# 1AC – Transgender

## 1AC – Harms

#### Current housing and shelter for trans homeless youth is not just inadequate, it’s a site of institutional violence and transphobia.

**Quintana et al. 10** [Nico Sifra Quintana, Josh Rosenthal, and Jeff Krehely. Center for American Progress. “On the Streets The Federal Response to Gay and Transgender Homeless Youth”. June 2010]

When gay and transgender youth fall through the safety nets designed to keep youth from homelessness, their last line of defense against living on the streets are adult- or youth oriented homeless shelters. Sadly, rather than finding refuge, safety, and care in shelters, too many gay and transgender homeless youth face discrimination and violence. In a 2007 report, the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force released striking anecdotal evidence that gay and transgender youth experience high rates of harassment and discrimination in homeless shelter organizations. The research cited reports from the Ruth Ellis Center in Detroit that transgender youth were being discriminated against in other Detroit service organizations.97 They noted that youth were being denied access to shelter at specific service organizations if they did not dress as their birth-assigned gender.98 Additionally, another Michigan facility was found to have made gay and transgender youth dress in orange to identify them from straight youth.99 According to a service provider for gay and transgender youth in Massachusetts, clients had reported being kicked out of other shelters in the state due to their sexual orientation or gender identify.100 In New York City, gay and transgender youth reported being frequently discriminated against and physically assaulted at certain faith-based shelter organizations.101 Some of this discrimination takes the form of open discrimination and harassment via shelter policies. More often, shelter staff and residents harass gay and transgender youth despite shelter policies. A less severe form of discrimination comes from well-meaning shelter staff who are not well trained in what policies and services are necessary to promote the development of gay and transgender youth. A shelter with any of these forms of discrimination ceases to be a safe place for gay and transgender youth.

#### Life on the streets is hard enough, but for trans folk there’s nowhere to go. It’s dangerous, violent, and there’s no protection.

Ray 06 [Ray, Nicholas. (2006). Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth: An epidemic of homelessness. New York: National Gay and Lesbian Task Force Policy Institute and the National Coalition for the Homeless.]

WHAT IMPACT DOES HOMELESSNESS HAVE ON LGBT YOUTH SPECIFICALLY? Whether LGBT youth are homeless on the streets or in temporary shelter, our review of the available research reveals that they face a multitude of ongoing crises that threaten their chances of becoming healthy, independent adults. MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES LGBT[rans] homeless youth are especially vulnerable to depression, loneliness and psychosomatic illness,6 withdrawn behavior, social problems and delinquency.7 According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the fact that LGBT youth live in “a society that discriminates against and stigmatizes homosexuals” makes them more vulnerable to mental health issues than heterosexual youth.8 This vulnerability is only magnified for LGBT[rans] youth who are homeless. SUBSTANCE ABUSE The combination of stressors inherent to the daily life of homeless youth leads them to abuse drugs and alcohol. For example, in Minnesota, five separate statewide studies found that between 10 and 20 percent of homeless youth self-identify as chemically dependent.9 These risks are exacerbated for homeless youth identifying as lesbian, gay or bisexual (LGB).10 Personal drug usage, family drug usage, and the likelihood of enrolling in a treatment program are all higher for LGB homeless youth than for their heterosexual peers.11 RISKY SEXUAL BEHAVIOR All homeless youth are especially vulnerable to engaging in risky sexual behaviors because their basic needs for food and shelter are not being met.12 Defined as “exchanging sex for anything needed, including money, food, clothes, a place to stay or drugs,”13 survival sex is the last resort for many LGBT homeless youth. A study of homeless youth in Canada found that those who identify as LGBT were three times more likely to participate in survival sex than their heterosexual peers, 14 and 50 percent of homeless youth in another study considered it likely or very likely that they will someday test positive for HIV.15 VICTIMIZATION OF HOMELESS LGBT YOUTH LGBT youth face the threat of victimization everywhere: at home, at school, at their jobs, and, for those who are out-of-home, at shelters and on the streets. According to the National Runaway Switchboard, LGBT[rans] homeless youth are seven times more likely than their heterosexual peers to be victims of a crime.16 While some public safety agencies try to help this vulnerable population,17 others adopt a “blame the victim” approach, further decreasing the odds of victimized youth feeling safe reporting their experiences.18 LGBT HOMELESS YOUTH AND THE JUVENILE AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEMS While there is a paucity of academic research about the experiences of LGBT youth who end up in the juvenile and criminal justice systems, preliminary evidence suggests that they are disproportionately the victims of harassment and violence, including rape. For example, respondents in one small study reported that lesbians and bisexual girls are overrepresented in the juvenile justice system and that they are forced to live among a population of inmates who are violently homophobic.19 Gay male youth in the system are also emotionally, physically and sexually assaulted by staff and inmates. One respondent in a study of the legal rights of young people in state custody reported that staff members think that “[if] a youth is gay, they want to have sex with all the other boys, so they did not protect me from unwanted sexual advances.”20 TRANSGENDER HOMELESS YOUTH Transgender youth are disproportionately represented in the homeless population. More generally, some reports indicate that one in five transgender individuals need or are at risk of needing homeless shelter assistance.21 However, most shelters are segregated by birth sex, regardless of the individual’s gender identity,22 and homeless transgender youth are even ostracized by some agencies that serve their LGB peers.23

#### Trans folk are dehumanized due to their non-conformity to the gender binary. Society’s intolerance stems from a lack of recognition of trans rights by the state – recognition and affirmation of identity is key.

