# 1NC – Harvard RR vs Philimon

## OFF

### 1NC – OFF

#### Outer space is outside earth

Dunnett 21 (Oliver Tristan, lecturer in geography at Queen’s University Belfast). Earth, Cosmos and Culture: Geographies of Outer Space in Britain, 1900–2020 (1st ed.). Routledge. 2021. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780815356301> EE

In such ways, this book argues that Britain became a home to rich discourses of outer space, both feeding from and contributing to iconic achievements in space exploration, while also embracing the cosmos in imaginative and philosophical ways.2

INSERT FOOTNOTE 2

2 This book primarily uses the term ‘outer space’ to describe the realm beyond the Earth’s atmosphere, conventionally accepted as beginning at the Kármán line of 100km above sea level. Other terms such as ‘interplanetary space’, ‘interstellar space’, ‘cosmos’, and ‘the heavens’ are used in specific contexts.

END FOOTNOTE 2

Cognisant of this spatial context, a central aim is to demonstrate how contemporary geographical enquiry can provide specific and valuable perspectives from which to understand outer space. This is an argument that was initiated by Denis Cosgrove, and his critique of Alexander von Humboldt’s seminal work Cosmos helped to demonstrate geography’s special relevance to thinking about outer space.3 The key thematic areas which provide the interface for this book’s research, therefore, are the cultural, political and scientific understandings of outer space; the context of the United Kingdom since the start of the last century; and the geographical underpinnings of their relationship.

#### “Appropriation” means exclusive ownership

Leon 18 (Amanda M., Associate, Caplin & Drysdale, JD UVA Law) "Mining for Meaning: An Examination of the Legality of Property Rights in Space Resources." Virginia Law Review, vol. 104, no. 3, May 2018, p. 497-547. HeinOnline.

Appropriation. The term "appropriation" also remains ambiguous. Webster's defines the verb "appropriate" as "to take to oneself in exclusion of others; to claim or use as by an exclusive or pre-eminent right; as, let no man appropriate a common benefit."16 5 Similarly, Black's Law Dictionary describes "appropriate" as an act "[t]o make a thing one's own; to make a thing the subject of property; to exercise dominion over an object to the extent, and for the purpose, of making it subserve one's own proper use or pleasure."166 Oftentimes, appropriation refers to the setting aside of government funds, the taking of land for public purposes, or a tort of wrongfully taking another's property as one's own. The term appropriation is often used not only with respect to real property but also with water. According to U.S. case law, a person completes an appropriation of water by diversion of the water and an application of the water to beneficial use.167 This common use of the term "appropriation" with respect to water illustrates two key points: (1) the term applies to natural resources-e.g., water or minerals-not just real property, and (2) mining space resources and putting them to beneficial use-e.g., selling or manufacturing the mined resources could reasonably be interpreted as an "appropriation" of outer space. While the ordinary meaning of "appropriation" reasonably includes the taking of natural resources as well as land, whether the drafters and parties to the OST envisioned such a broad meaning of the term remains difficult to determine with any certainty. The prohibition against appropriation "by any other means" supports such a reading, though, by expanding the prohibition to other types not explicitly described.168

#### Private entity means non-state

Warners 20 (Bill, JD Candidate, May 2021, at UIC John Marshall Law School) "Patents 254 Miles up: Jurisdictional Issues Onboard the International Space Station." UIC Review of Intellectual Property Law, vol. 19, no. 4, 2020, p. 365-380. HeinOnline.

To satisfy these three necessary requirements for a new patent regime, the ISS IGA must add an additional clause ("Clause 7") in Article 21 specifically establishing a patent regime for private nonstate third parties onboard the ISS. First, Clause 7 would define the term "private entity" as an individual, organization, or business which is primarily privately owned and/or managed by nonstate affiliates. Specifically defining the term "private entity" prevents confusion as to what entities qualify under the agreement and the difference between "public" and "private."99 This definition would also support the connection of Clause 1 in Article 21 to "Article 2 of the Convention Establishing the World Intellectual Property Organization." 100 A succinct definition also alleviates international concerns that the changes to the ISS IGA pushes out Partner State influence. 101 Some in the international community may still point out that Clause 7 still pushes towards a trend of outer space privatization. However, this argument fails to consider that private entities in outer space have operated in space almost as comprehensively as national organizations. 102

#### Violation - the aff does not defend the resolution OR they are extra-topical

#### 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 Outer Space 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

#### Attempting to stage a semiotic break through “hostage taking” and “symbolic extinction” through “symbolic terrorism” is a form of semiotic recapitulation that mystifies materialism. Violence is not an amalgamation of signs but is instead about flesh and bone – their project fuels capitalist pedagogy.

McLaren 10 [Peter, UC-Los Angeles and Nathalia E. Jaramillo, Purdue University, “Not Neo-Marxist, Not Post-Marxist, Not Marxian, Not Autonomist Marxism: Reflections on a Revolutionary (Marxist) Critical Pedagogy” Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies 2010 10: 251]

Ebert (2009; Ebert & Zavarzadeh, 2008) makes an important distinction between corporeality/materiality and matter/materialism. Materiality is related to objective idealism and refers to the acceptance of an idea in the mind as something real, something that escapes class interests. In this way, avant-garde scholars will deconstruct materialism as merely the effects of tropes and representations. It attempts to create a prefigurative origin for what is essentially an ontology. However, Ebert (2009) argues that this constitutes transforming materialism into materiality, into a contemplative corporeality of difference, purging materialism of its conceptuality and determinate meanings. Matter is turned into signs or the effect of signs or sign power. This has led to the recent interest in the politics of performativity—performing identities, performing pedagogy, performing class, and so on. However, Ebert argues that matter is not synonymous with physical objects; matter exists outside the consciousness of the subject, and it cannot be separated from its production and contradictions in history. Matter is objective reality in history. Ebert and Zavarzadeh (2008) characterize materialism as the objective (transformative) productive activities of humans involving them in social relations; these social relations occur under definite historical conditions that are independent of their will and are shaped by class struggle over the surplus produced by social labor. A materialism that excludes historical processes and operates as a medium of cultural practices is not materialism; it is materiality or what Ebert (2009) refers to as “matterism.” Avant-garde critics who would replace materialism with materiality (through the tropes of supplementarity, spectrality, undecidability, and difference) severely undercut the claim for the objectivity of class interests and ultimately replace class struggle with the struggle over the sign. Like Ebert, David McNally (2001) in his classic Marxist text, Bodies of Meaning, describes the deconstructive efforts of post-structuralists such as Jacques Derrida as a form of linguistic idealism. In his critique of anti-fetishistic thought (like that of Marx), that palpates the farthest reach of linguistic meaning, Derrida devalues dialectical critique as useless by disavowing embodied human activity, by ignoring laboring human bodies and rejecting them as metaphysical illusions. When Derrida deals with issues of the economy, he is interested only in capital that begets capital—that is, in credit or fictitious capital. Likewise, in his critique of Saussure, he critiques the notion of a transcendental signified, a universal equivalent or what McNally refers to as meaning’s gold standard (something positive that can exist outside of an endless reference of commodities to other commodities). There is nothing extralinguistic for Derrida, since language suspends all reference to something outside of it. Similarly, for Derrida, money lacks a referent. It is driven by credit and speculation and lacks any material foundations. Derrida deals with fictitious or dematerialized money, money that can be produced without labor, that is, money as an expression of hyperreality. Capital in this view is nothing more than a self-engendering dance on a solipsistic path of self-fecundation. The real is folded into the representation. Derrida (and Baudrillard and others) assimilate the economy (the same one that is throwing people out of their homes and into the streets at present) into their poststructuralist model of language. Contrary to Derrida, Ebert and McNally maintain that value is not a sign freed from its referent; rather, value expresses itself in material form. It must pass through laboring bodies and their history of struggle, through toiling subjects and practical human activity that takes place in an organic social universe of skin, hair, blood, and bone. And capitalism abstracts from these bodies, and commodifies them. The work of McNally and Ebert implodes the limitations of post-structuralist thought in dealing with capitalist exploitation. According to Ebert (2009), revolutionary agents of social transformation act ethically when they attempt to resolve the contradictions of their objective location in relations of exploitation. Capitalist violence often doubles as cultural discourses, and Ebert views popular culture, especially, as a narcosis of violence, predicated on distracting subjects from the central antagonism of capitalist society—the struggles over the surplus labor of the other––thereby producing subjects who cannot grasp the totality of the system. In Ebert’s view, the pedagogical practices developed by the poststructuralist avant-garde theorize experience in relation to trauma, desire, and affective relations in general as if these relations were antiseptically cleaved from relations of class, thereby replacing a conceptual analysis of the social totality with liberating pedagogical narratives grounded in local affective strategies—strategies that serve unwittingly as epistemological covers for economic conditions that help the subject cope with the objective material conditions of capitalist exploitation. This leads ultimately to a de-historicization of social life and draws attention away from the way in which all human beings who populate capitalist societies are implicated in some manner in international class struggles and the social division of labor (see also Zavarzadeh, 2003). Ebert and Zavarzadeh describe this process as a “pedagogy of affect.” They write that The pedagogy of affect piles up details and warns students against attempting to relate them structurally because any structural analysis will be a causal explanation, and all causal explanations, students are told, are reductive. Teaching thus becomes a pursuit of floating details—a version of games in popular culture. Students seem to know but have no knowledge. This is exactly the kind of education capital requires for its new workforce: workers who are educated but nonthinking; skilled at detailed jobs but unable to grasp the totality of the system—energetic localists, ignorant globalists. This pedagogy provides instruction not in knowledge but in savviness—a knowing that knows what it knows is an illusion but is undeluded about that illusion; it integrates the illusion, thereby making itself immune to critique. Savviness is enlightened false consciousness: a consciousness that knows it is false, but its “falseness is already reflexively buffered.” (2008, pp. 107-108)

