**Background**

White Supremacy is an ideology that believes that white people are genetically superior to people of other races and, as a result of their superiority, should be dominant over them. This racist theory of demographics and power has inspired many political organizations across the world, most notably the German National Socialist German Worker’s (Nazi) Party (Hitler).

Not all white supremacy is publicly declared. The United States has a long history of institutional white supremacy. In early American history, colonial elites elevated white laborers over blacks to prevent their overthrow by a united working class and imported African slaves with linguistic and cultural barriers to encourage the divide. Channeling white supremacist ideology, the elites told the poorest white laborers that it could be worse, they could be black, and to trust them. This continued in the early United States with the institution of slavery in the South (and racism and paternalism in the North). After the civil war, Jim Crow laws were an institutional expression of white supremacy, and non-governmental groups arose to help enforce this racial hierarchy, most famously the Ku Klux Klan (KKK).

The KKK was initially recruited from the ranks of former Confederate soldiers who were upset about losing the Civil War and angry about feeling “replaced” in society and power by former slaves. The KKK used mob violence to attack and scare black communities to not challenge the racial hierarchy, lynching, killing, and beating thousands of people. The organization has risen and fallen over the years, but remains a potent force dedicated to white supremacy today.

**Ideology:**

White supremacists create a twisted historical narrative about how things “were” (and how they should be again), often with pseudo Christian mythologies, glorification of the “Lost Cause” of the Confederacy in the civil war, and other heavily edited historical references. They weave together many patriarchal beliefs about masculinity and the historical role of white men as the “head of household,” the primary financial provider, and holder of political and military power. The existence and success of other groups threaten that position and are the enemy. Common assertions include that there is a conspiracy by Jews and others to control the global political, media and financial systems, the current Q conspiracies based around Donald Trump, and that inter-racial relationships “pollute” the purity of the white race.

The fear of “being replaced” is central to modern white supremacy, whether that is by immigrants, African Americans, the LGBTQ community, Jews, Catholics, or other religious minorities, (basically anyone who isn’t a white, protestant, straight male). Globalization and progressing social norms have left some white (mostly) men feeling left behind or left out as they are no-longer competitive in economic or social relations. Searching for answers and angry at the world, they become easy recruits to join white supremacist organizations. White supremacists recruit new followers by explaining this sense of loss through “replacement” by other groups that can be a focal point for hatred and frustration. Many white supremacists have purchased large numbers of guns and other weapons to make themselves feel more masculine, compensating for the loss of their traditional gender role as “protectors.”

While white supremacy has many structural expressions, others seek more direct confrontation to provoke racial conflict. Many white supremacists recognize that they don’t have the political or military might to implement their goals right now, but they could soon through “accelerationism,” and co-option of the conservative movement. This theory discusses how to polarize and radicalize populations by making them feel vulnerable due to unrelated crisis, such as the COVID pandemic or the protests against police brutality occurring today.

**Modern White Supremacy:**

White Supremacy didn’t go away with the abolition of slavery or Jim Crow laws, it merely became less public. White supremacy shifted focus from armed mobs to policymaking, building systemic barriers to social and economic progress for minority groups. Politicians make veiled references to “law and order,” often a dog-whistle reference that they’d use law enforcement against minority communities, and use techniques like “redlining” certain neighborhoods to hold back economic progress and social mobility. Scholar Michelle Alexander details how the mass incarceration system and the “war on drugs” are the next generation of white supremacist government policy, designed to be implemented primarily on black and brown populations to maintain the status quo racial hierarchy. Combined with non-governmental groups committed to racial violence, white supremacy is a many-faced hydra that will take structural changes to dismantle.

The election of Barack Obama in 2008, the nation’s first black president, rising immigration, and other factors kicked off a renewed growth in non-governmental white supremacist groups interested in direct action against minority groups. New organizations have emerged, such as the “Proud Boys” and the Atomwaffen to engage the next generation of white supremacists, and pseudo intellectuals like Richard Spencer have sought to add substance and justification to the movement.

President Trump’s campaign embraced much of the language of white supremacy, discussing the invasion of immigrants, foreign “rapists and murderers”, and “Making America Great Again” allows white supremacists to project that “America” is a white nation under siege. This language has legitimized direct action by individuals and organizations and removed some of the social taboos against open racism. Hate crimes and white nationalist violence have exploded since his election, most publicly at the “Unite the Right” march in Charlottesville, Virginia, where thousands of white supremacists engaged in direct combat with and drove a car into counter-protestors. These groups have multiplied, recruited new members digitally, carrying out attacks like the mass shooting in El Paso, and are collaborating more with international organizations with similar ideologies.

Attempts by law enforcement to shift their focus from “Islamic” terrorism towards domestic threats from white supremacy have been met with resistance from conservative lawmakers as attempts to police free expression and censor political speech.

Law enforcement has a troubling history enforcing white supremacist norms, frequently shooting black men who aren’t armed at the slightest “provocation,” while public white supremacist and mass murderer Dylan Roof was taken alive and bought a burger after a mass shooting at a church in South Carolina. When white anti-government militiamen took over a park ranger station, they were be-sieged and negotiated with, while black gangs are frequently met with overwhelming force.

**Strategy Sheet**

Most of the affirmatives on this topic are designed to take a “leftist” approach to shrinking the federal government’s law enforcement capabilities. This isn’t one of those affs.

This case is designed to identify some of the worst elements of society who commit lots of heinous racist crimes and to identify the outer (legal) limits of pressure that law enforcement can put on white supremacists, arrest them, and remove them from society. This affirmative is not designed to be a nuanced, precise instrument. and then to advocate for doing so. This means using the power of the state to fight racially motivated terrorists, a theoretically popular position.

Strategically, this has several implications:

* Link-Turn DAs: Most disadvantages will be built around harms to reducing the capacity of law enforcement. They won’t link to this affirmative, and the Aff can likely link-turn these disadvantages.
* Impact Turn Kritiks: Most Kritiks will be some form of criticism of state power as inherently bad. By focusing on the worst elements of society and using government as an agent for good against blatant, violent racists, the aff will present the greatest possible contrast and a great example of why biopower/state action might sometimes be good.

The affirmative is designed to be flexible depending on what sort of negative positions the other team is likely to use:

* Terrorism Scenario and Bio-Weapons Scenario: Useful straight up offense that adds up large body counts that the aff can prevent
* Gridlock: A tool to leverage against off-case positions like politics and counterplans
* Epistemology/Racism: Structural violence impacts that can be used in a wide array of situations. This area can be fleshed out to confront a broader swath of white supremacy.
* Framing Contention: Designed to help the aff against the K

White supremacy is a monolithic challenge, impacting most facets of society. We won’t be able to solve all of white supremacy through this advocacy (or any other single action), but we can solve some of the active violence and terrorism sponsored by white supremacists, the worst manifestations of white supremacy.

The main questions in this debate are:

On Case:

* Is a police/militarized response necessary, or at least part of the solution?
* Can the police, often accused of racial bias themselves, effectively respond?

 Off Case:

* Previous attempts to call out alt-right extremists or white supremacists (by many other names) has resulted in significant political backlash by conservatives who might agree with some of the motives but not the methods of their violent counterparts.
* Can the power of the state be used for good, and if so, this is likely one of the easiest examples to support state action to police its population.
* Can the use of police powers be contained to just targeting white supremacy?
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# 1AC

**Inherency: The Trump administration is giving white supremacists a free pass, especially after Charlottesville and El Paso, gutting specific programs designed to reduce radicalization**

**Reitman, Reporter, 2018**

Jane, New York Times, 11/3, US law enforcement failed to see the threat of white nationalism. Now they don’t know how to stop it. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/03/magazine/FBI-charlottesville-white-nationalism-far-right.html>

**In the months following Donald Trump’s inauguration, security analysts noted with increasing alarm what seemed to be a systematic erosion of the Department of Homeland Security’s analytic and operational capabilities with regard to countering violent extremism. It began with the appointment of a new national-security team. Like their counterparts now running immigration policy, the team came from the fringe of conservative politics,** some of them with connections to Islamophobic think tanks and organizations like ACT for America or the Center for Security Policy, whose founder, Frank Gaffney, was Washington’s most prominent peddler of anti-Muslim conspiracy theories. In addition to Gaffney, whose biased and statistically flawed data on the “Muslim threat” became the premise for Trump’s so-called Muslim ban, there were other ideological fellow travelers like Sebastian and Katharine Gorka, the husband-and-wife national-security team. Sebastian Gorka became a senior White House adviser, and Katharine Gorka became a senior adviser to the Department of Homeland Security. During the transition, Sebastian Gorka predicted the demise of “C.V.E.,” which he suggested was a fuzzy, politically correct approach to a problem — terrorism — that needed a better fix. Shortly afterward, Katharine Gorka, who once criticized the Obama administration for “allowing Islamists to dictate national-security policy,” made it clear, Nate Snyder recalls, that she didn’t like the phrase “countering violent extremism.” From now on, the mission would be focused on “radical Islamic terrorism,” the White House’s go-to phrase, which, as Sebastian Gorka later explained, was intended to “jettison the political correctness of the last eight years.” **A surreal scene, replicated in nearly every department and agency, soon began to play out** inside the Department of Homeland Security. George Selim, a longtime national-security expert in both the Bush and Obama administrations who headed the Office of Community Partnerships, which worked with local government and civic groups on C.V.E. efforts, noted that as the months passed, “it was clear that **there were fewer and fewer of the career civil servants at the table for critical policy decisions.”** Some political appointees seemed to have virtually no experience with the issues they had been tapped to advise on. Katharine Gorka, as her own LinkedIn biography notes, had never held a public-sector job before joining the department, nor did she seem to have any practical experience in national security, or law enforcement, or intelligence. Another new senior Homeland Security official, the retired Navy officer Frank Wuco, had made a career of lecturing to the military about the jihadi mind-set, often while role-playing as a member of the Taliban in a Pashtun hat and kaffiyeh. “That’s who was trying to tell me he understands the threat,” an official said dryly. By February 2017, after the Trump administration issued its first executive order trying to ban citizens of Muslim-majority countries from entering the United States, several American Muslim groups decided to reject federal C.V.E. grant money they were awarded under the Obama administration out of concern over the new administration’s framing of the issue. That March, **the White House froze the $10 million the previous administration had allotted for the grants**, pending review. While that review was underway, the Department of Homeland Security and the F.B.I. issued a joint intelligence bulletin, dated May 10, warning that white supremacists might pose “a threat of lethal violence” over the next year. The report, which some analysts said reflected a fraction of the actual numbers, said that white supremacists “were responsible for 49 homicides in 26 attacks from 2000 to 2016 . . . more than any other domestic extremist movement.” At the end of June, the Department of Homeland Security withheld grant money from several previously approved applicants whose focus was on studying extremists’ online networks and helping both white supremacists and Muslim extremists leave their movements. Though the total budget for C.V.E. was minuscule given the department’s overall grant budget, **rejecting those programs nonetheless produced “a real chilling effect,”** as one policy analyst recalls.

**And this is manifesting in specific policy changes enabling white supremacy**

**Rosand, Brookings Institution 2019**

Eric, Director, The Prevention Project, Organizing against Violent Extremism, May 26th, Responding to the Rise in Domestic Terrorism, Don’t Forget Prevention. <https://www.lawfareblog.com/responding-rise-domestic-terrorism-dont-forget-prevention>

As has been [well documented](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/national-security/dhs-won-t-answer-questions-about-staff-funding-office-fight-n997821), the **Trump administration cut federal resources for preventing extremist violence, including not renewing the one-time $10 million local grants program and significantly downsizing the relevant DHS office.** More broadly, **the Trump administration, despite the rhetoric on “domestic terrorism” in its 2018 counterterrorism strategy, ignored a congressional** [**request**](https://www.congress.gov/115/plaws/publ91/PLAW-115publ91.pdf) **to produce a strategy for countering violent extremism** both **at home** and abroad.

**This is manifesting in new organizations and more lone wolves, all of which is being under-covered by the media.**

**Reitman, Reporter, 2018**

Jane, New York Times, 11/3, US law enforcement failed to see the threat of white nationalism. Now they don’t know how to stop it. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/03/magazine/FBI-charlottesville-white-nationalism-far-right.html>

**Johnson’s 2009 report proved prescient.** In February 2011, the Southern Poverty Law Center said that in the previous year, **the number of domestic hate groups in the United States had reached more than 1,000 for the first time. The antigovernment Patriot movement gained 300 new groups** over the same time period, **a jump of over 60 percent. Every sphere of the far right was being energized at the same time. There was also an uptick in so-called lone wolves,** who held extremist views but associated with no specific organization. In May 2010, a year after Johnson’s report was released, a father and son from Ohio, members of a little-known antigovernment movement called “sovereign citizens,” shot and killed two police officers during a traffic stop in West Memphis, Ark. It was **the 12th attack or foiled plot by white-extremist “lone wolves” since 2009, almost all of which received little publicity.**

**Advantage One: Accelerationist Violence**

**White Nationalist Terrorism is a huge threat, recruitment is up, its manifesto has gone**

**viral and its being supported by Russian bots online.**

**VandeHei and Fischer 2019**

Jim and Sara, August 6th, Axios, The Era of White Nationalism,

<https://www.axios.com/white-nationalism-mass-shootings-el-paso-gun-violence-9348350c-98c8-4258-b70e-c6d990bb7614.html>

**White nationalism** — a racist extremism that was confined to the ugly fringes for most of our lives — **is a growing major danger in America.** The big picture: **Racial resentment and anxiety have been a central appeal for Donald Trump and his rhetoric** among the working-class, forgotten Americans who put him over the top, and who are at the core of his re-election strategy. **The appeal to** [**alienated young men**](https://www.chicagotribune.com/columns/clarence-page/ct-perspec-page-new-zealand-shooting-christian-picciolini-brenton-tarrant-0320-20190319-story.html)**, combined with the country's gun culture, creates a leading incubator of the mass shootings now plaguing the country.** In the past 18 months, white-extremist active shooters in the U.S. have been responsible for 65 deaths in seven episodes. [(NY Times)](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/08/04/us/white-extremist-active-shooter.html) Both parties are calling out the ideology after the El Paso massacre by an Anglo who complained online of a "Hispanic invasion": George P. Bush, a Hispanic Republican who is Texas land commissioner and the grandson and nephew of former presidents, [warned](https://twitter.com/georgepbush/status/1157832430067310592) this weekend of "white terrorism here in the U.S." **The FBI says homegrown violent extremists are now a top concern — "a persistent, pervasive threat,"** director Christopher Wray [called it](https://www.cnn.com/2019/04/04/politics/fbi-director-wray-white-supremacy/index.html) in April. Two weeks ago, Wray said the bureau had made 100 arrests for domestic terrorism in the past 9 months, with [many](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/wray-says-fbi-has-recorded-about-100-domestic-terrorism-arrests-in-fiscal-2019-and-most-investigations-involve-white-supremacy/2019/07/23/600d49a6-aca1-11e9-bc5c-e73b603e7f38_story.html) tied to white supremacy. The data: "Right-wing extremists killed more people in 2018 than in any year since 1995, the year of Timothy McVeigh’s bomb attack on the Oklahoma City federal building, according to the Anti-Defamation League," per the [NY Times](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/08/05/us/politics/domestic-terrorism-shootings.html). The reality: 2019 is worse. We're seeing all this unfold before our eyes on social media. **"The Great Replacement,"** a white-nationalist conspiracy theory cited by the El Paso suspect, **has gone viral on fringe platforms.** The suspect's online manifesto spread widely, despite efforts to contain it: An analysis by the social-media intelligence firm [Storyful](https://storyful.com/) found the manifesto was shared hundreds of times on Facebook and Twitter. Storyful found that white nationalists drove a substantial amount of online conversation during last week's Democratic debate. Sen. Kamala Harris [has been the target](https://www.wsj.com/articles/bots-pushed-divisive-content-misinformation-on-race-during-debates-11564678048) of right-wing nationalist conversation online, largely due to her background and race. **Russian bots have long been fueling the white nationalist movement in the U.S.** Foreign actors [have used](https://www.newsy.com/stories/pro-russian-bots-are-helping-the-white-nationalist-movement/) race **to sow divisions** in the wake of mass shootings and debates around race, including [Charlottesville](https://slate.com/technology/2017/08/russian-bots-are-sharing-extreme-right-wing-information-on-twitter-after-charlottesville.html) and [NFL kneeling](https://www.thedailybeast.com/how-russia-exploits-american-white-supremacy-over-and-over-again).

**And White supremacy in the U.S. is the lynchpin of global white supremacy and alt-right movements that are spawning violent trans-nationalism**

**Jipsin and Becker, University of Dayton, 2018**

Art and Paul, Professors, White Nationalism, born in the US, is now a global terror threat

<https://theconversation.com/white-nationalism-born-in-the-usa-is-now-a-global-terror-threat-113825>

In researching our upcoming book on [extremism](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13600860054872?journalCode=cirl20) – our joint area of [academic expertise](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/248957128_A_timeline_of_the_racialist_movement_in_the_United_States_A_teaching_tool) – we found that **hate crimes have risen alongside the global spread of white nationalism. Racist attacks on** [**refugees, immigrants, Muslims and Jews**](http://hatecrime.osce.org/2017-data) **are increasing worldwide at an alarming rate.** Scholars studying **the internationalization of hate crimes call this dangerous phenomenon “**[**violent transnationalism**](https://www.manchesteropenhive.com/abstract/9781526137579/9781526137579.xml)**.”** In Europe, white violence appears to have been [triggered](https://theconversation.com/perspectives-on-migrants-distorted-by-politics-of-prejudice-65550) by the sudden increase, in 2015, of refugees fleeing war in Syria and elsewhere in the Middle East. Ultra-nationalists across the continent – including [politicians](https://theconversation.com/how-viktor-orban-degraded-hungarys-weak-democracy-109046) at the [highest rungs of power](https://theconversation.com/the-fate-of-europe-will-depend-on-the-winner-of-the-french-presidential-election-76566) – used the influx as [evidence](https://dailystormer.name/tag/syrian-refugees/) of the imminent “[cultural genocide](https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2019/04/adam-serwer-madison-grant-white-nationalism/583258/)” of white people.

White nationalism is a US export **This disturbing international trend, in its modern incarnation, was born in the United States.** Since the 1970s, a small, vocal cadre of American white supremacists have sought to [export their ideology of hate](https://books.google.com/books/about/Cyber_Racism.html?id=co1NmAEACAAJ). Avowed racists like [Ku Klux Klan wizard David Duke](https://www.salon.com/2018/08/10/david-duke-showers-praise-on-fox-news-star-laura-ingraham-after-her-racist-rant-about-immigrants/), Aryan Nations founder [Richard Butler](http://www.historycommons.org/entity.jsp?entity=aryan_nations_1) and extremist author [William Pierce](https://nationalvanguard.org/2018/09/our-cause-by-dr-william-l-pierce/) believe the white race is [under attack worldwide](https://psmag.com/social-justice/how-the-pittsburgh-massacre-fits-into-americas-long-history-of-anti-semitism) by a cultural invasion of immigrants and people of color. The United States is diversifying, but it remains [77 percent white](https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045217). White supremacists, however, have long contended that the country’s [demographic changes](https://www.vox.com/science-and-health/2017/1/26/14340542/white-fear-trump-psychology-minority-majority) will [lead to an extermination of the white race and culture](https://archive.org/details/CPM_DSCI_Archives_Wickstrom). The “[alt-right](https://ifstudies.org/blog/the-demography-of-the-alt-right)” – an umbrella term describing modern online white supremacist movement – uses the same language. And it has expanded this 20th-century xenophobic worldview to portray refugees, Muslims and progressives as a threat, too. Alt-right leaders like Richard Spencer, [extremist Jared Taylor](https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/individual/jared-taylor) and the Neo-Nazi Daily Stormer editor [Andrew Anglin](https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2017/12/the-making-of-an-american-nazi/544119/) also [use social media](https://books.google.com/books/about/Cyber_Racism.html?id=co1NmAEACAAJ) to [share their ideology and recruit members](https://www.businessinsider.com/the-internet-has-become-a-fertile-landscape-for-extremism-2017-8) across borders. They have found [a global audience](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2001.00467.x) of white supremacists who, in turn, have also [used the internet](https://scholar.google.com/scholar_url?url=https://academic.oup.com/sf/article-abstract/84/2/759/2235330&hl=en&sa=T&oi=gsb&ct=res&cd=0&d=12178608111472026617&ei=r8yPXPLEC467ywSGqY-gAQ&scisig=AAGBfm2RkVOl4hcscwktIFzqkgxyVzEk7w) to share their ideas, encourage violence and [broadcast their hate crimes worldwide](https://www.npr.org/2019/03/19/704690054/facebook-admits-mosque-shooting-video-was-viewed-at-least-4-000-times). “The hatred that led to violence in Pittsburgh and Charlottesville is finding new adherents around the world,” [Jonathan Greenblatt](https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2019/03/15/new-zealand-christchurch-mosque-shootings-linked-u-s-racism/3175272002/) of the Anti-Defamation League, a civil liberties watchdog, told USA Today after the New Zealand attack. “Indeed, it appears that this attack was not just focused on New Zealand; it was intended to have a global impact.”