Weiss 01 [Jillian Todd Weiss. B.A. Yeshiva University, J.D. Seton Hall University School of Law. The Gender Caste System: Identity, Privacy, and Heteronormativity 10 Law & Sexuality 123 (2001)]

The heterosexual norm is the idea that people are, by virtue of heredity and biology, exclusively and aggressively heterosexual: males are masculine men, and are attracted only to feminine women. The opposite is supposed to be true of females.1 In contrast, the fundamental claim of transsexuality is that physical “sex” can be incongruent with psychological “gender”:3 males can be feminine females, and females can be masculine males.4 Advocates of legal rights for transsexual people often appear to assume that the proposition has been established in their favor. Opponents often appear to assume that the transsexual claim is obviously untrue. Statutes, regulations and court decisions show conflicting resolutions of the issue. This Article addresses that conflict. The term “norm” as applied to heterosexuality in our culture is a misnomer: while a “norm” implies that a minority falls outside it, as in a standard statistical bell curve, in regard to gender identity there is no room for outsiders. Thus, heterosexuality is not just a norm—it goes much further than that. It is actually a normative principle, a norm which creates a standard to be met, below which people are not permitted by society to deviate: a “heteronormative” standard. This standard has been enshrined into law, transforming a social custom into a legal control mechanism, a sort of “natural law” theory of gender. American law generally mandates that there are only two genders, male and female, that each person be labeled at birth, and that the label may not be changed. The derivation of legal power to regulate our lives in this way has never been clearly explicated, but has been presumed. Our society assigns a highly specific set of meanings to each gender. These meanings are what we call masculinity and femininity. This system appears to be justified by science, being simply a reflection of the natural order of biology and heredity. Transsexual people are not only abnormal, but their very humanity is in question.5 Our law merely reflects our society and science in its rejection of the transsexual claim, denying the right of transsexual people to self-determination and self-identification.

## 1AC – Advantage

#### Plan: Resolved: The United States will guarantee a right to housing by funding the nationwide expansion of shelters modeled after the Ali Forney Center which is dedicated to assisting homeless trans youth with temporary, transitional, and permanent housing.

**Quintana et al. 10** [Nico Sifra Quintana, Josh Rosenthal, and Jeff Krehely. Center for American Progress. “On the Streets The Federal Response to Gay and Transgender Homeless Youth”. June 2010]

One solution to this problem are homeless shelters dedicated to gay and transgender youth. Unfortunately, there are very few of these shelters. Says the founder of one of the leading shelters for gay and transgender youth, Carl Siciliano, “I doubt that there are even 200 [homeless shelter] beds in the country for LGBT youth, and there are thousands of LGBT youth, so it is a huge problem.”102 Indeed, nationwide there is an extreme lack of emergency shelter and housing options for gay and transgender homeless youth like Siciliano’s Ali Forney Center (see box). The majority of organizations providing shelter and transitional housing options for these youth are geographically isolated, located in a few major urban areas.103 The Ali Forney Center is a place where gay and transgender homeless youth are safe and receive the guidance and support they need to make a smooth transition from homelessness to stability.104 The center was established in 2002 in response to the large number of homeless gay and transgender youth who were being murdered on the streets of New York City. The Ali Forney Center is the largest homeless provider for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth in the nation, and has developed an outstanding model of service for homeless youth. The Ali Forney Center serves LGBT youth ages 16 to 24, and provides a drop-in center, emergency and transitional housing, street outreach, physical and mental health treatment, educational programs, and a family acceptance program that provides counseling services to families of LGBT youth.105 The Ali Forney Center operates a day center in Manhattan, offering street outreach, case management, medical care, mental health care, HIV testing, food, employment assistance, and referrals to the Ali Forney Center housing programs. The center offers both emergency and transitional housing options, with several emergency housing sites in New York City—providing a total of 28 emergency beds for LGBT youth needing immediate housing assistance. All emergency housing units are safe, clean, staff-supervised apartments where youth sleep in beds. Youth are allowed to stay in the emergency housing program for up to six months while staff assist them in finding more long-term housing.106 The Ali Forney Center also offers an excellent transitional housing program that prepares youth for financial stability and independent living. The transitional housing program currently offers apartment housing to 30 youth in New York City. Youth can stay in the transitional housing program for up to two years while they establish economic stability and the ability to move into permanent and independent living situations. All of the youth in transitional housing are currently employed, and threequarters of them are currently in college. The Ali Forney Center also operates a program that reaches out to families of LGBT youth to help them with accepting their child’s sexual orientation or gender identity.107 The project supports and strengthens families through counseling, education, and community outreach services.

#### The poor treatment and discrimination that trans youth face in most homeless shelters dehumanizes them and denies their gender identity – the aff solves for this by providing housing that affirms their right to be trans and their basic humanity. This means that the AC is a reorientation of societies values.

**Quintana et al. 10** [Nico Sifra Quintana, Josh Rosenthal, and Jeff Krehely. Center for American Progress. “On the Streets The Federal Response to Gay and Transgender Homeless Youth”. June 2010]

Transgender youth suffer the most discrimination in homeless shelters. Transgender people of all ages are being turned away from homeless shelters due to prejudice and discrimination, according to a 2003 report by the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.108 When admitted, most homeless shelters house individuals based on gender and few transgender people are housed according to the gender they identify as, which puts them at considerable risk for physical, sexual, and mental harassment and violence.109 Some shelters have strict dress codes regarding gender expression, and transgender people may be forced to express a gender they are not comfortable with in order to receive shelter and services. Lack of identity-affirming services in faith-based shelters Faith-based organizations provide much-needed hunger and poverty social services. But some faith-based organizations serving homeless youth are either unwilling or unable to provide gay and transgender youth with the environment and support services they need for positive youth development.

