## T – Just Gov:

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives must defend a just government

#### Just is defined as ‘acting in conformity with what is morally upright’ according to Merriam Webster

Merriam-Webster, "Definition of JUST," https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/just

acting or being in conformity with what is morally upright or good

#### The USFG is racist.

**White House 21**, 1-20-2021, "Executive Order On Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities Through the Federal Government," White House, https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/01/20/executive-order-advancing-racial-equity-and-support-for-underserved-communities-through-the-federal-government/

Section 1. Policy. Equal opportunity is the bedrock of American democracy, and our diversity is one of our country’s greatest strengths. But for too many, the American Dream remains out of reach. Entrenched disparities in our laws and public policies, and in our public and private institutions, have often denied that equal opportunity to individuals and communities. Our country faces converging economic, health, and climate crises that have exposed and exacerbated inequities, while a historic movement for justice has highlighted the unbearable human costs of systemic racism. Our Nation deserves an ambitious whole-of-government equity agenda that matches the scale of the opportunities and challenges that we face.

#### Violation: Being racist is not in line with being morally upright

#### 1] Precision – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution. Independent voter for jurisdiction – the judge doesn’t have the jurisdiction to vote aff if there wasn’t a legitimate aff.

#### 2] Limits – Their interpretation opens debate up to hundreds of potential unjust governments with different labor regulations and socioeconomic conditions which explodes the burden for neg prep. An ideal government is best, we can prep what that would look like and defend our interpretation.

#### 3] Philosophical education – It allows us to debate principles in the abstract about how a perfect government ought to act. It outweighs since every other topic is about specific states, but we only get this education for 2 months.

#### Fairness is a voter – its intrinsic to any competitive activity

#### Education is a voter – it’s the reason schools fund debate and host tournaments

#### Drop the debater – 1] it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm 2] Dropping the argument on T would be dropping the advocacy which is functionally the same

#### Use competing interps – 1] reasonability is self-serving and arbitrary – they can justify their brightline no matter how abusive it is 2] it invites arbitrary judge intervention, so we won’t know your abuse meter 3)

#### No RVIs – a] illogical – fairness is a burden just like the aff has the burden of inherency b] norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms c] chilling effect – debaters are scared to check real abuse which means inf abuse goes unchecked d] substance crowdout – prevents 1AR blipstorms and allows us to get back to substance

## K: The Aff is a Prison Warden in Disguise!

#### The 1AC sees criminal justice as reformable, redeemable, or forgivable, which prevents understanding carcerality as the structuring principle of society. Criminal justice reform gets coopted by liberal feel-good narratives that strengthen the prison regime even if they seem like gains in a vacuum.

Rodríguez**, 10**—Professor and Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside (Dylan, “The Disorientation of the Teaching Act: Abolition as Pedagogical Position,” The Radical Teacher, No. 88 (Summer 2010), pp. 7-19, dml)

The global U.S. prison regime has no precedent or peer and has become a primary condition of schooling, education, and pedagogy in every possible site. Aside from its sheer accumulation of captive bodies (more than 2.5 million, if one includes children, military captives, undocumented migrants, and the mentally ill/disordered),1 the prison has become central to the (re)production and (re)invention of a robust and historically dynamic white supremacist state: at its farthest institutional reaches, the prison has developed a capacity to organize and disrupt the most taken-for-granted features of everyday social life, including “family,” “community,” “school,” and individual social identities. Students, teachers, and administrators of all kinds have come to conceptualize “freedom,” “safety,” and “peace” as a relatively direct outcome of state-conducted domestic war (wars on crime, drugs, gangs, immigrants, terror, etc.), legitimated police violence, and large-scale, punitive imprisonment. In what follows, I attempt to offer the outlines of a critical analysis and schematic social theory that might be useful to two overlapping, urgent tasks of the radical teacher: 1) to better understand how the prison, along with the relations of power and normalized state violence that the prison inhabits/produces, form the everyday condition of possibility for the teaching act; and 2) to engage a historically situated abolitionist praxis that is, in this moment, primarily pedagogical.

A working conception of the “prison regime” offers a useful tool of critical social analysis as well as a theoretical framework for contextualizing critical, radical, and perhaps abolitionist pedagogies. In subtle distinction from the criminological, social scientific, and common sense understandings of “criminal justice,” “prisons/ jails,” and the “correctional system,” the notion of a prison regime focuses on three interrelated technologies and processes that are dynamically produced at the site of imprisonment: first, the prison regime encompasses the material arrangements of institutional power that create informal (and often nominally illegal) routines and protocols of militarized physiological domination over human beings held captive by the state. This domination privileges a historical anti-black state violence that is particularly traceable to the latter stages of continental racial chattel slavery and its immediate epochal aftermath in “post-emancipation” white supremacy and juridical racial segregation/apartheid—a privileging that is directly reflected in the actual demography of the imprisoned population, composed of a Black majority. The institutional elaborations of this white supremacist and anti-black carceral state create an overarching system of physiological domination that subsumes differently racialized subjects (including whites) into institutional routines (strip searching and regular bodily invasion, legally sanctioned torture, ad hoc assassination, routinized medical neglect) that revise while sustaining the everyday practices of genocidal racial slavery. While there are multiple variations on this regime of physiological dominance—including (Latino/a, Muslim, and Arab) immigrant detention, extra-territorial military prisons, and asylums—it is crucial to recognize that the genealogy of the prison’s systemic violence is anchored in the normalized Black genocide of U.S. and New World nation-building.2

Second, the concept of the prison regime understands the place of state-ordained human capture as a modality of social (dis)organization that produces numerous forms of interpersonal and systemic (race, class, gender, sexual) violence within and beyond the physical sites of imprisonment. Here, the multiple and vast social effects of imprisonment (from affective disruptions of community and extended familial ties to long-term economic/geographic displacement) are understood as fundamental and systemic dimensions of the policing and imprisonment apparatus, rather than secondary or unintended consequences of it.3

Third, the prison regime encompasses the multiple knowledges and meanings that are created around the institutional site and cultural symbol of “the prison,” including those that circulate in popular culture and among the administrative bureaucracies and curriculum of schools.

