## 1-Plan Spec

Interpretation: affirmative debaters must offer a hypothetical implementation of the resolution, to clarify aff debaters must run a plan

Violation- they don’t have a plan- meaning I don’t know who implements the res, how they implement the res

Standards

1- policy education

Absent implementation we don’t learn about policy since policy talk requires implementation and feasibility texts

Outweighs critical framing since

A- critical theory is useless if you can’t apply it

B- critical theory is constructed from the natural world so it depends on policy to exist

Implication is that plans control the internal link to real world education and that their aff is incomplete- that’s an independent disad

2- prep skew

They can redefine what a ‘strike’, ‘unconditional’, ‘workers’, ‘government’ is in the 1ar, meaning I don’t know which disads link which skews me on pre round prep- killing fairness

Voters

Education- only portable skill we take from debate

Fairness

a- constitutive of competitive activity

B- meta constraint on all arguments since we can’t determine truth or falsity if i couldn’t test their ideas

Dtd on plan spec- it’s their entire aff so dta means they concede

Competing interps first

A- modular debate produces the best norms- outweighs on scope

B- reasonability invites judge intervention which makes debate meaningless

No rvis- illogical, you don’t get a medal for not cheating- logic outweighs since everything depends on it- proven cuz they’re gonna try to refute this with logic

Cx doesn’t check

1. Moots preround prep- 4 minutes isn’t enough time to prep out a k aff
2. People can be shifty- they’d have an incentive to be

## 2- Daoism Kritik

#### Welcome to the realm of desire. Society controls desires- forgetting these structures overwhelms the language barrier that makes all other reformation fail. Thus the role of the ballot is to overwhelm desire.

Hansen, Chad, 3, Daoism (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy), No Publication, 2-19-2003, DOA: 9-4-2021, https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/daoism/, r0w@n

With the importation of Indo-European Buddhism from India, wu-wei started to be interpreted via the Western conceptual apparatus contrasting desire or purpose and reason. This shaped the modern Chinese interpretation and probably undermined the ideal. It became the target of attack among “modern” Chinese who regarded Daoist “non-striving” or “purposelessness” as the source of Chinese passivity. The activist 19th century reformer, Kang You-wei (Kang have-wei) took the denial of the slogan as his scholarly name. 9.5 Pusimplicity (Pre-linguistic Purity) 樸 The Daoist “primitivist” ideal as expressed mainly in the Laozi. It metaphorically represents the result of forgetting mingnames and desires (See Wu-wei). Translations include simplicity, “raw” wood, and D. C. Lau’s more elaborate “uncarved block.” The detailed translation more sensitively expresses Laozi’s point in using the metaphor in the context of a view of names as “cutting” things into types and Laozi’s distinctive theory that such socially constructed distinctions (institutions) control us by controlling our desires. When societies adopt names or terms, it does so in order to instill and regulate desires for one of the pair created by the name-induced distinction. Thus Daoist forgetting requires forgetting names and distinctions, but in doing so, frees itself from the socially induced, unnatural desires that cause strife and unhappiness in society (e.g. status, rare objects, fame, authority). Hence: “The Nameless uncarved block thus amounts to freedom from desire.” (Daode Jing 37) 10. Texts and Textual History Questions of textual theory are the focus of the bulk of modern scholarship. They include these kinds of questions. Existence (did Laozi or Zhuangzi actually exist) Authorship (did they write the texts attributed to them?) Dating (when did they exist or write their texts?) Relations (did Laozi influence Zhuangzi?)

#### The aff’s conceptualization of the subject mentally distances us from the real world- this prevents them from acting with the confines of the environing particulars of the ten thousand things

Pettman 05, Ralf Pettman, Taoism and The Concept of Global Security, International Relations of the Asian-Pacific, 2005, <https://sci-hub.se/https://doi.org/10.1093/irap/lci103>, r0w@n

