# 1NC TFA State Round 6

### 1NC – Race War PIK

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

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

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

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

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

### 1NC – Redaction PIK

#### Text - Vote Neg to redact the 1AC - the CP does the aff but doesn't say it.

#### Solves the Aff – 1] Disclosing militant strategies leads to militant crackdowns and the fracturing of undercommon collectivity and 2] Ruptures Semiotics because it’s non-communicative – the Aff feeds the system by speaking within spaces like Debate.

### 1NC – Cap K

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

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

CLASS WAR - NOT RACE WAR RACISM IS THE IDEOLOGY OF THE RICH Racism plays a powerful role in dividing the working class. The ideology of race is used to justify imperialism, wars, and the racial division of labor. Racism promotes nationalism on the basis of ethnic identity. This only strengthens enthusiasm for participation in national armies. Those people within the Working Class who hold racist views are puppets of the rich. Contrary to popular belief, racist ideology is actually derived from the Middle and Upper Classes where the real power to split and weaken the lower classes lies. This division occurs through discrimination in social services, education, immigration, and working conditions. The crucial part the Middle Class plays is to mimic mass culture which then becomes the “official” way of seeing the World. Within the “culture” specific racist and nationalistic ideas are promoted through the schools, media, church, etc.. This creates a constant flow of racist and nationalist ideas and disinformation, some of which is aimed at the rich themselves to explain why some must be at the “top” and others on the “bottom.” Most of this racist filth is received by the majority of the population, which is, of course, not in power. The rich actively promote nationalist and racist lies and always have. “Aryan Racialism” (White Supremacism) was first described in Europe by Count de Gobineau in his “Essay on the Inequalities of the Human Race.” Prior to World War I, rich Europeans created “chic” Aryan societies and established strong foundations for Hitler’s Nazi doctrine among the Upper and Middle Classes. In the United States, the Ku Klux Klan was originally a racist social club founded by seven southern aristocrats - J. Lester, J. Crowe, J. Kennedy, C. James, R. Reed, F. McCord, and later, Nathan Bedford Forest. Racial “Eugenics” (purifying the race by sterilizing persons claimed to be “inferior”) was pioneered by doctors in Lynchburg, Virginia and later copied by Nazi doctors in Germany. American racists like Henry Ford were quoted in Nazi newspapers. Ford got a Nazi medal for his racist writings. DIVIDE AND RULE Due to Capitalist-induced labor shortages in some nation-states, the exploitation of wage slaves from other countries becomes profitable. With immigration, our class receives different ‘ethnicities” and cultures. This does not cause a natural conflict. That is, until it is promoted as such by racist pundits. The rich have a lot to gain by taking advantage of our superficial differences. The racial division of labor is the most fundamental division in our class and causes further damage when members of our class follow these divisions. Sectors of the Working Class can become racist when they see themselves having artificial commonalities like “whiteness” with the ruling class rather than sticking with the real problems of their own class - the Working Class. They can also become confused by the efforts of the Ruling Class to trick us into competing with each other and be swayed by Ruling Class lies that people who are superficially different from us because of their skin color or culture are the cause of our economic problems instead of the REAL bastards who control the economy - the Capitalists and the Ruling Class! Their class identity becomes confused and is eventually replaced by a racial and/or national consciousness. This is a false allegiance which only serves to keep our class divided and enslaved to work and the government of the Rich. Sickeningly, many of the most politically active Working Class youth are racist/Neo-Nazis. But along with being “white” most are also disaffected and dispossessed. These youths actually have more in common both materially and socially with the Blacks, Latinos, or Asians in their communities, whom they claim they hate so much, than with their rich “Anglo-Saxon” Ruling Class role models. The violent racism and vehement super-patriotism of these dupes helps to legitimize the Ruling Class’s suppression of our class. Why is racism so strong in many sections of our class? It is because the rich need it there. Well-placed racist filth distorts and counters a truly unified class consciousness. It has been in the best interest of our rulers to distort the development of class identity, pride and solidarity with their own racist/nationalist version of these notions. THE HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF RACISM Racism/Nationalism begins with the development of capitalist society. Nationalism played a key role in the development of capital during the last period of European feudalism and was fostered by the emerging Capitalist Class. The new class used the “flag of nationhood’ to organize the population against the old aristocracy. Populations were organized along “ethnic” and/or religious lines to create national armies which didn’t exist in Europe until after the Napoleonic Wars. National armies were unprecedented in that they involved millions of soldiers and overwhelmed the societies outside of Europe (through colonialism) which introduced an injection of wealth that spurred industrialization and the pre-eminence of capitalists over the aristocrats. Thus, it was by using the lie of Nationhood that the new capitalist class gained control of society. When the new Working Class (rural peasants had become urban workers after 1850) realized that the “liberating” process of offing the old aristocracy was only a “coup d’ etat” by the new rich, Nationalism became a reactionary movement. It became a way of maintaining the loyalty of the rural and urban lower classes through patriotism. The position of the rich was strengthened, and loyalty was obtained by creating the illusion of people united by the common goals of their “nation.” As capitalism developed and primary resources were depleted (e.g. land, timber, ores, etc.), competition between these new nation-states began. This led to a new and unprecedented era of imperialism and colonialism which was effected in order to gain more primary capital. These new colonial powers used xenophobia (fear of people of other “nationalities”) and religious bigotry to justify long and terrible wars for riches. Xenophobia was also used to excuse the exploitation and systematic genocide (extermination of an ethnic group) of colonized peoples as cheap and expendable sources of labor. In early America, colonial elites like George Washington (who was the richest man in the U.S. at the time), feared concerted rebellion by English indentured servants (prisoners sold to rich colonial landowners as slaves), landless “Whites,” and African slaves (like the uprising which occurred in 1676 in Bacon’s Rebellion), who together made up more than 55% of the English colonial population. During the American Revolution, poor whites were kidnaped and forced to fight in the Aristocrats “Colonial Army,” but most battles were won by frontier militias fighting alongside the uniformed army made up of former European slaves who h8ad bought their freedom and settled on the frontier to get away from the class discrimination of elitist English land-owners. When the U.S. Constitution was written, James Madison was scared of the belief in social equality of Working Class Americans. He insisted on an electoral system which would forever insure that only the Rich controlled the government. The original Constitution denied freedom to non-whites and women. After the successful Haitian Revolution by African slaves against their French colonial rulers, American slave owners, fearful of the possibility of poor whites and African slaves staging a similar revolt in America, persuaded the Congress and President Jefferson to enact laws instituting specific legal divisions between “Whites” and “Blacks”: Only Whites could bear weapons, criminal punishments were made more severe for Blacks, inter-racial marriages were illegal, military and civilian life were racially segregated, and only whites could own land or be public officials. After the revolution, rich land speculators began to eye native American nations in the Ohio River Valley. They used the American Army to coerce the native people into ceding Kentucky to them in exchange for peace then used the army to burn their farms before invading their land and exterminating them. In 1831, Congress passed the “Indian Removal Act” which stole all remaining native land east of the Mississippi, then used the Army to move the native people to present-day Oklahoma. Over ½ Million people died resisting the U.S. invasion or from starvation and exposure to harsh weather on what became known as the “Trail of Tears” to the U.S.- designated resettlement area. This genocide was the beginning of “resettlement” to reservations which was later copied by Italian Fascists, German Nazis and racist South Africans. THE MYTH OF NATIONAL/RACIAL PRIDE At the heart of racism/nationalism is the truly lies idea that “ethnic”, national, or religious populations have a common destiny, despite any and all obvious class tensions within these populations. Under this idea the Ruling Class invents a false unity among the Working, Middle and Ruling Classes based on either national or religious origins. This fake identity creates a sense of pride , a sense of “achievement’ and a sense of “history.” The American identity is tied to a pride of “moral” superiority and the Capitalist domination of the Third World. The American Ruling Class used this pride of “moral” imperative to wage genocidal wars against the indigenous populations of an entire continent. This excuse has also been used to wage war and invade many other nations. This “pride” is all but impossible for many African, Native, Latino, or Asian Americans to feel. It is not meant for those people but it is meant for the White Ruling Class. National/Racial pride is singularly designed to manipulate the Working Class into national armies and to light wars overseas so one group of Capitalists can steal from another at our expense. The thoroughly repulsive idea of racist/nationalist solidarity is exercised through the practices of de facto racial discrimination which excludes and isolates people of color from certain areas of capitalist society: areas such as “decent” jobs, livable housing, and “good” schools, thereby forcing a sizable segment of the population into the dead end of petty crime and prisons, or an endless line of demeaning mind-numbing low-wage jobs. This practice further deepens the rifts within our class by creating an atmosphere of fear and suspicion between members of our class. The power to discriminate lies almost entirely in the hands of the Upper Class and their vicious guard dogs, the State. The white Working Class does not have the power to discriminate, but, plays a part in justifying discrimination by doing such foolish things as excluding certain “ethnic” groups from workplace activities or by intimidating them within their communities. Racial violence and exclusion are the only elective discriminatory power Working Class racists have. Although this pales in comparison to the racist power of our rulers, it can still be a matter of life and death for Working Class people of color. HOW RACIST LIES ARE SPREAD Racist ideology gains mass appeal by pretending to be “common sense”, When racist lies becomes common sense, it then evolves into “unquestioned knowledge”, “taken for granted”, or “the truth.” The problem for the Ruling Class is that their “common sense” is totally contradicted by the reality of class society. Because of this, racism needs to be perpetually updated and put forward and reintroduced at every “opportune” time (such as when there is civil unrest in communities of color or “gang killings”). Today’s racist jargon tries to camouflage itself, even to the point of denying it is racist, putting it under the heading of just plain “common sense”, as a racist agitator like Rush Limbaugh would put it. This “common sense” racism is a philosophy which relies heavily, if not entirely, on its gut-level, emotional impact. It relies heavily on FEAR, whether fear of the Black population or the consequences of a large and growing immigrant population. The use of fear as a basis of racism highlights the very nature of the problem of “common sense” racism. And that is this, fear makes people feel weak and insecure, and people of course will react negatively to negative emotion. This insecurity results in behavior between members of our class which cannot always be explained rationally. Thus playing on the fears of a segment of class also means playing fast and loose with the truth and twisting interpretations of events to fit a racist point of view. Fear of the Black population and groups like Latinos who are stereotyped as “immigrants” has long been used to justify racism. The racist demagogues concentrate on differences of what THEY call “alien” cultures which are then compared against the supposedly “morally” superior “American Way.” The promotion of this basic chauvinism along with the deliberate twisting of the cultures of people of color in a gross and alarmist way creates a negative feeling toward people of color. Many of the stereotypes thus created are used to sustain the myths about race. Many of the stereotypes at the forefront of the racist propaganda machine are ones that show a direst threat to “White” suburban tranquility, such as wanton, ultra-violence. During the 1960s drugs and crime were presented as synonymous with Black inner-city youth, although more drugs factually resided in the “White’ suburbs. The myth of violence is now ingrained in many “White” minds. This is one of the many ways that the Ruling Class promotes racist fear which of course leads to naked hostility and open hatred between large segments of our class. That is exactly what our rulers want! SCAPEGOATING IMMIGRANTS Another way the Ruling Class crushes the unity of the working class is to create direct competition between “native” and “immigrant” labor. They base this on the idea that native and immigrant or foreign-born workers have different economic positions within the society. In truth, immigrant workers are doubly exploited. As members of the Working Class they have both the worst jobs and highest unemployment rate. In fact, they make up a substrata of the Working Class due to the informal (but very real) racial divisions of labor. Racists flip this over and argue that immigrants and/or foreignborn people are taking our (“native”) jobs. They claim that unemployment within the Working Class is caused by competition from immigrants/foreign-born people rather than the Upper and Middle Classes who have the sole power to hire and fire. This scapegoating of immigrants conveniently removes Capitalists from responsibility for the failures of their system and for their own behavior. It places the blame on those who are least responsible. This is only a small example of the extent to which reality is distorted by racists. By scapegoating people of color for problems created by Capitalists and the Ruling Class, class anger at what are really CLASS issues is manipulated and presented to Working Class people as racism and racial issues. Racism is nothing more than another filthy and vile product of Capitalism. Racism exists alongside nationalism to divide us from other members of the Working Class in our “communities” and around the World. Racism is subtly used to rationalize world-wide poverty and wars. Nationalism creates a phoney unity between class enemies at the expense of the unity and solidarity of the Working Class. Anarchists advocate Working Class unity to destroy Racism, Nationalism, Capitalism, the Class System and the government of the Rich and build a society based on personal freedom, social equality, free association, mutual aid, cooperation, worker self-management of all work places and democratic self-government of all communities. FIGHT THE RICH - NOT THE POOR! NO WAR BUT THE CLASS WAR!

