# ac don’t shoot

Double consciousness also creates an element of conflict within the black American, as they struggle (often unsuccessfully) to to reconcile their identity as a black person and as an American citizen.

DuBois cites the example of the black artisan in “The Souls of Black Folk”. Conflicted between producing goods that reflect his unique perspective and life experience and goods that are marketable and acceptable to a broader population he is engaged in a battle of double aims (Edles and Appelrouth, 352). By working to create what is the best expression of himself he will be deemed unsuccessful and by creating what makes him successful he fails to express himself and in some ways may appear to be rejecting his true self. This example exemplifies the black struggle to unite the different components of their identity.

* Rolling eyes
* When u look like u have a purpose people stop u less often

## To do

affective fields are not pure- whiteness apriori constitutes the conditions by which subjects come to be in and navigate the world, positioning blackness as non-subject and creating structuring orientations in which the potentiality of blackness is ontologically foreclosed, Yancy 12. George. "Look A White!".Chapter 1: Looking at Whiteness - Finding Myself Much like a Mugger at a Boardwalk's End. 2012. AKB  
That Nicole comes… level of coming-to-be-in-the-world.

#### And, whiteness cannot be dismantled through analytic philosophical argumentation because whiteness has already set the terms of the debate. We should not debate about what constitutes oppression through theorizing. Instead we should suspend white epistemologies and refuse their conception of ethics. Headley 04

**Clevis Headley "Delegitimizing the Normativity of ‘Whiteness’: A critical Africana Philosophical Study of the Metaphoricity of "whiteness." From What Whiteness Looks Like?  Edited by George Yancy.  2004**  
From an Africana philosophical perspective, I argue for the teleo- logical suspension of

AND

a radically new concept of the human, a new metaphoricity of humanity.

#### link turn to agamben

Evgeny Morozov 14 Evgeny Morozov is the author of the Net Delusion: The Dark Side of Internet Freedom. He is a visiting scholar at Stanford University and a Schwartz fellow at the New America Foundation., 7-19-2014, Why the internet of things could destroy the welfare state, Guardian, https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2014/jul/20/rise-of-data-death-of-politics-evgeny-morozov-algorithmic-regulation, cw//az

The intelligence services embraced solutionism before other government agencies. Thus, they reduced the topic of terrorism from a subject that had some connection to history and foreign policy to an informational problem of identifying emerging terrorist threats via constant surveillance. They urged citizens to accept that instability is part of the game, that its root causes are neither traceable nor reparable, that the threat can only be pre-empted by out-innovating and out-surveilling the enemy with better communications.

Speaking in Athens last November, the Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben discussed an epochal transformation in the idea of government, "whereby the traditional hierarchical relation between causes and effects is inverted, so that, instead of governing the causes – a difficult and expensive undertaking – governments simply try to govern the effects".

For Agamben, this shift is emblematic of modernity. It also explains why the liberalisation of the economy can co-exist with the growing proliferation of control – by means of soap dispensers and remotely managed cars – into everyday life. "If government aims for the effects and not the causes, it will be obliged to extend and multiply control. Causes demand to be known, while effects can only be checked and controlled." Algorithmic regulation is an enactment of this political programme in technological form.

The true politics of algorithmic regulation become visible once its logic is applied to the social nets of the welfare state. There are no calls to dismantle them, but citizens are nonetheless encouraged to take responsibility for their own health. Consider how Fred Wilson, an influential US venture capitalist, frames the subject. "Health… is the opposite side of healthcare," he said at a conference in Paris last December. "It's what keeps you out of the healthcare system in the first place." Thus, we are invited to start using self-tracking apps and data-sharing platforms and monitor our vital indicators, symptoms and discrepancies on our own.

This goes nicely with recent policy proposals to save troubled public services by encouraging healthier lifestyles. Consider a 2013 report by Westminster council and the Local Government Information Unit, a thinktank, calling for the linking of housing and council benefits to claimants' visits to the gym – with the help of smartcards. They might not be needed: many smartphones are already tracking how many steps we take every day (Google Now, the company's virtual assistant, keeps score of such data automatically and periodically presents it to users, nudging them to walk more).

The numerous possibilities that tracking devices offer to health and insurance industries are not lost on O'Reilly. "You know the way that advertising turned out to be the native business model for the internet?" he wondered at a recent conference. "I think that insurance is going to be the native business model for the internet of things." Things do seem to be heading that way: in June, Microsoft struck a deal with American Family Insurance, the eighth-largest home insurer in the US, in which both companies will fund startups that want to put sensors into smart homes and smart cars for the purposes of "proactive protection".

An insurance company would gladly subsidise the costs of installing yet another sensor in your house – as long as it can automatically alert the fire department or make front porch lights flash in case your smoke detector goes off. For now, accepting such tracking systems is framed as an extra benefit that can save us some money. But when do we reach a point where not using them is seen as a deviation – or, worse, an act of concealment – that ought to be punished with higher premiums?

Or consider a May 2014 report from 2020health, another thinktank, proposing to extend tax rebates to Britons who give up smoking, stay slim or drink less. "We propose 'payment by results', a financial reward for people who become active partners in their health, whereby if you, for example, keep your blood sugar levels down, quit smoking, keep weight off, [or] take on more self-care, there will be a tax rebate or an end-of-year bonus," they state. Smart gadgets are the natural allies of such schemes: they document the results and can even help achieve them – by constantly nagging us to do what's expected.

The unstated assumption of most such reports is that the unhealthy are not only a burden to society but that they deserve to be punished (fiscally for now) for failing to be responsible. For what else could possibly explain their health problems but their personal failings? It's certainly not the power of food companies or class-based differences or various political and economic injustices. One can wear a dozen powerful sensors, own a smart mattress and even do a close daily reading of one's poop – as some self-tracking aficionados are wont to do – but those injustices would still be nowhere to be seen, for they are not the kind of stuff that can be measured with a sensor. The devil doesn't wear data. Social injustices are much harder to track than the everyday lives of the individuals whose lives they affect.

In shifting the focus of regulation from reining in institutional and corporate malfeasance to perpetual electronic guidance of individuals, algorithmic regulation offers us a good-old technocratic utopia of politics without politics. Disagreement and conflict, under this model, are seen as unfortunate byproducts of the analog era – to be solved through data collection – and not as inevitable results of economic or ideological conflicts.

However, a politics without politics does not mean a politics without control or administration. As O'Reilly writes in his essay: "New technologies make it possible to reduce the amount of regulation while actually increasing the amount of oversight and production of desirable outcomes." Thus, it's a mistake to think that Silicon Valley wants to rid us of government institutions. Its dream state is not the small government of libertarians – a small state, after all, needs neither fancy gadgets nor massive servers to process the data – but the data-obsessed and data-obese state of behavioural economists.

The 1AC is a form of counter-surveillance – you as a judge have an obligation to produce a space that focuses on challenging the starting point of status quo fear  
**Giroux 13** Henry A. Giroux 12, 5-2-2012, Violence, USA: The Warfare State and the Brutalizing of Everyday Life, Truthout, https://truthout.org/articles/violence-usa-the-warfare-state-and-the-brutalizing-of-everyday-life/, cw//az

This pedagogy of brutalizing hardness and dehumanization is also produced and circulated in schools, boot camps, prisons, and a host of other sites that now trade in violence and punishment for commercial purposes, or for the purpose of containing populations that are viewed as synonymous with public disorder. The mall, juvenile detention facilities, many public housing projects, privately owned apartment buildings and gated communities all embody a model of failed sociality and have come to resemble proto-military spaces in which the culture of violence and punishment becomes the primary order of politics, fodder for entertainment and an organizing principle for society. Even public school reform is now justified in the dehumanizing language of national security, which increasingly legitimates the transformation of schools into adjuncts of the surveillance and police state.(9)

The privatization and militarization of schools mutually inform each other as students are increasingly subjected to disciplinary apparatuses which limit their capacity for critical thinking, mold them into consumers, test them into submission, strip them of any sense of social responsibility and convince large numbers of poor minority students that they are better off under the jurisdiction of the criminal justice system than by being valued members of thy public schools. All of these spaces and institutions, from malls to schools, are coming to resemble war zones. They produce and circulate forms of symbolic and real violence that dissolve the democratic bonds of social reciprocity just as they appeal incessantly to the market-driven egocentric interests of the autonomous individual, a fear of the other and a stripped-down version of security that narrowly focuses on personal safety rather than collective security nets and social welfare.

Under such a war-like regime of privatization, militarism and punishing violence, it is not surprising that the Hollywood film “The Hunger Games” has become a box office hit. The film and its success are symptomatic of a society in which violence has become the new lingua franca. It portrays a society in which the privileged classes alleviate their boredom through satiating their lust for violent entertainment and, in this case, a brutalizing violence waged against children. While a generous reading might portray the film as a critique of class-based consumption and violence given its portrayal of a dystopian future society so willing to sacrifice its children, I think, in the end, the film more accurately should be read as depicting the terminal point of what I have called elsewhere the suicidal society (a suicide pact literally ends the narrative).(10)

Given Hollywood’s rush for ratings, the film gratuitously feeds enthralled audiences with voyeuristic images of children being killed for sport. In a very disturbing opening scene, the audience observes children killing each other within a visual framing that is as gratuitous as it is alarming. That such a film can be made for the purpose of attaining high ratings and big profits, while becoming overwhelming popular among young people and adults alike, says something profoundly disturbing about the cultural force of violence and the moral emptiness at work in American society. Of course, the meaning and relevance of “The Hunger Games” rest not simply with its production of violent imagery against children, but with the ways these images and the historical and contemporary meanings they carry are aligned and realigned with broader discourses, values and social relations. Within this network of alignments, risk and danger combine with myth and fantasy to stoke the seductions of sadomasochistic violence, echoing the fundamental values of the fascist state in which aesthetics dissolves into pathology and a carnival of cruelty.

Within the contemporary neoliberal theater of cruelty, war has expanded its poisonous reach and moves effortlessly within and across America’s national boundaries. As Chris Hedges has pointed out brilliantly and passionately, war “allows us to make sense of mayhem and death” as something not to be condemned, but to be celebrated as a matter of national honor, virtue and heroism.(11) War takes as its aim the killing of others and legitimates violence through an amorally bankrupt mindset in which just and unjust notions of violence collapse into each other. Consequently, it has become increasingly difficult to determine justifiable violence and humanitarian intervention from unjustifiable violence involving torture, massacres and atrocities, which now operate in the liminal space and moral vacuum of legal illegalities. Even when such acts are recognized as war crimes, they are often dismissed as simply an inevitable consequence of war itself. This view was recently echoed by Leon Panetta who, responding to the alleged killing of civilians by US Army Staff Sgt. Robert Bales, observed, “War is hell. These kinds of events and incidents are going to take place, they’ve taken place in any war, they’re terrible events and this is not the first of those events and probably will not be the last.”(12) He then made clear the central contradiction that haunts the use of machineries of war in stating, “But we cannot allow these events to undermine our strategy.”(13) Panetta’s qualification is a testament to barbarism because it means being committed to a war machine that trades in indiscriminate violence, death and torture, while ignoring the pull of conscience or ethical considerations. Hedges is right when he argues that defending such violence in the name of war is a rationale for “usually nothing more than gross human cruelty, brutality and stupidity.”(14)

War and the organized production of violence has also become a form of governance increasingly visible in the ongoing militarization of police departments throughout the United States. According to the Homeland Security Research Corp, “The homeland security market for state and local agencies is projected to reach $19.2 billion by 2014, up from $15.8 billion in fiscal 2009.”(15) The structure of violence is also evident in the rise of the punishing and surveillance state,(16) with its legions of electronic spies and ballooning prison population – now more than 2.3 million. Evidence of state-sponsored warring violence can also be found in the domestic war against “terrorists” (code for young protesters), which provides new opportunities for major defense contractors and corporations to become “more a part of our domestic lives.”(17) Young people, particularly poor minorities of color, have already become the targets of what David Theo Goldberg calls “extraordinary power in the name of securitization … [they are viewed as] unruly populations … [who] are to be subjected to necropolitical discipline through the threat of imprisonment or death, physical or social.”(18) The rhetoric of war is now used by politicians not only to appeal to a solitary warrior mentality in which responsibility is individualized, but also to attack women’s reproductive rights, limit the voting rights of minorities and justify the most ruthless cutting of social protections and benefits for public servants and the poor, unemployed and sick.

This politics and pedagogy of death begins in the celebration of war and ends in the unleashing of violence on all those considered disposable on the domestic front. A survival-of-the-fittest ethic and the utter annihilation of the other have now become normalized, saturating everything from state policy to institutional practices to the mainstream media. How else to explain the growing taste for violence in, for example, the world of professional sports, extending from professional hockey to extreme martial arts events? The debased nature of violence and punishment seeping into the American cultural landscape becomes clear in the recent revelation that the New Orleans Saints professional football team was “running a ‘bounty program’ which rewarded players for inflicting injuries on opposing players.”(19) In what amounts to a regime of terror pandering to the thrill of the crowd and a take-no-prisoners approach to winning, a coach offered players a cash bonus for “laying hits that resulted in other athletes being carted off the field or landing on the injured player list.”(20)

## notes

Evidence may be bracketed for problematic language or clarity. I don’t endorse any ableist language. Content warning:graphic mentions of assault

## Part 1

Alex Zimmerman 12, Alex Zimmerman is a Brooklyn-based journalist covering everything from cops to trains. His work has appeared in the Village Voice, Pittsburgh City Paper, and Pittsburgh Post-Gazette., 11-11-2012, This Black Man Survived a Police Shooting and Became an Activist, Vice, https://www.vice.com/en\_us/article/7bde3z/the-unarmed-black-man-who-survived-a-police-shooting-to-become-an-activist-1012, cw//az

"I remember the officers screaming, yelling, 'Where's the guns, where's the drugs?'" Ford says. "They pulled me out and slammed me on the ground and handcuffed me face down. I thought they Tased me until blood was coming out my mouth and from under me. I was like, Wow, they shot me... I thought I was going to die." It's been nearly three years since the evening when Pittsburgh officer David Derbish shot then 19-year-old Ford four times, leaving him paralyzed. Before that night, Ford was a fairly typical teenager: He enjoyed making music videos and boxing. He helped his uncle out at the body shop and was getting ready to start taking classes at a local community college. Now 22, Ford uses a wheelchair and has no sensation below his waist. He often wakes up with a tingling feeling in his hands and has trouble writing without cramping up. He certainly doesn't box anymore, but on a recent rainy Friday afternoon, as he wheels himself into a café, Leon Ford is smiling. That smile doesn't disappear, even when he talks about being shot or what he makes of the national conversation on policing issues and the Black Lives Matter movement. He's unrelentingly positive—and doesn't see why he should act otherwise. "You can either look at a situation as a curse or a blessing and I chose the blessing route," Ford says. "It's just how I learned to deal with my problems." But Ford also feels a sense of responsibility for speaking out on behalf of the many other unarmed black men whose confrontations with police ended differently. It's what makes his perspective on policing in America so unique. "Unlike Tamir Rice, Oscar Grant, Ezell Ford, Mike Brown, and many other victims of police misconduct, I survived to tell my story," Ford wrote in a September letter to Pittsburgh officials. "In many ways, I may also be telling their stories as well."

## framing

#### Rossipal 17 Surveillance must be genealogically analyzed through the starting point of racialized subjects where biopolitical control hasn’t lessened

Looking Back Racializing Assemblages and the Biopolitics of Resistance Christian Rossipal Department of Media Studies Stockholms universitet Master’s Thesis 30 ECTS credits Cinema Studies Master’s Programme in Cinema Studies 120 ECTS credits Spring 2017 Supervisor: Jan Olsson cw//az

In the oft-cited 1977 volume Discipline and Punish, Michel Foucault outlines and theorizes the history of “disciplining societies.”118 A point of departure for Foucault is the public execution as a site for spectacle, instill[s]ing fear and control in the people to be governed.119 In his analysis, the public execution has a juridical and political function, and is to be considered a “ceremonial by which a momentarily injured sovereignty is reconstituted.”120 It entails an indirect “hold over the body”: Thanks to the techniques of surveillance, the “physics” of power, the hold over the body, operate according to the laws of optics and mechanics, according to a whole play of spaces, lines, screens, beams, degrees and without recourse, in principle at least, to excess, force or violence.121 With less support for public scaffolds and gallows, the late 18th century saw the “slackening on the hold of the body.”122 More precisely, Foucault outlines a transition to a society of control which relied on internalization rather than overt physical discipline (e.g. public executions).123 This is, however, a highly Eurocentric historiography, as Simone Browne contends.124 She points out that when the “body is black, the grip [over the body] **hardly loosened d**uring slavery and continued post-Emancipation with, for example, the mob violence of lynching and other acts of racial terrorism.”125 Browne further underscores her point by examining how slave surveillance practices dovetailed the invention of modern surveillance – in turn offering new ways to understand contemporary surveillance practices.126 An important thing we can learn from this is that “[t]he historical formation of surveillance is not outside the historical formation of slavery.”127 Browne shows how slave surveillance was antecedent to still ongoing practices.128 Thus, she argues for a “surveillance studies that grapples with its constitutive genealogies,” since the Foucauldian framework still prevails.129 Going back to the 18th century, we can see how the slave pass system – monitoring blackness as property – was a direct and violent intrusion into the mobility of black bodies.130 Further, in 1790 the U.S. federal government introduced racial nomenclature as a population management tool.”131 The list of surveillance along racial lines goes on, with “[bodily] branding, the one-drop rule, quantitative plantation records that listed enslaved people alongside livestock and crops, slave passes, slave patrols, and runaway notices.”132 In other words, racializing surveillance exercise social control through technology and defines what is “in or out of place.”133 Racializing surveillance is not only relegated to the era of slavery. While it is true that surveillance today is ubiquitous and penetrates throughout contemporary society – the surveilling gaze is differential.134 “Today’s seeing eye is white,” to use John Fiske’s words.135 This in turn results in what Browne calls “black luminosity,” namely the “condition wherein blackness is rendered permanently visible, knowable, and traceable through a range of technological prostheses.”136 For instance: among U.S. citizens, black women are nine times more likely to get x-rayed at airports than white women (but still half as likely to carry contraband as white women).137 Moreover, and with **reference to over** ten empirical studies, Brian Jordan Jeffersson shows how “policies explicitly track down black and Latino males, [showing] racialized police brutality to be symptoms rather than aberrations of the NYPD’s emphasis on profiling, regulating behaviour, and overreliance on force.”138 Based on my field study, I suggest below that racializing surveillance is equally pervading in the specific field of copwatching (i.e. for political subjects allied with blackness). Public spaces are shaped for and by whiteness, and by extension some acts in public “are abnormalized by way of racializing surveillance and then coded for disciplinary measures that are punitive in their effects.”139 I would argue that copwatching is precisely such an abnormalized act, regardless of its actual legal status as a constitutional right.140 This is echoed in the way the copwatcher “Carlos” narrate his own contacts with the NYPD: I see three plainclothes males running out of a car real fast, so I was like, they have to be police. They started to proceed towards a male standing… and I pulled out my video recording camera and started recording quick. And I started walking towards the Pattison housing, which is in Bronx. I documented everything […]. The officers then approached me, we exchanged words. I put away my video cameras so that they’d think, like you know, that there’s nothing recording – sometimes when they see you do that, they would act like who they really are. One of them gave me a direct order to “get out of here.” I replied: “Did I break the law? I ain’t going nowhere if I ain’t break no law.” And so he said: “Ok, motherfucker, now you’re going to jail.” And they locked me up […]. As soon as I entered the precinct, I heard officers calling my name. Like a big celebration, like a prize party for me […]. They searched me and got to my two-way receiver radio, my walkie-talkie which I use to communicate with other copwatchers. So he said: “Oh, this is a scanner and a transmit. My man, you’re going down, you’re a felon now.” Then they all started clapping and yelling again, like “we got this motherfucker.” Now I know I got a target in my back. They want to remove me from the streets. They see [copwatchers]me as a threat to their way of operating, their broken windows policing, and the aggressiveness they bring to communities of colors.141 The quote above is quite representative of how I heard “Carlos” frame the NYPD in general – as an antagonistic force; a kind of enemy. This also echoes the general activist discourse I encountered in all other copwatch groups.142 In the case of “Carlos” it was also, in my perception, imbued with a lot of personal affect. Regarding the actual truth value of the NYPD practices referred to in the quote, you can of course claim that it is in “Carlos’s” interest to depict them as more brutal than they actually are – because of his antagonistic relationship to the department. However, he provided me with covert audio recordings of the precinct’s “prize party” and a video of the initial stop-and-frisk situation, substantiating these specific claims. Moreover, [Carlos] also showed me a scanned document on his cell phone. It was an official intelligence file, showing his picture. He told me, and I could read in the document, that the Metropolitan Transit Authority [MTA] and the NYPD had an undercover police officer who had surveilled [Carlos], noting his location, tracked his individual movement during protests, and taking photos of him in secret. It was clear that [Carlos] was both scared by this and a bit thrilled to be considered “public enemy number one,” as he said.143 The document had originally been released by The Intercept as part of a larger Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request, showing that the MTA and NYPD surveilled a number of Black Lives Matter protests throughout 2015, monitoring activists and their movements – “Carlos” among others.144 The document indicates a possible larger trend in the contemporary U.S. surveillance of blackness, focusingin on political activists – or instances when “blackness is looking back,” as I frame it further on in the thesis. As a counterpoint to “Carlos” seeing himself as “public enemy number one,” we should avoid the pitfall of a monolithic analysis of power – for instance, by looking at how race intersects other factors in policing. The bureaucracy of policing and the departments’ statistical emphasis has “created an internal accountability system which not only widens the chasm between police and ‘problem communities,’ but also pits them against one another [...].”145 In other words, police officers are forced to “produce numbers” in order to account for themselves within the departments, which in combination with the broken windows mantra has created an aggressive enforcement of petty crimes, in turn targeting communities of color. 146 I do not want to imply that the structural preconditions outlined above necessarily take individual agency away from police officers, nor that “Carlos” is wrong in his framing of a direct antagonism. Still, people form their activities to be accounted for – as Czarniawska notes, “accounting creates a space in which they [targets or goals] will be performed, dictating the coordinates of this space and structuring it in advance […].”147 What I want to highlight with the example of accounting, is that there are multiple powers at play behind what can appear as “blunt” racism. A policed situation or space does not even have to be race-inflicted itself, but since surveillance reify bodies along racial lines “the outcome is often discriminatory treatment of those who are negatively racialized by such surveillance.”148 The nature of surveillance has changed with the advent of the digital – and so has the surveillance of blackness.149 The ways of looking have been diversified and with them the power relationships behind.150 We are not living under a Foucauldian “panoptic gaze” (the invisible, singular all-seeing eye) – rather, we are entangled in a playing field of multiple gazes which are also being “abstracted to the level of symbols, or binary codes, aggregated and reconstituted at will, by those who control it.”151 Indeed, after the release of the article from The Intercept referenced above – and after Edward Snowden’s NSA leak152 – all of the activists I met were highly aware that someone could track their digital communication: [Eric] then got everybody to write down the name and number of a “point of contact” in case any of us got arrested, and also got everybody to install a message encryption app and started a new group chat through it – for safety reasons: “They keep track of us.”153 Data and information generated online (and offline) are today the subjects of aggregation by powerful institutions (e.g. corporations or governments) as mentioned above. Thus, “surveillance has become more of a matter of collecting and analyzing information rather than merely ‘looking down at people.’”154 Consequently, I will use the term “surveillance” in a broad and not necessarily ocular sense throughout the rest of this thesis. Browne further argues that the surveillance of blackness in the digitized era also has brought with it a new form of racializing, namely what she terms digital epidermalization (as the imposition of raceonto bodies).155 She identifies it by looking at how certain lineages of race thinking can be found in contemporary biometric technology.156 While biometric data seem to objectively ascribe gender and race to a person, it fails to account for the many nonconforming bodies who are absent in the underlying algorithm.157 For instance, based on prototypical whiteness, facial scanning systems can fail to read a black person’s face.158 At this juncture, biopolitics and visual media meet – which is further explored in Chapter 5.

