### 1

#### We are at the end of art and history as the capitalist regime has been stretched to its absolute limit forcing it to comb through the waste of modernity for the newest affective fuel which the aff readily supplies. Control lives on in de-regulated semiotic economies as abjection becomes the newest surplus value to be accumulated

James 16 (Robin James, UNC Charlotte, “Incandescence, Melancholy, and Feminist Bad Vibes: A Response to Ziarek’s Feminist Aesthetics and the Politics of Modernism”, [**http://differences.dukejournals.org/content/25/2/116.abstract**](http://differences.dukejournals.org/content/25/2/116.abstract), 2016) CJun

To use Jack Halberstam’s term, we like our women to “go gaga” because this incandescence, this “unpredictable feminine” (114) methodology allows us to eke even more light out of otherwise exhausted enlightenment modernity. If we’ve reached, as Ziarek discusses, the so-called end of art and the end of history (and the end of tonality and the end of representation and, well, the end of modernity), then the only way to find more resources is, like Pixar’s wall-e, by sifting through our vast piles of waste. And in that waste heap is abject femininity (what musicologist Susan Cook calls the feminized “abject popular”). Femininity is abject because its exclusion from patriarchy is what constitutes patriarchy as a coherent system. In both Ziarek’s aesthetics of potentiality and in resilience discourse, women artists do the cultural work of remaking abjection or constitutive exclusion into ecstatic radiance.13 In the former case, that work is revolutionary; in the latter case, that work normalizes. Resilience discourse transposes feminist revolution into a nationalist, patriarchal, white supremacist practice. Take, for example, Katy Perry’s “Firework,” in which the lyrics trace the affective journey from dejection to radiant exceptionality. The song begins by asking listeners to identify with feelings of irrelevance, weakness, loneliness, and hopelessness; it posits and affirms damage, suffering, and pain. But then Perry’s narrator argues that in spite and perhaps because of this damage, the listener has precisely the means to connect to others, to make a difference, to have hope: “[T]here’s a spark in you / You just gotta ignite the light and let it shine.” She uses the metaphor of fireworks (and their association with u.s. Independence Day celebrations) to describe the listener’s self-transformation from black dust to shining light: you may feel like trash, but if you can just light yourself on fire, that trash will burn with a dazzling radiance that lights up the sky, just as it lights up audiences’ faces. Here, Perry transforms abjection—feeling like trash, unmoored, socially dead—into incandescent triumph. In the song, the addressee’s personal triumph evokes u.s. nationalist narratives of overcoming colonization (i.e., the Declaration of Independence, celebrated on the Fourth of July). Feminine incandescence—the transformation of waste and melancholy into glowing potential—is no longer revolutionary. Not only parallel to u.s. nationalism, it is the very means for reproducing normativity. In resilience discourse, wild and crazy femmes—like, say, Ke$ha— reproduce normativity in the same way that deregulatory economic practices do (see Cardenas). Unlike Kant’s genius, who gives laws and generates order (i.e., regulation, giving a law) out of unruly materiality, the incandescent, “gaga” femme amplifies what feels like disorder by “resignif[ying] damaged bodies and objects previously expelled from the realm of meaning” (6). And to do this, incandescent femme geniuses use a specific type of experimentation, what Ziarek calls “a dynamic model of interrelation between literary form and material elements of the work of art” (6). This “dynamic interaction” between large-scale form and material details produces “effects” that are “unpredictable and unforeseeable” (Adorno qtd. in Ziarek 114). Experimental methods produce aleatory results.14 Neoliberalism, however, has systematized the aleatory; deregulatory practices are designed to control background conditions so that “dynamic interactions” between form and material produce a range of superficially random outcomes.15 Deregulation turns experimentation into the means of capitalist/hegemonic production. Brilliant gaga ecstasy is what fuels economic and social reproduction.16 So even though incandescent potentiality might be “the very opposite of the traffic in women” (Ziarek 119) figured as the exchange of commodities (e.g., in Irigaray and Rubin), it is quite consistent with neoliberal political and aesthetic economies. Who radiates with potentiality more than the resilient, entrepreneurial postfeminist woman? In the same way that feminized, blackened receptivity was the solution to modernist anxieties about alienation (e.g., the aforementioned Gooding-Williams), feminized, racially nonwhite resilience is taken as a solution to the problem of the “end of art.” Having transgressed all limits and prohibitions—for example, emancipating dissonance, making music out of noise—modernist art had no means of establishing its opposition to society/social normativity. Similarly, capitalism had colonized the globe, exhausting its ability to profit through simple expansion; with no new markets, with nothing else new to conquer, it needed a new method for generating surplus value. As Jeffery Nealon and others argue, capitalism has become a logic of investment and intensity. Instead of expanding and assimilating, it recycles waste and increases efficiencies. Thus, traditionally non- or devalued “women’s work” becomes the fastest growing sector of the service-and-care-work economy. And women’s art-making practices become the hottest new thing in the artworld: think of all the “feminist art” retrospectives and exhibits that have taken place in the past five or so years. Modernism’s constitutive outside becomes neoliberalism’s bread and butter; or, the abject is now censtral to the means of capital, political, and aesthetic production.17

#### Affirming damage is the new means of overcoming it in the pursuit of wholeness

James 15. Robin James, professor of philosophy at UNC Charlotte, Resilience & Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism, Zero Books, 2015: 88

