## OFF

### 1NC – OFF

#### Our Interpretation is the affirmative should instrumentally defend the resolution – hold the line, CX and the 1AC prove there’s no I-meet – anything new in the 1AR is either extra-T since it includes the non-topical parts of the Aff or effects-T since it’s a future result of the advocacy which both link to our offense.

#### “Resolved” means to enact by law.

Words & Phrases ’64

(Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### Voter for limits and ground - justifies infinite unpredictable aff advantage ground which overstretches research burdens while spiking core generics

#### Fairness - manipulating the balance of prep structurally favor’s the aff - people come to debate for different reasons but pursuit of the ballot is the only unifying characteristic

#### Clash - unpredictability destroys research accessibility and nuanced refinement - empathy and value clarification are key to fight dogma and create better advocates - turns case because precluding testing means the aff should be considered presumptively false

#### Any dissad’s to the TVA are neg ground - it’s :

#### The appropriation of outerspace by private entities is unjust

#### That’s Cho 21

#### No Impact Turn’s - Infinite prior resolutional questions and procedural issues bring into question if the debate should have happened in the first place AND reading it on the neg and switch side solve

#### Vote negative for deterrence - at worst agree with the aff and vote neg because we shouldn’t be burdened to debate it

### 1NC – OFF

#### Their politics of acceptance is the latest neoliberal resilience strategy - The attempt to skew the line between the enemy and the people is not radical and instead is a Bourgeois ideology that fails to resolve the contradictions in capitalism and let’s abusers cut and run

Struggle Sessions 18 [Unsigned Article, 9/6/28, “Popular Justice”, *Struggle Sessions*, <https://struggle-sessions.com/2018/09/06/popular-justice/> //GBS Majeed & Jacobs]