#### Housing specific to LGBT homeless youths is necessary and empirically succsesful. Otherwise, LGBT homeless youth would continue to face discrimination even after housing has been given to everyone.

**Hunter 08** http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full

One of the most effective ways administrative agencies can increase the safety of LGBT youth in homeless youth housing programs is by promoting the creation of programs specifically for LGBT youth.[123](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn123) LGBT youth are markedly less likely to be assaulted in facilities specifically reserved for them than they are in facilities where they are housed with non-LGBT youth.[124](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn124) In a recent survey of LGBT-specific housing programs, only two percent of occupants were assaulted on their premises per year.[125](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn125) This is a striking contrast to the estimated seventy percent of LGBT youth assaulted because of their sexuality or gender expression in group homes housing LGBT and non-LGBT youth.[126](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn126) Since this figure does not include assaults perpetrated for other reasons, it is likely that even more than seventy percent of LGBT youth living in group homes are assaulted in their group homes.[127](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn127) These data indicate that perhaps the most effective way to curb violence against homeless LGBT youth is to provide them with separate housing facilities so that they are not targeted for violence because of their sexual orientation or gender expression.[128](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn128) Although when couched in terms of “segregation” placing LGBT youth in separate facilities may seem controversial, this approach to creating welcoming living arrangements for homeless LGBT youth is already being used effectively by multiple housing programs. Examples include the Larkin Street Youth Project in San Francisco,[129](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn129) which operates emergency and transitional housing programs for LGBT youth, and Sylvia's Place,[130](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn130) the Ali Forney Center,[131](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn131) and Green Chimneys,[132](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn132) which operate such programs in Manhattan.[133](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn133) Any concern about the importance of integrating LGBT youth with the larger youth population is outweighed by the great risk of serious physical injury which LGBT youth face in homeless youth housing programs. Measures to increase the accountability of housing staff for the violent actions of youth in their care will only curb violence in these programs to the extent that violent youth themselves are deterred by the consequences imposed on them. Creating homeless youth housing programs specifically for LGBT youth will do much to ensure that LGBT youth have safe housing. There are two ways by which I suggest that LGBT-specific homeless youth housing programs be created. First, states can require as a condition of licensure that organizations operating homeless youth housing programs maintain separate facilities for LGBT youth and that at least twenty percent of the aggregate occupancy capacity of shelters operated by each such organization be represented by LGBT-specific facilities. Thus, if an organization operates facilities with a gross occupancy maximum of one hundred, it would be required to operate LGBT-specific facilities with a total occupancy capacity of at least twenty. The second method would require that a minimum of thirty percent of funds designated by regulating agencies to homeless youth shelters be designated to shelters housing only LGBT youth. New York City's Ali Forney Center for homeless LGBT youth, for instance, receives approximately one third of its funding from the City.[134](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn134) In addition to greatly reducing violence against LGBT youth, creating homeless youth housing programs specifically for LGBT youth would not entail the same increase in program costs that may arise out of mandating shelters with lower occupancy rates. Additionally, any potential increase in immediate costs resulting from the implementation of such homeless youth housing programs is likely to be at least partially offset by decreased future government expenditures, because in the long-term such programs will greatly decrease the criminality and social service needs of youth who participate in them. The success of LGBT-supportive housing programs in reducing violence against LGBT youth has been demonstrably accompanied by all the incidents of living in a household conducive to emotional growth. For instance, one hundred percent of youth between eighteen and twenty-four who completed the transitional housing program last year at Larkin Street Youth's Avenues to Independence based in San Francisco were able to move into stable, independent living arrangements.[135](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1744-1617.2008.00220.x/full#fn135)

#### It’s empirically verified that this model works – thousands of trans youth have benefited from this shelter and were able to get off the streets.

**Siciliano 12** [Carl Siciliano, founder of Ali Forney Center, “Providing Safe Shelter for Homeless LGBT Youth” JULY 12, 2012. https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2012/07/12/providing-safe-shelter-homeless-lgbt-youth]

When the Ali Forney Center first opened its doors ten years ago, there was simply no safe shelter for homeless LGBT[rans] kids in New York City. With nowhere safe to turn, many kids slept in parks and in the subways. Many turned to survival sex – trading sex for shelter. These young people struggled to survive in dangerous, squalid, humiliating situations. Ali Forney was a gay youth who was rejected by his family and forced to live on the streets of New York City at the age of 13. I was the director of a drop in center for homeless youth and met Ali when he was 17. In December of 1997, Ali was murdered on the streets. He was 22 years old. My central inspiration for doing the work we do has been enduring the tragic deaths of Ali and six other homeless LGBT youths during a time when NYC had no safe shelter for LGBT youth; I never want to see that happen again. When the Ali Forney Center opened its doors in June of 2002, I had no idea if we would survive. We had just one donor and a church offering us free use of their basement, where we provided six cots. Since we opened our doors there have been no murders of homeless LGBT[rans] youth on the streets of NYC. Ali’s murder was never brought to justice, but his spirit lives on in our work and in each of the lives we transform. Ten years later I am filled with gratitude for the response we have received from the LGBT community, and many of our allies. This response has allowed the Ali Forney Center to become [is] a remarkable success; we have become the largest and most comprehensive organization dedicated to homeless LGBT[rans] youth in the country. We now offer emergency shelter and longer term housing with a combined total of 77 beds in eight different residential facilities. We also offer two drop-in centers where we provide food, clothing, showers, free medical and mental health care, and educational and vocational assistance, helping thousands of kids who have flocked to us for help from all over the country and the world. And, after these ten years, I am full of pride for the success of so many of our kids. I rejoice in seeing how with the proper nurturing and support they are able to find the strength to overcome the most terrible mistreatment. Seeing many go to college, get jobs, and move out on their own is nothing short of a triumph over the most toxic effects of rejection. This prestigious award is one symbol of how far we have come in addressing this issue. I am truly grateful to receive this honor and to give a voice to the hundreds of thousands of homeless young people who are abandoned by their families and forced to do what they can to survive the streets.