Resilience must be performed explicitly, legibly, and spectacularly. Overcoming is necessary, but insufficient; to count and function as resilience, this overcoming must be accomplished in a visible or otherwise legible and consumable manner. Overcoming is a type of "affective labor" which, as Steven Shaviro puts it, "is productive only to the extent that it is a public performance, it cannot unfold in the hidden depths; it must be visible and audible" (PCA 49n33). In order to tune into feminine resilience and feed it back into its power supply, MRWaSP has to perceive it as such. "Look, I Overcame!" is the resilient subject's maxim or mantra. Gender and race have always been "visible identities," to use philosopher Linda Martin Alcoff's term, identities strongly tied to one's outward physical appearance. However, gendered/ racialized resilience isn't visible in the same way that conventional gender and racial identities are visible. To clarify these differences, it's helpful to think of resilience in terms of a "Look, I Overcame!" imperative. "Look, I Overcame!" is easy to juxtapose to Frantz Fanon's "Look, a Negro!", which is the touchstone for his analysis of gendered racialization in "The Fact of Blackness." In both cases, looking is a means of crafting race/gender identities and distributing white patriarchal privilege. But, in the same way that resilience discourse "upgrades" traditional methods for crafting identities and distributing privilege, the "looking" in "Look, I Overcame!" is an upgrade on the "looking" in "Look, a Negro!" According to Fanon, the exclamation "Look, a Negro!" racializes him as a black man. To be "a Negro" is to be objectified by the white supremacist gaze. This gaze fixes him as an object, rather than an ambiguous transcendence (which is a more nuanced way of describing the existentialist concept of subjectivity). "The black man," as Fanon argues, "has no ontological resistance for the white man" (BSWM 110) because, as an object and not a mutually-recognized subject, he cannot return the white man's gaze ("The Look" that is so important to Sartre's theory of subjectivity in Being & Nothingness). The LIO narrative differs from Fanon's account in the same way it differs from Iris Young's account of feminine body comportment: in resilience discourse, objectification isn't an end but a means. Any impediment posed by the damage wrought by the white/male gaze is a necessary prerequisite for subjectivity, agency, and mutual recognition. In other words, being looked at isn't an impediment, but a resource. Resilience discourse turns objectification (being looked at) into a means of subjectification (overcoming). It also makes looking even more efficient and profitable than simple objectification could ever be. Recognizing and affirming the affective labor of the resilient performer, the spectator feeds the performer's individual overcoming into a second-order therapeutic narrative: our approbation of her overcoming is evidence of our own overcoming of our past prejudices. This spectator wants to be seen by a wider audience as someone who answers the resilient feminine subject's hail, "Look, I Overcame!". Just as individual feminine subjects use their resilience as proof of their own goodness, MRWaSP uses the resilience of its "good girls" as proof that they're the "good guys"—that its social and ethical practices are truly just, and that we really mean it this time when we say everyone is equal. For example, the "resilience" of "our" women is often contrasted with the supposed "fragility" of Third-World women of color. Or, in domestic US race-gender politics, the resilience of some African-American women (their bootstraps-style class ascendance) is contrasted to the continued fragility of other African-American women, and thus used to reinforce class distinctions among blacks. There are a million different versions of this general story: "our" women are already liberated—they saved themselves—but, to riff on Gayatri Spivak, "brown women need saving from brown men." Most mainstream conversations about Third-World women are versions of this story: discussions of "Muslim" veiling, female circumcision, sweatshops, poverty, "development," they're all white-saviorist narratives meant to display MRWaSP's own resilience. Look, I Overcame!" upgrades "Look, a Negro!" by (a) recycling objectification into overcoming .and (b) compounding looking, so that one can profit from others' resilience, treating their overcoming as one's own overcoming. This upgrade in white supremacist patriarchy requires a concomitant upgrade in "looking." This shift in looking practices parallels developments in film and media aesthetics. As Steven Shaviro has argued, the values, techniques, and compositional strategies most common in contemporary mainstream Western cinema—like Michael Bay's Transformers—are significantly different than the ones used in modernist and post-modernist cinema, and that these differences in media production correlate to broader shifts in the means of capitalist and ideological production. Neoliberalism's aesthetic is, he argues, "post-cinematic." This post-cinematic aesthetic applies not just to film and media, but to resilience discourse. Its performance practices and looking relations configured by the "Look, I Overcame!" imperative, resilience is, in a way, another type of post-cinematic medium. In the next section I use Shaviro's theory of post-cinematic media to identify some specific ways in which traditional patriarchal tools are updated to work compatibly with MRWaSP resilience discourse. The looking in the "Look, I Overcame!" narrative is not the same kind of looking described by concepts like "the male gaze" or "controlling images." This looking is a type of deregulated MRWaSP visualization.

#### Multi-Racial White Supremacist Patriarchy (MRWASP) and its cycle of resilient and precarious populations within a deregulated economy are the organizing principles of misogynistic, ableist, anti-black, and anti-queer violence

James 15 (Robin James, UNC Charlotte, Resilience and Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism, Neoliberalism, <https://books.google.com/books/about/Resilience_Melancholy.html?id=Cf5JBgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=kp_read_button#v=onepage&q&f=false>, 2015)

