#### [ROJ & Giroux 1] THE AMERICAN EMPIRE IS CORRUPTING EDUCATION – it permits oppression for financial gain and DRIVES acceptance of the squo.

Giroux 1: Giroux, Henry A. [Waterbury Chair Professor, Pennsylvania State University] “Higher Education and the Politics of Disruption.” *Truthout*, March 17, 2015. CH

We now live at a time in which institutions that were meant to limit human suffering and misfortune and protect the public from the excesses of the market have been either weakened or abolished. (1) The consequences can be seen clearly in the ongoing and ruthless assault on the social state, workers, unions, higher education, students, poor people of color and any vestige of the social contract. Free-market policies, values and practices – with their emphasis on the privatization of public wealth, the elimination of socia cal ections and the deregulation of economic activity – now shape practically every commanding political and economic institution in the United States. Public spheres that once offered at least the glimmer of progressive ideas, enlightened social policies, noncommodified values, and critical dialogue and exchange have been increasingly commercialized – or replaced by private spaces and corporate settings whose ultimate fidelity is to increasing profit margins. For example, higher education is defined more and more as simply another core element of corporate power and culture, viewed mostly as a waste of taxpayers’ money, and denied its value as a democratic public sphere and guardian of public values. What has become clear is that the attack on the social state, workers and unions is now being matched by a full-fledged assault on higher education. Such attacks are not happening just in the United States but in many other parts of the globe where casino capitalism is waging a savage battle to eliminate all of those public spheres that might offer a glimmer of opposition to and protection from market-driven policies, institutions, ideology and values. We live at a time when it is more crucial than ever to believe that the university is both a public trust and social good. At best, it is a critical institution infused with the promise of cultivating intellectual insight, the imagination, inquisitiveness, risk-taking, social responsibility and the struggle for justice. In addition, higher education should be at the “heart of intense public discourse, passionate learning, and vocal citizen involvement in the issues of the times.” (2) Underlying this vision of the university are some serious questions about its relationship to the larger society. For instance, how might the university’s responsibility be understood with respect to safeguarding the interests of young people at a time of violence and war, the rise of a rampant anti-intellect  ualism, a devastating gap in income and wealth, the rise of the surveillance state, and the threat of ecological and nuclear devastation? What might it mean to define the university as a pedagogical space that disrupts, disturbs, inspires and energizes young people to be individual and social agents rather than as an institution that redefines itself in terms of market values and reacts mostly to market fluctuations? It is in the spirit of such considerations that I first want to address those larger economic, social and cultural interests produced largely by the growing inequalities in wealth, income and power that threaten the notion of higher education as a democratic public good. As higher education’s role as a center of critical thought and civic engagement is devalued, society is being transformed into a “spectacular space of consumption” and financial looting. One consequence is an ongoing flight from mutual obligations and social responsibilities and a loss of faith in politics itself. This loss of faith in the power of politics, public dialogue and dissent is not unrelated to the diminished belief in higher education as central to producing critically engaged, civically literate and socially responsible citizens. At stake here are not only the meaning and purpose of higher education, but also civil society, politics and the fate of democracy itself. And yet, under the banner of right-wing reforms, the only questions being asked about knowledge production, the purpose of education, the nature of politics and the future are determined largely by market forces.

Thus, **the Role of the Judge is to Promote Critical Education**, which means they must enhance our potential to fight dominant, oppressive social biases.

#### [ROB & Giroux 2] The Role of the Ballot is to Endorse the Better Method for Critically Empowering Students. Critical empowerment exists when we have the skills to question and attack the status quo. This is key to ALL alternatives.

**Giroux 2:** Giroux, Henry A. [Waterbury Chair Professor, Pennsylvania State University] “Radical Politics in the Age of American Authoritarianism: Connecting the Dots.” *Truthout*,April 2016. RP

