# 1NC Zion

## 1NC – Off

### 1NC – 1

#### The neoliberal system feeds on transgression and their supposed black aesthetic and symbolic rupture. The aff’s politics makes subjects enjoy and repeat endlessly the presentation and supposed overcoming of their pain as the fuel of exploitative systems of domination - it creates feedback loops which fuel interventionism and the dead-end politics of debate

James 15 (Robin James- Associate Professor of Philosophy @ UNC Charlotte, Resilience & Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism, Publisher: Zero Books, p. 97-103)//TR |rc Harun|

Neoliberalism upgrades regulatory systems into deregulated ones. In economics, this means controlling the market’s background conditions, rather than market activities themselves; market activities thus appear to operate “free” of direction98 For example, instead of instituting a single-payer health care system, one that ostensibly gives individuals no “choice,” the Affordable Care Act (aka “Obamacare”) allows people to “choose” among a highly circumscribed range of options (huge corporation A versus huge corporation B)—superficially this appears as ‘free choice,’ when in effect background constraints are basically a mode of soft coercion. In the same way that it restructures political economy, neoliberalism revamps the basic organizing principles of art. Regulatory, cinematic practices of objectification, fragmentation, and disavowal have been upgraded into deregulatory post-cinematic resilience. Section (a) addresses the difference between the male gaze/controlling images and deregulated MRWaSP visualization- Objectification and fragmentation are techniques with which the male gaze and controlling images regulate and exclude femininity in order to control the negative effects of damage. Compositional processes, on the other hand, are deregulatory techniques for producing feminized damage as a resource. Section (b) addresses the difference between the kinds of aesthetic pleasure produced by gazing/controlling, on the one hand, and visualization, on the other. Whereas the “visual pleasure” (a.k.a. “scopophilia”) in the title of Mulvey’s article on the male gaze comes from conquering feminized damage, the pleasure in post-cinematic media comes from resiliently overcoming damage—that Is, from making oneself into something like Tiqqun’s “Young Girl” (the ideal form of neoliberal human capital). 1. Compositional Processes: “Post-cinematic” media upgrades the logic and methods of classical narrative (tonality, the novel, Hollywood cinema) and modernist counter-narrative (like New Wave cinema or hip hop), reworking them into deregulatory practices like open works or generative processes. Regulatory techniques (like narrative, cinematic suturing, the male gaze, and controlling images) damage women for the purpose of excluding them from the undamaged work of art. Radical modernist and post-modernist works recuperate feminized damage as a means of deconstructrng regulations (i.e., as a means of anti-art practice). In both modernist and post-modernist aesthetics, there is a preestablished formal logic, and femininity is instrumentalized in both constructing and deconstructing that logic” Deregulatory techniques, on the other hand, liberate feminized damage so it can be directly put to work. Deregulatory works are organized so they don’t seem organized. Instead of following a pre-given formula, like narrative or tonality, visualization reveals the emergent order in an otherwise an-archic swarm. Structure “can only be apprehended bit by bit…and from moment to moment, through the constructive action of ‘linking’ one space to another” (Shaviro PCA 37). I call this technique “compositional process,” because it shares aspects of Bruno Latour’s concept of “compositionism” and composer Steve Reich’s notion of “gradual process.” “Musical processes,” Reich explains, “determine all the note-to note (sound-to-sound) details and the overall form simultaneously. (Think of a round or infinite canon.) (Reich, 34). Or, as Latour puts It the “micro- and macrocosm are now literally and not simply symbolically connected (HL 381). Unlike improvisation, which happens on top of a strictly regular format architecture (e.g.. a soloist Improvising over fixed chord changes and phrase-lengths), this “just-in-time’ production” (Shaviro PCA 53) is a method of generating emergent order: the moment-to- moment details unfold simultaneously with and as the overarching structure. Compositional processes are flexible and irregular. ‘Looseness or arbitrariness...Is in fact the very point” (Shaviro PCA 74) of structures designed to generate visual (or sonic) damage. “Engineered so as to maximize shock” (Shaviro PCA 80), compositional processes are designed to cultivate aesthetic damage, which manifests, for example, as fragmentation, disjunction, lack of narrative/tonal center or goal, and lack of regular meter or temporality. As I discussed in chapter one, deregulated works can be “entirely incoherent, yet immediately legible to anyone” (Shaviro PC 80) because the superficial chaos is , intentionally produced and controlled for by the work’s immanent structure. If regulation limits and prohibits irrationality and incoherence, deregulated visualization leverages and exploits It. “Things don’t need to harmonize, or fit together” (PCA 53) because deregulatory MRWaSP visualization explicitly affirms the damage that harmonization or integration is designed to obscure. In this way, MRWaSP visualization naturalizes feminized fragmentation, objectification, and incoherence. MRWaSP visualization “controls” feminized damage by amplifying it and putting it to work generating resilient aesthetic/human capital. So, following Shaviro’s analysis, if the cinematic gaze controls by organizing its visual field into active/passive, motion/stillness, subject/object hierarchies, MRWaSP visualization uses compositional processes. “modulation,” and “feedback” to do its work (PCA 16). 101 Sonic and visual “events, like a sample or a post-production effect. “interpenetrate and feed back upon one another” (Shaviro PCA 52) so that a “film’s sheer density of Incidents and references baffles our efforts to ‘translate’ what we see and hear into something more abstract, more metaphorically palatable and easily manageable” (Shaviro 78; emphasis mine). It’s like a DDOS for our eyes, ears, nerves, and brains. We’re given more sensory data than we’re capable of processing, so we have difficulty separating the signal from the noise. As Shaviro puts it, “the headlong rush...is all” (80). Dissonance, then, is the effect of overwhelming “noise” —either literal noise, or biopolitical/statistical “noise.” Being overwhelmed by something too big and/or strong to resist is a feature of conventional femininity and feminine sexuality (especially in rape culture); for example, there’s the fantasy of being swept off one’s Feet. Traditional European aesthetics strive to contain and domesticate overwhelming affects and sensations. For example, Kant’s feeling of sublimity is, as Christine Battersby and other feminist aestheticians have argued, a masculine conquest of potentially overwhelming, and thus feminizing, feelings.102 MRWaSP visualization, on the other hand, treats the experience of overwhelming sensory-affective experience as a net gain, not as a loss of control (because, in a deregulatory scheme, there’s no ‘control’ to lose). Feminized damage is now a resource, not a deficiency, a form of subjectivity and value-production, not a type of objectification and aesthetic/economic devaluation. Or rather, feminized damage is a resource and not a type of devaluation and desubjectification for otherwise privileged women, like professional white women who can “Lean In.” Damage that isn’t explicitly situated in a LIO narrative is treated as evidence of pathology. Persistent, unproblematized objectification are attributes of supposedly “voiceless” or “invisible” women who need to be saved and spoken for. MRWaSP visualization separates out resilient populations who can bounce back from sensory overload from precarious ones who can’t. MRWSSP visualization banks on sensory overload. This overload is the aesthetic equivalent of the “shock” in what Naomi Klein calls “shock capitalism”.’° ‘A variation on Machiavelli’s advice that injuries should be inflicted ‘all at once” (7; emphasis ,mine), Klein explains, this idea of crisis or shock is the foundation for contemporary practices of (re)development, privatization, arid investment. In post-cinematic media, shock- doctrine methods generate a surplus of pleasure. Post-cinematic media are designed to generate, amplify, and transmit damage so that we can hear, see and feel the damage we (or the characters we watch and identify with) ought to overcome. All that damage “makes sense” to audiences as fodder for a spectacular therapeutic narrative: Look, it must be overcome Whereas the male gaze and controlling images create the effect of coherence by blurring ‘damaged’ (feminized, blackened) elements out of focus, deregulated MRWaSP visualization puts damage at the center of our attention. The damage doesn’t just make sense, it feels good. ii. Pleasure: Without the security of universal structures, one must resiliently craft functional resource out of any and everything. Performing or viewing compositional processes, you never know what you’re going to get, what material you’ll have to work with, or what output performers will present you with. Thus, performers and audiences need to be flexible—they must turn damage (incoherence, accidents, chance occurrences) into a performative resource and/or listening pleasure.10’ Resilient subjects take pleasure in “feeling the burn,” as the saying goes. For example, Taio Cruz’s 2O12 single “Hangover” treats a hangover as something to gleefuly celebrate, evidence of one’s “work hard/play hard” cred. Don’t get me wrong—hangovers hurt. But resilient subjects savor and crave that damage like vampires do human blood, because it’s their fuel. It feels good to avow damage as what can be or has been overcome. Resilience discourse habituates us to affirm and avow our damage. In the same way that Pavlov’s dog is just following his programming when he or she drools upon hearing the sound of a bell (because he or she has been trained to associate that sound with the pleasure of eating), we’re just following our programming when we find aesthetic pleasure in being overwhelmed by dissonance—we’ve learned to associate that feeling of overwhelming damage with the pleasure of, feeding our human capital, our “selves,” if you will. This is a very different model of pleasure than the pleasure in gazing or controlling, which comes from avoiding damage. “Visual pleasure” as Muhey argues, is generated by the narrative devices that resolve or obscure challenges to the subject’s autonomy. Failing to acknowledge the work done by the camera allows the protagonist/gazer to feel more powerful and autonomous than he is. Subject/object binaries have the same effect, allowing the gazing subject to feel like he isn’t also the fragmented object of someone else’s gaze. The gaze is the means by which a classically liberal, modernist subject identifies and abjects objects from himself, as subject, and from society. Because the exclusion of the object is what constitutes the subject as such, this exclusion—in, for example, the form of resolution or closure—is invested as the site of traditional aesthetic pleasure. Modernist avant-gardes, on the other hand, produce “damaged goods,” works or subjects whose imperfections critique and oppose dominant aesthetic and ethical norms. In post- or critical-modernity, transgression of exclusionary boundaries is the site of aesthetic pleasure. Examples of this include Dada artists’ exquisite corpses, Afro-modernist antiphony, and feminist art’s use of ugliness and disgust (e.g., in Orlan’s work). Such practices transgress norms of coherence, homophony, and beauty as a means to critique them. This is why Mulvey argues that feminist film and film criticism ought to “make way for a total negation of the ease and plenitude of the narrative fiction film” (835). MRWaSP visualization avows and normalizes visual, compositional, and affective damage, recycling modernist transgression into raw materials for the neoliberal culture industry. Damage isn’t something subjects avoid, or which subjects do to objects — damage is the means and medium of subectification. Post- cinematic looking is a feedback loop in which we make visible, for others, our own self-objectification. To be recognized as a resilient subject, one must be seen by others as actively monitoring oneself (e.g., through quantified self practices like diet or exercise tracking). Because these practices collapse Image” and “bearer of the look” into the same role, conventional subject/object distinctions don’t make much sense. So, instead of producing conventionally gendered male gazers and feminine objects, post-cinematic visualization produces both resilient MRWaSP visualizers and pathological, toxic black holes (i.e., vampiric drains of light, energy, momentum, and so on). The next section focuses on this toxicity and the role of non-resilient women of color in MRWaSP visualization.

