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## 1

#### Interp: The affirmative must defend the desirability of a hypothetical policy action in which free press in a democracy priotizes objectivity over advocacy.

#### Violation: They don’t.

#### "Resolved" requires a policy.

Merriam Webster '18 (Merriam Webster; 2018 Edition; Online dictionary and legal resource; Merriam Webster, "resolve," <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/resolve;> RP)  
: a legal or official determination especially: a legislative declaration

#### Democracies are governments

Merriam Webster ND [https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/democracy] chsAK

Definition of democracy

a: government by the people especially  : rule of the majority

b: a government in which the supreme power is [vested](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/vest#h2) in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation usually involving periodically held free [elections](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/election)

#### Vote neg:

#### Violation – They don’t defend a policy action.

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits – Debate might have educational benefits but is fundamentally a game structured by wins and losses. Abandoning the topic makes the game too challenging by raising the bar for prep since it allows the aff to pick and choose what they want to defend outside the topic creating an infinite case-list for neg prep. Only the topic can provide a fair, limited stasis point for the division of aff and neg ground – without it debate turns into a monologue which guts all the benefits of the activity.

#### Limits o/w:

#### A] Prep burden – they infinite affs since you combine any K-lit in combination with rejections of the rez – controls the internal link to your offense since even if the aff is a good model if I can’t predict it we don’t get any engagement on critical issues.

#### B] Accessibility – small schools would be most affected by a massive unpredictable caselist that worsens structural disparities. This turns the case since our model of debate gives debaters skills for real-world change.

#### 2] Engagement –

#### A] Dialogue must be on an equal footing – else it gets distorted. Even if your aff is a radical idea, the way how it you present it in the academy makes it susceptible to manipulation.

Mott et al. 18, [Carrie Mott Rutgers University, USA Daniel Cockayne University of Waterloo, Canada] “Conscientious disengagement and whiteness as a condition of dialogue” Dialogues in Human Geography 2018, Vol. 8(2) 143–147 The Author(s) 2018 DOI: 10.1177/2043820618780575 journals.sagepub.com/home/dhg SLHS-RR

