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## T Framework

### 1NC – Hypothetical enactment

#### A. Interpretation: the affirmative may only garner offense from the hypothetical enactment of the resolution.

#### Violation: THEY DON’T MEET B/C \_\_\_\_\_\_\_

#### *\*GO SLOW\** Our interp is compatible with them reading \_\_\_\_\_ which solves their \_\_\_ offense and our offense bc \_\_\_\_\_.

#### B. Our Offense

#### 1. Limits- post-fiat impacts are limited enough based on the plan text but allowing performative and pre-fiat impacts opens the floodgates – there’s an infinite number of justifications behind the 1AC or performative aspects of they could claim to garner offense from. No part of the 1AC warranted why their performance was a good thing or how they could garner offense which especially proves our argument

#### 2. Causality – debating the resolution forces the affirmative to defend a cause and effect relationship, the state doing x results in y. Non topical affs establish their own barometer “I think x is good for me” that aren’t negateable. Only the neg promotes switch side debate

#### 3. Exclusionary rule- you can’t vote on the case outweighs T because lack of preparation prevents rigorous testing of the AC claims. If we win fairness we don’t have to “outweigh” other impacts

#### C. Drop the debater on T – the round is already skewed from the beginning because their advocacy excluded by ability to generate NC offense– letting them sever doesn’t solve any of the abuse

#### Theory is an issue of competing interpretations because reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters will exploit a judge’s tolerance for questionable argumentation.

#### 1. The state isn’t monolithic or fixed- it’s a contingent site of political struggle. Blanket rejection empowers right wing policies, while strategic resistance can use cracks in the state as a focal point of transformation Khachaturian 17

Khachaturian, PhD candidate, 17

(Rafael, PoliSci@Indiana Bloomington, 2-20, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2017/02/deep-state-michael-flynn-leaks-federal-bureaucracy-trump/)