#### The affirmative allows us to buy into a new adventure which decks collective struggle.

Price 15 (Zachary Price, PhD. The Postcolonialist. Economies of Enjoyment and Terror in Django Unchained and 12 Years a Slave. ISSN: 2330-510X, December 2014fiJanuary 2015, Vol. 2, Number 2. http:fifipostcolonialist.comficulturefieconomies-enjoyment-terror-django-unchained-12-years-slavefi) |rc Harun|

As scholars such as Eithne Quinn and Brandi Catanese have demonstrated, colorblind ideology has shaped labor markets from the Antebellum South to current day Hollywood. Slavery, as a production of the African American subject object, should be considered in terms of the stylized behaviors of Black bodies to occupy a certain social role as well as the economic imperatives that performance opens up in relation to those bodies at different moments in history. Django and 12 Years are representative of sources of labor in which unions, guilds, agencies, and a multi-million dollar Hollywood network are a part of an economic order that has historically marginalized Black labor. These diegetic experiences produce a paradoxical tension between Black performance within the Hollywood apparatus that affords employment to a small percentage of Black talent (actors, writers, directors, and producers)[5] and an almost return to plantation-like ghettoization through the corralling of laborers and objects within an industry which continues to propagate whiteness as the norm[6] reaping tremendous profit in the process.[7]