#### The will to secure civil society against the crises of financialization is parasitic on black exploitation and death in the form of racial capitalism

Melamed 15 Jodi Melamed is assistant professor of English and Africana Studies at Marquette University. She is the author of Represent and Destroy: Rational- izing Violence in the New Racial Capitalism (Minnesota, 2011). Racial Capitalism University of Minnesota Press Critical Ethnic Studies , Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 2015), pp. 76-85 DOA:3/23/19 WAKE SHC

**Our** dominant critical **understanding of** the term **racial** capitalism **stays close to** the usage of its originator, **Cedric Robinson**, in his seminal Black Marxism: The Making of a Black Radical Tradition.3 **Robinson develops the term to correct the developmentalism and racism that led Marx and Engels to believe mistakenly that European bourgeois society would rationalize social relations.** Instead, **Robinson explains**, the obverse occurred: “**The development**, **organization**, **and expansion of capitalist society pursued** essentially **racial directions**, **so** too **did social ideology. As a material force** . . . **racialism would inevitably permeate the social structures emergent from** capitalism. **I** have **use**d **the term** ‘**racial cap**italism’ to refer . . . **to** the subsequent structure as a historical agency.”4 Thus the term “racial capitalism” **require**s **its users to recognize that** capitalism **is racial capitalism.** **Capital can only be capital when it is accumulating**, and **it can only accumulate by producing and moving through relations of severe inequality among human groups**—**capitalists** with the means of production/workers without the means of subsistence, creditors/debtors, conquerors of land made property/the dispossessed and removed. These antinomies of accumulation **require loss**, **disposability**, **and the unequal differentiation of human value**, and **racism enshrines the inequalities that** capitalism **requires**. **Most obviously**, **it** **does this by displacing the uneven life chances that are inescapabl**y part of capitalist **social relations onto** fictions of **differing human capacities**, **historically race**. We often **associate racial** capitalism **with the central features of white supremacist capitalist development**, **including slavery, colonialism, genocide, incarceration regimes, migrant exploitation, and contemporary racial warfare.** Yet we **also** increasingly **recognize that contemporary racial** capitalism **deploys liberal and multicultural terms of inclusion to value and devalue forms of humanity differentially to fit the needs of reigning state**- **capital orders**.

**Racial Capitalism produces fascism, endless war and environmental destruction – state is key**

* Black author

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 humanity I 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 in favor of a material analysis toward revolution - Our form of study builds the Party based on the scientific formulation of Maoist principles to catalyze a mass base against capitalism and white supremacy

* Black author

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.

## Underview

### 1NC – AT: Surrender to Blackness

#### Surrender must be forced through collective political power – anything else is a liberal reinvestment of hope in white ethical redemption

* Black authors

Leonardo and Harris 13 Leonardo, Zeus, and Angela P. Harris. "Living with racism in education and society: Derrick Bell’s ethical idealism and political pragmatism." Race Ethnicity and Education 16.4 (2013): 470-488. //Elmer

