### 1

#### Our Interpretation is the affirmative should instrumentally defend the resolution – hold the line, CX and the 1AC prove there’s no I-meet

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

Words & Phrases ’64

(Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition)

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

#### Recognition requires policy action.

Britannica. https://www.britannica.com/topic/international-law/States-in-international-law

Recognition is a process whereby certain facts are accepted and endowed with a certain legal status, such as statehood, sovereignty over newly acquired territory, or the international effects of the grant of nationality. The process of recognizing as a state a new entity that conforms with the criteria of statehood is a political one, each country deciding for itself whether to extend such acknowledgment. Normal sovereign and diplomatic immunities are generally extended only after a state’s executive authority has formally recognized another state (see diplomatic immunity). International recognition is important evidence that the factual criteria of statehood actually have been fulfilled. A large number of recognitions may buttress a claim to statehood even in circumstances where the conditions for statehood have been fulfilled imperfectly (e.g., Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1992). According to the “declaratory” theory of recognition, which is supported by international practice, the act of recognition signifies no more than the acceptance of an already-existing factual situation—i.e., conformity with the criteria of statehood. The “constitutive” theory, in contrast, contends that the act of recognition itself actually creates the state.

The purpose of any just government is to help protect people from unjust harm from other people.

#### That’s Richardson 20

J.J. Richardson, 20 [J.J. Richardson, (J.J. Richardson is a fiction writer of books)]. "Role of Just Government." 10-31-2020, Accessed 11-18-2021. https://www.jjrlore.com/post/role-of-just-government // duongie

#### 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

#### 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

#### Not specifying the actor and/or method of the aff is a voting issue - decimates core neg ground and nuanced method debates - Cross X is too late for the 1NC strat

### 2

#### The defense of the notion of self-care as political warfare establishes a particularly violent form of resilience that colludes with racial capitalism by taking for granted the “self” that is being cared for – this reifies a conception of selfhood as defined through one’s capacity for political productivity, which enables both the devaluation and hyper valuation of non-resilient and resilient Black women

* Bpp and National Welfare Rights Organization all prove how capatlist coopts their movemnts and use them to destbalzie ours

LET 13 (low end theory: a blog by a feminist studies & ethnic studies prof who’s chosen to traffic in a form of pseudonym to try and hold at a distance the impulse to write to accrue or to manage academic cultural capital, “On Audre Lorde’s Legacy and the “Self” of Self-Care, Part 2 of 3,” <http://www.lowendtheory.org/post/50428216600/on-audre-lordes-legacy-and-the-self-of>, [AB])

Mundane murderousness, slow death (which may in many cases not be slow at all), has taken institutional form in part as a consequence of the consolidation of health care as a for-profit industry that defines health as the capacity to work. “Health,” in this context, is measured by the health of racial capitalism. Such a definition means that being healthy is understood as having the capacity to optimize your ability to be exploited. No medical leave, then, for the English prof who’s battling cancer. No capacity, then, to decide for herself what her health needs are and to act on that decision—the social infrastructure of neoliberalism has already coded giving its workers that much freedom, that kind of autonomy, as an unaffordable extravagance.

Care as extravagance. Historically speaking, it is here, in the Reagan era, that the “self” of self-care emerged. Donald Vickery and James Fries’s bestseller *Take Care of Yourself: A Consumer’s Guide to Medical Care* was published in 1981, and formed part of a larger explosion of “self-help” publications that encouraged a readership increasingly clobbered by a neoliberal assault—against liveable wages, workers rights, social services, and the welfare state writ large—to take it upon themselves to manage the consequences of that clobbering. And I would argue that the “self” of self-care came into being precisely as an effect of that management, as well as of the clobbering that both preceded and accompanied it. It euphemizes as a goodwill gesture (the benevolent “take care of yourself!”) an imperative that, if elaborated, looks much more like a relation of coercion and discipline (“take care of yourself or your job will go to someone who does”; “take care of yourself lest you fall ill and get saddled with medical debt”; “take care of yourself because you have no right to expect that society will”; “take care of yourself…or else”). The self of self-care, all of this is to say, has a history that should serve as a caution toward attempts to make self-care an unqualified good. It is a self that is specifically calibrated as a defensive reaction to the combination of austerity politics with reinvigorated forms of gendered racism that cut across the entire social formation.

Especially for those of us who were born and/or grew up in the Reagan and Bush I eras, the self of self-care was the form of selfhood that hegemonic institutions taught us to internalize. This is not to say that there is nothing of value to be found in the language of practice of self-care. It is to suggest, rather, that self-care is not simply a form of struggle but the outcome of various struggles that have played out on a larger scale than we tend to acknowledge when we speak of it. This struggle involved, among other things, the disqualification of initiatives by the radical labor movement to establish universal health care as a right rather than a “benefit” restricted to and contingent upon employment in certain sectors. It involved the marginalization of years of efforts by the Black Panther Party and the National Welfare Rights Organization both to establish community clinics and to redefine health care not as a commodity but as both a fundamental question of justice and a condition of community self-determination.[4]

With all of this said, what do we make of this Audre Lorde quote?: “Caring for myself is not self-indulgence, it is self-preservation, and that is an act of political warfare.” It is both thrilling and affirming, I think, to sit with the possibilities of redefining self-care as though it were going on the political offensive. This may especially be the case in a context where the dominant meaning of “care” either has become industrialized in such a way that it consolidates (instead of contests) one’s'alienation from her conditions of existence, or from the means necessary to inform herself about, determine, and pursue the course of care and wellbeing that she needs.

But what I think is especially important about this now regularly cited quotation is what comes before the first comma, what comes before, that is, the moment when self-care finds its euphemistic, sunny resolution as “political warfare”: the disavowal of self-care as “self indulgence.” What, after all, is wrong with self-indulgence, with stealing time to enjoy the self, to pursue ways of being and living that are not necessarily productive, even if to do so is to steal away from the justifiably voracious appetites of left political desire? Lorde’s rewriting of self-care as political warfare seems to me to be symptomatic of a philosophy of movement building that has an unacknowledged investment in surveilling the behavior of its members (and demanding that they surveil themselves), a philosophy that is so deeply committed to the idea that everything is political that it cannot see the ways it enforces that definition through the implicit demand that its members justify all their behavior on its terms. Everything is political, in other words, can be a particularly disciplinary and disciplining definition of the political because of the way that it privileges a kind of ruthless scrutiny, assessment, and justification of one’s behaviors on the basis of whether or not they generate political value. At the same time, it tends to regard the political less as a contestation over social transformation than as the sum total of “good” or “bad” political behaviors.