Specific comparisons of Taoist and non-Taoist approaches to global security Having briefly tried to define Taoism and the Tao, and having indicated some of the problems that arise in trying to doing so, I shall now move to the nub of the matter, which is to compare Taoism and rationalism in epistemological terms. I will then compare Taoist thinking with more rationalist thinking about global security in ‘human’ terms, and then with rationalist thinking about global security in more conventional terms. 4.1 Comparing Taoist and rationalist epistemologies The profundity of the concept of the Tao seems to preclude us from using Taoism to describe its meaning in logical, empirical, analytical terms. As a consequence we are typically invited to talk in analogical and metaphorical terms instead. But this is to jeopardize at once the sympathy of most contemporary social scientists, who as a group are likely to require something much more publicly verifiable before considering it reliable. Rationalists are not about to content themselves with accounts of an aptitude for living 6 The story is that of the drunk who returns home at night and loses his key while trying to open the front door to his home. He is subsequently found by a neighbour looking under a lamplight some distance away. After asking what the drunk is doing, and where he lost his key, the neighbour then asks why the drunk is not looking outside his front door. The drunk replies to the effect that the light is brighter under the lamp. Taoism and the concept of global security 71 expressed in ‘stories, verses, maxims’ and the like (Graham, 1989, pp. 199– 200; Giles, 1961 [1889]) If historically or philosophically minded, they will want to be more systematic. If positivists, they will want to use the hypothetico-deductive method. So let us be clear. Rationalism, which is the doctrine within which most thinking and practice about the concept of global security is currently done, prioritizes reason as an end in itself. Taoism, which is the doctrine I am trying to bring to bear upon the rationalist construction of this concept, is a way of thinking and practice that does not. It prioritizes sacral (and in this instance, Taoist) insights instead. These two are seemingly incommensurable. They would seem to represent an unbridgeable epistemological divide. Their protagonists not only talk different analytical languages, they talk past each other as well, which is just what I want to prevent, not just because I do not like dialogues of the deaf, but more importantly, because I think it is to capitulate to rationalism. From the rationalist perspective, Taoism looks anti-rational. As such, it is at best interesting. It is not reliable knowledge. From the Taoist perspective, however, rationalism is what one does with the rational part of one’s mind. It is only part of what Taoists do, nor need it be the larger part, since it includes the injunction to live in a state of sacral spontaneity. I noted above that rationalism is compromised at its root by the kind of self that is required if rationalism is to succeed. I argued that the individuated self – at one mind’s remove from the community – is objectifying. This self is created in turn by learning to be mentally distanced from the communalist context into which ‘one’ was born. Rationalism valorizes this individuated self, typically turning it into a primary normative purpose. Because this bias is built into rationalism itself, and because it limits and distorts so thoroughly what rationalism can do, we have to go outside rationalism to compensate for it. Otherwise, whenever we use rationalism, we will get the world right, but we will also get the world wrong. The most straightforward compensation procedure I know is one that enjoins us to get close to listen, and to take part, that is, to actively eschew the objectifying mind-gaze to participate in what one wants to understand. Anthropologists do this when they immerse themselves in a society not their own. The compensation bid need not stop there, however. It can be carried over from the social ground to the sacral one (and in this case the Taoist one), thus providing the kind of insight not otherwise available to rationalists because of how they choose to know. Those rationalists who get this far will no doubt want to follow their Taoist insights up by considering them rationally, but at least they will have Taoist insights to follow up. At least, having accepted immersion in the ‘shal- 72 Ralph Pettman low’ or meditative end of the experiential pool,7 or even beyond, they may have learned what otherwise they would not have been able to. The rationalist may even want to follow this up with further attempts to take part, and further rationalist reappraisals. By which point we will have constructed a cycle of knowing that is already rolling rationalism forward across the epistemological divide. We are still faced with fundamental uncertainty about the ground on which we stand (though most natural scientists will remain oblivious, and many social scientists likewise.) By eternally returning to both rationalism and Taoism, however, we no longer have to set the one up in opposition to the other. We do not have to abandon our regard for rigour, or our preference for specified indices of comparison, or for reassessing sacral insights in non-sacral ways. But nor do we have to abandon the idea that Taoism has something meaningful to say about the concept of global security. The two are no longer placed in contention, since to place them thus is to cleave to the rationalist line as the surest way to know what is true, and to ignore the way the ontological character of rationalism compromises any such surety. While we are used to having sacral illusion dispelled by analytic clarity, we are not so used to having analytic illusion dispelled by sacral clarity. That is the task before us, however, and it is a task with normative implications considerably more extensive than those rationalists would valorize. How does moving onto Taoist ground, and immersing ourselves in Taoist experience, play out in practice? Our section on mapping the concept of global security began by highlighting the making of modernity. If we start with this general project, and cast it in the light of the general Taoist knack for sacral spontaneity, we see at once how little this knack has to do with the rationalist way of thinking or being. Where the modernist/rationalist talks of empirical logic and scientific representation, the sacralist/Taoist talks (in Graham’s terms, at least) of the rejection of empirical logic, and an ‘infinite regress, testing by tests which in the end are themselves untested’ (Graham, 7 Arriving at Taoist precepts requires the use of what Waley calls ‘quietism’, or the ‘gradual inward-turning of . . . thought’ (Waley, 1934, pp. 43, 45). This involves the use of the mind in non-rationalist, indeed anti-rationalist ways, that allow it to become less distracted and more aware. For rationalists, meditation as a research methodology is too subjective. Why should we accept the results of Taoist quietism, they say, as a way to plan global security, for example, when we can use rationalist bargaining strategies and mediation practices instead? Why, for that matter, should we treat exploitation or global destitution or environmental neglect with meditative detachment, rather than with objective plans for changing the world for the better? Why should we use non-rational illumination to help rulers order the inter-state system when we have publically replicable ways of thinking that allow us to do so scientifically (Graham, 1989, p. 234)? Taoists respond by comparing their accounts of the world with modernist ones. They point out how modernist state-makers are taught to understand world affairs by objectifying. They point out how knowing of this sort is circumscribed by the nature of the primary experience that makes untrammelled reasoning possible (individuation). And they see themselves as eschewing these limits by inviting a different kind of primary experience. Taoism and the concept of global security 73 1981, pp. 10, 11). Where the rationalist talks of the hypothetico-deductive method, the Taoist talks (again in Graham’s terms) of an understanding of the ‘mysterious order which runs through all things’, and the universal motion of chi energy (Graham, 1981, pp. 12, 19–20). Where the rationalist talks of a detached and individuated intellectual vantage-point, separate from society, where reason can be given free reign to cogitate and communicate, the Taoist talks (in Hansen’s terms this time) of ‘heart-minds’ (Hansen, 1992, pp. 53, 85–86). Taoists respond to the situation they are in by unfocusing, that is, by allowing themselves to act with the ‘immediacy of an echo’, rather than the self-consciousness of someone who applies general principles. (Graham, 1981, pp. 6, 12, 14). They invite, in other words, the kind of recognition the ‘heart’ gives ‘when the mind is silent’ (Krishnamurti, 1972, p. 34). This is metaphorical language, but we are not, after all, trying to ascertain what is scientifically true. We are trying to locate scientific truth-finding within its sacral context.8 Faced with global security planning, Taoists highlight the way rationalist attempts to anticipate a particular foreign policy can only reach so far. Taoists highlight how those who really know what they are doing tend to eschew conscious thought to attend instead to the ‘total situation’. This ‘knack’, like a feel for the way a bacterium works, or for how to play a musical instrument, is not one that can be ultimately explained (Graham, 1983, p. 7). Taoists also compare the way they face the future with the way it is faced by those who promote the national interest, for example, or the relevant capitalist/corporate, politico-social, bourgeois, or masculinist interest. The rationalist entertains options A, B, and C, and plays out each one in advance, in a bid to anticipate what will turn out the best. Except that it is not possible to anticipate what will turn out the best. In choosing one policy option, the others cease to exist. Once, for example, option B is chosen, options A and C have no chance of happening. Option A might have been better, or might have been worse. Likewise option C. With the B policy chosen, these alternatives are no longer alternatives. Which is why contemplating such alternatives was futile in the first place, and making decisions on the basis of such contemplations makes no sense at all. It is not possible, that is, to know rationally what is in the national interest. To rely on rationalism is, therefore, to overplay rationalism, which is to underplay Taoism in turn, and to underplay sacral spontaneity (Graham, 1981, p. 14). 8 This is why Taoists see intellectual detachment in terms of a ‘returning’ to the ‘‘root’ or ‘trunk’ or ‘seed’ . . . [or] ‘gate’ . . . [or] ‘axis’ . . .’ (Graham, 1981, p. 21), and tend not to posit a reality behind appearances, as modernists/rationalists do. Taoist thought is figured against a very different metaphysical ground. As Graham says: ‘In so far as we can co-ordinate the Chinese concepts with our own, it seems that the physical world has more being and reality than the Way. However it is only by grasping the Way that we mirror the physical world clearly . . .’ (Graham, 1981, p. 21). 74 Ralph Pettman Modernist proponents of global security demur. Enough people in the world live as if modernist conceptions of global security ought to prevail, they note, for most of these conceptions to prevail in practice. Enough people behave as if world order is made up of sovereign states, for example, for this way of ordering world affairs to be a tangible, global reality. The same applies to liberal marketeering, global modes of making civil identity, the global formation of capitalist classes, the global advent of social movements, and the global advent of gender-specific practices. There is a self-fulfilling quality to the modernist project, and we must deal with its global consequences, they argue, whether the Taoist critique of the rationalist cause is valid or not. This is not to say that the people of the world live in the best of all possible worlds. Perhaps there is a preferred alternative, though perhaps (and this is the Taoist thought) there is no ‘preferred alternative’ either, at least of a rationally accessible sort. Perhaps it is a matter of standing back to look at this cosmos that we are all in, then standing close to listen, then feeling as best we can for how it moves, before standing back to look once more. Perhaps we might even learn something in taking ourselves through such a process, something we might need to know if we are to understand global security. 4.2 Comparing Taoist concerns with human security ones Speaking of the people of the world, I will now move to consider the concept of global security in terms of human security. The concept of human security still tends to be used to describe everything that the statist/militarist forms of security thinking are not (Paris, 2001). I think this is a mistake since I think it is more useful to see strategic security thinking as one aspect of human security thinking. I shall heed the conventional distinction here, however, as a way of comparing Taoist ideas and non-strategic security ones. The Taoist is likely to turn first to the pre- and post-modernist margins that modernist/rationalists create as they seek to extend their hegemonic grasp. Modernists consign to the margins those not deemed rationalistic enough, like women, and those who do not accept modernity as being necessarily beneficial, like many environmentalists. While feminists highlight the male-made character of global security, most feminists are also modernists, however. As such they are not in much of an epistemological mood to listen to Taoists, who they tend to think of as representing a pre-modernist way of thinking. Environmentalists, meanwhile, highlight the impact modernist humankind is having upon the planet’s ecosystems. The modernists among them tend to dismiss Taoist thinking likewise. The Taoist might turn next to those who speak the different analytic lan- Taoism and the concept of global security 75 guages mapped in the first section of this article with regard to the different assumptions analysts make about human nature and nurturing practices. Since those who speak these languages are all rationalists, however, the Taoist is likely to meet with the epistemological incomprehension already discussed. Perhaps the Taoist should apply a more specific Taoist technique, therefore. Perhaps a more particular expression of the Taoist perspective will be able to gain better purchase on the rationalist position. In this section I shall look at human security in the light of the Taoist preference for wu-wei, that is, active pacifism, or ‘no unnatural action’, or, as Graham calls it, ‘Doing Nothing’ (Graham, 1981, p. 288; 1989, pp. 232–233). To Needham, wu-wei means not using force when ‘subtler methods of persuasion, or simply letting things alone to take their own course’ promises a good outcome (Needham, 1956, pp. 37, 68). To Merton it means ‘perfect action – because . . . carried out . . . in perfect harmony with the whole . . . [and] not “conditioned” or “limited” by our own individual needs . . . desires . . . theories and ideas’ (Merton, 1965, p. 28). To Hansen it means action that avoids ‘artificially induced or learned purposes or desires . . . [since g]etting rid of wei . . . [means] freeing us from society’s purposes, socially induced desires, social distinctions or meaning structures . . .’ (Hansen, 1992, p. 214). Clearly, we are going to encounter here the same translation troubles we did earlier. A general reading of the Taoist literature seems to suggest that the Taoist sees wu-wei as a demonstrably caring, humble, frugal, yielding, and wise way to respond, however. It is the kind of (re)action that spares lives as much as it can, while leaving people as much as possible to themselves. It is the kind of (re)action that deals with large matters while they are still small, and fosters ‘being content’. It is the kind of counsel state-makers heed when they keep their ‘sharpest weapons where none can see them’, and regard all weapons as not ‘lovely’. It opposes conquest by force of arms, knows ‘the male’ and yet cleaves to that which is ‘female’, seeks the welfare of ordinary people, and endeavours to see and hear as ordinary people do. It tries not to stimulate the desire for products that are hard to get, and it tries not to legislate kindness or morality, exalt fame or riches, or rely upon either the ritual or overt use of power. In short, it tries to foster gentle friendships, true words, good government, due regulation, and effective deeds (Lao Tzu, 1997, pp. 11, 29, 31, 32, 37, 49, 75, 77, 81). Despite all the in-built universals (what constitutes wisdom or compassion? what is a true word? what is good government? what is an effective deed?), this concept is not a vague one. If it still seems so, it is given a graphic account in the practise of Taoist-inspired martial arts like that of tai 76 Ralph Pettman chi chuan, or judo, or aikido. In tai chi chuan the force of the opponent is returned or redirected, making it possible to prevail by yielding rather than by retaliating. This has important implications for conflict management and conflict resolution, even though it may well be one thing to redirect a punch to the person, and quite another to topple the global edifice of gender discrimination or capitalist exploitation, or to fight a guerrilla war. In Japanese judo, which is derived from the Chinese martial arts, weaker people learn to overcome stronger ones by moving in ways that do not offer resistance (Creel, 1970, p. 67). The same principle is manifest in aikido, a Taoist-style meditation in martial movement, where the purpose is to bring the self into accord ‘with the universe itself ’. This requires the practitioner to prevail over the ‘mind of discord’ in itself. In practice, this does not mean retreat. Nor does it mean retaliation. It means completing the task we all purportedly have, that is ‘to reconcile the world and make human beings one family’ (Uyeshiba, 1963, pp. 177, 178; Pettman, 1993). Returning to the analytic map of the concept of global security provided at the start, we can now compare the thinking of those who speak as liberal analysts of the inter-state system or society, for example, with their optimistic assumptions about the capacity for tit-for-tat behaviour, and Taoist thinking, which makes no such assumptions, and is not constrained by the rationalist context in which such assumptions are articulated. Wu-wei decrees no need to return tit-for-tat in promoting global security. It may mean practising reciprocity. It may not. There is no conceptual obligation either way, since ‘no unnatural action’ is not a contractual practice. The Tao te ching espouses a sense of the human whole instead. Since the Taoist also eschews legislated forms of morality, he or she is not bound to the kind of agreements that make international alliances and organizations possible. In dealing with global security matters, he or she seeks to employ sacral spontaneity rather than analytic deliberation, artlessness rather than purposefulness, and to engage in action not planned in the more premeditated way. This sounds to rationalist ears like a recipe for disaster, since it appears to lack all the certainty they are used to in securing global affairs. There are no agreed rules, or agreed habits of international practice where rules cannot be established, or established ways of using force where co-operative means fail. They are likely to point to the Hitlers of this world, who revel in Taoist-style spontaneity, and who take millions of innocent people down with them. And they are right to do so. Taoists are not racist fascists, however. This kind of spontaneity is not Taoist, even when it gets couched in sacral terms. The key Taoist works read nothing like the ideological writings of a Hitler or one of his ilk. Indeed, they speak from a perspective that shows these writings to be human Taoism and the concept of global security 77 atavisms. They repudiate them comprehensively. Moreover, Hitler was the product of rationalism gone awry. Reaching for the mind-view that made for his rise in the first place is not what we necessarily want to do next. If we turn to the rationalist proponents of world government, we find those who are more optimistic than the liberals about the possibility of global governance, and we find that Taoists do not make this kind of assumption either. Nor do they accept the conceptual constraints involved. Taoists do not see people as being calculating or altruistic. In practise ‘no unnatural action’ makes for a mirror-like appraisal of the moment. It may mean promoting world governance or government. It may not. Given the sacral spontaneity that wu-wei represents, any policy choice may be preferred (Graham, 1981, p. 91). It will depend on what lets most people live out their lives relatively unharassed. In terms of the politico-economic (market-making) dimension to world affairs, the practice of wu-wei may or may not stand in stark contrast to the dog-eat-dog thinking of contemporary economic protectionists, the tit-for-tat thinking of global marketeers, and the hail-fellow-well-met thinking of international socialists. While protectionists always see a need to defend their country against the predatory behaviour of trading and investing ‘others’, Taoists may or may not feel obliged to respond with economic nationalism of this sort. Likewise with the free trading and investing practices that those who see human beings as basically calculating espouse (though the Tao te ching does eschew the stimulation of a desire for products that are hard to get). Nor do Taoists necessarily espouse the planned production and distribution policies that altruistic socialists find most congenial either (though the Tao te ching does recommend distributing a country’s wealth evenly, without legislating kindness). If we focus upon issues to do with global economic development and human want, we can see that Taoists are not constrained to the rationalist languages currently used here to do their thinking with. The concept of wu-wei frees us from the constraints these languages impose. This does not mean that wu-wei prescribes set developmental policies of some other kind, or has a solution it can bring to bear upon a specific famine (though Taoism does enjoin us to be frugal and content, foster the welfare of ordinary people, and not exalt riches). It does mean that wu-wei will always see economic well-being as part of the security equation, however, which is still not an acknowledged part of the rationalist approach to global security. It will always argue that people should not want, as well, which is not yet the basic position in the rationalist world either. In terms of the politico-social dimension to world affairs, we can see how the practice of wu-wei may or may not entail the dog-eat-dog thinking of 78 Ralph Pettman contemporary nationalists, the tit-for-tat thinking of modernist proponents of human rights and democracy, or the hail-fellow-well-met thinking of modernist proponents of social movements. Taoism is not constrained to any particular policy or policies. Indeed, it enjoins us not to get caught up in the conventional thinking that these rationalist ways of talking about the self-in-world-society represent. This does not make it a panacea (though the humane and caring character of Taoism would make it the basis for one, as would its sense of cosmic respect). It does invite us to move beyond the rationalist way of thinking, though, to entertain the Taoist level of experience, before deciding what to do. Which brings us to that part of the analytic map sketched at the beginning that accounts for those who emphasize the importance of human nurturing practices, not human nature. Classical marxists emphasize the materialist nature of the nurturing environment, articulating an analytic language that describes and explains the concept of global security in terms of the capitalist mode of production, capitalist exploitation, and the relevant class struggle. Neo-marxists add a mentalist note to this story to account for the hegemonic power of the ruling class, and its capacity to craft a concept of global security that serves its particular interests. Taoist spontaneity is radically different in that it does not portend any particular alternative to the analytic certainties (neo)marxist doctrines represent. Nor does it preclude the policies they prescribe or proscribe. Wu-wei practice seeks responses that are more immediate, instead, and more appropriate to the global security situation, as read as a whole, and from one moment to the next. It seeks a sense of the whole security situation, before affirming that sense in such a way as to nurture as many concerned as possible. Of the analytic languages that articulate preconceptions about human nurturing practices, constructivism is the one most like Taoism. This analytic language highlights the mentalist aspect of the nurturing environment. It does not recommend any particular policy response, since it merely highlights the mentally-made component to them all. Taoism can look very similar, particularly when we find the Tao te ching recommending that we should think as ordinary people think, which is just what the so-called ‘commonsense’ version of constructivism does (Pettman, 2000). While constructivism does not prescribe a particular way of thinking about the concept of global security, it is still rationalist, however, and it still constrains us to a mentalist rather than a materialist consideration of the concept. Taoism does not. It is non-rationalist and sacralist. And while most rationalists are likely to find this a recipe for epistemological anarchy, some may find that it is an opportunity to explore and assess productive ways of thinking that rationalism precludes. Taoism and the concept of global security 79 4.3 Comparing Taoist concerns with conventional strategic ones The dominant (though not necessarily the most important) language spoken about contemporary world affairs is the (neo)realist one. It articulates all of our dog-eat-dog notions about an anarchic world system, and global and regional balances of power. Compare the concept of wu-wei. This would seem to have nothing to do with the whole politico-strategic spectrum (Pettman, 1998, p. 176). On the one hand we have the classical realist dialect of alliance-hopping, and the neo-realist dialect of structural reasons for self-help. We have prescriptions for the pursuit of the national self-interest, and for the proscription of intervention in other states’ affairs. We have state-centricity, and pessimistic assumptions about human nature. On the other hand we have the Taoist determination to make no such assumptions and accept no such constraints. We have clear but not dogmatic opposition to conquest by force of arms. We have the decision to be as flexible as possible about what foreign policies to adopt, and how to implement them. We have the determination to act or react with profound, indeed sacral spontaneity. Rationalists aptly point out that anything less than sacral spontaneity is likely to fall flat on its face. While we wrestle with whether we are profound enough, however, we can always, as the Tao te ching recommends, keep the state’s biggest guns out of sight, treat them as unattractive (no parades or fly-pasts), use overt force extremely reluctantly, ensure that collateral human damage is kept to an absolute minimum if we do have to use force, and treat any success as a tragedy not a triumph. The ultimate issue in the politico-strategic realm is war. How does wu-wei apply here? Human warring is regularly analysed rationally in terms of a range of causes, kinds and consequences. The results of these analyses are used to plan appropriate politico-strategic practices, whether of an offensive, defensive, or pre-emptive kind. Human warring can also be analysed by meditating, however – that is, by not cogitating so self-consciously upon the ways in which we relate to each other and the world. The results of these meditations can then be used to practice neither offence, defence, or preemption, but a kind of watchfulness, a kind of non-anticipation, a way of being in the world-moment that is equaniminous, open, and aware. The latter is the one that wu-wei exemplifies. It would be worthy but fruitless to try and deal with world conflict