As revolutionaries we are faced with two primary social contradictions differing in nature: those among the people and those between the people and their enemies. In both cases we seek to draw a line of demarcation between ourselves and the enemy and between right and wrong thinking. Among the people we draw these lines through democratic methods; against our enemies we draw lines separating them from the masses with violence (see Mao, “On the Correct Handling of Contradictions Among the People”). An antagonistic contradiction is characterized by the necessity of destroying one aspect of the contradiction in order to resolve it. The contradiction between the bourgeoisie and proletariat is one such contradiction. The bourgeoisie needs the proletariat and exploits it but the proletariat does not need the bourgeoisie; this contradiction must be resolved through violence by forcing the bourgeoisie out of power through revolutionary violence in the form of People’s War. This is the struggle for political power of the proletariat. Once the dictatorship of the proletariat is established the proletariat suppresses the bourgeoisie, but in destroying the bourgeoisie the proletariat itself also ceases to exist. The two depend on each other; the proletariat is defined as a class by its relation to the bourgeoisie (see Mao, “On Contradiction”). The Communist Party of Peru (PCP) writes in the General Political Line that the struggle for political power is tied to the struggle for revindications with the struggle for power being principal. In our context this is normally called the struggle for reforms, but this misses part of what the PCP is saying. The PCP refers to this struggle as the struggle for revindications in particular, a term unique to Indo-Peruvians—who make up a majority of the population of Peru—which means something like how the word “reparations” is used in the context of national oppression in the United States. The language is important because we are talking about something that involves raw human emotion and dignity. The masses’ dignity is stripped from them regularly through all sorts of various injustices, and so the masses demand revindications. This struggle is linked to the struggle for power by developing the struggle for revindications as a function of political power. Gonzalo aptly says that “… in diplomatic meetings agreements signed at the table only reflect what has already been established on the battlefield, because no one is going to give up what they have not obviously lost” (Interview with El Diario). The struggle for these revindications against class enemies signal a “change of sky” where the masses see the new power is growing and the old power is beginning to crumble. On the question of enemies among the masses While contradictions among the people are handled through democratic means the situation is different when we talk about individual members of the masses who have adopted bourgeois ideology to such a large extent that they prey on the masses through ingrained abusive patterns of behavior. If a worker who might ordinarily be considered part of “the people” nevertheless abuses and preys on the people, they are more aptly categorized as an enemy because of their antagonistic relation to the masses. In such cases rectification is conditional and frequently impossible without the ability for people’s militias to operate semi-openly and enforce verdicts from a trial. Apart from cases like outright harboring and covering up abuse, in the US, there are no fleshed out rectification processes for abusers that are actually proven to be effective and successful. Concepts popular among postmodernists and anarchists like “restorative justice” or “transformative justice” are riddled with idealism and frankly unsafe practices which are faulty attempts at thought reform that end up smoothing over contradictions in their misguided effort to “hold people accountable.” An anarchist booklet called “Accounting for Ourselves: Breaking the Impasse Around Assault and Abuse in Anarchist Scenes” published in 2013 recognizes a few problems with these “accountability processes.” These processes are noteworthy only insofar as they represent nascent attempts at rectification for abusers outside of the bourgeois justice system. The booklet defines restorative justice as something that “focuses on the needs of the ones harmed and those who did harm, rather than the need to satisfy the abstract principles of law or to exact punishment.” Meeting the needs of survivors is obviously something that should be encouraged but the scope here is far too narrow. Revolutionaries have a responsibility to serve the people. Abusive behaviors are not dispelled overnight without intense struggle, particularly class struggle. This process just lets these people off and leaves them free to abuse others because there is no focus on isolation of the predator. Isolation means enforcing a ban through violence by whatever means we have available with a threat of further violence if conditions are broken. The refusal to exact punishment here also outright neglects the struggle for power and arousing the initiative of the masses, something I will explain further below. Continuing: “Folks who’ve been harmed play an active role in resolving a dispute, while those who harm are encouraged to take responsibility for their actions and repair the harm they’ve done. It is based on a theory of justice that sees “crime” and wrongdoing as an offense against individuals or communities rather than the state.” Transformative justice on the other hand “links restorative justice’s focus on rectifying harm rather than strengthening state power with a critique of systematic oppression. According to Generation Five, an organization that grounds their work to end child sexual abuse in this model, the goals of transformative justice are: Safety, healing, and agency for survivors Accountability and transformation for people who harm Community action, healing, and accountability Transformation of the social conditions that perpetuate violence—systems of oppression and exploitation, domination, and state violence” There is no explanation here of what “rectifying harm” actually means. What do “accountability” and “transformation” look like for abusers? In fact this is not explained anywhere in the zine. This is because it means nothing. The only description of what an accountability process might involve is totally underwhelming: “In speaking about accountability processes, we’re referring to collective efforts to address harm —in this case, sexual assault and abuse—that focus not on punishment or legal “justice” but on keeping people safe and challenging the underlying social patterns and power structures that support abusive behavior. In the loosest sense, this might simply mean a few friends sticking up for someone who’s been hurt: asking them what they need, and trying to negotiate for those needs with the person who hurt them and among the community they share. Some processes involve a group that mediates between an individual and the person calling them out, or separate groups supporting each person and facilitating communication between them. These processes usually involve setting out conditions or “demands” for the person who’s been called out as a means of restoring safety