Rising racist violence We know **the alleged New Zealand mosque shooter’s hatred of Muslims was inspired by American white nationalism** – he [said so on Twitter](https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2019/03/15/facebook-youtube-twitter-amplified-video-christchurch-mosque-shooting/?utm_term=.7f1a54fde757).

**Scenario One: Terrorism**

**White supremacist terrorism is an immediate danger, using similar strategies to jihadi terrorism. A lack of law enforcement tools and resources is key**

**Blazakis et al 2019**

Jason, William Morrison, Middlebury University, Janet Byrne, Colin Clarke, Mollie Saltskog, Meredith Stricker, Emerita Torres, Mohamed El Shawesh, Stephanie Foggett, Adkadiusz Legiec, Soufan Center, September, White Supremacy Extremism

<https://thesoufancenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Report-by-The-Soufan-Center-White-Supremacy-Extremism-The-Transnational-Rise-of-The-Violent-White-Supremacist-Movement.pdf#page=56&zoom=100,96,296>

From Pittsburgh to Poway and Charleston to El Paso, **white supremacist extremists** (WSEs) **pose a clear terrorist threat to the United States.** And while extremist groups operating on American soil are often labeled or categorized as domestic terrorist organizations, this report will demonstrate that **they maintain links to transnational networks of like-minded organizations** and individuals, from Australia, Canada, Russia, South Africa, and elsewhere.1 **The danger of terrorism is growing in the United States,** just as it is elsewhere in the world, **with white supremacist extremists strengthening transnational networks and even imitating the tactics, techniques, and procedures of groups like al-Qaeda and the Islamic State** (IS). **These networks share approaches to recruitment, financing, and propaganda, with Ukraine emerging as a hub in the broader network of transnational white supremacy extremism**, attracting foreign recruits from all over the world. Where jihadis travel to fight in places like Syria, white supremacists now have their own theater in which to learn combat—Ukraine, where the conflict between pro-Russian separatists and Ukrainian government forces has been raging since 2014, attracting fighters from around the globe who are fighting on both sides. Recent research shows that around 17,000 foreigners from 50 countries, including the United States, have gone to fight in that conflict.2 Muslim foreign fighters flocked to Afghanistan in the 1980s, the Balkans in the 1990s, Iraq after the 2003 U.S. invasion, and Syria following the start of the civil war in 2011. While fighters espousing white supremacist beliefs have traveled to Ukraine, others have joined for a variety of reasons, much like their jihadi counterparts. Nonetheless, many fighters, particularly from Western countries, have taken advantage of the conflict in Ukraine to expand the global white supremacy extremist movement. Moreover, those that traveled to Ukraine for adventure, nationalism, or sheer boredom, may eventually become radicalized and grow more interested in white supremacist ideology over time. This demonstrates that the WSE movement has transnational roots and global connections, and is growing in both frequency and strength. Today, **white supremacist terrorism is responsible for more deaths on U.S. soil than jihadist terrorism** since 9/11. The Anti-Defamation League reports that over the past decade, white 3 supremacy extremists were responsible for three times as many deaths in the United States as were Islamists. In 2018, white supremacy extremists were connected to 50 murders, including 11 individuals killed at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, and were responsible for more killings last year than at any point since 1995, the year Timothy McVeigh bombed the Alfred P. Murrah Federal building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.4 In May 2019, a senior FBI official testified to Congress that the bureau is pursuing about 850 domestic terrorism investigations, a “significant majority” of which are related to white supremacist extremists.5 By nearly every metric, **white supremacy extremism has become one of the single most dangerous terrorist threats facing the United States,** if not the single most dangerous. Yet despite this, and despite numerous public overtures by intelligence and law 6 enforcement officials pleading for more help in countering this threat, **“there is a significant disparity in the amount of funds, personnel, and law-enforcement tools that America devotes to combating Islamist versus white nationalist terrorism.”**

**Specifically, accelerationist white supremacists are seeking to poison the water supply, derail trains, spread COVID, and spark a broader conflict**

**MacFarquhar and Goldman, Reporters 2020**

Neil and Adam, New York Times, Jan 22nd, A New Face of White Supremacy: Plots expose danger of the Base,

<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/22/us/white-supremacy-the-base.html>

**The plans were** as sweeping as they were **chilling: “Derail some trains, kill some people, and poison some water supplies.**” **It was the blunt, bloody prescription for sparking a race war** by a member of the Base, a white supremacist group that has come under intense scrutiny amid a series of stunning recent arrests. Federal agents, who had secretly recorded those remarks in a bugged apartment during a domestic terrorism investigation, pounced on seven members of the group last week in advance of a [rally on Monday by gun rights advocates in Richmond, Va](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/20/us/virginia-gun-rally.html). Three members of one cell in Maryland affiliated with the group [plotted attacks at the rally](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/01/16/us/fbi-arrest-virginia-gun-rally.html), **hoping to ignite wider violence** that would lead to the creation of a white ethno-state, law enforcement officials said. The “defendants did more than talk,” Robert K. Hur, the United States attorney for Maryland, said after a detention hearing on Wednesday in federal court in Greenbelt, Md. “They took steps to act and act violently on their racist views.”

The details that emerged in court and in documents from active cases in three other states — Georgia, Wisconsin and New Jersey — unveiled a disturbing new face of white supremacy.

The Base illustrates what law enforcement officials and extremism experts describe as an expanding threat, particularly from adherents who cluster in small cells organized under the auspices of a larger group that spreads violent ideology. **“We have a significant increase in racially motivated violent extremism in the United States** and, I think, **a growing increase in white nationalism and white supremacy extremist movements**,” Jay Tabb, the head of national security for the F.B.I., said at an event in Washington last week. Experts who have studied the Base say it seems to have followed the model of Al Qaeda and other violent Islamic groups in **working to radicalize independent cells or even lone wolves who would be inspired to plot their own attacks. They describe the Base as an “accelerationist” organization, seeking to speed the collapse of the country** and give rise to a state of its own in the Pacific Northwest by killing minorities, particularly African-Americans and Jews.

**White Supremacists seek to take advantage of (and increase) social unrest so they can step into the void. Aggressive response is necessary from law enforcement to stop them**

**Byman, Brookings Institution 2020**

Daniel, June 2nd, 2020, Riots, White Supremacy, and Accelerationism, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2020/06/02/riots-white-supremacy-and-accelerationism/?utm_campaign=Brookings%20Brief&utm_medium=email&utm_content=89020243&utm_source=hs_email>

**Accelerationism relies on a spiral of violence, and law enforcement must redouble efforts to ensure that white supremacists do not fan the flames. This involves increased efforts to disrupt white supremacist networks, monitor their activities to the extent the law allows, and ensure that resources and legal authorities are sufficient to confront the danger. It also requires educating law enforcement officers about white supremacist groups** and making sure that the public is aware that white supremacist violence will not be tolerated—an important step toward reassuring communities that see Floyd’s death as yet another sign that the police cannot be trusted. The task, however, goes beyond law enforcement. **For accelerationism to succeed, traditional politics must fail. Dialogue, compromise, and steady (if often too slow) progress are its enemies.** Part of the answer is political leadership at the top, but it’s not enough (nor realistic) to expect the current president to try to bring Americans together. Local leaders, civic organizations and ordinary **citizens must reject extreme answers and recognize that although the parts of the system need to change, it does not need to be rejected completely. Such steps, both local and national, can choke out the flames that fan accelerationism.**

**Scenario Two: Bio-Weapons:**

**And white supremacists are weaponizing coronavirus into a bio-weapon and using people’s fears over the virus to recruit and spread racist hate**

**Spitalnick, Reporter, 2020**

Amy, New York Daily News, April 6th, Another virus on the loose: Coronavirus and white supremacy make a terribly toxic combination

<https://www.nydailynews.com/opinion/ny-oped-about-that-other-virus-on-the-loose-20200406-5lqhqlb72jaalbefmuqdzuyw4e-story.html>

The other week, a neo-Nazi in Missouri [allegedly planned](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/fbi-says-man-killed-missouri-wanted-bomb-hospital-amid-coronavirus-n1169166) to car-bomb a hospital that’s treating coronavirus patients. Just days before, **white supremacists** [used social media](https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/coronavirus-terrorist-white-supremacy-fbi-bioterrorism-a9417296.html) to **discuss turning the virus into a bioweapon,** trading thoughts on targeting Jews, law enforcement and others through bodily fluids and other personal contact. Meanwhile, anti-Semitic conspiracy theories related to the virus are running rampant on far-right social media, while anti-Asian attacks skyrocket. **White supremacist terrorism was already a dire threat to our communities and national security. During this pandemic, the threat posed by these extremists is even more pronounced.** This week, there’s finally a glimmer of hope: The federal government took an important step forward, [designating](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/04/06/us/politics/terrorist-label-white-supremacy-Russian-Imperial-Movement.html) a white supremacist group based in Russia as a terrorist organization. But this is just one of many much-needed changes to how we approach the threat of white supremacy — a threat made all the more urgent by this pandemic. It's no surprise that a crisis like this would be exploited by the most hateful and cynical among us; that’s been the case since the beginning of mankind. But **the tools and tactics of the 21st century create unique risks.** **Right now, people are scared and angry, and looking for a scapegoat. So when these white supremacists take to the internet to spread their hate and violence, they can find an alarmingly receptive audience — especially at a time when many susceptible to these messages are at home, sitting online, scrolling through social media.** The risk, then, is not simply the original white supremacists’ propensity for violence, but also the willingness of their loyal followers to try to turn their violent ideas into action.

**Scientific advancements make bio-weapons more dangerous and lowers the threshold to use them. Bioweapons could even target specific races for genocidal violence**

**Charlet, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2018**

Katherine, Director of Carnegie’s Technology and International Affairs Program, Foreign Affairs, April 17th, The New Killer Pathogens: Countering the coming bio-weapons threat, <https://carnegieendowment.org/2018/04/17/new-killer-pathogens-countering-coming-bioweapons-threat-pub-76009>

**Gene-editing techniques** such as CRISPR **could make biological weapons more deadly.** Nations could develop novel or **modified pathogens that would spread more quickly, infect more people, cause more severe sickness, or resist treatment more fully.** Equipment needed for wide-area dispersal may become less necessary, for example, if a pathogen can be engineered to spread faster on its own. Whether that potential is tantalizing enough to convince countries to revitalize or initiate biological weapons programs is uncertain. These kinds of modifications have long been possible, just harder, using traditional genetic engineering techniques. But there are worrying signs that some leaders sense a new opportunity. In 2012, for example, Russian President Vladimir Putin intimated to his defense minister that he should plan to develop weapons based on new principles, including genetics. Another concern is that gene editing may make it easier to carry out targeted assassinations. Conceivably, a government might edit the genes of a deadly virus so that it would affect only a single target based on his or her genetic code. This capability does not yet exist, but it might become possible with time and effort. Nonetheless, as the biosecurity expert Gigi Gronvall has noted, given the prevalence of far easier methods of assassination, states may decide that developing and testing such a weapon is not worth the time, effort, and cost. **A related fear is that advances in gene editing could allow scientists to develop biological weapons capable of discriminating among target populations based on ethnic, racial, or other genetically defined characteristics.** According to Gronvall, these so-called ethnic weapons would be tricky to design and test, and any target population would likely have considerable overlap with nontarget populations. Still, the world is only in the early stages of the biotechnology revolution, and biological weapons have been used in ethnic and racial conflicts before. In the 1970s, for example, Rhodesia’s intelligence agency introduced cholera into wells in areas held by black nationalist guerillas. And in 1981, the apartheid government of South Africa launched Project Coast, which is believed to have looked into biological means to assassinate opponents. According to some accounts, researchers with Project Coast also discussed plans to selectively administer an antifertility vaccine to black women. These examples give reason to monitor the threat of targeted biological weapons. Some observers argue that gene editing could make it easier to develop or use biological weapons clandestinely, thus reducing the risk of international disapprobation. But maintaining a secret biological weapons program has never been particularly difficult. The equipment and agents required also have legitimate uses, and the challenges of international oversight mean that the odds of getting caught are low. It is unlikely that new technologies would change this in any fundamental way. Concerns that gene editing will make biological weapons so cheap that countries reassess their strategic value are also overstated. CRISPR does make gene editing less expensive; in 2014, a scientist at Vanderbilt University noted that an activity that used to take 18 months and cost about $20,000 took only three weeks and cost about $3,000. The expense can only have fallen in the years since this estimate was made. But biological weapons are already cheaper than alternatives such as nuclear weapons. And although gene editing lowers the cost of developing a deadly pathogen, it does little to reduce the price tag on the many other steps involved, such as weaponization, manufacturing, and delivery. Considering all of this, one particular concern emerges. **The combined factors of lower cost, easier access, and greater effectiveness mi**ght not be enough to sway major powers, but they **may incentivize rogue an**d small states **to reconsider the marginal utility of investing in biological weapons.** As a result, any strategy to address the risk of genetically edited biological weapons must take into account a broad range of state types, not just the major powers. Still, it’s important to put the threat in perspective: geneediting advancements need not change the basic calculus to the extent that some fear.

**Scenario Three: Gridlock:**

**White Supremacy causes political gridlock and polarization, poisoning our democracy and empowering a whole array of racist policy changes. Labelling white supremacists as terrorists carries normative weight and discourages associated ideologies**

**Byman, Brookings, 2017**

Daniel, Senior Fellow, Oct 3rd, Should we treat domestic terrorists the way we treat ISIS? <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/should-we-treat-domestic-terrorists-the-way-we-treat-isis-what-works-and-what-doesnt/>

What about the political impact of domestic terrorism? We often evoke the days after September 11 as a time of national unity in the face of horror. But **left- and especially right-wing violence is driving us apart.** On the left, the killing is minimal, but **images of** Antifa and other **violence is used to bolster the perception that Trump’s opponents are extreme and committed to stopping legitimate speech and protest. The impact is far greater on the right because of the scope and scale of the violence. Rightwing violence is usually in the name of a cause—racism,** anti-abortion, gun rights, opposition to migrants, and so on—**that at least some Americans support, even if the more mainstream groups vehemently reject violence.** Over 15 percent of Americans believe that [abortion should be illegal in all cases](http://www.pewforum.org/fact-sheet/public-opinion-on-abortion/), for example. But very few have ever taken up arms in support of that cause. In 2016 polls, meanwhile, [most white people](https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2016/07/21/white-people-think-racism-is-getting-worse-against-whitepeople/?utm_term=.1b73c77c85da) believed that anti-white bias was a bigger problem than anti-black bias, despite outcomes for white Americans exceeding those of black Americans on almost every metric. **Violent white supremacists thus poke at bigger political wounds than do jihadists, with many Americans sympathizing for the cause but rejecting the killing.** That problem is compounded by the fact that Americans are much more comfortable calling some types of political violence “terrorism” than others because **the terrorism label carries normative weight. It suggests that both the person’s actions and cause is beyond the pale. The definitions and laws above are all about actions, not the ideology behind it, but most non-experts lump the two together.** As terrorism analyst Brian Jenkins observed many years ago, **“terrorism is what the bad guys do.”**

**Advantage Two: Epistemology**

**White supremacist epistemology is a socio-political system of domination that is the root cause of normalized oppressive hierarchies**

**Seawright, University of Utah 2014**

Gardner, Educational Studies, November, Settler Traditions of Place: Making explicit the epistemological legacy of White Supremacy and Settler Colonialism for Place Based Education,

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280213813_Settler_Traditions_of_Place_Making_Explicit_the_Epistemological_Legacy_of_White_Supremacy_and_Settler_Colonialism_for_Place-Based_Education>

Charles Mills (1998) suggests that **white supremacy can be seen as a sociopolitical system, and a “particular mode of domination, with its special norms for allocating benefits and burdens, rights and duties;** its own ideology; and an internal, at least semi-autonomous logic that influences law, culture, and consciousness,” and as a conception that “encompasses de facto as well as de jure white privilege and refers more broadly to the European domination of the planet that has left us with the racialized distributions of economic, political, and cultural power that we have today” (98). **Central to this white supremacy is a particular conception of the rational social actor** who is driven toward ownership and the domination of nature, subsequently including a unique understanding of personhood in relation to “nature.” Mills explains the parameters of Western society’s rational social actor in his discussions of the operative herrenvolk ethic. The herrenvolk, or **master race ethic, is part of the epistemic package associated with white supremacy,** which facilitates the “cognitive and moral economy psychically required for conquest, colonization, and enslavement” (Mills 1997, 18). To properly situate this ethic, the social epistemology that serves as its foundation must be briefly explained. The **white social epistemology is part of a social contract dictating the norms and regulations at the foundation of dominant society.** In the case of the United States, **the social contract is infused with intersecting forms of domination and social control (patriarchy, white supremacy, heteronormativity, human supremacy, citizenship and civility;** Mills 1997; Pateman 1988; Pateman and Mills 2007). The social contract in question contains within it **the social technologies for the epistemic normalization of socially constructed hierarchies, as well as the impetus for dominant society to reinvest, reproduce, and valorize the status quo. Put simply, the social contract endeavors to teach people how to be oppressors and how to be the oppressed.**

**White Supremacy legitimizes discrimination**

**Matias and Newlove 2017**

Cheryl and Peter, Better the devil you see, than the one you don’t: bearing witness to emboldened en-whitening epistemology in the Trump era, International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 30:10, 920-928

[**http://www.thecyberhood.net/documents/papers/MN.pdf**](http://www.thecyberhood.net/documents/papers/MN.pdf)

In the 2016 US presidential campaigns, US society witnessed how presidential nominee, Donald J. **Trump, capitalized off Whiteness rhetoric as a means to rally those individuals who already harbored deep-rooted prejudice;** hence the public endorsement of White supremacist groups such as leaders from the Ku Klux Klan. **By self-aggrandizing and perversely pre-packaging Whiteness as an ideology that has been discriminated against or victimized by diversity or political correctness, Trump offered racists a way of justifying discrimination toward women, People of Color, immigrants, and Muslim Americans. In this emboldened en/whitening moment, hate speech by White supremacists are wrongly considered free speech, Whiteness incorrectly presents itself as in need of civil protection,** and willfully ignorant, ahistorical #alternativefacts reign supreme over historical reality. All of which sadly resembles the fascism behind Nazism.

**White supremacy dehumanizes non-white bodies**

**Seawright, University of Utah 2014**

Gardner, Educational Studies, November, Settler Traditions of Place: Making explicit the epistemological legacy of White Supremacy and Settler Colonialism for Place Based Education,

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280213813_Settler_Traditions_of_Place_Making_Explicit_the_Epistemological_Legacy_of_White_Supremacy_and_Settler_Colonialism_for_Place-Based_Education>

**This myth** maintenance **facilitates the continued valorization of white bodies and white actions and the dehumanization of bodies marked as non-white.** **Integral to the maintenance of white supremacy is the permanence of these justificatory systems of knowledge production that not only create valorizing narratives for racial hierarchies, and human exploitation, but ecological exploitation as well.** This myth maintenance also continues the rampant exploitation of non-human animals. Martusewicz et al. (2011) explain in EcoJustice Education that “[r]acism rests on, and depends upon anthropocentrism” (158).