At worst, everything is political can privilege a kind of left version of austerity logic, one that calls implicitly for the abstention from behaviors that don’t serve the Higher Purpose of generating and assessing individual behavior in the form of political value. It can only handle self-indulgence and extravagance when those things can be given a justifiable political form, when they can be commended or valorized, in other words, for how radical they are. It can only handle self-indulgence and extravagance, in other words, when they cease to be self-indulgent or extravagant at all, and claim, on the flip, to be productive and progressive.

Austerity logics, whether they come from the left or the right, get articulated through the bodies of black women by making certain kinds of demands on them. An important thing to understand about these demands is that they do not simply take the form of general devaluation. They do not simply take the form of the welfare queen stereotype. They can also take the form of a general overinvestment or hypervaluation—in feelings and performances of excessive admiration, deference, and high regard. They can inhabit the expectation—an expectation that, again, can have the force of a demand—that black women embody a kind of superhuman strength, or that they inherently possess an exceedingly resolute political consciousness. Unlike the bad faith that underwrites the demonization of black women as unproductive, this leftist hypervaluation of black women often takes the form of love.

Love: Killing love, perhaps. It is the kind of love that solicits a constant performance from black women, one that demands that they be endlessly productive, endlessly working, for the movement, even after death. It is for this reason that I spent some time in the last post attempting to contest the deification of Lorde: I want to make visible just how much work is implicitly called for in the desire for black women to be adequate to what is asked of them–which they very well may also want of themselves. The point is that any politics that seeks to celebrate the seemingly superhuman accomplishments of black women can become the unwitting collaborator with the entire field of the political that we might want to contest, a field in which the superhuman demands placed on black women are nothing short of murderous. The point is, while it may appear to honor the Audre Lordes (1934-1992) and the Barbara Christians (1943-2000) and the VèVè Clarks (1944-2007) and the Sherley Anne Williamses (1944-1999) with the demand that they rest in power, there may also be an ethics, if not also a justice, in insisting on their right to rest in peace.

#### Hartman’s archival work on slavery is a form of pained redress rooted in a melancholic slavish relationship to history. Blackness as a lack in need of suture locks the archive out of history as an objective unit which can be made fully present, authenticated, and exposed- the colonial ideal of transparency. The fantasy of an intimate relationship to the past and a pre-given fixity of ontological damnation makes their impacts structurally inevitable

Best 15

(Stephen Best, associate professor of English at UC Berkeley, PhD from the University of Pennsylvania, November 2015, “Come and Gone,” *small axe: a caribbean journal of criticism* Volume 19 Number 3, modified) gz

Huey Copeland asserts, in his magnificent new book *Bound to Appear: Art, Slavery, and the Site of Blackness in Multicultural America*, that the high-water mark of this complex visuality occurred during the black renaissance of the 1980s—a period of frenetic artistic activity, centered in New York and identified by many (Copeland included) with the publication of Toni Morrison's *Beloved* in 1987; a moment, as well, in which artists such as Ligon, Renée Green, Lorna Simpson, and Fred Wilson, the subjects of *Bound to Appear*, initially made their mark. Copeland reasons that the novel came to influence contemporary art practice on account of two factors. First, the novel's formal experiments into trauma and collective memory made it “a central touchstone for subsequent revisitations of slavery.”4 Second, the novel (or, to be more accurate, Morrison) completely redefined the politics of racial representation, broadly expanding the repertoire of responses to slavery by predicating the aesthetic ones on slavery's absence from the representational field.5 Morrison, rarely outmaneuvered when it comes to offering a critical context for her work, provided the following framing for the novel and its moment of production: “There is no place you or I can go, to think about or not think about, to summon the presences of, or recollect the absences of slaves … . There is no suitable memorial or plaque or wreath or wall or park or skyscraper lobby … . And because such a place doesn't exist (that I know of), the book had to” (3).6

The projects Copeland discusses, all installation works, “resonate with Morrison's invocation of slavery,” and each in its way extends Morrison's logic of presence and absence to “summon up the ghosts of the past” (9). Before I turn to discuss how contemporary art summons this past, it would help to place *Bound to Appear* in a critical context.

*Bound to Appear* can be categorized as the most recent in a long line of investigations into what has come to be called “the afterlife of slavery”—the general preoccupation with establishing the authority of the slave past in contemporary black life—and the first to explore that subject in the field of contemporary art. The projects that fall within this field are too many to mention here, but among them I would include Ian Baucom's *Specters of the Atlantic*, Colin Dayan's *The Law Is a White Dog*, Saidiya Hartman's *Scenes of Subjection* and *Lose Your Mother*, Stephanie Smallwood's *Saltwater Slavery*, and the *Representations* special issue on “redress” edited by Hartman and myself, all work underwritten, to some degree or another, by traumas of slavery and Middle Passage that appear unknowable, irrecoverable, and yet able to account for the *longue durée* of slavery.7 There is much to distinguish these works methodologically, and yet they share an inclination toward the melancholic view that history consists in the taking possession of such grievous experience and archival loss. As I have put it elsewhere, the vanished world of the black Atlantic comes into existence through loss and can only be sustained through more tales of its loss.8 This work, in addition to making an affective claim for continuity, to which a debt to Morrisonian ethics is owed, shares as well a belief in the political ontology of slavery, in the repetition of its structural inequalities in the present, a thesis offered in critical solidarity with Michel Foucault's “historical ontology”—a portmanteau term that sums up his lifelong interest in the conditions and the possibility of certain objects coming into being and sustaining their own unique temporal force, indifferent to historical context, historical period, or even, as in the case of American slavery these scholars would point out, the act of emancipation or the event of civil war.9 Structure and affect frequently affirm the authority of the slave past.

Copeland offers the visual as yet another register for this ontology, underscoring his affinities with this generation of work when he observes, for example, that Ligon's project is to engage “the regimes of viewership that subtend the afterlife of slavery” (149). One in fact picks up deeper soundings of the logic of historical ontology in Copeland's “carceral” vocabulary: “Can blackness ever appear other than through the scrim of its debilitating visual, institutional, discursive, and physical *constraints*,” he asks at one point, “the at once *censoring* and *spectacularizing* frameworks in which black being has been presented for public consumption,” “the *mastering conceit* from which African Americans have *sought refuge*?” (132, 129; italics mine). This is the lingua franca of a dominant strain in contemporary criticism, possessing dual origins in the thinking of Frantz Fanon and Foucault, and one need only take a moment to consider the post-Ferguson discourse of race and policing to be convinced of the validity of the thesis of slavery's visual afterlife.10 It will be my claim (and I will get to it presently) that when we reverse the thesis of slavery's afterlife and reconceptualize it as the basis for a historiography of slavery, we can tend also to hypostatize aspects of the slave past as missing from the visual field and in need of recovery—or, as one would have it, bound to appear. I would contend that this last entailment is not always tenable or justified by the historical record, and would invite us to reconsider this way of predicating loss. First, a bit of a confession.