#### The aff’s move towards justice lacks the re-evaluation of the relationality of desire and subjecthood that would enable real progress

Joseph Pratt 14, A Daoist Take on American Legal Theory, No Publication, 5-26-2014, DOA: 10-26-2021, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2441773, r0w@n

This consciousness is a sense of the world’s inherent goodness, and that a balance between the other and oneself is necessary to experience that beauty. 83 It is an awareness that separation is only for the experience of community and ultimately Oneness and the Dao. It also follows, as some people in early America understood, only when the common weal and individual pursuits are in harmony can people enjoy true equality and liberty and thus the freedom to pursue that happiness the world provides. This enlightened sense brings together Immanuel Kant’s individualism and Jeremy Bentham’s utilitarianism in a way that achieves much more than either could do separately. 84 81 PENNSYLVANIA CONSTITUTION OF 1776, Article XIV (noting “[t]hat a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles, and a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, industry, and frugality are absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty, and keep a government free”). 82 For an early case law comment on this point, see Currie’s Administrators v. Mutual Assurance Society, 14 Va. 315 (Va. 1809) (noting that a legislature could not limit a subsequent legislature’s actions on a particular matter, but only admonish that any change would violate a natural principle). 83 Professor Gabel calls for realizing an “unalienated relatedness,” while Professor Kennedy might refer to this consciousness as an “intersubjective zap.” See Gabel and Kennedy, Roll Over, supra note 36, at 1-14 (1984). Gabel also noted that union and otherness represent a false duality. Id. at 21. 84 Bentham’s utilitarianism would be considered a communalism to the extent it is concerned with the greatest good for the greatest number of people. In harmony with individualism, this communalism achieves the greatest good for everyone. In other words, there are no losers. Similarly, with respect to Kant’s individualism, people are not considered a means to an end. Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2441773 17 The problem is not liberalism per se.85 A strict republicanism, as in state Communism, was as dysfunctional as the Lochner era’s liberalism—both lasted less than 50 years. Whereas capitalism overemphasized the individual, Communism overplayed the communal. Without a genuine connection among people, the forced equality saps the work spirit and the society crumbles. Nor is the solution a capitalistic-socialism, as in modern China—in contrast with the socialisticcapitalism found in America. Emphasizing socialist principles without a deeper connection among the people also only perpetuates a wayward system. The two sets of social norms may differ, but the underlying problem is the same. To foster or preserve this consciousness, the law needs to structure social institutions and decide legal disputes in ways that facilitate this consciousness. In this respect, as in early America, the law must promote a harmonious balance between the common weal and individual pursuits, and discourage purely private material aims, recognizing they are neither productive nor fulfilling as they may seem. In this role, the law must be integrative—it must contemplate various personal and social factors, including the psychological, sociological, political, and economic. 86 At the level of legal theory, the opposing sides like Formalism and 85 This point, and critique of CLS, was noted early on. See Mark Hager, Book Review, Against Liberal Ideology: A Guide to Critical Legal Studies, by Mark Kelman, 37 AM. L. REV. 1051, 1057-59 (1988). 86 Professor Gabel has suggested that such a legal system will stress restorative justice, mediation movements, holistic lawyers and integrated legal education. See Gabel, Spiritual Practice, supra note 33, at 530-531. Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2441773 18 Realism as well as naturalism and positivism also must come back together—again as in early America—to constitute a simple holistic wisdom.87 Attaining a harmonious consciousness, at the same time, will reduce the need for law and legal theory. 88 Daoism stresses that in a balanced state, people believe the goodness has occurred naturally.89 Rather than a stratified society, which many early Americans also sought to avoid, people will seek arrangements where they can live and work in harmony with each other. There thus will be less overt economic conflict. Even in contractual matters, people will seek solutions that benefit all— recognizing that to injure another is to injure the group and ultimately oneself. In torts, similarly, the grounded consciousness will make people reasonable in their daily interactions and reduce negligence. When an accident occurs, the focus will also be on restoring the group’s balance—a solution where all may win. Some may question whether such a consciousness and way of life is possible or even preferable to today’s economic circumstances? At the end of feudalism, many also questioned America’s experiment with democracy, and it worked well in some portions of the country for several decades. The eventual widespread loss of this consciousness and balance between the common weal and individual pursuits, moreover, was not due to economic necessity. Rather, it stemmed from a pride in 87

#### Thus the alternative is creating a harmonious consciousness, making the law integrative, contemplative, and reconsiderate of the Western paradigm

Joseph Pratt 14, A Daoist Take on American Legal Theory, No Publication, 5-26-2014, DOA: 10-26-2021, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2441773, r0w@n

This consciousness is a sense of the world’s inherent goodness, and that a balance between the other and oneself is necessary to experience that beauty. 83 It is an awareness that separation is only for the experience of community and ultimately Oneness and the Dao. It also follows, as some people in early America understood, only when the common weal and individual pursuits are in harmony can people enjoy true equality and liberty and thus the freedom to pursue that happiness the world provides. This enlightened sense brings together Immanuel Kant’s individualism and Jeremy Bentham’s utilitarianism in a way that achieves much more than either could do separately. 84 81 PENNSYLVANIA CONSTITUTION OF 1776, Article XIV (noting “[t]hat a frequent recurrence to fundamental principles, and a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, industry, and frugality are absolutely necessary to preserve the blessings of liberty, and keep a government free”). 82 For an early case law comment on this point, see Currie’s Administrators v. Mutual Assurance Society, 14 Va. 315 (Va. 1809) (noting that a legislature could not limit a subsequent legislature’s actions on a particular matter, but only admonish that any change would violate a natural principle). 83 Professor Gabel calls for realizing an “unalienated relatedness,” while Professor Kennedy might refer to this consciousness as an “intersubjective zap.” See Gabel and Kennedy, Roll Over, supra note 36, at 1-14 (1984). Gabel also noted that union and otherness represent a false duality. Id. at 21. 84 Bentham’s utilitarianism would be considered a communalism to the extent it is concerned with the greatest good for the greatest number of people. In harmony with individualism, this communalism achieves the greatest good for everyone. In other words, there are no losers. Similarly, with respect to Kant’s individualism, people are not considered a means to an end. Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2441773 17 The problem is not liberalism per se.85 A strict republicanism, as in state Communism, was as dysfunctional as the Lochner era’s liberalism—both lasted less than 50 years. Whereas capitalism overemphasized the individual, Communism overplayed the communal. Without a genuine connection among people, the forced equality saps the work spirit and the society crumbles. Nor is the solution a capitalistic-socialism, as in modern China—in contrast with the socialisticcapitalism found in America. Emphasizing socialist principles without a deeper connection among the people also only perpetuates a wayward system. The two sets of social norms may differ, but the underlying problem is the same. To foster or preserve this consciousness, the law needs to structure social institutions and decide legal disputes in ways that facilitate this consciousness. In this respect, as in early America, the law must promote a harmonious balance between the common weal and individual pursuits, and discourage purely private material aims, recognizing they are neither productive nor fulfilling as they may seem. In this role, the law must be integrative—it must contemplate various personal and social factors, including the psychological, sociological, political, and economic. 86 At the level of legal theory, the opposing sides like Formalism and 85 This point, and critique of CLS, was noted early on. See Mark Hager, Book Review, Against Liberal Ideology: A Guide to Critical Legal Studies, by Mark Kelman, 37 AM. L. REV. 1051, 1057-59 (1988). 86 Professor Gabel has suggested that such a legal system will stress restorative justice, mediation movements, holistic lawyers and integrated legal education. See Gabel, Spiritual Practice, supra note 33, at 530-531. Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2441773 18 Realism as well as naturalism and positivism also must come back together—again as in early America—to constitute a simple holistic wisdom.87 Attaining a harmonious consciousness, at the same time, will reduce the need for law and legal theory. 88 Daoism stresses that in a balanced state, people believe the goodness has occurred naturally.89 Rather than a stratified society, which many early Americans also sought to avoid, people will seek arrangements where they can live and work in harmony with each other. There thus will be less overt economic conflict. Even in contractual matters, people will seek solutions that benefit all— recognizing that to injure another is to injure the group and ultimately oneself. In torts, similarly, the grounded consciousness will make people reasonable in their daily interactions and reduce negligence. When an accident occurs, the focus will also be on restoring the group’s balance—a solution where all may win. Some may question whether such a consciousness and way of life is possible or even preferable to today’s economic circumstances? At the end of feudalism, many also questioned America’s experiment with democracy, and it worked well in some portions of the country for several decades. The eventual widespread loss of this consciousness and balance between the common weal and individual pursuits, moreover, was not due to economic necessity. Rather, it stemmed from a pride in 87 Opposite theories like formalism and realism as well as naturalism and positivism unite in a wise contemplation to restore the Dao. 88 Others have noted that a common vision of the “Good” reduces explicit laws and legal institutions. See, e.g., ROBERT MANGABEIRA UNGER, LAW IN MODERN SOCIETY 241-242 (1976). 89 The Daodejing stresses this natural way. See, e.g., TAO TE CHING, supra note 5, at 73 (ch. 17). Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2441773 19 purely material gain—a sense that the individual self could outstrip the whole. It was a wrong step in a right direction. With a holistic consciousness, people again will be free to create and invent new ways of doing things. These new ways, moreover, will accord with the underlying natural order and thus be more productive than the former methods. In the present, post-capitalistic-industrial era, this harmonious approach will open up new metaphysical-physical possibilities, which have few, if any, of the negative side effects, such as pollution, cancer and war, of the discordant system. Just as America’s early homesteading outstripped feudalistic agricultural systems, a holistic approach to manufacturing will surpass the capitalistic-industrial order’s methods. In connection with a harmonious economy, this consciousness, by creating a stable community of secure individuals, will free people from the alienation and thus errant desire and displacement activity of modern societies. In the balanced state, people will be free to experience the world on a deeper and fuller basis. 90 Each person will have the opportunity to realize his or her unique contribution to the whole and thereby attain the happiness that ordinary existence promises. The social norms that previously channeled and controlled displacement activity will become redundant. When it comes to any such displacement conflict, the law will seek integrative ways to restore individual and societal balance. Finally, this consciousness, by showing individual health is related to universal principles of balance and harmony, will encourage people to lead healthy lives and 90 CLS scholars seeking to transcend ill-liberal tendencies have noted this relationship. See, e.g., Gabel and Kennedy, Roll Over, supra note 36. Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2441773 20 take responsibility for their illnesses. Daoist metaphysics demonstrates that harmony between the Yin and Yang applies all the way down to the cellular level (and farther). 91 When people live in balance, they accord with universal principles and experience physical, spiritual, and mental health. People will also recognize disease is a sign of imbalance and a call for adjusting a person’s consciousness. This natural health and individual responsibility will greatly reduce the need for tertiary social welfare norms. This basic change, of course, goes deeper than general legal norms. It calls for a reconsideration of the modern Western paradigm based on material separation (e.g., Newtonian physics, Darwinian biology, Freudian psychology, and Weberian sociology). As already noted, Daoism shows that the explicit separation is only for an implicit connection and ultimately Oneness and the Dao. 92 At the same time, this change in consciousness calls for a return to a holistic sense, as America’s founders understood, of people and the world as inherently good (the divine essence itself). This lucidity will resolve many disputes within academic fields and between science and religious forums. It will bring the various strands of thinking back under a single roof. In this respect, Daoism is a complete account of reality. 93 91 See WANG, YINYANG, supra note 6, at 2, citing the 200 C.E. Huangdi Neijing. 92 Quantum physics certainly challenges the traditional order, and some notable physicists have already argued an approach similar to Daoism. See, e.g., DAVID BOHM, WHOLENESS AND THE IMPLICATE ORDER (1980). See also, DAVID BOHM,ON CREATIVITY 104 (1996) (calling for a new mathematics that calls attention to a whole movement and to particular things only in some secondary function). 93 It’s not that this grand unified theory can be proven rationally, as Daoism holds, it can only be shown that it could be no other way. Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2441773 21 At some point, this change in consciousness is inevitable—as Daoism illustrates, the present situation is unsustainable. Conflict has served its purpose: disharmony is necessary for the experience of harmony and ultimately Oneness and the Dao. As described in Part III, however, the current economic conflict is dysfunctional, and the cultural and social welfare strife crippling.94 Throughout history, a conflicted society has always had to evolve or it would collapse;95 and, again, neither the law nor any other social norm could do anything about it. Many of America’s late 18th century constitutionalists understood that the conflict between liberalism and republicanism was inimical to democracy and a natural happiness. As Daoism also notes, this question is not a philosophical issue, it is a metaphysical point. Daoism demonstrates the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. When the implicit connection and explicit separation come together in harmony, a person may experience Oneness and ultimately the Dao.96 This ancient wisdom is simple but profound. In the modern era, thinkers must work to understand its implications. 97 There is much to do within current fields like physics, health, and divinity. In typical 94 Externalities are much greater than most people recognize, and include things like routine pollution, war and cancer. 95 Feudalism, for example, either transitioned to a balanced homesteading (something akin to early America) or collapsed (like what happened in Russia). 96 Professor Wang also noted this point. See WANG, YINYANG, supra note 6, at 223 (describing how “[t]he whole emergent regularity is more than the sum of its parts”). 97 For the many nuances of just the Yin and Yang, see Professor Wang’s book. WANG, YINYANG, supra note 6. Electronic copy available at: https://ssrn.com/abstract=2441773 22 Daoist fashion, this Eastern understanding calls for a Western pragmatism.98 In such a harmoniousstate may lie the solution to the world’s present challenges.

