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### 1AC

#### **We are in the midst of a race war. The 21st century waveof xenophobia and racialized white nationalist hate is the extended order of modernity that** *“re-embody the inheritances of 1619 and Manifest Destiny”*1. **Antitrust policy is forged in an internal debate over the expansion of white humanity in all its hypocrisy – the global promise of White Being determines the coordinates of an always-unfolding violence that** “*is already steeped in an edifice of accessibility*”1. **Narratives of racial progress ignore the pre-established template for progress that’s inextricably tied to white humanity – this establishment of statecraft is the “***theatre of racial nation-building with vacillating movements and subtitles: post-civil rights multiculturalism, resurgent white nationalism, post-racial liberalism, law-and-order, the War on Drugs, the War on Terror and the infrastructures of tolerance and repression* **[that]** *are never finally separable***”1.**

1Rodriguez 19 – Dylan Rodriguez, Dylan Rodríguez is Professor and Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies at the University of California, Riverside. He received his Ph.D. and M.A. degrees in Ethnic Studies from the University of California, Berkeley (2001), and earned two B.A. degrees and a Concentration degree from Cornell University (1995). “Insult/Internal Debate/Echo”, Propter Nos Volume 3, 2019, pp. 129-130)//Shreyas

#### competition is the ascendency of white logistics as “*supremacy is inherently armed*”2 – Anxieties over the loss of a “good life” fuels racial capitalism and recruitment into white nationalism which intensifies alienation and global genocide. The economy is not neutral but the waves and retreats of logistics that disavows the subject itself via antitrust policy. The smooth flowing globalized system of white logistics is what connects and creates the inextricable linkage of logistics. The fluctuating of weapons systems that oscillate between the “international” and “domestic” is not an isolated instance but the very same oscillation in discussions of antitrust that point to external violence while ignoring the racial terror that forms intimate violence within the system. This IS social militarization – the transformation of black and brown communities into the battlefields of the race war.

2Rodriguez 19 – Dylan Rodriguez, Dylan Rodríguez is Professor and Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies at the University of California, Riverside. He received his Ph.D. and M.A. degrees in Ethnic Studies from the University of California, Berkeley (2001), and earned two B.A. degrees and a Concentration degree from Cornell University (1995). “Insult/Internal Debate/Echo”, Propter Nos Volume 3, 2019, pp. 130)//Shreyas

#### The race war is not just “out there” but in here – debate is a microcosm of the race war. The so-called “neutrality” of fairness, predictability, stasis, clash, and topic education are ideological means of entry in which the protocols are not a “negotiation of competing models” but pre-determined by the logistics of white being that seeks to fix those that “need to be fixed”. Limits are not just the limits of the topic but the practices of the community.

#### The resolution is the is the imposition of an anti-social contract based on the logic of iterative improvement and the imposition of economic regulation - the 1AC traces the history of logistics as a project of simulation that renders the globe as a zone of death and the forcing of endless iterative improvement towards the perfection of economically rational subjects

#### Moten and Harney 21 – [Stefano Harney is a professor of Business Management at Singapore Management University. He co-wrote The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Study with Fred Moten.]

The moment you say it is mine because I worked on it and improved it, or you say that I am me because I worked on myself and improved myself, you start a war. And by misattributing the initiation of this war to nature, you then codify this war as the (anti)social contract.

It is said that the (anti)social contract and the public sphere it creates is a reaction to feudalism and absolutism. But this is only half the story, and an inaccurate half at that. Perhaps it’s better to think of the (anti)social contract as emerging, as Angela Mitropoulos says, not in opposition to absolutism but as the democratization of sovereignty. Even that might have had an inadvertently anarchic quality, as every man considered himself a king. But the (anti) social contract not only reacts to, while also refecting, absolutism, making every home/castle/hovel a hall of mirrors, it also emerges as a way to explain and justify the violence of European man. Everyone from Adam Ferguson to Immanuel Kant tries to explain why the Africans, Asians, and indigenous people being exterminated and enslaved are so much less warlike than Europeans. The Crusades misled Europeans into believing their brutality was part of humanity rather than an exception, even as religious war gave them a taste for blood that they could not ignore. So the (anti)social contract emerges less to confront absolutism than to contain the obvious historical exceptionalism of European savagery. Clearly the world could not be ordered around good and evil without some dire consequences for Europe. Tose who conceive of the (anti)social contract mistake the wars it instigates: wars of sovereigns against contractors, and of contractors against each other, and of contractors against those whom Bryan Wagner describes as “being subject to exchange without being a party to exchange,” the ones who are not one who are innumerable and un(ac)countable even in having been accumulated, even in having been fnancialized.12 Perhaps, in this regard, it would be even better to think of the (anti)social contract as emerging against a history of revolt: the peasant revolts that buried European feudalism, and which Robinson understands as “the socialist exchange” comprising Marxism’s anthropological (under)ground, is the revolt of nature, prosecuted by those who are made to stand in for nature, having been philosophically relegated to some essentially paradoxical state of nature by the ones who seek to engineer nature’s subordination to and within the socioecological disaster of improvement.

