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**The space race is deeply entangled with the development of carcerality, funded through wealth extracted from black communities through policing and exploitative labor. The use of space as a symbol of progress obfuscated racial divisions and cohered an ideological understanding of white upward mobility and black immobility.**

**Loyd 15.** Jenna M. 2015. "Whitey on the Moon: Space, Race, and the Crisis of Black Mobility." In Montegary, Liz and Melissa White, eds. Mobile Desires: The Politics and Erotics of Mobility Justice. Palgrave Pivot, 41-52.

But Watts is a country which lies, psychologically, uncounted miles further than most whites seem at present willing to travel. (Pynchon, 1966) From the days of chattel slavery until today, the concept of travel has been inseparably linked in the minds of our people with the concept of freedom. (Robeson, 1988, original emphasis) In the 1960 presidential election, candidate John F. Kennedy invoked moon exploration to displace the salience of religious division by focusing on unifying issues, including the spread of Communism that was ‘fester[ing] only 90 miles from the coast of Florida’ and crises in family farms, hunger, and unaffordable medical care that ‘know no religious barrier.’ The real problem was ‘an America with too many slums, with too few schools, and too late to the moon and outer space.’ This listing of ‘real issues which should decide this campaign’ suggested urgent, yet equally solvable, concerns. The space race ratified a national challenge, suggesting that returning the gaze from this ‘new frontier’ to domestic problems was the next step for technoscientific progress. When Dr Martin Luther King spoke of the moon in 1967, he was a world away from Kennedy’s Cold War hopefulness (Jordan, 2003). He delivered his final speech, ‘Where Do We Go From Here?: Chaos or Community?’, to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) on the ten-year anniversary of the organization’s formation following the Montgomery bus boycott. Despite the gains of the civil rights move- ment, King concluded, ‘the Negro still lives in the basement of the Great Society.’ He went on to question the consonance between scientific and social progress that had seemed so central to Kennedy’s understanding of the nation: Today our exploration of space is engaging not only our enthusiasm but our patriotism.... No such fervor or exhilaration attends the war on poverty.... Without denying the value of scientific endeavor, there is a striking absurdity in committing billions to reach the moon where no people live, while only a fraction of that amount is appropriated to service the densely populated slums. If these strange views persist, in a few years we can be assured that when we set a man on the moon, with an adequate telescope he will be able to see the slums on earth with their intensified congestion, decay and turbulence. King concluded his remarks by asking: ‘On what scale of values is this a program of progress?’ (King, as cited in Gilroy, 1991 [1987], pp. 345–346). Spectacular Cold War images of space travel drew on and renovated a constellation of meanings associated with mobility that inform US national identity, including celebratory narratives of continental exploration, limitless possibility, and freedom. Kennedy did not see any conflict between mastering space travel and meeting domestic needs – each a concrete signification of American capitalist providence in the Cold War period. King’s speech marks both of these registers. His imagined telescopic view of the earth traverses an expansive scale of human possi- bility, but under Pax Americana, King finds that ‘common humanity’ is an ideological vision papering over the reality of grave economic and racial divisions. Even before a man (much less The Man) was on the moon, liberal and radical social critics alike were deploying a rhetorical device I call lunar criticism – ‘If we can put a man on the moon, we can do X, Y, or Z’ – to question US national priorities and narratives of progress. Liberal iterations of lunar criticism suggested that the gap between promise and practice could be bridged as part of fulfilling the national creed. Radical social critics argued that what appeared to be an incidental gap was in fact a racialized conflict. Reaching the moon began to look less like a virtuous American project than a white American project that furthered Black economic exploitation and abandonment. The space race as a spectacle of freedom and (white) upward mobility must be held in tension with the deepening ‘urban crisis’ (Beauregard, 2003). As both a powerful discourse and material geography, the urban crisis was constituted through Cold War investments in suburban housing, freeways, and defense industry construction, relative disinvestment in central cities, and through militarized, counter-insurgency responses to the urban unrest of the 1960s (Loyd, 2014). Yet, the interrelations between these spaces have been obscured through enduring spectacular productions of capitalist suburban hyper-mobility and ‘ghetto’ immobilization and backwardness (Siddiqi, 2010). As novelist Thomas Pynchon dissected, ‘Watts’ was another country to white Americans, represent- ing a psychological distance that white Americans were disinclined to travel. This chapter situates radical iterations of lunar criticism within the context of urban crisis and on the cusp of what Jodi Melamed, following Howard Winant, calls the post-World War II ‘racial break’ after which ‘state-recognized US antiracisms replaced white supremacy as the chief ideological mode for making the inequalities that global capitalism generated appear necessary, natural, or fair’ (Melamed, 2011, p. xvi). By contrast, race-radical antiracisms ‘have made visible the continued racialized historical development of capitalism and have persistently foregrounded antiracist visions incompatible with liberal political solutions to destructively uneven global social-material relations’ (p. xvii). In the spectacular treatment of urban uprisings, the space called the ‘ghetto’ ideologically and tactically cohered the problems of urban crisis, which were actually metropolitan (urban-suburban) in form and imperial in process. To develop this argument, I analyze the work of Gil Scott-Heron whose poetry, songs, and writing exemplify the race-radical tradition. His poem ‘Whitey on the Moon’ delivers a radical antiracist critique of the US space program that ties otherworldly investments to ongoing histories of Black forced im/mobility and immiseration. To that end, this essay responds to the call within the new mobilities scholar- ship to examine the ‘role of past mobilities in the present constitution of modern notions of security, identity and citizenship’ (Cresswell, 2012, p. 646). I begin by situating mobilities within post-war militarized spectacle and racial politics. I then move to an analysis of how race-radical lunar criticism grappled with the dialectics of urban crisis, which included the simultaneous deployment of rhetorics of mobility and new means of social control and state power. I conclude by exploring how Scott-Heron’s race-radical vision offers insights into contemporary mobilizations for mobility justice. Cold War spectacles of (upward) mobility What sort of national spectacle was the moon when King spoke? Spectacle tends to be understood as an ideological mask or distortion of reality, but Shiloh Krupar usefully conceptualizes spectacle as ‘a tactical ontology – meaning a truth-telling, world-making strategy’ (2013, p. 10). Indeed, in Blank Spots on the Map (2009), Trevor Paglen shows how NASA was the visible institutional face of an expansive and largely secret Cold War military geography. Krupar and Paglen show how US militarization has developed through institutional apparatuses and personnel that create a world of plausible appearances. Visuality and material landscapes are interconnected such that hypervisibility (that is, the space race) is a technological apparatus simultaneously creating unseen spaces of waste and sacrifice. Thus, spectacle is a tool of reification and division that works by disconnecting spaces and categories – delineating human from nature, valued from abjected – that are actually produced together. Caren Kaplan’s work on the visual logic of modern war-making connects such spectacles to the mobility of states and imperial citizens. Air power is an iteration of the cosmic view, a ‘unifying gaze of an omniscient viewer of the globe from a distance’ (Kaplan, 2006, p. 401). Kaplan ties this viewpoint – which claims universality, neutrality, and freedom ‘from bounded embeddedness on earth’ – to Euro-American colonization (Kaplan, 2006, p. 402; also see Cosgrove, 1994). Modern military ‘air power is seamlessly linked to the cosmic view through its requirements for a unified, universal map of the globe that places the home nation at the center on the ground and proposes an extension of this home to the space above it, limitlessly’ (Kaplan, 2006, p. 402). The upshot, according to Kaplan, is that the mobility of air power simultaneously produces an imagination of fixed sovereign territories. Indeed, for Kaplan, modern war is paradoxical in that it ‘requires the movements of large armies and instigates the mass displacement of refugees, yet it also polices borders and limits freedom of movement’ (p. 396). I take these theories of spectacle to suggest that the Cold War space race produced a modern, white, upwardly mobile subject that obscured the simultaneous co-production of an immobilized, unfree population confined to a knowable, tactical domestic space. That is, the militarization of the ‘cosmic view’ facilitates not only abstract targets of foreign war, but also targets of domestic state and state-sanctioned violence and confinement. The militarized logic of the ‘home front’ both coercively compels a patriotic citizen subject and obscures the racial, gender, class, and other social divides within the nation that belie the state’s claim to national unity (Lutz 2002; Young 2003; Loyd 2011). As the United States faced vulnerability to charges of racism during the Cold War, a cultural project of racial liberalism enabling mobility of the US empire would simultaneously entail efforts to confine Black mobility and dissident thought. For example, Rachel Buff (2008) shows how the US government deployed the terror of deportation as a means of disrupting political organizing. In the immediate post-World War II era, both W. E. B. Du Bois and Paul Robeson were barred from foreign travel for their views on peace, nuclear abolition, and decolonization (Kinchy, 2009; Robeson, 1988). The experience, no doubt, contributed to the observation that the Robeson epigraph makes on the race-radical desire for free mobility. Race-radical lunar criticism The United States would not make its lunar touch down until 1969 (after Kennedy’s and King’s assassinations), but King found a moon landing a more plausible future than a Second Reconstruction. And it was more plausible. By the time of his speech, long, hot summers of urban uprisings punctured the image of freedom and opportunity that the United States projected around the world. Moreover, the War on Poverty, while less than three years old, was virtually dead letter. The 1966 midterm elections ushered in legislators who claimed a mandate to terminate the War on Poverty and urban social investments. The ‘great rat debate’ of 1967 captured the level of political polarization as Congress quibbled over a miserly sum of ‘no more than $16.5 million to combat rodent infestations in ghetto neighborhoods.’ A year later, the Los Angeles Times observed, ‘[r]ats are still coexisting with the poor as comfortably as ever’ (Abramson, 1968). It is within this context that Gil Scott-Heron’s ‘Whitey on the Moon’ makes landing in 1970 on his first album, Small Talk at 125th and Lennox. The poem’s narrative arc is wryly humorous and brief, delivered in less than two minutes, with a simple drum accompaniment common in street poetry. Scott-Heron tells the story of sister Nell, who has been attacked by a rat even as Neil Armstrong lands on the moon: A rat done bit my sister Nell with Whitey on the moon. Her face and arms began to swell and Whitey’s on the moon. I can’t pay no doctor bills, but Whitey’s on the moon. Ten years from now I’ll be payin’ still while Whitey’s on the moon. Debts for Nell’s medical treatment, which would not have been incurred were there basic tenant rights and public health investments, will extend into the foreseeable future as costs for rent, food, and taxes will continue to rise to pay for the voyage. The final line of the song offers a sardonic resolution to the outlandish situation. When the next doctor bills arrive, he will forward them ‘air mail special to Whitey on the moon.’ Marvin Gaye’s 1971 song ‘Inner City Blues (Make Me Wanna Holler)’ likewise links high taxes and inflation to an imperial project that results in the devastation of Black lives: ‘Markets, moon shots, spend it on the have-nots/Money, we make it, ‘fore we see it, you take it.’ Scott-Heron and Gaye flip racist narratives of the welfare queen as responsible for poverty, naming instead state neglect and the theft of Black wealth. Their songs reclaim the value being appropriated to a desirable national project that denies it rests on Black expropriation and death. In this reading, the moon counters temporalities and spatialities of racial liberalism that rendered white supremacy as historical and anachronistic by insisting that American white supremacy is part of the modern geopolitical order. Visual artist Faith Ringgold also depicted this reality in her 1969 paint- ing of an American flag entitled ‘Flag for the Moon: Die Nigger.’ The word ‘die’ reads across the block of stars in the flag’s upper left corner. The stripes of the flag are formed by elongated black letters aligned from the bottom to the top edge of the flag, spelling out the word ‘nigger’ between the customary 13 red stripes. The painting’s message is three-fold: the use of black paint in place of white draws attention to the negative space between the lines to illustrate the tense interrelation between the invis- ibility of white supremacy and Black people to the history of the United States. Ringgold indicts the act of placing the flag on the moon as sending a spectacular message underscoring the abandonment of Black needs. Yet, the painting’s reference to H. Rap Brown’s Die, Nigger, Die! suggests the immediate tension between structural racism and the possibility for liberatory Black politics and identity (Patton, 1998, p. 198). ‘Whitey on the Moon’ is often cited as an expression of afrofuturism, which Mark Dery defines as a genre of Black social thought concern- ing ‘culture, technology, and things to come’ (Dery, as cited in Nelson, 2002, p. 9). For Kodwo Eshun, afrofuturism provides a ‘resource for speculation’ that traces the ‘potentiality of space and distance within the high-pressure zone of perpetual racial hostility’ (Eshun, 2003, p. 299). He explains that afrofuturism ‘uses extraterrestriality as a hyper- bolic trope to explore the historical terms, the everyday implications of forcibly imposed dislocation, and the constitution of Black Atlantic subjectivities: from slave to negro to coloured...to black to African to African American’ (pp. 298–299). In an afrofuturist reading, radical lunar criticism uses the vast physi- cal distance of the earth to the moon to imagine alternative futures to the gaping racial divides in earthly living conditions and well-being. As Stevphen Shukaitis suggests, ‘the imaginal machine based around space imagery is made possible by its literal impossibility. In the sense that this possibility cannot be contained or limited, it becomes an assemblage for the grounding of a political reality that is not contained but opens up to other possible futures that are not foreclosed through their pre-given definition’ (2009, p.107). Given the coloniality of the cosmic view and the simultaneous construction of Black ‘placelessness and constraint’ (McKittrick, 2011, p. 948), I suggest that Scott-Heron’s lunar criticism is not so much concerned with the otherworldly as a space for imagining the earthly impossible, but for assembling earthly sites of decolonization and liberation. Scott-Heron’s race-radical critique explores what Katherine McKittrick calls ‘spaces of encounter that hold in them useful anticolonial practices and narratives’ (2011, p. 950). He offers a theory of militarized spectacle in which juxtaposition, or division, falls way to connection, to shared production. He shows how a landscape of rat-infested housing produces the man on the moon – through taxes and a vanishing horizon of medical debt – and names the spectacle obscuring this process ‘Whitey.’ In contrast to liberal iterations of lunar criticism, which suggested that solving poverty was possible within the terms of American capitalism, Scott-Heron linked American capitalism to the production of poverty, militarism, environmental devastation, and human abandonment. These themes found in ‘Whitey on the Moon’ are consistent across his work, and include persistent criticism of spectacular popular culture and consumerism, war and state violence (‘No Knock,’ ‘King Alfred’s Plan,’ ‘Did You Hear What They Said?,’ ‘H20 Gate Blues,’ ‘B Movie’), concern for children’s well being (‘Speed Kills,’ ‘Who Will Save the Children?’), the threat of nuclear destruction and climate change (‘We Almost Lost Detroit,’ ‘South Carolina (Barnwell),’ ‘Spacesong’), drugs and habituation to other people’s suffering (‘Billy Green Is Dead,’ ‘Angel Dust,’ ‘Home is Where the Hatred Is’), and structural unemployment (‘Who Will Pay Reparations on My Soul?’). Scott-Heron’s poems link histories of forced mobility to the development of blues consciousness and revolution, exemplifying what Clyde Woods (2000) calls a ‘blues epistemology.’ Indeed, Scott-Heron described himself as a ‘bluesologist’ (Ward, 2011), pursuing the science of the blues, offering a diagnostic that the ‘I ain’t got no money blues, I ain’t got no job blues, I ain’t got no woman blues’ are the same things (Mugge, 1982). For Woods, the blues ‘has been used repeatedly by multiple genera- tions of working-class African Americans to organize communities of consciousness....It was used to confront the daily efforts of plantation powers to erase African American leadership and the memory of social progress. ... The blues and its extensions are actively engaged in providing intellectually brutal confrontations with the “truths” of working-class African American life. It draws on African American musical practices, folklore, and spirituality to re-organize and give a new voice to working- class communities facing severe fragmentation’ (2005, p. 1008). The economic and racial forces of displacement and fragmentation were not distant from Scott-Heron. He was born in Chicago and spent much of his childhood living with his grandmother in the small town of Jackson, Tennessee. He saw the African American section of Jackson demolished to build the new highway between Memphis and Nashville before moving at the age of 13 with his mother to New York City (Scott- Heron, 2012). They first lived with his uncle in the Bronx and later in the Robert Fulton Houses in Chelsea. From there, he rode the subway for over an hour to Fieldston, a private high school in the Bronx. After his first year of college at Lincoln University in Oxford, Pennsylvania, which he chose to attend because Black writers and leaders such as Langston Hughes, Kwame Nkrumah, and Thurgood Marshall studied there, he took a leave of absence to complete his first novel, The Vulture. The book was published in 1970, the same year as his first album (and book of poetry), Small Talk at 125th and Lennox, which also debuted the well-known poem ‘The Revolution Will Not Be Televised.’ Scott-Heron’s blues offered an anticolonial vision of race-radical revo- lutionary consciousness, evident on the album From South Africa to South Carolina (1975), which ties together nuclear colonialism in South Carolina with apartheid in South Africa. Claudrena Harold (2011) observes that, ‘Scott-Heron’s descriptions of “down home” routinely moved beyond the geographical borders of the former Confederacy and into the transna- tional terrain commonly referred to as the Global South.’ ‘Delta Man,’ for example, traces the development of revolutionary consciousness along the sites of the plantation and Great Migration, from **the Mississippi Delta during slavery,** to Nebraska following the Civil War, and then to the inner city. The bridge between each of these places – ‘revolution outta be where I’m comin’ from’ – shuttles possibility between sites of forced mobility. The history lessons found in ‘**Spacesong’** and ‘Who’ll Pay Reparations on My Soul?’, moreover, **speak of white settler dispossession of Native** inhabitants. Such an expansive internationalist, **decolonial desire tempers the feeling of despair otherwise dominant in ‘Winter in America**.’ The song was written in 1975 at a moment when the possibility of the Black freedom and peace movements had been betrayed, leaving ‘nobody fight- ing ‘cause nobody knows what to save.’ Within an internationalist blues epistemology, however, the hopeful suggestion is that spring can still be found in movements outside of the United States (Peddie, 2011, 122). Mobilizing urban crisis The militarization of the urban crisis was accompanied by an ideological project to enclose the racialized ‘Black ghetto’ as a place separate from modern white suburbia, reifying it as a space of dangerousness that may be subject legitimately to exceptional rules and abandoned. The great rat debate contributed to this ideological crystallization. Southern Democrats and Republican opponents of the bill used innuendo (‘rats of the two-legged variety’ and ‘rats of the four-legged variety’) to tie the bill to race and rioting in Newark (Strickland, 1969, p. 342). Another congressman mockingly referred to it as the ‘civil “rats” bill’ (McLaughlin, 2011, p. 542). ‘Whitey on the Moon,’ by turn, revealed the truth that state abandonment is not just an afterthought, but a productive absence directly abetted by state violence. In drawing together the exploration of the moon with the extraction of value from and suppression of Black freedom movements, race-radical lunar criticism rejected the bifurcated militarized spectacle of limitless space and anachronistic ghetto confinement. Indeed, Scott-Heron offers a documentary trace of the new ‘great confinement’ that was then in the making (de Giorgi, 2006). In ‘No Knock,’ Scott-Heron invites listeners to take an incredulous interpretation of new legislation that enabled the police to enter a dwelling without notice: Long rap about “No Knock” being legislated for the people you’ve always hated in this hell hole that you/we call home. “No Knock,” the Man will say to keep this man from beating his wife. “No Knock,” the Man will say to protect people from themselves. His poem ‘King Alfred’s Plan’ discusses a Nixon plan for preventive detention that would create a caged future in the absence of Black political unity. ‘Locked in cages, pens, hemmed in shoulder to shoulder arms outstretched for just a crust of bread...Let us unite out of love and not hate / Let us unite on our own and not because of barbed wire death.’ As race-radical lunar criticism illustrates, the material and ideological struggle over urban crisis constituted a space for grappling with intersecting structures of white racial rule and empire, namely whether and how they could be democratically reconstructed. This offers a cultural trace of the shift from military Keynesianism to post-Keynesian militarism that Ruth Wilson Gilmore (1998) names as the conjuncture for the sharp expansion of the carceral state. In contrast to the ‘symbiotic’ progression from ‘ghetto’ to prison confinement offered by Wacquant (2001), race-radical lunar criticism illustrates both the tremendous contests over shifting forms of unfreedom and their situatedness within a broader crisis of imperialism that anticolonial and ‘domestic’ freedom struggles provoked. The uneven geography that the warfare-welfare state produced was the grounds of struggle over the costs and harms of militarization. Investments in defense were widespread but concentrated in New South and New West sites in the so-called Sunbelt, what Markusen and colleagues (1991) dubbed the Gunbelt. This unevenness was not only regional, but also shaped patterns of development at the metropolitan scale (Loyd, 2014). This social and spatial struggle was deeply racialized and gendered. For this reason, it is misleading to interpret the space race as a form of militarization that uniformly trumps basic needs, as liberal versions of spending priorities suggest. Conflicts over who would pay for the costs of empire and militarization were mediated through strug- gles over racism that took a spectacular form, splitting inner city from suburb in ways that obscured the intersections among race, class, and gender. The Black welfare mother was enlisted as the spectacular figure of national disorder, even though most welfare recipients were white and most Great Society spending supported middle class suburban homes. Scott-Heron’s retort to this scapegoating restored the racial economic context within which Black families and communities struggled for freedom. Cross-class welfare rights and peace movements questioned military Keynesianism, meaning that they increasingly rejected the wages of empire and believed that a democratic reconstruction of US society was possible only by ending its wars. Conclusion: race-radical lunar criticism for the prison home front As a sublime symbol of progress, exploration, and national purpose, the moon represented a material symbol of upward mobility and possibility for the nation. The Cold War space race as spectacle cohered an ideological understanding of upward mobility and progress. This spectacle, moreover, was not simply a mode of visuality, but also built material spaces of the economically buoyant Sunbelt-Gunbelt and fostered confinement of Black central city spaces and dislocation of residents from industries being developed elsewhere. Urban crisis, then, was fundamentally a crisis over Black ‘upward’ mobility in terms of movement through space (that is, the Great Migration and moving beyond confines of racial ghettos) and claims to political power and presence in public spaces. Race-radical lunar criticism defied the Cold War spectacle that would split the world in two, the nation into Black and white, American or failed American, by illustrating the relationships between the ghetto and suburb, the ghetto and empire. Critical interpretations of the relationship between racialized poverty and wealth, as offered through Black lunar criticism, did not disappear, but were submerged within a discourse that naturalized Black confinement in ghetto and prison spaces while obscuring the consolidation of political and economic forces responsible for a new, multiscalar regime of mobility and immobility. The political and cultural contest over this lived and ideological space of urban crisis underscores the uncertain future of the prison resolution. With mass incarceration in question from the left and right, race-radical lunar criticism offers some guidance for understanding how the present crisis may be resolved in favor of mobility justice. Scott-Heron’s song ‘Alien (Hold Onto Your Dreams)’ criticizes divide and conquer tactics, and ties the trajectories of transnational Latino/a migrants to African American histories of forced mobility. Moreover, Scott-Heron’s dialectical blues understanding of the politics of space suggests that dismantling the United States’ unprecedented carceral state will hinge not so much on comparing rates of spending on confinement versus welfare but on analyzing their interconnection and on developing political unity and (even) love. The peaceful promise of outer space – displacing the Man from the moon – remains tied to liberatory, decolonial projects on earth.