#### And a rights approach is uniquely key.

Cacanagh 14 [Michaela Cavanagh works as the communications and documentation officer for the [CVC/COIN Vulnerabilized Groups Project](file:///c%3A%5CUsers%5Ckalexander%5CAppData%5CLocal%5CMicrosoft%5CWindows%5CTemporary%2520Internet%2520Files%5CContent.Outlook%5CCBR4HMSI%5Cfocusright.org), a 5-year PANCAP Round 9 Regional Global Fund Grant in the Caribbean. “For the Transgender Community, Recognition of Their Human Rights is Key to Closing the Gap” Interagency Coalition on AIDS and Development. December 2014]

These means that status quo shelters that serve the general population or even the entire trans community are inadequate and at times can be as bad or worse than living on the streets because trans non-conforming youth are particularly vulnerable. Lumping them in with adults can be just as harmful. Also warrants why housing is good – other supposedly safe spaces just aren’t working. In a [recent study](http://www.natap.org/2013/HIV/PIIS1473309912703158.pdf) of ten low-income and middle-income countries, the prevalence of HIV in transgender women was found to be incredibly high, at nearly 18%. Transgender women who engage in sex work are especially vulnerable, and most in need of prevention, treatment, and care. This World AIDS Day, if we truly want to close the gap, we must work together to put the needs of our most vulnerable communities at the forefront of the fight. In the Dominican Republic, a small island nation situated in the Caribbean – the region with the second highest HIV prevalence in the world after sub-Saharan Africa – the Transgender and LGBT communities face harsh structural stigma and discrimination, making it nearly impossible for them to access health services or lead "normal" lives. Like in much of the developing world, homosexuality continues to be criminalized in the Dominican Republic. Not only that, but the stigma associated with being gay is still exceptionally harsh. For example, in a local newspaper earlier this year, [one headline read](http://elperiodicos.blogspot.com/2014/04/dos-mujeres-se-besan-en-el-malecon-como_2694.html), "Two women kiss on the boardwalk as if they were in their own home, provoking curious stares". As we know, if a community of people isn't accepted by broader society – either because of their identity or sexual practices or behaviour – they are driven further underground, further marginalized and pushed to the fringes of society. This not only means that there are fewer structures to protect them and their human rights, but also that it is [this means] far more difficult to access health services – especially for people with HIV, who are doubly stigmatized. If you identify as transgender, for example, attending university or finding a job are extremely difficult, simply because faculty or employers won't accept you as you are, and you become the subject of ridicule, rejection, or hate speech. Nearly 30% of gay or transgender people in Santo Domingo experience workplace discrimination, and over 45% experience rejection in school or at university, over 20% in the family, and over 16% in health services.[1](http://www.icad-cisd.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=646%3Afor-the-transgender-community-recognition-of-their-human-rights-is-key-to-closing-the-gap&catid=112%3Aworld-aids-day-blog-series-2014&lang=en#FN1) It's for this reason – that it's so often impossible to find a job or attend university while maintaining one's identity – that Transgender women turn to sex work as an alternative. This, in turn, leads to increased vulnerability when Trans women must put themselves in dangerous situations. Between December 2013 and October 2014, there have been 17 cases of transgender human rights violations reported to the Human Rights Observatory for Vulnerable Groups, indicating multiple cases of arbitrary arrest, police violence, and extortion.[2](http://www.icad-cisd.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=646%3Afor-the-transgender-community-recognition-of-their-human-rights-is-key-to-closing-the-gap&catid=112%3Aworld-aids-day-blog-series-2014&lang=en#FN2) In one instance, two police officers verbally and physically assaulted a Transgender sex worker named Maria. The police detained the sex worker's client and then asked for Maria's money. When she refused, they tied her hands with a belt and beat her until she was unconscious. Afterwards, they took her to a hospital and then detained her until the next day at a police station.[3](http://www.icad-cisd.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=646%3Afor-the-transgender-community-recognition-of-their-human-rights-is-key-to-closing-the-gap&catid=112%3Aworld-aids-day-blog-series-2014&lang=en#FN3) In order to banish HIV, we need to first banish fear of difference. We need to work with institutional power bearers, governments, and law enforcement officials – those who are designated with the responsibility of protecting the most vulnerable members of our communities – to sensitize them to people who are different, but who are just as deserving of respect and human rights. When these women are pushed underground, they do not seek the health services and treatment they need, and if they don't seek the treatment they need, then we will never see an end to the HIV epidemic. What's more: when Transgender women are told again and again that who they are is bad, different and shameful, it not only pushes them further underground, but it destroys their self-worth. As privilege holders, it's our duty to clear a space for them to come into the light. Not only so that the human rights of Trans women may be recognized, but so that they themselves may be recognized as people worthy of dignity and respect.

