# Black Framework

This file is meant to give you two distinct options with very similar cross-overs, depending on to what extent you want to defend the wall:

1. Full-USFG, engaging/talking about the state is key to black debate, or
2. Soft T – sort of a presumption argument – you have to advocate SOME change to education policy, can be bottom-up or top-down.

Feel free to change out the 1NC cards as you see fit. There are a lot of ways to run this, just like there are a lot of ways to run normal framework.

## 1NC Shell – USFG

#### **A - Interpretation and violation – the affirmative should defend the hypothetical implementation of topical government action**. The judge should evaluate this debate as a debate over the resolutional question.

#### The agent and verb implies a hypothetical implementation of a policy by the USFG

Ericson 3 (Jon M., Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4)

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, **each topic contains certain key elements**, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. **1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt** a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, **the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb should**—the first part of a verb phrase **that urges action**. 3. An action verb to follow *should* in the *should*-verb combination. **For example, should adopt** here means to put a program or policy into action though governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase *free trade*, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. **The** entire debate **is about whether something ought to occur.** What you agree to do, then, when you accept the *affirmative side* in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### Its implies ownership

**Glossary of English Grammar Terms 2005**

(http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/possessive-pronoun.html)

Mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs are the **possessive pronouns** used to substitute a noun and to **show possession or ownership.** EG. This is your disk and that's mine. (Mine substitutes the word disk and shows that it belongs to me.)

#### Education policy is the set of laws and rules that govern schools

Boundless ND (“Education Policy,” https://www.boundless.com/political-science/textbooks/boundless-political-science-textbook/domestic-policy-15/education-policy-98/education-policy-529-4862/)

Education policy refers to the collection of laws and rules that govern the operation of education systems. Education occurs in many forms for many purposes. Examples include early childhood education, kindergarten through to 12th grade, two and four year colleges or universities, graduate and professional education, adult education and job training. Therefore, education policy can directly affect the education of people at all ages. Examples of areas subject to debate in education policy, include school size, class size, school choice, school privatization, tracking, teacher education and certification, teacher pay, teaching methods, curricular content, graduation requirements, school infrastructure investment, and the values that schools are expected to uphold and model.

#### **B – Our interp is best for black debate:**

#### First is clash – having an agreed-upon stasis point prior to the debate is key to creating an accessible point of clash - changing the topic post facto structurally favors the aff because they speak last and permute alternatives—predictable ground and clash are key to engaging a well-prepared opponent and testing the affirmative’s method – the ability to defend a position against a knowledgeable opponent is key to export our politics to help our communities

#### Second, we impact turn all of their 2AC offense – Black Radical Liberalism is the most promising candidate for an emancipatory political theory

Mills 15 [Charles, the John Evans Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy at Northwestern University, “BLACK RADICAL LIBERALISM (and why it isn’t an oxymoron),” Feb 23, http://peasoup.typepad.com/peasoup/2015/02/black-radical-liberalism-and-why-it-isnt-an-oxymoron.html/AK47]

“Black radical liberalism” is my attempt to reconstruct from different and usually counterposed bodies of political thought what I see as the most promising candidate for an emancipatory African American political theory. So I am less concerned with the question of whether any African American political theorists actually self-consciously identified what they were doing under this designation than with the question of whether it stands up to criticism as a plausible way forward. In taxonomies of African American/black political thought, the standard contrast would be:1 I am arguing for a synthesizing, reconstructed black liberalism which draws upon the most valuable insights of the black nationalist and black Marxist traditions, and incorporates them into a dramatically transformed liberalism. So the taxonomies would now be drawn differently: Screen Shot 2015-02-23 at 9.04.04 AM How does black radical liberalism differ from black mainstream liberalism? By definition they are both “liberal” in endorsing liberalism as a political philosophy, but black radical liberalism seeks to transform liberalism to make it responsive to the alternative realities of the black diasporic experience in modernity, and the correspondingly necessary reordering of liberal normative priorities.Black radical liberalism both (i) recognizes white supremacy as central to the making of the United States and (more sweepingly) the modern world, and (ii) seeks the rethinking of the categories, crucial assumptions, and descriptive and normative frameworks of liberalism in the light of that recognition.Black mainstream liberalism either (i) refuses to recognize white supremacy (for example, by endorsing the “anomaly” view of U.S. racism [see Rogers Smith, Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in US History]) or, (ii) even if it does give lip service to its reality, assumes nonetheless that the categories, crucial assumptions, and descriptive and normative frameworks of liberalism can be adopted with little change to the task of getting rid of it. OBJECTIONS: (1) But how can Marxist and liberal insights be reconciled? Aren’t they necessarily opposed? Liberalism comes in different varieties, and black radical liberalism would obviously be a left-wing variety. Liberalism is opposed to state-commandist socialism, but state-commandist socialism has proved itself to be a historical failure, both economically and morally. Liberalism is not in principle opposed to social democracy or market socialism. (2) But how can black nationalist insights be reconciled either with Marxism or liberalism? Black nationalism likewise comes in different varieties. The key insight of the tradition, in my opinion, is the recognition of the reality and centrality of an ontology of race, and how it shapes people and their psychology, which can be accommodated in a modified Marxism and liberalism. (Obviously this means rejecting essentialist versions of black nationalism, whether onto-theological or culturalist. A “black Marxist”/”left nationalist” tradition has long existed that addresses these issues: see, e.g., Lucius Outlaw, Critical Social Theory in the Interests of Black Folks.) (3) But how can even a “black radical liberalism” (assuming it doesn’t fly apart from centrifugal forces) deal with the problems identified by Derrick Bell‘s “racial realism,” or more recent “Afro-pessimism”?There are no guarantees, but then no other competing ideology can offer them either. Insofar as black radical liberalism is attentive to trends within capitalism (e.g., the forthcoming consolidation and exacerbation of plutocracy in the Western world predicted by Thomas Piketty’s Capital in the Twenty-First Century), it would hope that an increasing number of the white poor/white working class may begin to wake up to the reality that the prospects for their children and grandchildren under plutocratic capitalism—albeit white-supremacist plutocratic capitalism—are not that great either. As a materialist political philosophy, black radical liberalism does not rest its hopes for social transformation on moral suasion alone, but on the mobilization of group interests. The strategy would be to combine the racial justice political project with a larger social justice political project, highlighting the startling fact that the U.S. has the most unequal distribution of income and wealth of all the Western democracies. So that (very sketchily) would be the real-world agenda. Let us now look at the (academic world) implications for Rawlsian liberalism.CHALLENGING MAINSTREAM WHITE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY Screen Shot 2015-02-23 at 9.10.39 AM IDEAL vs. NON-IDEAL THEORY In A Theory of Justice Rawls famously focuses on “ideal theory,” the normative theory of a perfectly just society, one of “strict compliance” with its principles of justice. Ideal theory, however, was supposed to be the necessary preliminary to properly doing non-ideal theory, including “compensatory justice.” But 40+ years later, the transition to theorizing “compensatory justice” has still not been made, and contemporary Rawlsian discussions of non-ideal theory are dealing with other senses of the term. Obviously, for a population historically subordinated in modernity through slavery, colonialism, and Jim Crow, non-ideal theory is the imperative. Afro-modern (as it is now called) political philosophy is centrally shaped by the experience of oppression, domination, exploitation, etc. So black radical liberalism is going to be a variety of non-ideal-theory liberalism, liberalism dealing with the overcoming of social oppression in a nominally liberal society. WELL-ORDERED vs. ILL-ORDERED SOCIETIES A related distinction is the difference between well-ordered (perfectly just) and (what I am going to call) ill-ordered societies. Rawls suggests we think of societies as “cooperative ventures for mutual advantage.” But a white supremacist state is not a cooperative venture for mutual advantage. To assume the cooperative-venture characterization would be to rule racist societies out of normative consideration from the start. So black radical liberalism rejects such a stipulation. Instead, it works with a conception of society broad enough to include ill-ordered societies. Ill-ordered societies are coercive rather than cooperative ventures, characterized by exploitation and asymmetries of respect rather than mutual advantage and reciprocal respect. Ill-ordered societies are, in other words, the world. CORRECTIVE JUSTICE In his A Short History of Distributive Justice, Samuel Fleischacker points out that universal distributive justice as a norm in the Western tradition is only slightly more than 200 years old (and of course initially really just extends over the “universe” of white males). At first, not even white women are included (Carole Pateman, The Sexual Contract), and certainly not people of color in Western societies (Mills, The Racial Contract). “Corrective justice” as a concept is even more undeveloped and untheorized, especially where groups are concerned. Basic implication: Western normative theory in general historically for most of 2500 years, and liberalism for most of modernity, has been complicit with rather than condemnatory of, group subordination. The under-theorization in the tradition of corrective justice for subordinated groups, despite the subordination of most of the population nominally in the theory’s ambit, is itself a manifestation of this complicity. Black radical liberalism reverses these normative priorities, and makes corrective justice its central concern.

#### Third, Black Switch Side Debate is key to all your offense – Conviction Based Debate (CBD) results in debates where the debaters have already decided their position in debate and the world such that we do not consider our relationship to Others. It produces insular debates that destroy education, ethics and reproduces anti-blackness because Conviction Based Debate is based off an assumption of mastery embedded in whiteness.

Evans 12 [Rashad, JD., Black debate extraordinare and JD, “The 1NC,” Nov 20, http://www.rwesq.com/the-1nc/]

Now, the debate! First, let me look at Casey Harrigan’s (“CH”) definition of SSD. He says that : Definition: switch side debate (SSD) is the practice that requires debaters to argue both for and against a given topic in alternating rounds. In effect, it has meant that debaters’ arguments are divorced from personal conviction and instead made contingently as a means of “testing” the truth value of a proposition. I will accept this definition, but I think it requires some more refinement. In a practical sense, SSD, at a minimum, requires that the affirmative defend the resolution. For the most part, the negative is unconstrained (except by competition) and most debates in which SSD comes up the question is whether the affirmative team should be required to affirm the topic, including some defense of an action by the United States Federal Government (“USFG”). **The essential question posed by SSD is whether the affirmative team should be required to defend the resolution even when they (1) fundamentally disagree with all or part of it and/or (2) are compelled to affirm other ideas because of their “personal convictions.”** The answer to this question must be yes. First, there are multiple ways to skin a cat and even more ways to affirm the resolution in the world of parametric debate because one need only affirm an interpretation of the resolution and not the resolution writ large. Therefore, there are rare instances in which there is no interpretation of the resolution that you cannot defend and these rare instances are most likely the product of lack of creativity and research. So in reality, the question is an even simpler one: should the affirmative team be required to defend an interpretation of the resolution. There are immense constitutive and instrumental benefits to SSD that cannot be otherwise obtained and therefore must be required. I ask that the judges: George, Justin and Kyla evaluate this debate holistically, which requires that they evaluate the benefits of SSD to the speaker (constitutive) and to society (instrumental). This also requires that they exclude nothing in their analysis of this debate. The Constitutive Debaters benefit from SSD. It requires that they engage in topics that they may not otherwise engage. The resolution poses a unique question and the debate round is a unique time to answer that question. One is much more likely to consider their personal convictions outside of the debate round than they are to consider the resolution outside the debate round. Therefore, independently of whether one agrees with the resolution or not, there are benefits to defending an interpretation of the resolution in that it requires you to consider something you may not have otherwise considered. These thought expiriments create more informed and thoughtful debaters and citizens. SSD creates a unique opportunity for self-reflexivity. The idea is to let your personal convictions guide you in the debate. The resolution doesn’t require that you suppress your identity or convictions, but is instead an opportunity to infuse that identity and those convictions into the resolution and public policy discussion. So, given who you are, what you believe and what you know what say you regarding energy production? What say you regarding democracy assistance? What say you regarding federal control in Indian Country? Therefore, the resolution is an opportunity for you to refine your personal convictions and put your identity in politics instead of relying exclusively on identity politics.SSD allows you to check your own privilege. Here, I will rely on my personal experience. I once participated in a 30 day creative challenge where the challenge leader would pose questions on facebook and the group would answer them in the comments section. One day he asked us to imagine we could be the other gender for 3 days and to discuss what would we do. I thought about this on the A-train from Harlem to Chelsea and again from Chelsea to Harlem and had no answer because I couldn’t imagine being a woman. I explained that as a gay man I don’t need to be a woman to have sex with a man, I don’t want a baby in me and more importantly I don’t want the physical vulnerability of being a woman. This realization really forced me to reevaluate my previous jokes even that as a gay many I was ontologically indistinct from a woman. I am not. I am gay and I am black…in many ways I am the the worlds bottom, but even I could would not want to occupy the body of a woman. That thought experiment taught me a lot about myself, privilege and the world. Sometimes, you have to take a walk in someone else’s stiletto to learn who you really are. Seriously CH, have you walked in stilettos? It will change your life. SSD is both necessary and sufficient to ensure that you debate your personal convictions. Remember, if you are staunchly opposed to the resolution you get to lodge those complaints on the negative. Also, remember that what is good for the goose is good for the gander and if you don’t have to debate the resolution then no one has to debate the resolution. This loosening of the restrictions on the resolution may mean that no one gets to debate anything they want. I mean lets face it, no one wants to be topical! There’s always a better version of your aff that isn’t topical. Every 2AC considers severance or intrinsicness because the resolution is flawed or insufficient. However, a true debater understands that they both have to debate on the affirmative and the negative and that in order to do either effectively there must be stability in the relationship between the affirmative and the negative. Therefore, committing yourself to the resolution is key preserving your own negative ground to engage in your critique of the resolution. As goes the resolution so goes your personal convictions about that resolution. The Instrumental SSD is the only way to organize a fair debate tournament. We must have a topic. There must be rules and allowing any and everyone go rogue because of their “personal convictions” it is a recipe for disaster. I don’t want to live and debate in that world. There must be strict requirements on defending the resolution to allow for fair and predictable negative ground. By the way, protecting fair negative ground is easier and more important than all other concerns regarding fairness. All people of all convictions have to be negative at some point. Which means that the affirmative-negative dialiectic is the only intersectional analysis that can be performed because all people of all identities will eventually find themselves on the affirmative or negative side in debate. Preserving negative ground then preserves the ground of women, minorities and hippies.SSD ensures that we have all hands on deck in these extraordinary times. We need all perspectives and all peoples to engage in all debates. SSD facilitates this. Allowing students to pick their own topic because of their “personal convictions” may mean that important issues get ignored all together. I mean, what would happen if we let the students set the curriculum? Would they learn anything, ever? How many times have you heard these questions in a classroom: why do I have to learn this? Will this be on the exam? My major is X, why do I need to learn Y? Blah. Yes, students would almost always like to do what they want to do. If we allowed this where would we be as a country? Who will be there to tackle the important questions pertaining to immigration, energy production, the Arab Spring, etc? Engaging the resolution from your specific social location can cause others to change their views. There are several examples of creative interpretations of the resolution that have inspired folk to view the topic and life differently. This is when debate is at its best and when it’s engaging in important knowledge production. Debate and debaters have the potential to infuse new arguments, ideas and perspectives into the resolution and into the broader discussion. Now, the line by line! CH says: 1. It presumes debate as a “pedagogical bull-pen”, which undermines the activity’s potential for radical change. Students are told “you can’t know anything until you debate both sides”, ignoring the VAST WEALTH of lived experience that underwrites specific claims about identity, the world, praxis, and the topic. In some ways, it is like Loyola’s argument about info accumulation – we are told to place a hold on “conviction” until we have “enough information” and “enough testing” when in reality there is either never a point where “enough is enough” OR we have \*already\* crossed that point and should be able to utilize the debate space for advocacy. It makes debate into a game about hypothetical action rather than a potential site for social justice. First, there are radically topical interpretations of the resolution. Second, how does one know that their lived experience is dispositive of any debate without testing it against the research and lived experiences of others. It’s not that you can’t know anything until you debate both sides but more importantly that you debate both sides before you conclude you know anything. Lastly, there is no internal link between resolutional debate and the loss of social justice. In fact, one should always debate the resolution in a way that produces social justice. 2. It is anti-Black. The norm of SSD and topic construction mandating USFG action presume that public policy is valuable because it is equally accessible to all participants, when in reality access is ANYTHING BUT that, relies on a belief that USFG action is a locus for change when in reality and history it has produced the opposite, marginalizes individual perspectives as “too local”, and does not account for the specific conditions of Black participation in debate. Your anti-Blackness argument is without warrant. To the extent that anti-Blackness is a problem, SSD is the solution. Certainly, holding on to ones conviction in avoidance of debate has never benefited Black people in the past. Thinking itself is Blackness (whiteness is anti-thought), so avoiding a debate because of personal conviction is quintessentially anti-Black. In fact, many of debates current ills stem from people avoiding debates and holding fast to their convictions. Also, the USFG is not uniquely anti-Black. The world is anti-Black, so to isolate the USFG is to fundamentally misunderstand Blackness. The USFG has been a locus for change where others have failed. For instance, the civil rights act regulated the racist behavior of private individuals and corporations. School desegregation required federal intervention to ensure state compliance with the constitution. The Violence Against Women’s Act regulates individual behavior in the home which was once considered a private matter. This is not to suggest that the USFG is a saint, but to suggest that the question requires more nuance and that nuance is provided only by SSD. The specific conditions of Blackness require SSD. After years of exclusion from education generally and debate specifically, its right time that we jump into the discussions. Black SSD not equal white SSD. Black debaters are the future and they will remake the world partially in an image of themselves. This requires that they theorize their Blackness across topics, resolutions and debates. This is the revolution we are waiting for.

## 1NC Shell – Soft T/Presumption

#### A – Interpretation – the affirmative must prescribe a course of action to substantially increase funding and/or regulation of education in the United States.

#### Education policy is the set of laws and rules that govern schools

Boundless ND (“Education Policy,” https://www.boundless.com/political-science/textbooks/boundless-political-science-textbook/domestic-policy-15/education-policy-98/education-policy-529-4862/)

Education policy refers to the collection of laws and rules that govern the operation of education systems. Education occurs in many forms for many purposes. Examples include early childhood education, kindergarten through to 12th grade, two and four year colleges or universities, graduate and professional education, adult education and job training. Therefore, education policy can directly affect the education of people at all ages. Examples of areas subject to debate in education policy, include school size, class size, school choice, school privatization, tracking, teacher education and certification, teacher pay, teaching methods, curricular content, graduation requirements, school infrastructure investment, and the values that schools are expected to uphold and model.

#### B – Violation – the aff isolates a problem with education policy but does not provide a method to change it.

#### C – Our interp is best for black debate:

#### First is clash – debating about methodology in the direction of the resolution is key to creating an accessible point of clash - changing the topic post facto structurally favors the aff because they speak last and permute alternatives—predictable ground and clash are key to engaging a well-prepared opponent and testing the affirmative’s method – the ability to defend a position against a knowledgeable opponent is key to export our politics to help our communities

#### Structureless debate recreates hierarchies by resulting in endless theorizing which further alienates participants from creating tangible solutions to challenge the structures which oppress them.

**Tonn, 5** [Mari Boor, phd philosophy from the University of Kansas, associate professor of rhetoric and communication studies at the University of Richmond, “

In practice, public conversation easily can emulate what feminist political scientist Jo Freeman termed "the tyranny of structurelessness" in her classic 1970 critique of consciousness-raising groups in the women's liberation movement,15 as well as the key traits Irving L. Janis ascribes to "groupthink."16 Thus, contrary to its promotion as a means to neutralize hierarchy and exclusion in the public sphere, public conversation can and has accomplished the reverse. When such moves are rendered transparent, public conversation and dialogue, I contend, risk increasing rather than diminishing political cynicism and alienation. Second, whereas Schudson focuses largely on ways a conversational model for democracy may mute an individual's voice in crafting a resolution on a given question at a given time, I draw upon insights of Dana L. Cloud and othersto consider ways in which a therapeutic, conversational approach to public problems can stymie productive, collective action in two respects.17 First, because conversation has no clearly defined goal, a public conversation may engender inertia as participants become mired in repeated airings of personal experiences without a mechanism to lend such expressions direction and closure. As Freeman aptly notes, although "[u]nstructured groups may be very effective in getting [people] to talk about their lives[,] they aren't very good for getting things done. Unless their mode of operation changes, groups flounder at the point where people tire of 'just talking.'"18 Second, because the therapeutic bent of much public conversation locates social ills and remedies within individuals or dynamics of interpersonal relationships, public conversations and dialogues risk becoming substitutes for policy formation necessary to correct structural dimensions of social problems. In mimicking the emphasis on the individual in therapy, Cloud warns, the therapeutic rhetoric of "healing, consolation, and adaptation or adjustment" tends to "encourage citizens to perceive political issues, conflicts, and inequities as personal failures subject to personal amelioration."

#### Second, we impact turn all of their offense – Black Radical Liberalism is the most promising candidate for an emancipatory political theory

Mills 15 [Charles, the John Evans Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy at Northwestern University, “BLACK RADICAL LIBERALISM (and why it isn’t an oxymoron),” Feb 23, http://peasoup.typepad.com/peasoup/2015/02/black-radical-liberalism-and-why-it-isnt-an-oxymoron.html/AK47]

“Black radical liberalism” is my attempt to reconstruct from different and usually counterposed bodies of political thought what I see as the most promising candidate for an emancipatory African American political theory. So I am less concerned with the question of whether any African American political theorists actually self-consciously identified what they were doing under this designation than with the question of whether it stands up to criticism as a plausible way forward. In taxonomies of African American/black political thought, the standard contrast would be:1 I am arguing for a synthesizing, reconstructed black liberalism which draws upon the most valuable insights of the black nationalist and black Marxist traditions, and incorporates them into a dramatically transformed liberalism. So the taxonomies would now be drawn differently: Screen Shot 2015-02-23 at 9.04.04 AM How does black radical liberalism differ from black mainstream liberalism? By definition they are both “liberal” in endorsing liberalism as a political philosophy, but black radical liberalism seeks to transform liberalism to make it responsive to the alternative realities of the black diasporic experience in modernity, and the correspondingly necessary reordering of liberal normative priorities.Black radical liberalism both (i) recognizes white supremacy as central to the making of the United States and (more sweepingly) the modern world, and (ii) seeks the rethinking of the categories, crucial assumptions, and descriptive and normative frameworks of liberalism in the light of that recognition.Black mainstream liberalism either (i) refuses to recognize white supremacy (for example, by endorsing the “anomaly” view of U.S. racism [see Rogers Smith, Civic Ideals: Conflicting Visions of Citizenship in US History]) or, (ii) even if it does give lip service to its reality, assumes nonetheless that the categories, crucial assumptions, and descriptive and normative frameworks of liberalism can be adopted with little change to the task of getting rid of it. OBJECTIONS: (1) But how can Marxist and liberal insights be reconciled? Aren’t they necessarily opposed? Liberalism comes in different varieties, and black radical liberalism would obviously be a left-wing variety. Liberalism is opposed to state-commandist socialism, but state-commandist socialism has proved itself to be a historical failure, both economically and morally. Liberalism is not in principle opposed to social democracy or market socialism. (2) But how can black nationalist insights be reconciled either with Marxism or liberalism? Black nationalism likewise comes in different varieties. The key insight of the tradition, in my opinion, is the recognition of the reality and centrality of an ontology of race, and how it shapes people and their psychology, which can be accommodated in a modified Marxism and liberalism. (Obviously this means rejecting essentialist versions of black nationalism, whether onto-theological or culturalist. A “black Marxist”/”left nationalist” tradition has long existed that addresses these issues: see, e.g., Lucius Outlaw, Critical Social Theory in the Interests of Black Folks.) (3) But how can even a “black radical liberalism” (assuming it doesn’t fly apart from centrifugal forces) deal with the problems identified by Derrick Bell‘s “racial realism,” or more recent “Afro-pessimism”?There are no guarantees, but then no other competing ideology can offer them either. Insofar as black radical liberalism is attentive to trends within capitalism (e.g., the forthcoming consolidation and exacerbation of plutocracy in the Western world predicted by Thomas Piketty’s Capital in the Twenty-First Century), it would hope that an increasing number of the white poor/white working class may begin to wake up to the reality that the prospects for their children and grandchildren under plutocratic capitalism—albeit white-supremacist plutocratic capitalism—are not that great either. As a materialist political philosophy, black radical liberalism does not rest its hopes for social transformation on moral suasion alone, but on the mobilization of group interests. The strategy would be to combine the racial justice political project with a larger social justice political project, highlighting the startling fact that the U.S. has the most unequal distribution of income and wealth of all the Western democracies. So that (very sketchily) would be the real-world agenda. Let us now look at the (academic world) implications for Rawlsian liberalism.CHALLENGING MAINSTREAM WHITE POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY Screen Shot 2015-02-23 at 9.10.39 AM IDEAL vs. NON-IDEAL THEORY In A Theory of Justice Rawls famously focuses on “ideal theory,” the normative theory of a perfectly just society, one of “strict compliance” with its principles of justice. Ideal theory, however, was supposed to be the necessary preliminary to properly doing non-ideal theory, including “compensatory justice.” But 40+ years later, the transition to theorizing “compensatory justice” has still not been made, and contemporary Rawlsian discussions of non-ideal theory are dealing with other senses of the term. Obviously, for a population historically subordinated in modernity through slavery, colonialism, and Jim Crow, non-ideal theory is the imperative. Afro-modern (as it is now called) political philosophy is centrally shaped by the experience of oppression, domination, exploitation, etc. So black radical liberalism is going to be a variety of non-ideal-theory liberalism, liberalism dealing with the overcoming of social oppression in a nominally liberal society. WELL-ORDERED vs. ILL-ORDERED SOCIETIES A related distinction is the difference between well-ordered (perfectly just) and (what I am going to call) ill-ordered societies. Rawls suggests we think of societies as “cooperative ventures for mutual advantage.” But a white supremacist state is not a cooperative venture for mutual advantage. To assume the cooperative-venture characterization would be to rule racist societies out of normative consideration from the start. So black radical liberalism rejects such a stipulation. Instead, it works with a conception of society broad enough to include ill-ordered societies. Ill-ordered societies are coercive rather than cooperative ventures, characterized by exploitation and asymmetries of respect rather than mutual advantage and reciprocal respect. Ill-ordered societies are, in other words, the world. CORRECTIVE JUSTICE In his A Short History of Distributive Justice, Samuel Fleischacker points out that universal distributive justice as a norm in the Western tradition is only slightly more than 200 years old (and of course initially really just extends over the “universe” of white males). At first, not even white women are included (Carole Pateman, The Sexual Contract), and certainly not people of color in Western societies (Mills, The Racial Contract). “Corrective justice” as a concept is even more undeveloped and untheorized, especially where groups are concerned. Basic implication: Western normative theory in general historically for most of 2500 years, and liberalism for most of modernity, has been complicit with rather than condemnatory of, group subordination. The under-theorization in the tradition of corrective justice for subordinated groups, despite the subordination of most of the population nominally in the theory’s ambit, is itself a manifestation of this complicity. Black radical liberalism reverses these normative priorities, and makes corrective justice its central concern.

#### Third, Black Switch Side Debate is key to all your offense – Conviction Based Debate (CBD) results in debates where the debaters have already decided their position in debate and the world such that we do not consider our relationship to Others. It produces insular debates that destroy education, ethics and reproduces anti-blackness because Conviction Based Debate is based off an assumption of mastery embedded in whiteness.

Evans 12 [Rashad, JD., Black debate extraordinare and JD, “The 1NC,” Nov 20, http://www.rwesq.com/the-1nc/]

Now, the debate! First, let me look at Casey Harrigan’s (“CH”) definition of SSD. He says that :

Definition: switch side debate (SSD) is the practice that requires debaters to argue both for and against a given topic in alternating rounds. In effect, it has meant that debaters’ arguments are divorced from personal conviction and instead made contingently as a means of “testing” the truth value of a proposition.

I will accept this definition, but I think it requires some more refinement. In a practical sense, SSD, at a minimum, requires that the affirmative defend the resolution. For the most part, the negative is unconstrained (except by competition) and most debates in which SSD comes up the question is whether the affirmative team should be required to affirm the topic, including some defense of an action by the United States Federal Government (“USFG”). **The essential question posed by SSD is whether the affirmative team should be required to defend the resolution even when they (1) fundamentally disagree with all or part of it and/or (2) are compelled to affirm other ideas because of their “personal convictions.”**

The answer to this question must be yes. First, there are multiple ways to skin a cat and even more ways to affirm the resolution in the world of parametric debate because one need only affirm an interpretation of the resolution and not the resolution writ large. Therefore, there are rare instances in which there is no interpretation of the resolution that you cannot defend and these rare instances are most likely the product of lack of creativity and research. So in reality, the question is an even simpler one: should the affirmative team be required to defend an interpretation of the resolution. There are immense constitutive and instrumental benefits to SSD that cannot be otherwise obtained and therefore must be required. I ask that the judges: George, Justin and Kyla evaluate this debate holistically, which requires that they evaluate the benefits of SSD to the speaker (constitutive) and to society (instrumental). This also requires that they exclude nothing in their analysis of this debate. The Constitutive Debaters benefit from SSD. It requires that they engage in topics that they may not otherwise engage. The resolution poses a unique question and the debate round is a unique time to answer that question. One is much more likely to consider their personal convictions outside of the debate round than they are to consider the resolution outside the debate round. Therefore, independently of whether one agrees with the resolution or not, there are benefits to defending an interpretation of the resolution in that it requires you to consider something you may not have otherwise considered. These thought expiriments create more informed and thoughtful debaters and citizens.

SSD creates a unique opportunity for self-reflexivity. The idea is to let your personal convictions guide you in the debate. The resolution doesn’t require that you suppress your identity or convictions, but is instead an opportunity to infuse that identity and those convictions into the resolution and public policy discussion. So, given who you are, what you believe and what you know what say you regarding energy production? What say you regarding democracy assistance? What say you regarding federal control in Indian Country? Therefore, the resolution is an opportunity for you to refine your personal convictions and put your identity in politics instead of relying exclusively on identity politics.

SSD allows you to check your own privilege. Here, I will rely on my personal experience. I once participated in a 30 day creative challenge where the challenge leader would pose questions on facebook and the group would answer them in the comments section. One day he asked us to imagine we could be the other gender for 3 days and to discuss what would we do. I thought about this on the A-train from Harlem to Chelsea and again from Chelsea to Harlem and had no answer because I couldn’t imagine being a woman. I explained that as a gay man I don’t need to be a woman to have sex with a man, I don’t want a baby in me and more importantly I don’t want the physical vulnerability of being a woman. This realization really forced me to reevaluate my previous jokes even that as a gay many I was ontologically indistinct from a woman. I am not. I am gay and I am black…in many ways I am the the worlds bottom, but even I could would not want to occupy the body of a woman. That thought experiment taught me a lot about myself, privilege and the world. Sometimes, you have to take a walk in someone else’s stiletto to learn who you really are. Seriously CH, have you walked in stilettos? It will change your life.

SSD is both necessary and sufficient to ensure that you debate your personal convictions. Remember, if you are staunchly opposed to the resolution you get to lodge those complaints on the negative. Also, remember that what is good for the goose is good for the gander and if you don’t have to debate the resolution then no one has to debate the resolution. This loosening of the restrictions on the resolution may mean that no one gets to debate anything they want. I mean lets face it, no one wants to be topical! There’s always a better version of your aff that isn’t topical. Every 2AC considers severance or intrinsicness because the resolution is flawed or insufficient. However, a true debater understands that they both have to debate on the affirmative and the negative and that in order to do either effectively there must be stability in the relationship between the affirmative and the negative. Therefore, committing yourself to the resolution is key preserving your own negative ground to engage in your critique of the resolution. As goes the resolution so goes your personal convictions about that resolution.

The Instrumental

SSD is the only way to organize a fair debate tournament. We must have a topic. There must be rules and allowing any and everyone go rogue because of their “personal convictions” it is a recipe for disaster. I don’t want to live and debate in that world. There must be strict requirements on defending the resolution to allow for fair and predictable negative ground. By the way, protecting fair negative ground is easier and more important than all other concerns regarding fairness. All people of all convictions have to be negative at some point. Which means that the affirmative-negative dialiectic is the only intersectional analysis that can be performed because all people of all identities will eventually find themselves on the affirmative or negative side in debate. Preserving negative ground then preserves the ground of women, minorities and hippies.