This is to say, again, that the political half of the story, in which the social contract is understood as improvement rather than its ge(n)ocidal imposition, is wrong and incomplete. The (anti)social contract is not only a political theory but also an economic practice: the practice of the juridical regulation and antisocialization of exchange in the imposition of improvement. In particular, the social contract specifed the individuation of its parties. Individuals now must be formed in order to enter into contract. And the economic contract emerges not in exchange but from the idea that ownership derives from improvement. As a result, it is not simply the individual, but rather the individual capable of self-improvement, who must and can enter into the contract. Te self-improving individual can also be thought of as the self-accumulating individual: not possessive (this is stasis without movement), not acquiring (this still bears the trace of anarchic exchange), but self-accumulating – that is, property-gathering in order to put property to work, including and most especially the properties of the self that can be deployed and improved while being posited as eternal and absolute. “Properties of the self” is not a pun here. Properties that can be accumulated and put to work include race, religion, and gender but also class, standing, trust, thrift, reliability, and punctuality. Tese can all be used to improve where to improve is to own, and own more, and thus set in motion further accumulation of self, others, and nature that all might be put to work.

Maybe it can be stated this way: ownership emerges in Europe as usufruct, in the improvement of land that grants and justifes it. It is extended and diffused throughout the regime the social contract defines in the self-ownership that will have taken its completed form in the individual – that brutal, brittle crystallization of an always and necessarily incomplete melding of subject and object. Ceaselessly at work in the task of making everything, including himself, subject to being put to work, the European is the usufruct of man. Man’s endless improvement, in which necessity is enforced as an absolute contingency, is fxed in European thought as the vicious grasping of its objects, including itself. Te historical unfolding of this fxation on fxing, the murderous interplay of capture and improvement, is given in and as self-improvement-in-self-accumulation’s violence towards whatever shows up at the rendezvous of diferentiation, incompletion, and afection. Te constantly changing activity of what appears to what appears as the self as the continual undoing of the very idea of the self and its eternally prospective completion-in-improvement can only be met, from the self’s myopic and impossible perspective, with a nasty combination of regulation and accumulation. Te one who accumulates does so at the expense of what it takes to be its others – women, slaves, peasants, beasts, the earth itself. Tus, the social contract, as a contract between the improving and accumulating ones, is inscribed upon the flesh of those who cannot be, and in any case refuse to be, a party to antisocial exchange under the terms of the (anti)social contract. Meanwhile, as much as the contractors are united in a strategy to subject to usufruction whatever cannot or will not be a (numerable, individuated) party to antisocial exchange, they are also dedicated to killing each other, to war in and as their beloved public carried out in the name of the improvement of that public and its problems – that is, its denizens. The self-accumulating individual’s war, his total mobilization against the innumerable and against his fellows under the sign of ownership as improvement, carried out in order to prevent the recrudescence of the natural, renders irredeemable the very premise of the (anti)social contract.

And every subcontract within the (anti)social contract must result in improvement. It’s not a matter of both parties being satisfed with what they have exchanged. Such a contract was not just badly made but at odds with the desired identity of the contractors. And here we can put it the other way around: the social contract is conceived by the political theorists also as a contract amongst those capable of self-improvement, or what they called progress, and this is why it was essentially destructive of the notions of exchange encountered amongst feudal rebels (Robinson’s An Anthropology of Marxism is instructive here) or of exchange encountered amongst Africans who would rather move elsewhere than enter into confict to gain improvement (Robinson’s Black Marxism is instructive here).13 Ferguson and Kant both say war is about improvement of the European race. And Robinson teaches us that this is carried out as a violent intra-European racialization of difference, a continually barbaric festival in which incursion and the instantiation of improvement as militarily enforced externalities produce Europe, and then the globe, as dead and deadly bodies politic, monsters whose mechanized, drone-like simulations of spirit regulate the social with the kind of latex afability and latent menace commonly associated with police commissioners and university provosts. Antisocial sociability is the basis of the social contract. In the end, improvement is war, which is why the public sphere is war, and why the private – in its anti- and ante-individual impurity, as refuge even under constant pressure – is a porch.