or trust and preventing the harm from happening again, and some method for following up to ensure that these demands are met.” In what world is it appropriate to negotiate with abusers to “keep people safe”? What is the purpose of non-partisan (read: bourgeois) “mediators” other than to shelter the abuser? The Party is partisan in this struggle as the vanguard party and judges cases on the basis of the class interests of the proletariat, as the class which leads all others in abolishing private property and class relations in general. The refusal on the part of anarchists to consider the class struggle cuts the hands off of their “accountability processes.” They reject “legal justice” of “the state” in general instead of focusing on destroying bourgeois justice and grasping proletarian justice. On the contrary we should use and expand all the tools we have at our disposal to increase proletarian political power and build the new state. Furthermore, who enforces the demands here? What do you do if the person tries to harm someone else? Here we must recall Mao’s thoughts on the subject: “Without a people’s army, the people have nothing.” There is no objective basis at which point we can be certain that someone is no longer a threat. The question has everything to do with power. Can we keep the masses and the movement safe from this person or not? This is the first question we should ask before considering rectification. Likewise there is no explanation of what “transformation of the social conditions that perpetuate violence” actually means or what these “systems of oppression” consist of or who controls them. We know for a fact that anti-people behaviors are tied directly to bourgeois ideology engendered in capitalist social relations. The struggle against abusers is part of the struggle for proletarian political power. The act of enforcing a ban on an abusive person is also a form of rectification, where they face a degree of violence and have to undergo thought reform anyway. Such people must be restricted before they can be worked out of their abusive thinking. While in a certain sense we would prefer to turn rubbish into something useful and, for example, turn patriarchal thinkers into proletarian feminist thinkers, it is wrong to attempt such without first being able to exercise dictatorship over them, making sure that they cannot harm the masses and act on their abusive patterns of thinking. Mao notes that “To maintain public order and safeguard the interests of the people, it is necessary to exercise dictatorship as well over thieves, swindlers, murderers, arsonists, criminal gangs and other scoundrels who seriously disrupt public order” (“On the Correct Handling…”). When rectification is not possible we do what we can to mobilize the masses and ensure that they are kept safe from anyone we consider a potential threat. Thought reform itself is a process of changing a person’s ideas and hence their behavior. Though we must use coercion to keep dangerous elements from harming the people, that isn’t the method we use to correct their thinking. We use coercion in the sense that we place restrictions on them to keep them from hurting the people again, but when possible, we want to encourage them and work with them to actually win them over against their bourgeois thinking to become proletarian fighters. The primary method of this is criticism and self-criticism (CSC); our principle in CSC is to “cure the sickness to save the patient” and “learn from past mistakes to avoid future ones.” We dig into their deepest and innermost thought patterns to fully expose errors in order to correct them. Current attempts at “rectification” for such people are riddled with problems that even anarchists recognize. “Accounting for Ourselves” identifies 10 main problems. In their words: There is no clear sense of when it’s over, or what constitutes success or failure. Standards for success are unrealistic. We lack the collective ability to realize many demands. We lack skills in counseling, mediation, and conflict resolution. This stuff depresses people and burns them out. Accountability processes suck up disproportionate time and energy. Subcultural bonds are weak enough that people just drop out. Collective norms encourage and excuse unaccountable behavior. The residue of the adversarial justice system taints our application of community accountability models. Sexual assault accountability language and methods are used in situations for which they were not intended. Many of these problems are obvious but they are inevitable consequences of idealism surrounding rectification. If there is one problem that stands out above all others it’s that demands cannot be realized in current conditions. If this is true then what is the point of a rectification process? The anarchists give four possible methods of dealing with abusers that attempt to resolve these contradictions: “survivor-led vigilantism,” “prevention” through “gender-based organizing,” “conflict resolution,” and “concentric circles of affinity.” Total prevention is of course impossible while capitalist social relations persist even through socialism. An organized political force must exist to confront this ideology. Conscious class organization of women along patriarchal lines of oppression into fronts and militias must be prioritized to combat patriarchal ideology and empower women of our class as revolutionaries and militants. The article suggests that organizations for men are supposed to prevent this, an idea seeped in identity politics that has nothing to do with the struggle for power. Conflict resolution for abusers is likewise not possible or desirable because these contradictions are antagonistic and they cannot just be “mediated” away. “Concentric circles of affinity” is an attempt to resolve the problem of how a (poorly-defined) “community” is meant to “hold someone accountable.” There are many social venues through which an enemy can travel, though generally they are confined to one city or town. The anarchists propose establishing rules in various communities based on varying levels of trust. Since they reject leadership and the party their concept of “accountability” within different communities is too narrow; as Communist we strive for the conquest of power for the proletariat through the entire country and eventually the world. We must have eyes and ears everywhere. Again the anarchists endanger the masses with their wrong-headed attempts at “accountability” without isolation. The only one that comes close is “survivor-led vigilantism” (again, disconnected from people’s war and proletarian leadership) which is quickly brushed aside with the clueless idea that “throttling an individual scumbag doesn’t do much to make anyone safer or end systematic rape culture, however satisfying it may feel to a vindicated survivor.” Even this is rooted in identity politics and survivor self-determination by insisting that the survivor lead the charge instead of revolutionaries carrying out justice on behalf of all survivors. Wielding the threat of violence to keep abusers out emboldens women as fighters and leaders. This is critical when militant women organizations are desperately needed for the revolutionary war effort which is impossible without the full participation and leadership of women.