When it comes to the apprehension of white supremacy, Bell is arguably at his best. He starts from the basic premise that racism is a relation based on the assertion of white lives over all others, ‘the sense that as whites, they are entitled to priority and preference over blacks’ (31). Not far off from George Lipsitz’s (1998) claim that whites benefit from raciology, or race logic (see Gilroy 2000), and on whose possessive investment it depends, Bell is clear that white America is parasitic upon its black counterpart; the nation preaches ‘accepting black contributions and ignoring the contributors. Indeed … had black people not existed, America would have invented them’ (27). One might take Bell’s conclusion to its logical end to argue that both race and blackness are invented constructs (cf. Lott 1999). Whiteness’s will to invention, driven as it is by an objective to exploit, is largely responsible for the continuing significance of race. In this project, racial minorities are participants but only insofar as they answer racial interpellation as a way to mobilize against racism (Leonardo 2011). Never underestimating the history of white power, Bell (1992a) writes, ‘Slavery is, as an example of what white America has done, a constant reminder of what white America might do’ (12). Too focused on the urgency of the project to spend his time grieving, Bell defies ‘common sense’: We must see this country’s history of slavery, not as an insuperable racial barrier to blacks, but as a legacy of enlightenment from our enslaved forebears reminding us that if they survived the ultimate form of racism, we and those whites who stand with us can at least view racial oppression in its many contemporary forms without underestimating its critical importance and likely permanent status in this country. (12) Known more popularly as Bell’s ‘racism is permanent’ thesis, this call is an ethical invitation for blacks and whites alike to fight against racism, untethered by the hope that it will one day subside. In fact, as Bell’s (1992a) allegorical tale of the ‘Space Traders’ makes clear, white America has repeatedly tried either to expurgate or eject the black body from US territory. Bell testifies to black folks’ resourcefulness in finding a way to exist, if not thrive, in a condition that thwarts their survival. His work underscores bell hooks’ insight (1992) when she peers into public representations of blackness: ‘we see that we are in trouble’ (6; italics in original). In the end, the cause has nothing to recommend it, other than a simple ethical imperative to do right by others. In fact, with some 500 years of genocide, land takeover, and slavery, empirical evidence is on Bell’s side that racism is likely a permanent fixture of US national development. Bell’s insistence on ethical action guided by a regulative ideal informs his political appeal for change. It is not change in the sense of a resolution he seeks, but a revolution guided by principle, even the occasional school principal. It is idealist in the hopeful sense without the metaphysical excess of utopianism. Bell recognizes that ‘we need not embrace the liberal hope that someday all racial discrimination will go away to move to challenge discrimination in the here and now’ (Harris 2008, p. 69). Indeed, grounded in realpolitik, Bell shows little patience for reforms guided by the hope of one day ending racism. To be real?: political pragmatism in Bell’s work Perhaps because of the very stringency of Bell’s ethical idealism, the more influential legacy of his work may be its aspect of hard-headed pragmatism. Bell’s notion of ‘racial realism,’ and his principle of ‘interest-convergence,’ like his ethical idealism, stem from the position that, given that American society is founded on white supremacy, racial justice for non-whites is impossible unless it also serves white interests. This position thrusts advocates into politics – the art of the possible – and urges them to be clear-eyed realists about the compromises they make, rather than living in the fantasy that someday racism will cease to exist. Take, for example, Bell’s assessment of Brown v. Board of Education. The case looms large in the American legal canon as the moment when the Supreme Court, pressed into a corner by the NAACP’s legal strategy of insisting on equality in segregated facilities and institutions, finally admitted the truth: Jim Crow segregation was an expression of white supremacy. In a dramatic moment, the Court, under the direction of Chief Justice Earl Warren – no bleeding-heart liberal – repudiated Plessy v. Ferguson and acknowledged that in the American South, separate was not and could not be ‘equal.’ Brown was not only a symbolic victory, moreover. Following its decision in the case, the Court issued a series of per curiam decisions without a written opinion, striking down de jure racial segregation in a wide variety of social contexts, all based on the authority of Brown. The decision thus represents a dramatic turning point in American racial history: the crumbling of the old regime of post-Civil War white supremacy. The decision in Brown no doubt inspired thousands of idealistic young people to go to law school in the hopes of using law to bend the arc of history more quickly toward justice. Yet, more than 50 years after 1954, elementary education remains dramatically racially segregated. Perhaps more important, the goal of a decent education for every child seems as far off as ever. And Bell saw this coming for a long while. In 1976, his Yale Law Journal article, ‘Serving Two Masters: Integration Ideals and Client Interests in School Desegregation Litigation,’ took note of ‘the increasing opposition to school desegregation at both local and national levels (not all of which can now be simply condemned as racist), while the once vigorous support of federal courts is on the decline’ (471). Bell also noted the presence of other troubling realities: ‘inflation makes the attainment of racial balance more expensive, the growth of black populations in urban areas renders it more difficult, an increasing number of social science studies question the validity of its educational assumptions’ (471). Yet, Bell observed, civil rights lawyers were pressing on with their objective of ‘unconditional integration,’ and in the process leaving behind their clients – parents who simply wanted a good education for their children, not a shining moral victory that might be achieved long after those children had graduated. Bell saw this not only as a problem of professional ethics, but as a failure to recognize ‘the real evil of pre-Brown public schools: the state-supported subordination of blacks in every aspect of the educational process’ (487). Bell continued: Racial separation is only the most obvious manifestation of this subordination. Providing unequal and inadequate school resources and excluding black parents from meaningful participation in school policymaking are at least as damaging to black children as enforced separation. (487–488) He suggested that ‘[l]ow academic performance and large numbers of disciplinary and expulsion cases are only two of the predictable outcomes in integrated schools where the racial subordination of blacks is reasserted in, if anything, a more damaging form’ (488) Today, of course, statistics on the percentage of black schoolchildren, especially boys, subjected to discipline, tracked into special education, and pushed into the ‘school-to-jail pipeline’ confirm Bell’s worst fears (see Winn 2010). Three years later, Bell’s reflections on Brown led to one of his most influential formulations: the idea of ‘interest-convergence.’ In his 1980 article, ‘Brown v. Board of Education and the Interest-Convergence Dilemma,’ written for a symposium commemorating the 25th anniversary of Brown, Bell took the view that ‘school desegregation has in large part failed.’ Beyond the problems of implementation, Bell saw a deeper reason for its failure: Whites may agree in the abstract that blacks are citizens and are entitled to constitutional protection against racial discrimination, but few are willing to recognize that racial segregation is much more than a series of quaint customs that can be remedied effectively without altering the status of whites.… Whites simply cannot envision the personal responsibility and the potential sacrifice inherent in [the] conclusion that true equality for blacks will require the surrender of racism-granted privileges for whites. (1979, 523) Bell concluded that the true ‘neutral principle’ supporting the Court’s decision in Brown was not ‘racial equality,’ since whites were not in fact committed to this, but another principle, whose elements: …rely as much on political history as legal precedent and emphasize the world as it is rather than how we might want it to be. Translated from judicial activity in racial cases both before and after Brown, this principle of ‘interest convergence’ provides: The interest of blacks in achieving racial equality will be accommodated only when it converges with the interests of whites. However, the fourteenth amendment, standing alone, will not authorize a judicial remedy providing effective racial equality for blacks where the remedy sought threatens the superior societal status of middle and upper class whites. (523) With these calm but cutting words, Bell parted company with his white liberal colleagues, such as Professor Charles Black, who had sought to defend the decision in Brown in idealistic terms. He then expanded on how the decision in Brown fostered the interests of ‘middle and upper class whites’: First, the [Brown] decision helped to provide immediate credibility to America’s struggle with Communist countries to win the hearts and minds of emerging third world peoples.… Second, Brown offered much needed reassurance to American blacks that the precepts of equality and freedom so heralded during World War II might yet be given meaning at home.… Finally, some whites realized that the South could make the transition from a rural, plantation society to the sunbelt with all its potential and profit only when it ended its struggle to remain divided by state-sponsored segregation. Thus, segregation was viewed as a barrier to further industrialization in the South. (518–519) Bell argued that the interest convergence principle explained not only the outcome in Brown, but the judicial backpedaling that followed it in the 1970s, which intensified in the 1980s and 1990s as middle- and upper-class whites perceived race-conscious affirmative action policies as a threat to their own ‘opportunity hoarding.’ He concluded that the best way for black parents to achieve ‘educational effectiveness’ for their children was to stop pursuing racial balance and to focus instead on the elements of a good education, which for Bell included the creation and development of ‘model,’ all-black schools, thereby lending support for Du Bois’ (1995) call for an education that is relevant for black folks, which retains the character of the race. Bell’s interest convergence principle dovetails with what he came to call ‘racial realism.’ In 1992, Bell proposed that blacks needed to let go of the desire to be fully accepted and embraced in America as the equals of whites. He offered a statement that, in his view, ‘many will wish to deny, but none can refute’: Black people will never gain full equality in this country. Even those herculean efforts we hail as successful will produce no more than temporary ‘peaks of progress,’ short-lived victories that slide into irrelevance as racial patterns adapt in ways that maintain white dominance. This is a hard-to-accept fact that all history verifies. We must acknowledge it and move on to adopt policies based on what I call: ‘Racial Realism.’ This mind-set or philosophy requires us to acknowledge the permanence of our subordinate status. That acknowledgement enables us to avoid despair, and frees us to imagine and implement racial strategies that can bring fulfillment and even triumph. (1992b, 373–374) For Bell, adopting racial realism meant that ‘[w]e need a mechanism to make life bearable in a society where blacks are a permanent, subordinate class’ (377). But this view of what it means to be a ‘realist’ has been contested. Bell is part of a cadre of scholars for whom white supremacy is a continuing reality, despite the nation’s embrace of civil rights and racial equality as ideals (Mills 1997; Bonilla-Silva 2001; Leonardo 2004; Gillborn 2005; Feagin and Elias 2012). As Mills notes, however, even naming the problem as ‘white supremacy’ is controversial among race scholars. Michael Omi and Howard Winant, for instance, argue that a commitment to racial realism entails an acknowledgement that racial identities are ‘unstable’: [R]aces are not teams; they are not defined solely by antagonism to one another. They vary internally and ideologically; they overlap and mix; their positions in the social structure shift; in other words they are shaped by political conflict. (2012, 4) Defending their work against an attack by Joe Feagin, Omi and Winant argue that the gains of the Civil Rights Movement were real and significant and that ‘the US racial regime has been transformed in significant ways’ (6). Similarly, Ian Haney Lopez (2006) proposes that ‘white domination’ is a more accurate term than ‘white supremacy’ to describe the present moment, acknowledging the defeat of white supremacy as an explicit ideology. Bell, however, as Omi and Winant recognize, is in a different camp, both with respect to the nature of white supremacy and the stability of racial identities. Bell has always been a ‘race man,’ seeing the world in black and white. While other critical race scholars have deplored the ‘black/white paradigm’ and sought to develop theories that incorporate indigenous peoples and Asian and Latino immigrants into their theories of race, Bell’s work is resolutely focused on African Americans. His view of the United States is consistent with his view of history, in which American national identity was forged alongside, and through, the invention of ‘whiteness,’ a category created as the opposite of ‘blackness.’ This view of American race relations is vividly dramatized in what is perhaps Bell’s most famous fable, ‘The Chronicle of the Space Traders.’ In this story, alien spaceships enter earth’s atmosphere on January 1, 2000, and the delegates from the stars offer the US everything the nation desperately needs: …gold, to bail out the almost bankrupt federal, state, and local governments; special chemicals capable of unpolluting the environment, which was becoming daily more toxic, and restoring it to the pristine state it had been before Western explorers set foot on it; and a totally safe nuclear engine and fuel, to relieve the nation’s all-but-depleted supply of fossil fuel. In return, the visitors wanted only one thing – and that was to take back to their home star all the African Americans who lived in the United States. (Bell 1992a, 159–160) The rest of Bell’s heartbreaking tale traces the political debates and legal machinations that slowly grind to an inevitable conclusion: On Martin Luther King, Jr. Day, January 17, 2000, ‘[h]eads bowed, arms now linked by slender chains, black people left the New World as their forebears had arrived’ (194). Positioned as the very last chapter in the book, the story forcefully articulates the Bell-Feagin position: black people never have been, and never will be, full members of American society. Who are the real realists here? Omi and Winant argue that ‘resistance is not futile,’ and suggest that it is Feagin’s, and Bell’s, stark view of race relations that is truly unrealistic. In a dramatic moment in their essay, they cry: Is white racism so ubiquitous that no meaningful political challenge can be mounted against it? Are black and brown folk (yellow and red people, and also others unclassifiable under the always-absurd color categories) utterly supine, duped, abject, unable to exert any political pressure? Is such a view of race and racism even recognizable in the USA of 2012? And is that a responsible political position to be advocating? Is this what we want to teach our students of color? Or our white students for that matter? (11) Perhaps, however, this is a classic glass half-full, half-empty dilemma. Rather than adjudicate between them, we might represent Omi and Winant, on one hand, and Bell, on the other, as the Weber and Marx of race scholarship. As Weber’s work focused on the status relations among classes, Omi and Winant’s ‘racial formation theory’ focuses on the constantly shifting status relations among racialized groups and the politics of the rise and fall of racial projects. Their account of American racial history is divided into phases that take the US from racial domination to racial democracy (Omi and Winant 1994). Bell’s principles of ‘interest convergence’ and ‘racial realism,’ in contrast, concentrate from beginning to end on whites and blacks as two classes whose interests are fundamentally antagonistic to one another – a kind of dialectical racialism in which two ‘race-classes’ exist, the tension between them forming the motor of history. As in Marx’s theorization of capital versus labor, this antagonism may produce complex and shifting political struggles, but the underlying dynamic has remained unchanged since slavery. Although it is certainly open to criticism regarding the failings of binary thinking, this view does make room for the existence of non-black and non-white races, just as Marx’s theory recognized the presence of the middle class to which he belonged (cf. Leonardo 2012).3 Nevertheless, Bell’s dialectical approach is clearly to be distinguished from Omi and Winant’s quasi-Weberian framework, which focuses on dispersal, status hierarchies, and an ever-shifting series of racial ‘projects.’ Taking this view, Bell’s and Omi and Winant’s positions are complementary rather than conflicting. Bell’s racial realism reminds us that race relations are, at the end of the day, a hierarchy, not the fluid contestation that Omi and Winant’s focus on instability might suggest. In focusing on black and white, Bell also anchors discussions of American race relations firmly in history (though his elision of indigenous identity and the dynamic of ‘savagery’ versus ‘civilization’ that characterized white–Indian relations from the founding is troubling). Omi and Winant, however, add complexity and dynamism to Bell’s static view of race relations. They attend to different realities, but both are ‘realistic.’ Where Marx saw capitalism as inherently unstable and looked forward to its eventual demise via the revolution of the proletariat, Bell treats white supremacy, as we have seen, as permanent. The only practical game in town, therefore, is either to convince whites that racial justice is in their own self-interest, or to focus on black separatism and self-determination. For Bell, moreover, white self-interest needs to be defined materially; in this strand of his work, the liberal dream of convincing white people that they would be morally and spiritually uplifted by letting go of racism, is foolish. This is an important point because the abstract appeal to increase white humanization through anti-racism is contradicted by the material loss they must be prepared and willing to take on. That is, recovering a lost white humanism is symptomatic of a certain interest convergence wherein white anti-racism is guided by a discourse of ‘gain’ (this time whites’ sense of their humanity), which is part of the original problem within racial accumulation.

