### T

#### Interp - The letter “A” is an indefinite article that modifies “just government” – the resolution must be proven true in all instances, not one particular instance

CCC Capital Community College [a nonprofit 501 c-3 organization that supports scholarships, faculty development, and curriculum innovation], “Articles, Determiners, and Quantifiers”, http://grammar.ccc.commnet.edu/grammar/determiners/determiners.htm#articles AG

The three articles — a, an, the — are a kind of adjective. The is called the definite article because it usually precedes a specific or previously mentioned noun; a and an are called indefinite articles because they are used to refer to something in a less specific manner (an unspecified count noun). These words are also listed among the noun markers or determiners because they are almost invariably followed by a noun (or something else acting as a noun). caution CAUTION! Even after you learn all the principles behind the use of these articles, you will find an abundance of situations where choosing the correct article or choosing whether to use one or not will prove chancy. Icy highways are dangerous. The icy highways are dangerous. And both are correct. The is used with specific nouns. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something that is one of a kind: The moon circles the earth. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something in the abstract: The United States has encouraged the use of the private automobile as opposed to the use of public transit. The is required when the noun it refers to represents something named earlier in the text. (See below..) If you would like help with the distinction between count and non-count nouns, please refer to Count and Non-Count Nouns. We use a before singular count-nouns that begin with consonants (a cow, a barn, a sheep); we use an before singular count-nouns that begin with vowels or vowel-like sounds (an apple, an urban blight, an open door). Words that begin with an h sound often require an a (as in a horse, a history book, a hotel), but if an h-word begins with an actual vowel sound, use an an (as in an hour, an honor). We would say a useful device and a union matter because the u of those words actually sounds like yoo (as opposed, say, to the u of an ugly incident). The same is true of a European and a Euro (because of that consonantal "Yoo" sound). We would say a once-in-a-lifetime experience or a one-time hero because the words once and one begin with a w sound (as if they were spelled wuntz and won). Merriam-Webster's Dictionary says that we can use an before an h- word that begins with an unstressed syllable. Thus, we might say an hisTORical moment, but we would say a HIStory book. Many writers would call that an affectation and prefer that we say a historical, but apparently, this choice is a matter of personal taste. For help on using articles with abbreviations and acronyms (a or an FBI agent?), see the section on Abbreviations. First and subsequent reference: When we first refer to something in written text, we often use an indefinite article to modify it. A newspaper has an obligation to seek out and tell the truth. In a subsequent reference to this newspaper, however, we will use the definite article: There are situations, however, when the newspaper must determine whether the public's safety is jeopardized by knowing the truth. Another example: "I'd like a glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put the glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Exception: When a modifier appears between the article and the noun, the subsequent article will continue to be indefinite: "I'd like a big glass of orange juice, please," John said. "I put a big glass of juice on the counter already," Sheila replied. Generic reference: We can refer to something in a generic way by using any of the three articles. We can do the same thing by omitting the article altogether. A beagle makes a great hunting dog and family companion. An airedale is sometimes a rather skittish animal. The golden retriever is a marvelous pet for children. Irish setters are not the highly intelligent animals they used to be. The difference between the generic indefinite pronoun and the normal indefinite pronoun is that the latter refers to any of that class ("I want to buy a beagle, and any old beagle will do.") whereas the former (see beagle sentence) refers to all members of that class

#### Violation – They spec the United States

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits – they can spec 123 different governments - that’s supercharged by the ability to spec combinations of types of strikes. This takes out functional limits – it’s impossible for me to research every possible combination of the 195 countries and worker types

ITUC 20**,** (International Trade Union Confederation, “World’s Worst Countries for Workers”), ITUC, 2020, https://www.ituc-csi.org/IMG/pdf/ituc\_globalrightsindex\_2020\_en.pdf // MNHS NL recut DD AG

In 2020, strikes have been severely restricted or banned in 123 out of 144 countries. In a significant number of these countries, industrial actions were brutally repressed by the authorities and workers exercising their right to strike often faced criminal prosecution and summary dismissals.

#### 2] TVA solves – just read your aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff – we don’t stop them from reading new FWs, mechanisms or advantages. a] it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff being non-T b] There’s only a small number of pics on this topic c] PICs incentivize them to write better affs that can generate solvency deficits to PICs

#### Drop the debater bc you can’t drop the arg on their advocacy

#### No rvis – they can dump on theory in the 1ar, chilling us from checking abuse

#### Competing interps – reasonability is arbtiary and causes race to the bottom

### K

#### **Academic philosophy serves to perpetuate antiblackness. The 1AC’s abstraction from the manifestations of racialized violence absolves white philosophers of their contributions to America’s apathy towards black death. Their race-neutral rhetoric and universal humanistic principles prevents effective mobilization against white supremacy. Vote negative to reject the Western metaphysical tradition and the perennial failure of white philosophy. To be clear, they can’t just say extinction o/w the kritik bc it indicts the very epistemology of the aff Curry and Curry 18**

[Tommy, PhD, Prof. of Philosophy @ TAMU, Gwenetta, PhD, Ass. Prof. of Gender and Race Studies @ Alabama], “On the Perils of Race Neutrality and Anti-Blackness: Philosophy as an Irreconcilable Obstacle to (Black) Thought,” American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 77, Nos. 3-4 (May-September 2018). DOI: 10.1111/ajes.12244] JJ

We begin with the first author’s reflections on philosophy and its recurring problem of denying the realities of race and racism, reflections that have arisen as a Black (male) philosopher whose life has been threatened for doing Black philosophy. The experience of confronting death, being fearful of being killed doing my job as a critical race theorist, and being threatened with violence for thinking about racism in America has a profound effect on concretizing what is at stake in our theories about anti-Black racism. Whereas my work on race and racism in philosophy earlier in my career was dedicated to the problems created by the mass ignorance of the discipline to the political debates and ethnological history of Black philosophers in the 19th and 20th centuries, I now find myself thinking more seriously about the way that philosophy, really theory itself—our present categories of knowledge, such as race, class, and gender, found through disciplines—actually hastens the deaths of subjugated peoples in the United States. Academic philosophy routinely abstracts away from—directs thought to not attend to the realities of death, dying, and despair created by—antiBlack racism. Black, Brown, and Indigenous populations are routinely rationalized as disposable flesh. The deaths of these groups launch philosophical discussions of social injustice and spark awareness by whites, while the deaths of white people direct policy and demand outrage. Because racialized bodies are confined to inhumane living conditions that nurture violence and despair that become attributed to the savage nature of nonwhites and evidence of their inhumanity, the deaths of these dehumanized peoples are often measured against the dangers they are thought to pose to others. The interpretation of the inferior position that racialized groups occupy in the United States is grounded in how whites often think of themselves in relation to problem populations. This relationship is often rationalized by avoidance and by the denials of whites about being causally related to the harsh conditions imposed on nonwhites in the world. Philosophy, and its glorification of the rational individual, ignores the complexity of anti-Black racism by blaming the complacency, if not outright hostility, towards Blacks on the mass ignorance of white America. To remedy this problem, Black philosophers are asked to respond by gearing their writings, lectures, and professional presence to further educate and dialogue with white philosophers in order to enable them to better understand anti-Black racism and white supremacy (Curry 2008, 2015). This therapy is often rewarded as scholarship. Philosophical positions that analyze racism as a problem of miscommunication, misunderstanding, and ignorance (philosophies predicated on the capacity of whites to change) are rewarded and praised as the cutting edge and most impactful theories about race and racism. Reducing racism to a problem of recognition and understanding allows white philosophers to remain absolved of their contribution to the apathy that white America has to the death and subjugation Black Americans endure at the hands of the white race. To some readers, speaking about races as different groups with opposite, if not antagonistic, social lives seems to run contrary to the idea that there are no real races, just people, only the human race. This is the core of race-neutral theory in academic philosophy. Race neutrality asserts that while race, class, and gender may in fact differentiate bodies, the capacity for reason—the human essence beneath it all—is what is ultimately at stake in the recognition of difference. While this mantra has been offered to whites since the integrationist strategies of the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1950s under Chief Justice Earl Warren, it has had little effect in restructuring the psychology of white individuals or remedying the institutional practices of racism that continue to exclude or punish Black Americans. How are Black scholars to speak about racism, specifically the violence and death that seem to gravitate towards Black bodies if the rules of philosophy and the fragility of white Americans insist that racism is not the cause of the disproportionate death Black Americans suffer and race is not a significant factor in Black people’s lives? This article is an attempt to debunk the seemingly neutral starting point of academic philosophy. For decades, Black philosophers have attempted to educate white philosophers and reorient the philosophical anthropologies of the discipline. Black, Brown, and Indigenous philosophers have dedicated their lives and careers to educating white philosophers and students, with little to no effect on the composition and disposition of the discipline. While it is not uncommon for philosophy departments to say they support diversity, the reality is that many, if not most, Black philosophers continue to write about the problem of racism, their experiences of marginalization, and the violence they suffer from white colleagues, disciplinary organizations, and universities. This article should be read as an attempt not to amend the Western metaphysical tradition but to reveal the obstacles that indicate its perennial failure. It is the position of the authors that many of the demands for disciplinary change are often expressed as politics, when in reality there are issues of metaphysics (the concerns of being) and philosophical anthropology (the concerns about the (non)being capable of thinking) that are unaddressed in much of the current literature. Section I of this article describes what Black philosophy has taken to be the problem of racism in academic philosophy more broadly. Since the 1970s Black philosophers have criticized, attacked, and attempted to reform the discipline with little effect. This section interrogates why that is the case. Section II argues that the failure of philosophy to change is a problem of metaphysics or the illusion that Blackness is compatible with the idea of the white human. Section III presents the social scientific evidence demonstrating the seeming permanence of anti-Black racism and the dangerous nature of colorblind ideology, which does not recognize that societal organization and racism determine the life chances of Blacks. This article ends with a suggestion of what Black philosophy would look like if its primary mandate were not to persuade whites to remedy their own racist practices, but to diagnose and build strategies against the present problems of racism in philosophy before us.