The (anti)social contract is haunted by the economic contract, which is not a contract of exchange like one might fnd in friendship, but a contract based on the claim to ownership of oneself, others, and nature that is always tied to what more one can make of, which is to say accumulate in and through, oneself, others, and nature. In other words, the expanding universe of ownership took a contractual form that was not limited, as is sometimes supposed, to free individuals – that is, to the European subject imagined by the European theorist; it is a contractual form, rather, that requires broad-spectrum contact as the material ground of its exclusive and exclusionary network. What makes it truly dangerous is that it could never get free of that from which it wished to distinguish itself; what is truly dangerous to it is that what is forced to grant its exception can refuse the contract to which it is a third (or an innumerable or a non-)party. Exchange, on the other hand, is a practice that prevents accumulation at, and as the elimination of, its source – the self-improving individual. Instead, exchange, given in and as the diferential and diferentiating entanglement of social life, even under the most powerful forms of constraint and regulation, is about a social optimum.

#### The race war is not just “out there” but within the very education spaces we participate in. Debate is a microcosm for the race war –black debaters being told to “calm down” for being too “ratchet”, the refusal to invite certain teams to a round robin because of the arguments they read, black debaters getting the cops called on them because their music is too loud, and coaches preffing all white juries to adjudicate debates out of fear of “race hacks”. The race war is happening now and it has been inseparable from the internal protocols of debate. The seeming neutrality of fairness, limits, predictability, and clash are not pre-determined by a resolutional stasis but an internal drive to quash militant skills against the race war. Ask yourself why positions like the kant aff are deemed predictable but insurgent strategies like the aff aren’t. The race war is here and you as a judge have to take arms with a side.

#### Thus, the ROTB is to abolish the white debate community – cross-racial affinity can only be found in moments of revolutionary violence.

**Harney 17** (Stefano Harney is a professor of Business Management at Singapore Management University. He co-wrote The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Study with Fred Moten. “Stefano Harney Part 2 Interview by Michael Schapira & Jesse Montgomery,” Full Stop, August 10, 2017 //tjb)