**Private space appropriation as worldmaking isn’t value neutral but is an apparatus of white science – scaling from cosmic elite and unequal IR, there is always someone left behind.**

**Stockwell 20** [Samuel Stockwell (Research Project Manager, the Annenberg Institute at Brown University). “Legal ‘Black Holes’ in Outer Space: The Regulation of Private Space Companies”. E-International Relations. Jul 20 2020. Accessed 12/7/21. <https://www.e-ir.info/2020/07/20/legal-black-holes-in-outer-space-the-regulation-of-private-space-companies/> //Xu]

**The US government’s support for private space companies is also likely to lead to the reinforcement of Earth-bound wealth inequalities in space.** Many NewSpace actors frame their long-term ambitions in space with strong anthropogenic undertones, by offering the salvation of the human race from impending extinction through off-world colonial developments (Kearnes & Dooren: 2017: 182). **Yet, this type of discourse disguises the highly exclusive nature of these missions. Whilst they seem to suggest that there is a stake for ordinary citizens in the vast space frontier, the reality is that these self-described space pioneers are a member of a narrow ‘cosmic elite’ – “founders of Amazon.com, Microsoft, Pay Pal… and a smattering of games designers and hotel magnates”** (Parker, 2009: 91). **Indeed, private space enterprises have themselves suggested that they have no obligation to share mineral resources extracted in space with the global community (Klinger, 2017: 208).** This is reflected in the speeches of individuals such as Nathan Ingraham, a senior editor at the tech site EngadAsteroid mining, who claimed that asteroid mining was “how [America is] going to move into space and develop the next Vegas Strip” (Shaer, 2016: 50). Such comments highlight a form of what Beery (2016) defines as ‘scalar politics’. **In similar ways to the ‘scaling’ of unequal international relations that has constituted our relationship with outer space under the guise of the ‘global commons’ (Beery, 2016: 99), private companies – through their anthropogenic discourse – are scaling existing Earth-bound wealth inequalities and social relations into space by siphoning off extra-terrestrial resources.** By constructing their endeavours in ways that appeal to the common good, NewSpace actors are therefore concealing the reality of how commercial resource extraction serves the exclusive interests of their private shareholders at the expense of the vast majority of the global population.

**The project of white science is that of erasure – blackness is rendered underthought and invisible in the name of progress and worldmaking. Your ballot should ask – what other possibilities exist?**

**Murillo’16** (John Murillo III is a PhD student in the English department at Brown University, and a graduate of the University of California, Irvine, with bachelor’s degrees in Cognitive Science and English. His research interests are broad, and include extensive engagements with and within: Black Studies–particularly Afro-Pessimism–Narrative Theory; Theoretical Physics; Astrophysics; Cosmology; and Neuroscience. “Quantum Blackanics: Untimely Blackness, and Black Literature Out of Nowhere” 2016 pgs. 146-151) NAE

* reps matter – interrogate underlying

I quote her at length to express the full shape of what is a facile-at-best, antiblack-atworst comparison between the nature of urban development and large-scale structure formation—of galaxies, galaxy clusters, stars, etc. Randall flattens the process of modern urbanization in a way that necessarily, if haphazardly, displaces the antiblack violence inherent in the organization and growth of cities to clarify the effects of dark matter on large-scale structure formation in the universe. **She presents an idyllic, simplistic framing of urbanization without addressing the violence animating the planning, arrangement, rearrangement, and maintenance of “urban” spaces: gentrification and the ensuing displacement** (New Orleans, in the still-burgeoning wake of Hurricane Katrina, provides a case-study);**165 the creation of food deserts and the destructive responses to the ways Black communities attempt to develop self-sufficient sources of nourishment** (AfrikaTown in Oakland);**166 forms of environmental racism** (e.g. the poisoning of the water of at least Flint, MI); **and the overpolicing of Black communities. To make this critical elision in the name of clarification to knowingly or unknowingly ground that clarification in an obfuscation of the realities of antiblack violence at the level of spatial arrangement and relation.** Clarification for the lay audience remains imbricated in an obfuscation of the violence that emerges in the arrangements, infiltrations, intrusions, displacements and death that characterize the relation between Blackness and space. This problem of obfuscation persists as she crafts the second metaphor, in which dark matter metaphorically stands-in for the “rank-and-file of society.” In an article about Dark Matter and the Dinosaurs that she writes for The Boston Globe entitled, “Seeing dark matter as the key to the universe—and human empathy,” she clarifies and focuses what she might mean by “rank-and-file.” Recounting a reading from the first chapter of her book for an audience at the artists’ colony, Yaddo, during which she ventured to help clarify the dark matter’s “unseen but important influences” on the universe, Randall recalls being asked, “I know this might sound like a crazy question, but were you really talking about race?” In her telling, Randall beams at the thought: “the real issue I was addressing was the transparency—both metaphorical and literal—of people, phenomena, particles, and forces that we don’t necessarily appreciate but that are important to our shared reality.” She revels in this connection and extends the metaphor into seminars she teaches at Harvard. Dark matter is the dominant form of matter in the universe, but it goes unnoticed and remains undetectable to current research methods and instruments. Ordinary matter does not interact strongly with or resemble dark matter; dark matter merely passes through ordinary matter, and ordinary matter phenomenological exacts more influence on the known universe, its shape, contents, and so on. Some might consider dark matter dangerous because of its “ominous-sounding name.” Dark matter’s very existence confounds and fascinates scientific and lay intellects alike, prompting extensive research into what it is, how it behaves, and what the full extent of its influence on reality might be. **In all, thinking critically about or researching dark matter demands an attempt at understanding the invisible, the underthought, the unimaginable, the terrifying, the otherworldy, the Black.** For Randall, research into dark matter, and the parallels between dark matter’s function in the universe and the positions of Black folk and nonblack people in the world, prompt questions of empathy: what is it to think through and about, and to identify with, the constituents, sentient or particulate, of another world? Of another universe? This is peculiar in its own right, particularly given the position of power Randall occupies. Occupying the political-ontological position of the Human, as a white, blonde woman of increasing acclaim in a field that continues to marginalize not only Black people (and on a different register, people of color), but Black womyn (cis- and transgender) in particular—providing fewer research opportunities, accepting fewer candidates to elite programs, research laboratories and projects, and offering little or no access, reinforcement, or encouragement at early ages167—she presents this metaphor, like the first, in a way that works to obfuscate the antiblackness undergirding it. Worse, in the second instance in particular, she wields Blackness, via the invocation of race and the focus on the “dark” of dark matter, as a tool to make a general claim about the need for empathy (the very concept of which Saidiya Hartman tears asunder in her work)168 without a substantive recognition of the singularity of Blackness. In both instances, clarification and connection turn on Randall’s blindness to the realities that characterize the Black position in the antiblack world, in the field of Physics (and in STEM fields in general) and with regard to the spatial formations created by the violent process of urbanization. In all, while dark matter can at least draw and hold the fascination, care, adoration, research, and funding of physicists, researchers, and laypersons with scientific interests, dark matter—at least in Randall’s metaphor—**does not experience or capture the profound, debilitating, exclusionary, and fatal violence generally characteristic of Black life and death for Black folk around the globe.** Troubling as these elisions are, they intersect with what are useful metaphors for our consideration when thinking about the relation between Blackness and space. If for Randall Black folk and dark matter function similarly, as the structuring, transparent— rather, unseen, unthought—feared condition of possibility for the formation of structure of the universe, the very condensation of matter that eventually produces the earth, its inhabitants, and the structures those inhabitants create to house and arrange themselves or others, then this metaphor proves useful. That Black folk qua dark matter likely facilitates the condition that make what we call “space” possible, be that space physical, politicalontological, psychic, or imaginative, clarifies the darkness before us in the labyrinthine structure of the mausoleum before us. Not only does it affirm what we understand to be the violent mechanics that edify this structure to begin with, but it also directs our questions about how we might make or inhabit a space to do the wake work of mourning and moving with the dead. The “dark universe,” this “zone of nonbeing,”169 this nowhere, that gives the (non-dark) universe form, as a metaphor for the kind of spatial arrangement we occupy primes us to read what Beatty and Me are doing with and in Dickens, CA. Differently, **how Beatty and Me work with the dark matter of Blackness to shape the space of Dickens as a site of Black interaction, confrontation, and creation will help confirm and challenge both what we know about being and going nowhere, and also better frame our understanding of the possibilities afforded us by being lost.**

**White science necessitates a sovereign subject of mastery and individualization that creates international necro-zones of racialized sacrifice – the subject of IR theory depends on an asymmetrical segregated order of nation states.**

**Agathangelou 11** [Anna M. Agathangelou (political scientist from York University in Toronto. She is the co-director of Global Change Institute, Cyprus and was a visiting fellow in the Program of Science, Technology and Society at John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard). “Bodies to the Slaughter: Global Racial Reconstructions, Fanon's Combat Breath, and Wrestling for Life”. Somatechnics, March 2011, vo. 1, No. 1 : pp. 209-248. Accessed 1/22/22. <https://www.euppublishing.com/doi/full/10.3366/soma.2011.0014> //recut Xu]

