# Neg vs Clements MM

## 1NC

### 1NC – OFF

#### Interp--- Affirmative disclosure must be reciprocal with negative disclosure

#### Violation--- the aff refused to disclose after asking us first---

#### 1] Email--- we were asked what the negative strategies have been including round reports before--- we disclosed fairly and they should too---

#### 2] Wiki--- affirmative teams should disclose the 1AC that was read every round--- they never did

#### Standards--- [a] Reciprocity--- infinite aff prep means aff teams should already be prepared against negative strategies--- they skew clash over the aff by justifying a new switch to obviate our arguments [b] Strat skew--- Disclosure is a necessary policy for the aff but not the neg--- asking dictates a reciprocal approach in which they should be good actors instead of prepping us out to avoid fairness [c] Its new--- justifies the above standards because it proves its exclusively to make negative debating harder on an already hyper-broad topic

#### Defense -

#### A] They don’t get I meets--- I asked them what the aff was and they refused to disclose reciprocally--- they don’t get an out B] Yes impact--- forcing us to prep multiple possible negatives within the same timeframe as they get to prep us out makes strategy skews inevitable C] No new theory--- they read an underview and could’ve been a good actor --- and no RVIs--- we shouldn’t lose for saying they did something bad--- that justifies big schools scaring small schools for challenging their heg etc D] neg theory is drop the debater--- dropping the arg makes no sense because it’s a neg presumption ballot if they don’t have an aff

### 1NC – OFF

#### The process of assimilation into European frames of resistance is an ongoing process in which the “intellectual European” understands their inecessity and instead attempts to immortalize themselves through systems of existing power by framing resistance as possible within current models of understanding resistance and others Timofei Gerber 19 [Dec 2019, The Epoche, Issue #27, MA in philosophy from the University of Heidelberg, Germany. He is also a co-editor of this magazine, Frantz Fanon: Anticolonial Revolutions and Revolutionary Theory, https://epochemagazine.org/27/frantz-fanon-anticolonial-revolutions-and-revolutionary-theory// //Hooch-EKH]

In a recorded conversation from 1972, Foucault and Deleuze talk about being “in the process of experiencing a new relationship between theory and practice” (Foucault/Deleuze, 205), one that had begun “in the most recent upheaval” (ibid., 207). They are here referring to the events of May 68. Deleuze continues: “At one time, practice was considered an application of theory, a consequence, at other times, it had an opposite sense and it was thought to inspire theory, to be indispensable for the creation of future theoretical forms” (ibid.). In either case, be it that theory, in the form of political and philosophical analysis, precedes practice, or that it is the result of political struggle, they are understood as distinct entities forming a hierarchical relationship. He adds that while previously, “their relationship was understood in terms of a process of totalization,” it is now “far more partial and fragmentary” (ibid.). One might be tempted to see here, especially in the last statement, an expression of what came to be known as postmodernism — the change from a concept of an all-encompassing knowledge to a multiplicity of ‘knowledges’ and all its madness. But it is clear that this shift is not to be understood as an abstract sliding into so-called post-truth, but as a concrete political realisation. Foucault notes: “In the most recent upheaval, the intellectual discovered that the masses no longer need him to gain knowledge: they know perfectly well, without illusion; they know far better than he and they are certainly capable of expressing themselves. But there exists a system of power which blocks, prohibits, and invalidates this discourse and this knowledge, a power not only found in the manifest authority of censorship, but one that profoundly and subtly penetrates an entire societal network” (ibid., 207). It is for that reason that the intellectual’s role changes profoundly. It is no longer about standing on the forefront of the people with his prefabricated theory in hand, but “to struggle against the forms of power that transform him into its object and instrument in the sphere of ‘knowledge,’ ‘truth,’ ‘consciousness,’ and ‘discourse’” (ibid., 208). The intellectual’s integration into the grid, for example through the university or the media, and the potentiality of him himself becoming a representative of the power structures, leads to a much more precarious position. As he gains insight into “the indignity of speaking for others” (ibid., Deleuze, 209), he can no longer position himself as a representative of the people. Foucault and Deleuze are very astute in their observation and its consequences, but they are wrong, and slightly narcissistic, in ascribing it to the political events of 1968, in which they themselves have participated. The profound shift in the relationship between theory and practice, its abandonment of universal totalisations, goes back to the revolutionary anticolonial struggle. May 68 happened 6 years after the Algerian War of Independence had ended, in a time where France was still struggling to establish its postcolonial order. One year earlier, in 1961, Frantz Fanon’s *The Wretched of the Earth* was published, a few days after the author’s death. This book, which Fanon wrote as an active participant of the Algerian War, anticipates and realises, as a ‘theory’ on the anticolonial struggle, the shift that Deleuze and Foucault will talk about 11 years later. That the relation between theory of practice was of primary importance for the thinkers of the African anticolonial struggles becomes clear from a quick look at the biographies of its most famous representatives, like Césaire, Senghor, Cabral, and, of course, Frantz Fanon. But it is not this activism that was the ‘novelty’ of anticolonial thinkers, as one might invoke, for example, Rosa Luxemburg, or others who wrote philosophical or political analyses. To understand their novelty, we have to look not at their biographies, but at their thoughts. More specifically, what Fanon and other anticolonial thinkers have realised, is that the analysis of the colonial situation necessitated a completely new theoretical frame, which included a rethinking of the relationship between theory and practice. As the dominant reference for critical analysis of a political and economic situation was Marxism, this meant a break with this tradition, including the Marxist notion of the revolutionary intellectual. This rupture was not only due to the fact that the Marxist analysis was deemed inappropriate for the analysis of the economic situation of the colony, which is, as we’ll see, structurally very different from the conditions of European capitalism. More radically, it is an abandonment of Western historiography, within which Africa is considered to be ‘lagging behind’ Europe, so that it needs to ‘catch up’ in the processes of industrialisation and ‘civilisation’. The rupture with the Marxist tradition, whose linear historiography remains within “Eurocentric assimilationism” (Armah, 50), was in that sense also the call for the colonies to abandon the imitation of the West and to find its own way: “Let us decide not to imitate Europe and let us tense our muscles and our brains in a new direction. Let us endeavor to invent a man in full, something which Europe has been incapable of achieving” (Fanon, 326).

