## 1

#### Interp: The affirmative may not garner offense external to the hypothetical implementation that the free press ought to prioritize objectivity over adovocacy

#### Resolved requires policy action

Louisiana State Legislature (<https://www.legis.la.gov/legis/Glossary.aspx>) Ngong

**Resolution**

**A legislative instrument** that generally is **used for** making declarations, **stating policies**, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution **uses the term "resolved".** Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. (Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4 and Senate Rules 10.9, 13.5 and 15.1)

#### First is fairness – radically re-contextualizing the resolution lets them defend any method tangentially related to the topic, which erases neg ground via perms and renders research burdens untenable by eviscerating predictable limits.

#### Second is clash – picking any grounds for debate precludes the only common point of engagement, which obviates preround research and incentivizes retreat from controversy by eliminating any effective clash absence of constant refinement dooms revolutionary potential.

#### SSD solves – it preaches self-reflexive ideologies that are key to check back dogmatism – arbitrarily bracketing off topics of discussion creates a groupthink mentality that dooms Social Movements.

#### Infiltration is best for militant preservation.

Williams 70 [Robert F., civil rights leader, promoter of self defense, interviewed by The Black Scholar, “Interviews,” The Black Scholar Volume 1 Number 7]

Williams: It is erroneous to think that one can isolate oneself completely from institutions of a social and political system that exercises power over the environment in which he resides. Self-imposed and premature isolation, initiated by the oppressed against the organs of a tyrannical establishment, militates against revolutionary movements dedicated to radical change. It is a grave error for militant and just minded youth to reject struggle-serving opportunities to join the man's government services, police forces, peace corps and vital organs of the power structure. Militants should become acquainted with the methods of the oppressor. Meaningful change can be more thoroughly effectuated by militant pressure from within as well as without. We can obtain valuable know-how from the oppressor. Struggle is not all violence. Effective struggle requires tactics, plans, analysis and a highly sophisticated application of mental aptness. The forces of oppression and tyranny have perfected a highly articulate system of infiltration for undermining and frustrating the efforts of the oppressed in trying to upset the unjust status quo. To a great extent, the power structure keeps itself informed as to the revolutionary activity of freedom fighters. With the threat of extermination looming menacingly before black Americans, it is pressingly imperative that our people enter the vital organs of the establishment. Infiltrate the man's institutions.

#### Procedural fairness is a voter and outweighs a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is a game and equity is necessary to sustain the activity, b] probability – debate can’t alter subjectivity, but it can rectify skews

#### Prefer Competing Interpretations – reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom. This means reject Aff Impact Turns predicated on their theory since we weren’t able to adequately prepare for it.

#### No RVIs – A – Encourages theory baiting – outweighs because if the shell is frivolous, they can beat it quickly B – its illogical for you to win for proving you were fair – outweighs since logic is a litmus test for other arguments

#### DTD – it’s key to norm set and deter future abuse

#### No impact turns

#### 1] T is just an argument for why the aff is a bad idea, which is what every single negative position says—there’s nothing unique about T that causes violence but the cap k or case turns don’t

#### 2] we’re not imposing a norm or forcing you to do anything—our norm is open to contestation because you can just win that a counter-interpretation is a better norm

#### TVA – 1] Affirm being objective reporting that racism is bad

#### The TVA is terminal defense – proves compatibility of our Models AND Solvency Deficits proves ground for engagement.

## 2

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

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

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

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

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

## 4

#### Text – Endorse the Affirmative’s Method of an Echo but submit a Negative Ballot on Tabroom.

#### Spectacularizing Racial Violence under a Politics of Recognition feeds the University.

Hartman 97, Saidiya V. Scenes of subjection: Terror, slavery, and self-making in nineteenth-century America. Oxford University Press on Demand, 1997. (Professor of English at UC Berkley)//Elmer