SSD ensures that we have all hands on deck in these extraordinary times. We need all perspectives and all peoples to engage in all debates. SSD facilitates this. Allowing students to pick their own topic because of their “personal convictions” may mean that important issues get ignored all together. I mean, what would happen if we let the students set the curriculum? Would they learn anything, ever? How many times have you heard these questions in a classroom: why do I have to learn this? Will this be on the exam? My major is X, why do I need to learn Y? Blah. Yes, students would almost always like to do what they want to do. If we allowed this where would we be as a country? Who will be there to tackle the important questions pertaining to immigration, energy production, the Arab Spring, etc?

Engaging the resolution from your specific social location can cause others to change their views. There are several examples of creative interpretations of the resolution that have inspired folk to view the topic and life differently. This is when debate is at its best and when it’s engaging in important knowledge production. Debate and debaters have the potential to infuse new arguments, ideas and perspectives into the resolution and into the broader discussion. Now, the line by line! CH says: 1. It presumes debate as a “pedagogical bull-pen”, which undermines the activity’s potential for radical change. Students are told “you can’t know anything until you debate both sides”, ignoring the VAST WEALTH of lived experience that underwrites specific claims about identity, the world, praxis, and the topic. In some ways, it is like Loyola’s argument about info accumulation – we are told to place a hold on “conviction” until we have “enough information” and “enough testing” when in reality there is either never a point where “enough is enough” OR we have \*already\* crossed that point and should be able to utilize the debate space for advocacy. It makes debate into a game about hypothetical action rather than a potential site for social justice. First, there are radically topical interpretations of the resolution. Second, how does one know that their lived experience is dispositive of any debate without testing it against the research and lived experiences of others. It’s not that you can’t know anything until you debate both sides but more importantly that you debate both sides before you conclude you know anything. Lastly, there is no internal link between resolutional debate and the loss of social justice. In fact, one should always debate the resolution in a way that produces social justice. 2. It is anti-Black. The norm of SSD and topic construction mandating USFG action presume that public policy is valuable because it is equally accessible to all participants, when in reality access is ANYTHING BUT that, relies on a belief that USFG action is a locus for change when in reality and history it has produced the opposite, marginalizes individual perspectives as “too local”, and does not account for the specific conditions of Black participation in debate. Your anti-Blackness argument is without warrant. To the extent that anti-Blackness is a problem, SSD is the solution. Certainly, holding on to ones conviction in avoidance of debate has never benefited Black people in the past. Thinking itself is Blackness (whiteness is anti-thought), so avoiding a debate because of personal conviction is quintessentially anti-Black. In fact, many of debates current ills stem from people avoiding debates and holding fast to their convictions. Also, the USFG is not uniquely anti-Black. The world is anti-Black, so to isolate the USFG is to fundamentally misunderstand Blackness. The USFG has been a locus for change where others have failed. For instance, the civil rights act regulated the racist behavior of private individuals and corporations. School desegregation required federal intervention to ensure state compliance with the constitution. The Violence Against Women’s Act regulates individual behavior in the home which was once considered a private matter. This is not to suggest that the USFG is a saint, but to suggest that the question requires more nuance and that nuance is provided only by SSD. The specific conditions of Blackness require SSD. After years of exclusion from education generally and debate specifically, its right time that we jump into the discussions. Black SSD not equal white SSD. Black debaters are the future and they will remake the world partially in an image of themselves. This requires that they theorize their Blackness across topics, resolutions and debates. This is the revolution we are waiting for.

# 2NC Blocks

## EXTRA DEFINITIONS

### Education

#### “Education” is limited to the curriculum – modifying the school system is beyond the resolution

Kumar 17 – Deputy Dean at the University Information Centre, (Satish, “MEANING, AIMS AND PROCESS OF EDUCATION”, https://sol.du.ac.in/mod/book/view.php?id=1448&chapterid=1321)

Narrower and Broader Meaning of Education Education in the Narrower Sense In its narrow sense, school instruction is called education. In this process, the elders of society strive to attain predetermined aims during a specified time by providing pre-structured knowledge to children through set methods of teaching. The purpose is to achieve mental development of children entering school. To make of narrow meaning of education more clear, the following opinions of some other educationists are being given- · The culture which each generation purposefully gives to those who are to be its successors, in order to qualify them for at least keeping up, and if possible for raising the level of improvement which has been attained. John Stuart Mill · In narrow sense, education may be taken to mean any consciously directed effort to develop and cultivate our powers. S. S. Mackenzie · Education is a process in which and by which knowledge, character and behaviour of the young are shaped and moulded. Prof. Drever · The influence of the environment of the individual with a view to producing a permanent change in his habits of behaviour, or thought and attitude. G. H. Thompson Education, in the narrower sense, is regarded as equivalent to instruction. It consists of the “specific influences” consciously designed in a school or in a college or in an institution to bring in the development and growth of the child. The word school includes the whole machinery of education from Kindergarten to the University. The education of the child begins with his admission in the school and ends with his departure from the University. The amount of education received by the child is measured in terms of degrees and diplomas awarded to him. The school represents formal education as it imparts education directly and systematically. There is deliberate effort on the part of the educator to inculcate certain habits, skills, attitudes or influences in the learner, which are considered to be essential and useful to him. According to John Dewey: “The school exists to provide a special environment for the formative period of human life. School is a consciously designed institution, the sole concern of which is to educate the child. This special environment is essential to explain our complex society and civilization”. The influences or modes of influences in the school are deliberately planned, chosen and employed by the community for the welfare of the members of the rising generation. The purpose of these influences is to modify the behaviour of the child in such a way that he may become different from what he would have been without education. It makes possible a better adjustment of human nature to surroundings. According to Mackenzie, education, in the narrower sense, is conscious effort to develop and cultivate our innate powers. Education, in the narrow sense, is also regarded as acquisition of knowledge. According to it education is a process by which knowledge or information on a subject is acquired. But many sensible educationists have criticized this view. They argue that emphasis on the knowledge is likely to reduce all schools to mere knowledge-shops. The acquisition of knowledge is not the only or supreme aim of education, yet it is one of the important aims of education. Education in the Broader Sense In its wider sense, education is the total development of the personality. In this sense. Education consists of all those experiences, which affect the individual from birth till death. Thus, education is that process by which an individual freely develops his self according to his nature in a free and uncontrolled environment. In this way, education is a life long process of growth environment.

### Increase

#### Increase means to make greater

Merriam-Webster 17  
(Merriam-Webster, dictionary, “Increase” <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/increase>, cVs)

Definition of increase increased; increasing intransitive verb 1 : to become progressively greater (as in size, amount, number, or intensity) 2 : to multiply by the production of young

### Policy

#### Policy means principles and measures to guide government in public management

The Law Dictionary 16 [“Law Dictionary: What is POLICY? definition of POLICY (Black's Law Dictionary),” from Black’s Law Dictionary, 2nd Edition, originally published 1910, Accessed Oct 24, 2016, http://thelawdictionary.org/policy/]

The general principles by which a government is guided in its management of public affairs, or the legislature in its measures. This term, as applied to a law, ordinance, or rule of law, denotes its general purpose or tendency considered as directed to the POLICY

#### An education policy is a statement that describes a course of action.

#### Miller 10 (Steven I. Miller, Loyola University 9-17-2010, "DEFINING EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES AS A FIELD," Educational Studies http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1207/s15326993es1202\_1?journalCode=heds20)

The first question becomes: what is a “social policy”, an “educational policy”, or a “policy” in general? There are probably as many notions of policy as people who engage in policy “analysis.” While by no mean exhaustive, some definitions may be as follows: 1. A policy is a historical or contemporary statement or series of statements which describe, prescribe and/or proscribe a course of action. These statements are usually written, but they could be oral. They may or may not imply contractual legal obligations. Additionally, a policy may be developed at different organizational levels and may be binding for only that level or for other levels, as well.

#### Critically examining the historical context of the actors in education policy is key.

#### Nagahara 10 (Minori Nagahara, 2010, “Fazal Rizvi and Bob Lingard: Globalizing Education Policy”, Journal of Educational Change, Springer Science and Media B.V // LR)

Warning against the reification of globalization as a catchall explanation for trends in global education policy, Rizvi and Lingard suggest that analysts need to critically examine the actors in education policy discourses—individuals, institutions, and organizations as well as their historical, cultural, and political contexts. The authors also make explicit their own stance toward policy analysis which draws from post-colonial, post-structural, and critical theories.

#### Centering pedagogy in education reform studies helps form connections between education policy and practice.

#### Nagahara 10 (Minori Nagahara, 2010, “Fazal Rizvi and Bob Lingard: Globalizing Education Policy”, Journal of Educational Change, Springer Science and Media B.V / LR)

Values allocation in education policy not only steers the goals of education, but also impacts curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation—the three ‘‘message systems’’ of Basil Bernstein (1971). Rizvi and Lingard note that traditionally, studies of education policy have focused more on issues such as funding and values while neglecting the three message systems. The separation of policy studies and curriculum studies, they suggest, have sidelined the discussion of curriculum, pedagogy, and evaluation in policy discussions and policy studies. The centrality of the three message systems to the work of teachers may help to explain why teachers have had difficulty connecting education policy with practice

#### Education reform should be centered at the input of the student.

Levin 2000 (Benjamin Levin, Deputy Minister of Education Province of Manitoba, June 2000, "Putting Students at the Centre in Education Reform," Journal of Educational Change, <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1023%2FA%3A1010024225888?LI=true> )

The pragmatic arguments for greater student participation in education reform are varied and overlapping, but the arguments can be thought of as embodying one or more of five lines: 1. Effective implementation of change requires participation by and buy in from all those involved, students no less than teachers; 2. Students have unique knowledge and perspectives that can make reform efforts more successful and improve their implementation; 3. Students’ views can help mobilise staff and parent opinion in favour of meaningful reform; 4. Constructivist learning, which is increasingly important to high standards reforms, requires a more active student role in schooling; 5. Students are the producers of school outcomes, so their involvement is fundamental to all improvement. The first three of these arguments have grown out of organizational considerations, having to do with ideas about how meaningful change in organisations is created and sustained. These ideas are widely promoted in regard to all kinds of organizations, not only schools. For example, ideas of quality management make similar claims about the importance of participation by all members of an organization. The latter two arguments, however, are unique to education because they have to do with how it is that learning occurs. Although the two lines of argument are treated separately, they are actually closely connected, as should become apparent as the arguments are developed.

### Regulation

#### Regulation are rules issued by government agencies

Law Dictionary 17 [Law Dictionary, No Date, “regulations,” <http://dictionary.law.com/Default.aspx?selected=1771>, accessed 6-26-17, DMJ]

n. rules and administrative codes issued by governmental agencies at all levels, municipal, county, state and federal. Although they are not laws, regulations have the force of law, since they are adopted under authority granted by statutes, and often include penalties for violations. One problem is that regulations are not generally included in volumes containing state statutes or federal laws but often must be obtained from the agency or located in volumes in law libraries and not widely distributed. The regulation-making process involves hearings, publication in governmental journals which supposedly give public notice, and adoption by the agency. The process is best known to industries and special interests concerned with the subject matter, but only occasionally to the general public. Federal regulations are adopted in the manner designated in the Administrative Procedure Act (A.P.A.) and states usually have similar procedures.

#### Regulation requires a specific piece of legislation by a government agency

Business Dictionary No date – (Business Dictionary, <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/regulation.html>, SL)

Law: Rule based on and meant to carry out a specific piece of legislation (such as for the protection of environment). Regulations are enforced usually by a regulatory agency formed or mandated to carry out the purpose or provisions of a legislation. Also called regulatory requirement.

### USFG – AT “We the People”

#### “We the people” is based off of slavery and sexism – that turns the aff – nice going

#### **Marshall 87 (Thurgood Marshall, Supreme Court Justice, 1987, “Reflections on the Bicenntenial of the United States Constitution”, Harvard Law Review / LR)**

For a sense of the evolving nature of the Constitution we need look no further than the first three words of the document's preamble: "We the People." When the Founding Fathers used this phrase in I787, they did not have in mind the majority of America's citizens. "We the People" included, in the words of the framers, "the whole Number of free Persons. "3 On a matter so basic as the right to vote, for example, Negro slaves were excluded, although they were counted for representational purposes - at three-fifths each. Women did not gain the right to vote for over a hundred and thirty years.4 These omissions were intentional. The record of the framers' de- bates on the slave question is especially clear: the Southern states acceded to the demands of the New England states for giving Congress broad power to regulate commerce, in exchange for the right to con- tinue the slave trade. The economic interests of the regions coalesced: New Englanders engaged in the "carrying trade" would profit from transporting slaves from Africa as well as goods produced in America by slave labor. The perpetuation of slavery ensured the primary source of wealth in the Southern states

## 2NC – FAIRNESS

#### A central stasis point is key to constructive dialogue over race relations that allows for effective cross-racial dialogue by allowing to be open to differences

Bell 14 – (Jeannine, Professor of Law at IU Maurer School of Law-Bloomington & Founding Member and Book Review Editor of Michigan Journal of Race and Law , “How to Improve Discussion of Race in the Classroom”, The Chronicle of Higher Education, <http://www.chronicle.com/article/How-to-Improve-Discussion-of/150857/>, 7/16/17, SL)

The grand juries’ decisions not to indict white police officers in the deaths of Michael Brown and Eric Garner bore all the hallmarks of sensitive topics that, to keep the peace, should be discussed only in private, or in small groups of people who share the same race and politics. I don’t have that luxury. I teach criminal procedure to a racially mixed group of law students. Early in the semester we had discussed the constitutional requirements for the use of deadly force by the police. Coming into class the day after the Ferguson decision was announced, I knew we needed to talk. I also wanted to talk. Though segregation is no longer required by law, too many Americans nevertheless grew up in segregated neighborhoods and attended segregated schools. A 2013 study by the Public Religion Research Institute revealed many whites’ social networks to be overwhelmingly—more than 90 percent—white. Giving in to the temptation to avoid all talk of race is a mistake because it helps perpetuate those divides. Given this continued structural social segregation, colleges and workplaces are important sites for **cross-racial dialogue** because these are the places where we are most likely to encounter people of different races. As a professor of courses in which race pervades many conversations, it has become increasingly clear to me that we can’t learn from one another if we don’t talk to each other. And it is my job to help my students learn how to talk with one another about the tenacious and delicate issue of race in America. In that spirit, I have tried the following approaches with my students when seeking **a constructive dialogue about race relations**. I think they apply equally well in any social setting—with friends, with family, or at the water cooler. Start by acknowledging differences. We are inevitably shaped by our life experiences, and there’s nothing wrong with that. To sharpen my students’ skills in cross-racial dialogue, I suggested that before engaging people in discussions about the events in Ferguson, they should acknowledge at the outset that they and the people with whom they are engaging are likely to have perspectives that are central to their experiences and **different from the experiences of others.** For example, many African-Americans see the killings of Michael Brown and Eric Garner as a sign of the not-so-distant past when the police enjoyed impunity for murdering African-Americans. They view the decisions not to indict as proof that our bloody past is still with us and that they can never protect their children from death at the hands of the police. On the opposite side, as I learned when I was embedded with the police department of a large U.S. city while researching my book on hate crimes, those in the law-enforcement community feel their safety is always at issue. They feel threatened by protesters and unfairly blamed when it is necessary for the police to use lethal force. **Recognizing and accepting such differences up front creates a neutral starting point for further discussion**. Discover the facts. It’s not just that people have different perspectives based on their life experiences; the Internet and social media make it easy for both sides to marshal facts that support their particular viewpoint. I told my students that their charge, if they want to learn anything, is to listen openly and fairly to facts they may initially want to reject. My responsibility as a teacher is to lay out the facts on either side and help students draw their own conclusions. For instance, when my students asked whether the prosecutor in Ferguson had a specific outcome in mind, I stressed that there is no way we could know for sure. I also pointed out that in most grand-jury investigations, the prosecutor asks for an indictment, but in this case the investigation was a data dump. This approach enables me to present the facts without hiding the ball about my own views—a practice that many students would find inauthentic. Allow room to maneuver. Presenting the facts on either side while not hiding the ball offers another advantage: It creates a **safe place for people to express myriad viewpoints**. My current criminal-procedure class contains a wide spectrum of student views, from completely anti-police to completely pro-police. Such diversity of opinion is the norm in a law school. As teachers, we are responsible for fostering constructive discussions around those opinions. These sorts of discussions test our views and even our relationships. The easiest way to emerge on the other side, with relationships intact, I remind my students, is not just to recognize the perspective of someone with an opposing viewpoint, but to respect it. If we are to build a society imbued with civility and understanding, **mutual respect** is the biggest challenge of all, and our greatest opportunity.

#### Race centered discussions require a stasis – that allows both sides to question important issues that is key to more effective debates

Bow 14 – (Charles B., American liberal journalist & Visual Op-Ed Columnist for the New York Times, “Constructing a Conversation on Race”, New York Times, 8/20/14, <https://www.nytimes.com/2014/08/21/opinion/charles-blow-constructing-a-conversation-on-race.html>, 7/19/17, SL)

The killing of an unarmed teenager, Michael Brown, by a police officer, Darren Wilson, and the protests that have followed have brought about calls for the much-ballyhooed — or bemoaned, depending on your perspective — conversation about race. I wish these calls were not so episodic and tied to tragedies. I also wish this call for a conversation wasn’t tied to protests. Protests have life cycles. They explode into existence, but they all eventually die. They build like pressure in the volcano until they erupt. Then there is quiet until the next eruption. The cycle is untenable and nearly devoid of aim and the possibility of resolution. What we must discuss is best discussed during the dormancy. The discussion just needs some guidance. Let’s start with understanding what a racial conversation shouldn’t look like. It shouldn’t be an insulated, circular, intra-racial dialogue only among people who feel aggrieved. A true racial dialogue is not intra-racial but interracial. It is not one-directional — from minorities to majorities — but **multidirectional**. Data must be presented. Experiences must be explored. Histories and systems must be laid bare. Biases, fears, stereotype and mistrust must be examined. Personal — as well as societal and cultural — responsibility must be taken. And privileges and oppressions must be acknowledged. We must acknowledge how each of us is, in myriad ways, materially and spiritually affected by a society in which bias has been widely documented to exist and in which individuals also acknowledge that it exists. Take the results of a CBS News poll released in July. While three-fourths of respondents believe, rightly, that progress has been made to get rid of racial discrimination, most Americans acknowledge that discrimination against blacks still exists today. It may come as little surprise that 88 percent of blacks gauged that level of discrimination as “a lot” or “some” as opposed to “only a little” or “none at all,” but 65 percent of whites agree the level of discrimination against blacks rises to “a lot” or “some.” Yet when asked whether whites or blacks have a better chance of getting ahead today, 63 percent of whites and 43 percent of blacks said that the chances were equal. (By comparison, 28 percent of whites and 46 percent of blacks said whites had a better chance of getting ahead, and only 5 percent of whites and 4 percent of black said blacks had a better chance.) We have to stop here and really process what we are saying: that even though we acknowledge the existence of discrimination, we still expect those who are the focus of it to succeed, or “get ahead,” at the same rate as those who aren’t. In effect, we are expecting black people to simply shoulder the extra burden that society puts on their shoulders — oppression — while others are free to rise, or even fall, without such a burden — privilege. Understanding this fundamental inequality, one that trails each of us from cradle to grave, is one of the first steps to genuine, honest dialogue, because in that context we can better understand the choice that people make and the degree to which personal responsibility should be taken or the degree to which it is causative or curative. And while acknowledging the inequality, and hopefully working to remedy it, we have to find ways to encourage and fortify its targets. I often tell people that while I know well that things aren’t fair or equal, we still have to decide how we are going to deal with that reality, today. The clock on life is ticking. If you wait for life to be fair you may be waiting until life is over. I urge people to fight on two fronts: Work to dismantle as much systematic bias as you can, as much for posterity as for the present, and make the best choice you can under the circumstances to counteract the effects of these injustices on your life right now. Next, understand that race is a weaponized social construct used to divide and deny. According to a policy statement on race by the American Anthropological Association, “human populations are not unambiguous, clearly demarcated, biologically distinct groups” and “there is greater variation within ‘racial’ groups than between them.” The statement continues: “How people have been accepted and treated within the context of a given society or culture has a direct impact on how they perform in that society. The ‘racial’ worldview was invented to assign some groups to perpetual low status, while others were permitted access to privilege, power, and wealth. The tragedy in the United States has been that the policies and practices stemming from this worldview succeeded all too well in constructing unequal populations among Europeans, Native Americans, and peoples of African descent.” It ends: “We conclude that present-day inequalities between so-called ‘racial’ groups are not consequences of their biological inheritance but products of historical and contemporary social, economic, educational, and political circumstances.” And yet, we have tuned our minds to register this difference above all others, in the blink of an eye. As National Geographic reported in October, “A study of brain activity at the University of Colorado at Boulder showed that subjects register race in about one-tenth of a second, even before they discern gender.” This means that racial registration — and responses to any subconscious bias we may have attached to race — are most likely happening ahead of any deliberative efforts on our part to be egalitarian. Another step is that we must understand that race is not an isolated construct or consideration. Race and class, education and economics, crime and justice, and family and culture all overlap and intersect. We can’t treat the organ as if it is separate from the organism. Lastly, some immunity must be granted. Assuming that the conversational engagement is honest and earnest, **we must be able to hear and say things that some might find offensive** as we stumble toward interpersonal empathy and understanding. We can talk this through. We can have this conversation. We must. Hopefully this provides a little nudge and a few parameters.

## 2NC – SKILLS

#### Only centering issues of black identity on material changes inside curriculum allows for the opening of equal dialogues that is critical for racial literary skills

Loy 17 – (James M., Miami University’s College of Education, Health, and Society, “Racial Literacy Matters: Why the Dialogue Around Equality and Inclusion Must Evolve”, Miami University, <http://miamioh.edu/ehs/news/2017/02/racial-literacy-matters.html>, 7/16/17, SL)

“What do you do?” was the impassioned question that resonated, again and again, throughout the captivated audience of Miami University students, staff, and faculty. What do you do, they were asked to consider, when a racial slur sparks a serious organizational controversy and forces difficult, sometimes confrontational interactions. Or when, for example, buildings are defaced with derogatory epithets or offensive symbols? Or when a growing culture of systemic inequalities, hidden biases, and unconscious microaggressions result in undeniably clear disparities between certain groups? “What do you do when you are confronted with these issues?” Dr. Shaun Harper, race and gender expert and renowned University of Pennsylvania professor, asked during his interactive talk titled, “**Racial Literacy as an Essential Skill** for Student Affairs Professionals.” According to Harper, who also serves as executive director of the Center for the Study of Race and Equity in Education, most people have no good answers to such a simple question. And this, he stresses, marks a glaring and unhealthy trend in a society still struggling to both understand and overcome issues that continue to prohibit true diversity and inclusion. “It is not just about talking about race and talking about racial problems and racial realities,” Harper says. “Nor is it just about understanding one’s racial identity and how that identity co-mingles with other identities and how one identifies race in one’s own social history, or racial development journey. All that stuff is really important. But it can’t just be that. It also has to be about skill building.” All across college campuses, public institutions, and even private businesses, issues centered squarely on race, inequality, and social injustice continue to arise. Sometimes these problems explode into highly charged episodes that are captured prominently in the national spotlight. But far more frequently they are more subtle and silent, and perpetuated through no nefarious will or active maliciousness of any particular individual or group. In these instances, inequities are unconsciously reproduced through a tacit reluctance, or even an admitted inability, to **open engaging dialogues** around important topics that are deemed by many to be just too uncomfortable. “It creates this cultural norm in many departments where we just don’t even go there,” says Harper. Across Miami University, this idea is most clearly echoed by the College of Education, Health and Society (EHS), which considers promoting diversity and inclusion to be among its highest priorities. Though EHS, too, is also very aware of the social barriers that continue to impede progress. “Any discussion about race often is very difficult because people honestly **don’t have the language** to appropriately talk about race, because within the conversation is always the intimidation that one is going to be offensive, and offended, by what is going to come out of the conversation,” says EHS Dean Michael E. Dantley. “And so then substantive conversations just aren’t held. And because they are not held, we **remain complicit with the racist kinds** of things that are happening in any institution.” This results in what Harper calls “codes of racial silence.” Such codes are typically adopted by people, or even entire organizations, that inadvertently maintain biased status quos. And it’s a cycle, Harper argues, that will only be broken once racial literacy becomes more seriously recognized, accepted, and taught as an essential skill. “We can’t even do racial equity if we don’t even know how to talk about race,” Harper explains. “Racial literacy is an actual form of literacy. It is about being able to read, both in actual literature, and also how to read situations and read people. But more fundamentally, it is also about how you talk comfortably and competently about racial realities in classrooms and departments and workplaces and student affairs divisions, and so on.” Many of these ideas have recently crystalized for Harper after completing an intensive research project to explore what methods were used to prepare future professionals to work with racially diverse populations, to close achievement gaps, to increase retention and persistence among students of color, and to end enduring racial inequities. “I was essentially interested in what people learn in their graduate programs about race, and their feelings of preparedness to deal with very complex, vexing racial problems on college campuses,” Harper says. To do so, he collected data, in part, from current graduate students studying student affairs, as well as early career student affairs professionals who were already working in the field. And after five years of exploring how graduate preparation programs (at 14 of the largest producers of student affairs professionals in the country) facilitated shifts in attitudes and assumptions about race and inequality, the results clearly showed a need for a substantial amount of improvement. Prior to entering their graduate programs, many students reported feeling inexperienced about issues of race and inequality. But they also looked forward to what Harper called “anticipated engagement” with the subject. That is, due in large part to various graduate program marketing campaigns that promised immersion in diversity-related topics, these students expected to learn more. Though in reality, however, aside from a limited number of obligatory and surface level diversity courses, more meaningful engagement was rarely, if ever, achieved. “There was almost unanimity here that unless someone was an ethnic studies major or unless someone had slipped and fallen into a sociology of race course, they didn’t really learn about race anywhere else throughout the undergraduate curriculum,” Harper says. “For the few who had, they were very self-directed. It wasn’t like there was an educational and curricular plan to ensure students were learning about race and social justice and people of color.” Even the early career professionals -- who had already been on the job for approximately five years and were chosen by Harper specifically because of their prestigious status as recent ACPA: College Student Educators International and NASPA: Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education award winners -- felt unprepared for the realties they encountered. “These people, who were exceptional professionals, confessed to us, unashamedly at times, ‘I still don’t know what to do,’” says Harper. “We would ask them,” Harper continues, “‘Give us some examples of some racial situations or some particularly tense racial moments.’ So they did. But then they said, ‘I certainly don’t know what to do when someone spray paints the N-word on a black student’s residence hall door, or defaces the Latino student cultural center, and so on.’ But, again, remember, these are exceptional standouts. How do they not know what to do? Because they had never learned how to do these things.” For Harper, then, it is critical that these skills are taught, and not just as part of a vaguely overarching adherence to a philosophy that pays lip service to diversity and inclusion. Rather, he envisions a more systematic approach that **deliberately and meaningfully infuses** entire curriculums with **actionable ways to be proactive, preemptive, and preventative**. Solving this problem may not be easy, and it will not happen overnight, but Harper does offer some practical suggestions to at least start moving in the right direction. He recommends reading relevant books such as Engaging the “Race Question'' by Alicia Dowd or Race Talk and the Conspiracy of Silence by Derald Wing Sue, for example. And he wants us reading not just as individuals, but as groups, before then participating **in interactive discussions** as a department, division, or office. He recommends paying attention to what happens elsewhere in the country, and engaging these issues in staff meetings to consider what could be done should similar incidents occur locally. And he recommends using cultural climate data more responsible. Rather than simply collecting such data and promptly shelving it away after a cursory glance, Harper wants it to become more public, talked about, and continually improved upon. Finally, he also recommends being honest about identifying and rectifying our hidden biases, regularly attending race and identity conferences such as NCORE, and even hiring a professional facilitator to start meaningful dialogues if necessary. Back at Miami, students, faculty, and staff members across campus can look toward EHS to lead many of the transformations that are more reflective of our increasingly global community, to make the changes needed to establish the holistic, integrated, and ethical educational approaches that Harper, as well as many others, know that society so desperately needs. “We have major players in EHS whose focus has been on race,” says Dean Dantley. “Their research has been on race. The research has been on social justice. Often courses that are taught here are grounded in notions of social justice and racial equity. So I think that our college is well positioned to begin, as Dr. Harper calls it, a more salient conversation about race.” Among those advancing this conversation is Dr. Stephen Quaye, EHS associate professor in the department of educational leadership, who leads classes in Miami University’s own Student Affairs in Higher Education (SAHE) graduate program including those that focus on critical methods to engage difficult issues surrounding race, class, privilege, and power. According to Quaye, recent progress throughout the student affairs graduate program has been comprehensive, and in ways that are relevant both inside and outside the context of classroom-based learning. For one, by actively recruiting and retaining more students of color, EHS has made quantifiable strides to diversify SAHE’s demographics. So now, when compared to previous years, current percentages have increased significantly. “We now enroll more than half of students of color, which, to me, is a dramatic shift from my first year here,” Quaye says. “That is a dramatic shift of not only actually recruiting, but also actually graduating and retaining more students of color. And then, our curriculum is also attuned to racial justice issues. I teach a course specifically about engaging issues of race in the classroom where students try to develop the racial literacy that is so critical for student affairs educators.” In his Diversity, Equity, and Dialogue course, for example, Quaye teaches students how to practice **self-awareness**, the important differences between shame and guilt, how these feelings are manifested in certain dialogues, as well as how to resist becoming defensive when confronted with biases, assumptions, stereotypes, or even overt racism. Beyond his efforts in SAHE, Quaye, along with three other EHS colleagues in the departments of family science and social work and educational psychology, have also recently secured funding to start a new project titled, “Incorporating Diversity and Inclusion in EHS Classrooms: An Opportunity for Interdisciplinary Learning and Strategy Sessions.” “It is a group of us who are trying to introduce diversity, and interweave it more throughout the program,” Quaye explains. “We are trying to develop what will essentially help students who have different identities succeed. It is really cool because it combines different departments, and it is another example of putting into practice some of the things Shaun Harper talks about. It recognizes that we can’t do it by ourselves. We have to work together in order to address race and racism.” So far, this particular EHS project is in very nascent stages, but it is also in line with others that are already in motion. Another project, born from a similar emphasis on interdisciplinary cooperation, is ambitiously poised to eventually redefine the entire EHS teacher education curriculum. It’s called the “Interdisciplinary Teaching and Curriculum Grant” and it focuses on the cultural and social realities of contemporary education and schooling. Starting with EDT 190, an introductory teacher preparation course, the project hopes to change the way future teachers will successfully manage increasingly diverse classrooms. By introducing issues of race, class, equality, and gender, the changes to EDT 190 are already underway, but similar changes to more advanced teacher educations courses will soon follow. For Ganiva Reyes, EHS Visiting Assistant Professor and Heanon Wilkins Fellow, the interdisciplinary grant is not only about helping students think critically about the forces that perpetuate inequality and inhibit inclusiveness, it is also about “centralizing culturally relevant teaching and social justice into the entire teacher preparation program.” For EHS, it’s one more way the college is moving toward increased racial literacy, particularly in the classroom. However, as Harper points out, this conversation is not just about the students. So every week, the dean’s office also sponsors a regular writing group, which provides a unique space for faculty to come together, to collaborate, to share ideas, and talk. “It is mostly made up of assistant professors, a lot of whom are people of color, and the dean provides lunch,” says Quaye. “It seems so simple, and yet so few places actually do things like that. Just having the space to get together, to write on a weekly basis, it helps build a community among other faculty of color who are then able to engage with people outside of that space.” If we are ever to break the codes of silence that still pervade most organizational cultures, it is clear that such efforts need to take place. And throughout EHS, this conversation has, at least, begun. The students and faculty are talking, they are learning how to engage with difficult social issues, and, from a much larger perspective, the work of transforming the curriculum in socially conscious and culturally relevant ways is underway. This is crucial work, and it’s a good start, but there is undoubtedly so much yet to be done. And not only for EHS, but for all institutions hoping to overcome one of the most challenging issues of our time. Otherwise we, all of us, will only continue to remain complicit in a system that sustains and reproduces social injustices year after year after year. But breaking this cycle will **require real effort**, a conscious determination, an ability to teach effectively, and, especially, a willingness to actually learn how. “The inequities are not going to close themselves or correct themselves,” says Harper. “How do we be sure that we have created a work place that is inclusive and responsive? We literally teach people how to talk about race, as well as how to do racial equity.”