## 1AC – Framework

#### The role of the ballot is to evaluate the simulated consequences of the affirmative policy vs a competiting neg policy option using a consequentialist standard.

#### 1. The aff deploys the state to learn scenario planning- even if politics is bad, scenario analysis of politics is pedagogically valuable- it enhances creativity, deconstructs biases and teaches advocacy skills

Barma et al 16 May 2016, [Advance Publication Online on 11/6/15], Naazneen Barma, PhD in Political Science from UC-Berkeley, Assistant Professor of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School, Brent Durbin, PhD in Political Science from UC-Berkeley, Professor of Government at Smith College, Eric Lorber, JD from UPenn and PhD in Political Science from Duke, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, Rachel Whitlark, PhD in Political Science from GWU, Post-Doctoral Research Fellow with the Project on Managing the Atom and International Security Program within the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard, “‘Imagine a World in Which’: Using Scenarios in Political Science,” International Studies Perspectives 17 (2), pp. 1-19,

What Are Scenarios and Why Use Them in Political Science? Scenario analysis is perceived most commonly as a technique for examining the robustness of strategy. It can immerse decision makers in future states that go beyond conventional extrapolations of current trends, preparing them to take advantage of unexpected opportunities and to protect themselves from adverse exogenous shocks. The global petroleum company Shell, a pioneer of the technique, characterizes scenario analysis as the art of considering “what if” questions about possible future worlds. Scenario analysis is thus typically seen as serving the purposes of corporate planning or as a policy tool to be used in combination with simulations of decision making. Yet scenario analysis is not inherently limited to these uses. This section provides a brief overview of the practice of scenario analysis and the motivations underpinning its uses. It then makes a case for the utility of the technique for political science scholarship and describes how the scenarios deployed at NEFPC were created. The Art of Scenario Analysis We characterize scenario analysis as the art of juxtaposing current trends in unexpected combinations in order to articulate surprising and yet plausible futures, often referred to as “alternative worlds.” Scenarios are thus explicitly not forecasts or projections based on linear extrapolations of contemporary patterns, and they are not hypothesis-based expert predictions. Nor should they be equated with simulations, which are best characterized as functional representations of real institutions or decision-making processes (Asal 2005). Instead, they are depictions of possible future states of the world, offered together with a narrative of the driving causal forces and potential exogenous shocks that could lead to those futures. Good scenarios thus rely on explicit causal propositions that, independent of one another, are plausible—yet, when combined, suggest surprising and sometimes controversial future worlds. For example, few predicted the dramatic fall in oil prices toward the end of 2014. Yet independent driving forces, such as the shale gas revolution in the United States, China’s slowing economic growth, and declining conflict in major Middle Eastern oil producers such as Libya, were all recognized secular trends that—combined with OPEC’s decision not to take concerted action as prices began to decline—came together in an unexpected way. While scenario analysis played a role in war gaming and strategic planning during the Cold War, the real antecedents of the contemporary practice are found in corporate futures studies of the late 1960s and early 1970s (Raskin et al. 2005). Scenario analysis was essentially initiated at Royal Dutch Shell in 1965, with the realization that the usual forecasting techniques and models were not capturing the rapidly changing environment in which the company operated (Wack 1985; Schwartz 1991). In particular, it had become evident that straight-line extrapolations of past global trends were inadequate for anticipating the evolving business environment. Shell-style scenario planning “helped break the habit, ingrained in most corporate planning, of assuming that the future will look much like the present” (Wilkinson and Kupers 2013, 4). Using scenario thinking, Shell anticipated the possibility of two Arab-induced oil shocks in the 1970s and hence was able to position itself for major disruptions in the global petroleum sector. Building on its corporate roots, scenario analysis has become a standard policymaking tool. For example, the Project on Forward Engagement advocates linking systematic foresight, which it defines as the disciplined analysis of alternative futures, to planning and feedback loops to better equip the United States to meet contemporary governance challenges (Fuerth 2011). Another prominent application of scenario thinking is found in the National Intelligence Council’s series of Global Trends reports, issued every four years to aid policymakers in anticipating and planning for future challenges. These reports present a handful of “alternative worlds” approximately twenty years into the future, carefully constructed on the basis of emerging global trends, risks, and opportunities, and intended to stimulate thinking about geopolitical change and its effects.4 As with corporate scenario analysis, the technique can be used in foreign policymaking for long-range general planning purposes as well as for anticipating and coping with more narrow and immediate challenges. An example of the latter is the German Marshall Fund’s EuroFutures project, which uses four scenarios to map the potential consequences of the Euro-area financial crisis (German Marshall Fund 2013). Several features make scenario analysis particularly useful for policymaking.5 Long-term global trends across a number of different realms—social, technological, environmental, economic, and political—combine in often-unexpected ways to produce unforeseen challenges. Yet the ability of decision makers to imagine, let alone prepare for, discontinuities in the policy realm is constrained by their existing mental models and maps. This limitation is exacerbated by well-known cognitive bias tendencies such as groupthink and confirmation bias (Jervis 1976; Janis 1982; Tetlock 2005). The power of scenarios lies in their ability to help individuals break out of conventional modes of thinking and analysis by introducing unusual combinations of trends and deliberate discontinuities in narratives about the future. Imagining alternative future worlds through a structured analytical process enables policymakers to envision and thereby adapt to something altogether different from the known present. Designing Scenarios for Political Science Inquiry The characteristics of scenario analysis that commend its use to policymakers also make it well suited to helping political scientists generate and develop policy-relevant research programs. Scenarios are essentially textured, plausible, and relevant stories that help us imagine how the future political-economic world could be different from the past in a manner that highlights policy challenges and opportunities. For