**Thus the Plan:** The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its policing, sentencing, and use of forensic science to undermine and deconstruct white supremacy, including the following:

1. Dramatically expand the focus, funding, and personnel dedicated to policing white supremacy;
2. Create a domestic terrorism statute that exclusively applies to white supremacy motivated violence, including a material support clause;
3. Increase the investigative and surveillance authority exclusively on white supremacist organizations;
4. Counter-Radicalization and screening for the police;
5. Build partnerships between the police, educational, and public health groups to reduce white nationalist radicalism, similar to best practices to combat radicalization by ISIS.

**Designating White Supremacists as terrorists unlocks resources and manpower, expands the legal tookit, discourages private sector cooperation**

**Byman, Brookings, 2017**

Daniel, Senior Fellow, Oct 3rd, Should we treat domestic terrorists the way we treat ISIS? <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/should-we-treat-domestic-terrorists-the-way-we-treat-isis-what-works-and-what-doesnt/>

It is all well and good to label left- and right-wing violence at home as terrorism, but **what if the U.S. government went beyond rhetoric and truly treated these groups as it treats Americans suspected of being involved with jihadist organizations like ISIS? The differences would be profound. Not only would the resources that law enforcement devotes to nonjihadist groups soar, but so too would the means of countering those groups. The legal toolkit would grow dramatically.** **Perhaps as important would be the indirect effects: banks, Internet companies, and other organizations vital to any group’s success would shy away from anything smacking of domestic terrorism.** **Nonviolent groups that share some of the radicals’ agenda would also face pressure, and many would feel compelled to change,** often in ways that go against U.S. ideals of free speech and free assembly. Taken to its logical conclusion, this thought experiment makes clear that treating domestic extremism just like foreign terrorism would be a mistake, but **moving a bit in that direction would be desirable. Federal law enforcement in the United States should have the legal authority to take on more responsibility for addressing domestic terrorism.** However, given the power of many terrorism-related laws and the political connotations, the terrorism label should be used sparingly, and the new authorities should be tightly defined and monitored. Independent of greater federal legal authority, **the resources allocated to countering domestic terrorism in general and right-wing violence in particular should increase given the danger these groups pose. Counterterrorism and law enforcement officials should also focus on the violent elements** within radical groups, using the law to move them away from the line that separates legitimate (if deplorable) protest and violence.

**And we should implement a material support clause, increase resources, and intelligence sharing**

**Rosand, Brookings Institution 2019**

Eric, Director, The Prevention Project, Organizing against Violent Extremism, May 26th, Responding to the Rise in Domestic Terrorism, Don’t Forget Prevention. <https://www.lawfareblog.com/responding-rise-domestic-terrorism-dont-forget-prevention>

The response to recent **right-wing violence has emphasized the need for tougher laws,** with [some](https://www.lawfareblog.com/road-map-congress-address-domestic-terrorism) commentators **urging Congress to adopt a domestic terrorism statute that includes the “material support” clause that exists for international terrorism. This would allow law enforcement to intervene at early stages of attack planning and plotting.** Some [experts](https://www.lawfareblog.com/american-terrorists-why-current-laws-are-inadequate-violent-extremists-home) have argued that a list of domestic terrorist groups should be created, modeled, where appropriate, on the one the Department of State maintains for foreign terrorist organizations. There have also been repeated calls, including by congressional leaders, for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) **to increase their data collection and analytic capabilities on this issue and for more** [**intelligence sharing**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/can-we-forget-politics-and-just-focus-on-keeping-people-safe/2019/05/03/d6cfe574-6d24-11e9-8f44-e8d8bb1df986_story.html?utm_term=.2fc29f47ba66) **on right-wing threats** with other countries. [**Ensuring**](https://homelandprepnews.com/stories/33138-legislation-would-work-to-prevent-domestic-terrorism/) **federal law-enforcement agencies have the resources and tools needed to prioritize the investigation and prosecution of domestic terrorist has also received attention.**

**Plan is a huge reversal by Trump which will cripple the movement and cause infighting**

**Carroll 2016**

Rory, The Guardian, December 27th, Alt-right' groups will 'revolt' if Trump shuns white supremacy, leaders say <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/dec/27/alt-right-donald-trump-white-supremacy-backlash>

**Activists who recently gave Nazi salutes** and shouted “hail Trump” at a gathering in Washington **will revolt if the new US president fails to meet their expectations,** the leaders told the Guardian. **The prospect of such disillusion and internecine squabbling may console liberals who fear a White House tinged with racism and quasi-fascism.** The analysis is all the more reassuring because it comes from far-right influencers and analysts, not wishful progressives. **Instead of enjoying proximity to power, according to this analysis, vocal parts of the loose coalition known as the “alt-right” could remain on the political fringe,** wondering what happened to their triumph. “Their hearts are bigger than their brains,” said Mark Weber, who runs the [Institute for Historical Review](http://www.ihr.org/), an organisation dedicated to exposing “Jewish-Zionist” power. “Saying they want to be the intellectual head of the Trump presidency is delusional.” Jared Taylor, a white supremacist who runs the self-termed “race-realist” magazine [American Renaissance](http://www.amren.com/), said the president-elect had already backpedalled on several pledges that had fired up the far-right. “At first he promised to send back every illegal immigrant. Now he is waffling on that.” [David Cole](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/may/03/david-stein-cole-holocaust-revisionist), a self-proclaimed Holocaust revisionist and [Taki magazine columnist](http://takimag.com/contributor/davidcole/328#axzz4Tb5UnSTk), envisaged the movement sliding into bickering and in-fighting, stuck in “rabbit warrens” of online trolling rather than policy shaping. “In January Trump will start governing and will have to make compromises. **Even small ones will trigger squabbles between the ‘alt-right’.** ‘Trump betrayed us.’ ‘No, you’re betraying us for saying Trump betrayed us.’ And so on. **The alt-right’s appearance of influence will diminish more and more as they start to fight amongst themselves.**” In an email interview Peter Brimelow, founder of the webzine [Vdare.com](http://www.vdare.com/), which alleges Mexican plots to remake the US, said Trump’s failure to deliver “important bones” could trigger a backlash. “I think **the right of the right is absolutely prepared to revolt. It’s what they do.”**

**The plan enables material support policing, deterring membership and capacity and ensuring oversight**

**McCord and Blazakis, Professors, 2019**

Mary, Georgetown University Law School, and Jason, Middlebury College, Feb 27th, A Road Map for Congress to Address Domestic Terrorism, <https://www.lawfareblog.com/road-map-congress-address-domestic-terrorism>

**Congress should also introduce and pass legislation creating a domestic terrorism offense**. Draft legislation could be the catalyst for the hearings recommended above. Based roughly on current [18 U.S.C. § 2332b](https://casetext.com/statute/united-states-code/title-18-crimes-and-criminal-procedure/part-i-crimes/chapter-113b-terrorism/section-2332b-acts-of-terrorism-transcending-national-boundaries), **the statute could make it a federal criminal offense to kill, kidnap, maim, commit an assault resulting in serious bodily injury or an assault with a dangerous weapon, or destroy property causing significant risk of serious bodily injury, when done with one of the intents included in the current** [**federal definition**](https://casetext.com/statute/united-states-code/title-18-crimes-and-criminal-procedure/part-i-crimes/chapter-113b-terrorism/section-2331-definitions) **of domestic terrorism:** (1) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population, (2) to influence the policy of government by intimidation or coercion, or (3) to affect the conduct of a government. The statute should apply to attempts and conspiracies too. **Enacting a federal crime of domestic terrorism would place it on the same moral plane as international terrorism,** as one of us [has written](https://www.lawfareblog.com/criminal-law-should-treat-domestic-terrorism-moral-equivalent-international-terrorism) [before](https://www.lawfareblog.com/its-time-congress-make-domestic-terrorism-federal-crime). **It would also bring with it more resources (the FBI would, after all, be responsible for investigating domestic terrorism and enforcing the statute) and better data (especially if paired with mandatory reporting requirements).** But it could do more than that, as the case of Hasson demonstrates. **If domestic terrorism were made a federal crime,** it could be one of the predicate crimes listed in [18 U.S.C. § 2339A](https://casetext.com/statute/united-states-code/title-18-crimes-and-criminal-procedure/part-i-crimes/chapter-113b-terrorism/section-2339a-providing-material-support-to-terrorists): “Providing material support to terrorists.” That statute criminalizes providing material support or resources “or conceal[ing] or disguis[ing] the nature, location, source, or ownership of material support or resources, knowing or intending that they are to be used in preparation for or in carrying out” any one of a list of terrorism offenses. With domestic terrorism added to this list, Hasson’s stockpiling of weapons and other equipment with intent to use them to commit the crime of domestic terrorism would fall within the scope of this statute, and would itself constitute providing material support to terrorists. **Making domestic terrorism an offense that people and organizations are prohibited from materially supporting avoids constitutional and other concerns that would be raised if the government were to designate domestic organizations as terrorist organizations,** the way it does for foreign terrorist organizations (FTOs). Under a separate statute, the designation of an organization as an FTO means that providing material support or resources (defined to include tangible or intangible property or services) to an FTO is itself a [federal crime](https://casetext.com/statute/united-states-code/title-18-crimes-and-criminal-procedure/part-i-crimes/chapter-113b-terrorism/section-2339b-providing-material-support-or-resources-to-designated-foreign-terrorist-organizations). **This is a strong deterrent, not only for people thinking of joining** an FTO like the Islamic State or al-Qaeda, **but for private companies whose products or services might be used** by FTOs and their members. But designation of a domestic organization as a terrorist organization would raise serious concerns about infringing on First Amendment rights and cause legitimate fears that the designation tool could be used wrongly to target unpopular ideologies. By contrast, including domestic terrorism among the list of crimes that one is prohibited from materially supporting (such as through the stockpiling of weapons) does not raise the same concerns. To the extent that fear about possible abuses remains, **any domestic terrorism statute should come with appropriate oversight requirements. Annual reporting on the number of domestic terrorism investigations opened, which individuals or groups were targeted, the predication for opening the investigations and the results of those investigations is one way to ensure that additional resources put toward the domestic terrorist threat are not misused.**

**Framing Contention:**

**Government is inevitable and biopower can be good, like arresting white supremacists.**

**First, governments are inevitable**

**Holcombe, Florida State University, 2004**

Randall, Professor, Government, Unnecessary but Inevitable <https://www.independent.org/pdf/tir/tir_08_3_1_holcombe.pdf>

In the foregoing arguments, I have maintained that **although government may not be desirable, it is inevitable because if no government exists, predators have an incentive to establish one.** From a theoretical standpoint, Nozick’s argument—that competing protection firms will evolve into a monopoly that then becomes the state—represents one form of the general argument that government is inevitable. Because of the prominence of Nozick’s work, I offer no further theoretical defense of it here. More significant, however, as de Jasay notes, **“Anarchy, if historical precedent is to be taken as conclusive, does not survive”** (1989, 217). **Every place in the world is ruled by government.** The evidence shows that anarchy, no matter how desirable in theory, does not constitute a realistic alternative in practice, and it suggests that if government ever were to be eliminated anywhere, predators would move in to establish themselves as one by force.

**Waiting around for theoretical purity allows human suffering to continue**

**Lombardi, Professor, 1996**

Mark, University of Tampa, PERSPECTIVES ON THIRD-WORLD SOVEREIGNTY: THE POSTMODERN PARADOX, p. 161)

That is why theoretical changes and paradigm shifts must be coterminous with applicative studiest. One does not and should not precede the other. **We cannot wait until we have a neat self-contained and accurate theory of transnational relations before we launch into studies of Third-World Issues and problem-solving. If we wait, we**

**will never address the latter and arguably most important issue-area: the welfare and quality of life for the human race.**

**Bio-power isn’t inherently good or bad, state power can be used for many things.**

**Dickinson, Professor 2004**

Edward Ross, University of Cincinnati, Central European History, v37, n1, p.36)

This notion is not at all at odds with the core Foucauldian (and Peukertian) theory. **Democratic welfare states are regimes of power**/knowledge no less than early twentieth-century totalitarian states; these systems are not “opposites,” in the sense that they are two alternative ways of organizing the same thing. But they are two very different ways of organizing it. **The concept “power” should not be read as a universal stifling night of oppression, manipulation, and entrapment, in which all political and social orders are grey,** are

essentially or effectively “the same.” Power is a set of social relations, in which individuals and groups have varying degrees of autonomy and effective subjectivity. And discourse is, as Foucault argued, “tactically polyvalent.” Discursive elements (like the various elements of **biopolitics) can be combined in different ways to form parts of quite different strategies** (like totalitarianism or the democratic welfare state); they cannot be assigned to one place in a structure, but rather circulate.

**A specific, political focus on white supremacy is necessary for defeating Trumpism, alternatives cede the political and empower white supremacy**

**Phillips, Center for American Progress, 2020**

Steve, Senior Fellow, Feb 21st, If Progressives Want to Win, They’ll Have to Talk About White Supremacy <https://www.thenation.com/article/politics/trump-white-supremacy-election/>

The Democratic nomination contest is at a pivotal point, especially for the left. Progressive issues are ascendant, moderate candidates are [vote-splitting](https://thehill.com/homenews/campaign/483201-worries-grow-as-moderates-split-democratic-vote), Bernie Sanders [tops the polls](https://www.cnn.com/2020/02/19/politics/cnn-poll-of-polls-bernie-sanders-leading-democrats/index.html), and Elizabeth Warren just had a [very strong debate performance](https://www.thenation.com/article/politics/democratic-debate-warren-nevada/) in Nevada. And yet despite the tantalizing proximity of progressive victory, **there remains a glaring hole at the heart of the left’s strategy: the failure to prioritize the fight against white nationalism and racial resentment—the sources of this president’s power, and the cornerstones of capitalism’s structural inequality. If the structural change** that Warren espouses **and the political revolution** that Sanders champions **don’t explicitly address the racial realities that lie at the heart of this country, then their movements could fail to inspire the kind of transformation the candidates say they want.** My [research](https://thenewpress.com/books/brown-new-white) has found that nearly half of Democratic voters are people of color, and a [dramatic drop-off in African American turnout in 2016](https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/05/12/black-voter-turnout-fell-in-2016-even-as-a-record-number-of-americans-cast-ballots/) was a principal factor in Hillary Clinton’s defeat. **Conveying the urgency of the fight against white supremacy could be critical to propelling the kind of turnout that will help Democrats win in November.** Donald Trump is obviously unlike any president we have seen in a long time. Trump, who famously said he could “[shoot somebody](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2016/jan/24/donald-trump-says-he-could-shoot-somebody-and-still-not-lose-voters)” on New York’s Fifth Avenue and not lose any voters, seems to defy the laws of political gravity. But many fail to appreciate what has kept him afloat. White identity politics are at the foundation of the United States— enshrined in slavery starting in 1619 and codified at the nation’s conception, with the passage of the 1790 Naturalization Act restricting citizenship to “free white persons.” Typically, political appeals to white racial resentment have come in more implicit and coded “[dog whistles](https://global.oup.com/academic/product/dog-whistle-politics-9780190841805?cc=us&lang=en&),” such as Ronald Reagan’s demonization of black “[welfare queens](https://www.thenation.com/article/archive/josh-levin-the-queen-book-review/).” It has been a long time since someone with Trump’s stature openly and unapologetically embraced the racist right wing; many might have assumed it would be political suicide to [brand Mexican immigrants](https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/donald-trump-announces-presidential-bid-trashing-mexico-mexicans-n376521) “rapists,” enact [bans on Muslim immigration](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/06/us/politics/travel-ban-muslim-trump.html), or whip up a xenophobic mob chanting, “[Build the wall!](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/donald-trump/trump-invites-man-dressed-border-wall-stage-campaign-rally-n1008076)” Trump’s speech and policies have unleashed deep wells of racial resentment, and [myriad academic studies](https://psmag.com/news/new-study-confirms-again-that-race-not-economics-drove-former-democrats-to-trump)—most of them ignored by Democratic consultants and leaders—have shown that this is a motivating factor for many of his supporters. (I have started [a list of these studies here](http://www.stevephillips.com/racialanxietyref).) The engine driving the Trump machine is white supremacy. Despite this, the most progressive candidates in this race have spent far more time critiquing other, more moderate candidates and supposedly race-neutral aspects of Trump’s time in office, such as [his tax cuts for the rich](https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/dec/16/bernie-sanders-tax-bill-republicans-trump), than they have fighting white nationalism. (Ironically, moderate Joe Biden may be the only one who has directly refuted Trump on this point: One of his [early campaign ads](https://youtu.be/VbOU2fTg6cI) challenged the president’s 2017 defense of the white supremacists in Charlottesville, Virginia.) Warren and Sanders are correct to [decry the rise of corporate interests](https://www.vox.com/2019/10/2/20893854/elizabeth-warrens-anti-corruption-lobbying-tax) within the Democratic Party. It’s admirable to fight for a higher minimum wage, universal health care, and aggressive action to save the planet from climate catastrophe. But in doing so, both progressive voting groups and candidates like Warren and Sanders are missing the strategic and moral imperative of reframing this election. With upcoming primaries in the more diverse states of the South and Southwest, candidates are starting to bump up issues pertaining to voters of color. Yet none of the remaining candidates have made Trump’s drive to make America white again a centerpiece of their campaign. This would go beyond talking about issues that resonate with communities of color. It would require **ably and enthusiastically countering Trump’s vision of a white America with what it really is: a proudly multiracial country. When progressive candidates fail to call out Trump’s appeals to white racial resentment**—or to match the force with which he makes them—**they’re allowing him to reap the benefits,** without paying the price. The default playbook for too many Democrats is to talk around white supremacy, usually for fear of turning off white voters. But **there is compelling evidence that the best way to blunt racist dog-whistling is to call it out.** In her 2001 book [The Race Card](https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691070711/the-race-card), Princeton political scientist Tali Mendelberg revealed how **Republicans’ use of coded racial messages, and their impact on voters, lost power when the implicit was made explicit.** In studying voluminous survey data on the 1988 presidential elections when George H. W. Bush used [ads about Willie Horton](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EC9j6Wfdq3o)—an African American who committed a crime after being released from prison—Mendelberg noted that Democrats feared that “if they [spoke] explicitly about race they [would] lose crucial white votes.” But her research found the opposite to be true: **“when campaign discourse is clearly about race—when it is explicitly racial—it has the fewest racial consequences for white opinion.”** Even Trump usually prefers to talk about a border wall than about the pro-white immigration agenda advanced by Stephen Miller, one the White House’s [most enthusiastic white supremacists](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/immigration/democrats-call-stephen-miller-resign-after-leak-xenophobic-emails-n1081941). The through line between this November’s election and the long-term goal of transforming this unequal nation should be an agenda that speaks to the pain so many Americans feel: the pain rooted in the racial wealth gap. The [average white family](https://www.stlouisfed.org/open-vault/2019/august/wealth-inequality-in-america-facts-figures) now has more than 10 times the wealth of the average black family, and 7.5 times that of the average Latino family. That is a direct consequence of centuries of public policies that have sanctioned white wealth creation by seizing land from indigenous people, importing Africans to do backbreaking unpaid labor, and exploiting Mexican and Central American farm workers—topped off by government-sanctioned racial discrimination in housing and hiring. Although it’s not widely discussed, Republicans are, in fact, experiencing some blowback from Trump’s actions—[especially from white-collar suburban voters](https://www.cnn.com/2019/11/19/politics/republicans-trump-voters-elections-impeachment-hearings/index.html) who gave Trump a chance in 2016 but defected to the Democrats in 2018, contributing to the Democratic takeover of the House and [seven previously Republican-held governors’ offices](https://www.npr.org/2019/12/10/785603938/chart-democratic-governors-make-a-big-comeback-under-trump). Groups and **leaders on the left have an opportunity, and an obligation, to push their preferred candidates to lead on the fight over America’s racial identity.**

# 2AC Inherency:

**Existing Trump efforts are laughable--no leadership, personnel, focus, or budget**

**Strickler and Ainsley, Reporters 2019**

Laura and Julia, NBC News, April 19th, DHS Won’t answer questions about staff, funding for office to fight domestic terror, <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/national-security/dhs-won-t-answer-questions-about-staff-funding-office-fight-n997821>

**A former senior DHS official** who did not want to be identified **called the new office "very half-baked," criticizing it for having "no transparency on budget or on who will run it." The person said that "it doesn't appear to be any functionally different than what it was. It is reintroducing, they are doing nothing different that I can tell."** Former DHS official George Selim, now a senior VP at the Anti-Defamation League, said: **"Federal law enforcement agencies need to increase their focus and resources on ways to prevent ideologically motivated crimes, not just assess them.** As ADL has documented, over the past decade more than 70 percent of extremist-related murders and homicides were committed by right-wing extremists."