It’s also good timing that you wrote to me about this comment I made to you in an earlier conversation because I just finished a terrific book called [Dixie Be Damned](https://www.akpress.org/dixie-be-damned.html) by Neal Shirley and Saralee Stafford. They write about insurrections in the South from the dismal swamp in the 18thcentury to a 1975 uprising in a North Carolina women’s prison. It’s stirring stuff and then in a really sound, clear-hearted concluding chapter they surprised me. They said **our enemies have been saved not by fascism but by democracy.** It should not have surprised me, given that we were just speaking about Du Bois and democratic despotism, but it did. They are right. And I think it is in this sense that a better university would be worse for us, has been worse for us, in a paradoxical way. Some ask, ‘Is another university possible?’ Well, that implies this one is possible but more than that it suggests another university would be better for us. I don’t know about that. This is not to say I do not find work like that of Marc Bousquet and Chris Newfield indispensable. I do. But there is something at stake in Shirley and Stafford’s book and I want to talk with you about it because I think it connects to your question about how the Undercommons book has been read and used. The authors quote Frank Wilderson on the way **blackness can never be disimbricated from the violence of slavery.**Then they say: ‘**Those who would risk extending solidarity across racial boundaries would find themselves the recipient of exemplary violence in order to instill fear of constant consequence for this treason. Ever after, meaningful cross-racial affinity can only be found in moments of revolutionary violence.**”  (Italics in the original.)Now this is an historical observation on their part, but to some extent it is also programmatic  for the authors. As an observation, well, they have just convinced me of its validity in the last 250 pages, and as program, well, I’m not a pacifist. **I’m for self-defense, and that can be violent.** **But do words like solidarity, affinity, to say nothing of the unlovely term allyship, accidentally preserve something we want to abolish?** And I feel bad using Shirley and Stafford to make this point because theirs is such a good book, but maybe that’s why I feel compelled to say, ‘even here’ this question comes up. What I mean is **who is this someone in solidarity with blackness, who is this ally of blackness, who is this someone with affinity to black struggle**? I think this means that this someone has his or her own struggles and is indicating that now she or he wants to join not in common struggles, but in the struggles of blackness. Because in a sense you have to have your own thing to be an ally or to be in solidarity.Ok, but what are your own struggles from which you would be offering solidarity, allyship, affinity?**Are you organizing in the white community, is that it? I think that is the implication**, that you have been working in white communities, and/or on the environment, or feminist issues, etc. But the problem is, **there’s no such thing as a white community. A white community is a contradiction in terms**, an oxymoron.**You can’t organize an oxymoron. The only thing you can do with a white community is work to abolish it**. Moreover at that point of abolition we may be able to say there is no such thing as a community, that a community is an oxymoron. You can’t commune and have a community. **Communing is anti-community. It’s undercommon.** Maybe the only kind of community that is possible is the maroon community, because it is by definition not a community, and when in some historical instances (of necessity even) it became one, it took on the same murderous qualities of any community. Okay, so then the question arising, if you do abolish the white community, what of the people who were marked as white, and in many cases who dwelt in the supremacy of whiteness, what becomes of them? Well, in the practice of abolition they will move closer to the only thing they ever had that was about life and not death, about love and not hate, blackness. **This is to say, people who present as white are not allies, or in solidarity, or showing affinity, because they have nothing of their own, no place from which to show this, no resource to bring, unless and until they embrace the one thing of their own they disown.The thing that can’t be owned born(e) of the owned, blackness.** Now **white people aren’t coming with much blackness, by definition.**And this is why the underlying humility motivating terms like ally, solidarity, and affinity is not misplaced, if that is indeed what underlies their use in practice. In any case, **whiteness is either absence or violence, and in either case, not much to offer as an ally. But on the other hand white people have a big role to play** in the revolutionary violence Shirley and Stafford speak of **because the act of abolition of white communities is a monumental task.** By contrast and in a sense to reverse while also honouring Wilderson’s initial point, Black people have for the very reason of this unrelenting violence and its brutal failure, a lot of blackness, if I can put it that way, a special, (under) privileged relationship to blackness, as Fred puts it. So another way to think of the historical events Shirley and Stafford are speaking about as cross-racial moments would be to think about these events as moments in which there was not a total coincidence between black people and blackness. In a way we could read moments of non-coincidence as moments not of liberation from blackness but generalization of blackness. But we have to be careful here. **Blackness is neither the opposite nor the total reversal or abolition of whiteness.**Blackness exists in/as the general antagonism. It’s always anti-colonial, always fugitive. So what we tried to do in the book is to think about how study, and planning, and logisticality, and hapticality named capacities for expanding the social poesis of blackness, of the anti-regulatory, jurisgenerative improvisation of the use of each other. And we were thinking about how the undercommons of study might be a place where those in blackness and those coming into blackness might commune, might serve the debt together, in difference **but not separability**, as  might say, not separability from that quantum blackness that moves across and against property, subjectivity, development, usufruction. And if you want to say **this is going to be a practice that is hard for a lot of people who do not experience the lived fact of the coincidence of being a black person and blackness, and it is going to be a humble practice, and even a practice of entering into service, feeling in debt, well that’s okay, cause all of that is what blackness is too.**

#### White Being determines the coordinates of the internal debate over violence and militarizes responses – you should forefront insurrection at the moment of the encounter with politics.

Rodríguez ‘19

[Dylan, Ethnic Studies at UC Riverside. January 2019. “Insult/Internal Debate/Echo”. Published in Propter Nos: Vol. 3. <https://trueleappress.com/2019/01/16/propter-nos-volume-3-2019/>] Pat

