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### 1

#### Interpretation – topical affirmatives defend “a just government”

#### Definitions

#### There are no current just governments, only existential just governments that ought – a defense of a current government as just is not false, and generically triggers presumption

Nebel, 2014 – current Assistant Professor of Philosophy at the University of Southern California & Executive Director of Victory Briefs

Jake Nebel studies Philosophy at Oxford on a Marshall Scholarship. As a coach, his students have won the TOC, NDCA, Glenbrooks, Bronx, Emory, TFA State, and the Harvard Round Robin. As a debater, he won six octos-bid championships and was top speaker at the TOC and ten other major tournaments. He co-directs the Victory Briefs Institute. “Jake Nebel on Specifying “Just Governments”, <https://www.vbriefly.com/2014/12/19/jake-nebel-on-specifying-just-governments/>, accessed 10/28/21, not sb

One of the most trolly observations to make in a debate on this topic is that just governments do not exist. It strikes me as plausible that no actually existing government is just. But most debaters will rightly trust their linguistic intuitions (in this case, but not in others!) and assume that this point is irrelevant to the resolution. The question is: why is it irrelevant? If “just governments” gets an existential reading, then the point should be relevant. If there are no just governments, then it is not the case that there are some just governments that ought to require employers to pay a living wage. So the resolution is not true. Reading “just governments” as a generic bare plural, then, is key to avoiding the trolly observation as a knockdown negative argument (or a knockdown presumption trigger, if presupposition failure makes the resolution neither true nor false). One might object that not even the generic reading can avoid the problem. After all, if there are no just governments, then how could it be true that just governments in general ought to do anything? Some linguists have held that generics never presuppose the existence of the kind of thing in question. But others, such as von Fintel (1996) and Greenberg (2003), have endorsed a more modest point, which is still enough for my purposes. This point starts with the fact that the resolution states a rule—namely, that just governments require employers to pay a living wage. Consider the rule, Trespassers ought to be prosecuted. We can affirm this rule even if there are no trespassers. But consider next, Some trespassers ought to be prosecuted. This statement is not true if there are never any trespassers. The lesson is that normative generics do not presuppose the existence of members of the relevant kind. Since the resolution is a normative statement, it does not presuppose that there actually are any just governments. Note that my argument here is very different from the just-as-trolly response that many make against the trolly observation. This response is that if there are no just governments, then the resolution is vacuously true. This is defended on the grounds that “just governments” refers to all just governments, and that this universal generalization is vacuously true if there are no just governments. My argument differs from this trolly response because I claim that “just governments” is generic, rather than universal: generics, unlike universals, allow exceptions. The trolly response also rests on more controversial assumptions than my response: the word “all” in English, in many cases, presupposes the existence of the things in question. And although there is no existence presupposition when the universal generalization states a rule—e.g., that all trespassers be prosecuted—the absence of trespassers does not make the rule vacuously true: it would not imply, for example, that all trespassers should be shot. More generally, we can’t assume that the English “all” is governed by the same rules as the universal quantifier in an ideal logical language.

#### The US is unjust

#### Violation – the Affirmative defends an unjust government. The Affirmative is a normative, instrumental hypothetical recognition of an unconditional right of workers to strike by a government that is not a just government.

#### Neg wins on Presumption – not my fault, don’t punish me because this is the worst worded resolution in the history of modern competitive debate for policy LARPers. Encourages ideological flexibility – you don’t have a right to LARP or read policy arguments based on hypothetical implantation because of “Resolved:” or some preordained right. Wording of the resolution means the neg doesn’t get disad links anyway – a just government would vote the intristicness against disad links in every debate because it doesn’t disprove the ‘good utility’ of the aff (and political capital isn’t real) – neither side loses any ground other than the team who thought the U.S. was a just nation (lol)

#### Truth Testing – vote neg on presumption triggers – if they defend an unjust government, they have not proven the resolution of “a just government” true, thus the resolution is not true.

#### Precision

#### Big G vs. little g – resolutions says little g NOT BIG G – little g refers to the function of the general government, not the political institution of The Government

Canada Public Works and Government Services, 2021

© Public Works and Government Services Canada, 2021, TERMIUM Plus®, the Government of Canada's terminology and linguistic data bank, Writing tools – Writing Tips, A product of the Translation Bureau, “capitalization: governments and government bodies”, <https://www.btb.termiumplus.gc.ca/tpv2guides/guides/wrtps/index-eng.html?lang=eng&lettr=indx_catlog_c&page=9bt1deKY6dSc.html>, accessed 10/29/21, sb

Government

The word Government is capitalized when it refers to the political apparatus of a party in power:

The Liberal Government introduced this measure.

It is lower-cased when it refers in a general way to the offices and agencies that carry out the functions of governing:

It is government policy not to discuss matters before the courts.

#### Capitalization Rules means Big G Government is the nation

Troutman, No Date – Class Writing Freelance Writer & Editor

5 Rules of Capitalization (Again), <https://www.classywriting.com/5-rules-of-capitalization-again/>, accessed 10/29/21, sb

1. Capitalize “government” when you refer to the U.S. Government or any foreign nation.

Examples: the Mexican Government; Her Majesty’s Government

#### Movements DA – Defense of an unjust government as just destroys the potentiality for reform and change.

#### Carceral Education DA – “a just government” doesn’t incarcerate 2.3 million of its own “citizens” – rhetorically representing the US as just forecloses on the possibility for abolition

#### Antiblackness

#### Defending the United States as “just” is complicit in antiblackness

#### America is justified as a “just government” because of its bill of rights – at least according to Thomas Jefferson, the principal author of the Declaration of Independence and the “Father of Democracy”

ACLU No Date

“THE BILL OF RIGHTS: A BRIEF HISTORY”, <https://www.aclu.org/other/bill-rights-brief-history>, accessed 10/29/21, sb

"[A] bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular, and what no just government should refuse."

- Thomas Jefferson, December 20, 1787

#### “All men are created equal” said the same third President of the United States Thomas Jefferson that enslaved more than six hundred people over the course of his life.

#### Thomas Jefferson was an antiblack a-hole that thought black women lacked imagination because they weren’t whole people (despite bringing 15-year-old slave Edith Hern Fossett with him to the White House to perform essential domestic duties)

Vats, 2020 – Associate Professor in Communication and African and African Diaspora Studies at Boston College

Anjali Vats is an Associate Professor of Communication and African and African Diaspora Studies at Boston College. She is also an Associate Professor (by courtesy) at Boston College Law School, where she currently teaches Critical Race Theory. Vats holds a Ph.D. in Communication from the University of Washington, a J.D. from Emory University School of Law, and an LL.M. in Intellectual Property Law and Policy from the University of Washington School of Law. “The Color of Creatorship: Intellectual Property, Race, and the Making of Americans”, Stanford University Press, September 29, 2020, Kindle, Accessed 8/14/21, sb