Another way of saying that is: MRWaSP uses resilience to cut the color line—and the gender binary, the line between homonormative and queer, and to differentiate between mainstreamable and non-mainstreamable people with disabilities. (And, to clarify again, by “resilience” I mean a specific neoliberal ideology, not the general sense of surviving in the face of hardship and oppression.) Resilient populations who can overcome their race/class/gender/ sexual/immigrant/religious/ damage in socially profitable ways move closer to the center of white supremacist privilege, whereas less resilient, precarious populations move further and further from this center. Resilience deregulates the work of racialization, gendering, sexualization, bodily normalization, and so on; it treats racialization/ gendering/sexualization/etc. like a deregulated marketplace. Traditionally, race and gender are regulatory mechanisms: they determine to whom and to what extent specific laws apply. They do so explicitly (e.g., the 3/5 rule in the US Constitution), and implicitly (e.g., racial profiling). Deregulation, on the other hand, “displace[s] fordist mechanisms of social control,” like social identities, with “market incentives and disincentives” (Fraser 168). In our post-identity world, we don’t directly prescribe what particular individuals can and can’t do (e.g., employment and housing opportunities must be open to anyone regardless of race or cis-gender identity). Rather, people are given nominally free reign to be “actively responsible agent[s]” (Fraser 168), free agents who play the (supposedly neutral) market for themselves. With deregulatory techniques like resilience, “the color line becomes etched more deeply even as it is, in some quarters, dissolved” into matters of individual choice” (Sexton 244). Rather than tying race status directly and primarily to phenotype (visible race), and then regulating on the basis of racial identity (e.g., Jim Crow, apartheid, etc.), resilience frames race or gender as an effect or outcome of one’s response to underlying, background conditions. At the surface level, individual “choice” isn’t regulated... because, at a deeper level, the game is rigged. Instead of writing rules for the game (that would be directly regulatory), deregulation dispenses with rules and regulates the playing field, the equipment, players’ access to training and practice—what Foucault calls “the conditions of the existence of the market” (BoB 140), its “material, cultural, technical, and legal bases” (141). A deregulatory institution carefully monitors and adjusts the conditions in which the game (i.e., the “market”) can be played so that no matter what happens, the outcome will always be one that hegemony has already bet on. It’s a way of fixing the match by managing background conditions rather than foreground activity. Background conditions are not equal, and they’re definitely controlled by histories of racial exploitation, patriarchy, and so on. It’s harder to bounce back if you’re starting from behind. Hegemony can regulate without appearing to or feeling like it’s regulating—that’s deregulation. MRWaSP is deregulated, but it is also dynamic. Your social/political status in MRWaSP— is thus not taken as an immutable given (like a “born this way” social identity), but as the effect of an ongoing process—the process, as Lester Spence puts it, of being “formed according to market logic” (Spence 15). MRWaSP doesn’t care so much who you are, but what happens through you: that investing in you furthers the aims of MRWaSP, and that these aims are not better accomplished by divesting your human capital. If the color line and the gender binary cut inside from outside, human from sub/non-human. MRWaSP doesn’t so much cut a tine as create a feedback process, one that’s flexible, tuneable, and tweakable so that the white always get whiter and the black always get blacker, so to speak. Racialization, gendering, etc., these aren’t lines that cut but processes that distribute.14 The process of resilience compounds past successes and past failures, creating a probabilistic distribution of success and failure. Your ability to bounce back from a crisis depends on the resources at your disposal; these resources (i.e., your material and social situation) is the result of your response, or your family’s response, to past crises. So, the more resilient you and your family have been, the more resilient you are likely to be now and in the future. Because white supremacy, sexism, ableism, and so on all shape the background material and ideological conditions in which we all work, those who have the best odds of successfully demonstrating their resilience are the ones who have the most heavily stacked decks. Moreover, bourgeois, cis gendered, able-bodied people of color are generally the most resilient ones...in no small part because MRWaSP has to make fewer material and ideological compromises to let them in. Thus, though MRWaSP’s methods are dynamic, the overall distribution of power, bodies, domination, resources, and so on, that remains relatively consistent. The second half of the book discusses the relationship between resilience discourse, MRWaSP, and pop music in much greater detail; it focuses especially on the role of anti- blackness in ideals of resilient femininity. There I will argue that resilient femininity plays a very specific and central role in producing African Americans” as “the exceptions unable to be re-formed” by neoliberal market logic” (Spence 15). MRWaSP is absolutely anti-black anti-queer, ableist, and misogynist. It Is a strategy for producing blackness, queerness, disability, and femininity as mutually-intensifying feedback loops of precariousness.’5 Just think about the most vulnerable populations in the US: it’s usually queer people of color, people whose situations actively deny them the opportunities and resources necessary to profit from their own resilience. People in precarious situations are constantly bouncing back from adversity, but they don’t get to re-invest the surplus value they generate back into their own human capital. Femininity, blackness, queerness, disability, class— these have always been technologies for extracting unpaid surplus value (e.g., slavery, housework, commodified labor). MRWaSP just updates them to work in neoliberalism’s preferred mode: deregulation.

#### The 1AC’s proliferation of meaning and information feeds into the broader system of communicative capitalism. They become information blips endlessly circulating within this academic space, failing to effectuate change.

Dean 5 (Jodi Dean, professor in the Political Science department at Hobart and William Smith Colleges in New York state, “COMMUNICATIVE CAPITALISM: CIRCULATION AND THE FORECLOSURE OF POLITICS”, [**https://commonconf.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/proofs-of-tech-fetish.pdf**](https://commonconf.files.wordpress.com/2010/09/proofs-of-tech-fetish.pdf), 2005) CJun