* A2 right to record cp solves
* A2 survey their phone records means no solvency
* Verifiable proof that changes narratives
* Is this sufficient for securitization?

#### Rossipal 2 The consumption of white perspective causes an internalization of inferiority which produces double consciousness, a split of identity that creates psychological violence – any step they take is automatically deemed wrong.
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4.2. The Racially Saturated Field of Visibility Black luminosity – the permanent visibility of blackness, as described in the previous subchapter – extends outside the field of surveillance to other visual economies. Amir Gupta-Nigam contends that “if whiteness evades description, blackness is saturated with signifiers.”159 This is not a rectified saturation, however, but rather an overdetermination of blackness, extending in many contradictory directions. Through popular visual culture (e.g. sports and crime shows) blackness is constructed as an undisciplined and transgressive force; with “extraordinary ability, criminal deviance, and libidinal pleasure.”160 At the same time, as Ella Shohat and Robert Stam argue, race and ethnicity as structural factors themselves are veiled by being “submerged” into colorblind rep**resentation**s.161 This is a result of the patriarchal white gaze permeating the field of visibility – a gaze which, of course, has deep roots and, for instance, can be traced back to the U.S. constitution and its “false universalism” (absenting black people from the conception of “Man”).162 Blackness is thus paradoxically both saturated with signifiers and made invisible at the same time, in an aporia between Black being and political ontology.163

* Blackness considered outside normal ethics
* double consciousness psych viol impact
* Theory takeout??

#### Browne 12 the panopticon is the modern-day plantation master’s house and keeps black folk in line but subversive methods turn whiteness’ ignorance against itself and revokes agency

Browne ’12 [Simone Brown, Browne holds an MA and Ph.D. in Sociology and Equity Studies in Education from the University of Toronto.[4] She was a faculty affiliate at the University of Kansas's Surveillance Studies Research Center, and has also worked as a faculty affiliate at the University of Texas at Austin's Center for Women and Gender Studies “Race and Surveillance” Simone 2012 cw//az]

According to Christian Parenti, the history of surveillance in America can be traced to the "simple accounts" of slave owners (2003: 15). Of course, the accounting practices of transatlantic slavery were also present outside of the Americas. These simple accounts included slave vessel manifests listing human cargo, plantation inventories, diaries which contained observations about plantation life and instructions for governing slaves. One example involved the "General Rules" recorded by Charles Tait for his Columbus, Texas plantation: "4th In giving orders always do it in a mild tone, and try to leave the impression on the mind of the negro that what you say is the result of reflection." The detailed cataloguing of slave life was a mechanism of disciplinary power, where disciplinary power, as Michel Foucault tells us, is "exercised through its invisibl[e]ity," while imposing a "compulsory visibility" on its targets (1979: 187). Disciplinary power, then, operated on the enslaved as a racializing surveillance that individuals were at once subjected to and that produced them as racial, and therefore enslavable, subjects. Such a racializing surveillance was apparent in the plantation security system, a system that relied on, as Parenti lays out, three "information technologies: the written slave pass., organized slave patrols, and wanted posters for runaways" (2003:15). Here, surveillance and literacy were closely articulated as slaves and indentured servants who could read and write could also forge passes and manumission papers or alter existing ones by replacing dates, names and other unique identifiers, in this way functioning as "antebellum hackers" able to "crack the code of the planters' security system" (20). These forged passes were used for unauthorized travel outside of the plantation and were produced by fugitives upon demand by slave patrollers, or "pattie rollers," who were often non-property owning but armed white men who policed slave mobilities. Sometimes producing a forged pass was not necessary. Any piece of printed text would do given that fugitive slaves were aware that many of these pattie rollers were illiterate, so they would hand over these "panes" when apprehended. This security system, then, relied on the "racially defined contours of (white) literacy and (Black) illiteracy," a dichotomy that was not to readily upheld (18). Less easily counterfeited passes were later fashioned out of metal. The compulsory visibility of the racial subject can be seen in the circulation of newspaper advertisements and wanted posters for runaway slaves and truant servants. These texts were primarily aimed at a white public that was assumed to be literate and free, and who in consuming these texts became part of the apparatus of surveillance, the eyes and ears of face-to-face watching and regulating. In detailing physical descriptions, the surveillance technology of the fugitive slave advertisement made the already hyper-visible racial subject legible as "out of place." For instance, a March 15 1783 advertisement in The Royal Gazette offering a "Two Dollars reward" for "a Mulatto, nr Quadroon Girl, about 14 years of age, named Seth but calls herself Sill," attests to the role of fugitive slave notices, and similarly wanted postern, in upholding racial categorization This notice we on to state: "sometimes says she's white and often paints her face tc over that deception." Seth's, or Sal's, duplicity is not limited to her use of an alias, as dm notice tells us but also to her racial ambiguity, witness her appaimit choosing to self-identify or pass as white, rather that. as "a Mulatto" (one black parent and one white parent) or a "Quadroon Girl" black grandparent) as per the racial nomenclature that arose out of slavery. Later such classifications as a form of population management. Were made official with the first US federal census in 1790. I will return to the census as technology that formalized racial categorization later. For now, the wanted notice for fugitive slaves as an information technology demonstrates that then as now race was a social construct that required constant: policing and oversight. However, the format of the fugitive notice was repurposed in the form of handbills that functioned as a means of counter-surveillance. An 1851 handbill produced by abolitionist Theodore Parker attests to this as it cautioned "colored people of Boston" to steer clear of of "watchmen and police officers and to "keep a sharp look out for kidnappers, and have top eye open" "Top eye" here was directive to look out and about **with** keen **intent** as police officers were empowered to act as slave catcher under fugitive slave laws. Black spectatorship, along with the gages of white abolitionist and other allies, functioned as a form of oppositional looking back at racializing surveillance. In her discussion of black spectatorship, the gaze and looking relations during slavery and the racial apartheid of Jim Crow in the southern United States, bell hooks tells us that black people often "cultivated the habit of casting the gaze downward so as not to appear uppity.” To look directly was an assertion of subjectivity, equality" (1992: 168). hooks suggests that the often violent ways in which blacks were denied the right to look back - think at the gruesome beating and murder of 14-year-old Emmett Till in Mississippi in 1955, allegedly for looking at a white woman—"had produced in us an overwhelming longing to look, a rebellious desire, an oppositional par" (116). Such politicized and oppositional looking were agential acts and can be seen, for example, in a June 14th 1763 runaway dare notice printed in the Royal Gazette for 16-year-old Sam, who is described in the notice as "five feet high" and "remarkable in turning up” the whites of his eyes when spoken to. This notice record’s Sam's oppositional gaze, his looking back and shows us that resistance can be found even in the simple act of rolling one's eyes. Black looks have the power to trouble surveillance at a "technology of whiteness" (Fiske: 1998: 69).

* Optimism?
* Gaze solvency

#### Davidson and Yancy 09 the role of the ballot is to consistently gaze upon opposition to disrupt white invisibility – it’s prerequisite to mass change

Critical Perspectives on bell hooks Edited by Maria del Guadalupe Davidson and George Yancy First published 2009 by Routledge 270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016 cw//az

George Yancy engages hooks’s critical pedagogy in terms of its importance for speaking to and challenging whiteness. He makes an important link between the banking system of education and how this approach is complicit with sustaining and creating an ethos around leaving whiteness unexamined. Th e banking system reinforces the white student as passive and normative, further concealing whiteness as privilege. Yancy argues that white students must come to see themselves as incomplete through an engaged pedagogy that encourages acts of problem-posing that enable students to name whiteness and make whiteness an object of critical refl ection. Cindy LaCom and Susan Hadley bring two very important theoretical lenses— disability studies and music therapy respectively—to bear upon hooks’s work in the area of critical pedagogy. LaCom and Hadley share hooks’s view that the classroom Introduction • 9 is a critical space for deconstructing various hegemonic practices. Deploying personal narrative, a critical approach used by hooks, they explore the classroom as an important site for engaging in practices of freedom. In stream with hooks, both challenge the view that embodiment (and even the arrangement of physical space) is inconsequential to our epistemic practices. Place and embodiment become important sites of critical embarkation not only for recognizing how certain bodies get marked (and how others are deemed “normative” and unmarked), but also for recognizing ways in which self-refl ection on one’s own oft en unexamined embodied standpoint within the context of classrooms can undo practices of unfreedom within and beyond the classroom, “And that can truly be transformative.” Tim Davidson and Jeanette R. Davidson employ a thoroughly engaging deconstruction of the role of whiteness in the academy. Th eir chapter argues that hooks’s direct confrontation and unmasking of whiteness in the academy through language that identifi es the “the functional structure of racism” creates a space for revolutionary transformation to occur. Th eir chapter engages hooks’s contention that racism, particularly in terms of its manifestation in the academy, is not to be reduced to a set of beliefs or attitudes, but is systemic and institutional. Th ey explore important themes such as personal narrative, feminism, postmodernism, the problematic servant-served construct, decolonization, and more, as these relate to hooks’s work vis-à-vis exploring and challenging whiteness qua white supremacy within the academy.

## Advocacy

#### I contend: Resolved: In the United States, reporters ought to have the right to protect the identity of confidential sources in cases of recordings of police. Vote aff to endorse the genealogical analysis of racialized subjects, Patterson

Brandon E.[Staff Reporter for Mother Jones, Howard University Graduate, As seen in: Mother Jones, HuffPost, USA Today, NBC News, Detroit Free Press, AZCentral.com, Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, Boston Herald, Des Moines Register, Knoxville News Sentinel], 12-7-2017, The reporter who exposed police brutality in the Laquan McDonald case may be forced to reveal sources, Mother Jones, <https://www.motherjones.com/crime-justice/2017/12/killer-cops-lawyers-want-to-force-testimony-from-the-reporter-who-exposed-their-client/>, accessed 9/1/2018 cw//az

The New York Times, the Associated Press, and the Online News Association were among the organizations that signaled their support for Kalven by putting their names on a brief by the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press. “Protection of reporters’ confidential sources serves the health of our democracy by ensuring that citizens have access to information needed ‘to make informed political, social, and economic choices,'” it reads. The Illinois shield law **was “adopted to** protect precisely **the types** of reporter-source communications at issue in this case—those that shed light onmatters of critical public importance, such as how police shootings **of civilians are investigated and resolved.”**

## Advantage

#### Hattery and Smith 18 Law enforcement enables society’s gaze upon black bodies as “dangerous criminals” and justifies brutality in the name of public security.

POLICING BLACK BODIES How Black Lives Are Surveilled and How to Work for Change Angela J. Hattery [Professor Angela J. Hattery, George Mason University (BA Carleton College, PHD University of Wisconsin-Madison) is a sociologist and serves as the Director of the Women & Gender Studies Program at George Mason University. Her research focuses on social stratification, gender, family, and race. She is the author of numerous articles, book chapters, and books, including her latest book Policing Black Bodies (January 2018), African American Families: Myths and Realities (2012/2016) The Social Dynamics of Family Violence (2012/2016), Prisoner Reentry and Social Capital (2010), Interracial Intimacies (2009); Interracial Relationships (2009); Intimate Partner Violence (2008); African American Families (2007) and Women, Work, and Family (2001). She teaches classes in gender and sexuality, intersections of race, class and gender, gender based violence and feminist methods.] and Earl Smith [Earl Smith, PhD, is {Emeritus} Professor of Sociology and the Rubin Distinguished Professor of American Ethnic Studies at Wake Forest University. He is the Director of the Wake Forest University American Ethnic Studies Program. Dr. Smith is the former Chairperson of the Department of Sociology, Wake Forest University, from 1997-2005. Prior to his appointment at Wake Forest University, Professor Smith was the Dean, Division of Social Science at Pacific Lutheran University (PLU) in Tacoma, Washington. He also served as Chairperson of the Department of Sociology at PLU. He is the author of numerous articles, book chapters, and books, including Gender, Power and Violence (2016),The Social Dynamics of Family Violence (2016, 2012), Prisoner Reentry and Social Capital (2010), Sport and Social Theory (2010), Race, Sport and the American Dream (2014/2009/2007), Interracial Intimacies (2009); Interracial Relationships (2009); and African American Families (2007). He teaches courses in Sociology and Sports Management at George Mason University.] Published by Rowman & Littlefield An imprint of The Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc. cw//az

In his book Rise of the Warrior Cop: The Militarization of America’s Police Forces, Radley Balko makes clear the connection between the militarization of the police and policing Black bodies. Today’s armored-up policemen are a far cry from the constables of early America. The unrest of the 1960s brought about the invention of the SWAT unit which in turn led to **the debut of** military tactics in the ranks of police officers. Nixon’s War on Drugs, Reagan’s War on Poverty, Clinton’s COPS program, the post-9/11 security state under Bush and Obama: by degrees, each of these innovations expanded and empowered police **forces**, always at the expense of civil liberties. And these are just four among a slew of reckless programs.4 But the militarization movement in law enforcement is not limited to arming police officers with the tools of war; it is also arming police officers with a way of thinking that Dave Grossman, otherwise known as “Professor Carnage,” refers to as “killology.” In his report titled “Professor Carnage,” Steve Featherstone details the curriculum that Dave Grossman has delivered to tens of thousands of police officers over the last two 160 POLICING BLACK BODIES decades and that he details in his book On Killing, which has sold more than half a million copies. Dave Grossman has transported his approach to soldiering, an ideology he refers to as “Killology,” seamlessly to the world of law enforcement. Grossman trains tens of thousands of police and other law enforcement agents to think of themselves as warriors. The police are soldiers in the war to protect **American** public safety. And, that war is ultimately a war on Black bodies, a war on Black men. Every state of war requires a state enemy and police officers are taught that Black men are that enemy of the state and sometimes they must be killed.5 Extending Grossman’s argument, when police officers kill a Black man, they haven’t committed a crime, any more than when an American soldier kills a member of the Taliban. They have done their job. They have eliminated the enemy, the threat to the American way of life, the threat to public safety. Policing Black bodies. When we analyz[ing]e the (lack of) accountability for police officers who kill unarmed Black men—they almost never go to prison—through this lens, we expose the logic of state-sanctioned violence, of the warrior police. Police officers who kill unarmed Black men (or any American citizen) don’t go to prison because they haven’t committed an individual act of violence, they’ve engaged in state-sanctioned practices to control the enemy. They are fighting the war on Black people. When we read and hear testimony of police who have killed an unarmed Black man, one of the most common defenses they invoke is that they feared for their life, that the Black man seemed wild, out of control, huge, like a monster. And this misperception is confirmed by experimental research. A 2017 study published in the American Psychological Association’s Journal of Personality and Social Psychology showed that white people perceived Black men as more muscular, heavier, taller, stronger, and more dangerous than white men the same size and weight.6 On September 16, 2016, Tulsa, Oklahoma, female police officer Betty Shelby shot and killed forty-year-old Black man Terence Crutcher while he stood by his disabled vehicle. She killed Crutcher because, as she put it, she feared for her life. Although Crutcher was unarmed, Officer Shelby said she believed he was about to reach for a weapon. In her widely viewed 60 Minutes interview that took place on April 2, 2017, when asked why she shot Crutcher, she responded, “Because it was an odd behavior. Zombie-like, I—I—it’s the best I can . . . . Zombie-like.”7 Officer Shelby was acquitted just a few weeks later on May 17, 2017. Like so many other police officers, Officer Shelby saw Crutcher as a big scary Black man. Often police officers report perceiving the unarmed Black men they kill as significantly bigger than they really are, as monsters. Darren Wilson, the police officer who shot and killed unarmed Black teen Michael Brown, described Brown as huge, like a monster. Wilson and Brown are about the same size and weight. Wilson was never indicted. According to Featherstone, “Jeronimo Yanez, the police officer who shot and killed Philando Castile in front of his girlfriend and her fouryear- old daughter during a routine traffic stop in a Minneapolis suburb last July [2016], had attended a seminar on warrior policing co-taught by Grossman. Yanez shot Castile seven times, at point-blank range, because he mistakenly believed that Castile was reaching for the gun in his pocket instead of his wallet.” Despite substantial forensic evidence, Yanez was acquitted of all charges on June 16, 2017. Police killings of unarmed Black men must be understood as nothing short of state-sanctioned violence. Policing Black bodies. One of the most common critiques of this argument is that police also kill unarmed white men. Black police officers kill unarmed Black men. These facts do not contradict our argument that police killings of unarmed Black men are a form of state-sanctioned violence. Rather, these facts reinforce our argument. As Chris Hayes argues in his book A Colony in a Nation, The Colony is overwhelmingly black and brown, but in the wake of financial catastrophe, deindustrialization, and sustained wage stagnation, the tendencies and systems of control developed in the Colony have been deployed over wider and wider swaths of working-class white America. . . . Maintaining the division between the Colony and the Nation is treacherous precisely because the constant threat that the tools honed in the Colony will be wielded in the Nation; that tyranny and violence tolerated at the periphery will ultimately infiltrate the core. American police shoot an alarmingly high number of black people. But they also shoot a shockingly large number of white people.8 Police violence waged on Black bodies is highly controversial and highly emotionally charged. Peruse any Facebook or Twitter feed after the next 162 POLICING BLACK BODIES police killing of an unarmed Black man or the failure to indict or convict the next officer who has killed an unarmed Black man, and you will witness the vitriol, more often than not fueled by emotions not facts.

