#### Subjects are fundamentally unstable because of *evolution* - : all subjects fluctuate as they continue to evolve. Babies become toddlers, teenagers become adults, all which prove evolution.

#### Affect is constitutive: it is the capacity to experience and to be experienced. In round, everyone has the capacity to experience each other. There is no way any person or thing can escape affection.

#### [Weheliye 1] The state’s conception of identity and inclusion only further exasperates exclusion: by using the WTO as an arbiter to determine whether non - western countries are valued or ignored, these countries are forced to experience violence and compete with one another for rights recognition.

**Weheliye 1**: Weheliye, Alexander. [Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University] ““Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human” 2014. JP/BP

Paradoxically, the particular biological material in question remains the property, at least nominally, of all humanity and is not proper to Moore the individual person: “Lymphokines, unlike a name or a face, have the same molecular structure in every human being and the same, important functions in every human being's immune system. Moreover, the particular genetic material which is responsible for the natural production of lymphokines, and which defendants use to manufacture lymphokines in the laboratory, is also the same in every person; it is no more unique to Moore than the number of vertebrae in the spine or the chemical formula of hemoglobin.”20 **So, while the court grants personhood to human subjects in an individualized fashion that is based on comparatively distinguishing between different humans, when biological material clashes with the interests of capital, the court appeals to the indivisible biological sameness of the Homo sapiens species**. Since the court's ruling does not place this slice of human flesh in the commons for all humans to share, it tacitly grants corporations the capability of legally possessing this material with the express aim of generating monetary profit. Considering that corporations enjoy the benefits of limited personhood and the ability to live forever under U.S. law, corporate entities are entrusted with securing the immortal life of biological matter, while human persons are denied ownership of their supposed essence.21 My interest here lies not in claiming inalienable ownership rights for cells derived from human bodies such as Lacks's and Moore's but to draw attention to how thoroughly the very core of pure biological matter is framed by neoliberal market logics and by liberal ideas of personhood as property. We are in dire need of alternatives to the legal conception of personhood that dominates our world, and, in addition, to not lose sight of what remains outside the law, what the law cannot capture, what it cannot magically transform into the fantastic form of property ownership. Writing about the connections between transgender politics and other forms of identity-based activism that respond to structural inequalities, legal scholar Dean Spade shows how the focus on inclusion, recognition, and equality based on a narrow legal framework (especially as it pertains to antidiscrimination and hate crime laws) not only hinders the eradication of violence against trans people and other vulnerable populations but actually creates the condition of possibility for the continued unequal “distribution of life chances.” If demanding recognition and inclusion remains at the center of minority politics, it will lead only to a delimited notion of personhood as property that zeroes in comparatively on only one form of subjugation at the expense of others, thus allowing for the continued existence of hierarchical differences between full humans, not-quite-humans, and nonhumans. This can be gleaned from the “successes” of the mainstream feminist, civil rights, and lesbian-gay rights movements, which facilitate the incorporation of a privileged minority into the ethnoclass of Man at the cost of the still and/or newly criminalized and disposable populations (women of color, the black poor, trans people, the incarcerated, etc.).23 To make claims for inclusion and humanity via the U.S. juridical assemblage removes from view that the law itself has been thoroughly violent in its endorsement of racial slavery, indigenous genocide, Jim Crow, the prison-industrial complex, domestic and international warfare, and so on, and that it continues to be one of the chief instruments in creating and maintaining the racializing assemblages in the world of Man. Instead of appealing to legal recognition, Julia Oparah suggests counteracting the “racialized (trans)gender entrapment” within the prison-industrial complex and beyond with practices of “maroon abolition” (in reference to the long history of escaped slave contraband settlements in the Americas) to “foreground the ways in which often overlooked African diasporic cultural and political legacies inform and undergird anti-prison work,” while also providing strategies and life worlds not exclusively centered on reforming the law.24 Relatedly, Spade calls for a radical politics articulated from the “ ‘impossible’ worldview of trans political existence,” which redefines “the insistence of government agencies, social service providers, media, and many nontrans activists and nonprofiteers that the existence of trans people is impossible.”25 A relational maroon abolitionism beholden to the practices of black radicalism and that arises from the incompatibility of black trans existence with the world of Man serves as **one example** of how putatively abject modes **of being need no tbe** redeployed **within hegemonic framework but** can be **operationalized as variable liminal territories or** articulated **assemblages in movements to abolish the grounds upon which all forms of subjugation are administered.**

#### [Weheliye 2] Collective suffering becomes the metric to determine whether a subject warrants recognition or not. The state becomes the arbiter of who deserves rights based on the degree to which they are suffering – leading to endless political and psychological violence.

