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#### We stole your aff – come and get it

**Moten and Harney 04.** Fred Moten and Stefano Harney, The University and the Undercommons, SEVEN THESES Social Text 79, Vol. 22, No. 2, Summer 2004. Copyright © 2004 by Duke University Press  
  
“To the university I’ll steal, and there I’l l steal,” t o borrow from Pistol at the end of Henry V, as he would surely borrow from us. **This is the only possible relationship to the American university today.** This may be true of universities everywhere. It may have to be true of the university in general. But certainly, this much is true in the United States: **it cannot be denied that the university is a place of refuge, and it cannot be accepted that the university is a place of enlightenment**. In the face of these conditions **one can only** sneak into the university **and** steal what one can. To abuse its hospitality**, to spite its mission, to join its refugee colony, its gypsy encampment, to be in but not of—this is the path of the subversive intellectual in the modern university**. Worry about the university. This is the injunction today in the United States, one with a long history. Call for its restoration like Harold Bloom or Stanley Fish or Gerald Graff. Call for its reform like Derek Bok or Bill Readings or Cary Nelson. Call out to it as it calls to you. **But for the** subversive intellectual**, all of this goes on upstairs, in polite company, among the rational men**. After all, **the subversive intellectual** came under false pretenses**, with** bad documents**,** out of love. **Her labor is as necessary as it is unwelcome**. The university needs what she bears but cannot bear what she brings. And on top of all that, she disappears. **She disappears into the underground, the downlow lowdown maroon community of the university, into the Undercommons of Enlightenment, where the work gets done, where the work gets subverted, where the revolution is still black, still strong**. What is that work and what is its social capacity for both reproducing the university and producing fugitivity? If one were to say **teaching**, one **would be performing the work of the university**. Teaching **is merely a** profession **and** an operation **of what Jacques Derrida calls** the **onto-**/auto-encyclopedic **circle of the Universitas**. But **it is useful to invoke this operation to glimpse the hole in the fence where labor enters, to glimpse its hiring hall, its night quarters**. **The university needs teaching labor, despite itself, or as itself, self-identical with and thereby** erased by it. It is not teaching then that holds this social capacity, but something that produces the not visible other side of teaching, a thinking through the skin of teaching toward a collective orientation to the knowledge object as future project, and a commitment to what we want to call the prophetic organization. But **it is teaching that brings us in**. Before there are grants, research, conferences, books, and journals there is the experience of being taught and of teaching. Before the research post with no teaching, before the graduate students to mark the exams, before the string of sabbaticals, before the permanent reduction in teaching load, the appointment to run the Center, the consignment of pedagogy to a discipline called education, before the course designed to be a new book, teaching happened. **The moment of teaching for food is therefore often mistakenly taken to be a stage, as if eventually, one should not teach for food**. If the stage persists, there is a social pathology in the university. But **if the teaching is successfully passed on, the stage is surpassed, and teaching is consigned to those who are known to remain in the stage, the sociopathological labor of the university**. Kant interestingly calls such a stage “self-incurred minority.” He tries to contrast it with having the “determination and courage to use one’s intelligence without being guided by another.” “Have the courage to use your own intelligence.” **But what would it mean if** teaching or rather what we might call “**the** beyond of teaching**” is precisely what one is asked to get beyond, to stop taking sustenance**? **And what of those minorities who refuse, the tribe of moles who will not come back from beyond2 (that which is beyond “the beyond of teaching”), as if** they will not be subjects**, as if** they want to think as objects**, as** minority? Certainly, **the perfect subjects of communication, those successfully beyond teaching, will see them as waste**. But **their collective labor will always call into question** who truly is taking the orders of the Enlightenment. The waste lives for those moments 102 Moten/Harneybeyond2 teaching when you give away the unexpected beautiful phrase— unexpected, no one has asked, beautiful, it will never come back. Is being the biopower of the Enlightenment truly better than this? Perhaps **the biopower of the Enlightenment know this, or perhaps it is just reacting to the objecthood of this labor as it must**. But **even as it depends on these moles, these refugees, they will call them uncollegial, impractical, naive, unprofessional**. And one may be given one last chance to be pragmatic—why steal when one can have it all, they will ask. But **if one hides from this interpellation, neither agrees nor disagrees but goes with hands full into the underground of the university, into the Undercommons—this will be** regarded as theft**, as a** criminal act. And **it is at the same time,** the only possible act. **In that Undercommons of the university one can see that it is not a matter of teaching versus research or even the beyond of teaching versus the individualization of research. To enter this space is to** inhabit the ruptural **and enraptured disclosure of the commons that fugitive enlightenment enacts,** the criminal**,** matricidal**,** queer**, in the cistern,** on the stroll of the stolen life**, the life stolen by enlightenment and** stolen back**, where the commons give refuge, where the refuge gives commons**. What the beyond2 of teaching is really about is not finishing oneself, not passing, not completing; **it’s about** allowing subjectivity to be unlawfully overcome by others**, a radical passion and passivity such that one becomes unfit for subjection, because one does not possess the kind of agency that can hold the regulatory forces of subjecthood, and one cannot initiate the auto-interpellative torque that biopower subjection requires and rewards. It is not so much the teaching as it is the prophecy in the organization of the act of teaching**.
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#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose affirmative frameworks, advocacy texts, and advantage areas thirty minutes before round if they haven’t read the affirmative before