At the root of this notion of developing a comprehensive view of politics is the need for educating ourselves by developing a critical formative culture along with corresponding institutions that promote a form of permanent criticism against all elements of oppression and unaccountable power.**One important task of emancipation is to fight the dominant culture industry by developing alternative public spheres and educational institutions capable of nourishing critical thought and** action. The time has come for educators, artists, workers, young people and others to push forward **a** new **form of politics** in which public values, trust and compassion trump neoliberalism's celebration of self- interest, the ruthless accumulation of capital, the survival-of-the-fittest ethos and the financialization and market-driven corruption of the political system. Political responsibility is more than a challenge -- it is the projection of a possibility in which new modes of identification and agents must be enabled that can sustain new political organizations and transnational anti-capitalist movements. Democracy must be written back into the script of everyday life, and doing so demands overcoming the current crisis of memory, agency and politics by collectively struggling for a new form of politics in which matters of justice, equity and inclusion define what is possible. Such struggles demand an increasingly broad-based commitment to a new kind of activism. As Robin D. G. Kelley has recently noted there is a need for more pedagogical, cultural and social spaces that allow us to think and act together, to take risks and **to get to the roots of the conditions that are submerging the United States into a new form of authoritarianism wrapped in the flag, the dollar sign and the cross.** Kelley is right in calling for a politics that places justice at its core, one that takes seriously what it means to be an individual and social agent while engaging in collective struggles. We don't need tepid calls for repairing the system; instead, we need to invent a new system from the ashes of one that is terminally broken. We don't need calls for moral uplift or personal responsibility. We need calls for economic, political, gender and racial justice. Such a politics must be rooted in particular demands, be open to direct action and take seriously strategies designed to both educate a wider public and mobilize them to seize power. The left needs a new political conversation that encompasses memories of freedom and resistance. Such a dialogue would build on the militancy of the labor strikes of the 1930s, the civil rights movements of the 1950s and the struggle for participatory democracy by the New Left in the 1960s. At the same time, there is a need to reclaim the radical imagination and to infuse it with a spirited battle for an independent politics that regards a radical democracy as part of a never-ending struggle. **None of this can happen unless progressives understand education as a political and moral practice crucial to creating new forms of agency, mobilizing a desire for change and providing a language** that underwrites the capacity to think, speak and act so as to challenge the sexist, racist, economic and political grammars of suffering produced by the new authoritarianism. The left needs a language of critique that enables people to ask questions that appear unspeakable within the existing vocabularies of oppression. We also need a language of hope that is firmly aware of the ideological and structural obstacles that are undermining democracy. We need a language that reframes our activist politics as a creative act that responds to the promises and possibilities of a radical democracy. Movements require time to mature and come into fruition. They necessitate educated agents able to connect structural conditions of oppression to the oppressive cultural apparatuses that legitimate, persuade, and shape individual and collective attitudes in the service of oppressive ideas and values. Under such conditions, radical ideas can be connected to action once diverse groups recognize the need to take control of the political, economic and cultural conditions that shape their worldviews, exploit their labor, control their communities, appropriate their resources, and undermine their dignity and lives. Raising consciousness alone will not change authoritarian societies, but it does provide the foundation for making oppression visible and for developing from below what Étienne Balibar calls "practices of resistance and solidarity." We need not only a radical critique of capitalism, racism and other forms of oppression, but also a critical formative culture and cultural politics that inspire, energize and provide elements of a transformative radical education in the service of a broad-based democratic liberation movement.

Thus, whoever better promotes critical empowerment wins.

### 1

1. Their appeal to black inspiration requires black debaters to perform these positions as a means of inspiration to another. Every time someone reads this they have to read it to a non-black audience to inspire black debaters.

#### [James 1] The aff’s appeals to “black terror” endorse the politics of capitalistic RESILIENCE – their PERFORMANCE is packaged as a 6-minute, consumable product” to counteract anti-Blackness.

James 1: James, Robin. [Associate Professor of Philosophy, UNC Charlotte] “Incandescence, Melancholy, and Feminist Bad Vibes: A Response to Ziarek’s Feminist Aesthetics and the Politics of Modernism.” Differences 25 (2), 2016. CH