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

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

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

#### Undercommuning is not revolutionary but drives capital

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

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

#### The aff’s aesthetic resistance couples with their interpretation of blackness to enable tokenization – that positions them as antagonistic to those who fail to represent in ways that generate surplus for the representational economy.

Nyong’o 14  
(Tavia Nyong'o is an American cultural critic, historian and performance studies scholar. He is currently a Professor of American Studies at Yale University where he teaches courses on black diaspora performance, cultural studies, social and critical theory. “Unburdening Representation” The Black Scholar 44(2) Summer 2014 <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00064246.2014.11413689> cVs)

A classic point of departure for discussions of the politics of representation is Gayatri Spivak's parsing of the two separate meanings of the term "representation" (two meanings that Spivak, incidentally, accuses Deleuze of running together in his critique). "To represent" can mean "to depict" or portray in artistic terms; it can also mean "to speak or decide for" in political terms. Even though these two different meanings are linked, their regular conflation was cause for Spivak's concern: The complicity of vertreten [to speak for] and darstellen [to depict], their identity in-difference as the place of practice – since this complicity is precisely what Marxists must expose, as Marx does in The Eighteenth Brumaire-can only be appreciated if they are not conflated by a sleight of word. From Spivak's postcolonial feminist Marxist perspective, it was the unthinking equation of speaking for (vertreten) with depicting (darstellen) that allowed ideology to operate unchallenged, for it is through this conflation that control over the means of portraying something becomes naturalized as a mode of political authority-a fact underscored to me as a child when coup leaders in my home country made it a priority to take over the national radio station in order to announce themselves the new rulers. Political authority, we all immediately understood, flowed from command over the means to communicate and represent such power. 72 Spivak is sometimes understood as taking the position that any act of minoritarian or subaltern speech, when within a hegemonic discourse, can only reproduce the terms of subordination guaranteed by that discourse. But I read her as instead suggesting that there is always a space of intervention, if only sometimes a hairline fracture, between the two senses of representation: vertreten and darstel/en. However much they can and do align, it is their tendency to pull out of sync with each other, for their alignment to be less than seamless, that enables possibilities. This misalignment of political and artistic representation is exploited by Afrofabulation, which is thus not properly speaking solely an aesthetic strategy, or a political one, but a tactic for taking up the time and space between them. This space, however, will be foreclosed if we understand political representation exclusively in bourgeois democratic terms. It is not only the terms of artistic or cultural representation in other words, but equally political representation that must be interrogated. And to speak of the political representation within the terms set by neoliberal democracy is necessarily to evoke the political economy of image-making that idealist political theories of democracy tend to occlude. In a well-known essay outlining what he termed the "burden of representation," Kobena Mercer detailed the untoward consequences for black artists of the conflation Spivak set forth: Whereas politicians and other public figures are elected into positions from which they speak as "representatives," this role has fallen on the shoulders of black artists not so much out of individual choice but as a consequence of structures of racism that have historically marginalized their access to the means of cultural production. When black artists become publicly visible only one at a time, their work is burdened with a whole range of extra-artistic concerns precisely because, in their relatively isolated position as one of the few black practitioners in any given field-film, photography, fine art-they are seen as "representatives" who speak on behalf of, and are thus accountable to, their communities. In such a political economy of racial representation where the part stands in for the whole, the visibility of a few token black public figures serves to legitimate, and reproduce, the invisibility, and lack of access to public discourse, of the community as a whole.9 Mercer's analysis of the "political economy of racial representation" is often evoked as establishing the right of individual artists, qua artists, to express themselves without fear of being taken as a representative of a community. And indeed, his critique clearly aimed at unburdening black representation, a process that for him involved resituating the artist from community delegate in the bourgeois public sphere to activist intervening in a contested and agonistic social topography. What should not be missed, however, is Mercer's careful insistence that it is the structural racism of bourgeois publicity and not the policing of black artistic expression by black communities (or non-black for that matter)-that produces the burden of representation. Unburdening representation, in this sense, cannot be mistaken for the "post-racial" discourse we encounter today. Post-racialism seeks to deny, on idealist and individualist grounds, any link between "speaking for" and "speaking as." Opposed to such a naive conception, unburdening representation would rather be a strategy of subverting the tokenizing mechanisms through which publicity, under conditions of what Jodi Dean terms "communicative capitalism," reproduces invisibility through the guise of empowerment.10

#### Vote negative for communist organizing – that requires collective struggle and the establishment of centralized organization to inform both theory and practice.