#### The continued wait for a moment of rupture extremifies the stereotype of the “lazy African and Arab,” engaging solely in noncompliance. This reliance on an integration into and out of academia solidifies the necessity of a “totalizing theory” which makes revolution impossible. The affirmative results in the imitation of the European form of cultural production by implanting the essential value of a “purely educated” movement. The alternative is the rural resistance--- a violent revolution which centers the rurality of colonization and a rejection of “modernization”--- reject the call to a “theory and praxis” and instead a forgetting of education as a core question of resistance Timofei Gerber 19 [Dec 2019, The Epoche, Issue #27, MA in philosophy from the University of Heidelberg, Germany. He is also a co-editor of this magazine, Frantz Fanon: Anticolonial Revolutions and Revolutionary Theory, https://epochemagazine.org/27/frantz-fanon-anticolonial-revolutions-and-revolutionary-theory// //Hooch-EKH]

The anticolonial struggle is as old as the colonies themselves, and so are the attempts to find a conceptual framework that could help the people get rid of the intruders. The inherent role of theory is therefore not to interpret the world, but to change it. The advantage of Marxism was that it not only offered the tools for economic analysis, but also sketched out a pathway towards revolution. Communism, with its egalitarian principles, obviously contrasted starkly against the violent exploitation of the autochthonous peoples by capitalist countries; and as the inherent connection of capitalism and imperialism has long been noticed by Marxist theorists, the anticolonial struggle could not avoid being anticapitalistic. Maybe that’s one of the reasons why anticolonial theories are kept under wraps nowadays. One of the primary questions for Fanon and for other theorists of the anticolonial struggle was, then, if the Marxist framework was appropriate for an analysis of the colonial situation and if it offered the appropriate instruments to lead the people to freedom. This question was very much discussed, already in the 40’s, in anticolonial journals like *Présence Africaine* or in *Phylon*, founded by W.E.B. DuBois, and where political questions from an African-American perspective were discussed. Fanon’s references to Marx are therefore not exceptional. “It is not just the concept of the precapitalist society, so effectively studied by Marx, which needs to be reexamined here. The serf is essentially different from the knight, but a reference to divine right is needed to justify this difference in status. In the colonies the foreigner imposed himself using his cannons and machines. Despite the success of his pacification, in spite of his appropriation, the colonist always remains a foreigner. It is not the factories, the estates, or the bank account which primarily characterize the ‘ruling class’. The ruling species is first and foremost the outsider from elsewhere, different from the indigenous population, ‘the others’” (Fanon, 5). As we can see, Fanon notes two differences to the Marxist framework: First of all, there is a difference in legitimation. While, of course, the 19th and the 20th centuries were ripe with theories of racial superiority, the factual basis of the control over the colonies was always violence. As much as the reduction “to the state of the animal,” and the use of “zoological terms” has affected the psyche of the colonised, “they know they are not animals. And at the very moment when they discover their humanity, they begin to sharpen their weapons to secure its victory” (ibid., 7f.). The second difference is that within industrial capitalism, it is a class that is exploited by another class, one part of the population by the other, while in the colony, the whole population is exploited, oppressed, and enslaved by an external force. Of course, it is well-known that colonisation doesn’t work without building alliances with local elites, with preferential treatments for chosen ethnic groups, and other strategies of fragmentation. But as the actual exploiter remains on the outside, there can be no class dynamic in the strict sense; it rather amounts to tribalisms that express the constant frustration of the people. “The colonial world is a Manichaean world,” in which the colonised is turned “into a kind of quintessence of evil” (ibid., 6). Due to this absolute segregation built on racist grounds, even the elite, in as far as it can claim to differentiate itself from the masses, is barred from assimilation. Let us return to the first aspect that we’ve noted above, violence, as it is central for Fanon’s analysis and titles the first chapter of *The Wretched of the Earth*. As the history of the colonies, as much as the history of slavery, shows, attempts at pacification never succeed: Neither the slave nor the colonised have failed to seize any opportunity to rebel, to organise and to fight against the aggressors. Direct violence therefore remains the primary method of upholding order. As effective as this method is, its result is not pacification, but quite the contrary, that the colonised is under constant “muscular tension” (ibid., 17), which, during ‘stable’ colonial times is expressed in tribal aggressions, criminality, or deviated to the fatalism of religion, which once again serves as the ‘opiate of the masses’ (ref. ibid., 18). Still, due to the open nature of colonial violence, the people are also constantly aware of the source of their misery. In that sense, they are inherently politicised, which expresses itself daily in the act of non-cooperation. The latter was racially reinterpreted as the ‘natural laziness’ of Africans or Arabs —meanwhile, “the colonized’s indolence is a conscious way of sabotaging the colonial machine” (ibid., 220). One can say for that reason that for minorities, for suppressed people in general, there is no difference between the private and the public: The decision to work hard or not is a political decision, to adhere to tradition is an act of defiance, while blindly accepting ‘modernisation’ is a betrayal of the people. The choice of clothing, of language, of consumer items, and the newspaper one reads — they all become a function of struggle or of submission. In short, the revolution only awaits its opportunity, and will happen on its own once the circumstances allow it. That’s why the people don’t need theory to be awoken; they are permanently ready, and it is with them that the struggle will begin. The seemingly stable situation of the colony is in fact a state of permanent pre-revolution. But, as we have noted, not everyone is suppressed in the same way. Nestled in the relative comfort of the city, the colonised intellectual comes into contact with “the colonialist bourgeoisie,” which, “by way of its academics, had implanted in the minds of the colonized that the essential values — meaning Western values — remain eternal despite all errors attributable to man” (ibid., 11). By accepting his own