Given this conception of the prison regime as a far-reaching and invasive arrangement of social power, state violence, and human domination, we might better be able to understand the significance of everyday routines of school-based discipline that imply the possibility of imprisonment as the punitive bureaucratic outcome of misbehavior, truancy, and academic failure. What, then, is the condition of “teaching” in the context of a prison regime that is so relentless in its innovation and intrusiveness?

We might depart from another critical premise: that the prison 4 (jail, detention center, etc.) cannot be conceptualized as a place that is wholly separate or alienated from the normalized intercourses of civil society or “the free world.” Speaking more precisely to the concerns raised by this issue of Radical Teacher, the massive carceral-cultural form of the prison has naturalized a systemic disorientation of the teaching act, so that teaching is no longer separable from the work of policing, juridical discipline, and state-crafted punishment.

Thus, I do not think the crucial question in our historical moment is whether or not our teaching ultimately supports or adequately challenges the material arrangements and cultural significations of the prison regime - just as I believe the central question under the rule of apartheid is not whether a curriculum condones or opposes the spatial arrangements of white supremacy and intensified racist state violence. Rather, the primary question is whether and how the act of teaching can effectively and radically displace the normalized misery, everyday suffering, and mundane state violence that are reproduced and/or passively condoned by both hegemonic and critical/counterhegemonic pedagogies.

I am arguing that our historical conditions urgently dictate that a strategic distinction must be drawn between liberal, social justice, critical, and even "radical" pedagogies that are capable of even remotely justifying, defending, or tolerating a proto-genocidal prison regime that is without precedent or peer, on the one hand, and those attempts at abolitionist pedagogy that - in an urgent embracing of the historical necessity of innovation, improvisation, and radical rearticulation - are attempting to generate new epistemic and intellectual approaches to meaning, knowledge, learning, and practice for the sake of life, liberation, and new social possibilities. I am concerned with addressing a pedagogical tendency that artificially separates the teacher- student relation and "the school" from "the prison."

Such strategic distinctions are useful for delineating the ways that multiple pedagogical epistemes5 (including otherwise critical and radical ones) operate from the a priori notion that prisons and policing serve necessary, peace-and-safety making, and "good" social functions that are somehow separable or recuperable from their historical primacy to socioeconomic/class repression, American apartheid,6 racial slavery,7 indigenous land displacement and cultural genocide,8 and white supremacist colonization.9 In other words, what might happen to the disoriented teaching act if it were re-oriented against the assumptive necessity, integrity, and taken-for-grantedness of prisons, policing, and the normalized state violence they reproduce?

Schooling Regime

The structural symbiosis between schools and the racist policing/prison state is evident in the administrative, public policy, and pedagogical innovations of the War on Drugs, “Zero Tolerance,” “No Child Left Behind,” and the school-based militarizations of the “school to prison (and military) pipeline.”10 Angela Y. Davis has suggested that “when children attend schools that place a greater value on discipline and security than on knowledge and intellectual development, they are attending prep schools for prison.”11 These punitive iterations of an increasingly carceral schooling industrial complex, however, represent a symptomatic reflection of how the racist state—and white supremacist social formation generally—are producing new categories of social identities (and redefining older ones) that can only be “taught” within a direct relationship to the regulatory mechanisms and imminent (state) violence of the prison industrial complex and the U.S. prison regime. (Even while some are relatively privileged by the institutional logics of relative de-criminalization, their bodily mobility and academic progression are contingent on the state’s capacity to separate and “protect” them from the criminalized.)

There are, at first, categories of social subjects that are apprehended and naturalized by the school-as-state—gifted and talented, undocumented, gang affiliated, exceptional, at-risk, average—who are then, by ontological necessity, hierarchically separated through the protocols of pseudo-standardized intelligence quotient, socioeconomic class, race, gender, citizenship, sexuality, neighborhood geography, etc. This seemingly compulsory, school-sited reproduction of the deadly circuits of privilege and alienation is anything but new, and has always been central to the routines of the U.S. schooling regime, particularly in its colonialist and post-emancipationist articulations.12 The idea of the U.S. prison apparatus as a regime, in this context, brings attention to how prisons are not places outside and apart from our everyday lives, but instead shape and deform our identities, communities, and modes of social interaction.

I have written elsewhere that the prison regime is an apparatus of power/violence that cannot be reduced to a minor “institution” of the state, but has in fact become an apparatus that possesses and constitutes the state, often as if autonomous of its authority.13 Here, I am interested in how this regime overlaps with and mutually nourishes the multiple “schooling regimes” that make up the U.S. educational system. The U.S. prison, in other words, has become a model and prototype for power relations more generally, in which 1) institutional authority is intertwined with the policing and surveillance capacities (legitimated violence) of the state, 2) the broadly cultural and peculiarly juridical racial/gender criminalization of particular social subjects becomes a primary framework for organizing institutional access, and 3) the practice of systemic bodily immobilization (incarceration) permeates the normal routines of the “free world.” To trace the movements of the prison’s modeling of power relations to the site of the school is to understand that policing/surveillance, criminalization, and immobilization are as much schooling practices as they are imprisonment practices. The teacher is generally being asked to train the foot soldiers, middle managers, administrators, workers, intellectuals, and potential captives of the school/prison confluence, whether the classroom is populated by criminalized Black and Brown youth or white Ph.D. candidates. Two thoughts are worth considering: the teaching act is constituted by the technologies of the prison regime, and the school is inseparable from the prison industrial complex.