**Even if they win that their colorblindness is theoretically ideal, it is practically impossible because racialized bodies are marked by their skin color – the psychological construction of Black as inferior makes their impacts inevitable – philosophy’s segregation of black scholarship is not neutral and not normal.**

Tommy J. **Curry and Curry 18** [Tommy, PhD, Prof. of Philosophy @ TAMU, Gwenetta, PhD, Ass. Prof. of Gender and Race Studies @ Alabama], “On the Perils of Race Neutrality and Anti-Blackness: Philosophy as an Irreconcilable Obstacle to (Black) Thought,” American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 77, Nos. 3-4 (May-September 2018). DOI: 10.1111/ajes.12244

Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2010: 15) explains that **colorblind racism emerged as a new racial ideology in the late 1960s** concomitantly with the crystallization of the “new racism” as America’s new racial structure. **Whites could no longer get away with the overt racist practices** that were used before the civil rights movements **but instead depended on more subtle ways to maintain their racial dominance** without using race. In today’s society, there are very few whites who outwardly consider themselves to be racist, but they will still support systems that create inequalities among minority populations.

Bonilla-Silva’s (1996) account of racism leads him to develop the idea of racialized social systems, a term that refers to societies where economic, political, social, and ideological levels are partially structured by the placement of actors in racial categories. Bonilla-Silva theorizes that **the racialized system incentivizes how racialized persons develop their identities within racist structures. Race is not simply imposed on bodies but is psychologically invested in by individuals in terms of how dominant racial groups identify themselves in relationship to the** **groups** and individuals **they construct as inferiors. For some groups assimilation is possible. This is the case for ethnic groups like the Irish and the Jews because their skin color is closer to that of whites, but it would be impossible for Black groups to similarly disappear. Colorblindness could exist in theory, but in reality, people see skin color, and in America, white skin stands for superiority.**

Racial **segregation** has been a mainstay of the American race problem since the beginning of slavery. Assigning the places that Blacks belonged, whether it be in the fields or as the “house Negro,” **has been one of the primary ways that racism has been enforced against Blacks**. Even after the end of slavery, **Jim Crow was established to terrorize Blacks into staying confined by their segregated spaces**. We would argue that **even today**, the established racial dynamic in America maintains racial segregation. In The Hidden Cost of Being African American, Thomas Shapiro (2004: 152) has shown how **whites have been able to move into the neighborhoods with the better schools and resources with the help of their inheritances**. Many of the people he interviewed about their housing location stated that they did not look at race when deciding to move to certain neighborhoods but rather they focused on the lifestyle and “standards” of the people. **Most stated that “it just happened” that there were no African Americans at the school their child attends. These understandings of “standards” and lifestyle are nested in the notion that white culture defines the norms and standards**. Eduardo Bonilla-Silva’s concept of “white habitus” explains the tendency whites have for racial segregation, namely, their preference for moving to all-white neighborhoods and the effects this practice has on African Americans.

Shapiro’s work parallels the findings of Bonilla-Silva’s theory of white habitus. Bonilla-Silva et al. (2006: 233) describe “white habitus” as a racialized, uninterrupted socialization process that conditions and creates whites’ racial taste, perceptions, feelings, and emotions and their views on racial matters. The most pronounced effect of white habitus is that “it promotes a sense of group belonging (a white culture of solidarity) and negative views about nonwhites.” **In these all-white spaces, whites become the standard or norm while anything or anyone different becomes unnatural or problematic**. White habitus promotes minorities being viewed based on stereotypes and generalizations perpetuated by the media or through other second-hand sources. **The greatest irony of Bonilla-Silva et al.’s interviews was their finding that “whites do not interpret their racial isolation and segregation from Blacks as something racial.”** This qualitative project shows that **even when whites are communally segregated** from Blacks, **they do not interpret this as a racialized or racist environment**. The absence of Blacks is thought to be compatible with how white Americans think about colorblindness. The idea of white superiority, or whiteonly neighborhoods, is not understood by many white Americans as racist. In one of Shapiro’s (2004: 152) interviews, the participant states that she has “Black friends.” However, Bonilla-Silva et al. (2006: 248) point out that when whites claim to have Black friends, they usually are referring to formal activities such as sports or classroom work groups. Once the activity is over the relationship ends; the so-called Black “friends” are not actual neighbors or friends who live within their social environment. **Academic philosophy operates similarly**.

**Racism deems Black life disposable and demands racialized violence – we’re not an ad-hom that criticizes the positionality or personal views of their authors – their philosophy is actively used as an expression of white supremacy and to rationalize the deaths of Black men and women.**

Tommy J. **Curry and Curry 18** [Tommy, PhD, Prof. of Philosophy @ TAMU, Gwenetta, PhD, Ass. Prof. of Gender and Race Studies @ Alabama], “On the Perils of Race Neutrality and Anti-Blackness: Philosophy as an Irreconcilable Obstacle to (Black) Thought,” American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 77, Nos. 3-4 (May-September 2018). DOI: 10.1111/ajes.12244

**Far too often, the Black philosopher is charged with making sense of the irrationality of white America’s erroneous perceptions of Black, Brown, and Indigenous people. The histories of terror, death, rape, and murder are** often **said to be remnants of the past. To speak of anti-Black racism as an ever-threatening doom**—a looming threat of death and dying—**after** the presidency of Barack **Obama seems heresy to many white Americans**. Despite the horrors that now confront the United States under the presidency of Donald Trump, it is often very difficult for Black speakers to convince white audiences of the divergent worlds codified by anti-Blackness. Black philosophers, especially Black men, often try to persuade academic audiences, who fear being in the same room as them, of their humanity through the academic endeavor. Because this Black person is a professor, there is, standing in front of the white audience, evidence that Black people are not all criminals, and that Black males specifically are not all violent or dangerous. In performing what a human being is thought to be by whites, the Black philosopher imitates that human for whites in hopes of being interpreted as human and consequently heard. To be a Black philosopher is to assert that the perilous nature of being Black is outside of the human. Whereas white philosophers often share a similar language with other whites, namely, that all people are human beings and rational individuals, Black philosophers who study race often speak in terms of their negations: non-being. Harris (2018) refers to this as “necro-being.” Curry (2016, 2017, 2018a, 2018b) speaks of the Man-Not. Wilderson (2009) writes of the slave.

**To be Black is to render the very grammar of the academy delusional. To speak of impending death and sub-personhood** and explain the experiences of violence and dehumanization that accompany this position to white individuals who only think of their existence in terms of always being human and persons is ineffable. **Perhaps** the theorist Calvin **Warren best captures this problem in his book Ontological Terror**: Blackness, Nihilism, and Emancipation. Warren (2018: 2) argues:

**The human being provides an anchor for the declaration, and since the being of the human is invaluable, then Black life must also matter, if the Black is a human** (the declaration anchors mattering in the human’s Being). **But we reach a point of terror with this syllogistic reasoning. One must take a step backward and ask the fundamental question: is the Black, in fact, a human being?** Or **can Black(ness) ground itself in the being of the human? If it cannot, then on what bases can we assert the mattering of Black existence?**

The consequence of attending to the problem of Blackness and the realities of death is that **the theories that emerge to account for what is taken to be the accidental positionality of whites who are thought to be human**, individuals, citizens, and persons **must make sense of a reality where to be Black is to be nonhuman, savage, alien, and reified and consequently subject to violence and wished dead. As** the late Critical Race Theorist, **Derrick Bell** (1997: 23) **once said**:

**We have never understood that the essence of the racism we contended against was not simply that we were exploited in slavery**, degraded by **segregation, and** frustrated by **the unmet promises of equal opportunity. The essence of racism in America was the hope that we who were Black would not exist**.

