# 1NC Octas TFA

### 1NC – Theory

Interp: 1AR theory, dtd, competing interps, no 2n paradigms

Violation

Standard – inf abuse

Clash

Norming outweighs

#### Vote neg on substance – I couldn’t engage in the aff in the first place

#### DTD – a] deters future abuse b] my strat has already been skewed so it’s the only way to rectify the abuse

#### Competing interps – a] reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation b] reasonability collapses since brightlines operate on an offense-defense paradigm

#### Norming outweighs – a] constitutivism – it’s the intrinsic purpose of theory b] magnitude – it’s the only out of round impact which link turns their arguments because they assume a good model of debate

#### No RVIs – a] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, b] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and c] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

#### No cross-apps, overviews, or aff meta theory – it’s how tricky debaters get away with abuse, force them to justify a CI.

#### Answering the spike doesn’t solve – it’s a matter of norming so possible in round responses doesn’t disprove the shell

#### DTA on 1AR shells/IVIs – they can blow up blippy shells in the 2AR but I split time and can’t preempt the 2AR causing intervention making it irresolvable so don’t drop me

#### Reasonability on 1AR shells/IVIs – 1AR theory is aff-biased because the 2AR gets to line-by-line with new answers

#### RVIs on 1AR theory – 2AR being able to win on a 15 second shell forces at least 2:30 in the 2NR so RVIs check time skew

### 1NC – K

#### The first commercial logistics began with the Atlantic slave trade necessitating a global paradigm of racism and eugenics. It’s an a priori issue to challenge operations management within academia.

**Moten & Harney 21** – Fred Moten, Professor of Performance Studies for the Tisch School of the Arts at NYU, PhD in English from UC Berkeley, 2020 MacArthur Genius Fellow, Stefano Harney, Professor of Strategic Management for the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Singapore Management University, PhD in Social and Political Sciences from the University of Cambridge, co-founder of Ground Provisions—a curatorial collective, founder of the School for Study—a nomadic study collective (2021, *All Incomplete*, pp 13-18) Justin **\*\*Unread parts have some graphic descriptions of the Atlantic Slave Trade.**

LOGISTICS

The imperium of cotton and sugar not only hosted these fiendish early experiments in breaking collectivity on the line and inserting and asserting wills but also gave us an early glimpse of an integrated global supply chain. The breeding and marching or shipping of the enslaved southward and westward from Tidewater and Piedmont plantations, or inland from the Caribbean and Pacifc Coasts of Colombia, to make crops financed through speculation on their torture-enforced, metric-imposed labor; and the bales of cotton or barrels of molasses loaded on ships in New Orleans or Bridgetown, insured in London, bound for Liverpool’s wholesale clearinghouses or Massachusetts distilleries, are links in a global value chain created by bankers, planters and slavers. But it is only in our time that this supply chain becomes fully integrated with the flow of the line inside the factory gates. Around the same time that operations management was coming to understand kaizen and the valuation of the fow of the line itself, it was also rethinking the linearity and finitude of the line. It is at this point that a new subdiscipline in operations management becomes frmly established as a rigorous academic discipline in the business schools: logistics. Of course, logistics already existed as a practice going back in military affairs as long as there have been sieges, invasions, and forts. Food, water, weapons, and people had to be transported and maintained to support any strategy of war. The African and Trans-Atlantic slave trade represented the great, hideous introduction of mass logistics for commercial rather than military or state purposes. It became the ghoulish lab of experiment in access for singular means of work and sex, worldmaking and subjectivization. Much would follow, including infrastructure projects for the circulation of people, goods, and information and, of course, more mass displacements, indentures and migrations in the brutal enforcement against indigenous peoples and he very idea and practice of indigeneity of the law of genocide and geocide. All of this logistics would not only bear this trademark of ‘continent of origin’ in the slave trade, but with usufruct the improvement of fow would become indistinguishable from racialization. Whiteness, as racialization’s origin and residuum, where access is imposition and submission in self-protection and self-determination rather than practicing incompleteness, is the self-improvement of flow. Blackness becomes what it already was, the prior interruption, the sabotage to come, the incapacity to breathe into the fow as the capacity for breath as means, for the breadth of means.