**Status quo efforts lack focus and legal tools**

**German and Robinson, Brennan Center for Justice, 2018**

Michael and Sara, New York University School of Law, Wrong Priorities Fighting Terrorism, <https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/2019-08/Report_Wrong_Priorities_Terrorism.pdf>

**After** the al Qaeda attacks of **September 11**, 2001, **the U.S. Department of Justice named terrorism prevention its number-one mission.**1 **But it does not treat all terrorism with the same urgency.** For many Americans, **this disparity became evident when Dylann Roof assassinated** Reverend Clementa Pickney and **eight members of his Mother Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church** in Charleston, South Carolina, in June 2015. In interviews, then-FBI Director James Comey refused to call the attack an act of terrorism, aggravating longstanding complaints that the Justice Department did not view domestic terrorism involving racist, Islamophobic, anti-Semitic, homophobic, and anti-immigrant violence from the far right as a national security problem on par with terrorist acts committed by Muslims.2 These concerns grew more pronounced as Donald **Trump’s bigoted campaign rhetoric inspired rallies around the country in which neo-Nazis, white nationalists, proto-fascists, and far-right militias openly engaged in violence.** This included beatings, stabbings, and shootings of counter-protesters and journalists, with little interference from law enforcement at the time and just a handful of belated federal prosecutions.3 **Many in federal law enforcement blamed their inadequate response to rising far-right violence on a lack of statutory authority to prosecute white supremacists and others as domestic terrorists.** As a result, Justice Department officials have called for a new statute that would create a domestic terrorism offense, perhaps modeled on the international terrorism statutory regime.

**Trump has deconstructed our response to right wing extremism**

**Rosand, Brookings Institution 2018**

Eric, Nov. 2nd, Senior Fellow, When combating domestic terrorism, you get what you pay for, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2018/11/02/when-fighting-domestic-terrorism-you-get-what-you-pay-for/>

Much has been [written](https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2018/10/trump-shut-countering-violent-extremism-program/574237/) about how **the Trump administration eviscerated** former President Barack Obama’s [limited](https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2017/02/16/fixing-cve-in-the-united-states-requires-more-than-just-a-name-change/) efforts to put in place the building blocks for this architecture. This included **a $10 million federal** [**program**](https://www.dhs.gov/cvegrants) **to support locally led efforts to prevent and counter all forms of violent extremism.** Unfortunately, Trump’s Department of Homeland Security budget has eliminated money for that initiative, thanks to former DHS Secretary John Kelly’s decision to [withdraw](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/15/us/politics/right-wing-extremism-charlottesville.html) funding for organizations focusing on right-wing domestic extremists. **The Trump team also slashed the funding and staff for the small countering violent extremism community partnership office and disbanded the interagency task force** that had created space for critical nonsecurity federal actors such as the Departments of Health and Human Services and Education to get into the game. And finally, the name of the small office at DHS was changed from Countering Violent Extremism to “Terrorism Prevention Partnerships.” **The name change only further complicates the goal of building trust and partnership between the federal government and key communities that are best-placed to identify individuals vulnerable to extremist propaganda.** Finally, **the White House continues to ignore the congressional** [**requirement**](https://www.congress.gov/115/plaws/publ91/PLAW-115publ91.pdf) **to submit a “comprehensive, interagency national strategy for countering violent extremism,**” which was due in June. Apparently the White House now thinks the [just-released](https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/NSCT.pdf) national counterterrorism framework, which eschews the term “countering violent extremism” and devotes little attention to the domestic situation, does the job. It does not. The fact is that **Washington has provided neither funding nor a comprehensive strategy to prevent violent extremist attacks in the United States.** Compare this to the situation of some of America’s closest allies such as Canada and the European Union. Many U.S. allies have long experience managing the threat from extremist violence from across the political and ideological spectrum. All have comprehensive strategies in place and have recognized that the most effective way to prevent jihadist-inspired violence at home is not to treat it as a special breed of violence but through policies, programs, and institutions that address all forms of extremist violence. They all include support for local prevention programs, networks, or hubs that reach a wide swath of non-law enforcement professionals and create an added layer of defense against such violence.

# 2AC Harms:

**American Nazis are rallying for expanded insurgency**

**Makuch and Lamoureaux, Reporters 2018**

Ben and Mack, Vice News, Nov 20th, Neo-Nazis are organizing secret paramilitary training across America <https://www.vice.com/en_us/article/a3mexp/neo-nazis-are-organizing-secretive-paramilitary-training-across-america>

**The creation of a new social networking platform called “The Base” appears to be an effort to shift Naziism from a divided digital space to physical, violent insurgency.** Aneo-Nazi who goes by the alias Norman Spear has launched **a project to** [**unify online fascists**](https://www.nytimes.com/2018/10/28/us/gab-robert-bowers-pittsburgh-synagogue-shootings.html) **and link that vast coalition of individuals into a network training new soldiers for a so-called forthcoming “race war.”** Spear, who claims to be an Iraq and Afghan war veteran, is a self-proclaimed white nationalist with a significant online following. His latest act involves bringing neo-Nazis together, regardless of affiliation and ideology, into a militant fascist umbrella organization. His tool for doing this? A social network he calls “The Base,” which is already organizing across the US and abroad, specifically geared toward partaking in terrorism. Within the confines of a secure chat room viewed by VICE, Spear and his burgeoning global web of terror cells are networking, creating propaganda, organizing in-person meet-ups, and discussing potential violence or “direct action” against minority groups, especially Jewish and black Americans. **An extensive online library contains a trove of manuals with instructions on lone wolf terror-tactics**, gunsmithing, data mining, interrogation tactics, counter-surveillance techniques, **bomb making, chemical weapons creation, and guerilla warfare.** The network's vetting process serves to funnel committed extremists from around the internet into **a group explicitly focused on providing users with terroristic skills, in order to produce real-world violence.** Members of The Base have made it clear they’re recruiting applicants with military and explosives backgrounds.

**Right wing media magnifies white supremacy and juices recruiting**

**Reitman, Reporter, 2018**

Jane, New York Times, 11/3, US law enforcement failed to see the threat of white nationalism. Now they don’t know how to stop it. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/03/magazine/FBI-charlottesville-white-nationalism-far-right.html>

Law enforcement’s inability to reckon with the far right is a problem that goes back generations in this country, and the roots of this current crisis can be traced back more than a decade. **With violent political messaging emanating from the White House and echoed throughout the conservative media and social-media landscapes, Levin only expects more attacks.** **“What we need to worry about is the guy who is riled up by this rhetoric and decides to go out and do something** on his own,” he told me in August. **“We have people who are ticking time bombs.”** In April 2009, **the Department of Homeland Security’s Office of Intelligence and Analysis issued a report warning of a rise in “right-wing extremism.”** The department is the country’s largest law-enforcement body, created after Sept. 11 to prevent and respond to various threats, most specifically those connected to terrorism.

**Americans are being slaughtered, we must confront the terrorist threat**

**Simon and Sidner, Reporters, 2019**

Mallory and Sara, May 15th, CNN, Tackle White Supremacy as Terrorism, experts say,

<https://www.cnn.com/2019/05/14/us/white-supremacy-terrorism-soh/index.html>

**Americans are being killed.** Murdered not for what they have done or being in the wrong place at the wrong time. **Slaughtered again and again because, whether Jewish, or black, or simply not "pure" white, they are seen as a pestilence to be purged. Their murderers are followers of a vile and hateful ideology that** [**meets the FBI definition of terrorism**](https://www.fbi.gov/investigate/terrorism)**. But** some top current and former law enforcement officials say that **they are not treated as terrorists, because they are American, and they are white.** But **amid the rising number of deadly white supremacist attacks,** the officials say **that must change. White supremacy must be called terrorism and tackled with the same vigor as ISIS and al Qaeda.** Manhattan District Attorney Cy Vance came to that realization while investigating the homicide of a black man in the center of New York City. 66-year-old Timothy Caughman was walking alone in Midtown Manhattan collecting cans to recycle when a man approached from behind. That man plunged a sword through Caughman's chest. Caughman uttered his last words as he turned toward his killer: "Why are you doing this?" The man continued to stab him. Caughman bled to death. The answer to Caughman's question would soon become clear. His killer, James Jackson, had come to New York from Maryland with a plan to start a race war. This was more than a murder, Vance decided. It was more than a hate crime. It was the targeted killing of a black man with the aspiration of dividing the races to keep killing each other, ending in the death of every black person in the United States and around the world, according to Jackson's manifesto, Vance said. The case was a seminal one for the district attorney's office and for New York state, where it was the first domestic terrorism conviction of its kind. Vance hopes it sends a message. "I think we needed to call it what it was," he told CNN. "This was an act of terrorism," Vance explained. "This exists in our country and it happened here." Manhattan District Attorney Cy Vance charged a white supremacist with a domestic terrorism charge.

It's just that Americans are having a hard time admitting it, he said. It is much easier, Vance continued, for people to call someone a terrorist when they have a different skin color, or don't speak English. But if you are trying to spread fear and wipe out a specific group of people, like Jackson was, then you must call them terrorist, he said. Calling someone a terrorist not only raises the profile of the case but can yield additional charges, and higher sentences.

On the face of it, the killing of Caughman fits into the FBI's category of "domestic terrorism": Perpetrated by individuals and/or groups inspired by or associated with primarily US-based movements that espouse extremist ideologies of a political, religious, social, racial, or environmental nature. Caughman's murder may not have sparked a national outcry. But it is part of a very public and growing, deadly trend of domestic terror attacks committed largely by white men. **From the Charleston church massacre through the killing of a protester in Charlottesville and the shootings at synagogues in Pittsburgh and Poway,** [**far-right extremists are responsible for -- or suspected of - most of the ideological killings in America in the last 10 years**](https://www.adl.org/murder-and-extremism-2018#the-perpetrators)**,** according to data from the Anti-Defamation League (ADL), which tracks extremist activity.

**White Nationalists poison our politics because they have momentum and energy.**

**French, US Army Reserve, 2019**

David, August 9th, Time, Fellow Republicans Must stand against the Alt-Right virus infecting the US. <https://time.com/5647330/republicans-against-alt-right-column/>

**The so-called alt-right seeks to fundamentally alter the American view of immigration, ethnicity and nationality.** [White nationalists](https://time.com/5555396/white-supremacist-attacks-rise-new-zealand/) view ethnicity as inseparable from culture, to such an extent that they claim immigrants from Latin America, Africa and Asia are simply incapable of assimilating into Western civilization, and that their inclusion will ultimately destroy America itself. **They argue that America is facing a “white genocide,”** that a “great replacement” is under way. In their view, white Western culture faces extinction at the hands of black and brown immigrants, a class of people who are typically cast as sick, dirty and violent, compared to the white guardians of Western civilization. So, yes, **the “alt-right” was thrilled by Trump’s campaign rhetoric, and it barraged Trump critics with threats and harassment.** But its influence extended well beyond online trolling and real-world intimidation. [Steve Bannon](https://time.com/4657665/steve-bannon-donald-trump/), Trump’s campaign CEO, called the website he ran, Breitbart .com, the “platform for the alt right.” At its height in 2016 and early 2017, Breitbart was one of the most influential websites on the right, frequently ranking second in web traffic only to Fox News. Breitbart relentlessly pushed “alt-right” themes into the national discourse. At one point, it had a “black crime” tag on its site, and it published an extensive “guide” to the so-called alt-right that miscast it as “young, creative and eager to commit secular heresies.” “Alt-right” words like cuckservative or cuck entered the lexicon. The term refers to pornography in which white men watch black men have sex with their wives. As Breitbart’s traffic declined following the departure of Bannon, other right-wing sites picked up the torch. Even now, you’ll find constant attacks on the “cucks” who dissent from Trump’s presidency or policies. Just last month, a Trumpist website called American Greatness published a poem called a “Cuck Elegy,” aimed at me, that refers to immigrants as “parasites.” Influential and respected conservatives write for that site. **Over the past few years, “alt-right” themes have also spread to Fox News,** which has hosted guests who’ve spread hysterical falsehoods about immigrants, including the pure fiction that they could introduce smallpox–a disease that was eradicated decades ago–into the U.S. Another guest discussed an extraordinarily racist book called The Camp of the Saints, which depicts Indian immigrants in the most vicious ways, as having “predicted what’s happening.” And we cannot forget that Trump’s repeated claim that illegal immigrants represent an “[invasion](https://time.com/5645501/trump-anti-immigration-rhetoric-racism/)” also echoes “alt-right” themes, even if unwittingly. These are but a few examples of **the injection of white nationalist ideas and themes into our political and cultural discourse.** To be clear, the vast majority of conservative or right-leaning Americans are not racist, hate racism, and utterly reject the ideology and language of white nationalism. Still, **the “alt-right” has achieved remarkable success in influencing our national debate. And they do it, in part, by casting themselves as fearless warriors against political correctness, telling the truths that only “the left” won’t like. This perception of influence gives radicals a sense of momentum and energy.**

As strange as it may sound, to focus on the President is to think too small. The old virus of white nationalism has been injected into our culture in a new way, and it’s imperative that we recognize its symptoms–including its language and ideas–and react with the energy and commitment to banish it back into the irrelevant margins of American life.

### Bio-Weapons

**White Supremacists are trying to weaponize Corona as a bioweapon**

**Woodward 2020**

Alex, March 22nd, The Independent, “Coronavirus: White supremacists planned to use virus as a bioweapon” <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/coronavirus-terrorist-white-supremacy-fbi-bioterrorism-a9417296.html>

Federal law enforcement warned that [**white supremacist**](https://www.independent.co.uk/topic/white-supremacist) **terrorists had considered weaponising** [**coronavirus**](https://www.independent.co.uk/topic/coronavirus) through saliva-filled spray bottles and contaminating non-white neighbourhoods with the virus, according to intelligence briefings. A brief from the Federal Protective Service written last month reported that white supremacists on the encrypted messaging app Telegram discussing spending **"as much time as possible in public places with their 'enemies'" to transmit the virus.They also plotted targeting law enforcement by leaving "saliva on door handles" and elevator buttons at government offices.** [In a brief obtained by Yahoo News](https://news.yahoo.com/federal-law-enforcement-document-reveals-white-supremacists-discussed-using-coronavirus-as-a-bioweapon-212031308.html) reports that **"violent extremists continue to make bioterrorism a popular topic among themselves"** and that "white racially motivated violent extremists" had expressed that it was their "obligation" to spread the virus should any of them be infected.

### International Impact/2AC Add On

**White Nationalists are working with and inspiring a broad network world-wide, which we can police and roll back**

**Byman, Brookings, 2019**

Daniel, 3/15, Senior Fellow, Center on Middle East Policy, Five Initial Thoughts on the New Zealand terrorist attack, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2019/03/15/five-initial-thoughts-on-the-new-zealand-terrorist-attack/>

5Finally, **many forms of right-wing terrorism are international terrorism, drawing on international networks, ideas, and personalities from around the world.** An Australian traveling to New Zealand to attack mosques is one example. Moreover, that Australian [drew on the radical ideas and actions of Norwegian Anders Breivik](https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2019/03/15/new-zealand-mosque-shooterbrenton-tarrant-says-attack-inspired/). He also [claimed to admire](https://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/news/world/gunman-opens-fire-in-christchurch-mosque/news-story/6f6ce5dc9db6cde5edf5ae778b6da368) President Trump “as a symbol of renewed white identity and common purpose” and in particular Black Lives Matter critic Candace Owens. Similarly, **neo-Nazi groups like the Atomwaffen Division have international chapters**. As [Mary McCord and Jason Blazakis argue](https://www.lawfareblog.com/road-map-congress-address-domestic-terrorism), **the international connections allow the United States to designate it as a foreign terrorist organization and use this legal power to try to uproot the organization. The domestic-foreign distinction should not be a barrier to understanding or action.**

**American White Nationalists are working with international white supremacists overseas**

**German and Robinson, Brennan Center for Justice, 2018**

Michael and Sara, New York University School of Law, Wrong Priorities Fighting Terrorism, <https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/2019-08/Report_Wrong_Priorities_Terrorism.pdf>

These informal definitions are misleading, however, as ideologies and **ideological movements are not cabined by national borders.**24 American white supremacists, for example, are influenced by British Israelism (a racist interpretation of Christianity justifying British colonization of nonwhite nations), National Socialism (a German political philosophy), and Odinism (an ancient Norse religion), among other ideologies that clearly did not originate in and are not exclusive to the United States. **White supremacist, anti-Semitic, fascist, and ethno-nationalist groups in the U.S. regularly associate with like-minded groups in Canada, Europe, Russia, and elsewhere.** **The British white nationalist who murdered Jo Cox, a member of the U.K. Parliament, was reportedly a supporter of an American neo-Nazi group.**25 **Some violent white supremacist groups** such as Volksfront, Blood and Honor, and Hammerskins **maintained international chapters or factions**. British, **American,** European, and Australian **nationalists have joined Nazi-affiliated fighting groups in the Ukraine, such as Right Sector and Azov Battalion.**2

### Root Cause: Structural Violence

**Root Cause: The White Supremacist epistemology connects race, capitalism, and colonization through the concept of ownership**

**Seawright, University of Utah 2014**

Gardner, Educational Studies, November, Settler Traditions of Place: Making explicit the epistemological legacy of White Supremacy and Settler Colonialism for Place Based Education,

<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280213813_Settler_Traditions_of_Place_Making_Explicit_the_Epistemological_Legacy_of_White_Supremacy_and_Settler_Colonialism_for_Place-Based_Education>

In the early 1900s, W. E. B. Du Bois began **an analysis of white supremacy** that sought to **unveil the linkages between racial caste, capitalism, and colonization.** In a question emerging from what appears as sardonic frustration with the racial order, Du Bois (1920/2003) pondered, “But what on earth is whiteness that one should so desire it? Then always, somehow, some way, silently but clearly, I am given to understand that whiteness is the ownership of the earth forever and ever, Amen!” (56). **This racially coded drive toward “ownership” is central to clarifying the conception of place within the white settler epistemology; it simultaneously speaks to the politics of capitalistic places** (the drive to accumulate wealth and property), **the dominant extractive ethic of place** (accumulating wealth and property by extracting it, via labor, from nature and inferior beings), **in addition to personal whiteness as a signifier of ownership/power.** The impetus to own and exploit all natural resources—labor power and the multitude of beings flattened into the environment—is the capitalistic impulse that advanced settler colonization and has overseen the growth of white supremacy. Settler colonialism entails a violent remaking of a place—a tearing down of previously established social norms and imposing a new socially constructed reality with its own rules and regulations. Albert Memmi (1965) provides a portrait of colonial social conditioning that becomes permanently imposed within settler nation-states: A foreigner, having come to a land by the accidents of history, has succeeded not merely in creating a place for himself but also in taking away that of the inhabitant, granting himself astounding privileges to the detriment of those rightfully entitled to them. And this is not by virtue of local laws, which in a certain way legitimize this inequality by tradition, but by upsetting the established rules and substituting his own. He thus appears doubly unjust. He is a privileged being and an illegitimately privileged one; that is, a usurper. (9) Eve Tuck and Wayne Yang (2012) offer a similar sentiment. They write, “Settler colonialism is different from other forms of colonialism in that settlers come with the intention of making a new home on the land, a homemaking that insists on settler sovereignty over all things in their new domain” (5). Tuck and Yang’s, as well as Memmi’s, understanding of the colonial project, emphasizes homemaking as the violent imposition of new social constructs defining the ecological world—defining place—at the expense of previously dominant Indigenous worldviews. The reconstitution of places through settler **colonization in North America was justified by an anthropocentric white supremacist epistemology established on particular understandings of civilization and personhood.**