culture’s inferiority, the intellectual starts not only imitating European forms of cultural production and the bourgeois ideals that it expresses, but also produces his work “exclusively with the oppressor in mind” (ibid., 173), as he needs to prove to him that he is not as inferior as his confrères. In this distantiation, which mimics bourgeois individualism, he becomes blind to the pleas and to the misery of the people. As he accepts the coloniser’s racist ideas, he also accepts the necessity of the colonial situation, which ‘helps’ the uncivilised to at least somehow enter the realm of reason. At best, he joins the national party and becomes a proponent of reform to at least slightly ameliorate the misery of the colonised nation (cf. ibid. 21). In short, in the colonial situation, it is the intellectual who is affected by a profound blindness, which makes him inherently inept to bring forth the liberation of the people. The intellectual isn’t a leader, he ‘can’t read the signs’; *in the colonised situation,* the intellectual is the blindest of all. In regard to the Marxist-Leninist conception, where it is the vanguard party that is to induce class consciousness, and thereby revolutionary intention to the people, the colonial situation is marked by a clear inversion. As power expresses itself through violence and not (only) exploitation, the people can’t help but be conscious and at least rudimentarily political. There is no need to ‘decipher the signs’. This is not to say that the European workers of the 19th century, who had to live and work in horrible conditions, weren’t aware of their condition. The history of the self-organisation of workers speaks for itself. But the Marxist-Leninist conceptual frame tends to underestimate such spontaneous organisations and deems them unable to realise the revolution. Either way, the contrast is evident in the colonial situation: The revolution, when it starts, starts with the people, and the intellectual actually arrives ‘late for the party’. If he is sympathetic to revolution, he constantly awaits the moment where the people are ‘ripe’ for revolution, or when a revolution becomes feasible (his only way out of this impasse is, as we’ll see, if he is forced to flee from the city and to hide within the peasantry). But as, rationally speaking, the coloniser, with his weapons and technologically advanced army, will remain ‘objectively’ superior, this moment will never come. But the people are not awaiting the intellectual’s permissions. Permanently alert and under tension, they are but waiting for the situation to gradually change until open rebellion becomes not ‘realistically feasible’, but objectively necessary: “Colonial exploitation, poverty, and endemic famine increasingly force the colonized into open, organized rebellion. Gradually, imperceptibly, the need for a decisive confrontation imposes itself and is eventually felt by the great majority of the people. Tensions emerge where previously there were none. International events, the collapse of whole sections of colonial empires and the inherent contradictions of the colonial system stimulate and strengthen combativity, motivating and invigorating the national consciousness” (ibid., 172). The question of theory hereby becomes more poignant: Why is the intellectual, theory, even needed*?* If the people are aware and revolutionary by default, what use do they have for analysis? It is true, the revolution is born out of spontaneity, but as the title of the second chapter — *Grandeur and Weakness of Spontaneity* — indicates, it is marked by an inherent ambivalence. What is it that the people want? “They are governed by a simple doctrine: The nation must be made to exist. There is no program, no discourse, there are no resolutions, no factions. The problem is clear-cut: The foreigners must leave. Let us build a common front against the oppressor and let us reinforce it with armed struggle” (ibid., 83). As the colonial situation is marked by a Manichean division, the first step of opposition has a dialectical clarity. The enemy is immediately recognised. The antidote against colonial violence is just as obvious: the violence of the revolution. But the latter is of a completely different fabric than the former. While the violence of the coloniser follows a politics of fragmentation, and has as its only goal to suppress, the alignment of the people’s violence to one purpose and to one enemy has a unifying and liberating effect: “In a state of genuine collective ecstasy rival families decide to wipe the slate clean and forget the past. Reconciliations abound. Deep-buried, traditional hatreds are dug up, the better to root them out. Faith in the nation furthers political consciousness. National unity begins with the unity of the group, the settling of old scores, and the elimination once and for all of any resentment” (ibid.). We have now talked about ‘the people’ like some abstract entity. A closer look at the colony’s economic structure will offer us insight, who exactly they are. As Fanon notes, “colonial domination [gives] preferential treatment to certain regions. […] Colonialism almost never exploits the entire country. It is content with extracting natural resources and exporting them to the metropolitan industries thereby enabling a specific sector to grow relatively wealthy, while the rest of the colony continues, or rather sinks, into underdevelopment and poverty” (ibid., 106). Colonies are therefore marked by a strong divide between the rural and the urban, whereas the former, exploited for monocultures, is barely diversified and industrialised, so that “the rural masses still live in a feudal state whose overbearingly medieval structure is nurtured by the colonial administrators and army” (ibid., 65). It is for that reason that the truly revolutionary parts of the population are the peasantry and the lumpen-proletariat, those who migrate to the city trying to evade the rural misery, but who get stuck in the slums, jobless and poor. They are the ones who have “nothing to lose” (ibid., 23). The revolution therefore originates in the rural ‘masses’. It is this situation that the militant intellectual, who refuses both assimilation and reformism, is confronted with. With a relatively complacent elite and a reactionary national party, he fails to initiate a revolutionary movement in the city, and, hunted by the police, he is finally forced to leave it and hide with the people (ibid. 28f.). But this exile is, so to speak, the best that could happen to him, for it is here that he establishes contact with the people. This aspect is fundamental for Fanon, as it has several consequences. First of all, the exiled militant rids himself of “all the Mediterranean values, the triumph of the individual, of enlightenment and Beauty” that “turn into pale, lifeless trinkets. All those discourses appear a jumble of dead words. Those values which seemed to ennoble the soul prove worthless because they have nothing in common with the real-life struggle in which the people are