Rose-Redwood et al. (2018) draw on Mouffe’s (2000) concept of agonistics—the idea that disagreement and dissensus, rather than centrist notions of compromise—are key to democratic politics and dialogue. In one sense, the authors agree— as we do—with Mouffe’s anti-universalist position. In another, they are critical of agonism for tending to assume a common ground upon which dialogue is able to proceed. They ask, ‘aren’t the most profound disagreements in academia precisely over what should serve as the foundational values of scholarly discourse and practice in the first place’ (RoseRedwood et al., 2018: 114)? To this critique, we would like to add emphasis to the problems that arise in circumstances when, as is common today, an agreed-upon foundation for dialogue is absent. We consider this especially urgent given, for example, UC Berkeley’s announcement of a (since-cancelled) ‘Free Speech Week’, in which white nationalist speakers were invited to campus to allow students to ‘hear both sides’ of the highly racialized debates in the wake of protests in Charlottesville, Virginia. When there is no shared foundation for agonistic dialogue, it is all-too-easy to annul real differences between speech acts (see for example Sultana, 2018), to conflate white supremacist speech or online harassment with academic or other attempts to engage with ideas. We claim that speech can be viewed from the point of view of nonequivalence, to situate difference itself as a condition for dialogue, rather than the assumed sameness that has emerged in the absence of a common foundation. The point here is not to silence people (nor to conflate white supremacist speech with online harassment) but to note that given the absence of a shared foundation for dialogue, it is sometimes necessary to conscientiously disengage when one is faced with white supremacist interlocutors or targeted harassment. Nonequivalence may appear to be anti-egalitarian and contrary to democratic practice, and we recognize the danger in this position. Yet, as Butler (2016) notes, if one group speaks or assembles with the specific aim of silencing or preventing the speech or assembly of others (e.g. by committing or inciting acts of violence against them or by outing others as queer, trans, or paperless), their speech and assembly work against claims to democracy, and therefore, through the frame of nonequivalence, should be assessed in this context and perhaps not be considered protected forms of speech or assembly. We claim nonequivalence in order to minimize extreme and explicitly antidemocratic acts of speech and assembly, and, in the context of this response, to highlight that harassment should not be counted as a foundation for thoughtful agonistic dialogue. Our article, ‘Citation Matters’, highlights ongoing conversations about the racialized and gendered dynamics of knowledge production within human geography. We point to preexisting scholarship that addresses these conversations—much of which has been written by women of color (e.g. Gilmore, 2002; Joshi et al., 2015; Kobayashi, 2006; Louis, 2007; Mahtani, 2014; Nagar, 2008; Pulido, 2002; Sanders, 2006; see also the very recent article by Tolia-Kelly, 2017). We saw our contribution as a way to emphasize that conversations about the imbalanced representations of spatial knowledge have been ongoing for decades, despite the fact that the most highly cited scholars in the field are white men whose bibliographies feature other white men most prominently. As we wrote the article, we discussed our shared concern that geographers were tired of the topic of citation politics and representation. It has been addressed in geography conferences, discussed on social media, and written about as a common problem in various subdisciplines in human geography. Yet, after the publication of our article, it became clear that the idea is still novel for many geographers, for scholars in other fields, and for the general public. Within a few weeks of the article becoming available online, we were contacted by a writer from the website Campus Reform who planned to publish about our article, asking us if we would respond to some questions. After reaching out to colleagues for advice, we decided to address some of the questions that we were sent. A quick search of articles previously published by this writer made it clear that they would most likely publish only the most superficial details of our article, with the specific aim of triggering Campus Reform’s right-wing readership. Nonetheless, we wanted to engage on some level with the hope of addressing obvious misunderstandings of our work. Despite our shared attempts to address the questions and explain the nuance specific to the context of human geography, our interlocutor, as anticipated, published a piece that severely distorted the contents of our article. Once it became public, other conservative and alt-right websites published similar pieces, resulting in targeted harassment for both of us through social media, e-mail, and communications sent to various parties at our respective institutions. The character of these messages was often slanderous, racist, sexist, misogynist, and homophobic and included e-mails accusing us of being—somehow—both race traitors and Nazi sympathizers. Carrie bore the brunt of the harassment, which we collectively attribute primarily to her being a woman, but also to her being first and corresponding author, and being located at a US institution. Shortly thereafter, the article was discussed in a piece published in The Washington Post. The attention a mainstream media outlet gave to our article led to broader popular interest across the political spectrum but also intensified the aforementioned harassment. It also brought the piece to the greater attention of geographers and other academics, who responded in various ways. Many, including some geographers, argued simply that it was bad science to pay attention to an