## 2NC – TVA

### General Solvency

#### **Student organization is possible and necessary – targeting specific policies and institutions is key**

Anderson ‘15, contributing writer for The Atlantic and is based in Washington, D.C., (Melinda, 11/23, “The Other Student Activists,” The Atlantic, https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2015/11/student-activism-history-injustice/417129/)

At the root of student organizing is the demand for fair and equal treatment, says Jose Sanchez, the safe schools coordinator for Voices of Youth in Chicago Education, an alliance of mostly high-school students of color. And nowhere is that more apparent than in the area of school discipline. For years Chicago has had gaping racial disparities in suspension rates for black and white children, and a new study from University of Chicago finds the most frequently suspended students are concentrated in schools serving the most vulnerable student populations. Examining this data, VOYCE set out to address the impact of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions on their peers and schools. Illinois Senate Bill 100 was created in 2012 by VOYCE activists who traveled regularly to the state capitol in Springfield to lobby and educate lawmakers.

“When we were advocating for [SB 100] we sometimes weren’t taken seriously and faced adultism,” says Sanchez, adding that VOYCE students overcame the challenges by sharing their personal stories, combined with data and research aimed at eliminating the school-to-prison pipeline and “structural racism in our education system.” In August the VOYCE-drafted bill was signed by Republican Governor Bruce Rauner, ending a bipartisan, hard-fought effort. Starting in the 2016 school year, districts throughout Illinois will be required to eliminate zero-tolerance punishment, minimize out-of-school suspensions and expulsions, and adopt other discipline-related policies.

Brennen, the Student Voice leader, reiterates the critical role that youth serve in bridging education policy and practice—and the historical legacy that lingers over this work. “The Little Rock Nine, Freedom Riders, Children’s Crusade of 1963 … young people put their lives on the line for quality schools,” he stresses. “Organizations working to improve education that aren’t including student voice are doing it wrong … [We’re] not presuming to be policy experts, but we are experts on how many policies play out at the classroom level. We’re a reality check.”

### Black Mothering / Pushout

#### A demand on the state is essential to recognize the violence black girls face every day & provide justice to make material changes

Gross 16 – (Kali Nicole, Associate Professor of African and African Diaspora Studies and Associate Chair of AADS, “There is No Justice for Black Girls in America”, <https://news.utexas.edu/2016/05/18/there-is-no-justice-for-black-girls-in-america>, UT News, 7/17/17, SL)

This week marks the anniversary of the tragic death of a 7-year-old black girl named Aiyana Stanley-Jones. Six years ago, Aiyana was killed while she slept at her grandmother’s house. Joseph Weekley, the Detroit SWAT officer who fatally shot her during a botched raid, is **still on the police force**. Despite being charged with involuntary manslaughter and two lesser charges, juries failed to reach verdicts and the charges were dropped in January 2015. The loss of this innocent girl is heartbreaking, and it is a stain on the soul of this nation. It’s also a sickening comment on the state of black girlhood in America. Earlier this year, news accounts and press releases made it seem like the moment for the recognition of black girls’ humanity had come at last. After years of lobbying, for example, the White House finally launched an initiative aimed at improving the lives of black and Latina girls — something similar to the program My Brother’s Keeper. More recently, The NoVo Foundation, created by Peter and Jennifer Buffett, launched a seven-year, $90 million commitment to “support and deepen the movement for girls and young women of color in the United States.” These developments follow the tireless work of organizations like the African American Policy Forum and the Human Rights Project for Girls as well as the careful research undertaken by scholars on the lives of black girls — from historians like LaKisha Simmons to social justice scholar Monique Morris to sociologist Carla Shedd. In April, the Black Girl Movement Conference in New York marked the nation’s first conference on black girls. This momentum is positive and necessary. Unfortunately, it does not **overshadow the virulent** hatred and misogynic feelings that jeopardize African American girls’ very existence. From the racist vitriol spewed at Malia Obama, a brilliant student who has been admitted to Harvard University, to the white supremacist’s bullets that whizzed past a 5-year-old black girl hiding among the dead during last summer’s shooting at the Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, South Carolina, to the beating and subsequent criminalization of a 16-year-old Spring Valley High School student by a school resource officer, black girls lives **have yet to matter**. Countless studies have now ticked off the ways that black girls are vulnerable to sexual assault and criminalization because of it. Studies have shown how black girls are suspended more than white girls and even black boys, who are themselves disproportionately targeted by school disciplinary policies. Research indicates that black children are regarded as violent threats, and black girls are viewed as loud, hostile and aggressive — stereotypes that eclipse their humanity and their youth. The failure to obtain justice for Aiyana is rooted in all of these issues. In order to upend these dynamics, we have **to continue to fight and get justice for this child** and her grieving family because we will not achieve substantive change for black children, let alone all black people, until we do. There is no moving forward until Joseph Weekley is punished for taking Aiyana’s life. There is no reconciliation until the humanity of our children is sacrosanct. There is no forgetting about Aiyana Stanley-Jones. She was 7 years old, asleep at her grandmother’s house. An officer shot and killed her and walked away. A peaceful rally will be held in Detroit outside the Coleman A. Young Municipal Center to remember Aiyana and all victims of police brutality**. We all should demand that the Department of Justice investigate this case.** We need justice for Aiyana and we need to turn the tide in this country for the sake of all black girls.

#### Morris’s use of policy solution to reform the educational system is the best way to combat violence towards the criminalization of black women

Chang 16 – (Clio, Write at the *New Republic* & Policy Associate at the Century Foundation, “How Black Girls Are Locked Out of America’s Schools”, New Republic, Published 3/14/16, <https://newrepublic.com/article/131482/black-girls-locked-americas-schools>, 7/18/17, SL)

On a Friday in April 2012, police officers arrived at a small public school in Milledgeville, Georgia. They were there to arrest a black female student for assaulting a principal and damaging school property. The girl in question was placed in handcuffs, brought to the police station, and charged with battery and criminal damage to property. Her name was Salecia Johnson. At the time, she was six years old. Johnson’s arrest made national headlines and, while the charges were dropped, she was suspended until the start of the next school year. A school superintendent defended the school’s actions, calling Johnson’s behavior “violent and disruptive” and stated that the police were called out of “safety concerns.” The police reaffirmed this claim, asserting that Johnson was placed in handcuffs for the safety of other students as well as her own. In the local paper, an op-ed was published in which the author called the child’s actions “a dangerous display of uncontrolled anger/rage.” In her new book Pushout: The Criminalization of Black Girls in Schools, Monique W. Morris argues that highly publicized cases like Johnson’s are only fragments of the widespread oppression black girls face in the American educational system. It’s a subject frequently overlooked in today’s conversations about racism and the school-to-prison pipeline, which focus on the plight of black men and boys. What this means, Morris explains, is that “the sometimes similar but frequently not so similar ways that Black girls are locked out of society become lost.” The legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw coined the term “intersectionality” almost 30 years ago, in response to anti-discrimination law that did not allow black women “to combine their race and gender claims into one”—leaving them unprotected from much of the discrimination they encountered. Crenshaw more recently defined the term as an “analytic sensibility, a way of thinking about identity and its relationship to power,” whether that identity is gender, race, class, or sexuality. Other scholars, such as Nikki Jones and Brittney Cooper, have employed this sensibility to better understand the challenges that black women and girls face. In writing Pushout, Morris, a social justice scholar, adds to this discourse by exploring the specific ways that black girls are pushed out of our country’s schools. From 1973 to 2010, the number of secondary students who were suspended or expelled rose by nearly 40 percent. There has been a great deal of research exploring the impact of “zero-tolerance” policies on black boys, but the consequences for black girls have been studied far less. And yet, according to the African American Policy Forum (AAPF), while black boys are the group most likely to be suspended from school, black girls have a higher relative risk—six times higher—of suspension in comparison to their white female counterparts. In New York City in 2012, 53 black girls were expelled, while no white girls were. And, according to Morris, while black girls represent 16 percent of female students, they represent almost half of all girls with a school-related arrest. Punitive policies, such as suspension and expulsion, are linked to school dropout and increased contact with the justice system, affecting these girls socially and economically for the rest of their lives. So why does this happen? First off, Morris notes that schools—unless they intentionally attempt to reverse these trends—often reflect the oppressive norms of society at large. These are the types of norms through which someone could see the temper tantrum of a black six-year-old girl as violent and dangerous. They also contribute to stereotyping that frames black girls as “sassy,” “ratchet,” and “defiant”—so much so that black girls often get labeled by their teachers as disruptive and disrespectful simply for asking questions in class. “I always question. And then sometimes, teachers get mad off of that,” one girl told Morris. “They say I’m disrespectful. That’s my label.” Black girls also aren’t simply allowed to be girls. It’s a phenomenon that Morris describes as “age compression,” in which black girlhood is conflated with black womanhood. The reasons for this are complex, but Morris notes that the hyper-sexualization of black females has been a constant, dating back to historic stereotyping of black women as “jezebels” with loose morals, an idea that was once used to justify the rape of slaves. In interviews, black teenagers tell Morris about how they are seen by others as much older than they actually are, leading to daily sexual harassment and abuse. One girl stated that she felt like, “No matter what a Black girl do, no matter how small she is or how big she is, a man is going to always look at her sexually.” This can lead to simple injustices in the classroom, such as black girls being sent home for wearing clothing that is “too promiscuous” even if their white counterparts are wearing the same exact thing. But it also lends itself to much more serious problems, such as teachers blaming girls for cutting class in situations where they are failing to show up because they are being prostituted or sexually exploited. Unsurprisingly, black girls are also overrepresented in the juvenile justice system (representing 33 percent of detained female youth, but only 14 percent of the general population), where Morris characterizes classroom environments as “hyperpunitive.” The girls Morris interviews describe the schoolwork as repetitive, uninspiring, and often below their skill level; in the juvenile court school they attended, all the girls were educated in a single classroom, despite their differing ages and grades. As one girl put it, “School here’s really frustrating for me. The teachers here know that we’re here temporarily, so I feel like they don’t make sure that we’re really learning.” Rather than helping the girls get back on track, correctional education pushes them even further behind. Many of these problems come back to the teachers, administrators, and correctional officers in these girls’ lives whose reflexive instinct is to control and surveil, rather than to stop and listen. Some of these girls do lash out in class but, usually, they are children who have been hurt in some way or another. As Morris repeatedly points out, “People who have been harmed are the ones who harm others.” The girls who Morris talks to relate feelings of being disrespected and ignored, and some disclose experiences of struggling with gender transitions, disabilities, poverty, and sexual abuse. It doesn’t have to be this way. Rather than serving as a reflection of our society’s punitive policies, schools can instead be a force for reversing these trends. It is arguably their very purpose—education, after all, is supposedly the great equalizer. Morris describes one school, which she nicknames Small Alternative High, where teachers are instructed to work hard to listen to their students and diffuse situations that might escalate. The school itself also has a flexible schedule, which helps students struggling with problems in their personal lives to stay enrolled and complete their credits. The AAPF report recommends a set of policies for schools and administrators, such as training teachers to recognize the signs of sexual abuse, revising protocols that funnel girls into the juvenile justice system, and expanding programs for girls who are pregnant or parenting. It also calls for a greater recognition of black girls in meaningful ways, such as in policy research, program funding, and advocacy. A recent White House report, Advancing Equity for Women and Girls of Color, also suggests increasing access to inclusive STEM and career technical education. We need look no further than the movement for police reform to see how issues of intersectionality can, and should, **be integrated into policy debates**. Black Lives Matter, a movement that originated with three women, has pushed racial justice to the forefront of the Democratic primary campaign, where it would have otherwise lingered on the sidelines. The movement initially started in 2013, after the acquittal of George Zimmerman, but has evolved since, shifting focus to pay special attention not only to the black men affected by institutional racism, but to black women, including trans and queer women, as well. When activists interrupted Bernie Sanders and Martin O’Malley at Netroots Nation last July, they weren’t just shouting “black lives matter”—they were also **shouting “say her name**,” referring to the women—Sandra Bland, Mya Hall, Alexia Christian—who had so quickly disappeared from national memory after their deaths. While Morris acknowledges the need for **better policy**, she ends her book with a different appeal. One that, if this were a piece of fiction, or a book on a different topic, would seem banal. It’s not. She argues that “countering the criminalization of Black girls requires fundamentally altering **the relationship between Black girls and the institutions of power** that have worked to reinforce their subjugation.” To put it more simply, it requires a system that cares about these girls. As one girl told Morris, “I just need … [someone to ask], ‘How are you doing with school?’” The only way to do this, and to begin fixing the school-to-prison pipeline, Morris writes, is to love our black girls like they matter.

#### Only a demand on the state allows us to recognize the criminalization of black girls and implement material policy actions to protect black girls

Gross 15 – (Kali Nicole, Professor of African American Studies at Wesleyan University & Received the John Hope Franklin Center manuscript prize in 2005 and the Letitia Woods Brown Memorial Book Prize from the Association of Black Women Historians in 2006, “Gross: It’s time to speak up for black girls”, myStatesman, <http://www.mystatesman.com/news/opinion/gross-time-speak-for-black-girls/zbwVuZm7Vfo11CohsPftJJ/>, 7/19/17, SL)

Niya Kenny has set a powerful example for the nation. She was arrested for standing up to a school resource officer when he viciously assaulted a fellow Spring Valley High School classmate in South Carolina. The video of the incident has sparked national outrage. We should be outraged — by this incident and the plight of black girls nationwide. As Kenny, who is 18, explained: “I had never seen nothing like that in my life, a man use that much force on a little girl. A big man, like 300 pounds of full muscle.” The rest of the student witnesses seemed traumatized and paralyzed. Her classmate’s alleged crime: Failing to hand over her cellphone and refusing to leave the classroom. Officers have since claimed the girl punched officer Ben Fields, but if her flailing does include a hit, it occurs after the officer puts her in what appears to be a chokehold. This sickening episode is only the latest in a nationwide pandemic of anti-black police violence visited upon black children — African-American girls especially. In light of the fact that Congress and President Barack Obama have yet to enact a single policy aimed at protecting this at-risk population, we should consider the state of black girlhood in the United States: Black girls are suspended from school at six times the rate of white girls. (Note: Black boys are suspended at three times the rate of white boys.) In places such as New York City, the African American Policy Forum found that disciplinary cases involving black girls were 10 times as common as cases involving their white counterparts. Forty percent of black girls have been sexually coerced by age 18. Sexual abuse of black girls also serves as a pathway to prison, as girls forced into sex work are then criminalized for their exploitation. Black girls are among the fastest-growing part of the juvenile justice population. Although black girls account for 14 percent of the general population, they make up 33.2 percent of girls detained and committed. Homicide is among the leading causes of death for black females between the ages of 15 and 19. **Enough is enough.** Now is the time for everyone to stand up for justice for black girls. **We must demand** that the school resource officer on the video not just be relieved of duty but also that he be charged for his brutality. The charges against the Kenny should be dropped, and her arrest record must be expunged. She should not be criminalized for standing up against racist brutality. Charges against her classmate should also be dropped. President Obama must use the resources of the federal government to create and implement **effective policies** that will empower and protect black girls. Specifically, lawmakers should start a national campaign to review and revise school practices that funnel students into the justice system, equalize federally funded initiatives so that they support at-risk girls and boys, and cultivate programs that identify early signs of sexual abuse so that young victims are supported rather than incarcerated. It is also time for Loretta Lynch, the first African-American female U.S. attorney general — who got her position in part because groups of black women flexed political muscle on her behalf — to actively investigate these injustices and to start putting bad officers behind bars — and those who cover for them . **We need to stand up for America’s black girls** not only because it’s the right thing to do, but also because of **how vital black girls** — and the women they go on to become — are for the country, whether it’s Bree Newsome ripping down a racist symbol of domestic terrorism; or Alicia Garza, Patrisse Cullors and Opal Tometi, three black “queer” women who organized mass action by boldly declaring #BlackLivesMatter; or the women in the BlackOUT Collective bearing their breasts to get America to #SayHerName. We have to **fight for all of our girls**. We also need to learn from mothers such as Doris Kenny, who said of her daughter Niya’s actions: “I’m not mad at her. She was brave enough to speak out against what was going on and didn’t back down, and it resulted in her being arrested.” I’m not mad either. I am outraged we inhabit a world where heroic young women such as Kenny are the ones arrested, rather than the cowardly authorities who prey on black children. No more of this America. No more.

### Reparations

#### Demands of the state by grassroots organizations can lead to achieving reparations.

Joe Feagin, May 28, 2014, Joe Feagin is Ella C. McFadden Professor in sociology at Texas A & M University, “A Legal and Moral Basis for Reparations”, Time, http://time.com/132034/a-legal-and-moral-basis-for-reparations/

Contemporary reparations might take several forms. One would be the gradual transfer of compensating wealth from unjustly enriched white communities to unjustly impoverished black communities, a government transfer linked to explicit restorative goals. The [National Coalition of Blacks for Reparations in America](http://www.cbpm.org/ncobra.html) has sought $400 million for both individual compensation and asset-generating programs enabling impoverished black communities to prosper. Substantial reparations would include providing well-funded government programs, over generations, at local and state levels for upgrading education, job training, housing and incomes for African Americans – as individuals, families and communities. Many argue there is no money for such moral and constitutional action. Yet, the U.S. government found [more than a trillion dollars](http://money.cnn.com/news/storysupplement/economy/bailouttracker) to bail out private institutions in the Great Recession—and trillions for recent irresponsible military actions. A U.S. government that was heavily involved in sustaining slavery and Jim Crow, and is implicated in contemporary discrimination, can find the substantial amounts needed to meet this country’s moral and restorative obligations to long-oppressed African Americans.

#### Organization from the grassroots level can be used to demand reparations in forms understood by the communities.

#### Davis 2000 (Adrienne D. Davis is a Professor of Law and Co-Director of the Gender, Work & Family Project at American University Washington College of Law, The Case for United States Reparations to African Americans, Human Rights Brief)

#### But what are reparations? What support do they find in law? How are they different from ordinary civil lawsuits and other civil rights remedies? Who awards them and who gets them? The framework of reparations is the duty to repair injury imposed on another. Unlike tort law, which addresses individual injury, in their conceptualization, reparations suits frame harm as group-based, even when the plaintiffs are individuals. Unlike criminal law, the harm is explicitly conceived of as against the group, not the state. Therefore, unlike criminal cases, the decision for bringing and shaping reparations lawsuits should lie with the victims, not with the state. In this sense, these suits should be organized at the grass-roots level and should be designed to recompense the harm as understood by communities, not decided by lawyers.

#### The government has profited off of the harm of black people and therefore is required to execute a plan to address those impacts.

Movement for Black Lives (The Movement for Black Lives is a group of black activists that advocates for policy actions to articulate their common vision, <https://policy.m4bl.org/reparations/>)

We demand reparations for past and continuing harms. The government, responsible corporations and other institutions that have profited off of the harm they have inflicted on Black people — from colonialism to slavery through food and housing redlining, mass incarceration, and surveillance — must repair the harm done. This includes: Reparations for the systemic denial of access to high quality educational opportunities in the form of [full and free access for all Black people](https://policy.m4bl.org/reparations/#full-and-free-access-for-all-Black-people) (including undocumented and currently and formerly incarcerated people) to lifetime education including: free access and open admissions to public community colleges and universities, technical education (technology, trade and agricultural), educational support programs, retroactive forgiveness of student loans, and support for lifetime learning programs. Reparations for the continued divestment from, discrimination toward and exploitation of our communities in the form of a [guaranteed minimum livable income](https://policy.m4bl.org/reparations/#guaranteed-minimum-livable-income) for all Black people, with clearly articulated corporate regulations. Reparations for the wealth extracted from our communities through environmental racism, slavery, food apartheid, housing discrimination and racialized capitalism in the form of [corporate and government reparations](https://policy.m4bl.org/reparations/#corporate-and-government-reparations) focused on healing ongoing physical and mental trauma, and ensuring our access and control of food sources, housing and land. [Reparations for the cultural and educational exploitation, erasure, and extraction](https://policy.m4bl.org/reparations/#reparations-for-the-cultural-and)of our communities in the form of mandated public school curriculums that critically examine the political, economic, and social impacts of colonialism and slavery, and funding to support, build, preserve, and restore cultural assets and sacred sites to ensure the recognition and honoring of our collective struggles and triumphs. Legislation at the federal and state level that requires the United States to acknowledge the lasting impacts of slavery, establish and execute a plan to address those impacts. This includes the [immediate passage of H.R.40](https://policy.m4bl.org/reparations/#immediate-passage-of), the “Commission to Study Reparation Proposals for African-Americans Act” or subsequent versions which call for reparations remedies.

### School to Prison Pipeline

#### **The USFG should adopt a federal disciplinary law that bans suspensions and expulsions for non-violent offenses and requires implicit bias training – that checks racist discipline in K-12 education**

McNeal 16 Laura R. McNeal is currently an Assistant Professor of Law at the University of Louisville’s Brandeis School of Law. She also works with the Charles Hamilton Houston Institute for Race and Justice at Harvard Law School. She holds a J.D. from Washington University School of Law and Ph.D. in Education from Illinois State University. Arizona State Law Journal: “MANAGING OUR BLIND SPOT: The Role of Bias in the School-to-Prison Pipeline.” July 31, 2016. <http://arizonastatelawjournal.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/McNeal_Final.pdf>.

The endemic challenge of dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline is not insurmountable and demands swift action to prevent students of color from being unfairly funneled into the juvenile and criminal justice system. We cannot allow the innocent children to be denied equal education opportunity due to overly harsh school disciplinary sanctions that unjustly remove them from their learning environment. I am proposing the adoption of a federal school disciplinary law designed to reduce abuse of discretionary power by school officials, minimize the influence of implicit bias, and stop the over reliance on school resource officers for routine school disciplinary matters. This federal school disciplinary law will impose mandates on all Title I funded K–12 schools. Any school district that fails to adhere to the law will risk losing their Title I funding. The proposed law will consist of the following four components: (1) permanent ban on all out of school suspensions and expulsions for non-violent offenses; (2) mandatory implicit bias training; (3) annual school discipline report card; and (4) School Disciplinary Community Review Board. A. Permanent Ban on Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions Every day an egregious amount of children, especially minority children, are removed from schools due to overly harsh and inequitable school disciplinary sanctions. This disturbing practice is problematic because when children are not in school they are not learning and are at a higher risk for not completing high school. According to recent school discipline data released by the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights, more than three million children in grades kindergarten to the twelfth grade were suspended at least once in the 2011–2012 school year. Although, as previously discussed, federal and state law requires that students be expelled for specific actions that fall under “zero tolerance” policies, administrators still have wide discretion for all other behaviors. Theref ore, this law is designed to address abuses of discretion for subjective catchall categories such as “willful defiance” that account for the majority of disciplinary sanctions imposed on students of color. The proposed federal law would eliminate school administrators’ authority to suspend or recommend for expulsion a student enrolled in grades K–12 for disrupting school activities or otherwise willfully defying the authority of those school personnel engaged in the performance of their duties. Under this law, a pupil shall not be suspended from school or recommended for expulsion, unless the superintendent of the school district or the principal of the school in which the pupil is enrolled determines that the pupil has committed any of the following acts: (A) Caused or threated to cause physical harm to another person; (B) Intentionally used force or violence upon another, except in self-defense; (C) Possessed, sold, or otherwise furnished a firearm, knife, explosive, or other dangerous object; (D) Unlawfully possessed, used, solicited, sold, or arranged, to sell a controlled substance on school property; (E) Committed or attempted to commit a crime as defined by state criminal law statutes; (F) Harassed, threatened, or intimidated a fellow student, including but is not limited to bullying; or (G) Any act, message, or activity on social media for the purpose of defaming, bullying, or causing physical harm to another student. Although this is not an exhaustive list of all of the possible violent offenses that can be committed in a schooling environment that would warrant possible suspension or expulsion, it is intended to provide schools with a framework for eliminating the practice of issuing out of school suspensions or expulsions under the guise of willful defiance for normal adolescent behavior. Additionally, providing a list of offenses is intended to demystify hegemonic notions that it is acceptable to remove students from their learning environment for non-violent offenses. Providing K–12 schools with more guidance on school disciplinary practices will also discourage school officials to rely upon the “catch all” category, willful defiance, and focus more on developmental approaches to school discipline, such as restorative justice principles. B. Mandatory Implicit Bias Screening and Training In light of the growing racial disparities in school disciplinary sanctions we can no longer afford to show deliberate indifference to the significance of race in dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline.

## 2NC – Black Liberalism

### Cede the Political

#### Infiltration is the key step in political resistance – rejection of institutions leads to inevitable failure – the Black Panthers prove that the only way to engage systems of oppression was to fight them from the inside

Reich 12 [Elizabeth, Ph.D., English, Rutgers University, Professor, Wayne State, A New Kind of Black Soldier: Performing Revolution in The Spook Who Sat by the Door, African American Review]

True to Greenlee's own philosophy—"if you're gonna be outsiders, man, take advantage of being outside"—The Spook Who Sat by the Door reimagines marginalization as a position of potential power. Like many of the products of the Third Cinema movement—^with which I believe Spook has almost as much in common as with black exploitation cinema—Spook is a didacfic film, intended to instruct its viewers. In the opinion of Fernando Solanas and Octavio Gefino, authors of the manifesto "Towards A Third Cinema," "Third cinema is . . . the cinema that recognizes in that struggle the most gigantic cultural, scientific, and artistic manifestation of our time, the great possibility of constructing a liberated personality with each people as the starting point—in a word, the decolonisation of culture" (n. pag.).^ In a similar spirit, "the purpose of the film [The Spook] was," according to Greenlee, "to encourage Blacks to create an action plan to 'survive in the belly of the beast' rather than always reacting as victims of a racist society" (Joiner 41). To that end, "Spook recodes the 'nightmare' of Watts as the first step in Black liberation" and proposes that black Americans, like other oppressed people around the world, can use both their experience as all-but-invisible subjects to become "spooks" or spies, and their intimate knowledge of how to survive violence and disfranchisement to become effective revolutionaries (Sheppard 25). Though Spook's revolutionaries are indeed able to transform themselves into different kinds of racialized subjects across the film (and across the batdes it depicts), they are not able to escape their positions as subjects of history. Spook is itself as much an historical allegory as a fictional story; its plot and protagonist seem to comment directly on the progress of the final years of the civil rights movement—and if not more obliquely, on the protracted suppression of black radicalism and globalism across the Cold War era as well. With its action set in inner-city Chicago, the film presents a visual and narrative iconography of the post-civil rights era black ghetto that would have been well known to television viewers of the time. Its images of civil rights struggles and black urban insurrection both reflected, and in some instances, revised those circulating nationally and internationally in the news.^ Also, Spook's tale of the Cobra gang's transformation into a paramilitary revolutionary force anticipates (if we observe the novel's first publication date in 1966) or recalls (if we consider the film's release in 1973) the birth and growth of the Black Panther Party. As Dixon and Greenlee show in their film, by the mid-1960s, "[a] growing army of idle and desperate black men and women began to appear in the industrial centers of the nation, driven to the edge by poverty"—an "army" that would become the basis for a widespread militant black nationalist movement. Spook not only depicts this "army" in numerous shots—^inside the pool hall; at the cafeteria; on the streets; on the basketball courts; or during widespread doting—but also imagines them as an army, telling the tales of both the failure of the civil rights movement to bring about sufficient and lasting social and political change, and the possible future success of a globally oriented black revolutionary left. The story Spook tails is also the outcome of what Penny Von Eschen describes as the failure of "Truman liberalism," which left black America without "a vibrant black press, a vigorous labor movement or cross-class coalitions uniting liberals and the left" (Von Eschen 187,188). The black characters that people Spook are the products of this destruction of prewar black intellectual and political culture: African Americans who believe they've won the battle for civil rights, but who have instead appropriated the purchasing power of the white elite (Freeman's girlfriend), men who have assumed die badge of the state (Freeman's best friend, a policeman), and working-class folks who have become each other's shortsighted oppressors in the urban squalor of the inner city (the Cobras, Shorty the drug dealer, and Dahomey the prostitute). Freeman's revolutionary efforts focus not only on transforming these demoralized characters into organized, military freedom fighters a la the Black Panthers, but also on reviving "anticolonial, anticapitalist and anti-imperialist crossclass coalitions," which Von Eschen argues were destroyed by the Truman administration's "severing of international and domestic politics" (188). In short, the militant and Third-Worldist philosophy that Freeman invests in and tries to deliver to his army as the first step in their training, is the product of the failure of the civil rights movement to deliver radical change."

### Impact

#### White supremacy subordinates black bodies – politicization of black identity is key

Mills 08 [Charles Mills is a Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy @ Northwestern University, *Blackness Visible*]

In the racial polity, by contrast with the colorless polity of abstract West-ern theory, the body necessarily becomes politicized, giving rise to a "body politics." White supremacy subordinates the body as the indicator of di-minished personhood, a subordination manifested both in the derogation of the nonwhite body, particularly the black body,43 and, especially during the regime of slavery, the impositions of certain postures, body languages. Resistance to these negative valorizations and somatic inflictions has perhaps most strikingly been manifested in the case of the Jamaican Rasta-fari: the deliberate transformation of the black body and its revisionist rein-scription into an alternative narrative of captive warriors in Babylon. The very fact that the flashing locks of the strutting dread are now a media cliche is a remarkable testimony to the abrogation of the original rules of the somatic space of the white polity. In addition, popular dance could be scrutinized for signs of reinventions of the postures of the body, micropol-itics of assertion, and stiffenings of the spine against the imposed deference required of subpersons. More generally, of course, Ralph Ellison's famous trope of invisibility, al-ready cited several times, relies on the notion of a peculiar class of bodies that appear only to disappear. Thus within this expanded vision of the sub-ject matter appropriately to be investigated by political philosophy, an evolving phenomenology of the black body would no longer seem out of place, being clearly tied in with the contested flesh of politicized (sub)-personhood. Lewis Gordon employs Sartrean ideas of embodied conscious-ness to explore how, in an "antiblack world:' the white Other determines that black presence becomes absence, so that one is seen as the unseen: "He is not seen in his individuality. To see him as black is to see enough. Hence to see him as black is not to see him at all. One's nonwhite body excludes one from full membership in the white body politic.