engaged” (ibid., 11). Second, he hears “the true voice of the country” and sees “the great and infinite misery of the people” (ibid., 79). These militants “discover that the rural masses have never ceased to pose the problem of their liberation in terms of violence, of taking back the land from the foreigners, in terms of national struggle and armed revolt. Everything is simple. These men discover a coherent people who survive in a kind of petrified state, but keep intact their moral values and their attachment to the nation. They discover a generous people, prepared to make sacrifices, willing to give all they have, impatient, with an indestructible pride” (ibid.). And last, but most importantly, they understand that it is not them who are to lead the people, and that they have to “let themselves be guided by the people and at the same time give them military and political training. The people sharpen their weapons. In fact the training proves short-lived, for the masses, realizing the strength of their own muscles, force the leaders to accelerate events” (ibid.). The intellectuals learn to overcome their prejudice of the ‘barbarous’ mass and to put their organisational and agitational skills to use in cooperation with the people. As great as the initial enthusiasm of the revolution is, victory does not come easy: “The epic is played out on a difficult, day-to-day basis and the suffering endured far exceeds that of the colonial period” (ibid., 90). The people get weary, and at some point, the coloniser changes his strategy. He no longer uses pure force to suppress the revolution but makes concessions and changes his rhetorics to pacify the people (cf. ibid. 91). At the same time, as the revolution becomes bigger and more complex, spontaneity shows its limits. The consequences of this are worth quoting in full length, as it is here that the intellectual’s role becomes clearer: “The task of the political commissioner is to nuance their [the peasants’] position and make them aware that certain segments of the population have their own specific interests which do not always coincide with the national interest. The people then realize that national independence brings to light multiple realities which in some cases are divergent and conflicting. At this exact moment in the struggle clarification is crucial as it leads the people to replace an overall undifferentiated nationalism with a social and economic consciousness. The people who in the early days of the struggle had adopted the primitive Manichaeanism of the colonizer — Black versus White, Arab versus Infidel — realize en route that some blacks can be whiter than the whites, and that the prospect of a national flag or independence does not automatically result in certain segments of the population giving up their privileges and their interests” (ibid., 93). As long as the revolution only inverts the Manichean order, it remains within its binary structure and fails to create something new: the nation, the new people, that are needed to permanently overcome the condition of suppression. The people need to discover the nuances of the struggle, and it is the militant’s job to help them do so, and this in turn will shape the idea of the future nation further. The danger of imitating the Western model, which is based on exploitation, is imminent, as the colonial economic structure is hierarchical by default. One of the primary dangers of post-independence is in that sense that the foreign rule is merely replaced by a local elite, the national bourgeoisie, which then becomes an “intermediary” (ibid., 100) for European interests and firms, thereby selling out the nation to multinational corporations. The task of the intellectual is in that sense twofold: On the one side, there is the positive task of cooperating to shape the future nation and creates its values and ideas, and the negative task of criticising anyone who tries to create a new national superstructure, and thereby to betray the national cause. The first task, the creation of the nation, cannot be done with help of an individualistic thinking, as this would once again reintroduce a binary structure, where the intellectual is leading the people. “Nobody has a monopoly on truth, neither the leader nor the militant. The search for truth in local situations is the responsibility of the community [affaire collective]” (ibid., 139). This is a radically democratic endeavour, but it is not anarchic. Obviously, the new nation will need a government. But it is not majority rule that will guarantee its democratic nature. “The flow of ideas from the upper echelons to the rank and file and vice versa must be an unwavering principle, not for merely formal reasons but quite simply because adherence to this principle is the guarantee of salvation” (ibid., 138). Just as the politics of the new nation needs to be one of radical decentralisation (cf. ibid.), so is the truth of the new nation created on a fragmentary basis through discussion, participation, and responsibility: “To politicize the masses is not and cannot be to make a political speech. It means driving home to the masses that everything depends on them, that if we stagnate the fault is theirs, and that if we progress, they too are responsible, that there is no demiurge, no illustrious man taking responsibility for everything, but that the demiurge is the people and the magic lies in their hands and their hands alone” (ibid.). Is this not exactly that which Deleuze will call “the indignity of speaking for others” (Foucault/Deleuze, 209) in his conversation with Foucault? The negation of the monopoly of truth, the wresting of it from the hands of the elites, now shows its fundamentally democratic core. And does Fanon not anticipate and already develop the following statement by Foucault: “It is not to ‘awaken consciousness’ that we struggle, but to sap power, to take power; it is an activity conducted alongside those who struggle for power, and not their illumination from a safe distance. A ‘theory’ is the regional system of this struggle” (ibid., 208). My intention is not to negate the originality of Deleuze’s and Foucault’s thought, but rather to show that it has its genealogy that they don’t seem to have grasped. May 68 as a child of the anticolonial struggle reintroduces a complexity not only into this particular event, but into the whole historiography of the second half of the 20th century. Forgetting it does not only lead to a whitewashing of these ideas, but also to many misunderstanding in view of their political nature. What fundamentally constitutes these ideas is the search for a new humanism, a new humanity that would free itself from exploitation and misery. In the words of Fanon: “[Decolonization] infuses a new rhythm, specific to a new generation of men, with a new language and a new humanity. Decolonization is truly the creation of new men. But such a creation cannot be attributed to a supernatural power: The “thing” colonized becomes a man through the very process of liberation” (ibid., 2).

