRN incident appears to be a culmination of a radicalization escalation process, sometimes even over years, with long histories of openly expressed violent, right-wing extremist, racist or anti-government opinions. Many of the plotters repeatedly threatened to use CBRN weapons in public to bystanders, families or friends. Even the lone actors were known to have gradually distanced themselves from their social environments getting more and more agitated and aggressive.

Now, the key question is: what makes a threat of far-right CBRN terrorism more likely and dangerous than compared with other violent ideologies, such as left-wing or jihadi terrorism? Of course, far-right extremists have equal access to open market technical equipment and supplies for manufacturing such weaponry as all other extremists in the country and their ideology is not more or less dangerous than jihadi or left-wing extremism, for example. Nevertheless, in 2012 international terrorism expert Peter Bergen stated, that “11 right-wing and left-wing extremists have managed to acquire CBRN material that they planned to use against the public, government employees or both” while there was no evidence of jihadists in the United States managing to do that. From these 11 cases only one (Joseph Konopka) was motivated by left-wing extremist (more specifically anarchist) political ideals. This fact is striking, since other violent extremists, especially Jihadists, certainly do not lack the willingness to use weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), as it is currently experienced in Syria and Iraq. But how indicative is this retrospectively almost singular right-wing CBRN terror threat for the future?

To assess the possibility of an attack, one has to take three factors into account: 1) the feasibility of the used weapon (acquisition, available know-how, technology, materials or agents), 2) the “effectivity” or costs and benefits of the weapon and 3) the motivation to use the weapon regarding the pursued aims. The assassination of an individual person with a plain firearm is feasible (through the ease of acquiring a firearm), effective (since a single, well-placed bullet will “do the job”) and sends a clear message in terms of motivation, however not to an extent exceeding every-day criminality encountered on the streets of big cities. Using a deadly toxin, like ricin, presents bigger hurdles in terms of feasibility, but is also highly effective (in terms of toxicity and evasion of forensic investigation) and, more important, will provide added value in terms of public attention and media coverage about the attack and the very ideology of the originators. Considering the attack on a crowded public space, planting explosives will lead to severe damage as well potentially high lethality. However, by mixing the explosives with radioactive material – a so called dirty bomb – will not only cause more fatalities through radiation, but also evoke a higher level of fear and terror. Additionally, such an incident would represent a difficult challenge for first responders and might render the government incompetent of an appropriate response and preparation in the eyes of the public. All terrorists potentially share this goal to make their attacks more impactful and deadly, even though right-wing terrorists rarely have aimed to produce mass casualties, so far.

Factor 2, the effectivity of a weapon is, depending on the planned operation, similar for all kinds of terrorist as well. However, the feasibility to use CBRN weapons (factor 1) might be higher for far-right terrorists than for others, e.g. jihadists, since the extreme right can rely on established and much larger support networks, which can provide the required material, know-how and dissemination ways. Of course, it is not impossible for lone actors from all ideological strands to acquire the material as well as the know-how. Regarding factor 3, the motive, the violent far-right might be in an extraordinary position right now, making it more dangerous than ever.

The current Trump administration is openly courting the extreme right and – in the eyes of observers – fuelling a rising far-right terror threat, for example through the inadequate reaction to the Charlottesville attack. In addition, the general public is much less likely to perceive violent actions from far-right extremists as “terrorism” compared, for example, with those acts by Islamic extremists. This gives violent extremists from the far-right considerably more space to radicalize, escalate violent tactics and plot attacks without interference from the outside than from any other violent extremist group in Western countries. The most significant danger, however, will come to light after the demise of the Trump administration. A future US government trying to put the far-right jinni that Trump has released back into the bottle will face a much stronger, self-confident and aggressive opponent, already dreaming of a race war. The current government is favoured by anti-government militias and sovereign citizens and they are looking for a new enemy: those “counter-revolutionaries” attempting to return the United States to a pre-Trump state. Even open civil war was threatened in a case of impeachment. far-right extremists of all different strands might have heavily stockpiled firearms and explosives, but they know they cannot outgun and outman law enforcement, National Guard or the Military. A fight to retain their perceived newly gained freedom and powers therefore must include a tactical edge forcing the government to refrain from a too aggressive crackdown. CBRN agents or even the potential to quickly acquire them are the most effective and logical way to ensure the government’s passivity, especially giving the history of CBRN plots within the far-right.

