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## **Background Information**

##

**Argument Overview**: The affirmative team wants to implement reforms to policing. Some of those reforms are requiring body cams, new de escalation training, and require officers to present their badge numbers to civilians. The negative can read this disadvantage against the affirmative as a response. The Defund the Police DA states that currently multiple cities and the federal government have already begun cutting funds from police forces. However when the aff plan passes and implements all of these police reforms, government agencies will have to allocate more money to the police. The DA says this is bad because we should be focusing on defunding the police and using that money to fund education, housing, and mental health assistance. If we can provide resources to at risk communities then the need for police will decrease and the opportunities for them to harm black and brown people.

**Historical Background**: Defunding the police doesn’t mean that there will be no police but rather we focus funding on supports that help people before a crime is committed. Currently, the police are called to intervene in situations that they are not qualified to deal with and even when they get training on how to deal with situations they still end up causing more harm than good. Reform is not working and it is wasting money that could be used to actually help people. This is why the DA calls for defunding not reform.

**Strategy Guide**

This file contains all the evidence you will need to run the Defund the Police Disadvantage. Before you run this affirmative, be sure to read over the background information, strategy guide, and familiarize yourself with the cards (or evidence) in this file. It will also help if you read over the Police Brutality Affirmative file.

When you run this negative you will:

1. Prepare the 1NC by highlighting the Defund the Police DA
2. Expand on your initial arguments in the 2NC and 1NR while also responding to the arguments made by the Affirmative team.
3. Make a closing statement in the 2NR, telling the judge why the Negative team’s arguments are more important (or outweigh) the Affirmative team’s arguments.

The goal of the negative is simple: Prove that the plan presented by the affirmative team is a bad idea. The more you focus on the plan and why it is a bad idea, the more often you’ll win debates.

**Speaking Roles on the Negative:**

* **1st Negative Speaker:** Your job is to introduce a range of negative arguments in the 1NC, and to definitively win at least one of those arguments in the 1NR.
* **2nd Negative Speaker:** Your job is to expand upon one or two arguments made in the 1NC, then to choose the best argument made by the negative team and show why the negative should win the debate in the 2NR. You are in charge of choosing negative strategy, since you’ll have to explain it in the 2NR

The speech times, along with cross-examination, are below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Speech** | **Time (Minutes)** |
| **1st Affirmative Constructive (1AC)** | **8** |
| **2nd Negative Speaker Questions 1st Affirmative Speaker** | **3** |
| **1st Negative Constructive (1NC)** | **8** |
| **1st Affirmative Speaker Questions 1st Negative Speaker** | **3** |
| **2nd Affirmative Constructive (2AC)** | **8**  |
| **1st Negative Speaker Questions 2nd Affirmative Speaker** | **3**  |
| **2nd Negative Constructive (2NC)** | **8**  |
| **2nd Affirmative Speaker Questions 2nd Negative Speaker** | **3**  |
| **1st Negative Rebuttal (1NR)** | **5**  |
| **1st Affirmative Rebuttal (1AR)** | **5** |
| **2nd Negative Rebuttal (Closing Statement) (2NR)** | **5**  |
| **2nd Affirmative Rebuttal (Closing Statement) (2AR)** | **5**  |
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**Uniqueness: Police Reforms Fail**

**Vitale 5/31** (Alex, is professor of sociology and coordinator of the Policing and Social Justice Project at Brooklyn College and the author of The End of Policing, 5/31/2020, The answer to police violence is not 'reform'. It's defunding. Here's why, <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/may/31/the-answer-to-police-violence-is-not-reform-its-defunding-heres-why>)/ DD

**Every time protests erupt after yet another innocent black person is killed by police, “reform” is meekly offered as the solution. But what if drastically defunding the police – not reform – is the best way to stop unnecessary violence and death committed by law enforcement against communities of color? Minneapolis, where George Floyd was killed by a police officer who kneeled on his neck for over eight minutes, has tried reform already. Five years ago, the Minneapolis police department was under intense pressure in the wake of both the national crisis of police killings of unarmed black men and its own local history of unnecessary police violence. In response, the department’s leaders undertook a series of reforms proposed by the Obama administration’s justice department and procedural reform advocates in academia. The Minneapolis police implemented trainings on implicit bias, mindfulness, de-escalation, and crisis intervention; diversified the department’s leadership; created tighter use-of-force standards; adopted body cameras; initiated a series of police-community dialogues; and enhanced early-warning systems to identify problem officers. In 2015, they brought in procedural reformer and implicit bias champion Phillip Atiba Goff to lead the National Initiative for Building Community Trust and Justice, a three-year, $4.75m project to use data collection, social psychology and police community dialogues to repair and strengthen the frayed relationship between cops and communities. Following that, Minneapolis implemented a series of training programs designed to professionalize policing in the hopes that it would reduce abuses that might trigger more protests. Officers were trained in how to respond to mental health crisis calls, how to de-escalate confrontations with the public, how to be “mindful” in dangerous circumstances, and how to be more self-aware of their implicit racial bias. In 2018, the department even wrote a report, Focusing on Procedural Justice Internally and Externally, to highlight the broad range of procedural reforms they had implemented. None of it worked. That’s because “procedural justice” has nothing to say about the mission or function of policing. It assumes that the police are neutrally enforcing a set of laws that are automatically beneficial to everyone. Instead of questioning the validity of using police to wage an inherently racist war on drugs, advocates of “procedural justice” politely suggest that police get anti-bias training, which they will happily deliver for no small fee.** What “procedural justice” leaves out of the conversation are questions of substantive justice. What is the actual impact of policing on those policed and what could we do differently? Over the last 40 years we have seen a massive expansion of the scope and intensity of policing. **Every social problem in poor and non-white communities has been turned over to the police to manage. The schools don’t work; let’s create school policing. Mental health services are decimated; let’s send police. Overdoses are epidemic; let’s criminalize people who share drugs. Young people are caught in a cycle of violence and despair; let’s call them superpredators and put them in prison for life. Police have also become more militarized. The Federal 1033 program, the Department of Justice’s “Cops Office,” and homeland security grants have channeled billions of dollars in military hardware into American police departments to advance their “war on crime” mentality**. A whole generation of police officers have been given “warrior” training that teaches them to see every encounter with the public as potentially their last, leading to a hostile attitude towards those policed and the unnecessary killing of people falsely considered a threat, such as the 12-year-old Tamir Rice, killed for holding a toy gun in an Ohio park. **The alternative is not more money for police training programs, hardware or oversight. It is to dramatically shrink their function. We must demand**
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**that local politicians develop non-police solutions to the problems poor people face**. **We must invest in housing, employment and healthcare in ways that directly target the problems of public safety. Instead of criminalizing homelessness, we need publicly financed supportive housing; instead of gang units, we need community-based anti-violence programs, trauma services and jobs for young people; instead of school police we need more counselors, after-school programs, and restorative justice programs. A growing number of local activists in Minneapolis like Reclaim the Block, Black Visions Collective and MPD 150 are demanding just that. They are calling on Mayor Jacob Frey to defund the police by $45m and shift those resources into “community-led health and safety strategies.” The Minneapolis police department currently uses up to 30% of the entire city budget. Instead of giving them more money for pointless training programs, let’s divert that money into building up communities and individuals so we don’t “need” violent and abusive policing.**
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**Link: The police are being defunded now and the plan reverses that**

**Yglesias 6/16** (Matthew, co-founded Vox.com with Ezra Klein and Melissa Bell back in the spring of 2014. He's currently a senior correspondent focused on politics and economic policy , 6/16/2020, Donald Trump is defunding the police, https://www.vox.com/2020/6/16/21286669/donald-trump-is-defunding-the-police)/DD