### 1NC – AT: Spikes

#### AT: Affirm even if negate

1. Begs the question of the case.
2. Turn – Overcorrecting against other minority bodies. Bias flips both ways

#### AT: Skeptical non-black

AT A: What black folk say != blackness itself

AT B: Blackness is believed – multi-racial coalitions prove – it’s also more contextual than they make it out ot be

#### Brady and Murrilio is about mindset and relatinoships NOT the ballot

#### AT: Reparations

1. Turn – ballot trivializes extent of black suffering and creates the idea of the ‘good’ black person who engaged in debate vs. ‘bad’ black person
2. C/A ballot DA

#### AT: Inspiration

1. Proves hope good which double turns substance
2. Turn – Taking learnings from debate and applying to the world is more inspirational as its more accessible to other black folk

#### AT: Black History Month

AT A: “Black history” as a concept is a double turn with the case

AT B/C/D: No warrant why ballot is key

#### **Yes 2nr I-meets – all defensive arguments are nibs and alt is always lose to 1ar theory**

## ON

### 1NC –- Presumption

#### Presumption - there is no relationship between voting aff and their advocacy or solvency - ontology means its cruel optimistic to think voting aff does anything.

### 1NC - <> - Falsifiability

#### Falsifiability should be a filter for the entirety of the ontology 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

#### They can only verify ontology with examples meaning that one example should disprove their thesis

### 1NC - <> - Materiality Comes First

#### Materiality precedes ontology - even if they win ontology is true, materiality filters how ontology operate in real world - they agree that AntiBlackness can get worst so reducing harm is still an intrinsic good

### 1NC – A2:Warren (State incrementalism bad)

#### 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.

#### Warren is in the context of US legislation and reformism – doesn’t rise to the level of blanket state bad

### 1NC – Debate Good

#### 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.

#### Brady definitely agrees w/ us – he’s an executive member at LBS AND he likes state action

Brady 12 2012. Nicholas. “Louder Than the Dark: Toward an Acoustics of Suffering”, http://www.thefeministwire.com/2012/10/louder-than-the-dark-towards-an-acoustics-of-suffering/. [Edited for Ableist Language].

Nicholas **Brady is an activist-scholar** from Baltimore, Maryland. He is an **executive board member of** **L**eaders of a **B**eautiful **S**truggle, a community-based think tank **focused** on empowering youth in the political process. Through the organization, he has helped to **produce policy** and critical intervention **papers**, **organize efforts in** Baltimore against the prison industrial complex, lead educational forums on a myriad of community-oriented projects, **and use debate as a critical pedagogical tool** to activate the voices of young people from ages 10 to 25. He is a recent graduate of Johns Hopkins University with a bachelor’s degree in Philosophy and is currently a doctoral student in the University of California-Irvine Culture and Theory program.

### 1NC - AT - Ontology

#### Ontology is Wrong – we’ll answer every warrant:

#### 1] Libidinal Economy is wrong.

Hook 21—Associate Professor of Psychology at Duquesne University (Derek, “Pilfered pleasure: on racism as “the theft of enjoyment”,” *Lacan and Race: Racism, Identity, and Psychoanalytic Theory*, Chapter 2, pg 36-39, dml)

What is immediately striking in these extracts is the role played by affect, or more accurately yet, by the “pained stimulation” of the aroused passions of enjoyment. What both authors highlight—and this speaks to the analytical value of the concept—is that forms of excess stimulation (the “negative pleasure” of jouissance) underlie and propel Symbolic and political constructions of otherness. Different cultural modes of enjoyment are, furthermore, fundamentally discordant. We have then not so much a “Clash of Civilizations”—to reference the Samuel Huntington’s (1997) much cited thesis—as a clash of enjoyments. Moreover, the difficulty that we have in realizing “full” enjoyment—something that is impossible in Lacanian theory for “castrated” speaking beings—is dealt with by imagining the supposedly unimpaired and inevitably disturbing enjoyment possessed by cultural/racial/sexual others. In short, the fact that we cannot attain the jouissance we feel we deserve results in perceptions of an unhindered, illegitimate, and undeserved enjoyment on the part of others. As Sheldon George notes: “the other’s jouissance, or enjoyment, [is] … the very core around which … otherness articulates itself” (2016: 3). Political jealousy, as Žižek calls it, is thus (at least in part) the result of incompatibilities and more importantly yet, perceived sacrifices of jouissance. Jouissance: unserviceable tool of political analysis? Despite having offered only a brief introduction to the above Lacanian ideas, we should pause here for a moment to voice a number of prospective methodological and conceptual problems implied by the racism as (theft of) enjoyment thesis. Doing so will help us focus the expository comments to follow, and indeed, to highlight the potential analytical advantages the thesis may have to offer. The first critique, which applies to a wide historical range of psychoanalytic theories of racism (see Cohen, 2002; Frosh 1989; Stavrakis 1999), is that of psychological reductionism. Simply put: the complexity of the various historical, discursive, and socioeconomic causes of racism are invariably deprioritized and accorded a peripheral explanatory role once the domain of the psychological is privileged. Accounts of the psychological factors underlying various instances of racism are thus not only de-historicizing and hopelessly generalizing; they are also invariably depoliticizing. A second critique: is jouissance not a hopelessly open-ended concept? Virtually any cultural behaviour, bodily intensity or libidinal activity can, it seems, be considered to be an instance of jouissance. In view of racism, for example, the other’s enjoyment can refer to everything from their incomprehensible cultural customs and/or religious beliefs (epitomized, for example, in odd food and dress restrictions), to perceived aspects of their distinctive physicality/sensuality (their food, the way they dance, the sound of their music), to attributions of superabundant vitality (they are excessively promiscuous, religious, lazy, etc.)? The concept of jouissance seems thus to be both underdifferentiated and overly inclusive, applying to a potentially endless array of behaviors and experiences. Without a clearer sense of how to differentiate what qualifies as enjoyment and what does not, the concept loses analytical value. A third line of critique: different modes of enjoyment are implied within the literature, without being properly distinguished. In Žižek’s descriptions of racism and jouissance, for example, jouissance is used broadly to refer to: visceral or passionate modes of experience (the “thrill of hate”); an array of enviable possessions (our “libidinal treasures”) perceived as under threat by cultural others; and a type of noxious “surplus vitality” possessed by such others. So, whose enjoyment are we most fundamentally concerned with in these notions of racism as jouissance, the other’s, or our own? What is the relationship between these two types of jouissance? And how are they related to a third mode, namely the “negative pleasure” of making—experiencing—such troubling attributions in the first place? Fourth, there is ever-present problem of de-contextualization in “shorthand” applications of the term. This leads to a situation in which enjoyment itself is treated as a causative force beyond adequate consideration of a series of accompanying concepts (the frame of fantasy, the operation of the signifier, the role of the law, the “object a” as cause of desire) that necessarily accompany its proper psychoanalytic application. What auxiliary terms must thus be utilized alongside the concept if it is to serve us as a viable analytical tool? Critique 1: the notion of enjoyment as psychologically reductionist There is a crucial passage that is repeated in a number of Žižek’s earlier books (1992, 1993, 2005) and that serves as perhaps his most direct exposition of racism as the theft of enjoyment: What is at stake in ethnic tensions is always [a kind of ] possession: the “other” wants to steal our enjoyment (by ruining our “way of life”) and/ or he has access to some secret, perverse enjoyment. In short, what gets on our nerves, what really bothers us about the “other” is the peculiar way he organizes his enjoyment (the smell of his food, his “noisy” songs and dances, his strange manners, his attitudes to work—in the racist perspective, the “other” is either a workaholic stealing our jobs or an idler living on our labour)” (1992: 165). While this seems, in many ways, a gripping account, from a sociologist or historian’s perspective, the degree of reductionism is staggering. The multiple complex sociological, economic, and socio-historical variables underlying distinctive historical forms of racism are brushed aside in favor of a generalizing psychoanalytic formula. Racism = reaction to perception that the (perversely enjoying) other has stolen our enjoyment. This reduction of racism to an affective equation is evident also in Žižek’s precursor in this conceptual domain, Jacques-Alain Miller: Why does the Other remain Other? What is the cause for our hatred of him, for our hatred of him in his very being? It is hatred of the enjoyment in the Other. This would be the most general formula for the modern racism we are witnessing today: a hatred of a particular way the Other enjoys … The question of tolerance or intolerance is … located on the level of tolerance or intolerance toward the enjoyment of the Other, the Other who essentially steals my own enjoyment (Miller, cited in Žižek 1993: 203). The depoliticization (indeed, the implicit psychologization) inherent in such a conceptual move is surprising inasmuch it is something that Žižek has proved critical of elsewhere. In a 1998 text, for example, Žižek outlines the charge of psychological reductionism against standard psychoanalytic explanations of racism, which offer a way of explaining racism that ignore … not only racism’s socioeconomic conditions but the sociosymbolic context of cultural values and identifications that generate reactions to the experience of ethnic otherness (1988: 154). Surely this also applies to the racism as theft of enjoyment formula outlined above? Explanations of racism as jouissance are surely prone to psychological reductionism inasmuch as they often appear to privilege a series of psychoanalytic assumptions (drive, fantasy, libido, projection, etc.) as existing prior to—or independently of—considerations of economic, historical, political, and socio-symbolic context?