Instead of racism being defined as a set of attitudes or beliefs about racial groups held by biased individuals, the authors prefer to understand racism as

a complex nexus, a cognitive architecture used to invent, reimagine, and evolve the presumed political, social, economic, sexual, and psychological superiority of the white races in society, while materializing the imagined inferiority and hastening the death of inferior races. Said differently, racism is the manifestation of the social processes and concurrent logics that facilitate the death and dying of racially subjugated peoples. (Curry 2017a: 4)

**Racism is a social process that demands the extinguishing of Black life. Racism craves death**. It is constructed, then legitimized through cultural and individual complacency. **When a young Black boy is killed, the instruments of the state, the authority of the police, and the vulnerability of the Black male body converge in the ultimate expression of violence** that results in death. **The public then rationalizes this exercise of state violence** and the individual will of the police officer who killed the Black boy **through empathy**. The white individual who sees the dead Black male body understands the need to kill the Black boy because Blackness socially expresses criminality, danger, and the possible death of a white life. **This fear of Blackness creates empathy for the officer who killed the Black boy**. He is thought of by the white interpreter who is watching the dead Black male body as a corpse. The fear shared between the officer and white onlooker is legitimated by the state because the state offers its society security from this Black male threat. **This is how populations feared by the society are simultaneously constructed and destroyed**.

This brief example describes the depth of the problem involved with racism. **Black philosophers are not simply objecting to the thoughts individuals hold about different groups of people, but how the thoughts that white individuals hold can be supported and expressed in violence against Black men and women**

**in the world**. Because a white supremacist world supports the fears of the white racist, **the** individual **racist’s anti-Blackness is aspirational. It is expressed as a will for there to be no Black bodies** there. **As such, the human becomes an untenable account of Black life, given this disposability**. The world is simply not organized in such a way that allows Blackness to not be seen, perceived, and dehumanized in relation to whites. **No amount of evidence** or argument **seems to be able to displace the faith philosophers have in education, dialogue, and mutual understanding** between Blacks and whites as the remedies of racism (Curry 2008). Generations of nonwhite philosophers have spent their careers and research showing the discipline the horrors of racism, xenophobia, and ethno-nationalist thinking, but there has been little to no change in departments or the discipline at large.

For many philosophers, the idea that racism is permanent is unthinkable. Despite the words and works of Black political theorists like the lawyer Robert F. Williams or Dr. Huey P. Newton, or even more canonically established Black figures like W. E. B. DuBois, Carter G. Woodson, Frantz Fanon, or Derrick Bell, philosophy as a discipline and **philosophers** more generally **refuse to acknowledge that racism remains the core and most determining aspect of America’s social processes**. Enamored by the stories of Blacks suffering, many scholarly conversations about Blackness and racism focus on the harm that Black individuals suffer at the hands of whites or the discipline of philosophy. Relatively few works actually analyze racism structurally or beyond identity at all. **Philosophical analyses do not revolve around death or the material consequences of anti-Blackness**. Instead, the fear and anxiety that Black philosophers and graduate students share with whites become more worthwhile topics.

**This turns the aff – America is organized around the subjugation and death of non-white people – discriminatory applications of their policy are inevitable absent a recognition of racialization in the law – their colorblindness is mutually exclusive with the necessary upheaval of the racial dynamics that necessitate inequality.**

Tommy J. and Gwenetta **Curry and Curry 18** [Tommy, PhD, Prof. of Philosophy @ TAMU, Gwenetta, PhD, Ass. Prof. of Gender and Race Studies @ Alabama], “On the Perils of Race Neutrality and Anti-Blackness: Philosophy as an Irreconcilable Obstacle to (Black) Thought,” American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Vol. 77, Nos. 3-4 (May-September 2018). DOI: 10.1111/ajes.12244

It is now accepted fact that **scientists have been able to demonstrate that race does not exist on a biological level, but instead was constructed by society**. Classifying race as a social construct conveys that there is a “process of endowing a group or concept with a delineation, name or reality” (Delgado and Stefancic 2012: 155). Race has a reality to it, a substance given by the historical and cultural projections of the specific society within which it is birthed. **While philosophers commonly entertain**, at least at the theoretical level, **the idea that race does not have any real consequence, that is a pernicious supposition**. Tessman and On (2001: 5) suggest that “**an analysis of racialization as the process of the social construction of race can lead theorists away from the possibility of race-conscious strategies for struggling against racism**.” **If the issues surrounding race and racism are not addressed, minorities will still fall victim to unfair treatment in education, housing, and the court systems**.

Although the concept of race is socially constructed, the populations most affected by racialization and racial disparities agree that **there are still real consequences to race because of its embeddedness within** practically **all facets of American society. Race consciousness is necessary to diagnose the function** and effects **of racialization in law, policy, and social interactions**. As the sociologist Michael Banton (2001: 164) argues, some elements of the racial idiom are still needed in law because “the concept of a racial group is the price to be paid for a law against indirect discrimination.” Contrary to the idea that race is mere societal rhetoric, Banton argues that the language of race is needed in law to combat prejudice and discrimination against victim groups. This point is made extremely clear by the data presented by Michelle Alexander in The New Jim Crow: Colorblindness in the Age of Mass Incarceration. She argues that **racism is a driving force behind social organization—an architecture around which social hierarchy and disparity accumulate. Racism explains why the penal system is filled with Black men who are incarcerated and how labeling them as felons**, primarily due to the criminalization of drugs, **causes them to lose their basic civil rights**. The Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, passed by Congress as part of the War on Drugs, called for strict lease enforcement and eviction of public housing tenants who engage in criminal activity (Alexander 2010: 142). In the spirit of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act, the Clinton Administration sought to strengthen the law in 1996, adding **the “One Strike and You’re Out”** legislation whose goal is to prevent people with criminal records from being able to live in public housing. This **measure to “crack down” on crime has had a debilitating effect on the family lives of people of color living in public housing units**.

**America is organized around the subjugation, death, and political suppression of racialized people’s voice**.

Even under the ethno-nationalist regime of Donald Trump, there is a reactionary consensus that has reemerged, namely, that a truly white supremacist society is colorblind. This follows a similar logic as the dissent of Justice John Harlan in Plessy v. Ferguson (1896):

The white race deems itself to be the dominant race in this country. And so it is, in prestige, in achievements, in education, in wealth, and in power. So, I doubt not, it will continue to be for all time, if it remains true to its great heritage and holds fast to the principles of constitutional liberty. But in the view of the Constitution, in the eye of the law, there is in this country no superior, dominant, ruling class of citizens. There is no caste here. Our Constitution is color-blind and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens. In respect of civil rights, all citizens are equal before the law.

**Notice** how **the assumption** behind Harlan’s words asserts **that the law guarantees equality, while the disparities in society are due to the racial superiority of the white race. In this sense, race is irrelevant in law, but undergirds the dynamics that produce inequality in the society**. Harlan believed that white supremacy was natural. He suggested, like many white liberals and conservatives today, that race should not matter in policy and the law, and that the social consequences that befall racial groups are the result of their superior or inferior racial traits.

Not even a decade ago, white America celebrated being post-racial. The election of President Barack Obama seemed to be a great leap forward and evidence that the United States, as a majority white country, had indeed moved to a place where race did not indicate the capacity of an individual. However, racial progress is interpreted differently by the oppressed populations. **Racism has always existed in American society and continues to be a major problem for** many **people of color** who live in the United States. **The** recent **election of** President Donald **Trump showed that there are always going to be consequences for disrupting** the grand narrative of **white supremacy**. Perhaps the best way to understand this backlash that resulted in the election of Trump is through a measure of covert or overt racism. **While many philosophers maintain that it is desirable to live in a colorblind society where race does not matter, social science research has vehemently rejected this notion**. Joe Feagin’s theory of systemic racism is beneficial for race analysis because it places white agents at the front of racial oppression. **Feagin** (2012: 937) **refers to systemic racism as “the foundational, large-scale and inescapable hierarchical system of US racial oppression devised and maintained by whites and directed at people of color.”** Racism is seen from a structural view and negatively impacts people of color because whites dominate the structures that dictate the order and organization of society. Systemic racism, as described by Feagin (2006), consists of six parts: the patterns of impoverishment and unjust enrichment and their transmission over time; the resulting vested group interests and the alienating racist relations; the cost and burdens of racism; the important role of white elites; the rationalization of racial oppression in a white-racist framing; and continuing resistance to racism. Feagin challenges Harlan’s explanation for white supremacy: instead of **whites** being inherently superior, they **rely on institutional racism to produce social structures that reward and elevate whites**.

#### The role of debate and the alternative is to surrender to blackness.

Brady and Murillo 14[Nicholas and John, “Black Imperative: A Forum on Solidarity in the Age of Coalition,” January 26, 2014, http://outofnowhereblog.wordpress.com/2014/01/26/black-imperative-a-forum-on-solidarity-in-the-age-of-coalition/, John Murillo III is a PhD student in the English department at Brown University, and a graduate of the University of California, Irvine, with bachelor’s degrees in Cognitive Science and English. His research interests are broad, and include extensive engagements with and within: Black Studies–particularly Afro-Pessimism–Narrative Theory; Theoretical Physics; Astrophysics; Cosmology; and Neuroscience. Nicholas Brady is an activist-scholar from Baltimore, Maryland. He was also a recent graduate of Johns Hopkins with a bachelor’s degree in Philosophy and currently a doctoral student at the University of California-Irvine Culture and Theory program.]