By slipping into the black body and figuratively occupying the position of the enslaved, Rankin plays the role of captive attester and in so doing articulates the crisis of witnessing determined by the legal incapacity of slaves or free blacks to act as witnesses against whites. Since the veracity of black testimony is in doubt, the crimes of slavery must not only be confirmed by unquestionable authorities and other white observers but also must be made visible, whether by revealing the scarred back of the slave-in short, making the body speak-or **through authenticating devices**, or, better yet, by enabling reader and audience member to experience vicariously the “tragical scenes of cruelty. If Rankin as a consequence of his abolitionist sentiments was willing to occupy the “unmasterly” position, sentimentalism prescribed the terms of his identification with the enslaved, and the central term of this identification was suffering. For Rankin, the pageantry of the coffle and for others who also possessed antislavery sentiments, the attempt to understand the inner feelings of the enslaved only effaced the horrors of slavery and further circumscribed the captive’s presumably limited capacity for suffering. For many eyewitnesses of the coffle, the terrors of slavery were dissipated by song and violence was transformed into a display of agency and good cheer. What concerns me here is the spectacular nature of black suffering and, conversely, the dissimulation of suffering through spectacle. In one respect, the combination of imagined scenes of cruelty with those culled from unquestionable authority evidences the crisis of witnessing that results from the legal subjection of slaves. At the same time, the spectacular dimensions of slavery engender this crisis of witnessing as much as the repression of black testimony since to the degree that the body speaks it is made to speak the master’s truth and augments his power through the imposition and intensification of pain. All this is further complicated by the “half-articulate” and “incoherent song” that confounds the transparency of testimony and radically complicates the rendering of slavery. In light of these concerns, this chapter wrestles with the following questions: Does the extension of humanity to the enslaved ironically reinscribe their subjugated status? Do the figurative capacities of blackness enable white flights of fantasy while increasing the likelihood of the captive’s disappearance? Can the moral embrace of pain extricate itself from pleasures borne by subjection? In other words, does the scene of the tyrannized slave at the bloodstained gate delight the loathsome master and provide wholesome pleasures entangled with the wielding of power and the extraction of enjoyment? Does the captive’s dance allay grief or articulate the fraught, compromised, and impossible character of agency? Or does it exemplify the use of the body as an instrument against the self? The scenes of subjection considered here-the coerced spectacles orchestrated to encourage the trade in black flesh; scenes of torture and festivity; the tragedy of virtuous women and the antics of outrageous darkies-all turn upon the simulation of agency and the excesses of black enjoyment. The affiliation of performance and blackness can be attributed to the spectacularization of black pain and racist conceptions of Negro nature as carefree, infantile, hedonistic, and indifferent to suffering and to an interested misreading of the interdependence of labor and song common among the enslaved. The constitution of blackness as an abject and degraded condition and the fascination with the other’s enjoyment went hand in hand. Moreover, blacks were envisioned fundamentally as vehicles for white enjoyment, in all of its sundry and unspeakable expressions; this was as much the consequence of the chattel status of the captive as it was of the excess enjoyment imputed to the other, for those forced to dance on the decks of slave ships crossing the Middle Passage, step it up lively on the auction block, and amuse the master and his friends were seen as the purveyors of pleasure. The amazing popularity of the “darkies” of the minstrel stage must be considered in this light. Contending variants of racism, ranging from the proslavery plantation pastoralism to the romantic racialism of abolitionists, similarly constituted the African as childish, primitive, contented, and endowed with great mimetic capacities. Essentially, these characteristics defined the infamous and renowned Sambo. This history is of central importance when evaluating the politics of pleasure, the uses of slave property, the constitution of the subject, and the tactics of resistance. Indeed, the convergence of terror and enjoyment cannot be understood outside it. The pageantry of the coffle, stepping it up lively on the auction block, going before the master, and the blackface mask of minstrelsy and melodrama all evidenced the entanglements of terror and enjoyment. Above all, the simulated jollity and coerced festivity of the slave trade and the instrumental recreations of plantation management document the investment in and obsession with “black enjoyment” dissimulate the extreme violence of the institution and disavow the pain of captivity. Indeed, the transubstantiation of abjection into contentment suggested that the traumas of slavery were easily redressed and, likewise, the prevalence of black song confirmed blacks’ restricted sentience and immunity to sorrow. Most important, enjoyment defined the relation of the dominant race to the enslaved. In other words, the nefarious uses of chattel licensed by the legal and social relations of slavery articulated the nexus of pleasure and possession and bespoke the critical role of the diversion in securing the relations of bondage. In this way, enjoyment disclosed the sentiments and expectations of the “peculiar institution.

#### The University de-radicalizes Movements and is a site of Social Death.

OUCB 9 (The Necrosocial: Civic Life, Social Death, and the UC; http://anticapitalprojects.wordpress.com/2009/11/19/the-necrosocial/, 11/19 //shree)

He and his look forward to a reproduction of the logic of representative governance, the release valve of the university plunges us into an abyss where ideas are wisps of ether—that is, meaning is ripped from action.  Let’s talk about the fight endlessly, but always only in their managed form: to perpetually deliberate, the endless fleshing-out-of—when we push the boundaries of this form they are quick to reconfigure themselves to contain us: the chancellor’s congratulations, the reopening of the libraries, the managed general assembly—there is no fight against the administration here, only its own extension. Each day passes in this way, the administration on the look out to shape student discourse—it happens without pause, we don’t notice nor do we care to. It becomes banal, thoughtless.  So much so that we see we are accumulating days: one semester, two, how close to being this or that, how far?  This accumulation is our shared history.  This accumulation—every once in a while interrupted, violated by a riot, a wild protest, unforgettable fucking, the overwhelming joy of love, life shattering heartbreak—is a muted, but desirous life.  A dead but restless and desirous life. The university steals and homogenizes our time yes, our bank accounts also, but it also steals and homogenizes meaning.  As much as capital is invested in building a killing apparatus abroad, an incarceration apparatus in California, it is equally invested here in an apparatus for managing social death.  Social death is, of course, simply the power source, the generator, of civic life with its talk of reform, responsibility, unity.  A ‘life,’ then, which serves merely as the public relations mechanism for death: its garrulous slogans of freedom and democracy designed to obscure the shit and decay in which our feet are planted. Yes, the university is a graveyard, but it is also a factory: a factory of meaning which produces civic life and at the same time produces social death.  A factory which produces the illusion that meaning and reality can be separated; which everywhere reproduces the empty reactionary behavior of students based on the values of life (identity), liberty (electoral politics), and happiness (private property).  Everywhere the same whimsical ideas of the future. Everywhere democracy. Everywhere discourse to shape our desires and distress in a way acceptable to the electoral state, discourse designed to make our very moments here together into a set of legible and fruitless demands. Totally managed death. A machine for administering death, for the proliferation of technologies of death. As elsewhere, things rule. Dead objects rule. In this sense, it matters little what face one puts on the university—whether Yudof or some other lackey. These are merely the personifications of the rule of the dead, the pools of investments, the buildings, the flows of materials into and out of the physical space of the university—each one the product of some exploitation—which seek to absorb more of our work, more tuition, more energy. The university is a machine which wants to grow, to accumulate, to expand, to absorb more and more of the living into its peculiar and perverse machinery: high-tech research centers, new stadiums and office complexes. And at this critical juncture the only way it can continue to grow is by more intense exploitation, higher tuition, austerity measures for the departments that fail to pass the test of ‘relevancy.’ But the ‘irrelevant’ departments also have their place.  With their ‘pure’ motives of knowledge for its own sake, they perpetuate the blind inertia of meaning ostensibly detached from its social context.  As the university cultivates its cozy relationship with capital, war and power, these discourses and research programs play their own role, co-opting and containing radical potential.  And so we attend lecture after lecture about how ‘discourse’ produces ‘subjects,’ ignoring the most obvious fact that we ourselves are produced by this discourse about discourse which leaves us believing that it is only words which matter, words about words which matter.  The university gladly permits the precautionary lectures on biopower; on the production of race and gender; on the reification and the fetishization of commodities.  A taste of the poison serves well to inoculate us against any confrontational radicalism.  And all the while power weaves the invisible nets which contain and neutralize all thought and action, that bind revolution inside books, lecture halls.