### Racial Contract

#### The modern sociopolitical order exists as a “contract” among human beings. The aff is emblematic of this liberal framework that only grants white people to full personhood while relegating non-whites to inferior categories

Mills 08 [Charles Mills is a Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy @ Northwestern University, *Racial Liberalism*]

Let me begin with some general points about the social contract. The concept is, of course, to be taken not literally but rather as an illuminating metaphor or thought experiment. We are asked to imagine the sociopolitical order (society, the state) as being self-consciously brought into existence through a “contract” among human beings in a presocial, prepolitical stage of humanity (the “state of nature”). The enduring appeal of the metaphor, despite its patent absurdity as a literal representation of the formation of sociopolitical systems, inheres in its capturing of two key insights. The first (against theological views of divine creation or secular conceptions of an organicist kind) is that society and the polity are artificial, human constructs. The second (against classical and medieval views of natural social hierarchy) is that human beings are naturally equal and that this equality in the state of nature should somehow translate into egalitarian sociopolitical institutions (Hampton, “Contractarian Explanation,” “Contract,” and “Feminist Contractarianism”). For the Lockean and Kantian contracts that (in conjunction and in competition) define the mainstream of the liberal tradition— but not for the Hobbesian contract—moral equality is foundational.2 The social ontology is classically individualist, and it demands the creation of a polity that respects the equal personhood of individuals and (whether in stronger or weaker versions) their property rights. Basic moral entitlements for the citizenry are then juridically codified and enforced by an impartial state. Economic transactions are, correspondingly, ideally supposed to be nonexploitative, though there will, of course, be controversy about how this concept should be cashed out. So fairness in a broad sense is the overarching contract norm, as befits an apparatus ostensibly founded on principles antithetical to a non-individual-respecting, socially aggregating utilitarianism. The moral equality of people in the state of nature demands an equality of treatment (juridical, political, and economic) in the liberal polity they create. The state is not alien or antagonistic to us but the protector of our rights, whether as the constitutionalist Lockean sovereign or the Kantian *Rechtsstaat*. The good polity is the just polity, and the just polity is founded on safeguarding our interests as individuals. But what if—not merely episodically and randomly but systematically and structurally—the personhood of some persons was historically disregarded and their rights disrespected? What if entitlements and justice were, correspondingly, so conceived of that the unequal treatment of these persons, or subpersons, was not seen as unequal, not flagged as an internal inconsistency, but accommodated by suitable discursive shifts and conceptual framings? And what if, after long political struggles, there developed at last a seeming equality that later turned out to be more nominal than substantive, so that justice and equal protection were still effectively denied even while being triumphantly proclaimed? It would mean that we would need to recognize the inadequacy of speaking in the abstract of liberalism and contractarianism. We would need to acknowledge that race had underpinned the liberal framework from the outset, refracting the sense of crucial terms, embedding a particular model of rights bearers, dictating a certain historical narrative, and providing an overall theoretical orientation for normative discussions. We would need to confront the fact that to understand the actual logic of these normative debates, both what is said and what is not said, we would have to understand not just the ideal, abstract social contract but also its incarnation in the United States (and arguably elsewhere) as a nonideal, racial contract.  Consider the major divisions in the political philosophy of the last few decades. In *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*, Michael Sandel makes the point that Rawls’s *A Theory of Justice* is important because—apart from carrying the Kantianism-versus-utilitarianism dispute to a higher theoretical level—it was central to not one but two of the major political debates of the 1970s and 1980s (184–85), left or social democratic liberalism versus right or laissez-faire liberalism (Rawls versus Robert Nozick) and liberalism or contractarianism versus communitarianism (Rawls versus Michael Walzer, Alasdair MacIntyre, Charles Taylor, and Sandel himself). A third major debate, initiated by Rawls’s essays in the 1980s and culminating in *Political Liberalism* (1996), could be said to be the debate of the two decades after 1990 on comprehensive versus political liberalism. In their domination of the conceptual and theoretical landscape, these **overarching frameworks tend to** set the political agenda, **establish**ing **a hegemonic framing of key assumptions and jointly exhaustive alternatives**. One locates oneself as a theorist by choosing one or the other of these primary alternatives and then taking up the corresponding sociopolitical and normative picture, adopting the defining terms, and making the argumentative moves characteristically associated with it. So though other theoretical and political alternatives are not logically excluded, they tend to be marginalized. But there is another debate—one that has been going on for hundreds of years, if not always in the academy—which is, in a sense, orthogonal to all three of the foregoing and is arguably more pressing than any of them: the conflict between racial liberalism (generally known as just liberalism) and deracialized liberalism. Racial liberalism, or white liberalism, is the actual liberalism that has been historically dominant since modernity: a liberal theory whose terms originally restricted full personhood to whites (or, more accurate, white men) and relegated nonwhites to an inferior category, so that its schedule of rights and prescriptions for justice were all color-coded. Ascriptive hierarchy is abolished for white men but not white women (Pateman) and people of color. So racism is not an anomaly in an unqualified liberal universalism but generally symbiotically related to a qualified and particularistic liberalism (Mehta; Sala-Molins). Though there have always been white liberals who have been antiracist and anti-imperialist, whose records should not be ignored (Pitts), they have been in the minority. Indeed, the most striking manifestation of this symbiotic rather than conflictual relation is that the two philosophers earlier demarcated as central to the liberal tradition, Locke and Kant, limited property rights, self-ownership, and personhood racially. Locke invested in African slavery, justified Native American expropriation, and helped write the Carolina constitution of 1669, which gave masters absolute power over their slaves (Tully; Arneil; Armitage; Bernasconi and Mann). Kant, the most important ethicist of the modern period and the famous theorist of personhood and respect, turns out to be one of the founders of modern scientific racism, and thus a pioneering theorist of subpersonhood and disrespect (Eze; Bernasconi, “Who” and “Kant”; Mills, “Kant’s *Untermenschen*”). So the inferior treatment of people of color is not at all incongruent with racialized liberal norms, since by those norms nonwhites are less than full persons.  If this analysis is correct, such inequality, and its historic ramifications, is arguably more fundamental than all the other issues mentioned above, since in principle at least all parties to the many-sided political debate are supposed to be committed to the nonracial moral equality of all. Thus, the rethinking, purging, and deracializing of racial liberalism should be a priority for us—and in fact the struggles of people of color for racial equality over the past few hundred years can in large measure be most illuminatingly seen as just such a project. As Michael Dawson writes in his comprehensive study of African American political ideologies, “The great majority of black theorists challenge liberalism as it has been practiced within the United States, not some abstract ideal version of the ideology. . . . [T]here is no necessary contradiction between the liberal tradition in *theory* and black liberalism. The contradiction exists between black liberalism and how liberalism has come to be understood in practice within the American context” (13).  Yet the need for such a reconstruction has been neither acknowledged nor acted on. Rawls and Nozick may be in conflict over left- wing versus right-wing liberalism, but both offer us idealized views of the polity that ignore the racial subordination rationalized by racial liberalism. Rawls and Sandel may be in conflict over contractarian liberalism versus neo-Hegelian communitarianism, but neither confronts how the whiteness of the actual American contract and of the actual American community and its conception of the good affects justice and conceptions of the self. Late Rawls may be in conflict with early Rawls about political versus comprehensive liberalism, but neither addresses the question of the ways in which both versions have been shaped by race, whether through an “overlapping consensus” (among whites) or a “reflective equilibrium” (of whites). From the perspective of people of color, these intramural **and intrawhite debates all fail to deal with the simple overwhelming reality on** **which** left and right, contractarian and communitarian, **comprehensive or political liberal should theoretically be able to agree: that the centrality of racial exclusion and racial injustice demands a reconceptualization of the orthodox view of the polity and calls for radical rectification.**

### Solvency

#### Empirically, Policy Change is Critical to solving the material effects of oppression

Glaude 16 (Professor of African American Studies and Religion @ Princeton, Eddie, Democracy in Black: How Race Still Enslaves, pgs. 185-197) CHANGE HOW WE VIEW GOVERNMENT

For more than three decades, we have been bludgeoned with an idea of government that has little to no concern for the public good. Big government is bad, we are told. It is inefficient, and its bloated bureaucracies are prone to corruption. Even Democrats, especially since Bill Clinton, have taken up this view. For example, Obama says, "We don't need big government; we need smart government." For some on the right, big government is bad because it aims to distribute wealth to those who are lazy and undeserving. "Big government" is just a shorthand for dreaded entitlement programs-all too often coded language for race. In this view, "big government" is the primary agent of enforcing racial equality, taking hard-earned stuff from white Americans and giving it to undeserving others. Government cannot do such a thing, they argue, without infringing on the rights of white Americans. And even government-mandated redistribution will not solve the problem. As Barry Goldwater put the point in 1964, "No matter how we try, we cannot pass a law that will make you like me or me like you. The key to racial and religious tolerance lies not in laws alone but, ultimately, in the hearts of men." From this perspective, government plays no role in changing our racial habits. Why would we want to make it bigger? But Goldwater failed to realize that governmental indifference can harden hearts, and government action can create conditions that soften them. People's attitudes aren't static or untouchable. They are molded by the quality of interactions with others, and one of the great powers of government involves shaping those interactions-not determining them in any concrete sense, but defining the parameters within which people come to know each other and live together. Today, for example, most Americans don't believe women should be confined to the home raising children, or subjected to crude advances and sexist remarks by men. The women's-rights movement put pressure on the government, which in turn passed laws that helped change some of our beliefs about women. Similarly, the relative progress of the 1960s did not happen merely by using the blunt instruments of the law. Change emerged from the ways those laws, with grassroots pressure, created new patterns of interactions, and ultimately new habits. Neither Obama's election to the presidency nor my appointment as a Princeton professor would have happened were it not for these new patterns and habits. None of this happens overnight. It takes time and increasing vigilance to protect and secure change. I was talking with a dose friend and he mentioned a basic fact: that we were only fifteen years removed from the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 when Ronald Reagan was elected president and Republicans began to dismantle the gains of the black freedom struggle. Civil rights legislation and the policies of the Great Society had just started to reshape our interactions when they started to be rolled back. We barely had a chance to imagine America anew-to pursue what full employment might look like, to let the abolition of the death penalty settle in, to question seriously the morality of putting people in prison cells, and to enact policies that would undo what the 1968 Kerner Commission described as "two Americas"­ before the attack on "big government" or, more precisely, the attack on racial equality was launched. The objective was to shrink the size of government ("to starve the beast") and to limit its domestic responsibilities to ensuring economic efficiency and national defense. Democrats eventually buckled, and this is the view of government, no matter who is in office, that we have today. It has become a kind of touchstone of faith among most Americans that government is wasteful and should be limited in its role-that it shouldn't intrude on our lives. Politicians aren't the only ones who hold this view. Many Americans do, too. Now we can't even imagine serious talk of things like full employment or the abolition of prisons. We have to change our view of government, especially when it comes to racial matters. Government policy ensured the vote for African Americans and dismantled legal segregation. Policy established a social safety net for the poor and elderly; it put in place the conditions for the growth of our cities. All of this didn't happen simply because of individual will or thanks to some abstract idea of America. It was tied up with our demands and expectations. Goldwater was wrong. So was Reagan. And, in many ways, so is Obama. Our racial habits are shaped by the kind of society in which we live, and our government plays a big role in shaping that society. As young children, our community offers us a way of seeing the world; it lets us know what is valuable and sacred, and what stands as virtuous behavior and what does not. When Michael Brown's body was left in the street for more than four hours, it sent a dear message about the value of black lives. When everything in our society says that we should be less concerned about black folk, that they are dangerous, that no specific policies can address their misery, we say to our children and to everyone else that these people are "less than"-that they fall outside of our moral concern. We say, without using the word, that they are niggers. One way to change that view is to enact policies that suggest otherwise. Or, to put it another way, to change our view of government, we must change our demands of government. For example, for the past fifty years African American unemployment has been twice that of white unemployment. The 2013 unemployment rate for African Americans stood at 13.1 percent, the highest annual black unemployment rate in more than seventy years. Social scientists do not generally agree on the causes of this trend. Some attribute it to the fact that African Americans are typically the "last hired and first fired." Others point to changes in the nature of the economy; still others point to overt racial discrimination in the labor market. No matter how we account for the numbers, the fact remains that most Americans see double-digit black unemployment as "normal." However, a large-scale, comprehensive jobs agenda with a living wage designed to put Americans, and explicitly African Americans, to work would go a long way toward uprooting the racial habits that inform such a view. It would counter the nonsense that currently stands as a reason for long-term black unemployment in public debate: black folk are lazy and don't want to work. If we hold the view that government plays a crucial role in ensuring the public good-if we believe that all Americans, no matter their race or class, can be vital contributors to our beloved community-then we reject the idea that some populations are disposable, that some people can languish in the shadows while the rest of us dance in the light. The question ''Am I my brother's or my sister's keeper?" is not just a question for the individual or a mantra to motivate the private sector. It is a question answered in the social arrangements that aim to secure the goods and values we most cherish as a community. In other words, we need an idea of government that reflects the value of all Americans, not just white Americans or a few people with a lot of money. We need government seriously committed to racial justice. As a nation, we can never pat ourselves on the back about racial matters. We have too much blood on our hands. Remembering that fact-our inheritance, as Wendell Berry said-does not amount to beating ourselves over the head, or wallowing in guilt, or trading in race cards. Remembering our national sins serves as a check and balance against national hubris. We're reminded of what we are capable of, and our eyes are trained to see that ugliness when it rears its head. But when we disremember-when we forget about the horrors of lynching, lose sight of how African Americans were locked into a dual labor market because of explicit racism, or ignore how we exported our racism around the world-we free ourselves from any sense of accountability. Concern for others and a sense of responsibility for the whole no longer matter. Cruelty and indifference become our calling cards. We have to isolate those areas in which long-standing trends of racial inequality short-circuit the life chances of African Americans. In addition to a jobs agenda, we need a comprehensive government response to the problems of public education and mass incarceration. And I do mean a government response. Private interests have overrun both areas, as privatization drives school reform (and the education of our children is lost in the boisterous battles between teachers' unions and private interests) and as big business makes enormous profits from the warehousing of black and brown people in prisons. Let's be clear: private interests or market-based strategies will not solve the problems we face as a country or bring about the kind of society we need. We have to push for massive government investment in early childhood education and in shifting the center of gravity of our society from punishment to restorative justice. We can begin to enact the latter reform by putting an end to the practice of jailing children. Full stop. We didn't jail children in the past. We don't need to now. In sum, government can help us go a long way toward uprooting racial habits with policies that support jobs with a living wage, which would help wipe out the historic double-digit gap between white and black unemployment; take an expansive approach to early childhood education, which social science research consistently says profoundly affects the life chances of black children; and dismantle the prison-industrial complex. We can no longer believe that disproportionately locking up black men and women constitutes an answer to social ills. This view of government cannot be dismissed as a naive pipe dream, because political considerations relentlessly attack our political imaginations and limit us to the status quo. We are told before we even open our mouths that this particular view won't work or that it will never see the light of day. We've heard enough of that around single payer health care reform and other progressive policies over the Obama years. Such defeatist attitudes conspire to limit our imaginations and make sure that the world stays as it is. But those of us who don't give a damn about the rules of the current political game must courageously organize, advocate, and insist on the moral and political significance of a more robust role for government. We have to change the terms of political debate. Something dramatic has to happen. American democracy has to be remade. John Dewey, the American philosopher, understood this: The very idea of democracy, the meaning of democracy, must be continually explored afresh; it has to be constantly discovered and rediscovered, remade and reorganized; while the political and economic and social institutions in which it is embodied have to be remade and reorganized to meet the changes that are going on in the development of new needs on the part of human beings and new resources for satisfying these needs. Dewey saw American democracy as an unfinished project. He knew that the aims and purposes of this country were not fixed forever in the founding documents, but the particular challenges of our moment required imaginative leaps on behalf of democracy itself. Otherwise, undemocratic forces might prevail; tyranny in the form of the almighty dollar and the relentless pursuit of it might overtake any commitment to the idea of the public good; and bad habits might diminish our moral imaginations. The remaking of America will not happen inside the Beltway. Too many there have too much invested in the status quo. A more robust idea of government will not emerge from the current political parties. Both are beholden to big money. Substantive change will have to come from us. Or, as the great civil rights leader Ella Baker said, "we are the leaders we've been looking for"-a model of leadership that scares the hell out of the Reverena Sharpton. We will have to challenge the status quo in the streets and at the ballot box. In short, it will take a full-blown democratic awakening to enact this revolution. On February 7, 2014, I flew to Raleigh, North Carolina, to join with tens of thousands of other like-minded people to protest the draconian laws passed by the North Carolina state legislature. Since 2010, while many people-especially black people-were still reeling from the 2008 recession/depression, Republicans eliminated Medicaid coverage for half a million North Carolinians, passed a voter-ID law designed to disenfranchise primarily African American voters, transferred $90 million from public schools to voucher schools and cut pre-K for 30,000 children, passed a law requiring women about to have an abortion to listen to the heartbeat of the fetus, repealed the earned income tax credit for 900,000 people, and constitutionally banned gay marriage. North Carolina Republicans had declared war. They represented clear examples of those who hold a view of government that hardens hearts and reinforces racial habits. I watched from afar as the Forward Together moral movement took shape in response. People from all across North Carolina organized and mobilized to take back the state from extremists. The state NAACP, with its charismatic leader, Reverend William Barber II, built a movement from the ground up to challenge what they took to be an allout assault on the moral and social fabric of the state. The movement was not simply a reaction to Tea Party Republicans. "We started this when the Democrats were in power," Barber said. "We put out the word. The state had not complied with the Leandro decision [a 1994 publiceducation-equity lawsuit]. We still had not given public employees collective bargaining rights. We didn't have a racial justice act." But the actions of the North Carolina GOP intensified the group's efforts. More than 900 people who engaged in nonviolent civil disobedience to protest the Republican agenda were arrested during the 2013 legislative session. Reverend Barber put out a call across the country for a massive march in February to launch the 2014 Forward Together campaign. Eighty thousand to 100,000 people answered. It was the largest mass demonstration in the South since the Selma march in 1965. I arrived early. It was cold, and clouds blocked the sun as organizers began to set up. A few people worked on their signs. One sign read PROTECT ALL N.C. CITIZENS with different examples of vulnerable groups written underneath (the mentally ill, the unemployed, teachers, the elderly, students, prisoners, the uninsured, minorities). I was struck from the beginning by the cross-section of people there. Old and young, straight and gay, black, white, and Latino all began to gather. I asked a few of them why they were marching. Leslie Boyd, a white woman from Asheville, North Carolina, told me about her son, Michael Danforth. He had suffered from a birth defect that made it next to impossible for him to get health insurance. He died in the hospital, and ever since, she has dedicated her life to health care activism. She started a small nonprofit called Western North Carolina Health Advocates, through which she met Reverend Barber. He asked her to join the movement. The cold weather drove me into the nearby McDonald's, where several people sipped coffee while they waited for the march to begin. I struck up a conversation with Martin Marshall from Atlanta, Georgia, and Ron Gray from Rock Hill, South Carolina. Martin told me a story about his childhood experiences with racism, about the wall that divided his white community from the black community, and how racism was still alive today. "Voter restrictions and access to health care " were · the reasons he was marching. Ron was less talkative. He said, "I will give you the short form: injustice. I am here because it is the right place to be." Sitting next to Martin and Ron was an older white couple, Bill and Betsy Crittendon from Chapel Hill, North Carolina. They were members of an interracial choir called the United Voices of Praise. They had been involved in interracial social issues for a number of years and found the "regressive policies that have come about in this state [to be] just awful, absolutely awful. They have completely reversed the course of this state." Mrs. Crittendon wasn't too optimistic that the march would change the minds of state legislators, but she and her husband understood the long-term significance of the march and the Forward Together movement. "People need to see and hear what this is all about .... Every step along the way is a building step [to clear] the way for justice issues." These were people from different walks of life who understood the common ground of suffering in this country. For them, that understanding did not require anyone to leave the particulars of their suffering at the door. Anti-racism remained a part of their advocacy whether they struggled for universal health care or a living wage. They joined with others to urge a fundamental change in North Carolina and the country that could help break down racial habits. Reverend Barber thinks of their efforts in this way: [It's] about showing people the intersectionality of their lives; the intersectionality of their moving together . ... We have a phrase: we is the most important word in the justice vocabulary. The issue is not what I can do, but what we can do when we stand together, fight together, pray together, and work together, and we feel movement together. As I finished the conversations in McDonald's, I looked outside. Busload after busload of people had begun to arrive. Before the march began, speakers rallied the crowd. The topics were wide-ranging, from LGBT concerns, the state of public education, issues of immigration and the status of undocumented workers, to racist voter-ID laws. It was an in-the-flesh performance of a multiracial, multi-issue coalition. And whenever someone shouted, "Forward together," the crowd replied, "Not one step back." Initially, to an outsider looking in, the moment resembled the traditional theater of contemporary American protest. A march serves as a moment of catharsis. People gather, tensions are released, folks go back to business as usual, and the men (and it is typically always men) who lead the march leverage the spotlight for personal gain. But a brief glance beneath the surface of this particular gathering revealed something much more expansive. The march was just the tip of an organizing iceberg. Reverend Barber declared, "The Moral March inaugurates a fresh year of grassroots empowerment, voter education, litigation, and nonviolent direct action." In other words, this march wasn't a culmination but a catalyst: it dramatized an organizing effort (which preceded the gathering) that encompassed the courtroom, the ballot box, and the streets. For Barber, the work of democracy doesn't happen through marches or backroom deals but through concerted efforts "to change the context in which power operates." Of course, voting matters. But democracy is about the commitment to get one's hands dirty, and that work is often selfless and thankless. At the heart of those efforts is a more robust conception of government-a belief that government has the capacity to transform lives through focused legislation-and an insistence that we shift the center of moral gravity in North Carolina and in the nation. Five demands guide this insistence: (1) secure pro-labor, anti-poverty policies that ensure economic sustainability; (2) provide well-funded, quality public education to all; (3) stand up for the health of every North Carolinian by promoting health care access and environmental justice across all the state's communities; (4) address the continuing inequalities in the criminal justice system and ensure equality under the law for every person, regardless of race, class, creed, documentation, or sexual preference; and (5) protect and expand voting rights for people of color, immigrants, the elderly, and students to safeguard fair democratic representation. Each demand carries with it an expectation of the role of government in safeguarding the public good and an affirmation of the dignity and standing of all Americans. If we were to embrace these demands as policy, we would be well on our way to a revolution of value. As we marched from historic Shaw University, the place where the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee was founded in April 1960, to the state capitol, Americans from all walks of life expressed a radically egalitarian vision of this country. This vision did not require African Americans to leave their experiences at the door. Alongside demands for marriage equality, cries for support of public education, and calls for a more robust commitment to labor, marchers embraced the call for an anti-racist politics. As Reverend Barber said, "Some people wanted us to emphasize poverty instead of race. But you have to speak the truth. [Race] can be the Achilles' heel of the movement or lend itself to your moral positioning." We have to confront white supremacy, or what Barber calls "the corruption of the spirit and the conscience," as a fundamental contradiction of American democracy, or face the consequences of our silence. As the march concluded, I stood amazed at the power of ordinary people. Thousands of people had come together, for a moment, to declare their commitment to a radical vision of democracy. This is what has been missing in contemporary American politics. Reverend Barber's inspiring remarks struck a chord that reached back to the nineteenthcentury abolitionists, black and white, who decided to become traitors in the name of American democracy. They turned their backs on the slave regime. Barber called us to do the same with the political extremists of our times. We need the kind of language that's not left or right or conservative or liberal, but moral, fusion language that says look: it's extreme and immoral to suppress the right to vote. It's extreme and immoral to deny Medicaid for millions of poor people. . .. It's extreme and immoral to raise taxes on the working poor by cutting earned income taxes and to raise taxes on the poor and middle class in order to cut taxes for the wealthy. It's extreme and immoral to use power to cut off poor people's water in Detroit. That's immoral! What we need to cut off is that kind of abusive power! It's extreme and immoral to re-segregate our schools and underfund our public schools. It's extreme and immoral for people who came from immigrants to now have a mean amnesia and cry out against immigrants and the rights of children . ... That's not just bad policy, it's against the common good and a disregard for human rights. It's a refusal to lean toward the angels of our better selves . ... In policy and politics in America, we face two choices. One is the low road to political destruction, and the other is the pathway to higher ground. Barber finished speaking-preaching, really. The crowd joined hands to sing "We Shall Overcome." The voices were full of emotion and faith, not the sound of trepidation heard in the voices of those who sang the song after Reagan's speech in the Rose Garden. For much of the march, the day had been cloudy and cold. But as he spoke, the sun finally broke through. "The sun has come out," Reverend Barber started to shout. "The sun has come out. We are on our way to higher ground. Even the universe blesses this day. Even the universe says yes to justice, yes to equality, yes to higher ground." Marchers shouted. In front of me stood a white Episcopalian preacher in tears. I wiped my own eyes. This is the kind of social movement that will transform our idea of government. It insists on the dignity and standing of black people and other marginalized groups, and it argues for a dramatic change in what we as Americans care" most about. To be sure, the Forward Together moral movement isn't the only form of struggle we need. (In some ways, Reverend Barber represents the long-standing tradition of the charismatic preacher as leader, although he happens to be aware of the pitfalls of the model of leadership even as he exemplifies it.) It represents just one example of what a democratic awakening must do if we are to change the terms of political debate in this country: it must enact a different way of thinking about government and its relation to the most vulnerable among us.

### AT Marxism

#### Liberal individualist and Marxist mappings of the world fail to take into account the social ontology produced by global white supremacy

Mills 08 [Charles Mills is a Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy @ Northwestern University, *Blackness Visible*]

One can appreciate, then, why this conceptual terrain is so apparently in-hospitable to the concerns of Third World theory. For if race is not even ac-knowledged to make a difference, how can these two discourses be located in the same universe? The way to bring them together, accordingly, is to point out the illusory character of abstract Kantianism and to recognize the actual Herrenvolk moral theory appropriate for a white-supremacist polity, in which the difference race makes is to demarcate persons from subpersons. Individuals are raced or colored bearers of a certain history and cul-ture, and this is what indicates their location in the racial polity. And if par-adigmatically in the Kantian normative framework, persons are not to be treated merely instrumentally, as means to others' ends, then sub persons (Native Americans, blacks) can be regarded as precisely those for whom such treatment is morally appropriate. It should be noted that this equation has always been recognized by black and Third World theory-antislavery, antisegregationist, anticolo-nial. Thus in the introduction to his classic Black Skin, White Masks, Frantz Fanon says bluntly, "At the risk of arousing the resentment of my colored brothers, I will say that the black is not a man."19 As he points out elsewhere, the colonial world is "a Manichean world;' "a world cut in two;' "divided into compartments ... inhabited by two different species;' and "it is evident that what parcels out the world is to begin with the fact of belonging to or not belonging to a given race, a given species" -on the one hand the "gov-erning race"; on the other, inferior creatures to be described in "zoological terms."20 Correspondingly, from the other side, so to speak, a white Alabaman ad-dressing a northern audience in 1860 describes with admirable clarity the founding principles of the United States: "Your fathers and my fathers built this government on two ideas; the first is that the white race is the citizen and the master race, and the white man is the equal of every other white man. The second idea is that the Negro is the inferior race."21 And this, of course, far from being an idiosyncratic perception, is accurately reflected in the Dred Scott decision, that blacks "had for more than a century before been regarded as beings of an inferior order, and altogether unfit to associ-ate with the white race, either in social or political relations; and so far infe-rior, that they had no rights which the white man was bound to respect:'22 So I am not making any claims to theoretical discovery here; I am argu-ing for the formal recognition of these realities within the framework of an orthodox theory that generally ignores them. Race has been a problematic "deviation" for both liberal individualist and Marxist class-centered map-pings of this system, because both have failed to take seriously the objective partitioning in the social ontology produced by global white supremacy. Bill Lawson points out that a "lexical gap" in mainstream liberal moral! political discourse obfuscates the distinctive history of black Americans. By simply assimilating them to the general category of citizens, it conceptually blurs the legacy of slavery, so that there is an inadequate "semantic basis" for "the framing of policies for implementing programs to bring about true citizenship for blacks."23 More generally, **the danger of the universalist and colorless language of personhood is that it too easily slips over from the normative to the descriptive, thus covertly representing as an already achieved reality what is at present only an ideal, and failing to register the embedded structures of differentiated treatment and dichotomized moral psychology that "subpersonhood" captures. An ideal is realized through recognizing and dealing with the obstacles that block its attainment, not through pretending they are not there.**

### AT Pomo

#### Philosophy is one of the whitest of the humanities. The literature base of the (aff/neg) cannot account for intersections of race

Mills 08 [Charles Mills is a Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy @ Northwestern University, *Racial Liberalism*]

Philosophers of color are absent not just from the halls of academe but from the texts also. Introductions to political philosophy standardly exclude any discussion of race,5 except, perhaps, for brief discussions of affirmative action. Historical anthologies of political philosophy will present a lineup of figures extending from ancient Greece to the contemporary world—from Plato to NATO, in one wit’s formulation—but with no representation of nonwhite theorists. Almost to the point of parody, the Western political canon is limited to the thoughts of white men. Steven Cahn’s Classics of Political and Moral Philosophy (2002), for example, a widely used Oxford anthology of more than twelve hundred pages, includes only one nonwhite thinker, Martin Luther King, Jr., and not even in the main text but in the appendixes.6 So it is not merely that the pantheon is closed to nonwhite outsiders but that a particular misleading narrative of Western political philosophy—indeed, a particular misleading narrative of the West itself—is being inculcated in generations of students. The central debates in the field as presented—aristocracy versus democracy, absolutism versus liberalism, capitalism versus socialism, social democracy versus libertarianism, contractarianism versus communitarianism—exclude any reference to the modern global history of racism versus antiracism, of abolitionist, anti-imperialist, anticolonialist, anti–jim crow, antiapartheid struggles. Quobna Cugoano, Frederick Douglass, W. E. B. DuBois, Mahatma Gandhi, Aimé Césaire, C. L. R. James, Frantz Fanon, Steve Biko, Edward Said are all missing.7 The political history of the West is sanitized, reconstructed as if white racial domination and the oppression of people of color had not been central to that history. A white supremacy that was originally planetary, a racial political structure that was transnational, is whitewashed out of existence. One would never guess from reading such works that less than a century ago “the era of global white supremacy” was inspiring “a global struggle for racial equality” (Borstelmann 15, 21). One would never dream that the moral equality supposedly established by modernity was in actuality so racially restricted that at the 1919 post–World War I peace conference in Versailles, the Japanese delegation’s proposal to insert a “racial equality” clause in the League of Nations’ covenant was soundly defeated by the “Anglo-Saxon” nations (including, of course, the United States), which refused to accept such a principle (Lake and Reynolds, ch. 12). Moreover, not just the political theorists of the struggle against racism and white supremacy are jim crowed but, even more remarkable, justice itself as a subject is jim crowed. Contemporary political philosophy, at least in the Anglo-American tradition, is focused almost exclusively on normative issues. Whereas the original contract theorists used the contract idea to address questions of our political obligation to the state, contemporary contract theorists, following Rawls, only use it to address questions of social justice. So how, one might ask, could white political philosophers possibly exclude race and racial justice as subjects, considering that racial injustice has been so central to the making of the modern world and to the creation of the United States in particular? The answer: through the simple expedient of concentrating on what has come to be called “ideal theory.”Ideal theory is not supposed to contrast with nonideal theory as a moral outlook contrasts with an amoral, realpolitik outlook. Both ideal and nonideal theory are concerned with justice, and so with the appeal to moral ideals. The contrast is that ideal theory asks what justice demands in a perfectly just society while nonideal theory asks what justice demands in a society with a history of injustice. So nonideal theory is concerned with corrective measures, with remedial or rectificatory justice (Roberts). Racial justice is preeminently a matter of nonideal theory, of what corrective measures are called for to rectify a history of discrimination. By the apparently innocuous methodological decision to focus on ideal theory, white political philosophers are immediately exempted from dealing with the legacy of white supremacy in our actual society. You do not need affirmative action— and you certainly do not need reparations—in a society where no race has been discriminated against in the first place. In fact, if the social constructionist position on race is correct and race is brought into existence through racializing processes linked with projects of exploitation (aboriginal expropriation, slavery, colonial rule), then a perfectly just society would be raceless! By a weird philosophical route, the “color blindness” already endorsed by the white majority gains a perverse philosophical sanction. In a perfectly just society, race would not exist, so we do not (as white philosophers working in ideal theory) have to concern ourselves with matters of racial justice in our own society, where it does exist— just as the white citizenry increasingly insist that the surest way of bringing about a raceless society is to ignore race and that those (largely people of color) who still claim to see race are themselves the real racists.

#### Our interp outweighs – Creating a global framework for situating discussions of racism and challenging the assumptions of white supremacy is necessary for challenging global systems of oppressive politics.

#### Mills 97 [Charles Mills is a Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy @ Northwestern University, *Racial Contract*]

White supremacy is the unnamed political system that has made the modern world what it is today. You will not find this term in introductory, or even advanced, texts in political theory. A standard under­ graduate philosophy course will start off with plato and Aris­ totle, perhaps say something about Augustine, Aquinas, and Machiavelli, move on to Hobbes, Locke, Mill, and Marx, and then wind up with Rawls and Nozick. It will introduce you to notions of aristocracy, democracy, absolutism, liberalism, representative government, socialism, welfare capitalism, and libertarianism. But though it covers more than two thousand years of Western political thought and runs the ostensible gamut of political systems, there will be no mention of the basic political system that has shaped the world for the past several hundred years. And this omission is not accidental. Rather, it reflects the fact that standard textbooks and courses have for the most part been written and designed by whites, who take their racial privilege so much for granted that they do not even see it as political, as a form of domination. Ironi­ cally, the most important political system of recent global history-the system of domination by which white people have historically ruled over and, in certain important ways, continue to rule over nonwhite people is not seen as a political system at all. It is just taken for granted; it is the background against which other systems, which we are to see as political are highlighted. This book is an attempt to redirect your vision, to make you see what, in a sense, has been there all along. Philosophy has remained remarkably untouched by the debates over multiculturalism, canon reform, and ethnic diversity racking the academy; both demographically and conceptually, it is one of the "whitest" of the humanities. Blacks, for example, constitute only about 1 percent of philosophers in North American universities-a hundred or so people out of more than ten thousand-and there are even fewer Latino, Asian American, and Native American philosophers.! Surely this underrepresentation itself stands in need of an explanation, and in my opinion it can be traced in part to a conceptual array and a standard repertoire of concerns whose abstractness typically elides, rather than genuinely includes, the experience of racial minorities. Since (white) women have the demo­ graphic advantage of numbers, there are of course far more female philosophers in the profession than nonwhite philosophers (though still not proportionate to women's percentage of the population), and they have made far greater progress in developing alternative conceptualizations. Those African American philosophers who do work in moral and political theory tend either to produce general work indistinguishable from that of their white peers or to focus on local issues (affirmative action, the black "underclass") or historical figures (W. E. B. Du Bois, Alain Locke) in a way that does not aggressively engage the broader debate. What is needed is a global theoretical framework for situating discussions of race and white racism, and thereby challenging the assumptions of white political philosophy, which would correspond to feminist theorists' articulation of the centrality of gender, patriarchy, and sexism to traditional moral and political theory. What is needed, in other words, is a recognition that racism (or, as I will argue, global white supremacy) is itself a political system, a particular power structure of formal or informal rule, socioeconomic privilege, and norms for the differential distribution of material wealth and opportunities, benefits and burdens, rights and duties. The notion of the Racial Contract is, I suggest, one possible way of making this connection with mainstream theory, since it uses the vocabulary and apparatus already developed for con­ tractarianism to map this unacknowledged system. Contract talk is, after all, the political lingua franca of ,our times.