In my own previous attempt to address the afterlife of slavery, in which my focus was on a problematic of historical injury in the political project of reparations and the political vocabulary of redress, the goal was, as Saidiya Hartman and I would write, “to interrogate rigorously the kinds of political claims that can be mobilized on behalf of the slave (the stateless, the socially dead, and the disposable) in the political present”—those rough cognates of the slave revealing the underlying work of political ontology. We asked, What is the time of slavery? Is it the time of the present? What is the story about the slave that we ought to tell out of the present we ourselves inhabit? In taking up these questions, we were concerned to elaborate neither “what happened then” nor “what is owed because of what happened then,” but rather the particular character of slavery's violence that appears to be ongoing and constitutive of the unfinished project of freedom.11 However, of late I have felt the urge to dissent from my own earlier investments in this historical ontology and to question what might be considered the epistemological “frames” this view of history compels on me, not least a tort historicism that views slavery as a site of wrongful injury—that is, the assumption that our birth into relation (our admittance to the social order) is the result of an injury from which we have yet to recover; that the social is historical in the sense of being structured by a present past of suffering and injury, so that for me to understand myself today I must necessarily believe myself (or, better, my historical proxy) to have been someone else (or potentially someone else) in the past; that the person I was prior to my wounding can in fact be known; and though missing from the field of knowledge, the scholar's recovery of knowledge of those dispossessed by history paves the royal road to a kind of tolerance or repair of damaged life. These sorts of historical and political investments (the acquisitive urges, strong claims-making, perfective activity) are common to agonistic critique, and while I cannot do full justice here to the terms of my dissent from this epistemology, for the moment I would like to observe, in line with the thinking of Stanley Cavell, that the agon of wrestling with the failure, resistance, or impossibility of something that was lost to history making an *appearance* often carries with it fears and desires about social *acknowledgment*. I hold that it does not always serve the project of critique to limn appearance to the social, or to conceptualize the social as ideally structured around a sense of mutual acknowledgment, and that at the very least it ought to concern us that a number of expressions of loss in the history of slavery do not serve that conception. These last exceptions I will take up more extensively in the next section of this essay.

I mention Cavell because no one has been more committed than him to exploring how the problem of appearance gets infused with the need for acknowledgment

#### Their attempt to break the silence of black mothering is an act that conflates “materialism” with “materiality” – violence is not some amalgamation of signs and discourse 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 - Racial capitalism requires predatory lending, financial states of exception, automated processing, extraction, confinement, and gratuitous violence

Wang 18 [Jackie, PhD African-American Studies @ Harvard, “Carceral Capitalism” p. 63-85//ak47]