“Surrender to blackness.” A grammatical imperative. Grammatical because syntactically it marks a command to or demand of a generalized addressee: “(Everyone) surrender to blackness.” Grammatical because the black flesh scarred and tattooed by these illegible hieroglyphics enunciates at the level of symbolic and ontological world orders: “Surrender to blackness” is a command at the level of the foundations of thought and being themselves; grammatical. Imperative because if there is any hope for a revolutionary praxis along any lines—race, class, gender, sexuality, (dis)ability—it must centralize, which is to say look in the face of, which is to say begin to the work of real love for, the blackness [preposition] which “an authentic upheaval might be born.” #BlackPowerYellowPeril failed to recognize this imperative as legible, let alone heed and meet its command/demand. Created by Suey Park (@suey\_park), the hashtag sought to draw from and build upon the accomplishments of Black womyn activists on twitter and tumblr who have long mobilized to generate productive and revolutionary interjections into the world’s violently antiblack discourses (see, for example, #solidarityisforwhitewomen, and #blackmaleprivilege) through extended, communal commentary, usually in direct opposition to the censoring strictures of any kind of respectability politics. Discussions about and within the hashtag can be found here, here, here, here(though this is very hasty, a bit shortsighted, and still not doing much more than glancing at, as opposed to engaging blackness), and here. But broadly, the intentions of the hashtag are founded upon a belief in the possibility of solidarity/coalition politics between Blacks and Asians, seeking to challenge persistent “tensions” between the communities for the sake of a common struggle against ‘white supremacy.’ For those nonblack participants, the drive toward solidarity represents a purely innocent and unquestioned, unquestionable, desire. All critiques of Asian antiblackness are rendered as derailing the move toward solidarity, for they are to bring up the obvious – clearly we are all human, we make mistakes, but to continuously bring up the “mistakes” and never “move on” is to foreclose the possibility of solidarity. And what a wonderful thing the blacks of the conversation were foreclosing – this solidarity thing. What a wonderful thing others were offering to us and we simply would not take. And yet, the unthought question remains: have you truly earned the right to act in solidarity, to form solidarity, to even believe in solidarity? And what is this solidarity thing we all hold near and dear to our hearts? Have we ever experienced it or do we simply have images we have transformed into memories of a solidarity that never existed? I know Black people and Asian people have worked together in the past, but have we ever formed a solid whole? And who is to blame for the fact that we have never had solidarity? The hashtag implies that both “sides” play an equal part in the failure to form solidarity. In the face of this, confessing our sins to each other forms the moment where we can form emotional bonds: “see, you were as racist as I, and how unfortunate it is that we let old whitey come between us. Never again will whitey make us part.” This is the logic behind much of the Asian confessing – white supremacy duped us into being antiblack racists – and also fed into the backlash aimed at blacks – “stop playing oppression olympics, that’s what whitey wants.” It must be foregrounded here that antiblackness cannot be simplified as “anti-black racism” and it is a singularity with no equivalent force – “anti-Asian” racism is not the flipside of antiblackness nor is orientalism or islamophobia. Antiblackness predates white supremacy by at least 300 years (and much more than that depending on how we trace our history) and we can understand antiblackness as the general tethering of the very concept of life to the ontological and unspeakable, unthinkable force of black death. That statement is a place to begin to define antiblackness, it is not the end for this force weaves itself in infinite variety throughout all corners of the globe, forming globe into world. This is not simply about the little racist microaggressions that people listed in their tweets, this is about a global force that the world – not simply whites – bond over and form their lives inside of and through. What #BlackPowerYellowPeril revealed, however, is that the underside of coalition politics remains a violent and virulent antiblackness. As blacks— John Murillo III (@writedarkmatter), New Black School (@newblackschool), Nicholas Brady (@nubluez\_nick), and others—raised questions and comments in the spirit of that singular imperative—“Surrender to blackness”—antiblackness emerged in the violence of the response levied against it; one need only visit the hashtag to bear witness. From outright refusals to engage the antiblackness central to the histories and politics of nonblack communities of color, to denials of the foundational, global, and singular nature of antiblackness, and to the repeated calls to police and remove this disruptive blackness and its imperative from the conversation, antiblackness exploded onto the scene. All of this in the name of “coalition.” This is because “coalition” politics and possibilities are fetishized, not loved. The fetish denies the necessary recognition of antiblackness at coalition’s heart, and that antiblackness left unattended renders the imperative illegible. It is a fetishization, then, of antiblackness. The fetish object at the heart of the coalition has always been black flesh – a fetishization where pleasure and terror meet to create the bonds of solidarity people so desire. Here, we open a forum on how the hashtag embodies this fetish, the distinction between fetish and love that must be made in excess of the hashtag and ones like it, and the absolute imperativeness of the imperative. Instead of fetishizing the object, you must surrender to blackness.

### DA

#### Biden’s reconciliation bill passes now but compromises are delicate

Caygle and Everett 10/20 (Heather and Burgess, Congress reporters at Politico) “Dems edge closer to ditching disarray” <https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/20/dems-edge-closer-ditching-disarray-516312> EE, DebateDrills

Nancy Pelosi and Chuck Schumer’s strategy to force through Democrats’ domestic agenda flamed out spectacularly in September. They’re ready to try it all over again.

With their party’s long-sought priorities on the line, the speaker and Senate majority leader are hustling to clinch a deal as soon as possible that would lock in evasive centrists on a framework for President Joe Biden’s $2 trillion social spending package. That framework, in turn, would free up needed progressive votes for a bipartisan infrastructure bill by Oct. 31.

It’s a rerun of the playbook Democratic leaders used just weeks ago, [only to have it blow up](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/01/house-democrats-biden-infrastructure-deal-514878) in their faces. But Democrats insist it actually might work this time, with political and legislative incentives aligning more neatly than they did in September.

Pelosi and Schumer are telling their members they need to secure an agreement on the social spending bill by the end of this week. The House could even vote by the end of the month.

“We’re getting there. The gaps are closing. The vibe in our caucus is different. Folks are being more clear-eyed about: ‘We’ve got to get this done,’” said Sen. Chris Coons (D-Del.), who is close to Biden. “There’s a lot of reasons why these next 10 days are critical. To chip shot this into December is really, really problematic.”

Democrats are also getting more specific, with Sen. Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) tossing a carbon tax and a green utilities program overboard while insisting on means testing much of the bill. Biden also told progressives Tuesday that an expanded boost to the child tax credit could be made shorter and that free community college could be jettisoned.

Biden’s price tag for the bill at the moment is around $2 trillion and he wants to lock down an agreement before heading overseas at the end of this month for climate talks, according to Democrats familiar with Tuesday’s discussions.

Rep. Jimmy Gomez (D-Calif.) said he left Biden’s meeting with progressives thinking “the president is committed to getting this done as soon as possible. And I was kind of surprised by that.”

Gomez said things remain “touch and go” and it’s unclear how much is finalized, even as Democratic leaders hope to close in on a framework in the coming days.

But it’s clear the momentum has shifted in recent days. Biden and Democrats are having substantive conversations about which programs will stay in the bill, which priorities will be cut and how to knit the rest together into a package both centrists and liberals can support.

“He's being decisive, he’s showing leadership,” Rep. Debbie Dingell (D-Mich.) said of Biden after progressives’ two-hour Tuesday meeting at the White House. “I think it’s going to get done this time.”

There’s still much more to get through, however. And Democrats have a crunch of deadlines waiting later this year that they must balance with [their last, best chance](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/17/democrats-agenda-last-chance-516160) to capitalize on their full control of Washington and pass once-in-a-generation legislation that would significantly shore up the nation’s social safety net.

Manchin and Sen. Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.) are the toughest votes to secure, but both were whirlwinds of activity on Tuesday. Each of the centrists met with Biden. And while Manchin was in the Democratic lunch with his colleagues settling on a quick timeline, Sinema was meeting with senior White House staff, according to her office. Sinema’s office declined to comment on her commitment to finishing things by the end of the week.

Though the odds are still stacked against the party, Democrats say it’s clear there’s a renewed sense of urgency among party leaders. Schumer is nudging his holdouts more than ever before, Pelosi is free from the constraints of [an agreement with moderates](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/08/24/gottheimer-house-dems-pelosi-deal-506819) that imploded and Biden is finally engaged in a meaningful way. Plus, nearly everyone has accepted the bill won’t be $3.5 trillion, as originally proposed.

“There’s a real consensus that it’s time,” said the party’s No. 3 Senate leader, Patty Murray (D-Wash.). “We all see the timeline, there’s a lot of struggle about what’s going to go in a bill that’s literally half the size of what people envisioned.”

