## 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must only defend that states ought to ban lethal autonomous weapons

#### 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

#### States are governments

MCRDS ‘33 (Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States) <https://www.jus.uio.no/english/services/library/treaties/01/1-02/rights-duties-states.xml> EE

The state as a person of international law should possess the following qualifications:

a. a permanent population;

b. a defined territory;

c. government; and

d. capacity to enter into relations with the other states.

#### Bans are legal prohibitions

MW n.d. “ban” Merriam Webster. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/ban> TG

: legal or formal prohibition

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Fairness – post facto topic adjustment structurally favors the aff by manipulating the balance of prep. They can specialize in 1 area of literature for 4 years which gives them a huge edge over people switching topics every 2 months – this crushes clash because all neg prep is based on the rez as a stable stasis point and they create a structural disincentive to do research – we lose 90% of negative ground while the aff still gets the perm which makes being neg impossible.

#### 2] SSD is good – it forces debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives. Non-T affs allow individuals to establish their own metrics for what they want to debate leading to ideological dogmatism – our argument is that the process of defending and answering proposals is an benefit of engaging the topic.

#### 4] TVA – a] Defend implemntation and win the ROTB o/w

#### The impact is fairness—a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game and some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity, b] probability – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but it can rectify skews which means the only impact to a ballot is fairness and deciding who wins, c] it internal link turns every impact – a limited topic promotes in-depth research and engagement which is necessary to access all of their education

#### 1] Use competing interps – topicality is question of models of debate which they should have to proactively justify and we’ll win reasonability links to our offense.

#### 2] Drop the debater because dropping the arg is severance which moots 7 minutes of 1nc offense

#### 3] No rvis—it’s your burden to be fair and T—same reason you don’t win for answering inherency or putting defense on a disad.

#### 4] They can’t weigh the case—lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume false—they’re also only winning case because we couldn’t engage with it

#### 5] No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative.

#### 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.

## 2

#### Interpretation—the aff must disclose the plan text, framework, and advantage area 30 minutes before the round.

#### Violation—they don’t, check ss (might need to change focus to see it)

Graphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### Prep and clash—two internal links—a) neg prep—4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics—30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply to cut and research their applications to the affirmative

#### c/a fairness. Education is a voter since it’s the reasons school fund debate.

## 3

#### 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. 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.

#### The role of the ballot is to embrace the politics of comradery.

Ford and Mallott Wubbena, Zane C. "Becoming Through Revolutionary Pedagogy: An Interview with Curry Malott and Derek R. Ford." *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies (JCEPS)* 14, no. 1 (2016).

Indeed, our chapter on Ferguson deals explicitly with the ontology or the nature of reality within the social universe of capital by situating the police killings of Michael Brown, Freddie Gray, and countless others, within the terrorist energy of capital itself. That is, **the states sanctioned murder of Black lives is best understood within the tendency of capital to work labour to death unless regulated or slowed down by proletarian resistance.** Marx’s detailed study of capital’s general law of accumulation allows **the communist pedagogue to create the knowledge needed to enact a revolutionary practice.** The critical pedagogue, especially the more privileged white critical pedagogue is an ally of the super-oppressed, the excluded, and the gentrified. **The ally assumes the more privileged worker represents the height of possibility. The communist pedagogue, on the other hand, understands their place within the nature of capitalist reality as a comrade**. **The notion of a comrade is important to a communist pedagogy because a comrade cannot exist outside of organized resistance—resistance against capitalism and its ideological apparatuses such as white supremacy. The comrade and the communist party from which her and his existence depends, is an ontological necessity of the communist pedagogy of becoming** advanced throughout our book**. It is Marx’s critique of political economy that allows us to understand the role of white supremacy, and its consequence of creating monumental differences in the life experiences and expectations of white versus Black workers, as central to capital’s ability to continue to function as such—as the exploiter of labour power. Marx, in other words, is fundamental for developing a thorough understanding of capital’s cynical recklessness and the routine murder of Black lives**. Our pedagogy of becoming draws on Marx providing us with a way out. That is, a way to see a communist future immanent within the contradictions of the capitalist present. DF**: The move from ally to comrade is an important one for us. A comrade is a co-conspirator, one who organizes and shares in the same fate as others while understanding their particular subject position within the totality and acting from that 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.**

## 4

#### Vote neg on presumption:

#### 1] The aff has no impact expect for themselves which means its non-unique – if their model of debate allows anyone to decide what the aff should be then anyone could decide what the aff is.