## Case

### ROTB

A2 policy challenge- they didn’t propose a policy so they don’t meet their own rotb

A2 cap k2 ethics- warrant doesn’t make sense- their warrant would mean that we always have to challenge everything that’s unethical

A2 policy debate good- they don’t propose a policy lol

A2 no neg rotb

1. Any response moots the 1ac- that’s the point of the 1nc
2. justifies people setting abhorrent frameworks and not having to justify them- having the event be a safe space comes over fairness or education- if you’re not here you can’t benefit
3. Clashing with the rotb means more critical education since I challenge bigger problems with the worldview of the ac- education over fairness since it’s the only thing we take away from debate

A2 Spillover

1. Ted cruz and matt gaetz ran cap ks and 60% of congress was in debate

### Case Proper

#### Their extinction evidence is terrible- it never says extinction once in the card- hold the line, they didn’t read a nuke war or climate change causes extinction card

#### None of their cards say rts collapses capitalism- means they don’t have a link to their own impact- they’ll say they’re a precondition- that just means their argument is incomplete because we don’t know if the other conditions will be met

1. Card says resolution/intern transfer inev

#### Communism fails— lack of incentives and knowledge ensure that mass death, starvation, and torture follow

Somin 17- law professor at George Mason University. He coauthored an amicus brief in California v. Texas, with a cross-ideological group of legal scholars, arguing that the challenge to the ACA as a whole should be rejected. [(Ilya Somin, “Lessons from a century of communism,” Washington post, 11/7/17, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2017/11/07/lessons-from-a-century-of-communism/]((Ilya%20Somin,%20))//mcu

Today is the 100th anniversary of the Bolshevik seizure of power, which led to the establishment of a communist regime in Russia and eventually in many other nations around the world. It is an appropriate time to remember the vast tide of oppression, tyranny, and mass murder that communist regimes unleashed upon the world. While historians and others have documented numerous communist atrocities, much of the public remains unaware of their enormous scale. It is also a good time to consider what lessons we can learn from this horrendous history. I. A Record of Mass Murder and Oppression. Collectively, communist states killed as many as 100 million people, more than all other repressive regimes combined during the same time period. By far the biggest toll arose from communist efforts to collectivize agriculture and eliminate independent property-owning peasants. In China alone, Mao Zedong’s Great Leap Forward led to a man-made famine in which as many as 45 million people perished – the single biggest episode of mass murder in all of world history. In the Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin’s collectivization – which served as a model for similar efforts in China and elsewhere – took some 6 to 10 million lives. Mass famines occurred in many other communist regimes, ranging from North Korea to Ethiopia. In each of these cases, communist rulers were well aware that their policies were causing mass death, and in each they persisted nonetheless, often because they considered the extermination of “Kulak” peasants a feature rather than a bug. While collectivization was the single biggest killer, communist regimes also engaged in other forms of mass murder on an epic scale. Millions died in slave labor camps, such as the USSR’s Gulag system and its equivalents elsewhere. Many others were killed in more conventional mass executions, such as those of Stalin’s Great Purge, and the “Killing Fields” of Cambodia. The injustices of communism were not limited to mass murder alone. Even those fortunate enough to survive still were subjected to severe repression, including violations of freedom, of speech, freedom of religion, loss of property rights, and the criminalization of ordinary economic activity. No previous tyranny sought such complete control over nearly every aspect of people’s lives. Although the communists promised a utopian society in which the working class would enjoy unprecedented prosperity, in reality they engendered massive poverty**.** Wherever communist and noncommunist states existed in close proximity, it was the communists who used walls and the threat of death to keep their people from fleeing to societies with greater opportunity. II. Why Communism Failed. How did an ideology of liberation lead to so much oppression, tyranny and death? Were its failures intrinsic to the communist project, or did they arise from avoidable flaws of particular rulers or nations? Like any great historical development, the failures of communism cannot be reduced to any one single cause. But, by and large, they were indeed inherent. Two major factors were the most important causes of the atrocities inflicted by communist regimes: perverse incentives and inadequate knowledge. The establishment of the centrally planned economy and society required by socialist ideology necessitated an enormous concentration of power. While communists looked forward to a utopian society in which the state could eventually “wither away,” they believed they first had to establish a state-run economy in order to manage production in the interests of the people. In that respect, they had much in common with other socialists. To make socialism work, government planners needed to have the authority to direct the production and distribution of virtually all the goods produced by the society. In addition, extensive coercion was necessary to force people to give up their private property, and do the work that the state required. Famine and mass murder was probably the only way the rulers of the USSR, China, and other communist states could compel peasants to give up their land and livestock and accept a new form of serfdom on collective farms – which most were then forbidden to leave without official permission, for fear that they might otherwise seek an easier life elsewhere. The vast power necessary to establish and maintain the communist system naturally attracted unscrupulous people, including many self-seekers who prioritized their own interests over those of the cause. But it is striking that the biggest communist atrocities were perpetrated not by corrupt party bosses, but by true believers like Lenin, Stalin, and Mao. Precisely because they were true believers, they were willing to do whatever it might take to make their utopian dreams a reality. Even as the socialist system created opportunities for vast atrocities by the rulers, it also destroyed production incentives for ordinary people. In the absence of markets (at least legal ones), there was little incentive for workers to either be productive or to focus on making goods that might actually be useful to consumers. Many people tried to do as little work as possible at their official jobs, where possible reserving their real efforts for black market activity. As the old Soviet saying goes, workers had the attitude that “we pretend to work, and they pretend to pay.” Even when socialist planners genuinely sought to produce prosperity and meet consumer demands, they often lacked the information to do so. As Nobel Prize-winning economist F.A. Hayek described in a famous article, a market economy conveys vital information to producers and consumers alike through the price system. Market prices enable producers to know the relative value of different goods and services, and determine how much consumers value their products. Under socialist central planning, by contrast, there is no substitute for this vital knowledge. As a result, socialist planners often had no way to know what to produce, by what methods, or in way quantities. This is one of the reasons why communists states routinely suffered from shortages of basic goods, while simultaneously producing large quantities of shoddy products for which there was little demand.