Mass Incarceration, the Debt Economy, and the Post-Work Society The purpose of the above summary of the Black Panther Party’s analysis of prisons and how technological innovation could lead to the lumpenization of the working class is to draw attention to the possibility that labor-saving technologies will not necessarily liberate humans from work as we move toward a post-scarcity and post-work society, but can lead to the creation of surplus populations that are housed—and generate value—in prison or are folded into the economy as debtors. Although Cleaver hypothesized that the welfare state would prop up consumption as more people were shunted from the production process, in the decades since he published his essay, the welfare state has contracted while the debt economy has ballooned. Maurizio Lazzarato, in The Making of the Indebted Man, analyzes the significance of this transition from social right to social debt: “When social rights (unemployment insurance, the minimum wage, health care, etc.) are transformed into social debt and private debt, and beneficiaries into debtors whose repayment means adopting prescribed behavior, subjective relations between ‘creditor’ institutions, which allocate rights, and ‘debtors,’ who benefit from assistance or services, begin to function in a radically different way, just as Marx foresaw.”³¹ For Lazzarato, debt should be conceptualized not only in terms of money and repayment, but also in terms of the disciplinary function of debt and the docile subjectivities produced by indebtedness. He writes: Unlike what happens on financial markets, the beneficiary as “debtor” is not expected to reimburse in actual money but rather in conduct, attitudes, ways of behaving, plans, subjective commitments, the time devoted to finding a job, the time used for conforming oneself to the criteria dictated by the market and business, etc. Debt directly entails life discipline and a way of life that requires “work on the self,” a permanent negotiation with oneself, a specific form of subjectivity: that of the indebted man. In other words, debt reconfigures biopolitical power by demanding a production of subjectivity specific to indebted man.³² Thus, as more people join the ranks of the lumpen or the precariat, and as production migrates around the globe or becomes more efficient, we have witnessed the expansion of the debt economy. Debt not only means that the creditor essentially owns the future of the debt (which would unconsciously and consciously affect the life choices made by the debtor), but that debt actually produces a specific kind of subjectivity. In Humans Need Not Apply, Jerry Kaplan—a futurist, entrepreneur, and fellow at the Stanford Center for Legal Informatics—predicts that 90 percent of the jobs that exist now will eventually be automated. While some post-Marxist tech critics hypothesize that automation will inevitably lead to guaranteed basic income, the monetization of the social value of our participation as users, and the creation of a post-work society, it seems just as plausible—given recent trends—that the social and economic crisis of unemployment caused by automation will lead to the creation of new debt and credit regimes. Such innovations are already incubating in Silicon Valley. In his book Humans Need Not Apply: A Guide to Wealth and Work in the Age of Artificial Intelligence, Kaplan proposes job mortgages as a way to weather what he believes will be an economic transitional phase: I will propose an approach to this problem in the form of a new type of financial instrument, the “job mortgage,” secured exclusively by your future labor (earned income) similar to the way your home mortgage is secured exclusively by your property. Out of work? Payments are suspended for some reasonable grace period, until you find another job. In the proposed system, employers and schools will have incentives to collaborate in a new way. Employers will issue nonbinding letters of intent to hire you if you acquire specified skills, and they will get certain payroll tax breaks if they ultimately follow through. These letters of intent will serve the same purpose for job mortgage lenders as an appraisal serves for a home mortgage lender. Training institutions will have to craft their curricula around the specific skills required by sponsoring employers in order to meet the requirements of the loans, or else students won’t enroll. You won’t be committed in advance to accepting a particular position if someone else makes you a better offer, but at least you have the comfort of knowing that you are acquiring the skills valued by the marketplace. In effect, this scheme introduces a new form of feedback and liquidity into labor markets, enforced through the discipline of the free market.³³ Far from inaugurating the communist utopia many of us wish for, technological innovations that reduce the need for human labor may just become an opportunity for financial institutions to have broader ownership of our futures through the creation of new credit instruments. Such an instrument as the job mortgage would not merely be a way to inject liquidity into labor markets, it would be a disciplinary apparatus that comes with a set of terms and requirements. Although the job mortgage would make lending institutions entitled to a percentage of borrowers’ future income, if borrowers don’t find a job, they would still have to pay back a portion of the loan. But questions remain about how borrowers would be punished if they failed to meet the requirements of the job mortgage. What if a borrower takes out a loan and decides to switch career paths? What if the debtor drops out and decides to live in a punk house and hitchhike across the country? What if, after learning how to program the software for selfdriving cars, a borrower decides it’s not for them and instead gets into producing electronic music? Will we even be able to imagine such futures for ourselves as the credit system colonizes all areas of our lives and constrains our futures? Will these credit instruments and the “discipline of the free market” reduce our lives to the acquisition of “marketable skills” and make it impossible to explore, wander, create, invent, learn (as opposed to “acquiring skills”), relax, form non-instrumentalized social bonds, loaf, and daydream? Without a revolution or a social movement to overturn or counter the direction of the debt economy and techno-capitalism, we might be catapulted into a future where our lives are disciplined and determined by our dependency on credit. The New Racial Capitalism The essays included in this book—which are more suggestive than they are conclusive—attempt to update the analytic of racial capitalism for a contemporary context. Rather than focusing on the axis of production by analyzing how racism operates via wage differentials, this work attempts to identify and analyze what I consider the two main modalities of contemporary racial capitalism: predatory lending and parasitic governance. These racialized economic practices and modes of governance are linked insofar as they both emerge to temporarily stave off crises generated by finance capital. By titling this book Carceral Capitalism, I hope to draw attention to the ways in which the carceral techniques of the state are shaped by— and work in tandem with—the imperatives of global capitalism. Predatory lending is a form of bad-faith lending that uses the extension of credit as a method of dispossession. When analyzing contemporary economic practices, a distinction can be made between good-faith and bad-faith forms of credit. Good-faith lending might have a fixed interest rate and be designed such that there is a possibility of the loan being paid. It enables borrowers to accumulate wealth, though as the debt economy expands, it is becoming increasingly difficult for people to ever get out of debt. Bad-faith lending might be a high-interest or free-floating interest rate loan (often offered with a “hook” rate that eventually expires) and is designed such that the borrowers will likely default and thus their property will be taken away (their goods repossessed, their homes foreclosed, etc.). In the United States, the kind of credit a borrower has access to depends in part on the race of the borrower. Today, before working on this introduction, I read an article in The New York Times about how the largest bank in the U.S.—JP Morgan—will pay $55 million in damages for discriminatory lending practices that targeted blacks and Latinxs for higher-interest mortgage loans than whites of the same income bracket (Wells Fargo also had to pay $175 million for engaging in the same practices). As predatory lending systematically prevents mostly poor black Americans from accumulating wealth or private property, it is a form of social exclusion that operates via the inclusion of marginalized populations as borrowers. For it is as borrowers that they are eventually marked for further social exclusion (through credit and e-scores). Predatory lending exists in many forms, including subprime mortgage loans, student loans for sham for-profit colleges (which Obama attempted to regulate, but may be revived by Education Secretary Betsy DeVos), car loans, and so forth. Predatory lending practices also have a decidedly spatialized character. In impoverished urban areas, predatory lending exists in the form of rent-to-own scams, payday loans, commercial bail bonds, and other practices. Overall, predatory lending enables profit maximization when growth is stagnant, but this form of credit will always be plagued by realization problems, which are sometimes resolved using state force. Parasitic forms of governance—which have intensified in the wake of the 2008 crash—are actually rooted in decades-old problems that are coming to a head only now. Beginning in the 1970s, there was a revolt in the capitalist class that undermined the tax state and led to the transformation of public finance. During the subsequent decades the tax state was gradually transformed into the debt state—“that is, a state which covers a large, possibly rising, part of its expenditure through borrowing rather than taxation, thereby accumulating a debt mountain that it has to finance with an ever greater share of its revenue.”³⁴ This model of public finance creates a situation where creditors, rather than the public, become the privileged constituency of governments. The hegemony of finance is antidemocratic not only because financial institutions are opaque and can influence finance through their ownership of the public debt, but also because fiscal crises (which can be induced by the financial sector) authorize the use of state power to extract from the public. Parasitic governance, as a modality of the new racial capitalism, uses five primary techniques: 1) financial states of exception, 2) automated processing, 3) extraction and looting, 4) confinement, and 5) gratuitous violence (with execution as an extreme manifestation of this technique). The Financial State of Exception Perhaps what I would call a financial state of exception would be best exemplified by the recent cases of the Flint water crisis and the Puerto Rican fiscal crisis. They both entail a suspension of the so-called normal democratic modes of governance (where decisions are made by elected officials) and the implementation of rule by emergency managers (EMs) who represent the interests of the financial sector. Usually it is a state, municipal, or sovereign debt crisis that authorizes the financial takeover of governance (but it can also be a “natural” disaster, as we saw in New Orleans with Hurricane Katrina). A financial state of emergency can also be induced when banks create a liquidity shortage by abruptly refusing to lend money to government bodies (which is what occurred in the 1975 bankruptcy of New York City). Flint, Michigan, is a perfect example of how a financial state of exception can produce a nightmarish outcome. As I write this, it has been more than a thousand days since Flint had clean water—but what does this have to do with the financial and government processes I have described above? In 2011, Governor Rick Snyder appointed emergency managers to seize control of the financial affairs of the city in the name of the public good. Like many other ailing postindustrial cities in Michigan that have experienced depopulation and the collapse of the tax base, Flint was facing a fiscal crisis. In 2014, to cut costs, the city switched its water source from Detroit’s Lake Huron system to the Flint River. Officials—including the emergency financial managers—did this knowing that the city did not have the infrastructure to properly treat the water. The untreated water corroded the pipes, and high levels of lead leaked into the water, poisoning the primarily black residents of the city. To give you a sense of how toxic the water was, consider that at five thousand parts per billion of lead, water is regarded as hazardous waste. When the Flint resident LeeAnne Walters had her water tested, the lead level was at 13,200 ppb. Like many of the children and infants exposed to the contaminated water, Walters’s son Gavin was diagnosed with lead poisoning. In short, the financial state of exception created by the budget crisis authorized the implementation of emergency financial managers whose primary goal was to make Flint solvent by any means necessary, even if it meant endangering the health of the residents. Under the auspices of the EMs, Flint was barred from borrowing money or issuing bonds. Given that, under the current fiscal paradigm, the federal government no longer provides significant funds to cities, the residents were left to suffer the consequences of the dramatic spending cuts. As dry and technical and boring as the topic of municipal finance and fiscal retrenchment is, we see in the case of the Flint water crisis that these matters form the invisible backdrop of our lives: they directly determine our quality of life and even our health