Kuhn ‘18

[Gabriel, Austrian-born writer and translator living in Sweden. Among his book publications is “All Power to the Councils! A Documentary History of the German Revolution of 1918-1919”. March 2018. “Don't Mourn, Organize! Is Communism a Pipe Dream—or a Viable Future?” <https://brooklynrail.org/2018/03/field-notes/Dont-Morn-Organize-Is-Communism-a-Pipe-Dreamor-a-Viable-Future>] pat

The forms of organization this requires must go further than the affinity group but stop short of the vanguard party. Affinity groups do not answer the demand for mass organizing that mass societies require. But neither do vanguard parties. They attempt to lead the masses, not organize them, and that’s a big difference. The party model might in general be insufficient for mass organizing today. The networks that movementism gave way to are perhaps more appropriate, but only if they can overcome the assumption that the looser the connections are, the better. This assumption is wrong. Loose connections might suit the needs of an ever more flexible market economy, but not of effective political organizing. To “have contacts” is not enough; you need to do something with them. And you need to stay committed to the projects you initiate. I will try to flesh this out by listing the aspects I consider most important in organizing today.

1. We need to leave sectarianism behind. The left is weak and each additional division weakens it further. In a 2011 article titled “Movement, Cadre, and the Dual Power,” Joel Olson made a simple, yet very important observation: “We believe that the old arguments between communists and anarchists are largely irrelevant today.” This must be our point of departure.

2. We need theory that is adapted to our times. It must overcome the false contradiction between “class struggle” and “cultural struggle.” There is a fruitful debate about a “new class politics” in the German-speaking world. Sebastian Friedrich, one of its main proponents, drew these conclusions in an article published by Counterpunch:

A new class politics does not relegate gender, race, and imperial legacy to issues that are supplementary to class relations. These issues, and the struggles they imply, are an integral part of class relations. In fact, feminist, anti-racist, and anti-colonial struggles are the base on which effective unified class struggles must be launched.… A new class politics must clarify where and how the specific experiences of workers based on gender, race, citizenship, and other factors converge. It must reveal the overlapping interests of workers as members of the class. This makes common struggles possible.

3. We must not rely on the “objective forces” identified by historical materialism. Subjective forces are important for change. It is easy to underestimate how much neoliberalism shapes the lives even of people opposed to it. In the Global North, political activism has become a leisure activity that people engage in or not, depending on their mood, the identity they are trying to create for themselves, or the road of “self-improvement” they have chosen. In almost all cases, it is secondary to professional careers and personal comforts. Under such circumstances, it is difficult to get anything done. There is nothing wrong with being “voluntaristic.” Radical change is dependent on people wanting radical change, no matter how much Marxists still insist on economic realities determining individual consciousness and, therefore, individuals’ capacity for political action. An organization’s efficiency relies on the individual qualities of its members, that is, responsibility, reliability, and accountability.

Making Things Concrete

If we want communism to be more than a pipe dream, we have to be willing to face reality, even if it confuses, challenges, or even frightens us. We cannot ignore struggles that refer to communist ideals, simply because they aren’t the struggles we’d like to see. If our enthusiasm for communism remains limited to lecture halls and conference rooms, it won’t be anything the powerful will lose sleep over.

The struggle that currently receives most attention among communists of all stripes in the Global North is the one in Kurdistan. In Rojava (Syrian Kurdistan), forces affiliated with the Kurdistan Workers’ Party, PKK, have established a direct-democratic council system, based on the “democratic confederalism” conceived by the imprisoned PKK leader Abduallah Öcalan. Öcalan describes democratic confederalism as “a non-state political administration or a democracy without a state,” and cites Murray Bookchin’s “libertarian municipalism” as a major influence. There are people who celebrate this as a form of anarchism. But as an observant friend of mine noted, an anarchism that is imposed by a leader is a strange kind of anarchism. Besides, there are reports from the ground that challenge the libertarian narrative. The editors of Lower Class Magazine, an online project dedicated to “low budget underground journalism,” travel regularly to Kurdistan and have the following to say:

The Western left sees Rojava as the realization of a democracy “from below”: communes, councils, a confederation; no hierarchies, no party, a spontaneous mass project. Anarchists and “libertarian” communists wax lyrically about the dawn of a direct-democratic Shangri-La. […] Yes, the change in Rojava comes “from below. It is based on the power of the people, no doubt. Communes and councils are at the heart of decision-making, that is true. But as essential is the following: None of this would be happening if it wasn’t for a vanguard leading the way. The revolution in Rojava proves that Leninist vanguardism is correct, not false.

Another European journalist visiting the region noted that the cadres of the People’s Protection Units, YPG, relate to the councils of Rojava in the same way the Bolshevists related to the councils of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, there are troubling pragmatic alliances, which have included collaboration with the U.S. military. Yet the people behind Rojava Solidarity NYC sum up the situation well:

Rojava, an autonomous region in Northern Syrian, the largest revolutionary territory of the 21st century, has projected anarchist and communist ideas to the forefront of political discourse and into the pragmatic and messy reality of everyday life. … From communal relationships to the councils and self-defense units, we can assess numerous potential routes by which we can create liberated communities at home, while learning from their possibilities and pitfalls.

Rojava won’t be the answer to our problems. No single struggle ever is. But the developments in Rojava challenge us to discuss real-life strategies for radical change. It is easy to focus on shortcomings, but if this is all we ever do, where will it get us?

Councils are essential for communist projects. Their power, which is based on the direct involvement and active participation of the masses, is curtailed as soon as political interest groups, such as parties, assume control over them. This conviction separated historical council communism, represented by figures such as Otto Rühle and Anton Pannekoek, from the Bolsheviks. Pannekoek wrote:

The councils are no government; not even the most central councils bear a governmental character. For they have no means to impose their will upon the masses; they have no organs of power. All social power is vested in the hands of the workers themselves.

Unless we want the transition to communism to entail enormous human suffering (which would be utterly absurd), we need to consider the fact that billions of people will need to be fed, sheltered, nursed, provided with access to clean water, and so forth. To produce according to the needs of the people rather than the needs of profit requires enormous efforts in planning, especially if current living standards are to be upheld. (Living standards don’t equal standards of consumption—the standards of consumption in the Global North cannot and should not be upheld, since they are unsustainable.) Furthermore, we must collectively dispose of industrial and nuclear waste, weapons of mass destruction, and ticking environmental bombs. None of this is possible without a level of centralization, no matter how visceral the reactions are that the word might provoke in some circles.

Only a council system can combine the centralization required by the complexity of modern societies with participative democracy. Centralization requires formal structures. Participative democracy requires these structures to be transparent. They need to be bottom-up rather than top-down, and delegates must be directly responsible to their constituencies. The council system is the only administrative framework to provide that.

Romanticizing particular struggles rarely does any good, no matter how council-based they are—or claim to be. If radicals in the Global North fail to address concerns with respect to struggles in the Global South, it is not respectful but condescending. To escape into the intellectual poverty of cultural relativism doesn’t help. We can only evolve from critical engagement. But real-life struggles are our starting point. It makes little sense to demand struggles for communism if we shy away from engaging with the ones that exist. Arundhati Roy put it simply after spending time with Maoist Naxalites in the forests of central India, an experience she chronicled in the book Walking with the Comrades. She said: “I went in because I wanted to tell the story of who these people are.” This informs revolutionary theory and, in turn, improves revolutionary practice. Most importantly, it is crucial for saving communist struggles from betraying their own principles. Everyone can watch failure unfold. The challenge lies in helping to prevent it.

### Case

#### Their investment into the university is a tool of speed-elitism. The move for more transparent discussions about revolutionary praxis mystifies the reliance on the highly exclusive and unethical technologies of the university. By figuring those technics as the metrics for liberatory strategization, that expands debate’s state of exploitation.