**Red Charity DA – the 1AC’s Mutual Aid politics are rooted in trade-union consciousness that is fundamentally reformist in nature, despite its radical veneer – they ideologically distinguish themselves from liberal charities while serving the same material purpose – only Partybuilding can create revolution**

**Kavga 18** (Kavga – editor at struggle-sessions. "All About that Base? No struggle?" *struggle-sessions*, 9-5-2018, https://struggle-sessions.com/2018/09/05/all-about-that-base-no-struggle/, DOA: 7-8-2020, jzn)

“The basic question of every revolution is that of state power. Unless this question is understood, there can be no intelligent participation in the revolution, not to speak of guidance of the revolution.” – VI Lenin, The Dual Power Marxist Center, and especially its supporters in the Seattle area and to a lesser extent Philadelphia promote what they call the “base building tendency”, while we do not view this as a tendency it is important to engage with their published content and hold it up against MLM, seeking to understand its flaws as well as any possible positive attributes. The main author behind this “tendency” is Sophia Burns, who claims that base building means avoiding both reformism and protest culture. We hope to provide an argument here that “**Base Building” is nothing innovative and that the “dual power” ideas behind it**, in essence, **are reformism**. DB Cooper summarizes Burns’ conception like this: “‘Dual power’, while not strictly synonymous, can essentially be understood as another term for base building; although it emphasizes itself as a political strategy for revolution, **rather than a political methodology for organizing the working** **class**, which base building can be defined as”; Cooper goes on to state that this ‘tendency’ “…emphasizes the need for revolutionaries to consciously and actively reject liberal narratives and modes of debate”. We are compelled to agree with the last part, opposing liberal styles of debate, although “liberal” here does not conform to the Maoist definition, nonetheless we must be forward with our disagreements, and call for a public theoretical exchange. The major point of contention with the “dual power” argument and Maoism are on the basis of Leninism: while Maoists fight for increased centralism, via its correlation with democracy, the “base building tendency” argues for **decreased centralism**, in essence falling into the age-old arguments that condemn all the major protest movements to spontaneity. According to Burns this means the “dual-power” conception “insists that each of them [“dual power” organizations] become self-sustaining and independent of our control as quickly as possible”. This reveals both a negation of Leninism and a diffused power conception. Power being the central question of Maoism can only be understood in real class terms, not only is a decentralized dual-power a false formula, but **it also lacks coherency about how this is established**—for Maoists power is conquered through revolutionary war and class struggle; the avoidance of the military question is a unifying characteristic in the Marxist Center. In this regard, there is no meaningful demarcation between them and anarchists or social-democrats. By rejecting any form of Party-building Burns has no choice except to fall into economism and spontaneity. The goal for them is to form these “dual power projects” which directly empower “the working, disabled, and oppressed people” avoiding politicizing and recruiting them into either a Party or a revolutionary mass organization. Marx, Lenin and Mao all were clear on the fact that **trade union consciousness is the climax of these types of mutual aid organizations without the influence and leadership** of the very formations that Marxist Center is in strict opposition too. There is little to no argument made on how these “dual power projects” plan to cultivate class consciousness or take up a revolutionary program as their own, let alone how they relate to and interpenetrate with the Communist movement. Let us turn to Lenin for an answer: “There can be no competition between a mutual aid society and a revolutionary circle; and when Revolutsionnaya Rossiya ascribes to the latter the determination to destroy the former, it is talking sheer nonsense. But if in this same mutual aid society there develops a certain political tendency—not to aid revolutionaries, for instance, or to exclude illegal books from the library—then every honest ‘politically minded’ person is in duty bound to compete with it and combat it outright” (VI Lenin, The Tasks of the Revolutionary Youth). What is an even harder mistake to witness is that these “dual-power” theorists see the “empowerment” of the masses in irreconcilable contradiction with the needs of the proletariat to constitute for itself a political Party—to organize its most advanced expression—the Communist Party. In doing so they have posited the empowerment of the masses as fully divorced from the question of political power—their “dual power” opposes itself to class power. While Marxist Center provides us with a nebulous “base building” and the vague “political revolutionary strategy of dual power”, Lenin’s thoughts on the topic come out in stark relief when discussing the revolutionary side of dual power opposed to the bourgeois power: “What is the class composition of this other government? It consists of the proletariat and the peasants (in soldiers’ uniforms). What is the political nature of this government? It is a revolutionary dictatorship, i.e., a power directly based on revolutionary seizure, on the direct initiative of the people from below, and not on a law enacted by a centralized state power”. There are a few points that the great Lenin is making here which deserve some commentary: 1) he is specifically talking about forming a government, 2) the workers and peasants in soldier’s uniforms speaks to both the militarized nature of this government as well as the masses which are formed into it, this is what Maoists call the New State and the Sea of Armed Masses, 3) Lenin leaves no room for doubt that dual power is won through “revolutionary seizure” meaning the conquest of power—taking it from the enemy by force—that it is not something that is built exclusively through independent mutual aid organizations with **no central push, no military and no Party**. Lenin lays out the characteristics of dual power, in both its militarized and mass aspects and we must quote at length: “The fundamental characteristics of this type are: (1) the source of power is not a law previously discussed and enacted by parliament, but the direct initiative of the people from below, in their local areas—direct ‘seizure’, to use a current expression; (2) the replacement of the police and the army, which are institutions divorced from the people and set against the people, by the direct arming of the whole people; order in the state under such a power is maintained by the armed workers and peasants themselves, by the armed people themselves; (3) officialdom, the bureaucracy, are either similarly replaced by the direct rule of the people themselves or at least placed under special control; they not only become elected officials, but are also subject to recall at the people’s first demand; they are reduced to the position of simple agents; from a privileged group holding ‘jobs’ remunerated on a high, bourgeois scale, they become workers of a special ‘arm of the service’, whose remuneration does not exceed the ordinary pay of a competent worker” [Our emphasis]. Lenin argues here for the construction of the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is, the formation of a workers state which simultaneously fights the enemy and reproduces itself—this theory and the central question of power forms the basis for the Maoist theory of Protracted Peoples War and its universality. What Marxist Center gives its followers is a domesticated house-broken version of “dual power” and “base building”. Let us return once more to Burns who provides her definition of “dual power”. After explicitly stating that “dual power projects” are not initiated or led by the Party she goes on to state that: “Dual Power is both a type of institution and a strategy to change the world. Dual Power means new, independent institutions for people to meet their own needs in ways capitalism and the government can’t or won’t.​ Unlike nonprofits, where a board of directors (and usually wealthy donors!) makes the decisions, Dual Power institutions are created and controlled by the people they benefit. By developing them, people create a second kind of social, economic, and even political power, separate from government and capitalism”. Without any discussion on armed struggle, its necessity or even its possibility, **the author has jumped to cultivating a disorganized lot of nongovernmental bodies which can separate from capitalism and even accomplish political power**! This kind of economism holds a particular appeal. It seems scientific in its formulas and tries to rely on notions of good-will, that as long as the masses are being provided for materially in some way, that they will respond by flocking to such a “dual power institution” with no threat of the (for some reason) repugnant “communist recruitment”. Never the less, this conception is reminiscent of Robert Owen, the target of Engels’ great work Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. The idea of wholly independent “cooperative societies” is renounced by Engels when confronting Owen: “He introduced as transition measures to the complete communistic organization of society, on the one hand, cooperative societies for retail trade and production. These have since that time, at least, given practical proof that the merchant and the manufacturer are socially quite unnecessary. On the other hand, he introduced labor bazaars for the exchange of the products of labor through the medium of labor-notes, whose unit was a single hour of work; institutions necessarily doomed to failure, but completely anticipating Proudhon’s bank of exchange of a much later period, and differing entirely from this in that it did not claim to be the panacea for all social ills, but only a first step towards a much more radical revolution of society” (Engels, Socialism Utopian and Scientific). As quoted above, while these cooperative societies can prove that the merchant and manufacturer are unnecessary, **they do not bring us any closer to political power, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the abolition of the capitalist mode of production**. Burns discusses different types of “dual power institutions”, demarcating them into two main categories. The first being Alternative Institutions, which are, “worker owned businesses”, “neighborhood vegetable gardens”, “house-sharing projects”, and “community owned free-clinics”. The second being Counter-Institutions, which are, “Labor Unions”, “campaigns against a new Wal-Mart store”, “tenants unions”, and “planned parenthood defense group[s]”. While Burns attempts to demarcate the “dual power projects” from NGOs, she does not hesitate to formulate them around the defense of an NGO (a bourgeois organization like Planned Parenthood) uncritically of course, while giving no mention to the need for any mass organizations, “dual power institutions”, or mutual aid societies coming to the defense of the revolution as Lenin insisted above. Both types of “dual power institutions” lack any and all mention of conquering terrain to organize independently of the bourgeoisie in any coherent way and both promote merely cultivating something on what is very much contested turf, through sheer will and a moral high ground, again lapsing into utopian socialist concepts already resolutely crushed by the emergence of Marxism. Further, no analysis is given to the class question of “labor unions”; they are seen without contradiction as a fighting organization—divorced from all the historical evidence to the contrary which proves them to have a capitulationist aspect, which in an imperialist country is its dominant aspect. All of Burns’ theory is **contingent on bribing workers out of politics**—NGOism to a fault.