What is Likely, What is Not? A Choice of Weapons

Some CBRN agents are more likely to be used in a terrorist attack than others, depending on factors such as ease of acquiring raw materials, difficulty of production, the required know-how, danger of storing the material for the terrorist, degradation of the material over time, deliverance, dispersion, and potential countermeasures. Nuclear and radiological weapons require radioactive elements that are generally stored under high-security and thus hard to obtain without a state sponsor. Low-level radioactive elements unsuitable for nuclear weapons, but sufficient for the construction of a ‘dirty bomb’ might be easier to obtain, since industry, agriculture and medical institutions are dependent on them. Americium, which is used in household smoke detectors, has indeed been found in the homes of far-right extremists, e.g. Tampa resident Brandon Russell. However, its actual effectiveness as a dirty-bomb ingredient is debated. Further, neo-Nazi James Cummings acquired four 1-gallon containers with a radioactive uranium and thorium mix in 2008, along with highly toxic beryllium powder and instructions to build a dirty bomb.

Chemicals and biological material, while for some part underlying governmental restrictions concerning proliferation and acquisition, are much easier to access. As noted by Edward You of the FBI’s Weapons of Mass Destruction Directorate, Biological Countermeasures Unit, “The materials are readily available (…), and the majority of equipment can be purchased outright and do not fall under any regulatory regime.” Precursors for chemical warfare agents, as sodium cyanide in the case of William Krar, can be simply bought online. Manuals explaining the synthesis of the active agents in small laboratory or kitchen setups have been found in many cases, illustrating that the required knowledge has already spread and advanced significantly. Explosives that have been found and used in terror associated cases include the so called ‘mother of Satan’, triacetone peroxide (TATP), and hexamethylene triperoxide diamine (HTMD). TATP can be synthesized from easily accessible household chemicals (acetone, hydrogen peroxide and sulfuric acid). Synthesis of chemical warfare agents like sarin, a nerve agent used by the Aum Shinrikyo attacks on the Tokyo subway, is highly demanding in terms of technology and know-how. Considering the difficulties of achieving sufficient quality of the material and the high risk for the producers during manufacturing and storage make and attack with nerve agents appear unlikely. However, structurally more simple chemicals, like cyanide compounds which can be commercially obtained, have been used in far-right terror plots.

Another potential dual-use chemical is chlorine. The highly reactive gas is nowadays widely used as disinfectant, bleaching agent and within different industry branches. Millions of tons are transported on roads and railways within the US every year, and may as such be targets for terrorist attacks. Upon contact with the human mucosa, the water soluble chlorine will at first cause local irritations and, during prolonged exposition of higher doses, evoke the deadly “dry-land drowning”. While no large scale attacks on hazardous material (HAZMAT) transports have been reported so far, guides to derail trains carrying such materials have been published by Jihadists and could easily be used by far-right terrorists as well. Additionally, application of commercially acquired chlorine as choking agent in local, small scale attacks pose a risk.