Hoofd 10 – Ingrid M. Hoofd is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Communications and New Media at the National University of Singapore, ("The Accelerated University: Activist-Academic Alliances and the Simulation of Thought." Ephemera: Theory and politics in organisation, Vol. 10, No.1 (September 2010), <http://www.ephemerajournal.org/contribution/accelerated-university-activist-academic-alliances-and-simulation-thought>) KB + TR Recut Justin

Cries announcing the **demise** of the university abound, in particular in Europe and North America. Those who utter these cries often do this in an admirable attempt to **renew** the original mandate of the university, namely the fostering of **truth**, **justice** and **democratic debate**. Giving up on the now largely neoliberal and managerial university system that plagues Europe and the United States, some such critics try to mobilise a renewal of this mandate **outside academia’s institutional walls** with people and groups who represent an alternative to neoliberal globalisation. Much of this mobilisation is in turn done through technologies and discourses of mobility and tele-communication. Examples here are the European anti-Bologna ‘new university’ projects like Edu-Factory, the various autonomous virtual universities, and the intellectual collaboration with local and international activists and non-Western academics. I am referring here in particular to the promising formation of various extra-academic ‘activist-research’ networks and conferences over the last years, like Facoltà di Fuga (Faculty of Escape), Mobilized Investigation, Rete Ricercatori Precari (Network of Precarious Researchers), Investigacció (Research), Universidad Nómada (Nomadic University), and Glocal Research Space. Characteristically, these projects organise events that try to set up dialogues between non-Western and anti-neoliberal activists and academics, and carve out spaces for offline and web-based discussion and participation. Initiators and participants of these projects often conceptualise their positions as relating closely to **alter-globalist activism** – positions which hence are **hoped** to effectively **subvert neo-liberalism** as well as the **elitist-managerial university space** and its problematic method of scientific objectification for capitalist innovation. In this paper, I will explain how such announcements of **the university’s demise**, the conceptualisation of its current situation as **one of crisis**, as well as the mobilisation of **the true academic mandate** today which often segues into a **nostalgia for the original university** of independent thought, truth and justice, are themselves paradoxically **complicit in the techno-acceleration that** precisely **grounds and reproduces neo-liberalism.** This is because the playing out of such nostalgia typically runs through the problematic invocation of **the humanist opposition between doing and thinking.** This causes the terms and their mode of production to become increasingly intertwined under contemporary conditions of capitalist simulation in which ‘thinking’ is more and more done in service of an economist form of ‘doing’. The aforementioned commendable projects thus paradoxically appear foremost as symptoms of acceleration. Moreover, I will argue that this acceleration increasingly renders certain groups and individuals as **targets of techno-academic scrutiny and violence.** This increasing objectification that runs through the contemporary prostheses of the humanist subject hence spells disaster for non-technogenic forms of **gendered**, **raced** and **classed otherness.** I therefore suggest that this disastrous state of affairs is precisely carried out by the humanist promise of transcendence, democracy and justice that currently speeds up institutions like the university, and vice versa. Following this line of thought through, I claim that technological acceleration then surprisingly also harbours the promise of the coming of **a radical alternative** to neo-liberalism, and that it is precisely through the eschatological performance of this promise – arguably a repetition of the Christian belief in the apocalypse – that these activist-research projects and their neo-liberal mode of production may fruitfully **become the future objects of their own critique.** In short then, this paper attempts to affirm and displace the projects’ call for reinstating the original ‘true’ or transcending the current ‘spoilt’ university, in the hope of gesturing towards yet another alterity, through its own accelerated argument. I argue that the complicity of projects like Edu-Factory and Facoltà di Fuga in technological acceleration should primarily be understood in terms of what I in my work call **speed-elitism** (Hoofd, 2009: 201). I extrapolate the idea of speed-elitism largely from the work of John Armitage on the discursive and technocratic machinery underlying current neoliberal capitalism. In turn, I will argue that these activist-academic projects exacerbate speed-elitism by connecting the latter to Jacques Derrida’s ideas on technology and thought, as well as the late Bill Readings’ and Fred Moten and Stefano Harney’s critiques of the contemporary university. In ‘Dromoeconomics: Towards a Political Economy of Speed’, Armitage and Phil Graham suggest that due to the capitalist need for the production of excess, there is a strong relationship between the forces of communication and the logic of speed. They connect the logic of speed specifically to a certain militarisation of society under neoliberalism. In line with Virilio’s Speed and Politics, they argue that the areas of war, communication and trade are today intimately connected through the technological usurpation and control of space (and territory), and through the compression and regulation of time. Eventually, Armitage and Graham suggest that ‘**circulation** has become **an essential process** of capitalism, **an end in itself**’ (Armitage and Graham, 2001: 118) and that therefore any form of cultural production increasingly finds itself tied up in this logic. Neoliberal capitalism is hence a system in which the most intimate and fundamental aspects of human social life – in particular, forms of thought and linguistic difference – are formally subsumed under this system by being **circulated** as capital. In “Resisting the Neoliberal Discourse of Technology’, Armitage elaborates on this theme of circulation by pointing out that the current mode of late-capitalism relies on the continuous extension and validation of the infrastructure and the optimistic discourses of the new information technologies. Discourses that typically get repeated in favour of what I designate as the emerging speed-elite are those of connection, instantaneity, liberation, transformation, multiplicity and border crossing. **Speed-elitism**, I therefore argue, **replaces Eurocentrism** today as the primary nexus around which global and local disparities are organised, even though it largely builds on the formalisation of Eurocentric conceptual differences like doing versus thinking, and East versus West. Under speed-elitism, the utopian emphasis on the transparent mediation through technologies of instantaneity gives rise to the fantasy of the networked spaces ‘outside’ the traditional academic borders as radical spaces, as well as the desire for a productive dialogue or alliance between activism and academia. This would mean that activism and academia have become *relative* others under globalisation, in which the (non-Western or anti-capitalist) activist figures as some kind of *hallucination* of radical otherness for the Western intellectual. This technological hallucination serves an increasingly aggressive neo-colonial and patriarchal economic state of exploitation, despite – or perhaps rather *because of* – such technologies of travel and communication having come to figure as tools for liberation and transformation. So the discourses of techno-progress, making connections, heightened mobility and crossing borders in activist-academic alliances often go hand in hand with the (implicit) celebration of highly mediated spaces for action and communication between allied groups. Such **discourses** however **suppress** the **violent colonial, capitalist and patriarchal history** of those technological spaces and the subsequent unevenness of any such alliance. More severely, they **foster an oppressive** sort of **imaginary ‘collective’ or ‘unity of struggles’ through the myth of ‘truly’ allowing for radical difference and multiplicity within that space** – a form of **techno-inclusiveness that** in turn **excludes** a variety of **non-technogenic groups and slower classes**. That these highly mediated spaces of thought and knowledge production are exclusivist is also shown by Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades’ study of the transformation of higher education in ‘The Academic Capitalist Knowledge/Learning Regime’. Slaughter and Rhoades argue that new technologies allow the neo-liberal university to precisely cross the borders of universities and external for-profit and non-profit agencies in the name of development, production and efficacy, resulting in ‘new circuits of knowledge’. These ‘opportunity structures’ (Slaughter and Rhoades, 2004: 306) that the neoliberal economy creates, I in turn argue, become precisely those spaces of imagination that come to signify as well as being resultant of the university’s humanist promise of reaching-out to alterity. This paradoxically also **leads to** what Slaughter and Rhoades accurately identify as a ‘**restratification among and within** **colleges** and **universities’** (2004: 307). *Thought* is then increasingly exercised in, and made possible through, spaces that are just as much spaces of acceleration and militarisation. The increasing complicity of the humanities in the applied sciences within the contemporary university, and hence the integration of critical thinking and neo-liberalist acceleration, is also a major theme running through Jacques Derrida’s *Eyes of the University*. Derrida there suggests that neo-liberalisation entails a militarisation of the university, claiming that ‘never before has so-called basic research been so deeply committed to ends that are at the same time military ends’ (Derrida, 2004: 143). The intricate relation between the military (‘missiles’) and the imperatives of the humanities (‘missives’) also pervades Derrida’s ‘No Apocalypse, Not Now’, in which he argues that the increasing urgency with which intellectuals feel compelled to address disenfranchisement and crisis **paradoxically** leads to a differential acceleration of such oppression through technologies of instantaneous action. But the relationship between new technologies and the subject’s *perception* of and subsequent desire for the incorporation of otherness that speed-elitism engenders, is best illustrated through Derrida’s *Archive Fever* and *Monolingualism of the Other*. Derrida’s concerns here are not so much directly with the contemporary university, but rather with the link between how thought is situated in technologies of communication (like language) and the emergence of authority as well as (academic and activist) empowerment.