A month ago, some Democrats privately grumbled that Pelosi was working with an artificial deadline based on an agreement she made with moderates in her chamber — but one that didn’t motivate, and maybe even alienated, key Senate holdouts from cutting a deal. Manchin and Sinema, specifically, are still fuming that the House hasn’t passed the Senate’s bipartisan infrastructure bill.

Still, just a few weeks later, several Democrats involved in the negotiations insist that even the centrists much-maligned by their party's base for chipping away at the bill are springing into action. At a caucus meeting Tuesday, Manchin listened intently to his colleagues in what one attendee called a “turning point, in that there was more of a focus on urgency.”

Importantly, Democrats on all sides are coming to grips with the reality that all of their demands will not be met. The Obamacare subsidies that House Democratic leaders have pushed for are still in the package, while liberals’ demand for a massive Medicare expansion — something Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) called non-negotiable last week — may be significantly pared back.

While jettisoning some policy proposals and slimming the bill seem like unwelcome developments for Democrats, the more specific negotiations indicate that the party is actually down to brass tacks. Still, Gomez said some of the discussion involved “trial balloons to see what the reactions of the different factions are.”

Sen. Jon Tester (D-Mont.) said on Tuesday morning that the “fact we don’t have a deal and have been gone for 10 days [on recess] means we’ve got to do better.” But after meeting with Biden Tuesday afternoon, his opinion had changed: “I think there’s a lot that’s happened the last 10 days, I just wasn’t aware of it. We’re getting to a point where we can move pretty well.”

It's critical for Pelosi and Schumer to show they can govern in a sharply divided Congress with the thinnest of majorities. Biden needs a huge win ahead of a global climate summit in Glasgow. And every Democrat wants to put a victory on the board to boost Virginia gubernatorial candidate Terry McAuliffe, whose loss would be [a major setback](https://www.politico.com/news/2021/10/16/democrats-reckoning-virginia-governor-race-516086) to the party’s agenda and midterm prospects.

Plus, the nation's highway trust fund runs dry at the end of October and will need more money from Congress — which the bipartisan infrastructure bill will supply once it clears the House.

House Majority Leader Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) insisted Tuesday that Democratic leaders are still pushing to finalize both a roughly $2 trillion social infrastructure bill and pass the $550 billion infrastructure bill by the end of the month. But even if party leaders can get their warring factions to agree to a framework for the spending bill after weeks of public feuding, that too will amount to a triumph after months of jockeying.

“We're working very hard to have both of those bills ready to be passed by the House of Representatives before that date,” Hoyer told reporters. “Now, if we make significant progress, that'll also be success towards those ends.”

#### The plan gets lumped in with the reconciliation bill and causes conflict

Mueller 09/21/2021 (Eleanor, labor reporter) “Unions squeeze pro-labor priorities into Democrats’ spending bill” Politico, <https://www.politico.com/news/2021/09/21/unions-reconciliation-bill-513423> EE, DebateDrills

Tucked amid the investments in child care, higher education and clean energy are below-the-radar provisions that would make it easier for workers to organize, such as giving the National Labor Relations Board sharper teeth and empowering it to conduct union elections online.

Both of those policies are also included in the Protecting the Right to Organize Act — an overhaul of U.S. labor law Democrats drafted to resuscitate tapering union membership, which is stalled in the Senate.

How much the language in the spending bill could really move the needle on the fortunes of organized labor remains to be seen. It must also survive the Byrd rule, which allows only spending-related legislation to move through the reconciliation process that Democrats intend to use to pass the bill. Democrats have had one of their other top priorities — immigration reform — stymied by the rule already.

Union officials are pouring time, money and energy into making sure the provisions — which they helped shape — make it across the finish line. If they are successful, it could constitute the biggest pro-union shift in U.S. labor law since the National Labor Relations Act was enacted in 1935, labor experts said.

“Labor is not only all over supporting it, it has helped craft it,” American Federation of Teachers President Randi Weingarten said in an interview.

Some on the employer side of the table say the provisions are far too consequential to be tucked into a massive spending bill.

“These are cataclysmic questions of the most fundamental policy that have gargantuan implications for the way labor and management is going to work together or not work together in this country,” said attorney Michael Lotito, who represents employers for the law firm Littler. “And this type of fundamental policy change is being done using a backdoor approach.”

Republican lawmakers have also denounced the tactic.

"The PRO Union Bosses Act was dead upon arrival in the Senate, so Speaker Pelosi and Committee Democrats are manipulating the legislative process to enact portions,” said Rep. Virginia Foxx (N.C.), the top Republican on the House Education and Labor Committee.

Unions and their allies have seen the reconciliation bill as a possible vehicle for the labor provisions since they were introduced in the PRO Act.

#### Infrastructure only passes if reconciliation does

Cochrane et al 10/18/2021 (Emily Cochrane, Luke Broadwater, and Jonathan Weisman, NYT reporters) Biden Meets With Feuding Democrats and Expresses Confidence a Deal Can Be Reached, <https://www.nytimes.com/live/2021/10/01/us/infrastructure-bill-house#house-infrastructure-delay-vote> EE, DebateDrills

President Biden, facing an intraparty battle over his domestic agenda, put his own $1 trillion infrastructure bill on hold on Friday, telling Democrats that a vote on the popular measure must wait until Democrats pass his far more ambitious social policy and climate change package.

It was largely a bid to mediate the impasse that has stalled a planned vote on the bipartisan infrastructure bill, which progressives refuse to support until they see action on the remainder of Mr. Biden’s agenda in a major budget bill to expand health care, education, climate change initiatives and paid leave.

“I’m telling you, we’re going to get this done,” Mr. Biden said at the Capitol after huddling with Democrats who have been feuding over the two bills. He added: “It doesn’t matter when. It doesn’t matter whether it’s in six minutes, six days or six weeks. We’re going to get it done.”

In private remarks, he counseled Democrats that while he wanted both pieces of legislation to become law, final passage of the Senate-passed infrastructure bill needed to wait until the party agreed to the details of the broader reconciliation package. But he also warned liberal Democrats that a proposed $3.5 trillion price tag would probably need to drop in order to accommodate centrist holdouts, and he tossed out a range of figures around $2 trillion as a possible alternative.

“He is the president of the United States, and he says that he wants to get this done, and he basically linked them together,” said Representative Henry Cuellar, Democrat of Texas. “I think if we get it done, there’ll be a victory. The question is when do we get that victory?”

Mr. Cuellar noted that moderates had an agreement with Speaker Nancy Pelosi of California to vote on the bill this week, and said it was up to her how to handle that promise.

On Friday evening, Ms. Pelosi indefinitely postponed a vote on the infrastructure bill that she had promised to moderates who had publicly pushed for a stand-alone vote. She wrote in a letter to colleagues, “Clearly, the bipartisan infrastructure bill will pass once we have agreement on the reconciliation bill.”

“Our priority to create jobs in the health care, family and climate agendas is a shared value,” she wrote, adding that leading lawmakers were “still working for clarity and consensus.”

Representative Pramila Jayapal of Washington, the chairwoman of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, said Mr. Biden “was very clear” that the two bills were tied together.

#### Failure of the infrastructure package locks in catastrophic climate change---extinction

Paul Bledsoe 9/4, strategic adviser at the Progressive Policy Institute and a professorial lecturer at American University’s Center for Environmental Policy. He served on the White House Climate Change Task Force under former President Bill Clinton, “Climate devastation is upon us. Congress must act.,” NY Daily News, 9-4-2021, https://www.nydailynews.com/opinion/ny-oped-climate-congress-20210904-mqbe75qni5b77ocke5orzrmjce-story.html?outputType=amp

Many Democrats publicly expressed the need to act on climate change, and offered legislation at the federal and state level. Yet while the ability of Democrats to pass needed legislation was hindered by some divisions within their own ranks, resistance came primarily from Republicans who overwhelmingly opposed any serious actions to limit climate change and the greenhouse gas emissions that cause it. With a few prominent exceptions like former Sen. John McCain, most Republicans derided climate concerns as alarmism and claimed any attempts to limit emissions would be devastating to the U.S. economy.

Fast forward 20 years, and our climate situation has grown immeasurably more grave. As predicted climate change impacts are inflicting huge human and economic costs in the U.S., with much worse to come without immediate action. Yet stunningly, our broken politics on climate change seem much the same as decades before.

Democrats, beginning with President Biden, are desperately pushing to enact hundreds of billions of dollars in climate change and clean energy measures later this month as part of a wider economic and budget bill. These actions can cut U.S. emissions by 50% below 2005 levels by the end of the decade, and put the U.S. in a stronger position to force other nations to act in key climate negotiations in November.

But right now Republicans are unified in opposition to any but cursory climate actions. John Barrasso of Wyoming, the top Republican on the Senate Energy Committee, claimed the Biden climate measure was a “spree to impose this green new disaster on every American,” willfully ignoring the real climate disasters all around us that Biden’s legislation will help limit. This summer, every single Republican member of the key Senate Finance Committee voted against tax incentives for solar, wind, geothermal, electric vehicles and dozens of other clean energy sources.