The historical record shows what the allegation of redemption entails when waged and executed by the subjects of a transatlantic, hemispheric, and global promise of white human vindication: formed in the crucible of the Encounter, it is the making of Mankind in White Being (with all its gendered correlates) that determines the economics, jurisprudence, political philosophy, social science, and geographic coordinates of conquest-in-permanence. There is preliminary and always-unfolding violence in raciality as a principle term in Mankind’s cohering of language, vision, feeling, science, spirit, and subjectivity in this globality of imagination and economy. The fraud of the post-racial and the post-civil rights allegations, then, is not merely in the unbroken chain of racist casualties produced through systemic and scenespecific assaults on both collective physiology and the mere possibility of shared, symbolic integrity. The deepest discrepancy is in the pretense that there is any possibility for categorical rather than piecemeal (temporary, fleeting, flimsy) inclusion in this apartheid speciation of “humanity,” an apartheid that cannot be dismantled in law or even nominally abolished, unless Mankind—and crucially, the material and symbolic grounds of Mankind’s global integrity as such—becomes the subject of a creative disintegration (some will call this terrorism, others call it their hope for tomorrow). The speciation draws its dominance from a changing circuit of abstraction and embodiment: there is a template for humanity’s progress, there are terms (scientific, Biblical, politico-economic, or otherwise) through which the most evolved, blessed, modern, and autonomous of the human species may be recognized as such, and these abstractions are always tied to notions of manifest personhood, including but not limited to genes, spirit, blood, epidermis, and cranial capacity (such is the rough description of humanity’s speciation—a narrative of differentiation within the category of human being that militarizes the terms of the ascendant species-group). These are the premises of White Being. Apprehend the United States, in the fullest distensions of its colonial and chattel formation, as an internal debate over the relative violence, vulgarity, sophistication, and political capaciousness of white humanity. The latter, you will recall, is the position that offers humanitarian favors against the wish and urge to violently decline them. There is a claim that persists beneath the din of civil accommodations, that changes in tenor but not in premise. Accusations of backwardness, savagery, tribalism, and even fundamentalism become self-replicating when such humanitarianism is rejected by the ungrateful, suspicious antagonists of white humanity’s creeping universals. The language of urban-to-rural insurrection—when the people “riot,” “loot,” burn, and destroy— moves from a vocabulary of anti-humanitarianism (which, in this sense, is also a recalibration of the world to mirror the evil) to insist that it is in the moment when the representatives of white humanity extend the helping hand that there must be a state of militant opposition; a tensing against the insult. It is in times like this that the white human creates the groundwork of its forcible universality. This is the other side of the aforementioned redemption: a rejection of the invitation to thrill in the absolute violence of a charity. There are different versions of the gesture—modernization, independence, full citizenship, franchise, rights. Appendages of another body, an alien body. Rejection comes later, when the charity is experienced as redemption in their evil, white evil, which created the need for their industrialized condescension in the first place. It is part of the generalized fact that the white human condition—the condition of Mankind’s restoration, remaking, and periodic reconstruction— is already steeped in an edifice of accessibility (the common sense of humanism rests on the myth of access). This human in the seat of humanism calls on other species to feed, to shit, to vote, to work, to speak, to dance, to enlist, to sit at the table in the house for a little while (but don’t overstay your welcome, because you should beware of the grounds of such hospitality). What if, after “American Apartheid,” there is only more chattel, more displacement, more of apartheid’s spatial and physiological ordering?

#### Debaters should play in fugitive scenario planning indebted to each other its our sa---that remixes the social life of debate to the function of competition, which is a prerequisite to organized politics.

**Lestelle ‘16** (Cody, Graduate Student @ University of Hawaii at Manoa in Political Science, Indigenous Politics, and Alternative Futures, “Playing to LIVE, Not Living to Pay: Abolishing/Decolonizing Education and Cultivating (Under)Commons [Preliminary Notes V1.0]”, January 19, 2016)/LRCH Jrhee