#### ROB is to vote for the better debater. Only evaluating the consequences of the plan allows us to determine the practical impacts of politics and preserves the predictability that fosters engagement. Rigorous contestation and third and fourth-line testing are key to generate the self-reflexivity that creates ethical subjects.

#### Vote Negative on Presumption – multiple warrants:

#### 1] Jay has been reading the Aff since last year AND won Colleyville while reading this aff – the Race War hasn’t ended nor have they worked the code against the code of Logistics – proves the Ballot isn’t key to their offense and only a risk of commodification

#### 2] The 1AC’s method of Endurance means they cannot leverage all of the Race War as offense, only the process of individual survival

#### Presumption is a sequencing question to any other part of this debate – Jay does not get the ballot for simply saying the Race War exists and identifies sociality in the Status Quo – they have to prove their affective orientation is successful in overcoming violent structures

#### AT Analytic 1 – No Race War in Debate – no examples, no evidence substantiates a claim that universal – don’t let them weigh it against FW.

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

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

The remarkable irony of the modern American conversation is that while race relations have empirically never been better, many members of different races are terrified of one another. Perceptions of crime are a primary source of this tension. The center-left mainstream media run stories almost daily about tough whites attacking blacks and other people of color for trivial reasons, while a substantial cottage industry on the far right focuses on sensational depictions of black crime. In reality, however, incidents like these, which make for almost weekly viral news stories, are quite rare; so, too, is serious interracial crime in general. According to the 2019 Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) crime report, blacks made up only 15 percent of those who criminally attacked whites in the United States in 2018. Whites attacked blacks even less often, 11 percent of the time. For good or ill, the person most likely to kill you remains your husband or wife, not an exotic stranger. It is well worth unpacking the actual U.S. national crime data as a means of tamping down tensions among countrymen. The media’s sensational fixation on interracial crime has grown steadily in recent years. A black friend has joked with me that 2018, in particular, was “the year of whites with crazy nicknames.” Major media outlets ran story after story about obnoxious Caucasians attacking blacks for the flimsiest of reasons. On June 29, 2018, “Pool Patrol Paula”—actually named Stephanie Sebby-Strempel—made headlines after allegedly shouting at and striking a pleasant young black man attempting to use a South Carolina public pool, telling him he didn’t belong in the water. When police officers attempted to arrest her for misdemeanor assault, she bit one of them. Sebby-Strempel did not police the waters alone. On July 5 of the same year, a man named Adam Bloom was dubbed “Pool Patrol PAUL” after getting into a heated argument with a black woman who was using his condo complex’s swimming facilities. When Bloom asked to see her resident ID, she replied: “This is textbook racial profiling.” Multiple officers had to be called in to resolve the situation. On Facebook, her video recording and breakdown of the incident went massively viral. On July 15, 2018—barely a week later—Chicago CVS manager Morry Matson got famous as “Coupon Carl,” following his decision to contact the police and accuse a black female customer of using a counterfeit coupon. The fact that Matson, a gay man, is not only himself a member of an “oppressed” minority group but also a leader of the moderate and all-LGBT Log Cabin Republicans did not suffice to save him from the scarlet “R” of alleged racism. He was fired days later, and the story became a cautionary tale for both blacks and whites. But the Queen of them all was BBQ Becky. On April 29, 2018, “Becky”—real name Jennifer Schulte—became internationally famous as a symbol of “the everyday racism black people face,” as USA Today put it, after she confronted a black family that was holding a cookout in a no-charcoal-grilling area of Oakland’s Lake Merritt. Schulte asked the family to leave, and they refused. The ensuing confrontation lasted several hours, during which family members accused Schulte of harassing them and several hostile park attendees followed her out of the park. Oakland Police eventually defused the situation, but a photograph of Schulte calling them on her cellphone trended online not long afterward and eventually became one of the most iconic memes of the past decade. Many laughed at the meme, but the legacy of incidents like these extends well beyond Internet in-jokes. According to Pew Social Trends’ analysis “Race in America 2019,” fully 71 percent of African Americans now see race relations as “generally bad,” and 56 percent think they have worsened under President Trump. It is impossible not to see epidemic media coverage of situations such as those mentioned above as a factor contributing to this malaise. While the mainstream media lean left and tend to focus their race-baiting on stories of white-on-black crime and harassment, a growing right-wing alternative media take the opposite tack, sensationalizing virtually every prominent story of black-on-white crime. The alt-right website American Renaissance literally maintains a “Black on White Crime Archive,” chock-full of stories such as “Anti-white Mob Cuts Off 18 Year Old’s Hand Following Road Rage” (this happened in the UK) and “The Porch Pirate of Potrero Hill: Inveterate Thief Blames Her Woes on Racism.” Similar content can be found at VDARE, World Net Daily, Info Wars, the Unz Review, the Stuff Black People Don’t Like blog, and a dozen similar outlets. Gonzo journalist Colin Flaherty runs an entire website devoted to stories about black-on-white crime. One tab on the site promises the “top 200 Black mob violence videos,” while another invites readers to “Make a Difference” by contacting Rush Limbaugh or Alex Jones and recommending Flaherty’s book on race-related crime. While content like this is generally at least somewhat less widely distributed than mainstream media stories about white rowdiness, this is not for want of trying. A quick Google search reveals that one of the most popular pieces ever to appear on Flaherty’s website is headlined: “Five Cases (of Black Crime) People Want on National TV.” Looking at today’s dueling headlines, it is tempting to ask: “So, do we have an epidemic of horrifically racist white-on-black crimes or an epidemic of brutish black-on-white crimes?” The answer is “neither.” Moreover, the statistics so thoroughly refute popular fear-mongering that Americans of all colors should take the media to task for the divisive false version of reality they so often present. In September of this year, the Trump administration’s Department of Justice released the 2019 Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) report, entitled “U.S. Criminal Victimization 2018,” a comprehensive breakdown of U.S. crime data for the year in question. The reality of interracial crime revealed within the pages of this thorough report is far indeed from the “race war” fantasies of extremists on either side. According to the report, only 15.3 percent of the 3,581,360 violent crimes against whites in 2018 were committed by blacks, who make up 12 to 13 percent of the U.S. population. These percentages are, needless to say, almost directly proportional. And whites were even less likely to commit racist crimes: Only about 11 percent of the 563,940 violent crimes against blacks were committed by whites. Significantly, no third group—say, Latinos—made up for these positive findings. During the study year, persons of Hispanic or Latino descent made up only 7.9 percent of all those who attacked blacks and just 10.2 percent of all those who attacked whites. The massive majority of crime in 2018 was intra-racial, with 62.1 percent of all attacks on white people coming from other whites (non-Hispanic whites make up 61 percent of the U.S. population) and 70.3 percent of all attacks on black people coming from other blacks. For good measure, nearly 50 percent of all attackers of Hispanics were themselves Hispanic. All told, only about 2,000,000 crimes, out of 5,061,940 violent crimes and roughly 12,000,000 total crimes, involved any interracial use of force whatsoever. It is true that, as alt-righters are fond of pointing out, there are more black attacks on whites than white attacks on blacks in a typical year: Generally about 500,000 of the first and 100,000 or fewer of the latter (59,777 in 2018). However, this fact taken alone is, in debater’s parlance, “true but