The Trump administration had a rough first month. On top of mass protests, historically low approval ratings, and staffing disorganization, the various bureaucracies of the federal civil service are riven with conflict and openly resisting the administration’s agenda. Last week, Michael Flynn resigned as national security adviser following leaked reports that he’d met with Russian intelligence prior to the presidential election. If anything, the rebellion within the intelligence community is only escalating. The mounting discord has led many to comment on the persistence of the “deep state” — shorthand for the nexus of corporate power and political and administrative institutions, including the branches of the armed forces, the federal bureaucracy, and the FBI, CIA, NSA, and other secretive intelligence agencies — and its ability to act as a check on the Trump presidency. According to critics — and until recently, references to the “deep state” were rarely positive — these subterranean networks exercise disproportionate influence over public policy. While parts of the Left have long been concerned about the deep state, lately the Right has taken up the term, using it to decry a purported fifth column of Obama loyalists. From Glenn Greenwald to Bill Kristol, Breitbart to Foreign Policy, it seems everyone now accepts the reality of the deep state, even if they disagree about its role in the present controversy. The term’s surge in popularity is understandable. The “deep state” appears to be an appropriate way to describe the complex networks tying together the various state apparatuses. In particular, it can easily be invoked to explain the seemingly invisible, drawn out, and arcane processes by which public policy is actually negotiated and made. Yet for the same reason, references to the deep state obscure more than they clarify. They shed hardly any light on the nature of the power struggle currently roiling the federal government. If we want to fight Trump, we’ll need conceptual and theoretical frameworks with more explanatory power than the “deep state” can provide. The Concept on Everyone’s Mind The notion of the deep state has a long history in American politics. While emanating from different ends of the political spectrum, President Eisenhower’s warnings in 1961 about the “military-industrial complex” and C. Wright Mills’s famous 1956 study of “the power elite” can both be seen as indictments of the deep state as an undemocratic distortion of policymaking. After Vietnam and Watergate, the concept embedded itself even more deeply in the political discourse, as the notion of a pluralistic distribution of power in American society appeared increasingly farcical in the face of structural inequalities. The regulatory state and the entrenched network of intelligence agencies came to be viewed as political actors just like the visible branches of government. With Trump’s ascendance to the White House, the “deep state” is once again on everyone’s mind. Trump — in keeping with his managerial style, which mirrors that of many authoritarian leaders — has attempted to sow discord among rival factions of his cabinet to ensure their direct loyalty. Likewise, he has sought to appoint outsiders to bureaucratic leadership positions, in part to prevent them from identifying with their appointed agencies, and in part to weaken the agencies traditionally favored by Democrats and progressives. A highly mobilized public has slowed down the latter. But so too has the civil service’s active disobedience (including, in the case of the intelligence bureaucracy, leaking highly damaging information). On one level, these sectors are hostile to Trump’s agenda because it seeks, at least in part, to upset the stability of the American political order and thus, of their institutional autonomy. But even if we grant that state agencies have their own interests and domains of authority that they jealously defend against encroachment, it’s unwise to think of the mounting internal opposition to Trump as a “deep state” giant now awake and attempting to restore things to normal. The Problem With the “Deep State” The deep state concept is harmful in two key ways. First, invoking the deep state implies a misleading view of the state as a monolithic, unitary actor. While the deep state is usually said to be a network of individuals and agencies, it is assumed that these component parts are held together by a common will or mission (in this case, something like defending the “national interest” against Trumpism). This leads to a reification of the state as an autonomous and internally coherent force. Yet modern capitalist states are more fragmented than they appear. First, they are composed of class fractions and coalitions that have frequently clashing interests and are motivated by short-term considerations. Often, these internal differences arise from the pressure exerted by various economic interests (such as the competition between the financial, manufacturing, and small business sectors). In addition, these class forces are intersected by other factors, including the different social bases of support behind the major political parties (including voter cleavages based on urban versus rural interests, racial and gender attitudes, and “populist” appeal), the mass media’s role in shaping certain ideological narratives, and competing visions of foreign policy and geopolitical strategy. As the Greek sociologist Nicos Poulantzas wrote in State, Power, Socialism, we need to “discard once and for all the view of the State as a completely united mechanism, founded on a homogeneous and hierarchical distribution of the centers of power moving from top to bottom of a uniform ladder or pyramid.” The state is better understood as a temporary and historically contingent crystallization of social forces, a formation whose institutions are as liable to come into conflict with each other in times of political duress as they are to align seamlessly in times of stability. It is not at all clear, then, that the leaks are a power play by a unified deep state. The rivalry within the White House between the Bannon and Priebus camps, and Trump’s intent to govern by executive order (with little consultation from Congress, the Justice Department, or the federal agencies responsible for implementing these orders) have disturbed the normal functioning of the bureaucracy. As state personnel develop ways of coping with the unpredictable and ad hoc nature of this administration, the dissent within their ranks is a sign of the uncertainty that they have been thrown into since the election, rather than a well-coordinated, conspiratorial effort. Second, to talk of the deep state is to suggest that political power is sealed off from broader social struggles. The state–civil society binary is one of the fundamental bases of liberal political theory. But this distinction is largely a byproduct of the way that political power has represented itself, rather than a social fact. Where the state ends and civil society begins has always been permeable and contested — in other words, subject to politics and political struggle. The state is not an entity standing over and above society, but instead one premised upon the social forces that bring it into being. Loose talk of the “deep state” misses this crucial point, advancing instead a facile vision of institutionalized power that constitutes its own foundation, and is therefore opaque, mysterious, and beyond the reach of citizens. The State and the Struggle Rejecting the deep state framework is not an academic exercise. The way we think about the state shapes how we, as democratic agents, conceive of and relate to organized political power. It affects how we organize and participate in the growing movement against the Trump administration and the GOP’s agenda. Treating the state as a nebulous substratum of bureaucratic networks and institutions — ones that really call the shots behind visible electoral politics — overlooks its potential as a terrain for political struggle. To again quote Poulantzas, “the State is not a monolithic bloc but a strategic field.” Through concerted struggles inside and outside of political institutions, the opposition can displace and alter the state’s internal dynamics. They can attack the hegemonic coalition (currently headed by Trump) at the core. What would this look in practice? What would it entail for the movement against Trumpism to analyze, leverage, and exploit for its own ends the various coalitions, fractions, and hegemonic blocs within the state that are now publicly clashing? First, it would mean embracing the plurality of political resistance, from legislative pressure to marches and public demonstrations, economic boycotts, and civil disobedience. Since the election we have seen a new politicization of civil society, and the proliferation of local initiatives seeking to stem the new administration’s onslaught. Among these are the rapid growth of the Democratic Socialists of America, and the movements for sanctuary cities and campuses. These struggles in civil society always reverberate within the state, turning the latter into a contested ground where these new movements can push back, both directly within and outside of state institutions, against the Trump agenda. Second, it would mean deepening the existing ties between the various popular struggles fighting Trump and the GOP, including the movements for women’s and reproductive rights, immigrant rights, workers’ rights, and environmental justice. In the short term, cultivating a broad coalition around overlapping interests (and seeking to fragment the support behind the Trump coalition, where possible) could encourage a further de-legitimization of the Trump administration’s far-right agenda, and thereby spur more refusals and defections from within the ranks of the civil service. Eventually, this movement building would go a long way in creating a positive common agenda for an already-revitalizing left. In sum, it would mean challenging the state’s ability to establish the new normal envisioned in Trump’s campaign agenda, and to inject popular struggles into the heart of the ruling coalition, which cannot act without the ongoing support of both major parties and the bureaucracy. But for any of this to happen, we first have to abandon the idea of a coherent, unitary deep state that is dictating politics behind the scenes. Relying on an illusory deep state to save us indulges in a fantasy at a time when we can ill afford to do so.