Alternatives to chemicals are agents of biological origin: toxins, bacteria (or spores – robust and dormant forms) and viruses. Toxins are harmful products of biological organisms, which interfere with vital body functions. Production and purification of these substances require in-depth knowledge and large amounts are thus hard to obtain. Ricin, which can be isolated from the castor oil plant, has been detected in multiple cases of far-right terror plots. While ricin is extremely deadly when taken up into the body, a wide spread application of ricin to target large groups of people is rather unlikely, just by the large amounts needed for such operation and the very proteinaceous nature. The isolation and cultivation of bacteria, although requiring some microbiological knowledge, can be done in improvised laboratory setups. Highly pathogenic strains are usually kept in isolated, high-security laboratories. However, Bacillus anthracis is an omnipresent, easy to isolate soil bacterium. Anthrax, as in the case of Larry Wayne Harris, is according to the CDC generally considered to be the most likely agent which might be used in large-scale bioterror. Viruses are dependent on cells as hosts for multiplication and thus require an even more complicated production process, which is highly unlikely to be established outside of academic or industrial laboratories. While the deadliest infectious diseases, like ebola or lassa, are caused by viral infections, application of viruses as terror agent by far-right extremist is unlikely. However, the growing industry and professionalization of DIY bio-laboratories across the United States was also noted by the FBI, which might also increase accessibility of the necessary technical equipment for potential biological and chemical terrorism.

Likely Goals of Right-Wing Terrorists

Existing research on right-wing CBRN terrorism is scarce and outdated. Few experts have even considered the potential threat, mostly in the late 1990s looking at Christian Millenarianism as a form of religious terrorism aiming for the apocalypse in a “sacrificial ritual of mass murder and suicide ”. Even though Christian millenarian groups have not attempted to develop CBRN weapons, they were scrutinized for such a potential threat after the Aum attack in Tokyo. Jessica Stern wrote in 1999 that “the costs of escalation to biological weapons seem to outweigh the benefits” for domestic extremists. Paul Blister and Nina Kollars confirmed this notion regarding the Christian Patriot Movement in 2011. Right-wing terrorism, however, goes beyond Christian fundamentalism and fanaticism circling around Armageddon. Especially given the dramatic increase in anti-government sentiment and militia groups in some western countries (e.g. the US and Germany) and their partial overlap with white supremacist and nationalist groups, there is potential for a future escalation of violent tactics if anyone might attempt to contain them again. Right-wing terrorists have usually not sought large public audiences for their attacks in order to communicate specific political programs but rather to annihilate their enemies by every means possible. In addition, to create chaos and panic, as well as erode a public’s trust in the government’s ability to provide safety by demonstrating its helplessness – a concept known as ‘strategy of tension’ among right-wing extremists – is thought to break the government’s monopoly of force and core political legitimacy.

Other research about right-wing extremism and terrorism has also shown, that an overlap between violent activists from the far-right and organized crime exists, which means that the acquisition of WMDs by these groups and actors could also be used as significant tool to shift the power base in extortion operations towards what could become right-wing extremist crime syndicates. In Austria for example a neo-Nazi group called ‘Object 21’ controlled large parts of the red light milieu along the Austrian-German border through the use of explosives, arson and attacks with butyric acid. In the United States, neo-Nazi oriented networks such as the Aryan Brotherhood for example, are deeply involved in drug trafficking. Highly militant and criminal hybrid networks could have severe impact within the organized crime world if they get their hands on CBRN weaponry, which is of course true not only of far-right but also for other terrorists.

Summing up, the potential goals of right-wing CBRN terrorism are most likely to use it for targeted assassinations, creating chaos and fear (not necessary connected with the own group and ideology, rather to erode trust in the government’s ability to protect, for which no large scale lethality is necessary as the agent itself might be scary enough), or to disrupt important commercial and logistical hubs to destabilize democratic governments, instead of producing mass casualties. In addition, it is a likely option that anti-government militias will use CBRN weapon capabilities to protect themselves from government prosecution and as leverage in extortion attempts involving their own “sovereignty” and criminal activities. This makes low to medium lethal CBRN terrorism with nevertheless severe psychological impact, creating sustained damage to democratic forms of government, a truly concerning threat. Based on previous cases, this threat seems to be greatest in the United States and Great Britain.

#### Nuclear terror alone causes nuclear war and total collapse-- extinction
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Though hard to accept, the detonation of a nuclear device – by states or non-state actors – is today a plausible scenario. And while much of the world’s focus has been on the current nuclear weapons arsenals possessed by states – about 14,550 warheads, all of which carry the risk of intentional or unintentional use – the threat of nuclear terrorism is here and increasing. For more than a decade, Al Qaeda, Aum Shinrikyo, and other terrorist groups have expressed their desire to acquire fissile material to build and detonate an improvised nuclear bomb. None of them could fulfill that goal – so far. But that does not mean that they will not succeed in the future.