###

### Obligation

**We must confront white supremacists with a powerful response that demonstrates leadership and resolve**

**Allen and McGurk 2019**

John, President, Brookings Institution, and Brett, Stanford University, August 6th, Washington Post, We Worked to defeat the Islamic State. White Nationalist Terrorism is an equal threat, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/we-worked-to-defeat-the-islamic-state-white-nationalist-terrorism-is-an-equal-threat/2019/08/06/e50c90e8-b87d-11e9-bad6-609f75bfd97f_story.html>

**The United States now faces a new national security threat.** The enemy is not the Islamic State but domestic and **homegrown white nationalist terrorism. And “terrorism” is the term that must be used.** The strain of thought driving this terrorism is now a global phenomenon, with mass atrocities in [Norway](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2019/03/15/new-zealand-suspect-allegedly-claimed-brief-contact-with-norwegian-mass-murderer-anders-breivik/?tid=lk_inline_manual_7&itid=lk_inline_manual_7), [New Zealand](https://www.washingtonpost.com/nzshooting/?tid=lk_inline_manual_7&itid=lk_inline_manual_7), [South Carolina](https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/national/charleston-church-shooting/?tid=lk_inline_manual_7&itid=lk_inline_manual_7) and also, law enforcement authorities suspect, [El Paso](https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/08/04/whats-inside-hate-filled-manifesto-linked-el-paso-shooter/?tid=lk_inline_manual_7&itid=lk_inline_manual_7). The attacks are cheered on by adherents in dark (but readily accessible) corners of the Internet. The terrorist acts may differ from Islamic State attacks in degree, but they are similar in kind: driven by hateful narratives, dehumanization, the rationalization of violence and the glorification of murder, combined with ready access to recruits and weapons of war. The first step to overcoming this dangerous strain of violence is to speak clearly and without equivocation. It is terrorism directed at innocent American civilians. **If the Islamic State or al-Qaeda were committing such acts, the nation would mobilize as one to overcome it. The U.S. government would deploy all legal means at its disposal to root out the facilitators of violence and protect the American people from further harm.** The United States would speak with a clear voice and lead the world in a determined response, strengthening alliances and sharing information with its allies. Unfortunately, when it comes to white nationalist terrorism, President **Trump speaks with equivocation, and his rhetoric,** wittingly or not, **has the effect of providing cover for extremists who excuse their actions in the language of political grievance. The United States must take a leadership role in overcoming this scourge of terrorism before it gets worse. Left unchecked, the risks increase** of an attack on the level of the 1995 truck bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in [Oklahoma City](https://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/national/longterm/oklahoma/oklahoma.htm?tid=lk_inline_manual_11&itid=lk_inline_manual_11) , which killed 168 people. [FBI Director Christopher A. Wray](https://www.washingtonpost.com/national-security/wray-says-fbi-has-recorded-about-100-domestic-terrorism-arrests-in-fiscal-2019-and-most-investigations-involve-white-supremacy/2019/07/23/600d49a6-aca1-11e9-bc5c-e73b603e7f38_story.html?tid=lk_inline_manual_12&itid=lk_inline_manual_12) two weeks ago warned that most terrorism-related arrests this year are linked to white supremacist terrorism. **The country now confronts a national security emergency on par with the Islamic State threat.** It demands moral clarity and a call from the Oval Office directing all assets of the federal government to develop a comprehensive, long-term campaign to protect all Americans. If the president will not act, then **Congress** and state and local governments **must** instead. **The matter is too urgent to wait for new national leadership — at stake is nothing less than the protection of the American people and our way of life. Focusing on this domestic threat must not diminish American efforts to combat and contain international terrorism. But placing an equal emphasis on the battle against white nationalist terrorism will be the first step in turning around what is now a dangerous national disgrace.**

# Solvency

**Heightened scrutiny would reveal other crimes that increase leverage**

**Byman, Brookings, 2017**

Daniel, Senior Fellow, Oct 3rd, Should we treat domestic terrorists the way we treat ISIS? <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/should-we-treat-domestic-terrorists-the-way-we-treat-isis-what-works-and-what-doesnt/>

**The counterterrorism microscope would also reveal numerous minor but prosecutable offenses not related to terrorism.** As investor guru Warren Buffett noted, “If a cop follows you for 500 miles, [you’re going to get a ticket](https://dealbook.nytimes.com/2013/10/16/warren-buffett-on-driving-violations-baseball-and-jamie-dimon/?%20mcubz=3&amp;_r=0).” **Arresting such individuals would send a message that the police were watching. Credit card fraud, drug use, and other minor crimes would serve as justification to arrest and disrupt suspected terrorists and as leverage to convince them to cooperate in other investigations of their associates.**

**Terrorist label is key, alternative gives political cover and emboldens alt right**

**Reitman, Reporter, 2018**

Jane, New York Times, 11/3, US law enforcement failed to see the threat of white nationalism. Now they don’t know how to stop it. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/03/magazine/FBI-charlottesville-white-nationalism-far-right.html>

**The refusal to name the attack as “terrorism” was, in some critics’ eyes, a crucial misstep that would have far broader implications.** “I was very pleased when the Obama administration started and said, We’re not going to use the phrase ‘war on terror,’ ” says Erroll Southers, a former F.B.I. agent and now director of the Safe Communities Institute at the University of Southern California. “I think **the Obama people decided, O.K., we’re not going to call it ‘terrorism,’** thinking it was a good thing. **The problem was they didn’t realize how much it emboldened the other side and gave them political cover.”**

**Material Support Clause is key**

**Hughes, Brookings Institution, 2015**

Seamus, Deputy Director, Program on Extremism, George Washington University, August 31st, Domestic Counter-terrorism, Material Support or Bust, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/markaz/2015/08/31/domestic-counterterrorism-material-support-or-bust/>

**The** [**material support clause**](https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/2339A) **is an admittedly impressive legal tool for law enforcement and prosecutors charged with protecting the public from terrorism.** With an unprecedented number of international terrorism-related arrests, **it provides a level of flexibility that is commensurate with the evolving threat.** No doubt, **there exists a subset of** radicalized Islamic State-supporting **Americans who, through their actions and fervor, require nothing less than the total tonnage of law enforcement surveillance and arrest apparatus.** However, it is naïve to assume there is not also a subset of radicalized Islamic State-supporting Americans where prosecutions should be a last resort.

**Solvency: Plan will increase staffing, funding, and focus on fighting white supremacy**

**Clark, Center for American Progress, 2019**

Simon, August 7th, Senior Fellow, Combating the White-Nationalist Terrorist Threat,”

<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2019/08/07/473372/combating-white-nationalist-terrorist-threat/>

**Rebuild the DHS Office of Targeted Violence and Terrorism Prevention** The Trump administration cut the DHS’s [budget for domestic terrorism prevention](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/national-security/we-have-problem-federal-agencies-scramble-fight-domestic-terror-limited-n1039441) from $21 million to $2.7 million; disbanded the only government-wide terrorism prevention office; and assigned its experts to other duties, all while cutting off funding for effective deradicalization programs aimed at white nationalists. **The DHS should restore these programs, reassign experts to their duties, reinstate and increase funding for deradicalization programs,** and require the acting secretary to present his roadmap to combat white nationalism to the appropriate congressional committees. **Prevent white-nationalist infiltration of the police** Since 1986, **U.S.** [**military guidelines**](https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/132506p.pdf) **have banned members of the military from engaging in white-supremacist activity, but police forces have no equivalent rules to prevent infiltration or detect radicalization.** The [Oklahoma police chief](https://thinkprogress.org/oklahoma-police-chief-resigns-white-supremacist-websites-ad914e03c929/) who ran white-supremacist sites, the [officers in Florida](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jul/21/police-ku-klux-klan-florida-fruitland-park) who recruited for the Ku Klux Klan, and the [assistant police chief in Kentucky](https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/policing/2018/02/02/if-black-shoot-them-facebook-message-re-enforces-image-racist-cop/1089102001/) who advocated shooting black kids who smoked marijuana are only some examples of racist attitudes on the part of law enforcement officers. **The Department of Justice should encourage state and local police forces to adopt and enforce guidelines to weed out white supremacists and vigorously prosecute police-related hate crimes. Make it an intelligence priority** to investigate international networks.

**Training can make a big difference**

**Lantigua-Williams, Reporter 2016**

Juleyka, The Atlantic, July 13th, How Much Can Better Training Do to Improve Policing? <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/07/police-training/490556/>

I asked them about some of the most promising or widely discussed avenues for reform. In the days following officer-involved shootings, **talk often turns to training,** not as a way to assuage the pain caused by incidents for officers and civilians, but **as a way to systematically address shortfalls in conduct, create procedures, and soothe some of the fears that persist.** But is training really the best way to make a meaningful intervention? Meares suggested that the fatal shooting of five officers in Dallas illustrates its limitations; sometimes, conflicts can’t be de-escalated. “There’s a set of training that is designed to help officers deal with situations that become escalated because of emotions and because the person they’re dealing with might have mental challenges,” she said. A lot of situations in which there’s a shooting, it’s time-pressure, there’s lots going on. We know how to train people to slow things down so that incidents don't happen. Now that was not this. It’s hard to see how something like de-escalation training, which is making a big difference, it's hard to see how it would have made a difference.

But Dallas was an exceptional incident. **There are millions of encounters between police and civilians every year, and** that, Serpas said, is where **training can make an enormous difference. “What’s happening in American policing is, as we embrace more and more of these concepts of justice and legitimacy and the delivery of services, we’re actually building good will along the way,”** he said. That’s what you really want to see, because when the public recognizes that the police is disconnected, and not interested, and not responsive to their issues; then when a crisis like this happens, there’s no reason for the public to expect the police is going to do anything different than they’ve always done. I think training should always approach these events from what can we learn, and how can we make sure that we don’t do this again? Then we recognize that in the latest data available, there were [63 million contacts](http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/press/pbtss11rpa11pr.cfm) between a 16-year-old or older person at least once with a police officer in the country in a single year. Forty-two percent of those, which is the biggest piece, were traffic stops. That’s where we are going to most likely talk to people, and that’s where we need to be the best prepared to practice these new skills and these new ideas of bias and how to deal with it and how to prepare yourself. **We have a lot of room to grow and a lot of room to be better; and training is key to it.**

**Solvency: Monitoring, rapid response, surveillance, pre-emption, and reducing recruitment**

**Byman, Brookings, 2017**

Daniel, Senior Fellow, Oct 3rd, Should we treat domestic terrorists the way we treat ISIS? <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/should-we-treat-domestic-terrorists-the-way-we-treat-isis-what-works-and-what-doesnt/>

What if the United States changed the rules anyway? **Treating domestic groups the way we do American individuals tied to designated foreign groups would make a profound difference.** Consider, notionally, an individual suspected of ties to ISIS and one suspected of ties to the National Socialist Movement, the organization of American Nazis, (or, if it suits your predilections, say Antifa). In addition to action against ISIS abroad, the response to the ISIS suspect at home would be characterized by a mix of the following: First, **there would be early action and monitoring. The government would move quickly to address the terrorism threat.** Depending on the opinion of the Department of Justice and FBI, a confidential informant might be used to befriend the suspect and gather evidence. A gentler approach might be a knock on the door by local law enforcement, working closely with federal officials, to assess the situation or possibly an attempt to work with relatives and community leaders to move the individual away from violence. **Second, there would be far more resources.** The anti-ISIS counterterrorism budget is robust. **Much of the funding goes to intelligence, including electronic surveillance, human sources, and other means.** As of 2016, the United States had spent [$6.2 billion in the fight against ISIS](http://thehill.com/policy/defense/269686-cost-of-isis-war-crosses-6b-mark), and the Trump administration’s budget proposal requested [another $2 billion](http://www.miamiherald.com/news/politics-government/article139006953.html) flexible fund for fighting the group. There is no neo-Nazi or Klan proto-state comparable to what ISIS has carved out in Iraq and Syria, and thus no need for expensive air and ground operations or satellite intelligence on suspected facilities. However, the numbers above are roughly the same as the FBI’s entire budget, which includes cyber defense, white collar crime, and other concerns. Of the small slice of the FBI budget that goes to counterterrorism, a [tiny portion](https://www.justice.gov/jmd/file/822286/download) specifically goes to activities focused on right-wing extremist organizations. Indeed, domestic terrorism gets normalized into the FBI’s, DHS’, and the Department of Justice’s regular budgets in part because many of the tools used to address domestic terrorism closely resemble what is done in the name of “ordinary” law enforcement.

**Third, there would be no tolerance for violence. When the individual seemed to be acquiring firearms, let alone materials for a bomb, law enforcement officials would swoop in.** It is hard to imagine concerns about First Amendment rights leading the government to allow a group of armed protestors to march through a town chanting slogans extolling the virtues of shari’a. Fourth, treating domestic extremist violence like ISIS-linked terrorism would open up broad use of the power of the law. **The statutes about providing material support for terrorism are incredibly powerful, enabling prosecutors to nab suspected terrorists for even limited support, including simply joining a group** (and thus giving one’s own person to the cause).

# 2AC The Police are White Supremacist

1. **Many police officers aren’t white supremacists, negative examples are the firm minority;**
2. **The plan includes counter-radicalization training for police forces;**
3. **Material Support Clause would allow investigators to clean up police departments and arrest collaborators;**
4. **Terrorist label would deter membership, dissuade potential business associates and encourage potential sympathizers to toe the line;**

**Byman, Brookings, 2017**

Daniel, Senior Fellow, Oct 3rd, Should we treat domestic terrorists the way we treat ISIS? <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/should-we-treat-domestic-terrorists-the-way-we-treat-isis-what-works-and-what-doesnt/>

Finally, **public perception would change. Using the terrorism label carries normative force and would change how these fringe groups are viewed. It would also indirectly shape causes seen as linked to a terrorist group.** Before 9/11, a handful of Americans favored a government ruled under Islamic law; after 9/11, the number of supporters remains a handful, but fear concerning this issue became a major political issue in some states. In 2017 alone, 13 states have introduced anti-sharia legislation; [Texas and Arkansas passed such laws](https://www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2017/08/08/anti-sharia-law-bills-united-states). **This public perception would give any government crackdowns legitimacy and**, at the same time, **put pressure on companies, local police departments, and others if they do not act decisively.**

# 2AC Militarized Approach Fails

1. Even if we can’t solve the root cause of white supremacists, I’d rather have them in jail than committing hate crimes or plotting bio-weapons attacks.
2. Their cards are in the context of engaging with folks pre-radicalization and can’t solve for the core of hard-core radicals that want to commit the worst atrocities right now.
3. Extend from the 1AC: Material Support prosecutions and the act of labeling certain behavior as “terrorist” has a chilling effect
4. The plan includes community engagement and trust building measures by the police to engage all of society in this fight instead of an arrest or ignore paradigm.
5. History proves, police-oriented action solves for violence--President Grant put down the KKK and we can do so again

**Hobbs, Stanford University, 2017**

Allyson, August 21st, The Guardian, The US Government destoyed the Ku Klux Klan once, it could do so again, https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2017/aug/21/us-government-ku-klux-klan-charlottesville

With Akerman’s oversight, **600 Klansmen were convicted** and 65 men were sent to the US penitentiary in Albany for sentences that could be as long as five years. **The intervention of the federal government marked an important divergence from the norm of letting state and local authorities handle racial crimes. With the passage of the first Enforcement Act, Congress made it a federal offense to deprive a person of civil or political rights.** Akerman knew that **destroying the Klan would require “extraordinary means”.** To his mind, there was only one side in this fight, not “many”. There was no equivalence to be drawn between the Klan and the African Americans who had been attacked and murdered. Grant did not view the Confederates as heroes. He did not embolden them or stoke their resentment about the Confederacy’s defeat. Instead, after the Enforcement Acts were passed, he sent federal troops to the South and stated categorically that “insurgents were in rebellion against the authority of the United States”. **By 1872, the Klan had been defeated. The weight of the federal government broke the back of the organization and reduced racial violence throughout the South.** [**Frederick Douglass**](https://www.theguardian.com/books/frederick-douglass) **declared that without Grant’s actions, black Americans likely would have been trapped in a condition similar to slavery. The violence did not end altogether, but the Klan was no longer a formidable player in American politics.** Nor would it be until 50 years later, when the second Klan rose in the 1920s.

1. Its try or die, either they can run a counterplan advocating for more soft approaches, in which case the permutation solves best, or to do nothing, since Trump isn’t going to do anything to combat white supremacy.

## Framework:

**Federal Legislation has made meaningful progress on improving the material conditions of African Americans in the United States**

**Turner-Lee, Brookings, 2017**

Nicol, Governance Fellow, Oct. 4th, Can White Supremacy be legislated under Trump? <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2017/10/04/can-white-supremacy-be-legislated-under-trump/>

At various periods of time, **federal legislation has attempted to exercise agency over these inequalities. The Emancipation Proclamation was signed by President Lincoln to free the slaves** and indentured servants during the Civil War. **In 1954, the Supreme Court struck down the constitutionality of “separate but equal” laws, ultimately initiating the dismantling of Jim Crow. President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and later the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to ensure the equal access and opportunity for African Americans and other disenfranchised groups.** Under the Civil Liberties Act of 1988 signed by President Reagan, more than 100,000 people of Japanese descent were compensated for their time spent incarcerated during World War II.

**Resistance outside of power is impossible, working in the system is the only choice**

**KOOPMAN 2007**

Sara Koopman, 2007 (Journal of International Women’s Studies Vol. 8 #3 April)

**There is no place of autonomy outside of power. We resist in, with, and through webs of power. We are fully enmeshed in the power relations that create the forum as a perceived space of autonomy. The forum, the way it is ever coming in to being, is shaped by hegemonic discourses, which are themselves continually remade and challenged, not stable or monolithic. Hegemony does not simply impose consent, it shapes how we struggle.**

# 2AC Off Case:

## Politics:

1. **Uniqueness Debate: Challenging White Supremacy has already been advocated for, political implications are non-unique.**

**Rosand, Brookings Institution 2019**

Eric, Director, The Prevention Project, Organizing against Violent Extremism, May 26th, Responding to the Rise in Domestic Terrorism, Don’t Forget Prevention. <https://www.lawfareblog.com/responding-rise-domestic-terrorism-dont-forget-prevention>

The response to recent **right-wing violence has emphasized the need for tougher laws, with** [**some**](https://www.lawfareblog.com/road-map-congress-address-domestic-terrorism) **commentators urging Congress to adopt a domestic terrorism statute that includes the “material support” clause that exists for international terrorism. This would allow law enforcement to intervene at early stages of attack planning and plotting.** Some [experts](https://www.lawfareblog.com/american-terrorists-why-current-laws-are-inadequate-violent-extremists-home) have argued that a list of domestic terrorist groups should be created, modeled, where appropriate, on the one the Department of State maintains for foreign terrorist organizations. **There have also been repeated calls, including by congressional leaders,** for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) **to increase their data collection and analytic capabilities on this issue and for more** [**intelligence sharing**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/can-we-forget-politics-and-just-focus-on-keeping-people-safe/2019/05/03/d6cfe574-6d24-11e9-8f44-e8d8bb1df986_story.html?utm_term=.2fc29f47ba66) **on right-wing threats** with other countries. [**Ensuring**](https://homelandprepnews.com/stories/33138-legislation-would-work-to-prevent-domestic-terrorism/) **federal law-enforcement agencies have the resources and tools needed to prioritize the investigation and prosecution of domestic terrorist has also received attention.**

1. **Link Debate:**
	1. Defense: Trump is an apologist for white supremacy (at best) and normal means will be passage of the plan over his veto, requiring a two thirds majority, substantial bi-partisan support including more than 15 Republican Senators. This will give cover to vulnerable senators, and will encourage ticket splitting
	2. Extend Gridlock: White supremacy has raised the cost of progressive legislation, causing the political backlash in the first place. The plan solves future backlash on other issues
	3. **Defense: The plan is bi-partisan**

**Turner-Lee, Brookings, 2017**

Nicol, Governance Fellow, Oct. 4th, Can White Supremacy be legislated under Trump? <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2017/10/04/can-white-supremacy-be-legislated-under-trump/>

Recently, **the House and the Senate** [**unanimously passed**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/powerpost/congress-is-set-to-send-trump-a-bill-denouncing-charlottesville-violence-white-supremacy/2017/09/12/a6ee4656-9801-11e7-b569-3360011663b4_story.html?utm_term=.91251226c4cf)[**a resolution**](http://www.cnn.com/2017/09/14/politics/donald-trump-charlottesville-resolution-white-supremacy/) **to reject white supremacy that was later signed by President Trump.** In its condemnation of the overtly racist demonstrations in Charlottesville, Virginia, and the resulting deaths of counter-protestor [Heather Heyer](http://www.cnn.com/2017/08/13/us/charlottesville-heather-heyer-profile/index.html) and [two Virginia State police officers](https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/public-safety/virginia-state-troopers-killed-in-helicopter-crash-monitoring-charlottesville-clash/2017/08/13/56649702-803d-11e7-b359-15a3617c767b_story.html?utm_term=.9696f0c093d0) patrolling the protests by helicopter, [**the resolution**](https://www.congress.gov/bill/115th-congress/senate-joint-resolution/49/text?q=%7B%22search%22%3A%5B%22charlottesville%22%5D%7D&amp;r=1) **calls upon the president and administration to denounce “…hate groups that espouse racism**, extremism, xenophobia, anti-Semitism, **and White supremacy.” The resolution also urges federal agencies**, including the Departments of Justice and Homeland Security, **to improve upon their data collection and investigation of hate crimes, and “address the growing prevalence of hate groups in the United States.”** In principle, **this rare demonstration of bipartisanship sends a strong message repudiating the racist acts** that occurred in August, especially amid the [president’s lackluster and ambivalent response to the violence](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/08/15/us/politics/trump-press-conference-charlottesville.html?mcubz=1).