## 2NC Black Switch Side Debate

#### Black SSD solves all their offense – it’s key to education, ethics, and black politics and thought – we have multiple impacts:

#### Ethics - No SSD results in conviction based debate where debaters have already decided your position in debate and the world such that you don’t have to consider your complicity in any structures.

#### White Supremacy and Anti-Blackness - The negative in this debate is the only team engaging in switch side debate because the affirmative has already decided to shotgun any possibility of criticism – this justifies white supremacist approaches to debate because your refusal to Switch Sides encourages white people to refuse to engage in any relation with other people based off an assumption of mastery that is embedded in whiteness

#### Most inclusive - Styles based off who you are should inform how you engage the resolution – because there are so many kinds of people in the world we should encourage debate which allows you to insert yourself into the relations with the resolution and the world

#### 2) Even in the context of theoretical discussions, the only solution is to require engagement in the resolution in order to produce the possibility for affirmation and criticism that allows for more holistic debates and ethical engagement with the world – Conviction Based Debate forecloses this possibility – this means they don’t get a perm.

## 2NC – Presumption

### Academy DA

#### It doesn’t matter how great of an academic you are. Without a specific defense of action to be taken, you’ll never be the radical that the system needs because you just bind the revolution inside of a book. Instead, the meaningless production of the 1AC only recreates the system it critiques by attempting to combat monolithic ideals.

Bryant 12 (Levi Bryant is Professor of Philosophy at [Collin College](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collin_College) “McKenzie Wark: How Do You Occupy an Abstraction” August 4, 2012 <http://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/08/04/mckenzie-wark-how-do-you-occupy-an-abstraction/> )

In the language of my machine-oriented ontology or onticology, we would say that we only ever encounter local manifestations of hyperobjects, local events or appearances of hyperobjects, and never the hyperobject as such. Hyperobjects as such are purely virtual or withdrawn. They can’t be directly touched. And what’s worse, contrary to Locke’s principle of individuation whereby an individual is individuated by virtue of its location in a particular place and at a particular time, hyperobjects are without a site or place. They are, as Morton says, non-local. This, then, is a central problem, for how do you combat something that is everywhere and nowhere? How do you engage something that is non-local? If an army is over there I can readily target it. If a particular munitions factor is over here, then I can readily target it. But how do we target something that is non-local and that is incorporeal? This is the problem with occupying an abstraction. Second, contemporary capitalism is massively redundant. This, I think, is what Wark is getting at when he speaks of contemporary power as “vectoral”. Under what Wark calls “vector power”, we have configurations of power where attacks at one site have very little impact insofar as flows can simply be re-channeled through another set of nodes in the network. Like a hydra, you cut off one head only to have another head appear in its place. The head can never be cut off once and for all because there is no single head. The crisis of contemporary politics is thus the crisis of the erasure of site. In the age of hyperobjects, we come to dwell in a world where there is no clear site of political antagonism and therefore no real sense of how and where to engage. Here I’m also inclined to say that we need to be clear about system references in our political theorizing and action. We think a lot about the content of our political theorizing and positions, but I don’t think we think a lot about how our political theories are supposed to actually act in the world. As a result, much contemporary leftist political theory ends up in a performative contradiction. It claims, following Marx, that it’s aim is not to represent the world but to change it, yet it never escapes the burrows of academic journals, and conferences, and presses to actually do so. Like the Rat-Man’s obsessional neurosis where his actions in returning the glasses were actually designed to fail, there seems to be a built in tendency in these forms of theorization to unconsciously organize their own failure. And here I can’t resist suggesting that this comes as no surprise given that, in Lacanian terms, the left is the position of the hysteric and as such has “a desire for an unsatisfied desire”. In such circumstances the worst thing consists in getting what you want. We on the left need to traverse our fantasy so as to avoid this sterile and self-defeating repetition; and this entails shifting from the position of political critique (hysterical protest), to political construction– actually envisioning and building alternatives. So what’s the issue with system-reference? The great autopoietic sociological systems theorist, Niklas Luhmann, makes this point nicely. For Luhmann, there are intra-systemic references and inter-systemic references. Intra-systemic references refer to processes that are strictly for the sake of reproducing or maintaining the system in question. Take the example of a cell. A cell, for-itself, is not for anything beyond itself. The processes that take place within the cell are simply for continuing the existence of the cell across time. While the cell might certainly emit various chemicals and hormones as a result of these processes, from its own intra-systemic perspective, it is not for the sake of affecting these other cells with those hormones. They’re simply by-products. Capitalism or economy is similar. Capitalists talk a good game about benefiting the rest of the world through the technologies they produce, the medicines they create (though usually it’s government and universities that invent these medicines), the jobs they create, etc., but really the sole aim of any corporation is identical to that of a cell: to endure through time or reproduce itself through the production of capital. This production of capital is not for anything and does not refer to anything outside itself. These operations of capital production are intra-systemic. By contrast, inter-systemic operations would refer to something outside the system and its auto-reproduction. They would be for something else. Luhmann argues that every autopoietic system has this sort of intra-systemic dimension. Autopoietic systems are, above all, organized around maintaining themselves or enduring. This raises serious questions about academic political theory. Academia is an autopoietic system. As an autopoietic system, it aims to endure, reproduce itself, etc. It must engage in operations or procedures from moment to moment to do so. These operations consist in the production of students that eventually become scholars or professors, the writing of articles, the giving of conferences, the production of books and classes, etc. All of these are operations through which the academic system maintains itself across time. The horrifying consequence of this is that the reasons we might give for why we do what we do might (and often) have little to do with what’s actually taking place in system continuance. We say that our articles are designed to demolish capital, inequality, sexism, homophobia, climate disaster, etc., but if we look at how this system actually functions we suspect that the references here are only intra-systemic, that they are only addressing the choir or other academics, that they are only about maintaining that system, and that they never proliferate through the broader world. Indeed, our very style is often a big fuck you to the rest of the world as it requires expert knowledge to be comprehended, thereby insuring that it can have no impact on broader collectives to produce change. Seen in this light, it becomes clear that our talk about changing the world is a sort of alibi, a sort of rationalization, for a very different set of operations that are taking place. Just as the capitalist says he’s trying to benefit the world, the academic tries to say he’s trying to change the world when all he’s really doing is maintaining a particular operationally closed autopoietic system. How to break this closure is a key question for any truly engaged political theory. And part of breaking that closure will entail eating some humble pie. Adam Kotsko [wrote a wonderful and hilarious post](http://itself.wordpress.com/2012/08/04/the-practical-know-how-of-humanities-academics/) on the absurdities of some political theorizing and its self-importance today. We’ve failed horribly with university politics and defending the humanities, yet in our holier-than-thou attitudes we call for a direct move to communism. Perhaps we need to reflect a bit on ourselves and our strategies and what political theory should be about.

### Cede the Political

#### Debate requires deliberation over antagonistic claims – the failure to engage means the aff fails, coalitions break down, and hawks seize the political – only engagement solves

**Mouffe 2009** (Chantal Mouffe is Professor of Political Theory at the Centre for the Study of Democracy, University of Westminster, “The Importance of Engaging the State”, *What is Radical Politics Today?*, Edited by Jonathan Pugh, pp. 233-7)The way we envisage social criticism has very important consequences for radical politics. Radical politics today is often characterised in terms of desertion, exodus and refusal to engage with existing institutions. Whereas I believe that radical politics should instead be concerned with building political engagement, through developing competing, antagonistic political claims. My aim here is to highlight the main differences between these two characterisations. The first could roughly be described as ‘critique as withdrawal’; the second as ‘critique as engagement’. I will argue that, ultimately, the problem with the form of radical politics advocated by ‘critique as withdrawal’ is that it has a flawed understanding of the very nature of ‘the political’ itself. Critique as withdrawal The model of social criticism and radical politics put forward by Michel Hardt and Antonio Negri in their books Empire (2000) and Multitude (2004) is a good illustration of ‘critique as withdrawal’. Empire is often referred to as the Communist manifesto for the twenty-first century in academic and activist conferences. In this book, the authors call for a total break with modernity and the elaboration of a postmodern approach. In their view such a break is required because of the crucial transformations of globalisation and the subsequent workers’ struggle experienced by our society during the last decades of the twentieth century. According to Hardt and Negri, these transformations can be broadly summarised in the following way: 1. Sovereignty has taken a new form: there is a new global sovereignty, which Hardt and Negri call ‘Empire’. They argue that this Empire is a new imperialism that replaces the attempt by nation states to extend their own sovereignty beyond their borders. In contrast to old-style imperialism, the current Empire has no territorial centre of power and no fixed boundaries; it is decentred and deterritorialised, progressively incorporating the entire global realm with open, expanding frontiers. 2. This transformation corresponds, they say, to the transformation of the capitalist mode of production. The role of industrial factory labour has been reduced. Priority is instead given to communicative, cooperative and affective labour. In the postmodernisation of the global economy, the creation of wealth tends towards regulating and mediating life itself. It permeates every aspect of our life. The scope of the rule of Empire is social life in its entirety. All aspects of our life are controlled – from the way we work and exchange ideas across international borders, through to how we think about our body image. 3. We are witnessing the passage from a ‘disciplinary society’ to a ‘society of control’ characterised by a new paradigm of power. In the disciplinary society, which corresponds to the first phase of capitalist accumulation, command is constructed through diffuse networks of apparatus. These produce and regulate customs, habits and productive practices with the help of disciplinary institutions like prisons, factories, asylums, hospitals, schools and others. The society of control, in contrast, is a society in which mechanisms of command are less obvious. The society of control is dominated by the many mechanisms of the globalised, postmodern capitalist society, which seek to directly organise the brain and body (from the internet, through to complex global systems of trade). What is directly at stake is the regulation of life itself. This is what they call ‘biopower’. 4. Hardt and Negri produce new terms to help explain this situation. These are ‘mass intellectuality’, ‘immaterial labor’ and ‘general intellect’. The central role previously occupied by the labour-power of mass factory workers in the production of surplus-value is today said to be increasingly filled by intellectual, immaterial and communicative labour-power. For Hardt and Negri, the figure of immaterial labour involved in communication, cooperation and the reproduction of affects occupies an increasingly central position in the schema of capitalist production. 5. A new term is needed to refer to this collective worker that Hardt and Negri call the ‘Multitude’. They believe that the transition to Empire – where territorial state sovereignty is less important – has opened up new possibilities for the liberation of this Multitude. The Multitude have shaped a new form of globalisation, which means that previous systems and structures of exploitation and control, such as the state, are no longer needed. This is why their book Empire is so often referred to as the Communist manifesto of the twenty-first century. According to this manifesto, the creative forces of the Multitude are capable of constructing a counter-empire, of overthrowing the state apparatus of control. The present systems of control are no longer necessary. An alternative political organisation of the global flows of exchange now dominates in this era of globalisation. We can, therefore, get rid of territorial sovereignty because it only serves to oppress our creativity. Hardt and Negri therefore clearly illustrate what I previously called, in my introduction to this chapter, ‘critique as withdrawal’: a refusal to engage with existing institutions. At this point it is worth introducing the work of Paolo Virno to complement the picture. Virno’s analyses in his book Grammar of the Multitude (2004) dovetail in many respects with those of Hardt and Negri. But there are also some significant differences. For instance, he is much less sanguine about the future. While Hardt and Negri have a messianic vision of the role of the Multitude, which will necessarily bring down Empire and establish an ‘Absolute Democracy’, Virno does not. For Virno, the present conditions are not right for a communist future. It is unlikely that the sort of ‘Absolute Democracy’ that Hardt and Negri envisage will actually take place. Instead of seeing the generalisation of immaterial labour as a type of ‘spontaneous communism’ like Hardt and Negri, Virno tends to see post-Fordism as a manifestation of the ‘communism of capital’. Under post-Fordism, consumers pursue different goals, with services responding accordingly. This means that today, for Virno, capitalistic initiatives orchestrate material and cultural conditions for their own benefit. And the role of political action should be to create a sphere of common affairs – which he calls the ‘Republic of the Multitude’ – to challenge this situation. Virno proposes two key terms to describe the type of political action which he thinks is necessary. These are ‘exodus’ and ‘civil disobedience’. And for me, they again illustrate what I call ‘critique as withdrawal’: something which is an important and influential trend in radical politics today because exodus advocates mass defection from the state. This requires the development of a non-state public sphere and a radically new type of democracy. It involves experimenting in new forms of nonrepresentative and extra-parliamentary democracy, organised around leagues, councils and soviets. The Multitude never aspire to transform themselves into a majority. They develop a power that refuses to become government. This is why, according to Virno, civil disobedience needs to be emancipated from the liberal tradition. He does not just want to ignore specific laws if they do not conform to the principles of a given territorial constitution or state. For Virno, like Hardt and Negri, radical disobedience goes much further – it puts the existence of the state itself in question. In both Hardt and Negri, and Virno, there is therefore emphasis upon ‘critique as withdrawal’. They all call for the development of a non-state public sphere. They call for self-organisation, experimentation, non-representative and extra-parliamentary politics. They see forms of traditional representative politics as inherently oppressive. So they do not seek to engage with them, in order to challenge them. They seek to get rid of them altogether. This disengagement is, for such influential personalities in radical politics today, the key to every political position in the world. The Multitude must recognise imperial sovereignty itself as the enemy and discover adequate means of subverting its power. Whereas in the disciplinary era I spoke about earlier, sabotage was the fundamental form of political resistance, these authors claim that, today, it should be desertion. It is indeed through desertion, through the evacuation of the places of power, that they think that battles against Empire might be won. Desertion and exodus are, for these important thinkers, a powerful form of class struggle against imperial postmodernity. According to Hardt and Negri, and Virno, radical politics in the past was dominated by the notion of ‘the people’. This was, according to them, a unity, acting with one will. And this unity is linked to the existence of the state. The Multitude, on the contrary, shuns political unity. It is not representable because it is an active self-organising agent that can never achieve the status of a juridical personage. It can never converge in a general will, because the present globalisation of capital and workers’ struggles will not permit this. It is anti-state and anti-popular. Hardt and Negri claim that the Multitude cannot be conceived any more in terms of a sovereign authority that is representative of the people. They therefore argue that new forms of politics, which are non-representative, are needed. They advocate a withdrawal from existing institutions. This is something which characterises much of radical politics today. The emphasis is not upon challenging the state. Radical politics today is often characterised by a mood, a sense and a feeling, that the state itself is inherently the problem. Critique as engagement I will now turn to presenting the way I envisage the form of social criticism best suited to radical politics today. I agree with Hardt and Negri that it is important to understand the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism. But I consider that the dynamics of this transition is better apprehended within the framework of the approach outlined in the book Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics (Laclau and Mouffe, 2001). What I want to stress is that many factors have contributed to this transition from Fordism to post-Fordism, and that it is necessary to recognise its complex nature. My problem with Hardt and Negri’s view is that, by putting so much emphasis on the workers’ struggles, they tend to see this transition as if it was driven by one single logic: the workers’ resistance to the forces of capitalism in the post-Fordist era. They put too much emphasis upon immaterial labour. In their view, capitalism can only be reactive and they refuse to accept the creative role played both by capital and by labour. To put it another way, they deny the positive role of political struggle. In Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics we use the word ‘hegemony’ to describe the way in which meaning is given to institutions or practices: for example, the way in which a given institution or practice is defined as ‘oppressive to women’, ‘racist’ or ‘environmentally destructive’. We also point out that every hegemonic order is therefore susceptible to being challenged by counter-hegemonic practices – feminist, anti-racist, environmentalist, for example. This is illustrated by the plethora of new social movements which presently exist in radical politics today (Christian, anti-war, counter-globalisation, Muslim, and so on). Clearly not all of these are workers’ struggles. In their various ways they have nevertheless attempted to influence and have influenced a new hegemonic order. This means that when we talk about ‘the political’, we do not lose sight of the ever present possibility of heterogeneity and antagonism within society. There are many different ways of being antagonistic to a dominant order in a heterogeneous society – it need not only refer to the workers’ struggles. I submit that it is necessary to introduce this hegemonic dimension when one envisages the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism. This means abandoning the view that a single logic (workers’ struggles) is at work in the evolution of the work process; as well as acknowledging the pro-active role played by capital. In order to do this we can find interesting insights in the work of Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello who, in their book The New Spirit of Capitalism (2005), bring to light the way in which capitalists manage to use the demands for autonomy of the new movements that developed in the 1960s, harnessing them in the development of the post-Fordist networked economy and transforming them into new forms of control. They use the term ‘artistic critique’ to refer to how the strategies of the counter-culture (the search for authenticity, the ideal of selfmanagement and the anti-hierarchical exigency) were used to promote the conditions required by the new mode of capitalist regulation, replacing the disciplinary framework characteristic of the Fordist period. From my point of view, what is interesting in this approach is that it shows how an important dimension of the transition from Fordism to postFordism involves rearticulating existing discourses and practices in new ways. It allows us to visualise the transition from Fordism to postFordism in terms of a hegemonic intervention. To be sure, Boltanski and Chiapello never use this vocabulary, but their analysis is a clear example of what Gramsci called ‘hegemony through neutralisation’ or ‘passive revolution’. This refers to a situation where demands which challenge the hegemonic order are recuperated by the existing system, which is achieved by satisfying them in a way that neutralises their subversive potential. When we apprehend the transition from Fordism to postFordism within such a framework, we can understand it as a hegemonic move by capital to re-establish its leading role and restore its challenged legitimacy. We did not witness a revolution, in Marx’s sense of the term. Rather, there have been many different interventions, challenging dominant hegemonic practices. It is clear that, once we envisage social reality in terms of ‘hegemonic’ and ‘counter-hegemonic’ practices, radical politics is not about withdrawing completely from existing institutions. Rather, we have no other choice but to engage with hegemonic practices, in order to challenge them. This is crucial; otherwise we will be faced with a chaotic situation. Moreover, if we do not engage with and challenge the existing order, if we instead choose to simply escape the state completely, we leave the door open for others to take control of systems of authority and regulation. Indeed there are many historical (and not so historical) examples of this. When the Left shows little interest, Right-wing and authoritarian groups are only too happy to take over the state. The strategy of exodus could be seen as the reformulation of the idea of communism, as it was found in Marx. There are many points in common between the two perspectives. To be sure, for Hardt and Negri it is no longer the proletariat, but the Multitude which is the privileged political subject. But in both cases the state is seen as a monolithic apparatus of domination that cannot be transformed. It has to ‘wither away’ in order to leave room for a reconciled society beyond law, power and sovereignty. In reality, as I’ve already noted, others are often perfectly willing to take control. If my approach – supporting new social movements and counterhegemonic practices – has been called ‘post-Marxist’ by many, it is precisely because I have challenged the very possibility of such a reconciled society. To acknowledge the ever present possibility of antagonism to the existing order implies recognising that heterogeneity cannot be eliminated. As far as politics is concerned, this means the need to envisage it in terms of a hegemonic struggle between conflicting hegemonic projects attempting to incarnate the universal and to define the symbolic parameters of social life. A successful hegemony fixes the meaning of institutions and social practices and defines the ‘common sense’ through which a given conception of reality is established. However, such a result is always contingent, precarious and susceptible to being challenged by counter-hegemonic interventions. Politics always takes place in a field criss-crossed by antagonisms. A properly political intervention is always one that engages with a certain aspect of the existing hegemony. It can never be merely oppositional or conceived as desertion, because it aims to challenge the existing order, so that it may reidentify and feel more comfortable with that order. Another important aspect of a hegemonic politics lies in establishing linkages between various demands (such as environmentalists, feminists, anti-racist groups), so as to transform them into claims that will challenge the existing structure of power relations. This is a further reason why critique involves engagement, rather than disengagement. It is clear that the different demands that exist in our societies are often in conflict with each other. This is why they need to be articulated politically, which obviously involves the creation of a collective will, a ‘we’. This, in turn, requires the determination of a ‘them’. This obvious and simple point is missed by the various advocates of the Multitude. For they seem to believe that the Multitude possesses a natural unity which does not need political articulation. Hardt and Negri see ‘the People’ as homogeneous and expressed in a unitary general will, rather than divided by different political conflicts. Counter-hegemonic practices, by contrast, do not eliminate differences. Rather, they are what could be called an ‘ensemble of differences’, all coming together, only at a given moment, against a common adversary. Such as when different groups from many backgrounds come together to protest against a war perpetuated by a state, or when environmentalists, feminists, anti-racists and others come together to challenge dominant models of development and progress. In these cases, the adversary cannot be defined in broad general terms like ‘Empire’, or for that matter ‘Capitalism’. It is instead contingent upon the particular circumstances in question – the specific states, international institutions or governmental practices that are to be challenged. Put another way, the construction of political demands is dependent upon the specific relations of power that need to be targeted and transformed, in order to create the conditions for a new hegemony. This is clearly not an exodus from politics. It is not ‘critique as withdrawal’, but ‘critique as engagement’. It is a ‘war of position’ that needs to be launched, often across a range of sites, involving the coming together of a range of interests. This can only be done by establishing links between social movements, political parties and trade unions, for example. The aim is to create a common bond and collective will, engaging with a wide range of sites, and often institutions, with the aim of transforming them. This, in my view, is how we should conceive the nature of radical politics.

### Institutions Good

#### Conversations of suffering that do not provide oppressed groups with a way to produce new institutions plays into the hands of white political power

**Grandpre & Love** (Lawrence & Dayvon, former policy debaters/coaches and experiences activists including members of the Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle) **2014** (The Black Book: Reflections from the Baltimore Grassroots, edited by Jade Fletcher, Pan-Afrikan Nationalism Defined, pg. 16-18, C.A.)

**The central issue that faces people of African descent is the development of socially, economically and independent Black institutions**. **Any conversation that does not substantiate this claim plays into the interests of established, White political power, built upon 246 years of chattel slavery**. Though many Black activists engage the left as natural political allies, both sides of the mainstream, left-right discourse are devoted to sustaining the generational wealth that Whites have accumulated through free labor, withheld resources and obstructed access. As Dr. John Henrik Clarke once said, "**The left and the right have us wrong." The political right promotes cutting government spending** on social programs that barely alleviate historical Disparities **on the premise that the beneficiaries are primarily Black and therefore undeserving, embodied by caricatures** like the welfare queen. **Conversely, the left advocates for increased spending on social programs in order to finance White-operated and controlled nonprofits**. **Either way, White interests remain the focus**. Consider how left-right politics framed in mainstream discourse. The left stands for racial integration, a key indicator and goal of "progress"; the right, homogeneity without government intervention. i.e. segregation. This model rarely takes into account whether integration was effective for improving the collective quality of life of Black people. Many luminaries of the Civil Rights Movement said no, it does not. **Malcolm X often remarked about lunacy of integration, arguing that the idea of asking White people to accept us into their institutions requires that we depend on White benevolence**. He argued that we are better off creating and carrying out our own solutions than looking to oppressors for liberation. He drew the only logical conclusion, given the record that White supremacist institutions had with addressing Black people's concerns. In his debate with Bayard Rustin. Malcolm X argued that segregation refers to second-class citizenship, but **separation means having independent institutions of equal caliber to those of Whites**. However, the notion of having separate Black institutions is often represented as being motivated by hate, as opposed to what Malcolm X observed as mere common sense. With regard to public. K-12 education, **integration has yielded poor results**. White families resisted forced legal integration en masse, "fleeing" the cities to live in federally subsidized suburbs and taking with them the substantial tax base that funds quality school districts. **Gutted of essential resources, schools have deployed incomplete solutions, like recruiting middle-class White teachers into predominantly working-class and impoverished Black communities,** where those teachers naively expect that they can educate Black youth without having immersed themselves in the history and culture of Black people. There are isolated incidences of success in charter schools, like the Harlem Children's Zone, but they require tremendous resources to produce their outcomes. Amos Wilson once said that **the purpose of education is to "train its students to protect and perpetuate the national interest." This means that students should be trained in the skills and knowledge necessary to improve their communities. Currently, our education System teaches young people how to be objects in the larger, American body politic, instead of agents and producers of their own political and economic institutions.** Teaching entrepreneurship and vocational Skills like plumbing. electrical work, and other building trades are excluded from the conversation about educating Black children in favor of producing loyal, liberal democratic Subjects, yet these skills are vital for build an indigenous economic base from which independent institutions can grow and nourish. In other words, **if we live in a, society based on White supremacy and anti-blackness then as people of African descent, we have different material interests than our White counterparts, and we need an education model that reflects that.** Promoting integration as racial justice inhibits Black self-determination.

#### We need to guide political strategy and displace white liberalism by unifying our communities towards building power

**Grandpre & Love** (Lawrence & Dayvon, former policy debaters/coaches and experienced activists including members of the Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle) **2014** (The Black Book: Reflections from the Baltimore Grassroots, edited by Jade Fletcher, Fighting the Youth Jail, pg. 176-177, C.A.)

LBS organized during this effort differently than some of our peers **in the Youth Jail Alliance**. **We tapped into the networks that we had developed over a few years to help bring attention to this issue**. **We** didn't attempt to do a series of events, or try to create a new organization, but instead, **understood that there are already people doing work and we need to try to bring together people who could lend us support in fighting the jail**. One of the things that I did was to become a teacher. This was an intentional effort to politicize young people. I taught African American Studies and Social Justice. **I used my classroom as a way to get students engaged in the fight against the Youth Jail.** In I took my students on several field trips to Annapolis to see how the process works. I was even able get one of my students to testify in support of one of the bills proposed to fight the youth jail. I really miss being a se it is the place where you can really see g people grow. The young people I mentored will grow up to become leaders on issues of Black Liberation in their own lives and careers. **Our organizing efforts were set apart from the work of our non-profit peers because we focused on the strategy of strengthening the networks that already exist, instead of trying to create a new network to work on the Youth Jail, This strategy' was both highly effective and truly respectful of Black leaders, community members, and organizations**. I don't want to give the impression that if you are in non- profit organization that we are calling you a sellout. There are individuals in these non-profit organizations and foundations who were very helpful to us. These people realized the limitation of the position that they are in, but were instrumental in giving us information that we needed to help us effectively talk to legislators. This is the proper role of people in non-profits: to be willing to provide support and resources to those of us in the grassroots. This is fundamentally different from what most non-profit organizations are used to. **Usually they are setting the agenda and are being supported by the community. This is backwards.** **We need to be the ones guiding the strategy. Our work on the youth jail was the first step toward changing the paradigm for how we fight social justice issues in Baltimore.**

#### We must create local political power by building our own institutions to consolidate black power

**Grandpre & Love** (Lawrence & Dayvon, former policy debaters/coaches and experienced activists including members of the Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle) **2014** (The Black Book: Reflections from the Baltimore Grassroots, edited by Jade Fletcher, Key Reflections, pg. 206-208, C.A.)

Throughout this book we have described our vision of the world and how we should approach social transformation. We want to take some time here to explicitly lay out specific action steps that we think are necessary in order to us closer to the development or institutional capacity and independent Black power. **Reframe the narrative of our struggle**: Often the white left describes the struggle of Black people in America as being the story of a people who are broken and deficient due to the onslaught of white supremacy/anti- blackness. This situates our Blackness as a pathology that needs to be removed, instead of the extension of a legacy of people of African descent that must be supported. TypicalIy Blackness as an identity foregrounds our experience of suffering. Instead, **we must illuminate the strengths that exist in our communities as the focal point of we narrate the Black Freedom Struggle**. We are not a people who are defined by our brokenness, but a people are defined by our ability to survive the most monstrous destruction of human life in the history of the world. The strength and brilliance that it has taken to survive and function in the system of global white supremacy/anti-blackness should be studied, built upon and narrated by us. This means that **we don't need white people to save us - we need to work to build and maintain our own lives and institutions.** Focus on the development of local community power with an eye to the national mainstream: Our issues often get swept up into a national political conversation in which we have very little actual power. **Politics should start with local political power because this is the only way to effectively build a base.** When we obsess over interjecting ourselves into the national political mainstream we are swept up into a discursive context that is impotent at building power in the hands of the people in our society that are the most dispossessed. **We must be politically astute and have an awareness of how we relate to the larger national political context, but we must keep our feet rooted in the local community in order to build power. Train young people**: Many organizations that fight for Black Liberation are personality driven. These organizations often revolve around a charismatic leader and tend to rely very little on its membership's substantive input. This can lead to a situation where the development of new leadership is not prioritized. When the old leader moves on, there is no one to take their place and the entire organization must be reinvented from scratch if it is to exist at all. **We must train youth at every step of the process so that leadership can be passed along in order that our institutions do not live or die on the strength of just one person.** **Be entrepreneurial**: The non-profit model often frames out the notion of doing business in a way that is socially responsible. While there are roles that non-profit organizations can play, we must develop business ventures that build in Black communities first financial sustainability and independence then wealth and eventually political power. Many of the big non-profits use our labor, suffering and human capital to build the social and political capital of white people who run social service organizations. **These are resources that we should use to develop our own institutions. We cannot settle for charity, we must build our own power.**

## AT: Perm

#### They don’t get a perm, this is a procedural. We have the only definition of climate policy and they don’t meet the interpretation. You have not done Switch Side Debate which means you have refused to engage the negative, and the Other of the resolution – this forecloses ethics and kills education. These are in round impacts which means it doesn’t matter what could happen in other debates.

## AT: State Bad/Antiblack

#### The state is not uniquely anti-black – to think that is to misunderstand the nature of blackness. Extend the Evans evidence. Blackness is the world – they don’t have a unique reason why not to debate about policy action in this debate. Technically, saying anything in the world, and especially in debate, is anti-black because it is immediately structurally adjusted, so this links back to them as much as it does to us. We have unique net benefits to our interpretation of debate and they have none to theirs because we’ve taken out their internal link to not engaging the resolution.

#### We can combine the black radical tradition with a liberal framework in order to produce Black Radical Liberalism – that’s our Mills evidence. Afro-Pessimism has failed to offer a pragmatic solution to the concrete realities of the world, only our model of debate can.

#### The Movement for Black Lives policy brief, which includes policy solutions to resolve the failure of the education system – specifically in the context of Black Life – proves that there is a topical version of the AFF that would forward our thinking about Black Liberation rather than diminish it. That they have refused to engage in the Black politics in this manner demonstrates that they are more anti-black than we are.

## AT: The Plan Would Get Co-Opted

#### We realize that every affirmative wants an impossible to beat Aff, but that is a) Conviction Based Debate which is unethical and bad for debate and black people, and b) is unrealistic – the important educational task for us is to figure out how to make the most strategic plans and policies in order to diminish the possibility of co-optation by elites while still advancing our goals towards Black Liberation.

#### And, even if the policy cannot be a universal solution for Black Liberation, it is still a necessary tactic in advancing the goal of Black Liberation and lessening Black suffering in the immediate.