**Capitalism generates endless slow violence, environmental destruction, and extinction**

Robinson 14(William I., Prof. of Sociology, Global and International Studies, and Latin American Studies, @ UC-Santa Barbara, “Global Capitalism: Crisis of Humanity and the Specter of 21st Century Fascism” The World Financial Review)

Cyclical, Structural, and Systemic Crises Most commentators on the contemporary crisis refer to the “Great Recession” of 2008 and its aftermath. Yet the causal origins of global crisis are to be found in over-accumulation and also in contradictions of state power, or in what Marxists call the internal contradictions of the capitalist system. Moreover, because the system is now global, crisis in any one place tends to represent crisis for the system as a whole. The system cannot expand because the marginalisation of a significant portion of humanity from direct productive participation, the downward pressure on wages and popular consumption worldwide, and the polarisation of income, has reduced the ability of the world market to absorb world output. At the same time, given the particular configuration of social and class forces and the correlation of these forces worldwide, national states are hard-pressed to regulate transnational circuits of accumulation and offset the explosive contradictions built into the system. Is this crisis cyclical, structural, or systemic? Cyclical crises are recurrent to capitalism about once every 10 years and involve recessions that act as self-correcting mechanisms without any major restructuring of the system. The recessions of the early 1980s, the early 1990s, and of 2001 were cyclical crises. In contrast, the 2008 crisis signaled the slide into a structural crisis*. Structural crises* reflect deeper contra- dictions that can only be resolved by a major restructuring of the system. The structural crisis of the 1970s was resolved through capitalist globalisation. Prior to that, the structural crisis of the 1930s was resolved through the creation of a new model of redistributive capitalism, and prior to that the struc- tural crisis of the 1870s resulted in the development of corpo- rate capitalism. A systemic crisis involves the replacement of a system by an entirely new system or by an outright collapse. A structural crisis opens up the possibility for a systemic crisis. But if it actually snowballs into a systemic crisis – in this case, if it gives way either to capitalism being superseded or to a breakdown of global civilisation – is not predetermined and depends entirely on the response of social and political forces to the crisis and on historical contingencies that are not easy to forecast. This is an historic moment of extreme uncertainty, in which collective responses from distinct social and class forces to the crisis are in great flux. Hence my concept of global crisis is broader than financial. There are multiple and mutually constitutive dimensions – economic, social, political, cultural, ideological and ecological, not to mention the existential crisis of our consciousness, values and very being. There is a crisis of social polarisation, that is, of *social reproduction.* The system cannot meet the needs or assure the survival of millions of people, perhaps a majority of humanity. There are crises of state legitimacy and political authority, or of *hegemony* and *domination.* National states face spiraling crises of legitimacy as they fail to meet the social grievances of local working and popular classes experiencing downward mobility, unemployment, heightened insecurity and greater hardships. The legitimacy of the system has increasingly been called into question by millions, perhaps even billions, of people around the world, and is facing expanded counter-hegemonic challenges. Global elites have been unable counter this erosion of the system’s authority in the face of worldwide pressures for a global moral economy. And a canopy that envelops all these dimensions is a crisis of sustainability rooted in an ecological holocaust that has already begun, expressed in climate change and the impending collapse of centralised agricultural systems in several regions of the world, among other indicators. By a crisis of humanityI mean a crisis that is approaching systemic proportions, threatening the ability of billions of people to survive, and raising the specter of a collapse of world civilisation and degeneration into a new “Dark Ages.”2 This crisis of humanity shares a number of aspects with earlier structural crises but there are also several features unique to the present: 1. The system is fast reaching the ecological limits of its reproduction. Global capitalism now couples human and natural history in such a way as to threaten to bring about what would be the sixth mass extinction in the known history of life on earth.3 This mass extinction would be caused not by a natural catastrophe such as a meteor impact or by evolutionary changes such as the end of an ice age but by purposive human activity. According to leading environmental scientists there are nine “planetary boundaries” crucial to maintaining an earth system environment in which humans can exist, four of which are experiencing at this time the onset of irreversible environmental degradation and three of which (climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and biodiversity loss) are at “tipping points,” meaning that these processes have already crossed their planetary boundaries. 2. The magnitude of the means of violence and social control is unprecedented, as is the concentration of the means of global communication and symbolic production and circulation in the hands of a very few powerful groups. Computerised wars, drones, bunker-buster bombs, star wars, and so forth, have changed the face of warfare. Warfare has become normalised and sanitised for those not directly at the receiving end of armed aggression. At the same time we have arrived at the panoptical surveillance society and the age of thought control by those who control global flows of communication, images and symbolic production. The world of Edward Snowden is the world of George Orwell; *1984 has arrived;*  3. Capitalism is reaching apparent limits to its extensive expansion. There are no longer any new territories of significance that can be integrated into world capitalism, de-ruralisation is now well advanced, and the commodification of the countryside and of pre- and non-capitalist spaces has intensified, that is, converted in hot-house fashion into spaces of capital, so that *intensive* expansion is reaching depths never before seen. Capitalism must continually expand or collapse. How or where will it now expand? 4. There is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a “planet of slums,”4 alienated from the productive economy, thrown into the margins, and subject to sophisticated systems of social control and **to** destruction - to a mortal cycle of dispossession-exploitation-exclusion. This includes prison-industrial and immigrant-detention complexes, omnipresent policing, militarised gentrification, and so on; 5. There is a disjuncture between a globalising economy and a nation-state based system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and have not been able to play the role of what social scientists refer to as a “hegemon,” or a leading nation-state that has enough power and authority to organise and stabilise the system. The spread of weapons of mass destruction and the unprecedented militarisation of social life and conflict across the globe makes it hard to imagine that the system can come under any stable political authority that assures its reproduction. Global Police State How have social and political forces worldwide responded to crisis? The crisis has resulted in a rapid political polarisation in global society. Both right and left-wing forces are ascendant. Three responses seem to be in dispute. One is what we could call “reformism from above.” This elite reformism is aimed at stabilising the system, at saving the system from itself and from more radical re- sponses from below. Nonetheless, in the years following the 2008 collapse of the global financial system it seems these reformers are unable (or unwilling) to prevail over the power of transnational financial capital. A second response is popular, grassroots and leftist resistance from below. As social and political conflict escalates around the world there appears to be a mounting global revolt. While such resistance appears insurgent in the wake of 2008 it is spread very unevenly across countries and regions and facing many problems and challenges. Yet another response is that I term *21st century fascism*.5 The ultra-right is an insurgent force in many countries. In broad strokes, this project seeks to fuse reactionary political power with transnational capital and to organise a mass base among historically privileged sectors of the global working class – such as white workers in the North and middle layers in the South – that are now experiencing heightened insecurity and the specter of downward mobility. It involves militarism, **extreme** masculinisation, homophobia, racism and racist mobilisations, including the search for scapegoats, such as immigrant workers and, in the West, Muslims. Twenty-first century fascism evokes mystifying ideologies, often involving race/culture supremacy and xenophobia, embracing an idealised and mythical past. Neo-fascist culture normalises and glamorises warfare and social violence, indeed, generates a fascination with domination that is portrayed even as heroic.

#### The alternative is to reject the aff’s Mutual Aid project and invest in the People’s War against Racial Capitalism - Our form of study builds the Party based on the scientific formulation of Maoist principles to catalyze a mass base against racial capitalism

Williams 18 [Carine, 7/30/18, “Why Black People Need Maoism in 2018”, *The Hampton Institute*, <http://www.hamptoninstitution.org/why-black-people-need-maoism.html#.XWwv7ZNKh0s> // KZaidi]