#### Violation: They didn’t tell us the fwk or advantage area --

Graphical user interface, text, application, email

Description automatically generated

#### Standards:

#### 1] Clash- Not disclosing incentivizes surprise tactics and poorly refined positions that rely on artificial and vague negative engagement to win debates. Their interpretation discourages third- and fourth-line testing by limiting the amount of time we have to prepare and forcing us to enter the debate with zero idea of what the affirmative is. Negatives are forced to rely on generics instead of smart contextual strategies destroying nuanced argumentation.

#### 2] Shiftiness- Not knowing enough about the affirmative coming into round incentivizes 1ar shiftiness about what the aff is and what their framework/advocacy entails. That means even if we could read generics or find prep, they’d just find ways to recontextualize their obscure advocacy in the 1ar.

#### I don’t even think this is a new aff – not sending the speech doc is an independent voter cuz it violates open source which is not reciprocal and skews pre-round prep

#### 1) Procedural fairness is the ONLY thing your ballot can resolve – redistributing wins towards them doesn’t remedy the structural oppression they mention which means you as the judge should aim for a procedurally balanced playing field

#### 2) Fairness constitutive of debate – constitutive rules OW because they are functionally the same as rules such as speech times and should be treated with the same respect

#### 3) Irreversibility – education can be gained in other portions of the debate, read articles out of round, go to camp, but fairness disadvantages are permanent

#### 4) Presumption that all arguments is evaluated first proves that fairness must come first

#### 5) Any theory of oppression proves the authority of fairness – unequal opportunity and arbitrary discrimination is bad in the RW and proves fairness is a side-constraint to deliberation

#### 6) Fairness is a precondition to solvency to the aff because there needs to be equal deliberation – means the theory shell comes lexically prior

#### CI – a) brightlines are arbitrary and self-serving which doesn’t set good norms b) it collapses since weighing between brightlines rely on offense defense

#### Neg theory is drop the debater – a) Prep skew – infinite prep means they frontline every shell enough to be efficient at DA and skew substance enough b) 1AR Flex –you moot 6 min of my offense and restart on unpredictable layers while kicking the args.

#### No rvi

#### [a] Baiting—they’ll bait the theory debate and prep it out—justifies infinite abuse since they’ll get away with unacceptable practices

#### [b] 1AR all-outs—they’ll collapse entirely to theory which crowds out substance and kills education.

#### [c] Chilling effect—people will be scared to read theory since they can lose off of it, so no one will check abuse.

#### [d] Norm—I shouldn’t be forced to keep advocating for a bad norm if I realize it’s bad in the middle of the round.

#### [E] Illogical—doesn’t make sense to win just for being fair.

#### Neg abuse outweighs Aff abuse – 1] Infinite prep time before round to frontline 2] 2AR judge psychology and 1st and last speech 3] Infinite perms and uplayering in the 1AR.

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier.
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#### The role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement –

#### A~ anything else moots 7 minutes of the NC – their framing collapses since you must say it is true that their theory of power is better than another before you adopt it.