#### Racial Capitalism is at its existential breaking point and the masses have organized.

Robinson 5/6 [William I. Robinson (Distinguished Professor of Sociology, Global Studies and Latin American Studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara). “What are the real reasons behind the New Cold War?” ROAR Magazine. May 6, 2021. Accessed 11/3/21. <https://roarmag.org/essays/new-cold-war-crisis-capitalism/?fbclid=IwAR2RzXn0SMlPSiLfXcXNtTcDIybQa6GxH_eodUmyEww2i59lh5qHpZpcwhk> //Xu]

The announcement on April 15 by President Biden that this administration was expelling 10 Kremlin diplomats and imposing new sanctions for alleged Russian interference in the 2020 US elections — to which Russia replied with a tit for tat — came just days after the Pentagon conducted military drills in the South China Sea. These actions were but the latest escalation of aggressive posturing as Washington ramps up its “New Cold War” against Russia and China, pushing the world dangerously towards international political and military conflagration. Most observers attribute this US-instigated war to rivalry and competition over hegemony and international economic control. These factors are important, but there is a bigger picture that has been largely overlooked of what is driving this process: the crisis of global capitalism. This crisis is economic, or structural. One of chronic stagnation in the global economy. But it is also political: a crisis of state legitimacy and capitalist hegemony. The system is moving towards what we call “a general crisis of capitalist rule” as billions of people around the world face uncertain struggles for survival and question a system they no longer see as legitimate. In the United States, the ruling groups must channel fear over tenuous survival away from the system and towards scapegoated communities, such as immigrants or Asians blamed for the pandemic, and towards external enemies such as China and Russia. At the same time, rising international tensions legitimate expanding military and security budgets and open up new opportunities for profit making through war, political conflict and repression in the face of stagnation in the civilian economy. All around the world a “people’s spring” has taken off. From Chile to Lebanon, Iraq to India, France to the United States, Haiti to Nigeria and South Africa to Colombia, waves of strikes and mass protests have proliferated and, in many instances, appear to be acquiring a radical anti-capitalist character. The ruling groups cannot but be frightened by the rumbling from below. If left unchallenged, the New Cold War will become a cornerstone in the arsenal of US rulers and transnational elites to maintain a grip on power as the crisis deepens. THE CRISIS OF GLOBAL CAPITALISM Economically, global capitalism faces what is known in technical language as “overaccumulation”: a situation in which the economy has produced — or has the capacity to produce — great quantities of wealth but the market cannot absorb this wealth because of escalating inequality. Capitalism by its very nature will produce abundant wealth yet polarize that wealth and generate ever greater levels of social inequality unless offset by redistributive policies. The level of global social polarization and inequality now experienced is without precedent. In 2018, the richest one percent of humanity controlled more than half of the world’s wealth while the bottom 80 percent had to make do with just five percent. Such inequalities end up undermining the stability of the system as the gap grows between what is — or could be — produced and what the market can absorb. The extreme concentration of the planet’s wealth in the hands of the few and the accelerated impoverishment and dispossession of the majority means that the transnational capitalist class, or TCC, has increasing difficulty in finding productive outlets to unload enormous amounts of surplus it accumulated. The more global inequalities expand, the more constricted the world market becomes and the more the system faces a structural crisis of overaccumulation. If left unchecked, expanding social polarization results in crisis — in stagnation, recessions, depressions, social upheavals and war — just what we are experiencing right now. Contrary to mainstream accounts, the coronavirus pandemic did not cause the crisis of global capitalism, for this was already upon us. On the eve of the pandemic, growth in the EU countries had already shrunk to zero, much of Latin America and sub-Sahara Africa was in recession, growth rates in Asia were steadily declining, and North America faced a slowdown. The writing was on the wall. The contagion was but the spark that ignited the combustible of a global economy that never fully recovered from the 2008 financial collapse and had been teetering on the brink of renewed crisis ever since. Even if there is a momentary recovery as the world slowly emerges from the pandemic, global capitalism will remain mired in this structural crisis of overaccumulation. In the years leading up to the pandemic there was a steady rise in underutilized capacity and a slowdown in industrial production around the world. The surplus of accumulated capital with nowhere to go expanded rapidly. Transnational corporations recorded record profits during the 2010s at the same time that corporate investment declined. The total cash held in reserves of the world’s 2,000 biggest non-financial corporations increased from $6.6 trillion in 2010 to $14.2 trillion in 2020 — considerably more than the foreign exchange reserves of the world’s central governments — as the global economy stagnated. Wild financial speculation and mounting government corporate, and consumer debt drove growth in the first two decades of the 21st century, but these are temporary and unsustainable solutions to long-term stagnation. THE GLOBAL WAR ECONOMY As I showed in my 2020 book, The Global Police State, the global economy has become ever more dependent on the development and deployment of systems of warfare, social control and repression simply as a means of making profit and continuing to accumulate capital in the face of chronic stagnation and saturation of global markets. This is known as “militarized accumulation” and refers to a situation in which a global war economy relies on perpetual state organized war making, social control and repression — driven now by new digital technologies — in order to sustain the process of capital accumulation. The events of September 11, 2001 marked the start of an era of a permanent global war in which logistics, warfare, intelligence, repression, surveillance and even military personnel are more and more the privatized domain of transnational capital. The Pentagon budget increased 91 percent in real terms between 1998 and 2011, while worldwide, total state military budgets outlays grew by 50 percent from 2006 to 2015, from $1.4 trillion to more than $2 trillion, although this figure did not take into account the hundreds of billions of dollars spent on intelligence, contingency operations, policing, bogus wars against immigrants, terrorism and drugs, and “homeland security.” During this time, military-industrial complex profits quadrupled. But focusing just on state military budgets only gives us a part of the picture of the global war economy. The various wars, conflicts and campaigns of social control and repression around the world involve the fusion of private accumulation with state militarization. In this relationship, the state facilitates the expansion of opportunities for private capital to accumulate through militarization, such as by facilitating global weapons sales by military-industrial-security firms, the amounts of which have reached unprecedented levels. Global weapons sales by the top 100 weapons manufacturers and military service companies increased by 38 percent between 2002 and 2016. By 2018, private for-profit military companies employed some 15 million people around the world, while another 20 million people worked in private security worldwide. The private security (policing) business is one of the fastest growing economic sectors in many countries and has come to dwarf public security around the world. The amount spent on private security in 2003, the year of the invasion of Iraq, was 73 percent higher than that spent in the public sphere, and three times as many persons were employed in private forces as in official law enforcement agencies. In half of the world’s countries, private security agents outnumber police officers. These corporate soldiers and police were deployed to guard corporate property, provide personal security for TCC executives and their families, collect data, conduct police, paramilitary, counterinsurgency and surveillance operations, carry out mass crowd control and repression of protesters, run private detention and interrogation facilities, manage prisons and participate in outright warfare. In 2018, President Trump announced with much fanfare the creation of a sixth military service, the “space force.” The corporate media duly towed the official line that this force was needed to face expanding threats to the United States. What went less reported is that a small group of former government officials with deep ties to the