## Afro Pess

### 1NC- Leong

#### Our thesis: The Atlantic Slave Trade provided the justification for the white human versus slave dichotomy – chattel slavery has recreated itself under different names, from Jim Crow to the Prison Industrial Complex – because of this, black death is not only accepted as normal, but pathologized and necessary for white civil society to survive. The plan is water denied from slaves in the hold of the slave ship – substantively, sustenance is available for black people, but structurally, it can never be distributed equally.

Leong (Diana, Assistant Professor of English & Environmental Humanities Graduate Program at Utah University) 2017 (The Salt Bones: Zong! and an Ecology of Thirst, Published January 4th 2016, Isle Journal, Volume 23 Issue 4, November 2016, C.A.)

Philip is acutely aware that the global systems of slavery attempted to define unequivocally the proper “mode of being human,” and this mode is largely emblematized by what Sylvia Wynter calls “Man.” Wynter’s remarkable article Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/ Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, its Overrepresentation—an Argument, traces the overrepresentation of “Man” through the various epistemes of the West, arguing that as the prototype for the human species, “Man” originated in Greco-Roman tradition and has since been idealized and idolized through Judeo-Christian philosophy, and the natural and human sciences.8 This imagined category, which we can also recognize in its various guises as the transcendental subject, the subject of law, or the subject of civil (and “civilized”) society, directs the form, scale, and scope of contemporary conflicts by measuring the degree to which those involved conform to its requirements. Plainly, the category of “Man” has undergone centuries of modification in response to historical demands, but Wynter emphasizes that at least since the advent of modern racial slavery, the mechanisms of “Man” have concentrated on establishing black populations as inferior: The correlated hypothesis here is that 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’s resources ... these are all differing facets of the central ethnoclass Man vs. Human struggle ... .This pattern is linked to the fact that ... the Black population group, of all the multiple groups comprising the post-sixties social hierarchy, has once again come to be placed at the bottommost place of that hierarchy (Gans, 1999), with all incoming new nonwhite/non-Black groups ... coming to claim “normal” North American identity by the putting of visible distance between themselves and the Black population group. (260–62) Among other things, to be “Man” means to be non-black. In particular, Wynter’s assessment of how the “Man versus human struggle” is coordinated through “struggles over the environment” and “the sharply unequal distribution of the earth’s resources” prepares our approach to understanding how the ecological relationships arranged by the slave ship are bound up with the “imposition of [‘Man’s’] necessity” (Wynter 260–62; Moten 756). In “Zong! #5,” Philip restages the legal drama of “absolute necessity” around the need for water to reveal thirst as the ecological remainder of the slaves’ frustrated claims to “Man.” Even though rain had more than likely replenished “Zong’s” water supplies, this was clearly not enough to prevent the crew from throwing slaves overboard. Any additional slaves thrown overboard after the rains reinforced the thirst of the remaining slaves as a permanent condition of absolute necessity, one that could not be satisfied or alleviated by water. For the slaves, water was a “peril” that could only be misrepresented (i.e., “lying”) as “sustenance”: “sea and/perils/of water/ (one day)/water–/day one ... /of months/of/weeks/of/days/of/sustenance/lying/dead” (original emphasis, Philip 9). The middle section of “Zong! #5” establishes the permanency of this experience by making it impossible to ascertain how long the slaves had gone without sufficient water: 10 of days of sour water enemies & want of died (seven out of seventeen) of good (the more of) of (eighteen instead of six) dead of rains (eleven days) of weeks (thirty not three) Odusanya Mxali Ogunba (Philip 10) The quantities scattered throughout this section alternately measure the dead—“(eighteen instead of six)/dead,” the duration of rainfall—“(thirty not three)/of/water,” or an unknown element— “(seven out of seventeen)/of.” The apparent randomness of the numbers inhibits reactions determined solely by the scale of the horrors suffered on “Zong.” Abolitionist rhetoric emphasized the number of slaves thrown overboard because the murder of one slave would likely prove insufficient to rouse white sympathies. But the focus on this number also confined the events aboard “Zong” to a specific temporal moment that remained firmly within the abolitionist timeline, a timeline that was resolved by the abolition of the trade itself. “Zong! #5” destabilizes this figure by demonstrating the immeasurability, and hence the irresolution, of the captives’ thirst. Removing this suffering from the historical time of abolitionist narrative situates it instead within ontological time, or “the time of time itself, the time by which the Slave’s dramatic clock is set” (Wilderson 339). The slave’s non-linear, ontological time enables the historical time of the non-slave to materialize by providing an illusion of stasis.9 In fact, the slaves’ thirst appears to show no historical movement whatsoever: of water day one ... for sustenance water day one ... one day’s water day one ... sour water day one ... three butts good of voyage (a month’s) Thandiwe Lukman Sabah Liu Sikumbuzo (Philip 11) The consistent italicization of “day one ...” fixes the fragment as a signifying whole that reaches through the ellipses to span the line breaks. If the slaves’ thirst was indeed simply the consequence of the resource scarcity that flourished on slave ships, then a re-distribution of resources should have attenuated the suffering of the enslaved. And yet, as “Zong! #5” demonstrates, even gaining access to water repeatedly returns the slave to “day one” of her journey. If the timeline of the nonslave, or of the sailor and the abolitionist, can be measured by the elimination of thirst or the abolition of slavery, then the slave, defined through her endless thirst, will always remain a slave. This subordination of historical time to ontological time is mirrored in the epigraph from St. Augustine that opens the “Sal” section of Zong!: “There was no then” (qtd. in Philip 58). If the slave’s thirst does not occupy a specific or immediate moment, a “then,” it may therefore occupy all moments simultaneously. This racialized experience of water not only became reasonable grounds for treating the slaves as less-than-human (e.g., the massacres), but also protected the value created by that treatment (e.g., the laws of the general average and absolute necessity). It is hardly surprising that in middle of its putative “water crisis,” Detroit began soliciting proposals for the large-scale privatization of its water and sewer systems. An ecology of thirst guarantees that the ability to control the relationship to water, and moreover to distill value from that relationship, remains one of the hallmarks of “Man.” Zong!’s second section expands on the effects of infinite thirst to consider how they might propose new ways of being “human.”

### L: Cap = Root Cause

#### Anti-Blackness is the root cause of economic exploitation and punishment-based subordination – divide and conquer framing is an ineffective lens for analyzing disproportionately gratuitous violence done to black people.

William Calathes, Professor @ NJCU (2017): Racial capitalism and punishment philosophy and practices: what really stands in the way of prison abolition, Contemporary Justice Review, DOI: 10.1080/10282580.2017.1383774