#### Socialism fails and causes a reversion back to capitalism – empirics

Muravchik 19 (Joshua, distinguished fellow @ World Affairs Institute, adjunct professor @ Institute of World Politics, former fellow at the Foreign Policy Institute of Johns Hopkins University’s School of Advanced International Studies, “Socialism Fails Every Time,” Wall Street Journal, 4/9/19, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/socialism-fails-every-time-11554851786>, ccm)

Self-described socialist Bernie Sanders has become a favorite of young voters by posing as an apostle of daring new ideas. Socialism, however, is anything but new. It’s hard to think of another idea that has been tried and failed as many times in as many ways or at a steeper price in human suffering.

The term “socialism” was coined by followers of Robert Owen (1771-1858), whom Karl Marx would label a “utopian socialist.” In 1825 Owen founded New Harmony, an Indiana commune, to demonstrate the superiority of what was first called the “social system.” The same year, Owen explained his experiment to a joint session of Congress attended by Supreme Court justices, President James Monroe and President-elect John Quincy Adams. Although Owen poured his fortune into it, New Harmony collapsed in disarray and recrimination within two years.

Owen’s son Robert Dale Owen salvaged the community by implementing what he called “a policy the very reverse” of socialism: “giving each respectable citizen every facility and encouragement to become (what every adult ought to be) a landed proprietor.”

Undeterred, others founded some 40 to 50 similar communes during the 19th century, and all collapsed quickly. New Harmony’s two years proved to be their median lifespan.

Based on the uniformly dismal results, the idea of socialism might have died a quiet death were it not for Marx (1818-83), who transformed socialism from an experiment—tried, tested and failed—into a prophecy, “the riddle of history solved.” Ironically, he called his vision “scientific socialism.”

Inspired by the dream of proletarian revolution overthrowing capitalist immiseration, socialist parties sprouted across Europe. Yet instead of growing poorer, workers in industrialized countries saw improvement in their living standards; and instead of disappearing, middle classes expanded—all disproving Marx.

It took Vladimir Lenin’s “vanguard” and the horrors of World War I to give socialism new life. In Russia, Lenin pioneered modern communism, which in the 20th century was imposed on 18 countries and one-third of mankind. Repression was justified by socialism’s purported economic benefits, but the actual trade-off entailed economic misery and the snuffing out of as many as 100 million lives.

Today Communist parties rule six countries. Most follow the lead of China, where the party redefined itself to include entrepreneurs. A 2012 Wall Street Journal report identified 160 people with an average net worth of more than $1 billion holding high government or party seats. No Chinese Bernie Sanders rails against them.

“Social democrats” and “democratic socialists” rejected Lenin’s methods. But their goals remained transformational. As British Labour Party leader Clement Attlee, who became prime minister in 1945, explained: “Our policy was not a reformed capitalism but progress toward a democratic socialism.” Labour sought to bring “main factors in the economic system”—including banks, mining and energy—under “public ownership and control.” Nationalization worked so badly, however, that Attlee soon beat a retreat and was voted out in 1951.

In 1981 Socialist François Mitterrand was elected president of France promising a clean “rupture” with capitalism. The results of his spending and nationalizations were so alarming that in 1982 Mitterrand reversed course and implemented austerity measures, which he dubbed “socialist rigor” to save face. “The aim is to bring about a real reconciliation between the left and the economy,” explained Socialist Party chief Lionel Jospin.

American socialists like Mr. Sanders, while often defending the likes of Fidel Castro, Daniel Ortega, Hugo Chávez and Nicolás Maduro, prefer to point to Scandinavia as a model. But Scandinavian social democrats learned to settle for dense social safety nets underwritten by remarkably free, capitalist economies. On the World Bank’s Ease of Doing Business scale, Denmark ranks third of 190 countries, Norway seventh and Sweden 12th.

Still other forms of socialism arose in the Third World. Encouraged by United Nations development experts, virtually all newly decolonized states adopted “African Socialism,” “Arab Socialism” or other variants. The result was years of economic stagnation until the successful models of East Asia began to reverse their thinking.

Successful socialism has been created in only one place on earth, the kibbutzim of Israel. They were democratic and egalitarian; sharing possessions, meals, even child rearing. But once the Jewish state was securely on its feet, kibbutzniks chose to switch to private enterprise. Socialism, they learned to their surprise, was not a happy way to live.

Socialism has failed everywhere it’s been tried—even where it succeeded. Surely today’s young people can create their own ideas and make their own mistakes rather than repeat those that darkened the times of their parents, grandparents and the generations before.

#### Historical examples do apply- the conditions they created were inevitable which is why they’ve ALWAYS HAPPENED

Somin 17- law professor at George Mason University. He coauthored an amicus brief in California v. Texas, with a cross-ideological group of legal scholars, arguing that the challenge to the ACA as a whole should be rejected. [(Ilya Somin, “Lessons from a century of communism,” Washington post, 11/7/17, https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/volokh-conspiracy/wp/2017/11/07/lessons-from-a-century-of-communism/]((Ilya%20Somin,%20))//mcu

III. Why the Failure Cannot be Explained Away. To this day, defenders of socialist central planning argue that communism failed for avoidable contingent reasons, rather than ones intrinsic to the nature of the system. Perhaps the most popular claim of this **sort** is that a planned economy can work well so long as it is democratic. The Soviet Union and other communist states were all dictatorships. But if they had been democratic, perhaps the leaders would have had stronger incentives to make the system work for the benefit of the people. If they failed to do so, the voters could “throw the bastards out” at the next election. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that a communist state could remain democratic for long, even it started out that way. Democracy requires effective opposition parties. And in order to function, such parties need to be able to put out their message and mobilize voters, which in turn requires extensive resources. In an economic system in which all or nearly all valuable resources are controlled by the state, the incumbent government can easily strangle opposition by denying them access to those resources. Under socialism, the opposition cannot function if they are not allowed to spread their message on state-owned media, or use state-owned property for their rallies and meetings. It is no accident that virtually every communist regime suppressed opposition parties soon after coming to power. Even if a communist state could somehow remain democratic over the long run, it is hard to see how it could solve the twin problems of knowledge and incentives. Whether democratic or not, a socialist economy would still require enormous concentration of power, and extensive coercion. And democratic socialist planners would run into much the same information problems as their authoritarian counterparts. In addition, in a society where the government controls all or most of the economy, it would be virtually impossible for voters to acquire enough knowledge to monitor the state’s many activities. This would greatly exacerbate the already severe problem of voter ignorance that plagues modern democracy. Another possible explanation for the failures of communism is that the problem was **bad leadership**. If only communist regimes were not led by monsters like Stalin or Mao, they might have done better. There is no doubt communist governments had more than their share of cruel and even sociopathic leaders. **But it is unlikely that this was the decisive factor in their failure**. Very similar results arose in communist regimes with leaders who had a wide range of personalities. In the Soviet Union, it is important to remember that the main institutions of repression (including the Gulags and the secret police) were established not by Stalin, but by Vladimir Lenin, a far more “normal” person. After Lenin’s death, Stalin’s main rival for power – Leon Trotsky – advocated policies that were in some respects even more oppressive than Stalin’s own. It’s hard to avoid the conclusion that either the personality of the leader was not the main factor, or – alternatively – communist regimes tended to put horrible people to positions of power. Or perhaps some of both.