At first glance, this distinction between politics as the circulation of content and politics as the activity of officials makes no sense. After all, the very premise of liberal democracy is the sovereignty of the people. And, governance by the people has generally been thought in terms of communicative freedoms of speech, assembly and the press, norms of publicity that emphasize transparency and accountability, and the deliberative practices of the public sphere. Ideally, the communicative interactions of the public sphere, what I’ve been referring to as the circulation of content and media chatter, are supposed to impact official politics. In the United States today, however, they don’t, or, less bluntly put, there is a significant disconnect between politics circulating as content and official politics. Today, the circulation of content in the dense, intensive networks of global communications relieves top-level actors (corporate, institutional and governmental) from the obligation to respond. Rather than responding to messages sent by activists and critics, they counter with their own contributions to the circulating flow of communications, hoping that sufficient volume (whether in terms of number of contributions or the spectacular nature of a contribution) will give their contributions dominance or stickiness. Instead of engaged debates, instead of contestations employing common terms, points of reference or demarcated frontiers, we confront a multiplication of resistances and assertions so extensive that it hinders the formation of strong counterhegemonies. The proliferation, distribution, acceleration and intensification of communicative access and opportunity, far from enhancing democratic governance or resistance, results in precisely the opposite – the post-political formation of communicative capitalism. Needless to say, I am not claiming that networked communications never facilitate political resistance. One of the most visible of the numerous examples to the contrary is perhaps the experience of B92 in Serbia. Radio B92 used the Internet to circumvent governmental censorship and disseminate news of massive demonstrations against the Milosevic regime (Matic and Pantic 1999). My point is that the political effi cacy of networked media depends on its context. Under conditions of the intensive and extensive proliferation of media, messages are more likely to get lost as mere contributions to the circulation of content. What enhances democracy in one context becomes a new form of hegemony in another. Or, the intense circulation of content in communicative capitalism forecloses the antagonism necessary for politics. In relatively closed societies, that antagonism is not only already there but also apparent at and as the very frontier between open and closed. <CONTINUED> One of the most basic formulations of the idea of communication is in terms of a message and the response to the message. Under communicative capitalism, this changes. Messages are contributions to circulating content – not actions to elicit responses. Differently put, the exchange value of messages overtakes their use value. So, a message is no longer primarily a message from a sender to a receiver. Uncoupled from contexts of action and application – as on the Web or in print and broadcast media – the message is simply part of a circulating data stream. Its particular content is irrelevant. Who sent it is irrelevant. Who receives it is irrelevant. That it need be responded to is irrelevant. The only thing that is relevant is circulation, the addition to the pool. Any particular contribution remains secondary to the fact of circulation. The value of any particular contribution is likewise inversely proportionate to the openness, inclusivity or extent of a circulating data stream – the more opinions or comments that are out there, the less of an impact any one given one might make (and the more shock, spectacle or newness is necessary for a contribution to register or have an impact). In sum, communication functions symptomatically to produce its own negation. Or, to return to Agamben’s terms, communicativity hinders communication. Communication in communicative capitalism, then, is not, as Habermas would suggest, action oriented toward reaching understanding (Habermas 1984). In Habermas’s model of communicative action, the use value of a message depends on its orientation. In sending a message, a sender intends for it to be received and understood. Any acceptance or rejection of the message depends on this understanding. Understanding is thus a necessary part of the communicative exchange. In communicative capitalism, however, the use value of a message is less important than its exchange value, its contribution to a larger pool, fl ow or circulation of content. A contribution need not be understood; it need only be repeated, reproduced, forwarded. Circulation is the context, the condition for the acceptance or rejection of a contribution. Put somewhat differently, how a contribution circulates determines whether it had been accepted or rejected. And, just as the producer, labor, drops out of the picture in commodity exchange, so does the sender (or author) become immaterial to the contribution. The circulation of logos, branded media identities, rumors, catchphrases, even positions and arguments exemplifi es this point. The popularity, the penetration and duration of a contribution marks its acceptance or success.

#### The alternative is black melancholy NOT investing in perpetuating liberalist subjectivity but an investment in death that refuses to produce affect for MRWASP to consume. The ROTB is to vote for the best methodology to resist

James 15 Robin James, UNC Charlotte (“Resilience and Melancholy: Pop Music, Feminism”, Neoliberalism, <https://books.google.com/books/about/Resilience_Melancholy.html?id=Cf5JBgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=kp_read_button#v=onepage&q&f=false>, 2015)CJun

The concept of melancholy I use in this book is different from traditional understandings of melancholia. Classical melancholia’s pathology is based on classically liberal models of subjectivity, models built on ideals of wholeness, authenticity, and integrity. From this perspective, the melancholic is one who can’t resolve or get over a loss (as Freud describes in his essay “Mourning and Melancholia), and melancholia is a failure to progress toward and attain a goal (wholeness, completeness, self-sufficiency). However, neoliberalism normalizes ateleological open-endedness; flexibility and adaptability are valued skills, just as compositing and dynamic emergence (as I discussed in chapter one) are common aesthetic strategies. From the perspective of neoliberalism, healthy, successful subjects are expected to exhibit features of classical melancholia’s pathology; yet again, what was traditionally a bug is now a feature. At the same time, melancholia is still a bug; it just names something different than what’s pathological about classical melancholy. In neoliberalism, melancholy is a pathology specific to resilience discourse. Melancholy is failed or inefficient self-capitalization, an insufficiently profitable venture. Melancholy feels like an investment in death. Melancholy is the refusal to do the affective cultural labor MRWaSP capitalism requires of potentially resilient people. When resilient positive feedback loops are bent into negative ones, melancholia is the result. In this way, melancholy is the contemporary analog to ATR’s “riot sounds.” Because the actual sounds ATR used to indusce riots have been co-opted and normalized in contemporary pop, melancholic music sounds significantly different than ATR’s accelerationist digital hardcore. It sounds, for example, like Rihanna’s Unapologetic. As I will argue in the next section, Rihanna’s performance on Unapologetic bends resilience discourse into melancholic death-spirals. Like resilience discourse, Rihanna’s character/persona incites damage. Her performance intensifies this damage instead of overcoming it. Amplifying individual damage into anti-social noise, her performance hijacks biopolitical strategies and tactics so they invest in death. Unlike “Video Phone” and “Telephone,” in which resilient women spectacularly execute supposedly misogynist black men, Rihanna’s Unapologetic repeatedly invokes her ongoing attachment to stereotypically misogynist black masculinity (e.g., in the figure of Chris Brown, her abusive ex-boyfriend). She rejects resilience discourse and its demand to overcome the damage MRWaSP attributes to black men. That is, she refuses to produce blackness, especially as embodied by a particular style of black masculinity, as what Lester Spence calls “the exception” to MRWaSP society. In this way, Rihanna performs a melancholic attachment to non-bourgeois black masculinity and to biopolitical death.

### Top Level

#### 1. The aff’s form of negation is only radical and noisy in relationship to resisting a liberal form of humanism. However, capitalism turns symbolic rejection into predictable noise that gets coopted. Destroying is only radical if hegemony wants you to build.