From prior to its inception, the United States has had a political economy built through the extraction of surplus value from racialized bodies (e.g. indentured servitude, dispossession of indigenous lands, chattel slavery) that are connected to ‘racially ontological hierarchies of space, which permitted the hyper-exploitation of certain (colorized) bodies and lands’ (McIntyre & Nast, 2011, p. 1466). Racialization is the core quality of capitalism because capitalism needs race to exploit, and the promotion of racial animus has been a core practice of the dominant white elite class. This exploitative racialized structural arrangement, however, has historic origins that predate this nation. ‘Capitalism and racism did not break from an Old World order, but rather emerged from the feudal order and evolved from it to produce a modern world system of “racial capitalism” dependent on slavery, violence, imperialism, and genocide’ (Kelley, 2017). Capitalism is ‘racial’ not because of some conspiracy to divide workers or justify slavery or dispossession, but because racialism already characterized European feudal society. Racialization within Europe was a colonial process including invasion, settlement, expropriation, and racial hierarchy. In fact, groups such as the Irish were functionally racialized in the centuries prior to the transatlantic slave trade (Robinson, 1983). Racialization characterized pre-colonial America as well. Virginia, for example, was established as a profit-seeking enterprise. White land-owning elites forced large numbers of people to work tobacco for them and, as a result, garnered great wealth. ‘Neither white skin nor English nationality protected servants from the grossest forms of brutality and exploitation. The only degradation they were spared was perpetual enslavement – that fate eventually befell descendants of Africans’ (Fields, 1990, p. 102). In Virginia and elsewhere, chattel slavery of black people replaced the indentured servitude of white Europeans and became the primary mechanism of labor exploitation. ‘Capital was kick-started by rape of the African continent’ (Wilderson, 2003, p. 229). The creation of the Negro, the fiction of the ‘dumb beast of burden fit only for slavery,’ was closely associated with the economic, technical, and financial requirements of Western Development from the sixteenth century on (Robinson, 1983). The veiled slavery of wage earners in England required an obvious and ‘pure’ form of chattel slavery in the New World. So, at the same time European labor was being thrown off land and pushed into industries, ‘African labor was being forced into the transatlantic slave trade and, following slavery, whiteness became the basis for racialized privilege’ (Harris, 1993, p. 1709). Racial capitalism uses punishments as mechanisms of subordination (Chen, 2013). In the period in which chattel slavery adequately controlled Afro-descended people, punishment was focused elsewhere. In fact, the expansion of punishment and penal authority was an effort to reassert control after the American Revolution. Elite white men defined themselves ‘against an increasingly vocal and growing groups of others – free blacks, laborers, immigrants and women’ (Manion, 2015, p. 3). These white elite men founded the first penitentiary in Philadelphia to maintain order. The Walnut Street Prison was a repository that housed women, immigrants, enslaved people and indentured servants, the Irish, and the AngloAmerican poor, struggling to make a living. ‘White elites used punishment to classify and segregate people along lines of difference – crime, class, gender, race and age’ (Manion, 2015, p. 20). Capitalism racializes, and the analysis of race changes over time. At one time or another, for example, Irish, Italians, and Jews were racialized as non-white people. Moreover, racial capitalism evolves and changes its forms of punishment. But throughout all historical periods, being ‘with’ and being ‘without’ are racial categories – and those without are condemned. ‘Whiteness is a treasured property in a society structured on racial caste’ (Harris, 1993, p. 1713). Within this society punishment is cast as ‘the natural solution to social ills and human relationships are delivered as differential rather than connective’ (Gilmore, 2007, p. 109). This solution of othering has a long history and punishment has played an integral role in its implementation, adjustability, and maintenance.

### 1NC- King

#### The role of the ballot, judge, and all nonblack people is to offer themselves up to unbecoming through black studies – this requires centering the white erotic gaze as the object of study and holding ourselves accountable for the affective investments in humanism we make every second of every day – voting neg is a surrender to blackness, an acknowledgement that the affirmative’s “moral duty” to “save” black people from fatalism is nothing more than a psychological predisposition to solidify the white self over the black body – rather than asking how we can save black studies, the critique is a call to recognize how black studies has saved us.

King, WGSS @GSU, 19

[Dr. Tiffany Lethabo, "Off Littorality (Shoal 1.0): Black Study Off the Shores of 'the Black Body’." Propter Nos. https://www.academia.edu/38170503/\_Off\_Littorality\_Shoal\_1.0\_Black\_Study\_Off\_the\_Shores\_of\_the\_Black\_Body\_]//AD