It is little wonder, then, that when the modern idea of the economy appears, as Timothy Mitchell teaches us, the discipline emerges shackled to racial science. Mitchell reminds us that the founding American economist, the one who inaugurates the discipline by building the first working model of this independent ‘economy,’ was not incidentally a racist and eugenicist, but necessarily so. Irving Fisher theorized that economics should be the study of money and what today would be called human capital. Both, according to Fisher, could be improved (and therefore speculated upon). But “racial degeneracy” meant that some had no understanding of the future. The degenerate races had therefore no desire or ability to improve. They would have to have their utility maximized for them, by usufruction.

#### Their unattainable politics culminates in racist categorization.

Moten 03 – Fred Moten, Professor of Performance Studies for the Tisch School of the Arts at NYU, PhD in English from UC Berkeley, 2020 MacArthur Genius Fellow (2003, “In the Break: The Aesthetics of the Black Radical Tradition,” <https://www.kit.ntnu.no/sites/www.kit.ntnu.no/files/Moten-Fred-Break-Aesthetics-Black-Radical-Tradition.pdf>) Justin

The relationship between object and objectivity in Piper is disjunctive. Think about objectivity as universality, as a set of faculties or attributes given in the set of human beings; objectivity is the quality of being universal, that which is true for everyone. When Piper speaks about wanting to eliminate subjective judgments (i.e., valuative or aesthetic judgments, the question of beauty and, even, pleasure—what might have been called the immanent aesthetic) from her experience of art, she moves within a certain desire for the objective (i.e., epistemological/ethical, the categorical and its imperatives, the transcendental aesthetic as the ideality of space-time) in art. Similarly, when Piper turns herself into an object of art she could be said to be moving in the desire for a detachment from certain subjective/invalid judgments. What she calls, in her description of the Untitled Performance for Max’s Kansas City, the self-consciousness of art-consciousness, especially in that it is shaped by the visual pathology of racist categorization, is the Weld of such bad judgment.

But Piper seems to deny the implications of what is, for Kant, an enabling paradox: the objective-transcendental ground of humanity seems inseparable from a certain subjective condition of its possibility— the ideality of space-time is always conditioned, made possible, by a specific experience of space-time. And this experience or immanence is always susceptible, has always been susceptible, to bad judgment, to the irrationality that is, at once, constitutive of the rational and the rational’s necessary extension when it reaches its limits. And in this last lies the rub since one must tap into the possibility of bad judgment— aesthetic judgment—in order precisely to work these necessary augmentations of (devolved or delimited) rationality. The repression or denial of the subjective conditions of objectivity in Piper’s philosophy is overcome by an aggressive critique of the subject enacted in and by the rematerialization of the object. But this rematerialization of the object is always also the rematerialization of the artwork. So that the repression or denial of the subject/ive, which moves into a critique of the subject/ive, is enacted by way of a return or recovery of the subject/ive where the subject /ive is (the) reanimated, rematerialized personhood as objet d’art.

#### Modern intellectualism only legitimates a racist order founded upon white exceptionalism, casting deviant knowledge production as “non-objective”. The alternative is Black Radical Tradition – forefronting black scholarship is an a priori issue that can form new forms of radical organization.

Johnson & Lubin 18 – Gaye Theresa Johnson and Alex Lubin. (August 2018, “Futures of Black Radicalism,” <https://rampages.us/goldstein/wp-content/uploads/sites/7807/2018/08/Johnson-and-Lubin-2017-Futures-of-Black-radicalism.pdf>) Justin

With other middle classes, the intellectual often acts as a reactionary in contrast to those striving for liberation from racial capitalism. Ideologically, intellectuals are more inclined to maintain their position in the class-stratified society than destroy it. An agent who emerged from liberal bourgeois academic institutions, the petit bourgeois intellectual’s role has been to legitimate the social order. As the Gulbenkian Commission on the Restructuring of the Social Sciences notes, “The intellectual history of the nineteenth century is marked above all by disciplinarization and professionalization of knowledge, that is to say, by the creation of permanent institutional structures designed both to produce new knowledge and to reproduce the producers of knowledge.” 32 Through a racialized, gendered, and especially class-specific project, academic institutions have privatized and restricted knowledge production to elites and those from the upper classes. Any knowledge production by the lower orders of society has been interpreted as illegitimate, backward, or nonscientific, thereby allowing the knowledge produced through academic institutions by intellectuals to mask power relations through claims of objectivity and positivism.

