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#### Engagement within the law seeking reform is a useless endeavor that that empowers the state

The Invisible Committee 07 (The Invisible Committee is the pen name of an anonymous author or authors who have written French works of radical leftist, anarchist literature; “The Coming Insurrection”, p. 95-96; [file:///C:/Users/Owner/Downloads/invisible-committee-the-coming-insurrection%20(1).pdf](file:///C:\Users\Owner\Downloads\invisible-committee-the-coming-insurrection%20(1).pdf) ; published in 2007) [AC]

We can no longer even see how an insurrection might begin. Sixty years of pacification and containment of historical upheavals, sixty years of democratic anesthesia and the management of events, have dulled our perception of the real, our sense of the war in progress. We need to start by recovering this perception. It's useless to get indignant about openly unconstitutional laws such as Perben II. It's futile to legally protest the complete implosion of the legal framework. We have to get organized. It's useless to get involved in this or that citizens' group, in this or that dead-end of the far left, or in the latest "community effort." Every organization that claims to contest the present order mimics the form, mores and language of miniature states. Thus far, every impulse to "do politics differently" has only contributed to the indefinite spread of the state's tentacles. It's useless to react to the news of the day; instead we should understand each report as a maneuver in a hostile field of strategies to be decoded, operations designed to provoke a specific reaction. It's these operations themselves that should be taken as the real information contained in these pieces of news. It's useless to wait-for a breakthrough, for the revolution, the nuclear apocalypse or a social movement. To go on waiting is madness. The catastrophe is not coming, it is here. We are already situated within the collapse of a civilization. It is within this reality that we must choose sides. To no longer wait is, in one way or another, to enter into the logic of insurrection. It is once again to hear the slight but always present trembling of terror in the voices of our leaders. Because governing has never been anything other than postponing by a thousand subterfuges the moment when the crowd will string you up, and every act of government is nothing but a way of not losing control of the population. We're setting out from a point of extreme isolation, of extreme weakness. An insurrectional process must be built from the ground up. Nothing appears less likely than an insurrection, but nothing is more necessary.

#### Their call to action over outrageous impacts strategically alters appendages to uphold the state and belief in the law through the management of crisis which justifies cycles of violence and dooms their policies to fail
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It is now publicly understood that crisis situations are so many opportunities for the restructuring of domination. This is why Sarkozy can announce, without seeming to lie too much, that the financial crisis is "the end of a world," and that 2009 will see France enter a new era. This charade of an economic crisis is supposed to be a novelty: we are supposed to be in the dawn of a new epoch where we will all join together in fighting inequality and global warming. But for our generation-which was born in the crisis and has known nothing but economic, financial, social and ecological crisis-this is rather difficult to accept. They won't fool us again, with another round of “Now we start all over again" and "It's just a question of tightening our belts for a little while." To tell the truth, the disastrous unemployment figures no longer arouse any feeling in us. Crisis is a means of governing. In a world that seems to hold together only through the infinite management of its own collapse. 'What this war is being fought over is not various ways of managing society, but irreducible and irreconcilable ideas of happiness and their worlds. We know it, and so do the powers that be. The militant remnants that observe us-always more numerous, always more identifiable-are tearing out their hair trying to fit us into little compartments in their little heads. They hold out their arms to us the better to suffocate us, with their failures, their paralysis, their stupid problematics. From elections to "transitions," militants will never be anything other than that which distances us, each time a little farther, from the possibility of communism. Luckily we will accommodate neither treason nor deception for much longer. The past has given us far too many bad answers for us not to see that the mistakes were in the questions themselves. There is no need to choose between the fetishism of spontaneity and organizational control; between the "come one, come all" of activist networks and the discipline of hierarchy; between acting desperately now and waiting desperately for later; between bracketing that which is to be lived and experimented in the name of a paradise that seems more and more like a hell the longer it is put off, and repeating, with a corpse-filled mouth, that planting carrots is enough to dispel this nightmare. Organizations are obstacles to organizing ourselves. In truth, there is no gap between what we are, what we do, and what we are becoming. Organizations, political or labor, fascist or anarchist-always begin by separating, practically; these aspects of existence. It's then easy for them to present their idiotic formalism as the sole remedy to this separation. To organize is not to give a structure to weakness. It is above all to form bonds-bonds that are by no means neutral-terrible bonds. The degree of organization is measured by the intensity of sharing-material and spiritual. From now on, to materially organize for survival is to materially organize for attack. Everywhere, a new idea of communism is to be elaborated. In the shadows of bar rooms, in print shops, squats, farms, occupied gymnasiums, new complicities are to be born. These precious connivances must not be refused the necessary means for the deployment of their forces.