**President Trump has repeatedly proposed cuts in federal funding for police, criticized landmark legislation that boosted financial support for police departments, and is currently involved in blocking legislation that would greatly reduce pressure on local governments to cut police funding. In layman’s terms, he’s been trying to defund the police.** Of course activists and intellectuals who have rallied behind the slogan “defund the police” have something bigger and grander in mind than random budget cuts. Ayobami Laniyonu, the University of Toronto sociologist, explains to my colleague Sean Illing that he wants “reinvestment of that money in otherwise underserved and marginalized communities. **Let’s get rid of the practice of managing homelessness, inequality, poverty, the consequences of decades of racial segregation, and the consequences of decades of disinvestment in public health with armed members of law enforcement.”** But as leading Democrats from former Vice President Joe Biden and Rep. James Clyburn on down have largely refused the call, Republicans have nonetheless pressed forward with a message of opposition to defunding police departments. What **Republicans** haven’t done is actually change their policy positions. They **continue to be in favor of forcing state and local governments to enact massive rounds of austerity in response to the coronavirus pandemic**. And even though polling shows the idea of cutting police funding to be unpopular, realistically, states and cities facing huge budget holes are going to need to ask police departments to share in some of the pain. This dispute about budgeting — where Democrats are fighting against austerity and Republicans are fighting for it — is different from the theoretical argument police abolitionists want to have about the future of law enforcement. But it’s a real one playing out this summer in Congress with real consequences for the lives of hundreds of millions of people. And in this debate, it’s **Trump who wants to defund the police. Trump’s budgets have routinely proposed police cuts In early February of this year, the Trump administration proposed a 58 percent cut in the federal government’s COPS Hiring Program, a federal program that supports police department staffing.** That’s not a one-off; his administration’s budget proposals have routinely called for huge cuts to this program, which was inaugurated in the 1990s as part of Bill Clinton’s pledge to hire 100,000 new police officers (Congress keeps declining to do this). Police staffing levels have stagnated and fallen since the heyday of this program in part as a result of the general trend toward state and local budget cuts in the wake of the Great Recession and huge GOP electoral wins in the 2010 midterms. Trump has never actually talked about this proposed further reduction in police spending, as far as I can tell, and it’s sharply at odds with both his rhetoric about the police and police unions’ enthusiastic embrace of him. But that disjuncture is part of a more general distinction between the memetic politics of police and the real world of budgeting, where GOP tax and spending policies squeeze law enforcement along with every other form of front-line public service provision. Democrats are trying to save police departments from cuts The fact that Joe Biden refuses to embrace the idea of “defunding the police” has attracted a fair amount of attention in recent days. Instead, he’s proposed spending “an additional $300 million to reinvigorate community policing in our country,” arguing in USA Today that “every single police department should have the money they need to institute real reforms like adopting a national use of force standard, buying body cameras, and recruiting more diverse police officers.” But the larger and more significant budgetary context is that the HEROES Act passed by House Democrats and stalled by Senate Republicans appropriates $900 billion to state and local governments. With that kind of fiscal support, cities that don’t want to defund their police departments wouldn’t have to. And cities that do want to experiment with shifting funding out of law enforcement and into mental health, drug treatment, and youth services will have the opportunity to do that. Republicans, meanwhile, have characterized this idea as a “blue state bailout” and say Congress should instead consider changes to bankruptcy law that might allow states to shed their pension obligations in bankruptcy. **Given the strain that the Covid-19 crisis has placed on state and local budgets, a lack of federal aid makes cuts to policing essentially inevitable.** These would not be cuts on the divest/reinvest model favored by anti-police activists but just old-fashioned budget cuts where there is less money for everything. And while it’s true that shedding pension obligations could relieve some pressure on current-day spending, many of those pension benefits go to police officers — who typically retire early and collect generous defined benefit pensions. American cities are facing broad arbitrary austerity Advocates of defunding or even “abolishing” the police are not generally talking about broad-brush cuts to budgets that just happen to include cuts to police budgets. Instead, the most common model is a dual movement to divest from law enforcement and security functions in order to invest in other social services. Marbre Stahly-Butts of Law for Black Lives explains: invest/divest is the idea that as we’re making reforms, as we’re pushing policy changes, as we’re overseeing shifts in practice, that we pay special attention to how money is being spent, and we demand a divestment from the systems that harm our communities, like the criminal legal system, like policing regimes, like the court system, and demand that money that’s currently being spent, that’s being poured into those systems with no accountability, be moved instead to community-based alternative systems that support our people, that feed our people, that ensure we have jobs, and housing – the things we need to take care of ourselves and our communities. **But the reality, as emphasized by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, is that state and local governments are facing a world of nearly unprecedented fiscal pain because of Covid-19. They’re facing budget gaps far exceeding what was**
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**seen during the Great Recession**. Under the circumstances, state and local governments are going to be divesting from everything and investing in nothing simply because there isn’t enough money to go around. Education will almost certainly pay the highest price, since it accounts for about a third of state and local spending, but the 4 percent going to police is unlikely to be spared either. This kind of willy-nilly budget cutting isn’t what thoughtful police defunders have in mind when they talk about reimagining the criminal justice system. But when pollsters find that two-thirds of the public opposes defunding the police, that probably is what the electorate fears. Many people might prefer something else in lieu of the traditional police presence in our cities. But few simply want the police to vanish. **Absent the kind of federal aid that Republicans are currently blocking, that’s what’s going to happen. America is going to have fewer police**, and fewer teachers and mental health workers, and fewer summer job programs and community centers, and just generally less of everything. That’s unlikely to be a happy ending for anyone.

**1NC (5/9)**

**Internal Link:Defunded the police solves for homelessness, mental illness, and education**

**Arnold 6/12** (Amanda,Staff Writer, The Cut. ,6/12/2020, What Exactly Does It Mean to Defund the Police?, <https://www.thecut.com/2020/06/what-does-defund-the-police-mean-the-phrase-explained.html>)/DD

**As thousands of protesters across the country have gathered to demand justice for George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, and other black people killed by the police, a related rallying cry has gained momentum: defund the police.** It’s an idea that’s been popular among activists and critics of the criminal-justice system for decades. In the past two weeks, though, it’s gained unprecedented support — and national media attention. **Proponents of defunding argue that incremental police reform has failed. A better solution, they argue, would be to more effectively address underlying factors that contribute to crime, like poverty and homelessness; this would be achieved by cutting police forces’ often-astronomical budgets on a city level and reallocating those funds toward social services, such as housing and youth services.** Some critics have dismissed defunding the police as a left-wing fantasy, but the concept is quickly gaining mainstream recognition. Perhaps most notably: **On June 7, the City Council of Minneapolis announced its intent to disband the city’s police department with a vetoproof majority and replace it with “a holistic model of public safety that actually keeps us safe.”** So what now? How, exactly, does a city defund the police? Has it ever been done before? Can it be done? Below, here’s everything to know about the demand. **What does it mean to defund the police?** Defunding the police does not necessarily mean getting rid of the police altogether. Rather, **it would mean reducing police budgets and reallocating those funds to crucial and oft-neglected areas like education, public health, housing, and youth services.** (Some activists want to abolish the police altogether; defunding is a separate but connected cause.) **It’s predicated on the belief that investing in communities would act as a better deterrent to crime by directly addressing societal problems like poverty, mental illness, and homelessness — issues that advocates say police are poorly equipped to handle, and yet are often tasked with**. **According to some estimates, law enforcement spends 21 percent of its time responding to and transporting people with mental illnesses. Police are also frequently dispatched to deal with people experiencing homelessness, causing them to be incarcerated at a disproportionate rate. Even some cops resent society’s overreliance on them. “We’re just asking us to do too much,” said former Dallas police chief David Brown in a 2016 interview. “Every societal failure, we put it off for the cops to solve. That’s too much to ask. Policing was never meant to solve all those problems.” And the outcome can be deadly: In 2015, the Washington Post found that one in four people killed by a police officer suffered from a serious mental illness at the time of their death. Advocates argue this could be avoided by replacing some police officers with trained social workers or specialized response teams.** “Municipalities can begin by changing policies or statutes so police officers never respond to certain kinds of emergencies, including ones that involve substance abuse, domestic violence, homelessness or mental health,” Philip V. McHarris and Thenjiwe McHarris argue in an op-ed for the New York Times. **“So if someone calls 911 to report a drug overdose, health care teams rush to the scene; the police wouldn’t get involved. If a person calls 911 to complain about people who are homeless, rapid response social workers would provide them with housing support and other resources. Conflict interrupters and restorative justice teams could mediate situations where no one’s safety is being threatened.”** The amount of money the United States spends on policing is staggering: According to a recent analysis, the sum is $115 billion, which is bigger than nearly every other country’s military budget. **In most cities, the police budget dwarves those for education, housing, and other crucial services**. For example, Los Angeles’s proposed police budget for 2021 is $1.8 billion — more than half of the city’s total spending for the year. **New York City’s annual police budget is a whopping $6 billion, which is more than the city spends on health, homeless services, youth development, and workforce development combined.** Defunding proposals would reallocate a fraction of that — for instance, activists and City Council candidates in New York City have proposed cutting the NYPD budget by $1 billion over the next four years. But wouldn’t crime increase without police? One of the main arguments raised by those who oppose defunding: “What will we do about crime if police forces are made to scale back?” Advocates counter that investing in communities and providing them with resources will reduce crime on its own — for example, a 2016 report from the Obama White House’s Council of Economic Advisers found that “a 10 percent increase in wages for non-college educated men results in approximately a 10 to 20 percent reduction in crime rates.” But on top of that, those in favor of defunding also point out that police departments across the country consistently have low rates of solving crimes, even as their budgets have
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increased threefold in the past 40 years. In 2019, for instance, Minneapolis police only cleared 56 percent of cases in which a person was killed. That same year, Baltimore recorded at least 347 homicides, a record-breaking level of violence, but ended the year with a 32 percent clearance rate for homicides; in 2015, the rate was 56 percent. Across the country, rape cases result in a notoriously low number of charges: In 2017, police closed just 32 percent of rape cases, and hundreds of thousands of rape kits have sat untested in police storage for years. According to an FBI database, about 30 percent of robberies and less than 15 percent of burglaries and motor-vehicle thefts result in arrests. When police investigate a crime involving a black victim, evidence shows that the clearance rate drops significantly: A 2014 New York Daily News investigation found that police solved about 86 percent of homicides when the victim was white. When the victim was black, the clearance rate dropped to 45 percent. **Meanwhile, police in the U.S. are killing far more people than law enforcement in other developed countries like the U.K., Japan, and Germany. In the first 24 days of 2015, U.S. police shot and killed more people than police in England and Wales had in the past 24 years. According to the Washington Post, since 2015, police have fatally shot approximately 1,000 people a year, and the rate that police kill black people is more than twice the rate of white people.** (Each year, about 50 police officers are shot and killed on the job.) Why not just reform police departments? Though many politicians argue for reforming police departments using commonsense solutions like installing civilian review boards and banning “warrior style” training, which instructs officers to view all encounters as dangerous and to prioritize their own safety, advocates argue that **incremental reform has failed to combat police violence in any meaningful way**. **After a white officer shot and killed Michael Brown in Ferguson in 2014, for instance, there was a nationwide push for officers to wear body cameras, which advocates predicted would improve police accountability. It has not been successful. An extensive study of more than 2,000 police officers, published in 2017, found that the body cameras had almost zero effect on deterring officers from acting with unnecessary force; and, as evidenced by the recent police shooting of David McAtee, officers can simply turn off their cameras. Another example: The NYPD banned choke holds more than two decades ago, which didn’t stop Officer Daniel Pantaleo from holding Eric Garner in one until he stopped breathing. Another reason reforms haven’t been tenable, advocates say, is police unions. The purpose of police unions is “to win members better salaries and benefits and to protect their job security — specifically by pushing for safeguards against investigation, discipline, and dismissal,” Daniel DiSalvo, a political-science professor at the City College of New York, writes in the Washington Post.** “These protections can make it difficult for police chiefs to manage their forces effectively and can allow a few bad officers to act with impunity, poisoning an entire organizational culture in the process.” **As BuzzFeed News notes, police collective-bargaining agreements protect even the most violent officers from oversight groups like civilian review boards and police internal-affairs departments, making it nearly impossible to punish officers for serious wrongdoing. While Minneapolis mayor Jacob Frey banned warrior training, the Minneapolis police union has openly defied the ban, and now offers the “fear-based” training — valued at $55,000 — to any officer who wants it, for free.** Police unions, which wield great political power, also push back against criminal-justice reform that would promote transparency and accountability. Amid the protests, pressure has mounted within unions that represent police officers — notably, the AFL-CIO — to expel all police affiliates; many of those putting pressure on the unions also support defunding. Is defunding actually possible?