Academic scholarship continues this practice under the neoliberal turn. Although people who were historically excluded from the academy have entered it, many have followed the path of becoming “private intellectuals.” 33 In her discussion of academic scholarship by those once marginalized by the academy, Ruth Wilson Gilmore notes several broad, overlapping tendencies that have shaped “oppositional studies” under neoliberalism, including “individualistic careerism,” “romantic particularism,” and “luxury production.” These tendencies, according to Gilmore, produce scholars and intellectuals who are disconnected from larger struggles for social change, who write about oppressive conditions in the abstract, and who produce knowledge accessible only to a specific few. 34 As much as they claim to be “oppositional,” such scholars and intellectuals “waste precious intellectual resources and displace needed energy from where it is most needed,” 35 a learned behavior that emerges from the social and cultural pedagogies of neoliberalism. As Barbara Tomlinson and George Lipsitz demonstrate, “neoliberal subjects” are produced in “entrepreneurial” universities that function through market competition and market subjects. Neoliberalism has been “invented, learned, and legitimated” 36 in the academy, where the petit bourgeois intellectual becomes an entrepreneur. Their scholarship is aimed at acquiring social capital and material rewards rather than producing knowledge that advances, informs, or supports the social struggles of those most marginalized.

No research is value-free; therefore all intellectual labor is political. Though guided by the rules and logics of academic research, the intellectual’s knowledge is never divorced from the historical context of its production. 37 There is no freefloating, neutral intellectual, and the petit bourgeois intellectual is part of an institution structured by dominance; this requires them to reflect on what their scholarship is doing and not doing. Does it follow the path of individualistic careerism, romantic particularism, or luxury production? Or does it pursue what Gilmore calls “organic praxis”? Does it connect to struggles in and outside of the academy? Does it recognize that the “street has always run into the campus” 38? The neoliberal turn is seductive; it inhibits radical scholarship that reveals the contradictions in its practice and ideology. To challenge this, the petit bourgeois intellectual and scholar must come to terms with their own positionality. They must, as the Italian socialist strategist Antonio Gramsci argues, develop a “new intellectual” grounded in social struggle:

The mode of being of the new intellectual can no longer consist in eloquence, which is an exterior and momentary mover of feelings and passions, but in active participation in practical life, as constructor, organizer, “permanent persuader” and not just a simple orator (but superior at the same time to the abstract mathematical spirit); from technique-as-work one proceeds to technique-as-science and to the humanistic co nception of history, without which one remains “specialized” and does not become “directive” (specialized and political). 39

The petit bourgeois intellectual can take the side of aggrieved communities. Alternatively, they can maintain their historical role of legitimating the social order and defending their position within the class structure. The latter is seductive, yet the following discussion should be useful in imagining the former.

THE BLACK RADICAL TRADITION AND CLASS SUICIDE

Have there been petit bourgeois intellectuals and scholars that have gone against their class interests and struggled from the position of the oppressed? What examples can the petit bourgeois intellectuals of today follow to challenge the neoliberal turn? A key site of such inspiration is the Black Radical Tradition. It is here where intellectuals and organizers from a petit bourgeois background but an enslaved and colonized past have emerged to exploit the contradictions of the system in order to speak, write, and organize against it. It is in the Black Radical Tradition that we find the emergence of a radical intelligentsia inspired by the historical struggles of their pasts and present and looking toward a future alongside the masses. As Robinson notes, those inspired by the Black Radical Tradition “began the realization of their history and their theoretical task” and became Black radicals whose work served the people. 40

Political scientist Michael Hanchard argues that Black political thought and theory have two distinct but interrelated purposes. The first is the practice of theorization and conceptualization in response to racial domination. The second consists of producing political writings and scholarship that center race and racism at the core of the Western modernity project. 41 Black political thought from the Black Radical Tradition pursues these two goals. However, before it embarked on theorization and conceptualization of race and racism, the tradition materialized from the struggles against European slavery, capital accumulation, and its inherent racialism. 42 “Even then,” Robinson notes, “the more fundamental impulse of Black resistance was the preservation of a particular social and historical consciousness rather than the revolutionary transformation of feudal or merchant capitalist Europe.” 43 Robinson illuminates the emergence of this tradition from surviving the destruction of Western civilization even before it began to provide a ruthless critique of it. It inspired many radical intellectuals through what Robinson refers to as “an ideology of liberation” against racial capitalism, while also challenging Western Marxism and its lack of accounting for the revolutionary forces of the Third World. 44 It showed that Marxist analyses must always be “stretched” to take into account the contradictions within social formations. 45 Moreover, Black radical intellectuals such as W. E. B. Du Bois and C. L. R. James critiqued and reflected on their own positions within the petite bourgeoisie and encouraged others to do the same. They, like Robinson, suggested that a radical tradition existed to inform revolutionary praxis.