#### Their calculative approach guts solvency and turns case – ultimately sacrifices minority rights to privileged legal interests

Williams and Arrigo 2k (Christopher R., associate professor of criminology at the University of West Georgia, and Bruce A., professor of crime, law, and society and the former chair of the department of criminal justice at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. “The Philosophy of the Gift and the Psychology of Advocacy: Critical Reflections on Forensic Mental Health Intervention” (2000), International Journal for the Semiotics of Law vol. 13, Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 215–242)

Ralph Waldo Emerson’s 1844 essay entitled “Gifts,” is, perhaps, the first full-blown exposition regarding the problem of the gift.18 Though limited in scope, his treatment delineates the paradoxical nature of the gift by suggesting the incursion of debt that is inherent in the practice of giftgiving. A failure to repay or reciprocate, implies Emerson, creates a tension between the one who gives and the one who receives, leaving the former disposed to feelings of inferiority and vengeance, while the latter endures a threat to one’s’s own independence. As Emerson notes, “. . . It is not the office of a man to receive gifts. How dare you give them? We wish to be self-sustained. We do not quite forgive a giver. The hand that feeds us is in some danger of being bitten ...”19 Where Hobbes’s position on human nature suspects the motives of the assigner, Emerson questions the psychology of the recipient, as well as the recognition by both parties that the bestowal of an award embodies a certain display or degree of power. For Emerson, then, there is a twofold danger inherent in the economy of gift-giving. In short, both giver and receiver are vulnerable to the effects of perversion and degradation.20 The corruption of the gift and the debasement of giving occur when what is offered is principally defined as something to be given. In other words, the usurpation of a “true” gift and a “pure” act of consigning is enacted once calculated as an award conceived and constructed for its value as a gift. In this sense, the gift need not be a material object or something possessing a physical nature. Rather, every act of helping, assisting, or intervening entails some form of a token or a gratuity. If the act of advocacy is generated in a less than genuine manner; that is, if it is not the giving of a “portion of thyself”21 but, rather, is a deliberate act constructed for the sole purpose of being given as some form of gift, then it is equally subject to the kind of perversions and degradations implied in Emerson’s essay. Emerson’s observations raise a number of questions about those gifts that are calculated, intentional efforts to provide something of value to someone else. One example are the various constitutional “rights” afforded persons with mental illness, and how such liberty protections form the basis of many advocacy efforts.22 While these constitutional safeguards are ostensibly provided to individuals with psychiatric disorders out of genuine interest in human welfare (i.e. as a manifestation of the compassionate disposition of the law, legal processes, and legal institutions), these apparent rights often conceal the more sinister motivating factors underlying juridical decision making. Indeed, it may be argued that the very purpose of availing such rights is to give the appearance of a compassionate and humane approach to individual justice when, in fact, these are merely self-interested attempts to quiet the voices of protest.23 In this context, the gift of rights appears as a deliberate effort to provide users of mental health services with the humanity that the law wants for them or that serves the interests of the legal sphere or other privileged and invested collectives. Is the law likely to give something when doing so threatens juridical or system-sustaining interests? We submit that this Machiavellian display of compassion fails to reflect the authentic, unadulterated desire of the recipient. Instead, it reflects a calculated and, thus, degraded enterprise of self-interested giving. Thus, when we advocate for the rights of persons with mental illness, we might do well to ask ourselves: whose desires do we truly re-present?24