The “prison industrial complex,” in contrast to the prison regime, names the emergence over the last three decades of multiple symbiotic institutional relationships that dynamically link private business (such as architectural firms, construction companies, and uniform manufacturers) and government/state apparatuses (including police, corrections, and elected officials) in projects of multiply-scaled human immobilization and imprisonment. The national abolitionist organization Critical Resistance elaborates that the prison industrial complex is a “system situated at the intersection of governmental and private interests that uses prisons as a solution to social, political, and economic problems.”14 In fact, as many abolitionist scholars have noted, the rise of the prison industrial complex is in part a direct outcome of the liberal-progressive “prison reform” successes of the 1970s. The political convergence between liberals, progressives, and “law and order” conservatives/reactionaries, located within the accelerating political and geographical displacements of globalization,15 generated a host of material transformations and institutional shifts that facilitated— in fact, necessitated—the large-scale reorganization of the prison into a host of new and/or qualitatively intensified structural relationships with numerous political and economic apparatuses, including public policy and legislative bodies, electoral and lobbying apparatuses, the medical and architectural/construction industries, and various other hegemonic institutional forms. Concretely, the reform of the prison required its own expansion and bureaucratic multiplication: for example, the reform of prison overcrowding came to involve an astronomical growth in new prison construction (rather than decarceration and release), the reformist outrage against preventable deaths and severe physiological suffering from (communicable, congenital, and mental) illnesses yielded the piecemeal incorporation of medical facilities and staff into prison protocols (as opposed to addressing the fact that massive incarceration inherently creates and circulates sickness), and reformist recognition of carceral state violence against emotionally disordered, mentally ill, and disabled captives led to the creation of new prisons and pharmaceutical regimens for the “criminally insane,” and so on. Following the historical trajectory of Angela Y. Davis’ concise and accurate assessment that “during the (American) revolutionary period, the penitentiary was generally viewed as a progressive reform, linked to the larger campaign for the rights of citizens,”16 it is crucial to recognize that the prison industrial complex is one of the most significant “reformist” achievements in U.S. history and is not simply the perverse social project of self-identified reactionaries and conservatives. Its roots and sustenance are fundamentally located in the American liberal-progressive impulse toward reforming institutionalized state violence rather than abolishing it.

The absolute banality of the prison regime’s presence in the administrative protocols, curricula, and educational routines of the school is almost omnipresent: aside from the most obvious appearances of the racist policing state on campuses everywhere, it is generally the fundamental epistemological (hence pedagogical) assumption of the school that 1) social order (peace) requires a normalized, culturally legitimated proliferation of state violence (policing, juridical punishment, war); 2) the survival of civil society (schools, citizenship, and individual “freedom”) depends on the capacity of the state to isolate or extinguish the criminal/dangerous; and 3) the U.S. nationbuilding project is endemically decent or (at least) democratic in spirit, and its apparent corruptions, contradictions, and systemic brutalities (including and especially the racial, gender, and class-based violence of the prison industrial complex) are ultimately reformable, redeemable, or (if all else fails) forgivable.

#### Vote neg for an abolitionist pedagogy that locates itself within a living history of radical anti-carceral movements. You are an educator who can mobilize abolition scholarship for radical ends—that’s the only ethical response to dominant carceral logics which will ensure genocidal violence and extinction.

Rodríguez**, 10**—Professor and Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside (Dylan, “The Disorientation of the Teaching Act: Abolition as Pedagogical Position,” The Radical Teacher, No. 88 (Summer 2010), pp. 7-19, dml)

Contrary to the thinly disguised ideological Alinskyism that contemporary liberal, progressive, critical, and “radical” teaching generally and tacitly assumes in relation to the prison regime, what is usually required, and what usually works as a strategy for teaching against the carceral common sense, is a pedagogical approach that asks the unaskable, posits the necessity of the impossible, and embraces the creative danger inherent in liberationist futures. About a decade of teaching a variety of courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels at one of the most demographically diverse research universities in the United States (the University of California, Riverside) has allowed me the opportunity to experiment with the curricular content, assignment form, pedagogical mode, and conceptual organization of coursework that directly or tangentially addresses the formation of the U.S. prison regime and prison industrial complex. Students are consistently (and often unanimously) eager to locate their studies within an abolitionist genealogy—often understanding their work as potentially connected to a living history of radical social movements and epistemological-political revolt—and tend to embrace the high academic demands and rigor of these courses with far less resistance and ambivalence than in many of my other Ethnic Studies courses.

There are some immediate analytical and scholarly tools that form a basic pedagogical apparatus for productively exploding the generalized common sense that creates and surrounds the U.S. prison regime. In fact, it is crucial for teachers and students to collectively understand that it is precisely the circulation and concrete enactment of this common sense that makes it central to the prison regime, not simply an ideological “supplement” of it. Put differently, many students and teachers have a tendency to presume that the cultural symbols and popular discourses that signify and give common sense meaning to prisons and policing are external to the prison regime, as if these symbols and discourses (produced through mass media, state spokespersons and elected officials, right-wing think tanks, video games, television crime dramas, etc.) simply amount to “bad” or “deceptive” propaganda that conspiratorially hide some essential “truth” about prisons that can be uncovered. This is a seductive and self-explanatory, but far too simplistic, way of understanding how the prison regime thrives. What we require, instead, is a sustained analytical discussion that considers how multiple layers of knowledge—including common sense and its different cultural forms—are constantly producing a “lived truth” of policing and prisons that has nothing at all to do with an essential, objective truth. Rather, this fabricated, lived truth forms the template of everyday life through which we come to believe that we more or less understand and “know” the prison and policing apparatus, and which dynamically produces our consent and/or surrender to its epochal oppressive violence.

As a pedagogical tool, this framework compels students and teachers to examine how deeply engaged they are in the violent common sense of the prison and the racist state. Who is left for dead in the common discourse of crime, “innocence,” and “guilt”? How has the mundane institutionalized violence of the racist state become so normalized as to be generally beyond comment? What has made the prison and policing apparatus in its current form appear to be so permanent, necessary, and immovable within the common sense of social change and historical transformation? In this sense, teachers and students can attempt to concretely understand how they are a dynamic part of the prison regime’s production and reproduction— and thus how they might also be part of its abolition through the work of building and teaching a radical and liberatory common sense (this is political work that anyone can do, ideally as part of a community of social movement).