#### 2] No Semiotics Warrant

* Black Author

Gordon, 18 – (Lewis, Professor @ UConn, and Scott Phillips, runs the HSImpact Podcast, “HSI Podcast 81 – Dr. Lewis Gordon” HSImpact, 4-24-18, transcribed 1:35-62:28, https://hsimpact.wordpress.com/2018/04/24/hsi-podcast-81-dr-lewis-gordon/)//usc-br/

SP: So, you kind of started talking about bad faith and then moved into the idea of a license. What do you think about to use a lose term the structural critiques that within, let’s say liberalism, there has to be a group that is not human? If they are afropessimists or settler colonialism theorists, that it’s not possible to expand the notion of white freedom and privilege to these other groups of people – that they are just fundamentally not recognized as a human being. Coming from an existentialist tradition, how would you respond to that argument? LG: Those are bad and circular arguments. The first thing to bear in mind is they throw in a sneaky premise. Once you put forward the question of “white freedom,” of course, but if you deal the question of freedom, the question of freedom doesn’t have to be white. The other part that’s strange about their arguments is that they’re dealing with concepts that are what we call “bad structuralism.” Let me explain what that is. Bad structuralism is when you treat the social world as ontologically complete. Its as if the social world is all there is and there’s nothing outside of it. The problem with that sort of argument is it fails to take into account that its humans who built a social world, and so if you’re the person who builds social worlds, you can by definition tear it down, with a toenail outside of it. The other part of it is they don’t understand what liberalism is. Liberalism is a particular form of conception of the human being that emerged, though a particular kind of political philosophy that questions the ability to have objectivity outside of the self. In other words, it collapses into form of subjectivity that prioritizes the category for opinion. That’s why in liberalism there is this obsession with individuals. If you look at the political philosophy of Thomas Hobbes for example, he started from the premise of one atomistic individual in motion colliding with other atomistic individuals in motion which is why he made an argument for there to be a supervening stronger force to keep them form collisions, or what he called war. Most forms of liberalism have some form of appeal like that. The problem with that is that most theories of liberalism doesn’t have a conception of freedom, and that is because most liberalisms confuse freedom with liberty and the crucial distinction between liberty an freedom is liberty is about the absence of a constraint. Freedom, however, requires something more. Freedom is about the responsibility one can take for one’s liberties, and so within the framework of freedom, freedom tends to have ethical implications, it tends to have questions of accountability, and meaning – all sorts of categories that need not be encapsulated by liberty. So, the problem with those accounts is they are based on profound misunderstandings, in some cases even at the level of incompetence of the concepts being articulated. If we think to the question of what a structure is, all structures are systems that are governed by rules that are produced by human beings, and once we understand that we begin to understand the paradox of structures because it’s not only that they are created by human beings, but also that in creating them the human being is also being created, in other words the human being is not a thing like a bowling ball or a glass of water that has a causal effect on other things, it’s in the very process of producing meaning that conceptions of the human being are born. This means that human beings are an always opening and evolving understanding of relationships, and that is also why when we talk about many of these issues we may notice that different kinds of human beings may emerge as things change. A great example relating to the racial category black or afro is that the meaning of what it is to be African has shifted to the rules and relationships we have about not only the continent of Africa and the peoples there but the very idea because in the ancient African formulations of what Africa was particularly in the eastern and north eastern parts of the continent from roughly Ethiopia up to modern day Egypt, the word Africa emerges from a very specific language Metu neter, which simply means originating from the womb, because in that world the origins of all life was from the south, in other words, the southern African area which interestingly enough matches onto a lot of continental anthropology. But if one transforms Africa into something derogatory, then its meaning is going to shift as well. Sorry for the buzz my neighbors are mowing their lawn. And so even if we get to the question of black, there is no reason for black to be intrinsically negative. Its just something I don’t understand. There’s many parts of the world where black is something very positive. It’s not ugly, it’s not wrong. There are many expressions of the word black that are good from financial expressions of “being in the black” we could talk about black beauty, the beauty of the night, whatever. But if you have a society that’s invested in negating blackness they impose upon blackness a negative meaning. And so, if we come back to this idea of systems what we begin to understand is that there’s no such thing as being able to affect the world without in that effect, that act of affecting it, the effect is being affected – in short everything human beings do that has an impact on the world is having an effect on human beings and transforming us. SP: So does this idea seem to imply that antiblack racism is only a conscious choice. I guess I’m thinking more about theories of implicit bias, or in the context of afropessimist they might raise an argument about a libidinal investment. So, does this existentialist frame emphasize that there is an individual responsibility and choice element Well this is where we get to false dilemmas. The simple answer is that some people choose deliberately to be racist while others don’t. One thing to bear in mind about bad faith is that bad faith is not necessarily about a moral prescription. Like there are instances where it can be good to be in bad faith such as if one is afraid, to convince yourself you have superpowers or in situations where one is being tortured, one may want to convince themselves that what’s being done to their body isn’t being done to their personhood – but in other words we create this false dichotomy of a separated self from the body. Now with the libidinal stuff that’s in psychoanalysis – now the thing to bear in mind is there are varieties of ways in which we live in a society and have impositions placed upon us and many of us respond to impositions in different ways – some of us resist them, some of us are afraid of resisting them and rationalize our incapacity to resist them. Those aren’t necessarily libidinal forces, they are just different ways people come with reality. Now the question about choices you see some groups do willfully lie. For example, if you look at a history of something like the national review, the right wing magazine, they were really lying – these were individuals who were committed to the idea that they will use any argument to defend the white race, and for that reason a fundamental deterrent to it was blacks. Now under that framework, they would espouse certain things as if they were rational or reasonable arguments, but the truth is if you look at the history of that magazine, and there’s a fellow named Steve Dertzel who did a wonderful dissertation on this, they would argue completely opposite things. And with these people who argue opposite things, that shows it’s not really about the evidence of the arguments it’s about the position they want to hold. And that’s the crucial part. A lot of people confuse argumentation with positions. Positions is where people decide they are going to stay in a particular place no matter of the evidence that’s brought forth. And dispositions and positions, those are connected to a variety of other things they could be anything from clear. They could be based in ignorance, or they can just be based in a willful desire to manipulate. In other words, the problem with some of these accounts is they are reductionist, they don’t really look at the particular cases in full, and they want to have a one-size-fits-all model when it comes to discussing human phenomena and what every human being learns from childhood onward is that one of the fundamental things about the human world is that the world is saturated with contingency. SP: In that context then, about talking about contingency. A lot of the arguments that students have a hard time dealing with is what you mentioned before as the move to ontologize or talk about political ontology… LG: I really hate that notion of political ontology – it’s a contradiction of terms – it’s one of the stupidest notions that’s being pushed out there. It’s part of the commodification of theory and intelligence. People could always cobble together things that don’t work but they put them together because they sound intelligent and sexy but in truth they’re nonsense. There is no political ontology. And let me explain why. For something to be ontological it has to be absolutely complete. The problem with political is that political by definition is that which comes out of human action. Human action is fundamentally incomplete. So, the notion that there could be a political ontology is a contradiction of terms. What one can have in a human action is a project – the aim – of trying to create an ontology. All an ontology means is being, so in other words here’s an ontological statement: “there is no more nor less reality than there is at any given moment of time.” That’s an ontological statement and its tautologically true, but the question if a pig drops in a river and there’s some starving human around. To make the claim that the humans will eat the pig and it’s just based on human nature and ontology just won’t work. Some might, but some wont – and some wont for the most bizarre reasons – some may not because they are kosher; some may not because they are vegans; some might not because they’d rather die than kill a living thing; and then some might because they just don’t care. And this is where existentialism comes in in a very important way. Existentialism rejects the notion of human nature because nature, human nature, is an ontological imposition on the human being. Political ontology is just nonsense. What the political is about is also the human negotiation of power, and human negotiation of power is fluid. But it sounds like something theoretically sound because it has the word ontology in it. But there’s a lot of nonsense people do in theory that I could list off. For instance, people think they’re doing political analysis if they put the phrase “politics of” before any noun. But the truth of the matter is that some things aren’t political. You could have the politics of clams, the politics of earwax, the politics of dirt. Now if you’re taking about the political negotiation in a social system of how you manage dirt or organizations of how people relate to it though rituals or as resources, that is political, but a lot of these expressions are used when they are ultimately meaningless or ambiguous or unclear.