author’s identity. Others pointed to links in their own fields between citation practices and white heteromasculinism. For example, Russell (2017: 8), writing in environmental education, drew on our article and other research to emphasize ‘how certain voices, methodologies, and intellectual traditions continue to be marginalized’ in her field. Responses and commentary on ‘Citation Matters’ from academics and the general public typically did not engage with our argument from the common ground that Mouffe describes— a point from which agonistic politics might be able to proceed—but from an apparently reactionary conviction that our claims (usually, we suspected, without having read them) were biased or misinformed. Dialogue, in our reading, suggests two or more voices participating in a conversation, on equal footing with one another and with tacitly agreed upon parameters. The public responses—in particular those in the form of harassment—occurred in a manner that we generally did not consider to be dialogic and that ultimately resulted in our disengagement. As Cottom (2015) points out, academics are particularly vulnerable for calls to create public scholarship and engage outside of the proverbial ivory tower. She writes, ‘[w]e’re all sensitive to claims that we’re out of touch and behind on neoliberal careerism. And some of us actually care about engaging publics’ (Cottom, 2015: n.p.). Yet the danger is that often we do not choose the parameters for engagement. As we learned, targeted harassment and doxing of academics is an increasingly common practice. Cottom points out that one condition for dialogue is that academic institutions must be able to protect their faculty and support them through the harassment that can accompany public engagement. However, in the context of an ever-more competitive job market for early career academics, many find themselves in temporary contracts, or positions that do not offer the possibility of tenure, a situation that increases one’s vulnerability and further limits the conditions for dialogue. Based on advice we received from colleagues and our institutions, for fears over personal safety and job security, and because of the emotional exhaustion that accompanies harassment (and the necessity to read and document harassment in case legitimate threats emerge and must thus be reported to the police), we chose to disengage from further dialogue. As early career scholars without the security of tenure, we were both grateful for the support of colleagues, our departments, and our respective institutions. The public attention on our work provided a forum for engagement, but the opportunity for dialogue seemed limited. The majority of the people contacting us had obviously not read our article, and, in instances where they had, the specificity and disciplinary context of our writing was overlooked. Instead, we seemed to symbolize some aspect of the perceived liberal and elite academy that many people wanted an opportunity to attack. Some of the advice that we were given for how to deal with online harassment was to disengage from public dialogue. One should lay low on social media, not respond to online trolling or offensive e-mails, and ‘wait for the storm to pass’. However, there are consequences to this approach. Friends and colleagues did not know what we were going through and were thus unable to offer support or guidance during a difficult and emotionally trying time. Out of fear of further attention and harassment, we turned down interview offers that may have actually been legitimate opportunities for dialogue. Conscientiously disengaging, in acknowledgement of the modern limits of dialogue, was for us an unfortunate but necessary strategy for both personal safety and emotional survival. In more general terms, disengagement is partially to blame for the fact that many academics do not realize how commonplace events like our experience actually are. We acknowledge, in consonance with Cottom’s comments above, that the ability both to engage and to be able to disengage is predicated on the privilege of institutional and other resources. Thankfully, the support that was available to both of us enabled us to get through this particular encounter. Of course, such resources may not be available to all scholars, such as those employed in precarious positions, at universities with limited resources, or to scholars of color and other academics from socially marginalized backgrounds. Throughout the 2-year period that we spent writing and editing ‘Citation Matters’, we frequently discussed our shared feeling that we wanted to call attention to a long-standing conversation. It was not a new idea that we were proposing, and we constantly fretted over whether it was still relevant. Hadn’t others stated this before, over and over again? Why should we be the ones, as two white scholars with relative degrees of privilege, to write about this? How could we possibly say anything new about it? One of our aims was to draw attention to the wealth of already existing scholarship—most of it written by women of color—on the topic of gendered and racialized representation in our field. As a consequence of the publicity that our article received, however, the focus once again remained on two white scholars. The ideas from others that we sought to highlight were attributed to us, erasing the rich history of critique on this topic by other scholars from social marginalized backgrounds, thereby successfully whitewashing these debates. We wish to point out the primary irony, however unsurprising, of this particular encounter—that whiteness appears once again to be the condition of dialogue. In this light, it is important to draw attention, as Rose-Redwood et al. (2018) do in their article, to how the limits of dialogue remain raced and gendered in pernicious and violent ways and to how the conditions for engagement appear to remain, still, determined by white heteromasculinity.