Neoliberalism co-opts this incandescence (or at least the most visible, legible part of its spectrum), domesticating its critical force into the means of producing aesthetic pleasure and reproducing social normativity. Potentiality has been “upgraded” into resilience.9 In resilient art, formal experimentation cultivates, or incites (to use a more Foucaultian term), shocks and feeds the resultant shockwaves back into the system.10 This feedback supports rather than destabilizes hegemonic institutions. The aesthetic damage through which modernist art established its heteronomous/ autonomous position of critique—stuttering, fragmented, degraded, aleatory, dissonant—is now the very medium of normalization.11 Neoliberal resilience, in other words, is a method or process of recycling modernist damage. For example, if modernist art invested aesthetic pleasure in the objectification of women (what Laura Mulvey famously calls scopophilia), neoliberal art invests aesthetic pleasure in women’s spectacular assumption of subjectivity—what Ziarek calls incandescence. If in modernity we liked doing damage to women, we now like to see women overcome that damage.12 This means that we expect women to perform their damage as a baseline from which “good” women then progress. That damage is the fuel for incandescent fires, so it must be constantly incited and invoked so that there’s something for incandescent women to ignite. In this way, resilience discourse normalizes traditional patriarchal damage (e.g., the damage of exclusion and objectification) as a systemic or background condition that individual women are then responsible for overcoming. “Undoing [. . .] feminism while simultaneously appearing to be engaging in a wellinformed and even well-intended response to feminism” (McRobbie 1), resilient incandescence is quintessentially postfeminist. We, the audience, use our identification with the resilient heroine as a way to disidentify with and (supposedly) transgress the imperatives of modernist patriarchy. This is why, as Ziarek explains, audiences have a “sympathetic identification with subversive femininity, with the mother avenging the murderous sacrifice of her daughter for political ends, rather than with the murderous father/king” (104). We enjoy women’s spectacular subjectivization (i.e., their overcoming of scopophilic objectification) because this distances us from unfashionable patriarchal formations and tastes (i.e., this latter scopophilia). In postfeminist neoliberalism, “bearing witness to both the destruction of women’s artistic capacities and women’s revolutionary aspirations” (5) becomes a source of aesthetic pleasure not because it’s revolutionary, but because it’s normative. To use Jack Halberstam’s term, we like our women to “go gaga” because this incandescence, this “unpredictable feminine” (114) methodology allows us to eke even more light out of otherwise exhausted enlightenment modernity. If we’ve reached, as Ziarek discusses, the so-called end of art and the end of history (and the end of tonality and the end of representation and, well, the end of modernity), then the only way to find more resources is, like Pixar’s wall-e, by sifting through our vast piles of waste. And in that waste heap is abject femininity (what musicologist Susan Cook calls the feminized “abject popular”). Femininity is abject because its exclusion from patriarchy is what constitutes patriarchy as a coherent system. In both Ziarek’s aesthetics of potentiality and in resilience discourse, women artists do the cultural work of remaking abjection or constitutive exclusion into ecstatic radiance.13 In the former case, that work is revolutionary; in the latter case, that work normalizes. Resilience discourse transposes feminist revolution into a nationalist, patriarchal, white supremacist practice. Take, for example, Katy Perry’s “Firework,” in which the lyrics trace the affective journey from dejection to radiant exceptionality. The song begins by asking listeners to identify with feelings of irrelevance, weakness, loneliness, and hopelessness; it posits and affirms damage, suffering, and pain. But then Perry’s narrator argues that in spite and perhaps [B]ecause of this damage, the listener has precisely the means to connect to others, to make a difference, to have hope: “[T]here’s a spark in you / You just gotta ignite the light and let it shine.” She uses the metaphor of fireworks (and their association with u.s. Independence Day celebrations) to describe the listener’s self-transformation from black dust to shining light: you may feel like trash, but if you can just light yourself on fire, that trash will burn with a dazzling radiance that lights up the sky, just as it lights up audiences’ faces. Here, Perry transforms abjection—feeling like trash, unmoored, socially dead—into incandescent triumph. In the song, the addressee’s personal triumph evokes u.s. nationalist narratives of overcoming colonization (i.e., the Declaration of Independence, celebrated on the Fourth of July). Feminine incandescence—the transformation of waste and melancholy into glowing potential—is no longer revolutionary. Not only parallel to u.s. nationalism, it is the very means for reproducing normativity.

## B. Impacts

#### 1. [James 2] First, their narrative of “overcoming” PERPETUATES CYCLES OF OBJECTIFICATION, requiring a public performance for a spectator’s benefit.

James 2: James, Robin. [Associate Professor of Philosophy, UNC Charlotte] *Resiliency and Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism*.Zero Books: Winchester, 2015. CH

(d) “Look, I Overcame!” 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 [black person!] Negro!” According to Fanon, the exclamation “Look, a Negro!” racializes him as a black man. To be “a Negro” [a black person] 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 ThirdWorld women of color.

#### 2. [James 3] Second, since resilience requires something to overcome, the aff ENTRENCHES the harm they try to solve, linking Black people into an endless feedback loop of oppression.

James 3: James, Robin. [Associate Professor of Philosophy, UNC Charlotte] *Resiliency and Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism*.Zero Books: Winchester, 2015. CH