Yet the understanding of people of color as being outside the boundaries of creatorship and citizenship persisted long after copyright’s formal exclusions ended. The ideological continuity of conceptions of true imagination lasted well into the mid-1900s, before evolving yet again. In the late 1700s, the trial of Phillis Wheatley, the first Black woman to publish a book of poetry in the United States, and Thomas Jefferson’s subsequent commentary on that trial formalized beliefs that Black women—and, by extension, other people of color—lacked the capacity to imagine, in part because they were not whole persons. Though primarily formed around anti-Black racial scripts, the framework of true imagination reared its head again in subsequent disputes involving Latinx and Black authors. Even as pushes against formal racism began to succeed, legal cases continued to perpetuate the racial double standards that Jefferson articulated in Wheatley’s trial. The underlying racial scripts that were determinative in these cases—i.e., that Black people lack the creativity, work ethic, and intelligence to imagine in a manner consistent with copyright law—operated to denigrate Latinx authors. In other words, racial scripts of anti-Blackness became vehicles for dehumanizing other people of color as well. 34 The racial double standard of Phillis Wheatley (1790) All evidence suggests that the young Phillis Wheatley did not set out to become the first African American to publish a book of poetry in 1790. Publishing the book was no small feat, and it happened only with the encouragement of her owner, Susanna Wheatley. 35 In order to receive copyright protection for her work, Wheatley was forced to prove to eighteen white men, who declared themselves the “most respectable characters in Boston,” 36 that she indeed possessed the creative capacity to write the poems that she claimed as her own. While Wheatley ultimately convinced those men that she had produced copyrightable poetry, she did so at great cost, both personal and racial. 37 Wheatley’s continuing difficulties highlight the extent to which her struggle was not simply about the quality of her work; it also had to do with the racial scripts and racist sentiments around Blackness at the time. Despite the complex legal negotiations over the vocabulary of copyright, specifically the standard of originality, that emerged in the 1820s, there does not appear to be any white analogue to Wheatley’s trial. Proving originality, a legal doctrinal standard that became more restrictive in the early and mid-1800s before becoming more liberal, nonetheless would not likely have given rise to suspicions about an inherent lack of capacity to imagine, as it did with Wheatley. 38 Instead, as Wheatley’s trial demonstrates, the presumptions against Black creatorship were unique and ingrained in American culture. For centuries after the trial, African American writers and artists sought to refute the claim that Black people lack imagination and, therefore, the ability to create with originality. Moreover, the anti-Black spectacle of Wheatley’s trial mobilized racial scripts that could be applied to other groups, such as Indigenous peoples and Latinx persons, thereby articulating and amplifying racist and colonialist sentiments about their incapacity to create. In 1781, Thomas Jefferson, who had never met Phillis Wheatley, described her as lacking the capacity for true imagination. Jefferson’s racialized proclamations about the capacity to create and the definition of true imagination, with analogues to “imitation,” came to be embedded in copyright law’s originality standard as continuing justification for racism. In essence, true imagination and imitation evolved into shorthand for racial scripts about Black creatorship. At a time when the violence of Jim Crow operated as a structural barrier to full equality for African Americans in the South, the phrase worked to demarcate white creativity from Black creativity. Jefferson, who crafted a secondhand racist and sexist account of Wheatley, commented in Notes on the State of Virginia: Misery is often the parent of the most affecting touches in poetry. Among the Blacks is misery enough, God knows, but not poetry. Love is the peculiar oestrum of the poet. Their love is ardent, but it kindles the senses only, not the imagination. Religion, indeed, has produced a Phillis Wheatley; but it could not produce a poet. The compositions published under her name are below the dignity of criticism. 39 Jefferson’s assessment sets up personhood, particularly of the mind, as a prerequisite for creatorship, arguing that Wheatley’s lack of imagination stems from her inhumanity. He constructs her work as not only unprotectable but also unworthy of criticism. His racism runs through this section of the text, reaffirming that Black people lack higher imaginative capacity despite a talent for music. Jefferson goes on to rhetorically construct a distinction between labor of the mind and labor of the body, identifying whites as superior in both and Black people as capable only of the latter. Incapacity for labor of the mind is justification for excluding enslaved persons from citizenship. Jefferson observes of African Americans: They seem to require less sleep. A black after hard labour through the day, will be induced by the slightest amusements to sit up till midnight, or later, though knowing he must be out with the first dawn of the morning . . . They are more ardent after their female: but love seems with them to be more an eager desire, than a tender delicate mixture of sentiment and sensation. Their griefs are transient. Those numberless afflictions, which render it doubtful whether heaven has given life to us in mercy or in wrath, are less felt, and sooner forgotten with them. In general, their existence appears to participate more of sensation than reflection. To this must be ascribed their disposition to sleep when abstracted from their diversions, and unemployed in labour. An animal whose body is at rest, and who does not reflect, must be disposed to sleep of course. Comparing them by their faculties of memory, reason, and imagination, it appears to me, that in memory they are equal to the whites; in reason much inferior, as I think one could scarcely be found capable of tracing and comprehending the investigations of Euclid; and that in imagination they are dull, tasteless, and anomalous. 40 Jefferson invokes typical racial scripts of anti-Blackness here, highlighting unintelligence, laziness, irresponsibility, uncontrollable desire, lack of complex emotion, inability to experience pain, and bestiality as reasons that African Americans could not possibly produce intellectual properties. 41 These racial scripts do not comport with collective white male understandings of Americanness and citizenship, which emphasize ingenuity, hard work, grit, discipline, thoughtfulness, depth of feeling, and measured civic engagement. Jefferson’s racist rant sets a high bar for Black creators as compared to white creators, who were held only to statutory requirements of showing “proof of the labor of the mind,” 42 which evolved into the modern-day standard of “a modicum of creativity.” 43 Jefferson’s widely read passage also uses the strangely sentimental and notably feminine benchmark of capacity to feel emotion to prove his point. Inability to feel with depth and breadth is a sign of the inhumanity of Blackness and a racial script that is redeployed in intellectual property law in similar ways across racial groups throughout the twentieth century. Capacity to feel with depth and breadth is a marker of the humanity of white men, though their expression of emotion is always measured. Jefferson goes on: “Why not retain and incorporate the blacks into the state, and thus save the expence of supplying . . . the vacancies they will leave?” 44 In response, he writes, “To these objections, which are political, may be added others, which are physical and moral.” 45 In addition to evidencing the racism that marked America’s early understandings of creativity as fundamentally linked to whiteness, Jefferson’s comments forge a connection between imagined (in)capacity to create, capacity to feel, and worthiness for the right to citizenship. In his tautological argument, Jefferson defines African Americans as lacking the capacity to feel and therefore create, which makes them ineligible for citizenship. In addition to advancing a racist and specious argument about Black creatorship, Jefferson trades in racial feelings. There is no objective standard for true imagination; there is only a racialized one, which is based on Jefferson’s individual sentiments projected onto the conceptual category of Black creativity. Through Notes on the State of Virginia, these personal assessments come to be public feelings, which sentimentalize and racialize creatorship, citizenship, and creativity. In a move that exemplifies emotional capitalism and anti-Blackness, Jefferson not only made it acceptable to link race, creatorship, and public feelings; he made it intuitive and compulsory.

#### Topical Version of the Aff – TVA – Topical affirmatives defend a hypothetical existential (potentially future?) just government’s recognition of an unconditional right of workers to strike. Tons of good, Topical K & Phil Affs. Affs can defend futurities of societal governance – abolition democracy, etc.

#### No predetermined right to policy LARP arguments on the Aff and neg LARP ground solves any policy making offense – everything is based on resolution’s wording. You still get policy arguments on the neg because you get tons of good counterplan ground like worker category PICs while excluding horrid reused neg ground like the politics DA.

#### The net benefit is in-depth debate – our interpretation of the topic allows for in depth 1-3 off debates that question core arguments of the topic

#### Topicality is voting issue for fairness and education. Drop the debater.

### 2

#### State recognition of the right to strike only reinscribes the racial capitalist state – it allows the state to modulate the potential and violence of the strike so that racial capitalism can never be effectively challenged

Marc Crépon & Micol Bez 19; Marc Crépon is a French philosopher and academic who writes on the subject of languages and communities in the French and German philosophies and contemporary political and moral philosophy. Micol Bez @ CPES (Cycle Pluridisciplinaire d’Études Supérieures) at the University of Paris Sciences and Letters. The Right to Strike and Legal War in Walter Benjamin's “Toward the Critique of Violence”. Critical Times 1 August 2019; 2 (2): 252–260. <https://read.dukeupress.edu/critical-times/article/2/2/252/141479/The-Right-to-Strike-and-Legal-War-in-Walter> brett

In other words, nothing would endanger the law more than the possibility of its authority being contested by a violence over which it has no control. The function of the law would therefore be, first and foremost, to contain violence within its own boundaries. It is in this context that, to demonstrate this surprising hypothesis, Benjamin invokes two examples: the right to strike guaranteed by the state and the law of war. Let us return to the place that the right to strike occupies within class struggle. To begin with, the very idea of such a struggle implies certain forms of violence. The strike could then be understood as one of the recognizable forms that this violence can take. However, this analytical framework is undermined as soon as this form of violence becomes regulated by a “right to strike,” such as the one recognized by law in France in 1864. What this recognition engages is, in fact, the will of the state to control the possible “violence” of the strike. Thus, the “right” of the right to strike appears as the best, if not the only, way for the state to circumscribe within (and via) the law the relative violence of class struggles. We might consider this to be the perfect illustration of the aforementioned hypothesis. Yet, there are two lines of questioning that destabilize this hypothesis that we would do well to consider First, is it legitimate to present the strike as a form of violence? Who has a vested interest in such a representation? In other words, how can we trace a clear and unequivocal demarcation between violence and nonviolence? Are we not always bound to find residues of violence, even in those actions that we would be tempted to consider nonviolent? The second line of questioning is just as important and is rooted in the distinction established by Georges Sorel, in his Reflections on Violence, between the “political strike” and the “proletarian general strike,” to which Benjamin dedicates a set of complementary analyses in §13 of his essay. Here, again, we are faced with a question of limits. What is at stake is the possibility for a certain type of strike (the proletarian general strike) to exceed the limits of the right to strike— turning, in other words, the right to strike against the law itself. The phenomenon is that of an autoimmune process, in which the right to strike that is meant to protect the law against the possible violence of class struggles is transformed into a means for the destruction of the law. The difference between the two types of strikes is nevertheless introduced with a condition: “The validity of this statement, however, is not unrestricted because it is not unconditional,” notes Benjamin in §7. We would be mistaken in believing that the right to strike is granted and guaranteed unconditionally. Rather, it is structurally subjected to a conflict of interpretations, those of the workers, on the one hand, and of the state on the other. From the point of view of the state, the partial strike cannot under any circumstance be understood as a right to exercise violence, but rather as the right to extract oneself from a preexisting (and verifiable) violence: that of the employer. In this sense, the partial strike should be considered a nonviolent action, what Benjamin named a “pure means.” The interpretations diverge on two main points. The first clearly depends on the alleged “violence of the employer,” a predicate that begs the question: Who might have the authority to recognize such violence? Evidently it is not the employer. The danger is that the state would similarly lack the incentive to make such a judgment call. It is nearly impossible, in fact, to find a single instance of a strike in which this recognition of violence was not subject to considerable controversy. The political game is thus the following: the state legislated the right to strike in order to contain class struggles, with the condition that workers must have “good reason” to strike. However, it is unlikely that a state systematically allied with (and accomplice to) employers will ever recognize reasons as good, and, as a consequence, it will deem any invocation of the right to strike as illegitimate. Workers will therefore be seen as abusing a right granted by the state, and in so doing transforming it into a violent means. On this point, Benjamin’s analyses remain extremely pertinent and profoundly contemporary. They unveil the enduring strategy of governments confronted with a strike (in education, transportation, or healthcare, for example) who, after claiming to understand the reasons for the protest and the grievances of the workers, deny that the arguments constitute sufficient reason for a strike that will likely paralyze this or that sector of the economy. They deny, in other words, that the conditions denounced by the workers display an intrinsic violence that justifies the strike. Let us note here a point that Benjamin does not mention, but that is part of Sorel’s reflections: this denial inevitably contaminates the (socialist) left once it gains power. What might previously have seemed a good reason to strike when it was the opposition is deemed an insufficient one once it is the ruling party. In the face of popular protest, it always invokes a lack of sufficient rationale, allowing it to avoid recognizing the intrinsic violence of a given social or economic situation, or of a new policy. And it is because it refuses to see this violence and to take responsibility for it that the left regularly loses workers’ support. The second conflict of interpretation concerns what is at stake in the strike. For the state, the strike implies a withdrawal or act of defiance vis-à-vis the employer, while for the workers it is a means of pressuring, if not of blackmail or even of “hostage taking.” The diference is thus between an act of suspension (which can be considered nonviolent) and one of extortion (which includes violence). Does this mean that “pure means” are not free of ambiguity, and that there can be no nonviolent action that does not include a residue of violence? It is not clear that Benjamin’s text allows us to go this far. Nevertheless, the problem of pure means, approached through the notion of the right to strike, raises the following question: Could it be that the text “Zur Kritik der Gewalt,” which we are accustomed to reading as a text on violence, deals in fact with the possibility and ambiguity of nonviolence? The opposition between the aforementioned conflicts of interpretation manifests itself in Benjamin’s excursus on the revolutionary strike, and specifically in the opposition between the political strike and the proletarian general strike, and in the meaning we should attribute to the latter. As previously discussed, the state will never admit that the right to strike is a right to violence. Its interpretative strategy consists in denying, as much as possible, the effective exercise of the right that it theoretically grants. Under these conditions, the function of the revolutionary strike is to return the strike to its true meaning; in other words, to return it to its own violence. In this context, the imperative is to move beyond idle words: a call to strike is a call to violence. This is the reason why such a call is regularly met with a violent reaction from the state, because trade unions force the state to recognize what it is trying to ignore, what it pretends to have solved by recognizing the right to strike: the irreducible violence of class struggles. This means that the previously discussed alternative between “suspension” and “extortion” is valid only for the political strike—in other words, for a strike whose primary vocation is not, contrary to that of the proletarian general strike, to revolt against the law itself. Essentially, the idea of a proletarian general strike, its myth (to borrow Sorel’s words), is to escape from this dichotomous alternative that inevitably reproduces and perpetuates the violence of domination.