Another issue advocates of defunding face: Police forces wield an immense amount of power and influence, and, historically, the data shows that many Americans find them trustworthy. As Eric Levitz notes on Intelligencer, “There are only three institutions that perennially command a ‘great deal’ or ‘quite a lot’ of confidence from Americans in Gallup’s polling: the military, small business, and the police.” In a Gallup poll from 2018, 54 percent of Americans expressed a “great deal” or “quite a lot” of confidence in the police. (However, a recent Data for Progress report with a similar sample size found that public trust in the institution has fallen amid the ongoing protests against police brutality: Of the 1,352 people surveyed, 37 percent said they are less likely to trust cops.) By supporting the effort to defund police, a prevailing argument goes, elected officials could risk alienating a significant portion of their constituents.While the call to defund the police has certainly gained momentum, a new ABC News–Ipsos poll indicates that many aren’t convinced: Out of a random national sample of 686 adults, 64 percent said they oppose the movement, while 34 percent said they support such a move. Among black Americans, support nearly doubled: Fifty-seven percent said they support defunding. And although a handful of **elected officials around the country have vocalized their support of defunding the police — including representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, who said she’s actively advocating for a “reduction of our NYPD budget” —** most politicians are loath to support the measure. Joe Biden’s spokesperson recently said the presidential candidate “supports the urgent need for reform … so that officers can focus on the job of policing,” but not defunding. Even Bernie Sanders does not believe defunding is the answer; instead, he thinks departments should better educate, train, and pay officers. But this is a change that would take place on a citywide level, not a national one, and some mayors are already heeding their constituents’ demands to reconsider how much money they spend on policing. **In total, CityLab reports,**
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**lawmakers in at least 17 U.S. cities — including Minneapolis, Los Angeles, and New York City — have put forward proposals or pledges to divest from the police. Meanwhile, school boards in Minneapolis and Denver have voted to terminate their contracts with local police departments, and a growing list of other cities are similarly considering removing police from their schools**. As of now, the Minneapolis City Council has not released any specifics regarding its approach to defunding the city’s $193.3 million police budget, though some members have offered general ideas. “We can invest in cultural competency and mental health training, de-escalation and conflict resolution … We can resolve confusion over a $20 grocery transaction without drawing a weapon or pulling out handcuffs,” wrote Councilman Steve Fletcher in an op-ed for Time. “The whole world is watching. We can declare policing as we know it a thing of the past, and create a compassionate, non-violent future.”
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**Impact: Structural violence is the more important impact. It can lead to death and lower quality of life**

**Burtle 10** (Adam, a documentary filmmaker, humanist, and the United States Citizen Ambassador to the United Nations, 2010, structural violence <http://www.structuralviolence.org/structural-violence/>)/DD

**Structural violence refers to systematic ways in which social structures harm or otherwise disadvantage individuals**. Structural violence is subtle, often invisible, and often has no one specific person who can (or will) be held responsible (in contrast to behavioral violence). I also hold that **behavioral violence and structural violence can intertwine — some of the easiest examples of structural violence involve police, military, or other state powers committing violent acts; of course one can blame the individual soldier, but the factors that lead to a soldier killing a civilian are far more complex than that explanation would imply**. Let me quote Dr. Paul Farmer, **“Structural violence is one way of describing social arrangements that put individuals and populations in harm’s way… The arrangements are structural because they are embedded in the political and economic organization of our social world; they are violent because they cause injury to people … neither culture nor pure individual will is at fault; rather, historically given (and often economically driven) processes and forces conspire to constrain individual agency.** Structural violence is visited upon all those whose social status denies them access to the fruits of scientific and social progress.” Lots of good material has been written directly and indirectly on structural violence, most notably (in my opinion) by Dr. Farmer. I recently came across this 2001 article that does a great job briefly summarizing some forms of American structural violence. If you’re looking to dive right in to academic texts, I’d start with Pathologies of Power or Infections and Inequalities; structural violence is a central theme of both. These are reasonably academic works, however, so I think any reader should be aware of that. For an easier read that doesn’t specifically define structural violence (but contains lots of it), I would suggest (Dr. Farmer’s biography) Mountains Beyond Mountains by Pulitzer winner Tracy Kidder. In all of these books, structural violence is being viewed primarily through the lens of health. One can view it in many other ways, but my interests often focus on health. One key aspect of structural violence is that it is often hard to see. Even more difficult than identifying structural violence is assigning culpability. When a baby dies of malnutrition, or from a vaccine-preventable disease, who should we blame? **Structural violence may lead to death, but just as often it may manifest in the form of outcomes that are not as positive as they otherwise could or should be — Paul Kivel writes, “Over 20 years’ worth of studies show that people of color who arrive at a hospital while having a heart attack are significantly less likely to receive aspirin, beta-blocking drugs, clot-dissolving drugs, acute cardiac catheterization, angioplasty, or bypass surgery. Race, class, and gender clearly make a difference in how patients are diagnosed and treated.” Whether those patients die at that moment, damage has been done. The accumulated effects of structural violence on an individual will necessarily mean less health and shorter life.** Dr. Farmer frequently uses the phrase “constraint of agency,” and I believe this is a particularly apt description. To challenge the notion that structural violence must manifest in obvious forms, such as civilians killed by bombs, or infants that die from preventable diseases, let us consider the subtle effects of distributed harm visited upon a large population in a so-called advanced country. **One such study, in 2009, concluded that more than 60 million extra Americans would be alive — that is, 60 million Americans died prematurely — due to the shorter life expectancies visited upon those of us in the United States.** It may help some readers to first think about structural barriers or structural inequality, and then extend that concept to structural harm. **If a citizen cannot receive government services because she cannot read the language the forms are printed in, that’s a structural barrier. If an immigrant seeking asylum cannot renew his business license and loses his livelihood because he fell through the cracks in a state law, here we see more structural inequality. It is not hard to imagine how these sort of structural inequalities lead to harm. The harm may be difficult to see, but it’s still there.** **Consider that approximately 100,000 African Americans will die every year simply because they are black; if they received the same social advantages that whites do, they wouldn’t have died — death is about as violent as you can get. A more recent study found 291,000 deaths attributable (in the US, in the year 2000) to poverty and income inequality, two social conditions that are closely tied to structural violence.** When tens of thousands of farmers in Uganda are illegally dispossessed — their homes and plantations burned — by an international forestry company, here is a form of structural violence. And it stings all the more when the forestry firm closes down and lays off its 500 Ugandan workers. When a family mines the land informally,
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too mired in poverty to afford to move away, and a landslide crushes their house, maybe with a few relatives inside, that’s structural violence. **When a Peruvian shantytown burns, people lose what little they owned, some of them burn alive, from a fire started due to improvised and unventilated indoor cooking. And a local fire department doesn’t exist because this shantytown is decades away from infrastructure that much of the ‘developed’ world enjoys. That’s structural violence. Did the shantytown kill them? The lack of fire department? The improvised indoor cooking? The situation is complex, but the harm is there and it is structural violence.** The word “violence” rightly conveys the implication of the harm caused. Gunshot wounds (including suicides) kill about 30,000 Americans every year, and a substantial portion of our society would like to limit gun access, or even outlaw guns entirely, yet how loud are the voices against a violence that kills — in just one example above — at least three times as many Americans every year? This is why I think it’s important to speak of structural violence. The number of murders in the US amount to around 30 per day. The number of babies who die in their first year of life, what academics call “infant mortality”, amounts to a little more than double that. There are many political groups that campaign to reduce the murder rate within the US, yet I know of no group committed to reducing our infant mortality rate. Most of these infant deaths are from causes I would ascribe to structural violence. The infant mortality rate for black babies is double that of white babies. Does a black baby somehow “deserve” to die twice as much as a white baby? Obviously no baby should die. So why do black babies die at twice the rate of white babies, and why do all our infants die at a rate far higher than other developed nations? If you’d like to look at the basic data (for 2011), see page 32 here, or for more detailed data (on 2010) see Table 21 here (about 95% of the way to the end of the document). For me, the point of the term “structural violence” is to act as an umbrella to encapsulate many different forms of various social and institutional failings that have real, if not always immediately appreciable consequences in peoples’ lives. I hope the content of this site can help you to develop your own ideas on what is or is not structural violence, and what can be done to work for a more just and egalitarian world. If you’re curious who runs this site, here is a short page explaining who I am. My contact info is near the bottom.

**2NC/1NR Overview**

**Extend our Vitale 5/31 evidence that states the police reform fails. 5 years ago the Minneapolis police department did racial and bias training, banned warrior policing strategies, and required body cameras and none of those reforms were able to prevent the deaths of countless unarmed black people in their city.**

**Extend our link that the plan spends more money to implement police reform when in actuality the government needs to promote defunding the police.**

**Defunding the police is the only way we are going to solve structural violence, that is our Arnold evidence. If we defund the police and invest in mental health, housing, and economic resources we will no longer need the police to intervene in situations that they are in-equipped to handle and save countless lives. You should vote for the team that best solves for the root cause of the problem not the band-aid solution.**

**2NC/1NR Uniqueness Extensions**

**Uniqueness: Reforms have historically failed**

**Cheney-Rice 6/17** (Zak,Staff Writer at New York Magazine, 6/17/2020, Atlanta’s Reforms Won’t Save the Next Rayshard Brooks, https://nymag.com/intelligencer/2020/06/atlantas-reforms-wont-save-the-next-rayshard-brooks.html)/DD