Through the act of “accompaniment” with aggrieved communities, this praxis emerges from the scholarship of the petit bourgeois intellectual. 46 This is done by highlighting not individuals but rather communities in struggle. H. L. T. Quan argues that Robinson’s scholarship on the Black Radical Tradition provides a method for doing this kind of work—one that avoids the pitfall of centering individuals that is often encouraged by masculinist historiographies. “As in the case of Robinson’s work,” Quan suggests, “when the focus is on communities rather than individuals, and democratic and communitarian practices rather than elitism, we are able to make that shift from great men’s history to people’s history.” 47 In his scholarship Robinson shows that the brilliance of the radical intellectuals he highlights was derivative. “The truer genius,” he argues, “was in the midst of the people of whom they wrote.” 48

The Black Radical Tradition that Robinson shares with us provides many examples of petit bourgeois intellectuals and scholars who have challenged their positions within the political, economic, and ideological system, endeavoring to struggle alongside the masses against the “fatal couplings of difference and power.” 49 Anticolonial revolutionary Amilcar Cabral described how they did it. In a 1966 plenary speech delivered at the First Solidarity Conference of the Peoples of Africa, Asia, and Latin America in Havana, Cuba, Cabral discussed socialist strategy, the importance of ideology in national liberation struggles, and his analysis of direct and indirect forms of imperialism. Toward the end of his speech, Cabral addressed the role of the petite bourgeoisie in national liberation struggles. “It is important to stress that the mission with which it is entrusted demands from this sector of the petty bourgeoisie a greater revolutionary consciousness,” Cabral notes, “and the capacity for faithfully expressing the aspirations of the masses in each phase of the struggle and for identifying with them more and more.” 50 He argues that in the colonial context, the petite bourgeoisie had not acquired as much capital as the colonial bourgeoisie and still had the ability to act as a revolutionary force against imperialism and neocolonialism. Cabral was clearly aware that their class position was seductive and could encourage their “natural tendencies” to become a pseudo-national bourgeoisie. 51 Cabral’s radical suggestion for avoiding this was class suicide.

This means that in order to play completely the part that falls to it, in the national liberation struggle, the revolutionary petty bourgeoisie must be capable of committing suicide as a class, to be restored to life in the condition of a revolutionary worker completely identified with the deepest aspirations of the people to which [they belong]. 52

As Robinson notes, Cabral was shaped by the contradictions of domination that emerged from the dialectics of Portuguese imperialism in Guinea-Bissau. 53 This experience made him one of the world’s foremost revolutionary theorists and practitioners of liberation. According to Basil Davidson, “there are many stories about [Cabral’s] habit of linking the everyday scene, the banal scene you take for granted and barely even see, with the intellectual groundwork of an overall theory of society: of a theory, that is, always riveted to the reality of time and place.” 54 Class suicide for Cabral was the ability to tie the everyday struggle of his people to his theoretical analysis, to build an organization like the African Party of Independence of Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde (PAIGC), and to keep the aspirations and needs of his people at the forefront. Cabral had realized that the Marxism in which he was trained while studying agronomy in Portugal needed further development. 55 His application of Marxism required actual engagement with material conditions in Guinea-Bissau. This allowed him to reformulate his theorization and program, evident in his speeches and writings on the peasantry, the culture of resistance, and national liberation. 56