example, terrorist organizations are a known threat that have captured the attention of the policy community, yet our responses to them tend to be linear and reactive. Scenarios that explore how seemingly unrelated vectors of change—the rise of a new peer competitor in the East that diverts strategic attention, volatile commodity prices that empower and disempower various state and nonstate actors in surprising ways, and the destabilizing effects of climate change or infectious disease pandemics—can be useful for illuminating the nature and limits of the terrorist threat in ways that may be missed by a narrower focus on recognized states and groups. By illuminating the potential strategic significance of specific and yet poorly understood opportunities and threats, scenario analysis helps to identify crucial gaps in our collective understanding of global politicaleconomic trends and dynamics. The notion of “exogeneity”—so prevalent in social science scholarship—applies to models of reality, not to reality itself. Very simply, scenario analysis can throw into sharp relief often-overlooked yet pressing questions in international affairs that demand focused investigation. Scenarios thus offer, in principle, an innovative tool for developing a political science research agenda. In practice, achieving this objective requires careful tailoring of the approach. The specific scenario analysis technique we outline below was designed and refined to provide a structured experiential process for generating problem-based research questions with contemporary international policy relevance.6 The first step in the process of creating the scenario set described here was to identify important causal forces in contemporary global affairs. Consensus was not the goal; on the contrary, some of these causal statements represented competing theories about global change (e.g., a resurgence of the nation-state vs. border-evading globalizing forces). A major principle underpinning the transformation of these causal drivers into possible future worlds was to “simplify, then exaggerate” them, before fleshing out the emerging story with more details.7 Thus, the contours of the future world were drawn first in the scenario, with details about the possible pathways to that point filled in second. It is entirely possible, indeed probable, that some of the causal claims that turned into parts of scenarios were exaggerated so much as to be implausible, and that an unavoidable degree of bias or our own form of groupthink went into construction of the scenarios. One of the great strengths of scenario analysis, however, is that the scenario discussions themselves, as described below, lay bare these especially implausible claims and systematic biases.8 An explicit methodological approach underlies the written scenarios themselves as well as the analytical process around them—that of case-centered, structured, focused comparison, intended especially to shed light on new causal mechanisms (George and Bennett 2005). The use of scenarios is similar to counterfactual analysis in that it modifies certain variables in a given situation in order to analyze the resulting effects (Fearon 1991). Whereas counterfactuals are traditionally retrospective in nature and explore events that did not actually occur in the context of known history, our scenarios are deliberately forward-looking and are designed to explore potential futures that could unfold. As such, counterfactual analysis is especially well suited to identifying how individual events might expand or shift the “funnel of choices” available to political actors and thus lead to different historical outcomes (Nye 2005, 68–69), while forward-looking scenario analysis can better illuminate surprising intersections and sociopolitical dynamics without the perceptual constraints imposed by fine-grained historical knowledge. We see scenarios as a complementary resource for exploring these dynamics in international affairs, rather than as a replacement for counterfactual analysis, historical case studies, or other methodological tools. In the scenario process developed for NEFPC, three distinct scenarios are employed, acting as cases for analytical comparison. Each scenario, as detailed below, includes a set of explicit “driving forces” which represent hypotheses about causal mechanisms worth investigating in evolving international affairs. The scenario analysis process itself employs templates (discussed further below) to serve as a graphical representation of a structured, focused investigation and thereby as the research tool for conducting case-centered comparative analysis (George and Bennett 2005). In essence, these templates articulate key observable implications within the alternative worlds of the scenarios and serve as a framework for capturing the data that emerge (King, Keohane, and Verba 1994). Finally, this structured, focused comparison serves as the basis for the cross-case session emerging from the scenario analysis that leads directly to the articulation of new research agendas. The scenario process described here has thus been carefully designed to offer some guidance to policy-oriented graduate students who are otherwise left to the relatively unstructured norms by which political science dissertation ideas are typically developed. The initial articulation of a dissertation project is generally an idiosyncratic and personal undertaking (Useem 1997; Rothman 2008), whereby students might choose topics based on their coursework, their own previous policy exposure, or the topics studied by their advisors. Research agendas are thus typically developed by looking for “puzzles” in existing research programs (Kuhn 1996). Doctoral students also, understandably, often choose topics that are particularly amenable to garnering research funding. Conventional grant programs typically base their funding priorities on extrapolations from what has been important in the recent past—leading to, for example, the prevalence of Japan and Soviet studies in the mid-1980s or terrorism studies in the 2000s—in the absence of any alternative method for identifying questions of likely future significance. The scenario approach to generating research ideas is grounded in the belief that these traditional approaches can be complemented by identifying questions likely to be of great empirical importance in the real world, even if these do not appear as puzzles in existing research programs or as clear extrapolations from past events. The scenarios analyzed at NEFPC envision alternative worlds that could develop in the medium (five to seven year) term and are designed to tease out issues scholars and policymakers may encounter in the relatively near future so that they can begin thinking critically about them now. This timeframe offers a period distant enough from the present as to avoid falling into current events analysis, but not so far into the future as to seem like science fiction. In imagining the worlds in which these scenarios might come to pass, participants learn strategies for avoiding failures of creativity and for overturning the assumptions that prevent scholars and analysts from anticipating and understanding the pivotal junctures that arise in international affairs.

#### 2. Imagining state solutions is key to getting students into politics and prevent a ceding of power to political elites.