* 1. **Link Turn:** Even if the plan is controversial now, deconstructing the alt-right will improve our politics for the better in the long-term, preventing another Trump-like presidency in the future. Material Support Clause will allow us to clean up politics and arrest white supremacist sympathizers in Congress.

**3. Internal Link Debate:**

1. **Intrinsicness: Do the Plan and Ignore Political Consequences, a Rational Actor can do both**
2. If Elections:
	1. Predictions Fail
	2. Your Model of Politics Fails
	3. People don’t care about policy
3. If Legislation:
	1. Peak Polarization: Political Capital Theory is out-dated

**4. Impact Debate:**

1. Extend Framing: Must Reject White Supremacy
2. Politics debate is just appeasement to white supremacist sympathizers.

## Topicality: Generic

1. **We Meet:** No plank of the 1AC advocates for anything outside of the strict boundaries of policing, sentencing, and/or forensic science
2. And reform can mean increase, the topic was designed to allow bi-directionality
3. **Counter-Interpretation: Plan is policing, and solves the aff without violating rights**

**Clark, Center for American Progress, 2019**

Simon, August 7th, Senior Fellow, Combating the White-Nationalist Terrorist Threat,”

<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2019/08/07/473372/combating-white-nationalist-terrorist-threat/>

So, what would a serious policy to contain, limit, and ultimately defeat white-nationalist terrorism look like? In many respects, **a counter-terrorism policy addressing this specific threat would look like any other effective counter-terrorism approach, relying on good police work built on investigation; infiltration; intelligence sharing; tracking of recruitment and radicalization; and targeted arrests.** Crucially, as the [law provides](https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCODE-2009-title18/html/USCODE-2009-title18-partI-chap113B-sec2331.htm), **these law enforcement efforts would be narrowly focused on acts dangerous to human life that violate U.S. criminal laws and appear to be intended to intimidate or coerce a civilian population; influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or affect the conduct of a government by mass destruction, assassination, or kidnapping. These efforts would not target any First Amendment related activity.** Two other elements are required to destroy this homegrown menace: an end to the [political rhetoric that fuels hate](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/race/news/2018/03/22/448323/the-rise-of-hate/) and the implementation of long-overdue [gun-violence prevention legislation](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/guns-crime/news/2018/03/28/448565/gun-violence-united-states-public-health-crisis/). The following recommendations focus specifically on the security policy responses that could improve our ability to prevent these attacks.

1. **Counter-Interpretation:** Your interpretation and our case are topical.
	1. This case will produce the best debates on the core question of the topic: Under what circumstances should the state use its power to control its citizens?
2. **Standards:**
	1. Defense: This is the most predictable case out there that increases the state’s power
	2. Offense: Insisting that the Aff can only reduce state power despite the wording of the resolution risks debate becoming a regressive race to the left, not an honest contestation of ideas, turning people off of the activity and cutting our funding
	3. Learning about the potential value of the state to solve problems is good--extend our framing evidence
	4. Finding ways to avoid talking about and confronting white supremacy is status quo masking that allows white supremacy to go unchallenged (and why we’re running this aff).

## T Policing

1. **We Meet:** No plank of the 1AC advocates for anything outside of the strict boundaries of policing
2. **And Counter-Interpretation:** **policing does include community building**

**Lantigua-Williams, Reporter 2016**

Juleyka, The Atlantic, July 13th, How Much Can Better Training Do to Improve Policing? <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/07/police-training/490556/>

**Law enforcement is only one small part of** what we should be doing in **policing. Policing is community building.** That means, I need to take **every effort, every tool at my disposal to build a community in a way that allows it to be most responsive to the people that we have sworn to serve and protect. It cannot be law enforcement. If you take that one small part and make that your mission, what happens to the activity of policing overall?**

1. **Counter-Interpretation:** Your interpretation and our case are topical.
	1. The literature advocates a policing plus approach, we should follow the literature instead of being forced to cut solvency cards out of context to meet artificial topicality requirements
2. **Counter-Interpretation:** Policing is things that the police do, so reforms that give them new missions should be topical. Neg ground about police overstretch is very predictable and something that folks should already be carrying.
3. **Standards:**
	1. Defense: This is the most predictable case out there that increases the state’s power
	2. Offense: Insisting that the Aff can only reduce state power despite the wording of the resolution risks debate becoming a regressive race to the left, not an honest contestation of ideas, turning people off of the activity and cutting our funding
	3. Learning about the potential value of the state to solve problems is good--extend our framing evidence
	4. Finding ways to avoid talking about and confronting white supremacy is status quo masking that allows white supremacy to go unchallenged (and why we’re running this aff).

## Biopower Kritik

1. **Link Debate: Permutations**
	1. Perm: Do Both
	2. Perm: Do the Plan, and reject all other instances of bio-power
		1. This permutation is critical, the entire aff is designed to test whether any instance of biopolitics can be good, so if they don’t have a specific link to the case, then the perm solves best.
	3. Perm: Do the Plan, then the alt
	4. Permutations are net beneficial:
		1. Aff is a net benefit: Stopping Nazis is good.
			1. Learning about real world engagement with anti-white supremacy politics and state mechanisms is a better methodology than their utopian alt
			2. Utopian Alts are bad, impossible to falsify and infinitely regressive. They are bad for debate and make the activity less relevant or fundable.
			3. Specific Alts encourage better debating and better methodology, falsifiability is key to hypothesis testing.
2. **Link Debate: No Link:** The aff is a specific instance where using the state is good, I dare them to say that arresting Nazis is bad.
3. **Internal Link Debate:** Extend Framing: Bio-power can be good, they haven’t contested this argument, just said that some instances of state power are bad. This has two implications:
	1. The entire Aff is an impact turn to the K, weigh our impacts against theirs
	2. Unless they have Aff-specific links, then the K doesn’t link, since we are a very specific instance of bio-power, we’ll defend it as the only good use of state power.
4. **Impact Debate:** Bio-power can is a force for good, extend Dickinson
5. **Alternative Debate:**
	1. Extend Framing: Government is inevitable
	2. Extend our Framing: Learning about state mechanisms and politics is the best way to challenge white supremacy, this is a solvency deficit to the alt
	3. Other Solvency problems

## CP Soft Approach to Combating Radicalization

1. **Permutation Debate:**
	1. Perm Do Both
	2. Perm: Do the Plan, and non-mutually exclusive parts of the CP
		1. We can both arrest nazis and expand civil society’s response to the white supremacist threat. President Obama demonstrated this tactic to be effective against domestic radicalization by ISIS. Build relationships and trust with communities, and hunt down the worst elements vigorously.
	3. Perm Do the Plan and Then the Alt
		1. Arresting Nazis and then preventing the radicalization of more sounds effective to me
	4. We can build trust in civil society by actually taking the white supremacist threat seriously for once.
2. **Solvency Debate:**
	1. The CP will take too long, and doesn’t solve current radicals. We should prevent the next Dylan Roof from shooting up a church
	2. Soft Approaches doesn’t work alone
3. **Offense:** Soft Approach Legitimizes White Supremacy as a legitimate, competing ideology
4. **Framing:** Must Reject all instances of white supremacy, not coddle them
5. **Net Benefit:** Strong Approaches to Fighting Nazis are popular, while soft approaches look weak and soft on crime

## Terrorism Trade-Off DA

1. **Uniqueness Debate:**
	1. The US has spent hundreds of billions of dollars and over-focused on islamic terrorism for decades, since before 9-11. If they haven’t neutralized it by now, they won’t do so any time soon.
2. **Link Debate:**
	1. Turn: US Overreach has motivated, not solved terrorism
	2. No Link: The plan doesn’t change the Patriot Act, FISA reform, or any reductions in law enforcement action against external terror threats
	3. No Link: Intelligence Agencies will still fight terrorism, and they’ll solve
	4. No Link: Circumvention: Trump will focus on fighting ISIS, he is hunting for wins in foreign policy to ensure re-election and to look tough to his base

**Rogin, Reporter 2020**

Josh, Feb 6th, Washington Post, Trump’s Foreign Policy is all politics, no policy, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/global-opinions/trumps-foreign-policy-is-all-politics-no-policy/2020/02/06/a126ed2c-492a-11ea-bdbf-1dfb23249293_story.html>

If his [State of the Union address](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/02/05/us/politics/state-of-union-transcript.html) is any indication, **President Trump’s foreign policy** in 2020 **will be more than ever about politics and less than ever about actual policy.** Most of his major foreign policy efforts have run their course. But **Trump is betting voters in November won’t care about the gap between his rhetoric and the world’s realities.** Foreign policy wasn’t exactly a major theme of the president’s annual speech to Congress. The few issues he mentioned were carefully tailored to his reelection campaign. The problem is, **Trump is running on successes that aren’t actually successes and mostly ignoring the failures.**

* 1. **No Link: Trade-Off Acceptable**

**Byman, Brookings, 2017**

Daniel, Senior Fellow, Oct 3rd, Should we treat domestic terrorists the way we treat ISIS? <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/should-we-treat-domestic-terrorists-the-way-we-treat-isis-what-works-and-what-doesnt/>

Even without such a legislative change, the government must allocate an appropriate level of funding and manpower to domestic terrorism. **The right-wing threat in particular is comparable to that of jihadist violence at home, and similar resources should be allocated to addressing it. The FBI and DHS should create larger offices dedicated to domestic groups and otherwise develop their intelligence presence.** **Some of the resources used for jihadist violence could be transferred with little loss.**

1. **Impact Debate:**
	1. Case Outweighs and Link Turn: The probability and magnitude of the threat of international terrorism is dwarfed in the impact of domestic terrorists inspired by White Supremacy. We have a disproportionate resource allocation towards jihad inspired violence now, and should shift resources towards the domestic struggle.

**Rosand, Brookings Institution 2019**

Eric, Director, The Prevention Project, Organizing against Violent Extremism, May 26th, Responding to the Rise in Domestic Terrorism, Don’t Forget Prevention. <https://www.lawfareblog.com/responding-rise-domestic-terrorism-dont-forget-prevention>

**The April** [**attack**](https://www.nytimes.com/2019/05/01/us/poway-synagogue-shooting-gun-control.html) **on a synagogue in** Poway, **California,** was the latest demonstration of **the rise in extremist violence in the United States committed not by “jihadists” inspired by ISIS or other international terrorists, but by white supremacists, neo-Nazis or other right-wing groups.** With the [Tree of Life Synagogue](https://www.publicsource.org/series/aftermath-the-tree-of-life-synagogue-attack/) attacks still fresh in many Americans’ minds, post-Poway discussions further highlighted how **the resources and tools available to prevent right-wing extremist violence or domestic terrorism in the United States are dwarfed by those available to deal with the jihadist-inspired violence that data shows to be a much lesser threat. Rectifying this imbalance requires urgent attention.**

1. **No Impact: Terrorism isn’t a threat--declining capabilities, successful US response**

**Bynam, Georgetown University, 2018**

Daniel, Vice Dean, School of Foreign Service, Brookings Institution, New York Times, Dec. 28th, The Good News About Terrorism <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/28/opinion/sunday/islamic-state-terrorism-europe.html>

In terrorism, we may remember 2018 for what didn’t happen: **The jihadist threat to the United States has dissipated. We had only** [**one death**](https://www.newamerica.org/in-depth/terrorism-in-america/what-threat-united-states-today/) **from jihadist-linked terrorism in this country**, and while disturbing, it was hardly an Islamic State spectacular. (In Florida, a teenage boy, inspired by jihadist videos, [stabbed](https://www.palmbeachpost.com/news/local/breaking-juvenile-arrested-fatal-palm-beach-gardens-stabbing/OVn87UACsAaFXcBuW0IWaL/) a 13-year-old friend to death during a sleepover.) **This death toll is dwarfed by the 2018 body count from right-wing terrorism (15) and a far cry from attacks like the 2016 Pulse nightclub shooting,** when a jihadist loner shot 49 people. **The number of jihadist** [**terrorism-related legal cases**](https://www.newamerica.org/in-depth/terrorism-in-america/part-i-overview-terrorism-cases-2001-today/) **has also plummeted, to 13 this year from 80 in 2015.** As the [recent killings](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-46586969) of five people at a Christmas market in Strasbourg, France, indicate, the European situation is worse, but not hopeless. In Europe, [around 20 people](https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/europe/2018-12-19/why-jihadist-attacks-have-declined-europe) have died from jihadist terrorism in 2018, a steep fall from 2015, when attacks in Paris and elsewhere led to [150 deaths](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/en/headlines/security/20180703STO07125/terrorism-in-the-eu-terror-attacks-deaths-and-arrests). **Around the world, global terrorism** [**fell in 2017**](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2018/08/15/terrorist-attacks-are-quietly-declining-around-world/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.89b9dee5dcd4)**, and 2018 looks even more promising.**  We can hope the death toll will be low in 2019, too. The Islamic State will not go away, but it is unlikely to return to its 2015 peak. None of this good news has stopped President Trump from emphasizing the terrorism threat. He [invoked it](https://www.rollcall.com/news/policy/trump-fumbled-claim-of-capturing-10-terrorists) to justify more funding for a border wall with Mexico (despite [no known jihadist terrorists](https://www.cnn.com/2018/12/11/opinions/trump-southern-border-terrorists-opinion-bergen/index.html) crossing to the United States from Mexico). Perhaps not surprisingly, Americans’ [fears of jihadist terrorism](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2018/03/23/why-are-americans-still-so-afraid-of-islamic-terrorism/?utm_term=.30786255beca) remain high. **A mix of successful counterterrorism efforts overseas and more effective measures and a weak jihadist movement at home explain the low death toll.** The American-led military campaign against the Islamic State has diminished the threat in the United States and Europe. The group has been largely driven underground, and its losses have tarnished its prestige and undermined its effectiveness.

1. **Framework:** Can’t fail to challenge white supremacy
2. **Turn: The term terror is a rhetorical tool to paper over the violence of US militarism that occurs on a daily basis. The terror expert industry is not academic but political—view their evidence with skepticism.**

**Greenwald Reporter, 2012**

Glenn, 8/15/12 Winner, I.F. Stone Award for Independent Journalism, “The sham “terrorism expert” industry.”

But **the most pernicious attribute of this “terror expert” industry,** the aspect that **requires much more attention,** is its pretense to non-ideological, academic objectivity . In reality, these **“terror experts”, almost uniformly, have a deeply ideological view — a jingoistic , highly provincial understanding— of what Terrorism is and is not. They generally fixate on Muslims to the exclusion of all other forms of Terror**. In particular, the idea that the U.S. or its allies now commit Terrorism is taboo, unthinkable **Their views on what Terrorism is track the U.S. Government’s and, by design, justify U.S. government actions.** **They are not “experts” as much as they are ideologues,** rank propagandists, and servants of America’s establishment power centers.

## 2AC Postmodernism Kritik:

**We have to know supremacists in order to challenge them**

**Hamid 2019**

Shadi, Foreign Policy Magazine, March 21st, White Supremacism isn’t insanity

<https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/03/21/murderous-white-nationalism-isnt-insanity-new-zealand-christchurch/>

**I won’t link to the accused shooter’s manifesto. But I think it’s important for analysts and government officials to read it carefully. This is what many of us did when the Islamic State would release its recordings and statements.** We tried to understand why young Tunisians would travel to Syria to fight in disproportionate numbers for a group that seemed so ostentatious in its savagery. In the process, **the analytical and policy community was able to reach a fairly sophisticated understanding of not just the group’s objectives but also of its particular way of** [**looking at the world**](https://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Brookings-Analysis-Paper_Mara-Revkin_Web.pdf)**,** including [the end times](https://www.amazon.com/ISIS-Apocalypse-History-Strategy-Doomsday/dp/1250112648). **In dealing with an apparent global rise in violent white supremacism, we may, once again, be obliged to immerse ourselves in a disturbing, sometimes terrifying universe** of thought that will, at least at first, seem foreign. Seventeen years of trying—and often failing—to combat Islamic extremism offers some important lessons, one of which is the importance of contending with, studying, and understanding the ideas that drive extremist sentiment. Even with a group as plainly ideological as the Islamic State, there was often a tendency to de-emphasize its religious motivations and to characterize its aims in more prosaic terms: that it was using Islam for power, rather than the other way around, or that it couldn’t truly believe what it said it believed about its almost unprecedentedly harsh interpretations of Islamic law. Could anyone truly believe that? But apparently they can, and they do. In reading the accused Christchurch shooter’s 74-page manifesto, it becomes clear that he thought carefully about what he hoped his savagery might accomplish. If we’re thinking about rationality in the [instrumental sense](https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/6518184.pdf) of whether ends can plausibly flow from the means, then the killer was at least somewhat rational. Still, this searching for explanations may seem beside the point. Why should it matter why he did what he did if we (almost) all readily acknowledge the sheer evil of the act? **Taking white nationalist ideas seriously, studying how such ideological communities are organized and motivated, suggests a more effective set of responses to the question of violent extremism.** I support a strong response to the New Zealand attack.

# Negative: Over-Police the KKK

# On Case:

## Inherency

**Status quo solves**

**German and Robinson, Brennan Center for Justice, 2018**

Michael and Sara, New York University School of Law, Wrong Priorities Fighting Terrorism, <https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/2019-08/Report_Wrong_Priorities_Terrorism.pdf>

But this approach is misguided. This is the first in a series of white papers exploring the federal government’s problematic responses and nonresponses to domestic terrorism. In this paper, we show that **existing statutes have long provided substantial authority for the federal government to investigate and prosecute acts of domestic terrorism.** One of the co-authors of this paper has personal experience investigating violent white supremacists and anti-government militia members as an FBI undercover agent in the 1990s. That work demonstrates that **traditional law enforcement tools provide ample authority to proactively prevent acts of domestic terrorism through criminal investigation and prosecution. Data produced by the federal government, supplemented with research from academic institutions and advocacy organizations, shows that far-right violence, sometimes categorized as hate crimes or civil rights violations,** is severely under-addressed as a matter of Justice Department policy and practice, rather than a lack of statutory authority

**Status Quo Solves, President Trump has implemented changes at DHS to fight white supremacy after El Paso**

**Strickler and Ainsley, Reporters 2019**

Laura and Julia, NBC News, April 19th, DHS Won’t answer questions about staff, funding for office to fight domestic terror, <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/national-security/dhs-won-t-answer-questions-about-staff-funding-office-fight-n997821>

When Kristen Welker of NBC News asked why the administration had defunded or disbanded some efforts to combat white nationalism, Sanders said, **"There are a number of programs that still exist, both at [the Department of Homeland Security] and in the Department of Justice and other place throughout the administration. To pretend that the president is anything but outraged or heartbroken over these incidents is a total mischaracterization."** DHS, however, has declined to answer questions about the funding and staffing of one of the anti-terror programs Sanders is apparently referring to, fueling concerns among ex-DHS officials about its effectiveness. **Acting DHS Secretary Kevin McAleenan announced the establishment of the Office of Targeted Violence and Terrorism Protection on April 19, the 24th anniversary of the Oklahoma City bombing,** which was planned and executed by [right-wing domestic terrorists](https://www.nbcnews.com/tech/social-media/hate-speech-hits-youtube-livestreams-house-hearing-rise-white-nationalism-n992386) Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nichols. **The new office, which rebrands an Obama-era initiative, will address both domestic and international terror,** and aims to prevent "acts of targeted violence such as [racially motivated](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/immigration/white-nationalist-leader-plotting-take-over-gop-n920826) violence" among other attacks, according to a statement from McAleenan posted on the DHS [website](https://www.dhs.gov/news/2019/04/19/acting-secretary-mcaleenan-announces-establishment-dhs-office-targeted-violence-and).