[...] It is against this same history that we want to present a proposal: That we form the necessary alternatives to education in small cells to much larger circles and guilds of sorcerers/witches, mages, healers, shamans, thieves and pirates. That instead of maintaining ourselves principally with money, the little papers and imagination of those from above, we capacitate ourselves according to our own so varied and autonomous social fabrics and infrastructures. **We already don't have time to live incarcerated in the classroom**, **being prepared for a future that will not exist**. **There are so many megaprojects destroying the past, present and future that they call us to immediate conflict**, to **the war against the multiverse**. From whichever side of the monster, inside, outside or between the schools, prisons and corporations **we can begin and continue stronger the work of capacitating and caring for ourselves and defending life** and recuperating that which they have stolen from us: everything. DOWN WITH ALL EDUCATION OF THOSE FROM ABOVE! MAY OUR AUTONOMOUS FORMS OF CARING FOR AND CAPACITATING OURSELVES GROW! LONG LIVE MOTHER EARTH AND MAGIC FOREVER! […] LA A3PA (ALIANZA PLANETARIA PIRATA PALETA ANARQUISTA) [The Planetary Pirate Paleta Anarchist Alliance] [Author's translation of excerpt of pamphlet found in Mexico City titled “MANIFIESTO PARA LOS BIENES COMUNALES DEL APRENDIZAJE MÁGICO Y LA A3PA (Manifesto for Commons of Magical Learning and the A3PA)] I imagine by now you, dear reader, should like an explanation of this strange appearance “(Under)Commons” in the title. This is to refer to both commons and/or undercommons. **Undercommons are distinct from that sort of space granted by some authority from above and only under certain select terms** and to certain select entities, such as agreements outlined in the Magna Carta. My use of undercommons is meant to indicate the sort of space forged directly, **from below and in an extralegal manner** (not necessarily illegally, just without regards or respect for law). This work should build on that of Stefano Harney and Fred Moten in Undercommons: Fugitive Planning and Black Studies by suggesting some potential tools and ideas for augmenting and guiding the cultivation of undercommons, which their book unveils the existence of. **In response to being forced to play a game against our will** (capitalism) **why not create our own game(s) and sets of rules which utilize “free play” (gaming the system) against it and our own autonomously structured play for our own purposes**? Living PlayNET is the name I give for just such a type of game, or platform, **that assists in collectively and individually executing the organizational tasks necessary in the fortification and utilization of the undercommons by strategically leveraging varying accesses to a variety of commons and private property regimes within the network of “players**”. Living PlayNET is basically a game, or platform for intentionally organized play, which helps guide us in the creation of something akin to but hardly resembling and far outdoing existing market and state-based social security systems and which is juxtaposed to the system of un-life that is the Empire of Money. **Yet since it is merely a proposal for a type of game, each collectivity of people choosing to play together will be autonomous and selfdetermining amidst a broader community of gamers** of the entire genre which grows in a rhizomatic fashion. Given that “fugitivity is being separate from settling”26, **it makes sense for decolonial games to seek to build on spaces of joint fugitivity, especially joint fugitivities between those otherwise “divided and conquered” by Empire**. In addition, Living PlayNET adheres closely to the practice of autonomy in all of its endeavors: La renovación de la política que hacen los que resisten y luchan en favor de la tuonomía es interrelacionar el ámbito de lo social y el ámbito de lo político, reincorporan la capacidad de creación de los sujectos sociales, potencian cambios sociopolíticos más allá de las reivindicanciones de grupo, desbordan el plano de su propia lucha. [The renovation of politics that those who resist and struggle in favor of autonomy make is to interrelate the social sphere and the political sphere, reincorporating the social subjects' capacity of creation, **they strengthen sociopolitical changes beyond the re vindications of group, they overflow the plane of their own struggle**.]27 For similar reasons, Living PlayNets tend to have strong affinity with Graffiti and things Alien:, ..Graffiti is an Art of the Commons. Graffiti is also an act of insurrection, it creates a crack in the foundation of Empire. It exposes the fallacy in the sacredness promoted by the idea of Private Property. For every act of Graffiti a symbol of wealth is desecrated and a piece of art is created for the Commons. The ability to desecrate Private Property (to attack it sacredness) resides in the artistic creativity in which Graffiti operates. This Artistic Creativity comes from the Soul, or that tiny flame burning within us that stubbornly resists the colonization by Empire. This Artistic Creativity is something alien to Empire. [Empire] can not deal with what seems Alien and attempts to purge it from itself. There is a reason artist are starving…28 **Through such a platform, genre of game, or mode of play as I am describing, we could find ways of better supporting the variously