**The killing of Rayshard Brooks on Friday prompted a rare admission from Atlanta’s mayor: The typical measures offered to curtail police violence — retraining officers and reforming departments — are failed experiments.** She then announced the city’s plan to implement several of those same measures as a solution. The past few weeks have provided many lessons. Whether they’re durable is proving to be another matter. Brooks, 27, was killed by Atlanta police after falling asleep in his car at a Wendy’s drive-through. Officer Garret Rolfe is seen in body-camera footage of the encounter asking Brooks to get out of the vehicle and subjecting him to a sobriety test; Brooks is polite and deferential throughout. When Brooks fails the test, Rolfe moves to handcuff him. A scuffle ensues — the details of how and why it began are unclear — and security footage from the eatery shows Brooks come away with Rolfe’s Taser and flee into the parking lot. As Brooks fires the Taser at Rolfe over his shoulder — wildly, missing badly — Rolfe deploys another Taser to little effect, then switches hands and draws a firearm. He fires three times. Brooks stumbles to the concrete with two bullets in his back. He died that night at a hospital. He is survived by his wife and four children. Protesters were already primed to respond — they’d spent weeks decrying the police killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis, whose death sparked nationwide protests and riots. In Atlanta, the early days of unrest were punctuated by the incineration of a police car and vandalism of the CNN Center. Nonviolent demonstrations have defined the weeks since, disrupted primarily by police, who’ve hemmed in peaceful crowds so they couldn’t disperse and assaulted dissidents without provocation; in one incident captured by local news crews, a group of police is seen surrounding a car in traffic, smashing its windows, and using Tasers against the two college students sitting inside. (Four officers have been fired in connection with the assault; six have been arrested.) Mayor Keisha Lance Bottoms has criticized both strains of misrule, condemning police violence while offering impassioned pleas for order, reserving her most scathing remarks for rioters. “We are all angry,” she said. “But what are you changing by tearing up a city? You’ve lost all credibility now. This is not how we change America.” The questions of who’s credible, and how we change America, have only grown more salient since. Demonstrations responding to Floyd were still underway when Brooks died, and the cycle repeated itself — more protests, including one action where dissidents blocked traffic across Interstate Highways 75 and 85, and the torching of the Wendy’s where the 27-year-old was shot. **The chaos was untenable for law-enforcement leadership; APD chief Erika Shields resigned, with Bottoms citing the need to repair frayed trust with Atlanta’s black communities, and was joined by eight other officers.** (Officer Rolfe — Brooks’s killer — has also been fired; Fulton County D.A. Paul Howard is weighing criminal charges against him.) **In remarks during a CNN town hall on Sunday, Mayor Bottoms noted that Rolfe had benefited from substantial investment of the sort long touted as critical for preventing police violence: He’d recently been trained in de-escalation tactics and took coursework in cultural awareness two months prior. Bottoms acknowledged the methods’ insufficiency. “We have implicit-bias training in this city,” she said. “We require people to go to the National Center for Civil and Human Rights … But yet and still, it’s not enough. I don’t think that we can out train our way as a country out of where we are and how we view race and how we interact with each other.** I think that while we are doing it in our police departments there is clearly a bigger conversation that has to be had across the country because we are not in a post-racial society and the biases are still there.” **These remarks aligned her, at least in principle, with proponents of police abolition; their analysis offers that policing can’t be reformed or retrained into gentility because its function is violence — specifically, violence toward preserving a kind of order to which black and poor people are considered fundamentally disruptive. The abolitionists’ solution is to pursue a world where policing is not reshaped or refined, but replaced altogether by massive investments in social welfare and new standards for addressing harm. This framework demands, among other items, shrinking the police’s purview, a pursuit articulated by the rallying cry, “Defund the police.”** It takes as affirmation years of reform efforts that have failed to meaningfully diminish police violence across the country, and done even less to alter its racial and class asymmetry. **Those years — most of which have fallen between the killing of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, in 2014 and today — have, among other lessons, demonstrated the folly of implicit-bias training. “We don’t have any evidence that anti-bias trainings work (in general), and we know even less about whether they work for police officers,” Joshua Correll, a University of Colorado professor who has been studying implicit bias for more than 20 years, told HuffPost last week. The same article cites a 2016 study showing that nine different methods for reducing bias had no effect beyond a few hours. The same ineffectuality has marked regulations intended to mitigate abuse. The famous example is Eric Garner’s death by chokehold in a city where police chokeholds had long been banned. The more immediate one is Floyd’s death in Minneapolis — a model of policing reform where, despite requirements that officers intervene to stop the vicious behavior of their colleagues, Derek Chauvin knelt on the handcuffed 46-year-old’s neck for almost nine minutes, while three of his fellow officers stood guard.** So it was that Monday brought Bottoms’s anticipated response to a string of problems that, by her own admission, included the failure of Rolfe’s de-escalation training and, by broader inference, the failure of reforms prompting officers to intervene when they see fellow police abusing the badge. From local WAGA: Bottoms said that the new rules will require officers [to] use de-escalation tactics prior to using physical or deadly force. All uses of deadly force must also be reported to the city’s citizens review board. Officers will also be required to intervene if they see another officer using force “which is beyond reasonable in the given services” and must immediately report that use of force to a supervisor. Alongside an administrative order “to convene a body to air grievances and propose solutions regarding police violence,” this is the extent of the city’s immediate response. “We understand that this is the beginning of a great deal of work that lies ahead of us to make sure that we do all we can do to protect our communities,” Bottoms acknowledged. “It is very clear our police officers should be guardians and not warriors within our communities.” But just as she was transparent about the extent of work yet required, offering tactics known to fail is its own form of transparency. The dissonance between admitting the impotence of certain methods and then pursuing them invites déjà vu. Moreover, nothing proposed here seems likely to have prevented Rayshard Brooks from being killed. The past several years have been a learning process in Atlanta. Black Lives Matter protests in 2016 drew withering condemnation from some of the city’s old guard — which is notable, given the dynamics at issue, for being among the nation’s blackest. The current mayoral administration rebuked the destructive methods used by some dissidents two weeks ago, only to demonstrate in the past week that their misrule was a prerequisite for city officials admitting that reformist approaches had failed, and that deeper change was required. We’ve come a ways since. But there seems to have been intentional ambiguity around what officials felt needed to be changed to begin with. If the goal was to stop racially disproportionate police violence, they knew precisely what didn’t work, and pursued it anyway. The lens through which this makes the most sense is that they wished to signal decisive action, but feared the ramifications of committing to anything that might materially challenge the notion of policing as a noble public safety institution. They’re not alone among American municipalities. And they might have bolder proposals forthcoming. But it’s an inauspicious start, the likely cost of which is inviting more fates like what met Rayshard Brooks.

**Police reforms have never worked**

**MP5150 No Date** (MPD150 is a participatory, horizontally-organized effort by local organizers, researchers, artists and activists. It is not the project of any organization. We stand on the shoulders of the work that many organizations have been doing for years and welcome the support of everyone who agrees with our approach. We hope that the process we are developing will help organizers in other cities to establish practical abolitionist strategies,The Successful Failure of Reform, <https://www.mpd150.com/the-successful-failure-of-reform/>)/DD

**When cases of police brutality, fabrication of evidence or corruption burst into public view they are inevitably followed by calls for police reform. The demanded changes sometimes produce temporary improvements, though more often, not. In any case are soon eroded, reversed or even turned into instruments of increased police power once the public outcry dies down. Here are the most common of these ill-fated efforts at accountability. Citizen Review Commissions.** What these bodies have in common is their lack of real power. They depend on police investigations, they are often required to include police officers and can only make recommendations to the police chief. What little authority they start out with is continually eroded by police push-back. Even when they recommend disciplinary action be taken, it rarely is. **Body and dash cameras** are potentially powerful tools for accountability. Therefore police departments have moved quickly to limit public access to the footage while permiting officers to view it before writing their reports. In the latest twist, departments are exploring the addition of face-recognition software to the cams – thus turning them into surveillance tools. **Residency requirements** – These measures force officers to live in the city they police. They can still choose segregated or isolated neighborhoods within that city, however. Such requirements are viewed with suspicion by other public workers who don’t want to face similar restrictions. **Better training** – Workshops and seminars on de-escalation, mental health responses and implicit racial bias can sometimes influence the perspective an a police officer here and there but are often met with resentment by cops who beleive they are already competent enough. The National Association of Police Organizations is fighting to block de-escalation training requirements, arguing that they are not needed and that they put officers lives in danger. **Hiring more African American and other officers of color.** Officers of color face pressure to leave white people alone and often end up focusing on dark and poor people because these cases dont get reversed by higher-ups or dismissed by prosecutors. This has actually led too increased racial profiling in some jurisdictions. At the same time, Black officers face racial discrimination within the department as well as retaliation for challenging police misconduct in their own communities. **Outside investigators**. A common demand is to have an outside agency investigate the local police . Investigations might be performed by a state agency, the FBI or the Justice Department. All these agencies tend to give a the benefit of the doubt to their fellow professionals so it is the rare case ends with punishment of an officer. Communities might also demand that a Grand Jury be empaneled to decide whether charges are warranted — or the reverse, that the prosecutor make the call instead. Jurisdictional and procedural demands such as these might affect some high profile cases but have no discernable effect on police behavior. Justice Department Consent Decrees. When a police or sheriff department faces a large number of brutality or corruption complaints it is sometimes placed under Justice Department supervision in what is called a Consent Decree. This is an agreement under which department procedures are examined and reformed data transparency rules imposed (until the Decree expires). There have been 68 of these in the last 20 years. Cities such as Cleveland, Miami and NY have been through the process more than once. The improvements that come from this process evaporate within a few years in the face of active resistance from all levels of the department. The Trump administration has taken the police view that the agreements are burdensone and unnecessary. **Community policing**. This police strategy is meant to get officers out of their cars so as to build relationships in the community. The community policing approach produces a one-way flow of information to the department and a cohort of community leaders prepared to “rebuild trust” after police incidents. Derived from counter-insurgency theory and spurred by the urban rebellions of the 1960s and 70s, community policing couples relationship-building with a greater reliance on tactical units, also known as SWAT teams. In place of thorough investigations the police act on tips from their sources, leading to door-busting, flash-bang raids which often produce tragic results. SWAT team raids increased 25-fold from 1980-2014, paralleling the spread of community policing. A resilient system. The police system has demonstrated a remarkable resilience. Local police and sheriff departments, regional fusion centers, police unions and professional associations, the FBI, ICE and the Department of Homeland Security are all parts of a networked system and shared culture that allows them to fend off attempts to impose accountability. **The failure of police reform is their most impressive success.**

**2NC/1NR Link Extensions**

**Link/Internal Link: The aff should focus on defunding not reform. Only defunding solves structural violence**

**Schuppe 6/10** (Jon, writes about crime, justice and related matters for NBC News, 6/10/2020, What would it mean to 'defund the police'? These cities offer ideas, https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/what-would-it-mean-defund-police-these-cities-offer-ideas-n1229266)/DD

https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/what-would-it-mean-defund-police-these-cities-offer-ideas-n1229266