Making matters worse, there is evidence of an illicit market for nuclear weapons-usable materials. There are sellers in search of potential buyers, as shown by the dismantlement of a nuclear smuggling network in Moldova in 2015. There certainly are plenty of sites from which to obtain nuclear material. According to the 2016 Nuclear Security Index by the Nuclear Threat Initiative, 24 countries still host inventories of nuclear weapons-usable materials, stored in facilities with different degrees of security.

And in terms of risk, it is not necessary for a given country to possess nuclear weapons, weapons-usable materials, or nuclear facilities for it to be useful to nuclear terrorists: Structural and institutional weaknesses in a country may make it favorable for the illicit trade of materials. Permeable boundaries, high levels of corruption, weaknesses in judicial systems, and consequent impunity may give rise to a series of transactions and other events, which could end in a nuclear attack. The truth is that, at this stage, no country in possession of nuclear weapons or weapons-usable materials can guarantee their full protection against nuclear terrorism or nuclear smuggling.

Because we live in a world of growing insecurity, where explicit and tacit agreements between the relevant powers – which upheld global stability during the post- Cold War – are giving way to increasing mistrust and hostility, a question arises: How would our lives be affected if a current terrorist group such as the Islamic State (ISIS), or new terrorist groups in the future, succeed in evolving from today’s Manchester style “low-tech” attacks to a “high-tech” one, involving a nuclear bomb, detonated in a capital city, anywhere in the world?

We attempted to answer this question in a report developed by a high-level multidisciplinary expert group convened by the NPSGlobal Foundation for the Latin American and Caribbean Leadership Network. We found that there would be multiple harmful effects that would spread promptly around the globe (Arguello and Buis 2016); a more detailed analysis is below, which highlights the need for the creation of a comprehensive nuclear security system.

The consequences of a terrorist nuclear attack

A small and primitive 1-kiloton fission bomb (with a yield of about one-fifteenth of the one dropped on Hiroshima, and certainly much less sophisticated; cf. Figure 1), detonated in any large capital city of the developed world, would cause an unprecedented catastrophic scenario.

[FIGURE 1 OMITTED]

An estimate of direct effects in the attack’s location includes a death toll of 7,300-to-23,000 people and 12,600-to-57,000 people injured, depending on the target’s geography and population density. Total physical destruction of the city’s infrastructure, due to the blast (shock wave) and thermal radiation, would cover a radius of about 500 meters from the point of detonation (also known as ground zero), while ionizing radiation greater than 5 Sieverts – compatible with the deadly acute radiation syndrome – would expand within an 850-meter radius. From the environmental point of view, such an area would be unusable for years. In addition, radioactive fallout would expand in an area of about 300 square kilometers, depending on meteorological conditions (cf. Figure 2).

[FIGURE 2 OMITTED]

But the consequences would go far beyond the effects in the target country, however, and promptly propagate worldwide. Global and national security, economy and finance, international governance and its framework, national political systems, and the behavior of governments and individuals would all be put under severe trial. The severity of the effects at a national level, however, would depend on the countries’ level of development, geopolitical location, and resilience.

Global security and regional/national defense schemes would be strongly affected. An increase in global distrust would spark rising tensions among countries and blocs, that could even lead to the brink of nuclear weapons use by states (if, for instance, a sponsor country is identified). The consequences of such a shocking scenario would include a decrease in states’ self-control, an escalation of present conflicts and the emergence of new ones, accompanied by an increase in military unilateralism and military expenditures.