Working through the effects of aesthetic and efficacious performance elucidates how race continues to structure relationships of power and how at “both institutional and cultural levels, performance has become the medium through which American anxieties about race (and in particular, blackness) are pondered, articulated, managed, and challenged” (Catanese 3). Ejiofor’s performance of Northrup as a free man, skilled laborer, violinist, and slave means survival as an actor within the Hollywood industry just as performance of labor meant survival for Northrup.[8] The desire and necessity to perform was at once a paradox for Northrup, for it was the offer from Merrill Brown and Abraham Hamilton (Northrup’s captors) to perform in their traveling circus company which lead to his kidnap. As Northrup wrote, “They also remarked that they had found much difficulty in procuring music for their entertainments, and that if I would accompany them as far as New-York, they would give me one dollar for each day’s services, and three dollars in addition for every night I played at their performances, besides sufficient to pay the expenses of my return from New-York to Saratoga” (Northrup 13). The slavers veil their nefarious intentions with promises of financial return just as Schultz’s relationship to Django was driven by the profit motive.

The Black body in these films is still a fungible object despite Tarantino and McQueen laboring to convince otherwise. These films ask us to suspend our disbelief and buy into, as Tarantino purports in an interview with Henry Louis Gates, “a different place…an unfathomable place… not just…a historical story play…but actually…a genre story… an exciting adventure” (Gates 50). Tarantino gets away with this by conflating a Western genre story (civil society) with that of the Antebellum South (social death). Django’s and Northrup’s struggle relies on unique exceptional individuals who are able to endure American slavery and further inflate colorblind ideology by suggesting that the “racial regime” (Robinson xii) is about individual choices (rugged individualism) and not the power of the institution or collective struggle to change it. Rugged individualism is embodied by Django’s decision to role play a Black slaver as well as his constant decision to return to emancipating his wife rather than taking up arms with other slaves. To be truly manumissioned (in the eyes of Wilderson or Fanon) would require fulfilling an excess lack which would mean the implosion of civil society and the film and entertainment industry as we know it. Historically, this is most clearly evidenced by the temporal relationship to the Constitution as a legal framework for slavery,[9] the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850, which further solidified the Constitution’s relationship to Black folks, and the Supreme Court’s ruling in Dred Scott v. Sandford of 1857, which not only upheld the Fugitive Slave Act, but removed the Black body (as text or corpus) out of any conceptualization of civil society in Justice Tauney’s decision.[10] There was no empathy for the Black within the Constitution because the Constitution only applied to human beings; not to property or those who were three-fifths of a human.

#### Their theorization assumes a Fanonian visual economy which produces blackness as an object – neoliberalism recycles that process into affective markets of resilience which demands visibility as the precondition of subjectification.

James ‘15

[Robin, Philosophy @ UNC Charlotte 2015. “Resilience & Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism.”] pat – [edited] for non-black debaters

Resilience must be performed explicitly, legibly, and spectacularly. Overcoming is necessary, but insufficient; to count and function as resilience, this overcoming must be accomplished in a visible or otherwise legible and consumable manner. Overcoming is a type of “affective labor” which, as Steven Shaviro puts it, “is productive only to the extent that it is a public performance. It cannot unfold in the hidden depths; it must be visible and audible” (PCA 49n33). In order to tune into feminine resilience and feed it back into its power supply, MRWaSP has to perceive it as such.

“Look, I Overcame!” is the resilient subject’s maxim or mantra. Gender and race have always been “visible identities,” to use philosopher Linda Martin Alcoff’s term, identities strongly tied to one’s outward physical appearance. However, gendered/racialized resilience isn’t visible in the same way that conventional gender and racial identities are visible. To clarify these differences, it’s helpful to think of resilience in terms of a “Look, I Overcame!” imperative. “Look, I Overcame!” is easy to juxtapose to Frantz Fanon’s “Look, a Negro!”, which is the touchstone for his analysis of gendered racialization in “The Fact of Blackness.” In both cases, looking is a means of crafting race/gender identities and distributing white patriarchal privilege. But, in the same way that resilience discourse “upgrades” traditional methods for crafting identities and distributing privilege, the “looking” in “Look, I Overcame!” is an upgrade on the “looking” in “Look, a Negro!”

According to Fanon, the exclamation “Look, a Negro!” racializes him as a black man. To be “a Negro [black]” is to be objectified by the white supremacist gaze. This gaze fixes him as an object, rather than an ambiguous transcendence (which is a more nuanced way of describing the existentialist concept of subjectivity). “The black man,” as Fanon argues, “has no ontological resistance for the white man” (BSWM 110) because, as an object and not a mutually-recognized subject, he cannot return the white man’s gaze (“The Look” that is so important to Sartre’s theory of subjectivity in Being & Nothingness). The LIO narrative differs from Fanon’s account in the same way it differs from Iris Young’s account of feminine body comportment: in resilience discourse, objectification isn’t an end but a means. Any impediment posed by the damage wrought by the white/male gaze is a necessary prerequisite for subjectivity, agency, and mutual recognition. In other words, being looked at isn’t an impediment, but a resource.

Resilience discourse turns objectification (being looked at) into a means of subjectification (overcoming). It also makes looking even more efficient and profitable than simple objectification could ever be. Recognizing and affirming the affective labor of the resilient performer, the spectator feeds the performer’s individual overcoming into a second-order therapeutic narrative: our approbation of her overcoming is evidence of our own overcoming of our past prejudices. This spectator wants to be seen by a wider audience as someone who answers the resilient feminine subject’s hail, “Look, I Overcame!”. Just as individual feminine subjects use their resilience as proof of their own goodness, MRWaSP uses the resilience of its “good girls” as proof that they’re the “good guys”—that its social and ethical practices are truly just, and that we really mean it this time when we say everyone is equal. For example, the “resilience” of “our” women is often contrasted with the supposed “fragility” of Third-World women of color. Or, in domestic US race-gender politics, the resilience of some African-American women (their bootstraps-style class ascendance) is contrasted to the continued fragility of other African-American women, and thus used to reinforce class distinctions among blacks. There are a million different versions of this general story: “our” women are already liberated—they saved themselves—but, to riff on Gayatri Spivak, “brown women need saving from brown men.” Most mainstream conversations about Third-World women are versions of this story: discussions of “Muslim” veiling, female circumcision, sweatshops, poverty, “development,” they’re all white-saviorist narratives meant to display MRWaSP’s own resilience.