But DHS declined to specify how many staff members or how much money the new office will have.

## Impact Debate

**Post-brink on harms**

**Bergengruen and Hennigan, Reporters, 2019**

Vera and W.J., Time, August 8th, America’s Lost Battle Against White Supremacy <https://time.com/5647304/white-nationalist-terrorism-united-states/>

**“Even if there was a crackdown right now, it’s going to take years for the momentum of these groups to fade,”** says Daryl Johnson, a former senior analyst at the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), whose 2009 report on right-wing extremism was lambasted by conservatives even before its release. **“I’m afraid we’ve reached a tipping point where we’re in for this kind of violence for a long time.” Right-wing terrorism is a global problem,** resulting in devastating attacks from New Zealand to Norway. **But it is particularly dangerous in the U.S., which has more guns per capita than anywhere else in the world, an epidemic of mass shootings, a bedrock tradition of free speech that protects the expression of hateful ideologies and laws that make it challenging to confront a disaggregated movement that exists largely in the shadows of cyberspace.**

**White Supremacists aren’t that big of a threat**

**Barron 2019**

Seth, April 12th, The truth about the ‘global white extremist threat’,

<https://nypost.com/2019/04/12/the-truth-about-the-global-white-extremist-threat/>

Last week, The New York Times featured [an illustrated timeline of “white extremist” killings](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/04/03/world/white-extremist-terrorism-christchurch.html) over the last nine years. According to the Times, **the record shows “an informal global network of white extremists whose violent attacks are occurring with greater frequency in the West.” The idea that white supremacist violence is a growing global threat has gained more currency** recently, notably in the wake of the ghastly Christchurch mosque massacre. New York Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, for instance, [asserted that “White supremacists committed the largest # of extremist killings in 2017.”](https://nypost.com/2019/03/19/ocasio-cortez-calls-out-trump-over-white-nationalism-comments/) **No one will deny that people who kill in the name of white supremacy commit evil, but is it true that white extremists are sowing a growing amount of worldwide mayhem? The evidence suggests otherwise. Even a superficial glance at the record indicates that of the nearly 20,000 people killed in thousands of extremist killings in 2017, white supremacists were responsible for very few.** The worst terrorist event of 2017, according to the State Department, was the explosion of a truck bomb in Somalia, which killed more than 580 people.

## Solvency

**Material Support Clause creates tough choices for families and isn’t effective for minors**

**Hughes, Brookings Institution, 2015**

Seamus, Deputy Director, Program on Extremism, George Washington University, August 31st, Domestic Counter-terrorism, Material Support or Bust, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/markaz/2015/08/31/domestic-counterterrorism-material-support-or-bust/>

The [material support clause](https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/18/2339A) is an admittedly impressive legal tool for law enforcement and prosecutors charged with protecting the public from terrorism. With an unprecedented number of international terrorism-related arrests, it provides a level of flexibility that is commensurate with the evolving threat. No doubt, there exists a subset of radicalized Islamic State-supporting Americans who, through their actions and fervor, require nothing less than the total tonnage of law enforcement surveillance and arrest apparatus. However, **it is naïve to assume there is not** also **a subset of** radicalized Islamic State-supporting **Americans where prosecutions should be a last resort. Further, in the cases of underage** Islamic State **supporters, there is a reluctance by law enforcement for various political, moral, and policy reasons to charge minors with material support to terrorism.**

**We should prioritize violent crime, not pick and choose by ideology since terrorism isn’t a big deal**

**German and Robinson, Brennan Center for Justice, 2018**

Michael and Sara, New York University School of Law, Wrong Priorities Fighting Terrorism, <https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/2019-08/Report_Wrong_Priorities_Terrorism.pdf>

But **there is a better way to address threats to American security — by focusing on violence rather than ideology.** Fortunately, **terrorism is rare in the U.S. and, with the exception of outlying mass-casualty attacks like 9/11 and the Oklahoma City bombing, the number of annual terrorist fatalities is relatively small** compared to those we experienced as recently as the 1970s.124 **The fatalities resulting from terrorist attacks make up a tiny percentage of deaths from criminal violence in the U.S.**, which are also significantly lower than just a few decades ago but still average almost 16,000 per year, according to UCR data.125 According to the Extremist Crime Database data cited in the 2017 Government Accountability Office report,126 **international and domestic terrorism fatalities combined constituted only 0.095 percent of all criminal homicides** recorded from 2002 through 2016.127 **Half of the violent crime in the U.S. goes unsolved, which in 2016 included 40 percent of homicides and 60 percent of rapes**.128 **A disproportionate share of these unsolved cases involve crimes against black and brown victims.**129 **A concerted effort by federal law enforcement to address violent crime more generally would ensure that resources are allocated in a manner correlated to the threat posed by the different groups whose violence meets the statutory definition of terrorism and not by their perceived ideologies or antipathy to U.S. government policies.**

**Designations are too broad--Insane Clown Posse Proves**

**Byman, Brookings, 2017**

Daniel, Senior Fellow, Oct 3rd, Should we treat domestic terrorists the way we treat ISIS? <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/should-we-treat-domestic-terrorists-the-way-we-treat-isis-what-works-and-what-doesnt/>

**For those linked to a group but not convicted of any crime, the consequences could still be dire and should trouble many Americans. In 2011, the FBI declared all Juggalos, the fans of the hip-hop group Insane Clown Posse, which has both violent and nonviolent members, to be a criminal street gang. The designation means that some Juggalos** and Juggalettes (female fans) **have lost custody battles, jobs, and otherwise suffered as their employers and the courts treated them as** [**gang members**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/sf/style/2017/08/31/the-fbi-labeled-insane-clown-posse-fans-a-gang-now-theyre-marchingon-washington/?utm_term=.f4a2611da152)**.** Juggalos staged [several protests](http://www.brownpoliticalreview.org/2015/11/insane-clown-problems-discrimination-against-juggalos-is-no-laughing-matter/) against the FBI designation and many describe its effects as discrimination.

**Material Support Clause goes too far, would loop in legitimate political actors**

**Byman, Brookings, 2017**

Daniel, Senior Fellow, Oct 3rd, Should we treat domestic terrorists the way we treat ISIS? <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/should-we-treat-domestic-terrorists-the-way-we-treat-isis-what-works-and-what-doesnt/>

**Nonviolent groups that share part of the radicals’ agenda would also be viewed differently. Many Sovereign Citizens share the NRA’s pro-gun agenda; eco-terrorists’ goals overlap with those of the Sierra Club. Today, such nonviolent political mobilization is not just protected under freedom of speech and freedom of assembly: it is considered vital to democracy, which requires citizens to express their views in the marketplace of ideas and to inform their elected officials.** But with a change to the treatment of domestic terrorists, peaceful organizations might become considered “feeders” of the violent organizations. At the very least, they would be suspected of creating a conducive environment to radicalism. Saudi Arabia, for example, funds an array of [mosques, textbooks, and extremist preachers](https://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/22/world/europe/how-the-saudis-turned-kosovo-into-fertile-ground-for-isis.html?mcubz=3) for Muslim communities around the world and is often blamed when young men take up arms in the service of these ideas. Domestic nonviolent groups would have an incentive to distance themselves from violent individuals, with the added benefit of helping to make sure that extremists do not slip through the cracks by hiding among a more moderate cohort. **This would have a chilling effect on organizations as many would avoid links to individuals who might have links to violence, however defined.**

## Turn: Policing Orientation Increases Radicalization

P**olice are white supremacists**

**Adler-Bell, Reporter, 2019**

Sam, August 7th, The New Republic, More Government Power is the Wrong Way to Fight White Supremacy, <https://newrepublic.com/article/154700/fbi-domestic-white-terrorism-el-paso-expansion-security-state>

In June, Buzzfeed [published](https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/emilyhoerner/police-facebook-racist-violent-posts-comments-philadelphia) the findings of **the Plain View Project, a systematic investigation into white supremacist sympathies among police officers nationwide. The project searched the Facebook pages of officers** in a dozen cities, including Phoenix, St. Louis, Philadelphia, and Dallas. **It** [**turned up**](https://www.plainviewproject.org/) **an extraordinary—if not exactly startling—amount of posts with violently racist imagery, language, and memes.** In Philadelphia, 327 officers—of 1,073 who could be identified on Facebook—**had posted white supremacist content, more than a third of whom had one or more federal civil rights lawsuits filed against them.** At least 64 of the officers were in leadership roles. **Almost all of those identified have remained on the force since the investigation.** I’ve thought of these numbers in recent days, as liberals and leftists have demanded more rigorous investigation and severe prosecution of white supremacist terrorism.

**Demonizing a community only causes more violence**

**Byman, Brookings, 2019**

Daniel, 3/15, Senior Fellow, Center on Middle East Policy, Five Initial Thoughts on the New -Zealand terrorist attack, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2019/03/15/five-initial-thoughts-on-the-new-zealand-terrorist-attack/>

**First, words have consequences. The demonization of** Muslim **communities, often by politicians who later act shocked and angry when violence occurs, contributes to societal polarization and inspires violence.** Britain’s Boris Johnson [offered the traditional “thoughts and prayers”](https://twitter.com/BorisJohnson/status/1106488989543006208) after the attack, but had [previously written](https://twitter.com/BorisJohnson/status/1106488989543006208) that women dressed in a burqa look like “bank robbers.” Incredibly, after the shooting, right-wing Australia Senator Fraser Anning [claimed,](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2019/03/15/right-wing-australian-senator-blames-immigration-new-zealand-mosque-attacks/?utm_term=.011c5f42d899) “The real cause of bloodshed on New Zealand streets today is the immigration program which allowed Muslim fanatics to migrate to New Zealand in the first place.” **Terrorists feed on this polarization and seek to worsen it.**

**Law enforcement engagement inspires new terrorists**

**Reitman, Reporter, 2018**

Jane, New York Times, 11/3, US law enforcement failed to see the threat of white nationalism. Now they don’t know how to stop it. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/03/magazine/FBI-charlottesville-white-nationalism-far-right.html>

**Years of law-enforcement investigation and infiltration of right-wing terror groups commenced,** and by the early 1990s, many of the movement’s most violent members were dead or in jail. **But the government standoffs at Ruby Ridge, Idaho, and Waco, Tex., energized a new generation of separatists, Patriot militias — the forerunners of today’s antigovernment militia groups — as well as individuals like Timothy McVeigh, who made his way through various antigovernment and racist ideologies and organizations under the radar of law enforcement, before the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing.**

## Can’t Solve: Police Racist

**The criminal justice system is built on racism, and they can’t be expected to enforce anti-white supremacy laws**

**Adler-Bell, Reporter, 2019**

Sam, August 7th, The New Republic, More Government Power is the Wrong Way to Fight White Supremacy, <https://newrepublic.com/article/154700/fbi-domestic-white-terrorism-el-paso-expansion-security-state>

But there is a contradiction at the heart of this call for more counterterrorism. If you believe, as I do, that **America under-polices white racist violence for endemic reasons—namely the association of whiteness and innocence in the American imagination, the white supremacist sympathies of U.S. law enforcement, and the white supremacist foundations of the republic itself—it is both incoherent and wrong-headed to advocate further empowering the security state to combat white terrorism. American policing is a project in many ways synonymous with a project of racial control. Demanding that same apparatus abandon its raison d’être in favor of combatting its own authorizing ideologies is nonsensical.** In short, **white supremacist police cannot be expected to police white supremacy.** But more importantly, **there has never been an expansion of the investigatory or punitive power of the American security state which has redounded to the benefit of racial and religious minorities. Quite the opposite. The more powerful law enforcement becomes, the easier it is, as a legal and statutory matter, for investigators to peer into the lives of marginalized people, the more severe the punishments meted for their perceived crimes, and the more abuses they will suffer at the hands of law enforcement.** There is no reason to believe that the expansion of the powers of the FBI to investigate and charge domestic terror cases would be used only or primarily to target white terrorists.

## Training Versus Hiring Turn

**Training is not helpful, and distracts from more foundational issues like hiring practices.**

**Lantigua-Williams, Reporter 2016**

Juleyka, The Atlantic, July 13th, How Much Can Better Training Do to Improve Policing? <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/07/police-training/490556/>

 But for Grady, another police chief, **the focus on training serves to distract from broader problems. “This is not a training issue,”** he said. **The problem is we’ve been addressing the issues wrongly for years. We keep wanting to say it’s a training issue. It’s not a training issue. That’s just a convenient thing to say, which causes everyone to be disarmed, and we no longer continue with the issue. In 36 years of policing, I cannot suggest to you a single training course that I could give someone that would change their thinking when it came to making a decision to shoot or not shoot when there is absolutely no threat to their person. This is not a training issue. This is an issue of who it is that we’ve decided we would allow to police our country.** This dates back to the beginning of policing, not to some recent phenomenon. Policing was never designed to take care of the people that it is being forced upon, generally speaking, the most vigorously ... I do not subscribe to the same theories as everyone else does when it comes to this issue of policing. **Recruitment is one mechanism by which large police departments with troubled histories have tried to implement system-wide changes. New York City has been very proud of its initiative to recruit college graduates into its police ranks, for example.** And college career fairs often include a recruiting table from the local police department. Not unrelatedly, community colleges are responsible for educating the bulk of civil servants in police departments around the country. Is recruitment, then, a better place to focus reform efforts?

**Grady is more optimistic about recruiting than training. “Who you hire to do the job makes a difference,”** he said.

**Hiring folks who view their role as a guardian instead of a warrior is the key to police reform**

**Lantigua-Williams, Reporter 2016**

Juleyka, The Atlantic, July 13th, How Much Can Better Training Do to Improve Policing? <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/07/police-training/490556/>

**There is,** the law professor Seth Stoughton has [argued](http://harvardlawreview.org/2015/04/law-enforcements-warrior-problem/), **a distinction between police who adopt the mindset of a guardian, and those who approach their job as warriors. In general terms, the former see their role as that of peacekeepers and protectors, while the latter see themselves more as enforcers and wielders of authority.** Serpas, like Stoughton, urges police to see themselves as guardians. **“I don’t think there is any question that if police are responding to what the community wants in a way that the community is going to support, then the officers have to be true to that by delivering the service in a way that the community can support,” he said. “Which means you don’t go in as an occupying force, as a warrior. You go in as a guardian. I think that when police officers enforce the law, particularly in neighborhoods that have a broken-windows component, or a quality-of-life component, they’ve got to really be in lockstep with the demands of the community.”** Grady argued that this sort of approach shouldn’t be seen as a new development, but as **a return to the ethos of American policing. “We’ve gotten distracted over the -years,”** he said, “and if you talk to most police officers today, and ask them, ‘What do you do for a living?’ they will tell you, ‘I am a law-enforcement officer.’” That’s a mischaracterization of what they were hired for. In the state of Illinois, the statutes don’t call them law-enforcement officers, they call them peace officers, but they don’t refer to themselves as peace officers. They refer to themselves as law-enforcement officers. They have given themselves a mission of law enforcement, but law enforcement was never the mission.

# Off Case:

## Terrorism Trade-Off DA

**Threat of jihadi terrorism is declining now thanks to counter-terrorism efforts, but the threat remains if we step back**

**BRINK 2019**

BrinkNews, June 27th, The Edge of Risk, Terrorism Risk is Declining, but a closer look shows an ominous, evolving threat,<https://www.brinknews.com/terrorism-risk-is-declining-but-a-closer-look-shows-an-ominous-evolving-threat/>

Let’s start with the good news: **Terrorism risk is declining in many countries.** **Between 2018 and 2019, plenty of evidence surfaced to underline this positive trend. The Islamic State (IS), which once controlled territory roughly equivalent in size to Portugal, no longer controls any land. In 2018, the number of people globally killed in terrorist attacks dropped by more than a quarter** compared to 2017, **and the number of total attacks around the world also fell by nearly a third. In 2014, the economic costs of terrorism peaked at almost $100 billion in tandem with the rise of IS; since then, the costs have fallen by nearly half.** But there’s also bad news: **Terrorism remains a dynamic risk and a serious threat** to people and organizations. The biggest problem areas identified in 2018, such as Afghanistan, saw little improvement in the past year — and new threats are on the rise. Lone wolf and small group attacks in public spaces and workplaces are becoming more prevalent, and extreme right-wing violence, bolstered by far-right political successes in the West, has created new problems for states, security services and civilians. **So although new data** in Marsh’s [2019 Terrorism Risk Insurance Report](https://www.marsh.com/us/insights/research/2019-terrorism-risk-insurance-report.html) **points to a positive general trend, there’s room — and significant demand — for policymakers, insurers and organizations to act to protect people and businesses.** Embracing terrorism risk and crisis management best practices and pursuing legislative priorities that support these preparations can help society better safeguard against the deadly costs of terrorism.