**James 13**

“From ‘No Future’ to ‘Delete Yourself (You Have No Chance to Win)’: Death, Queerness, and the Sound of Neoliberalism” by Robin James 2013 Journal of Popular Music Studies, Volume 25, Issue 4, Pages 504–536 // DD + JM + Lex VM

“Because it emerged during the Enlightenment, **liberal humanism has been the West’s dominant** epistemic and evaluative **paradigm. It organizes the world in ways that privilege the ideals of teleological development**, authenticity, rationality, and autonomous agency, or choice. **Many** well- known queer theories and **theorists** respond to, **critique**, and try to queer **not “hegemony” in general, but a classically liberal conception of hegemony.** For example, **“no future” is** a **radical**ly queer claim **only in a context where teleological development and progress are hegemonic ideals** (similarly, “anarchy” is radical only in response to a rigid insistence on arche). The musical structure of The Sex Pistols’s “God Save the Queen” makes this clear. This song, with its refrain, “no future,” has been central to Jack Halberstam’s critique of Lee Edelman’s 2004 book No Future, and to 6 Halberstam’s own concept of queer failure. Especially because Halberstam’s primary critique of Edelman is the latter’s “excessively small archive” (Halberstam Queer Art 109), it is interesting that neither Halberstam’s initial critique nor Edelman’s response addresses the song’s music; they only discuss lyrics. This is a particularly narrow approach to analyzing a song. Attending to the song’s music helps to clarify some theoretical limitations of the debate about “death” and “no future” as queer rallying cries. So what goes on, musically, in this track? Though its lack of guitar solo and stripped-down aesthetic make it a conventionally punk reaction to glammy excess, “God Save the Queen”—especially its harmony, formal composition, and instrumentation—is a rather conventional tonal rock song in the key of A. The A chord is easy to play on the guitar, hence its common use in punk songs. The song begins with a riff that plays the leading tone, G#, against the tonic, A. A very powerful and common way of creating tension, the same strategy is used in the well known *Jaws* theme. This riff also concludes the song. The journey from and back to this riff includes a foray into E in the two bridges with lyrics, and into B in the instrumental bridge near the end. E is the dominant (V) of A, and B is the dominant of E. So, the song uses a lot of very conventional harmonic gestures, like modulation to the dominant, to compose an even more conventional overall song structure. Though this song might have been very different than then- mainstream radio rock, its use of tonal harmony is rooted in 200-plus years of Western musical tradition. We can thus criticize the Pistols’s music for the same flaw that Halberstam identifies in Edelman’s text: it “does not fuck the law, big or little L” (*Queer Art* 107). In its use of harmony, “God Save” “succumbs to the law of grammar, the law of logic” (Halberstam Queer Art 2017). This song (like many punk songs) does not fuck the laws of tonal harmony so much as distill them to their essence. “God Save” isn’t *musically* an-archic. “God Save’s” conventional tunefulness distinguishes it from Edelman’s example of the sonic properties of queer death. Working from Hitchcock’s The Birds, he argues that queer **death sounds like meaningless repetition, “random signals,” white noise, or “electronic buzzing.”** Following from what he identifies as the “repetitive insistence of the sinthome (No Future 56), Edelman argues that meaningless, un(re)productive repetition is key to the critical force of queerness or, in his terms, “sinthomosexuality (No Future, 33).” Western sexual, epistemic, and aesthetic structures overemphasize “reproduction” to conceal the presence and importance of repetition. Reproductive futurity is “blin[d]” to “its own ‘automatic reiteration’ of the logic that always tops our ideological charts,” i.e., to its own compulsion to repeat and reinstall itself. In more Freudian terms (1927), “reproduction” is the fetishistic recognition and disavowal of “repetition.” For Edelman, queer **death is the negation of teleological rationality,** the an in an-arche. **To conventionally trained Western ears, it sounds anarchic.** This is more or less the exact claim that African American Studies scholars Tricia Rose (1994) and James Snead (1981) make about the way Western music “secrets” repetition. According to Rose, Snead claims that European culture “secrets” repetition, categorizing it as progression or regression, assigning accumulation and growth or stagnation to motion, whereas black cultures highlight the obser- vance of repetition, perceiving it as circulation, equilibrium . . . : “In European culture, repetition must be seen to be not just circulation and flow, but accumulation and growth. In black culture, the thing is there for you to pick up when you come back to get it. If there is a goal . . . it is always deferred; it continually ‘cuts’ back to the start . . . .” (69) As Rose and Snead indicate, Afro-diasporic musics tend to foreground repetition and, rather than trying to create a sense of evolutionary continuity—what Edelman calls “the genealogy that narrative syntax labors to affirm”—use “cuts” to create loops, which are then repeated over and over again (Edelman, *No Future* 23.) **In the same way that a DJ cuts** into the breakbeat **and loops it back to the beginning**, sinthomosexuality is a “textual machine . . . **like a guillotine,” that uses the cut to “reduc[e] the** assurance of meaning in **fantasy’s promise of continuity to the meaningless circulation and repetitions of the drive”** (Edelman, *No Future* 23 and 39). The mutual privileging of repetition and “the cut” is one of the main ties between Edelman’s theory of queerness and Afro-diasporic cultural and cosmological views. The queer-critical potential of looping, cutting, and the rejection of teleo-evolutionary development is also central to J. Jack Halberstam’s work on queer/trans cinema. For example, “queer time” involves the refusal of “growing up” (subjective evolutionary development to “normal” adulthood), and the “reveal” of a transgender character breaks linear narrative development by forcing viewers to revisit prior scenes in light of new knowledge about a character’s gender identity. If, in white heteropatriarchial hegemony, blackness and queerness are mutually implicative, the similarities between Edelman, Halberstam, and Snead and Rose should not be surprising. They are not just responding to the same interwoven networks of privilege and oppression, but to a specific way of understanding power: “reproductive futurity” and the European ideology of teleological “accumulation and growth” are both **classically liberal frameworks whose centering of wholeness**, resolution, **development, and assimilation encourage the** elision and **misconstrual of “repetition.” Negation is a counter-hegemonic response to this supposedly coherent arche of teleological development**, accumulation, and growth. **Destroying is radical only if hegemony wants you to build. These** queer, Afro-diasporic **strategies of repetition, cutting, and meaningless noise are not responses to power in general; rather, they are specifically targeted critiques of a classically liberal concept of power. Sounds are** meaningless, random, and **“noisy” only when evaluated against a specific standard** of audiological significance, logic, and musicality. **Noisy an-*arche* sounds** queer and **illogical only to ears tempered by a *logos* that privileges development, teleology,** euphony, virtuosity/perfection/mastery, **and rationality.** **Neoliberalism, however, doesn’t care about linear progress. It has a different logic, one that co-opts** classically queer **negation, redistributing it and putting it in the service of privileged groups.** In the next section, I examine Atari Teenage Riot’s use of the Pistols’s riff from “God Save.” The riff’s musical recontextualization demonstrates that the queer/Afro-diasporic **negations of classically liberal ideals of teleological *arche* have**, in the intervening twenty years, **been used to condense queer/black assemblages around a different kind of logic** of death**—death not as negation** (the *an* in an-*arche*), **but as disinvested, “bare” life.**” (505-508)