MRWaSP is deregulated, but it is also dynamic. Your social/political status in MRWaSP— is thus not taken as an immutable given (like a “born this way” social identity), but as the effect of an ongoing process—the process, as Lester Spence puts it, of being “formed according to market logic” (Spence 15). MRWaSP doesn’t care so much who you are, but what happens through you: that investing in you furthers the aims of MRWaSP, and that these aims are not better accomplished by divesting your human capital. If the color line and the gender binary cut inside from outside, human from sub/non-human. MRWaSP doesn’t so much cut a tine as create a feedback process, one that’s flexible, tuneable, and tweakable so that the white always get whiter and the black always get blacker, so to speak. Racialization, gendering, etc., these aren’t lines that cut but processes that distribute.14 The process of resilience compounds past successes and past failures, creating a probabilistic distribution of success and failure. Your ability to bounce back from a crisis depends on the resources at your disposal; these resources (i.e., your material and social situation) is the result of your response, or your family’s response, to past crises. So, the more resilient you and your family have been, the more resilient you are likely to be now and in the future. Because white supremacy, sexism, ableism, and so on all shape the background material and ideological conditions in which we all work, those who have the best odds of successfully demonstrating their resilience are the ones who have the most heavily stacked decks. Moreover, bourgeois, cis gendered, able-bodied people of color are generally the most resilient ones...in no small part because MRWaSP has to make fewer material and ideological compromises to let them in. Thus, though MRWaSP’s methods are dynamic, the overall distribution of power, bodies, domination, resources, and so on, that remains relatively consistent. The second half of the book discusses the relationship between resilience discourse, MRWaSP, and pop music in much greater detail; it focuses especially on the role of anti- blackness in ideals of resilient femininity. There I will argue that resilient femininity plays a very specific and central role in producing African Americans” as “the exceptions unable to be re-formed” by neoliberal market logic” (Spence 15). MRWaSP is absolutely anti-black anti-queer, ableist, and misogynist. It Is a strategy for producing blackness, queerness, disability, and femininity as mutually-intensifying feedback loops of precariousness.’5 Just think about the most vulnerable populations in the US: it’s usually queer people of color, people whose situations actively deny them the opportunities and resources necessary to profit from their own resilience. People in precarious situations are constantly bouncing back from adversity, but they don’t get to re-invest the surplus value they generate back into their own human capital. Femininity, blackness, queerness, disability, class— these have always been technologies for extracting unpaid surplus value (e.g., slavery, housework, commodified labor). MRWaSP just updates them to work in neoliberalism’s preferred mode: deregulation.

## C. Alternative

#### [James 4] Vote neg to DRAIN NEOLIBERALISM’S BATTERIES – embrace melancholia instead of endorsing the aff’s resilient performance. Refuse the productivity of the debate space to stop debate from plugging your ballot back into the system.

James 4: James, Robin. [Associate Professor of Philosophy, UNC Charlotte] *Resiliency and Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism*.Zero Books: Winchester, 2015. CH

Melancholy isn’t just failed or misfired resilience; it is the continual, compounded draining of neoliberalism’s batteries. If resilience is a positive feedback loop, melancholia is a vicious cycle. Melancholic hang-ups bend resilient circuits into entropic ones; instead of amplifying life, they go into the death. (e) Spiraling Downward Into The Death Neoliberal melancholy often looks, on the surface, just like resilience. It takes the procedures and practices of resilience and uses them to invest in what MRWaSP otherwise renders as exception, what, as Lester Spence puts it, “cannot be remade for the purposes of capital” because it “does not operate according to market dictates” (38-9). Applying resilience to phenomena that, when remade as a market, do not generate sufficient surplus value for MRWaSP produces melancholy. Markets that don’t operate according to MRWaSP’s dictates are melancholic because they detract from MRWaSP’s vitality. For example, there is a whole subgenre of right-wing outrage journalism focused on people on public assistance who “waste” their money on supposedly frivolous purchases like manicures or name-brand apparel and electronics. In March 2014, the Tea Party News Network posted an online survey that asked “Do you agree with welfare recipients being forbidden to spend their taxpayer provided welfare money at lingerie shops, tattoo parlors, nail salons, jewelry stores, and anything other than food?” Similarly, the website somecards.com has a relatively large number of user-created ecards that reflect similar attitudes about the behavior of “welfare recipients.” Many mockingly depict women living indulgent lives full of manicures and designer clothes, while simultaneously reinforcing the stereotype that uses “welfare recipients” as a code word for urban, working-class black women.132 As Hill-Collins notes, “portrayed as being content to sit around and collect welfare, shunning work and passing bad values on to her offspring,” the point of racializing this “welfare queen” stereotype is to “labe[l] as unnecessary and even dangerous to the values of the country the fertility of women who are not White and middle class,” values such as (Black Feminist Thought, 87). The poll and the ecards give voice to a widespread worry that “welfare recipients”—that is, black women—are unable to properly execute the economic rationality we expect of good neoliberal subjects: they invest in the “wrong” things, in things that don’t maximize the vitality and profitability of MRWaSP. Nails, hair, and clothes are investments in black aesthetics, in a black woman’s own enjoyment of and satisfaction with her body. These small pleasures might be a way to “bounce back” from the daily grind of dealing with the increasingly baroque and repressive welfare state bureaucracy, and from, you know, constant, pervasive anti-black misogyny. These melancholic behaviors might also be very canny investments in one’s own human capital. As Tressie McMillan Cottom argues, poor African-Americans sometimes cultivate the appearance of uppermiddle class respectability in order to accumulate the human capital necessary to successfully navigate MRWaSP institutions. She explains: It took half a day but something about my mother’s performance of respectable black person — her Queen’s English, her Mahogany outfit, her straight bob and pearl earrings — got done what the elderly lady next door had not been able to get done in over a year. I learned, watching my mother, that there was a price we had to pay to signal to gatekeepers that we were worthy of engaging. It meant dressing well and speaking well. So, designer clothes, nice jewelry, these things may seem like exorbitant purchases for someone on a very limited budget. However, if these investments actually help you navigate the institutions that determine your access to and the success of your interaction with the welfare system or the justice system, then these investments are actually quite savvy: the returns far outweigh the costs. The return is access to more and better human capital than is usually granted black femininity; for example, as Cottom argues, her investments in a Jones New York suite “signaled that I was not a typical black or a typical woman, two identities that in combination are almost always conflated with being poor.”