### 1NC – OFF

#### Interpretation: Affirmatives should affirm whether or not a hypothetical action should be taken to resolve the resolution of “resolved: the appropriation of space by private entities is unjust” Resolved” means to enact a policy by law.

Words & Phrases ’64 (Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or **determination by resolution or vote**; as ‘it was resolved **by the legislature**;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as **meaning “to establish by law”**.

#### Prefer it:

#### Predictable stasis--- Only a resolutional focus on hypothetical government action maintains equitable research burdens, a predictable stasis for aff and neg ground, and a stable mechanism to test aff solvency--- each is key to education

#### Clash--- having regulated and predictable negative ground is key to having evenly contestable debates. Specifically, predictable ground is important, 2AC reclarifications of what we could have read means nothing if we couldn’t have predicted it in the first place

#### Anatomizing Power---the aff’s attempt to shift the focus away from the core imperial power of the USFG which reflects a privileged position that obscures national liberation movements and hinders them by removing pressure from the USFG--- put away fancy worded framework disads, their bottom up analysis fails to climb up to the global economic floor which is the root cause to 1AC impacts

Maupin, 21 [​Caleb Maupin is a widely acclaimed speaker, writer, journalist, and political analyst. He has traveled extensively in the Middle East and in Latin America. He was involved with the Occupy Wall Street movement from its early planning stages, and has been involved many struggles for social justice. He is an outspoken advocate of international friendship and cooperation, as well as 21st Century Socialism. “Chapter Two: Redefining Capitalism and Socialism,” 7/1/21, Midwestern Marx]