Fanon scales colonisation to the level of the slave and colonised body. He illustrates the incommensurability of the intimate encounter of black flesh with the body of the coloniser and focuses on the structuring processes required to make it possible. **He begins his critique with the normative imperial order of slavery and colonisation and those humanist interventions claiming to protect the sovereign subject. He tells us that the constitution of this sovereign subject depends on an asymmetrical segregated-order:** This world divided into compartments, **this world cut in two is inhabited by two different species ...** When you examine at close quarters the colonial context, it is evident that what parcels out the world is to begin with the fact of belonging to a given race, a given species ... The cause is the consequence; you are rich because you are white, you are white because you are rich. (Fanon 1967d: 39–40, emphasis in original) Fanon points out that this order’s constitution depends on direct violence that turns a species into slaves, black, and colonised. **This violence makes it possible for zones to become ‘civil’ spaces of ‘generalized trust’ and security for the sovereigns; the species occupying them possess ‘generalized trust’ and are racially white.** This relation ends up being taken for granted: belonging to a given race of property relations is the precondition for any ‘civil’ encounter. Indeed, as Wilderson argues, ‘Fanon makes clear how some are zoned, a priori, beyond the borders of generalized trust’ (Wilderson 2010: 33). The establishment of gratuitous violence zones, positions and constitutes simultaneously the species and the colonised. Further, ‘the condition of possibility upon which subjectivity’ (Fanon 1967d: 39–40) is based must be recognised and theorised. The creation of colonised zones, the interstate state system, racialised whiteness, and property relations require theorising if we are to disrupt those relations which unify and entify a normative ‘ethical order’. Fanon, of course, is clear: without the vertical existence of breath, that is, giving one’s breath as nourishment for blackness, slavery, and colonisation, there is no such order. **This order, even when it claims inclusion, segregates subjects of recognition from ‘species’. Subjects are positioned into the interstate structure of worlds with sovereign protection, able to take by force and accumulate anything, from things to life itself.** Fanon seems to have anticipated Foucault who argues: ‘Power is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising power ... The individual ... is not the vis-a`-vis of power; it is I believe, one of its prime effects’ (Foucault 1980: 98). However, Fanon does not begin with this prime effect of power, as he wants us to learn to read social relations, racism, and economies of violence as if experiencing our own gratuitous violence, in an attempt to think the impossible place of the slave, the black body, and the colonised – in other words, the living being whose existence is already assumed as structurally impossible and, hence, as breath which can never be synonymous with life. The basis of the (inter) state structure, Fanon recognises, is already the juristic sovereign person whose essence, or what Goodrich calls the sovereign that the state has a right to kill, is already secured from the threat of mutilation. On the one hand, Foucault (1990: 138) asks this about state power: ‘How could power exercise its highest prerogative by putting people to death, when its main role was to ensure, sustain, and multiply life, to put this life in order?’ **On the other hand, Fanon makes explicit the matrix of violence which requires and makes sure that species are zoned as black and colonised: ‘**Individualism is the first to disappear ... the colonialist bourgeoisie had hammered into the native’s mind the idea of a society of individuals where each person shuts himself up in his own subjectivity, and whose only wealth is individual’ (Fanon 1967d: 47): Their first encounter was marked by violence and their existence together – that is to say the exploitation of the native by the settler – was carried on by a dint of a great array of bayonets and cannons. The settler and the native are old acquaintances. In fact, the settler is right when he speaks of knowing ‘them’ well. For it is the settler who has brought the native into existence and who perpetuates his existence. The settler owes the fact of his very existence, that is to say, his property, to the colonial system. (Fanon 1967d: 36) But why such insistence? What tension does Fanon want to foreground? Fanon actually has a different ‘locus of enunciation’ and insists on a long trajectory of the effects of the imperial, colonial, and slave order and vertical relations of what he calls ‘combat breath’ (Fanon 1967c: 65). By drawing out Fanon’s idea of ‘combat breath’ and articulating it as struggles that disrupt the practices of violence and the final destruction of countries and people**, we see that enforcing the right to life of the radical individual (the propertied man of a structure of white supremacy which depends on slavery and colonisation) will authorise thanatopolitics and necroeconomics, not by suspending a right to life but rather by enforcing a right to that ‘liberal’ life.** But this minimalist right to life could preclude crucial relations in the everyday continuum-spaces of the human and the non- human, including ecologies and it does by deploying practices of disfigurement and destruction.**Fanon exposes the imperial European re-assemblage of power and demonstrates that state power shifts are connected to the emergence of an ‘international’ order and apparatuses that make possible a particular sovereign-master-colonising subject. In his view, colonial power says: ‘Since you want independence, take it and starve ... A regime of austerity is imposed on these starving men; a disproportionate amount of work is required for their atrophied muscles’** (Fanon 1967d: 96). Fanon notes the prevalence of suffocation and starvation in world politics, the devouring of the flesh and the subsequent redistribution of its existential vital energy that is turned into wealth. Amelioration requires more than changing working conditions and setting up less exploitative structures (such as socialism and communism). Rather, it requires ‘regime[s] which [are] completely oriented toward the people as a whole’ which prioritise the principle ‘that man is the most precious of all possessions’.8 **Such a locus will preclude ‘that caricature of society where all economic and political power is held in the hands of the few who regard the nation as whole with scorn and contempt’ (Fanon 1967d: 98).**

**Thus, I affirm Resolved: The appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust. Spec and definitions in doc.**

The – “used to point forward to a following qualifying or defining clause or phrase”. Google. <https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.2103j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>

Appropriation – “an act or instance of appropriating something”. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/appropriation>

Of – “indicating an association between two entities, typically one of belonging”. <https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60.1494j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>

Outer Space – “the physical universe beyond the earth's atmosphere”. <https://www.google.com/search?q=outer+space+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=outer+space+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60.2363j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>

By – “identifying the agent performing an action.”. <https://www.google.com/search?q=by+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=by+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59.1433j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8>

Is – “dialectal present tense first-person and third-person singular of BE”. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/is>

**Private belongs “**Affecting or belonging to private individuals, as distinct from the public generally. Not official.**”**

**That’s Black’s Law Dictionary** [“What is PRIVATE?” Black’s Law Dictionary. No Date. Accessed 1/4/21. <https://thelawdictionary.org/private/> //Xu]

**Entity is “**Legally, equal to a person who might owe taxes. A generic term inclusive of person, partnership, organization, or business. An entity can be legally bound. An entity is uniquely identifiable from any other entity.**”**

**That’s Black’s Law Dictionary** [“What is ENTITY?” Black’s Law Dictionary. No Date. Accessed 1/4/21. <https://thelawdictionary.org/entity/> //Xu]

**Against the will of private entities to appropriate outer space, we reject the regime of property as the white science of logistics.**

**Moten and Harney, 21** (Fred Moten, Professor of Performance Studies for the Tisch School of the Arts at NYU, PhD in English from UC Berkeley, 2020 MacArthur Genius Fellow, Stefano Harney, Professor of Strategic Management for the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Singapore Management University, PhD in Social and Political Sciences from the University of Cambridge, co-founder of Ground Provisions—a curatorial collective, founder of the School for Study—a nomadic study collective, 2021, *All Incomplete*, pp 13-18) gz

**The first theft shows up as rightful ownership**. This is **the theft of fleshly, earth(l)y life**, which is then **incarcerated in the body**. But the body, it turns out, is just the first principal-agent problem. **The body is just an overseer**, a factor, a superintendent for **the real landlord**, the real owner, **the individual**, in his noxious, heavy-handed conceptuality. The legal term for this principal-agent problem is mind. In this regard, the designation ‘mind/body problem’ is a synecdochal redundancy in abstraction rather than an entanglement, or even an opposition, of *anima* and matter, mama and soul. There’s this formulation that Robert Duncan gets from Erwin Schrödinger that helps a certain disordering along. Schrödinger says “living matter evades the decay to equilibrium.” Well, if Proudhon is right, and slavery, murder, robbery, and property are a unit; if the general regime of private property is most accurately understood as social death; then what if death/private property is that equilibrium of which Schrödinger speaks? What John Donne speaks of by way of God’s sovereign capacity to preserve is a problem that will have been meant to solve a problem; and when Schrödinger speaks of evading the decay to equilibrium, he isn’t saying that all decay is bad. Corruption is our (accursed) share, our antological practice, our eccentric centering, as M.C. Richards might say. How we evade ownership/equilibrium is given precisely in that refusal to prevent loss that we call sharing, rubbing, empathy, hapticality: the undercommon love of flesh, our essential omnicentric or anacentric eccentricity. **Every thing, in the wake of such disordering, is loss prevention**. John Locke creates the tabula rasa as a container for properties – properties of the mind, and properties owned by the propertied mind. Self-knowledge is self-possession and self-positioning in Locke. His accumulation process is auto-location, because one can’t help but settle for that. From the first moment, which appears to keep happening all the time, all property is posited, **beginning with the positing/positioning of a body for locating ownership, and the owned, and a mind for owning**. The posit and the deposit inaugurate ownership as incorporation, whose inevitable end, given in continual withdrawal, is loss. This requires the production of **a science of loss**, which is to say **the science of whiteness**, or, **logistics**. **Every acquisition, every improvement, is an ossification of sharing**. This ossification is given in and as **containment**. The first odious vessel produced by and for logistics is **not the slave ship, but the body** – **flesh conceptualized – which bears the individual-in-subjection**. **A profound viciousness** begins with this **colonization of the posited body**, the **appointment of the posited mind**, and the **manipulation – in various modalities of brutality – of their mutually enveloping redundancy, given in the dead perpetual motion of the will to colonize**. This enclosure, this settlement, will be repeated because it must be repeated. Every slave will have been every time the mirror in which the self, in seeing itself, comes into existence in and as itself, which is an **omnicidal fantasy**. Locke invents **the derivative** here, a degraded part of the accursed share that is poised to **draw on the power of this share, but only to create more derivatives**, to **create more zones of dispossession by positing possession, in the denial of loss that prepares for loss**. **All property is loss because all property is the loss of sharing**. In its willfulness, **property is theft**; but beyond the murderousness that would attend theft-in-acquisition one mind/body at a time, the theft in question here is **absolute serial murder**, which **we survive only insofar as all property remains vulnerable to sharing**. This is to say nothing other than that **all property is fugitive**. It flees from its own positing, runs from being-deposited. **All (property) jumps bail**. Sharing, exhaustion, expending, derivation will have been contained and congealed in the measurable and accountable individual unit of the derivative. But sharing is our means, the earth’s means in us and our means in earth. Logistics would seem to value means over ends – everything is how to get it there, not what it is – but logistics is really the degradation of means, the general devaluation of means through **individuation and privatization, which are the same thing**. It is the science of lost means advanced with every act of **loss prevention**.

**We affirm the normative statement but our analysis isn’t separate from the broader framework of fugitive science – the anti-Black technologies of space exploration isn’t limited to whiteness, but is radically retooled toward a shadow archive of blurred lines and assemblages.**

**Murillo 19** [Brackets Original. Dr. John Murillo III (Assistant Professor of African American Studies at the University of California, Irvine. His primary research interests are Black speculative fiction, critical theory, quantum mechanics, and popular media). “Review: Fugitive Science: Empiricism and Freedom in Early African American Culture, by Britt Rusert”. Vol. 5 No. 1 (2019): Special Section on Crip Technoscience. Catalyst Journal. Apr 1, 2019. Accessed 1/4/22. <https://catalystjournal.org/index.php/catalyst/article/view/30498/24698> //Xu]