“Look, I Overcame!” upgrades “Look, a Negro [Black]!” by (a) recycling objectification into overcoming and (b) compounding looking, so that one can profit from others’ resilience, treating their overcoming as one’s own overcoming. This upgrade in white supremacist patriarchy requires a concomitant upgrade in “looking.” This shift in looking practices parallels developments in film and media aesthetics. As Steven Shaviro has argued, the values, techniques, and compositional strategies most common in contemporary mainstream Western cinema—like Michael Bay’s Transformers—are significantly different than the ones used in modernist and post-modernist cinema, and that these differences in media production correlate to broader shifts in the means of capitalist and ideological production. Neoliberalism’s aesthetic is, he argues, “post-cinematic.” This post-cinematic aesthetic applies not just to film and media, but to resilience discourse. Its performance practices and looking relations configured by the “Look, I Overcame!” imperative, resilience is, in a way, another type of post-cinematic medium. In the next section I use Shaviro’s theory of post-cinematic media to identify some specific ways in which traditional patriarchal tools are updated to work compatibly with MRWaSP resilience discourse. The looking in the “Look, I Overcame!” narrative is not the same kind of looking described by concepts like “the male gaze” or “controlling images.” This looking is a type of deregulated MRWaSP visualization.

#### Neurosis doesn’t emerge from no-where *(get it).* Rather, specific locations, such as debate, instill us with an anti-black exceptionalist mythos that maintains the foundations of material oppression through representative scholarly tokenism and disinterested inquiry. The 1AC de-radicalizes criticism in favor of a neurotic bourgeois fanaticism that ensures anti-black death by way of voiding the world of black people.

Curry Forthcoming (Tommy J. Curry, Texas A&M University, Department of Philosophy, Faculty Member. Black Studies, Not Morality: Anti-Black Racism, Neo-Liberal Cooptation, and the Challenges to Black Studies Under Intersectional Axioms. (Forthcoming in Emerging Voices of Africana: Disciplinary Resonances, Third World-Red Sea Press, ed. Michael Tillotson. https://www.academia.edu/8160498/\_Draft\_Black\_Studies\_Not\_Morality\_Anti-Black\_Racism\_Neo-Liberal\_Cooptation\_and\_the\_Challenges\_to\_Black\_Studies\_Under\_Intersectional\_Axioms) |rc Harun|

There is a mythology at work in how Black people think about the utilization of knowledge against the structures of racism and white supremacy that result in the inevitability of anti-Black death. In the academy and the concentric communities that center scholarly knowledge as the basis of discourse, there is a practice among various levels of students that de-radicalize the potential of these criticisms to make meaningful change in the structures and mentality of all those involved. The Black undergraduate and graduate student lacking the professional credentials to assert their opinion as true, or insightful, as the product of scholarly research, utilizes mimicry to convince the listener of the rightness of their position. In taking on, or parroting, the radical literature of their heroes and heroines, they strive to transform the insights of these/ their professors, lawyers, activists into a new morality. This morality seeks to escape any practical debates about the construction and constructing of a new world, or new consciousness. For these students, repeating the sacred texts of high intellectuals; the manipulators of post-structural texts/postcolonial discourse/psychoanalytic theories of death, life, power, gender, the Black woman, capitalism, bare life, vestibularity, and of course race, seek to convince the world that as disciples of these texts, they (the poor, the Black, the female, the marginalized student) in fact do hold the key to understanding the world beneath them, as they are now elevated to the realms of theory, from the perspectives of their gods who reside in the Ivory tower.

The mistake Black theorists make in understanding the ineffectiveness of their theories to transform the world is fundamentally rooted in the actuality of the world before them. Despite the radicality—the (new) content, the (revolutionary) ideas, and the (existential) ethicality— of the proposed theory, there is an apriori belief by the “radical (Black) theorist” that the oppressor class, be they: white, bourgeois, or male; the people the theory is directed towards, are in fact moral people able to be persuaded, convinced, and transformed through their own capacities and recognition of the “other realities” suffered by the oppressed. There is an erroneous belief that Black theory can be understood, acted upon, recognized by a person that can understand, or a newly emerged person that can now understand, the perspective of the “representative of the oppressed” speaking to them. Why is this case? What is it in the act of critiquing whites, the bourgeoisie, or men that make the oppressed believe fundamentally that these groups can change? For the people who are “actually oppressed,” “materially oppressed,” “silenced,” or the Black male who is killed/dead and cannot speak, but only be spoken about by the academics who use his death as a symbol—a catalyst—of conversation with whites, this belief does not exist. But for this group, Black theorists and their parrots, who are the “representatives of the oppressed” that merely act as sleeping dictionaries, or in the case of Black men, talking monkeys this belief is substantiated by an ancient faith in reason and the modern hope of discourse.