The Movement for Black Lives 16 [The Movement for Black Lives, a collective of more than 50 organizations representing thousands of Black people from across the country, Platform of the Movement for Black Lives, https://policy.m4bl.org/platform/AK47]

Black humanity and dignity requires Black political will and power. Despite constant exploitation and perpetual oppression, Black people have bravely and brilliantly been the driving force pushing the U.S. towards the ideals it articulates but has never achieved. In recent years we have taken to the streets, launched massive campaigns, and impacted elections, but our elected leaders have failed to address the legitimate demands of our Movement. We can no longer wait. In response to the sustained and increasingly visible violence against Black communities in the U.S. and globally, a collective of more than 50 organizations representing thousands of Black people from across the country have come together with renewed energy and purpose to articulate a common vision and agenda. We are a collective that centers and is rooted in Black communities, but we recognize we have a shared struggle with all oppressed people; collective liberation will be a product of all of our work. We believe in elevating the experiences and leadership of the most marginalized Black people, including but not limited to those who are women, queer, trans, femmes, gender nonconforming, Muslim, formerly and currently incarcerated, cash poor and working class, disabled, undocumented, and immigrant. We are intentional about amplifying the particular experience of state and gendered violence that Black queer, trans, gender nonconforming, women and intersex people face. There can be no liberation for all Black people if we do not center and fight for those who have been marginalized. It is our hope that by working together to create and amplify a shared agenda, we can continue to move towards a world in which the full humanity and dignity of all people is recognized. While this platform is focused on domestic policies, we know that patriarchy, exploitative capitalism, militarism, and white supremacy know no borders. We stand in solidarity with our international family against the ravages of global capitalism and anti-Black racism, human-made climate change, war, and exploitation. We also stand with descendants of African people all over the world in an ongoing call and struggle for reparations for the historic and continuing harms of colonialism and slavery. We also recognize and honor the rights and struggle of our Indigenous family for land and self-determination. We have created this platform to articulate and support the ambitions and work of Black people. We also seek to intervene in the current political climate and assert a clear vision, particularly for those who claim to be our allies, of the world we want them to help us create. We reject false solutions and believe we can achieve a complete transformation of the current systems, which place profit over people and make it impossible for many of us to breathe. Together, we demand an end to the wars against Black people. We demand that the government repair the harms that have been done to Black communities in the form of reparations and targeted long-term investments. We also demand a defunding of the systems and institutions that criminalize and cage us. This document articulates our vision of a fundamentally different world. However, we recognize the need to include policies that address the immediate suffering of Black people. These policies, while less transformational, are necessary to address the current material conditions of our people and will better equip us to win the world we demand and deserve.We recognize that not all of our collective needs and visions can be translated into policy, but we understand that policy change is one of many tactics necessary to move us towards the world we envision. We have come together now because we believe it is time to forge a new covenant. We are dreamers and doers and this platform is meant to articulate some of our vision. The links throughout the document provide the stepping-stones and roadmaps of how to get there. The policy briefs also elevate the brave and transformative work our people are already engaged in, and build on some of the best thinking in our history of struggle. This agenda continues the legacy of our ancestors who pushed for reparations, Black self-determination and community control; and also propels new iterations of movements such as efforts for reproductive justice, holistic healing and reconciliation, and ending violence against Black cis, queer, and trans people.

# More Standards

## Grassroots

### Legalism Good

#### EJ movement proves the capacity of legal change.

Carrie R. **Samphon 16**, So It ‘‘Became White Activists Fighting for Integration?’’ Community Organizations, Intersectional Identities, and Education Reform

Environmental justice (EJ) has become an important frame for understanding battles over environmental conditions and sacred sites on indigenous lands. **Native Americans have long been a part of the US environmental justice move- ment, and indigenous peoples have used EJ language and organizing themes in other countries and regions as well**. In the US, tribal groups participated in the First National People of Color Environmental Leadership Summit in 1991, and helped to shape the landmark Principles of Environmental Justice. **Many of those participants and other native groups went on to develop the US-based In- digenous Environmental Network, to expand the scope of support for the rights of indigenous peoples and the places they live worldwide**. **These movements are part of a global process of native, tribal, and aborigi- nal consciousness-raising over the past 20 years, replayed from Canada and New Zealand to Peru and Nigeria. Threats to indigenous peoples—their rights, lands, and cultures—have been a powerful catalyst to mobilization, as native communities aght against the companies, governments, policies, and other forces that threaten to fragment, displace, assimilate, or drive them toward cul- tural disintegration. In battles over environmental degradation, land rights, sa- cred sites, food security, climate change, local ecological knowledge and more, indigenous groups have embraced diverse notions of environmental justice.** This article argues that **the environmental justice struggles of indigenous peoples reveal a broad, integrated, and pluralistic discourse of justice—one that can incorporate a range of demands for equity, recognition, participation, and other capabilities into a concern for the basic functioning of nature, culture, and communities**. We focus on the ways **these movements conceptualize and articu- late justice.** We arst examine various discourses of justice that have emerged from, and been employed by, activists in the US movement for environmental justice. Next, we examine a capabilities-based approach to justice and explore how it addresses communities. We then offer two emblematic indigenous bat- tles from North and South America to illustrate the elements of justice articu- lated by the groups involved. One case from northern Arizona and another from southern Chile show how **indigenous environmental justice claims are embedded in broader struggles to preserve identity, community, and traditional ways of life.** These studies conarm that indigenous demands for environmental justice go beyond distributional equity to emphasize the defense and very func- tioning of indigenous communities—**their ability to continue and reproduce the traditions, practices, cosmologies, and the relationships with nature that tie native peoples to their ancestral lands.1 These cases illustrate the popular use of capabilities in indigenous movements, and the applicability of capabilities the- ory as a framework for comparative analysis.** Moreover, indigenous EJ alters im- portant elements of capabilities theory as articulated in practice, presenting in- triguing points of departure for theorists interested in rethinking its bases.

### Survival Strat

#### Equipping young Black youth with political skills is uniquely key to their survival.

**BYP 100 16 (** Black Youth Project 100, BYP100 is an activist member-based organization of Black 18-35 year olds, dedicated to creating justice and freedom for all Black people. The organization does this through building a collective focused on transformative leadership development, direct action organizing, advocacy and education using a Black queer feminist lens, **)**

A collective moment of trauma in the wake of a not- guilty verdict in the killing of Trayvon Martin’s pushed 100 young Black activists into creating what is now the Black Youth Project 100 (BYP100). We were agitated into existence. And **we continue to train, mobilize, and organize young Black people so that our world is transformed into what we believe it should be** -- free of police-state violence. While the Black community is not a monolith, common experiences of police brutality, abuse and racial profiling are widespread and deeply felt. We asked Black youth to share their stories of how they’ve been criminalized by the police through our #CriminalizedLives campaign. What we heard back was both devastating and unfortunately predictable. The Agenda to Keep us Safe emerges out of our stories, and serves as a cornerstone in BYP100’s long-term campaign to end the criminalization of Black youth. The times we live in call for a resurgence of national Black liberation organizing to transform the society in which we live. As an organization, we **approach this work through transformative leadership development, non- violent direct action organizing, political education, and public policy advocacy**. Given our collective experiences as activists, we are compelled to approach the work of Black liberation with strategic thinking and actions. **Public policy advocacy sits at the intersection of both**. The Agenda is the first of our broad initiatives to change public policy on national and local levels. **Organizing to achieve public policy change is one major aspect of our larger mission to create freedom and justice for all Black people**. Our aim is to **equip young people with a clear set of public policy goals to organize towards and win in their local communities. BYP100 works through a Black queer feminist lens -- meaning that we are radically inclusive and strive to move those of us who are marginalized (e.g. Black women, girls and LGBTQ folks) to the center**. Thus, the Agenda is meant for young people who want to approach civil rights, racial justice, LGBTQ rights, and women’s rights work differently. Further, the Agenda is not meant to advance politics of respectability -- we want ALL Black people to be able to live in their dignity. We invite you to join our growing collective of educators, parents, community organizers, professors, artists, workers and students to ensure that the ideas in the Agenda to Keep us Safe become reality. The criminalization of Black youth is a national shame, and in communities across the U.S., Black youth have lost faith in law enforcement agencies’ willingness to keep us safe. We envision a society where communities have the resources they need to be safe. Now is the time to hold police - who took an oath to serve and protect us – accountable for our safety. Black Youth Project 100 (BYP100) is dedicated to the long-term fight to end the criminalization of Black youth. We believe that **strategies to achieve this goal and ultimately transform our lives and communities require grassroots organizing and public policy advocacy at the local, state, and federal level.** Thus BYP100 wants **decision makers, elected officials, and law enforcement agencies to implement and enforce our Agenda to Keep Us Safe**. **The Agenda can be used by organizers and activists to identify problems affecting their communities. The Agenda provides some very clear and attainable reforms that would make significant strides towards our goal of creating an America where Black youth no longer have to live in fear of police and a racist criminal justice system. These policy recommendations can serve as the foundation for very effective campaigns to end the criminalization of Black youth in our nation**. BYP100 chapters in Chicago, Washington, D.C., New York City, and the Bay Area are engaged in local campaigns to advance the Agenda. **There is no established lobby for Black youth in America. We have to represent our interests and share our ideas about how to make our communities better with elected officials. The Agenda can be used to effectively to lobby decision makers and to advocate for laws that will make us more secure in our neighborhoods**. **The Agenda is a starting point in your research to identify problems and strategic solutions to those problems**. We have included additional resources and information from a host of organizations, think tanks, and government agencies that could be of further assistance in developing campaign.

### Solnit

#### This card is too good to give it one fixed tag. Depending on the debate and its use you should adjust it. There are many argumetns it makes from perfectionism bad, to incremental action good, no alternative to hope, there is even a perm like part at the bottom that makes the argument you can look at the horrors of the past while still trying to make progress in the future.

Solnit 16 (Rebecca, Master's degree in journalism from the University of California, Berkeley, Published March 15th 2016, “Hope in the Dark: Untold Histories, Wild Possibilities”, pg 137-142//nm)

This book was written for something—for the encouragement of activists who share some of my dreams and values. We are all activists in some way or another, because our actions (and inactions) have impact. And it was written against something—a defeatist, dismissive frame of mind that is far too widespread. We talk about politics as though they were a purely rational exercise in the world of deeds and powers, but how we view that world and act in it has its roots in identities and emotions. There is, in other words, an inner life to politics, and I wanted to get at it, to plant and to weed there. I went on the road from 2003 onward, talking about hope, change, civil society movements, and the power of stories. I met with joyous embrace of the ideas I was talking about from people who’d already arrived at their own versions of these ideas independently, and from people who wanted encouragement or alternative views. Often, I also encountered bitterness, defeatism, and sometimes rage. It was, at first, surprising that talking about hope made some people furious. Some had the sense that they were protectors of knowledge that might otherwise be lost, about injustices and wrongs and injuries, and they saw those as the stories that need to be told. I had a different sense, that we need stories that don’t gloss over the ugly damage out there but that don’t portray it as all there is either. The mainstream media don’t tell much about the dank underside of our institutions and the damage they do, but they won’t tell you much about populist insurrections, grassroots victories, or beautiful alternatives either. Both matter; because the former are so well attended to, I’ve taken the latter as my beat. The despairing were deeply attached to their despair, so much so I came to refer to my project as stealing the teddy bear of despair from the loving arms of the left. What did it give that particular sector of the left? It got them off the hook, for one thing. If the world is totally doomed no matter what, little or nothing is demanded of you in response. You can go be bitter and idle on your sofa if you’re already comfortable and safe. It was striking that the people with the most at stake were often the most hopeful. And that those who were active were often hopeful, though it may be the other way around: some of those who are hopeful are active. Yet the range of the hopeful extends beyond that, and you can find hope in surprising corners. Early in my hope tours, I gave a talk to a roomful of people of color in Washington State. Some had memories of the civil rights movement, some identified with their fellow Mexicans who’d risen up as the Zapatistas, and a small, elegant Asian woman about my age said, in a voice of bell-like clarity, “I think that is right. If I had not hoped, I would not have struggled. And if I had not struggled, I would not have survived Pol Pot.” It was a stunning statement, by a Cambodian immigrant whose hope must have been small and narrow at the time—just to survive. I am often amazed at the lack of bitterness on the part of many of those who have most right to it, though I’ve seen exhaustion, physical, emotional, and moral, among frontline activists. For the desperate, the alternative to hope—and the struggle to realize that hope—is death or privation or torture or a grim future or no future for their children. They are motivated. From afar I’ve watched the Coalition of Immokalee Workers, the mostly undocumented Haitian, Latino, and Mayan Indian immigrants who fought for farmworkers’ rights with panache, brilliance, and creativity for the last decade. Realizing they couldn’t extract a living wage from farmers, they went after the buyers and brought gigantic corporations—McDonald’s, Walmart, Burger King, Taco Bell, Whole Foods—into line with their fair-price terms for tomato pickers. Along the way they were cheerful, spirited, and hopeful. It seemed in part to be a cultural style. There’s a romantic idealism in Latin American politics, a sense of possibility for the world and heroic engagement for the self. It may come from recent memories of death squads and beautiful insurrections and from turbulent national histories, from a sense that everything can change suddenly, for the better or the worse. That it’s not a problem of the English language is evident in the beautiful spirit of many Black movements past and present, some of them faith-based, some of them energized by hip-hop. And then there were my people, middle-class white people. It was as though many of us didn’t know how to be this other kind of person, this person who could speak of big dreams, of high ideals, of deep emotions, as though something more small-scale and sarcastic was the reduced version of self that remained to us. I’ve had great visionary companions the past dozen years from many places and races, but I’ve met so many of my kind who are attached for various reasons to their limits and their misery. A friend born in the 1950s reminds me that his generation in their youth really expected a revolution—the old kind where people march with weapons and overthrow the government and establish a utopia—and were permanently disappointed that it hadn’t come to pass. When I was young, people still jestingly said, “After the revolution,” but the catchphrase came from the idea that regime change was how to change everything, and that nothing short of regime change mattered. Though everything had changed—not enough on many fronts, but tremendously. And everything matters. My friend’s different from many of his peers, and we talked about the more profound revolutions that had unfolded in our lifetimes, around race, gender, sexuality, food, economics, and so much more, the slow incremental victories that begin in the imagination and change the rules. But seeing those revolutions requires looking for something very different than armed cadres. It also requires being able to recognize the shades of gray between black and white or maybe to see the world in full color. Much has changed; much needs to change; being able to celebrate or at least recognize milestones and victories and keep working is what the times require of us. Instead, a lot of people seem to be looking for trouble, the trouble that reinforces their dismal worldview. Everything that’s not perfect is failed, disappointing, a betrayal. There’s idealism in there, but also unrealistic expectations, ones that cannot meet with anything but disappointment. Perfectionists often position themselves on the sidelines, from which they point out that nothing is good enough. The idea that something is flawed, doomed, fatally compromised, or just no good frequently arises from what I call naïve cynicism. It often comes out of less information and less responsibility for results than deeply engaged activists have. I’ve often seen, say, a landmark piece of climate legislation hailed as a victory and celebrated by people working hardest on the issue, but dismissed and disparaged by those who are doing little or nothing for the cause in question. They don’t actually know what work went into producing the legislation, what it will achieve, and what odds were overcome to get it. Criticizing it seems to be a way of reinforcing an identity, but that criticism is often vague and ill informed when it comes to the facts. And the question arises about that identity too: is it attached to losing? Nevertheless, such dismissive critiques are often presented as worldliness, as knowledge and experience, even when they draw from neither. The naively cynical measure a piece of legislation, a victory, a milestone not against the past or the limits of the possible but against their ideas of perfection, and as this book reminds you, perfection is a yardstick by which everything falls short. They may fear that celebrating anything means undermining the dissatisfaction that drives us—if dissatisfaction drives us rather than parks us in the parking lot of the disconsolate. The business of how we get from bad to good, from dying to surviving and maybe to thriving, isn’t their responsibility. The deeply engaged well know that the particular bit of legislation under discussion isn’t everything we hope for, doesn’t get us all the way there, and also know that it can be a step forward from which further steps can and must be taken, and that change is often made incrementally, not by a great leap from evil to pure goodness. Maybe an underlying problem is that despair isn’t even an ideological position but a habit and a reflex. I have found, during my adventures in squandering time on social media, that a lot of people respond to almost any achievement, positive development, or outright victory with “yes but.” Naysaying becomes a habit. Yes, this completely glorious thing had just happened, but the entity that achieved it had done something bad at another point in history. Yes, the anguish of this group was ended, but somewhere some other perhaps unrelated group was suffering hideously. It boiled down to: we can’t talk about good things until there are no more bad things. Which, given that the supply of bad things is inexhaustible, and more bad things are always arising, means that we can’t talk about good things at all. Ever. Sometimes it seemed to come out of a concern that we would abandon the unfinished work if we celebrated, a sense that victories or even joy and confidence are dangerous. That celebrating or just actively fomenting change is dangerous. The young activist Yotam Marom, who came of age as an activist at Occupy Wall Street, contemplated this state of affairs in the essay “Undoing the Politics of Powerlessness.” He wrote: Today, when I think about the politics of powerlessness, it feels clear as day to me that the source of all of it is fear. Fear of leaders, of the enemy, of the possibility of having to govern, of the stakes of winning and losing, of each other, of ourselves. And it’s all pretty understandable. We call each other out and push one another out of the movement, because we are desperate to cling to the little slivers of belonging we’ve found in the movement, and are full of scarcity — convinced that there isn’t enough of anything to go around (money, people, power, even love). We eat ourselves alive and attack our own leaders because we’ve been hurt and misled all our lives and can’t bear for it to happen again on our watch … And perhaps most importantly: Our tendency to make enemies of each other is driven by a deep fear of the real enemy, a paralyzing hopelessness about our possibilities of winning. After all, whether we admit it or not, we spend quite a lot of our time not believing we can really win. And if we’re not going to win, we might as well just be awesome instead. If we’re not going to win, we’re better off creating spaces that suit our cultural and political tastes, building relationships that validate our non-conformist aesthetic, surrendering the struggle over the future in exchange for a small island over which we can reign. How do we get back to the struggle over the future? I think you have to hope, and hope in this sense is not a prize or a gift, but something you earn through study, through resisting the ease of despair, and through digging tunnels, cutting windows, opening doors, or finding the people who do these things. They exist. “You gotta give them hope,” said Harvey Milk long ago, and then he did exactly that. I believe that you can talk about both the terrible things we should engage with and the losses behind us, as well as the wins and achievements that give us the confidence to endeavor to keep pursuing the possibilities. I write to give aid and comfort to people who feel overwhelmed by the defeatist perspective, to encourage people to stand up and participate, to look forward at what we can do and back at what we have done. This book was always for them. And if you’ve read this far, for you.

### AT Afro-Pessimism

#### Theorizing around the spectacles of slavery does nothing except cause emphatic responses. We need CONCERETE political stragies to navigate and power communities.

Lawrence Grandpre and Dayvon Love 14, The Black Book: Reflections From The Baltimore Grassroots, Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle, an organization designed by debaters.

Many of the narratives that are used to represent the horrors of slavery revolve around the spectacular horrors of beatings and whippings etc. This narrative and representational emphasis on the spectacular violence of enslavement, has the effect of obscuring the way that the everyday framework of suffering that is the structural position of the slave is a form of brutality in itself. There are day to day routines that constitute the violence of enslavement that are misunderstood as a footnote to the way we understand the oppression of enslaved people. When we focus on the spectacle of suffering, this has three major implications on how we organize ourselves. The first implication is that our bodies are marked as sites of empathy. Empathy is the way in which white people can identify with the suffering Black people face. We become objects of the white imagination. We become the wretched oppressed minority that needs white redemption in order to be liberated from our misery. What happens is that white people don’t actually identify with the suffering - instead 150they identify with what their own imaginations register as the suffering that they can know and observe. Empathy has the effect of making white people think that they can transcend the corporeal limitations of their bodies and locate themselves as being a part of Black suffering. One key element of the white imagination is that white people are convinced of their own indispensability to Black people’s struggle for freedom and therefore project all of their ideas and feelings onto Black bodies and Black issues. A concrete example of the way this effects organizing is through much of the language and framework from which the struggle for social justice is framed. Much of the left has established a canon of literature and ideas that are used in radical circles to qualify someone as sufficiently radical. If you are radical you must read Foucault, Derrida, Marx, De Beauvoir, Sartre, Agamben, and others. What all of these theorist have in common is that they place the notion of resisting power as central to the project of challenging oppression. You will hear many people of color taught that the objective of our work is to fight racism and global oppression. This emphasis crowds out and at times discourages the notion of building up independent institutions to develop the power necessary to protect ourselves from the oppression lodged at us by civil society. Many of us get so consumed in this discourse that we become obsessed with the idea of fighting racism abstractly, but spend very little time building the institutions needed to effectively empower ourselves and 151fight white supremacy. This all comes as a result of the way that white interpolation “re-presents” our bodies and our issues in ways that we internalize as our own. We need to reject white people’s framing of our issues and embrace our own indigenous thoughts about how we should move politically. White people frame us as needing their empathy and redress in order to achieve justice and then we often reproduce this discourse in our efforts at organizing. This discourse reinforces a narcissism in which we talk primarily about how to change the minds and hearts of white people, instead of focusing on how we can build independent institutions that we can use as a basis for protecting our interest. This doesn’t mean that we should not criticize and demand things from white society, but this should not be the prevailing framework for how we do our work. We need to focus on organizing our own power instead of focusing on the white left mantra of resisting power.

### AT Settler Colonialism

#### Indigenous bodies need grassroots strategies that engage in institutions.

Carrie R. **Samphon 16 (** Policy Researcher, So It ‘‘Became White Activists Fighting for Integration?’’ Community Organizations, Intersectional Identities, and Education Reform )

Most scholars research community engagement in education from a community organizing standpoint (Fabricant 2010; Gold et al. 2004; Oakes et al. 2006; Warren and Mapp 2011). For instance, Warren and Mapp (2011) associate community organizing in education with groups that ‘‘concentrate on building active participation and leadership at the ground level’’ (p. 7). These authors further explain that **‘‘the core work of organizing groups rests in building the capacity of community members to create institutional and policy change on their own behalf’’** (p. 7). Scholars also differentiate more grassroots community organizing from the work of relatively established community organizations, such as those that have national ties and dues paying members. This distinction is done with the caveat that **grassroots community organizing is aligned with self-advocacy and empowerment among local groups** (Warren and Mapp 2011). In other cases, however, studies highlight a broader approach, including various organizations (e.g., leadership, advocacy, community-based, foundations) that collaborate with targeted communities to achieve education reform (Rene ́e and McAlister 2011). Anyon (2014) refers to non-target based groups as ‘‘brokers’’ and ‘‘intermediaries’’ (p. 163). In fact, she calls on **these groups to use their ‘‘privilege status to provide spaces and opportunities for low-income urban residents to air grievances, discuss and strategize—most important—engage in contentious poli- tics’’** (p. 163). Still, some scholars such as Mart ́ınez and Quartz (2012) expand their analysis, researching bureaucratic ‘‘insiders’’ and local/national community ‘‘out- siders’’ who successfully worked toward education reform. Here, I use the term **community engagement as an umbrella term that recognizes grassroots organizing as well as the work among relatively established organizations within the broader community. There is plenty of empirical evidence to support effectiveness of organizing among beneficiaries of proposed education reforms (i.e., grassroots, ground level, etc.).** For instance, Fuentes (2012) found that African American parents successfully organized to challenge deficit-based perspectives of parent involvement and student expectations by **‘‘engaging with the community around issues that matter to them’’** (p. 646). Similarly, Stovall (2005) examined a small group of African American community organizers that developed and implemented successful programs aimed at increasing cultural relevancy and academic performance in schools. Attesting to its effectiveness, several Chicago schools implemented this programming to better address student so-called behavioral issues, particularly among Black children. Though scholarly consideration has been given to large organizations focused on organizing in local and regional communities such as Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) and Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) (Anyon 2014; Warren 2011), empirical research on ‘‘brokers’’ (described above) from a community engagement standpoint is still relatively sparse. However, numerous organizations at local, state, and national levels, including The League, often fall into this category (e.g., Teach for America, I Have Dream Foundation, Communities in Schools, Children’s Defense Fund, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People). Given these organizations’ substantial access to resources, large social and political networks, and experience with informing policy, the role of such organizations in education reform deserves more scholarly attention. Furthermore, expanding the scope of research on community engagement in education only adds to the already limited work in this area (Warren 2005), which some scholars deemed ‘‘under-researched’’ (Mediratta et al. 2008, p. 1). Finally, some of these organizations include individual members that are either from the targeted communities of education reform or who share an affinity (i.e., cultural, racial, etc.) with these communities. For instance, The League had a few Black members that were not necessarily targets of reform, but closely connected to the targeted community and played a large role in The League’s efforts. As such, differentiating community groups based on characteristics (i.e., demographic, geographic, financial, etc.) is sometimes complicated by the myriad of intersectional identities and experiences of individual members, which is a phenomenon that this study explores.

#### Indigenous mobilization key to make changes to squo.

**Lucero** **06**(Jose Antonio **,**Indigenous Political Voice and the Struggle for Recognition in Ecuador and Bolivia)

The strength of **indigenous mobilization has shaped development and political agendas in some striking ways**. Through these **mobilizations** and subsequent negotiations, CONAIE in Ecuador **obtained important spaces in the national political system**, gaining control of the Directorate of Bilingual Education (DINEIB), the indigenous development agency (CODENPE), the Office of Indigenous Health, and a central role in the World-Bank-supported Program for the Development of Indigenous and Afro-Ecuadorian Peoples (PRODEPINE). In Bolivia, four councils of bilingual education for Aymara, Guarani, Quechua, and “Multi-ethnic”Amazonian peoples as well as a Ministry of Peasant and Indigenous Affairs (with an indigenous vice- minister) are among the spaces which have been opened since the mid-1990s by intercultural reforms. **These state spaces have further institutionalized relationships between indigenous people and international donors including multilateral and state institutions** like the World Bank, the Inter-American Bank, DANIDA (Denmark), and DFID (U.K.) as well as international NGOs like Oxfam-America (U.S.) and IBIS (Denmark). **Electorally, indigenous people have also taken advantage of state reforms and changing political conditions to gain important representation on local and national elected office**. After a decade of refusing to take part in elections, in 1996 CONAIE allied with non-indigenous social movements and formed the Pachakutik Pluricultural Movement (MUPP), which has won between 6 and 10% of the national vote in elections since 1996. Several high profile Pachakutik mayors In recent years the long-neglected demands of the world’s indigenous peoples have garnered increased recognition. The United Nations Human Rights Council recently approved a Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which is still waiting to be approved by the General Assembly. Bolivia elected Evo Morales as its first indigenous president in 2005. Native American tribes in northern Arizona went to court and have so far successfully delayed the expansion of a ski resort on their sacred San Francisco Peaks. With the media coverage surrounding these and other events, “indigenous issues” are becoming more prominent topics of national and international discussion. But what exactly are “indigenous issues”? How can faculty members address these issues in an educational environment? **Educating about indigenous peoples is more than narrating past events of colonization and genocide.** It is discussing living communities, in the U.S. and throughout the globe, that have distinct cultures, languages, and forms of social and political organization. Whether organized as reservations, communities, or pueblos, **indigenous peoples demand a voice in national government and education**. Far from seeking full integration, **they insist on respect for their collective rights as a people, their continuing spiritual and cultural connections to ancestral lands, and their autonomy and self-determination. In response to their voices, educational institutions have a responsibility to properly inform the global community about the growing worldwide indigenous movement**. Higher education has begun to change in this direction. Many U.S. universities have established Native American and indigenous studies programs, and more indigenous students and faculty throughout the world are entering universities. Indigenous faculty and students do not often passively observe the indigenous issues covered in the classroom. Due to their strong personal connections to indigenous communities and issues, these faculty and students are transforming indigenous studies into a more socially active discipline. This social involvement is a hallmark of the Applied Indigenous Studies Program at Northern Arizona University where I teach. Social activism begins in the classroom, where it is first imperative to educate students about the continuing threats to indigenous people’s cultures, physical survival, and self-determination. Faculty members must then frame class discussions to encourage students to get involved and do something about those issues. This is where university studies in law, environmental science, or public health can improve conditions for indigenous communities through civic engagement.Students must consider the voices and writings of indigenous peoples themselves. If possible, students should have the opportunity to listen and speak respectfully with indigenous community leaders about their perspectives on their history and solutions to their current problems. By fostering these conversations, interaction with indigenous communities and organizations outside of the classroom can also be a source of positive change.As an instructor, I apply a model of classroom learning and activism. In the classroom, I emphasize how laws and policies have affected indigenous peoples in the past and present. I also argue that indigenous traditional knowledge and culture, combined with mainstream education, can help revitalize indigenous nations economically and politically.I also use a comparative approach to help my students understand indigenous cultures in the U.S. Using real-life examples taken from my human rights legal work in Central America, I help my students, many of whom come from Native American reservation communities, relate the experiences of indigenous peoples in Central America to their own contexts. I then encourage them to formulate solutions to the problems they and other indigenous peoples face as they try to protect their own cultures, territories, or sacred sites. Indigenous studies must combine classroom theory with activism. Education can become a tool to further the aims of community and tribal economic self-sufficiency, sustainable development, and self-determination.

## More – Black Policymaking

### Black Institutions

#### Black public spheres need a new awakening – face to face interactions and community level organizing has historically provided tools to transform material reality in America

Dawson 15 (Michael C., John D. MacArthur Distinguished Service Professor of Poly Sci @ U Chicago, “Blacks In and Out of the Left” pp. 198-199) RR Jr

2. The black public sphere, what I have called the black counterpublic, must be rebuilt from the bottom up, and quickly. We need to learn from some of the more technologically innovative forces within the progressive movement to use technology as a way to help people in neighborhoods meet and talk face-to-face, have these smaller groups link to each other’s discussion, and give people at the local level an online set of tools to help them organize themselves. The black public sphere has historically been central to the multiple social movements that have emerged out of black civil society, movements that in turn transformed America for the better. The black public sphere, as King and many others have said, has also been the site of trenchant, effective and influential critiques of democracy in America, as well as the instrument through which African Americans have been able, sometimes effectively, to influence political debate within the country as a whole. That is why it must be rebuilt.

### Discussion Good

#### Discussing the process of achieving reforms is valuable – we know that we’ll never be allowed to occupy positions of federal legislative power but creating movements from our subject position is valuable

Alexander 10 (Michelle Alexander, associate professor of law at Ohio State University, a civil rights advocate and a writer. “New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness” ProQuest ebrary, pp. 213-215) RR Jr

A bit of civil rights history may be helpful here. Civil rights advocacy has not always looked the way it does today. Throughout most of our nation’s history— from the days of the abolitionist movement through the Civil Rights Movement— racial justice advocacy has generally revolved around grassroots organizing and the strategic mobilization of public opinion. In recent years, however, a bit of mythology has sprung up regarding the centrality of litigation to racial justice struggles. The success of the brilliant legal crusade that led to Brown v. Board of Education has created a widespread perception that civil rights lawyers are the most important players in racial justice advocacy. This image was enhanced following the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1965, when civil rights lawyers became embroiled in highly visible and controversial efforts to end hiring discrimination, create affirmative action plans, and enforce school desegregation orders. As public attention shifted from the streets to the courtroom, the extraordinary grassroots movement that made civil rights legislation possible faded from public view. The lawyers took over. With all deliberate speed, civil rights organizations became “professionalized” and increasingly disconnected from the communities they claimed to represent. Legal scholar and former NAACP Legal Defense Fund lawyer Derrick Bell was among the first to critique this phenomenon, arguing in a 1976 Yale Law Journal article that civil rights lawyers were pursuing their own agendas in school desegregation cases even when they conflicted with their clients’ expressed desires. 3 Two decades later, former NAACP Legal Defense Fund lawyer and current Harvard Law School professor Lani Guinier published a memoir in which she acknowledged that, “by the early 1990s, [civil rights] litigators like me had become like the Washington insiders we were so suspicious of. . . . We reflexively distanced ourselves from the very people on whose behalf we brought the cases in the first place.” 4 This shift, she noted, had profound consequences for the future of racial justice advocacy; in fact, it was ~~debilitating~~ to the movement. Instead of a moral crusade, the movement became an almost purely legal crusade. Civil rights advocates pursued their own agendas as unelected representatives of communities defined by race and displayed considerable skill navigating courtrooms and halls of power across America. The law became what the lawyers and lobbyists said it was, with little or no input from the people whose fate hung in the balance. Guinier continued: In charge, we channeled a passion for change into legal negotiations and lawsuits. We defined the issues in terms of developing legal doctrine and establishing legal precedent; our clients became important, but secondary, players in a formal arena that required lawyers to translate lay claims into technical speech. We then disembodied plaintiffs’ claims in judicially manageable or judicially enforceable terms, unenforceable without more lawyers. Simultaneously, the movement’s center of gravity shifted to Washington, D.C. As lawyers and national pundits became more prominent than clients and citizens, we isolated ourselves from the people who were our anchor and on whose behalf we had labored. We not only left people behind; of the movement itself. 5 Not surprisingly, as civil rights advocates converted a grassroots movement into a legal campaign, and as civil rights leaders became political insiders, many civil rights organizations became top-heavy with lawyers. This development enhanced their ability to wage legal battles but impeded their ability to acknowledge or respond to the emergence of a new caste system. Lawyers have a tendency to identify and concentrate on problems they know how to solve— i.e., problems that can be solved through litigation. The mass incarceration of people of color is not that kind of problem. Widespread preoccupation with litigation, however, is not the only— or even the main— reason civil rights groups have shied away from challenging the new caste system. Challenging mass incarceration requires something civil rights advocates have long been reluctant to do: advocacy on behalf of criminals. Even at the height of Jim Crow segregation— when black men were more likely to be lynched than to receive a fair trial in the South— NAACP lawyers were reluctant to advocate on behalf of blacks accused of crimes unless the lawyers were convinced of the men’s innocence. 6 The major exception was anti– death penalty advocacy. Over the years, civil rights lawyers have made heroic efforts to save the lives of condemned criminals. But outside of the death penalty arena, civil rights advocates have long been reluctant to leap to the defense of accused criminals. Advocates have found they are most successful when they draw attention to certain types of black people (those who are easily understood by mainstream whites as “good” and “respectable”) and tell certain types of stories about them. Since the days when abolitionists struggled to eradicate slavery, racial justice advocates have gone to great lengths to identify black people who defy racial stereotypes, and they have exercised considerable message discipline, telling only those stories of racial injustice that will evoke sympathy among whites.