#### 2. The information revolution under neoliberalism has left black women to die – white masculine content and control of technology has hurt black women and children for years, while framing neoliberalism and “saving” them

Noble 16 (Safiya Umoja Noble, assistant professor in the Department of Information Studies in the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies at UCLA , appointments in the Departments of African American Studies, Gender Studies, and Education, Her research on the design and use of applications on the Internet is at the intersection of race, gender, culture, and technology, working on a monograph on racist and sexist algorithmic bias in search engines like Google , Associate Editor for the Journal of Critical Library and Information Studies, “A Future for Intersectional Black Feminist Technology Studies”, published 2016, accessed 8/30/17, <http://sfonline.barnard.edu/traversing-technologies/safiya-umoja-noble-a-future-for-intersectional-black-feminist-technology-studies/)> //AJA

Neoliberal narratives of digital technologies and the internet have flourished in information and internet studies and suggest that the web is a panacea of social liberation and empowerment. These ideas have been refuted with much evidence by critical theorists in the field, yet work remains to be done in shifting the complex, global patterns of capital that build the material infrastructures of the information and communications revolution at the expense of Black life diasporically. Meanwhile, in other academic and political arenas, the struggle to recognize multiple, interlocking systems of oppression has been ongoing for roughly 40 years. Brittney Cooper has already offered a detailed analysis of intersectional theory,[3] tracing the emergence of the term “intersectionality”[4] and its problematics and possibilities. Yet the term remains highly pertinent to the field of information and communication studies, which has not sufficiently responded to nor benefitted from intersectional lenses such as Black queer feminist intervention. Indeed, systems of interlocking oppression have rarely been a framework of analysis in the field of internet studies, overlooked in favor of dominant and frequently technologically deterministic perspectives that ignore interlocking, structural, and globalized sites of oppression. What is potent about Black feminism is its focus on the liberation of Black women globally, intentionally linking Black women in the West with Black women in the Third World, and making interdependent experiences shaped by race, gender, patriarchy, capitalism, and imperialism a driving imperative for liberation movements to end oppression. This through line—from the pan-Africanist movement of the early twentieth century, to the Combahee River Collective—powerfully resurfaced in the 2014 statement by the three Black and queer women who founded the #BlackLivesMatter movement. It is this lens that I wish to invoke in theorizing whether a liberatory, intersectional internet is even plausible, when contextualized in a Black feminist tradition. In doing so, I explore the ways that the internet and its infrastructure are central to the myriad oppressive conditions facing Black life in the US and in the African diaspora. The goal of theorizing a liberatory, intersectional internet is to heighten awareness of how the global communications infrastructure is not just a site of communications affordance, nor is it made equally and equitably available to all people. On the contrary, it is implicated in a number of environmental and oppressive conditions for Black life. By making these connections more visible, my hope is to shift discourses away from simple arguments about the liberatory possibilities of the internet toward more critical engagements with how the internet is a site of power and control over Black life—a perspective relevant to scholars working in Black Studies, gender studies, and information studies. Intersectionality was developed by many feminist, antiracist scholars and activists of color as a framework for deepening an analysis of power and oppression across multiple axes.[5] Intersectionality, however, has been woefully under-engaged as a way of thinking about the political economy of the internet and has, in fact, been separated from its Black feminist roots. To echo the critiques that Black women have levied at feminist movements over time, the pervasive under-commitment to the concerns of Black women as we intersect with, and are intersected by, technologies exemplifies a broader unwillingness among those promulgating mainstream discourses to engage with notions of racism, class, and sexuality in the fields of computer science, digital media studies, information, and technology studies. We need more interdisciplinary research and theorizing about how a range of digital technologies are embedded with intersectional and uneven power relations, from the ways in which technologies are structured, through the range of engagements that happen on the web, to the materiality of digital communications infrastructures that include the role of the state and capital in the extraction, manufacture, and disposal of the digital. Theorizing about the liberatory potentials of the internet for activism, communication, media-making, and culture is often the focus of research about the internet. Often, this research focuses on the United States and is without sufficient power critique. The study of race on the internet is not new and has been written about by many scholars who have argued that race is a meaningful part of the field, albeit under-theorized. The primary focus of research on race and the internet is in the US context and has largely engaged issues of representation and racial formation. In response to this, Jessie Daniels has called for more attention in the nascent field of digital media studies to critique what is truly missing; namely, discussions of white supremacy as the primary framework that structures research inquiries in the field.[6] Lori Kendall and André Brock, in particular, have also offered meaningful critiques of how normative presumptions of whiteness and maleness serve as a default identity of internet users.[7] Brock characterizes how technology design and practice are instantiated with racial ideologies: [T]he Western Internet, as a social structure, represents and maintains White, masculine, bourgeois, heterosexual and Christian culture through its content. These ideologies are translucently mediated by the [internet] browser’s design and concomitant information practices. English-speaking internet users, content providers, policy makers, and designers bring their racial frames to their internet experiences, interpreting racial dynamics through this electronic medium while simultaneously redistributing cultural resources along racial lines. These practices neatly recreate social dynamics online that mirror offline patterns of racial interaction by marginalizing women and people of color.[8] Brock argues that technology discourses normalize White masculinity as a presupposition for the prioritization of resources, content, and design of information and communications technologies (ICTs); in this, Brock’s work is representative of recent important scholarship that calls attention to the culture of the internet and how racism operates or structures it. Jerry Kang’s foundational 2000 paper addressing critical race theory and cyberspace was also among the first to look at the architecture of racial representation on the web, and the liberatory possibilities thereof, which unfortunately, were never fully achieved as envisioned by early web theorists.[9] Since that time, many new media scholars have continued to write about race online, addressing the complexities of multiple and simultaneous racialized and gendered identities that affect values embedded in the internet. Nevertheless, the large-scale uptake of intersectional analysis as applied to the internet in its various forms had been notably missing, particularly in discussions of the internet’s materiality. In recent years, there has been a shift: Black feminism, where once missing from information studies, is now being used as a theoretical framework for thinking about Black women’s representations and engagements online.