#### Rossipal 3 To cop-watch, “sousveillance”, is the subaltern recklessly eyeballing whiteness which confronts comfortability of living in a society made for them and turns the state against itself. Current laws prevent the gaze, but that ends now.

Looking Back Racializing Assemblages and the Biopolitics of Resistance Christian Rossipal Department of Media Studies Stockholms universitet Master’s Thesis 30 ECTS credits Cinema Studies Master’s Programme in Cinema Studies 120 ECTS credits Spring 2017 Supervisor: Jan Olsson cw//az \*brackets from original evidence, parenthesis are grammatical edits

The roleplay clearly illustrates and reflects the distribution of multiple visions Galloway discuss. The copwatchers circle the scene to convene upon one point – e.g. the police officer – in a “reverse panopticon.” The singular point that sousveillance activists convene upon could be seen as a Euclidean point, while the “subjective” [sousveillance] points of view have metastasized into multiplicity. What this produces is a curvature of space. Space bends and recedes. Space grows deep as the subject metastasizes and engulfs it.194 In the specific field of copwatching, I argue this creates a contestation of space interrelated with the inherent antagonism between whiteness and blackness. 195 The contestation of space could be quite viscerally experienced out in the field – between the natural order of whiteness’ extension in space and the “curvature” created by multiple subalterns “looking back.” As Sara Ahmed notes: “White bodies are comfortable as they inhabit spaces that extend their shape [italicized in original].”196 Copwatchers raising the video camera to “look back” potentially unsettle this dynamic. Moreover, “Eric” pushed people around during the roleplay in order to show how copwatchers themselves could easily become entangled in an ongoing physical situation. Further, when we were out copwatching, we were told to not only cover a potential crime scene but also each other. To not end up alone, we were divided into pairs when we were out filming. As “Eric” instructed us: copwatchers should “film themselves film the police.” It is a security measure, he told me, in case a police officer seizes a camera you have that situation recorded as well. “Otherwise they can claim whatever they want.” This is an apprehension he told me he had since his 2012 arrest at a gas station (which sparked the initial idea for the copwatch organization): I started yelling at them “stop hurting her!” and I tried to take some pictures. And because of that, one of the cops came after me, arresting me and then claimed that I spit in his face – which is a felony and carries a 2 to 10-year prison sentence. After that, fortunately, I found witnesses who were willing to come forward, including one who took video with his cell phone.197 The cell phone footage from the witness later got “Eric” exonerated in court. 198 The subsequent precaution and strategies are not unique for “Eric,” however. I could discern a prevailing notion that “you have to be careful,” keep back-up records, and protect yourself – both among the activists I met and the organizers at Witness. 199 For instance, “Carlos” always used a dashboard video camera in his car, in case the NYPD tried to “falsify anything” against him.200 Thus, in this specific context, we could extend Galloway’s model and say that the reverse panopticon not only convenes on one point, but also turns in other directions as a means of protection (from real or perceived threats). As an additional example of this, cameras are used to cast what I would call a demarcating gaze: We’re committed to anti-oppression in our dealings with each other, and in our community we don’t tolerate racism, sexism, homophobia, xenophobia, or other forms of oppression. Should anyone violate these rules, participants shall turn their cameras on them, publicly admonishing and rebuking them – and in addition, notify an organizer.201 Thus, by “turning the cameras” the sousveillance gaze demarcates space into an outside and inside of the group. It marks a line through space between the subaltern and hegemonic forces. We can further trace the dynamics of these gazes by re-considering Galloway’s model, cited above. 202 Even if we do think about Galloway’s “matrices of vision” – or Mann’s “veillances” – in strictly ocular terms, we can think about them beyond the camera’s mediating optics. Mann points out that before the advent of cameras, “the only veillance was sousveillance which was given by the body-borne camera formed by the eye, and the body-borne recording device comprised of the mind and brain.”203 This seemingly equal distribution of veillance capacity (i.e. to each their own eyes) does not necessarily render an equal distribution of power, however – as visual culture scholar Nicholas Mirzoeff shows.204 With reference to French colonization in the Caribbean – and specifically sugarcane plantations – Mirzoeff shows how the white overseer surveilled the native unpaid workers from a central, high position: “While the overseer is present as sign of the compulsion that ultimately underpinned the labor force, his cane is at rest [i.e. the stick which could wield punishment]. It is his eyes that are doing the work.”205 With this in mind – as well as “the racially saturated field of visibility” from the previous subchapter – sousveillance can only in-itself become a balancing force against racializing surveillance in a society which is already democratic and anti-racist.206 In other words, there needs to be some amendment to this framework in order to account for actual resistance under a state of oppression. In this theoretical void, Simone Browne has intervened and coined the term “dark sousveillance.” She introduces the concept as a critical position in relation to racializing surveillance – manifesting itself in sousveillance, anti-surveillance, and other practices.207 Browne further shows how such forms of resistance can be traced back to the era of slavery in the U.S.208 Among other things, it include(ing)ed pranks at the expense of those surveilling plantations, warnings veiled in songs, the forging of slave passes, the observation of slave owners, and the planning of escape. 209 Browne further suggests that we should think about the “strategies used in the flight to freedom from slavery as necessarily ones of undersight [i.e. sousveillance].”210 Even after the abolition and the Reconstruction, there were clear looking hierarchies in place in the U.S. – the most striking example being “reckless eyeballing.” Forbidden under the Jim Crow segregation laws, “reckless eyeballing” meant that if you were deemed a “colored” person, simply looking at a white person could get you punished; “especially a white woman or person in authority.”211 As bell hooks points out, “black people learned to appear before whites as though they were zombies, cultivating the habit of casting the gaze downward so as to not appear uppity.”212 Still, there were resistance practices growing beneath the surface. The prohibitions had resulted in a “longing to look” – an “oppositional gaze” – infusing black looks with the politicized potential to disrupt racializing surveillance.213 The looks proclaimed: “‘Not only will I stare. I want my look to change reality.’”214 However, Southern laws were pitted against such resistance: In a famous case, as late as 1951, the black man Matt Ingram was convicted for “assaulting a white woman in North Carolina because she had not liked the way he had looked at her from a distance of sixty-five Feet.” 215 According to Mirzoeff, this eyeballing disposition still lives on in the U.S. prison system today.216 Shifting focus to the oppositional look of contemporary copwatching, we can see that it has legally been acknowledged as a First Amendment constitutional right by federal and state courts. 217 In a landmark case in 2011, the First Circuit held that the First Amendment clearly gave citizens the right to record police officers and other public officials while they were performing their official duties in public spaces, as long as the citizens did not interfere with the police officer's legitimate work and made the recordings overtly (not secretly).218 Still, just as the oppositional gaze during U.S. segregation, there are forces pitted against copwatching practices. For instance, in a number of states, eavesdropping statues will prohibit any citizen from making recordings without the consent of all participating parties.219 Overriding the First Amendment, such laws have frequently been used to “arrest, detain, and harass photographers, including citizens and members of the credentialed press.” 220 Moreover, there are direct historical connections to be made between segregation and copwatching, since Hans Toch has shown that the history of copwatching in the U.S. can be traced back to the protest movements of the 1960s.221

#### Zamutto 16 Confidentiality and partnerships with media for recorders of police brutality uniquely resists surveillance and flips the script on what is deemed deviant and criminal

Zamutto, Jackei. [Documentary "American Native", "Ahead of Time: The Extraordinary Journey of Ruth Gruber", Free State Studios Education University of Colorado Boulder] “You Captured Police Abuse on Video. Now What?” WITNESS Media Lab, WITNESS Media Lab, 14 July 2016, lab.witness.org/you-captured-police-abuse-on-video-now-what/. Cw//az

If you feel strongly that all or a portion of the video should be shared with the public, work with a trusted media outlet, legal expert, or advocacy organization whose expertise can guide you through the decision-making process. For instance, a legal expert can assess the content of the video and help determine if the footage could implicate others who appear in it (e.g. a video of someone being detained at a protest could unintentionally expose the identities or actions of other protesters nearby). Timing & Audience Collaborating with advocates can help determine the best timing and audience for the video’s release so that it makes the greatest impact in exposing abuse. For instance, waiting to share footage can be a powerful way to expose lies in police reports. e.g. Feidin Santana waited until the police report was released before sharing his video of a police officer fatally shooting Walter Scott in South Carolina. The police report stated that the officer “felt threatened” after Scott tried to grab his taser. However Santana’s video shows the officer shoot Scott in the back as he ran away, and then shows the officer drop an object, allegedly the taser, next to the body. When Santana decided to release the video he worked with an activist from the Black Lives Matter movement to get in touch with the family, and then the media. Shortly after **the** video **was** released in the New York Times, the officer was arrested and charged with murder. Another example is the group Stop the Killing, Inc. who released their video of the killing of Alton Sterling in Baton Rouge, LA after the police report was released. The video has contributed to **the** ongoing investigation into Mr. Sterling’s death. Preserve Regardless of whether or not you decide to share the video publicly, it is important to preserve an unmodified version of the file in a secure place. If possible, store several additional copies in separate locations. This will help ensure that your video does not get lost and that you are able to provide the original video for authentication, if needed. Apps such as iCloud, Google Photos or Dropbox can be useful for automatically backing up your photos and videos, likely protecting them in the event that your device is confiscated or destroyed. e.g. Kianga Mwamba was arrested while filming police activity in Baltimore. Fortunately her phone was set to automatically backup the images, so her video was recovered after officers allegedly tried to delete the footage. The video was later used to drop the bogus charges against her. If you are live streaming, consider these four ways to save your video for later use. Respect A trusted individual may be able to help connect you with the victim’s family or legal representation. Contacting the family before publishing the video may lessen the trauma of first seeing it on social media or the news. Consider how you might involve the family in decisions around releasing the video. 2) DECIDE IF YOU WANT YOUR NAME ASSOCIATED WITH THE VIDEO Harassment Having your name publicly tied to the video can make you vulnerable to aggressions from the **public**, **Internet** trolls **and** hostile authorities. It could also result in long periods of time in the media spotlight or legal proceedings. Kelly Matheson, Senior Attorney and Video as Evidence Program Manager at WITNESS, cautions that “once you get on the train, it’s hard to get off.” e.g. After Ramsey Orta filmed the death of Eric Garner at the hands of Staten Island police, he gave the NY Daily News exclusive rights to publish the video. He also granted them permission to credit him for filming the incident. Ever since the video went viral, Orta and his family have been repeatedly harassed and targeted by police. In a TIME article following up with Orta one year after the event, Josh Sanburn writes, “Orta expressed ambivalence and even outright regret over getting involved. And if he had to do it over again, he says he would release the video anonymously.” Social media apps Be wary of social media apps that instantly share your content, identity, and location without giving you time to assess the situation. Unless you’re using an app dedicated to filming abuses, filming with your phone’s native camera app is the best way to ensure you have options for how, where and when you share the footage. It’s also important to know that “newsworthy” videos posted on personal social media accounts can be embedded in news publications without the permission of the creator. If your name or account information is visible in the embed, it could lead to an overwhelming amount of media requests, comments and harassment.

They continue

Media Contracts If done strategically, releasing the video through a trusted media outlet can help protect your rights and your video. Always discuss the usage rights with the producer or reporter before signing anything. Do you want to give them exclusive rights? Can they share it with syndicated organizations? Do you want to receive credit or payment? e.g. According to the Eyewitness Media Hub, Paul Nolan, an eyewitness who filmed a racial confrontation in the Paris subway, released his video exclusively to The Guardian and asked to be credited. Doing this provided him with a form of legal representation and support, as well as payment. The Guardian watermarked the video and posted it on their site, requiring all other outlets to use their embed link. They also monitored and responded to misuses (of which there were many), and managed the numerous permissions requests.

o/ws:

#### Cyclical violence -> exacerbates rates of arrests of source e.g. orta which throws them into the mouth of the prison industrial complex. Bio political control also fractures collective resistance.

#### Probability- look toward small link chain impact scenarios – their threats are constructed to preserve the squo the strategy used to block the civil rights movement, arguing change is risky.

#### Empirics prove – recordings decrease police abuse

Ly ’14 Laura [reporter at CNN] “Can cell phones stop police brutality?” November 19, 2014. Study cited: (Rialto, California (998 shifts) and Mesa, Arizona – a total of one year, tracking all citizen complaints, litigation, and instances of misconduct. Variables of age, race, and other characteristics controlled for) https://www.cnn.com/2014/11/18/us/police-cell-phone-videos/index.html cw//az

Luis Paulino's August 2012 beating by NYPD officers was captured on video and posted online. The video shows officers throwing Paulino to the ground. Several officers punch him repeatedly. According to Paulino, the officers started in on him after he saw them violently beating another young black man on the sidewalk. In the background, an unidentified male can be heard encouraging people to record what was happening and yelling, "He didn't do nothing!"

For Paulino, the video proved to be vindicating. He was initially charged with disorderly conduct, resisting arrest and obstructing a government official, but all charges were dropped**.**

Without the video, "there wouldn't have been anything but my word against 15 police officers," Paulino told journalist Soledad O'Brien.

Paulino has filed a lawsuit against the city. The NYPD will not comment on the case, citing the legal proceedings.

"When you are in public spaces, where you have a right to be, you can photograph anything that is in plain view," said Jay Stanley, a senior policy analyst for the American Civil Liberties Union. Stanley's research focuses on technology-related privacy and civil liberties issues.

The ACLU says that photographing things that are plainly visible from public spaces is a "constitutional right" and that this includes "federal buildings, transportation facilities, and police and other government officials carrying out their duties."

Law enforcement officials also do not have the right to confiscate any video or photographs being taken, nor can they ask to view it without a warrant.

"If you are not interfering in any real way with legitimate police operations, they don't have the right to interfere in any way," Stanley said.

Still, even with the perceived ubiquity of cell phone videos showing alleged acts of police misconduct, it seems that some errant officers aren't deterred by the cameras.

Stanley said he believes authorities are simply still adjusting to the availability of new technology and the knowledge that they may be recorded at any time.

"For police officers, it can take a while to sink in [that they may be filmed]. As police officers do take in that new reality, we may see a revolution in terms of a drastic reduction in brutality. We may not, but it's too early to tell," he said.

Paul Callan, a CNN contributor and former prosecutor, said he believes that drastic reduction has already begun.

"I believe that the existence of cell phone video and social media postings has substantially reduced police brutality over the long run. Although the intensity of news coverage of cases such as [George] Zimmerman and Michael Brown makes it feel like there is more police brutality, my sense of the situation as a lawyer who is in court several times a week is that the number of cases is diminishing," Callan said.

Some police departments are embracing camera technology and are even utilizing it to strengthen transparency and accountability between their officers and the community. Police departments in Rialto, California, and Mesa, Arizona, have implemented body-camera programs for their officers.

The initiative seems to be working. A 2014 study by the U.S. Department of Justice cites both departments, noting an 88% reduction in citizen complaints and a 60% reduction in officer use-of-force incidents after one year of camera deployment in Rialto. In Mesa, there were 40% fewer complaints for officers with cameras and 75% fewer use-of-force complaints overall.

#### Antony and Thomas ’10 the aff method and consequences are key to deconstructing conventional notions of evidence and information

‘This is citizen journalism at its finest’: YouTube and the public sphere in the Oscar Grant shooting incident Mary Grace Antony Washington State University, USA Ryan J. Thomas Washington State University, USA cw//az

‘What the hell is wrong with the person filming[?]’ Some comments criticized the quality of the video footage, stating that it was impossible to determine anything because the camera was unsteady and there was too much **external** noise and commotion. YouTube user amerizilian stated ‘it’s funny how you said ”I got that,” because you didn’t. [L]earn how to hold a camera steady’ (observateur, 2009a). Other such comments included ‘What the hell is wrong with the person filming[?]’, and ‘Geez ... c’mon you ignorant clowns, learn how to focus and shoot a camera’ (observateur, 2009a). These remarks reveal viewers’ dissatisfaction with the gritty and **unrefined** production quality of the video, and simultaneously suggest an inability to appreciate the chaotic circumstances under which **the event was filmed. Rather**, these users compare footage of a real fatality at a crowded subway station with the polished and slick production aesthetics characteristic of mainstream media products. Their frustration is thus indicative of a dependency on traditional video formats and conventional narrative structures.

They continue

Reactions such as these therefore portray the internet and YouTube as providing a forum for voices of the **oppressed** and subjugated. It constitutes a democratic yet subversive platform where the citizen **can** reclaim power that has been usurped and wielded by corrupt authorities, either through direct physical action, or through technological artifacts. In this sense, these responses express a reversal of the typical Big Brother metaphor that characterizes the relation between state and citizen. Although surveillance technologies are increasingly used to scrutinize the actions of citizens, YouTube and **cellphone** cameras provide the opportunity to reverse this power **dynamic** and afford citizens the potential to monitor state agents. Therefore, the state ultimately becomes a victim of its own repressive modes and apparatuses.