already existing fugitivities as well as best prepare ourselves for the next opportunity for wholesale flight**: The lone fugitive escape is an individualistic form of resistance; fugitive escapes that involved hundreds, sometimes thousands of indentured servants or slaves, enough fugitives to disrupt the daily activities of a county, city or colony can be called wholesale flight. Because of the ubiquitous informer, the ever vigilant overseer and the observant attentive planter and because of the bleary eyed watchman who legged his nightly beat in the local cities and the patrol who trooped through the countryside, wholesale flight could hardly go unnoticed by the local authorities. For mass flight to occur a shift in power had to come about that loosened the planter's reins of authority. Such a shift took place during the colonial wars where the angry face of turmoil, armed conflict and violent disorder undermined the planter's authority.29 Utilizing a certain concept of play guided by a certain Zapatista strategic insight to passing walls, **we may grant a wide range of interdimensional mobility and rapid intelligence to our struggles**. In the introduction of Play: A Theory of Learning and Change, Tara Brabazon hints at the extremely decolonial potential of play, writing “Stuart Brown states that, **'play provides freedom from time**.' This disconnection from the clock is also a dislocation from a map. Space and time merge, blur and transform[…].” This insight into play combined with the following Zapatista method is a grimoire sure to be of much use in even the stickiest of intergalactic crises: If there exists no geographic location for that tomorrow, we start gathering twigs, stones, strips of clothing and meat, bones and clay, and we begin constructing and islet, or better yet, a rowboat planted in the middle of tomorrow, the place where one can still just barely see the storm looming ahead. ...And if there is no hour, day, week, month, or year on the calendar that we recognize, well we begin to gather the fractions of seconds, barely minutes, and filter them through the cracks that we open in the wall of history...And if there’s no crack, well, we’ll make it by scratching, biting, kicking, hitting with our hands and head, with our entire body until we manage to create in history the wound that we are...And then it turns out that someone walks by and sees us, sees the Zapatistas, hitting ourselves hard against that wall...30 We eventually learn that we are all the growing cracks in the wall and that we should not seek to mend the cracks but to join them, that another world may hatch. Further writing from Brabazon on play [P]lay, a re-creation of self in and for new contexts and conditions, is the work of imagination. Play is an act of mediation and translation. It carries hope and alternatives into repressive environments. It is not locked into the binary oppositions of work and play, **but instead flits between analogue and digital, adult and child, and creates scenarios for different and defiant ways of learning and living**.31 **The permissive and nurturing attitude toward imagination granted by modes-ofbeing grounded in play are crucial for populating and defending the world in which many worlds fit and the undercommons which we utilize to craft our many worlds**. **Those with access to more elite society commons and private property really owe it to themselves** **and everyone else to play:** it offers them a way out and a way to give others ways out. **Prison is simply the other side of education**. **In the world generated and maintained by education one is supposed to look to the job market**. But there are only so many jobs and now the robots are taking over and one truth is increasingly obvious: you can't eat money, but it can eat us if we let it. Recognizing the arbitrariness and illegitimacy of the success/failure generating function of education should alleviate negative judgment on the part of successful academics toward their companions suffering worse **for their different location in the carceral complex known as prison**. Lottery and other **gamefication** concepts **can serve as structuring mechanisms/autonomous organizing tools for the multitude to reconcile tensions** between careerist and movement oriented motivations32: e.g. if tenure faculty, administrators and other coveted positions within academia and elsewhere can exhibit certain behaviors **and participate in certain traditions in order to build material and symbolic solidarity with movement they can be rewarded by the mechanic of the game**. Gains of dignity, honor, and a generally strengthened undercommons which is really the autonomous alternative to social security could be their rewards. When undercommoning33 is thought of as a process of un-damming, the flow of money can be seen to be organized in such a direction as to begin to repair the damage $ has done and to restore the natural flows of abundance (8). **To conclude, a particularly urgent problem** (**whether or not one opts to play**) which Living PlayNETs and generally this writing hopes to address **via advocacy for decolonization, games, play, undercommons and critique of education**, is the fact of: “The unpreparedness of the educated classes, the lack of practical links between them and the mass of the people, their laziness, and, let it be said, their cowardice at the decisive moment of the struggle will give rise to tragic mishaps.” (Fanon34).