Cabral had a clear understanding of the class and colonial conditions in Guinea-Bissau and encouraged the petite bourgeoisie to strive for similar awareness. In a message to Guinean and Cape Verdian civil servants and employees in commerce, Cabral reminded them that they were “servitors of Portuguese colonialism,” 57 and therefore received rewards such as homes, bread, health, and education that the majority of their compatriots were denied. Cabral recognized the class anxiety that these segments of the population felt toward national liberation, but urged them to revise their outlook. They had a responsibility to the African continent to join the struggle against colonialism. “Many with awareness of this necessity have bravely put themselves on the side of our people and our companions in struggle,” Cabral declared. 58 The destiny of the petite bourgeoisie must mirror the destiny of the people. “Turn each post you hold, in the civil service or in commerce,” he argued, “into a fortress of combat for the immediate destruction of Portuguese colonialism.” 59 It was time to recognize their historical role and refuse the “selfishness and blind” ambition inflicted on them by Portuguese colonialism. To achieve success in these efforts, Cabral believed that the culture of Guinean society had to be replaced with a revolutionary culture that would counter petit bourgeois class interests. This would include, as Patrick Chabal argues, a “set of beliefs” and “political experiences, which would lead them to accept their responsibilities as revolutionaries.” 60 Cabral’s involvement in the struggle for national liberation rejected notions of bourgeois individualism: “Nobody is indispensible in this struggle; we are all needed but nobody is indispensable.” 61 It was his loyalty to this struggle that led to his assassination.

Frantz Fanon also discussed the notion of class suicide. Born in Martinique, Fanon attained revolutionary consciousness in Algeria and learned to challenge and disinvest in the class position he had obtained through bourgeois academic institutions in France. Although, as Robinson notes, Fanon was struggling with his own personal contradictions, he soon learned about the importance of liberation from the revolutionary struggles of the Algerian people. 62 It was in this period that Fanon wrote his most important work, The Wretched of the Earth, which described the struggles he was witnessing. Fanon began his work thus: “National liberation, national reawakening, restoration of the nation to the people or Commonwealth, whatever the name used, whatever the latest expression, decolonization is always a violent event.” 63 He was not speaking from an abstract position but from the trenches of revolutionary struggle. In a letter written days before his untimely death, he declared: “We are nothing on earth if we are not in the first place the slaves of a cause, the cause of the people, the cause of justice and liberty.” 64

In his liberationist theorizing, Fanon provides a critique of the national bourgeoisie and colonized intellectuals that emerge in the anticolonial struggle. Fanon argues that historically, the national bourgeoisie “often turns away from his heroic and positive path, which is both productive and just, and unabashedly opts for the antinational, and therefore abhorrent, path of a conventional bourgeoisie, a bourgeois bourgeoisie that is dismally, inanely, and cynically bourgeois.” 65 In the colonial context, Fanon illustrates that colonized intellectuals are trained to think of society in individualist terms, clinging to the “notion of a society of individuals where each is locked in his subjectivity, where wealth lies in thought.” 66

The only way for the intellectual and the national bourgeoisie to avoid these conceits, according to Fanon, is to struggle alongside the people for liberation, educating themselves through the strength of collective knowledge sharing: “Village assemblies, the power of the people’s commissions and the extraordinary productiveness of neighborhood and section committee meetings.” 67 The real-life struggles of the people, Fanon argues, provide the colonized intellectual with better knowledge of real-world struggles than the “falsity” of the theories, values, perceptions, and cultural preoccupations taught to them by Western civilization.

Just as the intellectual should depart from their “egoism, arrogant recrimination, and the idiotic, childish need to have the last word,” the national bourgeoisie should repudiate its class position and serve the people it represents. Fanon notes:

In an underdeveloped country, the imperative duty of an authentic national bourgeoisie is to betray the vocation to which it is destined, to learn from the people, and make available to them the intellectual and technical capital it culled from its time in the colonial universities. 68

Fanon, like Cabral, held ambitiously to the (some may argue idealist) vision of the national and petite bourgeoisie coming to terms with their class illusions and enlisting in national liberation. Both men were exemplars of this process. To Fanon, the colonized intellectual must engage in dialogue with those suffering and organizing against oppression and exploitation. At first the interaction would be difficult given the intellectual’s training by bourgeois institutions in false notions of objectivity and neutrality, but, through the process of active engagement, their academic labor would change:

Whereas the colonized intellectual started out by producing work exclusively with the oppressor in mind—either in order to charm him or to denounce him by using ethnic or subjectivist categories—[they] gradually [switch] over to addressing [themselves] to [their] people. 69

To Fanon, the colonized intellectual and national bourgeoisie have a historic mission. Either they fulfill it by joining the revolutionary struggle, or they betray it and capitulate to the seductions of class aspirations.

Radical writings were important to Fanon as tools for building a liberatory culture with visions of an alternative social structure.