#### 2] The aff isn’t a shift from the status squo – its only about what’s good for them but we don’t know if that’s a shift which means there’s no unique reason the aff does anything.

#### It flows neg:

#### A] We start with premise that things are false. This is why we don’t believe conspiracy theories are true. This means the aff has to prove it is true before assuming that is it.

#### B] It’s more likely that statement will be false than true – there’s a bunch of ways to prove something false, but only 1 way to prove that it’s true (only way to prove sky is blue if its actually blue; but bunch of ways to prove its false – i.e. could be yellow, purple, red, green).

### Case

#### Framing issue – a 1% risk of defense to their ontology arguments means you vote NEG --- it’s like Pasqual’s Wager – if they’re right about their constitutivism claims, then things can’t get worse and *there’s no disad to trying*, but if they’re wrong then they’ve foreclosed meaningful institutional changes to address violence

#### Their criticisms of “futurity” actively do violence to oppressed groups. Futurity helps, and doesn’t ignore, present struggles.

Manalansan 15 [Martin F. Manalansan IV - Associate Professor of all of the following at The University of Illinois: Gender and Women's Studies, Asian American Studies, Anthropology, Latin American and Caribbean Studies, LAS Global Studies, Center for East Asian and Pacific Studies, and Center for Global Studies. The author holds a Ph.D. in Social Anthropology from The University of Rochester and studied philosophy, Asian Studies and anthropology at the University of the Philippines. As part of claims about futurity, the author references lived excahnges with queer trans women of color. The author also references concurring professional exchanges with David L. Eng, Professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania; Gayatri Gopinath, who is an associate professor of Social and Cultural Analysis and director of Asian/Pacific/American Studies at New York University.; Roderick Ferguson, who is a professor of African American and Gender and Women's Studies in the African American Studies Department at the University of Illinois, Chicago; Chandan Reddy, who is an Associate Professor of Gender, Women & Sexuality Studies at the University of Washington; and the late José Esteban Muñoz, was an American academic in the fields of performance studies, visual culture, queer theory, cultural studies, and critical theory; “A Question from Bruno Latour” This article is part of the series Queer Futures. Fieldsights - Theorizing the Contemporary, Cultural Anthropology Online, July 21, 2015 - https://www.culanth.org/fieldsights/703-a-question-from-bruno-latour]

**My response** to the question of “no future**” comes from my encounters, engagements, and conversations** with colleagues **under the aegis of queer-of-color critique**, scholars like David Eng, Gayatri Gopinath, Roderick Ferguson, Chandan Reddy, and the late José Esteban Muñoz, among others. **We appreciate** the renegade antireproductive stance of the “no future” **camp, which states that we should not subscribe to a future** that is **entrenched in heteropatriarchal dreams** of marriage and procreation. However, there was a general sense among us that the issue of “no future” comes from a vantage point and a comfortable perch of privilege. **As a scholar** invested and immersed in the plight of queers of color, futurity is not just a possibility but a necessity. To paraphrase my queer-of-color critique colleagues, we cannot not think of a future—it is the very fuel of existence, the pivot that animates and propels energies, performances, **feelings, and other bodily capacities. The promise** and peril **of queer**, **both as a stance and as a field of study**, is precisely in its anticipatory and hopeful dimensions. **Queer is constituted by a yearning and a longing for something better than what is here right now**. It is, as Muñoz would say, a horizon that we are drawn to and which is not yet here. Consider the group of undocumented immigrant queers of color in New York City whose lives I have been following for years. Dwelling in cramped domiciles and working in contingent jobs, there is very little to witness in their lives that suggests a kind of gay/lesbian triumphalism or the bright markers of the new normal. In fact, **they live in precarious conditions but**—a very important caveat—**they live** in **moments that showcase** fleeting gestures and images of **fabulosity** set amidst the squalor and mess of their lives. **These moments**, while fleeting, **provide some way** for them to think of **another day**, giving them a brief glimpse of a time and a place where there are sequined gowns, plush salons, and many sparkling things. **While this might be called naïve hopefulness**, thinking of a future that is an alternative to the present is a potent way to think beyond and against the status quo—**to plant the seed for** social **transformation.** **In other words, there is a political potential to queer futurity.** Or, to put it another way, **we need to complicate and unravel the negativity inherent in the “no future” stance and to be open to the various alternative ways** a future or **futures can be imagined, particularly by those in the margins.** Otherwise, we can all just pack our bags, go back home, put on some makeup, close the door, and hide under the bedcovers.