#### B] Clash turns critical education since it means we can never test your method/framing to get the best version of it. Lack of in-depth refutation turns the debate into a monologue without educational benefits.

[Ralf Poscher 16, director of the Institute for Staatswissenschaft and Philosophy of Law, Professor of Public Law and Legal Philosophy, “Why We Argue About the Law: An Agonistic Account of Legal Disagreement,” in Metaphilosophy of Law, ed. Gizbert-Studnicki, Dyrda, Banas, 2/19/16, SSRN] CY

This also holds where we seem to be in agreement. Agreement without exposure to disagreement can be deceptive in various ways. The first phenomenon Postema draws attention to is the group polarization effect. When a group of like‐minded people deliberates an issue, informational and reputational cascades produce more extreme views in the process of their deliberations.105 The polarization and biases that are well documented for such groups106 can be countered at least in some settings by the inclusion of dissenting voices. In these scenarios, disagreement can be a cure for dysfunctional deliberative polarization and biases.107 A second deliberative dysfunction mitigated by disagreement is superficial agreement, which can even be manipulatively used in the sense of a “presumptuous ‘We’”108. Disagreement can help to police such distortions of deliberative processes by challenging superficial agreements. Disagreements may thus signal that a deliberative process is not contaminated with dysfunctional agreements stemming from polarization or superficiality. Protecting our discourse against such contaminations is valuable even if we do not come to terms. Each of the opposing positions will profit from the catharsis it received “by looking the negative in the face and tarrying with it”. These advantages of disagreement in collective deliberations are mirrored on the individual level. Even if the probability of reaching a consensus with our opponents is very low from the beginning, as might be the case in deeply entrenched conflicts, entering into an exchange of arguments can still serve to test and improve our position. We have to do the “labor of the negative” for ourselves. Even if we cannot come up with a line of argument that coheres well with everybody else’s beliefs, attitudes and dispositions, we can still come up with a line of argument that achieves this goal for our own personal beliefs, attitudes and dispositions. To provide ourselves with the most coherent system of our own beliefs, attitudes and dispositions is – at least in important issues – an aspect of personal integrity – to borrow one of Dworkin’s favorite expressions for a less aspirational idea. In hard cases we must – in some way – lay out the argument for ourselves to figure out what we believe to be the right answer. We might not know what we believe ourselves in questions of abortion, the death penalty, torture, and stem cell research, until we have developed a line of argument against the background of our subjective beliefs, attitudes and dispositions. In these cases it might be rational to discuss the issue with someone unlikely to share some of our more fundamental convictions or who opposes the view towards which we lean. This might even be the most helpful way of corroborating a view, because we know that our adversary is much more motivated to find a potential flaw in our argument than someone with whom we know we are in agreement. It might be more helpful to discuss a liberal position with Scalia than with Breyer if we want to make sure that we have not overlooked some counter‐argument to our case. It would be too narrow an understanding of our practice of legal disagreement and argumentation if we restricted its purpose to persuading an adversary in the case at hand and inferred from this narrow understanding the irrationality of argumentation in hard cases, in which we know beforehand that we will not be able to persuade. Rational argumentation is a much more complex practice in a more complex social framework. Argumentation with an adversary can have purposes beyond persuading him: to test one’s own convictions, to engage our opponent in inferential commitments and to persuade third parties are only some of these; to rally our troops or express our convictions might be others. To make our peace with Kant we could say that “there must be a hope of coming to terms” with someone though not necessarily with our opponent, but maybe only a third party or even just ourselves and not necessarily only on the issue at hand, but maybe through inferential commitments in a different arena. f) The Advantage Over Non‐Argumentative Alternatives It goes without saying that in real world legal disagreements, all of the reasons listed above usually play in concert and will typically hold true to different degrees relative to different participants in the debate: There will be some participants for whom our hope of coming to terms might still be justified and others for whom only some of the other reasons hold and some for whom it is a mixture of all of the reasons in shifting degrees as our disagreements evolve. It is also apparent that, with the exception of the first reason, the rationality of our disagreements is of a secondary nature. The rational does not lie in the discovery of a single right answer to the topic of debate, since in hard cases there are no single right answers. Instead, our disagreements are instrumental to rationales which lie beyond the topic at hand, like the exploration of our communalities or of our inferential commitments. Since these reasons are of this secondary nature, they must stand up to alternative ways of settling irreconcilable disagreements that have other secondary reasons in their favor – like swiftness of decision making or using fewer resources. Why does our legal practice require lengthy arguments and discursive efforts even in appellate or supreme court cases of irreconcilable legal disagreements? The closure has to come by some non‐argumentative mean and courts have always relied on them. For the medieval courts of the Germanic tradition it is bequeathed that judges had to fight it out literally if they disagreed on a question of law – though the king allowed them to pick surrogate fighters.109 It is understandable that the process of civilization has led us to non‐violent non‐ argumentative means to determine the law. But what was wrong with District Judge Currin of Umatilla County in Oregon, who – in his late days – decided inconclusive traffic violations by publicly flipping a coin?110 If we are counting heads at the end of our lengthy argumentative proceedings anyway, why not decide hard cases by gut voting at the outset and spare everybody the cost of developing elaborate arguments on questions, where there is not fact of the matter to be discovered? One reason lies in the mixed nature of our reasons in actual legal disagreements. The different second order reasons can be held apart analytically, but not in real life cases. The hope of coming to terms will often play a role at least for some time relative to some participants in the debate. A second reason is that the objectives listed above could not be achieved by a non‐argumentative procedure. Flipping a coin, throwing dice or taking a gut vote would not help us to explore our communalities or our inferential commitments nor help to scrutinize the positions in play. A third reason is the overall rational aspiration of the law that Dworkin relates to in his integrity account111. In a justificatory sense112 the law aspires to give a coherent account of itself – even if it is not the only right one – required by equal respect under conditions of normative disagreement.113 Combining legal argumentation with the non‐argumentative decision‐ making procedure of counting reasoned opinions serves the coherence aspiration of the law in at least two ways: First, the labor of the negative reduces the chances that constructions of the law that have major flaws or inconsistencies built into the arguments supporting them will prevail. Second, since every position must be a reasoned one within the given framework of the law, it must be one that somehow fits into the overall structure of the law along coherent lines. It thus protects against incoherent “checkerboard” treatments114 of hard cases. It is the combination of reasoned disagreement and the non‐rational decision‐making mechanism of counting reasoned opinions that provides for both in hard cases: a decision and one – of multiple possible – coherent constructions of the law. Pure non‐rational procedures – like flipping a coin – would only provide for the decision part. Pure argumentative procedures – which are not geared towards a decision procedure – would undercut the incentive structure of our agonistic disagreements.115 In the face of unresolvable disagreements endless debates would seem an idle enterprise. That the debates are about winning or losing helps to keep the participants engaged. That the decision depends on counting reasoned opinions guarantees that the engagement focuses on rational argumentation. No plain non‐argumentative procedure would achieve this result. If the judges were to flip a coin at the end of the trial in hard cases, there would be little incentive to engage in an exchange of arguments. It is specifically the count of reasoned opinions which provides for rational scrutiny in our legal disagreements and thus contributes to the rationales discussed above. 2. THE SEMANTICS OF AGONISTIC DISAGREEMENTS The agonistic account does not presuppose a fact of the matter, it is not accompanied by an ontological commitment, and the question of how the fact of the matter could be known to us is not even raised. Thus the agonistic account of legal disagreement is not confronted with the metaphysical or epistemological questions that plague one‐right‐answer theories in particular.

#### 3] SSD solves – no reason critiquing discourse regarding the topic can’t happen on the neg – we just get the benefits then.

#### 4] TVA – read an aff about how objectivity k2 fighting antiblackness. Solves all their offense since they still get the same educational benefits. Disads to the TVA prove there’s negative ground and that it’s a contestable stasis point, and if their critique is incompatible with the topic reading it on the neg solves and is better because it promotes switch-side debate.

#### Procedural fairness is a voter – it’s constitutive of debate and allows for method engagement. Outweighs:

#### A] Decision-making: every argument concedes to the validity of fairness i.e. that the judge will make a fair decision based on args presented – if they win fairness bad vote neg on presumption because there’s no obligation to fairly evaluate their arguments.