aerospace industry had pushed behind the scenes for its creation as a way to hype military spending on satellites and other space systems. In February of this year, the Federation of American Scientists reported that military-industrial complex lobbying is responsible for the decision by the US government to invest at least $100 billion to beef up its nuclear stockpile. The Biden administration announced in early April to much acclaim that it would pull all US troops out of Afghanistan. While US service troops in that country number 2,500, these pale in comparison with the more than 18,000 contractors that US government has hired to do its bidding in the country, including at least 5,000 corporate soldiers that will remain. The so-called wars on drugs and terrorism, the undeclared wars on immigrants, refugees and gangs — and poor, dark-skinned and working-class youth more generally — the construction of border walls, immigrant detention centers, prison-industrial complexes, systems of mass surveillance and the spread of private security guard and mercenary companies, have all become major sources of profit-making and they will become more important to the system as stagnation becomes the new normal. In sum, the global police state is big business at a time when other opportunities for transnational corporate profit-making are limited. But if corporate profit, and not an external threat, is the reason for expanding the US state and corporate war machine and the global police state, this must still be justified to the public. The official state propaganda narrative about the “New Cold War” serves this purpose. CONJURING UP EXTERNAL ENEMIES There is another dynamic at work in explaining the New Cold War: the crisis of state legitimacy and capitalist hegemony. International tensions derive from the acute political contradiction in global capitalism in which economic globalization takes places within a nation-state-based system of political authority. To put this in technical terms, there is a contradiction between the accumulation function and the legitimacy function of states. That is, states face a contradiction between the need to promote transnational capital accumulation in their individual national territories and their need to achieve political legitimacy and stabilize the domestic social order. Attracting transnational corporate and financial investments to the national territory requires providing capital with all the incentives associated with neoliberalism, such as downward pressure on wages, union busting, deregulation, low or no taxes, privatization, investment subsidies, fiscal austerity and on so. The result is rising inequality, impoverishment and insecurity for working and popular classes; precisely the conditions that throw states into crises of legitimacy, destabilize national political systems and jeopardize elite control. International frictions escalate as states, in their efforts to retain legitimacy, seek to sublimate social and political tensions and to keep the social order from fracturing. In the US, this sublimation has involved channeling social unrest towards scapegoated communities such as immigrants — this is one key function of racism and was a core component of the Trump government’s political strategy — or towards an external enemy such as China or Russia, which is clearly becoming a cornerstone of the Biden government’s strategy. While the Chinese and Russian ruling classes must also face the economic and political fallout of global crisis, their national economies are less dependent on militarized accumulation and their mechanisms of legitimization rest elsewhere — not on conflict with the US. It is Washington that is conjuring up the New Cold War, based not on any political or military threat from China and Russia, much less from economic competition, as US- and Chinese-based transnational corporations are deeply cross-invested, but on the imperative of managing and sublimating the crisis.The drive by the capitalist state to externalize the political fallout of the crisis increases the danger that international tensions will lead to war. Historically wars have pulled the capitalist system out of crisis while they serve to deflect attention from political tensions and problems of legitimacy. The so-called “peace dividend” that was to result in demilitarization when the original Cold War ended with the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union evaporated almost overnight with the events of September 2001, which legitimated the sham “War on Terror” as a new pretext for militarization and reactionary nationalism. US presidents historically reach their highest approval ratings when they launch wars. George W. Bush reached an all-time-high of 90 percent in 2001 as his administration geared up to invade Afghanistan, and his father George H. W. Bush achieved an 89 percent approval rating in 1991, right as the US declared the end of its (first) invasion of Iraq and the “liberation of Kuwait.” THE BATTLE FOR THE POST-PANDEMIC WORLD We are currently witnessing a radical restructuring and transformation of global capitalism based on a much more advanced digitalization of the entire global economy and society. This process is driven by so-called fourth industrial revolution technologies, including artificial intelligence and machine learning, Big Data, autonomously driven land, air and sea vehicles, quantum and cloud computing, 5G bandwidth, bio- and nanotechnology and the Internet of Things, or IoT. The crisis is not only economic and political, but also existential because of the threats of ecological collapse and nuclear war, to which we must add the danger of future pandemics that may involve much deadlier microbes than coronaviruses. The pandemic lockdowns served as dry runs for how digitalization may allow the dominant groups to step up restructuring time and space and to exercise greater control over the global working class. The system is now pushing towards expansion through militarization, wars and conflicts, through a new round of violent dispossession and through further plunder of the state. The ruling classes are also using the health emergency to legitimate tighter control over restive populations. The changing social and economic conditions brought about by the pandemic and its aftermath are accelerating the process. These conditions have helped a new bloc of transnational capital, led by the giant tech companies, interwoven as they are with finance, pharmaceuticals and the military-industrial complex, to amass ever greater power and to consolidate its control over the commanding heights of the global economy. As restructuring proceeds, it heightens the concentration of capital worldwide, worsens social inequality and also aggravates international tensions and the dangers of military conflagration. In 2018, just seventeen global financial conglomerates collectively managed $41.1 trillion dollars — more than half the GDP of the entire planet. That same year, to reiterate, the richest one percent of humanity led by 36 million millionaires and 2,400 billionaires controlled more than half of the world’s wealth while the bottom 80 percent — nearly six billion people — had to make do with just five percent of this wealth. The result is devastation for the poor majority of humanity. Worldwide, 50 percent of all people live on less than $2.50 a day and a full 80 percent live on less than $10 per day. One in three people on the planet suffer from some form of malnutrition, nearly a billion go to bed hungry each night and another two billion suffer from food insecurity. Refugees from war, climate change, political repression and economic collapse already number into the hundreds of millions. The New Cold War will further immiserate this mass of humanity. Capitalist crises are times of intense social and class struggles. There has been a rapid political polarization in global society since 2008 between an insurgent far-right and an insurgent left. The ongoing crisis has incited popular revolts. Workers, farmers and poor people have engaged in a wave of strikes and protests around the world. From Sudan to Chile, France to Thailand, South Africa to the United States, a “people’s spring” is breaking out everywhere. But the crisis also animates far-right and neofascist forces that have surged in many countries around the world and that sought to capitalize politically on the health calamity and its aftermath. Neofascist movements and authoritarian and dictatorial regimes have proliferated around the world as democracy breaks down. Such savage inequalities are explosive. They fuel mass protest by the oppressed and lead the ruling groups to deploy an ever more omnipresent global police state to contain the rebellion of the global working and popular classes. Global capitalism is emerging from the pandemic in a dangerous new phase. The contradictions of this crisis-ridden system have reached the breaking point, placing the world into a perilous situation that borders on global civil war. The stakes could not be higher. The battle for the post-pandemic world is now being waged. Part of that battle is to expose the New Cold War as a ruse by the dominant groups to deflect our attention from the escalating crisis of global capitalism.