## Uv generic

#### Fitzpatrick sousveillance first

[Critical Theory, Information Society and Surveillance Technologies](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13691180210159300) Tony Fitzpatrick [Information, Communication & Society](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rics20/5/3)Vol. 5 , Iss. 3,2002 (CWLC)

Organised acts by individuals are here termed ‘subversive’. Hacking is a good example of information subversion (Thomas 2000; Taylor 2000) to which we might add those such as crackers, phreakers and cyberpunks, all of whom use technology to carve out spaces of freedom and autonomy that the same technology can foreclose in the hands of corporations (Starr 2000: 73-80). The downloading of music from the Internet using MP3 technology, for instance, is popularly subversive, not only because it is widespread but because it seems to engender no more popular disapproval than the use of blank cassettes for taping music off the radio. Another example of subversion **can be** found in the kind of **counter-surveillance** that some individuals pursue **against the surveillance** apparatus; **this can mean** filming the police who film demonstrations or it can mean using data protection legislation to expose corporate misdemeanours. At its best, then, **subversion** can constitute acounter-cultural **movement which,** like their predecessors in the 1960s, is not anti-capitalist per se but does **represent a form of** resistance against powerful **corporations and** state **agencies**. To be subversive, then, hacking et al must not be done fo r its own sake (still less for personal gain) but in order to undermine the information systems of economic and political power. Subversion **can** occur both outside the law but also within it, by exploiting ambivalences within the law and/or by encouraging the legal apparatus to catch up with developments in ICT, a time lag that governments and corporations are often able to exploit for undesirable ends. Organised acts by groups can be termed ‘rebellious’. For instance, many businesses have found there websites subjected to ‘denial of service’ attacks, effectively putting much of that company out of operation for significant periods of time – of course such attacks can also be the result of individual grudges against the company in question, or even of random and capricious malevolence. However, the most famous example of rebellion remains the Zapatista movement’s successful and continued mobilisation of world opinion against the attempt by the Mexican government to deprive them of their land rights (Castells 1997: 72-83). In addition, we might also consider the kind of opposition, mentioned in the above discussion of RIPA, to legislation that threatens civil liberties. The USA has been an important source of opposition to other attempts at over-regulating cyberspace (Jordan, 1999). **Acts of** resistance therefore consist of material and/or discursive actions that disclose social alternatives by attempting to open what economic and political powers attempt to close: the heterotopic spaces of autonomy which are the source of alt**ernative** visions **of** individuality and **society** (Foucault, 1986) but which risk being silenced by informatic capitalism in its attempt to reduce human diversity to digital bytes and data streams. Resistance **is** always a strate**gy** that positions itselfagainst **the** hegemony of the dominant nodes of money and power that are embedded in sites of work and consumption (see above). **An act** of resistance **therefore** requires sites of resistance: the sites are the sine qua non of the acts which simultaneously confirm and destabilise **the condition of** their existence. A site of resistance is both materially and culturally transformed by the acts of resistance to which it gives rise. A site makes an act possible and an act is the means by which we become aware of a site’s transformative potential. Therefore, a site must facilitate an ideological orientation, i.e. a critique of existing power and its alternatives. These observations are hardly new, deriving from the critical theoretical tradition, e.g. Marx’s observation that capitalism makes possible the conditions of its own demise. Without wanting to replicate that kind of messianic faith we can point, on the basis of the above analysis, to two sites that characterise informatic capitalism: the office and the body. The office rather than the factory floor is now the archetypal workplace due to the shift towards a post-industrial economy. Yet these offices are not fixed, they are mobile and dispersed informational systems. An office is no longer about shelves and paper files but about being connected to a server, whether at work or from home; and it is the malleability of the office which makes it both possible and desirable for employers to survey their employees. The body is no longer a simple appendage to the machine but what some like to call a terminal plugged into the informatic circuitry. The cyborg is neither just a metaphor (Haraway 1991) nor a physical assemblage of machine and organism, but a risk processor that increasingly simulates an informational system by relating to its environment as a series of dichotomous zeroes and ones: threatening/non-threatening, insider/outsider, same/other (Fitzpatrick 1999). Yet the body and the office are not merely sites of domination but sites, pace Foucault, of creative becoming. Workplace surveillance reminds us that capital not only wants our labour it wants our souls, our ever-demonstrable commitment to the corporate ethic; bodily surveillance at the level of consumption, or in what formally remain public spaces, reminds us that there are consequences (of social exclusion and stigma) for those who do not conform to the persona of the law-abiding shopper. These reminders are also ways of retrieving the desire for social alternatives: even as we are reduced to information we can desire to become something more. If information systems reduce us to database files and categories then information is also a means of mobilisation. Agency has not vanished into a destructured residue of the modern self, and to be human is to be more than a feedback loop of information, but if information undoubtedly constitutes the formation of identity as never before (Lyon 1998: 100) then **the information** that constitutes the self **can be used by the self**, **through interaction with others in** potential **sites of resistance,** **to carve out the spaces of hope that allow us to imagine social alternatives**. The self in any capitalist society is a struggle for self-determination in conflict with the nautonomous forces of state and capital

#### The AC is symbolic rejection, limiting the state’s ability to intrude on subaltern strategies. It exposes discrepancies of the system and reshapes throughout time, destabilizing grip on power

Zanotti: Zanotti, Laura. “Governmentality, Ontology, Methodology: Re-Thinking Political Agency in the Global World.” Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, vol. 38, no. 4, 2013, pp. 288–304. JSTOR, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/24569418. \*bracketed for problematic language and clarity cw//az

Studying discourses as archives, and looking at agency as performativity instead of as normativity has important implicat[es]ions for questioning images of liberal power as a "unitary script" endowed with the capacity to inscrib[ing]e "freedom" in its design. Archives are not only places where epistemic stabilities are constructed, so that scripts of power can be produced and reproduced. They are also places where these stabilities are contested and ambiguities emerge. Archeological inquiries do indeed focus on mapping "discontinuities" of governmental scripts. In this way, they open the space for analytically grasping discrepancies and for unsettling discuses that portray themselves as mighty and coherent. As anthropologist Ann Laura Stoler puts it, attention to archival conventions "may lead in two directions: to the consensual logic they inscribed, but also much more directly to their arbitrary rules and multiple points of dissention."59 Colonial archives for Stoler are not clear and linear manifestations of power might. Instead, it was "epistemic uncertainty that generated the densest debates and the longest paper trails... Like imperial formations themselves, colonial truth claims were provisional and subject to change.60 An archival method of inquiry shifts the focus from the totalizing coherence of discourses of power to the historical and contingent permutation of linkages among statements. These permutations in turn are generated by political encounters and engagement. Unlike positions that adopt governmentality as a descriptive tool and end up embracing the liberal substantialist ontological assumptions and epistemological framework they criticize, positions that embrace an intra-agential (or relational) ontology, maintain that nothing "is" but everything is made within specific practices. Governmentality as a research program that explores "the present as multiply constituted, polytemporal... and recombinatory... and not just the expression of a singular logic or the resultant of a linear process"61 has an important role to play as a methodology of inquiry that brings to the foreground the techniques through which power is practically enacted, the ambiguity embedded in its practices, and the various tactics for unsettling it that become possible in the context of multifarious political encounters. Because political power scripts do not stand as substances that preexist the practices of their making and the specific relations that construct them, the application of a relational ontology and of an archival methodology opens the way for non idealist, engrained in praxis, analyses of politics and conceptualizations of political agency. In this framework, the space for politics is rooted on ambiguity and performativity, that is on the making and remaking of meaning, subjects, power, and political spaces in the context of agonic relations.

#### I don’t defend that theory is coherent but if it is:

#### Neg should check possible interps in cx to deter frivolous theory and engage in substance as clarifying o/ws spending speech time; Competing mutually exclusive interps means the 1AC is always subject to theory binaries and neg gets infinitely more violations: spec shells, o-spec, t

#### Aff RVIs

#### theory moots aff discussion and offense and 1ar isn’t enough time to win on both substance and theory so 2n collapse makes it impossible; theory is always a 2nd off strategy for you to skirt around the aff

## Uv framework

#### Prefer- resolves the rfp

a) Indeterminacy: Rules cant secure their own application. If I see a sequence 1+1, I might think the answer was 2, because of different social rules. But, limited examples in the past can make no claim onto current ones, only more previous repetitions of action. This means that the only hope is in the unidentifiable moral particulars of life. Even if the content of their framework is true the application is impossible to apply to new situations.

b) Action Theory: demanding that limited human knowledge can deductively analyze truth totally accurately is epistemically arrogant and freezes action because we can never be sure we are taking the correct way forward. Outweighs – our approach comes prior to evaluation under a philosophical model.

And, refusal of anti-blackness is a prior meta-ethical side constraint. All valid ethical theories are designed to optimize our interactions with the other, but anti-blackness destroys ethics by silencing the ethical calls of the other in the name of atrocity, destroying the basis for all ethical relations with others.   
 Yancy ‘5 [George, Associate Professor of Philosophy at Duquesne University and Coordinator of the Critical Race Theory Speaker Series, “Whiteness and the Return of the Black Body”, The Journal of Speculative Philosophy 19.4 (2005) 215-241, Muse]

The reader will note that the question regarding how it feels to be a problem does not apply to people who have at some point in their lives felt themselves to be a problem. In such cases, feeling like a problem is a contingent disposition that is relatively finite and transitory. When Black people are asked the same question by white America, the relationship between being Black and being a problem is non-contingent. It is a necessary relation[in anti-blackness]. Outgrowing this ontological state of being a problem is believed impossible. Hence, when regarding one's "existence as problematic," temporality is frozen. One is a problem forever. However, it is important to note that it is from within the white imaginary that the question "How does it feel to be a problem?" is given birth. To be[black] human is to be thrown-in-the-world[at birth]. To be human not only means to be thrown within a context of facticity, but it also means to be in the mode of the subjunctive. It is interesting to note that the etymology of the word "problem" suggests the sense of being "thrown forward," as if being thrown in front of something, as an obstacle. Within the white imaginary, to be Black means to be born an obstacle at the very core of one's being. To ex-ist as Black is not "to stand out" facing an ontological horizon filled with future possibilities of being other than what one is. Rather, being Black negates the "ex" of existence. Being Black is reduced to facticity. For example, it is not as if it is only within the light of my freely chosen projects that things are experienced as obstacles, as Sartre might say; as Black, by definition, I am an obstacle. As Black, I am the very obstacle to my own meta-stability and trans-phenomenal being. As Black, I am not a project at all. Hence, within the[ir] framework of the white imaginary, to be Black and to be human are contradictory terms. [End Page 237] Substituting the historical constructivity of whiteness for "manifest destiny," whites remain imprisoned within a space of white ethical solipsism (only whites possess needs and desires that are truly worthy of being respected [Sullivan 2001, 100]). It would seem that many whites would rather remain imprisoned within the ontology of sameness, refusing to reject the ideological structure of their identities as "superior." The call of the Other qua Other remains unheard within the space of [anti-blackness]whiteness's sameness. **Locked within [anti-blackness]** their self-enthralled structure of whiteness, whites[agents preclude] occlude the possibility of developing new forms of ethical relationality to themselves and to non-whites. It is partly through the process of abandoning their hegemonic, monologistic discourse (functioning as the "oracle voice") that whites might reach across the chasm of (nonhierarchical) difference and embrace the non-white Other in his or her Otherness. "A true and worthy ideal," as Du Bois writes, "frees and uplifts a people" (1995b, 456). He adds, "But say to a people: 'The one virtue is to be white,' and people rush to the inevitable conclusion, "Kill the 'nigger'!" Of course, the idea that "the one virtue is white" is a false ideal, for it "imprisons and lowers" (456). Whiteness is a "particular social and historical [formation] that [is] reproduced through specific discursive and material processes and circuits of desire and power" (McLaren 1998, 66). On this score, reproduced through circuits of desire and power, whiteness [anti-blackness] strives for totalization; it desires to claim the entire world for itself and has the misanthropic effrontery to territorialize the very meaning of the "human**."**

# ac v afropess

## Part 1

Alex Zimmerman 12, Alex Zimmerman is a Brooklyn-based journalist covering everything from cops to trains. His work has appeared in the Village Voice, Pittsburgh City Paper, and Pittsburgh Post-Gazette., 11-11-2012, This Black Man Survived a Police Shooting and Became an Activist, Vice, https://www.vice.com/en\_us/article/7bde3z/the-unarmed-black-man-who-survived-a-police-shooting-to-become-an-activist-1012, cw//az

"I remember the officers screaming, yelling, 'Where's the guns, where's the drugs?'" Ford says. "They pulled me out and slammed me on the ground and handcuffed me face down. I thought they Tased me until blood was coming out my mouth and from under me. I was like, Wow, they shot me... I thought I was going to die." It's been nearly three years since the evening when Pittsburgh officer David Derbish shot then 19-year-old Ford four times, leaving him paralyzed. Before that night, Ford was a fairly typical teenager: He enjoyed making music videos and boxing. He helped his uncle out at the body shop and was getting ready to start taking classes at a local community college. Now 22, Ford uses a wheelchair and has no sensation below his waist. He often wakes up with a tingling feeling in his hands and has trouble writing without cramping up. He certainly doesn't box anymore, but on a recent rainy Friday afternoon, as he wheels himself into a café, Leon Ford is smiling. That smile doesn't disappear, even when he talks about being shot or what he makes of the national conversation on policing issues and the Black Lives Matter movement. He's unrelentingly positive—and doesn't see why he should act otherwise. "You can either look at a situation as a curse or a blessing and I chose the blessing route," Ford says. "It's just how I learned to deal with my problems." But Ford also feels a sense of responsibility for speaking out on behalf of the many other unarmed black men whose confrontations with police ended differently. It's what makes his perspective on policing in America so unique. "Unlike Tamir Rice, Oscar Grant, Ezell Ford, Mike Brown, and many other victims of police misconduct, I survived to tell my story," Ford wrote in a September letter to Pittsburgh officials. "In many ways, I may also be telling their stories as well."

#### Police reform is consistent with any meta level kritik.

Wilderson 16 Frank, American writer, dramatist, filmmaker and critic. He is a full professor of Drama and African American studies at the University of California, Irvine, received his BA in government and philosophy from Dartmouth College, his Masters in Fine Arts from Columbia University and his PhD in Rhetoric and Film Studies from the University of California, Berkeley. Interviewed by Samira Spatzek, and Paulavon Gleich. “‘The Inside-Outside of Civil Society’: An Interview with Frank B. Wilderson, III.” Black Studies Papers 2.1 (2016) SA-IB

The question is, can Black political organizing in Ferguson and Baltimore and these places catch up with that, because unfortunately, we have a problem in that the country is so much more of a police state than it has ever been and you know that just by watching television. When I was in school, if you liked the American flag, if you liked the police, you didn’t have any friends. Now, I find young college students are very slow to say that they hate America, very slow to say that they hate the police. What we’re trying to do now is to infuse an antagonistic orientation in Black people who are white-collar people in college so that their intellectual skills can be enhanced by the orientation that is felt by Black people in the ghetto. If this doesn’t happen they run risk of being anointed and appointed (by the power structure) to manage the anger of Black people in the street, rather than relate to that anger. So that’s a hurdle that we have to overcome. You know, I’ve been doing political education workshops for Black Lives Matter in New York and Los Angeles, and probably will do more in Chicago. And what I hope to have people do workshop exercises around is this concept that I have called “Two Trains Running (Side by Side).” By that I mean, you can do your political organizing that will help us get relief from police brutality right now. We need that. We need that. But that work that we do should be seen as puny in terms of its philosophical and theoretical orientation so that we can educate ourselves politically to be against the police as an institution and against the United States as a country, even while we are working to reform police practices, because we do not have the strength right now that we had in the 1960s and 1970s to act in the way the Black Liberation Army did, or Baader Meinhof, we do not have the strength to act in the revolutionary mode, but that lack of strength, that lack of capacity, should not contaminate our orientation. We should not feel that we have to accept the existence of police even if we’re working in reformist measures politically. Hopefully this idea of two trains running will pick up. Black Lives Matter has done a great job in opening up a new Black political organizing space. That’s great. Now let’s use that space for an educational project that is soundly anti-American, and soundly anti-police even if tactically, we have to work for police reforms.

# 1ar

## Extensions

### Substance

Framing:

Extend Rossipal 2 Psychological violence thru double consciousness manifests when black bodes see themselves through the white gaze. Subaltern flesh must use power structures’ unfounded construction of the other against them to resolve the gaze: forged slave passes from LITERATE blacks given to ILLITERATE white slave catchers that allowed them freedom. – that’s Rossipal 17

I’m going for countergaze offense Rossipal 3: The aff is countergaze against digital plantation surveillance - black bodies turn cameras on the police and expose their treachery. Even when their cameras get taken away, the oppressed unite and record that instance instead so nothing slips by. The aff is key to spreading the word in public without the police targeting the sources.

the decrease of police violence is a form of rejecting the countergaze that’s Rossipal 3 – extend Hattery and Smith 18: brutality is justified by security logic that makes the black man the enemy

### Performance

my performance of their testimony is an act of calling out the state in countergaze, that o/ws their offense on strength of link. only i recognize the perspective of individuals affected. fiat is arbitrary: question of what's happening right now. You’ll get fiat any other round, uniqueness is on my side

### Defending the state

#### - Turns/hijacks Hobbes – if security creates a relationship in which the sovereign has complete control and doesn’t protect the wellbeing of its citizens then it’s not a sovereign, a shield law is key to promote an actual sovereign instead of competing sovereigns in the state of nature

#### - Link turns the Kritik – without engaging in the state we cannot check the power it has and the panoptic relationship it has created in which citizens have no power, also terminal defense to the alt because your alt will just get co-opted by the government because the citizens have no power to enact change under a security state

#### Security states create a panoptic relationship between the government and its people. Gowder 2

Gowder, Paul (JD Harvard Law). "Secrecy as Mystification of Power: Meaning and Ethics in the Security State." ISJLP 2 (2005): 1.

Consequently, the disciplinary power of the security state comes from the conjunction of the power of the officials to watch everyone and the lack of power in the watched class to reciproc[ity]ally watch the officials.54 This permits the application of power universally on each citizen under the panoptic eye, since no citizen can know whether she is being watched at any moment. Reason-secrecy achieves this effect by secretly examining data about the public, which then is used to exercise power on individuals selected by this secret examination. The security state thus exercises power over us all by placing us in anticipation of power being exercised on us.55 Because of that structural feature of reason-secrecy, it implies all the ethical difficulties inherent in risk-secrecy. The panoptic nature of the relationship between the holder of secret reasons and a citizen who is the object of secrecy implies that each person presenting herself for inspection under secret reasons (i.e. at an airport) has no way of knowing whether or not harm will be inflicted on her (i.e. a denial of flight) by the State. Thus, whether or not she is actually harmed, the citizen is not able to ground the possibility of harm in any choice or characteristic of herself. From the point of view of the experience of the person presenting herself for inspection, the State is placed in exactly the same position as the terrorist: each may strike at any moment and do injury to our beleaguered citizen without any rhyme, reason, or predictability.

### against pess

#### on the ontology debate

#### crossapply the testimony - ford has experienced way worse violence by the state than you and I and is

"I remember the officers screaming, yelling, 'Where's the guns, where's the drugs?'" Ford says. "They pulled me out and slammed me on the ground and handcuffed me face down. I thought they Tased me until blood was coming out my mouth and from under me. I was like, Wow, they shot me... I thought I was going to die." It's been nearly three years since the evening when Pittsburgh officer David Derbish shot then 19-year-old Ford four times, leaving him paralyzed. Before that night, Ford was a fairly typical teenager: He enjoyed making music videos and boxing. He helped his uncle out at the body shop and was getting ready to start taking classes at a local community college. Now 22, Ford uses a wheelchair and has no sensation below his waist. He often wakes up with a tingling feeling in his hands and has trouble writing without cramping up. He certainly doesn't box anymore, but on a recent rainy Friday afternoon, as he wheels himself into a café, Leon Ford is smiling. That smile doesn't disappear, even when he talks about being shot or what he makes of the national conversation on policing issues and the Black Lives Matter movement. He's unrelentingly positive—and doesn't see why he should act otherwise. "You can either look at a situation as a curse or a blessing and I chose the blessing route," Ford says. "It's just how I learned to deal with my problems." But Ford also feels a sense of responsibility for speaking out on behalf of the many other unarmed black men whose confrontations with police ended differently. It's what makes his perspective on policing in America so unique. "Unlike Tamir Rice, Oscar Grant, Ezell Ford, Mike Brown, and many other victims of police misconduct, I survived to tell my story," Ford wrote in a September letter to Pittsburgh officials. "In many ways, I may also be telling their stories as well."

Who are you to tell him he can’t live his life this way? To clarify, I don’t think everyone who experiences this violence must act in this manner but they have the ability to do so.