Giroux 06, Henry, Sociologist, “The abandoned generation: The urban debate league and the politics of possibility,” 2006

The decline of democratic values and informed citizenship can be seen in research studies done by The Justice Project in 2001 in which a substantial number of teenagers and young people were asked what they thought democracy meant. The answers testified to a growing depoliticization of American life and largely consisted of statements along the following lines: "Nothing," "I don't know," or "My rights, just like, pride, I guess, to some extent, and paying taxes," or "I just think, like, what does it really mean? I know its our, like, our government, but I don't know what it 6 technically is." The transition from being ignorant about democracy to actually sup- porting antidemocratic Tendencies can be seen in a number of youth surveys that have been taken since 2000. For instance, a survey released by the University of California, Berkeley, revealed that 69 percent of students support school prayer and 44 percent of young people aged fifteen to twenty-two support government restric- tions on abortions. A 2004 survey of 112,003 high school students on First Amendment rights showed that one third of students surveyed believed that the First Amendment went too far in the rights it guarantees and 36 percent believed that the press enjoyed too much freedom. This suggests not just a failing of education, but a crisis of citizenship and democracy. ￼One consequence of the decline in democratic values and citizenship literacy is that all levels of government are being hollowed our, their role reduced to dismantling the gains of the welfare state as they increasingly construct policies that ￼criminalize social problems and prioritize penal methods over social investments. When citizenship is reduced to consumerism, it should come as no surprise that people develop an indifference to civic engagement and participation in democratic public life. Unlike some theorists who suggest that politics as critical exchange and social engagement is either dead or in a state of terminal arrest, I believe that the current depressing state of politics points to an urgent challenge: reformulating the crisis of democracy as a fundamental crisis of vision, meaning, education, and political agency. Central to my argument is the assumption that politics is not simply about power, but also, as Cornelius Castoriadis points out, "has to do with political judgments and value choices," meaning that questions of civic education—learning how 8 to become a skilled citizen—afe central to democracy itself. ￼Educators at all levels need to challenge the assumption that politics is dead, or the nature of politics will be determined exclusively by government leaders and experts m the heat of moral frenzy. Educators need to take a more critical position, arguing that knowledge, debate, and dialogue about pressing social problems offer individuals and groups some hope in shaping the conditions that bear down on their lives.

#### 3. Ideal theory strips away particularities making ethics inaccessible and epistemically skewed

Mills 05, Charles, 2005, Ideal Theory” as Ideology,

“The crucial common claim—whether couched in terms of ideology and fetishism, or androcentrism, or white normativity—is that **all theorizing**, both moral and nonmoral, **takes place in an intellectual realm dominated by** concepts, assumptions, norms, **values, and framing perspectives that reflect the experience** and group interests **of the privileged group** (whether the bourgeoisie, or men, or whites). So a simple empiricism will not work as a cognitive strategy; one has to be self-conscious about the concepts that “spontaneously” occur to one, since many of these concepts will not arise naturally but as the result of social structures and hegemonic ideational patterns. In particular, it will often be the case that **dominant concepts will obscure** certain **crucial realities**, blocking them from sight, or **naturalizing them**, while on the other hand, concepts necessary for accurately mapping these realities will be absent. Whether in terms of concepts of the self, or of humans in general, or in the cartography of the social, it will be necessary to scrutinize the dominant conceptual tools and the way the boundaries are drawn. This is, of course, the burden of standpoint theory—that certain realities tend to be more visible from the perspective of the subordinated than the privileged (Harding 2003). The thesis can be put in a strong and implausible form, but weaker versions do have considerable plausibility, as illustrated by the simple fact that for the most part the crucial conceptual innovation necessary to map nonideal realities has not come from the dominant group. **In** its **ignoring** of **oppression, ideal theory** also **ignores the consequences of oppression.** If societies are not oppressive, or **if in modeling them we can abstract** away from oppression **and assume moral cognizers of** roughly **equal skill, then the paradigmatic moral agent can be featureless. No theory is required about the particular group-based obstacles that may block the vision of a particular group.** By contrast, **nonideal theory recognizes that people will** typically **be cognitively affected by their social location, so that** on both the macro and the more local level, **the descriptive concepts arrived at may be misleading.**” (175)

#### 4. Debate should deal with the real-world consequences of oppression.

Curry 14, Tommy, The Cost of a Thing: A Kingian Reformulation of a Living Wage Argument in the 21st Century, Victory Briefs, 2014,