**Weheliye 2**: Weheliye, Alexander. [Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University] ““Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human” 2014. JP

Suffering, especially when caused by political violence, has long functioned as the hallmark of both humane sentience and of inhuman brutality. **Frequently, suffering becomes the defining feature of those subjects excluded from the law, the national community, humanity, and so on due to the political violence inflicted upon them even as it, paradoxically, grants them access to inclusion and equality.** In western human rights discourse, for instance, the physical and psychic residues of political violence enable victims to be recognized as belonging to the “brotherhood of Man.” **Too often, this tendency not only leaves intact hegemonic ideas of humanity as indistinguishable from western Man but demands comparing different forms of subjugation in order to adjudicate who warrants recognition and belonging.** As W. E. B. Du Bois asked in 1944, if the Universal Declaration of Human Rights did not offer provisions for ending world colonialism or legal segregation in the United States, “Why then call it the Declaration of Human Rights?”2 Wendy Brown maintains, “politicized identity” operates “only by entrenching, restating, dramatizing, and inscribing its pain in politics; it can hold out no future...that triumphs over this pain.”3 Brown suggests replacing the identitarian declaration “I am,” which merely confirms and solidifies what already exists, with the desiring proclamation “I want,” which offers a Nietzschean politics of overcoming pain instead of clinging to suffering as an immutable feature of identity politics. While I recognize Brown's effort to formulate a form of minority politics not beholden to the aura of wounded attachments and fixated almost fetishistically on the state as the site of change, we do well to recall that many of the political agendas based on identity (the suffragette movement, the movement for the equality of same-sex marriages, or the various movements for the full civil rights of racialized minority subjects, for instance) are less concerned with claiming their suffering per se (I am) than they are with using wounding as a stepping stone in the quest (I want) for rights equal to those of full citizens. Liberal governing bodies, whether in the form of nation-states or supranational entities such as the United Nations or the International Criminal Court make particular forms of wounding the precondition for entry into the hallowed halls of full personhood, only acknowledging certain types of physical violence. For instance, while the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees passed a resolution in 2008 that includes rape and other forms of sexual violence in the category of war crimes, there are many forms of sexual violence that do not fall into this purview, and thus bar victims from claiming legal injury and/or personhood.4 Even more generally, the acknowledgment and granting of full personhood of those excluded from its precincts requires the overcoming of physical violence, while epistemic and economic brutalities remain outside the scope of the law. **Congruently, much of the politics constructed around the effects of political violence, especially within the context of international human rights but also with regard to minority politics in the United States, is constructed from the shaky foundation of surmounting or desiring to leave behind physical suffering so as to take on the ghostly semblance of possessing one's personhood. Then and only then will previously minoritized subjects be granted their humanity as a legal status.** Hence, the glitch Brown diagnoses in identity politics is less a product of the minority subject's desire to desperately cling to his or her pain but a consequence of the state's dogged insistence on suffering as the only price of entry to proper personhood, what Samera Esmeir has referred to as a “juridical humanity” that bestows and rescinds humanity as an individualized legal status in the vein of property. **Apportioning personhood in this way maintains the world of Man and its attendant racializing assemblages, which means in essence that the entry fee for legal recognition is the acceptance of categories based on white supremacy and colonialism, as well as normative genders and sexualities.**

#### [Krupar et al] The alternative is abolitionist biomedicine, a *refusal* of this world. To clarify, this means that we reorient the ways in which we conceptualize health in order to understand the underpinnings of policymaking.