#### Every act of government is just a way of not losing control of the population. Their call to change the politics of the present is just a maneuver designed to strengthen the power of the state. Not waiting is the only option because it enters into the logic of insurrection.
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We can no longer even see how an insurrection might begin. Sixty years of pacification and containment of historical upheavals, sixty years of democratic anesthesia and the management of events, have dulled our perception of the real, our sense of the war in progress. We need to start by recovering this perception. It’s useless to get indignant about openly unconstitutional laws such as Perben II. It’s futile to legally protest the complete implosion of the legal framework. We have to get organized. It’s useless to get involved in this or that citizens’ group, in this or that dead-end of the far left, or in the latest “community effort.” Every organization that claims to contest the present order mimics the form, mores and language of miniature states. Thus far, every impulse to “do politics differently” has only contributed to the indefinite spread of the state’s tentacles. It’s useless to react to the news of the day; instead we should understand each report as a maneuver in a hostile field of strategies to be decoded, operations designed to provoke a specific reaction. It’s these operations themselves that should be taken as the real information contained in these pieces of news. It’s useless to wait—for a breakthrough, for the revolution, the nuclear apocalypse or a social movement. To go on waiting is madness. The catastrophe is not coming, it is here. We are already situated within the collapse of a civilization. It is within this reality that we must choose sides. To no longer wait is, in one way or another, to enter into the logic of insurrection. It is to once again hear the slight but always present trembling of terror in the voices of our leaders. Because governing has never been anything other than postponing by a thousand subterfuges the moment when the crowd will string you up, and every act of government is nothing but a way of not losing control of the population. We’re setting out from a point of extreme isolation, of extreme weakness. An insurrectional process must be built from the ground up. Nothing appears less likely than an insurrection, but nothing is more necessary.

#### The affirmative involvement of the state renders the power of exploitation under the state—thus the alternative when involving politics must seek to work outside of the law

Newman 10{Saul, associate professor in the Department of Government in the School of Public Affairs at American University in Washington, DC, “Politics of Postanarchism” (2010), Edinburgh University Press, pp. 107-109}