Additionally, the abolitionist teacher can prioritize a rigorous—and vigorous—critique of the endemic complicities of liberal/progressive reformism to the transformation, expansion, and ultimate reproduction of racist state violence and (proto)genocide; this entails a radical critique of everything from the sociopolitical legacies of “civil rights” and the oppressive capacities of “human rights” to the racist state’s direct assimilation of 1970s-era “prison reform” agendas into the blueprints for massive prison expansion discussed above.17

The abolitionist teacher must be willing to occupy the difficult and often uncomfortable position of political leadership in the classroom. To some, this reads as a direct violation of Freirian conceptions of critical pedagogy, but I would argue that it is really an elaboration and amplification of the revolutionary spirit at the heart of Freire’s entire lifework. That is, how can a teacher expect her/ his students to undertake the courageous and difficult work of inhabiting an abolitionist positionality—even if only as an “academic” exercise—unless the teacher herself/himself embodies, performs, and oozes that very same political desire? In fact, it often seems that doing the latter is enough to compel many students (at least momentarily) to become intimate and familiar with the allegedly impossible.

Finally, the horizon of the possible is only constrained by one’s pedagogical willingness to locate a particular political struggle (here, prison abolition) within the long and living history of liberation movements. In this context, “prison abolition” can be understood as one important strain within a continuously unfurling fabric of liberationist political horizons, in which the imagination of the possible and the practical is shaped but not limited by the specific material and institutional conditions within which one lives. It is useful to continually ask: on whose shoulders does one sit, when undertaking the audacious identifications and political practices endemic to an abolitionist pedagogy? There is something profoundly indelible and emboldening in realizing that one’s “own” political struggle is deeply connected to a vibrant, robust, creative, and beautiful legacy of collective imagination and creative social labor (and of course, there are crucial ways of comprehending historical liberation struggles in all their forms, from guerilla warfare to dance).

While I do not expect to arrive at a wholly satisfactory pedagogical endpoint anytime soon, and am therefore hesitant to offer prescriptive examples of “how to teach” within an abolitionist framework, I also believe that rigorous experimentation and creative pedagogical radicalism is the very soul of this praxis. There is, in the end, no teaching formula or pedagogical system that finally fulfills the abolitionist social vision, there is only a political desire that understands the immediacy of struggling for human liberation from precisely those forms of systemic violence and institutionalized dehumanization that are most culturally and politically sanctioned, valorized, and taken for granted within one’s own pedagogical moment. To refuse or resist this desire is to be unaccountable to the historical truth of our moment, in which the structural logic and physiological technologies of social liquidation (removal from or effective neutralization within civil society) have merged with history’s greatest experiment in punitive human captivity, a linkage that increasingly lays bare racism’s logical outcome in genocide.18

Abolitionist Position and Praxis

Given the historical context I have briefly outlined, and the practical-theoretical need for situating an abolitionist praxis within a longer tradition of freedom struggle, I contend that there can be no liberatory teaching act, nor can there be an adequately critical pedagogical practice, that does not also attempt to become an abolitionist one. Provisionally, I am conceptualizing abolition as a praxis of liberation that is creative and experimental rather than formulaic and rigidly programmatic. Abolition is a “radical” political position, as well as a perpetually creative and experimental pedagogy, because formulaic approaches cannot adequately apprehend the biopolitics, dynamic statecraft, and internalized violence of genocidal and proto-genocidal systems of human domination.

As a productive and creative praxis, this conception of abolition posits the material possibility and historical necessity of a social capacity for human freedom based on a cultural-economic infrastructure that supports the transformation of oppressive relations that are the legacy of genocidal conquest, settler colonialism, racial slavery/capitalism,19 compulsory hetero-patriarchies, and global white supremacy. In this sense, abolitionist praxis does not singularly concern itself with the “abolition of the prison industrial complex,” although it fundamentally and strategically prioritizes the prison as a central site for catalyzing broader, radical social transformations. In significant part, this suggests envisioning and ultimately constructing “a constellation of alternative strategies and institutions, with the ultimate aim of removing the prison from the social and ideological landscape of our society.”20 In locating abolitionist praxis within a longer political genealogy that anticipates the task of remaking the world under transformed material circumstances, this position refracts the most radical and revolutionary dimensions of a historical Black freedom struggle that positioned the abolition of “slavery” as the condition of possibility for Black—hence “human”—freedom. To situate contemporary abolitionism as such is also to recall the U.S. racist state’s (and its liberal allies’) displacement and effective political criminalization of Black radical abolitionism through the 13th Amendment’s 1865 recodification of the slave relation through the juridical reinvention of a racial-carceral relation:

Amendment XIII Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.21 [emphasis added]

Given the institutional elaborations of racial criminalization, policing, and massive imprisonment that have prevailed on the 13th Amendment’s essential authorization to replace a regime of racist chattel slavery with racist carceral state violence, it is incumbent on the radical teacher to assess the density of her/his entanglement in this historically layered condition of violence, immobilization, and capture. Prior to the work of formulating an effective curriculum and teaching strategy for critically engaging the prison industrial complex, in other words, is the even more difficult work of examining the assumptive limitations of any “radical pedagogy” that does not attempt to displace an epistemological and cultural common sense in which the relative order and peace of the classroom is perpetually reproduced by the systemic disorder and deep violence of the prison regime.

In relation to the radical challenging of common sense discussed above, another critical analytical tool for building an abolitionist pedagogy entails the rigorous, scholarly dismantling of the “presentist” and deeply ahistorical understanding of policing and prisons. Students (and many teachers) frequently enter such dialogues with an utterly mystified conception of the policing and prison apparatus, and do not generally understand that 1) these apparatuses in their current form are very recent creations, and have not been around “forever”; and 2) the rise of these institutional forms of criminalization, domestic war, and mass-scale imprisonment forms one link in a historical chain of genocidal and proto-genocidal mobilizations of the racist state that regularly take place as part of the deadly global process of U.S. nation-building. In other words, not only is the prison regime a very recent invention of the state (and therefore is neither a “permanent” nor indestructible institutional assemblage), but it is institutionally and historically inseparable from the precedent and contemporaneous structures of large-scale racist state violence. Asserting the above as part of the core analytical framework of the pedagogical structure can greatly enable a discussion of abolitionist possibility that thinks of the critical dialogue as a necessary continuation of long historical struggles against land conquest, slavery, racial colonialism, and imperialist war. This also means that our discussions take place within a longer temporal community with those liberation struggles, such that we are neither “crazy” nor “isolated.” I have seen students and teachers speak radical truth to power under difficult and vulnerable circumstances based on this understanding that they are part of a historical record.