## Add-Ons

### Alt Solves

#### [James 5] The alt solves – we use melancholia to resist cycles of oppression.

James 5: James, Robin. [Associate Professor of Philosophy, UNC Charlotte] *Resiliency and Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism*.Zero Books: Winchester, 2015. CH

Because MRWaSP must at least pay lip service to neoliberalism’s idealization of individual free choice, it has to delegitimize the rationality of choices that aren’t in its interest. That’s why this logic is “stupid”: this rhetorical move frames what would otherwise be seen as one free choice among others and as ignorance, pathology, or as a symptom of one’s inability to make free choices for oneself. When white women and people of color practice resilience in ways that don’t adequately support MRWaSP, they do not appear to be exercising free choice, to be choosing an alternative way of life. Rather, they appear to lack the capacity to choose— they’re supposedly victims of poverty, ignorance, misogynist ethnic cultural traditions, and so on, capable only of “stupid people logic.” Melancholia is resilience that isn’t socially legible as such[,]. It’s the application of resilient techniques— market-based calculation, balancing cost and benefit, investing in oneself—to material that MRWaSP cannot or does not want to capitalize on, to damage it does not want to recycle but render exceptional. Melancholia is the inability to recover from damage, to invest in oneself, in a way that MRWaSP recognizes as “healthy.” “Healthy” subjectivity is supposed to work as a positive feedback loop on both the subjective and the social levels: gains in the microcosm are compounded and amplified at the macrocosmic level. Melancholy, on the other hand can become a pathological vicious cycle wherein gains at microcosm are drains to the macrocosm. At the individual level, melancholia is double-edged: because what is good for you isn’t what’s healthiest for MRWaSP, your good decisions will be punished and pathologized, not rewarded. Smart self-capitalization is derided as “stupid,” for example. This sort of concern-trolling can be a way for MRWaSP to turn melancholic damage back into profit; it’s an opportunity for healthy subjects to demonstrate their, well, health—that they know better, that they’re not stupid, etc. This is why we should avoid getting troll-baited into fighting accusations of stupidity, toxicity, and so on: it’s just co-opting our noise and turning it back into signal. Instead, we should focus our energies on changing the circumstances and institutions that make our survival appear toxic, that make investments in ourselves seem pathological and irrational. Melancholia can, I think, be a way to do just this. Though MRWaSP will always try to recoup melancholic noise as resilient signal, there can be instances in which melancholia stacks the deck against MRWaSP so that any attempts to profit from melancholy, to overcome or co-opt its damage for monetary, aesthetic, and political gain are losing bets for MRWaSP. In such instances, [M]elancholy diminishes the capacity at which neoliberal institutions can function. Instead of recycling this damage into more life (by overcoming it and/or rendering it exceptional), melancholy intensifies it, pushing it into the death.

# Case

#### OFF FW

#### Totalizing diagnosis of antiblackness is wrong – relies on epistemic certainty which no one has – alternative futures are possible because human systems are incomplete and changeable.