meaningless.” The honest math around the topic gets more complicated than this, but it’s worth noting as a starting point that there are five times as many white people as black people in the United States. Even an utterly anti-racist black criminal would thus find himself confronted with 500 to 600 percent more white targets than black ones. It is also true that, on average, whites have more money than blacks do, making the former more tempting targets for such crimes as robbery. And the black violent-crime rate overall, as per the BJS, is roughly 2.4 times the white rate, making blacks statistically more likely to be involved in crime against members of all groups. Once variables such as these are adjusted for, we see that blacks attack whites less than would be mathematically predicted, even in a default scenario where no racial hostility whatsoever existed on either side. In that scenario, we would expect blacks to make up around 30 percent of attackers of whites (12 percent multiplied by 2.4 percent), but blacks in fact make up only 15.3 percent of those who attack whites. At an even more basic level of analysis, whites make up 61 percent of the population but only 46 percent of those attacked by black criminals. Whites return the favor, attacking black citizens—again, 12 percent or more of the population—roughly 3 percent of the time. The absolute absence of an American race war is most obvious in the context of that most warlike of crimes: murder. Figures from every recent year indicate that roughly 85 percent of murders of whites and an astonishing 91 to 95 percent of murders of blacks are intra-racial. In the representative year of 2015, there were only 500 black-on-white murders and 229 white-on-black murders reported nationally, according to the International Business Times. To put these figures in context, the Homicide Data Tables of the FBI’s Uniform Crime Report for the same year indicate that 5,854 whites and 7,039 blacks were murdered. For good or ill, social scientists almost universally note that the person most likely to kill you is a current or former lover and not five strangers from a different ethnic group. There certainly are some interesting heterodox nuggets to be mined from the BJS and other major data sets, which might advance the agenda of one group or another. For example, it is hard not to notice that Asian Americans apparently take it on the chin from everyone else in terms of criminal victimization. While blacks committed 70 percent of all acts of violence against blacks in 2018, and whites committed well over 60 percent of violent acts against whites, Asian Americans committed only 24.1 percent of all violent acts against Asians. Whites (24.1 percent), blacks (27.5 percent), and Hispanics and “others” combined (21.4 percent) all attacked Asians roughly as often as other Asians did. The report also showed an unusually high percentage of attacks against Asians (2.9 percent) in which one Asian was assaulted by “multiple offenders of various races.” This is well ahead of the corresponding findings for blacks (1.9 percent) and whites (2.1 percent) and rivaled only by that of Hispanics. And, of course, American Jews are another small, successful group who are subjected to inter-racial attacks with disproportionate frequency. The New York City area, in particular, has witnessed an astounding wave of anti-Semitic attacks, almost all committed by people of color, during the past few months. On December 28, 2019, a bearded black man wielding a machete stabbed five Orthodox Jews inside Rabbi Chaim Rottenberg’s in-home shul in the New York suburb of Monsey. The sole suspect in the attack had previously Googled phrases like “Why did Hitler hate the Jews?” on his home computer. This incident occurred less than a month after six people were killed during a shooting at a kosher supermarket in Jersey City, New Jersey, apparently carried out by acolytes of the racialist Black Hebrew Israelite movement. These were far from the only anti-Semitic attacks in and around New York during this period. New York City police have cited “at least eight anti-Semitic incidents” between December 13 and December 31 of the past year. In one case, an African-American woman, Tiffany Harris—who was arraigned on December 28 for slapping and cursing at three ultra-Orthodox women in the Brooklyn neighborhood of Crown Heights—was charged again, on December 30, for punching a Jewish woman in the face in front of her two young children. Notably, Harris was released from custody without paying bail in either case, courtesy of “bail reform” laws championed by current New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio. New York does not appear to be an extreme outlier. It would be virtually impossible to determine how many attacks against Jews have been subsumed into the “white” category of interracial crime statistics and thus estimate the percentage of all crime directed specifically at them. It definitely can be said, however, that American Jews—who, with an estimated population of 6,829,000, represent 1.7 percent of the total U.S. population—were the targets of at least 11.7 percent of all U.S. hate crimes (835 out of 7,120) and almost 60 percent of hate crimes motivated by the victim’s religion (835 out of 1,419) in 2018. In contrast, American Muslims, with a population very similar in size to that of Jews, reported only 188 total hate crimes in 2018, while blacks experienced slightly more than twice as many hate crimes as those against Jews (1,943) despite having a population more than six times as large. As with Asian Americans, Jews are attacked by members of multiple ethnic groups. In 2018, 179 of the 835 attacks on Jews were perpetrated by whites, 41 were described as black, and there were at least 14 incidents involving multiracial groups who attacked Jews. Two hundred and fifty-eight perpetrators were not definitively identified in racial terms. Three-hundred forty-three police/FBI reports apparently did not include a racial description of the suspect. Analysis of patterns of interracial crime in general, and of the Asian and Jewish case studies in particular, lends support to a point frequently made by conservatives: The presentation of interracial crime by the center-left mainstream media dominant in the United States is more than a bit dishonest. While there is little serious interracial violence, black-on-white crimes make up about 80 percent of violent criminal incidents involving whites and blacks in a typical year. It’s fair to say, based on empirical analysis, that mainstream media coverage of interracial crime slants in almost exactly the opposite direction: Rare incidents of white-on-black violence receive far more coverage than more common black-on-white assaults. At the most basic qualitative level of review, every single one of the incidents of white-on-black harassment discussed in this piece became a national or international story, while the black-on-white cases received mostly local coverage. More broadly, entire storylines that characterize American criminal justice, such as the epidemic of diverse and minority-generated violence against Asian Americans and Jews, are frequently missing from the national headlines. In a remarkable piece headlined “Is It Safe to Be Jewish in New York ?” Ginia Bellafante of the New York Times largely admits that the legacy media underreport East Coast anti-Semitism because of the diverse racial backgrounds of those brutalizing Jews. To quote directly: “The varied backgrounds of people who commit hate crimes…make combatting and talking about anti-Semitism in New York much harder.” This blunt statement by Bellafante, who deserves credit for her honesty, caused David Marcus of the Federalist to point out the obvious: If dozens of Jewish taxpayers were being beaten bloody by white men in MAGA hats or Pepe the Frog T-shirts, this “would not be hard to talk about—it would be a clear cut case of bigotry.” Similarly slanted media coverage is not uncommon as regards other important issues involving race and violence. When, for my book Hate Crime Hoax, I conducted in-depth quantitative analysis of how police shootings are covered, I found that non-blacks make up 70 percent of police-shooting victims but receive perhaps 20 percent of national media coverage of police shootings. A Google search for the phrase “well-known police shooting” turned up four white cases, four Hispanic cases, and 32 black cases in the first 10 pages of search results, with all cookies and trackers that might affect these results having previously been deleted. But the big picture of interracial crime—and ethnic conflict more broadly—in the United States is a surprisingly positive one. There certainly are small groups that are targeted with disturbing frequency, and the mass media have certainly failed in reporting honestly on these trends. However, there is no current or upcoming race war, or indeed general epidemic of interracial violence.