#### 3] Communicative Ontology is wrong.

King-Watts 15, Eric. "Critical cosmopolitanism, antagonism, and social suffering." Quarterly Journal of Speech 101.1 (2015): 271-279. (B.A. and M.A., University of Cincinnati. PhD., Northwestern University)//Elmer

I have been asked by more than one graduate student at more than one university how I hope to reconcile the claims of Afro-Pessimism with my insistence that **voice is a fundamental** human **capacity**. I maintain, more or less consistently, that voice is a public occurrence animated by the acknowledgment of the ethical and affective dimensions of speech.16 The repetition of the inquiry is energized by the fact and mode of Afro-Pessimism being taken up in debate and argument organizations, programs, and competitions. I am not going to attempt to complete this reconciliation in this space, in part because I have not quite accomplished it. But I do have to briefly sketch out the terms of the challenge in order to try to evaluate the strengths and limits of critical cosmopolitanism as an academic practice that would ask “why and how” Communication Studies might interact with the Afro-Pessimistic enclave in Black Studies. While criticizing the work of Black film theory, Frank Wilderson embarks upon an ambitious and provocative campaign meant to foster an understanding of the conditions of impossibility for Black subjectivity within the contemporary ontological paradigm. The term “Afro-Pessimism” signals the work of scholars who are “theorists of structural positionality.”17 As such, Blackness and Whiteness18 are interrogated as emerging through a conjuncture with brutal modern technologies of organization and domination, and the birth of the very idea of race. Put simply, it took the modern invention of slavery and colonialism to bring about the racial ideologies that make Blackness and Whiteness intelligible. The Slave/Black, then, should not be considered exploited labor or simply oppressed. “Rather, the gratuitous violence of the Black's first ontological instance, the Middle Passage, ‘wiped out [his or her] metaphysics … his or her customs and sources on which they are based.’”19 The Black occupies a coordinate that marks a fundamental structural antagonism with the West, with Whiteness and, indeed, with the Human. It is quite easy to see why the term “Pessimism” is apt. The Black names the condition of state violence, a flesh-object brought into the world for “accumulation and fungibility.”20 The Black is essential to the production of Western subjectivity and to notions of what it means to be human. “In short, White (Human) capacity, in advance of the event of discrimination or oppression, is parasitic on Black incapacity: Without the Negro, capacity itself is incoherent, uncertain at best.” Not only is the Black incapacitated as a structural determinate, the Black is “a structural position of noncommunicability.”21 But there is a form of communication here nevertheless because the Black paradoxically signifies the “outside” that allows for the articulation of “anti-Black solidarity.”22 There is theoretical and historical support for such an analysis. For example, the early twentieth-century Americanization projects used Blackness as an exclusionary trope meant to help spur non-White immigrants from Europe and Asia toward Whiteness.23 And here is where the term “Pessimism” seems inadequate. As a structurally overdetermined body-image in the Western imaginary and symbolic field, Blackness registers near-nothingness: In perceiving Black folk as being alive, or at least having the potential to live in the world, the same potential that any subaltern might have, the politics of Black film theorists' aesthetic methodology and desire disavowed the fact that “[Black folk] are always already dead wherever you find them.”24 Given this dire diagnosis, why and how might we interact with Afro-Pessimism? Speaking from the point of view of a Black rhetorical scholar (and a scholar of Blackness), the answer to why is virtually self-evident: thinking through Blackness as a condition of possibility for rhetorical action and social justice is a life-long pursuit that, given the tragic killing of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri in August 2014, feels especially burning.25 Given the affective intensity of the charge of Black noncommunicability, a failure to meaningfully interact would engender a different kind of “violence”; in this case a structural injunction sponsored by a lingering and recurring anxiety regarding the authority of Communication Studies. And so how might we interact? If I take up the orientation of critical cosmopolitanism, I need to recognize immediately that my efforts can be dismissed by the Afro-Pessimist as colonial; that is, as a reiteration of the sort of practices that presume that one's epistemologies can translate other's bodies of knowledge into comprehensible and useful concepts and constructs. And yet, we must begin where we are, not where we hope to be. Hence, I want to make two modest and one not-so-modest suggestions for how Communication Studies in general and Rhetorical Studies in particular might interact: first, Wilderson calls for “a new language of abstraction” to elaborate “Blackness's grammar of suffering.”26 But in my reading, Afro-Pessimism is already too reliant on a language of abstraction. Lois McNay, in The Misguided Search for the Political, recently contends that theories of political power are overwrought owing to a social weightlessness brought about through high abstraction. She recommends the reinvigoration of the concept of “social suffering”—not as an entrenched category of victimage but, rather, as the habitus of lived experience that must be articulated to analyses of structural positionality.27 Second, I agree with McNay (who says nothing about Afro-Pessimism, by the way) that structural antagonisms are not static, but are movable and moving configurations. The Afro-Pessimist in Wilderson's account must agree that when a non-Black person is thrust toward the horrible **condition approximating** (but not identical to) the Black's structural position, that adjustment can rightfully be called a “Blackening.” As a happening—and not an event that has simply always already happened—this racialized procedure makes itself felt and knowable in the dense social fabric of the everyday. If the Black is in a structural position that delimits the impossibility of capacity, might we enjoin an analysis of the vocabulary of that impossibility itself? And since a “Blackening” receives intelligibility from the structural position of the Black, might we gain some productive understanding from a scrutiny of key discursive and material forms of “Blackening”? Was not Michael Brown “Blackened” in and through (and not only a priori to) his bodily encounter with state violence? Given my ongoing scholarly interest in the Zombie, I am willing to concede that an Afro-Pessimist might claim that Brown was, at the moment he was shot to death, “the dead but sentient thing, the Black” struggling “to articulate in a world of living subjects.”28 This concession functions as an assertion: the Zombie is not wholly outside Western intelligibility; it haunts the nether regions between Human and Black. Its undead existence is material and social, and supplies some vital resources for inventing a new language—a grammar of (Black) suffering. Perhaps “there is no way to Africa through the Black,”29 but maybe there is a route through the Zombie. I have argued for such a project using the terminology of reanimating Zombie voices.30 Lastly, we might think of this gloomy predicament as a tenuous point of contact with Afro-Pessimism. Wilson's intellectual history provides the basis for such a conception. Communication Studies has been (and continues to anguish over the extent that it still is) in the structural position of inferior and alienated. There should be no shame in admitting that the discipline, in relation to both the Social Sciences and the Humanities, has been and is subject to being “Blackened.” Indeed, its originary moment, as I alluded to above, meant the rejection of a set of nationalistic proprietary politics that treated Speech teachers like disposable labor. By any reasonable measure, that structural positioning—despite the fact that the people involved were White—was a racialization, a “Blackening.” Let's be perfectly clear: there is no identification being made here with the fundamental antagonism associated with the Black. However, this racialized politics (among other political registers) might provide a new critical vocabulary for Communication scholars if we do the painful work of coming to grips with the discursive and material practices of “Blackening.” There are structures of different scales. Academic structural dynamics are not dissociated from the identity ideologies implicated in nationalism and cosmopolitanism, citizenship and exile, privilege and destitution, Whiteness and Blackness. Indeed, Wilderson's critique is launched from and resides within those very same structural dynamics. It seems to me then that, at the very least, our shared social suffering with Afro-Pessimism—although of vastly different magnitudes and qualities—should be asserted as a mode of transnational fidelity.

#### And 4] No Social Death AND it doesn’t justify Afro-Pessimism – Patterson agrees w/ us.

Patterson 18 Orlando Patterson March 2018 “The Kerner Report on race, 50 years on” <https://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2018/03/harvard-professor-reflects-on-the-kerner-report-50-years-on/> (author of Slavery and Social Death (1982) John Cowles Professor of Sociology at Harvard University)//Re-cut by Elmer