The stakes of the climate crisis are far more profound and long-lasting than most leaders seem to recognize. What’s needed is a united, bipartisan front like that the U.S. created during the Cold War, in part to force other key nations like China to cut their emissions as aggressively as we do. An inkling that this may be possible is found in bipartisan support for recent legislation promoting American technology innovation to compete globally, and significant bipartisan support for infrastructure legislation.

But slow action to cut emissions won’t work. We must act decisively and quickly now in Congress this fall to create a clean energy future and cut emissions that are destabilizing our climate. Otherwise, we are consigning ourselves and all of those who come after us to a devastated and denuded world.

### NC

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing.

#### Prefer it:

#### 1] Actor specificity:

#### A] Aggregation – every policy benefits some and harms others, which also means side constraints freeze action.

#### B] No act-omission distinction – choosing to omit is an act itself – governments decide not to act which means being presented with the aff creates a choice between two actions, neither of which is an omission

#### o/w – governments have unique responsibilities to each of their citizens

#### Extinction comes first regardless of any framework – this also hijacks resolvability bc this is the most objective!

Pummer 15 [Theron, Junior Research Fellow in Philosophy at St. Anne's College, University of Oxford. “Moral Agreement on Saving the World” Practical Ethics, University of Oxford. May 18, 2015] AT

There appears to be lot of disagreement in moral philosophy. Whether these many apparent disagreements are deep and irresolvable, I believe there is at least one thing it is reasonable to agree on right now, whatever general moral view we adopt: that it is very important to reduce the risk that all intelligent beings on this planet are eliminated by an enormous catastrophe, such as a nuclear war. How we might in fact try to reduce such existential risks is discussed elsewhere. My claim here is only that we – whether we’re consequentialists, deontologists, or virtue ethicists – should all agree that we should try to save the world. According to consequentialism, we should maximize the good, where this is taken to be the goodness, from an impartial perspective, of outcomes. Clearly one thing that makes an outcome good is that the people in it are doing well. There is little disagreement here. If the happiness or well-being of possible future people is just as important as that of people who already exist, and if they would have good lives, it is not hard to see how reducing existential risk is easily the most important thing in the whole world. This is for the familiar reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. There are so many possible future people that reducing existential risk is arguably the most important thing in the world, even if the well-being of these possible people were given only 0.001% as much weight as that of existing people. Even on a wholly person-affecting view – according to which there’s nothing (apart from effects on existing people) to be said in favor of creating happy people – the case for reducing existential risk is very strong. As noted in this seminal paper, this case is strengthened by the fact that there’s a good chance that many existing people will, with the aid of life-extension technology, live very long and very high quality lives. You might think what I have just argued applies to consequentialists only. There is a tendency to assume that, if an argument appeals to consequentialist considerations (the goodness of outcomes), it is irrelevant to non-consequentialists. But that is a huge mistake. Non-consequentialism is the view that there’s more that determines rightness than the goodness of consequences or outcomes; it is not the view that the latter don’t matter. Even John Rawls wrote, “All ethical doctrines worth our attention take consequences into account in judging rightness. One which did not would simply be irrational, crazy.” Minimally plausible versions of deontology and virtue ethics must be concerned in part with promoting the good, from an impartial point of view. They’d thus imply very strong reasons to reduce existential risk, at least when this doesn’t significantly involve doing harm to others or damaging one’s character. What’s even more surprising, perhaps, is that even if our own good (or that of those near and dear to us) has much greater weight than goodness from the impartial “point of view of the universe,” indeed even if the latter is entirely morally irrelevant, we may nonetheless have very strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Even egoism, the view that each agent should maximize her own good, might imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. It will depend, among other things, on what one’s own good consists in. If well-being consisted in pleasure only, it is somewhat harder to argue that egoism would imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk – perhaps we could argue that one would maximize her expected hedonic well-being by funding life extension technology or by having herself cryogenically frozen at the time of her bodily death as well as giving money to reduce existential risk (so that there is a world for her to live in!). I am not sure, however, how strong the reasons to do this would be. But views which imply that, if I don’t care about other people, I have no or very little reason to help them are not even minimally plausible views (in addition to hedonistic egoism, I here have in mind views that imply that one has no reason to perform an act unless one actually desires to do that act). To be minimally plausible, egoism will need to be paired with a more sophisticated account of well-being. To see this, it is enough to consider, as Plato did, the possibility of a ring of invisibility – suppose that, while wearing it, Ayn could derive some pleasure by helping the poor, but instead could derive just a bit more by severely harming them. Hedonistic egoism would absurdly imply she should do the latter. To avoid this implication, egoists would need to build something like the meaningfulness of a life into well-being, in some robust way, where this would to a significant extent be a function of other-regarding concerns (see chapter 12 of this classic intro to ethics). But once these elements are included, we can (roughly, as above) argue that this sort of egoism will imply strong reasons to reduce existential risk. Add to all of this Samuel Scheffler’s recent intriguing arguments (quick podcast version available here) that most of what makes our lives go well would be undermined if there were no future generations of intelligent persons. On his view, my life would contain vastly less well-being if (say) a year after my death the world came to an end. So obviously if Scheffler were right I’d have very strong reason to reduce existential risk. We should also take into account moral uncertainty. What is it reasonable for one to do, when one is uncertain not (only) about the empirical facts, but also about the moral facts? I’ve just argued that there’s agreement among minimally plausible ethical views that we have strong reason to reduce existential risk – not only consequentialists, but also deontologists, virtue ethicists, and sophisticated egoists should agree. But even those (hedonistic egoists) who disagree should have a significant level of confidence that they are mistaken, and that one of the above views is correct. Even if they were 90% sure that their view is the correct one (and 10% sure that one of these other ones is correct), they would have pretty strong reason, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, to reduce existential risk. Perhaps most disturbingly still, even if we are only 1% sure that the well-being of possible future people matters, it is at least arguable that, from the standpoint of moral uncertainty, reducing existential risk is the most important thing in the world. Again, this is largely for the reason that there are so many people who could exist in the future – there are trillions upon trillions… upon trillions. (For more on this and other related issues, see this excellent dissertation). Of course, it is uncertain whether these untold trillions would, in general, have good lives. It’s possible they’ll be miserable. It is enough for my claim that there is moral agreement in the relevant sense if, at least given certain empirical claims about what future lives would most likely be like, all minimally plausible moral views would converge on the conclusion that we should try to save the world. While there are some non-crazy views that place significantly greater moral weight on avoiding suffering than on promoting happiness, for reasons others have offered (and for independent reasons I won’t get into here unless requested to), they nonetheless seem to be fairly implausible views. And even if things did not go well for our ancestors, I am optimistic that they will overall go fantastically well for our descendants, if we allow them to. I suspect that most of us alive today – at least those of us not suffering from extreme illness or poverty – have lives that are well worth living, and that things will continue to improve. Derek Parfit, whose work has emphasized future generations as well as agreement in ethics, described our situation clearly and accurately: “We live during the hinge of history. Given the scientific and technological discoveries of the last two centuries, the world has never changed as fast. We shall soon have even greater powers to transform, not only our surroundings, but ourselves and our successors. If we act wisely in the next few centuries, humanity will survive its most dangerous and decisive period. Our descendants could, if necessary, go elsewhere, spreading through this galaxy…. Our descendants might, I believe, make the further future very good. But that good future may also depend in part on us. If our selfish recklessness ends human history, we would be acting very wrongly.” (From chapter 36 of On What Matters)

## Case

### Fwk

#### 1] Justification of pragmatism as a method to find truth requires experimentation with what is an acceptable kind of idea – the only way to arrive at conclusions is by deciding that some ideas are good and some are bad, which means pragmatism alone is insufficient – a definition of the good can not be derived experientially since definitions are required to make sense of experience

#### 2] Maybe truth is the end of inquiry, but not every action is an inquiry -- other considerations can’t be calculated under the framework so only the NC can resolve complicated ethical questions

#### 3] Moral truths require generalizations for them to be correct -- pragmatism can never pursue a correct theory of truth, since that requires an external standard of what a correct method of seeking truth is, and what truth is at all, making the framework infinitely regressive

#### 4] Pragmatism is self-effacing – to say absolutism is a bad thing is itself an absolute – there must be certain absolutes

#### 5] Pragmatism circular because it uses the framework to justify itself; you’d have to experiment with pragmatism to realize that it’s true, which requires a presumption that it’s the correct theory

#### 6] Pragmatism requires some kind of external ethical theory – it’s descriptive in that it claims that there’s one function of thought – that’s the intention of the individual when asking ethical question – but there are different components of ethical thought- we have deep convictions – only the NC deals with the complexities of moral questions

#### 7] TJFs are a voting issue for strat skew – they force me to win on both theory and framework to win while you can only debate one and kick the other, which kills fairness since I have to engage on both layers with minimal time – worst case just drop the TJF. No 1ar theory – their responses to my interp will always be new in the 2ar bc of lack of a 3nr

### Offense

#### 1] Aff can’t solve the sum total of their offense – Viren you can’t be out here reading a plan aff specific to the US and try to weigh all of the prag offense in the world – this is a drop in the bucket