So we begin here and at a bit of length because this kind of narrative of experimentation and research done unseen, in the margins and between the lines, warrants revisiting after reading Britt Rusert’s profoundly illuminating **Fugitive Science: Empiricism and Freedom** in Early African American Culture. **Rusert chronicles what she describes as a shadow archive—a history that lurks behind, undergirds, and complicates the dominant archive—of “African American science writing [and cultural production] in the antebellum period” (2017, p. 8), and she she calls this archive fugitive science. Fugitive science describes a heterogeneous, innovative, resistant, “dynamic and diverse archive of engagements with, critiques of, and responses to” (p. 4) the antiblack racial science that proliferated the antebellum episteme, and it expands the definition of science to include forms of praxis and experimentation typically, and often deliberately, unrecognized as science: conjuring, performance, astrology, mysticism, mesmerism, and imaginative speculation.** Citing Michel Foucault’s The Order of Things: An Archaeology of rhe Human Sciences, Rusert charactizes fugitive science as a “counter-science,” (p. 6) one undergirded by a “subterranean politics and furtive insurgency” (p. 17) aimed at appropriating, confronting, mocking, or otherwise destabilizing the logics of the racial science of the antebellum period and its political and ideological echoes in eras beyond. **It is a science of the “unthought” (Hartman & Wilderson, 2003) that innovates from the outside margins of history or in between the lines of the archive; it describes a set of “ongoing experiments in freedom, radical empiricisms” (p. 20) that refuse the normative constrictions and often deathly, antiblack consequences of what would typically be recognized as scientific inquiry.** Irreducible to any one form of thought production (from writing to visual art to performance), **it treats science—and knowledge writ large—as an “assemblage of different fields and practices that could” and should “be dismantled, reassembled, and redirected” (p. 132) toward Black thought’s work of “imagining the unimaginable” (Sharpe, 2014, p. 59): liberation from, or the end of, the antiblack world.** In that way, Rusert’s fugitive science is alchemical: from base elements marshaled from countless arenas of thought and experience, fugitive scientists such as Benjamin Banneker, Henry Box Brown, Martin R. Delaney, Sarah Mapps Douglass, and even Brenda Smith, my grandmother, Blacken and transmute an altogether radical unique, and “unthinkable” scientific practice. **Rusert categorizes three forms of fugitive science, but the lines between them blur and even disappear from case to case—it is, after all, a radically dynamic form of knowledge production; moving through the text, one might do well to also consider these forms to be like frequencies on which all fugitive science articulates.** The oppositional frequency of fugitive science describes work done to intervene explicitly into scientific discourses, especially those that reinforced the ruling, antiblack episteme. Works operating on the practical frequency attempted to instrumentalize science and technology in ways that could help advance the project of emancipation. And finally, the speculative frequency of fugitive science wields the imaginative richness of scientific inquiry to explore the limits, conditions of possibility, and revolutionary potential of Black existence. Throughout her chronicling of the history and genealogy of fugitive science, Rusert reveals the fluidity of these forms, the ease with which an individual figure, work, or exchange may articulate on one or more of these frequencies at once. As examples, Benjamin Banneker’s confrontations with Thomas Jefferson over Jefferson’s infamous Notes on the State of Virginia locate the oppositional origin point for Rusert’s history of fugitive science. Banneker’s extensive critiques of Jefferson and those that followed in their wake—like James McCune Smith’s essays—act as intentionally and predominantly oppositional works meant to intervene against racial science. On another frequency, Martin R. Delany’s novel, Blake; or, The Huts of America, weaves a speculative history and future of revolutionary movement and organization that marshals both practical astronomical knowledge and metaphysical rumination. A work of more remarkably varied frequencies, Rusert reads Delany’s novel as aiming to radically destabilize the boundaries between metaphysical mysticism and science, and to provide information that could all advance the cause of Black liberation in and beyond the antebellum period. And on still another frequency, the little-known teachings and lectures on physiology of Sarah Mapps Douglass, which she offered almost exclusively to Black women and young girls, indirectly offers a response to “the forms of experimental science that exploited [Joice] Heth, [Sarah] Baartman, and countless other women of African descent in the nineteenth-century Atlantic world” (p. 185), where Black women were (and are) subject to layer of violent erasure that render(ed) them the “mute experimental subjects of nineteenth century science” (p. 181). Further, Douglass’s lectures operate on a lower frequency than the other subjects of Rusert’s texts, a frequency of the lapses silences of the unavailable archive—muted, censored, displaced, or forgotten into unavailability—necessitating speculation in the form of inferences, like stitches, drawn from the limited records Rusert is able to collect. In this way, Douglass also responds to the longue dureé of the deliberate and casual erasure of Black women from the still unfolding history and genealogy of fugitive science. Each work, moment, and exchange of fugitive science encapsulates a dynamic expression announcing anew the defiant, creative, and uncontainable project of Black freedom on multiple frequencies. Essential to fully tuning into the frequencies of these and the many fugitive scientists of Rusert’s study—and of Rusert’s study itself as well—is an attention to the grand questions about and implications for Black knowledge production and critical, creative thought that her chronicle compels us to (re)consider. As and after we read Fugitive Science, we must rethink the ways we define, recognize, and take seriously science, critique, resistance, and knowledge itself. After encountering the variable frequencies and forms fugitive science takes, how can we delimit what constitutes scientific inquiry? **How might we better tune to the lower frequencies of intellectual and creative endeavors that we otherwise miss, that are rendered inaudible, or that we would normally disallow from being truly engaged as knowledge?** Like I have been compelled to do, both at the outset of these remarks and in my own research, we might begin by radically reconsidering our encounters with the alternative, vexing, sometimes fraught fragments of experimentation, research, and speculation that comprise the vast, varied, and still-unfolding archive of Black thought. We might search the silences and lower frequencies for those articulations of Black innovation that fugitively traverse the static. We must, then, innovate an alternative form of reading and listening that will enable us to find what we, prior to reading this text, did not know we would do well to seek. **Only then might the full expression of Fugitive Science and all its lessons from the antebellum period enable us to continue and advance the revolutionary struggle against racist science and its ripples in the contemporary moment.**

**View the 1AC as an act of Planning, not Policy – instead of forcing normative outcomes via spaces of study, you should affirm acts of self-preservation within educational spaces.**

**Greer 18**, G. H. "Who Needs the Undercommons? Refuge and Resistance in Public High Schools." Brock Education: A Journal of Educational Research and Practice 28.1 (2018): 5-18. (Concordia University (Canada), Art Education Department, Graduate Student.)//Elmer

Planning While study in the undercommons is a sociality that provides **refuge, joy, and resilience**, planning is the ongoing process of resistance which protects study. In the terms of complexity theory, planning creates the conditions for study to emerge. Planning defends study, for example, by attending **to methods**, when economic forces are oriented toward outcomes. In such a case, study thrives in the fascination required to build a car from scratch but is extinguished by a production line. Planning may then take the form of activism against the process of de-skilling workers. Generally, study is in trouble where labour is detached from purpose, discovery, and agency; and planning poses resistance to such divisions. Resistance may take a passive form like absenteeism or an active form like student strikes; it is an ongoing social experiment. The subjects of difference who inhabit the undercommons initiate planning in support of further difference: “planning in the undercommons is not an activity, not fishing or dancing or teaching or loving, but the ceaseless experiment with the future presence of the forms of life that make such activities possible” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 74). Importantly, “[p]lanning is self-sufficiency at the social level, and it reproduces in its experiment not just what it needs, life, but what it wants, life in difference…” (p. 76). Planning resists the austerity of conformity. Difference may bring the concept of diversity to mind for social justice educators. There are a number of distinctions between the difference that propels planning in the undercommons and diversity as it is understood in the field of education. Social justice education organized around diversity involves “eliminating the injustice created when differences are sorted and ranked in a hierarchy that unequally confers power…” (Adams, Bell, Goodman, & Joshi, 2016, p. 3, emphasis in original). In this sense, equitable diversity is an end goal that is, significantly, often supported by the implementation of policy. Planning, on the other hand, is a process, rather than an outcome, that resists policy, as explained below. Planning appears distorted, if at all, **from the commons where the rules are made**: “Because from the perspective of **policy it is too dark in there, in** the black **heart of the undercommons, to see**” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 79). Planning may become invisible or **appear criminal in the light**. Historical examples of such distortions are plentiful. The Freedom Riders were planning in 1961, boarding buses into their own brutalization to desegregate the southern United States; in the light of curricular history, Freedom Riders disappear and are replaced by parliamentary motions. There was planning at the Stonewall Riots in June of 1969 when homeless queer kids led by trans women of colour revolted against police brutality; the political necessity of Stonewall disappears in the parade lights of Pride every year on its own anniversary. Planning made visible but distorted is apparent in current events in the criminalization of self-preservation: from immigration (Ackerman & Furman, 2013), to activism (Matthews & Cyril, 2017; Alonso, Barcena, & Gorostidi, 2013), to panhandling (Chesnay, 2013). Educators who wish to see the planning of the undercommons, or to make it visible to students, must research to discover the exclusions of curriculum. When we include stories like the Stonewall Riots or the Freedom Riders in our teaching, we offer a connection to students who see their lives reflected therein. Stories of resistance to injustice, particular to local contexts, are important educational resources. In addition to these, pedagogical models which support the development and scholastic direction, of planning skills among students include: problem-based learning (Walker, Leary, Hmelo-Silver, & Ertmer, 2015), choice-based art education (Douglas, & Jaquith, 2009), critical media literacy (Funk, Kellner, & Share, 2016), and anti-oppressive education (Kumashiro, 2000). Policy From the perspective of the undercommons, policy inevitably conflicts with the forms of study and planning described above. Policy is the **instrument of efficiency**; it seeks measurable, predictable outcomes. The immeasurable social experiments and emerging differences of planning and study cannot be reconciled with administrative control as exercised through policy. Policy from the perspective of the undercommons operates under three rules. First, it diagnoses planners as problematic and prescribes itself as the solution; “This is the first rule of policy. It **fixes others**” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 78). Second, policy requires the participation of planners in the fixing of themselves; “Participating in change is the second rule of policy.” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 80). In this way, participantsimplicate themselvesin order to fulfill the third rule of policy: that “wrong participation” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 81) provokes all manner of crises. If there is no crisis then the participant is fixed and may be deputised in order to fix others. More commonly, any crisis at all proves that policy was right about the planners all along; and of course, they were bound to fail. The circular logic of policy as viewed from the undercommons reflects what Spade (2015) calls administrative violence. Spade (2015) details a story which I relate here to clarify the operations of policy. Bianca, a trans girl, was sent home from her high school in 1999 for wearing clothing that affirmed her gender. She was not allowed to return to her classes. Bianca’s parents called the school and received no response. Spade met Bianca in 2002 when she was homeless, unemployed, and attempting to leave an abusive relationship. Bianca had enrolled in a welfare work program but was outed as a trans woman by her male identification (ID). She was subsequently harassed and forced to quit, losing her income and making her ineligible for Medicaid. She became homeless, and because of her male ID she was barred from women’s shelters and fearful of further abuse at shelters for men. Without an address, medical benefits, or an income Bianca was unable to complete the process to correct her ID and could not afford the hormone treatments that allowed her to maintain a feminine appearance. Bianca’s ability to pass as a cisgender woman protected her on the street from further harassment by both the public and the police. In order to afford hormone injections, Bianca engaged in sex work. The injections were not regulated because they had to be obtained illegally which placed Bianca at increased risk of infection by HIV, hepatitis, and other diseases. Although Bianca’s story is not recent, the factors that contributed to her difficulties are relevant: transgender youth are still significantly over-represented in groups of early school leavers, homeless youth, and survivors of violence (Morton et al., 2018; Keuroghlian, Shtasel, & Bassuk, 2014). In the language of the undercommons Bianca planned to survive by expressing her gender, but this plan was subverted by school policy, causing her not to graduate and significantly reducing her prospects for employment. Following the first rule of policy according to the undercommons, Bianca’s school would not accept her attendance until she fixed her gender. Bianca then followed the second rule of policy and made attempts to become a participant. She tried to stay at shelters and enrolled in a social welfare work program. In each of these cases, she experienced the crisis of harassment. Following the third rule of policy, these crises were framed as the result of Bianca’s wrong participation: she did not have the right identification. For survival, Bianca must then become a fugitive by engaging in criminalized activity: sex work and the illegal procurement of hormones. In an educational context, considering policy, according to The Undercommons, pushes educators to ask how the rules in our schools create, rather than respond to, fugitivity among students. Fugitivity Being a fugitive according to The Undercommons means being marked as an outsider. Fugitivity happens to people when: first they act, and second policy outlaws those actions. But fugitivity must also be embraced. Those who refuse the rules of policy, as outlined above, become fugitive. Fugitives will not be fixed, refuse to participate, and deny responsibility for the crises that befall them. Fugitivity recognises systemic racism, classism, ableism, and cis/heteronormativity in the disallowance of demographic-specific behaviour. It is fugitive sociality that composes the undercommons in order to provide refuge and resistance. In high schools, the undercommons provides social refuge in the form of patient listening and covert smiles to: hat wearing, cell phone texting, hall running, affection displaying, fugitive students; and granola bar giving, grade fudging, student failing, smiling before Christmas, fugitive teachers. These now-fugitive activities are planning behaviours, they sustain study for those that commit them. These things have been happening since before policy determined that education is a predictable and measurable thing. Fugitive planners generate study with unforeseeable ends and immeasurable learning. Turning planners into fugitives has some effects: ease of administration and evaluation is one; the reinforcement of unjust hierarchies is another.