**Your theory relies on INDUCTIVE appeals and then UNIVERSALIZES them to create a sociological model to explain blackness- that empirically fails.**

**1: Different black people have different experiences which means there’s no reason they’re overcoded the same way- if I take a black person who believes they are free who lives in India, and universalize their experience I would get a different model than yours- that means you cherrypick**

**2: Double bind- either A- blackness is phenotypic but that wouldn’t explain why albino people are treated in abad way so your theory cannot explain certain “black” people or B- it’s a social construct but social constructs are only put into place by power relations which means they’re always capable of changing.**

**3: Privilege disad- politics of blackness exclude bodies that don’t fit into the contours of what counts as the black body- some people cannot get up and burn down civil society- quare bodies might need spaces of non-blackness because historically black culture rejects sexual deviancy but also might need black spaces because LGBTQ spaces are anti-quare- two impacts**

**I- you can’t give survival strategies to bodies because you make a forced choice**

**II- you literally kill people, like people who need welfare to put food on the table, because you say their reliance on the state makes them complicit**

On the links

countergazing is a form of surveillance slaves – deemed property – did to survey and keep oppressors in check. Means ontology links aren’t a disad. Also understanding the master’s routine is k2 a successful uprising; maroon abolitions were planned in the undercommons not just at the snap of fingers so the aff’s prerequisite and justifies perm: do the aff then alt

turn: we reject the same structures u do but operate as a negative right that visually exposes the states inconsistency so more people are disillusioned – that;s rossipal 3

the alt:

1. **Perm do the Aff as a better instance of the alt:** 
   1. **the 1AC is a method of rupturing civil society by changing the flows of powers**
   2. **society gains coherence through demarcating bodies and forcing them into overdetermined roles but the 1AC says no to that which means it is your alt in actual practice.**
2. **Perm do the aff as a method of unifying the purpose of the alt- we only break down civil structures once the collective recognizes the enemy –if your arguments are true the state is the enemy we need to unify against which means rejecting it destroys focus points**

**If not method**

1. **Perm do the aff then the alt- solves better- people need access to the alt which means we need to resolve the material conditions that prohibit them from accessing anything**

### Framing Against big stick impacts

“high magnitude low probability” impacts are an independent voter

1. You recreate abjection: Security is meaningless without otherization to specify conditions of irrational insecurity – the black women gets x-rayed 9 times more than the white that’s Olsson 17
2. the white gaze force feeds to black children that all they will ever amount to is a prisoner or if they’re lucky, a token which
   1. kills value to life thus aff framing is prerequisite
   2. Proves their calculations are skewed – policymakers think gentrifying entire black communities is a-okay if it pleases some yuppies
3. Policy freeze- there’s always a risk of extinction in any argument- means we could never take any action because acting is the same as not acting. This means remote possibilities have an effective credence level of 0.
4. Their risks are the modem day plantation securitization constructed to preserve the status quo or focus efforts on big stick policy decisions — it’s the same strategy used to block the civil rights movement

#### Resolving the white gaze is key to resolving other structures of domination

Farough 04 [Steven D, Department of Sociology & Anthropology, Assumption College. The Social Geographies of White Masculinities, pages 255-256. [http://crs.sagepub.com/content/30/2/241.short accessed 7/10/15](http://crs.sagepub.com/content/30/2/241.short%20accessed%207/10/15)] “he” refers to the subject being interviewed and brackets in original evidence cw//az https://books.google.com/books?id=sM29e8rAmy0C&pg=PA76&lpg=PA76&dq=Consistent%20with%20hooks%E2%80%99%20(1992)%20oppositional%20gaze%2C%20I%20found%20that%20it%20is%20not%20just%20that%20some%20of%20my%20respondents%20are%20afraid%20of%20robbery%20or%20being%20beaten%20up%20in%20urban%20spaces%2C&source=bl&ots=7Wu\_obHi\_K&sig=TQv5Xm5F-3umLLhKDKy1HG4ASyo&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwja0dOO1KLdAhUN2qwKHfK0ABMQ6AEwAHoECAEQAQ#v=onepage&q=Consistent%20with%20hooks%E2%80%99%20(1992)%20oppositional%20gaze%2C%20I%20found%20that%20it%20is%20not%20just%20that%20some%20of%20my%20respondents%20are%20afraid%20of%20robbery%20or%20being%20beaten%20up%20in%20urban%20spaces%2C&f=false

Consistent with hooks’ (1992) oppositional gaze, I found that it is not just that some of my respondents are afraid of robbery or being beaten up in urban spaces, it is also the experience of being looked at that exposes them as privileged. In this section I will specifically explore the narratives of three white men to highlight the inter-relationship between the oppositional gaze, social geography, and identity transformation. For instance, consider Jesse, an urban raised, working class white man who offers his interpretation of being stared at. “You know, when I go into the ghetto and I see them, you know, in the morning hanging out, ten people ... and I honestly felt that they hated us more than we hated them, you know.” Jesse specifies this perceived hate though staring. I mean, I mean, I was on the bus a couple weeks ago. You know, and this black kid was looking at me. Younger kid, 19 or 20. So he is staring at me. And I – you know how you just know that someone is looking at you. [Int: Right, yeah.] He is staring at me, he’s looking at me in the eyes. So I looked at him, and I’m saying to myself ‘if I turn away from them, he’s going to think, like, you know, he punked me.’ You do know what I’m saying? [Int: Right.] So, I’m staring at him, staring at him, staring at him. So he says, ‘what are you looking at’? I said, ‘nothing.’ I said, ‘I’m not looking at anything.’ And I just wanted – I just wanted to say something to him. Because I just wanted to take it out on him. [Int: umm hmm.] But he was just smart enough and walked away. But I’ve had other run ins. They are definant. They are defiant people. I mean, you know – I don’t allow other people to do this. Racist how I look at it. But I see it, man, all the time, you know? (emphasis added) Jesse notes that the stare was rooted in a context of “defiance.” In this narrative he argues that the young black man on the bus engaged in a scrutinizing stare. Jesse believes that this stare is “racist,” a look of contempt toward a white man. Also rooted in this staring contest was the production of masculinity in an urban context. As Connell (1987) notes, hegemonic forms of masculinity are not only defined in relation to femininities, but is also produced by marginalizing other men. According to Connell (1987) the prolonged stares and verbal exchange are produced by the historical connection between public space and the entitlement of being a man. Eye contact between men can evoke a sense of defending one’s right to the public sphere. In this ritual, who ever looks away first is interpreted as deferring to the other man. Yet in the context of staring Jesse’s interpretation makes references to racialized and gendered social power. Jesse notes that he could not stop staring, otherwise he would “lose” in the visual exchange. The narrative ends with anger – “They are defiant. They are defiant people... Racist is how I look at it.” Jesse’s ending comments of African Americans being “defiant” and “racist” in this narrative are important because it moves his specific experience with a young black man on a bus to a more general account of racialized and gendered social power. Jesse interprets the gaze as a stare that is sending a message of hatred toward white people, an oppositional gaze. The stare clearly makes Jesse angry. In this context the stare implicitly reminds him of his white masculinity, and thus makes it impossible to feel as if separate from racialized and gendered forms of social power. Subsequently Jesse’s narrative maps an emotionally frustrating experience, one that not only addresses the potential for physical conflict but one that lays the foundation of how he positions himself as a white man in structural and discursive space as well. As a result, Jesse’s racialized and gendered narrative leads him into a subsequent story where he provides an implicit class-based analysis, one that places his biography in relation to the context he lives and his standpoint as a white man. Geographically, Jesse lives in a part of Boston that he feels has a large population of African Americans. He also believes that whites are not privileged in this area. In fact whites are the new recipients of discrimination. In another part of the interview, Jesse notes that whites have been helping out blacks for too long. The following narrative makes the point more apparent.

#### Only the most rational institutions can talk about extinction – speculation within places like debate only increases miscalculation.

Bostrom ‘13

Nick Bostrom (University of Oxford) “Existential Risk Prevention as Global Priority” Feb 2013.

“Existential risk requires a proactive approach. The reactive approach—to observe what happens, limit damages, and then implement improved mechanisms to reduce the probability of a repeat occurrence—does not work when there is no opportunity to learn from failure. Instead, we must anticipate emerging dangers, mobilise support for action against hypothetical future harm, and get our precautions sufficiently right the first time. That is a tall order. Few institutions are capable of operating consistently at such a level of effective rationality, and attempts to imitate such proactive behaviour within less perfect institutions can easily backfire. Speculative risk-mongering could be exploited to rationalise self-serving aggressive action, expansion of costly and potentially oppressive security bureaucracies, or restrictions of civil liberties that keep societies free and sane. The result of false approximations to the rational ideal could easily be a net increase in existential risk.”

### Framing Against theory

1. **Theory is bad- A- recreates dialects that denies perspectives B- destroys creativity in the long run- means if we win framing your use of theory is non-ethical.**

**Acampora** Christa Davis Acampora [Associate professor of philosophy at Hunter College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York.] Critical Affinities Nietzsche and African American Thought. Edited by Jacqueline Scott and A.Todd Franklin. *Chapter 8:Unlikely Illuminations: Nietzsche and Frederick Douglass on Power, Struggle, and the Aisthesis of Freedom.*

Although contests typically end when a particular individual distinguishes himself or herself in whatever way the contest sets up as decisive, there is a significant communal basis to this distinction. Victors can only become such by virtue of the institutions that make their activities meaningful in such a way; they require a certain kind of communal recognition for their actions to afford them any sort of status or special significance; victories are always contingent upon the community whose judgment provides the basis of legitimacy for any such claim to superiority. Thus victors are always indebted for their honor to those who would bestow it; it is not simply taken or even independently earned. Moreover, victors are significantly indebted to other competitors, those immediate and those who have preceded them.Their actions both supply a contest relative to which the victors’ actions appear as excellent and draw out the particular performance that earned the victor his or her distinction.23 The fragility of these arrangements is underscored by Nietzsche as he charts examples of corruption of agonistic relations. These are interesting to consider, because they provide further insight into how Nietzsche refines his understanding of the distinction between creative and destructive expressions of power. Although the Greeks are Nietzsche’s exemplars of agonism, they clearly failed to sustain this remarkable feature of their culture.24 **Exceptional victory has a tendency to induce hybris, a belief in invincibility that can lead to the commission of violence, and a lack of respect for one’s opponents and the shared institutions that legitimate the triumph**.25 Nietzsche claims that this happened in Athens following the Persian Wars—when the Athenians showed themselves to be such decisive victors in the war against the Persians, they disrupted the rivalry among the Greek city-states that had previously prevailed and served to regulate the significance of what it meant to be “Greek”.26 **Public contests that provided creative outlets for the desire to strive deteriorated into spectacle.Without the creation of a new outlet for struggle, Nietzsche imagines, the Greeks might have** become so brutal as to engage in wanton destruction and annihilation of each other (BT 15). Instead, what emerged as a replacement for the kind of contests he admired was Socratic philosophy with its dialectic, which had the appearance of the old kind of struggle.27 But dialectic was significantly different, according to Nietzsche, because it failed to provide the openness described earlier. First, **dialectic was dominated by an unbeatable opponent, namely, the Socratic position of truth,** and, secondly, the standards of judgment were absolutely uncontestable—reason rules tyrannically in Nietzsche’s caricature. Moreover, with the Socratic game struggles that constituted the public sphere were replaced with spiritual ones waged by individuals. And with that**, the cultural (social) possibilities withered.**

## T/theory

### K v theory

theory is an act of surveillance checks deviation from white debate academia

Rossipal - double consciousness: stuck in the bind, view themselves thru the white lens that society views them, when black gaze something bad happens. theory forces the judge to vote thru a white lens -> forcing role of the oppressor

aff is prereq - to understand if theory is an act of whiteness is to look towards the rotb – voters like fairness and education presume the judge should care about

clarification: act of reading ci isn’t that theory is good, but a necessity back up strategy as long as no rvi. I engage in different discussion even ones i disagree w e.g. climate deniers don't engage the other side -> open up ur mindset, net benefit of dogmatism.

Their ruse of education/fairness is being used to shift discourse away from my advocacy, in the same way that the state uses appeals to the ethical to shift discourse away from their oppressive policies. **Delgado 92:**

Richard Delgado (Law Professor at University of Colorado). “Shadowboxing: An Essay On Power,” In Cornell Law Review. 1992.

**We have cleverly built power's view of the appropriate standard of conduct into the very term fair. Thus, the stronger party is able to have his/her way and see her/himself as principled at the same time.** Yet society and law accept only this latter message (or something like it), and not the former, more nuanced ones, to mean refusal. Why? **The "objective" approach is not inherently better or more fair. Rather, it is accepted because it embodies the sense of the stronger party, who centuries ago found himself in a position to dictate what permission meant. Allowing ourselves to be drawn into reflexive, predictable arguments about** administrability, **fairness,** stability, and ease of determination **points us away from what** **really counts: the way in which stronger parties have managed to inscribe their views and interests into "external" culture**, so that we are now enamored with that way of judging action. First, we read our values and preferences into the culture; then we pretend to consult that culture meekly and humbly in order to judge our own acts.

K comes before the role of the ballot:

### Spec agents

#### Counterinterpretation: opposite of the interp

Violation:

Key to neg flex: allows for neg to reinterpret actor and generate links depending on the neg strat link turns ground and clash args

Semantics first: key to prep on topic and controls the internal link to the pragmatic/ground

Nebel The Meaning of the Resolution Victory Briefs ’18

[a PhD candidate in philosophy at New York University and (starting fall 2019) assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California. He works mostly on questions about value, rationality, morality, and language. As a debater, Jake won the Glenbrooks (twice), Greenhill (twice), Harvard, Emory, Bronx, the Bronx Round Robin, the MBA Round Robin, the VBT Round Robin, and the FFL State Championship, was in finals of NSDA Nationals, and was top speaker at the TOC, Greenhill, Harvard, Bronx (twice), the Bronx Round Robin (twice), Yale (twice), the Vassar Round Robin, the Crestian Classic, and the FFL State Championship. As a coach, Jake’s students have won the TOC, NDCA, the Dukes & Bailey Cup, the Glenbrooks, the Harvard Round Robin, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and other national, regional, and local championships. He is also executive director of Victory Briefs and has worked at 31 sessions of the Victory Briefs Institute.] accessed 8/23/18 cw//az

What distinguishes the “ought” of general desirability from the practical “ought” that appears in most LD resolutions? The main difference is that, as Wedgwood and others point out, the “ought” of general desirability is not tied to any particular agent or time. For example, the sentence “There ought to be no violence” does not entail that any particular agents are obligated, at any particular time, to end violence. On this view, since the resolution uses the “ought” of general desirability, the resolution does not necessarily imply that any particular agent has an obligation to do anything, at any particular time, to make it the case that reporters have the right to protect the identity of confidential sources.

Ur interp doesn’t solve: I could say usfg which means u don’t get any links and allows for shiftiness between courts and congress.

Turn: net better – you can specify for me

on spec: infinitely regressive. There’s always more I could spec or less

A: your interp is arbitrary- this means you don’t solve abuse, make theory a tool as opposed to a check on the abuse, and sets up a brightline of if you can clarify the question in cross ex within 15 seconds it should be fine- this also puts you in a double bind either 1- the offense you get is minimal so you wouldn’t have asked it in the first place or 2- the offense you get is huge so 15 seconds is a small time commitment

B:Causes theory prolif- crows out all substance education which outweighs because theory can always be debated but we only have 2 months for substance-means even if fairness first- this has stronger links and ows on magnitude and makes your interp awful because otherwise debate without education would just be a coinflip activity

### Spec instance

#### Counterinterpretation: on the septoct nsda ld topic, the affirmative may specify an instance in which reporters may have a right if the negative has disclosed a no whole-res aff shell on the wiki

I meet:

#### Key to aff flex – aff has some leeway on specificity while granting generic and specific links to NC thru disclosure

#### Unique benefit is anti militarist knowledge production. Our current epistemology is corrputed by the state – we need to rupture this ideology, that’s the rotb. TVA is impossible – our discussion will always be co-opted or outweighed by the neg, we need the 1AC – anything else feeds back into the militarist white gaze

#### Means you would have to defend this on every single topic which makes no sense

Aff flex: u still get generics: cap k, kant nc, politics disads while I don’t need to resolve every single pic on the topic, prefer I give an empirical caselist. Specifically key on this topic

1. 1ar generation of new offense moots the discussion of the aff and 6 minutes of the ac which creates a structural skew
2. This topic has sm process and other pics: survivors, national security, media ride alongs, etc.: I can’t read generics against that whereas u can read stuff against prefer qualitative abuse. Hypercharged because this is the first tournament on the topic

Semantics collapse to pragmatics: Stronger link to voters of education/fair. We shouldn’t listen to res if it’s a bad debate that forces u to defend something oppressive. It shouldn’t matter how we achieve voters as long as we do

### Solvency advocate

#### I meet: I’m the solvency advocate lol

#### Counterinterpretation: The affirmative advocacy does not have to provide a solvency advocate if 1. they can produce cases where inherency has happened in the status quo 2. The aff is disclosed 30 minutes before the round

I meet:kalven, Josh Wolf, was incarcerated for not complying with a federal court's mandate to relinquish a video while covering a protest, linda tracy and disclosed

Planks solve your offense you could prep it out

Stronger link to fairness – internal link to predictability is so u can answer it but if there’s no author on the topic who wants the aff, u should be able to generate more reasons it’s a bad idea

Critical thinking – allows for new strat formations

Turn: net better for new knowledge production – it’s key to breaking away from the academy else we would never be generate new methods. It’s a form of subaltern speaking out.

Generics still apply: midterms, fem killjoy, t, etc.

### Absolute privilege

### Rotb spec

#### Counter-interpretation: The aff can read a role of the ballot with the text of x, if they’re willing to clarify implications in cross or prep:

**I meet**

**prefer**

1. **Your interp is infinitely regressive and punishes affs for everything- you could always add or subtract a plank which makes it impossible to meet a new version of this. If I do spec, you can say I can’t spec that far which puts the aff in a double bind- allowing the 1AC to acquiesce to demands A- stops theory debate and allows substance which outweighs because we have prep on it, and promotes research of published lit and B- gives you the chance to make demands. That’s net better because it lets you generate real abuse stories**
2. **Every framework implicitly uses a role of the ballot so your arg would apply to every 1AC. Debate still happens when people read kant which proves your points are irrelevant. Err aff over 10 years of evidence is on my side. Also you violate your own shell- you don’t spec if we have to be fair or educational under your role of the ballot so under your interp you would have two framing mechanisms- use X and be fair or just use X.**

## framing

#### hooks 2

hooks 2 [Black Looks: Race and Representations Bell hooks South End Press Boston, MA Copyright 19 92 by Gloria Watkins. Hooks is a feminist author and social activist, professor of African American Studies and English at Yale, Associate Professor of Women’s Studies and American Literature.]

When thinking about black female spectators, I remember being punished as a child for staring, for those hard intense direct looks children would give grown-ups, looks that were seen as confrontational, as gestures of resistance, challenges to authority. The "gaze" has always been political in my life. Imagine the terror felt by the child who has come to understand through repeated punishments that one's gaze can be dangerous. The child who has learned so well to look the other way when necessary. Yet, when punished, the child is told by parents, "Look at me when I talk to you." Only, the child is afraid to look. Afraid to look, but fascinated by the gaze. There is power in looking. Amazed the first time I read in history classes that white slave owners (men, women, and children) punished enslaved black people for looking, I wondered how this traumatic relationship to the gaze had informed black parenting and black spectatorship. The politics of slavery, of racialized power relations, were such that the slaves were denied their right to gaze. Connecting this strategy of domination to that used by grown folks in southern black rural communities where I grew up, I was pained to think that there was no absolute difference between whites who had oppressed black people and ourselves. Years later, reading Michel Foucault, I thought again about these connections, about the ways power as domination reproduces itself in-different locations employing similar apparatuses, strategies, and mechanisms of control. Since I knew as a child that the dominating power adults exercised over me and over my gaze was never so absolute that I did not dare to look, to sneak a peep, to stare dangerously, I knew that the slaves had looked. That all attempts to repress our black peoples right to gaze had produced in us an overwhelming longing to look, a rebellious desire, an oppositional gaze. By courageously looking, we defiantly declared: "Not only will I stare. I want my look to change reality." Even in, the worse circumstances of domination, the ability to manipulate one's gaze in the face of structures of domination that would contain it, opens up the possibility of agency. In much of his work, Michel Foucault insists on describing domination in terms of “relations of power" as part of [is] an effort to challenge the assumption that power is a system of domination which controls everything and which leaves no room for freedom. “Emphatically stating that in all relations of power "there is necessarily the possibility of resistance," he invites the critical thinker to search those margins, gaps, and locations on and through the body where agency can be found.