**Despite the pronouncement of debate as an activity** and intellectual exercise **pointing to** the **real world consequences** of dialogue, thinking, and (personal) politics when addressing issues of racism, sexism, economic disparity, global conflicts, and death, many of the discussions concerning these ongoing challenges to humanity are fixed to a paradigm which sees the adjudication of material disparities and sociological realities as the conquest of one ideal theory “Ideal Theory as Ideology,” Charles Mills outlines the problem contemporary theoretical-performance styles in policy debate and value-weighing in Lincoln-Douglass are confronted with in their attempts to get at the concrete problems in our societies. At the outset, Mills concedes that “ideal theory applies to moral theory as a whole (at least to normative ethics as against metaethics); [s]ince ethics deals by definitiocan with normative/prescriptive/evaluative issues, against factual/descriptive issues.” At the most general level, the[re is a] conceptual chasm between what emerges as actual problems in the world (e.g.: racism, sexism, poverty, disease, etc.) and how we frame such problems theoretically—the assumptions and shared ideologies we depend upon for our problems to be heard and accepted as a worthy “problem” by an audience—is the most obvious call for an anti-ethical paradigm, since such a paradigm insists on the actual as the basis of what can be considered normatively. Mills, however, describes this chasm as a problem of an ideal-as-descriptive model which argues that for any actual-empirical-observable social phenomenon (P), an ideal of (P) is necessarily a representation of that phenomenon. In the idealization of a social phenomenon (P), one “necessarily has to abstract away from certain features” of (P) that is observed before abstraction occurs. ¶ This gap between what is actual (in the world), and what is represented by theories and politics of debaters proposed in rounds threatens any real discussions about the concrete nature of oppression and the racist economic structures which necessitate tangible policies and reorienting changes in our value orientations. As Mills states: “What distinguishes ideal theory is the reliance on idealization to the exclusion, or at least marginalization, of the actual,” so what we are seeking to resolve on the basis of “thought” is in fact incomplete, incorrect, or ultimately irrelevant to the actual problems which our “theories” seek to address. Our attempts to situate social disparity cannot simply appeal to the ontologization of social phenomenon—meaning we cannot suggest that the various complexities of social problems (which are constantly emerging and undisclosed beyond the effects we observe) are totalizable by any one set of theories within an ideological frame be it our most cherished notions of Afro-pessimism, feminism, Marxism, or the like. At best, theoretical endorsements make us aware of sets of actions to address ever developing problems in our empirical world, but even this awareness does not command us to only do X, but rather do X and the other ideas which compliment the material conditions addressed by the action X. As a whole, debate (policy and LD) neglects the need to do X in order to remedy our cast-away-ness among our ideological tendencies and politics. How then do we pull ourselves from this seeming ir-recoverability of thought in general and in our endorsement of socially actualizable values like that of the living wage? It is my position that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s thinking about the need for a living wage was a unique, and remains an underappreciated, resource in our attempts to impose value reorientation (be it through critique or normative gestures) upon the actual world. In other words, King aims to [we must] reformulate the values which deny the legitimacy of the living wage, and those values predicated on the flawed views of the [oppressed] worker, Blacks, and the colonized (dignity, justice, fairness, rights, etc.) used to currently justify the living wages in under our contemporary moral parameters.

#### 5. No act omission distinction for states means means based theories collapse to consequentialism.

Sunstein and Vermule 05[Cass R. Sunstein and Adrian Vermeule. The University of Chicago Law School. “Is Capital Punishment Morally Required? The Relevance of Life‐Life Tradeoffs.” JOHN M. OLIN LAW & ECONOMICS WORKING PAPER NO. 239. The Chicago Working Paper Series. March 2005]

In our **view,** both the argument from causation and the argument from intention **go wrong by** overlook**ing** the distinctive features of government **as a moral** agent. Whatever the general status of the act-omission distinction as a matter of moral philosophy,38 the distinction is least impressive when applied to government.39 The most fundamental point is that unlike individuals, governments always and necessarily face a choice distinction does not make a morally relevant difference. Most generally, government is in the business of creating permissions and prohibitions. When it explicitly or implicitly authorizes private action, it is not omitting to do anything, or refusing to act.40 Moreover, the distinction between authorized and unauthorized private actionfor example, private killing—becomes obscure when the government formally forbids private action, but chooses a set of policy instruments that do not adequately or fully discourage it.

#### 6. Oppression is created by social systems so only a focus on material conditions can solve.

Johnson no date Allan Johnson (PhD in sociology, he joined the sociology department at Wesleyan University)  http://www.cabrillo.edu/~lroberts/AlanJohnsonWhatCanWeDO001.pdf

Privilege is a feature of social systems, not individuals. People have or don't have privilege depending on the system they're in and the social categories other people put them in. To say, then, that I have race privilege says less about me personally than it does about the society we all live in and how it is organized to assign privilege on the basis of a socially defined set of racial categories that change historically and often overlap. The challenge facing me as an individual has more to do with how I participate in society as a recipient of race privilege and how those choices oppose or support the system itself. In dealing with the problem of privilege, we have to get used to being surrounded by paradox. Very often those who have privilege don't know it, for example, which is a key aspect of privilege. Also paradoxical is the fact that privilege doesn't necessarily lead to a "good life," which can prompt people in privileged groups to deny resentfully that they even have it. But privilege doesn't equate with being happy. It involves having what others don't have and the struggle to hang on to it at their expense, neither of which is a recipe for joy, personal fulfillment, or spiritual contentment.... To be an effective part of the solution, we have to realize that privilege and oppression are not a thing of the past. It's [is] happening right now. It isn't just a collection of wounds inflicted long ago that now need to be healed. The wounding goes on as I write these words and as you read them, and unless people work to change the system that promotes it, personal healing by itself cannot be the answer. Healing wounds is no more a solution to the oppression that causes the wounding than military hospitals are a solution to war. Healing is a necessary process, but it isn't enough.... Since privilege is rooted primarily in systems—such as families, schools, and workplaces—change isn't simply a matter of changing people. People, of course, will have to change in order for systems to change, but the most important point is that changing people isn't enough. The solution also has to include entire systems, such as capitalism, whose paths of least resistance shape how we feel, think, and behave as individuals, how we see ourselves and one another.

#### 7. Contesting the policy focus and ethical framework on the 1AC is bad, prefer the AC focus as long as it is theoretically legitimate. A: it moots 6 minutes of AC offense since it uplayers my offense, which destroys aff, ground. B: Also means the neg never has to clash and engage with the aff which means they get superficial education. C: Coopts all their offense- they can read their role of the ballot when their aff.

### Underview

#### omitted