#### Normative universalist conceptions of the “worker” exclude racialized incarcerated populations and cannot create movements to challenge the white supremacist carceral system

Kilgore 19, Ivan, currently located at California State Prison, Solano. He is a journalist who has exposed the horrific conditions of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation during the COVID-19 pandemic and faced numerous attempts at retaliation for doing so. He is additionally the founder of the United Black Family Scholarship Foundation and the author of several books such as Mayhem, Murder & Magnificence. “Not Worker, But Chattel”, <http://www.realcostofprisons.org/writing/kilgore-not-worker-but-chattel.pdf>, Accessed 10/30/21 VD

In what follows, I argue that a Black abolitionist politic—a set of beliefs and practices formed in opposition to the white supremacist state; struggles for life and death initiated by and for those inhabiting the social position of chattel property—must both be definitively against “work” and against defining ourselves as “workers.” As a number of Black Studies scholars write, there are fundamental differences between the political category of the “worker” and that of the “slave.” Rendered civilly dead by U.S. law, I am to the State as the slave was to the plantation Master. The same relation of coercive racist violence applies: my Black body is always vulnerable, open to an enveloping State terror. As property of the State, I exist in direct confrontation with the punitive core of capitalist relations of force. Every movement I make carries with it the possibility of authority’s lash. I am the bodily raw material that gives the prison industrial complex purpose and social meaning. Beyond recognizing the structure of violence that I inhabit, it should also be noted how the very act of naming myself—a slave held captive by the State—as “worker” enables various tactics of seduction which operate to displace the gravity of the situation. Because job assignments are seen as a relative privilege behind these walls, we are lured into conformity and compliance to work, often merely out of a need to survive. While I discuss this latter dilemma for the majority of this essay, I would first like to begin by unpacking the former, clarifying the structural position of the (prison) slave. There are two essential dilemmas that prisoners face when organizing as the worker-on-strike instead of the slave-in-revolt. One is that a prison strike must be organized differently, its operations conducted differently, and requires a level of active solidarity (from others not in our position, non-imprisoned people) far greater than any other united workplace action. Many on the outside need to take up more of the risk. For example, there are numerous ways that free-world people can participate in a prison strike that does not mistake symbolic action for direct, disruptive tactics. We need mass civil disobedience, not more civic performance. If our goal is to clog the arteries of the prison regime from within, it might be more effective to choose methods that interrupt the prison’s reproduction from without. While we are staging sit-ins, boycotts, stoppages, and refusing trays inside, free-world activists could occupy the offices of a Department of Corrections, stage protests at a prison warden’s private house, or stage sit-ins in the buildings of government institutions and corporations that benefit from the smooth functioning of the prisoncrat’s political-industrial machine. As an outside comrade once pointed out, “phone zaps” are effective in certain historical situations, but disrupting this fascist regime requires a whole lot more. As Frank B. Wilderson argues, the worker is exploited at best, yet only shot, brutalized, or imprisoned because they engage in sabotage or forceful strike. The slave however is rendered the object of gratuitous violence as a perpetual structural constant. By missing this point and defining ourselves as imprisoned “workers,” we open ourselves up to the public’s misrecognition of the levels of risk involved with organizing on the inside. The universalist category of the worker also fails to grasp the centrality of our captivity to the making of U.S. society’s sense of (racial) freedom and (white) civilizational ascendency over the wretched of the earth. This, in fact, brings me to my second point, a thing much more complex to explain. That is, the fact that our enslavement by the State holds a culturally specific purpose for the society that appears driven to physically disappear us.

#### Calls for legal recognition of our movement creates liberation for some at the cost of criminalizing and dispossessing racialized populations

Weheliye 14, Alexander, professor of African American Studies at Northwestern University where he teaches black literature and culture, “Habeas Viscus: Racializing Assemblages, Biopolitics and Black Feminist Theories of the Human”, <https://www.dukeupress.edu/habeas-viscus>, Accessed 10/31/21 VD

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.”22 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 not be redeployed within hegemonic frameworks 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.

#### Capitalist accumulation and expropriation occurs through racial domination – racialized bodies are assigned economic values and marked as vulnerable to repression

Wang 18, Jackie, black studies scholar, poet, multimedia artist, and PhD candidate in the Department of African and African American Studies at Harvard, “Carceral Capitalism”, <http://criticaltheoryindex.org/assets/CarceralCapitalism---Wang-Jackie.pdf>, Accessed 10/30/21 VD