Kropotkin’s writing has an almost religious faith in the good intentions of human beings and their willingness to cooperate without coercion, combined with a gentle pacifism that fears the cruelty of authoritarian structures. He writes: “We shall see then what a variety of trades, mutually cooperating on a spot of the globe and animated by the social revolution, can do to feed, clothe, house, and supply with all manner of luxuries millions of intelligent men. We need write no fiction to prove this. What we are sure of, what has already been experimented upon, and recognized as practical, would suffice to carry it into effect, if the attempt were fertilized, vivified by the daring inspiration of the Revolution and the spontaneous impulse of the masses.” However, despite holding a vision of a voluntary society where all cooperate with each other in the absence of coercion, Kropotkin was not opposed to using force and violence to achieve his goals. The Anarchist organizations and networks he associated with throughout Europe advocated “Propaganda of the Deed,” the use of bombings and assassinations in the hopes of sparking a rebellion among the wider population. How much Kropotkin was directly involved in such activities remains unclear, but it is clear that many people who were inspired by Kropotkin’s teachings and worked with his organizations engaged in Left Adventurist Terrorism. In 1916, most anarchists and revolutionary socialists were protesting and opposing the war between imperialist powers. Kropotkin published his “Manifesto of The Sixteen” that announced support for British and American imperialism in their war against Germany, Austria, and Turkey. This earned Kropotkin a large amount of scorn and was seen as a slap in the face and betrayal of the many socialists like Rosa Luxemburg and Eugene Debs, who went to prison for opposing the war. Peter Kropotkin is a figure that is worthy of respect despite criticisms of his political line and actions. He was willing to make great sacrifices and take great risks on behalf of oppressed peasants and factory workers, and he did a great deal to put forward a vision of post-capitalist society that would resolve the injustices of the world. Marxists of course reject Left Adventurism and Terrorism along with idealistic fairy tales. They favor instead to build a mass movement of workers to seize control of the state, and create a rational, centrally planned economy to eliminate all scarcity, marching toward the ultimate goal of a stateless, classless world. The fact that the BreadTube internet universe claims Kropotkin’s legacy and presents itself as the main representative of not just Kropotkin’s ideas, but all anti-capitalism in 21st Century America is deeply problematic. The intellectual laziness and shallow analysis presented by various BreadTube voices is a total disservice to his legacy, however complex it may be. The Marxist Definition of Capitalism The teachings of Karl Marx understand socialism to be a result of the innate human drive for progress and the expansion of productive forces. For most of humanity’s existence, we lived as hunter gatherers in tribes. The first social revolution came with the domestication of animals and the growing of crops. The dawn of agriculture brought forth a new mode of production and a new set of social relations to correspond to it. Soon society was divided between landowners and slaves. Eventually feudalism, a more efficient mode of production, replaced slavery. In the 1700s capitalism emerged in Europe as the mercantile classes replaced the kings and nobles, and industrial production replaced subsistence farming. Capitalism resulted in the creation of two social classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The bourgeoisie are those who own the banks, factories, land, means of transportation and other centers of economic power, and operate them in order to make profits. The rest of society makes up another class, the proletariat, a class Marx described as: “the modern working class, developed — a class of laborers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as their labor increases capital. These laborers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market.” The interests of the capitalists who own the means of production and the workers who sell their labor power to capitalists are diametrically opposed. Capitalists seek to drive wages down and maximize their profits. As a result workers form unions and organize strikes in the hopes of increasing their pay and bettering their conditions. Capitalism is defined by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels as a system in which the means of production are privately owned and operated to make profits for those who own them. Marx described capitalism as “the anarchy of production.” Engels explained “For in capitalistic society, the means of production can only function when they have undergone a preliminary transformation into capital.” Mao Zedong, the leader of the Chinese Communist Party, said that capitalism was a system of “Profits in command.” The capitalist system is defined as a system of production for profit. The capitalist is always looking to make production more efficient in order to increase his profits. As Marx explained, “The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production.” The capitalist seeks to hire the least amount of workers, replace human labor with machines, de-skill jobs, and make human labor more easily replaceable, all in order to churn out more and more products for lower and lower cost. The capitalist seeks to increase his profit margin so those profits can be reinvested and his operations can expand only to make more profits, which can then be reinvested again. This is what Marx referred to as “The General Law of Capitalist Accumulation.” Driving down labor costs, however, has an unplanned side-effect. The purchasing power of workers is derived from the wages they are paid. In the drive to efficiently produce goods and maximize profits, the capitalist system is prone to cyclical crises of overproduction. The workers cannot afford to buy back the products they produce. The market becomes glutted with products that cannot be sold. As a result, prices drop, companies go out of business, and workers lose their jobs, because too much has been created. Marx wrote in his text The Poverty of Philosophy: “From day to day it has becomes clearer that the production relations in which the bourgeoisie moves have not a simple, uniform character, but a dual character; that in the selfsame relations in which wealth is produced, poverty is also produced; that in the selfsame relations in which there is a development of the productive forces, there is also a force producing repression; that these relations produce bourgeois wealth; i.e., the wealth of the bourgeois class — only by continually annihilating the wealth of the individual members of this class and by producing an ever-growing proletariat.” This problem of abundance creating poverty is uniquely capitalist. In previous systems, people starved because not enough food had been created, but in capitalism, starvation can occur because too much food has been produced. In previous systems, homelessness resulted from a lack of housing, but in the aftermath of the 2008 financial crisis when “the housing bubble burst,” many Americans lost their homes or became homeless because too much housing had been constructed. Marxists often will cite a parable dialogue between a coal miner and his son. Son: Father, I am very cold, why can’t we light the stove? Father: We cannot light the stove because we don’t have any coal. Son: Why don’t we have any coal? Father: Because I lost my job at the coal mine and we do not have any money to purchase coal. Son: Why did you lose your job at the coal mine?