I have had little trouble "convincing" most students - across distinctions of race, class, gender, age, sexuality, and geography - of the gravity and emergency of our historical moment. It is the analytical, political, and practical move toward an abolitionist positionality that is (perhaps predictably) far more challenging. This is in part due to the fraudulent and stubborn default position of centrist-to-progressive liberalism/reformism (including assertions of "civil" and "human" rights) as the only feasible or legible response to reactionary, violent, racist forms of state power. Perhaps more troublesome, however, is that this resistance to engaging with abolitionist praxis seems to also derive from a deep and broad epistemological and cultural disciplining of the political imagination that makes liberationist dreams unspeakable. This disciplining is most overtly produced through hegemonic state and cultural apparatuses and their representatives (including elected officials, popular political pundits and public intellectuals, schools, family units, religious institutions, etc.), but is also compounded through the pragmatic imperatives of many liberal and progressive nonprofit organizations and social movements that reproduce the political limitations of the nonprofit industrial complex.22 In this context, the liberationist historical identifications hailed by an abolitionist social imagination also require that such repression of political-intellectual imagination be fought, demystified, and displaced.

Perhaps, then, there is no viable or defensible pedagogical position other than an abolitionist one. To live and work, learn and teach, and survive and thrive in a time defined by the capacity and political willingness to eliminate and neutralize populations through a culturally valorized, state sanctioned nexus of institutional violence, is to better understand why abolitionist praxis in this historical moment is primarily pedagogical, within and against the "system" in which it occurs. While it is conceivable that in future moments, abolitionist praxis can focus more centrally on matters of (creating and not simply opposing) public policy, infrastructure building, and economic reorganization, the present moment clearly demands a convening of radical pedagogical energies that can build the collective human power, epistemic and knowledge apparatuses, and material sites of learning that are the precondition of authentic and liberatory social transformations**.**

The prison regime is the institutionalization and systemic expansion of massive human misery. It is the production of bodily and psychic disarticulation on multiple scales, across different physiological capacities. The prison industrial complex is, in its logic of organization and its production of common sense, at least proto-genocidal. Finally, the prison regime is inseparable from - that is, present in - the schooling regime in which teachers are entangled. Prison is not simply a place to which one is displaced and where one's physiological being is disarticulated, at the rule and whim of the state and its designated representatives (police, parole officers, school teachers). The prison regime is the assumptive premise of classroom teaching generally. While many of us must live in labored denial of this fact in order to teach as we must about "American democracy," "freedom," and "(civil) rights," there are opportune moments in which it is useful to come clean: the vast majority of what occurs in U.S. classrooms - from preschool to graduate school - cannot accommodate the bare truth of the proto-genocidal prison regime as a violent ordering of the world, a primary component of civil society/school, and a material presence in our everyday teaching acts.

As teachers, we are institutionally hailed to the service of genocide management, in which our pedagogical labor is variously engaged in mitigating, valorizing, critiquing, redeeming, justifying, lamenting, and otherwise reproducing or tolerating the profound and systemic violence of the global-historical U.S. nation building project. As "radical" teachers, we are politically hailed to betray genocide management in order to embrace the urgent challenge of genocide abolition. The short-term survival of those populations rendered most immediately vulnerable to the mundane and spectacular violence of this system, and the long-term survival of most of the planet's human population (particularly those descended from survivors of enslavement, colonization, conquest, and economic exploitation), is significantly dependent on our willingness to embrace this form of pedagogical audacity.

#### Domestic warfare is the intensely materialized modality of the state. Refining the violent machine only assumes and takes for granted the mystified permeance of domestic warfare as a constant production of targeted suffering against black, brown, and aboriginal peoples and forgoes the possibility of an abolitionist praxis to challenge the premise of these wars. How can we normalize the social liquidation and physical evisceration of entire groups of people under the guise of pursuing “winnable policies?”

Rodríguez 10[Dylan; Associate Professor at University of California, Riverside, where he began his teaching career in 2001; “WARFARE AND THE TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT”; http://criticalresistance.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/06/Critical-Resistance-Abolition-Now-Ten-Years-of-Strategy-and-Struggle-against-the-Prison-Industrial-Complex.pdf; accessed: 7/7/20; AB] \*\*typos/page numbers removed if they interrupted the text\*\*