**Krupar et al**: Krupar, Shiloh. [Georgetown University], Ehlers, Nadine. [University of Sydney, Australia] “Biofutures: Race and the governance of health” *Society and Space,* 2016. JP

The Du Boisian vision of alleviating the racial ‘‘cut’’ in the governance of life has yet to be realized. In the era of neoliberal biopolitics, black lives are especially imperiled in the very same moment that life is ostensibly affirmed. **Biomedical targeting technologies are predicated on the laudable pursuit of attending to vulnerable populations and alleviating racial disparities of health. These technologies potentially address specific conditions that affect black life, in accord with Du Bois’ call to attend to the color line**. In the contemporary era, race-based pharmaceuticals and medical hot spotting bring black subjects into the fold of the vital politics of life through customizing care at different scales of existence—the individual body and the environment of certain populations. Yet in doing so, as we have shown, these practices continue to ontologize those bodies and spaces as a problem. **Thus, while they may not explicitly fortify the color line in the Du Boisian sense, they more ominously resecure anti-blackness through the supposed fostering of life.** The targeting of specific bodies or spaces extracts them from broader relations of structural racism and customizes medical resources in ways that objectify race or racialized space as that which should be secured against. Ultimately such biomedical targeting recursively protects the reality that health optimization is an exclusionary anti-black project. Our main intervention has been to examine the epistemological underpinnings of anti- blackness with respect to new health governance along the lines of race. Our two examples of BiDil and medical hot spotting show that biomedical targeting anticipates risk and failure and performs death-expectant interventions that ultimately expel African Americans from optimal health but do so in different ways. BiDil extols black responsibility of risk, enlisting African Americans in self-care for lived and embodied conditions of anti-blackness, that is, for violence against blacks and for historically accumulated disadvantage and ill-health from the positioning of African Americans outside of the category of Human. Medical hot spotting further demonstrates anti- blackness as the structural positioning of African Americans outside the rest of the populace as demarcated ‘‘problem spaces’’ inhabited by ‘‘problem bodies.’’ The practice orchestrates violence through spatial abstraction and data-based mapping operations that contain and surveil race as a threat, and, like BiDil, it calls for individualized responsibility. In short, these biomedical targeting technologies fail to cultivate black futures. Instead, they ontologically secure blackness as nonfuturity. **Futurity lies at the heart of biopolitical governance and practices, which intervene into life in order to control but also improve the prospects of the population.** In a Foucauldian understanding, biopolitics exerts a positive influence over life, ‘‘that endeavors to administer, optimize, and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulations’’ (Foucault, 1978: 137). **Yet, if health, as we have shown, is an exclusionary anti- black achievement, it seems imperative to work to abolish race as an operation that biopolitically adjudicates. To this end, biomedical efforts that seek to organize reparative justice must work against reestablishing race as an ontology at the very same moment that we labor toward alleviating those very real social disparities predicated on race**. As such, a just politics would need to address the epistemology of anti-blackness as the basis for health. **Essentially, such a politics would refuse this world, precisely because it is structured through anti-blackness and ‘‘looks like no future at all’’ (Bliss, 2015: 93).**

**They add:**

While medical die-ins could be looked at as supporting more resources for customizing biomedicine, the very performative act of the die-in suggests a move away from the medical environment to a more expansive envisioning of racial justice. This momentary refusal to be instrumental to pervasive medical institutional racism—and the effort to link biomedicine to broader social relations—powerfully draws connections between police brutality against blacks and the protocols and practices of the U.S. health care system that have led to poorer health, shorter life expectancies, and inferior medical care for black Americans (Lewis, 2014). The collective action of suspended medical professional operations—of enacting protest as a professional obligation to public health—opens up the potential to address the role of explicit and implicit forms of discrimination and structural racism in clinical learning environments, medical administrative decision-making, medical education curricula, and daily hospital operations. In doing so, white coat die-ins advocate for future abolitionist practices that refuse to resecure race as the problem: That reject the racialized biopolitics of health because it ‘‘kills, sickens, and provides inadequate care’’; and that publicly mourn the ruins of black nonfuturity that are our institutions (Anon, 2014). **And, while these same doctors or medical students might support race-targeted pharmaceuticals and race-based coordinated care, surely what the Black Lives Matter movement is ultimately demanding is something more imaginative and visionary than prescriptive and constraining reinstantiations of racial essentialism as the means through which to cultivate black life. What remains, then, is the question of how such a refusal of what is might translate into practical efforts toward an abolitionist biomedicine—in relation to both care delivery and drug development—to rework the biopresent and pursue alternative biofutures.**