​ Father: Because there is too much coal. Friedrich Engels explained why cyclical economic crises result from the built-in problem of production organized for profit in his text Socialism: Utopian and Scientific, writing: “The whole mechanism of the capitalist mode of production breaks down under the pressure of the productive forces, its own creations. It is no longer able to turn all this mass of means of production into capital. They lie fallow, and for that very reason the industrial reserve army must also lie fallow. Means of production, means of subsistence, available laborers, all the elements of production and of general wealth, are present in abundance.” Imperialism: The Capitalism of Our Time Much of BreadTube’s discussion of capitalism centers around the inequity of relations between employers and employees. This is certainly a very big aspect of Marxian analysis of capitalism. Marx described the alienating environment of the worker, the way workers are reduced to “appendages of machines” who sell their labor power to the employer like any other commodity. Marx described how the worker is not paid the full value of ~~his~~ labor, with the surplus value being stolen from in order to become the profits of the capitalist. However, the bulk of Marx’s analysis was focused on the problems that flow from production being organized for profits, as shown above. The irrational profit motive leads to capital centralizing into fewer and fewer hands, gluts overproduction, poverty amidst plenty, and all kinds of social chaos. In the aftermath of Marx’s death, Vladimir Lenin analyzed the further development of capitalism. Lenin showed that increasingly the industries became dominated by financial institutions, and that the banks who supply credit become the central institutions in western countries. In the 1890s, capitalism in the United States, Britain, France, Germany and other western countries became dominated by huge conglomerates. Banks and industries tied together in huge trusts as multinational corporations spread their tentacles across the globe. The western monopolies worked to stop economic development in Africa, Asia, and Latin America and maintain their dominance in global trade. Excess commodities were dumped onto the developing world that served as a captive market. This higher stage of capitalism was called “Imperialism.” Lenin described the five stages of imperialism: “We have to begin with as precise and full a definition of imperialism as possible. Imperialism is a specific historical stage of capitalism. Its specific character is threefold: imperialism is monopoly capitalism; parasitic, or decaying capitalism; moribund capitalism. The supplanting of free competition by monopoly is the fundamental economic feature, the quintessence of imperialism. Monopoly manifests itself in five principal forms: (1) cartels, syndicates and trusts—the concentration of production has reached a degree which gives rise to these monopolistic associations of capitalists; (2) the monopolistic position of the big banks—three, four or five giant banks manipulate the whole economic life of America, France, Germany; (3) seizure of the sources of raw material by the trusts and the financial oligarchy (finance capital is monopoly industrial capital merged with bank capital); (4) the (economic) partition of the world by the international cartels has begun. There are already over one hundred such international cartels, which command the entire world market and divide it “amicably” among themselves—until war redivides it. The export of capital, as distinct from the export of commodities under non-monopoly capitalism, is a highly characteristic phenomenon and is closely linked with the economic and territorial-political partition of the world; (5) the territorial partition of the world (colonies) is completed.” It is because of this global setup called imperialism that Nigeria can be the top oil producing country in Africa, exporting more of this valued commodity than any other country on the continent. Yet they still have only 62% literacy, along with a very low life expectancy and a high infant mortality rate, according to the CIA World Factbook. It is because of imperialism that Honduras and Guatemala are drug and gang infested countries where much of the population lacks access to education and running water. In comparison, Nicaragua, which has broken out of imperialism, has been able to roll back poverty and raise living standards. The Central American countries that have economies and governments dominated by the United States are kept poor, subject to foreign domination and impoverishment. When the British colonized India and Bangladesh, they burned the looms and forced people that had been weaving for thousands of years to import their cloth from British textile mills. In more recent times, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) devastated the agricultural sectors of Mexico, Haiti, and other countries. Writing for the New York Times on November 24th, 2013, Laura Carlsen explained: “As heavily subsidized U.S. corn and other staples poured into Mexico, producer prices dropped and small farmers found themselves unable to make a living. Some two million have been forced to leave their farms since NAFTA. At the same time, consumer food prices rose, notably the cost of the omnipresent tortilla. As a result, 20 million Mexicans live in “food poverty”. Twenty-five percent of the population does not have access to basic food and one-fifth of Mexican children suffer from malnutrition. Transnational industrial corridors in rural areas have contaminated rivers and sickened the population and typically, women bear the heaviest impact.” Much of the developing world is very rich in terms of natural resources and human labor. In order to maintain a monopoly, the western multinational corporations, with full support of the government apparatus and international institutions like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, force countries into unnatural poverty due to foreign economic domination. The mechanism for enforcing the rule of western monopolies is war. If countries break out of the grip of western capitalism and begin to develop their economies, they become subject to attack. If one looks at the economies of Russia, China, Venezuela, Iran, Cuba, Syria, or any other country the imperialists target for regime change, one will see a level of independence and striving toward development that the international monopolies cannot permit. Often this independence is directly related to the most valuable commodity in our outmoded fossil fuel economy, petroleum. Vincent Copeland’s text, Expanding Empire, describes in clear terms the nature of imperialist economics: “The expansion into foreign countries resulted from a new stage in the expansion of business: The export of capital. Business had been