**Trade-off between resources and personnel for domestic and international terrorism**

**Maurer and Johnson, GAO 2013**

David and Charles, Government Accountability Office, DHS Should Take Action to Better Ensure Resources Abroad Align with Priorities <https://www.gao.gov/assets/660/658132.pdf>

According to OIA officials, the International Engagement Plan lays out in one place for the first time all of DHS’s international activities in an effort to improve organizational and programmatic resource alignment. However, they acknowledged that it does not necessarily serve to identify **a clear set of priorities and principles that would help to guide future resource decisions.** Instead, it represents more of a compendium of the many activities and priorities each of the contributing components and offices within DHS already had planned or under way. They noted that having a crosscutting view of all the activities and goals across the international footprint is a significant step forward for the department. They also said that more **clarity on strategic priorities in future iterations would help ensure better organizational and programmatic alignment,** but current priorities are largely determined independently by each component, and the department has not established a routine and crosscutting process for clarifying department-wide priorities. **Specific strategic priorities would provide DHS critical information to guide resource trade-off decisions and ensure that resources are directed to the highest homeland security priorities across the department and government-wide.**

**Nuclear Terrorism would cause extensive destruction and is likely**

**Roth and Bunn, Professors 2017**

Nikolas, and Matthew Harvard Kennedy School "The effects of a single terrorist nuclear bomb," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 9-28-2017, http://thebulletin.org/effects-single-terrorist-nuclear-bomb11150

The escalating threats between North Korea and the United States make it easy to forget **the “nuclear nightmare,”** as former US Secretary of Defense William J. Perry put it, that **could result even from the use of just a single terrorist nuclear bomb in the heart of a major city.** At the risk of repeating the vast literature on the tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki—and the substantial literature surrounding nuclear tests and simulations since then—we attempt to spell out here the likely consequences of the explosion of a single terrorist nuclear bomb on a major city, and its subsequent ripple effects on the rest of the planet. Depending on where and when it was detonated, **the blast, fire, initial radiation, and long-term radioactive fallout from such a bomb could leave the heart of a major city a smoldering radioactive ruin, killing tens or hundreds of thousands of people and wounding hundreds of thousands more.** Vast areas would have to be evacuated and might be uninhabitable for years. **Economic, political, and social aftershocks would ripple throughout the world.** A single terrorist nuclear bomb would change history. The country attacked—and the world—would never be the same. The idea of terrorists accomplishing such a thing is, unfortunately, not out of the question; **it is far easier to make a crude, unsafe, unreliable nuclear explosive that might fit in the back of a truck than it is to make a safe, reliable weapon of known yield that can be delivered by missile or combat aircraft.** Numerous government studies have concluded that it is plausible that a sophisticated terrorist group could make a crude bomb if they got the needed nuclear material. **And in the last quarter century, there have been some 20 seizures of stolen, weapons-usable nuclear material, and at least two terrorist groups have made significant efforts to acquire nuclear bombs.**

**Terrorism would destroy the global economy**

**Roth and Bunn, Professors 2017**

Nikolas, and Matthew Harvard Kennedy School "The effects of a single terrorist nuclear bomb," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 9-28-2017, http://thebulletin.org/effects-single-terrorist-nuclear-bomb11150

The economic impact of such an attack would be enormous. **The effects would reverberate for so far and so long that they are difficult to estimate** in all their complexity. **Hundreds of thousands of people would be too injured or sick to work** for weeks or months. Hundreds of thousands more would evacuate to locations far from their jobs. Many places of employment would have to be abandoned because of the radioactive fallout. **Insurance companies would reel under the losses;** but at the same time, many insurance policies exclude the effects of nuclear attacks—an item insurers considered beyond their ability to cover—so the owners of thousands of buildings would not have the insurance payments needed to cover the cost of fixing them, **thousands of companies would go bankrupt, and banks would be left holding an immense number of mortgages that would never be repaid. Consumer and investor confidence would likely be dramatically affected, as worried people slowed their spending.** Enormous new homeland security and military investments would be very likely. If the bomb had come in a shipping container, the targeted country—and possibly others—might stop all containers from entering until it could devise a system for ensuring they could never again be used for such a purpose, throwing a wrench into the gears of global trade for an extended period. (And this might well occur even if a shipping container had not been the means of delivery.) Even the far smaller 9/11 attacks are estimated to have caused economic aftershocks costing almost $1 trillion even excluding the multi-trillion-dollar costs of the wars that ensued. The cost of a terrorist nuclear attack in a major city would likely be many times higher. The most severe effects would be local, but **the effects of trade disruptions, reduced economic activity, and more would reverberate around the world.** Consequently, while some countries may feel that nuclear terrorism is only a concern for the countries most likely to be targeted—such as the United States—in reality it is a threat to everyone, everywhere. In 2005, then-UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan warned that **these global effects would push “tens of millions of people into dire poverty,” creating “a second death toll throughout the developing world.”**

**Nuclear lashout would be crazy**

**Roth and Bunn, Professors 2017**

Nikolas, and Matthew Harvard Kennedy School "The effects of a single terrorist nuclear bomb," Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 9-28-2017, http://thebulletin.org/effects-single-terrorist-nuclear-bomb11150

**The government of the country attacked would face desperate decisions:** How to help the city attacked? How to prevent further attacks? How to respond or retaliate? Terrorists—either those who committed the attack or others—would probably claim they had more bombs already hidden in other cities (whether they did or not), and threaten to detonate them unless their demands were met. The fear that this might be true could lead people to flee major cities in a large-scale, uncontrolled evacuation. There is very little ability to support the population of major cities in the surrounding countryside. The potential for widespread havoc and economic chaos is very real. If the detonation took place in the capital of the nation attacked, much of the government might be destroyed. A bomb in Washington, D.C., for example, might kill the President, the Vice President, and many of the members of Congress and the Supreme Court. (Having some plausible national leader survive is a key reason why one cabinet member is always elsewhere on the night of the State of the Union address.) Elaborate, classified plans for “continuity of government” have already been drawn up in a number of countries, but the potential for chaos and confusion—if almost all of a country’s top leaders were killed—would still be enormous. Who, for example, could address the public on what the government would do, and what the public should do, to respond? Could anyone honestly assure the public there would be no further attacks? If they did, who would believe them? In the United States, given the practical impossibility of passing major legislation with Congress in ruins and most of its members dead or seriously injured, some have argued for passing legislation in advance giving the government emergency powers to act—and creating procedures, for example, for legitimately replacing most of the House of Representatives. But to date, no such legislative preparations have been made. In what would inevitably be a desperate effort to prevent further attacks, traditional standards of civil liberties might be jettisoned, at least for a time—particularly when people realized that the fuel for the bomb that had done such damage would easily have fit in a suitcase. Old rules limiting search and surveillance could be among the first to go. The government might well impose martial law as it sought to control the situation, hunt for the perpetrators, and find any additional weapons or nuclear materials they might have. Even the far smaller attacks of 9/11 saw the US government authorizing torture of prisoners and mass electronic surveillance. And what standards of international order and law would still hold sway? **The country attacked might well lash out militarily at whatever countries it thought might bear a portion of responsibility.** (A terrifying description of the kinds of discussions that might occur appeared in Brian Jenkins’ book, Will Terrorists Go Nuclear?) **With the nuclear threshold already crossed in this scenario—at least by terrorists—it is conceivable that some of the resulting conflicts might escalate to nuclear use.** International politics could become more brutish and violent, with powerful states taking unilateral action, by force if necessary, in an effort to ensure their security. After 9/11, the United States led the invasions of two sovereign nations, in wars that have since cost hundreds of thousands of lives and trillions of dollars, while plunging a region into chaos. Would the reaction after a far more devastating nuclear attack be any less?

## Politics DA Links

**CVE is politically toxic**

**Rosand, Brookings Institution 2019**

Eric, Director, The Prevention Project, Organizing against Violent Extremism, May 26th, Responding to the Rise in Domestic Terrorism, Don’t Forget Prevention. <https://www.lawfareblog.com/responding-rise-domestic-terrorism-dont-forget-prevention>

Even before President Trump, **U.S. efforts at countering violent extremism (CVE)—which focused primarily on jihadi-related extremism—were championed primarily by government officials but attracted** [**little**](https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR2647.html)[**public**](https://oversight.house.gov/sites/democrats.oversight.house.gov/files/documents/testimony.Hughes.pdf) **or local support. Those on the political** [**left**](https://www.brennancenter.org/sites/default/files/publications/Brennan%20Center%20CVE%20Report.pdf) **tended to see CVE efforts at home as too law-enforcement oriented and raised concerns about** the targeting of American Muslims and the violation of their **civil liberties. Those on the** [**right**](https://warontherocks.com/2018/12/can-americas-countering-violent-extremism-efforts-be-salvaged/) **felt they** [**lacked**](https://warontherocks.com/2018/12/can-americas-countering-violent-extremism-efforts-be-salvaged/) **metrics and were too** [**politically correct**](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x44EREtI7uY&feature=youtu.be)**—and thus were** [**insufficiently**](https://www.rushlimbaugh.com/daily/2016/06/16/obama_s_cve_program_is_an_outrage_and_the_republicans_are_funding_it/) **focused on what they (despite the evidence) saw as the “real” threat of “radical Islam.”** Many communities around the country that might want to become more involved in local initiatives to prevent extremist violence have felt excluded from what they perceived to be an overly securitized, Washington-centric conversation that was perceived -(rightly or wrongly) to be about preventing future ISIS and al-Qaeda-inspired attacks, and not about extremist or targeted violence more broadly, including right-wing and gang violence. These stakeholders felt that CVE programs did not sufficiently take into account their broader concerns, which often [were](https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/releases/amp-amp0000065.pdf) linked to rising levels of Islamophobia and broader feelings of discrimination and stigmatization. As has been [well documented](https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/national-security/dhs-won-t-answer-questions-about-staff-funding-office-fight-n997821), the Trump administration cut federal resources for preventing extremist violence, including not renewing the one-time $10 million local grants program and significantly downsizing the relevant DHS office. More broadly, the Trump administration, despite the rhetoric on “domestic terrorism” in its 2018 counterterrorism strategy, ignored a congressional [request](https://www.congress.gov/115/plaws/publ91/PLAW-115publ91.pdf) to produce a strategy for countering violent extremism both at home and abroad. **The polarizing and politicized debates in the United States around CVE efforts have not allowed the space for a serious, practical discussion about how best to prevent extremist violence at home that is informed by the existing data and evidence. A more serious approach should incorporate good practices and lessons learned from U.S. allies in Europe,** as well as Australia and Canada, all of which are confronted by both jihadi and right-wing threats. Seize the Day

**Plan will be perceived as over-kill**

**Byman, Brookings, 2017**

Daniel, Senior Fellow, Oct 3rd, Should we treat domestic terrorists the way we treat ISIS? <https://www.brookings.edu/articles/should-we-treat-domestic-terrorists-the-way-we-treat-isis-what-works-and-what-doesnt/>

**Many of the current measures to fight domestic terrorists, such as arrests, work well.** In addition, **most Americans probably don’t want their government to be treating legitimate political movements with suspicion or making banks or Internet companies suppress free speech.** U.S. law enforcement, intelligence, and counter-messaging professionals should apply the law aggressively to prevent and disrupt violent activity while leaving individuals espousing the same ideas to protest in peace.

## Soft Approach Counterplan

**Counterplan: The United States Federal Government should adopt a non-militarized approach to counter the rise of white supremacy, including greater support for Mental Health and educational professionals, religious leaders and the private sector to counter-radicalization.**

**Rosand, Brookings Institution 2019**

Eric, Director, The Prevention Project, Organizing against Violent Extremism, May 26th, Responding to the Rise in Domestic Terrorism, Don’t Forget Prevention. <https://www.lawfareblog.com/responding-rise-domestic-terrorism-dont-forget-prevention>

However, **by largely limiting the focus to the existing counterterrorism tool kit and how it can be applied to the rising right-wing threat in the United States, we are in danger of adopting the same overly narrow, security-driven approach to preventing domestic terrorism that has characterized efforts against jihadi-inspired violence at home. We need a national framework that includes an** [**ecosystem**](https://www.bing.com/search?q=ecosystem+rosand+meserole&form=EDGEAR&qs=PF&cvid=2b15a76fdecf4bdaad0141a88684c1f7&cc=US&setlang=en-US&plvar=0) **of actors and programs that extends beyond law enforcement and involves mental health professionals, social workers, teachers, religious and other community leaders, parents, nongovernmental organizations, and the private sector (beyond just social media companies).**

**2NC Overview: Extend the Counterplan:**

**Most nations have adopted the CP’s approach, successfully, with the U.S. as an outlier.**

**Rosand, Brookings Institution 2019**

Eric, Director, The Prevention Project, Organizing against Violent Extremism, May 26th, Responding to the Rise in Domestic Terrorism, Don’t Forget Prevention. <https://www.lawfareblog.com/responding-rise-domestic-terrorism-dont-forget-prevention>

**Virtually every industrialized country that faces extremist violence threats has developed a national framework** that outlines the roles and responsibilities of actors at the national and local levels and **across law-enforcement and non-law-enforcement disciplines** (see, for example, [Canada](https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrcs/pblctns/ntnl-strtg-cntrng-rdclztn-vlnc/index-en.aspx), [Denmark](https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network/docs/preventing_countering_extremism_radicalisation_en.pdf), and [Switzerland](https://www.newsd.admin.ch/newsd/message/attachments/50703.pdf)). Such **frameworks lay the foundations for multidisciplinary local** [**programs**](https://www.osce.org/secretariat/418274?download=true) **that can intercede with individuals showing observable signs of being at risk of, vulnerable to or already on the path of radicalization** to violence—regardless of their ideological, political or other motivation. **These mechanisms aim to stop the path to violence at an early stage, enabling the mobilization of professionals and other community members who may be better placed to deliver an effective and preventive intervention because they have particular competence, expertise or perceived credibility or legitimacy that the police do not possess.** These programs are primarily for concerned family or other community members who suspect that an individual is becoming radicalized but has not yet committed to violence. (**They also offer the police an option between arrest and doing nothing. This is important when dealing with individuals who have yet to commit a crime but could put people’s lives at risk if they don’t receive some form of intervention, and it encourages family members who are understandably reluctant to work with authorities if it means their loved ones end up in jail.**) Prior[**studies**](https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/19434472.2015.1101147) **have shown that for three out of four persons who go on to commit violent attacks, their family or friends knew that something was seriously awry, but they did not get help, call the police or stop the attack.** This is [often](https://www.thegctf.org/Portals/1/Documents/Framework%20Documents/C/GCTF-Rabat-Washington-Good-Practices_ENG.pdf?ver=2018-09-21-122245-707) because they do not know whom to call other than the police and are often reluctant to make that call and potentially risk heavy law-enforcement action. Many of these programs rely on psychologists, religious leaders or former extremists to help individuals, whether associated with right-wing or jihadi groups, to [disengage](http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20190501-how-do-you-prevent-extremism) from violence. **Many of the ecosystems of programs enacted by U.S. allies are due, at least in part, to the generous and long-term national-level funding and guidance that have been made available to support locally led efforts to develop and sustain extremist violence prevention** (and disengagement) initiatives framed around the concerns of specific communities. Yet **the United States has become the outlier.**

**2NC CP Solvency: Details and pivot description**

**Rosand, Brookings Institution 2019**

Eric, Director, The Prevention Project, Organizing against Violent Extremism, May 26th, Responding to the Rise in Domestic Terrorism, Don’t Forget Prevention. <https://www.lawfareblog.com/responding-rise-domestic-terrorism-dont-forget-prevention>

**The current spotlight on right-wing extremist violence** in the United States—and the widely available data showing that it, and not jihadi-inspired violence, is a much greater threat to cities and communities around the country—**creates a unique opportunity to move beyond the unproductive CVE debates** of the past few years. It’s time for a more productive conversation that includes communities that are concerned about extremist violence of any stripe affecting them and want to contribute to prevention efforts. **A smart, comprehensive and sustainable national framework to prevent violent extremist attacks is long overdue. A better approach must go beyond investigations, prosecutions and arrests; involve more than just removing extremist content from social media platforms; and rally the support of the Departments of Health and Human Services and Education, alongside the federal law-enforcement agencies, and state, local and community-level actors and organizations.** Core elements of a framework could [include](https://www.dhs.gov/sites/default/files/publications/Los%20Angeles%20Framework%20for%20CVE-Full%20Report.pdf) the following: **An emphasis on government collaboration and engagement with communities. The involvement of professionals from across different disciplines, such as mental health, social work, mentoring and education.** A national network connecting front-line practitioners and professionals working to prevent different forms of extremist violence in their communities. An approach based on evidence rather than on [assumptions](https://organizingagainstve.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/GCCS_ROADMAP_FNL.pdf). The development of nondiscriminatory tools to enable professionals and community members to better identify those most at risk or vulnerable to committing acts of extremist violence and local programs that can address those risk factors and vulnerabilities. **A small-grants program, ideally overseen by the Department of Health and Human Services, that provides funding and guidance to community-based and other local organizations interested in starting new or scaling up existing programs aimed at preventing extremist violence,** but framed around local concerns. **More broadly, the adoption of a** [**public health**](https://www.start.umd.edu/news/how-public-health-can-improve-initiatives-counter-violent-extremism) **(as opposed to a law-enforcement-driven) approach to preventing extremist violence, which offers opportunities for multipurpose programming, avoiding stigma, and leveraging existing public health resources, including mental health professionals, social workers or teachers.**

**Policing creates an endless cycle, while a public health option solves better**

**Hughes, Brookings Institution, 2015**

Seamus, Deputy Director, Program on Extremism, George Washington University, August 31st, Domestic Counter-terrorism, Material Support or Bust, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/markaz/2015/08/31/domestic-counterterrorism-material-support-or-bust/>

if they know the response will not necessarily result in long-term, substantial legal trouble for their loved ones. **The United States would do well to take pieces of various international interventions programs and adapt them to a domestic context. An effective intervention program would bring together mental health professionals, social workers, religious leaders, community partners, law enforcement, and, when appropriate, school officials to develop a strategy for intervening in an individual’s radicalization process.** Each strategy should be individually tailored, as each person is susceptible to different drivers of radicalization. It also requires providing legal guidance to intervention workers who, without such latitudes, would place themselves at risk of civil and legal repercussions if the intervention goes awry. Law enforcement officials will continue to arrest individuals who pose a threat to our communities. They will also keep using informants. Select Muslim-American organizations will undoubtedly protest some counterterrorism practices. Nevertheless, **without a viable alternative to filing material support charges, the United States is stuck in an endless cycle in which each side throws up their hands and the next 200 families are left talking to their loved ones through a prison cell** or learning about their deaths in the latest issue of Dabiq. Without another option, it is material support or bust. That choice is untenable.

## Topicality: T Reform = Reduce

**Interpretation: Reform means to reduce**

**Bonner 2019**

Marianne, June 25th, What does tort reform mean? The Balance Small Business Forum, <https://www.thebalancesmb.com/how-tort-reform-affects-your-business-4152126>

Tort **reform means laws designed to reduce litigation. The laws generally focus on a specific industry,** such as the medical profession. While most [tort](https://www.thebalancesmb.com/insuring-your-business-against-tort-related-lawsuits-4126869) reform in the U.S. has been enacted by the states, some has been passed by the federal government.

**Violation:** The affirmative is an increase in the criminal justice system, not a reduction

**Standards:**

Their interpretation makes the topic bi-directional, most core affirmatives end the War on Drugs, Reduce Mass Incarceration, or otherwise reduce the power of the state over people

Bi-Directionality Bad, multiplies research burden, unlimits the topic, and makes it impossible to be negative, especially for small schools and novices. Causes bad, shallow debates which are bad for education, and destroys fairness.

## T: Policing

**Interpretation: Policing is actions done by police officers, not engaging non-police resources**

**Collins English Dictionary No Date**

[**https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/policing**](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/policing)

**Policing** in British English (pəˈliːsɪŋ) NOUN 1. **the activities carried out by** [**police**](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/police)[**officers**](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/officer) **in order to** [**preserve**](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/preserve) **law and order** the policing of public places 2. the actions of a person or group in authority in order to [ensure](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/ensure) fairness and [legality](https://www.collinsdictionary.com/us/dictionary/english/legality) in an area of public life the policing of new housing developments a more rigorous policing of new developments independent policing of clinical procedures

**Violation:** Aff goes beyond policing to non-police resources, expanding the bounds of the topic

**Standards:**

1. The police are a very specific entity doing very specific things centered around law enforcement. Going beyond them unlimits the topic, expands research burden of the negative which is bad for fairness and education
2. Specifically, community engagement and non-law enforcement programs are neg ground, counterplans and case turns, key to balancing the resolution.

## Extra T: Intelligence Assets

**Interpretation: The Plan includes intelligence assets, which isn’t included in policing or criminal justice reform**

**AFCEA 2007**

Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association, The Need to Share, April 2007, <https://www.afcea.org/mission/intel/documents/springintel07whitepaper_000.pdf>

The Law Enforcement Community **Pure law enforcement focuses on building a legal case related to a crime that already has been committed**—an historical perspective with a forensic cast. A case is carefully constructed based on admissible evidence. The evidence is handled in a prescribed manner. The rules associated with chain-of-custody are designed to protect the integrity of information and reduce the pollution of evidence as much as possible. A set of procedures is followed precisely to ensure the case will be successfully prosecuted. **In comparison, intelligence agencies often collect information in a way that is not admissible in a U.S. Court.** Law enforcement agencies are Copyright 2007 by AFCEA International Reproduction is authorized with appropriate citation 6 traditionally reluctant to use such information because of the potential of it being challenged and thereby jeopardizing a case.4 The pursuit of criminals requires secrecy—not information sharing. Premature release of data can destroy a criminal prosecution. Witnesses can change their testimony or even disappear. Important evidence may not become available if criminals learn that they are of interest to law enforcement. The law enforcement community lacks not only the desire but also an effective way of routinely providing information to the intelligence community. The Intelligence Community The intelligence community has its own deeply embedded culture and value systems. **In contrast to law enforcement, the intelligence community focuses beyond the borders of the United States and on the future—assessing foreign trends and actions.** Intelligence community analysts evaluate what they learn, interpret the importance of the information, and determine who should be informed. “Need to know” historically has been paramount.5 Protecting “sources and methods” is regarded as crucial to keeping sources intact. Intelligence professionals are constantly reminded that they are responsible for foreign intelligence and must unerringly adhere to the laws and policies designed to protect the rights of U.S. persons.

**Violation:** Intelligence and the police are different, one of their planks goes beyond the topic

**Standards:**

1. They read the 1AC with multiple planks, and have to defend all of them. Allowing them to kick planks makes the aff a moving target, and discourages good plan writing
2. Adding intelligence and international policing unlimits the topic, making it even harder to predict and research affirmative cases
3. This causes low clash shallow debates which aren’t educational and destroys fairness for an already aff-bias topic