Racial Capitalism and Settler Colonialism Given the dual character of capitalist accumulation identified by both Rosa Luxemburg and David Harvey, what new understanding of capitalism would be generated by focusing on dispossession and expropriation over .work and production? Contemporary political theorists as well as critical ethnic studies, black studies, and Native studies scholars and activists analyze how racial slavery and seeder colonialism provide the material and territorial foundation for U.S. and Canadian sovereignty. Rather than casting slavery and Native genocide as temporally circumscribed events chat inaugurated the birth of capitalism in the New World ("primitive accumulation"), they show how the racial logics produced by these processes persist to this day: In order to recuperate the frame of political economy, a focus on the dialectic of racial slavery and settler colonialism leads to important revisions of Karl Marx's theory of primitive accumulation. In particular, Marx designates the transition from feudal to capitalist social relations as a violent process of primitive accumulation whereby "conquest, enslavement, robbery, murder, in short, force, play the greatest part." For Marx, chis results in the expropriation of the worker, the proletariat, who becomes the privileged subject of capitalist revolution. [f we consider primitive accumulation 35 a persistent structure rather than event, both Afro-pessimism and settler colonial studies destabilize normative conceptions of capitalism through the conceptual displacements of the proletariat. As Coulthard demonstrates, in considering Indigenous peoples in relation to primitive accumulation, "it appears that the history and experience of dispossession, not proletarianization, has been the dominant background structure shaping the character of the historical relationship between Indigenous peoples and the Canadian state." It is thus dispossession of land through genocidal elimination, relocation, and theft that animates Indigenous resistance and anticapitalism and "less around our emergent status 35 'rightless proletarians.'" If we extend the frame of primitive accumulation to the question of slavery, it is the dispossession of the slave's body rather than the proletarianization of labor that both precedes and exceeds the frame of settler colonial and global modernity. 13 As lyko Day notes, Native dispossession occurs through the expropriation of land, while black dispossession is characterized by enslavement and bodily dispossession. Although both racial logics buttress white accumulation and are defined by a "genocidal limit concept" that constitutes these subjects as disposable, Day notes that "the racial content of Indigenous peoples is the mirror opposite of blackness. From the beginning, an eliminatory project was driven to reduce Native populations through genocidal wars and later through statistical elimination through blood quantum and assimilationist policies. For slaves, an opposite logic of exclusion was driven to increase, not eliminate, the population of slaves."14 A debate has ensued in critical ethnic studies about which axis of dispossession is capitalism's condition of possibility: the expropriation of Native land or chattel slavery? Was the U.S. made possible primarily by unbridled access to black labor, or through territorial conquest? Is the global racial order defined-as Day writes-primarily by the indigenous-settler binary or the black-nonblack binary? At stake in this debate is the question of which axis of dispossession is the "base" from which the "superstructures" of economy, national sovereignty, or even subjectivity itself emerge. Those who argue that settler colonialism is central have sometimes made the claim that even black Americans participate in settler colonialism and indigenous displacement by continuing to live on stolen land, while those who center slavery and antiblackness have sometimes viewed Native Americans as perpetrators of anriblackness insofar as some uibes have historically owned slaves and seek state recognition by making land-based claims to sovereignty-a claim that relies on a political grammar that black Americans do not have access to, as slaves were rem from their native lands when they were transported co the Americas (see Jared Sexton's "The Vel of Slavery"). Although weighing in on this debate is beyond rhe scope of this essay, I generally agree with Day's assertion that to treat this set of issues as a zero-sum game obfuscates the complexity of these processes. With that said, it is important to note that this book deals primarily with the antiblack dimensions of prisons, police, and racial capitalism, though I acknowledge that analyses of settler colonialism are equally vital to understanding the operations of racial capitalism and how race is produced through multiple expropriative logics. Gendered Expropriation Though this book focuses primarily on black racialization in a contemporary context, it is worth noting that expropriation reproduces multiple categories of difference--including the man-woman gender binary. Although categories of difference were not invented by capitalism, expropriative processes assign particular meanings to categories of difference. "Woman" is reproduced as inferior through the unwaged theft of her labor, while the esteem of the category of "man" is propped up by the valorization of his labor. Even when women are in the professional workforce, they are still vulnerable to expropriation when they are given or take on work beyond their formal duties-whether it's washing the dishes at the office, mentoring students, or doing thankless administrative work while male colleagues gee the "dysfunctional genius" pass. But above all, gendered expropriation occurs through the extraction of care labor, emotional labor, as well as domestic and reproductive labor all of which is enabled by the enforcement of a rigid gender binary. This system is propped up by gender socialization, which compels women to psychologically internalize a feeling of responsibility for others. Although, at a glance, ic might seem that the expropriation of women's labor happens primarily through housewifeitization, the marriage contract, and the assignment of child-care duties to women, in the current epoch-characterized by an aging baby boomer population and a shortage of geriatric health-care workers-women are increasingly filling this void by taking care of sick parents, family members, and loved ones. It is hardly surprising that two-thirds of those who care for chose with Alzheimer's disease are women, even as women are the primary victims of this disease. Given thac women's lives are often interrupted by both childcare duties and caring for ailing family members, it's also hardly surprising that women accumulate many fewer assets and arc more likely to retire into poverty than their male counterparts. A recent report found that the European Union gender pension gap was 40 percent, which far exceeds the gender pay gap of 16 percent. Overall, gender is a material relation that, among other things, bilks women of their futures. The aged woman who has toiled by caring for others is left with little by the end of her life. Though gender distinctions are maintained through expropriative processes, they also have consequences beyond the economic and material realm. While it could be said that disposability is the logic that corresponds to racialized expropriation, gendered subjectivation has as its corollary rapeability. It also goes without saying that these expropriative logics are not mutually exclusive, as nonwhite women and gender-nonconforming people may be subject to a different set of expropriative logics than white women. Racalized Expropriation Although I do not claim that expropriation should be defined exclusively as racialization (again, because different expropriative logics reproduce multiple categories of difference), this book deals primarily with the antiblack racial order that is produced by late-capitalist accumulation. Michael C. Dawson and Nancy Fraser are two contemporary political theorists who have defined expropriation as a racializing process in capitalist societies. In "Hidden in Plain Sight," Dawson takes Fraser to task for not acknowledging racialized expropriation as one of the "background domains" of capitalist society. Understanding the logic of expropriation, in his view, is necessary for understanding which modes of resistance are needed at this historical juncture. His article begins with a meditation on the question: Should activists and movements such as Black Lives Matter focus on racialized state violence (police shootings, mass incarceration, and so forth), or should they focus on racialized inequality cawed by expropriation and exploitation? What is the relationship between the first logic-characterized by disposability-and the second logic-characterized by exploitability and expropriability? Rather than describing these logics as distinct forms of antiblack racism, he analyzes them as two dimensions of a dynamic process whereby capitalist expropriation generates the racial order by fracturing the population into superior and inferior humans: Understanding the foundation of capitalism requires a consideration of "the hidden abode of race": the ontological distinction between superior and inferior humans-codified as race-that was necessary for slavery, colonialism, the theft of lands in the Americas, and genocide. This racial separation is manifested in the division between full humans who possess the right to sell their labor and compete within markets, and chose that are disposable, discriminated against, and ultimately either eliminated or superexploited.15 Black racialization, then, is the mark that renders subjects as suitable for-on the one hand-hyperexploitation and expropriation, and, on the other hand, annihilation. Before the neoliberal era, the racial order was propped up by the state, and racial distinctions were enforced through legal codification, Jim Crow segregation, and other formal arrangements. In a contemporary context, though the legal regime undergirding the racial order has been dismantled, race has maintained its dual character, which consists of "not only a probabilistic assignment of relative economic value but also an index of differential vulnerability to state violence." 16 In other words, vulnerability to hyperexploitation and expropriation in the economic domain and vulnerability to premature death in the political and social domains. My essay on the Ferguson Police Department and the city's program of municipal plunder is an attempt to make visible the hidden backdrop of Mike Brown's execution: the widespread racialized expropriation of black residents carried out by the criminal justice arm of the state. It is not just that Mike Brown's murder happened alongside the looting of residents at the behest of the police and the city's financial manager, but that racial legacies that have marked black residents as lootable are intimately tied to police officers' treatment of black people as killable. The two logics reinforce and are bound up with each other. In her response co Dawson's analysis of racialization as expropriation, Fraser develops Dawson's claims by looking at the interplay between economic expropriation and "politically enforced status distinctions." 17 Not only does accumulation in a capitalist society occur along the two axes of exploitation and expropriation, but one makes the other possible in that the "racialized subjection of those whom capital expropriates is a condition of possibility for the freedom of those whom it exploits." 18 In other words, the "front story" of free workers who are contracted by capitalists to sell their labor-power for a wage is enabled by, and depends on, expropriation that takes place outside this contractual arrangement. Fraser further extends Dawson's analysis by offering a historical account of the various regimes of racialization. In her analysis of the "proletarianization" of black Americans as they migrated from the South to industrial centers in the North and Midwest during the first half of the twentieth century, she points out that even in the context of industrial "exploitation," the segmented labor market was organized such that a "confiscatory premium was placed on black labor." Black industrial workers were paid less than their white counterparts. In some sense, the racialized gap in earnings can be thought of as the portion that was expropriated from black workers. It is not as though the black laborers who joined the ranks of the industrial proletariat were newly subjected to exploitation rather than expropriation, but that these two methods of accumulation were operating in tandem. In the "present regime of racialized accumulation"- which she refers to as "financialized capitalism"-Fraser notes that there has been a loosening of the binary that has historically separated who should be subjected to expropriation from who should be subjected to exploitation, and that during the present period, debt is regularly deployed as a method of dispossession: Much large-scale industrial exploitation now occurs outside the historic core, in the BRICS countries of the semi-periphery. And expropriation has become ubiquitous, afflicting not only its traditional subjects but also those who were previously shielded by their status as citizenworkers. In these developments, debt plays a major role, as global financial institutions pressure states to collude with investors in extracting value from defenseless populations. 19 While I agree with Fraser's claim that the "sharp divide" berween "expropriab le subjects and exploitable citizen-workers" has been replaced by a "contin uum" (albeit a continuum chat remains racialized), I would add that the existence of poor whites who have fallen out of the middle class or have been affected by the opiate crisis at the present juncture represents not racial progress for black Americans, but the generalization of expropriability as a condition in the face of an accumulation crisis. In other words, immiseration for all rather than a growing respect for black Americans. Fraser rightly points out that "expropriation becomes tempting in periods of crisis."20 Sometimes the methods of accumulation that were once reserved exclusively for racialized subjects bleed over and are used on those with privileged status markings. If expropriation and exploitation now occur on a continuum, then it has been made possible, in part, by late capitalism's current modus operandi: the probabilistic ranking of subjects according to risk, sometimes indexed by a person's credit score. As I will demonstrate in the coming sections, this method is not a race-neutral way of gleaning information about a subject's personal integrity, credibility, or financial responsibility. It is merely an index of already-existing inequality and a way to distinguish between which people should be expropriated from and which should be merely exploited.

#### Neoliberal capitalism will produce extinction – the system reproduces crises that depoliticize the left, undermine futural thought, and postpone its demise – the impacts are environmental collapse, endless war, and the rise of fascism

Shaviro 15, (Steven Shaviro is an American academic, philosopher and cultural critic whose areas of interest include film theory, time, science fiction, panpsychism, capitalism, affect and subjectivity. He earned a PhD from Yale in 1981. “No Speed Limit: Three Essays on Accelerationism” <https://track5.mixtape.moe/qdkkdt.pdf> rvs)