#### 3] Race war is ahistorical and essentializes coalitional politics vital for positive transformation---choosing a side does NOT demand militancy.

Beaty and Raphael ’16 [Thalia and T.J.; July 11; Senior Producer for visual investigations at ProPublica; Digital Content Editor, citing Al Amin and Stanley Nelson; The Takeaway, “Is America Headed for a Race War?” <https://www.wnycstudios.org/podcasts/takeaway/segments/story-race-and-violence-america>; RP]

The United States is still reeling from a week of racial tension and graphic violence, and while there is more than enough anger in America, some continue to fan the fire that has been lit under the summer of 2016. Fox's Bill O'Reilly has insisted that “[white Americans despise](https://mediamatters.org/video/2016/07/08/o-reilly-instructs-naacp-director-and-african-americans-distance-themselves-black-lives-matter/211462)” the Black Lives Matter movement, and the head of the National Association of Police Organizations accused President Obama of being responsible for a “[War on Cops](http://www.politico.com/story/2016/07/obama-war-on-cops-police-advocacy-group-225291).” As tension continues to mount, some claim that we’re starting to see the beginning of a race war in America. But in reality, the narrative of racial warfare in the United States goes back two centuries. In [a letter](http://www.nytimes.com/1865/04/21/news/murderer-mr-lincoln-extraordinary-letter-john-wilkes-booth-proof-that-he.html?pagewanted=all) he wrote before assassinating President Abraham Lincoln, John Wilkes Booth claimed that "this country was formed for the white, not for the black man" — a theme picked up by the KKK in its angry, murderous, and garbled calls for white power. Back in 1967, black militants like [Jamil Abdullah Al Amin](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/H._Rap_Brown), formerly known as H. Rap Brown, also said that racial violence in the United States was unavoidable. “I say violence is necessary," Al Amin [said](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=scYQGiybJbY) decades ago. "Violence is a part of America’s culture. It is as American as cherry pie. Americans taught the black people to be violent. We will use that violence to rid ourselves of oppression if necessary.” And then there are [The Turner Diaries](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Turner_Diaries) from 1978 — a novel about a race war started to prevent the government from suspending the Constitution. The book seemed to inspire Timothy McVeigh, who carried out the Oklahoma City bombings in 1995. Just last week after the shooting in Dallas, Texas, former Illinois Congressman Joe Walsh [wrote](http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/joe-walsh-war-obama-black-lives-matter-dallas-article-1.2703883) on Twitter: "3 Dallas Cops killed, 7 wounded. This is now war. Watch out Obama. Watch out black lives matter punks. Real America is coming after you." He later [deleted](http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/breaking/ct-joe-walsh-twitter-dallas-tweet-20160708-story.html) that tweet and said he did not mean it as a call for violence. Have we crossed a threshold in this country? Is the nation really evolving into a war zone, with battlefields popping up everywhere by surprise? [Stanley Nelson](https://twitter.com/stanleynelson1), a documentary film director and MacArthur fellow who made documentary "[The Black Panthers: Vanguard of the Revolution](http://theblackpanthers.com/home/)," believes there’s a way forward out of this tension. “I think that we may be on the edge of something good,” he says. “I think that people are looking at police violence and people are looking at racism in a different way than they were certainly [seeing things] even three days ago.” The change in perception, Nelson says, can be linked to changing technology. “The difference is that people have a camera in their pocket, and they’re able to film these things,” he says. “That’s what’s changed — the way we look at it — because we’re now able to see it and it’s impossible to deny.” Though he does sense change, Nelson also says that there are no “clear, quick answers” to the questions surrounding racism, racial tension, police brutality, and gun violence in America. “There’s a feeling that there’s a culture in the police department that has to change, and how do you change a culture?” he asks. “I think one of the most startling things that’s happened is that these killings have gone on in every sector of the country — it’s not just the south, the north, or the east. So what does that say about police departments?” As tensions continue to simmer, Nelson says that it’s important for America to “speak honestly about what is going on.” However, such an exercise seems to be increasingly difficult as the 2016 election marches forward. “Donald Trump has fanned the flames of racism in this country,” Nelson says. “He was a real driving force in the birther movement, and he started out his campaign by calling Mexicans rapists, and he’s called for banning Muslims from this country. There’s a feeling that we’re under attack, and at the same time, other Republicans are saying, ‘Yeah, that’s racist, but we’ll still support him.’ It’s very scary, I think, for African-Americans to look out and see that Donald Trump has over 50 percent of the white male vote.” When comparing the racial struggles of the 1960s to the present, Nelson argues there are several similarities — similarities to be hopeful about. “One thing that’s important to remember about the ‘60s is that it was a movement not only of African-Americans, but it was a movement of all people,” he says. “If you look at any of the huge marches, it’s not just black Americans, it’s white Americans, Asians, and Latinos — everybody is participating. And I think just as today, everybody’s outraged by what’s going on. I hope that we are at the start of a movement.” While some claim that a race war is on the horizon, Nelson sees a future that joins together different groups. “We’re at a place, hopefully, where change is something that people are thinking about, that black people, white people, Asians, Latinos — everybody in this country is thinking about how we get better,” he says. “That’s one of the things that the United States offers — the chance to get better.” In order to see that things get better, Nelson argues that we must start viewing police brutality as human issue instead of a black or brown issue. “I’m very heartened by young people,” he says. “When you look at these demonstrations that are taking place all over the country, it’s not just black people, it’s everybody who’s protesting. That’s what we have to understand — it has to be everybody who protests these police killings, which have gone on and on again for the last two years. Because of video cameras that we have in our pockets, we’ve seen evidence that this is really happening — irrefutable evidence. Before we could kind of pass it off.” Rejecting calls for a race war and choosing a non-violent path forward is “the only way that you can win,” Nelson says. “The very idea of the civil rights movement and non-violence was to say, ‘Look, look at what’s happening in the south — look at the dogs, look at the hoses. You have to pick a side,’” he says. “I think that’s maybe where we’re coming to now, and I think that’s maybe not a bad moment. Maybe it’s a moment of change.”

#### AT Beller –

#### 1] Doesn’t mention race once – it says the “linguistic commons” have been infiltrated by commodity exchange – a] can’t let them generalize Debate to a “race war”, b] means you can’t escape it – you participate in this debate, you pay entry fees, hire coaches and judges, etc., and c] proves Cap is the Root Cause.

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

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

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

#### AT Rodriguez –

#### The Aff may be radical in content but the form of it is co-opted into the University – this means their situation of the refusal within debate de-radicalizes their entire method.

Webb, Darren. "Bolt-holes and breathing spaces in the system: On forms of academic resistance (or, can the university be a site of utopian possibility?)." Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies 40.2 (2018): 96-118. (Senior Lecturer in Education at the University of Sheffield)//Elmer