#### 2] Contestability is non uq and exists in the squo – unions already exist but are limited – insofar as Lindblom just talks about why unions are good, that makes it non uq

#### 3] Public forums like those for strikes already exist in things like prominent court cases etc – they shouldn’t get access to these impacts

### Util advantage

#### Agriculture is being automized – makes the aff non inherent and means that if workers strike, they’ll just be fired, not helped

Brown 21 [Dalvin Brown, 4-22-2021, "Farmers have more mouths to feed. Bring in the robots.," Washington Post, https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/04/22/tech-in-farming-growth/]

Robots are shouldering more responsibility at Church Brothers Farms in Gonzalez, Calif. From sunrise through sundown, rows of lettuce, broccoli, and cauliflower are planted, tended to and harvested on the thousand-acre ranch — partially by humans, increasingly by machines. The products are then packaged and shipped to major grocery store chains and restaurants nationwide. You might have seen their products in the frozen food aisle under the Green Giant brand at Walmart, Target or virtually every other major supermarket. But what you probably haven’t seen is how much more work autonomous machines and drones are doing on the farm as the minimum wage ticked up a dollar in California this year, heading toward $15 an hour for larger employers across the Golden State, effective 2022. “In the past, labor was relatively cheap compared to technology. Today the cost of labor has risen. So technology and labor costs are getting much closer,” said Josh Ruiz, vice president of agricultural operations at Church Brothers Farms, which employs 60 full-time workers. He runs the firm’s innovation department, which brings in tech from other companies and toys with building in-house farm contraptions. “While I wish I could pay everybody who works for me $100 an hour, the problem is our consumers are not willing to pay that kind of food price,” he said. [Farmworkers could be replaced by robots sooner than we think](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/national/wp/2019/02/17/feature/inside-the-race-to-replace-farmworkers-with-robots/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_9)

It’s not just California, and Church Brothers is far from the only farm going hi-tech. Labor costs, climate change and growing food demand are ushering in an era of machine modernization across the nation’s agricultural landscape. The situation prompted Church Brothers to invest in several autonomous robots and drones in recent years. The company even spent a million dollars to create a broccoli harvesting contraption that works, but it requires more investment, Ruiz said. Advocates for robotic farming tout increased automation as a step toward improving efficiency while freeing people from monotonous, backbreaking tasks that few laborers want to do. Labor unions welcome more machines, so long as farmworkers benefit, too. “Technological change can be advantageous. We don’t want to stand in the way of creating a production method that’s less taxing on the (human) body,” said Baldemar Velasquez, president of the [Farm Labor Organizing Committee,](http://www.floc.com/wordpress/) a union representing farmworkers in the Midwest and North Carolina. “But agriculture is like any other job. As soon as automation begins to take place, it creates a problem (for) job opportunities.” [Why it will be years before robot butlers take over your household chores](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/03/23/future-robots-home-jetsons/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_16) Automation has been plucking away at the work humans have to do on the farm for decades. Machines now milk cows, unearth vegetables and package products faster and more cheaply than humans can. But now, in the age of artificial intelligence, robots and computer vision are enabling mechanisms to do even more. Cameras on drones provide vast information on crop health. Robotic lenses can zoom in on seedlings to predict when vegetables will be ripe for picking. Autonomous machines can roam around and get rid of weeds without a human operator. Many small farms operate with slim profit margins and can’t or don’t want to invest in the latest gadgetry. However, those that can afford to welcome a shift, have more options than ever to choose from as “AgTech” start-ups prepare AI-powered systems for a full farm invasion. Last week, Seattle-based Carbon Robotics released a new weed-eliminating robot that autonomously drives through fields to target unwanted plants. Unlike other automated weeders on the market, which apply targeted herbicide or move soil to attack weeds at the root, the latest machine uses high-power lasers to zap away pest plants without disrupting the ground. “We’re pretty proud of the fact that we don’t tear up the topsoil,” said Paul Mikesell, founder and CEO of Carbon Robotics, the manufacturer of the Autonomous Weeder. The company primarily sells its products on the West Coast throughout Washington, New Mexico, Oregon and California, but it’s expanding into other regions. Other firms take different approaches to automate tasks on the farm. This year, Tevel Aerobotics Technologies unveiled [a flying autonomous robot](https://www.tevel-tech.com/) that uses artificial intelligence to identify ripe fruit and pluck it all day. Industry heavyweight John Deere is investing in autonomy and AI to have its tractors embed individual seeds in the ground perfectly at the same distance and depth thousands of times in mere seconds. Start-ups like [Bear Flag Robotics](https://www.bearflagrobotics.com/) are working to bring computer vision to tried-and-true tractors already on the market. This comes as drones become more commonplace, too, enabling ranchers to monitor plants and livestock from above. [Robotic lizards may have a place in future disaster response, researchers say](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2021/04/06/innovations-robot-lizard-australia/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_31) It all contributes to what’s known as precision agriculture, where farmers use less to grow more or adopt new gadgets to increase crop production while cutting down on waste. The field is increasing in popularity. The market for advanced farming tools was estimated to be about $7 billion in 2020, and it’s projected to reach $12.8 billion over the next four years, according to the research firm MarketsandMarkets. Part of the projected rise stems from farms wanting greater efficiency in the face of labor issues. The number of people working as farmers, ranchers and other agricultural professionals is expected to drop 6 percent by 2029, according to the [Bureau of Labor Statistics.](https://www.bls.gov/ooh/management/farmers-ranchers-and-other-agricultural-managers.htm#tab-6) The industry has already faced decades of job declines in the United States, even as agricultural production rises to feed a growing population. Government investment is also expected to contribute to more intelligent devices on farms, analysts say. And not just in the United States. In October, the United States Department of Agriculture announced a $14.6 million development fund for institutions working on innovations to support farmers. Earlier this year, the European Union kicked off a [$9.4 million program](https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101016807) to replace unsafe, laborious tasks with machines across Spain, Greece, France and the Netherlands. The European agency also plans to enhance older-model farm equipment with autonomous systems to keep costs down. It’s the kind of thing Bear Flag Robotics specializes in. For the past four years, the Sunnyvale, Calif.-based company has worked on its suite of AI-powered cameras, GPS and lidar systems designed to be retrofitted onto ordinary tractors. It raised $7.9 million in funding to bring the tech to more tractors. The firm buys the 15-feet-tall vehicles from dealerships, suits them up with navigation systems and lets growers rent them. The company works with farmers to set up a boundary map of the area that needs work. Its algorithm plots a path for the tractor to follow, and the equipment uses that pattern to traverse a field. Farming operations pay per acre to use them. A real-time video feed is shared with the farmer, who can command and control the machine if something goes wrong. Church Brothers Farms is a customer, though it’s illegal for tractors to move without a safety driver onboard in California, so they assign a worker to be onboard. “One day, the autonomous tractor might allow me to operate at night with one person managing five tractors, versus having five drivers that don’t want to work through the middle of the night,” Ruiz said. The farm also deploys weed-killing robots from [FarmWise](https://farmwise.io/) and [Naio Technologies](https://www.naio-technologies.com/en/) that use computer vision to find and weed crops. Smart weeding is a crowded field of AgTech, with companies taking varying approaches to get the task done. San Francisco-based FarmWise scans the ground for invasive weeds around crops and plucks them out. France-based Naio uses a series of brushes and tools to scrape, suffocate or pull weeds to kill them. [In these West Virginia and California agricultural towns, farmers and ranchers are battling the pandemic and big industry](https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/2020/road-to-recovery/farmers-ranchers-coronavirus-food-california-west-virginia/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_51) Carbon Robotics says it wants to avoid damaging the soil, so it has used thermal bursts to fry weeds since the company started in 2018. The firm’s latest weeding machine has eight lasers, twice as many as the previous generation to kill more weeds faster, CEO Mikesell says. Growers are interested in the robots because hand-weeding is physically taxing, expensive and time-consuming for humans to do. Robots, on the other hand, can get the job done again, and again. And they don’t cut corners if they get tired. “The machines don’t know that it’s Friday at five o’clock. They can just keep running, and do the job properly, regardless of what the time clock says,” Ruiz said. “They’re programmable and sometimes do a better job because they operate at the right speed.” It’s true that AI-powered farm machines may one day be able to perform most tasks that require people today. But for the time being, humans have a leg up in some areas, such as handling delicate objects. Robots tend to have [dexterity problems](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2020/12/23/innovations-bionic-hand-ai/?itid=lk_inline_manual_56), which can cause them to hold objects like fruit and vegetables too aggressively.