#### Futurism is straight-up good – the alternative has zero emancipatory potential – try or die on the aff.

**Bevernage 15** [October 2015, Berber, Assistant Professor of History at the University of Ghent, “The Past is Evil/Evil is Past: On Retrospective Politics, Philosophy of History, and Temporal Manichaeism,” History and Theory Volume 54, Issue 3, pages 333–352]

Torpey is certainly not the only intellectual expressing these worries. According to historian Pieter Lagrou, **“our contemporary societies, for lack of future projects, shrink into a ‘passeist’ culture.”**12 In European public discourse, he argues, **the focus on** crimes of **the** distant **past** has become so strong that it tends to **marginalize claims of victims of contemporary crimes** and human rights violations. Therefore, Lagrou argues, “a commemorative discourse of victimhood is very much the opposite of a constructive and dynamic engagement with the present, but rather a paralyzing regression of democratic debate.”13 Lagrou's argument closely resembles many others that turn against retrospective politics and “victim culture” such as Ian Buruma's warning about the peril of minorities defining themselves exclusively as historical victims and engaging in an “Olympics of suffering”14 and Charles Maier's claims about a “surfeit of memory.”15

These warnings about the perils of a retrospective politics outweighing or even banning politics directed at contemporary injustices or striving for a more just future should be taken seriously. Yet the alternative of an exclusively present- or future-oriented politics disregarding all historical injustice is not desirable either. Contemporary injustice often manifests itself in the form of structural repetition or continuity of injustices with a long history. Moreover, totalitarian versions of progressivist politics have frequently abused the idea of a struggle for a more just future in order to justify past and present suffering. It could even be argued that the rise of dominant restrospective politics has been initiated partly on the basis of disillusionment with the exculpatory mechanisms of progressivist ideology.16 Some indeed claim that much of present-day retrospective politics and the “setting straight” of historical injustices would be unnecessary had totalitarian progressivist politics focused less exclusively on the bright future and shown more sensitivity to the contemporary suffering of its day. This claim certainly makes sense if one thinks of extreme examples such as Stalin's five-year plans and Mao's Great Leap Forward. Yet, as Matthias Frisch rightly argues, the risk of the justification of past and present suffering lurks around the corner wherever progressive logics of history or promises of bright and just futures are not counterbalanced by reflective forms of remembrance.17

Therefore, we should resist dualist thinking that forces us to choose between restitution for historical injustices and struggle for justice in the present or the future. **Rather, we should look for types of retrospective politics that do not oppose but complement** or reinforce the emancipatory and utopian elements in present- and future-directed politics—**and** the other way around: **present- and future-oriented politics that do not forget about historical injustices**.

In this paper I want to contribute to this goal by focusing on the issue of retrospective politics and by analyzing how one can differentiate emancipatory or even utopian types of retrospective politics from retrospective politics that I classify here as anti-utopian. I argue that the **currently dominant** strands of **retrospective politics** indeed do **tend to** be anti-utopian and **have a very limited emancipatory potential**. Moreover, I claim that currently dominant retrospective politics **do not radically break with** several of the **exculpatory intellectual mechanisms** that are typically **associated with progressivist politics but actually modify and sometimes even radicalize them**. In that restricted sense, and only in this sense, it can be argued that currently **dominant retrospective politics do not represent a fundamentally new way of dealing with historical evil and the ethics of responsibility**.