When I am confronted with yet another white project on Black people’s bodies—specifically Black people’s genitals, entrails, and rotting carcasses—I am now compelled to ask more questions of (as opposed to shut down) the scholar. Following Musser, who develops an empathetic reading practice in Sensational Flesh, I argue that there is generative potential and value to mining the white and nonblack scholar’s desires, motivations, and affective states in the midst of thinking about Blackness.24 Some of these black erotic and kinky methods and practices even run alongside queer methods of feeling, thinking, and writing. For example, Ann Cvetkovich models critical memoir as a mode of writing and knowledge production in Depression: A Public Feeling that encourages a contemplative and affective practice. Cvetkovich’s critical mode of feeling, attending to, and writing about how depression feels as “everyday sensations that do not immediately connect to any larger diagnosis or explanatory framework” is one of many models and templates for noticing.25 In a way, Cvetkovich directs her own attention to feeling and describing the “minutiae and boring effects” of depression in a way that defamiliarizes how she and her readers think and talk about depression. 26 What is important about this practice is that Cvetkovich’s attention to the minutiae, mundane, boring, and ordinary feelings of depression can break with the scripted, polite, respectable and accepted way of talking about depression. This mode of writing and thinking allows Cvetkovich to pick at or puncture the layer of film of academic discourse that covers and floats on top of the pulsing and ugly ways that depression lies under the surface and expresses itself under ordinary (and often uninterrogated) circumstances. As a research method, Cvetkovich’s “Depression Journals,” that accompany the scholarly essays in the second half of the book, help reveal “the emotional investments that guided” and shaped her more scholarly and conventional essays.27 Queer methods like Cvetkovich’s provide evidence of the existence of reflexive and contemplative tools that white and non-white scholars have already developed and can access if they choose. These tools can be sharpened and adapted to respond to the challenge that black kinky and erotic methods present. Further, the most generative white queer theory contains a playful, kinky, and open-spirit of public sexual experimentation and exhibitionism (a large part gifted from black queer theorist Samuel Delany28) that allows it to offer its own white body up for use. I hold out hope that the critical and ethical white and nonblack scholars who acknowledge queer theory’s deviance, kink, funk, bare-backed, rawness are able to follow, or rather accept, the invitation of the black kinky call to show your goods. Give black erotic and kinky studies something to play and think with. What is your body doing in response to blackness? That is the unexplored and yet to be answered kinky question. Queer and necessarily anti-racist theoretical labor that seeks to abolish anti-black violence must attend to and study the white and non-black body’s becoming and unbecoming at the site of blackness. The queerest and most radical scholarship must, and will, abandon its own practice of dissemblance in the face of its own desire (whatever it may be at the moment) for blackness. The anti-racist project that seeks the eradication of anti-black violence must relinquish its posture of “respectable” and duty-bound interest. The black kinky and erotic method is a demanding lover/fuck. Stop being so prudish and so selfish with all of the “let me see yours” without bending it over and spreading it— wide and white or non-black—for Black kinky methods to gaze upon. Far from staid and serious, white, and non-black practices of scholarly withholding while gazing and examining with the best intent are actually anthropological (I see/notice you). Far from altruistic or an expression of allyship, white and non-black scholars are interested, invested, and erotically motivated (understood broadly) by their studies of black people, black expressive culture, theory, and life.29 With a recognition and deep awareness of the erotic currents that animate white and non-Black interests in blackness and sometimes (often) black bodies, white and non-Black scholars could be receptive to asking themselves the following questions. How could my desire—to the extent that it can be made known—be made useful as an object of study? Since the body is always implicated in the production of knowledge, how will I acknowledge my own body as a white/non-black scholar while studying Black bodies? How does studying black bodies make me feel? How do/es my skin, eyes, genitals, mind, tongue feel when I think about the black body? (For those who have done meditation or yoga this is a practice of noticing that might feel familiar.) What are the methodological implications of attending to my own body and its sensations as an object of knowledge as I attend to Black bodies? Am I willing to make myself an object as I make blackness an object? I consider these questions because the exercise of situating oneself in the vein of, “I acknowledge that I am a white-cis-queer-male-setter-scholar working on yada…” has become an inane exercise. I want to know how it feels to acknowledge arousal—and or other sensations—at the sight of Black bodies in pain, rebellion, movement, ecstasy, and make that feeling—your feeling—an object for study. This kind of empathetic disclosure interrupts the violence of politesse and its performance of “pure” and anti-racist intent on the part of the white/non-black researcher. This empathetic practice of accountability does not naively assume that that the white/non-black scholars’ interest in blackness/black bodies is an expression of allyship. The corporate university does not produce scholars whose primary interest is in producing knowledge for political action and more specifically the eradication of anti-black racism. The corporate university trains us to work against our best selves. The humanist or social scientist in the corporate university is trained to intervene upon and improve fields of study. The scholar who will be successful is trained to develop an impulse to improve, develop, elevate, abstract, queer, trans or post-humanize existing fields, especially Black Studies. The successful scholar will be able to track their accomplishment and growth by documenting a record of the impression or legacy they have left on the field. The question that white and non-black scholars in the academy must ultimately answer is how did I advance, intervene upon, or “save” Black Studies. Rarely are white and non-black scholars asked to reflect upon and come to terms with how Black Studies “saved” them. To be clear, I am not cynical or invested in an indictment and understanding of white and non-black anti-blackness as hopelessly intractable, unrelenting, or unchangeable. The empathetic practice of disclosure and engagement I invite assumes and holds space for the possibility that people can be (and want to be) accountable and ethical. Further, this kind of empathetic practice requires more than accountability. Unlike the empathy of the abolitionist or the misguided white liberal subject that Hartman treats as an object of inquiry in Scenes of Subjection, this empathetic practice is an erotic process of unbecoming.30 This erotic call toward an unbecoming submits to the mandate of Lorde’s erotic movement toward chaos.31 Is it possible to invite the Lordean chaos that can ensue when one approaches blackness (in its embodied form in this case) and submits to its invitation to abolish a self that makes and remakes itself through the sensuous objectification and destruction of black people? If approached ethically, the power of black presence and embodiment can undo and reorganize the white and non-black body and self on different terms. White and non-black scholars could choose to open themselves to a Black erotic method and practice of unravelling their investments in possessing themselves and the black captive body. If white and non-black scholars can bare or expose the ways that their white/non-black self depends on rendering the black body a captive “being for” whiteness/others, it is possible to render themselves available for being radically rearranged by Blackness. This work leaves room for the formation of a new kind of body—a Deleuzean Body Without Organs—that can be undone and remade in relation to blackness.32 This kind of ethic and reorientation can interrupt the current impulse to objectify black embodiment and black life while transforming the white and non-black scholars who hope to abolish antiblack violence in their own work.