#### Discussing a non-traditional approach to reforms is valuable insofar as it invites dialogue and fosters critical consciousness among black communities which invite social movements

Alexander 10 (Michelle Alexander, associate professor of law at Ohio State University, a civil rights advocate and a writer. “New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness” ProQuest ebrary, pp. 211-213) RR Jr

The recent decisions by some state legislatures, most notably New York’s, to repeal or reduce mandatory drug sentencing laws have led some to believe that the system of racial control described in this book is already fading away. Such a conclusion, I believe, is a serious mistake. Many of the states that have reconsidered their harsh sentencing schemes have done so not out of concern for the lives and families that have been destroyed by these laws or the racial dimensions of the drug war, but out of concern for bursting state budgets in a time of economic recession. In other words, the racial ideology that gave rise to these laws remains largely undisturbed. Changing economic conditions or rising crime rates could easily result in a reversal of fortunes for those who commit drug crimes, particularly if the drug criminals are perceived to be black and brown. Equally important to understand is this: Merely reducing sentence length, by itself, does not disturb the basic architecture of the New Jim Crow. So long as large numbers of African Americans continue to be arrested and labeled drug criminals, they will continue to be relegated to a permanent second-class status upon their release, no matter how much (or how little) time they spend behind bars. The system of mass incarceration is based on the prison label, not prison time. Skepticism about the claims made here is warranted. There are important differences, to be sure, among mass incarceration, Jim Crow, and slavery— the three major racialized systems of control adopted in the United States to date. Failure to acknowledge the relevant differences, as well as their implications, would be a disservice to racial justice discourse. Many of the differences are not as dramatic as they initially appear, however; others serve to illustrate the ways in which systems of racialized social control have managed to morph, evolve, and adapt to changes in the political, social, and legal context over time. Ultimately, I believe that the similarities between these systems of control overwhelm the differences and that mass incarceration, like its predecessors, has been largely immunized from legal challenge. If this claim is substantially correct, the implications for racial justice advocacy are profound. With the benefit of hindsight, surely we can see that piecemeal policy reform or litigation alone would have been a futile approach to dismantling Jim Crow segregation. While those strategies certainly had their place, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the concomitant cultural shift would never have occurred without the cultivation of a critical political consciousness in the African American community and the widespread, strategic activism that flowed from it. Likewise, the notion that the New Jim Crow can ever be dismantled through traditional litigation and policy-reform strategies that are wholly disconnected from a major social movement seems fundamentally misguided. Such a movement is impossible, though, if those most committed to abolishing racial hierarchy continue to talk and behave as if a state-sponsored racial caste system no longer exists. If we continue to tell ourselves the popular myths about racial progress or, worse yet, if we say to ourselves that the problem of mass incarceration is just too big, too daunting for us to do anything about and that we should instead direct our energies to battles that might be more easily won, history will judge us harshly. A human rights nightmare is occurring on our watch. A new social consensus must be forged about race and the role of race in defining the basic structure of our society, if we hope ever to abolish the New Jim Crow. This new consensus must begin with dialogue, a conversation that fosters a critical consciousness, a key prerequisite to effective social action. This book is an attempt to ensure that the conversation does not end with nervous laughter.

### Movement for Black Lives

#### The Movement for Black lives proves Black radicalism can center around agenda setting policy work

The Movement for Black Lives 16 [The Movement for Black Lives, a collective of more than 50 organizations representing thousands of Black people from across the country, Platform of the Movement for Black Lives, https://policy.m4bl.org/platform/AK47]

Black humanity and dignity requires Black political will and power. Despite constant exploitation and perpetual oppression, Black people have bravely and brilliantly been the driving force pushing the U.S. towards the ideals it articulates but has never achieved. In recent years we have taken to the streets, launched massive campaigns, and impacted elections, but our elected leaders have failed to address the legitimate demands of our Movement. We can no longer wait. In response to the sustained and increasingly visible violence against Black communities in the U.S. and globally, a collective of more than 50 organizations representing thousands of Black people from across the country have come together with renewed energy and purpose to articulate a common vision and agenda. We are a collective that centers and is rooted in Black communities, but we recognize we have a shared struggle with all oppressed people; collective liberation will be a product of all of our work. We believe in elevating the experiences and leadership of the most marginalized Black people, including but not limited to those who are women, queer, trans, femmes, gender nonconforming, Muslim, formerly and currently incarcerated, cash poor and working class, disabled, undocumented, and immigrant. We are intentional about amplifying the particular experience of state and gendered violence that Black queer, trans, gender nonconforming, women and intersex people face. There can be no liberation for all Black people if we do not center and fight for those who have been marginalized. It is our hope that by working together to create and amplify a shared agenda, we can continue to move towards a world in which the full humanity and dignity of all people is recognized. While this platform is focused on domestic policies, we know that patriarchy, exploitative capitalism, militarism, and white supremacy know no borders. We stand in solidarity with our international family against the ravages of global capitalism and anti-Black racism, human-made climate change, war, and exploitation. We also stand with descendants of African people all over the world in an ongoing call and struggle for reparations for the historic and continuing harms of colonialism and slavery. We also recognize and honor the rights and struggle of our Indigenous family for land and self-determination. We have created this platform to articulate and support the ambitions and work of Black people. We also seek to intervene in the current political climate and assert a clear vision, particularly for those who claim to be our allies, of the world we want them to help us create. We reject false solutions and believe we can achieve a complete transformation of the current systems, which place profit over people and make it impossible for many of us to breathe. Together, we demand an end to the wars against Black people. We demand that the government repair the harms that have been done to Black communities in the form of reparations and targeted long-term investments. We also demand a defunding of the systems and institutions that criminalize and cage us. This document articulates our vision of a fundamentally different world. However, we recognize the need to include policies that address the immediate suffering of Black people. These policies, while less transformational, are necessary to address the current material conditions of our people and will better equip us to win the world we demand and deserve.We recognize that not all of our collective needs and visions can be translated into policy, but we understand that policy change is one of many tactics necessary to move us towards the world we envision. We have come together now because we believe it is time to forge a new covenant. We are dreamers and doers and this platform is meant to articulate some of our vision. The links throughout the document provide the stepping-stones and roadmaps of how to get there. The policy briefs also elevate the brave and transformative work our people are already engaged in, and build on some of the best thinking in our history of struggle. This agenda continues the legacy of our ancestors who pushed for reparations, Black self-determination and community control; and also propels new iterations of movements such as efforts for reproductive justice, holistic healing and reconciliation, and ending violence against Black cis, queer, and trans people.

#### BLM Proves the necessity of engaging policy at every level of the State

Movement for Black Lives 2016 ( About Us https://policy.m4bl.org/about/)

In response to the sustained and increasingly visible violence against Black communities in the U.S. and globally, a collective of more than 50 organizations representing thousands of Black people from across the country have come together with renewed energy and purpose to articulate a common vision and agenda. Our resistance and rebellion are not new, but like other times in history have come to a critical mass, and the bravery of those in Ferguson and across the country captured the attention of the world. A year ago, over 2,000 of us gathered in Cleveland to reflect on the state of our movement for liberation and celebrate our people, both those who have fallen and those who have survived. It was there that we began the process of uniting to articulate a shared vision of the world we want to live in. Cleveland reaffirmed what we already knew. Neither our grievances nor our solutions are limited to the police killing of our people. State violence takes many forms – it includes the systemic underinvestment in our communities, the caging of our people, predatory state and corporate practices targeting our neighborhoods, government policies that result in the poisoning of our water and the theft of our land, failing schools that criminalize rather than educate our children, economic practices that extract our labor, and wars on our Trans and Queer family that deny them their humanity. On the last day of the conference hundreds gathered to have strategy conversations about what liberation would look like and the policies, organizing and resources that would be needed to get us there. During those conversations we received a mandate – it was time to articulate our vision and unite behind it. In response to this mandate, the Movement for Black Lives Policy Table engaged in a year long process of convening local and national groups to create a United Front. The result of our collective efforts is this platform. In addition to the groups in the United Front, we have also engaged our people. We have received feedback from hundreds of people through surveys, national calls, organizational membership, engaged dozens of other organizations, researchers, and other individuals for their insights and expertise to begin developing a framework for shared policy priorities. It does not include every policy Black people should be working on, but elevates those for which there was shared energy and action in this political moment. What Is This? Our hope is that this is both an articulation of our collective aspirations as well as a document that provides tangible resources for groups and individuals doing the work. We recognize that some of the demands in this document will not happen today. But we also recognize that they are necessary for our liberation. For each of the 30+ policies in the document, we have policy briefs that describe the steps that must be taken to get us closer to our liberation. These briefs include information about whether legislation can happen at the local, state or federal level, information about groups already working on related projects, and resources including model legislation and talking points. Why a Platform? We want this platform to be both a visionary agenda for our people and a resource for us. We take as a departure point the reality that by every metric – from the hue of its prison population to its investment choices – the U.S. is a country that does not support, protect or preserve Black life. And so we seek not reform but transformation. As this platform launches in the context of the Democratic National Convention, we also recognize that neither mainstream political party has our interests at heart. We know all too well that the reforms that have passed at the local and state level do not address the root causes of the killing, dehumanization, and torture of our people. Instead, many increase police budgets and diagnosis the problem as one of “implicit bias” or “bad apples.” At best these are band aids on gaping bullet wounds, and at worse they are interventions that simply increase corporate and state power and make it easier for the state to devalue and destroy our communities. Our history has taught us that we must create our own agenda, we must implement it, and we must hold elected leaders accountable to following through. In a long tradition of Black covenants for Freedom, from the African National Congress Freedom Charter to the Black RadicalFreedom Agenda, we offer this document as an articulation of our aspirations in this moment. We are Black people from all walks of life – young, elder, queer, cis, trans, differently abled. We have come together in the rich tradition of our ancestors to imagine new ways forward for our liberation. We are dreamers and doers knowing that our work draws on the best of our history but must go beyond it to forge a fierce, free and beautiful future together that we can only imagine into reality.

### No Trade Off

#### Contingent legal change is necessary and doesn’t trade off with revolutionary resistance

Newton 80 [Huey, Co-founder of the Black Panther Party for Self-Defense, WAR AGAINST THE PANTHERS: A STUDY OF REPRESSION IN AMERICA,[libcom.org/files/WATP.pdf](http://libcom.org/files/WATP.pdf)

Use of Democratic Reforms by the Party to Build Community Institutions ThePanthers, despite their explicit repudiation of democratic capitalism as a system that was inherently incapable of permitting Black and poor people from enjoying full and equal participation in it, did not eschew democratic means of reform, nor did they discourage Black capitalism. To thecontrary, from its very inception, the Party utilized existing legal machinery in order to bring about social change and encouraged indigenous Black financial enterprises. In addition to the legal police patrols already mentioned, the Party frequently filed civil law suits seeking relief for its members, w and Black and poor people generally, from various injustices.18 ThePanthers also turned to the ballot box, first by running members for mayor and city council in Oakland in 1972 and 1974, and comings surprisingly close to victory. In 1976, Party involvement was admittedly credited by two successful Black candidates for their elections, to the offices of Mayor of Oakland and Supervisor of Alameda County, the first two Black persons to be elected to these positions in Oakland's history, despite a sizeable Black population that had resided there since World War II.19 Moreover, the Party incorporated some of its main survival programs such as its Intercommunal Youth Institute and Seniors Against a Fearful Environment (SAFE). The Youth Institute, a school for more than one hundred Party and other children from the first through the eighth grades, was incorporated as the Educational Opportunities Corporation.20 SAFE was an escort and busing program in which young Blacks took seniors out into the community—a combination of Black and gray power that to some extent provides both groups what they need and desire—people power. 21 The device of incorporation allowed both survival programs to avail themselves of tax-deductible contributions and some limited government benefits. The Party also advocated growth of indigenous community businesses, even though they were capitalistic. This is because the Party recognized that Black capitalism has come to mean to many people Black control of another one of the institutions in t thee community. This positive quality of Black capitalism should, the Party felt, be encouraged. Since the people see Black capitalism in the community as Black control of local institutions, this is a positive characteristic because the people can bring more direction and focus to the activities of the capitalist. At the same time, the Black capitalist who has the interest of the community at heart will respond to the needs of the people because this is where his true strength lies. So far as capital [in] general is concerned, the black capitalist merely has the status of a victim because the big capitalists have the skills, make the loans„ and in fact control the Black capitalist. If he wants to succeed in his enterprise, the Black capitalist must turn to the community because he depends on them to make his profits. He needs this strong community support because he cannot become independent of the control of the corporate capitalists who control the large monopolies. The Black capitalist will be able to support the people by contributing to the survival programs of the Black Panther Party. In contributing to such programs he will be able to help build the vehicle which will eventually liberate the Black community. He will not be able to deliver the people from their problems, but he will be able to help build the strong political machine which will serve as a revolutionary vanguard and guide the people in their move toward freedom.22 A practical application of the Party's view toward Black capitalism and the use of legal means of reformoccurred in Oakland, California, in 1971. A group of small Black-owned retail liquor stores and taverns asked the BPP for support in a boycott against Mayfair Supermarkets because Mayfair purchased alcoholic beverages from companies that excluded Black truck drivers. The BPP joined in the boycott, and within a period of days, Mayfair ended its discriminatory practices. The Party then asked the group of Black businessmen who had solicited Party help to make a nominal continuing contribution to one or more survival programs. The businessmen, who had approached the Party initially through an organization called the California State Package Store and Tavern Owners Association (Cal-Pak), declined to contribute except via a single gift. The Party rejected Cal-Pak's offer, stating, . . . a continuing trickle of support is more important to the community than a large, once-only hush mouth gift. We will not be paid off; we will not be quiet. We will not go away. . . Why should the Black community nourish a Black profiteer who has no concern for his brother?23 It was considered important tothe Party's concept of building community institutions that contributions from the Black businesses not only be continuing, but that they come from the association representing them. This would, in the Party's view, constitute participation through a united front and build Cal-Pak as a community institution along with the survival programs. Since the Party had been asked for assistance in the Mayfair boycott by representatives of Cal-Pak, it also followed logically that Cal-Pak should support the survival programs. When Cal-Pak refused, the Party called for a boycott of the liquor stores of the president of Cal-Pak, Bill Boyette, and picketed the two liquor stores he owned. Five months later, Cal-Pak and the Party reached an agreement. Congressman Ronald Dellums, who helped negotiate the settlement, announced at a press conference in January 1972 that: . . . an agreement has been reached of great importance to all of the people in the Bay Area and, in particular, the Black population of this area. This agreement, between the Black Panther Party and the Ad Hoc Committee for Promotion of Black Business, officially ends the boycott of Boyette's Liquor Stores by the Black Panther Party. . . The United Fund of the Bay Area, Inc., sponsored and created by the Ad Hoc Committee for the Promotion of Black Business and the Cal-Pak Liquor Dealers, has already begun the task of collecting funds from Black businesses and individuals for programs of special need in the Black community. Operating as a nonprofit social vehicle for the Black community, this new organization will make disbursements to various significant organizations in the Black community on a regular and continuing basis. Among the programs that will benefit are the survival programs of the Black Panther Party.24 This willingness by the Party to usedemocratic means of reform and to support Black capitalism was criticized by someas inconsistent with the Panther ideology of revolutionary intercommunalism. This is partly because progressive people *quite correctly observe* that "It is very clear, upon reflection, what function law serves within any culture. It protects the culture's ideology. Under capitalism it protects property, the men who own it and guard it."25 From this observation, it is only a brief inferential step to the conclusion that, because law is a product and perpetuator of corporate interests in this country, it cannot be a force for significant socioeconomic change. But while this conclusion is logical in a mechanistic-sense, it is illogical, and therefore wrong, in a dialectical sense: According to the materialist conception of history, theultimately determining element in history is the production and reproduction of real life... [I]f somebody twists this into saying that the economic element is the only determining one, he transforms that proposition into a meaningless, abstract, senseless phrase. The economic situation is basis, but the various elements of the super-structure: political forms of the class struggle . . . constitutions established by the victorious class . . . judicial forms, had even the reflexes of all these actualstruggles in the brains of the participants . . . also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their form.26 In sum, the Panthers combined a unique blend of elements that set them apart from traditional civil rights and minorityorganizations: a revolutionary ideology that argued for the necessity of fundamental socioeconomic change, a practical series of survival programs that served the community and fostered institutional growth and consciousness, and a willingness to employ creative legal means within the democratic system to achieve their ends. It was these unique elements that made the Panthers popular with many Blacks and, at the same time, a nemesis to the federal government.

### AT Call-Outs/Referendum

#### Engaging in material strategies to resolve Call Out oppressive behavior is the only way to account for the constant shift of violence

Ahmad 15 – (Asam, multidisciplinary writer & Co-founder of “Its Get Fatter Project” a body-positivity project by QTPOC for all people of color, “A Note on Call-out Culture”, <https://briarpatchmagazine.com/articles/view/a-note-on-call-out-culture> , 7/16/17, SL)

Call-out culture refers to the tendency among progressives, radicals, activists, and community organizers to **publicly** name instances or patterns of oppressive behaviour and language use by others. People can be called out for statements and actions that are sexist, racist, ableist, and the list goes on. Because call-outs tend to be public, they can enable a particularly armchair and academic brand of activism: one in which the act of calling out is seen **as an end in itself**. What makes call-out culture so toxic is not necessarily its frequency so much as the nature and performance of the call-out itself. Especially in online venues like Twitter and Facebook, calling someone out **isn’t just a private interaction** between two individuals: it’s a **public performance** where people can demonstrate their wit or how pure their politics are. Indeed, sometimes it can feel like the performance itself is more significant than the content of the call-out. This is why “calling in” has been proposed as an alternative to calling out: calling in means speaking **privately with an individual** who has done some wrong, in order to address the behaviour without making a spectacle of the address itself. In the context of call-out culture, it is easy to forget that the individual we are calling out is a human being, and that different human beings in different social locations will be receptive to different strategies for learning and growing. For instance, most call-outs I have witnessed immediately render anyone who has committed a perceived wrong **as an outsider** to the community. One action becomes a reason to pass judgment on someone’s entire being, as if there is no difference between a community member or friend and a random stranger walking down the street (who is of course also someone’s friend). Call-out culture can end up mirroring what the prison industrial complex teaches us about crime and punishment: to banish and dispose of individuals rather than to **engage with them** as people with complicated stories and histories. It isn’t an exaggeration to say that there is a mild totalitarian undercurrent not just in call-out culture but also in how progressive communities police and define the bounds of **who’s in and who’s out**. More often than not, this boundary is constructed through the use of appropriate language and terminology – a language and terminology that are forever shifting and **almost impossible** to keep up with. In such a context, it is impossible not to fail at least some of the time. And what happens when someone has mastered proficiency in languages of accountability and then learned to justify all of their actions by falling back on that language? How do we hold people to account who are experts at using anti-oppressive language to justify oppressive behaviour? We don’t have a word to describe this kind of perverse exercise of power, despite the fact that it occurs on an almost daily basis in progressive circles. Perhaps we could call it anti-oppressivism. Humour often plays a role in call-out culture and by drawing attention to this I am not saying that wit has no place in undermining oppression; humour can be one of the most useful tools available to oppressed people. But when people are reduced to their identities of privilege (as white, cisgender, male, etc.) and mocked as such, it means we’re treating each other as if our individual social locations stand in for the total systems those parts of our identities represent. Individuals become synonymous with systems of oppression, and this can turn systemic analysis into moral judgment. Too often, when it comes to being called out, narrow definitions of a person’s identity count for everything. No matter the wrong we are naming, there are ways to call people out that do not reduce individuals to agents of social advantage. There are ways of calling people out that are compassionate and creative, and that recognize the whole individual instead of viewing them simply as representations of the systems from which they benefit. Paying attention to these other contexts will mean refusing to unleash all of our very real trauma onto the psyches of those we imagine to only represent the systems that oppress us. Given the nature of online social networks, call-outs are not going away any time soon. But reminding ourselves of what a call-out is meant to accomplish will go a long way toward creating the **kinds of substantial, material changes in people’s behaviour** – and in community dynamics – that we envision and need.

# Relevant Framework Classics

### Citizen Engagement DA (Good Against Neolib)

#### Citizen engagement is the key to challenging bad education policy – equipping students with the tools to be critical of policy is the only way to put pressure on decision makers

Winton ‘10, (Sue, “Democracy in Education Through Community-Based Policy Dialogues,” Canadian Journal of Educational Administration and Policy, Issue #114, December 2, 2010, pp. 72-74)

Citizen engagement in education policy can help challenge political spectacles and other undemocratic aspects of education policy. Engagement can occur in many ways. Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, and Delli Carpini (2006) and Putnam (2000) distinguished between civic engagement and political engagement. Zukin et al. (2006) defined civic engagement as “participation aimed at the public good…usually through direct hands-on work in cooperation with others” (p. 51). Political engagement, on the other hand, refers to citizens‟ efforts to influence selection of public officials or government policy, usually through voting (Zukin et al., 2006). These two engagements overlap and together make up two types of public engagement. Two other kinds of public engagement are cognitive engagement and public voice. Cognitive engagement involves “paying attention to politics and public affairs” (Zukin et al., 2006, p. 54). Public voice includes activities citizens engage in to give public expression to their views on public issues (Zukin et al., 2006). Examples of public voice include signing petitions, contacting an elected official, writing letters to the editor or in political blogs. Thus, there is an effort to make one‟s views known publicly. A notable absence in Zukin et al.‟s (2006) concept of public voice is dialogue between ordinary citizens. Indeed, citizens‟ talk about public issues with other citizens is absent in all four components of their conception of public engagement. Grönlund, Strandberg, and Himmelroos (2009) did recognize talk as a kind of public participation and called it discursive participation. Zukin et al. (2006) suggested that the concepts of civic engagement, political engagement, public voice, and cognitive engagement are interrelated but distinct. An important difference between their conceptions of civic engagement and cognitive engagement is civic engagement’s emphasis on behaviour and cognitive engagement’s focus on attention. In their review of the concept of student engagement, Fredricks, Blumenfeld, and Paris (2004) argued that engagement is a meta-concept made up of three others: behavioural, cognitive, and emotional engagement. Cognitive engagement involves “thoughtfulness and willingness to exert the effort necessary to comprehend complex ideas and master difficult skills” (Fredricks et al., 2004, p. 60), whereas behavioural engagement involves taking some action. Thus, like Zukin et al. (2006), Fredricks et al. (2004) differentiated between behavioural and cognitive components of engagement, although they considered them part of the „meta‟ construct of engagement. Unlike Zukin et al. (2006), Fredricks et al. (2004) recognized emotional engagement as a component of engagement. Emotional engagement refers to positive or negative feelings and reactions. These reactions are assumed to influence an individual’s willingness to invest himself/herself in a school and its work. This study draws from Zukin et al. (2006), Fredricks, et al. (2004), and Grönlund et al. (2009) and views engagement as involving behavioural, emotional, and cognitive components. Behavioural engagement here includes political and civic engagement as well as discursive participation. Indeed, I am particularly interested in the effects of discursive participation in policy dialogues on other aspects of participants’ behavioural engagement, as well as cognitive and emotional engagement with education policy. Policy dialogues between ordinary citizens have the potential to strengthen democracy in education. Research on policy deliberations finds that through engaging in dialogue participants hear alternate narratives and are introduced to a variety of perspectives (Delli Carpini, Cook, & Jacobs, 2004). Davies et al. (2009) reported similar findings from policy dialogues not intended to inform policy directly. Further, a positive experience in public deliberation inspires future involvement (Levine, Fung, & Gastil, 2005). Additional benefits of public deliberation include public-seeing, political judgement, empathy, imagination, understanding, and affection between citizens (Barber, 2003). Citizens who are knowledgeable about policy issues may raise questions about policy decisions and practices (Smith et al., 2004). They may join others with similar interests and concerns and apply pressure on decision-makers through direct action or policy texts. Ideas or texts may prompt responses that may not have otherwise occurred. Participating in policy dialogues may also affect participants‟ views of themselves as policy actors by introducing them to actions that others have taken at the local level and giving them ideas about what is possible by ordinary citizens. A belief in the potential of policy dialogues to indirectly impact education policy at the provincial level as well as their potential to promote action at the local level grounded the SATC policy dialogues organized by People for Education. This initiative and its impact on participants‟ engagement with education policy are discussed below.

#### **Only conversation about educational reform gets at the root cause of structures of power**

Gerrard ‘13, Melbourne Graduate School of Education, The University of Melbourne (Jessica, “Class Analysis and the Emancipatory Potential of Education,” Volume 63, Issue 2, April 2013, Pages 185–202, Wiley Online Library)

In many ways, this focus on knowledge and identity exploration appears to offer a productive pathway for understanding how the cultural practice of education might contribute to challenging social injustices and oppression. For instance, it suggests that pedagogical encounters between teachers and students may provide a basis for creating dialogical cultures of emancipatory education. Undoubtedly, there is much value in insisting on pedagogical openness and in questioning “absolutist and ahistorical categories and values, sustained and propagated through the symbolic unifying power of grand narratives, by which ‘~~man~~ (person),’ ‘reason,’ ‘history’ and ‘culture’ were first projected in universalist European terms.”15 There is significant value in — and need for — interrogating taken-for-granted conceptualizations of social power that obfuscate or exclude the multiple operations of power, including gender, race, sexuality, disability, age, and so on. Correspondingly, Rancière's and others' insistence on interrogating the locus of authority is a useful reminder of the paternalistic tendencies of some enactments of emancipatory politics, and with this education. However, there is a danger that a narrow focus on openness and deconstruction and on classroom cultures of dialogue draws attention away from the need to engage with and name the material character — and effect — of social inequalities and oppression. There is an urgent need, as Slavoj Žižek argues, to reclaim radical dissent without slipping into relativist claims of authority and power, on the one hand, or liberal fantasies of the potential for democratic social power under capitalism, on the other.16 If we focus solely on the interactive dynamics of pedagogy as the primary site of radical education, we may overstate the possibilities for enacting social change through education and at the same time gloss over the very real possibilities for education to disturb neoliberal “common sense” through connecting classroom learning to analyses of, and challenges to, the social, cultural, and material inequalities of everyday life.17 What is particularly lost in the move away from normative definitions of power is recognition of the perpetual (though changing) patterns of social class. Foundationally groundless conceptions of emancipation have shifted focus from materialist understandings of social structure to everyday local sites of repression and agency.18 Class analysis, by definition, rests on a desire to understand the workings of discursive and material structures and, with this, normative conceptions of oppression and power. Moreover, while complexly intertwined with other oppressions, and remade anew under contemporary neoliberal economic, social, and cultural conditions, class remains a powerful foundation for social relations. Of course, there are many who remain firmly dedicated to Marxian analysis in critical pedagogy and, along with this, to an assertion of working-class action in education.19 These contributions help to counter powerful neoliberal norms of markets, “choice,” high-stakes standardized achievement, and competitive meritocracy. Nevertheless, there is an underlying tension in much of this work between the proclamation of — and urging for — emancipatory working-class education and the lived reality of working-class schooling.20 Feminists have long charged champions of critical pedagogy with neglecting to address the difficult roles it assigns to classroom teachers, leaving them unsupported in the complicated task of becoming “critical pedagogues” (a criticism that resonates with my own personal experience).21 More recently, others have suggested that critical pedagogy has become overly reliant on rhetoric, leaving it “stretched so much that what it actually signifies is nearly impossible to ascertain.”22 Awad Ibrahim goes so far as to say that the reliance on Marxism leads to a glossing over of difference and identity.23 Moreover, while clearly based upon considered analyses of class relations and social power, there is a danger that the fervent call for revolutionary pedagogy may romanticize radical working-class education. Ironically, it is the complex working-class relations to education, and with this the difficulty of mobilizing struggles for social change, that are in danger of being glossed over.24 There is a need, therefore, to understand better the intersections between the existing schooling experiences of working-class communities and the potential for a radical or emancipatory orientation in working-class education. It is with this in mind that I open a conversation between critical educational theory and the analyses of working-class relations to education in the sociology of education

### Clash - Poscher

#### A clear, well-defined resolution is critical to allow the neg to refute the aff in an in-depth fashion – this process of negation produces iterative testing and improvement, where we learn to improve our arguments based on our opponents’ arguments. This process does not proscribe particular styles or forms of argument, but does require a common point of disagreement around which arguments can be organized.