INTRODUCTION: WARFARE AND THE TERMS OF ENGAGEMENT As I've said before, we've taken down the surrender flag and run up the battle flag. And we're going to win the war on drugs. Pres. Ronald Reagan, Radio Address to the Nation on Federal Drug Policy, October 2, 1982 My generation will remember how America swung into action when we were attacked in World War II. The war was not just fought by the fellows flying the planes or driving the tanks. It was fought at home by a mobilized nation-men and women alike-building planes and ships, clothing sailors and soldiers, feeding marines and airmen; and it was fought by children planting victory gardens and collecting cans. Well, now we're in another war for our freedom, and it's time for all of us to pull together again. In this crusade, let us not forget who we are. Drug abuse is a repudiation of everything America is. The destructiveness and human wreckage mock our heritage. Think for a moment how special it is to be an American. Can we doubt that only a divine providence placed this land, this island of freedom, here as a refuge for all those people on the world who yearn to breathe free? Pres. Ronald Reagan, Address to the Nation on the Campaign Against Drug Abuse, September 14, 1986 91 ABOLITION NOW! This war is not yet won, not by a long shot. When we say zero tolerance, we mean, simply, that we've had it. We will no longer tolerate those who sell drugs and those who buy drugs. All Americans of good will are determined to stamp out those parasites who survive and even prosper by feeding off the energy and vitality and humanity of others. They must pay. That's why the administration ... has advocated tougher measures than ever before to combat the drug runners and the drug dealers. We're doing this by seizing the ill-gotten possessions of drug dealers and their accomplices. Those fancy cars and fancy houses and bank accounts full of dirty money aren't really theirs. They were bought from the sale of illegal blood pollutants. We do not tolerate companies that poison our harbors and rivers, and we won't let people who are poisoning the blood of our children get away with it either. Those who have the gall to use federally subsidized housing to peddle their toxins must get the message as well. We will not tolerate those who think they can do their dirty work in the same quarters where disadvantaged Americans struggle to build a better life. We want to kick the vermin out and keep them out. Pres. Ronald Reagan, Radio Address to the Nation on Economic Growth and the War on Drugs, October 8, 1 988 We give up freedom when we addict ourselves to drugs. This fact is not lost on the terrorists. Asa Hutchinson, Administrator, Drug Enforcement Administration, "The Past, Present, & Future of the War on Drugs, " November 15, 2001 This introductory litany of dread reminds us that domestic warfare is both the common language and intensely materialized modality of the US state. While this form of legitimated state violence certainly predates Reagan's "war on drugs" and his/its inheritors, the scope and depth of domestic warmaking seems to be mounting with a peculiar urgency in our historical moment. To take former NYPD and current LAPD Chief William Bratton on the strength of his own words, the primary work of the police is to engage aggressively in "the internal war on terrorism," which in these times entails everything from record-breaking expansions of urban police forces, to cross-party consensus in legislating state offensives against criminalized populations of choice, and the reshuffling of administrative relationships between the militarized and juridical arms of local and federal government to facilitate the state's various localized "wars on gangs." It is in this context that we can urgently assume the political burden of critically assessing the work of progressive US based community and non-profit organizations, grassroots movements, and issue-based campaigns: that is, if we are to take the state's own language of domestic warfare seriously, what do we make of the political, ideological, institutional, and financial relationships that progressive movements, campaigns, and organizations are creating in (uneasy) alliance with the state's vast architectures of war? Under what conditions and sets of assumptions are progressive activists, organizers, and scholars able to so militantly oppose the proliferation of American state violence in other parts of the world, while tolerating the everyday state violence of US policing, criminal law, and low-intensity genocide? We are collectively witnessing, surviving, and working in a time of unprecedented state-organized human capture and state-produced physical/social/ psychic alienation, from the 2.5 million imprisoned by the domestic and global US prison industrial complex to the profound forms of informal apartheid and protoapartheid that are being instantiated in cities, suburbs, and rural areas all over the country. This condition presents a profound crisis-and political possibility-for people struggling against the white supremacist state, which continues to institutionalize the social liquidation and physical evisceration of Black, brown, and aboriginal peoples nearby and far away. If we are to approach racism, neoliberalism, militarism/militarization, and US state hegemony and domination in a legitimately "global" way, it is nothing short of unconscionable to expend significant political energy protesting American wars elsewhere (e.g. Iraq, Afghanistan, etc.) when there are overlapping, and no less profoundly oppressive, declarations of and mobilizations for war in our very own, most intimate and nearby geographies of "home." This time of crisis and emergency necessitates a critical examination of the political and institutional logics that structure so much of the US progressive left, and particularly the "establishment" left that is tethered (for better and worse) to the non-profit industrial complex (NPIC). I have defined the NPIC elsewhere as the set of symbiotic relationships that link political and financial technologies of state and owning class social control with surveillance over public political discourse, including and especially emergent progressive and leftist social movements. This definition is most focused on the industrialized incorporation, accelerated since the 1970s, of pro-state liberal and progressive campaigns and movements into a spectrum of government-proctored non-profit organizations. 93 ABOLITION NOW! It i s i n the context of the formation of the NPIC as a political power structure that I wish to address, with a less-than-subtle sense of alarm, a peculiar and disturbing politics of assumption that often structures, disciplines, and actively shapes the work of even the most progressive movements and organizations within the US establishment left (of which I too am a part, for better and worse): that is, the left's willingness to fundamentally tolerate-and accompanying unwillingness to abolish-the institutionalized dehumanization of the contemporary policing and imprisonment apparatus in its most localized, unremarkable, and hence "normal" manifestations within the domestic "homeland" of the Homeland Security state. Behind the din of progressive and liberal reformist struggles over public policy, civil liberties, and law, and beneath the infrequent mobilizations of activity to defend against the next onslaught of racist, classist, ageist, and misogynist criminalization, there is an unspoken politics of assumption that takes for granted the mystified permanence of domestic warfare as a constant production of targeted and massive suffering, guided by the logic of Black, brown, and indigenous subjection to the expediencies and essential violence of the American (global) nation-building project. To put it differently: despite the unprecedented forms of imprisonment, social and political repression, and violent policing that compose the mosaic of our historical time, the establishment left (within and perhaps beyond the US) does not care to envision, much less politically prioritize, the abolition of us domestic warfare and its structuring white supremacist social logic as its most urgent task of the present and future. Our non-profit left, in particular, seems content to engage in desperate (and usually well-intentioned) attempts to manage the casualties of domestic warfare, foregoing the urgency of an abolitionist praxis that openly, critically, and radically addresses the moral, cultural, and political premises of these wars. Not long from now, generations will emerge from the organic accumulation of rage, suffering, social alienation, and (we hope) politically principled rebellion against this living apocalypse and pose to us some rudimentary questions of radical accountability: How were we able to accommodate, and even culturally and politically normalize the strategic, explicit, and openly racist technologies of state violence that effectively socially neutralized and frequently liquidated entire nearby populations of our people, given that ours are the very same populations that have historically struggled to survive and overthrow such "classical" structures of dominance as colonialism, frontier conquest, racial slavery, and other genocides? In a somewhat more intimate sense, how could we live with ourselves in this domestic state of emergency, and why did we seem to generally forfeit the creative possibilities of radically challenging, dislodging, and transforming the ideological and institutional premises of this condition of domestic warfare in favor of short-term, "winnable" policy reforms? (For example, why did we choose to formulate and tolerate a "progressive" political language that reinforced dominant racist notions of "criminality" in the process of trying to discredit the legal basis of "Three Strikes" laws?) What were the fundamental concerns of our progressive organizations and movements during this time, and were they willing to comprehend and galvanize an effective, or even viable opposition to the white supremacist state's terms of engagement (that is, warfare)? This radical accountability reflects a variation on anticolonial liberation theorist Frantz Fanon's memorable statement to his own peers, comrades, and nemeses: Each generation must discover its mission, fulfill it or betray it, in relative opacity. In the underdeveloped countries preceding generations have simultaneously resisted the insidious agenda of colonialism and paved the way for the emergence of the current struggles. Now that we are in the heat of combat, we must shed the habit of decrying the efforts of our forefathers or feigning incomprehension at their silence or passiveness.