My perspective is not a pessimistic one, however. Besides the currently dominant retrospective politics, **there exist** other strands **of retrospective politics that do have emancipatory** or even utopian **features** and that do not force us to choose between restitution for historical injustices and struggle for justice in the present or the future. Anti-utopianism and **ethical “passeism,”** I argue, **are not inherent or necessary features** of all retrospective politics but rather result from a specific, underlying type of historical thought or philosophy of history18 that treats the relation between past, present, and future in antinomic terms and prevents us from understanding “transtemporal” injustices and responsibilities. Sometimes this type of historical thought indeed stimulates a moralistic stance in which the past is charged with the worst of all evil, while the present becomes morally discharged by simple comparison. The latter type of “temporal Manichaeism” can be highly problematic, I argue, because it not only posits that the “past is evil” but also tends to turn this reasoning around and stimulates the wishful thought that “evil is past.”

#### Psychoanalysis is infinitely regressive, not falsifiable, and too abstract

Gordon 1 – Paul Gordon, accomplished psychotherapist, “Psychoanalysis and Racism: The Politics of Defeat,” RACE & CLASS v. 42 n. 4, 2001, pp. 17-34.

But in the thirty years since Kovel wrote, that attempt to relate mind and society has been fractured by the advent of postmodernism, with its subsumption of the material/historical, of notions of cause and effect, to what is transitory, contingent, free-¯oating, evanescent. Psychoanalysis, by stepping into the vacuum left by the abandonment of all metanarrative, has tended to put mind over society. This is particularly noticeable in the work of the Centre for New Ethnicities Research at the University of East London, which purports to straddle the worlds of the academy and action by developing projects for the local community and within education generally.28 But**,** in marrying **psychoanalysis** and postmodernism, on the basis of claiming to be both scholarly and action oriented, it **degrades scholarship and** undermines **action, and ends in discourse analysis a language** in which metaphor passes for reality**.** Cohen's work unavoidably raises the question of the status of psycho- analysis as a social or political theory, as distinct from a clinical one. Can psychoanalysis, in other words, apply to the social world of groups, institutions, nations, states and cultures in the way that it does, or at least may do, to individuals? Certainly there is now a considerable body of literature and a plethora of academic courses, and so on, claim- ing that psychoanalysis is a social theory. And, of course, in popular discourse, it is now a commonplace to hear of nations and societies spoken of in personalised ways. Thus `truth commissions' and the like, which have become so common in the past decade in countries which have undergone turbulent change, are seen as forms of national therapy or catharsis, even if this is far from being their purpose. Nevertheless, the question remains: does it make sense, as Michael Ignatieff puts it, to speak of nations having psyches the way that individuals do? `Can a nation's past make people ill as we know repressed memories sometimes make individuals ill? . . . Can we speak of nations ``working through'' a civil war or an atrocity as we speak of individuals working through a traumatic memory or event?' 47 The problem withthe application ofpsychoanalysis to social institutionsis that **there can be no testing** of the claims made. If someone says, for instance, that nationalism is a form of looking for and seeking to replace the body of the mother one has lost, or that the popular appeal of a particular kind of story echoes the pattern of our earliest relationship to the maternal breast, how can this be proved? The **pioneers** of psychoanalysis, from Freud onwards, all **derived their ideas in the context of** theirwork with individual **patients** and their ideas can be examined in the everyday laboratory of the therapeutic encounter where the validity of an interpretation, for example, is a matter for dialogue between therapist and patient**. Outside** of the consulting room, **there can be no such verification process**, and the further one moves from the individual **patient,** the less purchase psychoanalyticideas canhave**.** Outside the therapeutic encounter, anything and everything can be true, psychoanalytically speaking. Butif everything is true, then nothing can be false and therefore nothing can be true. An example of Cohen's method is to be found in his 1993 working paper, `Home rules', subtitled `Some re¯ections on racism and nation- alism in everyday life'. Here Cohen talks about taking a `particular line of thought for a walk'. While there is nothing wrong with taking a line of thought for a walk, such an exercise is not necessarily the same as thinking. One of the problems with Cohen's approach is that a kind of free association, mixed with deconstruction, leads not to analysis, not even to psychoanalysis, but to . . . well, just more free association, an endless, indeed one might say pointless, play on words. This approach may well throw up some interesting associations along the way, connections one had never thought of but it is not to be confused with political analysis. In `Home rules', anything and everything to do with `home' can and does ®nd a place here and, as I indicated above, even the popular ®lm Home Alone is pressed into service as a story about `racial' invasion.