[10] Black feminist scholars examine digital technology phenomena by seeing how race, gender, class, power, sexuality, and other socially constructed categories interact with one another in a matrix of relations that create conditions of inequality or oppression. Black feminist thought also offers a useful and anti-essentializing lens for understanding how both race and gender are constituted through historical, social, political, and economic processes,[11] creating openings for challenging research questions and new analytical possibilities. As a theoretical approach, it challenges the dominant research on race and gender, which tends to universalize problems assigned to race or Blackness as “male” (or the problems of men) and organizes gender as primarily conceived through the lenses and experiences of White women, leaving Black women in a precarious and understudied position.[12] Intersectionality has moved to the fore in Black studies, gender studies, sociology, and other fields; so much so that in some cases the concept and word have been divorced from Black feminist epistemologies and scholarship entirely. The word “intersectionality” is often invoked even as the Black, radical, queer, and feminist intellectual traditions from which the term was generated are silenced. It has rarely been invoked in information studies research, making this contribution to the scholarship even more important. In previous research, both critical race theory and Black feminism helped me make sense of the ways that technology ecosystems—from traditional classification systems such as library databases[13] to new media technologies such as commercial search engines—are structuring detrimental narratives about Black life,[14] and reproducing racist narratives that work in service of material disenfranchisement. I have used Black feminism to study the potency and problematics of the hypersexualized image of Black women and girls in Google searches and the implications of such for public information resources. In doing so, I show how Black women are located in a long and tragic history of misrepresentation that has material consequences in Black women’s lives. The prevalence of derogatory images of Black women in the media is meaningfully tied to the real-world circumstances that demean the value of Black women’s lives, and these images serve as justification for systemic exclusion and oppression.[15] For example, the Center for American Progress reports a number of sobering facts about Black women’s lives in the US: Black women receive 65% of new AIDS diagnoses Single African American women have a median wealth of $100 African American women with children have zero median wealth The poverty rate of African American lesbian couples is 21.1 percent versus 4.3 percent for White lesbian couples African American women are three times more likely than White women to be incarcerated. According to the American Civil Liberties Union, Latinas and African American women are disproportionately affected both by crime (since they are more likely to be victimized) and by incarceration, especially those who are primary caregivers for their children.[16] The kinds of economic and social precarity described above are tied directly to the legacy of enslavement and colonization, which persists in contemporary life for many Black women and children around the globe. Therefore, rather than follow the traditions in new media and information studies that primarily focus on racial representation without direct ties to the material conditions of oppressed people, I now co-locate my digital studies work with Daniels’s call[17] for an analysis that foregrounds how white supremacy structures the internet as we know it in the West. In the context of the digital, this intersectional framing allows for questions—absent from other analyses—that link the processes and structures of hegemony, imperialism, and power to the material implications of the project we know as the internet. The Intersectional Internet Infrastructure I now move to theorizing the materiality of the internet through an intersectional analysis of the labor of extracting and disposing of digital technologies. This move from representation to other forms of materiality provides an important new contribution to moving the fields of information and communication studies toward research that examines the global distributions of resources that disproportionately and negatively impact Black life, and the lives of those in the Global South, in the material creation, use, and disposal of digital technology engagements.[18] To engage in these continued research efforts requires an expansion of our definitions of white supremacy to include how global flows of capital from US corporations and Silicon Valley structure labor markets and material infrastructures that are part of an oppressive system of digital technological engagements, largely hidden from view in the consumerist model of technology adoption. In the US, Black women’s participation with the digital is frequently evinced in neoliberal preoccupations with learning to code, or to enter science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields, given and in spite of the low employment rates of Black women in Silicon Valley and across science and information technology fields. Rather than focus this paper on how Black women and girls can participate in such projects, a matter I take up elsewhere, I will say that these projects are largely an individualized, privatized approach to thinking about Black women’s empowerment, in neoliberal fashion. Here, I instead focus on the “interlocking oppressions” that are now entering the collective consciousness of academics and activists, who are engaging in what I have previously termed a Black feminist technology studies approach to thinking through the implications of the internet as global communications infrastructure.[19] I focus on this because many African American digital technology projects are disconnected in their context, content, and intent from the materiality of ICT processes in the Black/African diaspora. Framed for a Western audience—commonly presumed as the intended target for many internet technologies and platforms—they are hidden from view. Further, the neoliberal project privileges the technology experiences of individuals over the collective, the consumer over the producer, the African-American over the Black/African diaspora. Intersectional analysis allows for needed linkages between the labor and resources involved in the web and other global communications infrastructure projects that both facilitate, and are a source of, globalized extractive capitalism.

#### 3. Capitalist commodification is the root cause of the hypersexualization of black women’s bodies.

Dagbovie-Mullins 13 (Sika A., Associate Professor of English at Florida Atlantic University where she teaches African American literature; 2004 Ph.D. English, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; 1999 M.A. English, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; 1997 B.A. English, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois) “Pigtails, Ponytails, and Getting Tail: The Infantilization and Hyper-Sexualization of African American Females in Popular Culture” The Journal of Popular Culture, Vol. 46, No. 4, 2013

The historical construction of black females as sexual commodities distinguishes contemporary representations of black female bodies from those of other women. Patricia Hill Collins reminds us, “Black women’s bodies have been objectified and commodified under U.S. capitalist class relations” (Black Feminist Thought 132).8 She asserts that historically, “Black women’s sexuality could be reduced to gaining control over an objectified vagina that could then be commodified and sold.... current portrayals of Black women in particular—reducing women to butts—works to reinscribe these commodified body parts” (133). Like the sexualization of black women, the sexual objectification of black girls has roots in slavery. Wilma King notes, “[o]nce slave girls reached adolescence, they faced the possibility of sexual exploita- tion” (158). Popular cultural representations of black girls in the twentieth century frequently merged girlhood and sexual objectifica- tion. As David Pilgrim points out, “An analysis of Jezebel images [in twentieth century racist paraphernalia] also reveals that Black female children are sexually objectified. Black girls, with the faces of pre-teen- agers, are drawn with adult sized buttocks, which are exposed. They are naked, scantily clad, or hiding seductively behind towels, blankets, trees, or other objects.”9 Contemporary images of black females (ado- lescent and adult) in magazines, videos, and television thus have differ- ent meanings and historical connotations than sexualized images of females with different racial and/or ethnic backgrounds.