Regarding the economic and financial impacts, a severe global economic depression would rise from the attack, likely lasting for years. Its duration would be strongly dependent on the course of the crisis. The main results of such a crisis would include a 2 percent fall of growth in global Gross Domestic Product, and a 4 percent decline of international trade in the two years following the attack (cf. Figure 3). In the case of developing and less-developed countries, the economic impacts would also include a shortage of high-technology products such as medicines, as well as a fall in foreign direct investment and a severe decline of international humanitarian aid toward low-income countries. We expect an increase of unemployment and poverty in all countries. Global poverty would raise about 4 percent after the attack, which implies that at least 30 million more people would be living in extreme poverty, in addition to the current estimated 767 million.

[FIGURE 3 OMITTED]

In the area of international relations, we would expect a breakdown of key doctrines involving politics, security, and relations among states. These international tensions could lead to a collapse of the nuclear order as we know it today, with a consequent setback of nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation commitments. In other words, the whole system based on the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty would be put under severe trial. After the attack, there would be a reassessment of existing security doctrines, and a deep review of concepts such as nuclear deterrence, no-first-use, proportionality, and negative security assurances.

Finally, the behavior of governments and individuals would also change radically. Internal chaos fueled by the media and social networks would threaten governance at all levels, with greater impact on those countries with weak institutional frameworks. Social turbulence would emerge in most countries, with consequent attempts by governments to impose restrictions on personal freedoms to preserve order – possibly by declaring a state of siege or state of emergency – and legislation would surely become tougher on human rights. There would also be a significant increase in social fragmentation – with a deepening of antagonistic views, mistrust, and intolerance, both within countries and towards others – and a resurgence of large-scale social movements fostered by ideological interests and easily mobilized through social media.

Prevention, preparedness, response

Given the severity of the impacts, no country in possession of nuclear weapons or weapons-usable materials can guarantee its full protection against nuclear terrorism or nuclear smuggling for proliferation purposes. Nor is it realistic to conceive of full compensation to others in the international community, if a catastrophic event happens because of any country’s acts or omissions. Therefore, we consider that prevention is the only acceptable way forward to preserve global stability.

Consequently, it is essential for countries to make every effort to prevent nuclear terrorists from fulfilling their goals. It is true that the “primitivism” of currently active terrorist organizations gives a certain space to do what is necessary to enhance the current nuclear security effort concerning prevention and response. However, the perception of the “low likeliness” of a nuclear terrorist attack neutralizes the required sense of urgency in decision-making. Being in fact a “high-risk” scenario, it is imperative that governments consider this reality when setting priorities and making decisions about nuclear security.

## OV

#### 1] No 1ar theory: [a] I only have one speech to respond which outweighs on infinite abuse because they can read any number of shells [b] aff frames the round means they pick neg ground and if the 1ar is hard, they should just write a better aff [c] 1ar restart, 4-6-3 tim skew, inifinite abuse.

#### 2] Use reasonability on 1ar theory – **[a] Competing interps moots 7 mins of NC offense which outweighs minimal neg abuse. [b] Offense-defense disincentivizes substantive education by shifting the round from substance to a norm so their model prioritizes diminishing marginal skews over substance. That outweighs – the end goal of theory is better substantive debates.** Reject aff overviews – allows them to homogenize my arguments and kills in depth line by line work, which is key to clash. **[c] kills recourse – would incentivize infinite 1ar shells so the neg needs reasonability to protect their core ground.**

#### 3] neg theory highest layer of the round a) framing of the round b) if the aff was abusive the neg is justifiecdi n being abusive

#### 4] Accept neg paradigm issues – otherwise they can put infinite spin on 1nc contextualization which means we never have good theory debates if we are disagreeing on the rules of the game. Leads to infinite theory debates, which kills the point of theory.

## On case

#### Presumption and permissibility negates – a) more often false than true since I can prove something false in infinite ways b) real world policies require positive justification before being adopted c) the aff has to prove an obligation which means lack of that obligation negates d) resolved in the resolution indicates they proactively did something, to negate that means that they aren’t resolved e) winning the nc proves since otherwise we’d be blindly deceived when skeptical f) to negate[[1]](#footnote-1) means to deny the truth of which means if the aff is false you vote neg g) permissibility can’t affirm since then anything would be ok which would justify racism – we should be safe and do nothing.