exporting ordinary commodities of trade for centuries. The export of capital was something new—especially for the United States. And it couldn’t be done without foreign wars. The reason for this isn’t very complicated. The export of capital goods—that is, machinery, mining equipment, railroad engines, earth-moving tools, etc., is intended not to make just a quick "small" profit, but a constantly repeating profit that can go on forever, if the exploiter can hold onto the "investment." The investment of capital in a foreign country should be regarded somewhat like sending a huge suction pump. The pump pulls out the metals from the ground, the products from the soil and the fruits from the trees—with the help, of course, of the labor of the "native" people working on this suction pump. It is as if the pump were connected to pipes that run back to the "home" country, via the banks and big corporations. All the rich products are showered from the pipes into the treasuries of these institutions, in the form of profits… Whole nations are drained by these great suction pumps—or "investments." And the profits are so great that rival groups of big business, led by small cliques of big banks, go to war with each other over the exploitation of these nations.” BreadTube voices tend to talk of capitalism in merely the simple factory floor analogies rather than understanding the concentration of global economic power in the hands of monopolistic associations. BreadTubers talk of “pencil factories” where workers produce the pencils, but a capitalist gets the profits. These analogies are certainly relevant in understanding the nature of capitalist production, but BreadTube voices obscure the big picture for a microcosm that obscures analysis of global events.Furthermore, BreadTube voices tend to argue that anything resembling Lenin’s analysis of capitalism in its imperialist stage is somehow anti-semitic. BreadTubers will often claim that references to bankers, international bankers, or globalism is merely a coded repackaging of Nazi conspiracy theories about Jewish global domination. This allegation is absurd, and would render not just all adherents of Marxism-Leninism, but also many liberal critics of globalization such as Noam Chomsky, Arundhati Roy, and Naomi Klein to be Nazi propagandists. The world is not dominated by low level businessmen who own individual factories, but by an elite of ultra-rich, globally oriented capitalists. These capitalists do not focus their business efforts on a single national market. The ruling class of Wall Street and London are “globalists,” and they dominate the world economy with gigantic financial institutions, “international banks.” To analyze a world of gigantic multinational corporations that beat down entire nations simply in terms of the inequity between the owners of an allegorical pencil factory and his employees is simply inadequate. By declaring analysis of gigantic corporations or finance capitalists dominating the world to be “fascist” or “Trump-like” BreadTube is, in essence, blocking out and “cancelling” essential contemporary Marxist analysis. Lenin’s understanding of imperialism enabled him to reorient much of the Marxist movement. Marx argued that all nationalism was a barrier to workers solidarity, though in his later life he became somewhat sympathetic to the Irish freedom struggle. Marx argued that European colonialism was bringing development and progress to places like India. Lenin’s understanding of how capitalism developed in the late 19th century laid the basis for revolutionaries embracing the national liberation struggles of colonized people. As the Chinese Communist Party’s document Long Live Leninism, published April 16, 1960, summarizes: "Lenin pointed out that the oligarchy of finance capital in a small number of capitalist powers, that is, the imperialists, not only exploit the masses of people in their own countries, but oppress and plunder the whole world, turning most countries into their colonies and dependencies. Imperialist war is a continuation of imperialist politics.” Lenin understood that an aristocracy of labor, a strata of well paid workers enabled European social-democratic parties to become reformist and eventually support the First World War. Lenin saw that the revolutionary energy was coming from the east and the colonized world: “In the light of the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism, Lenin came to the conclusion that, because capitalism developed extremely unevenly in different countries, socialism would achieve victory first in one or several countries but could not achieve victory simultaneously in all countries.” Lenin argued that socialism in the developing world would come about with the working class leading the struggle to liberate entire nations from the yoke of imperialist domination. Because of the stratification of the working class within the imperialist homelands and the rise of social reformism and the aristocracy of labor, Communists in western countries had a special task: “The liberation movements of the proletariat in the capitalist countries should ally themselves with the national liberation movements in the colonies and dependent countries; this alliance can smash the alliance of the imperialists with the feudal and comprador reactionary forces in the colonies all dependent countries, and will therefore inevitably put a final end to the imperialist system throughout the world.” Imperialism, the rule of the world by western monopolies who keep the world poor in order to make themselves rich, is the capitalism of our time. Opposing capitalism in our time means opposing imperialism, and this understanding is essential, especially for those living in the imperialist world centers. The lack of any analysis of imperialism and anti-imperialism, and the constant allegation that those who do analyze such things are covert anti-semites reveals a very big flaw in the BreadTube sphere and its viewpoint.

### 1NC – Adv

#### [1] The assumption the topic furthers space exploration is wrong--- tons of teams are constantly running anti colonization affirmatives that focus on changing our home--- their solvency level is nonexistent insofar as they can’t prove the topic itself inherently brings up the call to space exploration

#### [2] This Is a negative argument--- vote neg to vote aff because none of their evidence is contextual to private entities--- they can’t access change through the ballot because even if they win that the appropriation of outer space is bad they can’t access any change because states just continue anyways

#### [3] Whitey on the moon flows negative because it’s exclusively about NASA--- the aff can’t resolve the colorline or links to the T argument

### 1NC – Underview

#### We’re not reading util answers so it doesn’t matter insofar as we win any of our impacts outweigh on a structural or solvency level

#### Evaluate only competing interpretations

#### 1-- arbitrary -- it's self-serving by saying the AFF is close enough -- that opens the debate into what is good enough for you to decide -- that takes the debating out of our hands and into yours to decide -- different judges have different preferences based off of what their teams run, what arguments they like or dislike, etc which makes outcomes of debates uncertain and up to judge intervention