**The exclusive nature of worldmaking in outerspace is not a contingency struggle but a structural one – only through aesthetics and fugitivity, the social life of blackness is found, outside of law and structure.**

**Lloyd 20** [Brackets original. David Lloyd (distinguished professor of English at the University of California, Riverside). “The social life of black things: Fred Moten’s consent not to be a single being”. Radical Philosophy. Spring 2020. Accessed 1/5/22. <https://www.radicalphilosophy.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/rp207_lloyd.pdf> //Xu]

**What Moten shows us, and elaborates across consent not to be a single being, is that the terms of that double bind are intimately connected with the imagination of both subjecthood and freedom in the post-Enlightenment aesthetic tradition.** The cultural productivity of those whose quotidian experience is one in which ‘pain is alloyed with pleasure’ constitutes a radical and thorough-going refusal of those terms, an ‘affirmative refusal’ [UM 186] that ‘refuses what was refused to them’, to use a phrase repeated several times throughout these essays. The black radical tradition entails ‘a refusal of a polity or community structured by refusal’ [UM 90] that turns out to be also a certain form of dissenting assent, a crucial act of consent. To refuse the poisonous gift of an autonomy or a citizenship or a right that is always withheld is also to refuse the tortured logic that apprehends racialisation – as, in one moment of his restless dialectic, Fanon does – only as the negation that installs a lack in being in the black non-subject, or as an enduring social death. As Moten puts it in a passage I want to return to, ‘Taylor speaks of and out of possibilities embedded in a social life from which Fanon speaks and of which he speaks but primarily as negation and impossibility’ [UM 160]. **Moten spells out at length the ways in which the performance of black music and poetic writing embody and figure the modalities of that ‘social life’ in a meditation on Francophone poet Édouard Glissant and jazz musician Anthony Braxton that tracks the relation of the soloist** – who embodies what is elsewhere described as a ‘differential integrity in and to the unit’ [UM 69] – to the ensemble, ‘in the depths of our common impasse, our common flight, and our common habitation’: They allow and require us to be interested in the unlikely emergence of the unlikely figure of the black soloist, whose irruptive speech occurs not only against the grain of a radical interdiction of individuality that is manifest both as an assumption of its impossibility as well as in a range of governmental dispositions designed to prevent the impossible, but also within the context of a refusal of what has been interdicted (admission to the zone of abstract equivalent citizenship and subjectivity, whose instantiations so far been nothing but a set of pseudoindividuated aftereffects of conquests and conquest denial, a power trip to some fucked-up place in the burnt-out sun), a kind of free or freed ‘personality’ that will have turned out to be impossible even for the ones who are convinced they have achieved it, even as they oversee its constant oscillation between incompleteness and repair, distress and fashion. … Such refusal, such dissent, takes the form of a common affirmation, an open consensus given in the improbable, more than im/possible, consent, in Glissant’s words, ‘not to be a single being’. [UM 136] Where the Kantian aesthetic at once feelingly apprehends (in all his‘black genius’ [SL32]) and yet seeks to regulate the lawless generativity of this collectively backed solo performance in the interests of a disciplined freedom and autonomy, **the aesthetics of blackness follows in its fugitive, improvisatory performances not the road to freedom but a line of flight that is obviously grounded in the liberatory practices of the enslaved, but is also entirely attuned to the ruse of freedom that Hartman has called its ‘encumbrance’.** As she put it,‘The discrepant bestowal of emancipation conferred sovereignty as it engendered subjection.’11 Moten’s understanding of the articulation of the freedom drive in the politicoaesthetic imagination of blackness with the conditions of constraint and of privation, working, like Olaudah Equiano, ‘between law and motion, between constraint and a privileged loss of control’ [SL 61], is all too cognisant of the knowledge that ‘Leaving, differing, stealing away, is always under the threat of interdiction, of protected theft, of mastery’s protected “right” to steal, of the roguish force that is always most powerfully wielded by proper subjects and proper states’ [SL 113]. Fugitivity, then, does not escape the law, conditioned as it is by the long reach of the law that it calls forth, but no more does it embrace the sovereignty of freedom, the autonomy of the subject in its disciplined and abstracted individuated representation of the universal. **Nevertheless, this ‘unruly music that moves in disruptive, improvisational excess … of the very idea of the (art) work’, and that is also ‘the site of a certain lawless, fugitive theatricality’ [SL 111], remains in its own peculiar relation to law, but one that exceeds any Kantian regulation of the imagination.** Drawing on legal theorist Robert Cover’s classic essay ‘Nomos and Narrative’, Moten notes that ‘the fearsomeness of ungoverned generativity is held, for Kant, in the fact that what is being generated is law; that, above all, it is what Cover calls “the fecundity of the jurisgenerative principle”, which is manifest as endless mutation and differentiation, that freaks him out’ [UM 115].12 Cover’s point, on which Moten so generatively elaborates, is thatjurisgenesis, the capacity to create legal meaning, exceeds the law as written and determined by any given legal system. It is, therefore, ‘the problem of the multiplicity of meaning – the fact that never only one but always many worlds are created by the too fertile forces of jurisgenesis’13 that the institutions of the law are concerned to contain by imposing a single nomos, or legal order. **The law seeks ‘to maintain some coherence in the awesome proliferation of meaning lost as it is created – by unleashing upon the fertile but weakly organised jurisgenerative cells an organising principle itself incapable of producing the normative meaning that is life and growth’.**14 The rationale for legal interpretation and for those interpretive institutions, the courts, is, accordingly, not the need for law, but the ‘need to suppress law, to choose between two or more laws, to impose upon laws a hierarchy. It is the multiplicity of laws, the fecundity of the jurisgenerative principle, that creates the problem to which the court and the state are the solution.’ Accordingly, ‘[i]nterpretation always takes place in the shadow of coercion’.15 Cover’s ‘jurispathic’ courts, in all their implicit violence against difference and multiplicity, correspond to Kant’s judgment of taste that seeks to ‘clip the wings of the lawless imagination’, to curtail the flights of fantasy that generate ‘the awesome proliferation of meaning’ that is at once fertile and ephemeral, ante- and anti-institutional. **Cover’s formulations prompt Moten ‘to imagine something on the order of an anoriginary criminality with which blackness is inextricably linked – or to think blackness, perhaps more precisely as the paradoxically anarchic principle and expression of a jurisgenerativity that demands a reconfiguration of the very idea of law’ [SL 19] – and, we might say by extension, of the aesthetic.** 17 It’s not hard to see how the fugitive nature of an unconstrained jurisgenerativity corresponds to the protocols of improvisation and the ‘weakly organised cell’ of the ensemble, not least as Moten goes on to characterise blackness’s undoing of the law’s sentence in precisely such terms: ‘the improvisational para-statement – the extragrammatical run-on, that informal incompletion where the sentence lives against its own execution – continually and ubiquitously establishes itself otherwise, elsewhere and at another time, neither here nor there nor here and now, as a kind of anoriginal (declaration of) independence’ [SL 20]. That allusion to the declaration of independence affirms less the autonomy of a black life-form than a procedure, the sheer generative performativity of improvisation itself as it brings into being some new state of play out of the fugitive encounter of constraint and invention in and through the interdependence of the ensemble. Everywhere Moten insists on this performativity of a blackness that is not an ontological essence nor an originary identity but a constant process, a performativity that is necessarily non-performance insofar as it is never subjected or given over to institution, to the dismay of interpretation.17 One way to grasp the significance of this performativity of blackness is by watching how, in the passage I partially quoted above, Moten invokes Cecil Taylor’s ‘claim on aestheticosocial life’ over and against that still Hegelian dimension of Fanon that is fascinated by the demand for recognition and haunted by its refusal: [Taylor] speaks not only out of but also of the lived experience of the black. This is to say that Taylor moves by way of an experience, an aesthetic sociality that Fanon can never embrace insofar as he never really comes to believe in it, even though it is the object, for Fanon, of an ambivalent political desire as well as a thing (of darkness) he cannot acknowledge as his own. In other words, Taylor speaks of and out of the possibilities embedded in a social life from which Fanon speaks and of which he speaks but primarily as negation and impossibility. [UM 160]18 In some sense, the whole of consent not to be a single being could be seen to flow from and to this passage. Performativity, this capacity to invent out of nothing and out of the constraints that proclaim one’s nothingness, is the generative cell of the ‘aesthetic sociality’ of blackness. Aesthetic sociality significantly shifts the terms in displacing ‘the political aesthetics of enclosed common sense’ and even the ‘politicoaesthetic imagination’ elsewhere invoked. **The sociality of the aesthetic refuses the moment of individuation through which the Kantian subject of taste arrives at its universality by way of the enclosure of a common sense that proscribes the feelings on which life-in-common is predicated as ‘pathological’.** Aesthetic sociality, as the social life predicated on that pathological lived experience of pleasure and pain, stands – in ways understated here but that form the groundwork of the trilogy’s larger critique – against the ambivalence of Fanon’s precisely political desire. For the sphere of politics is the terrain of one’s recognition as both citizen and autonomous subject, the domain of formal freedoms for which the Kantian aesthetic limns the conditions of possibility in that ‘enclosed common sense’ through which the subject finds its abstract universality. The very formulation ‘social life’ in itself contests the containment of black life in the dismal frame of ‘social death’; Orlando Patterson’s seminal formulation in his history of slavery. Not only is black life ‘irreducibly social’, its ‘irreducibly aesthetic sociality’ is an ongoing ruptural apposition to the politics of aesthetics as that has been imagined since Kant: **‘black life is lived in political death or … in the burial ground of the subject by those who, insofar as they are not subjects, are also not, in the interminable (as opposed to the last) analysis, “death-bound”’ [UM 194].19** In his extended critique of Hannah Arendt’s ‘degradation of sociality’ in both her book-length On Violence and in her occasional essays on the civil rights movement, Moten addresses the distinction she makes between the non-public realm of the social and the valorised public realm of the political. This distinction is for Arendt troubled by what appears to her as the violence of black social movements and their claims, their irruption into what is ‘the already given institutional structure’ whose protection, she insists, is ‘the prepolitical condition of all other, specifically political, virtues’ [UM 91, citing Arendt].20 Arendt’s emphasis on the inviolability of those ‘given’ political institutions of liberal society has as its obverse an overlooked and prior violation of blackness: Her yoking of that insistence to the eternally dangerous black example is nothing less than the reimposition of the obligation to consent (to one’s own violation). This reimposition will have been justified insofar as refusing the obligation, however violently imposed, however unaccompanied by some reciprocal promise, is to relinquish one’s claim to a polity and, therefore, to humanity. [UM 91] In a quite brutal inversion of the old Aristotelian adage that man is a political animal, Arendt suggests that to refuse or contest the political itself, and not merely the specific form or allowances of some political regime’s given institutions, is to be something less than human. But what if the historical preference of the enslaved, whose legacy continues to inform black social life, were rather to take flight from than to accept enforced incorporation into those institutions whose freedoms are so differentially bound to enslavement? Then the mere non-violent, Bartlebeyan act of ‘preferring not to’ be conscripted to those institutions in the coercive name of freedom and sovereign subjecthood manifests as a mode of violence: And if the slave, in the interest of the abolition of slavery, which is understood by her not as a goal but as an ideological commitment, relinquishes that place, flees that ‘home’, then not only is she expelled from humanity but she is also guilty of a violence fundamental to the tacit consensus (imposed upon her in the absence of any protection of her personhood and in the oppressive fullness of its protection of her acquired thingliness) in which and from which that home is constructed. [UM 92] In a peculiar twist on Walter Benjamin’s recognition that the state regards any nonviolent movement that chal lenges the foundations of its law as a manifestation of violence, Arendt, the political subject, ‘can only understand such preference as violence’.21 Arendt’s (mis)understanding is a general disposition of the political intellectual, a constitutive ignorance of the subject, one might say: Blackness as violence, in a communicability that, again, will have always already exceeded the very idea of what are imprecisely called black bodies and the bounds imposed on black people when they are constrained to bear their bodies as loss; blackness as a refusal of a polity or community structured by refusal; blackness as a form of social thought in social life is the irreducible, antifoundational danger to which legitimate American intellectual work responds. [UM 90] **If we follow Moten’s formulation of ‘blackness as a form of social thought in social life’ in the context of these imperiously political demands, we can see not only why black refusal, black irruption, black fugitivity, necessarily appear within and to the polity as violence, criminality, something other than humanity.** We can also see that ambivalent Fanonian political desire, the desire for incorporation or assimilation (what Denise Ferreira da Silva has nicely dubbed ‘engulfment’, and Moten ‘exclusionary assimilation’ [UM 38]),22 the desire for rights and the right to rights, the very desire for freedom, betray the subject as well as the subjected to the subjection that is their constitutive obverse. For this social life has been forged in exclusion from, ‘in apposition’ (to use Moten’s favored phrase) to, citizenship, as ‘the refusal of refused and therefore tainted citizenship’ [UM 93]. Forged thus, and forged in this domain of an imposed and ‘acquired thingliness’ through which the commodified human is denied even her vestigial humanity, black sociality has nothing recuperative about it; it takes oblique flight not against but to the side and in the shadow of those political ends that at times stand in for but could never realise the imaginative excess of black freedom dreams: It’s not about what it is to live under the shadow of a falsifying disregard, even when it reveals a threadbare aspect of an otherwise sumptuous life of the mind; the thing is that lived, luxuriant mindfulness that such disregard brings inadvertently into relief: the collective head, the hydratic passage, the hydraulic story that is the refuge and fugue(d) state of the stateless, the refusers, the refugees, which we share in common where blackness and study are in play. [UM 95]