#### STRIKES ARE HIGH NOW AND MORE ARE COMING- PROVES NO UNIQUENESS OR REASON WHY THE AFF IS KEY

**Romero 10-21** Dani Romero (REPORTER, yahoo finance) 10/21/21, ‘Strikes are contagious’: Wave of labor unrest signals crisis in tight job market,<https://news.yahoo.com/strikes-are-contagious-wave-of-labor-unrest-signals-crisis-in-tight-jobs-market-135052770.html>

As employers of all sizes grapple with an acute worker shortage amid what’s being called the pandemic era’s Great Resignation, it’s become increasingly clear that people with jobs aren’t all that happy, either. At an ever-lengthening list of workplaces around the country, workers this year have been getting loud about the state of wages, working hours and conditions. **From healthcare to entertainment, nearly 100,000 U.S. workers are either striking or preparing to strike in a bid to improve working conditions. New data signals that worker unrest is growing: a Cornell Labor Action Tracker shows that more than 180 strikes have been recorded this year, and over 24,000 workers have walked off the job this month.** This all plays out against a backdrop of an economy bouncing back from an economic shutdown during the pandemic. More than 10,000 John Deere workers went on strike Thursday, the first major walkout at the agricultural machinery giant in more than three decades. “**We have noticed a bit of an uptick in late September into early October,** for example, we've already documented 39 strikes on the month of October,” Johnnie Kallas, a Ph.D. student at Cornell University’s School of Industrial and Labor Relations, or ILR, who tracks labor actions across the country, said in an interview. “Those numbers are already the **largest of any month in 2021,**” he added. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, which records only large work stoppages, has documented **12 strikes involving 1,000 or more workers.** That represents a big jump from when the pandemic started over 19 months ago. “What will happen is you'll see **more workers going on strike**,” Kate Bronfenbrenner, director of labor education research and senior lecturer at Cornell school of industrial and labor relations, told Yahoo Finance. “Each time **there's a ripple effect with each one of those**, if the John Deere strike isn’t settled, you're going to see another big group go out,” she said. **“If companies don't move, you're going to see this spread from one group to another. Strikes are contagious,”** Bronfenbrenner added.

1. **strikes hurt working conditions in the long term.**

**Lovenheim and Bio 20** Lovenheim, M. F., & Bio, A. W. A. (2020, August 5). *A Bad Bargain*. Education Next. https://www.educationnext.org/bad-bargain-teacher-collective-bargaining-employment-earnings/. Sosa Re-Cut Justin

These data enable us to examine the effects of teacher collective-bargaining policies on multiple indicators of students’ labor-market success. Taken as a whole, our results clearly indicate that **laws supporting collective bargaining for teachers have adverse long-term consequences for students**.

Earnings. We find strong evidence that teacher collective bargaining has a negative effect on students’ earnings as adults. **Attending school in a state with a duty-to-bargain law for all 12 years of schooling reduces later earnings by $795 dollars per year (see Figure 3). This represents a decline in earnings of 1.9 percent relative to the average**. Although the individual effect is modest, it **translates into a large overall loss of earnings for the nation as a whole**. In particular, our results suggest a total loss of **$196 billion per year** accruing to those who were educated in the 34 states with duty-to-bargain policies on the books.

Hours worked. Consistent with this reduction in earnings, we also find that exposure to a duty-to-bargain law throughout one’s school years is **associated with a decline of 0.49 hours worked per week. This is a 1.4 percent decline relative to the average**, and it suggests that a reduction in hours worked is a main driver of the lower earnings.

Wages. The reduced earnings caused by unionization could also reflect lower wages, and **the evidence suggests a negative relationship between collective-bargaining exposure and wages.** While this relationship is not statistically significant, it is consistent with our other results and suggests that teacher collective bargaining may also have a modest adverse effect on average wages.

Employment. The fact that teacher collective bargaining reduces working hours suggests that duty-to-bargain laws may also affect employment levels. In fact, when we use the share of individuals who are employed as the outcome variable, we find that duty-to-bargain laws reduce employment. Specifically, **exposure** to a duty-to-bargain law for all 12 years of schooling **lowers the likelihood that a worker is employed by 0.9 percentage points.** Duty-to-bargain laws have no impact on unemployment rates, however, suggesting that they reduce employment by **leading some individuals to drop out of the labor force altogether.**

Occupational skill level. **Finally, we analyze the effects of collective bargaining on the skill level of a student’s selected occupation, as measured by the share of workers in that occupation who have any education beyond a high school diploma.** The results suggest yet another negative effect: **being exposed** to a duty-to-bargain law for all 12 years of schooling **decreases the proportion of such workers in an occupation by** almost half of a percentage point (or **0.6** percent relative to the average). This effect is modest in size, but it **implies that teacher collective bargaining leads students to work in occupations requiring lower levels of skill.**

Educational attainment. The reduced earnings and labor force participation associated with teacher collective bargaining raise the possibility that affected students may have completed less education. Our analysis, however, finds little evidence of bargaining power having a significant effect on how much schooling students completed. This finding is surprising in light of the substantial labor-market effects we document, but it comports with prior research that has found no effect of duty-to-bargain law passage on high-school dropout rates.

Additionally, educational attainment is but one measure of the amount of human capital students accumulate. Even if students do not complete fewer years of education, they may be acquiring fewer skills while they are in school. We believe that **our results** concerning earnings and employment are driven by other aspects of school quality that are not reflected in educational attainment, and they **reinforce the importance of studying** labor-market outcomes directly in order to understand **how** major reforms such as the enactment of teacher **collective-bargaining laws affect students’ life outcomes.**

#### Strikes are yet another set of temporal reification- they empty worker’s pockets, and get circumvented by employer awareness, scabs, and power balances.

Organizing Work, 19, Why don’t strikes achieve more?, No Publication, 5-1-2019, DOA: 10-28-2021, https://organizing.work/2019/05/why-dont-strikes-achieve-more/, r0w@n

Acknowledging that unions are signing two-tier or rollback contracts is demoralizing. It is especially so at a time when labor is supposed to be in a strong bargaining position because of a decent economy with low unemployment. If strikes are the best tactic labor has, and the economic circumstances are in our favor, why are unions signing crappy contracts? Why don’t strikes achieve more? There are a number of factors that contain how effective strikes can be, and impel unions to settle them. For one thing, they are expensive. If a union is providing even minimal strike pay, it needs a war chest of millions of dollars to be able to support even a few hundred workers. Strikes drain union coffers, and they take a financial, physical, and emotional toll on workers as well, who aren’t usually earning as much in strike pay as they would on the job, while getting yelled at or hit by cars or freezing on the picket line. Quite often, strikes don’t succeed in completely shutting down a business, not least because employers can legally hire scabs. The product may suffer, and employers may take a hit, but they can hobble along (while draining the union’s bank account). (A note on the alleged $100 million loss suffered by Stop & Shop during the recent strike, which leftists also celebrated: that figure was put out by the employer, and is more than double an estimate put forward by an industry analyst. We should always remain skeptical about boss communications. In this case, they may be crying poverty to get workers to sign the proposed collective agreement.) Sometimes strikes end because of government intervention, as when workers are legislated back to work, or fired en masse. Less dramatically, the government can intervene to bring about some kind of settlement in the form of binding arbitration. Sometimes employers even goad unions into striking, knowing what a heavy toll strikes take. If an employer knows they can weather a strike much better than the union, they are perfectly incentivized to provoke one and starve the union out. The bottom line is that strikes, under the current labor relations system, are not the slam-dunk tactic the left takes them to be. Strikes can only take place when the contract has expired, and once the membership has been balloted. This means that the employer has years to prepare, knowing when the contract is set to expire. They probably even know roughly how long the strike can last. They’ve also seen strikes before, and aren’t bowled over by them. There is no element of surprise. They know the union won’t do anything too drastic like occupy the workplace or chain the doors shut. They hire scabs, they manage public relations (often by crying poverty or publicly claiming the union won’t come to the table), and they wait it out. Of course we in left labor circles sympathize with strikers and see their cause as morally and politically righteous. But sympathy is one matter, and clear-eyed analysis is another. That we wish workers victory does not mean we suspend judgement about the effectiveness of their tactics. Nor is any of this meant to judge or condemn unions for choosing the tactics that they do. Instead, it is about zooming out and understanding what factors are constraining the situation in general. When leftists picture strikes, they are probably in part remembering black-and-white images of workers in the 1910s and 1920s streaming out of factories and mines and violently clashing with Pinkerton guards. But strikes have been tamed by the labor relations framework established by the Wagner Act (the National Labor Relations Act) of 1935 and the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947. Those legislative measures were passed in response to massive upheaval, in which workers shut down production with strikes, or employers shut down production with lockouts. The goal of the Wagner Act is right there in its full title: “to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce.” The NLRA forced employers to sit down and bargain with workers, not out of a desire to strengthen workers as a class, but to funnel disputes between workers and bosses into a less disruptive process – in boardrooms and away from the shopfloor — so that economic production could continue. Taft-Hartley further contained strikes in numerous ways, again in response to creative and effective forms of economic disruption, by outlawing sympathy strikes, political strikes, “wildcat” strikes taken without the authorization of union leadership, secondary picketing and boycotts, and so on. Under this legal framework, strikes are a blunted tactic, quite intentionally so. They do accomplish something – in each of the three cases described above, workers would almost certainly have got a worse deal had they not struck. There are also strikes that yield apparently better deals, such as the contract bargained by Unite Here with Marriott hotels – arguably in part because contracts at seven different bargaining units expired simultaneously, allowing almost 8,000 workers to strike at once. But strikes don’t change the big-picture balance of power between employers and workers. Most of the time, strikes are like a fistfight in which one side gets a bloody nose, the other gets a black eye, and each walks away saying “You shoulda seen the other guy.” At best, a win looks like giving the other side two wounds while you only suffer one.