## 5

#### Class war, not race war – the history of racist violence is grounded by the capitalist misinformation – ensures genocidal wars – vote neg for working class unity against the bourgeoisie.

ICC 9 (Insurgency Culture Collective, We are Class War Anarchists. We advocate the methods of Revolutionary Syndicalism to win the class war against the corruption of the rich and powerful. “Class War, Not Race War.” Posted on 4-26-09. <http://freepacifica.savegrassrootsradio.org/redblack/postersetc/classrace.pdf> //shree)

CLASS WAR - NOT RACE WAR

RACISM IS THE IDEOLOGY OF THE RICH

Racism plays a powerful role in dividing the working class. The ideology of race is used to justify imperialism, wars, and the racial division of labor. Racism promotes nationalism on the basis of ethnic identity. This only strengthens enthusiasm for participation in national armies. Those people within the Working Class who hold racist views are puppets of the rich.

Contrary to popular belief, racist ideology is actually derived from the Middle and Upper Classes where the real power to split and weaken the lower classes lies. This division occurs through discrimination in social services, education, immigration, and working conditions. The crucial part the Middle Class plays is to mimic mass culture which then becomes the “official” way of seeing the World. Within the “culture” specific racist and nationalistic ideas are promoted through the schools, media, church, etc.. This creates a constant flow of racist and nationalist ideas and disinformation, some of which is aimed at the rich themselves to explain why some must be at the “top” and others on the “bottom.” Most of this racist filth is received by the majority of the population, which is, of course, not in power. The rich actively promote nationalist and racist lies and always have. “Aryan Racialism” (White Supremacism) was first described in Europe by Count de Gobineau in his “Essay on the Inequalities of the Human Race.” Prior to World War I, rich Europeans created “chic” Aryan societies and established strong foundations for Hitler’s Nazi doctrine among the Upper and Middle Classes. In the United States, the Ku Klux Klan was originally a racist social club founded by seven southern aristocrats - J. Lester, J. Crowe, J. Kennedy, C. James, R. Reed, F. McCord, and later, Nathan Bedford Forest. Racial “Eugenics” (purifying the race by sterilizing persons claimed to be “inferior”) was pioneered by doctors in Lynchburg, Virginia and later copied by Nazi doctors in Germany. American racists like Henry Ford were quoted in Nazi newspapers. Ford got a Nazi medal for his racist writings.

DIVIDE AND RULE

Due to Capitalist-induced labor shortages in some nation-states, the exploitation of wage slaves from other countries becomes profitable. With immigration, our class receives different ‘ethnicities” and cultures. This does not cause a natural conflict. That is, until it is promoted as such by racist pundits. The rich have a lot to gain by taking advantage of our superficial differences. The racial division of labor is the most fundamental division in our class and causes further damage when members of our class follow these divisions. Sectors of the Working Class can become racist when they see themselves having artificial commonalities like “whiteness” with the ruling class rather than sticking with the real problems of their own class - the Working Class. They can also become confused by the efforts of the Ruling Class to trick us into competing with each other and be swayed by Ruling Class lies that people who are superficially different from us because of their skin color or culture are the cause of our economic problems instead of the REAL bastards who control the economy - the Capitalists and the Ruling Class! Their class identity becomes confused and is eventually replaced by a racial and/or national consciousness. This is a false allegiance which only serves to keep our class divided and enslaved to work and the government of the Rich.

Sickeningly, many of the most politically active Working Class youth are racist/Neo-Nazis. But along with being “white” most are also disaffected and dispossessed. These youths actually have more in common both materially and socially with the Blacks, Latinos, or Asians in their communities, whom they claim they hate so much, than with their rich “Anglo-Saxon” Ruling Class role models. The violent racism and vehement super-patriotism of these dupes helps to legitimize the Ruling Class’s suppression of our class. Why is racism so strong in many sections of our class? It is because the rich need it there. Well-placed racist filth distorts and counters a truly unified class consciousness. It has been in the best interest of our rulers to distort the development of class identity, pride and solidarity with their own racist/nationalist version of these notions.