A Black intellectual socialized to imitate white theories and by effect the pre-established semiotics that signify “intellect” as the basis of their discourse with whites under the banner of radicality, pessimism or anti-racist realism is of the greatest concern. In its brute reality, this discursive replication was the primary concern of Carter G. Woodson’s The Miseducation of the Negro (1933). Contrary to the pop culture summation of Woodson’s 1933 work, Woodson was not primarily concerned with the general education of Blacks by whites, Woodson was concerned with the “highly educated Negro,” who in studying the ideas founded upon white understandings of philosophy, economics, law, and religion, sought to apply this knowledge to the Black community. “The educated Negro have the attitude of contempt toward their own people because in their own as well as in their mixed schools Negroes are taught to admire the Hebrew, the Latin and the Teuton and to despite the African” (Woodson, 1933, p.1). Woodson’s comment upon the disciplinary/civilizational basis of “theory,” is profound, despite being almost a century old. The highly educated Negro, the same culprit of E. Franklin Frazier’s Failure of the Negro/Black Intellectual, seeks to distant themselves from the Black community who remain mere objects of study. Seeing themselves as ontologically different from the other-Black-objects they study, these Black theorist(s) speak to white gatekeepers and members of their own intellectual class who reward them for the adamancy and spread of the ideas offered as morality. By claiming to be enlightened and spreading “truth” the post-structural/intersectional theorist need not know about the actual conditions of the people they speak of, they need only present these bodies and their conditions through the theories accepted by their particular discipline and/or disciplinary community. Black Study effectively becomes the process of confining/distorting/revising Black life to fit theory. As Ahmed reminds us, “facts require explanations, and all explanations, even bad ones, presume a configuration of concepts, which we provisionally call 'theory,' In other words, theory is not simply a desirable but a necessary relation between facts and their explanations” (1994, p.34). It is when this theory is considered to be ontological—fundamental and necessary to the facts they seek to explain—that they become apriori and ideological. It is this paradigm from which the theory we concern ourselves with, and its effect upon the actual study of Black people, are placed at odds with Black Studies. Since the ontological claim is apriori, it dismisses the need for the study of Black life since it takes the relation between the facts of Black existence and theories proposed to be necessary to the Black bodies observed. The truth concerning Blackness thereby becomes revelation of some constant unchanging principle within Blackness rather than the study of structures, historically conditioned and dynamic, upon Black peoples. This bourgeois fanaticism voids the world of actual Black people and replaces them with Black subjects found wanting for knowledge, recognition, and the politics of the “Black theorist-observer.”

#### Contrary to the aff’s demand to comb the archives to reveal it to the university we affirm the pure negation of the black radical tradition- the opacity of the archive which acts as a self-imploding bomb in the semiotic economy of debate- this is a radical break with the theory of coloniality and anti-blackness as haunting and the projection of new worlds through their scholarship – rather we say there is radical appearance and undoing of western metaphysics in the act of disappearance itself

Best 15 (Stephen Best, associate professor of English at UC Berkeley, PhD from the University of Pennsylvania, November 2015, “Come and Gone,” *small axe: a caribbean journal of criticism* Volume 19 Number 3, footnotes 20, 34, and 35 included in curly braces) gz |rc Harun|