#### Decolonial pedagogy within debate most must theorize through a lens of illegibility that counteracts the university’s claim to sovereignty through counteractive fugitive science.

Brough 17 [Taylor, University of Vermont, B.A., 2016 CEDA Nationals Champion, “Open letter to non-Black Native people in debate,” https://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/2017/03/23/open-letter-to-non-black-native-people-in-debate/]

I should start by saying that I think Frank Wilderson is right about the position of Native people in the US racial schema. In Red, White, and Black, he argues compellingly that Native people are situated in a liminal space between life and death—that we are haunted by the dual specters of sovereignty and genocide; that our demands occur simultaneously in a coherent register of land repatriation, land theft, and treaty rights and in an incoherent register of an incomprehensible and ongoing magnitude of massacres, rape, starvation, boarding schools, and smallpox. Wilderson’s work has provided me with some of the tools to describe the gap between coherence and incoherence, a gap which is made especially evident in debate rounds. And particularly clear is that Native debate[1] is inclined towards talking in the grammar of sovereignty rather than genocide. I am here preoccupied with our enunciative capacities in debate—with what I perceive “Native debate,” and specifically non-Black Native debaters, to be doing in service of Settler/Master (mis)recognition, what the consequences of such doing might be, and what it might mean to push against the disciplining force of recognition in debate. The ontological fact of genocide/sovereignty as a dual positioning for Native people, coupled with academia’s push to identify ourselves at the site of (coherent and recognizable) trauma (what Wilderson terms “intra-human conflicts”), has led Native thought in debate, broadly, to do three related things: 1) prioritize the coherent discussion of sovereign loss over one of genocide and its incoherence, 2) articulate ourselves as always in conversation with (read: traumatized by) the Settler, 3) distance ourselves from a Black/Red conversation or from Black/Red theorizing. These three moves are all antiblack in addition to being an insidious manifestation of the genocide that structures half of our (non?)being. Depressingly, if we were to historicize “Native debate,” we would have to begin with a litany of non-Native debaters reading “Give Back the Land,” offering sovereignty as a solution to a tragic history of genocide that relegates Native people to phobic/phillic objects of the past whose futures are in the hands of those Settlers who bravely dare to talk about them. The terrain in which everyone can become Native—or at least become an advocate for Natives—is a cleared landscape produced by genocide but also, significantly, produced by antiblack slavery.[2] This history of non-Native debaters’ representations of sovereignty, land repatriation, and treaty rights as the only solution to genocide also reaches into the present. What is most disturbing to me about this ongoing history is that we have yet to tie virtually any debate round to actual, material land repatriation, sovereign gains, or the upholding of treaty rights. These material gains involve labor from Native people organizing at the grassroots level, not an academic labor from Settlers. Debate arguments do not facilitate sovereign benefits for Native peoples. Further, the struggle for sovereignty itself does not overcome or solve genocide. The removal of the Hunkpapa Lakota Oyate and their relatives at the Oceti Sakowin camp at Standing Rock should be proof enough of this—sovereignty as a politic is often met with, rather than resolving, genocidal violence. Non-Black Native people in debate have performed a similar land-based politic. Native debate has become so associated with words like “land,” “sovereignty,” “space,” “place,” “treaty rights,” and others, that it is almost impossible to theorize Native debate absent sovereignty as a grammar that marks our existence. So both non-Native debaters (who claim to advocate for Native peoples’ sovereignty) and Native debaters (who claim to advocate for something that usually falls into the grammar of sovereignty) are talking in essentially the same register, with incredibly limited slippage towards genocide as a vector of violence. And, for Native people, like non-Natives, debate arguments do not and cannot facilitate the material elements of decolonization that these land-based arguments frequently rely upon.[3] [Footnote 3: There are clearly significant differences between Native people’s arguments in favor of sovereignty and those of Settlers. But the Native debaters who claim to solve sovereignty or material decolonization are also often misrepresenting and misrecognizing the history of struggle for sovereignty or treaty rights within our various nations. It is, in fact, the similarity in these misrepresentations and misrecognitions between Settlers and Native people that is disturbing to me here, and worthy of theorizing.] Sovereign gains don’t happen in debate rounds, but for some reason the (mis)recognition of Native enunciation as sovereignty persists, in that the word “land” harkens to Native debate in almost every instance, that almost every debate involving Native people reading perceptibly “Native” arguments includes a discussion of “treaties” or “sovereignty” or “land-based pedagogy” or “spatiality.” What other reason could this be than a structure of desire around recognition from the Settler/Master? If we really follow the history of how “Nativeness” has been misrepresented in debate by Settlers, it becomes clear that much of contemporary Native debate, strangely (or as I argue, not so strangely), mimics these misrepresentations. Of course, debate is an economy of (mis)recognition. That “Native” becomes coextensive with “land” in debate is no accident. It is an enunciation that has been evoked prior to the involvement of any Native debaters or coaches. And it is reiterated by non-Black Native debaters with increasing certainty about the truthiness of Native relationships to the land. Systematically absent from this conversation, of course, is a discussion of genocide. I have gestured above towards the ways that the desire for recognition from the Settler/Master motivates this conceptual move towards the register of sovereignty. As Wilderson writes, “The crowding out, or disavowal, of the genocide modality [by the sovereign modality] allows the Settler/’Savage’ struggle to appear as a conflict rather than as an antagonism. This has therapeutic value for both the ‘Savage’ and the Settler: the mind can grasp the fight, conceptually put it into words. To say, ‘You stole my land and pilfered and appropriated my culture’ and then produce books, articles, and films that travel back and forth along the vectors of those conceptually coherent accusations is less threatening to the integrity of the ego, than to say, ‘You culled me down from 19 million to 250,000.’”[4] This gesture towards conceptual coherence and therapeutic value is why there is a celebrated and ongoing association between “land” and “Native” in both non-Native argumentation and in arguments made by Native people. It is why we cannot theorize about Native debate absent the contingent register of sovereignty. I am hesitant to claim that sovereignty should be completely abandoned as an analytic for obvious reasons—I think Wilderson also gives credit to indigenous conceptions of sovereignty, what it unseats, and how it operates, while still articulating a critique of sovereignty unrivaled by much of Native studies. I am not interested in suggesting that all Native people ignore our peoples’ land relationships or histories of broken treaties as politic throughout the United States or the world. I agree with Qwo-Li Driskill’s suggestion, alongside similar ones from other Native theorists, that sovereignty must be re-theorized significantly rather than echoing the propertied enterprise that confers legibility to state formations. Regardless of my reluctance to disavow the potential for sovereignty as a politic outside debate rounds, I think it is obvious that sovereignty in its terms in debate—as a recognized and fundamentally “Native” utterance—is genocidal and anti-Black. Broadly, my argument is that genocide is an undertheorized arm of an antagonism that halfway positions Native people, and that the basis of such undertheorization is the desire to be (mis)recognized as nearly-Human by the Settler. This claim invites an investigation of the context of (mis)recognition in debate and what is particular about debate itself with regard to Wilderson’s theory of position. Debate is inevitably a space of recognition, coherence, and transparency. It seeks to uncover, make clear, and expand consciousness more than it promises to occlude, hide, or make incoherent. This condition of debate is significant not because that makes it different from the rest of the academy, or the rest of civil society, but because it offers a specific situation from which to apply the critique of recognition. In the age of academic identity politics, the identification of the self as a subject of trauma has emerged as the primary locus of (recognizable) enunciation. Many who are familiar with Eve Tuck’s work have read her critical analysis on the academy’s demand for damage-centered narratives and the kinds of traumatized neoliberal subjectivity they produce—as those who are continually indebted to a parasitic regime of recognition. When this critique is applied in debate, it frequently targets identity-politics models of intervention in academia which posit the traumatized subject as a primary locus of critique. For example, many of the ableism debates I’ve judged contained arguments locked entirely in this register—where the traumatized subject is itself offered as a structural analytic in a manner that is always parasitic on Blackness. Teams who read arguments that they refer to as “disability pessimism” and describe disability as a form of “ontological death” often go on to claim that no change has come from reading critical arguments in debate and that we should be pessimistic about the ability for debate to become more inclusive of disabled people. This is, at best, an appropriation of Afropessimism based on a reductive reading of Black debate. Significantly, the misrecognition of Black debate that is rearticulated through “disability pessimism” also includes the secondary claim that critical argumentation has not produced shifts in the institutional schema of debate. But “disability pessimism” would not exist without Black debate. You can’t bite Afropessimism and then disavow the intellectual labor of Black people as the condition of possibility for your argument. Worse still, “things have never changed in debate for disabled people,” is not an advocacy. It is just a recognized enunciation of the trauma of degraded subjectivity. In this example, the degraded subject masquerades trauma as analysis while occluding structural phenomena. They merely say, “The world is a horrible and traumatizing place for me, therefore listen to me reiterate my trauma.” And more often than not, as Eve Tuck writes, “All we are left with is the damage.”