**Gordon 15:** Gordon, Lewis. [Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy and Africana Studies, Affiliations in Judaic Studies and Caribbean, Latino/a, and Latin American Studies, University of Connecticut at Storrs, Visiting Europhilosophy Professor at Toulouse University, France, Nelson Mandela Visiting Professor in Political and International Studies at Rhodes University] "Lewis Gordon presents "What Fanon Said."" https://youtu.be/UABksVE5BTQ?t=1h22m58s, 1:22:58-1:41:12, 2015. EL

The first thing to bear in mind you may wonder why in the beginning of the talk I talked about philosophical anthropology. And many people when they are trying to talk about social change, they never think about what a human being is and this is something Fanon pays attention to. Many people want to have closed conceptions of human beings because then human beings can be predicable. And in fact, in Fanon’s writing he gave an example in which he said: one of the problems is that when he would walk in reason seems to walk out. Now, one problem we have to bear in mind when we try to look at the question of human beings in terms of rigid closed systems is that we often are trying to get as a model of how we work as theorists on issues of social change that are actually based on what we can call law like generalizations. Now what is a law like generalization? It is when you make sure that whatever you say has no contradiction down the line. So if you are to say this much, the next stage must be consistent with that, and the next stage until you are maximally consistent. Do you get that? But here is the problem—and I can just put it in a nut shell—nobody, nobody in this room would like to date, be married to, or be a best friend with a maximally consistent person. You know what that is. Its hell. And this tells you something, because if somebody where maximally consistent, you know what you would say that person is not reasonable. And we have a person here who does work on Hegel that can point out this insight, that a human being has the ability to evaluate rationality. Now why is that important? Because you see the mistake many of us make is we want to push the human being into that maximized law like generalization model. So when we think about our philosophical anthropology, some people, the question about intersectionality for instance, what some people don’t understand is that what intersectionality is raising is important insight. Nowhere is there ever a human being who is one identity. People talk about race; do you ever really see a race walking? You see a racialized man or woman, or transman or transwoman, or [inaud], you see what I’m getting at. Do you ever see a class walking? Class is embodied in flesh and blood people. And we can go on and on, a man, a woman, a color, and so forth. So if we enrich our philosophical anthropology, we begin to notice certain other things. And one of the other things we begin to realize is that we commit a serious problem when we do political work. And the problem is this. The question about Wilderson for instance. There is this discussion going on, and allot of people build it out of my early books. I have a category I call, as a metaphor, an antiblack world. You notice an indefinite article—an antiblack world. The reason I say that is because the world is different from an antiblack world. The project of racism is to create a world that would be completely antiblack or anti-woman. Although that is a project, it is not a fait accompli. People don’t seem to understand how recent this phenomenon we are talking about is. A lot of people talk about race they don’t even know the history of how race is connected into theonaturalism. How, for instance, Andalucia and pushing out the Moors. The history of how race connected to Christianity was formed. A lot of people don’t understand that from the standpoint of a species whose history is 220,000 years old, what the hell is 500 years? But the one thing that we don’t understand too is we create a false model for how we study those last 500 years. We study the 500 years as if the people who have been dominated have not been fighting and resisting. Had they not been fighting and resisting we wouldn’t be here. And then we come into this next point, because you see the problem in the formulation of pessimism and optimism is they are both based on forecasted knowledge, a prior knowledge. But human beings don’t have prior knowledge. And in fact—what in the world are we if we need to have guarantees for us to act. You know what you call such people? Cowards. The fact of the matter is our ancestors—let’s start with enslaved ancestors. The enslaved ancestors who were burning down those plantations, who were finding clever ways to poison masters, who were organizing meetings for rebellions, none of them had any clue about what the future would be 100 years later. In fact, some had good reason to believe that it may take 1000 years. But you know why they fought? Because they knew it wasn’t for them. One of the problems we have in the way we think about political issues is we commit what Fanon and others who have thought in the existential tradition would call a form of political immaturity. Political immaturity is it’s not worth it unless I, me, individually get the payoff.

#### Libidinal explanations of anti-blackness are wrong which prove they misread Fanon.

Peter Hudis 15, Professor of English and History @ Queens College, 2015, “Frantz Fanon: Philosopher of the Barricades,” Pg. 35-37