#### Raising questions about the types of reforms that are appropriate in response to injustice diverts attention from why we have those injustices in the first place. The alt solves because it avoids false dilemmas and opens the door to more substantive change.

Green 20[Ben; PhD Candidate in Applied Math at the Harvard School of Engineering and Applied Sciences and an Affiliate at the Berkman Klein Center for Internet and Society at Harvard; “The False Promise of Risk Assessments: Epistemic Reform and the Limits of Fairness.” In Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAT\* ’20), January 27–30, 2020, Barcelona, Spain. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 13 pages.https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372869; accessed: 6/29/2020; AB]

The challenges raised by questions of algorithmic fairness are not—and must not be—limited to the scope of analysis presented by algorithmic fairness. Algorithmic decision making raises fundamental questions about the structure of institutions and the types of reform that are appropriate in response to injustice. Yet as currently constituted, algorithmic fairness narrows these debates to the precise functioning at the decision point itself. This approach overlooks and legitimizes the context that gives structure and meaning to the decision point. In turn, it leads down a path toward dilemmas that, within this scope, appear intractable. Escaping these false choices requires that “we question [our] assumptions and try to look at the issues from another point of view” [114]. Approaching algorithms as sociotechnical imaginaries rather than as discrete technologies enables this expanded scope of analysis. By highlighting the entire context surrounding algorithms as subject to reimagination and reform, this approach avoids the trap of false dilemmas and makes possible more substantive change. Engaging in this manner with today’s complex socio-legal-technical environments will inform new paths for algorithms and for reform, in the criminal justice system and beyond.

#### Abolition requires departure from reform the aff is ineffective and reinforce system coherence of those systems

Rodriguez 19 – Professor of Ethnic Studies and Chair of the Academic Senate, University of California, Riverside

Dylan, Abolition as Praxis of Human Being: A Foreword, 132 Harv. L. Rev. 1575. HeinOnline.

Abolition is a dream toward futurity vested in insurgent, counter- Civilizational histories - genealogies of collective genius' that perform liberation under conditions of duress. The late Black-liberation warrior, organizer, and Vice President of the Provisional Government of the Republic of New Afrika2 Safiya Bukhari once wrote, in characteristi- cally crystallized terms, "[b]y definition, security means the freedom from danger, fear, and anxiety."' 3 Security and freedom, for peoples sub-jected to the normalized state- and culturally condoned violence of (global) U.S. nation-building, require a decisive departure from typical demands for policy reform, formal equality, and amped-up electoral par-ticipation; rather, what is needed is a mustering of collective voice that abrogates the political-discursive limits of "demand" itself.

The long historical praxis of abolition is grounded in a Black radical genealogy of revolt and transformative insurgency against racial chattel enslavement and the transatlantic trafficking of captive Africans. Understood as part of the historical present tense, abolitionist critique, or- ganizing, and collective movement (across scales of geography and col- lectivity) honor and extend this tradition. The contributors to this issue of the Harvard Law Review signify the breadth, rigor, and strategic bril- liance of contemporary abolitionist praxis, as their work represents a broader field of creative and rigorously theorized struggle against the continuities of carceral state violence, including but not limited to im- prisonment, jailing, detention, and policing. In this sense, abolition is not merely a practice of negation - a collective attempt to eliminate institutionalized dominance over targeted peoples and populations - but also a radically imaginative, generative, and socially productive communal (and community-building) practice. Abolition seeks (as it performs) a radical reconfiguration of justice, subjectivity, and social formation that does not depend on the existence of either the carceral state (a statecraft that institutionalizes various forms of targeted human capture) or carceral power as such (a totality of state-sanctioned and extrastate relations of gendered racial-colonial dominance).

Contemporary reformist approaches to addressing the apparent overreach and scandalous excesses of the carceral state - characterized by calls to end "police brutality" and "mass incarceration" - fail to rec- ognize that the very logics of the overlapping criminal justice and polic- ing regimes systemically perpetuate racial, sexual, gender, colonial, and class violence through carceral power. Thus, in addition to being inef- fective at achieving their generally stated goals of alleviating vulnerable peoples' subjection to legitimated state violence, reformist approaches ultimately reinforce a violent system that is fundamentally asymmetrical in its production and organization of normalized misery, social surveil-lance, vulnerability to state terror, and incarceration.