The problem may be summarized as follows. Capitalism has indeed created the conditions for general prosperity and therefore for its own supersession. But it has also blocked, and continues to block, any hope of realizing this transformation. We cannot wait for capitalism to transform on its own, but we also cannot hope to progress by appealing to some radical Outside or by fashioning ourselves as militants faithful to some “event” that (as Badiou has it) would mark a radical and complete break with the given “situation” of capitalism. Accelerationism rather demands a movement against and outside capitalism—but on the basis of tendencies and technologies that are intrinsic to capitalism. Audre Lord famously argued that “the master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house.” But what if the master’s tools are the only ones available? Accelerationism grapples with this dilemma. What is the appeal of accelerationism today? It can be understood as a response to the particular social and political situation in which we currently seem to be trapped: that of a long-term, slow-motion catastrophe. Global warming, and environmental pollution and degradation, threaten to undermine our whole mode of life. And this mode of life is itself increasingly stressful and precarious, due to the depredations of neoliberal capitalism. As Fredric Jameson puts it, the world today is characterized by “heightened polarization, increasing unemployment, [and] the ever more desperate search for new investments and new markets.” These are all general features of capitalism identified by Marx, but in neoliberal society we encounter them in a particularly pure and virulent form. I want to be as specific as possible in my use of the term “neoliberalism” in order to describe this situation. I define neoliberalism as a specific mode of capitalist production (Marx), and form of governmentality (Foucault), that is characterized by the following specific factors: 1. The dominating influence of financial institutions, which facilitate transfers of wealth from everybody else to the already extremely wealthy (the “One Percent” or even the top one hundredth of one percent). 2. The privatization and commodification of what used to be common or public goods (resources like water and green space, as well as public services like education, communication, sewage and garbage disposal, and transportation). 3. The extraction, by banks and other large corporations, of a surplus from all social activities: not only from production (as in the classical Marxist model of capitalism) but from circulation and consumption as well. Capital accumulation proceeds not only by direct exploitation but also by rent-seeking, by debt collection, and by outright expropriation (“primitive accumulation”). 4. The subjection of all aspects of life to the so-called discipline of the market. This is equivalent, in more traditional Marxist terms, to the “real subsumption” by capital of all aspects of life: leisure as well as labor. Even our sleep is now organized in accordance with the imperatives of production and capital accumulation. 5. The redefinition of human beings as private owners of their own “human capital.” Each person is thereby, as Michel Foucault puts it, forced to become “an entrepreneur of himself.” In such circumstances, we are continually obliged to market ourselves, to “brand” ourselves, to maximize the return on our “investment” in ourselves. There is never enough: like the Red Queen, we always need to keep running, just to stay in the same place. Precarity is the fundamental condition of our lives. All of these processes work on a global scale; they extend far beyond the level of immediate individual experience. My life is precarious, at every moment, but I cannot apprehend the forces that make it so. I know how little money is left from my last paycheck, but I cannot grasp, in concrete terms, how “the economy” works. I directly experience the daily weather, but I do not directly experience the climate. Global warming and worldwide financial networks are examples of what the ecological theorist Timothy Morton calls hyperobjects. They are phenomena that actually exist but that “stretch our ideas of time and space, since they far outlast most human time scales, or they’re massively distributed in terrestrial space and so are unavailable to immediate experience.” Hyperobjects affect everything that we do, but we cannot point to them in specific instances. The chains of causality are far too complicated and intermeshed for us to follow. In order to make sense of our condition, we are forced to deal with difficult abstractions. We have to rely upon data that are gathered in massive quantities by scientific instruments and then collated through mathematical and statistical formulas but that are not directly accessible to our senses. We find ourselves, as Mark Hansen puts it, entangled “within networks of media technologies that operate predominantly, if not almost entirely, outside the scope of human modes of awareness (consciousness, attention, sense perception, etc.).” We cannot imagine such circumstances in any direct or naturalistic way, but only through the extrapolating lens of science fiction. Subject to these conditions, we live under relentless environmental and financial assault. We continually find ourselves in what might well be called a state of crisis. However, this involves a paradox. A crisis—whether economic, ecological, or political—is a turning point, a sudden rupture, a sharp and immediate moment of reckoning. But for us today, crisis has become a chronic and seemingly permanent condition. We live, oxymoronically, in a state of perpetual, but never resolved, convulsion and contradiction. Crises never come to a culmination; instead, they are endlessly and indefinitely deferred. For instance, after the economic collapse of 2008, the big banks were bailed out by the United States government. This allowed them to resume the very practices—the creation of arcane financial instruments, in order to enable relentless rent-seeking—that led to the breakdown of the economic system in the first place. The functioning of the system is restored, but only in such a way as to guarantee the renewal of the same crisis, on a greater scale, further down the road. Marx rightly noted that crises are endemic to capitalism. But far from threatening the system as Marx hoped, today these crises actually help it to renew itself. As David Harvey puts it, it is precisely “through the destruction of the achievements of preceding eras by way of war, the devaluation of assets, the degradation of productive capacity, abandonment and other forms of ‘creative destruction’” that capitalism creates “a new basis for profit-making and surplus absorption.” What lurks behind this analysis is the frustrating sense of an impasse. Among its other accomplishments, neoliberal capitalism has also robbed us of the future. For it turns everything into an eternal present. The highest values of our society—as preached in the business schools—are novelty, innovation, and creativity. And yet these always only result in more of the same. How often have we been told that a minor software update “changes everything”? Our society seems to function, as Ernst Bloch once put it, in a state of “sheer aimless infinity and incessant changeability; where everything ought to be constantly new, everything remains just as it was.” This is because, in our current state of affairs, the future exists only in order to be colonized and made into an investment opportunity. John Maynard Keynes sought to distinguish between risk and genuine uncertainty. Risk is calculable in terms of probability, but genuine uncertainty is not. Uncertain events are irreducible to probabilistic analysis, because “there is no scientific basis on which to form any calculable probability whatever.” Keynes’s discussion of uncertainty has strong affinities with Quentin Meillassoux’s account of hyperchaos. For Meillassoux, there is no “totality of cases,” no closed set of all possible states of the universe. Therefore, there is no way to assign fixed probabilities to these states. This is not just an empirical matter of insufficient information; uncertainty exists in principle. For Meillassoux and Keynes alike, there comes a point where “we simply do not know.” But today, Keynes’s distinction is entirely ignored. The Black-Scholes Formula and the Efficient Market Hypothesis both conceive the future entirely in probabilistic terms. In these theories, as in the actual financial trading that is guided by them (or at least rationalized by them), the genuine unknowability of the future is transformed into a matter of calculable, manageable risk. True novelty is excluded, because all possible outcomes have already been calculated and paid for in terms of the present. While this belief in the calculability of the future is delusional, it nonetheless determines the way that financial markets actually work. We might therefore say that speculative finance is the inverse—and the complement—of the “affirmative speculation” that takes place in science fiction. Financial speculation seeks to capture, and shut down, the very same extreme potentialities that science fiction explores. Science fiction is the narration of open, unaccountable futures; derivatives trading claims to have accounted for, and discounted, all these futures already. The “market”—nearly deified in neoliberal doctrine—thus works preemptively, as a global practice of what Richard Grusin calls premediation. It seeks to deplete the future in advance. Its relentless functioning makes it nearly impossible for us to conceive of any alternative to the global capitalist world order. Such is the condition that Mark Fisher calls capitalist realism. As Fisher puts it, channeling both Jameson and Žižek, “it’s easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of capitalism.”

#### Neoliberalism strips language of its critical possibility and produces race neutrality – this reifies whiteness and lets white people think they are free of responsibility – thus the ROTB is to challenge racial capitalism

**Giroux 03,** Henry, American and Canadian scholar and cultural critic, Communication Education, “Spectacles of Race and Pedagogies of Denial: Anti-Black Racist Pedagogy Under the Reign of Neoliberalism”, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/0363452032000156190?journalCode=rced20>, Accessed 6/28/21 VD