[5] These so-called interventions posited by identity politicians are ineffective in that they fail to provide a solution to a problem that they have misidentified because of their own egoistic (contingent) investments. In other words, identity politics doesn’t work because it is antiblack. Identity politics is only interested in iterating a degraded subject as fundamentally innocent of violence, ethical, and on the right side of history at all times, because of that person’s experience of a (contingent, as opposed to gratuitous) violence. Identity politics that have pushed us all to identify ourselves based on our traumas accrue, for Native people, in intra-communal policing strategies that use trauma as a site of authenticity—and authenticity as a foundational, genocidal gloss for identification. In many ways, this conversation about position begs a question of indigenous authenticity in debate—who is and is not really Native is a question fraught with centuries of historical baggage. And it carries weight in debate because the epistemic terrain of “indigenous scholarship” or “Native thought” demands a conversation about embodiment and experience as instantiations of the ontological. For Native people, the debate around authenticity is structured by a debate about blood quantum—or more accurately, blood quantum is one of the many genocidal registers through which we can understand the subject/object formation of the Native. Genocide and sovereignty are the co-constitutive registers determining Native position as being in/out of the world in the first instance. As Eve Tuck describes, those who are traumatized are seen as having truly lived. Trauma and authenticity slip between each other as discourses which authorize us to enunciate a “Native” experience, one that is apparently generalizable to experiences far beyond our own, and one that tends to be used in service of the land-based arguments about sovereignty that I have thoroughly critiqued above. The competitive space of debate exacerbates such trends. The slippage between trauma and authenticity is so real for us (perhaps because of the depth of genocide as a specter and its haunting gratuitous continuance) that it has become an easy disciplinary mechanism for creating affective investments in white racial kinship. In other words, Native people are still relying on Settler/Master regimes of recognition that can confer validation for certain (coherent) traumas. So you have a few Native people who are already insecure about whether or not we are indigenous enough, who seek to prove our authenticity by articulating it in the terms of trauma. But, under the structure I’ve described above, such trauma can only authorize our authenticity insofar as it can be made coherent to white judges in order to receive their validation and value! For many non-Black Native people in debate, this apparently justifies the slippage away from Blackness and the prioritizing of antiblack racial anxieties over an actual conversation about ontology and modernity. In other words, in an instance of identity politics, where trauma must be isolable, human, subjectified, and coherent in order to be validated as authenticity by the Settler/Master, sovereignty gets the job done in a way genocide does not. Again, it is the assumption that recognition by the Settler/Master is favorable, or even necessary, that motivates Native people’s investments in arguments about land, space, place, sovereignty, and treaties. It is also this assumption that facilitates the false move to authenticity (false in that it is only given coherence by a genocidal and antiblack apparatus of recognition). Native people have been (mis)recognized by the Settler/Master since Taino peoples were met with Columbus’ genocidal misrecognitions in 1492. Much of this (mis)recognition rests on the incoherence of genocide. “Genocide is not a name for violence in the way that ‘arson’ is; genocide is a linguistic placeholder connoting that violence which out-strips the power of connotation. To represent it we have to dismantle it, pretend that we can identify its component parts, force a name into its hole—macrocytes, spur cells, kidneys at half-throttle, a thoroughly ulcerated stomach, Wounded Knee, Sand Creek—and make it what it is not, the way one fills the tucked sleeve of a one-armed boy. But these fillers, these phantom limbs of connotation, can only be imagined separately, and as such they take on the ruse of items that science, love, aesthetics, or justice—some form of symbolic intervention—can attend to and set right. They become treatable, much like the massacre at Wounded Knee were it not for the fact that to comprehend Wounded Knee, three hundred-plus men, women, and children in a snow-filled ravine, one must comprehend those three hundred synchronically over three thousand miles (the forty-eight contiguous states) and diachronically over five hundred years. Here, madness sets in and the promises of symbolic intervention turn to dust. We are returned to the time and space of no time and space, the ‘terminal.’”[6] The magnitude of this hole—the impossibility of representing or narrativizing how genocide as a modality continues to position not just Native peoples but the extent to which it is a structural principle of modernity itself—is not easy. It is certainly not as easy to articulate in a debate round as sovereign loss is, nor is it as easy for Settlers to hear. In order to no longer occlude the emergence of Red/Black theorizing in debate, non-Black Native people in debate must begin speaking in the register of incoherence, which demands engaging conceptually and argumentatively with Black people in debate. The avoidance of such a conversation (or series of conversations) can only be rooted in antiblackness and will only reproduce antiblackness. While Native people can be recognized by the Settlers we are talking to in the register of sovereignty, structurally, Black people (including people who are Black and Native) have no such register at the level of ontology. “Whereas Humans exist on some plane of being and thus can become existentially present through some struggle for, of, or through recognition, Blacks cannot reach this plane.”[7] The simultaneous coherence and incoherence of the “Savage” position has thus far led non-Black Native people collectively to invest ourselves in antiblack kinship relations in debate that refuse to speak to or with Black people except when using them as a scapegoat to gain recognition from the Settler/Master institution of debate. This is because, more often than not, non-Black Native debaters are only tasked with talking to Settlers. I don’t mean this in terms of whether we have white friends—I mean argumentatively and conceptually, our work is creating a Settler/Native binary that conspicuously erases and systematically under-theorizes Blackness, antiblackness, slavery/prison, and Black people. Too many non-Black Native debaters don’t even have an answer to the question of whether Black people are Settlers. That there are Native debaters who feel ambiguous about this question at all suggests the rootedness of Native debate in antiblackness. It is beyond the scope of this letter to offer specific critiques of the myriad of (inadequate) ways that many non-Black Native scholars claim to “position” “Blackness,” but it is overwhelmingly true that their discussion of antiblackness consistently describes it as a system of racial identification subservient to settler colonialism. In debate, however, this neglects the indebtedness of non-Black Native debaters to the intellectual and argumentative labor of Black debaters, coaches, and judges. In other words, to reduce antiblackness in debate to a system of racial identification subsumed structurally by settler colonialism is ahistorical, given that it has been the work of Black people in debate that has made Native debate possible at all, as tenuous and numerically small as we are. Why, then, are non-Black Native people in debate so invested in describing settler colonialism as the sole matrix of power under which violence operates? Much of this scholarship (Eve Tuck’s work, Jodie Byrd’s, and other similar texts from Native studies) critiques integrationist elements of Black studies as seeking inclusion in the national project—but Afropessimism broadly, and Wilderson’s work specifically, is far from integrationist. To my knowledge (which is extensive but obviously not exhaustive when it comes to Native debate), non-Black Native debaters have been largely unwilling to contend with the thesis of Wilderson’s book, even when reading other scholars who allege disagreement with him, as most of these scholars do, from the vantage point of sovereignty. A coherent conversation with the Settler about sovereignty in debate is unlikely to challenge the (mis)recognition that leads to the high level of politicization around who is really Native and who is not. Similarly, the numeric lack of Native people in debate, as a function of genocide itself, makes it difficult to articulate what Native resistance has been, is going to be, or even what it is doing right now. Rather than an aspirational politic that suggests we should culturally infuse debate with indigeneity (the implicit endpoint of many of these conversations about “decolonization” which are ultimately revivalist and inclusionist attempts related to Native spiritual or cultural practices), there is an (under-theorized) incoherence to our position that I believe should motivate us to enter into the fraught terrain of Red/Black theorizing. Nothing Native is happening in debate—not that there are not Native people in debate, but I do not believe debate is a space that we should aspire to “indigenize,” “decolonize,” or anything in that register. In debate, Native people are misrecognized, whether through technologies of capture like blood quantum mythologies, misreadings of indigenous cosmologies, or genocidal imaginations of Noble Savages. Fuck non-Black non-Native people who are structurally responsible for those misrecognitions. To the degree that recognition is inevitable in debate, I think many of us are pushed by our coaches, debate partners, by those who judge us, and by civil society more broadly, to articulate ourselves within those frames in order to authenticate ourselves. This is my analysis of trauma politics above. How does the register of authenticity change when we are talking to someone other than the Settler/Master and their junior partners? I believe it changes significantly. I believe that for Native debate to a) increase meaningful Native participation in debate,[8] b) attend to the irreconcilable genocidal question that for us always undergirds sovereignty but can never be coherent in the way that sovereignty and land loss can, and c) attend to social death and the non-position of the Black, it is imperative that we stop talking to and for white people argumentatively. (Mis)recognition is inevitable in a communicative and performative space like debate. Therefore, we have to make decisions about whose recognitions we will orient ourselves towards, how we want to be recognized, and by whom. Structurally, non-Black Native people have not been talking to Black people because many of us refuse to be authorized by the ethical dilemmas of accumulation and fungibility that attend Blackness.[9] There are, for example, many non-Black Native people who express ressentiment about Black debate—that Black debate has not made space for Native debate, as if that was the obligation of Black debaters and coaches, or as if Black debate by virtue of its very existence has not made space for Native debate, or as if Settler/Master debate does not owe argumentative space to Native people. It is disturbing that non-Black Native people tend to express major grievances with Black debate, or with Resistance or Wilderson or Afropessimism (all coded as Black debate), rather than with Settler/Master debate, including the debaters, coaches, judges, and practices that attend to its institutional form. Further, it is clear from the argumentative content of much of Native debate— not merely the systematic absencing and/or undertheorizing of Black people from those theoretical angles, which itself should disprove them, but also the primary focus being sovereign restoration, treaty reconciliation, or the return of indigenous lands (usually meaning all of Turtle Island)—that antiblackness is endemic to its ongoing function. That so many people reading arguments about treaty rights, land repatriation, or decolonization have not found an answer to the question “What happens to Black people when the land is returned?” is very telling about the anti-Black investments that attend enunciations of sovereignty in debate. That there are Native people in debate who continue to insist that Black people are positioned as Settlers when all evidence points to the contrary (though this is not to suggest that individual Black people cannot invest themselves in settlerist nation-building projects), is antiblack and inadequate scholarship that cannot forefront a theory of position.