As Copeland makes clear, his four artists make their own departures from the Beloved project, most crucially by way of their work's facture (i.e., workmanship, the execution of its surfaces) and what Copeland calls a style of “antiportraiture,” the response of black artists who have long been objectified on account of their race “refus[ing] the gaze” (9), denying access to their interiority, and generally claiming “an opacity and inscrutability” (205) long denied them by choosing to conceal or obscure the surfaces of their art (Lorna Simpson's turned-away self-portraits arguably exemplify this style).19 What is more, the Beloved moment was so thoroughly structured by the paradigm of the revenant (the imperative to “summon the presences” or “recollect the absences” of slaves), so committed to a logic of appearance, like the Harlem Renaissance and Black Arts movements before it, and committed too to “a replaying of the trauma of slavery that repressed horrors have somehow been recovered or bubbled up from a temporal interregnum” (9), that to say that these artists produced anti-portraits hostile to a logic of appearance is essentially to say that their work was not a part of its historical moment. I see no problem in saying that, and in fact wish that Copeland had, but I also understand that doing so one risks descending to a level of absurdity (how can art not be a part of the historical moment in which it was made?).20 {20 The critics Hubert Damisch, Georges Didi-Huberman, and Ernst van Alphen have challenged the core axiom of the discipline of art history—“that the meaning of art can only be formulated historically … [that an] artwork, therefore is always an expression of the historical period or figure that produced it”—and I mean to court the same skepticism in what I have to say here. Damish maintains that it is impossible to possess the “period eye” (a term attributed to Michael Baxandall) of another time in history. See Yve-Alain Bois, Denis Hollier, Rosalind Krauss, and Hubert Damisch, “A Conversation with Hubert Damisch,” October 85 (Summer 1998): 9. Damisch and van Alphen, drawing largely on theories of the artwork's autonomy indebted to Theodor Adorno, argue for a view of the artwork as “an act of thought,” that “works of art appear to full advantage only if we deal with them as ways of thinking.” See Ernst van Alphen, Art in Mind: How Contemporary Images Shape Thought (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 2. See also Georges Didi-Huberman, Confronting Images: Questioning the Ends of a Certain History of Art (University Park: Penn State University Press, 2009).} Such a claim requires that we take a moment to think through the conditions under which this flurry of artistic activity, this shared interest in slavery and its representation, might be said not to have congealed into an “event” historically understood. The vocabulary of presence and absence, the logic of appearance, the idea that black art in 1980s New York signaled a turning point in the structure of racial representation—these are the principles and conceptual postures that have been fundamental to the exploration of blackness in the aesthetic realm, but they all build on the assumption that there is (or was) something missing from the visual field, something that contemporary art at a particular moment in time found itself in a unique position to recover and represent. I would argue that there is a longer genealogy of sustained and practiced antipathy to appearance in the black tradition, and that the artists discussed in Bound to Appear are part of it—a kind of “antiportraiture,” if you will, in the sense of a long-standing commitment to representation-against-appearance, but a tradition of profound philosophical and ethical significance. I thus propose here the sketch of a genealogy of black ascesis, borrowing the latter term from Michel Foucault, who characterized it as “the work that one performs on oneself in order to transform oneself or make the self appear which, happily, one never attains”—significance falling on that anticipation of failure, on an appearance that one never attains.21 Copeland in many respects engages that tradition, but my contention would be that to recognize that this tradition was not predicated on a sense of lack, specifically on a sense of something being missing from the visual field, ought to have consequences for our method, in something of a reversal of the Heisenbergian principle that viewing the object changes the object. I would argue, on the contrary, that viewing the object changes the method, and these consequences manifest on the scholarly practices that we use to “discipline” art: either the attempt to explicate the artwork's meaning consists in restating what it represents, to explain it historically through recourse to its moment of production, or to restore its fragments to the context from which they were taken. I will make the case for black ascesis in contemporary art practice by turning to an artist at a remove from the time and place of artistic activity attended to in Bound to Appear—Mark Bradford—in whose canvases I espy an invitation to what I like to think of as a philosophical project of self-divestiture, a project that often involves the failure to make an appearance. But what does Copeland mean by that word appear? Bound to Appear Copeland takes his title from Cedric Robinson's critical tour de force, Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition, and specifically a synoptic passage in which Robinson explains the ways the effects of racism and nationalism (“racialism,” in his language) will expand throughout the modern capitalist world: As an enduring principle of European social order, the effects of racialism were bound to appear in the social expression of every strata of every European society no matter the structures upon which they were formed. None was immune … . It was … a quite natural occurrence … . But to the … radical intelligentsias[,] it was also an unacceptable one, one subsequently denied. Nevertheless, it insinuated itself into their thought and their theories. And thus, in the quest for a radical social force, an active historical subject, it compelled certain blindnesses, bemusements.22 Robinson's carefully chosen words lend an air of the inevitable both to racialism's appearance (“every strata,” “no matter the structures,” “none was immune,” “natural occurrence,” “compelled”) and to the Western scholarly and political ignorance (“blindnesses,” “bemusements”) of an ongoing philosophically coherent and ideologically committed movement among blacks—what he terms the black radical tradition.23 And while Western society, on account of this enduring racialism, provided a “social cauldron” of black radicalism (“its location and its objective condition”), it would prove to be neither its “specific inspiration” nor “the foundation for its nature or character.”24 In short, racialism is never the cause of which the black radical tradition is the effect. On this premise, Robinson makes the case that slavery did not define the black condition.25 Copeland, in twisting the phrase “bound to appear” into his titular figure, gives it the agility of a two-way verbal pun (that again!): “The black body is bound to appear due to its vital place in the American cultural imaginary” (205). Bound in the sense of inevitable, once again, but bound as well in the sense that the body that commands such privileged psychic space does so because of slavery. Copeland's turn of phrase, by serving the projects of both visual studies and the study of slavery, grounds his book's claims for appearance. But given the causal disjunct that Robinson posits between Western radicalism and the black radical tradition (that is, the claim that black radicalism “cannot be understood” in terms of the context of its genesis; that it “is not a variant” of Western radicalism),26 one might question whether or not, and if so how, slavery could “appear” in contemporary art, in a way that makes sense for visual art, while staying true to the terms of Robinson's argument. I think it makes sense for us to push harder on that verb—to appear—and to ask whether Robinson expected the black radical tradition, with which Copeland aligns his four artists, would ever make an appearance of the visual sort (12). I do not feel it would be overstating the matter to say that Black Marxism is a curious source from which to draw one's title if the goal is to foreground the specifically visual resonances of the phrase “bound to appear.” Evidence of the black radical tradition seems to have been recondite, more felt than seen, its presence more intuited than witnessed, its actualization more paradoxically present than empirically given. As Robinson, who invented the phrase, would go on to describe it, in the black radical tradition revolutionary activity was focused on “the structures of the mind,” where defeat or victory were largely “internal affair[s]”—it was a tradition that “more easily sustained suicide than assault.”27 Some origins to the tradition: (1) The followers of Nongqawuse, the Xhosa prophetess who claimed in 1856 that the ancestral spirits told her that the Xhosa should slaughter all their cattle and destroy their crops (the repository of all their wealth), in return for which the spirits would banish their British occupiers into the sea—a millennialist prophesy that would result in a cattle-killing of such apocalyptic proportions that three-quarters of the Xhosa nation would die of the resulting famine.28 (2) The enslaved Africans, mulattoes, and poor whites who throughout much of the seventeenth century escaped to the Palmares, a region of steep and precipitous mountains on the coast of Brazil, where they established settlements, a republic consisting of smaller palmares (or quilombos), and a king with the power to negotiate treaties with the colonial governor of the state of Pernambuco—but a society of fugitives who would abandon and burn their settlements to the ground each time Portuguese armies approached, melting away into the surrounding forest, their state reclaimed by wilderness, their society leaving no trace.29 (3) The rebels who in 1915 struck valiantly, though futilely, against British colonial rule in Nyasaland, upon hearing the following entreaty from their leader, John Chilembwe, a millenarian Christian minister: “We have determined to strike a first and a last blow and then we will all die by the heavy storm of the whiteman's army.”30 These are the roots from which the black radical tradition emerges, and none can be understood in the terms of class conflict or individual resistance most common to Western rationality (“the individualistic and often spontaneous motives that energized the runaway, the arsonist, the poisoner”), not to mention in terms of a desire to bring about positive social change. These origins provide evidence, on the contrary, of a “very different and shared order of things,” of a tradition founded on a “very different role for consciousness than was anticipated in Western radicalism.”31 With violence “turned inward” rather than directed at their oppressors, these rebels “lived on their terms, they died on their terms, they obtained their freedom on their terms … [and they] defined the terms of their destruction.” What lends this tradition its “radical” accent is as much the inwardness of the violence as the violence itself, the tradition's actualization through self-abnegation rather than against it. But, as a politics, if politics is what we want to call it, such communities sought not to achieve a positive set of social outcomes (e.g., the attenuation of the objective power of the enemy, the overthrow of slavery, the actualization a new world) but instead to prioritize “the renunciation of actual being for historical being,” the community's successful mobilization “against its material aspect.”32 Victory and freedom make their appearance in disappearance. The people stake their claim on and as community in the moment of its dissolution—an ethics (a far more accurate term, in my view) committed to “the integral totality of the people” against their material aspect. In Robinson's summation, this ethics involved a “shared sense of obligation to preserve the collective being, the ontological totality.”33 What kind of tradition is this?34 {34 David Scott feels degrees more discerning when he asks of the critical commonplace “the black radical tradition”: What makes us think that we can string these words together? See his “On the Very Idea of a Black Radical Tradition,” Small Axe, no. 46 (March 2013): 1–6.} By what logic does one “preserve” the collective being in acts of self-destruction, self-renunciation, inwardness, and collective disappearance? What is that? (Robin D. G. Kelley sees the change inspired by the black radical imagination as having roots in the surreal.)35 {35 A surrealism avant la lettre in Afro-diasporic culture recognized “the imagination as our most powerful weapon”; and the Europeans who would claim the name realized that “entire cultures had methods of thought and communication that transcended the conscious.” Robin D. G. Kelley, Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination (Boston: Beacon, 2002), 159–60.} Some observers, knowing the level of violence the situation warranted, and knowing too who ought to have been its proper recipient, dismissed those who chose this plan of action as an “outlandish people”; and though this description was intended to disparage and dismiss, it seems in fact to be the most accurate.36 Black radicalism is quite literally the consciousness of those who remembered another land, those with distinct imaginings of an elsewhere, or those with a superior moral claim on “home.”37 Returning to the paradox of the black radical tradition with that distinction in mind, the logic of appearance-in-disappearance starts to make a great deal more sense. To assert that self-destruction “preserve[s] the collective being,” “the integral totality of the people,” is to understand that self-annihilation presents a primary figure for diaspora. (Ask again the question What is that? and the answer is diaspora.) It would be falling short of the mark to designate this collective being “missing,” for though clearly absent, the only evidence of its actualization is its self-destruction. So what could it mean to say, then, as Copeland does, that “it is within this lineage that the four practitioners examined in this book belong” (12)? What does it mean to say that Glenn Ligon, Lorna Simpson, Fred Wilson, and Renée Green, each committed in his or her unique ways to the visualization of slavery's effects, to “the visual structures, logics, and modes of speaking arising from it that continue to inform the present,” that they share a tradition with African millennialists and Palmares fugitives? And what could it mean to say that these artists “made clear that the black body is bound to appear due to its vital place in the American cultural imaginary” (205), that they restored something that was missing from the visual field, when under Robinson's dispensation the black radical tradition signifies not something missing from our understanding but something that “cannot be understood within the particular context of its genesis”?38 I think Copeland is right about the connection but not always for the right reasons.