Fanon’s vantage point upon the world is his situated experience. He is trying to understand the inner psychic life of racism, not provide an account of the structure of human existence as a whole. Racism is not, of course, an integral part of the human psyche; it is a Social construct that has a psychic impact. Any effort to comprehend social distress that accompanies racism by reference to some a priori structure- be it the Oedipal Complex or the Collective Unconscious- is doomed to failure. Carl Jung sought to deepen and go beyond Freud's approach by arguing that the subconscious is grounded in a universal layer of the psyche- which he called "the collective unconscious:' This refers to inherited patterns of thought that exist in all human minds, regardless of specific culture or upbringing, and which manifest themselves in dreams, fairy tales, and myths. Jung referred to these universal patterns as "archetypes:' It may seem, on a superficial reading, that 1 Fanon is drawing from Jung, since he discusses how white people tend to unconsciously assimilate views of blacks that are based on negative stereotypes. Even the most "progressive" white tends to think of blacks a certain way (such as "emotional;' "physical," or / "aggressive"), even as they disavow any racist animus on their part. However, Fanon denies that such collective delusions are part of a psychic structure; they are not permanent features of the mind. They are habits acquired from a series of social and cultural impositions. While they constitute a kind a collective unconscious on the part of many white people, they are not grounded in any universal "archetype." The unconscious prejudices of whites do not derive from genes or nature, nor do they derive from some form independent of culture or upbringing. Fanon contends that Jung "confuses habit with instinct." Fanon objects to Jung's "collective unconscious" for the same reason that he rejects the notion of a black ontology. His phenomenological approach brackets out ontological claims on both a social and psychological level insofar as the examination of race and racism is concerned. He writes, "Neither Freud nor Adler nor even the cosmic Jung took the black man into consideration in the course of his research.” This does not mean that Fanon rejects their contributions tout court. He does not deny the existence of the unconscious. He only denies that the inferiority complex of blacks operates on an unconscious level. He does not reject the Oedipal Complex. He only denies that it explains (especially in the West Indies) the proclivity of the black "slave" to mimic the values of the white "master." And as seen from his positive remarks on Lacan's theory of the mirror stage, he does not reject the idea of psychic structure. He only denies that it can substitute for an historical understanding of the origin of neuroses .23 Fanon adopts a socio-genetic approach to a study of the psyche because that is what is adequate for the object of his analysis. For Fanon, it is the relationship between the socio-economic and psychological that is of critical import. He makes it clear, insofar as the subject matter of his study is concerned, that the socio-economic is first of all responsible for affective disorders: "First, economic. Then, internalization or rather epidermalization of this inferiority."24 Fanon never misses an opportunity to remind us that racism owes its origin to specific economic relations of domination- such as slavery, colonialism, and the effort to coopt sections of the working class into serving the needs of capital. It is hard to mistake the Marxist influence here. It does not follow, however, that what comes first in the order of time has conceptual or strategic priority. The inferiority complex is originally born from economic subjugation, but it takes on a life of its own and expresses itself in terms that surpass the economic. Both sides of the problem-the socio-economic and psychological-must be combatted in tandem: "The black man must wage the struggle on two levels; whereas historically these levels are mutually dependent, any unilateral liberation is flawed, and the worst mistake would be to believe their mutual dependence automatic:''5 On these grounds he argues that the problem of racism cannot be solved on a psychological level. It is not an "individual" problem; it is a social one. But neither can it be solved on a social level that ores the psychological. It is small wonder that although his name never appears in the book, Fanon was enamored of the work of Wilhelm Reich. This important Freudian-Marxist would no doubt feel affinity with Fanon's comment, "Genuine disalienation will have been achieved only when things, in the most materialist sense, have resumed their rightful place:'27

OFF ADVANTAGES

OFF METHOD

#### Changing discourse in debate without shifting actual power structures risks an illusion of transformation

**Bankey 13:** Brendon Bankey is a PhD student at Kansas and has a MA in communication from Wake Forest University. He debated for Trinity University. “THE “FACT OF BLACKNESS” DOES NOT EXIST: AN EVOCATIVE CRITICISM OF RESISTANCE RHETORIC IN ACADEMIC POLICY DEBATE AND ITS (MIS)USE OF FRANTZ FANON’S BLACK SKIN, WHITE MASKS,” August 2013, Pg. 16-17, AFGA)

**Not all resistant rhetoric succeeds in displacing power**, however. As such, **‘superficial transformations’ occur when “new discourses emerge without a reversal of power relations, or where practices change without the existence of thought**.” According to Phillips, examining these stifled discourses of resistance “can help to answer the question of why some transformations remain superficial while others open deep fractures in our experience of the present.”46 In accordance with Phillips’ suggestion, I will attend to Reid-Brinkley’s model of resistance and its “localized point of contingency and transformation” to examine “the inventional practices” of disruption it employs as a means of assessing the possibility for her movement to achieve its non-competitive goals. Given recent competitive successes of non-traditional debaters engaging in acts of resistance in the flesh, **it seems especially relevant to assess** whether this model of resistance can ensure the vitality of black public voice or **whether it is simply a competitive strategy that allows marginalized debaters to succeed by reversing power relations to impose new discourses that reinforce racialized essentialisms**.

#### Performance requires debaters to perform based on specific race or class, which reinforces differences among people, shattering coalitions.