#### Thus, we affirm militant preservation.

#### In a moment in which policy and proceduralism are tied to White Being bent on a pervasive will to fix, sociality itself is our resistance, that begins at the level of militant preservation. This is the ap-positionality of being together yet against the very institutions that seek political and logistical control. Militant preservation is the sociopoesis of institutionality itself – not as a site for the social reproduction of policy, but rather the imagination of a disruptive site of planning that generates the social energy to grapple with institutions.

Melamed 16 (Jodi Melamed, Associate professor of Africana and English Studies at Marquette University, “Proceduralism, Predisposing, Poesis: Forms of Institutionality, In the Making”, English Faculty Research and Publications, 4/1/2016)//Shreyas

For our purposes, Stefano Harney and Fred Moten’s The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study, a performative event repeated with each reading, can be seen to work for a rupture of neoliberalized and liberal modes of institutionality. It works to undo and estrange their constitutive and constituting logics, their modes of individualizing, rationalizing, politicizing, critiquing, and formalizing social being into dominant ‘institutions’ and their ‘will to fix’ (apprehension of) the conditions of the material and the real. From the matrix of meaning the Undercommons creates, liberal and neoliberal modes of institutionality come into focus as continuous within a developing genealogy of unfreedom and truncations of social life, whose strategies include racial capitalist, settler colonial, and liberal democratic logics and practices alike. One description of the university’s institutionality captures this perfectly: “The University Is the Site of the Social Reproduction of Conquest Denial.”26 Another description makes it clear that the university institutionalizes the same violence as the prison: “The university, then, is not the opposite of the prison, since they are both involved, in their way, with the reduction and command of the social individual.”27 Thus for Moten and Harney, neo/liberal institutionality, generally considered, abhors social being outside its forms. Thus sociality itself (along the lines of what they call “consent not to be one”) is resistance. 28 The performance of The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study is structured around the play of two categories of terms: 1) terms that distill the specific violences of neo/liberal modes of institutionality, which reduce and harm human capacities of sociality and continuously refresh the coloniality and raciality of institutional forms, and 2) terms that help us think and organize desire for forms of social being that are illiberally collective, unoccupied by professionalism, sociopoetical, in-the-making, and shared beyond the logics of democratic capitalist humanist Enlightenment traditions or critical moves that fall under the category of legitimation-by-reversal (i.e., the commons as reverse legitimation of privatization, redistribution as the reverse legitimation of dispossession, the critical professional as the reverse legitimation of the university as site of the social reproduction of conquest denial). While some of the terms in the first category incline towards a critique of liberal institutionality (‘politics’ and ‘critique’), many of them catch hold of a neoliberalization of institutionality, including ‘policy’ and ‘logistics.’ For Moten and Harney, capital today “wants control of the means [of social reproduction…]by gaining access to and directly controlling the informal experiment with the social reproduction of life itself.”29 In neoliberal times, this requires the use of directly political forms in addition to economic compulsion. ‘Policy’ is a name for the form political control and command takes. It is a deputized, dispersed form of command which controls social reproduction by diagnosing ‘incorrectness’ for those it represents to be in need of improvement, of change, of policy. Moten and Harney counterpose ‘planning’ to ‘policy.’ “Planning is self-sufficiency at the social level, and it reproduces in its experiment not just what it needs, life, but what it wants, life in difference, in the play of the general antagonism.”30 It begins with “militant preservation” in the face of ‘policy’.31 To escape the proceduralism of ‘policy,’ Moten and Harney offer the sociopoesis of the statement, “There’s nothing wrong with us.”32 Similarly, ‘logistics’ is a name for the “capitalist science” of the moment, which “wants to dispense with the subject altogether,” to containerize “bodies, objects, affects, information” for circulation as capital, “as if it could reign sovereign over the informal, the concrete and generative indeterminacy of material life.”33 To “logistics” Harney and Moten counterpose “hapticality, or love,” “the capacity to feel through others, for others to feel through you, for you to feel them feeling you,” a capacity attached in sociopoetic imagination to the bodies of people captured in the hold of slave ships (the first form of logistical transportation).34 The Undercommons, in this way, repeatedly performs the defeat of neoliberal proceduralism by the sociopoetical imagination, asserting “the necessarily failed administrative accounting of the incalculable.”35 In these performances, the concept of the ‘undercommons’ holds a special weight of desire and meaning, circulating as a term for “the nonplace of abolition,” a beneath and beyond of the university inhabited by maroons, castaways, and fugitives, and an “appositionality” of “being together in homelessness.”36 How do the streams of meaning performatively attached to ‘the undercommons’ as a tool for sociopoesis frame or interact with the concept of ‘institutionality,’ as we’ve been discussing it here? In the interview that makes up the last chapter of text, in answer to a question about the relationship between the university and the undercommons, Harney states, I don’t see the undercommons as having any necessary relationship to the university…. [T]he undercommons is a kind of comportment or on-going experiment with and as the general antagonism, a kind of way of being with others[. I]t’s almost impossible that it could be matched up with particular forms of institutional life. It would obviously be cut through in different kinds of ways and in different spaces and times.”37 As a “kind of comportment,” a way of being and doing, the undercommons is not in contradiction with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s dictum that there is no such thing as “a noninstitutional environment.”38 Rather, it’s a kind of practice that cannot be encompassed by “institutional life.” It may be thought of as the placeholder for a vision of sociality without institutionality, or perhaps the sociality that happens all the time beyond and below the incorporative maneuvers of dominant institutions. On the othe hand, the ‘undercommons’ might be thought of in relation to institutionality as an excessive and ruptural sociality, a sociopoesis which demands that the active social content institutionality congeals returns to fluidity through a generative unthinking of the “hard materiality of the unreal.”39 My suggestion for thinking about pedagogy is to advocate for thinking and teaching that renews our sense of institutions as sites where the form and appearance of social being and collectivity is determined through social action and contest, even as we problematize institutions as always explicitly incorporative, as constituted out of the durable predispositions of adaptive hegemonies. Inspired by Ferguson and Harney and Moten, my call is perhaps to work for a disruptive institutionality, to work with the paradox of institutionality—which pits congealed social process against lived presence—to plan for what Audre Lorde called “a new and more possible meeting,” for a broader sense of collective social being than neo/liberal forms of institutional power let us imagine and practice.40 Infused with the disruptive potential of illiberal discourses of collectivity, “institutionality” can be made to line up anti-intuitively with critical rubrics that empower us to try to inhabit social being otherwise (undercommons, abolition, fugitivity), while reminding us that “radical change requires structure.”41