* gaze solvency

#### This evi is hot

Looking Back Racializing Assemblages and the Biopolitics of Resistance Christian Rossipal Department of Media Studies Stockholms universitet Master’s Thesis 30 ECTS credits Cinema Studies Master’s Programme in Cinema Studies 120 ECTS credits Spring 2017 Supervisor: Jan Olsso cw//az

Grounded theory is a qualitative empirical method, first developed by Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss in the 1960s.37 One of the method’s most distinctive traits is its “constant comparative mode.”38 More precisely, that the researcher start out with two empirical samples and from that point a comparative analysis unfolds. In Barbara Czarniawska’s words, “a tentative hypothesis based on [the] two samples directs the choice of the third one, and so on, until a theory emerges.”39 Thus, a thesis based on grounded theorizing will likely be at an angle in relation to previous literature in the field; cutting across otherwise more linear progression in the respective research corpus. In my view, this is one of the great affordances of grounded theorizing – you think with, against, and through the field to develop an original theory. Following Glaser and Strauss’s method, the current thesis will move between ethnographic data and the theoretical frameworks outlined in the previous chapter. Consequently, it will facilitate the means to (at least partly) fill the research gap Bock has identified, as mentioned in the previous chapter.40 The method will also enable quite radical shifts of register between, for instance, the particulars of the field and more abstract analyses of their ontological status. Further, the geographical scope of the field study enables a comparative study of localities, spaces, and their connections. This echoes Vicki Meyer – the Production Studies scholar – who claims that it is precisely the “connection between macro and micro that is so frequently lost in the efforts to describe the current media landscape, its interconnected industries, and its networks of professionals.”41 Retrofitting Meyer’s quote for the present field, you could say that it is the connection between transversal and local that is so frequently lost in the efforts to describe current media activism, its interconnected affiliations, and its networks of political subjects. Czarniawska offers a productive complement to Meyers: In relation to the methods of ethnology, she points out that every village is local, but when villages are tightly interconnected as the global village, the connections become more interesting than local customs alone. Put differently, there is no way to understand local customs without reference to the global village. This is why all possibilities for doing a mobile ethnology are worth investigating.42 Following Czarniawska’s line of reasoning – but doing ethnography rather than ethnology – I conducted field studies in multiple cities and have incorporated a kaleidoscopic range of empirical source material. The ethnographic data consists of a field diary (based on participatory-observations), transcribed interviews, scanned documents, and cyberethnography data (e.g. copies of emails and social media posts). This enabled me to tackle the virtualization of practices found in many of the copwatch groups and the simultaneity of experience (e.g. coeval time) it entailed.43 I also interlace with case studies and ethnographic material from previous scholarly publications. In logical terms, grounded theory is an abductive approach.44 Abduction is, in short, a process with multiple inferential steps toward a hypothesis; a process of generating and selecting hypotheses.45 It is thus as type of inference – deduction and induction being the two other forms. While deduction shows that something is necessarily true, and induction shows that something is operative, “abduction merely suggests that something may be.”46 Based on this outline, abduction may seem like a weak choice. It has major advantages, however, since it is the only form of inference to account for explanatory power. Consider induction, which only deal with raw data in order to infer logically “from the bottom up” (e.g. frequencies and statistics). Such an approach is seriously flawed in dealing with the present field study, since part of the study is in finding the object-of-study itself. In other words, to do original grounded theory we need to explore different options, since we do not know what to measure from the start – and “[u]nlike induction, abduction does not infer the truth of a hypothesis, but rather poses it as a question.”47 Moreover, if we instead consider deduction, it will only allow for strictly logical reasoning from a given set of premises – which can be of use once you have a set of premises at hand, but hardly as an overarching method of inference for a field study. Thus, abduction and grounded theory seem to go hand-in-hand. Georgina Born even points us to the fact that abduction is inherent to ethnography itself, since she claims that ethnography “entails an oscillation between phases of more deductive and more inductive work; it is a subtle tool for the application and the amendment of theory.” 48 Consequently, in the tradition of ethnography, the present study will not be striving to be representative – rather, it is an abductive line of reasoning through the specific, meaningful and exceptional which is of interest.

#### The constant gaze causes an internalization of inferiority which produces a psychotic split of identity. This culminates a double consciousness, a sense of being two souls in one

Du Bois '1903 \*\*bracketed \*\* [William Edward Burghardt "W. E. B", American sociologist, historian, civil rights activist, Pan-Africanist, author, and editor Ph.D Harvard "The Souls of Black Folk" Chapter I. Of Our Spiritual Strivings 1903 WHS//NAO]

After the Egyptian and Indian, the Greek and Roman, the Teuton and Mongolian, the Negro is a sort of seventh son, born with a veil, and gifted with second-sight in this American world,—a world which yields him no true self-consciousness, but only lets him [blacks] see himself [themselves] through the revelation of the other world. It is a peculiar sensation, this double-consciousness, this sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity. One ever feels his two-ness,—an American, a [black]~~Negro;~~ two souls, two thoughts, two unreconciled strivings; two warring ideals in one dark body, whose dogged strength alone keeps it from being torn asunder. 3 The history of the American Negro is the history of this strife,—this longing to attain self-conscious manhood, to merge his double self into a better and truer self. In this merging he wishes neither of the older selves to be lost. He would not Africanize America, for America has too much to teach the world and Africa. He would not bleach his Negro soul in a flood of white Americanism, for he knows that Negro blood has a message for the world. He simply wishes to make it possible for a man to be both a Negro and an American, without being cursed and spit upon by his fellows, without having the doors of Opportunity closed roughly in his face. 4

#### In the scope of the white gaze, the black body becomes the subject for a violent process of interpellation- where black bodies internalize their inferiority by viewing themselves from the perspective of whiteness

Yancy 1 \*\*\*bracketed for gendered language, other brackets were in the original text\*\*\* (George Yancy, Associate Professor of Philosophy at Duquesne University and Coordinator of the Critical Race Theory Speaker Series, “Whiteness and the Return of the Black Body”, The Journal of Speculative Philosophy 19.4 (2005) 215-241, Muse :)

To have one's dark body invaded by the white gaze and then to have that body returned as distorted is a powerful experience of violation. The experience presupposes an anti-Black lived context, a context within which whiteness gets reproduced and the white body as norm is reinscribed.The late writer, actor, and activist Ossie Davis recalls that at the age of six or seven two white police officers told him to get into their car. They took him down to the precinct. They kept him there for an hour, laughing at him and eventually pouring cane syrup over his head. This only created the opportunity for more laughter, as they looked upon the "silly" little Black boy. If he was able to articulate his feelings at that moment, think of how the young Davis was returned to himself: "I am an object of white laughter, a buffoon." The young Davis no doubt appeared to the white police officers in ways that they had approved. They set the stage, created a site of Black buffoonery, and enjoyed their sadistic pleasure without blinking an eye. Sartwell notes that "the [white] oppressor seeks to constrain the oppressed [Blacks] to certain approved modes of visibility (those set out in the template of stereotype) and then gazes obsessively on the spectacle he/she[they have] has created" (1998, 11). Davis notes that he "went along with the game of black emasculation, it seemed to come naturally" (Marable 2000, 9). After that, "the ritual was complete" (9). He was then sent home with some peanut brittle to eat. Davis knew at that early age, even without the words to articulate what he felt, that he had been violated. He refers to the entire ritual as [is] the process of "niggerization." He notes: The culture had already told me what this was and what my reaction to this should be: not to be surprised; to expect it; to accommodate it; to live with it. I didn't know how deeply I was scarred or affected by that, but it was a part of who I was. (9) Davis, in other words, was made to feel that he had to accept who he was, that "niggerized" little Black boy, an insignificant plaything within a system of ontological racial differences. This, however, is the trick of white ideology; it is to give the appearance of fixity, where the "look of the white subject interpellates the black subject as inferior, which, in turn, bars the black subject from seeing him/herself[themselves] without the internalization of the white gaze" (Weheliye 2005, 42). On this score, it is white bodies that are deemed agential. They configure "passive" [End Page 217] Black bodies according to their will. But it is no mystery; for "the Negro is interpreted in the terms of the white man. White-man psychology is applied and it is no wonder that the result often shows the Negro in a ludicrous light" (Braithwaite 1992, 36). While walking across the street, I have endured the sounds of car doors locking as whites secure themselves from the "outside world," a trope rendering my Black body ostracized, different, unbelonging. This outside world constitutes a space, a field, where certain Black bodies are relegated. They are rejected, because they are deemed suspicious, vile infestations of the (white) social body. The locks on the doors resound: Click. Click. Click. Click. Click. Click. ClickClickClickClickClickClickClick! Of course, the clicking sounds are always already accompanied by nervous gestures, and eyes that want to look, but are hesitant to do so. The cumulative impact of the sounds is deafening, maddening in their distorted repetition. The clicks begin to function as coded sounds, reminding me that I am dangerous; the sounds create boundaries, separating the white civilized from the dark savage, even as I comport myself to the contrary. The clicking sounds mark me, they inscribe me, they materialize my presence in ways that belie my intentions. Unable to stop the clicking, unable to establish a form of recognition that creates a space of trust and liminality, there are times when one wants to become their fantasy, to become their Black monster, their bogeyman, to pull open the car door: "Surprise. You've just been carjacked by a ghost, a fantasy of your own creation. Now, get the fuck out of the car." I have endured white women clutching their purses or walking across the street as they catch a glimpse of my approaching Black body. It is during such moments that my body is given back to me in a ludicrous light, where I live the meaning of my body as confiscated. Davis too had the meaning of his young Black body stolen. The surpluses being gained by the whites in each case are not economic. Rather, it is through existential exploitation that the surpluses extracted can be said to be ontological—"semblances of determined presence, of full positivity, to provide a sense of secure being" (Henry 1997, 33).

## Testimony

Brentin Mock 12, staff writer at CityLab. He was previously the justice editor at Grist., 11-12-2012, How Leon Ford Survived Getting Shot by Pittsburgh Police, CityLab, https://www.citylab.com/equity/2018/05/pittsburgh-police-shooting-survivor-wants-to-change-the-game/559493/, cw//az

He’s been working ever since, helping the victims of police violence and their families, and by giving speeches all over the country on how to improve police relations. In an era of fiery protests and uprisings, as seen in Baltimore and Ferguson, Ford is focused on continuing that energy into crafting more progressive laws and policies.

## Substance

#### Focusing on the process is good

Pieroni 9 [Caroline Lynch Pieroni (Caroline focuses her practice on employment litigation and advice, business litigation, including defense of large-scale or class action consumer claims, and First Amendment and media law. She has represented a variety of clients before and during litigation, tailoring her approach to fit the unique circumstances of each case and the needs of each client. A significant portion of her practice involves defending employment disputes in and outside of the courtroom and offering human resources training to clients, including Fortune 500 companies. She defends clients in EEOC or human rights investigations and represents them in lawsuits brought by employees alleging discrimination, breach of contract, wage and hour violations, or related issues. Her counsel includes advice on compliance with employment laws and regulations, and she has tried multiple employment cases to a defense verdict. Caroline’s experience also includes defending companies in an array of business and consumer disputes, including purported class actions and large-scale consumer claims. She tries cases in court and handles them in arbitration, and she advises clients on strategy and costs related to arbitration, and the rules, costs and nuances of using the American Arbitration Association to resolve a dispute. She also counsels clients in relation to investigations by government agencies. She draws on her previous experience as a newspaper reporter with The Courier-Journal in Louisville when representing various newspapers and media outlets in First Amendment, open records and open meetings cases. Caroline advises media outlets on the risks of certain publications, assists them in seeking access to public records and meetings and uses her media background to advise clients who are handling matters likely to attract media attention. Prior to joining the firm, Caroline served as a judicial law clerk to Judge John G. Heyburn, II of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Kentucky.), Staying out of Jail..Sometimes: Maintaining a Free Press through Journalist Shield Laws Requires Changes Not Only at the Federal Level, but Also among the States, 47 U. Louisville L. Rev. 803 (2009)] WJ

A. The Definition of "Journalist" Should Focus on the Process of Journalism, Not the Person or the Medium Determining who is a journalist is often central to the debate about shield laws, and with the advent of the Internet and growth of at-home computers, this question has become more difficult, rather than easier. As we have seen, laws vary widely on who exactly deserves the protection of a shield law. The MLRC's model law defines "news media" as any person or entity who is, or has been, engaged in gathering, preparing, or disseminating news or information to the public for one of the following entities: any newspaper, magazine or other periodical, book publisher, news agency, wire service, radio or television station or network, cable or satellite or other transmission system or carrier, or channel or programming service for such station, network, system or carrier, or audio or audiovisual production company that disseminates news or information to the public by any means, including, but not limited to, print, broadcast, photographic, mechanical, 108 electronic or other means now known or hereafter devised. The draft also includes protection for those who assist the gatherer and the parent companies of the gatherer.'0 9 But what is notably absent is protection for individual citizen journalists or bloggers working of their own accord.110 Consequently, while industry advocates argue for the right to a free press- regularly invoking First Amendment ideals about the free flow of information-this definition only protects the big media corporations and their operations, not the free flow of information generally. It does this by focusing too much on a laundry list of acceptable "entities" and the people within those entities who should be covered. It is too mechanically focused on traditional mediums and the traditional players within them. With different language, the proposed federal shields of 2007 and 2009 commit the same foul. Before the Free Flow of Information Act of 2007 passed the House of Representatives, the language defining a "covered person" was changed to include an element of financial gain."' It covered "a person who [is engaged in journalism] for a substantial portion of the person's livelihood or for substantial financial gain and includes a supervisor, employer, parent, subsidiary, or affiliate of such covered person."'"12 The language of the 2009 bill could end up similarly limited by an amendment that was proposed in the Senate Judiciary Committee." 3 That amendment defines a "covered person" as one "who obtains the information sought while working as a salaried employee of, or independent contractor for an entity."'14 In both cases, the federal bills exclude more journalists than the MLRC's draft by leaving out students and arguably some part-time reporters, bloggers, and others who may have been regularly engaged in the practice ofjournalism but were not earning a substantial portion of their livelihood from it. These definitions fail because they all result in the traditional media protecting the traditional media, instead of protecting the process of journalism. Protecting the free flow of information is not achieved by protecting the mainstream media actors; rather, it is achieved by protecting the process of information gathering and dissemination as news. At least one recent writer has endorsed this idea," and a handful of state shield statutes have employed definitions of "journalist" or "journalism" that focus on the act, not the person. In her 2003 article in the Houston Law Review, Linda L. Berger, a current law professor and former newswoman for the Associated Press, wrote: Although it is possible to define who is a journalist by listing job titles and employers, such definitions are increasingly unhelpful...Journalists' shield laws, whether constitutional or statutory, are designed to protect the free flow of information, not to protect individual or institutional status. In particular, their purpose is to protect the process through which information that is useful to self-governance is gathered and provided to the public. It may be that those who fall within a definition of journalist are those most likely to produce the desired information, but they are certainly not the only individuals who might do so. Though most states still define "journalist" or "reporter" by the individual's connection to a traditional news media outlet, a few states have broad definitions that focus, at least partially, on the journalistic process.' 8 These definitions could serve as a stand-up example for a model shield law. For example, North Carolina's statute defines a journalist as "[a]ny person, company, or entity.. . engaged in the business of gathering, compiling, writing, editing, photographing, recording, or processing information for dissemination via any news medium.' 19 Likewise, Michigan's statute protects "[a] reporter or other person who is involved in the gathering or preparation of news for ' 20 broadcast or publication.' It is important that the authors of a model law get this basic definitional element right, so that not only the precariously monopolistic media industry but all those who practice journalism are covered. Additionally, a model shield must carefully balance the competing interests of justice with a shield that offers real protection. Only a privilege that is absolute in some, but not all, areas can achieve this.

#### The plan establishes free press rights that support a right to record.

Kies ’11 Marianne F [Marianne Kies is an associate in the firm’s Litigation group. She specializes in complex civil litigation, with a particular emphasis in mass tort litigation. Ms. Kies also maintains an active and diverse pro bono practice] “Policing the Police: Freedom of the Press, the Right to Privacy, and Civilian Recordings of Police Activity” 2011, 80 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 274. IB

Journalism is an unlicensed vocation in the United States, 125 with no continuing education requirements or entry examination. 126 The absence of government regulation derives from the fundamental First Amendment vision that "no one should have to obtain a license to speak."' 27 According to the Supreme Court, the word "freedom" visA-vis the press includes not only the right to be free from prior restraints on publication, but also a nearly absolute exemption from subsequent punishment when reporting on matters of public concern. 128 Whether civilian recorders of police activity are protected by freedom of the press is thus contingent upon the resolution of two factors: (1) that recordings of police activity necessarily implicate matters of "public concern," and (2) that civilian recorders of the police belong to the special category of the "press."

The first condition is easily satisfied, as exemplified by the Supreme Court's rulings in Near v. Minnesota ex rel. Olson129 and New York Times Co. v. Sullivan.130 In Near, the Court stated that public officials, "whose character and conduct remain open to debate and free discussion in the press," cannot institute proceedings to restrain publications commenting on those topics. 131 The Court applied this rule to strike down a Minnesota law that allowed the suppression of publications containing malicious, scandalous, or defamatory material targeting public officials. 132 After Near, the Court extended its emboldened reading of the First Amendment to establish that any punishment for publications concerning public officials must be extremely limited to withstand judicial scrutiny.133 In Sullivan, the Court stated that even falsehoods concerning public officials are constitutionally protected unless the statements were made with "actual malice. '' 134 Near and Sullivan express the Court's position that information about the conduct of public officials is necessarily of public concern, and therefore is protected by freedom of the press from both prior restraint and almost all subsequent punishment.

Whether civilian recorders of police activity are members of the "press" is slightly more difficult to establish. Historically, members of the press consisted only of "traditional media" such as newspapers, television, and radio. 35 In the twenty-first century, however, "spatial and temporal barriers" to journalistic endeavors have disappeared. 136

Due to the advent of miniature recording devices and the Internet, participation in public debate has never been easier.137 The Supreme Court has yet to define citizen journalists as members of the "press."'1 38 In August 2011, the First Circuit became the only federal circuit court to explicitly so hold in Glik v. Cunniffe.13 9 Simon Glik was arrested on October 1, 2007, for using his cell phone's video camera to film an arrest transpiring in the Boston Commons. 140 The Commonwealth charged Glik under Massachusetts's wiretapping law,'141 and following the dismissal of these charges, Glik brought suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.142 The district court denied the defendant police officers' claim to qualified immunity. 143 On appeal, the First Circuit affirmed the district court order, concluding that Glik was exercising "clearly-established First Amendment rights in filming the officers in a public space,"'144 and that the police officers violated Glik's Fourth Amendment rights by arresting him without probable cause. 145

Although Glik constitutes the first instance of an federal appellate court defining civilian recorders as citizen journalists, at least one commentator 146 and several federal circuit courts have suggested that citizen journalists may constitute members of the "press" in the related context of reporter privilege.14

#### That checks police brutality and creates public accountability.

Ly ’14 Laura [reporter at CNN] “Can cell phones stop police brutality?” November 19, 2014. Study cited: (Rialto, California (998 shifts) and Mesa, Arizona – a total of one year, tracking all citizen complaints, litigation, and instances of misconduct. Variables of age, race, and other characteristics controlled for) https://www.cnn.com/2014/11/18/us/police-cell-phone-videos/index.html IB

Luis Paulino's August 2012 beating by NYPD officers was captured on video and posted online. The video shows officers throwing Paulino to the ground. Several officers punch him repeatedly. According to Paulino, the officers started in on him after he saw them violently beating another young black man on the sidewalk. In the background, an unidentified male can be heard encouraging people to record what was happening and yelling, "He didn't do nothing!"

For Paulino, the video proved to be vindicating. He was initially charged with disorderly conduct, resisting arrest and obstructing a government official, but all charges were dropped**.**

Without the video, "there wouldn't have been anything but my word against 15 police officers," Paulino told journalist Soledad O'Brien.

Paulino has filed a lawsuit against the city. The NYPD will not comment on the case, citing the legal proceedings.