#### B] Probability: Voting aff can’t solve any of their impacts but it can solve ours. All the ballot does is tell tab who won which can’t stop any violence but can resolve the fairness imbalance in this particular debate.

#### C] Controls the internal link to getting educational benefits b/c if otherwise there’d be no engagement.

#### DTD – DTA incoherent.

#### Competing interps – they have to proactively to justify their model and reasonability links to our offense.

#### No Cross-apps:

#### A] It’s better to have a flawed model than no model at all I indict my ability to engage with the case.

#### B] Logic – if you’re being unfair – you’re using a layer that you get the auto-win as the highest layer, so you’ll win every time – also makes evaluation of whether that layer is even true impossible.

#### C] When theory doesn’t come first there’s intervention since there is no way for a proper evaluation of arguments in the first place – assume all 1AC truth claims false since evaluation is suspect.

#### No impact turns or RVIs:

#### A] Perfcon – if T’s bad and you vote for them on that arg, you’re voting on T.

#### B] Substance – if T’s bad then we should try debating on substance – impact turns force me to go for T since I need to defend my position.

#### C] Illogical – don’t win for being fair and logic is a meta-constraint for argumentation.

## 2

#### The aff’s form of fragmented politics completely cedes the political to capitalism. Their engagement in an embracement of unproductivity is too individualized and resists collective and concrete change. They enjoy the melancholic pleasures of being distanced and accommodated to the real world, and as a result remains stuck without change. Therefore, the ROTB is to endorse politics of comradery Dean13

“Communist Desire”, Jodi Dean, , 2013, LHP AM

An emphasis on the drive dimension of melancholia, on Freud's attention to the way sadism in melancholia is 'turned round upon the subject's own self', leads to an interpretation of the general contours shaping the left that differs from Brown's**. Instead of a left attached to an unaclmowledged orthodoxy,** **we have one that has given way on the desire for communism, betrayed its historical commitment to the proletariat, and sublimated revolutionary energies into restorationist practices that strengthen the hold of capitalism**. **This left has replaced commitments to the emancipatory, egalitarian struggles of working people against capitalism - commitments that were never fully orthodox, but always ruptured, conflicted and contested - with incessant activity** (not unlike the manic Freud also associates with melancholia), and so **now satisfies itself with criticism and interpretation, small projects and local actions, particular issues and legislative victories, art, technology, procedures, and process**. It sublimates revolutionary desire to democratic drive, to the repetitious practices offered up as democracy (whether representative, deliberative or radical). **Having already conceded to the inevitably of capitalism, it noticeably abandons 'any striking power against the big bourgeoisie',** to return to Benjamin's language. For such a left, **enjoyment comes from its withdrawal from responsibility, its sublimation of goals and responsibilities into the branching, fragmented practices of micro-politics, self-care, and issue awareness**. Perpetually slighted, harmed and undone**, this left remains stuck in repetition, unable to break out of the circuits of drive in which it is caught** - unable because it enjoys. **Might this not explain why such a left confuses discipline with domination, why it forfeits collectivity in the name of an illusory, individualist freedom that continuously seeks to fragment and disrupt any assertion of a collective or a common?** The watchwords of critique within this structure of left desire are moralism, dogmatism, authoritarianism and utopianism - watchwords enacting a perpetual self-surveillance: has an argument, position or view inadvertently rukeo one of these errors? Even some of its militants reject party and state, division and decision, securing in advance an inefficacy sure to guarantee it the nuggets of satisfaction drive provides. **If this left is rightly described as melancholic, and I agree with Brown that it is, then its melancholia derives from the real existing compromises and betrayals inextricable from its history - its accommodations with reality, whether of nationalist war, capitalist encirclement, or so-called market demands.** Lacan teaches that, like Kant's categorical imperative, the super-ego refuses to accept reality as an explanation for failure. Impossible is no excuse - desire is always impossible to satisfy. A wide spectrum of the contemporary left has either accommodated itself, in one or another, to an inevitable capitalism or taken the practical failures of Marxism-Leninism to require the abandonment of antagonism, class, and revolutionary commitment to overturning capitalist arrangements of property and production. **Melancholic fantasy (the communist Master, authoritarian and obscene) as well as sublimated, melancholic practices (there was no alternative) shield this left, shield Ltd, from confrontation with guilt over such betrayal as they capture us in activities that feel productive, important, radical.**

#### Forms are of identity-based oppression are explicitly linked to class domination – our alt is a prerequisite to solve, Marsh 95

(James L., Professor of Philosophy at Fordham University, “Critique, Action, and Liberation p. 282-283)