Central to anarchism, as we have seen, is the repudiation of state authority. The state is seen as a violent institution of domination – as a structure which sustains and intensifies other hierarchies and relations of power and exploitation, including economic relations. The state is always accompanied by a statist mind-set or political logic which affirms the idea of the necessity and inevitability of the state, particularly at revolutionary junctures, and prevents us thinking beyond it. Yet thinking beyond the state is something we must do. Indeed, I see this as being the central task for radical politics today. As Badiou also recognises, the state, and the failure to transcend or escape its thrall, is one of the fundamental problems of radical politics: More precisely, we must ask the question that, without a doubt, constitutes the great enigma of the century: why does the subsumption of politics, either through the form of the immediate bond (the masses), or the mediate bond (the party) ultimately give rise to bureaucratic submission and the cult of the State? 5 What must be explained, in other words, is the relation that ties us to the state and which leads to the perpetuation of state power. Like the anarchists, Badiou sees the state as more than simply an institution or series of institutions; it is also a certain relationship of domination to which people are bound through mechanisms like parliamentary democracy or organisations like the vanguard party. This is why, for Badiou, there is a certain link between the party and the state – the revolutionary party is a centralised and disciplined organisation structured around the aim of seizing state power; indeed, he refers to it as if it were the one entity – the party-state. 6 This critique of the state and the party has clear resonances with anarchism. As we saw in Chapter 3, anarchists regard the party as an authoritarian structure which is organised around the future goal of gaining state power; indeed, the party is a microcosm of the state itself, and an instance of the state even before it gets into power. If radical politics is to escape the pitfalls of state power and its inevitable authoritarianism, it must also eschew the form of the party. We also find further parallels with anarchism in Badiou’s understanding of the state and its relation to society. In Badiou’s analysis, the state is seen as a certain way of representing a social situation, a way of including and counting as one – say through categories of citizenship, practices such as voting – the multiple elements or parts of that situation. Here, Badiou maintains, much like Stirner, that the state has no regard for the individual, for differences; 7 it simply incorporates the individual as an anonymous element in an overall structure, through the ordering and assigning of places and roles. We could say, for instance, that the state’s surveillance of public places, its obsession with identification and information gathering, its management of crowds and movements of people, are measures designed to ensure that everyone stays put, that everyone is counted, that nothing escapes its incorporation. Furthermore, according to Badiou, while the state is a re-presentation of a situation structured by a particular set of social relations – say those of bourgeois society with its class hierarchies and capitalist economic exchanges – at the same time it is also distinct and separate from it, forming a kind of excrescence. For Badiou, however, the problem with the Marxist analysis of the state is that by focusing on this point of excess – on seeing the state as a coercive apparatus that can simply be seized in a revolutionary upheaval and later suppressed – is that the state is much more intransigent and inexorable than Marxists imagined, and that the revolution would simply lead to a changing of the guard: This is because even if the route of political change . . . is bordered by the State, it cannot in any way let itself be guided by the latter, for the State is precisely non-political, insofar as it cannot change, save hands, and it is well known that there is little strategic signification in such a change. 8 Instead, radical politics must bear witness to the event, in which is revealed what Badiou calls the void of the situation: that which is not counted or formally included in the situation, its radical and destabilising excess. 9 I shall return to this idea of the event and its political consequences later; but it would appear at this stage that there are certain parallels with anarchism in Badiou’s approach to the question of the state in revolutionary politics. The idea that the Marxist seizure of state power will produce only a changing of the guard is, as we saw in Chapter 3, precisely the same warning given by anarchists in the nineteenth century. Rather than the state having a class or ‘political’ character – so that if the right class controlled it its oppressive character would be transformed – the state is, as Badiou puts it, ‘non-political’ in the sense that it cannot change in this way. In anarchist terms, this refers to the way that the state has its own specific structural logic of domination and self-perpetuation that is not reducible to class, and that cannot be displaced simply because representatives of a different class are at the helm. So, anarchists would share Badiou’s point that what is needed is a different form of politics which is not ‘guided’ by the state: that is, which does not have as its aim the revolutionary seizure of state power through the vanguard party, but rather which seeks to overcome state power through the construction of a different set of relations. In other words, there is a need for a politics situated outside the state. Indeed, Badiou talks about the need for a politics that ‘puts the State at a distance’. 10 This might take the form of non-party political organisations which shun involvement in parliamentary processes and which focus on specific issues, such as the status and rights of illegal migrants, 11 or an autonomous commune where new, egalitarian relations are made possible and whose existence constitutes a fundamental rupture with state-ordered society. 12

#### The alternative avoids the violent stifling of the state and solves
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It goes without saying that the attachment of the French to the state-the guarantor of universal values, the last rampart against the disaster-is a pathology that is difficult to undo. It's above all a fiction that no longer knows how to carry on. Our governors themselves increasingly consider it as a useless encumbrance because they, at least, take the conflict for what it is militarily. They have no complex about sending in elite antiterrorist units to subdue riots, or to liberate a recycling center occupied by its workers. As the welfare state collapses, we see the emergence of a brute conflict between those who desire order and those who don't. Everything that French politics has been able to deactivate is in the process of unleashing itself It will never be able to process all that it has repressed. In the advanced degree of social decomposition, we can count on the coming movement to find the necessary breath of nihilism. Which will not mean that it won't be exposed to other limits. Revolutionary movements do not spread by contamination but by resonance. Something that is constituted here resonates with the shock wave emitted by something constituted over there. A body that resonates does so according to its own mode. An insurrection is not like a plague or a forest fire-a linear process which spreads from place to place after an initial spark It rather rakes the shape of a music, whose focal points, though dispersed in time and space, succeed in imposing the rhythm of their own vibrations, always taking on more density. To the point that any return to normal is no longer desirable or even imaginable. When we speak of Empire we name the mechanisms of power that preventively and surgically stifle any revolutionary potential in a situation. In this sense, Empire is not an enemy that confronts us head-on. It is a rhythm that imposes itself; a way of dispensing and dispersing reality; Less an order of the world than its sad, heavy and militaristic liquidation. What we mean by the party of insurgents is the sketching out of a completely other composition, an other side of reality, which from Greece to the French banlieues is seeking its consistency.