#### [Wehelieye 4] Deviant bodies are compared against one another under the state as the color line sets the basis for how subjects should be – women, queer folk, and black people stray from the standard conception of the Western Man, and face oppression as a result. Thus, the Role of the Ballot is to deconstruct western Man.

**Weheliye 4**: Weheliye, Alexander. [Associate Professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University] ““Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics, and Black Feminist Theories of the Human” 2014. JP

Consequently, **racialization figures as a master code within the genre of the human represented by western Man, because its law-like operations are yoked to species-sustaining physiological mechanisms in the form of a global color line—instituted by cultural laws so as to register in human neural networks—that clearly distinguishes the good/life/fully-human from the bad/death/not-quite-human**. This, in turn, authorizes the conflation of racialization with mere biological life, which, on the one hand, enables white subjects to “see” themselves as transcending racialization due to their full embodiment of this particular genre of the human while responding anti-pathetically to nonwhite subjects as bearers of ontological cum biological lack, and, on the other hand, in those subjects on the other side of the color line, it creates sociogenically instituted physiological reactions against their own existence and reality.40 Since the being of nonwhite subjects has been coded by the cultural laws in the world of Man as pure negativity, their subjectivity impresses punishment on the neurochemical reward system of all humans, or in the words of Frantz Fanon: “My body was returned to me spread-eagled, disjointed, redone, draped in mourning on this white winter's day. The Negro is an animal, the Negro is bad, the Negro is wicked, the Negro is ugly.” **Political violence plays a crucial part in the baroque techniques of modern humanity, since it simultaneously serves to create not-quite-humans in specific acts of violence and supplies the symbolic source material for racialization**. For Wynter, the promise of black studies—and the numerous other ruptures precipitated by the 1960s—lies in its liminality, which contains potential exit strategies from the world of Man. **However, we must first devise new objects of knowledge that facilitate “the calling in question of our present culture's purely biological definition of what it is to be, and therefore of what it is like to be, human.”** We must do so because we cannot fully understand the present incarnation of the human from within the “biocentric and bourgeois” epistemic order that authorizes the biological selectedness of Man and, conversely, the creation of “dysgenic humans” (those who are evolutionarily dysselected), “a category comprised in the US of blacks, Latinos, Indians as well as the transracial group of the poor, the jobless, the homeless, the incarcerated,” the disabled, and the transgendered.43 Within our current episteme, these groups are constituted as aberrations from the ethnoclass of Man by being subjected to racializing assemblages that establish “natural” differences between the selected and dysselected. In other words, black, Latino, poor, incarcerated, indigenous, and so forth populations become real objects via the conduit of evolutionarily justified discourses and institutions, which, as a consequence, authorizes Man to view himself as naturally ordained to inhabit the space of full humanity. **Thus, even though racializing assemblages commonly rely on phenotypical differences, their primary function is to create and maintain distinctions between different members of the Homo sapiens species that lend a suprahuman explanatory ground (religious or biological, for example) to these hierarchies**. As Wynter explains, “all our present struggles with respect to race, class, gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, struggles over the environment, global warming, severe climate change, the sharply unequal distribution of the earth resources...—these are all differing facets of the central ethnoclass Man vs. Human struggle.”44 Wynter's oeuvre facilitates the analysis of the relay between different forms of subjugation, because in it the human operates as a relational ontological totality. Therefore, the Man versus Human battle does not dialectically sublate the specificity of the other struggles but articulates them in this open totality so as to abolish Man and liberate all of humanity rather than specific groups.