**In 2017, when a shortage of inpatient psychiatric beds in Dallas was driving up the number of 911 calls, overwhelming emergency rooms and crowding jails with mentally ill people, the city decided to try something different. It put an officer, a paramedic and a social worker in every car responding to mental health calls in the city’s troubled south-central region, an attempt to get people the help they needed without an arrest or violent confrontation. The pilot program, RIGHT Care, led to a drop in arrests in the area. RIGHT Care is one of several programs across the country drawing the attention of activists seeking to end law enforcement's systemic abuse of black Americans. In the aftermath of George Floyd’s death at the hands of Minneapolis police last month, protesters in many cities have said they are fed up with trying to change police behavior and are instead advancing a more radical idea: to “defund the police” by cutting their budgets and offloading police functions to other municipal departments or community groups. Taken literally, calls to defund police departments conjure images of empty precinct stations and the proliferation of citizen patrols. But if the ideas behind the movement take hold, their implementation may look less like the Minneapolis City Council’s vote to disband its police department and instead resemble more moderate experiments already underway in cities and towns around the country. That includes projects like RIGHT Care that don’t reject police or seek to take away their entire budget but rather aim to decrease their role in situations that are not dangerous, while allowing medical and social services workers to take the lead. “There is no magic switch to turn off and boom there’s no police department,” said Alex Vitale, a sociology professor at Brooklyn College, whose 2017 book “The End of Policing” has become a manifesto for protesters and police-reform advocates. “People are trying to figure out what kind of society would be possible that doesn’t rely on police and prisons to solve its problems, and that’s a long-term political vision that is important to this movement. But if you look at what people are doing on the ground, it’s taking money for gang enforcement and spending it on after-school programs and youth counselors**. It’s about going to budget hearings and lobbying city council members and holding town hall meetings in neighborhood centers.”Image: Demonstrators call to defund the Minneapolis Police Department on June 6, 2020.**Demonstrators call for defunding the Minneapolis Police Department on June 6, 2020. That work, advocates say, could be better done by outreach workers, social workers and community workers trained to de-escalate street feuds. That could be paid for by diverting money from police budgets to municipal programs that deal with underlying causes of crime, including poverty, inadequate housing and poor education. “When we talk about defunding the police, what we're saying is invest in the resources that our communities need,” Black Lives Matter co-founder Alicia Garza told NBC News’** “Meet the Press.” **“So much of policing right now is generated and directed towards quality-of-life issues, homelessness, drug addiction, domestic violence. … But what we do need is increased funding for housing, we need increased funding for education, we need increased funding for quality of life of communities who are over-policed and over-surveilled.”** "Power To The Polls" Voter Registration Tour Launched In Las Vegas On 1st Anniversary Of Women's MarchBlack Lives Matter co-founder Alicia Garza speaks in Las Vegas in 2018. Some cities have responded with gestures of support. **New York Mayor Bill de Blasio has pledged to shift money from the NYPD budget to youth and social-services programs. Los Angeles Mayor Eric Garcetti has vowed to pull $150 million from the LAPD to boost funding for health care, jobs and “peace centers**” — which critics noted was a small drop in the department’s $1.8 billion budget. **Portland, Oregon, has agreed to pull police from public schools. Several Minneapolis institutions, including the public school district, the University of Minnesota and the Park and Recreation Board, have moved to curtail or end their contracts with city police.** Law enforcement officials have said cutting police budgets could cause a dangerous uptick in crime and police abuses. Attorney General William Barr has warned of “vigilantism” and “more killings.” President Donald Trump has threatened to use the movement against Democrats. Former Vice President Joe Biden, who is running against Trump, also came out against defunding police. And so the movement will likely remain a local issue, playing out in municipal budget battles and emulating programs like RIGHT Care in Dallas**. RIGHT Care was funded by a $3 million grant from a local foundation in response to the overwhelming demand of emergency mental health calls, not only on hospitals but also police. As in many departments around the country, officers in Dallas had come under scrutiny for using deadly force on black residents, including those suffering emotional breakdowns. David Brown, who served as police chief from 2010 to 2016, was criticized for saying the officers who shot a schizophrenic man holding a screwdriver in 2014 followed department rules. Brown later said publicly that police should not be responding to most mental health calls, which is part of the reason Dallas police agreed to become part of RIGHT Care. Since the program began in early 2018, arrests and ambulance calls for people experiencing mental health troubles have declined in the south-central region of Dallas where the program operates, which has freed up officers to deal with other calls, officials said.** Trump says Obama didn't reform policing — but he did. Then the president ditched it. Buffalo officials ask state to probe firing of Black officer who stopped white colleague's chokehold “Police involvement is still very important to this program,” said Kurtis Young, director of social work at Parkland Health and Hospital System, which provides social workers to the program. “It’s not taking away something or defunding police. It’s adding a service to the community.” Another example cited by advocates is Building Healthy Communities, a project in Salinas, California, where fatal shootings by police — including four in 2014 — frayed public trust and led to an array of internal reform efforts aimed at correcting deficiencies identified in a 2015 Justice Department review of the department. The police killing of a young mother in 2019 raised new protests. With that backdrop, **Building Healthy Communities has successfully fought an increase in school police officers in elementary schools and lobbies city leaders to prioritize social services and economic development over expanded police budgets.** Lead organizer Jesus Valenzuela said their work is similar in spirit to the “defund the police” movement, but they are careful not to use those words because they want to work with police and avoid being demonized by people who support law enforcement. “Our message is not explicitly ‘defund the police,’ but we do want money to come from the budget,” Valenzuela said. “The moment we say ‘defund the police,’ the reaction is to make us look like we are anti-police. We become part of the pro- and anti-police narrative.” In Milwaukee, where neighborhoods erupted in unrest following the fatal police shooting of a black man in 2016, police have also enacted a series of reforms regarding use of force. In addition, the city created an Office of Violence Prevention in 2008 and expanded it in 2016. The office is under the health department, where it uses public health strategies, rather than just police enforcement, to reduce shootings and other serious crimes. The office helped residents develop a “Blueprint for Peace” that outlines “community-driven solutions” to violence, including methods to interrupt conflicts and retaliatory gun attacks, increase investment in youth programs and improve health care, family resources and employment opportunities in vulnerable neighborhoods. That approach tries to correct imbalances in funding between those services and police operations, and is similar in spirit to the strategy advocated by defund the police proponents. But the Milwaukee plan is envisioned as complementing police work, not cutting it out. “We don’t look at this as an either/or proposition,” Reggie Moore, the office’s director, said. **Advocates have also pointed to a Eugene, Oregon, program that dispatches medics and crisis workers on calls for help that don’t necessarily require police, and the Health Alliance for Violence Intervention, a network of hospital-based programs that try to break cycles of violence by helping victims get better health care and social services. Even in Minneapolis, City Council members who voted to dismantle the police department said they will take an incremental approach. That will start with an effort to redirect funds from the police to other programs — including the city’s own violence-prevention office — that might become part of whatever the city’s new public safety system looks like, several council members said in an online panel hosted by The Appeal, a journalism website that focuses on criminal justice reform. “We’re talking about abolishing a failed police structure that doesn’t keep us safe,” Council Member Jeremiah Ellison said.** He also said that the replacement would include a system that responds to violent crime. David Kennedy, director of the National Network for Safe Communities at John Jay College of Criminal Justice in New York City, which works with police and community leaders to disrupt gun violence, said he’s watched the defund movement evolve from an “advocacy aspiration to political reality almost overnight.” The challenge, he added, was that “almost all of the details still need to be worked out.”

**Link: Cities are already defunding the police and are gaining momentum**

**Holder 6/9** (Sarah, is a writer for CityLab in San Francisco, focused on urban politics, housing, and work ,6/9/2020, The Cities Taking Up Calls to Defund the Police, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-06-09/the-cities-taking-up-calls-to-defund-the-police>)/DD