"When you are in public spaces, where you have a right to be, you can photograph anything that is in plain view," said Jay Stanley, a senior policy analyst for the American Civil Liberties Union. Stanley's research focuses on technology-related privacy and civil liberties issues.

The ACLU says that photographing things that are plainly visible from public spaces is a "constitutional right" and that this includes "federal buildings, transportation facilities, and police and other government officials carrying out their duties."

Law enforcement officials also do not have the right to confiscate any video or photographs being taken, nor can they ask to view it without a warrant.

"If you are not interfering in any real way with legitimate police operations, they don't have the right to interfere in any way," Stanley said.

Still, even with the perceived ubiquity of cell phone videos showing alleged acts of police misconduct, it seems that some errant officers aren't deterred by the cameras.

Stanley said he believes authorities are simply still adjusting to the availability of new technology and the knowledge that they may be recorded at any time.

"For police officers, it can take a while to sink in [that they may be filmed]. As police officers do take in that new reality, we may see a revolution in terms of a drastic reduction in brutality. We may not, but it's too early to tell," he said.

Paul Callan, a CNN contributor and former prosecutor, said he believes that drastic reduction has already begun.

"I believe that the existence of cell phone video and social media postings has substantially reduced police brutality over the long run. Although the intensity of news coverage of cases such as [George] Zimmerman and Michael Brown makes it feel like there is more police brutality, my sense

of the situation as a lawyer who is in court several times a week is that the number of cases is diminishin**g**," Callan said.

#### Aff makes surveillance illegal - The government can't do anything with the data they gather from surveillance, and since the aff gives reporters the right to protect confidential sources from ANY actor, surveillance of privileged communications gets overturned as an effect of the aff.

Borkoski 12 (Kali, Manager of SCOTUSBlog, October 29, 2012, Suing over surveillance secrets, www.scotusblog.com/2012/10/suing-over-surveillance-secrets/)

Shane Kadidal, who has led much of CCR’s litigation in this case, distinguishes CCR’s case, in which its attorneys and staff were the only plaintiffs, from the ACLU’s cases, which have included journalists and other individuals from outside the legal profession. In his view, this difference makes CCR’s case a more straightforward one than Clapper. “The Supreme Court has not recognized any kind of constitutional or inherent journalists’ privilege,” Kadidal points out, “whereas there are obviously a whole slew of legal privileges that apply to attorneys’ communications.” This matters, he explains, because the Court has previously held that a warrant to monitor communications – unlike a warrant to search a particular physical space for particular objects – risks being overly inclusive since communications can cover a much broader range, including privileged conversations with attorneys and work product discussing client’s cases with experts, all of which attorneys are duty-bound to keep confidential.

### A2 see more images of violence which cause collective trauma

#### Your argument is paternalistic patronizing and problematic- prefer evidence from real people who have went through these experiences

Sam Adler-Bell 15, 5-7-2015, That's What You Get for Filming the Police, Truthout, https://truthout.org/articles/that-s-what-you-get-for-filming-the-police/, cw//az

The protests in Baltimore were fueled, in part, by video captured by a bystander of cops dragging a handcuffed Freddie Gray into their police van. The 25-year-old can be heard screaming in pain. He was unresponsive when they arrived at the station and died a week later. “There’s no incentive for the cops not to fuck with us in the first place.” Walter Scott Sr., whose son was shot in the back by Officer Michael Slager in North Charleston, South Carolina, weeks earlier, said, “I fell to my feet and my heart was broken,” when he first saw footage of his son’s death. But he “thanked God” that someone took the video. Without it, the real circumstances of his son’s death, he said, “would never have come to light. They would have swept it under the rug, like they did so many others.” William Murphy, Freddie Gray’s family’s lawyer, echoed that sentiment on April 27. “Thank God for cellphone video cameras,” he said, “because now the truth is finally coming out. And it’s ugly.” For decades, said American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) senior policy analyst Jay Stanley, “It’s been the word of uniformed police officers against the word of accused criminals – who are usually poor, Black or other minorities. Judges, prosecutors and the public have historically taken the side of the police.” But videos – usually captured by camera-equipped cell phones – are beginning to change that. “There’s a shift,” Stanley added, “in what people are willing to believe.”

#### Their argument relies on mischaracterization

**Professors Tuck and Yang, 14** in response to an email inquiry from Chris Randall ghs-am

On Tuesday, November 11, 2014, Chris Randall <[chrisrandall1966@gmail.com](mailto:chrisrandall1966@gmail.com)> wrote: Dear Professors Tuck and Yang, I hope that all is well and that the semester is treating you both kindly. My name is Chris Randall I am an African-American student at Rutgers University, a member of its debate team, and a high school debate coach for a myriad number of inner city debate programs in the United States. I have recently read your book chapter titled "R-Words:Refusing Research". In the debate community on both the high school, and intercollegiate debate circuits "R-Words" is being used defeat any team that describes through their rhetoric and argumentation scenes of violence, racism, pain or suffering of any kind that happen in inner cities or historic descriptions of violence i.e slavery or the middle passage; on the basis that the academy will consume it and thus it should not be stated in any academic forum at all I fear this is a gross oversimplification of this work. I have attached an example of how your work is being used as to give you a visual of what I am describing; and also to get some clarity on your intent in writing this piece. Thank you in advance for taking time out of your busy schedules to help with this matter. Sincerely, Chris Randall

In response:

Dear Chris, Thanks for your email. We wanted you to know that we received it, but need to think more about what you have shared with us. We can say that you are correct, the intent of our essay is not to close down very necessary analyses and discussions about violence, racism, suffering or pain. Our argument is that to have these discussions, we cannot only focus on the slave or pained body, but the system (slavery, racism) that requires that pain, and also the otherwise invisible benefactors of those systems. We cannot talk about pain without talking about power, in other words. The Erased Lynching series is a good example, because it puts focus on the spectators who showed up to watch a lynching, and does not circulate images of the humiliated body. The fact of lynching is not silenced, as seems to be happening in the debate settings you are describing. Is it possible to think about how pain narratives are used in debate discourses? Are they truly effective? Or might it be more impactful to only present pain narratives alongside interrogations of the systems that produce and require that pain? It is the latter that we are trying to suggest in our article. Pleading for the powerful to see the pain that is caused by oppression seems like a flimsy theory of change. We will think more on this, but if this prompts a reply in the meantime, please do write back. Eve and Wayne

### Evi weighing

#### prefer – this link to the framing uses grounded theory that abductively

#### 1. takes nationwide field studies

#### 2. looks at past publications

#### 3. compares individual samples and is the only type of inference to take into account explanatory power

#### [clark 16] spamming videos anonymously desensitizes video – media allows for a focus on an ethics of care

Meredith Clark 16, assistant&nbsp;professor at the University of North Texas., 4-22-2016, Coverage of black female victims of police brutality falls short: Column, USA TODAY, https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/policing/spotlight/2016/04/22/police-violence-women-media/83044372/, cw//az

The same media that amplifies videos that often bring perpetrators to accountability, has a responsibility to discuss the implications of broadcasting such violence. For each “shocking” video, ethical, responsible reporting demands that we contextualize what audiences have seen. Simply showing the occasional video isn't enough. It’s media’s responsibility to report the facts about such violence. Reported statistics on state violence, which includes police brutality, too frequently reflect the experiences of men and blot out the impact of such crimes against women of color. Visceral images neglect to tell the entire story, nor do they explain how the victim, the aggressor, and our society arrived at such a violent moment. Unless the videos are used with discretion, and paired with ethic of care for the public-health impact of such exposure, user-generated “content” depicting violence against women adds to the lessening of respect for women overall, not just at the hands of police. We can do better. We did better in our reporting of efforts to bring back the Chibok girls. We may not be able to re-wind the tape to stop the assaults against women and girls at home, but we do not have to compound the problem by desensitizing audiences in the name of making news.

#### Borden 17 Reporters are stretched thin and can’t directly cover the police – video submissions are key to diversifying the narrative

Jeremy [ Politics, U.S. Regional As seen in: Cannabis Wire, The Washington Post, The Independent, The Atlantic, Medium, Yahoo, Christian Science Monitor, The Sacramento Bee, Kansas City Star, The Charlotte Observer, NerdWallet], 10-18-2017, ‘Cease and desist’: Journalism’s strained relationship with police, Columbia Journalism Review, https://www.cjr.org/united\_states\_project/chicago-police-union-reporters.php, cw//az

In a phone interview, Faulk recounted the details of his arrest. Using a controversial tactic called “kettling,” police rounded up a group of people that included peaceful protesters, area residents, and Faulk. Journalists reported that police took a protest chant and used it themselves: “Whose streets? Our streets!” Faulk, who has filed an internal affairs report with the police department among other complaints, said that officers blocked off exits, and turned the protest into a violent melee. The Post-Dispatch covered Faulk’s arrest and condemned the police’s actions: “Mass arrests that punish law-abiding protesters and journalists is not good policing,” the paper wrote in an editorial. Faulk, whose misdemeanor charge is pending, said he struggles with pain from being thrown to the ground, pepper sprayed, and having his hands tightly bound. He has been taken off reporting the story and planned cops shifts, he told CJR. “If we had only gotten the police narrative of that night, it would have been, ‘ Well, police owned the night and rounded up all these rambunctious criminals,’” he said. While he was in police custody, Faulk continued to report, and helped deliver phone numbers of sources to reporters who turned around a detailed story about what happened. That story, which voiced concerns about police tactics in its headline, received more than 1 million page views. Faulk says the story has “been able to diversify the narrative and put more of a human face on everyone involved.” Following reports of police actions, St. Louis Mayor Lyda Krewson and interim Police Chief Lawrence O’Toole have asked for a third-party investigation. Elizabeth Donald, the president of the St. Louis Society of Professional Journalists, said the city police department has made it difficult for journalists to cover protests in the wake of the 2014 and 2015 Ferguson protests in and around St. Louis. “Unfortunately, given the treatment Mike Faulk received, the lack of apology, and the history of police action against journalists in the Ferguson upheaval, I would be sorely pressed to call this a mere unfortunate circumstance,” she says via email. “It appears to be a pattern of hindering reporters in the performance of their duty.” How do we proceed? We know you have an obligation to report. …How do we work this out? AS THE RANKS OF LOCAL JOURNALISTS have declined, fewer reporters are assigned to the police beat full time. That is one of the biggest problems facing journalists today, says Handelman, the police media expert. “They come in and parachute and ask a few questions and then move on to another story.” Frank Straub, a former police chief who now works at the Washington, DC-based Police Foundation, says the press is “in the business of making money and selling commercials, and you kind of get that.” Still, he adds, “the media has done a fairly good job of capturing the tension that exists around the country.”

#### Ly 14 Empirics prove: filming drastically reduces police abuse

Can cell phones stop police brutality? Laura Ly [news editor, Columbia school of Journalism MSN, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Las Vegas Review-Journal, WDIV-TV (Detroit, MI), WTSP-TV (St Petersburg, FL), WPLG-TV (Pembroke Park, FL), WJXT-TV (Jacksonville, FL), WMUR-TV (Manchester, NH), Missoulian and more], CNN Updated 5:31 PM ET, Wed November 19, 2014 (CWLC) \*brackets in original evidence

For police officers, it can take a while to sink in [that they may be filmed]. As police officers do take in that new reality, we may see a revolution in terms of a drastic reduction in brutality. We may not, but it's too early to tell," he said. Paul Callan, a CNN contributor and former prosecutor, said he believes that drastic reduction has already begun. "I believe that the existence of cell phone video and social media postings has substantially reduced police brutality over the long run. Although the intensity of news coverage of cases such as [George] Zimmerman and Michael Brown makes it feel like there is more police brutality, my sense of the situation as a lawyer who is in court several times a week is that the number of cases is diminishing," Callan said. Some police departments are embracing camera technology and are even utilizing it to strengthen transparency and accountability between their officers and the community. Police departments in Rialto, California, and Mesa, Arizona, have implemented body-camera programs for their officers. The initiative seems to be working. [A 2014 study](http://www.policeforum.org/assets/docs/Free_Online_Documents/Technology/implementing%20a%20body-worn%20camera%20program.pdf) by the U.S. Department of Justice cites both departments, noting an 88% reduction in citizen complaints and a 60% reduction in officer use-of-force incidents after one year of camera deployment in Rialto. In Mesa, there were 40% fewer complaints for officers with cameras and 75% fewer use-of-force complaints overall. On September 4, NYPD Commissioner Bill Bratton announced that the police department would be testing two types of body cameras that would allow officers to record audio and video during their patrols. "The NYPD is committed to embracing new and emerging technology in order to continue to keep New York City safe," Bratton said. "Having patrol officers wear body cameras during this pilot demonstrates our commitment to transparency while it will also allow us to review its effectiveness with the intention of expanding the program." The statement came less than a week after it was announced that officers in Ferguson, Missouri, had adopted the use of body cameras after the death of Michael Brown, an unarmed teen who was fatally shot by an officer.

#### even in brazil, which has battled centuries of racial tensions and corruption, this is the only solution

Neri, Priscila [Priscila is a Brazilian journalist and activist. She joined WITNESS in 2008 and currently oversees the organization’s work in Latin America, including our critical response project on using video to demand accountability for police violence in Brazil. From 2011-2014 Priscila helped lead WITNESS’ global campaign on forced evictions, which trained 144 activists and supported 24 advocacy campaigns in Brazil, Cambodia, Egypt, India and Mexico. Before coming to WITNESS, Priscila ran the NY office of the Center for Digital Inclusion, worked as a reporter for Brazilian newspaper O Estado de S.Paulo, and shot a documentary about seven incredible women in the dry inlands of northeastern Brazil, where her grandmother was born. Priscila’s been featured for her work at WITNESS in the New York Times.] “Dispatch from Brazil: If Killed by Police, Guilty by Default ... Unless There's Video?” WITNESS Media Lab, 29 Oct. 2015, lab.witness.org/dispatch-from-brazil-if-killed-by-police-guilty-by-default-unless-theres-video/. Cw//az

Now imagine the perpetrator was a police officer and, because of that, there is only a 0.8% chance of that crime ever being investigated or brought to justice. Even if completely false, the police officers’ version of events (your son was armed, your nephew attacked us…) will become the official story without much contestation and you would spend the rest of your life trying to correct the facts and demand justice. Deep down, you know how unlikely it is that anyone be held to account for your loss, especially if your son was young, black and poor. People will be outraged for a few days, but then go about their daily lives. The media didn’t really care what happens in your part of town. It is just the way things are. It was the way they’ve always been. This is the reality for the thousands of families that have lost loved ones at the hands of police in Brazil. Officially, Brazilian police kill 2,000 people every year. But like in the U.S., that number is far from reliable—reporting is irregular—and, on top of that, many instances of extrajudicial killings by police end up masked as “deaths by resistance” (considered a “justified” use of lethal force, proof or no proof). Activists believe the actual number of people killed by police in Brazil is as high as four or five times the official count. WITNESS in Brazil When WITNESS first began supporting networks and movements using video to fight police violence in Brazil, it was fascinating to look back at emblematic cases and realize how important video had been to break this engrained pattern of impunity. Against all odds, the existence of a video often served as a real hope—sometimes the only hope—for truth and accountability in cases of violence perpetrated by police. Video provided undeniable evidence, dismounted false narratives and helped ramp up the pressure on the processes, institutions and authorities responsible for ensuring justice. “He ascribes this anonymity in part to the fact that there was no video of his death, as there was in the cases of Eric Garner and Walter Scott.” It’s not unlike what happens in the U.S. Victor White III, a 22-year-old black man from Louisiana, died in March 2014 just hours after being detained. Cops said he shot himself while sitting in the back of the police car, handcuffed—a version later contested by the coroner’s report. His father, the Rev. Victor White III told Slate that, “most Americans don’t know his son’s name. He ascribes this anonymity in part to the fact that there was no video of his death, as there was in the cases of Eric Garner and Walter Scott.” It’s as if the existence of a video is the best way to ensure the word of a police officer does not prevail over the silence of a dead victim. In Brazil, generally there are two types of cases of police killings that have resulted in some form of justice or accountability: those cases involving a high profile, rich or well-connected victim, or cases in which there was video. Consider the following examples, taken from research we are collaborating on with our partners at Article 19 Brazil: 1) Favela Naval – São Paulo, March, 1997: Comparable to the Rodney King moment in the U.S., the Favela Naval case began after a covert filmer recorded hours of footage showing the actions of a group of police officers at a checkpoint in a community on the outskirts of São Paulo. Over several days, the officers extorted and tortured different people, and also killed an innocent man. The video was sent to a journalist and then broadcast by the nation’s most-watched news show, generating unprecedented public discussion in Brazil and charges against the officer that fired the deadly shot. (Reiterating how rare this was and still is: a mere filing of charges falls into the 0.8% category I mentioned above. Prosecutions of officers are scarce, and convictions even more so). In court, the video was used by both the prosecution and the defense to argue different points. The officer (known as Rambo) was sentenced to 46 years in prison (later reduced to 15 in appeals). When he was released after 8 years, Rambo gave a frank assessment, admitting he would have never even been charged had that video not existed. The family of the man who was killed in the video was awarded compensation by the courts, but more than a decade later the state has yet to make those payments. Despite that, the images achieved an enormous feat in an era marked by rampant police abuse and zero accountability. Image by Collective ñ. Free use. Image by Collective ñ. Free use. 2) Claudia Ferreira – Rio de Janeiro, March, 2014: Claudia was hit by gunfire on the neck on her way to buy bread one evening in her community, Morro da Congonha. A mother of four children who also raised her four nieces and nephews, Claudia was thrown into the trunk of a police car after she was injured; officers claim they were attempting to take her to the hospital. On the way there, her body fell out and was dragged for roughly 800 feet before the officers stopped the car to throw her back inside. The person driving the car behind the police vehicle witnessed the incident and had the instinct to take his phone out and film the horrific scene. The images were shared with a local newspaper and fueled widespread outrage and protest. The repercussion led to the detention of the three officers involved, a meeting between Claudia’s family and the state governor, a statement by the Brazilian president and an agreement for compensation to Claudia’s family. Perhaps the most powerful aspect of this tragic story is the following detail: prior to Claudia’s death, the officers involved in the case had, between them, already been involved in 69 other cases where people died at their hands. It took a video—shaky, amateur, accidental—to get them off the streets, albeit temporarily. It’s unlikely the family would have been awarded any kind of reparation without visceral imagery that surfaced. 3) The José Case – São Paulo, March, 2014: José, 17, heard a knock at his apartment door in São Paulo in the middle of the night. When he opened it, there were two officers asking him and his mother to accompany themto the precinct to cooperate on an unspecified matter. Only after arriving there did he realize he was being accused of stealing a car. The evidence? Rumors from witnesses that the assailants had fled into the building whereJosé lived. Acting on those tips, police asked the doorman who the last people to enter the building were, and that led to José. Despite his family attesting that he had been home, and the blatant lack of evidence, José was convicted the following month and sentenced to serve time at a juvenile detention center. His savior? Surveillance camera footage from his building’s elevators, which showed José exiting his building several times over the course of the night to smoke cigarettes on the sidewalk (no car theft involved). The footage was edited by a group of investigative journalists (the amazing folks at Ponte) and then shown to the judge overseeing the case. Ten hours later, José was released and cleared. 4) Alan Lima – Rio de Janeiro, February, 2015: Alan, 15, was enjoying a night with friends—riding bikes, telling jokes and, as many teenagers do, recording themselves on their cellphones. Military police arrived suddenly and began shooting in their direction, killing Alan and wounding his 19-year-old friend Chauan. For several days, the officers maintained that the boys were armed and that they only fired their own guns in self-defense after shots were fired at them as they patrolled the area. When the video Alan had recorded on his cellphone surfaced, they proved the opposite: the boys were unarmed and the only shots heard are from the police. The videos led to investigations of nine police officers and, in a rare example of accountability climbing the ladder of command, the chief commander was fired, even though he was not even physically present at the scene. The head investigator in charge of the case said the videos were “definitive proof” of the boys’ innocence. These four examples—enraging, heartbreaking, unacceptable—illustrate the potential of video to catalyze justice in faster and more effective ways than ever before. The more people equipped to shoot video from their phones and collect evidence, the harder it is to hide or deny the truth. But the power of video has yet to be fully leveraged. Imagine what could be accomplished if these images were more strategically filmed, shared and deployed. How many more Alans and Josés and Claudias could be cleared? Could they be avoided altogether? Still from video about Papo Reto by Fusion. Raull Santiago, member of Papo Reto. Still from video by Fusion. Of course video is not a magic wand, and even with perfect video we still live in an imperfect world. Even the best evidence can only go so far within legal and political institutions characterized by systemic racism and classism. But video has undeniably served as a powerful counterweight—a tool to ensure more voices are heard in more spaces. People from communities on the frontlines of police violence in Brazil have embraced this potential and taken to video and social media to speak out, even at great personal risk. Our partners at Coletivo Papo Reto have been featured by the NYTimes Magazine and by Fusion TV for their brave activism, refusing to accept war as normal life and fighting back with just their phones and some good old community organizing. They understand how powerful these images can be, and so do the police. One of our partners said this: “a few years ago, officers would stop us, pat us down, look for weapons. Now they just ask for our phones and tell us to type in our passwords so they could browse our gallery and delete any videos that may be damaging to them”.