## 2NR

### Overview

This debate is a method debate – if we prove that

Our kritik takes the position of the Comrade- proletarian resistance to the capitalist state is the best method to address the aff’s harms [insert more specific description of that harm]. Organized resistance against capitalism and thereby white supremacy [or the patriarchy, or heteronormativity, or ableism] is the only true revolutionary solution- that’s our Ford evidence. Think about white laborers- racial politics in America have driven working class white laborers further into a self-contradictory and hateful ideology born from ethnic differences, which turns the aff. Voting for Trump doesn’t help the white working class; it hurts them- no healthcare, no retirement plans, and no economic growth.

The real solution must come from a comradeship between alienated workers to revolt against the system that enables all forms of oppression. In the 1940s, segregation and racist science were used as a tool to suppress working class Black and White Americans and divide them along color lines, so that the truly powerful bourgeoise could subdue resistance. That proves our kritik controls the internal link to the aff- race wars are born out of larger societal inequality that makes their reductive theory of power appealing. Only institutionalized party politics can solve the question of why their impacts occur in the first place.

### Link

Extend our link analysis- the aff’s fragmented politics is a retreat into racial, sexist, or ableist divisions that are entirely unthreatening to the bourgeoise- why do you think Pepsi, Google, Facebook, and every major corporation has expressed support for the Black Lives matter movement? Or Elon Musk can tweet all day about pronouns and embracing racial struggle while Tesla workers are overworked on $10 an hour and sustain life-threatening injuries? The aff’s focus on melancholy is a coping strategy that gets absorbed by larger class structures. This is not a link of omission- our argument is that the aff’s performative activism is exactly what obfuscates the power of class relations and is a symptom of exactly what the bourgeoise want. That dooms their movement from ever succeeding and is an independent DA to the aff.

### Alt

Extend the alt- institutional party politics- I’ve already given you an analysis, but our Malott evidence is great on this issue- the black Panthers were dangerous because of their fundamentally Marxist roots. That proves our alt solves the case since we address the true cause of oppression. c/a Here that it’s the root cause.

### Perms

No perms- if they don’t win a perm, there’s no way they can win this debate- they’ll say we need to include their analysis but:

1. It’s a methods debate, which is a question of starting points- you can’t start from two separate ideologies
2. Skews my strategy- I’ve generated links to fundamental assumptions of the aff which means perms are severing out of their dedication to a racial analysis
3. Risk of a link o/w- if there’s any chance their theory of power makes true revolution impossible, it dooms the alternative and will result in the status quo, where dominant corporations absorb Leftist ideas.
4. Backburner DA- their movement always sidelines class issues which means we never really address the actual problem.
5. Our alt is better on it’s own- we are intersectional- read our alt evidence- but it’s a question of what we ground our fundamental movement on- real solutions based on class struggles in America and not a decadent obsession with racial difference.
6. THE PERM MAKES THE ALT FAIL – it is historically proven – the blank panther party

* Answer their args top down
* Key point to win here is that they don’t get a perm- class + race is a compelling arg, so try to win this procedurally

Make sure you answer the actual aff evidence and explain strategically wh

### Cant Weigh Case

#### You can’t weigh case

#### 1] Their only winning their TOP and Case Claims because we couldn’t engage, had to spend time on T, and had no prep to to read. This takes out every one of ur args responding to why you can weigh case because they are predicated on you winning case