THE HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF RACISM

Racism/Nationalism begins with the development of capitalist society. Nationalism played a key role in the development of capital during the last period of European feudalism and was fostered by the emerging Capitalist Class. The new class used the “flag of nationhood’ to organize the population against the old aristocracy. Populations were organized along “ethnic” and/or religious lines to create national armies which didn’t exist in Europe until after the Napoleonic Wars. National armies were unprecedented in that they involved millions of soldiers and overwhelmed the societies outside of Europe (through colonialism) which introduced an injection of wealth that spurred industrialization and the pre-eminence of capitalists over the aristocrats. Thus, it was by using the lie of Nationhood that the new capitalist class gained control of society.

When the new Working Class (rural peasants had become urban workers after 1850) realized that the “liberating” process of offing the old aristocracy was only a “coup d’ etat” by the new rich, Nationalism became a reactionary movement. It became a way of maintaining the loyalty of the rural and urban lower classes through patriotism. The position of the rich was strengthened, and loyalty was obtained by creating the illusion of people united by the common goals of their “nation.”

As capitalism developed and primary resources were depleted (e.g. land, timber, ores, etc.), competition between these new nation-states began. This led to a new and unprecedented era of imperialism and colonialism which was effected in order to gain more primary capital. These new colonial powers used xenophobia (fear of people of other “nationalities”) and religious bigotry to justify long and terrible wars for riches. Xenophobia was also used to excuse the exploitation and systematic genocide (extermination of an ethnic group) of colonized peoples as cheap and expendable sources of labor.

In early America, colonial elites like George Washington (who was the richest man in the U.S. at the time), feared concerted rebellion by English indentured servants (prisoners sold to rich colonial landowners as slaves), landless “Whites,” and African slaves (like the uprising which occurred in 1676 in Bacon’s Rebellion), who together made up more than 55% of the English colonial population. During the American Revolution, poor whites were kidnaped and forced to fight in the Aristocrats “Colonial Army,” but most battles were won by frontier militias fighting alongside the uniformed army made up of former European slaves who h8ad bought their freedom and settled on the frontier to get away from the class discrimination of elitist English land-owners. When the U.S. Constitution was written, James Madison was scared of the belief in social equality of Working Class Americans. He insisted on an electoral system which would forever insure that only the Rich controlled the government. The original Constitution denied freedom to non-whites and women. After the successful Haitian Revolution by African slaves against their French colonial rulers, American slave owners, fearful of the possibility of poor whites and African slaves staging a similar revolt in America, persuaded the Congress and President Jefferson to enact laws instituting specific legal divisions between “Whites” and “Blacks”: Only Whites could bear weapons, criminal punishments were made more severe for Blacks, inter-racial marriages were illegal, military and civilian life were racially segregated, and only whites could own land or be public officials.

After the revolution, rich land speculators began to eye native American nations in the Ohio River Valley. They used the American Army to coerce the native people into ceding Kentucky to them in exchange for peace then used the army to burn their farms before invading their land and exterminating them. In 1831, Congress passed the “Indian Removal Act” which stole all remaining native land east of the Mississippi, then used the Army to move the native people to present-day Oklahoma. Over ½ Million people died resisting the U.S. invasion or from starvation and exposure to harsh weather on what became known as the “Trail of Tears” to the U.S.- designated resettlement area. This genocide was the beginning of “resettlement” to reservations which was later copied by Italian Fascists, German Nazis and racist South Africans.

THE MYTH OF NATIONAL/RACIAL PRIDE

At the heart of racism/nationalism is the truly lies idea that “ethnic”, national, or religious populations have a common destiny, despite any and all obvious class tensions within these populations. Under this idea the Ruling Class invents a false unity among the Working, Middle and Ruling Classes based on either national or religious origins.

This fake identity creates a sense of pride , a sense of “achievement’ and a sense of “history.” The American identity is tied to a pride of “moral” superiority and the Capitalist domination of the Third World. The American Ruling Class used this pride of “moral” imperative to wage genocidal wars against the indigenous populations of an entire continent. This excuse has also been used to wage war and invade many other nations. This “pride” is all but impossible for many African, Native, Latino, or Asian Americans to feel. It is not meant for those people but it is meant for the White Ruling Class. National/Racial pride is singularly designed to manipulate the Working Class into national armies and to light wars overseas so one group of Capitalists can steal from another at our expense. The thoroughly repulsive idea of racist/nationalist solidarity is exercised through the practices of de facto racial discrimination which excludes and isolates people of color from certain areas of capitalist society: areas such as “decent” jobs, livable housing, and “good” schools, thereby forcing a sizable segment of the population into the dead end of petty crime and prisons, or an endless line of demeaning mind-numbing low-wage jobs. This practice further deepens the rifts within our class by creating an atmosphere of fear and suspicion between members of our class.

The power to discriminate lies almost entirely in the hands of the Upper Class and their vicious guard dogs, the State. The white Working Class does not have the power to discriminate, but, plays a part in justifying discrimination by doing such foolish things as excluding certain “ethnic” groups from workplace activities or by intimidating them within their communities. Racial violence and exclusion are the only elective discriminatory power Working Class racists have. Although this pales in comparison to the racist power of our rulers, it can still be a matter of life and death for Working Class people of color.

HOW RACIST LIES ARE SPREAD

Racist ideology gains mass appeal by pretending to be “common sense”, When racist lies becomes common sense, it then evolves into “unquestioned knowledge”, “taken for granted”, or “the truth.” The problem for the Ruling Class is that their “common sense” is totally contradicted by the reality of class society. Because of this, racism needs to be perpetually updated and put forward and reintroduced at every “opportune” time (such as when there is civil unrest in communities of color or “gang killings”). Today’s racist jargon tries to camouflage itself, even to the point of denying it is racist, putting it under the heading of just plain “common sense”, as a racist agitator like Rush Limbaugh would put it.