Under the reign of neoliberalism in the United States, society is largely defined through the privileging of market relations, deregulation, privatization, and consumerism. Central to neoliberalism is the assumption that profit making be construed as the essence of democracy, thus providing a rationale for a handful of private interests to control as much of social life as possible to maximize their financial investments. Strictly aligning freedom with a narrow notion of individual interest, neoliberalism works hard to privatize all aspects of the public good and simultaneously narrow the role of the state as both a gatekeeper for capital and a policing force for maintaining social order and racial control. Unrestricted by social legislation or government regulation, market relations as they define the economy are viewed as a paradigm for democracy itself. Central to neoliberal philosophy is the claim that the development of all aspects of society should be left to the wisdom of the market. Similarly, neoliberal warriors argue that democratic values be subordinated to economic considerations, social issues be translated as private dilemmas, part-time labor replace full-time work, trade unions be weakened, and everybody be treated as a customer. Within this market-driven perspective, the exchange of capital takes precedence over social justice, the making of socially responsible citizens, and the building of democratic communities. There is no language here for recognizing antidemocratic forms of power, developing nonmarket values, or fighting against substantive injustices in a society founded on deep inequalities, particularly those based on race and class. Hence, it is not surprising that under neoliberalism, language is often stripped of its critical and social possibilities as it becomes increasingly difficult to imagine a social order in which all problems are not personal, social issues provide the conditions for understanding private considerations, critical reflection becomes the essence of politics, and matters of equity and justice become crucial to developing a democratic society. It is under the reign of neoliberalism that the changing vocabulary about race and racial justice has to be understood and engaged. As freedom is increasingly abstracted from the power of individuals and groups to participate actively in shaping society, it is reduced to the right of the individual to be free from social constraints. In this view, freedom is no longer linked to a collective effort on the part of individuals to create a democratic society. Instead, freedom becomes an exercise in self-development rather than social responsibility, reducing politics to either the celebration of consumerism or a privileging of a market-based notion of agency and choice that appear quite indifferent to how power, equity, and justice offer the enabling conditions for real individual and collective choices to be both made and acted upon. Under such circumstances, neoliberalism undermines those public spaces where noncommercial values and crucial social issues can be discussed, debated, and engaged. As public space is privatized, power is disconnected from social obligations, and it becomes more difficult for isolated individuals living in consumption-oriented spaces to construct an ethically engaged and power-sensitive language capable of accommodating the principles of ethics and racial justice as a common good rather than as a private affair. According to Bauman (1998), the elimination of public space and the subordination of democratic values to commercial interests narrow the discursive possibilities for supporting notions of the public good and create the conditions for “the suspicion against others, the intolerance of difference, the resentment of strangers, and the demands to separate and banish them, as well as the hysterical, paranoiac concern with ‘law and order”’ (p. 47). Positioned within the emergence of neoliberalism as the dominant economic and political philosophy of our times, neoracism can be understood as part of a broader attack against not only difference but also the value of public memory, public goods, and democracy itself. The new racism both represents a shift in how race is defined and is symptomatic of the breakdown of a political culture in which individual freedom and solidarity maintain an uneasy equilibrium in the service of racial, social, and economic justice. Individual freedom is now disconnected from any sense of civic responsibility or justice, focusing instead on investor profits, consumer confidence, the downsizing of governments to police precincts, and a deregulated social order in which the winner takes all. Freedom is no longer about either making the powerful responsible for their actions or providing the essential political, economic, and social conditions for everyday people to intervene in and shape their future. Under the reign of neoliberalism, freedom is less about the act of intervention than it is about the process of withdrawing from the social and enacting one’s sense of agency as an almost exclusively private endeavor. Freedom now cancels out civic courage and social responsibility while it simultaneously translates public issues and collective problems into tales of failed character, bad luck, or simply indifference. As Amy Elizabeth Ansell (1997) points out: The disproportionate failure of people of color to achieve social mobility speaks nothing of the justice of present social arrangements, according to the New Right worldview, but rather reflects the lack of merit or ability of people of color themselves. In this way, attention is deflected away from the reality of institutional racism and towards, for example, the “culture of poverty”, the “drug culture”, or the lack of black self-development. (p. 111) Appeals to freedom, operating under the sway of market forces, offer no signposts theoretically or politically for engaging racism, an ethical and political issue that undermines the very basis of a substantive democracy. Freedom in this discourse collapses into self-interest and as such is more inclined to organize any sense of community around shared fears, insecurities, and an intolerance of those “others” who are marginalized by class and color. But freedom reduced to the ethos of self-preservation and brutal self-interests makes it difficult for individuals to recognize the forms that racism often take when draped in either the language of denial, freedom or individual rights. In what follows, I want to explore two prominent forms of the new racism, color blindness and neoliberal racism and their connection to the New Right, corporate power, and neoliberal ideologies. Unlike the old racism, which defined racial differences in terms of fixed biological categories organized hierarchically, the new racism operates in various guises proclaiming among other things race neutrality, asserting culture as a marker of racial difference, or marking race as a private matter. Unlike the crude racism with its biological referents and pseudoscientific legitimations, buttressing its appeal to white racial superiority, the new racism cynically recodes itself within the vocabulary of the civil rights movement, invoking the language of Martin Luther King, Jr. to argue that individuals should be judged by the “content of their character” and not by the color of their skin. Amy Elizabeth Ansell (1997), a keen commentator on the new racism, notes both the recent shifts in racialized discourse away from more rabid and overt forms of racism and its appropriation particularly by the New Right in the United States and Britain: The new racism actively disavows racist intent and is cleansed of extremist intolerance, thus reinforcing the New Right’s attempt to distance itself from racist organizations such as the John Birch Society in the United States and the National Front in Britain. It is a form of racism that utilizes themes related to culture and nation as a replacement for the now discredited biological referents of the old racism. It is concerned less with notions of racial superiority in the narrow sense than with the alleged “threat” people of color pose—either because of their mere presence or because of their demand for “special privileges”—to economic, socio-political, and cultural vitality of the dominant (white) society. It is, in short, a new form of racism that operates with the category of “race”. It is a new form of exclusionary politics that operates indirectly and in stealth via the rhetorical inclusion of people of color and the sanitized nature of its racist appeal. (pp. 20––21) What is crucial about the new racism is that it demands an updated analysis of how racist practices work through the changing nature of language and other modes of representation. One of the most sanitized and yet pervasive forms of the new racism is evident in the language of color-blindness. Within this approach, it is argued that racial conflict and discrimination is a thing of the past and that race has no bearing on an individual’s or group’s location or standing in contemporary American society. Color blindness does not deny the existence of race but denies the claim that race is responsible for alleged injustices that reproduce group inequalities, privilege Whites, and negatively impacts on economic mobility, the possession of social resources, and the acquisition of political power. Put differently, inherent in the logic of color blindness is the central assumption that race has no valence as a marker of identity or power when factored into the social vocabulary of everyday life and the capacity for exercising individual and social agency. As Charles Gallagher (2003) observes, “Within the color-blind perspective it is not race per se which determines upward mobility but how much an individual chooses to pay attention to race that determines one’s fate. Within this perspective race is only as important as you allow it to be” (Gallagher, 2003, p. 12). As Jeff, one of Gallagher’s interviewees, puts it, race is simply another choice: “you know, there’s music, rap music is no longer, it’s not a black thing anymore … when it first came out it was black music, but now it’s just music. It’s another choice, just like country music can be considered like white hick music, you know it’s just a choice” (Gallagher, 2003, p. 11). Hence, in an era “free” of racism, race becomes a matter of taste, lifestyle, or heritage but has nothing to do with politics, legal rights, educational access, or economic opportunities. Veiled by a denial of how racial histories accrue political, economic, and cultural weight to the social power of whiteness, color blindness deletes the relationship between racial differences and power, and in doing so reinforces whiteness as the arbiter of value for judging difference against a normative notion of homogeneity (Goldberg, 2002, takes up this issue brilliantly, especially in pp. 200––238). For advocates of color blindness, race as a political signifier is conveniently denied or seen as something to be overcome, allowing Whites to ignore racism as a corrosive force for expanding the dynamics of ideological and structural inequality throughout society (Marable, 1998, p. 29). Color blindness is a convenient ideology for enabling Whites to ignore the degree to which race is tangled up with asymmetrical relations of power, functioning as a potent force for patterns of exclusion and discrimination, including, but not limited to, housing, mortgage loans, health care, schools, and the criminal justice system. If one effect of color blindness’s functions is to deny racial hierarchies, another consequence is that it offers Whites the belief not only that America is now a level playing field, but that the success that Whites enjoy relative to minorities of color is largely due to individual determination, a strong work ethic, high moral values, and a sound investment in education. Not only does color blindness offer up a highly racialized (though paraded as race-transcendent) notion of agency, but it also provides an ideological space free of guilt, self-reflection, and political responsibility, despite the fact that Blacks have a disadvantage in almost all areas of social life: housing, jobs, education, income levels, mortgage lending, and basic everyday services (see Bonilla-Silva, 2001, for specific figures in all areas of life, especially the chapter “White Supremacy in the Post-Civil Rights Era”). In a society marked by profound racial and class inequalities, it is difficult to believe that character and merit—as color blindness advocates would have us believe—are the prime determinants for social and economic mobility and a decent standard of living. The relegation of racism and its effects in the larger society to the realm of private beliefs, values, and behavior do little to explain a range of overwhelming realities, such as soaring black unemployment, decaying cities, and segregated schools. Paul Street (2002) puts the issue forcibly in a series of questions that register the primacy of, and interconnections among, politics, social issues, and race.

#### The alternative is to engage in a Black feminist poethical reading of the Zapatistas’ Dead – this recognizes that capital is built on the bodies and labor of the slave and the Native to form concrete movements against racial capitalism

**da Silva 20,** Denise Ferreira, Professor and Director of the Institute for Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Social Justice at the University of British Columbia, Otherwise Worlds: Against Settler Colonialism and Anti-Blackness”, <https://www.dukeupress.edu/otherwise-worlds>, Accessed 10/30/21 VD