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater whose best eliminates structural oppression – ideal theory fails.

Tommy J **Curry, 15** (Tommy J Curry, The Cost of a Thing: A Kingian Reformulation of a Living Wage Argument in the 21st Century., No Publication, https://www.academia.edu/9798210/The\_Cost\_of\_a\_Thing\_A\_Kingian\_Reformulation\_of\_a\_Living\_Wage\_Argument\_in\_the\_21st\_Century, 8-28-2015)//iLake-💣🍔

Despite the pronouncement of debate as an activity and intellectual exercise pointing to the real world consequences of dialogue, thinking, and (personal) politics when addressing issues of racism, sexism, economic disparity, global conflicts, and death, many of the discussions concerning these ongoing challenges to humanity are fixed to a paradigm which sees the adjudication of material disparities and sociological realities as the conquest of one ideal theory over the other. In “Ideal Theory as Ideology,” Charles Mills outlines the problem contemporary theoretical-performance styles in policy debate and value-weighing in Lincoln-Douglass are confronted with in their attempts to get at the concrete problems in our societies. At the outset, Mills concedes that “ideal theory applies to moral theory as a whole (at least to normative ethics as against metaethics); [s]ince ethics deals by definition with normative/prescriptive/evaluative issues, [it is set] against factual/descriptive issues.” [[1]](#footnote-1) At the most general level, the conceptual chasm between what emerges as *actual* problems in the world (e.g.: racism, sexism, poverty, disease, etc.) and how we frame such problems *theoretically*—the assumptions and shared ideologies we depend upon for our problems to be heard and accepted as a worthy “problem” by an audience—is the most obvious call for an anti-ethical paradigm, since such a paradigm insists on the actual as the basis of what can be considered normatively. Mills, however, describes this chasm as a problem of an ideal-as-descriptive model which argues that for any actual-empirical-observable social phenomenon (P), an ideal of (P) is necessarily a representation of that phenomenon. In the idealization of a social phenomenon (P), one “necessarily has to abstract away from certain features” of (P) that is observed before abstraction occurs.[[2]](#footnote-2) This gap between what is *actual* (in the world), and what is represented by theories and politics of debaters proposed in rounds threatens any real discussions about the concrete nature of oppression and the racist economic structures which necessitate tangible policies and reorienting changes in our value orientations. As Mills states: “What distinguishes ideal theory is the reliance on idealization to the exclusion, or at least marginalization, of the actual,”[[3]](#footnote-3) so what we are seeking to resolve on the basis of “thought” is in fact incomplete, incorrect, or ultimately irrelevant to the actual problems which our “theories” seek to address. Our attempts to situate social disparity cannot simply appeal to the ontologization of social phenomenon—meaning we cannot suggest that the various complexities of social problems (which are constantly emerging and undisclosed beyond the effects we observe) are totalizable by any one set of theories within an ideological frame be it our most cherished notions of Afro-pessimism, feminism, Marxism, or the like. At best, theoretical endorsements make us aware of sets of actions to address ever developing problems in our empirical world, but even this awareness does not command us to *only* do X, but rather do X and the other ideas which compliment the material conditions addressed by the action X. As a whole, debate (policy and LD) neglects the need to do X in order to remedy our cast-away-ness among our ideological tendencies and politics. How then do we pull ourselves from this seeming ir-recoverability of thought in general and in our endorsement of socially actualizable values like that of the living wage? It is my position that Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.’s thinking about the need for a living wage was a unique, and remains an underappreciated, resource in our attempts to impose value reorientation (be it through critique or normative gestures) upon the actual world. In other words, King aims to reformulate the values which deny the legitimacy of the living wage, and those values predicated on the flawed views of the worker, Blacks, and the colonized (dignity, justice, fairness, rights, etc.) used to currently justify the living wages in under our contemporary moral parameters.
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