When they hear Maoism, many people think of China, Peru, and the Philippines. They picture peasants "surrounding the cities from the countryside." This is, of course, understandable, but a mistake. Maoism is not simply "everything that Mao did," or "everything that happened in China between 1949 and now." I have spent a great deal of my time writing working to dispel these sorts of myths, some peddled in an unprincipled fashion by anti-Maoists. Maoism is a living, breathing science. By science we mean something with universal principles that can be taken and applied by all who have a material interest in making revolution. In the United States, this is Black people, or the New Afrikan nation. It was not by accident that the original Black Panther Party (BPP) developed close relations with the revolutionary leadership of the People's Republic of China. Huey didn't go to China to play; he went to study and learn things that could be applied back home. Of course, he eventually degenerated in political line and practice, taking a right opportunist course along with Bobby Seale (always a centrist) and Elaine Brown (who guided the party, in his absence, into a mainstream political force that led into the arms of the Democratic Party). This opportunism in the highest expression of revolutionary sentiment, practice, and force in this country to date needs to be studied and ruthlessly criticized, yet we should be careful. We must place things in their historical context and ensure that we are able to divide one into two, meaning see the beneficial as well as the negative aspects of a thing but also realize that one aspect must be primary. The BPP was destroyed by a combination of factors: lack of a really scientific method of analysis and cohesive program of political education, failure to promote and apply the Marxist-Leninist principle of Democratic Centralism (debate inside the party, formation of a political line through this debate, and the upholding of this decision by all party members and organs), and a culture of liberalism that ended with comrades fighting comrades, thus opening the door for external factors (the FBI and other LE agencies) to play havoc and get cadre railroaded into prison and killed. We must study and learn all of these lessons, because when we develop another organization with the prestige, mass base, and power that the Panthers had, and we will, they will come for us all again. So, why do we need Maoism? Because we are against the most brutal, bloody, and vicious empire known to humankind. This country is looting and enslaving our class siblings all over the world. To overturn this order of things, to smash it and rebuild it in the interests of the revolutionary proletariat of the entire world, we must apply the synthesis of 200 years of systematic, organized class struggle, which is Marxism-Leninism-Maoism: the continuity of the revolutionary project that was Marxism-Leninism, with a rupture from the dogmatism and revisionism. Maoists do not uphold "Actually Existing Socialism" because a scientific analysis rooted in the principles laid down by the revolutionary movements and projects that gave us Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao would demonstrate that stealing food from Filipino fisherfolk, like the People's Republic of China (PRC) has been doing, is 100% non-Marxist. This is in disagreement with many Marxist-Leninist organizations today, which uphold these things and other imperialist depredations carried out under the faded red banner of China. The Maoist argument is that Marxist-Leninist terrain has been spent, and the 21st century must learn from Maoism. "You haven't seized state power yet!" others cry. Indeed, and there has never been a truly Maoist party that has initiated armed struggle in the imperialist metro poles. This doesn't mean that Maoist principles cannot be applied to these countries, this means that we must be ever more creative in our application and ever more disciplined in our party-building efforts. Party building in the USA requires the careful and thorough cultivation of a mass base. Tens of thousands, even hundreds of thousands, of people must depend on and follow this party and participate in mass organizations before it can even begin to call itself a vanguard. This is what many who came out of the New Communist Movement of the mid-late 1970s failed to realize. The days of endless squabbling sects that fight over "mass bases" of a handful of other activists must be put to an end, and we must have a truly mass perspective. There is optimism in the spread of For the People (FTP) organizations and the development of the Organizing Committee for a Maoist Communist Party (MCP-OC) which has a more mass orientation and places primacy on the development of a class analysis and political line in the USA that is based in painstaking investigation and rooted in the aspirations and struggles of the most oppressed, along with a record of seeking to develop international solidarity and prison work. This, I believe, is the best hope for New Afrikan Maoists in the United States and I wholeheartedly encourage Black comrades to develop FTP-type organizations in their own communities under OC guidance. Even if this isn't done, at the very least studies in Maoism, studies in Maoist revolutions, and studies in Maoist theory are beneficial. After and during these studies, think about how it can be applied on your block and in your community. Learn about and be like Fred Hampton. Time is up for spinning our wheels; we must get together, unite on a principled and unshakeable basis, and mount a formidable resistance against decades and centuries-old oppression based in capitalism and white supremacy. I also encourage support and donation to the Hampton Institute as an invaluable resource in promoting revolutionary ideology and practice in the finest Marxist tradition.

### 1NC – OFF

#### Text - We affirm the 1AC absent the phrase ‘race war.’

#### The concept of “race war” has a racist pedigree – assumes equal force is being used by both sides which mystifies anti-blackness – endorse militancy as an endurance strategy without this discursive formation

Stoehr 12 John Stoehr's writing has appeared in American Prospect, Reuters, the Guardian, Dissent, the New York Daily News and The Forward. He is a frequent contributor to the New Statesman and a columnist for the Mint Press News. 'Race war': A trick of political rhetoric https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/04/201241264514867938.html

New Haven, CT - Last weekend, two white men went on a shooting rampage in Tulsa, Oklahoma, killing three African Americans and wounding two others. One of the men, Jake England, has suggested the slaughter was meant to avenge the death of his father at the hands of a black man who was not among the killed or wounded. Four days prior to this, one of my students, in a class presentation on American journalism that touched on the civil rights movement of the tumultuous 1960s, innocently used the phrase "**race war**". I say "innocently", because he didn't possess a full understanding of that **phrase's racist pedigree**. He merely tried to capture the tensions and frequent pangs of **violence** that sprang from that historic uprising. Black Americans mobilised in great numbers to demand that the United States live up to its values and grant the blessings of liberty, equality and justice to all, even Americans whose ancestors embodied the diametric opposite of freedom. What my student, a self-identified liberal, couldn't have known is that **"race war" is a trick of political rhetoric** that at the time was meant to **mask the dynamics of racism - who was on the receiving end, who on the giving end**. Political spin takes on the weight of history if it's repeated enough, and journalists are great at repeating political spin, especially when that spin helps satisfy an item on the checklist of journalistic writing: balance. Balance requires presenting both sides of the story as if they are equal even if they are unequal. Balance, at least in theory, gives the appearance of impartiality but in practice it can distort more than it reveals. I touched on this recently when I wrote about the media's use of the word "clash" to describe conflicts between law enforcement and protesters of the Occupy Wall Street movement. Last fall, cops in cities around the United States were dressed in body armour, face shields and helmets while wielding various and sundry forms on "non-lethal" weaponry like pepper spray, rubber bullets and sonic grenades. Protesters possessed nothing of the sort. "Clash" implied equal forces, but protesters were targets of police violence. "Clash" not only concealed this reality, but **gave credence to the movement's opponents** who claimed Occupy Wall Street was merely a carnival of thugs whose calls for justice were illegitimate. **"Race war"** similarly **distorts reality when used to describe**, say, **conflict between black protesters and** Alabama **state troopers** in 1965. Protesters marched from Selma to Montgomery during the peak of the civil rights movement and police deployed the "non-lethal" weaponry of the day: fire hoses, batons and dogs.

#### Frame subtraction is best---absent a stable plan, treat the entire 1AC as negative offense. We can correct and refine frames throughout the debate---key to nuance and detailed clash.

### 1NC – OFF

#### Text - Vote Neg to redact the 1AC - the CP does the aff but doesn't say it.

#### Solves the Aff – 1] Disclosing militant strategies leads to militant crackdowns and the fracturing of undercommon collectivity and 2] Ruptures Semiotics because it’s non-communicative – the Aff feeds the system by speaking within spaces like Debate.