Next, we must consider the question concerning the relationship among racism, sexism, and classism. A tendency now exists in leftist circles to talk about racism, sexism, and class domination as distinct, coequal forms of domination. Such a tendency is understandable in the light of the economism and reductionism of much of the Marxist left, but is finally not justified. 50 Three different models are possible here, a vulgar Marxist model that denies any autonomy at all to the sexual or racial domains, the three-sector model mentioned above, and a sophisticated Marxist model that asserts the dominance of class exploitation but allows relative autonomy on lived and ideological levels to the other two spheres. The sophisticated Marxist approach, in my opinion, is the best account. It allows some diversity, specificity, and autonomy between and among spheres. The sophisticated Marxist model thus retains the strengths of the other two while avoiding and overcoming their onesidedness. Why is class domination ultimately more fundamental and important and overriding? It is more universal, extending not only over the United States and Western Europe but also the Third World in Africa, Asia, and South America; not only over women and African-Americans but also most men and whites. Class struggle is the most antagonistic of conflicts – fundamental cooperation is emerging between the sexes and races but not between labor and capital. Racism and sexism in the West and North we are approaching rejecting in principle but not capital. The reign of capitalism up to this point has been nonnegotiable in the West. Capitalism defines the modern in a way that sexism and racism do not. Indeed, sexism and racism are holdovers from prior epochs and, as such, subordinate moments in the capitalistic mode of production. Also, an asymmetry exists between racism and sexism, on the one hand, and capitalism on the other. Progress in overcoming racism and sexism occurs up to the point where that overcoming infringes upon fundamental capitalistic social relations. The fate of Martin Luther King’s civil rights movement when it came North and began to be more openly economic in its orientation is one example; the fate of women professionals asking for salaries equal to men in a context of economic retrenchment is another. Capitalism will transform sexual and racial relations to achieve its goals, but the reverse is generally not true. Capital twists racism and sexism to its own ends, using the former to fragment the working class and the latter, of which American foreign policy in Vietnam and Nixon’s machismo in the Watergate tapes is a dramatic example, to legitimize a tough-minded, quantitative, technocratic, one-dimensional domination. Also, if Habermas is correct, late capitalism has more or less immunized the monopoly sphere of the economy from serious conflict. The result is that conflict has been displaced to other spheres more or less peripheral to this central monopoly sphere. Racism and sexism, then, to an extent are indirectly displaced forms of class domination and colonization, like the contradiction between symbolic interaction and purposive rational action. As such displaced forms, and in their own right as well, they are important and must be fought, but they are not equal in importance to class domination. Racism and sexism serve capital as ideology. If this fact is not recognized, then at a certain point the revolutionary élan of the civil rights and feminist movements is negated. We make the mistake of thinking that an African-American person is fully liberated if he becomes an NFL quarterback and a woman if she becomes an executive on Wall Street. Both movements at that point have simply degenerated into demands for equal participation in the rat race. Another way of putting the same point is to say that capitalism is a process of self-expanding value oriented to the production of surplus value. As such, capitalism, to the extent that it fully comes into its own, will relate racism and sexism to itself and incorporate them in various ways. Racism and sexism are like other holdovers from precapitalist epochs, like rent or interest, which come in fairly late in Marx’s analysis in volume 3 of *Capital*. Capital, because of its thirst for surplus value, has an infinity to it and tends to overcome limits and incorporate them into itself, twisting them to its own ends. In this respect, racism and sexism, without downplaying their tremendous moral evil and the enormous suffering they inflict in their contemporary manifestations, are no different from rent and interest. One does not get at what is specific and essential in capitalist modernity by talking about rent or interest or racism or sexism as such, but by understanding these phenomena as related to and incorporated into this process of capitalist valorization. As a glance at and reflection on the streets of Los Angeles after the 1992 riots shows (see below), capitalized racism is not the same as precapitalist racism. As reflection on the use of women in advertisements to sell products indicates, capitalized sexism is not the same as precapitalist sexism.

#### The alternative is to embrace institutionalized party politics. MALOTT

[Curry Stephenson Malott. “In Defense of Communism Against Critical Pedagogy, Capitalism, and Trump.” *Critical Education 8,* no. 1 (2017).] LHP JW & BT