#### 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

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.

## 3

#### Text: We endorse the entirety of the affirmative except for their trigger warning process and instead advocate for an alternative trigger warning process involving an anonymous submission option.

#### The 1ac proves their method of cw def violates

#### The affirmative’s trigger warning requires debaters to out themselves - preround design determines effectiveness.

Capwell 2015 Jessica, Assistant Editor, Debating the Place of Trigger Warnings in the Classroom, October 22, https://thecolgatemaroonnews.com/4492/news/debating-the-place-of-trigger-warnings-in-the-classroom/

The panel also touched on the possibility of students taking advantage of trigger warnings to opt out of academic responsibilities. Egger suggested alternative ways for students to engage with the material that would cause less distress. “Maybe they have a private one-on-one conversation, maybe they put pen to paper, maybe it’s something on a laptop,” Egger said. Thursday’s panel discussion did not conclude with a clear answer to what kind of trigger warnings, if any, belong in higher education, but attendees did walk away with the sense that the conversation had made progress in exploring issues and ambiguities surrounding the question regarding the necessity of trigger warnings. Senior Sam Hom was intrigued by the thought that the way a trigger warning is delivered could make it ineffective. “One of the most interesting points brought up was how to protect someone’s anonymity,” Hom said. “If someone leaves the room after a trigger warning is given for sexual assault, people in the class may make assumptions about that individual’s personal life.”

#### Trigger warnings lacking anonymous reporting process worsens trauma and foreclose access to the debate space

Tiffe 2012 Rachel, Assistant Professor in Women & Gender Studies at Merrimack College, Pedagogy of a Trigger?, Sept 4, https://rebelgrrlacademy.wordpress.com/2012/09/04/pedagogy-of-a-trigger/

Some teachers try to work around this by giving the same kind of trigger warning you often see on the top of articles on Feministing or Jezebel, but verbally, right before the clip is shown. I have always found this to be a pretty terrible approach, because if there is a student who might feel triggered, any hope for anonymity is lost. Imagine: “There are images of sexual violence in the clip I’m about to show, so if you feel like you might be triggered, you’re welcome to leave.” Student gets up and leaves, and perhaps experiences humiliation on top of the already inevitable reminder of past sexual trauma. Not awesome.

### 1NC - Survivability - Presumption

#### Presumption - there is no relationship between voting aff and their advocacy or solvency - The Black Matrix and Maternalism means its cruel optimistic to think voting aff does anything

#### B] especially against new k affs – a] no time to test their theory of power b] not defending the res means no res stasis point supercharges lost of ground

### 1NC – AT Hines and Wilmot

#### They say hines and wilmot

#### 1-- Yes, there are racist frames to evaluate how black people present themselves in the activity BUT we haven’t performed such AND arbitrarily voting aff doesn’t solve it.

#### 3 – You’ve double turned yourself – it says spectatorship of scenes of subjection cause spirit murder.

### 1NC – AT Hill Collins

#### They say Hill Collins --

#### 1-- Asignation DA – The 1AC’s framing of Black womanhood betrays the Black and trans\* feminist work at play – rather than reinvesting into monocers of womanhood – the 1NC forefronts from Blackness and trans\*ness as disruptive orientations and care that excavates the interstices of categorization itself.

Green & Bey 17 [Marquis Bey is a PhD candidate in the English department at Cornell University, whose work concerns Black feminism, transgender studies, critical theory, and contemporary Black literature. Kai M. Green is an assistant professor of Women’s Gender and Sexuality Studies at Williams college, as well as a poet, filmmaker and interdisciplinary scholar whose work focuses on Black feminist theory, queer of color critique, performance studies, media studies, and trans studies. “Where Black Feminist Thought and Trans\* Feminism Meet: A Conversation” Souls: A Critical Journal of Black Politics, Culture, and Society, 19:4, p 438-454, 2017 //tjb]

*KMG*: One of my favorite quotations is from D.L. Smith’s essay, “What is Black Cul- ture?” where he writes, “Perhaps in losing ourselves, we will find ourselves.”11 We are made into subjects through processes of imprint upon bodies, identity; race, gender, class, and/or sexual orientations. Without these identities, we fear that we will lose some sense of ourselves that is bound to history, so we carry it (history), sometimes by choice and other times, identities are placed upon us from the world around us and we have no real choice in how others choose to perceive us or our embodied histories. The fact of the matter is that we know that just because you are poor doesn’t mean that you will have radical anti-capitalist politics. Just because you are Black doesn’t mean that you will somehow have an affinity towards or with other Black people. These identities are scripts and the people who carry these scripts in their body, or rather those who embody evidence of particular identities, constantly prove how categorical labels are always already, they be, incapable of articulating the fullness of we (subjects) who endure, challenge, reinforce, despise, love, and sometimes encourage the naming. This limit does not exist simply because of a failure to acknowledge intersectional identities that many people carry, that is, a Black transgender working class woman—we could continue to add on here bisexual, college educated, Latinx, Republican—all of these identity claims start to help you understand the fullness of a subject, but none of these give you the full subject even if we keep listing out all of the identities we hold, we will only ever be approaching the fullness of a being or subject as said being changes in and over time. So I think the fear that we will lose ourselves without these categories is a trap that keeps us holding on to categories that we know fail us. There is a bind though because these identity categories prove useful in garnering state recognition, and also in creating a sense of.

### 1NC – AT Hartman Belly of the Ship

#### They Say Hartman 16:

#### 1 -- Double Bind—If they win Misogynoir is a pervasive structure that isn’t locked into temporal categories, that means that the aff has no UQ for its impacts and its solvency mechanism isn’t able to overcome the harms of the 1AC OR the orientation of advocacy exists in the status quo and there is no unique reason to vote aff.

#### 2 -- 1NC Best and 1NC McCkittrick impact turn this framing of the plantation as the belly of the world

### 1NC – AT Join in Making the Black Living Room

#### They Say Endorse the Cultivation of Living Rooms

#### 1 – excludes poor black lumpenproletariat – what happens for people who don’t own houses and can’t be like June Jordan and rent spaces.

#### 2 – their framing of the aff as the ONLY mode of resistance pathologizes how the process of space making is in of itself a form of laboring that some people don’t have the energy to do

#### 4 -- The 1AC’s investment in a minoritarian protest within the academic confines of debate is nothing more than the re-instantiation of power. The state, capital, and the academy itself hegemonically invests in the representation of unrest in order to pacify resistance and re-weaponize protest against the possibility for revolutionary subjectivity – turning case.