How to apprehend the world anew, without separability, determinacy, and sequentiality presumed in the very categories and concepts—that is, the forms of the subject—which are still our critical tools and raw materials? Abstraction or reflection has to go. This is a job for intuition. I am thinking with Hortense Spillers’s articulation of the flesh as the ethical ground from which to critically consider conquest and slavery—namely, the wounded flesh exposes total violence as a means that ensures profit and its accumulation through the appropriation of total value, that is, that global capital consists in nothing more than the expropriated productive capacity of slave bodies and Native lands. For the flesh and soil expose the limits of spacetime, that is of the (social) scientific and historical accounts of colonial and racial subjugation, which cannot but reproduce what elsewhere I call the racial dialectic. For flesh is no more and no less than what has been (which nourishes us as animal, vegetable, or mineral) and of what has yet to become, that which returns to the soil to be broken down into the nano elements, the particles that emerged at the beginning and remain in the composition of everything that happens and exists in the universe. The Dead’s words have ethical force: everything for everyone. For if the flesh holds, as a mark/ sign, colonial violence, the Dead’s rotting flesh returns this marking to the soil, and the Dead then remain in the very compositions of anything, yes, as matter, raw material, that nourishes the instruments of production, labor, and capital itself. That is how the dead slave/Native lives in/ as capital. What I am proposing then is an approach to reading, as a materialist practice, one that includes imaging of what happens and has happened as well as what has existed, exists, and will exist otherwise—all and at once. From without the subject and its form, the World, becomes the stage of indeterminacy, that is, of The Thing or matter released from the grips of the forms of the understanding. Beyond Kant’s forms and laws (and rules), Hegel’s Spirit (whose materiality is also that of phenomena), and the concepts and categories of historical materialism (but as a constituent of Karl Marx’s raw material), all that exists and happens refers to the Thing or prime matter. I’ll conclude with a comment on the kind of onto-epistemological departure that reading history from the horizon of death demands. What is it about modern grammar that renders the Zapatista Dead’s words without political (in the strict meaning of addressing the state) significance (both as meaning and value), transforming them into expressions of beliefs that refer to a time before exposure to Europeans, their reason, and the tools and modalities of violence it justifies? When I turn to the original presentation of the historical materialist text, I find how the pillars of modern thought that sustain reason’s ruling render the Dead’s words incomprehensible.11 This is not loss because that incomprehensibility also exposes how transcendental reason has not been able to comprehend everything, the Thing, or matter. Post-Enlightenment Reason comprehends what it engulfs, which is only what separability, determinacy, and sequentiality can work with, and which is always already translated as form, more precisely as temporal (historical or social) ones that, in the historical materialist text, for instance, are figured as juridical devices, such as title and contract. For example, here is how it appears when, deploying a Black feminist reading device, which I call blacklight, I try to find an answer for an obvious question in Marx’s presentation of the theory of value in Capital, volume 1, chapter 7.12 The question: How is it that slavery and conquest are only relevant as moments of primitive accumulation (violent preconditions) and not as crucial to the ongoing accumulation of (industrial and financial) capital in the late eighteenth and throughout the nineteenth century and beyond? If there is something upon which Marxists do not disagree it is that labor time materialized in a commodity accounts for its exchange value. What most do not question is what happens to the materialized labor in the commodities that enter as raw material (cotton) and instrument of production (the iron used in the spindle). What happens to these materializations of slave labor in Virginia and Minas Gerais working on conquered (Indigenous) lands (cotton) and extracted (gold) from conquered lands? My point with these questions is that if one accepts determinacy, as it operates in the attribution of productivity to human activity—that is, that social labor time determines value—why is the claim not taken seriously that accumulated (exchange) value that constitutes global capital includes both the surplus value appropriated from the wage (contract) labor and the total value yielded by slave (title) labor on colonized lands. The answer is because exchange value is measured “by the quantity of labour expended on and materialized in [a commodity], by the working-time necessary, under given social conditions, for its production.”13 Unfortunately, my claim is incomprehensible—much like the Zapatistas’ Dead—because it refuses determinacy (and sequentiality) in the differentiation (separation) of social conditions. Let me explain how determinacy operates in both moments. First, it appears in Marx’s statements on the production of value in his consideration of the “labour process independent of the particular form it takes under given social conditions.”14 I am not refusing this deployment of determinacy here for the sake of this argument because doing so would break with the basic tenet of historical materialism. This would defeat the purpose of this chapter, which is to challenge the disavowal of slave labor as productive of exchange value. In any event, determinacy operates here in two distinctions: (a) when considering the “labor process” in general, between labor and its objects (means of production or instruments of production): land, raw materials, and so forth; that is, in Marx’s statement that living labor is the sole subject, the productive force: “the soil (and this economically speaking, includes water) . . . is the universal subject [meaning object] of labour,”15 and (b) in Marx’s argument, when considering labor as a “value-creating activity,” that the labor expended in creating raw materials—such as cotton and iron or gold—is also mere object: “The raw material serves now merely as an absorbent of a definite quantity of labour,” it is changed in the process of spinning (by the labor time in it) into the yarn, which as the product is “nothing more than a measure of the labour absorbed by the cotton.”16 Under capitalist social conditions of production, the social labor time expended in the production of cotton disappears in the process of production of the yarn; it is used by the spinner. Though it enters in the price the capitalist paid for the cotton and the spindle, it has no significance (explanatory value) to the exchange value of the commodity, the yarn. In this distinction between the labor process in general and (surplus) value-creating labor, the productive capacity (that is, their capacity to work) of Native lands and enslaved bodies vanishes into/as raw material. They have no part in surplus value, because what counts is living labor time. Second, the key statement in the explanation of the law of value is the phrase “under certain social conditions.” For Capital is also a piece of sociological theorizing, and its main concern is to provide a clear and distinct description of capitalist social conditions, according to the formalizing trust of classical knowledge and the temporal trust of Hegel’s account of history. More important, what distinguishes capital accumulation is the particular historical stage, in which freedom has an economic and juridical shape. It requires “free laborers, in the double sense that neither they themselves form part and parcel of the means of production, as in the case of slaves, bondsmen, &c., nor do the means of production belong to them, as in the case of peasant-proprietors; they are, therefore, free from, unencumbered by, any means of production of their own.” Hence, the enslaved laborer picking cotton on the plantations in Virginia or mining in the mountains of Minas Gerais does so under social (economic and juridic) conditions of unfreedom, as “part and parcel of the means of production.”17 For Marx, they do not enter in the reproduction (accumulation of) capital because the land where the cotton grows and the bodies of those who tend the land and pick the cotton are instruments of production, not dead labor, but raw material. That is, slave labor does not count as dead/past labor. However, because the raw material (cotton and gold) would not exist without it, it enters the calculation of the value of the yarn as an underdetermined element in the conditions of production. At the same time, as such, as raw material, slave labor also differs from the cotton it creates for the production of the yarn. For, as noted above, the cotton is a raw material whose exchange value disappears once living labor transforms it into an elementary component of the yarn—that is, when it realizes it use value. But the price of the slave’s labor is already surplus value and his/her labor is extracted, rather than willfully applied to its subjects. More important, the slave is presented as a raw material given by nature, like the soil (land and water), and not one that is in itself use value (that is the product of past labor).18 “In slave-labor,” Marx argues, “even that part of the working-day in which the slave is only replacing the value of his own means of existence, in which, therefore, in fact, he works for himself alone, appears as labor for his master. All the slave’s labor appears as unpaid labor. In wage-labor, on the contrary, even surplus labor, or unpaid labor, appears as paid. There the property relation conceals the labor of the slave for himself; here the money-relation conceals the unrequited labor of the wage-laborer.”19 Evidently, if one accepts this second operation of determinacy, in the differentiation of social conditions of production, my claim that the accumulated surplus value that constitutes capital contains the total value yielded by slaves laboring on Native lands is absolute nonsense. But it is nonsense, it seems, precisely because the settler slave owner did expropriate the total value. Though necessity guides the original presentation of historical materialism, its formulation of labor rests on the concept of freedom (as a descriptor of social conditions)—in the two senses Marx highlights above, from land (and other means of production) and to enter into a contract. The juridical forms of title and contract, respectively, account for the determination of two kinds of labor: slave labor, which as raw material, an object, as an instrument of production does not produce exchange value, and wage labor, which, even if dispossessed, remains a subject, free and equal. This is what renders my case nonsense, not the statement that slave owners expropriated the total value produced by slave labor in Native lands. What to do? To move to dissolve the categories of historical materialism. If we are to apprehend the words of the Dead (the Native and the slave), our political imagination must learn how to do without separability, sequentiality, and determinacy. Now listen!! What are the Zapatistas’ Dead saying? What is in the demand that does distinguish a subject (everyone is us) and an object (everything or nothing), or I and Other: “For everyone, everything,” say our dead. “Until it is so, there will be nothing for us.” Heed the call from the Zapatistas’ Dead, who speak history in the voice of the earth, their flesh and blood nurturing the mountains and rivers of the Mexican southeast, demanding everything to everyone or nothing, the return of the total value yielded by Native lands and slave labor; calling for the end of the rule of state-capital; because global capital is postcolonial capital, that is, it lives off the value yielded by the productive capacity of Native lands and slave bodies, so that the end of the anticolonial struggles, decolonization, will only be accomplished if the line separating the colonial present from the colonial past is erased because this is the only way to seize the colonial future. What is it that the Dead call for? Listening to the Dead requires seizing the spatiality and temporality that constitute Hegelian and Marxian formulations of the dialectical. Heeding the call of these insurgencies against state-capital, I am convinced, requires a materialist perspective that can answer to the Zapatistas’ Dead call for decolonization, or as I prefer, the end of the world as we know it. Emphasis on know! For what the Dead’s words and the Zapatistas’ reply presumes is an in/distinction between Thing, One, Us—thus violating the basic rules of modern grammar, namely separability, determinacy, and sequentiality.20 For the Dead (speaking in the mountains and forests) there is no distinction between everything, everyone, and us, no separability (extension and its related attributes, such as solidity), that is. No separation between the Dead and us and everything (what is happened and what is happening), no sequentiality, that is. These functions of our political grammar are presupposed in descriptions of the state and its legal borders and common history and social subjects. A Black feminist poethical reading is a kind of radical imaging; it is a compositional method that attends to matter not toward comprehending it in the fixed forms of the understanding or subsuming it to the idea(l)s of Reason. While a tool for critique, Black feminist poethical reading consists in a confrontational method that erases the distinction between the actual and the virtual, as it presupposes that, beyond space-time, all that happens and exists is deeply implicated. As a mode of critical intervention, it is creative in that it images the World as having always already been otherwise than its modern picturing. That is, its deployment of the figural (against the formal) unsettles the onto-epistemological pillars that sustain critical projects derived from the Kantian program. Reading the Dead is imaging, with an intention, a manner of composing and recomposing what is given (global capital) so as to expose fissures through which possibilities can be contemplated and with what is not necessarily followed by what is supposed to come.