#### Fanon must be read not as revolutionary violence but revolutionary self-cannibalism where disappearance accelerates and overwhelms the visual economy which fractures colonial subjects – the alternative is creative apoptosis.
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Between 1994 to 1999, Algiers witnessed a transformation in its history when the Islamic Salvation Front and Armed Islamic Group incited an aggressive Islamist regime. Oussama Tabti was six years old. 24 years later he speaks of this childhood through his art practice. I met him at the Dak’Art Biennale in Senegal in 2012 where we both exhibited together. His installation Stand By showed scanned images of the back pages of books including the date that these were borrowed from the library of the French Cultural Centre.

Oussama Tabti, Stand By (2012) An interruption of dates between 1994 and 1999 corresponded to the time when the centre was closed during the regime. The censorship of literature, art and education is a testimony of a painful period and its effects on the artistic and cultural life. Tabti’s installation investigates this lost memory of the traumas of 1994 to 1999 by assembling its void. He makes the ‘robbing’ of memory a marker for an archive. “A date is a closing but for others a beginning”[[7]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn7). The silence precisely marked his history. It marks a new library that even if torn or burned down, its ashes create new voices and new choices. In such erasures and submergences, new creations of the self emerged and evolved.

African critique of consciousness and creative apoptosis. Hegelian consciousness was reformed in pan-africanism with Nkrumah and Césaire to pursue identity to the origin, to the truth of history, to what ‘rightly belongs to us Africans’, to incite a common freedom of consciousness. For Frantz Fanon, the concept of race offers no escape, and he sees it as an invented concept designed to negate equality, that must be deconstructed: “The force that shatters the appearance of identity is the force of thinking”.[[8]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn8) In this procedure, he escapes Hegelian dialectics of master and slave, exiting representation to merge what Adorno in Negative Dialectics calls a “togetherness of diversity”.[[9]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn9) More precisely, Fanon’s approach is similar to the way Adorno, in the chapters “Logic of Disintegration” and “Dialectics of Identity,” exorcises identity in order to break it as a totality and transform it as multiple form free to reconfigure and to cameleon-ise. Adorno wanted to get rid of Hegelian telos and its motion of identity that rejected the possibility for ‘difference’, ‘air’ or appearance (stated by Luce Irigaray as the other[[10]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn10)). Against this “reduction of human labour to the abstract universal concept of average working hours”[[11]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn11) which he thought imposed an obligation to become identical or total, he abolished the totality of identity with nonidentity, proposing instead ´air´ as untruth (the negative). Like Fanon’s, Adorno’s critique was thus directed against consciousness itself, in order to liberate it, allowing the “subjective pre-formation of the phenomenon moving in front of the non-identical, in front of the individuum ineffabile”[[12]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn12).

In Fanon’s dialectic of the subhuman (Agamben’s “inhuman”), the “violence” that becomes the tool of social reconstruction through deconstruction of racial concepts is not an annihilation of the other (colonizer), but instead a reappropriation and incorporation of the colonizer’s violence: “It is only when the colonized appropriates the violence of the colonizer and puts forth his own concrete counter-violence that he re-enters the realm of history and human historical becoming”[[13]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn13). More precisely, this means to self-cannibalize: it is a liberation through creative apoptosis. In this sense, violence attains self-creation by conjugating the self, the performed body. In the words of Jean Paul Satre, “violence is neither sound and fury, nor the resurrection of savage instincts, nor even the effect of resentment: it is man recreating himself”[[14]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn15). But who, precisely, is leading, and who is speaking at this instance? It becomes clear that conjugating the present self requires an archive of action: memory reveals itself as a paradox[[15].](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn15)

Art for revolutionary times. In the rise of the Egyptian revolution and the Arab citizen’s democratic uprising, the unfolding events build new arenas of creativity and public life in the visual arts. However, two years after the revolution and the people are still being brutally massacred through all forms of oppressive aggressions. A protest against the facade of a democratic election, and the continuing corruption inside governmental institutions, Bahia Shehab’s provocative street art practice and conversation partly changed her micro society. In her unfolding street narratives for Practicing Art for Revolutionary Times, presented in Berlin’s Haus Der Kunst in 2013, she interacts with the community by organizing and educating through creative use of digital media platforms and apparatuses, working towards a realization of what Fanon calls social reconstruction aimed at “understanding social truths”[[16]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn16). Beginning a story through the medium of street graffiti, her messages become part of a physical and digital conversation across communities through new forms of public interventions. She explains how her visuals and the ongoing conversations and responses transformed her work and how her messages became informed by collective work. The cyber-street dialogues allowed for overcoming fears and discourse on social justice. She used humor and sensibility for citizen reportage and critical citizenship in learning from the past and leading new heritage and archives of remembrance.