In her discussion of the International Section of **the Black Panther Party** Kathleen Cleaver (1998), echoing Harry Haywood, notes that the Party understood that, “Black self-determination was not feasible under American imperialist domination” (p. 212). Cleaver (1998) notes that while the BPP’s membership was exclusively Black, their message and **practice was geared more toward the communist ethic of power to the people and the unification of all anti-imperialist movements and workers’ states rather than on the more isolationist practice of Black nationalism and Black Power.** Regarding the revolution in Algeria, which the CIA was concerned would pave the way for rise to power of communists through the National Liberation Front (NLF) (Blum, 2004), Cleaver (1998) notes that, “the Panthers admired the Algerian revolution and considered its victory a powerful example of the ability of oppressed people to attain power over their destiny” (p. 213). **Black Panther Party members would be represented at the Organization of African Unity conferences hosted in Algeria and had visited and established relationships with workers’ states such as Cuba and the DPRK.** The BPP therefore struggled to extend the communist movement in the U.S. which was difficult given the limitations of the CP-USA and the SWP as demonstrated by Marcy (1976). Huey P. Newton was not only the BPP’s co-founder, but he was also its revolutionary theoretician, and, as such, was continuously engaged in the process of developing the Party’s tendency, the influences of which were wide-ranging, including Marxist-Leninism. Newton (1995) would eventually come to adopt what is obviously Lenin’s (1917/2015) framework outlined in The State and Revolution. For example, **Newton** (1995), in a creative twist on Lenin, would argue that U.S. imperialism had negated the conditions for states to exist such as economic and territorial sovereignty. Newton (1995) therefore **argued that the world consisted not of states or nations, but of imperialists, on one hand, and dominated or colonized oppressed communities on the other**. From this point of view Cuba, China, the Soviet Union, and the DPRK were examples of liberated communities. **Oppressed communities within the U.S. such as the Black community, from this perspective, should follow the example of liberated communities adopting their revolutionary goals adapted for the American context. The Panthers therefore argued for a unified struggle of all oppressed communities the world over aimed at destroying imperialism and the capitalist system in general and replacing it with communism.** **Under communism**, in accordance with Lenin’s model, **Newton was adamant that oppressed communities would retain their right to self-determination, realized under the protection of democratic centralism dedicated to fighting the counterrevolutionaries of the capitalist class.** Newton also understood that **racism and all manner of bigotry would also have to be eradicated through education in order for the proletarian state to be able to wither away and for communism to be able to flourish freely.** **The BPP’s first campaign** **was the establishment of a regularized armed patrol targeting the state’s Oakland Police Department** due to their history of terrorizing and murdering members of the Black community, the vast majority of which represented some of the highest concentrations of unskilled, super-exploited workers. The BPP understood that the role of the police was to employ deadly force to create an intimidation-based consent to extreme exploitation. Huey Newton, who has been described as a youth of rare brilliance, at the height of his popularity, commanded the respect and commitment of the African American community across the country, leading to the establishment of BPP chapters from coast to coast**. A fundamental component of why Newton was so dangerous in the eyes of the U.S. bourgeoisie was because he understood that the global proletariat was a great chain, and each conglomeration of workers around the world can be thought of as links in the great chain. What happens to workers in England affects workers and the price of their labor in the U.S.** Lenin applied this insight to unions and the role of the strike. When one shop strikes and wins victories, they affect the average price of labor within the whole branch of industry, and can also inspire workers in the same region to take similar actions, thereby affecting other branches of industry. **Newton**, familiar with the work and tradition of Harry Haywood, **employed this concept in the U.S. to understand how racism was used to push down the price of labor amongst Black and Brown workers, and in turn, their communities, and because all workers are links in the same chain, the overall price of labor within the whole country is suppressed.** **From this view it makes little sense to hold on to colonial structures and pressure more privileged white workers to paternalistically support more oppressed and exploited workers as a moral act because it is far more revolutionary for more privileged workers and less privileged workers to dissolve their class differences through revolutionary struggle as comrades.** This requires an engagement with racial differences within the labor market rather than pretending they do not exist. **The anti-communism of the American Left is so deep-seated that it is uncommon in retrospective discussions of the BPP to acknowledge that they were a Party in the communist sense that stood in solidarity with workers’ states.** For example, as a political prisoner in the U.S., BPP leader George Jackson found inspiration in the political writings of imprisoned Palestinians in Israel (Pierce, 2015). The BPP not only was a descendant of Malcolm X, but they were also following in the communist footsteps of Harry Haywood, adopting much of his analysis and practice. They regularly sent delegations to workers’ states, and routinely distributed Maoist literature at their rallies. Perhaps the internal contradictions of the BPP were too great to overcome, as some commentators suggest. However great their errors were, however, the evidence seems to suggest that the FBI’s COINTELPRO (Counter Intelligence Programs) operations played the most decisive role in the destruction and elimination of the BPP. The same can be said of the SWP and the CP-USA who had been subjected to COINTELPRO operations since the 1940s (Churchill & Vander Wall, 1990). The goal of COINTELPRO was to disrupt, discredit, and neutralize communism and the political Left in general. Churchill and Vander Wall (1990) describe this war as secret because it was. The FBI, for example, would employ agent provocateurs who would infiltrate the ranks of the BPP in order to foment internal dissent within the organization as