#### B~ The ballot says vote aff or neg based on a topic – five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true so it's constitutive and jurisdictional. I denied the truth of the resolution by disagreeing with the aff which means I've met my burden.

#### C~ it’s the most logical since you don’t say vote for the player who shoots the most 3 points, the better player wins since debate is a game with rules given by how there’s a winner and loser. Answers collapse to truth testing since they require truth value i.e. truth testing is false requires proving that it is true that truth testing is false. Inclusion is a fallacy of origin because just because something is a prerequisite doesn’t make it more important

#### D~ Nothing leaves this round other than the result on the ballot which means even if there is a higher purpose, it doesn’t change anything, and you should just write whatever is important on the ballot and vote for me.

#### E~ ROBs that aren’t phrased as binaries maximize leeway for interpretation as to who is winning offense. Scalar framing mechanisms necessitate that the judge has to intervene to see who is closest at solving a problem.

#### F~ Other ROBs open the door for personal lives of debaters to factor into decisions and compare who is more oppressed which causes violence in a space where some people go to escape

#### 1] the[[3]](#footnote-3) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but appropriation isn’t a disease

#### 2] appropriation[[4]](#footnote-4) is “a sum of money or total of assets devoted to a special purpose” but the rez doesn’t spec a purpose.

#### 3] of[[5]](#footnote-5) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 4] outer[[6]](#footnote-6) is “being away from a center” but the rez doesn’t have a center

#### 5] space[[7]](#footnote-7) is “an area rented or sold as business premises” but there aren’t premises

#### 6] by[[8]](#footnote-8) is “so as to go past” but there’s nothing to do so

#### 7] private[[9]](#footnote-9) is “a soldier of the lowest rank, in particular an enlisted person in the US Army or Marine Corps ranking below private first class” but the rez doesn’t talk about the military

#### 8] entities[[10]](#footnote-10) are “an organization (such as a business or governmental unit) that has an identity separate from those of its members” but the rez doesn’t spec the members

External worlds

Bonini
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#### Interpretation: The aff must explicitly specify a comprehensive advocacy text in the 1AC where they clarify how their offense links back to the role of the ballot, is it post-fiat offense or pre-fiat offense and a clear explanation of the advocacy’s actor, action and object

#### Violation: They didn’t

#### Standards:

#### 1. Engagement – Knowing their advocacy is a prerequisite to making meaningful arguments, so its impossible to engage the aff. Our interp ensures that I read something relevant to your method, and knowing pre-fiat or post-fiat offense gives us a standard for what is relevant. This is true of kritikal affs since there is no norm on what “symbolic terrorism” is in the same way there is for what counts as a plan. Few impacts:

#### a) Education – When two ships pass in the night we don’t learn anything - This also guts novice inclusion because now they can never learn arguments in round.

#### b) Link turns the aff – Your impacts are premised on engaging with issues of oppression, but no one will take seriously a position that can’t be clashed with

#### c) Strategy Skew – You can recontextualize your advocacy to make up reasons why my links and offense don’t link in the 1AR

#### Framing: You can’t use the aff to exclude my shell. My shell simply constrains how you read your advocacy. My method is your advocacy with specification, so if I’m winning comparative offense, the shell outweighs even if method debates in general preclude theory.

## ON

A2 pp

#### Reject 1ar theory and 2ar weighing.

#### 7 - 6 time skew exacerbated by 2 to 1 speeches skew.

#### No 3nr, so 2ar gets to weigh however they want

#### Resolvability – 1. Judge has to intervene on whether the 2ar arguments are good enough.

=

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.google.com/search?q=the+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=the+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i64j69i61j69i60l2.1976j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <https://www.google.com/search?q=appropriation+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=appr&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i57j69i59l2j69i60l3.1218j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <https://www.google.com/search?q=of+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=of+definition&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j69i61l3.1473j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/outer> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. <https://www.google.com/search?q=space+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=space+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57.2076j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. <https://www.google.com/search?q=by+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=by+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60.1586j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. <https://www.google.com/search?q=private+definition&rlz=1C1CHBF_enUS877US877&oq=private+definition&aqs=chrome..69i57.1858j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/entity> //Xu [↑](#footnote-ref-10)