GAZETTE: In 1968, the Kerner Report concluded that “the nation was moving toward two societies, one black, one white — separate and unequal.” What is your assessment of the situation 50 years later? PATTERSON: Since then, there have been very important changes, but also some disappointments. There is no doubt that in **the public sphere**, particularly in the political realm, there have been substantial improvements. A good example is the election of a black president, but we should see this simply as the result of major changes in our political system that allowed blacks to be elected as mayors, congressional and senatorial representatives, and the occasional governor in the past 50 years. The Obama election didn’t mark a post-racial era. That’s an exaggerated and absurd claim. It’s nonsense. We all know that the major disadvantages that African-Americans face have roots in their enslavement. For most of the time African-Americans have lived in this country, they have been viewed as the quintessential outsiders, as people who didn’t belong to the dominant political or moral community. That was reflected in the absence of blacks in important political positions but also in the national conversation, up to about the 1960s. That has changed completely. In addition to that, there are some **important economic changes**, and this shouldn’t be sniffed at. There is **a genuine black middle class**. Finally, there is also the strong influence of blacks in the **cultural life** of the country. But in spite of their presence in the public sphere, black Americans still remain quite segregated in their private lives. GAZETTE: What are the factors that allowed segregation to continue? Some experts argue that segregation is almost as bad as before, or perhaps even worse. PATTERSON: Here is the great irony: The highest levels of segregation are in the most liberal Northeastern states, including New York, which deems itself the pre-eminent liberal state. On the other hand, cities that have experienced the highest levels of integration are the new Sun Belt cities — Houston, for instance. Part of the reason is that in newer cities people don’t feel that they and their ancestors have been living there for generations. And outsiders are not seen as suspicious because everybody is an outsider in a new city. There have been some changes in education at the elite level. But by and large this has been a major area of disappointment. The number of black students in overwhelmingly majority-black schools is as great as it was when the report came out. That, of course, is related to housing segregation. Now, blacks can afford good schools if they can afford to live in places that have such schools. There was a time when they wouldn’t get in or were admitted in token numbers. But much of the progress has been at the upper-middle-class level. Those at the bottom, the black poor, are not seeing much change. In relative terms, the black poor may even be slightly worse off. They certainly are as segregated as they ever were, and the violence in the inner cities has increased substantially since the Kerner Report. GAZETTE: The report blamed “structural racism” created by “white institutions” and “white society” for the violence and the conditions of the ghettos and the inner cities. One of its recommendations was to improve the conditions of the ghettos or simply get rid of them. Why has it been hard to accomplish this? PATTERSON: There is evidence that indicates that the ghettos must go. But it’s important to know there is some ambivalence within the African-American community. For many, having a black community ensures black cultural and communal life, both of which could dissipate if blacks are integrated in the broader white community. I disagree. Ghettos never worked. When people say that black neighborhoods are needed for black culture to live on, I point to the Jews, because even as they integrated, they preserved their culture. All other groups in America recognize that staying clustered in ghettos is not good. That was true of Jews. It’s been true of Asians. That’s also true of Irish and Italians, and more recently it’s been true of Hispanics. There is a growing Hispanic middle class that is very integrated. I don’t see why black Americans can’t do the same. Researchers found that blacks who moved to better neighborhoods were better off than those who stayed in their neighborhoods with similar resources. GAZETTE: What other factors have prevented integration from happening? PATTERSON: There has always been right-wing and racist opposition to any government attempt at integration. There was already some hostility to the [federal government’s] Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing program in the late ’90s. But there is also the hypocrisy and the “not-in-my-backyard” view of many middle- and upper-middle-class people, including white liberals, who have strongly resisted attempts at building moderate-income and low-income housing in the suburbs. And finally, there is the reluctance of some black leaders to promote integration too vigorously because of the argument that we need black neighborhoods to preserve African-American traditions, racial pride, a sense of identity, as well as the political advantages of being clustered. But Martin Luther King Jr. strongly supported integration, and he referred to an integrated society as America’s beloved community. Between the right-wing opposition, the white liberal hypocrisy, and the ambivalence of black leaders, integration has faded away from the national agenda. But the main reason for the lack of integration is that blacks don’t have the income to integrate; they can’t afford to live in the suburbs or send their kids to private schools. Some can do it, and that’s some progress, but it’s not enough. GAZETTE: Some are saying it’s time for a new report on the racial divide in the U.S. Do we need a new version of the Kerner Report? PATTERSON: It can do no harm, but I don’t think it would be effective. Bill Clinton tried a National Conversation on Race, and it didn’t lead to much. What I think is more important is that the leadership within both the black and the liberal communities work together to improve the situation in the inner cities. Right now, people are fully aware of the despair and pessimism that exist in the black community, especially in regard to black youth, police brutality, black unemployment, and mass incarceration, which is an abomination. One in three black youth is likely to risk imprisonment. That’s an abomination for all Americans. We know what the solutions are: integration, education, and decent jobs. Whether we need another commission to say that again, I don’t think so. There has to be a joint effort of all communities and a massive infusion of support at the local, state, and federal level to provide better education in the inner cities because this goes beyond providing jobs. The jobs are not coming back even for white people in the Midlands, and I don’t expect them to come back in the inner cities. GAZETTE: Finally, how relevant is the Kerner Report in the era of Black Lives Matter? PATTERSON: We’re going through a period of extreme despair about the situation of African-Americans. The most extreme form of this despair is a movement called Afro-pessimism, which holds that black Americans are still viewed as they were viewed in the slavery days as different, inferior, and as outsiders. I find myself in an odd situation because the Afro-pessimists draw heavily on one of my books, “Slavery and Social Death,” which is ironic, because I’m not a pessimist. I don’t think we’re in a situation of social death, because one of the elements of social death is that you’re not recognized as **an integral member of the civic community**, the public sphere, and we certainly are, on the political and cultural levels. And we’re very integrated in the military, which is the quintessence of what defines who belongs. The Afro-pessimists are right, though, to point to persisting segregation in the private sphere. When the report came out, it was a period of turmoil. It was one of those times when people felt that civilization was on the brink of collapse. In a way, what is happening now is similar to what happened then. And like in the past, the right and the left are at loggerheads about which direction to take. People on the right view behavior as the reason for poverty and crime, while liberals point to structural factors, as well as racism. My take is that the problems of black America go back several centuries. The state sanctioned both slavery and Jim Crow after Reconstruction as a form of neo-slavery. When slavery was finally abolished in 1865, it ended the legal capacity of one person to own another, but the culture of slavery and the set of institutions that were built up to support that system persisted. The state also legally sanctioned and economically supported the postwar growth and segregation of the suburbs. So I see this as a state-sanctioned, structurally created problem, and therefore the state must bear a major responsibility in correcting it. The question is how we move forward. In a fair world, the state will assume its responsibility and invest in a giant, massive infusion of support at the local, state, and federal levels to reverse the situation. Maybe, on second thought, we do need another report to alert people to the fact that the level of segregation is as great as it ever was.

#### 5] No Natal Alienation

Taylor 13, Terrell Anderson. Optimism and Pessimism in Twentieth Century African American Literature. Diss. Georgetown University, 2013. //Elmer

Unlike Wilderson and Patterson, West argues that black culture exists, and that it has served vital purposes. He argues **against the thesis of natal alienation** by explaining that African Americans have maintained certain African cultural features, specifically "kinetic orality, passionate physicality, improvisational intellectuality, and combative spirituality" ("Black Strivings" 80). While the ur-text of black culture may not be a tangible text but a guttural cry (a reference possibly drawn from the work Aime Cesaire), West argues that black culture, at its best, transfigures and transforms that cry into an "existential arsenal" that simultaneously expresses "the profoundly tragicomic character of black life" and generates "creative ways of fashioning power and strength..." ("Black Strivings" 81-82). West contends that black culture generates community, agency, and identity in a society that would deny African Americans these anchors of humanity. West finds examples of these cultural moments and practices within the arts, music, and especially literature.

### 1NC – AT: Pre-empts

#### They’ll say we dropped an ontology claim – this answers all of them.

#### Materiality – Don’t let theory be the enemy of material improvements – the end of the world is the telos of our politics but keeping people alive in the interim is key to that

Frank B. Wilderson 16, it’s Wilderson, “‘The Inside-Outside of Civil Society’: An Interview with Frank B. Wilderson, III”, https://www.academia.edu/26032053/\_The\_Inside-Outside\_of\_Civil\_Society\_An\_Interview\_with\_Frank\_B.\_Wilderson\_III

So that’s a hurdle that we have to overcome. You know, I’ve been doing political education workshops for Black Lives Matter in New York and Los Angeles, and probably will do more in Chicago. And what I hope to have people do workshop exercises around is this concept that I have called “Two Trains Running (Side by Side).” By that I mean, you can do your political organizing that will help us get relief from police brutality right now. We need that. We need that. But that work that we do should be seen as puny in terms of its philosophical and theoretical orientation so that **we can educate ourselves politically to be against the police as an institution** and against the United States as a country, even while we are working to reform police practices, because we do not have the strength right now that we had in the 1960s and 1970s to act in the way the Black Liberation Army did, or Baader-Meinhof, we do not have the strength to act in the revolutionary mode, but that lack of strength, that lack of capacity, should not contaminate our orientation. We should not feel that we have to accept the existence of police even if we’re working in reformist measures politically. Hopefully this idea of two trains running will pick up. Black Lives Matter has done a great job in opening up a new Black political organizing space. That’s great. Now let’s use that space for an educational project that is soundly anti-American, and soundly anti-police even if tactically, we have to work for police reforms.

#### The aff does nothing – isn’t that the whole point of their theory?

Ford and Brown 21 [Derek R. Ford (assistant professor of education studies at DePauw University, where he teaches and researches at the nexus of pedagogy and political movements. He’s written six books, the latest of which is Marxism, Pedagogy, and the General Intellect: Beyond the Knowledge Economy (2021). He’s also the lead editor of Liberation School’s “Reading Capital with Comrades ” podcast series) and Nino Brown (public school educator and labor activist in Boston. He is also an organizer with the ANSWER coalition, the Jericho Movement and the Boston Liberation Center. He’s a member of the Liberation School Collective and is an editor of the forthcoming book on Marxist pedagogy, Revolutionary Education: Theory and Practice for Socialist Organizers (2021). “Teaching politically and the problem of Afropessimism”. Monthly Review. Oct 05, 2021. Accessed 11/29/21. <https://mronline.org/2021/10/05/teaching-politically-and-the-problem-of-afropessimism/> //Xu + Elmer]

* APess is Eurocentric
* Its ahistorical and tied to material instances of exploitation
* Marx is historically good at antiracist organizing – advocated for abolitionists
* They can’t organize cuz everything is static – called protesters against Condaleeza Rice anti-Black
* They cause fracturing and infighting – Latinx fighting immigration based oppression
* Get coopted cuz no organizing=no political investigation