This “common sense” racism is a philosophy which relies heavily, if not entirely, on its gut-level, emotional impact. It relies heavily on FEAR, whether fear of the Black population or the consequences of a large and growing immigrant population. The use of fear as a basis of racism highlights the very nature of the problem of “common sense” racism. And that is this, fear makes people feel weak and insecure, and people of course will react negatively to negative emotion. This insecurity results in behavior between members of our class which cannot always be explained rationally. Thus playing on the fears of a segment of class also means playing fast and loose with the truth and twisting interpretations of events to fit a racist point of view.

Fear of the Black population and groups like Latinos who are stereotyped as “immigrants” has long been used to justify racism. The racist demagogues concentrate on differences of what THEY call “alien” cultures which are then compared against the supposedly “morally” superior “American Way.”

The promotion of this basic chauvinism along with the deliberate twisting of the cultures of people of color in a gross and alarmist way creates a negative feeling toward people of color. Many of the stereotypes thus created are used to sustain the myths about race. Many of the stereotypes at the forefront of the racist propaganda machine are ones that show a direst threat to “White” suburban tranquility, such as wanton, ultra-violence. During the 1960s drugs and crime were presented as synonymous with Black inner-city youth, although more drugs factually resided in the “White’ suburbs. The myth of violence is now ingrained in many “White” minds. This is one of the many ways that the Ruling Class promotes racist fear which of course leads to naked hostility and open hatred between large segments of our class. That is exactly what our rulers want!

SCAPEGOATING IMMIGRANTS

Another way the Ruling Class crushes the unity of the working class is to create direct competition between “native” and “immigrant” labor. They base this on the idea that native and immigrant or foreign-born workers have different economic positions within the society. In truth, immigrant workers are doubly exploited. As members of the Working Class they have both the worst jobs and highest unemployment rate. In fact, they make up a substrata of the Working Class due to the informal (but very real) racial divisions of labor. Racists flip this over and argue that immigrants and/or foreignborn people are taking our (“native”) jobs. They claim that unemployment within the Working Class is caused by competition from immigrants/foreign-born people rather than the Upper and Middle Classes who have the sole power to hire and fire. This scapegoating of immigrants conveniently removes Capitalists from responsibility for the failures of their system and for their own behavior. It places the blame on those who are least responsible. This is only a small example of the extent to which reality is distorted by racists. By scapegoating people of color for problems created by Capitalists and the Ruling Class, class anger at what are really CLASS issues is manipulated and presented to Working Class people as racism and racial issues.

Racism is nothing more than another filthy and vile product of Capitalism. Racism exists alongside nationalism to divide us from other members of the Working Class in our “communities” and around the World. Racism is subtly used to rationalize world-wide poverty and wars. Nationalism creates a phoney unity between class enemies at the expense of the unity and solidarity of the Working Class.

Anarchists advocate Working Class unity to destroy Racism, Nationalism, Capitalism, the Class System and the government of the Rich and build a society based on personal freedom, social equality, free association, mutual aid, cooperation, worker self-management of all work places and democratic self-government of all communities.

FIGHT THE RICH - NOT THE POOR!

NO WAR BUT THE CLASS WAR!

#### Capitalism causes massive violence and inevitable extinction – the fundamental task is developing tools for organization and tactics to bring about revolution.

Escalante 19 [Alyson, revolutionary Marxist (duh), philosophy at U of Oregon. 09/08/2019. “Truth and Practice: The Marxist Theory of Knowledge”. <https://failingthatinvent.home.blog/2019/09/08/truth-and-practic-the-marxist-theory-of-knowledge/>] Pat

The world we live in today is in a dire state. Climate destruction continues at a fast pace, and every with every passing day, capitalism proves itself to be incapable of addressing this. Capitalist production and its endless drive for resources to match artificial market demands has created a climate crisis that leaves us on the brink of potential extinction**.** Governments around the world are turning to far right and fascist leaders to assuage their fears of an uncertain future, and the most marginalized and oppressed suffer because of it. Fascism is on the rise, and history tells us very clearly what that can result in without opposition. The decaying US empire continues to lash out in violence across the globe in a desperate attempt to re-assert its power and hegemony. Whole countries are destroyed in its desperate bids for more fossil fuels. The world burns from America’s white phosphorus weaponry. The need for a revolutionary movement capable of replacing capitalism with something better has never been so clear. The choice between socialism or barbarism has never been so stark. More and more people are starting to realize that reform cannot save us, that capitalism and imperialism themselves are the problem, and that we must unite and band together to fight for a better world. The question then is: how will we know what strategies, what tactics, and what ideas to unite around? If the skeptics and postmodernists are correct that knowledge is always relative and localized, then we cannot built a global and universal strategy to unite around. If they are correct then we are doomed to small acts of localized or individual resistance in the face of apocalypse. To embrace such a vision of the world (with its accompanying epistemological skepticism) is to embrace defeat. The masses do not want to embrace defeat, they want to know how to fight back. Marxism can provide the tools necessary to engage in that fight. Marxism, with its self criticism and its insistence on incorporating the valuable ideas of its critics has created a means for unifying workers across the globe with anti-colonial and anti-imperialist struggles. The Marxist belief in the possibility of true ideas, tested and verified in practice, creates the possibility for unity on a global scale. The scientific status of Marxism means that as our climate changes, as our world looks more and more grim, Marxism will adapt through struggle and practice; it will provide us with the ideas and tools we need to fight and win. There will be no victory for the workers of the world without the ability to wield a revolutionary science. What is at stake in questions of Marxist epistemology is the very possibility of creating a philosophical and scientific basis for revolution. We must defend this possibility. We must defend the scientific status of Marxism, and must insist on the possibility of victory.