### 3

#### Counterplan Text: Agricultural laborers ought to unconditionally strike.

#### Acts of recognition by the colonizer block the future potentialities for change and reifies colonial oppression – the aff is an act of fixity, a colonial mimicry where the Other is only valuable once their desire to be recognized by the colonizer has been assured and fulfilled

LaRue 11, Robert LaRue, “MOVING BEYOND THIS MOMENT: EMPLOYING DELEUZE AND GUATARRI‟S RHIZOME IN POSTCOLONIALISM”, Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of MASTER OF ARTS IN ENGLISH THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON August 2011, <https://rc.library.uta.edu/uta-ir/bitstream/handle/10106/6148/LaRue_uta_2502M_11318.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>, accessed 11/1/21, sb

Throughout his work as a psychiatrist, Fanon‟s attempts to delineate the path(s) of colonial oppression and find a way to help colonized individuals move beyond the problems of colonization always returned to the idea that “the last shall be first” (Wretched 2). Although presented in various forms, Fanon‟s desire to replace the first with the last only creates a loop because, instead of opening new pathways, it seeks to “substitute” one “thing” for another (Wretched 1). Even though, for Fanon, it seemed that ontology did “not [to] permit us to understand the being of the black man” (Black Skin 110) it seemed so because the ontology of the colonized was viewed as starting in, and around colonization. Since the rhizome refuses points, instead preferring continuous connections and fluid motions, understanding ontology as effect serves no purpose. This reliance on a point-based experience, if Cartesian humanism holds that existence is to be understood as a series disconnected instances of “I‟s,” becomes most clearly evidenced in the language of colonization each time the colonizer, or even Fanon himself, articulates that it is the colonizer who “fabricated and continues to fabricate the colonized subject” (Wretched 2). Fanon seems to look at Sartre‟s existentialism as a way to connect the dots. However, as discussed in chapter 1, in joining the “I‟s” into one system, Sartre presents Fanon with a new set of challenges. Fanon‟s insistence on the colonizer being the “point” of the colonized, and postcolonial, existence fixes postcoloniality. The rhizome, in its “lineness,” soothes the tensions between these points. While it must be acknowledged that it was the colonizer who created circumstances that brought the “colonized” into a state of colonization, the existence of colonized individuals should not be understood as fixed at the point of interaction. Instead, the existence of the colonized extends beyond—both before and after—this “moment” of interaction. An understanding of this extension is precisely what the rhizome promotes. In soothing the series of disjointed points into multiple lines, Fanon‟s attempt to escape the fixity of his colonized body can be more easily realized because there can be an understanding that the stereotype (which becomes the linguistic model to signify the colonized) does not, and cannot exist. Fixity blocks the history—and futures—of bodies by turning them into singular sites that begin at the present moment(s) of “recognition,” or, as Homi Bhabha so aptly states it, fixity “facilitates colonial relations, and sets up a discursive form of racial and cultural opposition in terms of which colonial power is exercised” (112; emphasis in original). Through colonial linguistics, the body becomes expressly felt, “overdetermin[ing the colonized] from without” (Black Skin 116). At each interaction with the white world, the colonized are “assailed at various points” while “the[ir] corporeal schema crumble[s], its place taken by a racial epidermal schema” (112) so that the only understanding of their body is that which is handed to them by the colonizer. The body no longer becomes just the experiences of the individual, it becomes layered with the images that the colonizer has of the black man‟s experience. If Fanon s interested in having “those who have kept [the colonized] in slavery” so that they can “help rehabilitate man, and ensure his triumph everywhere, once and for all” (Wretched 61; my emphasis) there can be no freedom from this fixed body because the signifying colonized will always carry “traces” (as Derrida would put it) of its previous image/utterance relationship. Fanon‟s insistence that postcolonials can finally be “elevated” and given recognition as “humans” seems contradictory because, within the colonizer‟s mind, the separation of “Us” and “Them” is needed in order to assure the colonizer of his/her place. Therefore, Fanon‟s desire to “take [the] place” of the colonizer (Wretched 23) belies the truth that the postcolonial individual will never have a place within the colonist‟s system of power. By demanding a substitution of roles, Fanon seems to have ignored—either intentionally or unintentionally—his own recognition that “in the white world the man of color encounters difficulties in the development of bodily schema” and any “consciousness of the body” comes as “a third-person consciousness” (Black Skin 110-11). In other words, within the “white world” of colonization, there is no room for “man of color” to be anything other than what the white man sees him as. The fixed categories of “the Other” always remain because the without them, the colonizer‟s own identity becomes jeporadized since there would no longer be an understanding of “me” based on what “I am not.” By introducing Deleuze and Guattari‟s rhizome into this understanding of experience as reality, the reading of the body expands so that the body, instead of remaining fixed, becomes a state of constant motion. Through an understanding of the rhizome, the postcolonial body no longer becomes a single unit (a monolith), instead, it becomes lifted from its binary relationship as a signifier (it is lifted from its status as a monolithic corporeal schema) and is able to be “read” as fluid and as a system of possibilities. As the language of colonization turned the existence of colonized individuals into one of fixed categories (i.e. savage, cannibalistic, uncivilized, etc.), the rhizome‟s multiplicities offer a chance to, as Ingram argues, move beyond a state of representation—where the body has its meaning(s) inscribed on it from outside sources, such as the perceptions of others—and towards a state of signification—where the body is no longer tied to fixed categories of meaning (3). By moving beyond the reliance on representation—which can never fully grasp the entirety of the thing it attempts to represent— and moving towards signification, postcolonial individuals gain the perspective that they have “meaning, but not one that is fixed or predetermined” (18). The European humanism, from which Fanon draws his claims, depends on these representations. It is because of this dependence that there can never be a new understanding of the postcolonial individual within the system of European humanism. The rhizome seeks to “think outside of the form/matter binary” (9) and allow all of its lines to create their own meanings—meanings that are not created by the Other, but created with an understanding of the Other as part of, not apart from, each line. This may seem problematic since it seems to corrode any knowledge of the “Self,” but, in fact, the body is freed from an understanding of the “Self” that relies on a point-based system of “mirroring” (Lacan) which holds the system of oppression in place. This psychology is based on a single fixed point: the “dictatorial conception of the unconscious (Deleuze and Guattari 17). The unconscious, in the system of mirroring, becomes the point of origin for the Self. This once again brings about the searching for an origin, for the point of beginning for the individual. And, since much—if not all—of psychoanalysis grounds itself in Western concepts/ideals, any attempt to excavate the postcolonial individual‟s origin from a psychological (or more appropriately psychoanalytical) means only leads back to a troubled system of power. Instead of looking to “uncover” or “reduce the unconscious or to interpret it or to make it signify according to a tree model,” a rhizome “is precisely th[e] production of the unconscious” because it disengages itself from the “leader/follower” framework (17-18). It is not safe to say that the rhizome is a social body, since it does not require agreements the way that language does (rhizomes do not require the approval of its member to validate its existence). It simply is. Each line in the rhizome exists with or without recognition. Saying that existence relies upon mutual recognition insinuates that neither party exists prior to their mutual interaction. Insinuations such as these once again seek to fix the location of individuals, turning them into subjects in a game of power. Lacan is correct when he discusses the mirror‟s role in the construction of the self, showing how it creates new movements and new recognitions within the individual (2); however, this admission is near-sighted because he fails to note the effects that the individual has upon the mirror. On their own, the two bodies exist independently of one another. When they meet, not only is the individual altered by the mirror‟s reflection, but the mirror is altered by the individual. Each wave of the individual‟s arm deterritorializes the mirror and reterritorializes it, giving it new properties and new motions. Each new reflection creates a new mirror, just as it creates a new understanding in the mirrored. And each understanding shifts in accordance with different mirrors. There no longer remains a singular “source,” a singular “point” from which the individual can take its recognition. It is by understanding these multilateral effects and assemblages (the ways in which each line of interaction) cast effects on one another that the rhizome comes to “produce” the unconscious. Instead, rhizomes should be seen as natural connections of bodies based, with a large emphasis, on motion. In addition to this, rhizomes require reconstitutions of all “bodies” involved, removing the unilateral shifts that are typically assumed to occur in colonization. In other words, as explained by Bhabha and Gayatri Spivak, among others, postcoloniality can no longer be seen as the sole existence of the once colonized “Others.” As a rhizome, then, the postcolonial body (not only how it physically connects with the microbes, viruses, and other life forms in its environment, but the psychological understanding of it as well) exists in a constant state of flux and as a constant source of deterritorializations and reterritorializations. In the postcolonial context, this is a powerful shift in focus because it allows Fanon‟s theory of the body to free itself from the singlesided transmissions of colonial knowledge(s). While Bhabha‟s discussion on mimicry makes a similar move of shifting colonial knowledge from a monologue to a dialogue (as he argues that mimicry highlights the “performance” of the colonist‟s existence), it too rests on performance which is problematic because the system of ascension remains intact since “colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognizable Other”8 (122). And, it is this upward movement that threatens to impede the progress of postcoloniality. Even as colonized individuals disrupt the security (or the certainty) of the colonists‟ knowledge of their (the colonists‟) own place, the postcolonial‟s desire to “prove” themselves only serves to validate the colonizer‟s superiority. Deleuze and Guattari‟s rhizome, however, moves beyond mimicry, as “[mimicry] relies on binary logic to describe phenomena” (11), insisting on understanding reality as a something like a giant ocean where each instance of contact sends forth ripples, and as each ripple moves outward, which alter the dynamic of the surrounding waters. As the rhizome highlights the interconnectivity of beings (of bodies), the hierarchical structure of mimicry is laid horizontal, placing all subjects equal to one another. Rhizomes “are flat, in the sense that they fill or occupy all of their dimensions” existing on a single plane (9). Rhizomes can never contain “a dualism or a dichotomy, even in the form of the good and the bad” because there is no end. Every seeming “rupture” always “tie back to one another” (9), and this ability to self-heal and avoid dualisms or dichotomies speaks directly to the systems through which postcolonial individuals must work. An understanding of the postcolonial Self can be, then, understood as a line in a multiplicity of lines which can never be separated because they are one another.

### Case

#### Antiblackness > extinction –

#### [1] The impacts of racial cap are happening right now meaning we o/w on probability and timeframe – probability x timeframe > magnitude because it’s a question of what impacts are worth taking action on in the first place

#### [2] Suffering beyond suffering – racial cap pushes black people beyond suffering through prison labor and racial dispossession

#### [3] Education – the university sustains antiblackness and the PIC through its contradictions – that means we have an epistemological obligation to reject antiblackness

#### Util is racist –

#### [1] Extinction is all lives matter – you’ve basically said you won’t care about black people when it’s only about black people but now that white people’s lives are threatened, you’ll care about black people

#### [2] Reps of extinction puts black people’s demands on the backburner – the “necessary evil” logic is used to stave off extinction which never happen

#### [3] Death count DA – black casualties in crises and wars are never counted– the US invaded Libya and killed a bunch of black people but didn’t report any of those deaths which shows that black people are viewed as fungible and the benefits of util will never apply to black folks in the context of the government