### A: Unflinching Paradigmatic Analysis

#### The alternative is unflinching paradigmatic analysis- refuse moralized appeals to pragmatism that compromise an orientation towards the end of the world.

Wilderson, PhD, ‘10

(Frank, Rhetoric/FilmStudies@Berkeley, ProfAAS@UCIrvine, Red, White, and Black) BW

STRANGE as it might seem, this book project began in South Africa. During the last years of apartheid I worked for revolutionary change in both an underground and above-ground capacity, for the Charterist Movement in general and the ANC in particular. During this period, I began to see how essential an unflinching paradigmatic analysis is to a movement dedicated to the complete overthrow of an existing order. The neoliberal compromises that the radical elements of the Chartist Movement made with the moderate elements were due, in large part, to our inability or unwillingness to hold the moderates’ feet to the fire of a political agenda predicated on an unflinching paradigmatic analysis. Instead, we allowed our energies and points of attention to be displaced by and onto pragmatic considerations. Simply put, we abdicated the power to pose the question—and the power to pose the question is the greatest power of all. Elsewhere, I have written about this unfortunate turn of events (Incognegro: A Memoir of Exile and Apartheid), so I’ll not rehearse the details here. Suffice it to say, this book germinated in the many political and academic discussions and debates that I was fortunate enough to be a part of at a historic moment and in a place where the word revolution was spoken in earnest, free of qualifiers and irony. For their past and ongoing ideas and interventions, I extend solidarity and appreciation to comrades Amanda Alexander, Franco Barchiesi, Teresa Barnes, Patrick Bond, Ashwin Desai, Nigel Gibson, Steven Greenberg, Allan Horowitz, Bushy Kelebonye (deceased), Tefu Kelebonye, Ulrike Kistner, Kamogelo Lekubu, Andile Mngxitama, Prishani Naidoo, John Shai, and S’bu Zulu.

### AT: Buidraillard L: Baudrillard theory/person

#### Baudrillard’s a sexist and so are his theories link

#### A. Yikes - Baudrillard has literally advocated for killing women as an edgy experiment. He views women as objects to be acted upon and for men to sacrifice—he perpetuates rape culture because he thinks women who say they’ve been abused are lying and hysterical—the cherry on top is he blames failure of revolutionary thought on women because feminist scholars don’t agree with his misogynist theories- that’s Brodribb

#### B. Objectification – he literally says to be women are only to be appearance and attempting to resist this is futile. That’s Gallop. Objectifying women is probs bad - This is literally engrained in his theories

C. Subjection location – Baudrillard claims not to speak from the masculine viewpoint but the position of truth where he can advise women… but he just masks his privilege recreating patriarchal norms