#### Undercommuning is not revolutionary but drives capital

Neary 12 (Mike, Professor Mike Neary, Dean of Teaching and Learning, Director of the Graduate School and Director of the Centre for Educational Research and Development, University of Lincoln, Brayford Pool, Lincoln LN6 7TS. Before taking up the role of Dean of Teaching and Learning at the University of Lincoln in 2007, Mike taught political sociology at the University of Warwick (1994–2007). Prior to becoming an academic, Mike worked in youth and community development in south London (1980–1994). “Student as producer: an institution of the common? Or how to recover communist/revolutionary science.” The Higher Education Academy, July, <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/assets/documents/disciplines/social-sciences/ELiSS0403A_Guest_paper.pdf> //shree)

This subversive aspect of Student as Producer is not only a function of Marxist social theory; it is the defining ethic of academic life and the experimental science on which it is based. These values and ethics have not had to be reinvented but are conjured out of the activities of academic workers at Lincoln and elsewhere: “the Undercommons”, some of whom have not yet abandoned the notion of revolution (Harney and Moten 2009): Maroon communities of composition teachers, mentorless graduate students, adjunct Marxist historians, or queer management professors, state college ethnic studies departments, closed down film programmes, visa-expired Yemeni student newspaper editors, historically black college sociologists and feminist engineers. And what will the university say of them? It will say they are unprofessional. How do those who exceed the profession, who exceed and by exceeding escape, how do those maroons, problematise themselves, problematise the university, force the university to consider them a problem, a danger? The Undercommons … are always at war, always in hiding. (Harney and Moten 2009: 149) The subversion starts with a negative critique of higher education based on the dysfunctionality of its core activities, teaching and research, where the priority and status given to research divides institutions, and sets staff and student against each other (Boyer 1990; Brew 2006) This negative critique forms the basis of Student as Producer’s attachment to the notion of research-engaged teaching (Jenkins and Healey 2009): reengineering the relationship between teaching and research so that undergraduates become part of the academic project of the university. This is how subversion works, by using the language and protocols of the enterprise university against itself. For example, employability is redefined by Student as Producer as the world of work, giving space for academics to engage in a critical debate about student unemployability, poverty and debt (Neary 2006). The debate about the student learning environment is framed around the politics of space and spatiality, the construction of democratic and horizontal spaces within which collaborations can multiply (Neary and Saunders 2010). Technologies for education at the University of Lincoln are imbued with the “hacker ethic” (Himanen 2001; Winn 2012) where “a new subjectivity is taking shape around a voluntarily entered, collective labour activity” (Soderburg 2008: 2) against the “boredom of commodified labour” (Soderburg 2008: 44) and “a gut reaction against the regularisation and intensification of work” (Soderburg 2008: 18). Hacking here becomes a practice of provocative emancipation (Soderburg 2008: 94) in which “struggle is carried out inside the enemy host and must therefore be subversive rather than confrontational in character” (Soderburg 2008: 134). Students are free to engage with Student as Producer in whatever ways suit their inclinations: as a standout item on a CV to gain an advantage in the job market (Student as Producer 2011), as a platform from which to influence HE policy at the national and international level (QAA 2012b), or as a radical critique on which to design alternative and experimental forms of higher learning (Alternative Art College 2012). While not all students appreciate the freedom that is on offer, Student as Producer can be most dynamic and effective when committed and dedicated staff work with this dissensus, in some cases to create an enriched “rhizomic” learning environment (Coley, Lockwood and O’Meara 2012). This subversive ethic and academic-valued approach is written into the bureaucratic framework for teaching and learning at the University of Lincoln, through its teaching and learning strategy, and in the documentation for staff and students that shapes the protocols and procedures for quality validation, monitoring and reporting procedures, including the Student as Producer user guide (http://studentasproducer.lincoln.ac.uk). The problem is how to maintain subversion in a context in which student as consumer is the operational imperative among providers of higher education. Part of the answer to that question lies in constantly radicalising the practice and principles of Student as Producer to avoid recuperation; this involves critically engaging with revolutionary ideas like Roggero’s institution of the common. Student as Producer: institution of the common. Student as Producer exists beyond the University of Lincoln, forming part of a worldwide movement of academic activism, including scholars and students, against the increasing corporatisation and privatisation, against fees and the deregulation of higher education (Neary 2012). Where these actions have been theorised, they are ripped from the pages of the most subversive authors of the 20th century, including Henri Lefebvre, Guy Debord, Raoul Vaniegem, now written up to coincide with contemporary events. These new subversive writings include the Invisible Committee’s (2009) The coming insurrection, Tiqqun’s (2010) Introduction to civil war, and Communiques from occupied California: After the fall is now (2010: http://afterthefallcommuniques.info/.). An important book to emerge in this moment is Giggi Roggero’s The production of living knowledge: the crisis of the university and the transformation of labor in Europe and North America, published in 2011. Roggero is a founding member of the Edu-factory Collective: As was the factory, so now is the university. Where once the factory was a paradigmatic site of struggle between workers and capitalists, so now the university is a key space of conflict, where the ownership of knowledge, the reproduction of the labour force, and the creation of social and cultural stratifications are all at stake. This is to say the university is not just another institution subject to sovereign and governmental controls, but a crucial site in which wider social struggles are won and lost. (Federici and Caffentzis 2007) The book is written through the prism of autonomist Marxism and postcolonial studies, incorporating Marxist and poststructuralist theory to recuperate the