When the colonized intellectual writing for [their] people uses the past [they] must do so with the intention of opening up the future, of spurring them into action and fostering hope. But in order to secure hope, in order to give it substance, [they] must take part in the action and commit [themselves] body and soul to the national struggle. 70

#### The impact of categorization and exceptionalism is genocide and ecological destruction.

**Moten & Harney 21** – Fred Moten, Professor of Performance Studies for the Tisch School of the Arts at NYU, PhD in English from UC Berkeley, 2020 MacArthur Genius Fellow, Stefano Harney, Professor of Strategic Management for the Lee Kong Chian School of Business at Singapore Management University, PhD in Social and Political Sciences from the University of Cambridge, co-founder of Ground Provisions—a curatorial collective, founder of the School for Study—a nomadic study collective (2021, *All Incomplete*, pp 13-18) Justin

Exception is a categorization one grants oneself only at the price of imagining that it has been granted by an Other. To declare one’s exceptionalism is not a matter of exempting, or excluding, or excusing oneself, all of which are transitive. Exceptionalism imagines the intransitive and attributes action to Others and, more importantly, an originary kind of power to someone else. And it is here that we see how the pre-text Serequeberhan identifes is in fact pre-given in a double sense – it must be given but in order to be given it must also have been granted. Tere is no dialectic here. Rather, we might say it is only the European who has ever been both master and slave. Tis is his drama. It is held in the body, and enacted in the world, that he has to have. Te exception will have been a power given by an Other to selves who, in taking it and its accompanying knowledge on, are supposed to have been provided, in this give and take, their own confrmation. But the pre-text is never truly grounded, never truly granted, never truly given. Europe is constantly disestablished by what it seeks to envelop, which, in and out of turn, envelops it. What surrounds the European even in his midst is the native informant Gayatri Spivak identifes as a creation text for a world of exception, against, but nonetheless within, the general antagonism of earthly anarrhythmia and displacement. Te paradox of the pre-text is thus that being exceptional can no more be taken than it can be given and can no more be claimed than it can be granted. Tis simultaneity of being-master and being-slave is sovereignty’s static, omnicidal decline. Tis is what it is to be chained to the struggle for freedom, a ‘rational‘ instrument run amok in place, as man’s perpetually stilled motion.

What does it mean to stand for improvement? Or worse, to stand for what business calls a ‘commitment to continuous improvement‘? It means to stand for the brutal speciation of all. To take a stand for speciation is the beginning of a diabolical usufruct. Improvement comes to us by way of an innovation in land tenure, where individuated ownership, derived from increasing the land’s productivity, is given in the perpetual, and thus arrested, becoming of exception’s miniature. This is to say that from the outset, the ability to own – and that ability’s first derivative, self-possession – is entwined with the ability to make more productive. In order to be improved, to be rendered more productive, land must be violently reduced to its productivity, which is the regulatory diminishment and management of earthly generativity. Speciation is this general reduction of the earth to productivity and submission of the earth to techniques of domination that isolate and enforce particular increases in and accelerations of productivity. In this regard, (necessarily European) man, in and as the exception, imposes speciation upon himself, in an operation that extracts and excepts himself from the earth in order to confirm his supposed dominion over it. And just as the earth must be forcefully speciated to be possessed, man must forcefully speciate himself in order to enact this kind of possession. This is to say that racialization is present in the very idea of dominion over the earth; in the very idea and enactment of the exception; in the very nuts and bolts of possession-by-improvement. Forms of racialization that both Michel Foucault and, especially and most vividly, Robinson identify in medieval Europe become usufructed with modern possession through improvement. Speciated humans are endlessly improved through the endless work they do on their endless way to becoming Man. This is the usufruct of man. In early modern England, establishing title to land by making it more productive meant eliminating biodiversity and isolating and breeding a species – barley or rye or pigs. Localized ecosystems were aggressively transformed so that monocultural productivity smothers anacultural generativity. The emergent relation between speciation and racialization is the very conception and conceptualization of the settler. Maintenance of that relation is his vigil and his eve. For the encloser, possession is established through improvement – this is true for the possession of land and for the possession of self. The Enlightenment is the universalization/ globalization of the imperative to possess and its corollary, the imperative to improve. However, this productivity must always confront its contradictory impoverishment: the destruction of its biosphere and its estrangement in, if not from, entanglement, both of which combine to ensure the liquidation of the human differential that is already present in the very idea of man, the exception. To stand for such improvement is to invoke policy, which attributes depletion to the difference, which is to say the wealth, whose simultaneous destruction and accumulation policy is meant to operationalize. This attribution of a supposedly essential lack, an inevitable and supposedly natural diminution, is achieved alongside the imposition of possession-by-improvement. To make policy is to impose speciation upon everybody and everything, to inflict impoverishment in the name of improvement, to invoke the universal law of the usufruct of man. In this context, continuous improvement, as it emerged with decolonization and particularly with the defeat of national capitalism in the 1970s, is the continuous crisis of speciation in the surround of the general antagonism. This is the contradiction Robinson constantly invoked and analyzed with the kind of profound and solemn optimism that comes from being with, and being of service to, your friends.