It is easy to be seduced by the language of the undercommons. Embodying and enacting it, however, is difficult indeed. Being within and against the university, refusing the call to order through insolent obstructive unprofessionalism, is almost impossible to sustain. Halberstam (2009, 45) describes the undercommons as “a marooned community of outcast thinkers who refuse, resist, and renege on the demands of rigor, excellence, and productivity.” A romantic and appealing notion for sure but **refusing and reneging on “the university of excellence” will cost you your job.** When Moten **describes subversion** as a “series of immanent upheavals” expressed through “vast repertoires of high-frequency complaints, imperceptible frowns, withering turns, silent sidesteps, and ever-vigilant attempts not to see and hear” (2008, 1743), **one is reminded instantly of Thomas Docherty, disciplined and suspended for his negative vibes.**7 Being with and for the maroon community is difficult too. First of all, “Where and how can we find/see the Undercommons at work?” (Ĉiĉigoj, Apostolou-Hölscher, and Rusham 2015, 265). Where and how can one find those liminal spaces of sabotage and subversion, and how does one occupy them in a spirit of hapticality, study, and militant arrhythmia that brings the utopic underground to the surface of the fierce and urgent now? Beautiful language, but how does one live it? Networks do, of course, exist—the Undercommoning Collective, the Edu-Factory Collective, the International Network for Alternative Academia, to name but a few. These are promising spaces for bringing together and harboring the maroons and the fugitives. But networks are typically **short-lived**, and—as Harney and Moten warned—**there is a danger of institutionalization, of taking institutional practices with you** into alternative spaces “**because we’ve been inside so much**” (Harney and Moten 2013, 148). And so, predictably, **meetings of the fugitives come with structure, order, an official agenda**, and circulated minutes. The outcasts convene in conventional academic conferences, with parallel sessions, panels of papers, lunch breaks, wine and nibbles (e.g., Edu-Factory 2012). These spaces offer time out, welcome respite, a breathing space, a trip abroad, and then one returns to work. If hapticality, the touch of the undercommons, is “a visceral register of experience … the feel that what is to come is here” (Bradley 2014, 129–130), then this seems elusive. It is hard to detect a sense of the utopic undercommons rising to the surface of the corporate-imperial university. Moten describes the call to disorder and to study as a way to “excavate new aesthetic, political, and economic dispositions” (Moten 2008, 1745). But this notion of excavating is highly problematic. It is common within the discourse of “everyday utopianism”—finding utopia in the everyday, recovering lost or repressed transcendence in “everydayness” (Gardiner 2006)—to describe the process of utopian recovery in terms of excavating: excavating repressed desires, submerged longings, suppressed histories, untapped possibilities. But the fundamental questions of where to dig and how to identify a utopian “find” are never adequately addressed (see Webb 2017). Gardiner defines utopia as “a series of forces, tendencies and possibilities that are immanent in the here and now, in the pragmatic activities of everyday life” (2006, 2). But how are these forces, tendencies and possibilities to be identified and recovered? For Harney and Moten, **it is through study, hapticality and militant arrhythmia**. These are slippy concepts, however, evading concrete material referents. What is it to inhabit the undercommons? Those who have written of their experiences refer to “small acts of marronage” such as poaching resources and redeploying them in ways at odds with the university’s designs and demands (Reddy 2016, 7), or exploiting funding streams “to form cracks in the institution that enable the Others to invade the university” (Smith, Dyke, and Hermes 2013, 150). For Adusei-Poku (2015), the undercommons is a space of refuge which is all about survival (2015, 4–5). We who feel homeless in the university are forced into refuge. We gather together to survive. We may gain satisfaction from small acts of marronage, but this is less about bringing the utopic common underground to the surface as it is a form of “radical escapism” (Adusei-Poku 2015, 4). Benveniste (2015, v) tells us that: “The undercommons has no set location and no return address. There is no map for entering and no guide for staying. The only condition is a living appetite. Listen to its hunger for difference.” We need more than poetry, however. And **we need more than a series of minor acts of resistance**. As Srnicek and Williams rightly emphasize, resistance is a defensive, reactive gesture, resisting against. Resistance is not a utopian endeavour: “We do not resist a new world into being” (Srnicek and Williams 2016, 47). The undercommons, when one can find it, is a bolt hole, a place of refuge, a breathing space in the system. We need something more. The occupation Can the occupied building operate as a site of utopian possibility within the corporate-imperial university? Reflections on, and theorizations of, two recent waves of occupation—“Occupied California” 2009–2010 and the UK Occupations 2010–2011—have answered this question affirmatively. The “occupation” should not be understood here as solely or necessarily “student occupation.” It goes without saying—though sadly so often does need saying —that “faculty also have a responsibility to fight with and for students” (Smeltzer and Hearn 2015, 356). Though led by a new historical subject, “the graduate without a future” (Schwarz-WeinStein 2015, 11), the importance of faculty support for the occupations was emphasized on both sides of the Atlantic (Research and Destroy 2010, 11; Dawson 2011, 112; Holmes and R&D and Dead Labour 2011, 14; Ismail 2011, 128; Newfield and EduFactory 2011, 26). Long before Occupy took shape in Zuccotti Park, “occupation” was being heralded as the harbinger of a new society and a new way of being. If we return to the notion of creating utopian spaces, the key aim for some of the occupiers was to create communes within the university walls—to communize space (Inoperative Committee 2011, 6).8 Communization here is understood as a form of insurrectionary anarchism that refuses to talk of a transition to communism, insisting instead upon the immediate formation of zones of activity removed from exchange, money, compulsory labor, and the impersonal domination of the commodity form (Anon 2010a, 5). As one pamphlet declared: We will take whatever measures are necessary both to destroy this world as quickly as possible and to create, here and now, the world we want: a world without wages, without bosses, without borders, without states. (Anon 2010d, 34) This is a revolutionary anarchism that takes the university campus as the site for a practice—communization—that not only prefigures but also realizes the vision of a free society. Heavily influenced by The Coming Insurrection (Invisible Committee 2009), but tapping into a long tradition of anarchist theory and practice from Hakim Bey’s Temporary Autonomous Zones (Bey 1985) to David Graeber’s Direct Action (Graeber 2009), occupation becomes “the creation of a momentary opening in capitalist time and space, a rearrangement that sketches the contours of a new society” (Research and Destroy 2010, 11). It is “an attempt to imagine a new kind of everyday life” (Hatherley 2011, 123). Firth (2012) refers to these momentary openings as critical, experimental utopias: Such utopias are … simultaneously immanent and prefigurative. They are immanent insofar as they allow space for the immediate expression of desires, satisfaction of needs and also the articulation of difference or dissent. They are prefigurative to the extent that they allow one to practice and exemplify what one would like to see at a more proliferative range in the future (26) The ultimate aim is for the practice to spread beyond the campus through a dual process of provocative rupture—the idea that insurrectionary moments can unleash the collective imagination and stimulate an outpouring of creativity that blows apart common sense and offers glimpses of a future world (Gibson-Graham 2006, 51; Shukaitis and Graeber 2007, 37)—and “contaminationism,” that is, spreading by means of example (Graeber 2009, 211). It may well have been the case that communism was realized on the campuses of Berkeley and UCL, that a momentary opening in capitalist space/time appeared through which another world could be glimpsed. The occupation, however—whether California, London, or anywhere else—is likely always to remain a localized temporary disruptive practice. A practice with utopian potency, for sure, in terms of suspending normalized forms of discipline and opening new egalitarian discursive spaces (Rheingans and Hollands 2013; Nişancioğlu and Pal 2016). In terms of wider systemic change, however, “small interventions consisting of relatively non-scalable actions are highly unlikely to ever be able to reorganise our socioeconomic system” (Srnicek and Williams 2016, 29). What “the occupation” demonstrates more than anything is the reality of the corporate-imperial university, as the institutional hierarchy, backed by the carceral power of the police and criminal justice system, inevitably disperses the occupiers—often using militarized force—and repossesses the occupied space in a strong assertion of its ownership rights not only to university buildings but also to what constitutes legitimate thought and behavior within them (on this see Docherty 2015, 90). The significance, and utopian potential, one attaches to campus occupations depends in part upon the significance one attaches to the university as a site of struggle. For the Edu-Factory Collective: As was the factory, so now is the university. Where once the factory was a paradigmatic site of struggle between workers and capitalists, so now the university is a key space of conflict, where the ownership of knowledge, the reproduction of the labour force, and the creation of social and cultural stratifications are all at stake. This is to say the university is not just another institution subject to sovereign and governmental controls, but a crucial site in which wider social struggles are won and lost. (Caffentzis and Federici 2011, 26) Clearly, if this is true, then the form the struggle takes, and the example it sets, is of immense significance. Srnicek and Williams describe as “wishful thinking” the idea that the occupation might spread beyond the campus by means of rupture or contamination (2016, 35). However, if the university really is a key site of class struggle (Seybold 2008, 120; Haiven and Khasnabish 2014, 38), a site through which wider struggles are refracted and won or lost, then the transformative potential of the occupation needs to be attended to seriously. The analysis of the university offered by the Edu-Factory Collective is, however, outdated. Sounding like Daniel Bell writing in 1973 about how universities had become the “axial structures” of post-industrial society (Bell 1973, 12), the analysis does not hold water today. Moten overdoes it when he tells us that “the university is a kind of corpse. It is dead. It’s a dead institutional body” (Moten 2015, 78). What is clear, however, is that “focusing on the university as a site of radical transformation is a mistake” (Holmes and R&D and Dead Labour 2011, 13). As has been widely noted, there is very little distinguishing universities from other for-profit corporations (Readings 1996; Lustig 2005; Washburn 2005; Shear 2008, Tuchman 2009). What does separate them is their inefficiency, due in large part to the fact that universities operate also as medieval guilds, with faculties “ruled by masters who lord over journeymen and apprentices in an artisanal system of production” (Jemielniak and Greenwood 2015, 77). If the university is a sinister hybrid monstrosity—part medieval guild, part criminal corporation—which has no role other than reproducing its own privilege, then no special status can be attributed to campus protests. In this case, “A free university in the midst of a capitalist society is like a reading room in a prison” (Research and Destroy 2010, 10). A reading room in a prison. Another apposite metaphor. The occupation is a safe space, offering temporary respite, a place to hide, a refuge, a bolt-hole, a breathing space. As with the utopian classroom and the undercommons, what the occupation suggests is that “defending small bunkers of autonomy against the onslaught of capitalism is the best that can be hoped for” (Srnicek and Williams 2016, 48). Conclusion Zaslove was right to characterize utopian pedagogy within the corporateimperial university as the search for bolt-holes and breathing spaces in the system. He himself suggests that, “All university classes should become dialogic-experiential models that educate by expanding the zones of contact with wider communities” (2007, 102). Like so many others, Zaslove sees dialogic-experiential models of education beginning in the classroom then expanding outward. The literature is full of references to “exceeding the limits of the university classroom” (Coté, Day, and de Peuter 2007a, 325), “extend [ing] beyond the boundaries of the campus” (Ruben 2000, 211), and “breeching the walls of the university compounds and spilling into the streets” (Research and Destroy 2010, 10). This all brings to mind Giroux’s notion of academics as border crossers (Giroux 1992), but it also paints a picture of academics taking as their starting point the university and from there crossing the border into the community and the street. The University can be the site for fleeting, transitory, small-scale experiences of utopian possibility—in the classroom, the undercommons, the occupation. It cannot be the site for transformative utopian politics. It cannot even be the starting point for this. Given the corporatization and militarization of the university, academics are increasingly becoming “functionaries of elite interests” inhabiting a culture which serves to reproduce these interests (Shear 2008, 56). Within the university, “radical” initiatives or movements will soon be co-opted, recuperated, commodified, and neutralized (Gibson-Graham 2006, xxvi; Seybold 2008, 123; Neary 2012b, 249; Rolfe 2013, 21). Institutional habitus weights so heavily that projects born in the university will be scarred from the outset by a certain colonizing “imaginary of education” (Burdick and Sandlin 2010, 117). And we have long known that the university is but one space of learning, and perhaps not a very important one at that.