We and our students want radical transformation, and so many often jump to the latest and seemingly most radical sounding phrases, slogans, and theories. In education, as in so many other disciplines, one of the increasingly dominant phrases is “anti-Blackness” and the theory of Afropessimism. The two foundational theorists here are Frank Wilderson and Jared Sexton. For Wilderson, Afro-pessimism contends that “Blackness cannot be separated from slavery,” and that “the Slave’s relationship to violence is open-ended, gratuitous, without reason or constraint,” whereas “the human’s relationship to violence is always contingent.”3 There are crucial problems with this framework that make it perfectly acceptable to capitalism and perfectly antithetical to those who want to change the world. For one, they are completely Eurocentric in that Africa and the African diaspora are flattened into “Blackness” as a condition of the “human.” As Greg Thomas notes, this is “the [B]lackness and humanism of white Americanism, specifically and restrictively, an isolationist or exceptionalist Americanism.”4 In other words, Afropessimism takes aim at a civil society and takes refuge in a Blackness that are both uniquely American. The U.S. historical and political experience is transformed into a transcendent, static, and universal ontological status or structure. More specifically, the theories of academics in highly prestigious and exclusive institutions in the U.S. are presented as ahistorical and global realities. As identities, Black and Blackness are, in the U.S., fairly recent developments. The earliest recorded appearances are in Richard Wright’s 1954, Black Power and in 1966 as the first words spoken by Black Panther Stokely Carmichael when he left his jail cell after imprisonment for registering voters. White and whiteness are older but still relatively recent. Theodore Allen writes that he “found no instance of the official use of the word ‘white’ as a token of social status before its appearance in a Virginia law passed in 1691, referring to ‘English or other white women.’”5 The point here, as Eugene Puryear observes, “is that the ideology of white supremacy emerged not because of timeless antagonisms based on phenotype differences, but in a precise historical context related to the development of racial slavery.”6 This is precisely the historical context that Afropessimism erases and precisely the phenotypes they use to define Blackness. Afropessimism addresses an apparent radical omission in the primary theory that oppressed people have utilized for liberation: Marxism. Wilderson’s work, however, is based on a fundamental misreading of Marxism, such as his contention that in “Marxist discourse” (whatever that is) “racism is read off the base, as it were, as being derivative of political economy.”7 To be sure, there’s an unfortunate history of some Marxist groupings asserting “class first” politics, but Marx and Engels, and Lenin, together with the history of the international communist movement, always asserted the primacy of race. Marx’s theory of class was a theory of race and colonialism, as was his communist organizing. As a historical-materialist, Marx understood that the base and superstructure of society change over time and are context-dependent. Neither the base nor superstructure are unified, static, or ahistorical. The relations of production in the U.S. are neither unified nor even strictly economic in the sense that they’re structured and divided by hierarchies of race, nationality, gender, dis/ability, sexuality, and other divisions. In an 1894 letter, Engels clarifies yet again the base-superstructure model, what it entails, how it works, and exactly what it’s supposed to do. First, he says that “economic conditions… ultimately determines historical development. But race itself is an economic factor.”8 Marx not only supported anti-colonial uprisings in India and China but even said that they might ignite the revolution in Britain. “It may seem a very strange, and very paradoxical assertion,” Marx wrote about the 1850-53 Taiping Rebellion in China, “that the next uprising of the people of Europe, and their next movement for republican freedom and economy of government, may depend more probably on what is now passing in the Celestial Empire.”9 Marx fought ruthlessly against racism and national chauvinism, particularly as he experienced the deep-seated racism of English workers against the Irish. He “argued that an English workers’ party, representing workers from an oppressor nation, had the duty to support an oppressed nation’s self-determination and independence” and that “English workers could never attain liberation as long as the Irish continued to be oppressed.”10 He recognized that the fate of Black slaves, Black workers, and white workers were bound together when he wrote in Capital that “Labour cannot emancipate itself in the white skin where in the [B]lack it is branded.”11 Marx even organized workers to support the abolitionist struggle by galvanizing them to oppose a British intervention in the U.S. Civil War on behalf of the slaveocracy, an intervention that, because the British had the largest Navy in the world, could have altered the war drastically.12 Perhaps the real problem is that Marx treats race as a dynamic and contingent social production rather than a fixed and abstract ontological category. Black people face particular forms of oppression in the U.S. and elsewhere, as do other oppressed and exploited peoples. These change over time and are in a dialectical relationship with the overal social totality. Iyko Day got it right by equating economic reductionism to Afro-pessimism, insofar as it “frames racial slavery as a base for a colonial superstructure” and “fails to take into account the dialectics of settler colonial capitalism.”13 Why the neoliberal university loves Afropessimism The reason anti-Blackness critique is welcome in schools is because it is devoid of praxis and politics, or, to be more precise, because it celebrates its lack of politics. The impossibility of praxis and the rejection of organizing are fundamental tenets for two reasons. The first is that there is no answer to the question “what is to be done?” and the second is that the mass movements necessary for transformation are “from the jump, an anti-black formation,” as Wilderson told IMIXWHATILIKE.14 Of course, the only thing to do is to condemn every attempt at fighting oppression and improving material conditions. For example, when a student group at one of our schools staged a protest when Condoleeza Rice came to speak, they were denounced as “anti-Black.” There was no political criteria for such a denouncement, no defense of Rice, and likely no knowledge of the reasons behind the protest. It didn’t matter that Rice was a key figure of the white supremacist imperialist power structure, or that she played a major role in the murder of hundreds of thousands of Iraqis, the torture of thousands of Arab and African people. Examples of “anti-Blackness” that often come up in organizing are that non-Black people of color are to be met with suspicion when organizing on issues that sharply affect Black people. One such issue is immigration. In the struggle for immigrant rights, which is often overcoded as a “Latinx” issue, some Black activists and organizers point to the fact that 44% of those caged by ICE, for example, are Haitians. Instead of directing their ire towards the racist state that holds many Black immigrants in horrendous conditions, the focus then becomes the irrevocable anti-Blackness that exists in Latinx communities. Ideologies like Afro Pessimism have working class people of color (Black people included) fighting amongst each other, with the same framework as liberal identity politics. They both reduce solidarity to checking one’s privilege and fashioning oneself as the consummate ally of Black people and their liberation. So, instead of building a united front against the racist state, the lack of corporate/mainstream media focus on the fact that there are many Black immigrants, and immigration is a “Black issue” unnecessarily shifts attention to other workers who are subjected to the same “anti-Black” ideology of the ruling class and it’s media apparatuses. Instead of calling out the “Latinx community” for their “anti-Blackness” a revolutionary perspective frames the issue as not one stemming from any said community, but from the ruling class which oppresses the vast majority of immigrants in this country. Capital in these instances are let off the hook. The problem is no longer that the ruling class owns the means of production and thus the means of ideological production that reinforce anti-working class ideologies such as racism. The problem is the “anti-Blackness”–and the often posited “inherent” anti-Blackness–of non-Black communities. It’s a structural feature of society, but apparently one that can’t be changed. As a result, there’s no need to do anything except critique. No wonder, then, that Afropessimism is so welcome in the neoliberal university and the increasingly corporatized public school system in the U.S. It’s incredibly easy to call something anti-Black, to condemn anti-Blackness, and to play more-radical-than-thou. It’s more than easy, it’s what academia is about. Moreover, and this is related to the Rice protest mentioned earlier, when “Black faces” do appear in “high places,” they’re immunized from any possible critique from any group that isn’t Black (enough). It doesn’t matter if the head of a school, corporation, or any other entity has the same politics as the imperialist and racist power structure, because they’re black and so to critique or challenge them would be an act of anti-Blackness. This last reason is why white people love Afropessimism so much. The vague calls to “follow Black people” not only fulfill racist tropes that all Black people are the same (in, for example, their unruliness and “threat” to society) but moreover let white people off the hook for doing any real political investigation and work. The real response to “Follow Black people” is: “Which Black people?” Should Derek follow his comrade Nino or John McWhorter? Should he go to the police protest organized by the local Black Lives Matter group or the one organized by the local Congress of Racial Equality? Should he get his racial politics from Barack Obama or Glen Ford? He certainly shouldn’t get his politics–or take his lessons in class struggle–from today’s Afropessimists. None of this is to devalue Black leadership in the Black liberation movement, to be clear. Black people have and will lead the Black struggle and the broader class struggle. Nor is it to claim that random white people should show up to a Black Lives Matter protest and grab the microphone. Then again, how much of a problem is that really? Shouldn’t we forget the myth that we can learn all the proper rules before we struggle and instead just go out and struggle? And as we struggle, be conscientious of our actions and how they could be perceived; know that we’ll make mistakes and own up to them; and most importantly build with those whom this racist society has segregated us from so we can unite against a common enemy. Black people will lead the Black struggle and the class struggle. So too will Asian Americans, Indigenous people, and Latino/a/xs. So too will the child of an African immigrant and a Filipino domestic worker. So too will some white people. The key ingredients are unity, political clarity, and strategic proficiency. Such a recipe entails a necessary risk in that, first, politics are divisive and draw lines between friends and enemies and that, second, achieving unity and strategic proficiency takes hard work without any guarantees of success. Educators who are or want to be radical, however, have no choice but to accept this risk. We need to be rooted in movements and resist incorporation into neoliberal structures, refusing to allow them to guide our political decisions. Only if we have hope and faith in the power of the masses to change the world does it make sense to struggle at all. We choose to struggle! And we hope our students do too.