concept of ‘living labour’ as a key Marxist category (Read 2003). Living labour recognises the working class, in its various compositions (eg Black Power, the student and women’s movement) as capital’s autonomous radical subject and the counterpoint against which capital is forced to rearrange its own failed regimes of accumulation. In the post-second world war period these regimes include Keynesianism, monetarism and now neoliberalism, as a set of disastrous intellectual ideas and programmes for action (Clarke 1988). The key issue for Roggero, like Drucker, is to highlight the rise of knowledge, also known to Roggero as “cognitive capitalism”, and the “knowledge worker” as the new regime of production to reinvigorate capitalist accumulation. Whereas Drucker points to the inevitability of knowledge production for capitalism and the associated death of Marxism, Roggero argues that the university and the production of knowledge have become a battlefield over what he calls the production of “abstract knowledge”: knowledge for the capitalist market and the law of value (Roggero 2011: 6) against the production of living knowledge. At the centre of Roggero’s argument is the new institutional form by which living knowledge will be produced: the institution of the common. Key to Roggero’s formulation is the way in which he distinguishes the notion of “the commons” from that of “the common”: the former is “identified as something that exists in nature (water, earth, environment, territory, but also as well as information and knowledge)”; the latter is denaturalised, ie the outcome of an historical and social process: the crisis of capitalism, in which things, including knowledge, are common only because they are “embodied in living labour, its production and its struggles” (Roggero 2011: 8). In other words, “the common is the organization of something that did not exist beforehand, or the new composition of existing elements in a subversive social relationship” (Roggero 2011: 8). For Roggero, living knowledge is something that is constituted through class struggle, co-operation and radical practice. The purpose then is to turn the crisis of the university into a field of radical research in order to investigate and produce living knowledge: the institution of the common (Roggero 2011: 29). Roggero provides a practical method to go with this theoretical exposition. He refers to this method as “self-education” or “militant enquiry” or “co-research”: conricercia. This method is profoundly anthropomorphic grounded in the methods of anarchist sociology and “new anthropology” (Roggero 2011: 140), based on ethnography and ethnomethodology: “Co-research questions the borders between research and politics, knowledge and conflicts, university and social context, work and militancy” (Roggero 2011: 5). Roggero’s method is not to be confused with workers’ enquiry: knowledge gathered by sociologists to be revealed to workers so they can overcome false consciousness and advance their struggle (Wright 2002). Conricercia is fundamentally constitutive, where “the production of knowledge is immediately the production of subjectivity and the construction of organisation” (Roggero 2011: 138), bringing together intellectual and political action from the perspective of living knowledge and living labour as a form of revolutionary practice. The power of Roggero’s work is that it creates an inspirational, theoretically informed case study for workers and students protesting against austerity and precarity in higher education. However, its limits can detract from and undermine the revolutionary process it is attempting to support. Ironically, for a method that seeks to denaturalise the commons, the constitutive agent, living labour, appears ready made. However, labour is not an already existing autonomous radical subject; rather, labour has been fabricated by the social relations of capitalist production. Labour, as such, does not exist as but is constituted only as real abstraction (Dinerstein and Neary 2002). The consequences of this fetishising of labour have been argued persuasively elsewhere: at one extreme the privileging of labour as the affirmative subject leads to the prescription for a worker society in which preoccupation with work as the epitome of human sociability predominates; at another extreme, the privileging of labour underestimates the extent to which humanity has been subsumed by the capital relation (Postone 1996; Endnotes 2010). A full exposition of capitalist work, as well as its possible radical alternatives, requires a substantive elaboration of the social relations of labour in capitalism, which must include an enquiry into the real nature of labour and its relation to the natural world (Foster 2000). The separation of the natural from the social is characteristic of 20th century Marxism (Foster 2000; Burkett 1999; Smith 1990). In Roggero’s version of post-autonomia, Marxism is framed within a political economy of the social–human world, rather than a “political ecology” (Castree 2007; Gorz 1987) or a “strong historical materialism” (Foster 2000: 9). The power of a “strong historical materialism is that it does not impoverish its materialism by denying the natural-physical aspects of material existence” (Foster 2000: 9). The full power of Marxist science lies in a reinvigoration of nature as a significant contribution to value: “labour is the father of material wealth, the earth its mother” (Marx, quoted in Foster 2000: 168). As Marx discovered in his doctoral thesis on epicurian materialism, “Nothing comes from nothing” (Foster 2000: 176); and that the purpose of communist science is to recover the substance out of which everything is made so that it can be remade in a way that supports the struggle for life. Just as in the natural sciences in order to maintain and enhance the natural world it is important to understand its real nature. Hence Marx’s statement from his doctoral dissertation: “happiness lies also in knowledge of the meteors” (Marx’s doctoral dissertation, quoted in DeGolyer 1992: 125). For Marx, science is the relationship between the natural and the social world, the development of which is natural history (Foster 2000). Marx was clear that only when “science starts from nature is it real science” (Foster 2000: 77) and that human history was therefore “a real part of natural history … Natural science will in time subsume the science of man just as the science of man will subsume natural science: there will be one science” (Marx, quoted in Foster 2000: 77). This one science, or communism, does not rely on speculative or philosophical solutions, but is a scientific method of enquiry and reason based on an awareness of the historical development of humanity as the alienation from nature (Foster 2000: 114). This alienation can only be overcome through “the significance of revolutionary practical critical activity” (Marx’s theses on Feuerbach, quoted in Foster 2000: 112).