[IMAGE OMITTED] Shehab’s resistance is also the type favored by Fanon; a form of organization that institutes new forms of relationship amongst participants. It promotes a process of culture, change and investigation that develops new ideas and forms of aesthetics and body politic, allowing for new social imagination and collective metamorphosis. To supplement the Fanonian discourse, in the following, I will demonstrate how the myth of Drexciya may prove useful in grounding an understanding of social politics and the nation.

Language of the Drexciya: Dispersing the Diaspora from the depths of the Atlantic into out of space. Drexciya is a modern myth invented for the programming of a 1990´s underground US music electro group, referring to an imaginary sub-continent populated by water breathing militaristic mutants. Their ‘aquatic assault programming’ deciphered new links between history, representation, the idea of Africa, origin and cultural authenticity. They used their synthesizer as a sonic weapon (similar to a whale’s calling, that is too high for the human ear), to pulsate, emit and radiate inharmonic tones that would project a distance between the listener and the sound in its entirety, with no room for prescribed imaginary visuals and would leave one feeling shut out to their own devices of impossible re-interpretations.  At times, the sounds provoke an attack on the senses. The role of mythology, in this case the ‘aquatic invasion’ is to incarnate the soldiers of an ongoing perceptual war against control systems, codifications of Other and Self, as a form to overcome racism. With sensations of vigilance in its aggressive sonic fusions, the image and sounds make the myth into a proposition. It asks a shift in individual political empowerment, it is the undoing of the idea of the West, the territorial sovereignty of the state and of the disjuncture and difference between the imaginary, the symbolic and the real.

And so the future feeds forward into the past by inventing another outcome for the Middle Passage, this sonic fiction “opens a bifurcation in time which alters the present by feeding back through its audience – you the landlocked mutant descendent of the Slave Trade”[[17]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn17). Drexciya rejects the singular specie by identifying with the alien, the Other, the foreigner. This proposes an insight into Afrodiasporic pop culture as in Sun Rae’s instructions to citizens of the Earth where he shows that becoming alien allows an extraterrestrial perspective. This ET approach generates a new cycle towards the human. Drexciya brings this extraterritorial sequel down to earth and under the water. Their sonic fiction sinks through the streets deforming reality through a systematic confusion of technology. Drexciya rebel through cryptic myth systems, changing logics and animating conceptual explosions, which multiplies our perceptions. Their obsessive continental drift reconfigures the placeless space of the net. It communicates through mystification and conceptual ‘mess age’ (Marshall McLuhan).

“During the greatest Holocaust the world has ever known, pregnant America-bound African slaves were thrown overboard by the thousands during labour for being sick and disruptive cargo. Is it possible that they could have given birth at sea to babies that never needed air? Are Drexciyans water-breathing aquatically mutated descendents of those unfortunate victims of human greed? Recent experiments have shown a premature human infant saved from certain death by breathing liquid oxygen through its underdeveloped lungs”[[18]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn18).

Seven years after Bon Voyage, Kiwanga directs Afrogalactica, a future of the United States of Africa in 2058 that is recalled as a past by another future no longer belonging to Earth.  Posing as an anthropologist from the future, the artist reflects on some major themes in Afrofuturism and their role in their development of the United States of Africa Space Agency. Diving into the past to retrieve archives of popular culture, she uses science fiction to make projections about the future. But which future? Civilians form new community formations in space. In her story, Imamou mother ship was lost in its galactic mission with over 200 Afronauts onboard taking away with them a library of our ancestors´civilisations. Attempts were found to salvage this ancestry through memory but only very little could be remembered of it. History was lost. In retracing these steps to memory, the artist projects an archive of imagery of popular black and afro-modern culture. Her critic defines the impossibility to create a museum of archive knowledge based on memory because it would entail a selection of how we would appropriate history. Our memory acts as a political anthropology or anthropogagy – a cannibal selection based on a given language. Her approach enables us to explore the acting out of memory in conscious recall and continuous transmission but also in the disjunctive temporality of the unconscious and the archive. This Foucaultnian "countermemory” interrupts heritage’s normalizing imperatives, imposing beginnings, middles and ends. The fetishisation of the present that ignores historical past, “a use of history that severs its connection to memory..... a transformation of history into a totally different form of time”[[19]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn19), has specific political effects. Countermemory produces a negative heritage that is for Foucault itself a form of participation in the transgressive, hybrid and performative. While seeking the Brazilian modern identity in Manifesto Antropofago (1928), Oswald de Andrade unapologically wrote a manifesto of cannibalism to de-colonize and devour foreign cultural influences that could push Brazilian identity to the future[[20]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn20). It was both a dictum against the colonizer’s power and a criticism of the colonized peoples´ hunger for what is not their own. In Vanessa Ramos Velasquez’s version, Digital Anthropophagy and the Anthropophagic re-manifesto for the digital age (2010), instead, cultural cannibalism becomes a practice for the digital age where the virtual world is a new frontier and “anyone can be a colonizer”[[21]](http://seismopolite.com/#_edn21). Velasquez’ self-cannibalism is a quiet revolution and a model for acculturation: Acting ‘against memory’ she eats it for renewal. Like Deleuze to eat one’s words is to negate the leading speaker, forgetting the singular author and allowing language for the multiple, for the resonance of dialogue and to include community. Making reference to Brazilian indigenous peoples, she re-introduces anthropophagy, self-cannibalism, transmuting into the digital where cultural consumption and information becomes an apoptosis. The digital ‘cannibal’ honorably eats the foreigner in order to incorporate his strength and experiences and see through his eyes the unknown. Eating the piece of the manifesto as a Eucharist, she metaphorically spits our experiences.

## Case

### Vote for me stuff

#### 1] Even if it’s a good model the judge shouldn’t endorse it, results in guilt politics where the judge does nothing but believes they participate, this leads to broader exported violence in everyday life. Paints suffering as vote for us to remedy, assuages the judge of guilt bc of indivual actions when they have in fact done nothing

#### 2] Any arg that defines what indivuals can read or how they engage based on race is causes authenticiy testing. Begs the question of who is black enough and people pretending to be black, this causes physic violenc and turns their violence posited in the 1AC

#### 3] Paternalism DA- they deny the possibillity for a legit victory- voting aff doesn’t remedy strucutral harms, you recreate the logic of paternalism where people feel they are helping black debaters and reproduces stereotypes that black debaters can only win on race based arguments