#### And automation of jobs kills the leverage of worker strikes – Paris proves

Cokelaere 20 [Hanne Cokelaere, 1-15-2020, "Robot scab! How automation is threatening striking French workers," POLITICO, https://www.politico.eu/article/robot-scab-automation-threatening-striking-french-workers/]

PARIS — A national strike has brought most public transport in the French capital to a halt for 42 days and counting, but two Metro lines have been operating as if nothing is amiss. The secret? They run without drivers. Unions have long been worried that automating public transport could cost jobs, but the ongoing standoff between workers and the government over [pension reform](https://www.politico.eu/article/never-mind-the-strikes-heres-the-french-pension-reform-strikes-edouard-philippe-emmanuel-macron/) is highlighting the potential advantages of replacing humans with machines. During the Christmas break, strike action saw hundreds of dazed tourists and exasperated Parisians hoping to travel across the city jammed into a hallway at the Saint-Lazare station — a hub where trains, suburban rail and Metro lines intersect. But only one of the four Metro lines usually servicing the second-busiest station on the Paris Metro system was operating. “The No. 14 is the only one running,” an employee of the Paris public transport operator told the seething crowd. Paris has two automated lines: The No. 14 connecting Saint-Lazare with stops across the Seine River was the first to be opened in 1998. The No. 1, the capital’s busiest link from East to West, went driverless in 2012 to allow trains to run at a higher frequency than would be possible with human operators. Work to upgrade a [third Metro](https://www.ratp.fr/automatisationdela4) connection — a key link crossing the city north to south — is due to be completed in 2022, and Paris public transport operator RATP is [mulling](http://www.leparisien.fr/info-paris-ile-de-france-oise/transports/comment-valerie-pecresse-veut-automatiser-la-ligne-13-du-metro-12-04-2019-8051640.php) a fourth automated line. The strikes have made driverless trains a political issue, and it's being seized on by candidates for the Paris mayoral election in March. Benjamin Griveaux, a candidate to replace Anne Hidalgo in the town hall, [pledged](https://twitter.com/BGriveaux/status/1206520951913033728) in December to work with regional authorities to speed up the automation of the Metro network to “make the lives of Parisians easier — even during strikes.” His competitor, a [rebel candidate](https://www.ft.com/content/73c7a6a6-ee57-11e9-ad1e-4367d8281195) from Griveaux's own La République En Marche party, echoed the plan. “An automated Metro is a more punctual Metro — [a Metro] that can continue to operate in times of strikes,” he said in an [LCI interview](https://twitter.com/VillaniCedric/status/1214859687163768832). That's dismaying unions. Frédéric Delebarre, a representative of the CGT union at the RATP, complained that advocating the automation of public transport to soften the blow of the strikes “is cutting corners left and right.” Delebarre said automation would take years and would be very expensive, so it makes sense for the government to negotiate an end to the strikes instead. “To prevent conflicts ... it's easier for the government to abandon its reform program than to automate the [Metro] lines. That's less costly,” he said. But so far the government isn't backing down on reforming the pension system, although it is showing signs of movement on the actual retirement age. It wants to introduce a [universal points system](https://www.politico.eu/article/never-mind-the-strikes-heres-the-french-pension-reform-strikes-edouard-philippe-emmanuel-macron/) to save up a pension, and do away with France's more than 42 industry-specific systems. Among the unions' concerns are [an increase of the retirement age,](https://www.cgt.fr/actualites/france/retraite/mobilisation/et-ma-retraite-cest-pour-quand) exceptions for taxing jobs and a [decrease](https://www.cgt.fr/comm-de-presse/reforme-des-retraites-aujourdhui-dans-la-rue-demain-continue) of pension payments. As the strikes drag on, public opinion is shifting against workers while enthusiasm grows for driverless trains. Some fed-up Parisians have launched an [online petition](https://www.change.org/p/gouvernement-et-ratp-lancons-l-automatisation-de-l-ensemble-des-lignes-de-m%C3%A9tro-parisien) calling for a full automation of the Metro network, which has gathered over 10,000 signatures. Any acceleration of the current robot plans would be a bitter outcome for transport worker unions, which argue that they've got the best interests of passengers at heart by sticking with people. “It’s not about [opposition to] automation in itself, or modernization,” Delebarre said. “It simply has an impact on employment.” Having a human on board trains also “allows for a faster intervention for users, and it reduces feelings of insecurity,” he added. The Solidaires union in September [sought](https://solidaires.org/Train-fou-sur-la-ligne-1-Quand-l-usager-devient-otage-de-l-automatisation) to highlight what it sees as the safety risks of automation following an incident it described as an “unhinged” Metro whizzing past three stops. That showed the need for a “human presence” on trains, the union said. It “remains opposed to the politics of automation of metro lines, which eliminates jobs, dehumanizes the network and creates a drop in security.” The company admitted the events may have been upsetting but [denied](https://twitter.com/Ligne1_RATP/status/1174299887741165568) passengers were in any danger. According to a RATP spokeswoman, automating lines doesn’t remove the Metro’s reliance on staff. There are still people controlling the system even if they're no longer driving trains. Even the No. 1 and No. 14 lines still need human backup. “If we’re able to open those lines, that’s because there’s enough staff to open them,” she said. While the strikes have focused attention on automated metro lines, the main goal of the RATP is to make its system more efficient rather than get rid of occasionally striking workers. "We’re in favor of automated Metro links, but we're not unrealistic," said Michel Babut, deputy president of the transport users' association AUT. “We know not all lines will be automated.” The main aim of increasing automation is to tackle overcrowding. “Saturation happens every day of the year. Strikes, fortunately, don't.”

### Extra maybe

#### Substitutability—only consequentialism explains necessary enablers.

Sinnott-Armstrong 92 [Walter, professor of practical ethics. “An Argument for Consequentialism” Dartmouth College Philosophical Perspectives. 1992.]

A moral reason to do an act is consequential if and only if the reason depends only on the consequences of either doing the act or not doing the act. For example, a moral reason not to hit someone is that this will hurt her or him. A moral reason to turn your car to the left might be that, if you do not do so, you will run over and kill someone. A moral reason to feed a starving child is that the child will lose important mental or physical abilities if you do not feed it. All such reasons are consequential reasons. All other moral reasons are non-consequential. Thus, a moral reason to do an act is non-consequential if and only if the reason depends even partly on some property that the act has independently of its consequences. For example, an act can be a lie regardless of what happens as a result of the lie (since some lies are not believed), and some moral theories claim that that property of being a lie provides amoral reason not to tell a lie regardless of the consequences of this lie. Similarly, the fact that an act fulfills a promise is often seen as a moral reason to do the act, even though the act has that property of fulfilling a promise independently ofits consequences. All such moral reasons are non-consequential. In order to avoid so many negations, I will also call them 'deontological'. This distinction would not make sense if we did not restrict the notion of consequences. If I promise to mow the lawn, then one consequence of my mowing might seem to be that my promise is fulfilled. One way to avoid this problem is to specify that the consequences of an act must be distinct from the act itself. My act of fulfilling my promise and my act of mowing are not distinct, because they are done by the same bodily movements.10 Thus, my fulfilling my promise is not a consequence of my mowing. A consequence of an act need not be later in time than the act, since causation can be simultaneous, but the consequence must at least be different from the act. Even with this clarification, it is still hard to classify some moral reasons as consequential or deontological,11 but I will stick to examples that are clear. In accordance with this distinction between kinds of moral reasons, I can now distinguish different kinds of moral theories. I will say that a moral theory is consequentialist if and only if it implies that all basic moral reasons are consequential. A moral theory is then non-consequentialist or deontological if it includes any basic moral reasons which are not consequential. 5. Against Deontology So defined, the class of deontological moral theories is very large and diverse. This makes it hard to say anything in general about it. Nonetheless, I will argue that no deontological moral theory can explain why moral substitutability holds. My argument applies to all deontological theories because it depends only on what is common to them all, namely, the claim that some basic moral reasons are not consequential. Some deontological theories allow very many weighty moral reasons that are consequential, and these theories might be able to explain why moral substitutability holds for some of their moral reasons: the consequential ones. But even these theories cannot explain why moral substitutability holds for all moral reasons, including the non-consequential reasons that make the theory deontological. The failure of deontological moral theories to explain moral substitutability in the very cases that make them deontological is a reason to reject all deontological moral theories. I cannot discuss every deontological moral theory, so I will discuss only a few paradigm examples and show why they cannot explain moral substitutability. After this, I will argue that similar problems are bound to arise for all other deontological theories by their very nature. The simplest deontological theory is the pluralistic intuitionism of Prichard and Ross. Ross writes that, when someone promises to do something, 'This we consider obligatory in its own nature, just because it is a fulfillment of a promise, and not because of its consequences.'12 Such deontologists claim in effect that, if I promise to mow the grass, there is a moral reason for me to mow the grass, and this moral reason is constituted by the fact that mowing the grass fulfills my promise. This reason exists regardless of the consequences of mowing the grass, even though it might be overridden by certain bad consequences. However, if this is why I have a moral reason to mow the grass, then, even if I cannot mow the grass without starting my mower, and starting the mower would enable me to mow the grass, it still would not follow that I have any moral reason to start my mower, since I did not promise to start my mower, and starting my mower does not fulfill my promise. Thus, a moral theory cannot explain moral substitutability if it claims that properties like this provide moral reasons.