## 1NC – Case

### 1NC – Overview

#### 1] Spikes that aren’t on top are a voting issue- it means I have to wait for the 1ac to finish to formulate a strategy since I don’t know what your going to read which moots 6 min of prep

#### 2] Spikes that weren’t disclosed are a voting issue- prevents us from rigorously testing your norm and incentivizes surprise tactics

#### 3] Under views are a voting issue—one small theory analytic can take out huge chunks of the 1nc which kills substantive clash

#### 4] New 2NR Responses- A] none of the spikes have a clear implication in the 1ac B] It’s key to robustly contest their norm

#### 5] Negating is harder so auto reject aff fairness claims- they have a 2ar judge psychology advantage and have infinite prep before round

#### 6] RVI’s on each spike- otherwise they can read the most absurd paradigm issues for 6 min and are never held accountable

### 1NC – AFC

2NR- AFC (1:18)

CI- The violation

CI- The violation if the affirmative framework is morally repugnant

1] Negative testing- we should get to test the affirmative from multiple angles and sides that o/w’s since it’s the constitutive and inescapable role of the negative

2] Phil Ed- Reading an alternative framework is key to clashing over core philosophical issues and learning the nuances of them. That outweighs A] Uniqueness- it’s the only thing unique to LD debate B] Time frame- philosophical knowledge helps us make ethical decisions in the future outside debate.

3] Strategic Case Writing- Contesting your framework forces the aff to write the most strategic framework that they can leverage. Turns fairness offense since it means aff teams are able to win framing debates more efficiently

4] Inclusion- Frameworks could be morally repugnant and justify horrible atrocities. We need to be able to contest their framework to hedge against ethical practices that impose psychic violence onto some debaters. That outweighs A] Pre-req- it’s an impact filter to other standards B] Performativity- you making arguments assumes your voice is included

5] Real World- You will constantly be confronted by individuals with different views then your own. That outweighs on portability since debate is only pedagogically valuable if it’s skills can be exported.

Education over fairness- it’s the only durable impact outside debate and it’s the only reason schools fund it. Education is also what makes debate unique so you should prioritize it.

Their interp is arbitrary

A2 Time Skew/Strat skew

1] Non-unique- all arguments skew time and strategy to some extent.

2] Inevitable- Any argument that operates on a higher layer like 1ar theory would moot speech times

3] Turn- reading turns to only your offense would moot the time you spent reading the FW

4] Turn- our interp forces 1ar critical thinking and efficiency which is better since it lets them get faster for more abusive NC’s

A2 Topic Literature

1] Turn- our interp forces you to consider what the topic would say under different ethical perspectives which is better since they would just lock us into one ethical perspective

2] Topic Skews- under some frameworks the topic literature can be very aff leaning like I-law so we need a deterrent

3] Turn- AFC can be used by non-topical teams to say we can’t contest their self-serving ROTBs which still moots the topic.

### 1NC – Underview

### 1NC – Framework

#### Top-level: none of these framework arguments have warrants—these are extremely complex normative claims that philosophers spend entire books justifying, which can’t be reduced to 2 line analytic blips so err heavily neg

#### 1] The veil of ignorance relies on people removing themselves from any sort of social situation—but it is impossible to remove someone from society and thus makes it impossible to know how anyone would act.

#### 2] All people have different subjective beliefs and the veil of ignorance doesn’t actually provide any way of evaluating these against one another—the only non-arbitrary way to distinguish is consequences.

### 1NC – Offense

Censorship DA –