#### Laws are just a suggestion, the system will never work as is

International Brotherhood Of Teamsters, 19, Report Shows Companies Are Doing All They Can to Crush Unions, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 12-19-2019, DOA: 10-28-2021, https://teamster.org/2019/12/report-shows-companies-are-doing-all-they-can-crush-unions/, r0w@n

Organizing workers to join a union is not an easy job. Companies will go to extreme lengths to quash any such efforts. And the law, as a new report by the Economic Policy Institute (EPI) explains, is merely an inconvenience for many. The document finds that employers are charged with violating federal law in 41.5 percent of all union election campaigns and illegally firing workers in nearly 20 percent of elections. The report is a comprehensive analysis of employer conduct in union representation elections supervised by the National Labor Relations Board in 2016 and 2017. “Employers routinely threaten, intimidate and fire workers when they try to form a union at their workplace,” said Celine McNicholas, EPI’s director of government affairs and a co-author of the report. “Employers face few consequences because our current labor law fails to provide works meaningful protections.” EPI’s document also details the “union avoidance” industry, estimating that employers spend nearly $340 million per year hiring anti-union lawyers and consultants to help prevent employers from organizing, including at some of the nation’s largest companies such as Google, Coca-Cola, AT&T and elsewhere. During the Obama administration, regulations to curb the so-called “persuader rule” were instituted that would have limited the ability of companies to force workers to participate in meetings with outside anti-union interlopers. But efforts to limit such activity were defanged. As it stands, in almost 30 percent of elections, employers were charged with illegally coercing, threatening or retaliating against workers for union support. Employers with larger bargaining units were more likely to be charged with violating the law, including some 54 percent of employers in elections involving more than 60 workers. “Far more workers want union representation than are able to obtain it under our current system,” Ben Zipperer, EPI’s economist and co-author of the report, said. “This is a result of not only decades of legislative and judicial attacks to workers’ rights, but also a largely secretive industry dedicated to helping employers derail unionization efforts.”

#### Even if companies get held accountable they delay forever and rig political systems to override decisions

Emily Bazelon, 20, Why Are Workers Struggling? Because Labor Law Is Broken (Published 2020), The New York Times, 2-19-2020, DOA: 10-28-2021, https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2020/02/19/magazine/labor-law-unions.html, r0w@n

The N.L.R.B. challenged McDonald’s’ premise, arguing that McDonald’s jointly employed Caldwell and helped undercut the Fight for $15. The N.L.R.B. presented evidence showing McDonald’s’ corporate employees helping franchisees, including Jo-Dan, fight off unionization. In emails and text messages, the company connected franchisees with a hotline for legal advice from the law firm Littler Mendelson, and circulated the names of pro-union workers. In Philadelphia, the regional director of employee relations for McDonald’s, Maggie Calabrese, wrote a memo about the firing of Caldwell and others, noting a call she had with the franchise operator, John Dawkins: “I shared with John the benefits of working with” an anti-union consultant that McDonald’s recommended, she wrote. McDonald’s had another tactic at its disposal — delay. The company mounted objections to entering documents into the record and canceled hearing dates. The trial dragged on into 2017, and after Donald Trump’s inauguration, he appointed a new N.L.R.B. general counsel, Peter B. Robb, who has spent much of his career representing companies against unions. In January 2018, Robb unveiled a proposed settlement: About 20 workers, including Caldwell, would divide roughly $170,000 in back pay; McDonald’s would admit no wrongdoing; and Robb would reverse the initial position the N.L.R.B. had taken in bringing the case that McDonald’s should be treated as a joint employer of the workers at its franchises. This stance would make it nearly impossible for employees to band together to address problems in the workplace. In July 2018, the judge at the trial, Lauren Esposito, rejected the settlement proposal, saying it was not reasonable “based on the nature and scope” of the case. Esposito concluded that McDonald’s was directly involved in suppressing union organizing because it had “formulated and implemented” the franchisees’ response to the Fight for $15. If the N.L.R.B. accepted Esposito’s findings, a union would be able to conduct a drive to organize McDonald’s workers across the country. But the N.L.R.B., whose five members are nominated by the president to serve staggered five-year terms, had the power to overrule Esposito. With two Trump appointees in the majority, the board ordered the judge to approve the settlement by a vote of two to one. (A fourth board member didn’t participate in the decision; the fifth seat was vacant at the time.) One of the two N.L.R.B. members who overruled Esposito, William J. Emanuel, was a former partner at Littler Mendelson, the firm McDonald’s hired to give legal advice to franchisees, but declined to recuse himself. Trump’s chairman of the N.L.R.B., John F. Ring, whose former firm also advised McDonald’s on the Fight for $15, later issued an unprecedented report finding that each N.L.R.B. member could “insist on participating” in a case even if the agency’s own ethics officials said otherwise. In response to my questions about the case, McDonald’s sent a statement: “McDonald’s and its franchisees agreed to resolve the proceeding in a manner that provides 100 percent of the remedies that those employees were eligible to receive under the National Labor Relations Act.” Trump’s N.L.R.B. has hamstrung union activism in other ways. In May 2019, the agency classified Uber drivers as independent contractors, diminishing their ability to unite to demand better pay. It has also proposed a rule barring graduate students from forming unions. The rulings are an indication that for tens of millions of low-wage workers, in sectors like fast food and the gig economy, American labor law is utterly deficient. If the N.L.R.B. can undermine vulnerable employees when they try to unionize, what does the law’s promise — to protect the rights of workers to come together — really mean? The National Labor Relations Act, signed by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in 1935, was a response to corporate behavior during the Great Depression. As unemployment deepened in the early 1930s, companies used their leverage to break unions — by conditioning a job on a worker’s agreement not to join one, or hiring private security to threaten union leaders, or sending strikebreakers to interrupt picket lines. Union membership fell to around 2.5 million in 1933 from four million in 1920.

#### At every level the system is rigged for the rich and powerful by the rich and powerful- it’s only getting worse and radical change is needed

Drew Desilver, 18, For most Americans, real wages have barely budged for decades, Pew Research Center, 8-7-2018, DOA: 10-28-2021, https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/08/07/for-most-us-workers-real-wages-have-barely-budged-for-decades/, r0w@n

On the face of it, these should be heady times for American workers. U.S. unemployment is as low as it’s been in nearly two decades (3.9% as of July) and the nation’s private-sector employers have been adding jobs for 101 straight months – 19.5 million since the Great Recession-related cuts finally abated in early 2010, and 1.5 million just since the beginning of the year. But despite the strong labor market, wage growth has lagged economists’ expectations. In fact, despite some ups and downs over the past several decades, today’s real average wage (that is, the wage after accounting for inflation) has about the same purchasing power it did 40 years ago. And what wage gains there have been have mostly flowed to the highest-paid tier of workers. The disconnect between the job market and workers’ paychecks has fueled much of the recent activism in states and cities around raising minimum wages, and it also has become a factor in at least some of this year’s congressional campaigns. Average hourly earnings for non-management private-sector workers in July were $22.65, up 3 cents from June and 2.7% above the average wage from a year earlier, according to data from the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics. That’s in line with average wage growth over the past five years: Year-over-year growth has mostly ranged between 2% and 3% since the beginning of 2013. But in the years just before the 2007-08 financial collapse, average hourly earnings often increased by around 4% year-over-year. And during the high-inflation years of the 1970s and early 1980s, average wages commonly jumped 7%, 8% or even 9% year-over-year. After adjusting for inflation, however, today’s average hourly wage has just about the same purchasing power it did in 1978, following a long slide in the 1980s and early 1990s and bumpy, inconsistent growth since then. In fact, in real terms average hourly earnings peaked more than 45 years ago: The $4.03-an-hour rate recorded in January 1973 had the same purchasing power that $23.68 would today. A similar measure – the “usual weekly earnings” of employed, full-time wage and salary workers – tells much the same story, albeit over a shorter time period. In seasonally adjusted current dollars, median usual weekly earnings rose from $232 in the first quarter of 1979 (when the data series began) to $879 in the second quarter of this year, which might sound like a lot. But in real, inflation-adjusted terms, the median has barely budged over that period: That $232 in 1979 had the same purchasing power as $840 in today’s dollars. Meanwhile, wage gains have gone largely to the highest earners. Since 2000, usual weekly wages have risen 3% (in real terms) among workers in the lowest tenth of the earnings distribution and 4.3% among the lowest quarter. But among people in the top tenth of the distribution, real wages have risen a cumulative 15.7%, to $2,112 a week – nearly five times the usual weekly earnings of the bottom tenth ($426).

## 2NR

### RTS Larp

#### Desires are socially induced as a means of controlling the masses by the ruling elite. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that best overwhelms desires by embracing *wuyu*- that’s Chad

#### *Wuyu* outweighs

#### Desire systems prevent any improvement- internal link to the aff

#### Outweighs on scope since the k is the internal link to all conflicts

#### The Alternative is creating a harmonious consciousness, instituting legal reforms while being mindful of desire systems that will try to corrupt them- that forces us to reconsider every element of the western paradigm.

#### Their concept of the subject isolates them from understanding these desire systems- it pretends like they and the state they role-play is above those systems.

#### Their attempt to move to socialism without changing desire systems is them acting against the flow of the universe and absent the alternative will always fail.