## Case

#### There is not a race war – singular isolated instances do not prove a universal structure.

Wilfred C. Reilly 20, PhD, associate professor of political science at Kentucky State University, “No, There Is No Coming Race War”, <https://www.commentarymagazine.com/articles/no-there-is-no-coming-race-war/> [note – he uses the term “blacks” to refer to Black people, and while normally this would be edited out, the author himself is Black, so we decided to leave the original syntax in]

The remarkable irony of the modern American conversation is that while race relations have empirically never been better, many members of different races are terrified of one another. Perceptions of crime are a primary source of this tension. The center-left mainstream media run stories almost daily about tough whites attacking blacks and other people of color for trivial reasons, while a substantial cottage industry on the far right focuses on sensational depictions of black crime. In reality, however, incidents like these, which make for almost weekly viral news stories, are quite rare; so, too, is serious interracial crime in general. According to the 2019 Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) crime report, blacks made up only 15 percent of those who criminally attacked whites in the United States in 2018. Whites attacked blacks even less often, 11 percent of the time. For good or ill, the person most likely to kill you remains your husband or wife, not an exotic stranger. It is well worth unpacking the actual U.S. national crime data as a means of tamping down tensions among countrymen. The media’s sensational fixation on interracial crime has grown steadily in recent years. A black friend has joked with me that 2018, in particular, was “the year of whites with crazy nicknames.” Major media outlets ran story after story about obnoxious Caucasians attacking blacks for the flimsiest of reasons. On June 29, 2018, “Pool Patrol Paula”—actually named Stephanie Sebby-Strempel—made headlines after allegedly shouting at and striking a pleasant young black man attempting to use a South Carolina public pool, telling him he didn’t belong in the water. When police officers attempted to arrest her for misdemeanor assault, she bit one of them. Sebby-Strempel did not police the waters alone. On July 5 of the same year, a man named Adam Bloom was dubbed “Pool Patrol PAUL” after getting into a heated argument with a black woman who was using his condo complex’s swimming facilities. When Bloom asked to see her resident ID, she replied: “This is textbook racial profiling.” Multiple officers had to be called in to resolve the situation. On Facebook, her video recording and breakdown of the incident went massively viral. On July 15, 2018—barely a week later—Chicago CVS manager Morry Matson got famous as “Coupon Carl,” following his decision to contact the police and accuse a black female customer of using a counterfeit coupon. The fact that Matson, a gay man, is not only himself a member of an “oppressed” minority group but also a leader of the moderate and all-LGBT Log Cabin Republicans did not suffice to save him from the scarlet “R” of alleged racism. He was fired days later, and the story became a cautionary tale for both blacks and whites. But the Queen of them all was BBQ Becky. On April 29, 2018, “Becky”—real name Jennifer Schulte—became internationally famous as a symbol of “the everyday racism black people face,” as USA Today put it, after she confronted a black family that was holding a cookout in a no-charcoal-grilling area of Oakland’s Lake Merritt. Schulte asked the family to leave, and they refused. The ensuing confrontation lasted several hours, during which family members accused Schulte of harassing them and several hostile park attendees followed her out of the park. Oakland Police eventually defused the situation, but a photograph of Schulte calling them on her cellphone trended online not long afterward and eventually became one of the most iconic memes of the past decade. Many laughed at the meme, but the legacy of incidents like these extends well beyond Internet in-jokes. According to Pew Social Trends’ analysis “Race in America 2019,” fully 71 percent of African Americans now see race relations as “generally bad,” and 56 percent think they have worsened under President Trump. It is impossible not to see epidemic media coverage of situations such as those mentioned above as a factor contributing to this malaise. While the mainstream media lean left and tend to focus their race-baiting on stories of white-on-black crime and harassment, a growing right-wing alternative media take the opposite tack, sensationalizing virtually every prominent story of black-on-white crime. The alt-right website American Renaissance literally maintains a “Black on White Crime Archive,” chock-full of stories such as “Anti-white Mob Cuts Off 18 Year Old’s Hand Following Road Rage” (this happened in the UK) and “The Porch Pirate of Potrero Hill: Inveterate Thief Blames Her Woes on Racism.” Similar content can be found at VDARE, World Net Daily, Info Wars, the Unz Review, the Stuff Black People Don’t Like blog, and a dozen similar outlets. Gonzo journalist Colin Flaherty runs an entire website devoted to stories about black-on-white crime. One tab on the site promises the “top 200 Black mob violence videos,” while another invites readers to “Make a Difference” by contacting Rush Limbaugh or Alex Jones and recommending Flaherty’s book on race-related crime. While content like this is generally at least somewhat less widely distributed than mainstream media stories about white rowdiness, this is not for want of trying. A quick Google search reveals that one of the most popular pieces ever to appear on Flaherty’s website is headlined: “Five Cases (of Black Crime) People Want on National TV.” Looking at today’s dueling headlines, it is tempting to ask: “So, do we have an epidemic of horrifically racist white-on-black crimes or an epidemic of brutish black-on-white crimes?” The answer is “neither.” Moreover, the statistics so thoroughly refute popular fear-mongering that Americans of all colors should take the media to task for the divisive false version of reality they so often present

#### The plan

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

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

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