Ferguson’12 (Roderick A. Ferguson is the co-director of the Racialized Body research cluster at UIC. Prior to his appointment there, he was professor of race and critical theory in the Department of American Studies at the University of Minnesota, serving as chair of the department from 2009 to 2012. In the fall of 2013, he was the Old Dominion Visiting Faculty for the Council of the Humanities and the Center for African American Studies at Princeton University. In 2004, he was Scholar in Residence for the “Queer Locations” Seminar at the University of California’s Humanities Research Institute in Irvine, California. From 2007 to 2010, he was associate editor of the American Studies Association’s flagship journal [American Quarterly](https://www.americanquarterly.org/). “Reorder of Things : The University and Its Pedagogies of Minority Difference” 2012. Pgs. 5-8)NAE

The history of the U.S. ethnic and women’s studies protests presents the transition from economic, epistemological, and political stability to the pos­sibility for revolutionary social ruptures and subjectivities. For instance, the San Francisco State student strikes of 1969 advocated a “Third World revolution” that would displace and provide an alternative to racial in­ equality on that campus. That same year, 269 similar protests erupted across the country. 3 At Rutgers, black students took over the main educa­tional building, renaming it “Liberation Hall.” At the University of Texas at Austin, a student organization called Afro Americans for Black Libera­tion “insisted on converting the Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Library to a black studies building and renaming it for Malcolm X.” 4 Inspired by the black power movement, Chicano students would also form “the United Mexican American Students, the Mexican American Student Associa­tion, and MECha, Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán, while oth­ ers in San Antonio founded the Mexican American Youth Organization, MAYO.” 5 Those students would also begin to demand Chicano studies courses and departments. Similarly, in 1969 American Indian activists took over Alcatraz Island and claimed it as Indian territory, with hopes of building a cultural center and museum. 6 And in 1970, the first women’s studies programs would be established at San Diego State University and at SUNY-Buffalo. While the state governments in California and Wisconsin called out the National Guard on students advocating for ethnic studies, systems of power also responded to these protests by attempting to manage that transition, in an attempt to prevent economic, epistemological, and political crises from achieving revolutions that could redistribute social and material relations. Instead, those systems would work to ensure that these crises were recomposed back into state, capital, and academy. Whereas modes of power once disciplined difference in the universalizing names of canon­icity, nationality, or economy, other operations of power were emerging that would discipline through a seemingly alternative regard for difference and through a revision of the canon, national identity, and the market. This theorization of power converges with and diverges from Foucault’s own observations, converging with him through an emphasis on the strate­gic nature of power relations. For instance, recall his argument about power in the first volume of The History of Sexuality, where he argues for power’s “intentional and nonsubjective” nature. 7 According to Foucault, whatever intelligibility power relations may possess, it “is not because they are the effect of another instance that ‘explains’ them, but rather because they are imbued, through and through, with calculation.” 8 Elaborating on the strategic but nonindividualized character of power, Foucault wrote that “there is no power that is exercised without a series of aims and objec­tives. But this does not mean it results from the choice or decision of an individual subject.” 9 The Reorder of Things builds on this element of Foucault’s theorization by looking at how state, capital, and academy saw minority insurgence as a site of calculation and strategy, how those institutions began to see minority difference and culture as positivities that could be part of their own “series of aims and objectives.” As formations increasingly character­ized by the presence of minority difference, state, capital, and academy— in different but intersecting ways— began to emerge as hegemonic processes that were “especially alert and responsive to the alternatives and opposi­tions which [questioned] or [threatened their] dominance.” 10 Hence, this book looks at the diverse but interlocking ways in which state, capital, and academy produced an adaptive hegemony where minority difference was concerned. In keeping with Foucault, the book eschews an individualized notion of power, preferring instead to regard power as a complex and multisited social formation. Rather than being embodied in an individual or a group, power— Foucault says— is a set of relations in which “the logic is perfectly clear, the aims decipherable, and yet it is often the case that no one is there to have invented them, and few who can be said to have formulated them.” 11 In this book, the impersonal nature of power is derived from the ways in which hegemonic investments in minority difference and culture are distrib­uted across institutional and subjective terrains during and after the period of social unrest, terrains such as universities and colleges, corporations, social movements, media, and state practices. The book also uses the category “power” in the spirit of Foucault’s own implicit belief that complex situations deserve a name. Even though the name is ill-fitting, it is the “closest [we] can get to it.” 12 Addressing the cat­achresis called power, Foucault says, “power establishes,” “power invests,” “power takes hold.” 13 Furthermore, in his description of biopower, he writes, “Power would no longer be dealing simply with legal subjects over whom the ultimate dominion was death, but with living beings, and the mastery it would be able to exercise over them would have to be applied to the level of life itself.” 14 For Foucault, power becomes like a character in a story, a code name for the “multiplicity of force relations.” 15 Like Fou­cault, I use power as shorthand for a plurality of relations, arguing that if power is the “name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society,” 16 then power in the age of minority social movements becomes the new name for calculating and arranging minority difference. While The Reorder of Things attempts to rigorously attend to how dominant modes of power in the post– World War II moment utilized minority difference, the book does not reduce the “the political and cul­ ural initiatives” of the social movements— those grand champions of minority culture— to the terms of hegemony. Indeed, as part of its own archival investigation, the book attempts to unearth those elements of the social movements that were antagonistic to the terms of hegemony, giving attention to how university and presidential administrations in the sixties attempted to beguile minorities with promises of excellence and uplift. Thus, as part of its investigation of the changing networks of power, the book analyzes how dominant institutions attempted to reduce the initiatives of oppositional movements to the terms of hegemony. This book diverges from Foucault as it takes racial formations as the genealogy of power’s investment in various forms of minority difference and culture while extending Foucault’s emphasis on the productive— and not simply the repressive— capacities of power. From the social movements of the fifties and sixties until the present day, networks of power have at­ tempted to work through and with minority difference and culture, trying to redirect originally insurgent formations and deliver them to the norma­tive ideals and protocols of state, capital, and academy. In this new strategic situation, hegemonic power denotes the disembodied and abstract promo­tion of minority representation without fully satisfying the material and social redistribution of minoritized subjects, particularly where people of color are concerned. One of the central claims of this book, then, is that the struggles taking place on college campuses because of the student pro­tests were inspirations for power in that moment, inspiring it to substitute redistribution for representation, indeed encouraging us to forget how rad­ical movements promoted the inseparability of the two.

### 1NC – AT Refuse to Make Debate a Cite of spirit Murdering

#### They Say Refuse Spirit Murder:

#### 1 – your ballot can’t solve it – BUT instead makes the judge feel more ethical and refuse to change the material conditions for violence

### 1NC – AT RoB and RoJ

#### The Roll of the Ballot and Judge is to Vote for the Better Debater – anything else is impact justified, self serving, and arbitrary making it impossible to predict. If someone did something actively antiblack like say the N word, or the forms of violence their card describes – that’s not a question of you as a judge but requires you intervene stop the round and take it to tab.