#### Teacher strikes can be disastrous and hurt student growth, killing potential for innovation

**Norton and Hernandez 18** [Hilary and Tracy. *Hilary Norton is BizFed chair and executive director of FAST (Fixing Angelenos Stuck in Traffic).* *Tracy Hernandez is the founding CEO of the Los Angeles County Business Federation (*[*BizFed*](http://www.bizfedlacounty.org/)*) and president of IMPOWER Inc.*. “Commentary: A teachers strike is bad for our students, families and economy ”. 10-10-2018. No Publication. http://laschoolreport.com/commentary-a-teachers-strike-is-bad-for-our-students-families-and-economy/.] SJ//VM

While a strike looms within our nation’s second-largest school district, the business community of Los Angeles urges the Los Angeles Unified School District and United Teachers Los Angeles to resolve their differences in a way that doesn’t put students at risk. As the organized, grassroots voice of the business community in Greater Los Angeles, BizFed works to support the public institutions that serve our community and the families that work to build our region’s economy. BizFed represents 390,000 businesses that employ nearly 4 million people throughout Los Angeles County. The majority of these employees are working to support their families, many of which include LAUSD students. It is important that the needs of students are placed first in the negotiations. Last week, BizFed wrote a letter to the LAUSD board and the UTLA executive officers urging them to do everything possible to avoid a strike. We received appreciative and positive feedback from LAUSD Board President Mónica García and Superintendent Austin Beutner as well as UTLA President Alex Caputo-Pearl. When schools are closed due to strikes, students miss learning opportunities, parents must take days off from work and our region is disrupted. Beyond hurting families, this strike will hurt our businesses and their ability to sustain and create new jobs. This potential strike by LAUSD teachers will be the first in nearly three decades. The strike in 1989 lasted nine days; the most recent teachers strike in West Virginia lasted seven days. For a family living paycheck to paycheck, over a week of unpaid time off to watch their children should not be the deciding factor between paying the rent and putting food on the table; the entire family’s livelihood is threatened. Imagine a single mom who is a nurse and has no one to watch her children. She must choose between leaving her children at home or missing a shift. That money cannot be paid back. Every day that a student is not in the classroom, they lose learning opportunities. Students fall behind the content standards set by the California State Board of Education, and teachers have to add those lost days into their curriculum. Students lose daily social interactions with their peers, which helps build character and good citizenship. Think of a student who has the dream of being a doctor. They miss school and now are discouraged and lose the aspiration of being a doctor. At-risk youth are the most vulnerable when there are school closures. If parents don’t have the ability to skip work during a teacher strike, can’t afford childcare or don’t have family that can help out, that means students are left unsupervised. Anyone who has children knows that the course of their lives can change in an instant. We must avoid putting our children’s health and safety at risk. In LAUSD, over 84 percent of the students qualify for free or reduced-price meals; the district serves over 700,000 meals each day. For many of these students, this is their only chance to eat a healthy breakfast, lunch and supper after school. A child’s nutrition should not be compromised at the hands of this potential strike. As business leaders, we value the importance of treating teachers fairly while maintaining fiscal solvency. We urge LAUSD and UTLA to find a resolution that accomplishes both. Employers care deeply for the strength and effectiveness of our K-12 educational systems. These students will also become the workforce that will grow our economy into the future. We understand that LAUSD needs more resources and support from the state, but they do not need to exacerbate the problem by cutting off the current stream of per-pupil state funding each day the strike occurs. The business community is ready to stand with its school district and teachers to support our public education system. We implore LAUSD and UTLA to avoid public fights, come to a resolution and work with the larger community to improve our city’s education system for all. Keep our future leaders learning!