It is within this irreconcilable reformist contradiction that an aboli-tionist historical mandate provides a useful and necessary departure from the liberal assumption that either the carceral state or carceral power is an inevitable and permanent feature of the social formation. This historical mandate animates abolition as a creative, imaginative, and speculative collective labor: while liberal-to-progressive reformism attempts to protect and sustain the institutional and cultural-political coherence of an existing system by adjusting and/or refurbishing it, abo- litionism addresses the historical roots of that system in relations of op- pressive, continuous, and asymmetrical violence and raises the radical question of whether those relations must be uprooted and transformed (rather than reformed or "fixed") for the sake of particular peoples' ex- istence and survival as such.7

### FW

#### The role of the ballot is to endorse an abolitionist pedagogy and deconstruct carceral logic:

1. Epistemology is key – the “common sense” we produce is a surrender to the prison’s oppressive violence as we accept its logic of imprisonment and discriminatory targeting of certain groups. It’s a lie fed to us that bad criminals have to be locked away from the rest of society to protect the larger “innocent” majority. We need to push against these assumptions and question the criminal/innocent dichotomy. We need to understand how the prison reproduces itself in order to understand how we can destroy it.
2. Debate classroom is key – it’s a place to generate knowledge and our understandings of the world. Re-evaluating these assumptions allows us to be better activists in the real world by understanding what “liberal” policies are actually effective.
3. Pre-fiat pedagogical implications outweigh, we utilize educational spaces like debate to critique the system at its roots rather than giving useless ways to reform it, educating about the flaws and methods of taking down the PIC
4. Under Util we outweigh, abolition of prisons fundamentally removes any chance of exploitation for any prisoner, breaks a system that is intended to marginalize and oppress people of color all across the U.S. and actually end recidivism

## Case:

### 1nc-legal recognition

#### Strikes are already happening in the squo

LAIGNEE BARRON, journalist at Time magazine, 2018 – [“Here's Why Inmates in the U.S. Prison System Have Launched a Nationwide Strike”, https://time.com/5374133/prison-strike-labor-conditions/]//bread

What may shape up to be one of the largest prison strikes in modern U.S. history began Tuesday, with inmates across the country protesting what they call “modern day slavery.” The nearly three-week strike targets poorly paid prison labor, prison conditions and life-long sentencing, and was spurred by deadly riots earlier this year at the Lee Correctional Institution where seven inmates were killed. Through labor strikes, hunger strikes and sit-ins staged from Aug. 21 to Sept. 9, protest organizers are demanding an end to what they see as exploitation and racism in the world’s largest incarceration complex. “Prisoners understand they are being treated as animals. We know that our conditions are causing physical harm and deaths that could be avoided,” Jailhouse Lawyers Speak, a nationwide inmates’ collective, said in a pre-strike [statement](https://itsgoingdown.org/pre-strike-statement-from-jailhouse-lawyers-speak/). “Prisons in America are a warzone,” it added. It’s unclear how many of the [almost 2.3 million people](https://www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/pie2018.html) serving time in America’s vast incarceration system will risk substantial penal retaliation to join the protest. But the movement has the potential for massive operational disruption as correctional institutions rely on prison labor, from cooking and serving the meals, to washing the laundry, to maintaining the grounds. As correctional facilities from coast to coast are hit with strikes, here’s what to know. Who is protesting and whyLed by inmate organizations like Jailhouse Lawyers Speak and Incarcerated Workers Organizing Committee, the 19-day strike has countrywide reach with at least [17 states](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-45261381) reportedly participating so far.

#### Which begs the question of – what does the aff do?

## 2n:

The PIC is irredeemable, built on penal logic and racism. No amount of political reform can change those underlying foundations, which means only the alt offers a solution that can resolve the long-term state violence inflicted by the system. Small policy reforms still operate on the acceptance of this domestic warfare, coming at the cost of a radical re-imagining of alternative futures.

The aff is an instance of reifying the PIC complex and fails to understand why this violence against prisoners exist in the first place, it is merely a prison warden in disguise. Only the alt stands any chance of resolving the aff’s impacts, means that it’s try or die.

### FW: you should prioritize epistemology first

It’s question of starting points – if we’ve proven that their knowledge and assumptions of the world are wrong, then that is independent reason to reject the 1AC. Debate is an educational activity where the discourses and reps in round shape how we understand the world. You should prioritize the epistemology of the aff above the fiated impacts of the plan, if we prove that their assumptions are wrong, it proves why their plan would reify and build a world that we think is violent.

### The link debate:

The aff is a desire to improve the conditions of imprisonment, to make it look better and refiy the PIC – giving workers the right to strike without addressing the reason WHY they’re paid so terribly, WHY they’re incarcerated in the first place, is putting the responsibility of improving their living conditions on them, ignoring the state violence that the us has inflicted upon black and brown people that causes their high incarceration rates in the first place.

It’s like saying “oh, now you can go fight for yourself!”, which washes away the state’s atrocities and guilt, the state’s role in creating these conditions in the first place. The aff is the wrong starting point for understanding the prison industrial complex. Reforms like the aff never amount to structural changes, and only makes the system look cleaner and more “fair”, covering up the racism and injustice that is fundamental to the PIC.

Look, the aff basically shifts the responsibility of taking care of people from the state to the workers, forcing them to fight for their rights

Look at the aff’s Lueng ev that says that black and brown people are incarcerated at higher rates – the aff can’t explain why any of that happens, but we can. It’s not a problem of strikes, it’s a problem with the system. Only the alt can resolve

The aff can’t do jack shit about recidivism bc it doesn’t fucking address why prisoners are pit in prison in the first place because of marijuana

AT aff and alt

The alt:

#### The alt endorses abolitionism politics by encouraging pedagogical questioning of the prison system and organizing into mobilized movements that can envision alternatives. It rejects the aff’s politics by endorsing a scholarly framework that disidentifies with the state and instead allies with the possibilities of insurgency.

The alt asks questions of “what does a world look like without PIC”? “how can we challenge structural problems that cause incarceration in the squo?” “what are some alternatives to prisons?”

Only the alt can question *why* POC are incarcerated at higher rates than

#### Framework—means they don’t get a perm cuz it’s just a question of the 1AC’s rhetoric not whether the plan is in the direction of abolition

#### View competition through the lens of starting points—alt starts with the idea that abolition is necessary despite opposition and then tries to build pedagogies that can accomplish it. The aff takes the opposite approach it starts from the idea opposition makes abolition infeasible and then compromises with that opposition

#### Group the perms -

* 1. They all sever or are intrinsic which is bad for competitive equity as it makes the 1AC a shifting target and should be rejected
  2. Perm is impossible – the alt is a refusal of the aff’s politics of using the state and its prison logic.

The permutation ensures cooption – the aff’s logic of incarceration doesn’t challenge the state and its power politics. It allows the state to portray itself as an advocate for justice by “fixing” the bad parts of the machine

AT The net benefits