**On June 7, members of the Minneapolis city council announced something that just weeks ago might have seemed politically untenable: They would disband the Minneapolis Police Department entirely, and start over with a community-led public safety system. Though the mayor reaffirmed on Monday that he wouldn’t support the dissolution of the force, the council has secured a veto-proof majority.** “Our commitment is to do what’s necessary to keep every single member of our community safe and to tell the truth: that the Minneapolis Police are not doing that,” city councilmember Lisa Bender said at a rally. “Our commitment is to end our city’s toxic relationship with the Minneapolis Police Department, to end policing as we know it, and to recreate systems of public safety that actually keep us safe.” Although it’s unclear how the council plans to disband the police department, the move nonetheless marks a foundational shift in how many U.S. politicians talk about policing in the city — one that reflects the growing understanding that there’s something systemic wrong with the institution. No other city has gone as far as Minneapolis, where the killing of George Floyd sparked global protests. **The Minneapolis Parks Department, the University of Minnesota, some local museums and the public school system have already severed ties with the police department. The Racist History of Curfews in America But lawmakers in at least 16 other U.S. cities have proposed or made pledges that would divest some resources from the police. Several more have proposed taking police out of schools.** Many of the ideas are more incremental in their rhetoric than Minneapolis’s, calling instead for budget cuts or reductions in officer counts. Some are waiting to conduct firmer research or get more public input before making concrete plans. Even in Minneapolis, councilmembers haven’t yet laid out details about how their proposal would work, instead promising that they’d listen to locals before determining a path. **But already, in the weeks since Floyd’s death, communities have been heard — in the streets and online — sparking an acute focus on funding as a reform vehicle. “These ideas are not new, but what we are seeing today is the emergence of a groundswell of support for them from elected officials and — most importantly — from their communities and constituents across the country,”** says Sarah Johnson, the director of Local Progress, an alliance of local policymakers that advocate for progressive reforms. relates to The Cities Taking Up Calls to Defund the Police Marie Patino/CityLab As the role and pervasive power of the police has been questioned, so, too, have bloated budgets: **Even as crime has fallen across the country, police and public safety have consistently made up an average of 3.7% of state and local spending, a Bloomberg Businessweek analysis of Urban Institute data found. Since the 1970s, spending on police has nearly tripled, reaching $114.5 billion in 2017. By reducing the number of police deployed, de-militarizing them, and rethinking their role in prosecuting smaller offenses, advocates say cities could cut departments down to scale. With the money saved, cities could reallocate resources toward other public services — like schools, social workers and mental health professionals — and away from enforcement and incarceration.Reducing police budgets After peaceful protest in front of Mayor Eric Garcetti’s house and on the streets of Los Angeles, the city became one of the first where true police defunding will take hold. The mayor and the city council president plan to cut $100 to $150 million from the LAPD’s budget, and reinvest that, plus $100 million more, in black communities.** Activists were encouraged by the move, but it falls far short of what they’re seeking: a dramatic slashing of the $1.86 billion budget to represent just 6% of the city’s discretionary fund, rather than 53%. **In New York City, despite initial resistance, Mayor Bill de Blasio agreed to propose a July budget that includes cuts to the $6 billion police budget, paired with more investment in youth and social services, though he shared few details**. The city’s comptroller has urged him to reduce the budget by $1.1 billion, and councilmembers Carlos Menchaca and Brad Lander have made clear they won’t sign a budget that doesn’t “meaningfully” redirect funds from policing to coronavirus recovery and social services. **And in San Francisco, supervisor Shamann Walton has announced his own plans to redirect funding from the police to black communities like the one he represents.** Details there are scarce, too, but Walton has won the support of Mayor London Breed — who, in the past, has worked to increase police presence in the city. Rerouting funds to social services Where defunding efforts are still nascent, understanding the gaps between spending on social services and policing will be key to determining how much funding to redirect, policymakers say. In Chicago, for instance, the public dollars that go to supporting public health, family services, the department for people with disabilities, and libraries combined is about $1 billion, says Chicago alderman Rossana Rodriguez-Sanchez, who’s joined with the city’s progressive caucus to lead calls to defund the police. In contrast, the 13,000-member-strong police department’s budget has grown every year for the past eight years, reaching $1.78 billion in 2020; $153 million of the city’s budget is earmarked for police misconduct settlements. “You don’t need to be armed to direct traffic or lead a parade through a crowd. What kinds of jobs could we create in the city for unarmed safety officers?” “As we have created this austerity situation where poverty has increased and the gaps between the rich and the poor have increased, we’ve also created this really huge police department that has lots of military equipment and a lot of surveillance,” she said. “I don’t think it’s a coincidence.” Though she says more research needs to be done before the council identifies a target number for divestment, she says the city could start by getting Chicago police officers out of public schools, and halt plans to build a new $100 million police academy. (Mayor Lori Lightfoot has resisted calls to cut police funding in the past.Rodriguez-Sanchez says public support is growing for non-financial reforms, too, including a push to create a Civilian Police Accountability Council, which would introduce more public oversight over the police department. The ordinance is currently held up in the city’s public safety committee. “Imagine the kind of support services we can have if we divest resources from punishment to funding basic human needs,” she wrote on Twitter. Smaller cities have similarly disparate spending priorities. While more than 33.5% of St. Louis, Missouri’s general fund and 20% of its total city budget went to policing in 2019, only 2.3% of the city budget went to mental health according to an analysis by Local Progress. “We’ve continued to underfund social services and human services while putting upwards of 50% of our budget into policing and jails,” said Megan Ellyia Green, a St. Louis councilmember who worked with Durham Mayor Pro Tempore Jillian Johnson on an op-ed advocating for police divestment in January. A sales tax passed in 2017 to hire more police officers and give raises to existing ones has raised $50 million a year; Green says she wants the city to divert those funds into “violence interruptors, social workers and substance abuse counselors,” and ”to start to go after the root causes of crime in our city.” She’s also joining activists in calling on the city to close a medium-security jail nicknamed “the Workhouse,” where only about 100 primarily non-violent offenders are held, the vast majority of whom are awaiting trial but cannot afford bail**. Recent reforms have already shrunk the jail’s budget from $16 million to closer to $8 million**, but Green notes those funds could be saved if it was shuttered entirely. Incarcerated people could be transferred into St. Louis’ Justice Center, “but the goal should be to have the maximum amount of people not within our jails, and provide people with the supports they need to wait for their day in court at home,” she said. Reducing officer counts Where the cop-to-population ratio is especially high, lawmakers are emphasizing the need to shrink head counts. **Washington, D.C., for example, employs about 3,800 officers. That means the Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) has 55 officers per every 10,000 residents, a proportion that city councilmember David Grosso notes is double the national average.** In a proposed amendment to councilmember Charles Allen’s police reform bill — which would “find savings in MPD’s budget” — Grosso offered a plan to limit the number of sworn officers to 3,500, and to put a hiring freeze on the department if it exceeds that number. Two city councilmembers in Hartford, a city of 122,000 in Connecticut, have proposed what Local Progress believes to be “the largest percent reduction currently being proposed among cities with largest police-to-population ratio.” **The policymakers, Wildaliz Bermudez and Josh Michtom, are calling for a 25% cut of the police budget. That would translate into an estimated $9 million in savings cut from “areas within the department least likely to reduce violent crime and most likely to contribute to the criminalization of Black and Brown people.”** While **the national momentum is unprecedented**, city leaders like St. Louis Councilmember Green and Durham Mayor Pro Tempure Johnson, have been nudging reforms for years. **Last summer, Durham’s city council denied a $1.2 million proposal to fund 18 new police officers, instead raising wages for part-time government workers in a city where crime has consistently declined.** To determine future policing priorities, Durham created a community safety task force, charged with things like looking at how the city deals with crisis response and investigating alternatives to school policing. “The police chief and the sheriff have been strong advocates of broad reforms to the criminal legal system, but the questions around defunding or divesting obviously go further than reform,” she said. “We can make policing better, but policing is never going to be the right solution for certain problems.” Johnson is planning on analyzing the city’s 911 calls to gain more clarity on which could be fielded by community health workers or people trained in crisis intervention instead of law enforcement. **“If we could divert 20% of the calls that are currently being responded to by police to other agencies, that’s a huge difference,” she said. Redirecting resources doesn’t have to stop with 911, she added: “You don’t need to be armed to direct traffic or lead a parade through a crowd. What kinds of jobs could we create in the city for unarmed safety officers to be able to do that kind of work?”** Obstacles to reform Even where political will is growing, obstacles to passing legislation at the city level remain. Baltimore Mayor Bernard C. “Jack” Young’s proposed budget, which the council will vote on this week, is set to allocate more than $500 million to the police — more than three times the spending on “housing and community development, employment development, homeless services, recreation and parks, art and culture, health, and civil rights” combined, the Baltimore Fishbowl notes. Although a few city councilmembers in Baltimore have expressed support for police budget cuts, the city’s strong-mayor leadership means that even if the council votes to defund, it can’t decide where the money is reinvested. Leadership change may accelerate things: In an upset Monday, councilmember Bill Henry — a longtime advocate for diverting police funds into things like supporting youth — won Baltimore’s comptroller seat, giving him the power to audit city agencies. And the primary election for Baltimore mayor will mean new leadership at the top, too. Even in Minneapolis, it’s unclear what bold pledges to disband the police will or can mean in practice. Councilmembers haven’t yet taken a vote or elaborated on what a plan might look like and activists question whether eliminating the department is even a good idea without clear plans about what will replace it. Michelle Gross, president of the Minneapolis chapter of Communities United Against Police Brutality, told the Associated Press the promise was “just plain optics.” Getting police out of schools While policymakers work to reduce the number of police on the streets, public school systems like Minneapolis’s that have contracts with local departments or employ their own officers are taking similarly bold steps in their hallways. “We have such a dearth of funding in education and a lack of prioritization in education. **We can’t afford to waste money by paying police officers to come in and not just disrupt education, but really funnel kids away from the educational system and into the criminal system,” said Sylvia Torres-Guillén, the ACLU of California’s director of education equity. “Studies have shown that students are more likely not to graduate from high school if they are arrested. Every time law enforcement touches a student, they are more likely not to complete school.”Public schools in Rochester, New York, cut five out of 12 “school resource officers” — agents from the Rochester police department — from its budget in May, and the city is pushing to cut the rest. Contracts between police and Denver public schools may be phased out, too, as reforms gain the support of the majority of the school board members and the superintendent. And in Portland, the superintendent of public schools has decided to “discontinue” its use of school resource officers entirely,** heeding the demands of the city council’s lone black member, Jo Ann Hardesty, has been making since she took office in 2019. W**hen the final city budget vote is cast on June 10, Hardesty wrote in an op-ed that she “will be re-introducing a series of amendments to not only disband the three aforementioned Portland police specialty units, but to move that money out of the Portland police budget and into policing alternatives such as Portland Street Response.” “This is only the beginning,”** she wrote. The volume of messages from constituents supporting efforts to defund the police has never been higher, Green, Johnson, and Rodriguez-Sanchez told CityLab. “I think we’re finally getting to the point where we’re recognizing that policing does not equate [with] public safety,” said Green. “And that if we’re perpetually underfunding all these support services that can actually prevent crime, that’s actually causing us to have higher crime rates.” CORRECTION: This article has been updated to correct the spelling of Josh Mishtom’s name.

**2NC/1NR Impact Extensions**

#### **Prioritize systemic violence**

**Nixon 13—**Rachel Carson Professor of English and an affiliate of the Nelson Institute Center for Culture, History and Environment (Rob, “Book excerpt: Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor,” In Common, Fall/Winter 13, http://nelson.wisc.edu/news/in-common/fall-winter2013/story.php?s=1439&page=1)//JLE