**Bankey 13:** Brendon Bankey is a PhD student at Kansas and has a MA in communication from Wake Forest University. He debated for Trinity University. “THE “FACT OF BLACKNESS” DOES NOT EXIST: AN EVOCATIVE CRITICISM OF RESISTANCE RHETORIC IN ACADEMIC POLICY DEBATE AND ITS (MIS)USE OF FRANTZ FANON’S BLACK SKIN, WHITE MASKS,” August 2013, Pg. 114-115, AFGA)

Reid-Brinkley’s dissertation concerning strategies of bodily resistance, or resistance in the flesh, in high school and intercollegiate policy debate provides an example of rhetorical scholarship that appropriates Fanon’s “fact of blackness”—that the black body takes anti-human form as “an object among other objects” in social spaces—absent a discussion of disalienation. In this chapter, I apply my reading of Fanon to Reid-Brinkley’s scholarship as a means of illuminating the extent to which her method for resistance in policy debate undermines Fanon’s goal of disalienation. Through this criticism, I argue that Reid-Brinkley’s **resistance fails to generate a vision of policy debate “freed from” what Fanon describes as “the springboard of embodying resistance of others” because, by prioritizing the importance of the body in order to distinguish her movement from traditional forms of debate, it requires those who resist to dig “into [their] flesh in order to find self-meaning.” Because of this dependency on the ‘biological difference’ that the skin signifies, the specific inventional strategies** Reid-Brinkley offers for marginalized bodies to resist **fail to unlock** the **“suffocating reification”** that Fanon attributes his objectification to in L’Expérience Vécue du Noir. **The unfortunate result of this reification is the construction of a rhetorical barrier that hinders the ability of traditional debaters to acknowledge the** styles and **voices of those engaging in resistance**.

OFF METHOD

#### Using debates to advance a movement fails to expand them and causes backlash

**Bankey 13:** Brendon Bankey is a PhD student at Kansas and has a MA in communication from Wake Forest University. He debated for Trinity University. “THE “FACT OF BLACKNESS” DOES NOT EXIST: AN EVOCATIVE CRITICISM OF RESISTANCE RHETORIC IN ACADEMIC POLICY DEBATE AND ITS (MIS)USE OF FRANTZ FANON’S BLACK SKIN, WHITE MASKS,” August 2013, Pg. 53-54, AFGA)

**Policy debate is**, above other considerations, **a competition between academic institutions. And while some schools consider the educational benefits debate provides to be more important than an evaluation of wins and losses, it is difficult to dismiss the role competition plays in the activity**. Reid-Brinkley acknowledges this role in her discussion of genre violation when she discusses the “competitive obstacle” the Louisville Project created for their opponents by choosing to engage in alternative styles of affirming the resolution.23 Note the importance of the resolution in her analysis: Traditionally in policy debate, the affirmative must argue in support of the resolution that has been chosen for that year’s debate competition. In the first affirmative speech of the debate, the affirmative provides a structured nine minute speech in support of a specific policy idea that provides a justification for the correctness of the resolutional statement. The speech normally contains three observations or contentions that argue 1) that the status quo of a political situation provides a barrier to solving a problem and the affirmative suggests a course of action to rectify the problem; 2) they outline the potential advantages to their suggested course of action; and 3) they argue that their suggested course of action will solve the identified problem and result in the external advantages. Granted, **it would be a tremendous disservice to those in support of Reid-Brinkley’s movement to state that their sole purpose for resistance is to win debates That said, one cannot deny the strategic advantage afforded to movement teams that choose to shift the terms of the debate to a discussion** of whether or not marginalized bodies should be included in the activity. **Atchison and Panetta’s concern with the “debate as activism” approach highlights the competitive nature of debate as one of the primary reasons locating resistance in individual debates creates a barrier to community change. Debaters, traditional or otherwise, that “have spent countless hours preparing for” a “proposed resolution” will likely be unwilling to agree with the premise that they should lose a debate because of a wider community problem whose outcome their present debate cannot control. Creating “the ballot” as the nexus for resistance “does little to generate the critical coalitions necessary to address the community problem, because the competitive focus encourages teams to concentrate on how to beat the strategy with little regard for addressing the community problem.”** Moreover, as Atchison and Panetta observe:**When a team loses a debate because the judge decides that it is better for the community for the other team to win, then they have sacrificed two potential advocates for change within the community. Creating change through wins generates backlash through losses.**

### Performative stuff

### TERROR DA

#### SNITCHING DA TO THE AFF: they DISCLOSE STRATEGIES OF RESISTANCE — that’s uniquely bad, since they are PUTTING METHODS OUT TO NON-BLACK PEOPLE TO COOPT — even if the method is a good idea, THEIR PERFORMANCE OF THAT METHOD IS UNIQUELY BAD — reason they should lose.