#### Technological innovation solves every existential threat – which outweighs.

Matthews 18 Dylan. Co-founder of Vox, citing Nick Beckstead @ Rutgers University. 10-26-2018. "How to help people millions of years from now." Vox. https://www.vox.com/future-perfect/2018/10/26/18023366/far-future-effective-altruism-existential-risk-doing-good

If you care about improving human lives, you should overwhelmingly care about those quadrillions of lives rather than the comparatively small number of people alive today. The 7.6 billion people now living, after all, amount to less than 0.003 percent of the population that will live in the future. It’s reasonable to suggest that those quadrillions of future people have, accordingly, hundreds of thousands of times more moral weight than those of us living here today do. That’s the basic argument behind Nick Beckstead’s 2013 Rutgers philosophy dissertation, “On the overwhelming importance of shaping the far future.” It’s a glorious mindfuck of a thesis, not least because Beckstead shows very convincingly that this is a conclusion any plausible moral view would reach. It’s not just something that weird utilitarians have to deal with. And Beckstead, to his considerable credit, walks the walk on this. He works at the Open Philanthropy Project on grants relating to the far future and runs a charitable fund for donors who want to prioritize the far future. And arguments from him and others have turned “long-termism” into a very vibrant, important strand of the effective altruism community. But what does prioritizing the far future even mean? The most literal thing it could mean is preventing human extinction, to ensure that the species persists as long as possible. For the long-term-focused effective altruists I know, that typically means identifying concrete threats to humanity’s continued existence — like unfriendly artificial intelligence, or a pandemic, or global warming/out of control geoengineering — and engaging in activities to prevent that specific eventuality. But in a set of slides he made in 2013, Beckstead makes a compelling case that while that’s certainly part of what caring about the far future entails, approaches that address specific threats to humanity (which he calls “targeted” approaches to the far future) have to complement “broad” approaches, where instead of trying to predict what’s going to kill us all, you just generally try to keep civilization running as best it can, so that it is, as a whole, well-equipped to deal with potential extinction events in the future, not just in 2030 or 2040 but in 3500 or 95000 or even 37 million. In other words, caring about the far future doesn’t mean just paying attention to low-probability risks of total annihilation; it also means acting on pressing needs now. For example: We’re going to be better prepared to prevent extinction from AI or a supervirus or global warming if society as a whole makes a lot of scientific progress. And a significant bottleneck there is that the vast majority of humanity doesn’t get high-enough-quality education to engage in scientific research, if they want to, which reduces the odds that we have enough trained scientists to come up with the breakthroughs we need as a civilization to survive and thrive. So maybe one of the best things we can do for the far future is to improve school systems — here and now — to harness the group economist Raj Chetty calls “lost Einsteins” (potential innovators who are thwarted by poverty and inequality in rich countries) and, more importantly, the hundreds of millions of kids in developing countries dealing with even worse education systems than those in depressed communities in the rich world. What if living ethically for the far future means living ethically now? Beckstead mentions some other broad, or very broad, ideas (these are all his descriptions): Help make computers faster so that people everywhere can work more efficiently Change intellectual property law so that technological innovation can happen more quickly Advocate for open borders so that people from poorly governed countries can move to better-governed countries and be more productive Meta-research: improve incentives and norms in academic work to better advance human knowledge Improve education Advocate for political party X to make future people have values more like political party X ”If you look at these areas (economic growth and technological progress, access to information, individual capability, social coordination, motives) a lot of everyday good works contribute,” Beckstead writes. “An implication of this is that a lot of everyday good works are good from a broad perspective, even though hardly anyone thinks explicitly in terms of far future standards.” Look at those examples again: It’s just a list of what normal altruistically motivated people, not effective altruism folks, generally do. Charities in the US love talking about the lost opportunities for innovation that poverty creates. Lots of smart people who want to make a difference become scientists, or try to work as teachers or on improving education policy, and lord knows there are plenty of people who become political party operatives out of a conviction that the moral consequences of the party’s platform are good. All of which is to say: Maybe effective altruists aren’t that special, or at least maybe we don’t have access to that many specific and weird conclusions about how best to help the world. If the far future is what matters, and generally trying to make the world work better is among the best ways to help the far future, then effective altruism just becomes plain ol’ do-goodery.
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