When Lawrence Summers, then president of the World Bank, advocated that the bank develop a scheme to export rich nation garbage, toxic waste, and heavily polluting industries to Africa, he did so in the calm voice of global managerial reasoning. Such a scheme, Summers elaborated, would help correct an inefficient global imbalance in toxicity. Underlying his plan is an overlooked but crucial subsidiary benefit that he outlined: offloading rich-nation toxins onto the world’s poorest continent would help ease the growing pressure from rich-nation environmentalists who were campaigning against garbage dumps and industrial effluent that they condemned as health threats and found aesthetically offensive.Summers thus rationalized his poison-redistribution ethic as offering a double gain: it would benefit the United States and Europe economically, while helping appease the rising discontent of rich-nation environmentalists. Summers’ arguments assumed a direct link between aesthetically unsightly waste and Africa as an out-of-sight continent, a place remote from green activists’ terrain of concern. In Summers’ win-win scenario for the global North, the African recipients of his plan were triply discounted: discounted as political agents, discounted as long-term casualties of what I call in this book “slow violence,” and discounted as cultures possessing environmental practices and concerns of their own. I begin with Summers’ extraordinary proposal because it captures the strategic and representational challenges posed by slow violence as it impacts the environments and the environmentalism of the poor. **Three primary concerns animate this book, chief among them my conviction that we urgently need to rethink politically, imaginatively, and theoretically what I call “slow violence.” By slow violence I mean a violence that occurs gradually and out of sight, a violence of delayed destruction that is dispersed across time and space, an attritional violence that is typically not viewed as violence at all. Violence is customarily conceived as an event or action that is immediate in time, *explosive and spectacular in space, and as erupting into instant sensational visibility*. We need, I believe, to engage a different kind of violence, *a violence that is neither spectacular nor instantaneous*, but *rather incremental and accretive*, its calamitous repercussions playing out across a range of temporal scales. In so doing, we also need to engage the representational, narrative, and strategic challenges posed by the relative invisibility of slow violence. Climate change, the thawing cryosphere, toxic drift, biomagnification, deforestation, the radioactive aftermaths of wars, acidifying oceans, and a host of other slowly unfolding environmental catastrophes present formidable representational obstacles that can hinder our efforts to mobilize and act decisively. The long dyings—*the staggered and staggeringly discounted casualties*, both human and ecological that result from war’s toxic aftermaths or introduction climate change—are underrepresented in strategic planning as well as in human memory. Had Summers advocated invading Africa with weapons of mass destruction, his proposal would have fallen under conventional definitions of violence and been perceived as a military or even an imperial invasion. Advocating invading countries with mass forms of slow-motion toxicity, however, requires rethinking our accepted assumptions of violence to include slow violence. Such a rethinking requires that we complicate conventional assumptions about violence as a highly visible act that is newsworthy because it is event focused, time bound, and body bound. We need to account for how the temporal dispersion of slow violence affects the way we perceive and respond to a variety of social afflictions — from domestic abuse to posttraumatic stress and, in particular, environmental calamities. A major challenge is representational: how to devise arresting stories, images, and symbols adequate to the pervasive but elusive violence of delayed effects. Crucially, slow violence is often not just attritional but also exponential, operating as a major threat multiplier; it can fuel long-term, proliferating conflicts insituations where the conditions for sustaining life become increasingly but gradually degraded.**

**2AC Answers: Defund DA**

**Non-Unique: Police reforms work and spill over**

**Rummler 6/17** (Orion, is a general newsdesk and breaking news reporter at Axios, interested in AI and surveillance , 6/17/2020, The major police reforms that have been enacted since George Floyd's death, https://www.axios.com/police-reform-george-floyd-protest-2150b2dd-a6dc-4a0c-a1fb-62c2e999a03a.html)/DD

More than three weeks of protests across the U.S. following George Floyd's killing have put pressure on governments to scale back the use of force police officers can use on civilians and create new oversight for officer conduct.**Why it matters: Police reforms of this scale have not taken place in response to the Black Lives Matter movement since its inception in 2013, after George Zimmerman's acquittal for shooting Trayvon Martin, an unarmed black teenager.** **What's new: President Trump signed an executive order on Tuesday that incentivizes police departments to ban chokeholds in order to receive federal grants. The order also encourages police to work with mental health professionals in the field and moves to create a national registry for officers with a track record of excessive force. Catch up quick: Connecticut Gov. Ned Lamont signed an executive order on Monday to ban state police from using chokeholds, require that troopers wear body cameras and report all use of force on civilians, and prohibit the state's emergency services from buying military-grade equipment from the federal government**. Seattle City Council banned the use of tear gas and chokeholds by police on Monday night, per the Seattle Times. Seattle's Black Lives Matter chapter is suing the city's police alongside the ACLU, accusing officers of using chemical irritants on protesters a day after Mayor Jenny Durkan announced a 30-day ban on tear gas. **Durkan said Friday she'd issue an order mandating that officers turn on body cameras during protests**. Atlanta Mayor Keisha Lance Bottoms pledged Monday to sign administrative orders reforming the police following the death of Rayshard Brooks, a black man shot by police in the city last week. New York Police Department commissioner Dermot Shea announced Monday the NYPD would disband its plainclothes anti-crime unit. New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo (D) said Saturday police must work with communities to enact reforms by April 1, 2021 to be eligible for state funds. **Cuomo signed an executive order on the reforms Friday, along with legislation to ban police use of chokeholds and repeal a decades-old law that sealed records of alleged officer misconduct from the public**. The New York City Council announced its support Friday for cutting the NYPD budget by $1 billion next year after Mayor Bill De Blasio pledged to do so. Minnesota Gov. Tim Walz (D) endorsed proposed police reforms last Thursday including a ban on restraints and chokeholds, and state Attorney General Keith Ellison will have independent jurisdiction over the prosecution of police-involved deaths. A Hennepin County judge approved a deal last Tuesday between Minneapolis and the city's human rights department to ban police chokeholds and neck restraints, and require officers witnessing unauthorized force to intervene. A veto-proof majority of the Minneapolis City Council has signed a pledge earlier to replace the police department with a community-based public safety model. The Minneapolis Police Department said it would withdraw from its union contract last Wednesday. **The Phoenix Police Department said last Tuesday it wouldn't allow officers to use the "sleeper" hold, a few days after California Gov. Gavin Newsom directed state police to do the same. In California, the Berkeley City Council voted last Wednesday to prohibit the use of tear gas without setting an end date to the ban. Los Angeles County District Attorney Jackie Lacey announced last Tuesday her department's investigation bureau would stop using the carotid "sleeper" chokehold. San Francisco Mayor London Breed directed the city's police department to ban the use of tear gas, tanks and bayonets on unarmed civilians**. She's developing a plan to divert non-violent calls from police and to behavioral health professionals. **In Texas, Austin City Council unanimously voted last Thursday to limit police use of force** and reduce the department's 2021 budget, the Texas Tribune reports. **Houston Mayor Sylvester Turner signed an order last Wednesday to ban police use of neck restraints and chokeholds, "unless objectively necessary to prevent imminent serious bodily injury or death to the officer or others." He added officers couldn't kneel on a suspect's neck and body cameras must be used by those serving a no-knock warrant. Dallas police officers were ordered by the city's police chief earlier this month to intervene if another officer uses excessive force, NPR reports**. Iowa passed a reform bill last week specifying that chokeholds are only acceptable "when a person cannot be captured any other way" or if the officer "reasonably believes the person would use deadly force." **Louisville, Kentucky's Metro Council unanimously voted last Thursday to ban "no-knock" search warrants in the city. The Washington, D.C., Council passed 90-day legislation last Tuesday banning officers from using rubber bullets or chemical irritants on peaceful protesters, the Washington Post reports. The Broward County, Florida, Sheriff's Office said last Tuesday it would ban officers from using chokeholds unless "deadly force is justified" and prohibit officers from shooting at moving vehicles unless there are life threatening circumstances.** **Denver's police announced that its officers and SWAT unit would turn on body cameras during "tactical operations," and officers will need to report to a supervisor "if they intentionally point any firearm at a person." New Jersey's attorney general announced earlier this month his office would update its use-of-force policy for all police in New Jersey by the end of the year. The big picture: Allowing lawsuits, transparency into law enforcement disciplinary records and limiting use of force are all core aspects of police reform, experts and advocates say.**

**No Link: Trump just increased federal funding for police**

**Breuninger 6/16** (Kevin, works for CNBC**,** 6/16/2020, Trump signs executive order urging police reform, says cops need more funding,https://www.cnbc.com/2020/06/16/trump-signs-executive-order-urging-police-reform-says-cops-need-more-funding.html)/DD

With protesters around the country pressing their fight against police brutality and racism, **President Donald Trump on Tuesday signed an executive order aimed at tracking misconduct by law enforcers and creating incentives for departments to improve their practices. The president, during a speech in the White House Rose Garden that heaped praise on the police and took time to attack his political opponents, said that “law and order must be further restored nationwide, and your federal government is ready, willing, and able to help.”** The action from Trump, who has focused on the violence seen at some demonstrations and aggressively demanded “law and order” from state leaders, comes as lawmakers of both parties pursue proposals to reform law enforcement in the wake of George Floyd’s death in police custody. Trump lauded law enforcement officers at the event, saying that “the least we can do, because they deserve it so much, they have to get our gratitude and we have to give them great respect for what they do.” “In many cases local law enforcement is underfunded, understaffed and under [supported],” he added. Trump said he held a meeting shortly before the news conference with a number of families of people who have died in altercations with the police. “Your loved ones will not have died in vain,” he said. “We are one nation, we grieve together and we heal together.” U.S. President Donald Trump is applauded by law enforcement leaders surrounding him as he holds up an executive order on police reform after signing it during an event in the Rose Garden at the White House in Washington, June 16, 2020. U.S. President Donald Trump is applauded by law enforcement leaders surrounding him as he holds up an executive order on police reform after signing it during an event in the Rose Garden at the White House in Washington. **The Trump administration’s order rejects calls to “defund the police” that have gained traction from within the nationwide protest movement. “I strongly oppose the radical and dangerous efforts to defund, dismantle and dissolve our police departments,” Trump said in the Rose Garden. “Americans know the truth: Without police there is chaos, without law there is anarchy, and without safety there is catastrophe.”** But he added, “Though we may all come from different places and different backgrounds, we’re united by our desire to ensure peace and dignity and equality or all Americans.” Trump said before signing the order that it will ban the use of police chokeholds “except if the officer’s life is at risk.” But the text of the order is less specific: **The standards for certification, it says, require state and local policing outfits to ban the use of chokeholds “except in those situations where the use of deadly force is allowed by law.” Broadly speaking, the order aims to incentivize police departments to update their standards on training and credentialing by rewarding them with federal grant money opportunities. It also requires the attorney general to create a database to track individual cops on metrics such as excessive use-of-force complaints. That information would be shared between departments and would “regularly and periodically” be made publicly available, the order says.** The order would also give departments incentives to involve trained professionals, such as social workers, to respond to calls for certain nonviolent issues — including mental health, drug addiction and homelessness — rather than police alone. Here’s what else is in the order: **The attorney general has the authority to allocate money to state and local law enforcement agencies that are seeking credentials from an certified independent body that assesses their policies and practices; Those reviews would look at an agency’s training practices, including use-of-force and de-escalation techniques, along with performance management and community engagement efforts; The credentialing bodies must confirm that an “agency’s use-of-force policies prohibit the use of chokeholds — a physical maneuver that restricts an individual’s ability to breathe for the purposes of incapacitation — except in those situations where the use of deadly force is allowed by law”;** The attorney general must create a database to share between law enforcement agencies that documents “instances of excessive use of force related to law enforcement matters, accounting for applicable privacy and due process rights”; The database will also track officer firings, decertifications, criminal convictions for on-duty conduct and civil judgments against officers for “improper use of force”; The attorney general and the Health and Human Services secretary will find ways to train officers regarding “encounters with individuals suffering from impaired mental health, homelessness, and addiction” and advise agencies on developing “co-responder programs” in which non-police professionals show up to certain situations alongside cops; Within 90 days, the secretary of Health and Human Services will send a summary report to the president on community-support models addressing mental health, homelessness, and addiction; Administration officials must pitch proposals to Congress that includes “recommendations to enhance current grant programs to improve law enforcement practices and build community engagement”; The administration’s goal is to “bring police closer together with the communities,” a senior administration official said while describing the executive order in a press call Monday evening. “We’re not looking to defund the police; we’re looking to invest more and incentivize best practices.” The administration worked with numerous police groups, religious leaders and family organizations in crafting the order, according to senior administration officials. Senate Minority Leader Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., criticized Trump and his order in a statement following the signing ceremony. “While the president has finally acknowledged the need for policing reform, one modest executive order will not make up for his years of inflammatory rhetoric and policies designed to roll back the progress made in previous years,” Schumer said in the statement. **“Unfortunately, this executive order will not deliver the comprehensive meaningful change and accountability in our nation’s police departments that Americans are demanding,” Schumer said**. The president has not delivered a formal address on the protests or the issues of widespread police misconduct and structural racism alleged by activists. On social media, however, he has taken a bellicose stance against the rioting and looting that occurred at some protests following Floyd’s death on Memorial Day, pressuring governors and mayors to call in the National Guard to quell the unrest. Floyd, an unarmed Black man, died after a white officer in Minneapolis knelt on his neck for more than eight minutes. Floyd was suspected of passing a counterfeit $20 bill. The confrontation was captured on video. Trump’s popularity has fallen, polls show, amid criticism over his response to the demonstrations and his handling of the coronavirus pandemic. He faces reelection in November against presumptive Democratic nominee Joe Biden, who has widened his lead over Trump in most recent national polls. Trump said Monday that the fatal police shooting on Friday of another Black man — Rayshard Brooks in Atlanta – “was a terrible situation.” On Tuesday, Trump slammed Biden and former President Barack Obama over their records on police reform. They “never even tried to fix this,” Trump said, “because they had no idea how to do it.” In fact, an Obama administration task force issued dozens of recommendations for better policing after the 2014 shooting of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri. Lawmakers of both parties are currently working on passing their own legislative proposals to reform the police. Democrats unveiled a sweeping bill last week that would change “qualified immunity” rules for officers, making it easier for people whose constitutional rights were violated to recover damages.The White House has said that ending qualified immunity is a “non starter.” A senior administration official told reporters Monday evening that I don’t see anything that has that in there passing Congress any time soon.” Republicans picked Sen. Tim Scott, R-S.C., one of three Black members of the Senate, to lead a working group to develop reform measures of their own. Scott said on NBC’s “Meet the Press” on Sunday that he believes both parties will be able to find a path forward to pass a bill into law.