## ON

#### Vote Negative on Presumption – multiple warrants:

#### 1] Their forms of sociality through the “Echo” that they embrace are ongoing – black forms of collectivity within debate like LBS, forms of spiritual endurance, etc. which proves there is no unique benefit to voting Aff

#### 2] Jay, Abhived already read it in LD and Nae Edwards, NoBro and Coppell did it for years before-hand – the Race War hasn’t ended nor have they worked the code against the code of Logistics – proves the Ballot isn’t key to their offense and only a risk of commodification

#### 3] The 1AC’s method of Endurance means they cannot leverage all of the Race War as offense, only the process of individual survival

#### Presumption is a sequencing question to any other part of this debate – Tommy [not abhived] does not get the ballot for simply saying the Race War exists and identifies sociality in the Status Quo – they have to prove their affective orientation is successful in overcoming violent structures

#### AT Beller –

#### 1] Doesn’t mention race once – it says the “linguistic commons” have been infiltrated by commodity exchange – a] can’t let them generalize Debate to a “race war”, b] means you can’t escape it – you participate in this debate, you pay entry fees, hire coaches and judges, etc., and c] proves Cap is the Root Cause.

#### 2] They will go for this as “Debate Bad” – that’s untrue – Debate is Good for Racial Liberation.

LBS 18 Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle 2018 "History" <https://www.lbsbaltimore.com/about-us/history/> //Elmer

The **organizational focus on public policy** **stems from** the **unique experience** many of its founders had with the rigorous academic activity **of** policy **debate**. The founders of LBS ignited their passion for debate as high school students of the local urban debate league; however, it was their **collegiate debate** experience at Towson University that **catapulted them** **into** the **world of activism** and advocacy. In a community which has traditionally favored a dispassionate C-SPAN style of debate, LBS founders proliferated a style that was rooted in the cultural and intellectual resources of people of African descent. Antecedents to the style of debate LBS founders practiced were the Black students of the University of Louisville’s debate program, directed by Ede Warner and Daryl Burch. Their unique policy debate arguments challenged the norms and procedures of collegiate debate, which was usually mired in structural racism. The success of Louisville debaters, Elizabeth Jones and Tonia Greene – a quarterfinalist in two prominent national debate competitions, set a path for **challenging white supremacy by utilizing** the **pedagogical practices and research methodologies** **that** policy **debate required**. Deven Cooper and Dayvon Love, both from Baltimore City, transformed the college debate community as Towson University students when in 2008 they won the CEDA National Debate Championship. This was the first time a team of Black college debaters had accomplished such as feat in the history of policy debate. As Towson University student debaters, LBS founders consistently defeated teams from powerhouse debate schools such as Dartmouth, Harvard, and Northwestern University. Their unique racial justice lens and analysis of issues ranging from Supreme Court Statutory Law to Federal Agricultural Policy has led to successful experiences both as debaters and coaches. While matriculating through college, the founders of LBS collectively decided to create an organization that would export their policy debate and student organizing experience to the Baltimore community. Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle was formulated and legally constituted as a Limited Liability Corporation in August of 2010. The decision to establish LBS as an LLC was a tough strategic question addressed via several internal, critical analysis sessions. While establishing the organization as a non-profit organization would have more easily allowed for short-term financial contributions from foundations, the founders recognized that it also would have hindered an ability to exercise the economic, political, and social freedom that is now experienced. It was of utmost importance to establish a politically independent organization from inception. This decision has necessitated a significant level of sacrifice, both as individuals and collectively as an organization. Nevertheless, the founders remained steadfast in their commitment to establish an organization that could make a profound impact in the Baltimore community. Simultaneously, Governor Martin O’Malley was attempting to construct a multi-million dollar prison for youth charged as adults. **LBS’** early **grassroots organizing** work centered on mobilizing Black youth in Baltimore City to **help** **stop** the **planned construction of a youth jail**. This climate culminated in a large series of protests called Youth Justice Sunday. It was a multi-organizational, Black grassroots effort aimed to voice opposition to the jail. This led to a statewide conversation, amongst local and state officials, about youth incarceration. We were successful in our efforts to lead the halting of the construction of the youth jail. Since then, LBS has forayed in electoral politics, challenged the equitable practices of the non-profit sector, levied public criticism of state agencies and elected officials, and participated in several coalitions aimed at Black self-determination and community empowerment efforts.

#### AT Rodriguez –

#### 1] If you think they’re right about their theory - their re-tooling of the Code through the “Echo” gets coopted within the university – this ev is unbelievably fire AND indicts their Form of Militancy.

#### On Logistics theory

#### Governance is inevitable and turns case

Renaux 19 [Valarie, 5/29/19, Philosophy. Writing on Marxism, eliminativism in philosophy of mind and metaethics, suffering(-focused ethics), and philosophical pessimism, “Marxism and the State”, <https://medium.com/@valarierenaux/marxism-and-the-state-eeb6ceca4515> //GBS Majeed & Jacobs]