#### No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative

### Debate Good

#### Debate is fundamentally good for making change – it creates real world thinkers that can change the world and them engaging in the debate space fundamentally disproves their arguments b/c if there was no value that we got out of debate, then they wouldn’t be here. Also outweighs:

#### A] Privilege: Even if they can win that debate is bad in general they can’t tell someone else, like an 8th grade novice that debate is bad and shouldn’t engage in it b/c their standpoint is privileged and furthers capitalism – they’ve already gotten to experience it and deem that it’s bad, but cannot dogmatically tell others that they don’t have the right to determine that for themselves.

#### B] Double-bind: If debate is bad, they shouldn’t even care about winning the ballot – even if they prove a reason they should win, that just means you vote neg because it proves that debate is redeemable and can be changed.

#### C] Debate good – gives us access to critical literature like the aff – if they participate in debate they wouldn’t know about any of the pedagogy.

#### D] Debate good -

### TFW – Fairness + Debate Good

#### Overview: 2 big picture question – fairness and whether debate is good. As long as I win any risk of link to either, auto-vote neg.

#### Fairness is a voter an comes first: Extend that fairness is constitutive to debate – it functions the same way how disclosure, flipping before round, and following speech times works. This means that their ROB is only a contingency on fairness and I control the internal link to their net benefits, because if rounds were not structured fairly, we’d never be able to get any of the educational benefits that their model of debate advocates for.

#### Fairness outweighs on:

#### A] Decision-making: every argument they make concedes to the validity of fairness i.e. that the judge will make a fair decision based on the arguments presented. This means if they win fairness bad vote neg on presumption because you have 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.

#### This essentially puts them into a double-bind b/c either they want the ballot and prove all of our arguments about fairness true because there is intrinsic value to winning, or they’re only here for the discussion in which case vote neg but recognize the educational value of the aff.

#### Fairness also operates on a sliding scale – even if there’s some sorts of unfairness doesn’t mean that we shoulnd’t try our best to reduce them.

#### Debate is fundamentally good for making change – it creates real world thinkers that can change the world and them engaging in the debate space fundamentally disproves their arguments b/c if there was no value that we got out of debate, then they wouldn’t be here. Also outweighs:

#### A] Privilege: Even if they can win that debate is bad in general they can’t tell someone else, like an 8th grade novice that debate is bad and shouldn’t engage in it b/c their standpoint is privileged and furthers capitalism – they’ve already gotten to experience it and deem that it’s bad, but cannot dogmatically tell others that they don’t have the right to determine that for themselves.

#### B] Double-bind: If debate is bad, they shouldn’t even care about winning the ballot – even if they prove a reason they should win, that just means you vote neg because it proves that debate is redeemable and can be changed.

### TFW – Interp Proper

#### Vote negative for the best models of debate – my interpretation is that the resolution should determine the division of affirmative and negative ground because it is the only stasis point that comes before us debating. In this resolution, resolved means a policy action and the United States thus should implement a policy action that ends economic sanctions. Extend the violation that they don’t advocate for any policy action of removing economic sanctions.

#### My interp is key to limits since rejections of the resolution allows the aff functionally limitless ground since can combine any of their kritikal literature with methods to reject the resolution making it functionally impossible to negate because I’ll never know what the aff is. That outweighs and is an independent voter for accessibility since if ppl don’t have to defend the resolution, big-schools will just make super obscure affs that no one is prepped to beat and small schools are left in the dark which worsens already existing structural disparities. That also turns the case because it means your aff makes debate into a super violent space IRL.

#### Extend that switch-side debate solves – they could’ve just read their position on the neg which means

#### Extend the engagement standard and the Mott 18 card which shows that dialogue must be on equal ground or else it recreates the same power structures that you criticize – prefer evidence over their analytics b/c is shows empirically that their Aff is violent – that also functions as a TURN under their own ROB b/c it means they can’t solve for any of the harms they talk about.