**No Internal Link Turn: Defunding and Reform can and should happen at the same time**

**Lopez 6/7** (Christy E., s a professor at Georgetown Law School and a co-director of the school’s Innovative Policing Program,

,June 7, 2020, Defund the police? Here’s what that really means,<https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/2020/06/07/defund-police-heres-what-that-really-means/>)/DD

**Since George Floyd’s death, a long-simmering movement for police abolition has become part of the national conversation, recast slightly as a call to “defund the police.”** For activists, this conversation is long overdue. But for casual observers, this new direction may seem a bit disorienting — or even alarming. **Be not afraid. “Defunding the police” is not as scary (or even as radical) as it sounds, and engaging on this topic is necessary if we are going to achieve the kind of public safety we need**. During my 25 years dedicated to police reform, including in places such as Ferguson, Mo., New Orleans and Chicago, it has become clear to me that “reform” is not enough. Making sure that police follow the rule of law is not enough. Even changing the laws is not enough. **To fix policing, we must first recognize how much we have come to over-rely on law enforcement. We turn to the police in situations where years of experience and common sense tell us that their involvement is unnecessary, and can make things worse. We ask police to take accident reports, respond to people who have overdosed and arrest, rather than cite, people who might have intentionally or not passed a counterfeit $20 bill.** We call police to roust homeless people from corners and doorsteps, resolve verbal squabbles between family members and strangers alike, and arrest children for behavior that once would have been handled as a school disciplinary issue. Demonstrators paint the words “defund the police” as they protest near the White House on Saturday. Demonstrators paint the words “defund the police” as they protest near the White House on Saturday. Police themselves often complain about having to “do too much,” including handling social problems for which they are ill-equipped. Some have been vocal about the need to decriminalize social problems and take police out of the equation. It is clear that we must reimagine the role they play in public safety. Defunding and abolition probably mean something different from what you are thinking. For most proponents, **“defunding the police” does not mean zeroing out budgets for public safety, and police abolition does not mean that police will disappear overnight — or perhaps ever. Defunding the police means shrinking the scope of police responsibilities and shifting most of what government does to keep us safe to entities that are better equipped to meet that need. It means investing more in mental-health care and housing, and expanding the use of community mediation and violence interruption programs.** Police abolition means reducing, with the vision of eventually eliminating, our reliance on policing to secure our public safety. It means recognizing that criminalizing addiction and poverty, making 10 million arrests per year and mass incarceration have not provided the public safety we want and never will. The “abolition” language is important because it reminds us that policing has been the primary vehicle for using violence to perpetuate the unjustified white control over the bodies and lives of black people that has been with us since slavery. That aspect of policing must be literally abolished. **Still, even as we try to shift resources from policing to programs that will better promote fairness and public safety, we must continue the work of police reform. We cannot stop regulating police conduct now because we hope someday to reduce or eliminate our reliance on policing. We must ban chokeholds and curb the use of no-knock warrants; we must train officers how to better respond to people in mental health crises, and we must teach officers to be guardians, not warriors, to intervene to prevent misconduct and to understand and appreciate the communities they serve. Why must we work on parallel tracks? First, all police will not be defunded or abolished anytime soon, and we cannot wait to make changes that will save lives and reduce policing harm now**. **Experienced advocates know this. This is why, for example, Campaign Zero just launched the #8cantwait campaign, which urges law enforcement agencies to immediately adopt eight use of force reforms, even as it continues its divest/invest strategy to end police killings. More fundamentally, we must continue with reforms because abolition doesn’t go far enough**. Policing didn’t invent America’s institutionalized racism, social inequity or stereotyped masculinity: Policing harms are a product of these broader pathologies. If we were to get rid of policing tomorrow, those pathologies would remain. And they would continue to be deadly: Race bias in our health-care system has likely killed far more African Americans and Latinx via covid-19 than the police have this year. Successful police reforms help us learn how to identify and mitigate the harms of these structural features, even as we work to remake them. In this moment, we have a chance to make not just policing, but our entire country, fairer and safer. We must think creatively and educate ourselves. We must ask hard questions and demand answers about public safety budgets. We should have unflinching debates about when, where and how to seek police reforms instead of defunding. But we should move forward on both tracks so that we can save lives even as we transform the police.

**Link Turn: Defunding the police will not work**

**Filler and Mueller 6/15** (Graham and Mike, State Rep. Graham Filler (R-DeWitt) represents residents of Clinton and Gratiot counties. A former assistant attorney general, he now chairs the House Judiciary Committee. State Rep. Mike Mueller (R-Linden) represents residents in parts of Genesee and Oakland counties. He is a retired sheriff’s deputy, 6/15/2020, Opinion: Defunding the police is not the answer, https://www.detroitnews.com/story/opinion/2020/06/16/opinion-defunding-police-not-answer/3190863001/)/DD

**While there’s no doubt the recent deaths of George Floyd, Breonna Taylor and others are horrific and wrong, they have played an important role in opening the eyes and ears of many to the inequalities people of color face every day. We clearly need to work on building better relationships between law enforcement officers throughout Michigan and the residents in our communities. That’s something we should all get behind. However, some local governments are taking the wrong steps to fix this important issue. The radical movement calling to defund local police departments that’s gaining momentum is a ridiculous idea that we must all reject. If our local communities follow through on these calls, it would only end up hurting many of the people who need protection most. That is far too high a price to pay for a political talking point or to appease some of the more radical protesters who have attempted to hijack this movement.** Our local leaders must do better. No matter what reforms we pursue, the simple truth is failing to provide resources to local police departments will put Michigan families at risk. **Criminals would have free reign, knowing that no one is going to respond if our families, friends or neighbors call for help. Far more crimes would go unsolved and justice would be denied with fewer investigators and resources on the job. And victims would be left alone with no one to turn to in the absolute worst moments of their lives. That’s not right.** The overwhelming majority of our local law enforcement officers are highly regarded and courageous people who we can rely on to protect our communities and come to the rescue of our loved ones in times of need. They answer the call to serve when a victim of sexual assault or domestic violence seeks help, when a local shop’s security alarms goes off in the middle of the night, and when you witness someone trying to burglarize unlocked cars in your neighborhood. Putting an end to that honorable profession would do a great disservice to our local communities. **Defunding local police departments would also crater communities that are already facing a tough economic situation during this pandemic. Without police protection, job providers would suffer and flee. Tourism would disappear.** Main Street would become a ghost town. No one should accept that outcome. **We absolutely believe the misconduct and bias demonstrated by some law enforcement officers highlights the need for reform. We are working on bipartisan plans right now to do just that and strengthen our public safety, raise the standard on police training and guarantee constitutional rights for everyone. But efforts to defund or abolish local police departments are not the answer. George Floyd’s murder was senseless and shocking. Like all Americans who have seen the footage of his death, we are sickened by the actions of the officer involved and the silence of the officers who looked on. We should all feel compelled to speak out against this injustice and fight for reforms. The actions we take now are going to shape our future, and we truly believe we can have change without disbanding an essential part of our society. That’s why we must focus on making real reforms to improve the system instead of promoting the dangerous political rhetoric of defunding our local police departments.** We will fight to ensure police departments throughout Michigan have adequate funding to both protect our communities and provide training to ensure officers are well equipped to peaceably de-escalate situations and improve community relations. We urge our local public officials to do the same.