#### 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 hypervaluation of non-resilient and resilient Black women

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])

This post is an experiment. It attempts to find a new route to the question of what it means to politicize Audre Lorde’s legacy. Its search is partly in response to what I described in part 1 as the tendency in some cases to deify Lorde by extracting her from the political context in which she lived, or by reducing her to a set of pithy (if brilliant) quotations, or by invoking her as an unqualified paragon of black women’s resilience. In attempting to route the conversation differently, my strategy is to try and glimpse Lorde through an archive that is not of her published writings but of a set of struggles and contexts that affirm dimensions of her humanity and her work that are too rarely emphasized—her struggles with health and wellness, her status as worker, her vulnerability to the very discourses that demand that she be seen as powerful. Doing this means following a route that may, to some, seem rather circuitous. I can only hope that by the end, those divergences will make some sense.

To begin, here is Alexis Pauline Gumbs:

[A]s Audre Lorde’s archival papers prove, she was denied medical leave, had to turn down prestigious fellowships (including the senior fellowship at Cornell) that required residency in places too cold for her to live during her fight against cancer. The English Department at Hunter, which recently honored Lorde with a conference 20 years after her death, rejected her proposals at the end of her life to teach on a limited residency basis that would allow her to teach poetry intensive classes for students during warm weather in New York and to live in warmer climates during the winter based on her health needs.

Audre Lorde didn’t die a natural death. She died an institutionally produced one, a death that was generated at the level of social infrastructure. I want us to learn to regard Audre Lorde’s death as an effect of racial capitalism—its fundamentally unequal provisioning of wealth and social goods, its ableist and productivist standards as to what constitutes a healthy person, its fashioning of health care as a private commodity rather than as a fundamental right, and its particular commingling of sexism and racism that at one and the same time materializes the constant demand that black women work and renders the work they do invisible. The conditions that produced Audre Lorde’s death, in other words, might also serve as a reminder that in the aggregate, black women bear a disproportionate share of racial capitalism’s propensity to work its workers to death. And a major feature of these death-making conditions is to be found in the ways in which it is structured so as to refuse to recognize as work what so many black women do for themselves, for each other, and for their communities—this may include but is not limited to the largely unwaged work of cooking, cleaning, raising, educating, and caring for children and adults in its myriad forms. (This is the work, to paraphrase part of the most overlooked chapter of Angela Davis’s Women, Race, and Class, that no one notices until it’s not done.)

To reiterate, these death-making conditions serve as a motor for racial capitalism not only through the erasure, devaluation, and naturalization of life-making and life-sustaining (also called "reproductive”) work that women are expected to learn to do, to do, and to love doing,[1] but also because through the erasure of “women’s work” as work, they serve to compel and coerce workers to accept waged labor above and beyond the work they already perform. This compulsion and coercion regularly takes the form of the form of the stigmatization and surveillance of poor people and poor women especially, who use governmental assistance to survive. And again, here, black women bear the brunt of the burden of capitalism’s stigmatization of the poor (of color). "Welfare,“ as Dorothy Roberts puts it, "has become a code word for race.” By which she means: a code word for blackness. Think here of the sheer prominence of the “welfare queen” stereotype (and its deployment to make common sense out of the notion that black women who use governmental assistance are parasitic on the social body). Think here, also, how the racializing and gendering of that stereotype authorizes the constant surveillance to which welfare recipients are regularly and systematically subjected, surveillance whose purpose it is to call into doubt the ability of welfare recipients to make fitting choices in deciding how and what to feed themselves (and those that depend upon them), how and what they should consume.

It matters that Audre Lorde, by virtue of a class mobility that materialized in the form of advanced degrees, international recognition and renown, and semi-stable employment with what were clearly circumscribed “health benefits,” may have been able to escape the worst of the state-sanctioned, Reaganomics-fueled state surveillance directed towards poor black women.[2] And it also matters that the racializing and gendering project of the capitalism that underwrites that surveillance also shaped the conditions in which she lived and died in ways that are too rarely recognized. We in the U.S. left are well trained to express outrage when black lives are stolen in spectacular events—not only in the assassinations of “our” Malcolms and Martins, but even in the executions of our less famed Emmetts and Oscars and Trayvons. Yet we are not always best equipped to organize against the politics that produce deaths not in spectacular (and regular), direct, face-to-face expressions of violence but rather, through other, less readily visible, rhythms and structures of everyday life. To ask that we regard Audre Lorde’s death as the outcome of a politics (and not just a disease) is both to invoke Lorde less as an exceptional figure than as a powerfully exemplary one, and to direct our attention to how the murderousness of capitalism expresses itself where it is most mundane.[3]

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.

Case

#### 1] Presume neg – it’s the affs job to prove a desirable change from the squo. statements are false till proven true that’s why we don’t believe conspiracy theories

#### 2] Reject framing arguments that parameterize content – debate should be an open forum to attack ideas from different directions – anything else brackets out certain modes of knowledge production which their ev would obviously disagree w/.

#### Prefer –

#### 1. Competition- The competitive nature of debate wrecks the interactive nature of debate – the judge must decide between two competing speech acts and the debaters are trying to beat each other – this is the wrong forum for interaction

#### 2. Spillover- How does educational orientations spill over beyond this space? Empirically denied – judges vote on this shit on this time and nothing ever happens.

#### 3. Prescription- certain interactions are prescripted – eg subjectivity– can’t be reformulated so easily