#### Civilian control shifts power: any battle with police means the people need to control the narrative Simonson 2

Beyond Body Cameras: Defending a Robust Right to Record the Police JOCELYN SIMONSON\* Assistant Professor, Brooklyn Law School. © 2016, Jocelyn Simonson] cw//az recut \*bracketed for grammar and clarity

In contrast, when civilians film[ing] the police, local residents hold[s] **the** police accountable, resulting in **a palpable** power shift. Civilians record footage from their own perspective and control the release of that footage to the public or the authorities. They also do more than that: they communicat[ing]e to police officers in the moment **that** someone is watching them. The transfer of power inherent in the act of observation turn[ing]s the film**ing** of a police officer in public into **a form of** resistance—into a challenge to their authority. Indeed, filming by disempowered populations has its own term and meaning in social theory: sousveillance is a special term for when cameras are turned on those in power.45 Sousveillance— being watched from below, rather than from on high—facilitates the **transfer of** power from authorities to **the** less powerful.46 Many civilians recognize the importance of this power shift. Organized copwatching groups, for example, have proliferated around the United States, in part because they link the power transfer involved in filming the police to efforts at larger social change.47 One organized copwatching group describes its main purpose as “organiz[ing] and empower[ing] community residents to work collectively to change the relationships of power that affect our community.”48 In this way, **filming police in public can become a form of civic engagement**, a public gesture in which a civilian says through the pointing of a cell phone at an officer that they are holding that officer accountable in the moment

#### Entralgo 18, reporters are getting deported in retaliation for covering these issues

Rebekah [Rebekah Entralgo is a reporter at ThinkProgress. Previously she was a news assistant on the NPR Business Desk. She has also worked for NPR member stations WFSU in Tallahassee and WLRN in Miami.], 7-9-2018, ICE detains journalist who covered police brutality, Thinkprogress, https://thinkprogress.org/journalist-detained-by-ice-says-he-was-targeted-for-police-coverage-fe07638fefea/, cw//az

Memphis-based journalist Manuel Duran says he was “without a doubt” targeted by the city’s police department for his work, according to an interview conducted by The Daily Beast. “I was doing my work and nothing more, like any other journalist does,” he told the news outlet. In April, Duran was one of several reporters covering a Memphis protest when he was arrested for refusing orders to clear the street, according to a police affidavit. Although local prosecutors dropped the charges two days after his arrest, federal immigration agents were outside the Shelby County jail waiting to arrest and transport him to a detention center in Jena, Louisiana, where he remains. A police official denied singling out Duran because he is a journalist, saying at a press conference, “The question that we targeted Mr. Duran is just false.” ICE has also denied the claim. “The allegation that ICE engages in retaliation towards individuals who protest is categorically false. Mr. Duran was arrested [by ICE] because he is in violation of federal immigration law,” ICE spokesman Bryan D. Cox told The Daily Beast. Duran’s claim that he was arrested for doing his job isn’t far-fetched, however, considering his past reporting that has been critical of the police department. A year before his arrest, Memphis Noticias, the news website Duran founded, published a video interview with a woman whose friend was arrested by Memphis Police and subsequently transferred to ICE custody, despite promises from Memphis Mayor Jim Strickland that the city’s government was not cooperating with ICE. Duran told The Daily Beast that he is aware of three confirmed cases of the city’s police department collaborating with ICE. Memphis police asked Duran to take the video down but he refused. A court petition filed by the Southern Poverty Law Center (SPLC) alleges that Duran also reported on a number of stories involving the city’s police department, including shootings, individual police misconduct, and a man whose body was found in a vehicle at the police impound lot. Duran’s attorney says his client’s journalism holds local officials accountable and provides government transparency for those in his community. “He’s the only one that’s doing it for the Spanish-speaking community in Memphis. His absence is a huge loss,” he said. ICE has attempted to deport Duran back to El Salvador. He fled the Central American country in 2006 after receiving repeated death threats for his reporting on its law enforcement and judicial system. In 2007, Duran received an order of removal after missing an immigration hearing. According to Duran, he never received a notice of that hearing. NPR reported in March that at least 20 activists have been arrested by ICE on immigration charges.

#### newell 13: states aren’t unified and wiretapping laws prevent citizens from legally recording police in public – giving a right to the press is uniquely key for minorities to submit their perspectives as confidential sources to popular discussion without being convicted of a felony

Bryce Clayton, FACING THE TRAGIC QUESTION: CITIZEN JOURNALISM AND SURVEILLANCE OF POLICE IN PUBLIC SPACES JOURNAL OF LAW, TECHNOLOGY & POLICY @ The University of Illinois http://illinoisjltp.com/journal/wp-content/uploads/2013/12/Newell\_Original.pdf [Newell is currently a doctoral student in the Ph.D. program in Information Science at the University of Washington Information School in Seattle, Washington. He is also a Google Policy Fellow at the Samuelson-Glushko Canadian Internet Policy and Public Interest Clinic (CIPPIC) at the University of Ottawa Faculty of Law; a Grad Fellow of the Comparative Law and Society Studies (CLASS) Center at the University of Washington; and documentary filmmaker. He holds a J.D. from the University of California, Davis School of Law, and is licensed to practice law in California (currently inactive). He has been published in various law reviews and peer-reviewed publications, and has presented research at national and international conferences. The Journal accepts solicited and unsolicited pieces, except for piece previously published. If an piece is accepted for peer-review, then the Journal acquires the right of first publication. The author may elect to have the piece immediately posted online as a work-under-review to expedite publication and receive additional comments from online readers. ] accessed 8/31/18 cw//az

More recently, in the early morning hours of January 1, 2009, a number of Bay Area Rapid Transit passengers recorded Officer Johannes Mehserle shooting and killing a young man named Oscar Grant in the back with his gun while Grant was lying on the subway platform, supposedly resisting restraint while the officers were attempting to place handcuffs on him. Multiple recordings of the killing were uploaded to YouTube, despite officer attempts to confiscate cameras in the vicinity, and the reaction to the videos and news reports fueled both peaceful and violent protests in the days following the incident. In 2010, when Mehserle was convicted of involuntary manslaughter rather than the murder to which he was accused, additional riots broke out across the city of Oakland. The potential for citizen recordings of police misconduct (or alleged misconduct) to incite violence, alter media coverage of policing related incidents, and to provide evidence needed to hold officers accountable, has begun to be documented and recognized widely. The officers under surveillance have also reacted. In a dozen U.S. states, wiretapping (or eavesdropping) statues prohibit citizens from making audio or audio-visual recordings of conversations without getting consent from all parties to the recorded conversations. These state laws vary in their scope, but have been used frequently in recent years to arrest, detain, and harass photographers, including citizens and members of the credentialed press. These laws would have made recordings like those described above illegal (at least as far as conversations or speech were part of the recordings). In the United Kingdom, an anti-terrorism law similarly used by police officers to detain and question photographers has recently been held to be in violation of the European Convention for Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

#### No unlawful gunning of police or crime increase

Ray Sanchez [Newsdesk Editor — CNN Metro New York, U.S. As seen in: CNN, CNN International, MSN, CNN en Español, MSN Canada, KYW-TV (Philadelphia, PA), KCNC-TV (Denver, CO), KYW-AM (Philadelphia, PA), St. Louis Post-Dispatch, El Mundo (Spain), NewsOK.com, WRAL-TV (Raleigh, NC), KPRC-TV (Houston, TX), WDIV-TV (Detroit, MI)] , Cnn 15, 10-16-2015, Rahm Emanuel: Anti-police backlash makes officers 'fetal', CNN, https://www.cnn.com/2015/10/16/us/rahm-emanuel-police-comments/index.html, cw//az

The raw numbers -- at least, in terms of officers dying by firearms -- do not show them becoming targets. Nationally, police deaths are down 21% this year, compared with the same period last year, according to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund. There have been 30 firearms-related deaths this year, including two in training accidents, and 38 in 2014. Traffic accidents -- followed by shootings -- are the leading cause of police deaths. "Do police officers feel under siege? Yes, they do feel that way. I've heard a lot of them say that," said David Harris, a University of Pittsburgh School of Law professor and an expert on policing. "But there's no evidence of the so-called Ferguson effect -- that police are hesitating to do their jobs -- or that criminals are being emboldened by the rhetoric. They're not doing their jobs any differently. The job is harder in the last year, but they aren't just lying down."

#### Turn: chilling effect is only for bad cops: this affirms reform and accelerates aff solvency Murphy

Murphy, David, "“V.I.P” Videographer Intimidation Protection: How The Government Should Protect Citizens Who Videotape The Police" (2013). Law School Student Scholarship. Paper 73. <http://scholarship.shu.edu/student_scholarship/73> (CWLC) \*bracketed for gendered language

Police assert that this trend is a threat to certain societal interests.51 Jim Pasco, the executive director of the Fraternal Order of Police, 52 remarked that the proliferation of cheap video equipment has “a chilling effect on some officers who are now afraid to act for fear of retribution by video.”53 Pasco’s statement implies that video causes police officers to secondguess their actions before they act. 54 This means that the police officers either act differently or put less consideration into their actions when they know their conduct is not recorded on camera. If a police officer knew that ~~his~~ [their] conduct was lawful, justified, and otherwise correct, [they]~~he~~ would not hesitate from acting regardless of whether or not a videographer is recording his conduct. A police officer’s hesitation when he knows his conduct is being recorded reinforces the argument that the filming of police officers in public causes police officers to lawfully and thoughtfully conduct police business. Pasco and the police seem to consider recorded observation of police conduct to be a defect of society’s new power to digitally record in the public, but perhaps it is actually a positive feature which reduces occurrences of police misconduct

#### Tons of people in the U.S. own cell phones

Singh, Ajay. 2017. Prolepticon: Anticipatory Citizen Surveillance of the Police. Surveillance & Society 15(5): 676-688. http://library.queensu.ca/ojs/index.php/surveillance-and-society/index| ISSN: 1477-7487 cw//az

The nascent ability to challenge police-driven narratives in the United States is made possible through the spread of camera-enabled cellphones amongst citizenry. Over the last 15 years, cellphone ownership amongst Americans aged 18 years or older rose from 53 percent in the summer of 2000 to a staggering 92 percent by April 2015 (Pew Research Center 2015). Relatedly, the rate of those who do not own any type of cellphone is declining, from 17 percent in 2011 to 10 percent in 2014 (Pew Research Center 2014). Moreover, smartphones, hybrid devices that combine many elements of a personal computer with a phone that allows the user to have access to the internet and web based application (Portokalidis, Homburg, Anagnostakis and Bos 2010), are increasingly becoming more ubiquitous amongst the American population. Between 2011 and 2015, smartphone ownership amongst American adults rose from 35 percent to 68 percent. Most smartphones are connected to the internet at all times, either through Wi-Fi connections or mobile connections with a service provider, allowing the user access to cloud storage, a complex of servers that stores data in a remote location.

#### Cloud storage means police will never be able to delete all copies

Singh, Ajay. 2017. Prolepticon: Anticipatory Citizen Surveillance of the Police. Surveillance & Society 15(5): 676-688. http://library.queensu.ca/ojs/index.php/surveillance-and-society/index| ISSN: 1477-7487 cw//az

With this arrangement for storage, when a user takes a video or an image, the recording is immediately saved not only on the phone’s hard drive or memory unit, but also in the cloud. This prevents officers from destroying the footage through destruction of the device, confiscation of the phone or forcing the user to delete the footage, as in the 2012 August case in New York where police confiscated the phone of a citizen who had filmed the police shooting of a man in Times Square (Schwirtz and Edwards 2012). A similar incident unfolded in Antioch, California in 2014 August, where officers confiscated and deleted footage from the phones of multiple witnesses who observed police roughly arresting another citizen (Wang 2014). If the user does delete the footage from any local storage on the phone, the footage will still exist in the cloud.3

#### Lopez 17 Police aren’t accountable in the status quo because their word overrides eyewitness testimony but video opens persepctives

German Lopez@Germanrlopezgerman.Lopez@Vox [I have written for Vox since it launched in 2014, with a focus on criminal justice, guns, and drugs. Previously, I worked at CityBeat, a local newspaper in Cincinnati, covering politics and policy at the local and state level.] 17, 6-16-2017, The cop who shot Philando Castile was cleared of manslaughter. His being charged was still rare., Vox, https://www.vox.com/2015/4/8/8369769/police-shooting-charges-convictions, cw//az

The Minnesota police officer who drew widespread protests after he shot and killed Philando Castile has been found not guilty after being charged with second-degree manslaughter. After 27 hours of deliberation, the jury found St. Anthony, Minnesota, police officer Jeronimo Yanez not guilty for manslaughter, as well as two counts of dangerous discharge of a firearm, according to the Star Tribune. While he will no longer be employed as a police officer in St. Anthony, the village announced after the verdict, **Yanez was one** of the **rare officer**s **to be charged for** using **force on the job** — but it's even rarer for cops to be convicted and imprisoned for such actions. An analysis by FiveThirtyEight's Reuben Fischer-Baum found police are convicted in 33 percent of cases and incarcerated in 12 percent when they go to trial, while members of the general public are convicted 68 percent of the time and incarcerated 48 percent of the time when they go to trial. Legal standards generally give officers a lot of legal room to use force without fear of punishment. The intention is to give police officers leeway to make split-second decisions to protect themselves and bystanders. And although critics argue that these legal standards give law enforcement a license to kill innocent or unarmed people, police officers say they are essential to their safety. But there are other reasons police are rarely charged and convicted, as well. Sometimes the investigations fall onto the same police department the officer is from, which creates major conflicts of interest. Other times the only available evidence comes from eyewitnesses, who may not be as trustworthy in the public eye as a police officer. "There is a tendency to believe an officer over a civilian, in terms of credibility," David Rudovsky, a civil rights lawyer who co-wrote Prosecuting Misconduct: Law and Litigation, told Vox's Amanda Taub. "And when an officer is on trial, reasonable doubt has a lot of bite. A prosecutor needs a very strong case before a jury will say that somebody who we generally trust to protect us has so seriously crossed the line as to be subject to a conviction." The Scott shooting follows national outrage over several police killings of black men in the past year, including the deaths of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, and Eric Garner in New York City, where both grand juries declined to bring charges against the officers involved. A couple of factors might have helped lead to charges in the Scott killing: an outside agency — the South Carolina Law Enforcement Division — is investigating the shooting, and it was caught on tape, something that has been integral in inspiring public outrage over police use of force incidents since the Rodney King beating more than 20 years ago. But whether the charges will lead to a conviction remains unclear — and history shows it rarely happens.

#### Maloney et al no date found A2 black male gaze

Lyndsey Maloney, Andrew Miller, Shay Nix and Ben Osborn The Oppositional Gaze: Black Female Spectators, ENGL 359, https://xuengl359.wordpress.com/home/theoryguide/the-oppositional-gaze-bell-hooks/, cw//az

Black male gaze vs. Black female gaze – When it comes to the gaze of black men, hooks argues that it could occur without punishment in theaters and from the comfort of the home. Black men could at least connect with gendered relation through ‘spaces of phallocentric power.’ Black women lacked representation in cinema. Even when presented in cinema, black women were the object of male gaze. The role of black women in film – “Even when representations of black women were present in film, our bodies and being were there to serve,” hooks argues (310). As a result, hooks points out that black women dismiss cinema as a significant relation to their lives. They don’t expect to see a meaningful representation of the black female. They simply cannot identify with the recipient of the gaze or the person actively performing the gaze. Omission of race in feminist film theory – There has been plenty of feminist criticism in film before hooks’ essay, but feminist film theory has overlooked the role of the black female. For instance, hooks acknowledges the importance of Laura Mulvey’s “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema,” but adds that race should be considered in Mulvey’s argument. Reducing the concept of a ‘pleasure in looking’ to active male and passive female leaves black female spectators choosing not to identify with the “film’s imaginary subject because such identification was disenabling” (313).

### retaliation

Briallen Hopper 15, 4-22-2015, Charging media for using police-shooting video may be the price of equal justice, Conversation, https://theconversation.com/charging-media-for-using-police-shooting-video-may-be-the-price-of-equal-justice-40062, cw//az

Meanwhile, in Chicago, a young woman who used her Blackberry to record encounters with police was charged with a Class 1 felony under a law there that restricted people from recording police without their knowledge. She was later acquitted, but even the possibility of prosecution remains a significant deterrent for potential witnesses. Second, bystanders may face legal action for unrelated matters if they witness police violence and decide to come forward. They are making themselves visible to police in ways that undermine their own security from police attention. It is not unusual for police to make suspects out of witnesses or people who submit complaints. Alice Goffman’s book, On the Run, details how some police, when they need evidence, may pressure bystanders or even spouses to turn into informants.

They continue

In other words, civilians who record law enforcers may rationally believe their actions will be futile. And even when their evidence does affect the case, there are new costs to be borne. In a high-profile case like Walter Scott’s, a witness can reasonably expect to give up normal life for the duration of the media attention and ongoing trial. In addition to threats from around the country and the fear of police surveillance, any semblance of day-to-day routine is forfeited.

Amos Barshad 16, 10-6-2016, Ramsey Orta Is Now In Prison. Is This What Happens To Copwatchers?, FADER, https://www.thefader.com/2016/10/06/ramsey-orta-is-now-in-prison-is-this-what-happens-to-copwatchers, cw//az

Earlier this week, Ramsey Orta — the Staten Island resident who filmed the death of Eric Garner — reported to prison on Rikers Island to begin a four year sentence. According to the New York Daily News, authorities charge that Orta ”sold heroin, crack cocaine, marijuana, oxycodone and anti-anxiety pills to an undercover officer nine times” and “was also busted with a .25-caliber handgun.” For his part, Orta contends that his charges stem from a prolonged campaign of retaliation from the NYPD. During one raid of his home, Orta told Democracy Now, he was met by an officer holding a phone in his face. ”I asked them, ‘Why is you filming me?’”, Orta said. “And he said, ‘You filmed us. Now we’re filming you.’”

More examples

Ruben An sued the NYPD in July for arresting him in while he filmed police officers in 2014. Ramsey Orta, who filmed Eric Garner’s arrest in 2014, said he was later arrested in “retaliation.” He is suing the city of New York.

Lynwood Keith Golden was arrested after filming police in Wetumpka, Alabama in June. He has filed a lawsuit.

Maurice Crawley was arrested in Syracuse, N.Y., in July while filming an arrest, sparking protests.

Kenneth Holmes was arrested in May while filming an arrest in Austin, Texas.

A lawsuit alleges that police illegally detained Abdullah Muflahi, the man who filmed police officer Blane Salamoni shoot Alton Sterling. They seized his convenience store surveillance video and cell phone in Baton Rouge.