well as provide authorities with critical intelligence that could be used against the radicals. For example, the FBI would employ convicts as undercover agents to infiltrate groups like the BPP. William O’Neal was such a character who joined the BPP as an undercover FBI agent. O’Neal would eventually work his way up the ranks of the BPP and become Fred Hampton’s personal security guard. Hampton was of interest to the FBI because he was the Chairman of the Chicago chapter of the BPP and a dynamic, influential revolutionary leader who had made great strides in fostering working class solidarity across racial lines. O’Neal seems to have drugged Hampton and provided the FBI and Chicago PD with a floor plan of Hampton’s apartment making it much easier to execute his assassination, which was carried out in 1969 on December 4th at approximately 4:30 AM (Churchill & Vander Wall, 1990). Among the tactics employed by COINTELPRO operatives to neutralize the BPP nationwide included eavesdropping, sending bogus mail, “black propaganda” operations, disinformation or “gray propaganda,” harassment arrests, infiltrators and agent provocateurs, “pseudo gangs,” bad-jacketing, fabrication of evidence, and assassinations (Churchill & Vander Wall, 1990). While most of these tactics require explanations and examples to develop a full understanding, suffice it to say that the FBI’s efforts to destroy the communist movement within America’s Black working class was only limited by the creative deviancy of COINTELPRO agents. At the first Black Radical Tradition conference at Temple University in early January 2016, Mumia Abu-Jamal, phoning in from prison to deliver a keynote presentation, argued that **the FBI’s secret war to exterminate and neutralize the BPP** was designed to not only obliterate them, but to replace them. That is, the **goal was to remove the Black community’s organic leadership and replace it with a puppet leadership no different than the way the imperialist U.S. military has instituted regime changes across the globe**, such as in Iraq and Afghanistan and as is the current goal for Syria. The Black bourgeois leadership class that has emerged in the U.S. might be understood as serving this purpose. **Globally, the Soviet Union, and the communist movement more generally, have suffered the same fate at the hands of the imperialist counterrevolutionaries.** Whether operating within the U.S. through federal and state police agencies or outside the U.S. through the military and the CIA the physical bourgeois assault on the communist horizon has been fundamental. This imperialist thread is also another link in the chain of the global class war. The coalescing of the revolutionary center of gravity with that of the economic center will be the great turning point in…history. **The first truly revolutionary outburst on the social soil of the American continent will light the flames of a new revolutionary conflagration which is sure to envelop the entire globe. It will graphically demonstrate how "East meets West" not by the construction of new and more tortuous artificial, boundaries, but by the revolutionary destruction of all of them. It will be the supreme and ultimate alliance of the great truly progressive classes of the East and West in a final effort to accomplish their own dissolution. This in turn will terminate the first great cycle of man’s development from subman—man—to Communist Man, and set him on the path to new and higher syntheses.** (Marcy, 1950, p. 41) What Marcy describes here began to take place in 1966 with the birth of the Black Panther Party. Rather than realizing its global revolutionary vision, its leaders were murdered, imprisoned and demonized. Despite this and other setbacks, **the ultimate unification of the world’s proletarian masses, united around a shared vision of communism, remains the unrealized potential of the present, capitalist moment.** However, even though it is changing, the communist vision is still stigmatized as incomplete, outdated, or hopelessly Eurocentric. That is, this communist coming-to-be should not be interpreted as the violent imposition of a European conception of being forced onto non-European and indigenous subjectivities. Rather, **communism offers a global economic structure where indigenous subjectivities can be reformulated after centuries of physical, biological and cultural genocide.** The communist traditions’ conception of Oppressed Nations offers a more complete picture of how the sovereignty of the world’s indigenous peoples would be an integral component of a socialist future. Marx’s notion of each according to her ability and each according to her need offers a more philosophical approach to understanding the inclusiveness of a communist ethic. Marcy’s work is crucial because he is absolutely clear that the threat of US imperialism situated in a world forever at war, makes all states dedicate such a large portion of their national productive capacity on the military to render serious efforts for socialist planning nearly impossible. For this reason, Marcy (1950) argues that the center of global capitalist economic power, which is the U.S., must develop into the center of global revolutionary gravity. Marcy therefore suggests that only through the defeat of U.S. imperialism can the unification of the global proletarian class camp be realized. This, perhaps, remains true today. Each day then, Lenin (1917/2015) grows more relevant and more urgent. Ironically enough there is a strong tendency within the U.S. Left, and the educational Left in particular, that argues that the actual communists, communists in China, the former Soviet Union, and the DPRK, are not the real communists, but state capitalists betraying the spirit and intent of Marx. The arrogance of such positions is absurd, even taking into consideration the imperfections of real existing communism. **Given the anti-communist nature of U.S. society, I believe that other potential communists, people like myself who had been involved in Marxism and/or critical pedagogy for decades, might struggle with the necessary solidarity with the aforementioned communist states. This is important because members of communist parties cannot pick and choose which aspects of the Party’s platform to support and defend. Party members, correctly in my view, must support and defend the entire platform.** To clarify what a communist Party program entails I will briefly turn to the PSL as an example. The purpose here is not to provide a complete overview, but to spark the reader’s interest.

**particular position. But comradeship doesn’t glorify difference over unity, which often results in inaction and provides all sorts of excuses for not getting involved in the work of organizing and agitating.**
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