Here, perhaps, is a manifestation of one of the foundational flaws in anarchist theory: its veneration of human nature (as it understands it, at least). Bakunin claims that “human nature” makes corruption and counterrevolutionary, anti-proletarian actions inevitable once a section of the working class seizes power. Why does he say this? What proof does he have? In a word, none. ‘Human nature’ as it is predominantly understood is nothing more than our proclivity towards certain actions within specific material contexts, which are subject to change — and thus so are the proclivities. Even if it could be established that capitalist society generates some kind of fundamental proclivity among the working class and even humanity as a whole to act out of greed, selfishness and short-termism (which is practically speaking impossible to prove anyway), it does not follow that this is inherent and unavoidable in the human animal itself as some kind of abstract template for our actions. By elevating the human creature itself to the level of pseudoreligious ideology, anarchism practises exactly the same form of ideologising that the bourgeoisie and the feudal and even patrician classes before them have long done. Marxism rightfully does not concern itself with such sophistry, with such meaningless protestations against placing power in the hands of the working class and its party. “During its lifetime the working class state will continually evolve up to the point that it finally withers away: the nature of social organisation, of human association, will radically change according to the development of technology and the forces of production, and man’s nature will be equally subject to deep alterations always moving away more and more from the beast of burden and slave which he was.”²⁴ This links closely with the final problem with Bakunin and the anarchists’ position on the state that we shall address here. Bakunin describes his fictitious once-proletarians as “look[ing] down” on the workers from the “governing heights of the State.” What does this mean? It means, in one clear sense, that Bakunin sees the state as something distinct from society, something separate from and alien to it, something parasitical and detached from the productive elements of society. But never has or will the state be something “imposed on society from without,”²⁵ something that stands above class distinctions, or gendered divisions in labour, or religious and secular ideology alike, or indeed anything else. The state is not separate from society; it is society, it is the inevitable and necessary product of a society as it exists at certain stages of historical-economic development, and without it, the society would be reduced to utter barbarism, open, ubiquitous kinetic violence, a marked decline in living standards for all, both relative and actual, a severe degradation in the quality of goods, and so on. In a word, you would have social and even civilisational collapse. This is because ‘society’ is not one harmonious thing; rather, it is the aggregate of all human social and economic relations, and these humans and their socioeconomic situations are anything but uniform. Without the state, with its monopoly on violence and its often dominant role in the cultural narrative, these contradictions — irreconcilable contradictions — would be acted out through direct, physical struggle. There are but two outcomes to such a thing: either a state will be formed anew, but only after an extended period of acute crisis dealing devastating damage to all, and so the destruction of the state (and more precisely the failure to build a new state to replace it) was not only pointless but entirely undesirable to the society, or, worse still, the construction of a new state, for whatever reason, fails, and the population collapses into a regressed state of primitive-communism. History would have been reset. There does not exist some dichotomy of society and state, only the existence of a society with a state, and if a society has a state, it needs a state, and simply seeking its destruction is entirely misguided and naïve, springing from a fundamental misconstruing of what the state is, what society is, and what one’s own material interests are. In a word, it is idealism — it is utopianism. It should be evident from the rest of this essay that the state is not something that can be simply dismantled and destroyed by force and violence; it can only “wither away” when the material conditions are right. To attempt to act outside of history as anarchism does is dangerous to all, never mind arrogant and individualist. It is a position in absolute opposition to the interests of the workers. General remarks on the nature of class dictatorship Mao Zedong famously taught that “[p]olitical power grows out of the barrel of a gun.”²⁶ Truly there is no more succinct and accurate description of politics — which is, at its core, the systematised control and regulation of violence — than this. Anything that suggests otherwise is an obfuscation; such obfuscations serve an agenda, and all but always one of the ruling class. The class destined to vanquish class society itself has no need of the propaganda and sophistry of traditional class rule; we can, and should, state in no uncertain terms that the only rational expression of our political interests is a class dictatorship won and maintained by force of arms for the exclusive benefit of our economic class at the expense of all others. The proletarian state represents, for the first time in history, the material and thus socio-political interests of the vast majority of the people. From this simple fact an equally simple conclusion can be drawn: namely, that both when the working class is barred from power and when it holds it, it is only benefited by a frank and open understanding of the thoroughly class- and violence-based nature of state power. In the former situation, the proletarian is aware that society is organised upon his exploitation and that he has no material interest whatsoever in the preservation of the status quo, while in the latter, he sees that he should not be afraid of ‘tyranny,’ that the bourgeoisie are justly and necessarily without power and rights, and that should they be granted them, they will use them to undermine and overthrow the régime and institute terror of a previously unprecedented scale and harshness. In short, the stripping away of the pretensions and illusions of the state represent, and reinforce, heightened class consciousness. In terms of our interests, power is best manifested naked, and as proletarians, we have, unequivocally, a side on which to fall in the class struggle. As such, our political goals must include as a matter of necessity the seizure of state power. The lessons of the Paris Commune and of all revolutionary ventures throughout history is that the revolution that does not seize state power is thwarted. Never, in all human history, has this truth been countered. What’s more, the nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat is that it is exactly that: a dictatorship. All true communists know this to be so, and do not fear, but relish the opportunities that lie in controlling the state. The state is a tool — a weapon, and no weapon has morals in and of itself. Only when the sword is taken up and brandished in anger does it become an instrument of war and not simply a sliver of metal. The state is much the same. The anarchic view of the state is one of an enemy of ‘the people,’ one that is inherently undesirable and wretched, whoever straddles it. Marxism is not so naïve, not so utopian: the state serves her masters, and serves them well; when the working class reigns, the state delivers its Terror upon the counterrevolution and with it the socialist society can progress, in time, to a communist one. Without it, the working class movement is simply destroyed the instance the bourgeois reaction can organise itself anew. Marxism is scientific socialism; it is not utopianism. It would be false and misleading to claim that Marxism has ends; rather, it merely has analyses and observations. In their scientific study of the march of history and the intricacies of the capitalistic mode of production, the Marxists have discovered and laid out the series of progressions and laws that, hopefully, this essay has allowed the reader to understand, if only in brief: that “the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle,”²⁷ that the working class must smash the existing bourgeois state, that the working class must create its own state to serve its own needs, and that this state must inevitably be the last stage of the state in all history. Marxism does not talk of that which is impossible; only that which is possible. The triumphs of the working class movement during the twentieth century prove this to be so, but much that was won has since been lost. As the Great Acceleration of the Anthropocene deepens, the need to place power in the hands of the workers intensifies with every passing week towards a singularly apocalyptic zenith. In the past, Marxists have rightly given the slogan socialism or barbarism?, but today, that is no longer sufficient: today, it it must be socialism or extinction? In matters of war and revolution, liberalism’s façades are quick to fall from the eyes of the class conscious worker. The premier and central issue of working class politics must be the conquest of state power. Only then can we change the world.

#### Falsifiability should be a filter for the entirety of the logistics debate - their theory is untestable and should be considered presumptively false OR its only value rest in enabling an understanding of the world and the subsequent actions as a result of that understanding

#### Materiality precedes logistics - even if they win logistics is true, materiality filters how those ontological depictions operate in real world - they agree that anti-black violence can get worst so reducing harm is still an intrinsic good