Ralf Poscher 16, director of the Institute for Staatswissenschaft & Philosophy of Law, Professor of Public Law and Legal Philosophy, “Why We Argue About the Law: An Agonistic Account of Legal Disagreement,” in *Metaphilosophy of Law*, ed. Gizbert-Studnicki, Dyrda, Banas, 2/19/16, SSRN

Hegel’s dialectical thinking powerfully exploits the idea of negation. It is a central feature of spirit and consciousness that they have the power to negate. The spirit “is this power only by looking the negative in the face and tarrying with it. This […] is the magical power that converts it into being.”102 The tarrying with the negative is part of what Hegel calls the “labour of the negative”103. In a loose reference to this Hegelian notion Gerald Postema points to yet another feature of disagreements as a necessary ingredient of the process of practical reasoning. Only if our reasoning is exposed to contrary arguments can we test its merits. We must go through the “labor of the negative” to have trust in our deliberative processes.104 This also holds where we seem to be in agreement. Agreement without exposure to disagreement can be deceptive in various ways. The first phenomenon Postema draws attention to is the group polarization effect. When a group of like‐minded people deliberates an issue, informational and reputational cascades produce more extreme views in the process of their deliberations.105 The polarization and biases that are well documented for such groups 106 can be countered at least in some settings by the inclusion of dissenting voices. In these scenarios, disagreement can be a cure for dysfunctional deliberative polarization and biases.107 A second deliberative dysfunction mitigated by disagreement is superficial agreement, which can even be manipulatively used in the sense of a “presumptuous ‘We’”108. Disagreement can help to police such distortions of deliberative processes by challenging superficial agreements. Disagreements may thus signal that a deliberative process is not contaminated with dysfunctional agreements stemming from polarization or superficiality. Protecting our discourse against such contaminations is valuable even if we do not come to terms. Each of the opposing positions will profit from the catharsis it received “by looking the negative in the face and tarrying with it”. These advantages of disagreement in collective deliberations are mirrored on the individual level. Even if the probability of reaching a consensus with our opponents is very low from the beginning, as might be the case in deeply entrenched conflicts, entering into an exchange of arguments can still serve to test and improve our position. We have to do the “labor of the negative” for ourselves. Even if we cannot come up with a line of argument that coheres well with everybody else’s beliefs, attitudes and dispositions, we can still come up with a line of argument that achieves this goal for our own personal beliefs, attitudes and dispositions. To provide ourselves with the most coherent system of our own beliefs, attitudes and dispositions is – at least in important issues – an aspect of personal integrity – to borrow one of Dworkin’s favorite expressions for a less aspirational idea. In hard cases we must – in some way – lay out the argument for ourselves to figure out what we believe to be the right answer. We might not know what we believe ourselves in questions of abortion, the death penalty, torture, and stem cell research, until we have developed a line of argument against the background of our subjective beliefs, attitudes and dispositions. In these cases it might be rational to discuss the issue with someone unlikely to share some of our more fundamental convictions or who opposes the view towards which we lean. This might even be the most helpful way of corroborating a view, because we know that our adversary is much more motivated to find a potential flaw in our argument than someone with whom we know we are in agreement. It might be more helpful to discuss a liberal position with Scalia than with Breyer if we want to make sure that we have not overlooked some counter‐argument to our case. It would be too narrow an understanding of our practice of legal disagreement and argumentation if we restricted its purpose to persuading an adversary in the case at hand and inferred from this narrow understanding the irrationality of argumentation in hard cases, in which we know beforehand that we will not be able to persuade. Rational argumentation is a much more complex practice in a more complex social framework. Argumentation with an adversary can have purposes beyond persuading him: to test one’s own convictions, to engage our opponent in inferential commitments and to persuade third parties are only some of these; to rally our troops or express our convictions might be others. To make our peace with Kant we could say that “there must be a hope of coming to terms” with someone though not necessarily with our opponent, but maybe only a third party or even just ourselves and not necessarily only on the issue at hand, but maybe through inferential commitments in a different arena. f) The Advantage Over Non‐Argumentative Alternatives It goes without saying that in real world legal disagreements, all of the reasons listed above usually play in concert and will typically hold true to different degrees relative to different participants in the debate: There will be some participants for whom our hope of coming to terms might still be justified and others for whom only some of the other reasons hold and some for whom it is a mixture of all of the reasons in shifting degrees as our disagreements evolve. It is also apparent that, with the exception of the first reason, the rationality of our disagreements is of a secondary nature. The rational does not lie in the discovery of a single right answer to the topic of debate, since in hard cases there are no single right answers. Instead, our disagreements are instrumental to rationales which lie beyond the topic at hand, like the exploration of our communalities or of our inferential commitments. Since these reasons are of this secondary nature, they must stand up to alternative ways of settling irreconcilable disagreements that have other secondary reasons in their favor – like swiftness of decision making or using fewer resources. Why does our legal practice require lengthy arguments and discursive efforts even in appellate or supreme court cases of irreconcilable legal disagreements? The closure has to come by some non‐argumentative mean and courts have always relied on them. For the medieval courts of the Germanic tradition it is bequeathed that judges had to fight it out literally if they disagreed on a question of law – though the king allowed them to pick surrogate fighters.109 It is understandable that the process of civilization has led us to non‐violent non‐ argumentative means to determine the law. But what was wrong with District Judge Currin of Umatilla County in Oregon, who – in his late days – decided inconclusive traffic violations by publicly flipping a coin?110 If we are counting heads at the end of our lengthy argumentative proceedings anyway, why not decide hard cases by gut voting at the outset and spare everybody the cost of developing elaborate arguments on questions, where there is not fact of the matter to be discovered? One reason lies in the mixed nature of our reasons in actual legal disagreements. The different second order reasons can be held apart analytically, but not in real life cases. The hope of coming to terms will often play a role at least for some time relative to some participants in the debate. A second reason is that the objectives listed above could not be achieved by a non‐argumentative procedure. Flipping a coin, throwing dice or taking a gut vote would not help us to explore our communalities or our inferential commitments nor help to scrutinize the positions in play. A third reason is the overall rational aspiration of the law that Dworkin relates to in his integrity account111. In a justificatory sense112 the law aspires to give a coherent account of itself – even if it is not the only right one – required by equal respect under conditions of normative disagreement.113 Combining legal argumentation with the non‐argumentative decision‐ making procedure of counting reasoned opinions serves the coherence aspiration of the law in at least two ways: First, the labor of the negative reduces the chances that constructions of the law that have major flaws or inconsistencies built into the arguments supporting them will prevail. Second, since every position must be a reasoned one within the given framework of the law, it must be one that somehow fits into the overall structure of the law along coherent lines. It thus protects against incoherent “checkerboard” treatments114 of hard cases. It is the combination of reasoned disagreement and the non‐rational decision‐making mechanism of counting reasoned opinions that provides for both in hard cases: a decision and one – of multiple possible – coherent constructions of the law. Pure non‐rational procedures – like flipping a coin – would only provide for the decision part. Pure argumentative procedures – which are not geared towards a decision procedure – would undercut the incentive structure of our agonistic disagreements.115 In the face of unresolvable disagreements endless debates would seem an idle enterprise. That the debates are about winning or losing helps to keep the participants engaged. That the decision depends on counting reasoned opinions guarantees that the engagement focuses on rational argumentation. No plain non‐argumentative procedure would achieve this result. If the judges were to flip a coin at the end of the trial in hard cases, there would be little incentive to engage in an exchange of arguments. It is specifically the count of reasoned opinions which provides for rational scrutiny in our legal disagreements and thus contributes to the rationales discussed above. 2. The Semantics of Agonistic Disagreements The agonistic account does not presuppose a fact of the matter, it is not accompanied by an ontological commitment, and the question of how the fact of the matter could be known to us is not even raised. Thus the agonistic account of legal disagreement is not confronted with the metaphysical or epistemological questions that plague one‐right‐answer theories in particular. However, it must still come up with a semantics that explains in what sense we disagree about the same issue and are not just talking at cross purposes. In a series of articles David Plunkett and Tim Sundell have reconstructed legal disagreements in semantic terms as metalinguistic negotiations on the usage of a term that at the center of a hard case like “cruel and unusual punishment” in a death‐penalty case.116 Even though the different sides in the debate define the term differently, they are not talking past each other, since they are engaged in a metalinguistic negotiation on the use of the same term. The metalinguistic negotiation on the use of the term serves as a semantic anchor for a disagreement on the substantive issues connected with the term because of its functional role in the law. The “cruel and unusual punishment”‐clause thus serves to argue about the permissibility of the death penalty. This account, however only provides a very superficial semantic commonality. But the commonality between the participants of a legal disagreement go deeper than a discussion whether the term “bank” should in future only to be used for financial institutions, which fulfills every criteria for semantic negotiations that Plunkett and Sundell propose. Unlike in mere semantic negotiations, like the on the disambiguation of the term “bank”, there is also some kind of identity of the substantive issues at stake in legal disagreements. A promising route to capture this aspect of legal disagreements might be offered by recent semantic approaches that try to accommodate the externalist challenges of realist semantics,117 which inspire one‐right‐answer theorists like Moore or David Brink. Neo‐ descriptivist and two‐valued semantics provide for the theoretical or interpretive element of realist semantics without having to commit to the ontological positions of traditional externalism. In a sense they offer externalist semantics with no ontological strings attached. The less controversial aspect of the externalist picture of meaning developed in neo‐ descriptivist and two‐valued semantics can be found in the deferential structure that our meaning‐providing intentions often encompass.118 In the case of natural kinds, speakers defer to the expertise of chemists when they employ natural kind terms like gold or water. If a speaker orders someone to buy $ 10,000 worth of gold as a safe investment, he might not know the exact atomic structure of the chemical element 79. In cases of doubt, though, he would insist that he meant to buy only stuff that chemical experts – or the markets for that matter – qualify as gold. The deferential element in the speaker’s intentions provides for the specific externalist element of the semantics. In the case of the law, the meaning‐providing intentions connected to the provisions of the law can be understood to defer in a similar manner to the best overall theory or interpretation of the legal materials. Against the background of such a semantic framework the conceptual unity of a linguistic practice is not ratified by the existence of a single best answer, but by the unity of the interpretive effort that extends to legal materials and legal practices that have sufficient overlap119 – be it only in a historical perspective120. The fulcrum of disagreement that Dworkin sees in the existence of a single right answer121 does not lie in its existence, but in the communality of the effort – if only on the basis of an overlapping common ground of legal materials, accepted practices, experiences and dispositions. As two athletes are engaged in the same contest when they follow the same rules, share the same concept of winning and losing and act in the same context, but follow very different styles of e.g. wrestling, boxing, swimming etc. They are in the same contest, even if there is no single best style in which to wrestle, box or swim. Each, however, is engaged in developing the best style to win against their opponent, just as two lawyers try to develop the best argument to convince a bench of judges.122 Within such a semantic framework even people with radically opposing views about the application of an expression can still share a concept, in that they are engaged in the same process of theorizing over roughly the same legal materials and practices. Semantic frameworks along these lines allow for adamant disagreements without abandoning the idea that people are talking about the same concept. An agonistic account of legal disagreement can build on such a semantic framework, which can explain in what sense lawyers, judges and scholars engaged in agonistic disagreements are not talking past each other. They are engaged in developing the best interpretation of roughly the same legal materials, albeit against the background of diverging beliefs, attitudes and dispositions that lead them to divergent conclusions in hard cases. Despite the divergent conclusions, semantic unity is provided by the largely overlapping legal materials that form the basis for their disagreement. Such a semantic collapses only when we lack a sufficient overlap in the materials. To use an example of Michael Moore’s: If we wanted to debate whether a certain work of art was “just”, we share neither paradigms nor a tradition of applying the concept of justice to art such as to engage in an intelligible controversy.

### Dialogue – General

#### One of the greatest values of competitive policy debating is the opportunity to rigorously test ideas, ensuring dialogue. Debating the resolution gives the participants the opportunity to consider, research, and prepare the best arguments they can. Just doing oratory will make people better advocates. The unique benefit of debating a reasonably narrow topic is the depth of preparation and the more rigorous testing of ideas.

**Steinberg and Freeley 13**
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Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a controversy, a difference of opinion or a conflict of interest before there can be a debate. If everyone is in agreement on a feet or value or policy, there is no need or opportunity for debate; the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four,” because there is simply no controversy about this state­ment. Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions of issues, there is no debate. Controversy invites decisive choice between competing positions. Debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered. For example, general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration. How many illegal immigrants live in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity to gain citizenship? Does illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? How are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification card, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this “debate” is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy. To be discussed and resolved effectively, controversies are best understood when seated clearly such that all parties to the debate share an understanding about the objec­tive of the debate. This enables focus on substantive and objectively identifiable issues facilitating comparison of competing argumentation leading to effective decisions. Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor deci­sions, general feelings of tension without opportunity for resolution, frustration, and emotional distress, as evidenced by the failure of the U.S. Congress to make substantial progress on the immigration debate. Of course, arguments may be presented without disagreement. For exam­ple, claims are presented and supported within speeches, editorials, and advertise­ments even without opposing or refutational response. Argumentation occurs in a range of settings from informal to formal, and may not call upon an audi­ence or judge to make a forced choice among competing claims. Informal dis­course occurs as conversation or panel discussion without demanding a decision about a dichotomous or yes/no question. However, by definition, debate requires "reasoned judgment on a proposition. The proposition is a statement about which competing advocates will offer alternative (pro or con) argumenta­tion calling upon their audience or adjudicator to decide. The proposition pro­vides focus for the discourse and guides the decision process. Even when a decision will be made through a process of compromise, it is important to iden­tify the beginning positions of competing advocates to begin negotiation and movement toward a center, or consensus position. It is frustrating and usually unproductive to attempt to make a decision when deciders are unclear as to what the decision is about. The proposition may be implicit in some applied debates (“Vote for me!”); however, when a vote or consequential decision is called for (as in the courtroom or in applied parliamentary debate) it is essential that the proposition be explicitly expressed (“the defendant is guilty!”). In aca­demic debate, the proposition provides essential guidance for the preparation of the debaters prior to the debate, the case building and discourse presented during the debate, and the decision to be made by the debate judge after the debate. Someone disturbed by the problem of a growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, “Public schools are doing a terri­ble job! They' are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do some­thing about this” or, worse, “It’s too complicated a problem to deal with." Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed—such as “What can be done to improve public education?”—then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step. One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies, The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities” and “Resolved; That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference. This focus contributes to better and more informed decision making with the potential for better results. In aca­demic debate, it provides better depth of argumentation and enhanced opportu­nity for reaping the educational benefits of participation. In the next section, we will consider the challenge of framing the proposition for debate, and its role in the debate.

#### Dialogue should be an end in itself—focused, pre-determined topics are key to effective dialogue
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Debate games are often based on pre-designed scenarios that include descriptions of issues to be debated, educational goals, game goals, roles, rules, time frames etc. In this way, debate games differ from textbooks and everyday classroom instruction as debate scenarios allow teachers and students to actively imagine, interact and communicate within a domain-specific game space. However, instead of mystifying debate games as a “magic circle” (Huizinga, 1950), I will try to overcome the epistemological dichotomy between “gaming” and “teaching” that tends to dominate discussions of educational games. In short, educational gaming is a form of teaching. As mentioned, education and games represent two different semiotic domains that both embody the three faces of knowledge: assertions, modes of representation and social forms of organisation (Gee, 2003; Barth, 2002; cf. chapter 2). In order to understand the interplay between these different domains and their interrelated knowledge forms, I will draw attention to a central assumption in Bakhtin’s dialogical philosophy. According to Bakhtin, all forms of communication and culture are subject to centripetal and centrifugal forces (Bakhtin, 1981). A centripetal force is the drive to impose one version of the truth, while a centrifugal force involves a range of possible truths and interpretations. This means that any form of expression involves a duality of centripetal and centrifugal forces: “Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear” (Bakhtin, 1981: 272). If we take teaching as an example, it is always affected by centripetal and centrifugal forces in the on-going negotiation of “truths” between teachers and students. In the words of Bakhtin: “Truth is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction” (Bakhtin, 1984a: 110). Similarly, the dialogical space of debate games also embodies centrifugal and centripetal forces. Thus, the election scenario of The Power Game involves centripetal elements that are mainly determined by the rules and outcomes of the game, i.e. the election is based on a limited time frame and a fixed voting procedure. Similarly, the open-ended goals, roles and resources represent centrifugal elements and create virtually endless possibilities for researching, preparing, presenting, debating and evaluating a variety of key political issues. Consequently, the actual process of enacting a game scenario involves a complex negotiation between these centrifugal/centripetal forces that are inextricably linked with the teachers and students’ game activities. In this way, the enactment of The Power Game is a form of teaching that combines different pedagogical practices (i.e. group work, web quests, student presentations) and learning resources (i.e. websites, handouts, spoken language) within the interpretive frame of the election scenario. Obviously, tensions may arise if there is too much divergence between educational goals and game goals. This means that game facilitation requires a balance between focusing too narrowly on the rules or “facts” of a game (centripetal orientation) and a focusing too broadly on the contingent possibilities and interpretations of the game scenario (centrifugal orientation). For Bakhtin, the duality of centripetal/centrifugal forces often manifests itself as a dynamic between “monological” and “dialogical” forms of discourse. Bakhtin illustrates this point with the monological discourse of the Socrates/Plato dialogues in which the teacher never learns anything new from the students, despite Socrates’ ideological claims to the contrary (Bakhtin, 1984a). Thus, discourse becomes monologised when “someone who knows and possesses the truth instructs someone who is ignorant of it and in error”, where “a thought is either affirmed or repudiated” by the authority of the teacher (Bakhtin, 1984a: 81). In contrast to this, dialogical pedagogy fosters inclusive learning environments that are able to expand upon students’ existing knowledge and collaborative construction of “truths” (Dysthe, 1996). At this point, I should clarify that Bakhtin’s term “dialogic” is both a descriptive term (all utterances are per definition dialogic as they address other utterances as parts of a chain of communication) and a normative term as dialogue is an ideal to be worked for against the forces of “monologism” (Lillis, 2003: 197-8). In this project, I am mainly interested in describing the dialogical space of debate games. At the same time, I agree with Wegerif that “one of the goals of education, perhaps the most important goal, should be dialogue as an end in itself” (Wegerif, 2006: 61).

### Dialogue – Solves Access

#### Dialogic democracy is the best way to create cross-cultural understanding —our vision of debate is the opposite of exclusion

**Gooding-Williams 3**
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I begin with the assumption that fostering the capacity for democratic deliber- ation is a central aim of public education in a democratic society.531 also follow a number of contemporary political theorists in supposing that democratic deliber- ation is a form of public reasoning geared towards adducing considerations that all parties to a given deliberation can find compelling.54 On this view, successful deliberation requires that co-deliberators cultivate a mutual understanding of the differences in conviction that divide them, so that they can formulate reasons (say for implementing or not implementing a proposed policy) that will be generally acceptable despite those differences.55 In the words of one theorist, "[deliberation encourages people with conflicting perspectives to understand each other's point of view, to minimize their moral disagreements, and to search for common ground."56 Lorenzo Simpson usefully glosses the pursuit of mutual understanding when he writes that it requires "a 'reversibility of perspectives,' not in the sense of my collapsing into yon or you into me, but in the sense that I try to understand - but not necessarily agree with - what you take your life to be about and you do the same for me . . . [i]n such a . . . mutual understanding you may come to alter the way in which you understand yourself and I . . . may find that listening to you leads me to alter my self-understanding."57 According to Simpson, the search for common ground need not leave us with the convictions with which we began. On the contrary, the process of democratic deliberation can be a source of self-trans- formation that enriches one's view of the issues at hand and even alters one's conception of the demands of social justice.58 In multicultural America, multicultural public education is a good that promotes mutual understanding across cultural differences, thereby fostering and strengthening citizens' capacities for democratic deliberation. In essence, multi- cultural education is a form of pedagogy whereby students study the histories and cultures of differently cultured fellow citizens, many of whose identities have a composite, multicultural character. More exactly, it is a form of cross-cultural hermeneutical dialogue, and therefore a way of entering into conversation with those histories and cultures.59 By disseminating the cultural capital of cross- cultural knowledge, multicultural education can cultivate citizens' abilities to "reverse perspectives." By facilitating mutual understanding, it can help them to shape shared vocabularies for understanding their moral and cultural identities and for finding common ground in their deliberations.60 By strengthening a student's ability to reverse perspectives, multicultural education may bolster her disposition to engage the self-understandings of differ- ently cultured others, even if the particulars of her multicultural education have not involved an engagement with the cultures of precisely those others (consider, e.g., someone whose multicultural education has included courses in Asian- American literatures, but who knows nothing of American Latino subcultures). Acquiring a know-how and a feel for cross-cultural hermeneutical conversation is likely to reinforce a student's inclination to understand and learn from the self- interpretations of cultural "others" in just the way that the cultivation of an athletic skill (e.g., the ability to "head" a soccer ball) tends to reinforce one's inclination to participate in the sports for which having that skill is an advantage (e.g. playing soccer). In the case of multicultural education, one cultivates a skill which is motivationally conducive to the sort of mutual understanding that is crit- ical to the flourishing of deliberative democracy in a multicultural society.61 Let me summarize my argument so far. In contrast to Schlesinger. who yearns for a society 111 which the understanding of key political ideals remains immune from deliberative debate animated by cultural and other group differences, I have been suggesting that deliberative debate of this sort is an appropriate medium for seeking and forging common grounds and ideals. I have also been arguing (1) that a commitment to deliberative democracy in multicultural America entails a commitment to promoting the mutual understanding of differences through cross-cultural dialogue and (2) that such a commitment justifies the institution of multicultural education. The promotion of mutual understanding avoids Schlesinger's and Asante's kitsch, because it is not predicated off an imperative to preserve an uncomplicated national or ethnic identity in the face of cultural and social complexity. Indeed, the ideal of mutual understanding invites increasing complexity by suggesting that cross-cultural educational insights, since they can effect changes in the self-understandings of persons who have benefitted from a multicultural education, may alter and further complicate those persons' identities, perhaps making them more multicultural. In what follows, I further explore the implications of this ideal by proposing that a commitment to deliberative democracy in multicultural America justifies a form of multicultural education that is, specifically race-conscious.

### AT Performance

#### Discourse needs to be grounded in materiality; failure to do so privileges those with power

#### Johnson 05 [E. Patrick Johnson, "Quare" Studies, or (Almost) Everything I Know about Queer Studies I learned from my Grandmother" In Black Queer Studies: A Critical Anthology, 138-39]

Theories of performance, as opposed to theories of performativity, also take into account the context and historical moment of performance (Strine 7). We need to account for the temporal and spatial specificity of performance not only to frame its existence, but also to name the ways in which it signifies. Such an analysis would acknowledge the discursivity of subjects, but it would also ‘‘unfix’’ the discursively constituted subject as always already a pawn of power. Although many queer theorists appropriate Foucault to substantiate the imperialism of power, Foucault himself acknowledges that discourse has the potential to disrupt power: Discourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it, any more than silences are. We must make allowances for the complex and unstable process whereby discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it,but also undermines and exposes it,renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it.(100–101, my emphasis)Although people of color may not have theorized our lives in Foucault’s terms, wehave used discourse in subversive ways because it was necessary for our survival. Failure to ground discourse in materiality is to privilege the position of those whose subjectivity and agency, outside the realm of gender and sexuality, have never been subjugated. The tendency of many lesbians, bisexuals, gays, and transgendered people of color is to unite around a racial identity at a moment when their subjectivity is already under erasure.

**Performances sever material ends. The aff needs to provide methods that allow us to strategically theorize how we can embrace identity politics.**

**Johnson 05 [E. Patrick Johnson, "Quare" Studies, or (Almost) Everything I Know about Queer Studies I learned from my Grandmother" In Black Queer Studies: A Critical Anthology, 138-39]**

Taken together, performance and quare theories alert us to the ways in which these disidentificatory performances serve material ends, and they do this work by accounting for the context in which these performances occur. The stage, for instance, is not confined solely to the theater, the dance club, or the concert hall. Streets, social services lines, picket lines, loan offices, and emergency rooms, among others, may also serve as useful staging grounds for disidentificatory performances. Theorizing the social context of performance sutures the gap between discourse and lived experience by examining how quares use performance as a strategy of survivalin their day-to-day experiences. Such an analysis requires that we, like Robin Kelley,reconceptualize‘‘play’’(performance) as‘‘work.’’Moreover, quare theory focuses attention on the social consequences of those performances. It is one thing to do dragon the club stage but quite another to embody a drag queen identity on the street. Bodies are sites of discursive effects, but they are sites of social ones as well. I do not wish to suggest that quare vernacular performances do not, at times,collude with sexist, misogynist, racist, and even homophobic ideologies. Lesbian,bisexual, gay, and transgendered people of color must always realize that we cannot transgress for transgression’s sake lest our work end up romanticizing and prolonging our state of struggle and that of others. In other words, while we may occasionally enjoy the pleasures of transgressive performance, we must transgress responsibly or run the risk of creating and sustaining representations of ourselves that are anti-gay,anti-woman, anti-transgender, anti-working class, and anti-black. Despite this risk, **we must not retreat to the position that changes within the system are impossible. The social movements of the past century are testament that change is possible. Ultimately, quare studies offers a more utilitarian theory of identity politics**,focusing not just on performers and effects, but also on contexts and historical situatedness. It does not, as bell hooks warns, separate the ‘‘politics of difference from the politics of racism’’(26). Quare studies grants space for marginalized individuals to enact ‘‘radical black subjectivity’’(hooks 26) by adopting the both/andposture of‘‘disidentification.’’Quare studies proposes a theory grounded in a critique of naıve essentialism and an enactment of political praxis. Such theorizing may strategically embrace identity politics while also acknowledging the contingency of identity, a double move that Angelia Wilson adroitly describes as‘‘politicallynecessary and politically dangerous’’(107).

### AT Social Death

#### Reducing black people to fungible bodies and reading their experiences through pain creates the worst form of depoliticization – not only do they disregard black agency and resistance, they further perpetuate a narrative of white domination

Kelley 16, Robin D.G. Kelley is one of the most distinguished experts on African American studies and a celebrated professor who has lectured at some of America’s highest learning institutions. He is currently Professor of American Studies and Ethnicity at the University of Southern California. 3/22/16, “Black Study, Black Struggle,” <http://www.blackagendareport.com/black_study_black_struggle>, NN

Second only to a desire for increased diversity, better mental health services were a chief priority for student protesters. Activists framed their concerns and grievances in the language of personal trauma. We shouldn’t be surprised. While every generation of black Americans has experienced unrelenting violence, this is the first one compelled to witness virtually all of it, to endure the snuffing out of black lives in real time, looped over and over again, until the next murder knocks it off the news. We are also talking about a generation that has lived through two of the longest wars in U.S. history, raised on a culture of spectacle where horrific acts of violence are readily available on their smartphones. What Henry Giroux insightfully identifies as an addiction does nothing to inure or desensitize young people to violence. On the contrary, it anchors violence in their collective consciousness, produces fear and paranoia – wrapped elegantly in thrill – and shrouds the many ways capitalism, militarism, and racism are killing black and brown people. So one can easily see why the language of trauma might appeal to black students. Trauma is real; it is no joke. Mental health services and counseling are urgently needed. But reading black experience through trauma can easily slip into thinking of ourselves as victims and objects rather than agents, subjected to centuries of gratuitous violence that have structured and overdetermined our very being. In the argot of our day, “bodies” – vulnerable and threatening bodies – increasingly stand in for actual people with names, experiences, dreams, and desires. I suspect that the popularity of Ta-Nehisi Coates’s Between the World and Me (2015), especially among black college students, rests on his singular emphasis on fear, trauma, and the black body. He writes: “In America, it is traditional to destroy the black body—it is heritage. Enslavement was not merely the antiseptic borrowing of labor—it is not so easy to get a human being to commit their body against its own elemental interest. And so enslavement must be casual wrath and random manglings, the gashing of heads and brains blown out over the river as the body seeks to escape. It must be rape so regular as to be industrial. . . . The spirit and soul are the body and brain, which are destructible—that is precisely why they are so precious. And the soul did not escape. The spirit did not steal away on gospel wings.” Coates implies that the person is the brain, and the brain just another organ to be crushed with the rest of the body’s parts. Earlier in the book, he makes the startling declaration that enslaved people “knew nothing but chains.” I do not deny the violence Coates so eloquently describes here, and I am sympathetic to his atheistic skepticism. But what sustained enslaved African people was a memory of freedom, dreams of seizing it, and conspiracies to enact it – fugitive planning, if you will. If we reduce the enslaved to mere fungible bodies, we cannot possibly understand how they created families, communities, sociality; how they fled and loved and worshiped and defended themselves; how they created the world’s first social democracy. “Trauma is real. But reading black experience through trauma can lead to thinking of ourselves as victims rather than agents.” Moreover, to identify anti-black violence as heritage may be true in a general sense, but it obscures the dialectic that produced and reproduced the violence of a regime dependent on black life for its profitability. It was, after all, the resisting black body that needed “correction.” Violence was used not only to break bodies but to discipline people who refused enslavement. And the impulse to resist is neither involuntary nor solitary. It is a choice made in community, made possible by community, and informed by memory, tradition, and witness. If Africans were entirely compliant and docile, there would have been no need for vast expenditures on corrections, security, and violence. Resistance is our heritage. And resistance is our healing. Through collective struggle, we alter our circumstances; contain, escape, or possibly eviscerate the source of trauma; recover our bodies; reclaim and redeem our dead; and make ourselves whole. It is difficult to see this in a world where words such as trauma, PTSD, micro-aggression, and triggers have virtually replaced oppression, repression, and subjugation. Naomi Wallace, a brilliant playwright whose work explores trauma in the context of race, sexuality, class, war, and empire, muses: “Mainstream America is less threatened by the ‘trauma’ theory because it doesn’t place economic justice at its core and takes the focus out of the realm of justice and into psychology; out of the streets, communities, into the singular experience (even if experienced in common) of the individual.” Similarly, George Lipsitz observes that emphasizing “interiority,” personal pain, and feeling elevates “the cultivation of sympathy over the creation of social justice.” This is partly why demands for reparations to address historical and ongoing racism are so antithetical to modern liberalism. “Through collective struggle, we alter our circumstances; contain, escape, or possibly eviscerate the source of trauma.” Managing trauma does not require dismantling structural racism, which is why university administrators focus on avoiding triggers rather than implementing zero-tolerance policies for racism or sexual assault. Buildings will be renamed and safe spaces for people of color will be created out of a sliver of university real estate, but proposals to eliminate tuition and forgive student debt for the descendants of the dispossessed and the enslaved will be derided as absurd. This is also why diversity and cultural-competency training are the most popular strategies for addressing campus racism. As if racism were a manifestation of our “incompetent” handling of “difference.” If we cannot love the other, we can at least learn to hear, respect, understand, and “tolerate” her. Cultural competency also means reckoning with white privilege, coming to terms with unconscious bias and the myriad ways white folks benefit from current racial arrangements. Powerful as this might be, the solution to racism still is shifted to the realm of self-help and human resources, resting on self-improvement or the hiring of a consultant or trainer to help us reach our goal. Cultural-competency training, greater diversity, and demands for multicultural curricula represent both a resistance to and manifestation of our current “postracial” moment. In Are We All Postracial Yet? (2015), David Theo Goldberg correctly sees postracialism as a neoliberal revision of multicultural discourse, whose proposed remedies to address racism would in fact resuscitate late-century multiculturalism. But why hold on to the policies and promises of multiculturalism and diversity, especially since they have done nothing to dislodge white supremacy? Indeed I want to suggest that the triumph of multiculturalism marked a defeat for a radical anti-racist vision. True, multiculturalism emerged in response to struggles waged by the Black Freedom movement and other oppressed groups in the 1960s and ’70s. But the programmatic adoption of diversity, inclusion, and multiculturalism vampirized the energy of a radical movement that began by demanding the complete transformation of the social order and the eradication of all forms of racial, gender, sexual, and class hierarchy. The point of liberal multiculturalism was not to address the historical legacies of racism, dispossession, and injustice but rather to bring some people into the fold of a “society no longer seen as racially unjust.” What did it bring us? Black elected officials and black CEOs who helped manage the greatest transfer of wealth to the rich and oversee the continued erosion of the welfare state; the displacement, deportation, and deterioration of black and brown communities; mass incarceration; and planetary war. We talk about breaking glass ceilings in corporate America while building more jail cells for the rest. The triumph of liberal multiculturalism also meant a shift from a radical anti-capitalist critique to a politics of recognition. This means, for example, that we now embrace the right of same-sex couples to marry so long as they do not challenge the institution itself, which is still modeled upon the exchanging of property; likewise we accept the right of people of color, women, and queer people to serve in the military, killing and torturing around the world. “I want to suggest that the triumph of multiculturalism marked a defeat for a radical anti-racist vision.” At the same time, contemporary calls for cultural competence and tolerance reflect neoliberal logic by emphasizing individual responsibility and suffering, shifting race from the public sphere to the psyche. The postracial, Goldberg writes, “renders individuals solely accountable for their own actions and expressions, not for their group’s.” Tolerance in its multicultural guise, as Wendy Brown taught us, is the liberal answer to managing difference but with no corresponding transformation in the conditions that, in the first place, marked certain bodies as suspicious, deviant, abject, or illegible. Tolerance, therefore, depoliticizes genuine struggles for justice and power: Depoliticization involves construing inequality, subordination, marginalization, and social conflict, which all require political analysis and political solutions, as personal and individual, on the one hand, or as natural, religious, or cultural on the other. Tolerance works along both vectors of depoliticization – it personalizes and it naturalizes or culturalizes – and sometimes it intertwines them. But how can we embrace our students and acknowledge their pain while remaining wary of a culture that reduces structural oppression to misunderstanding and psychology? Love, Study, Struggle Taped inside the top drawer of my desk is a small scrap of paper with three words scrawled across it: “Love, Study, Struggle.” It serves as a daily reminder of what I am supposed to be doing. Black study and resistance must begin with love. James Baldwin understood love-as-agency probably better than anyone. For him it meant to love ourselves as black people; it meant making love the motivation for making revolution; it meant envisioning a society where everyone is embraced, where there is no oppression, where every life is valued – even those who may once have been our oppressors. It did not mean seeking white people’s love and acceptance or seeking belonging in the world created by our oppressor. In The Fire Next Time (1963), he is unequivocal: “I do not know many Negroes who are eager to be ‘accepted’ by white people, still less to be loved by them; they, the blacks, simply don’t wish to be beaten over the head by the whites every instant of our brief passage on this planet.” But here is the catch: if we are committed to genuine freedom, we have no choice but to love all. To love all is to fight relentlessly to end exploitation and oppression everywhere, even on behalf of those who think they hate us. This was Baldwin’s point – perhaps his most misunderstood and reviled point. To love this way requires relentless struggle, deep study, and critique. Limiting our ambit to suffering, resistance, and achievement is not enough. We must go to the root – the historical, political, social, cultural, ideological, material, economic root – of oppression in order to understand its negation, the prospect of our liberation. Going to the root illuminates what is hidden from us, largely because most structures of oppression and all of their various entanglements are simply not visible and not felt. For example, if we argue that state violence is merely a manifestation of anti-blackness because that is what we see and feel, we are left with no theory of the state and have no way of understanding racialized police violence in places such as Atlanta and Detroit, where most cops are black, unless we turn to some metaphysical explanation. For my generation, the formal classroom was never the space for deep critique precisely because it was not a place of love. The classroom was – and still is – a performative space, where faculty and students compete with each other. Through study groups, we created our own intellectual communities held together by principle and love, though the specters of sectarianism, ego, and just-plain childishness blurred our vision and threatened our camaraderie. Still, the political study group was our lifeblood – both on and off campus. We lived by Karl Marx’s pithy 1844 statement: “But if the designing of the future and the proclamation of ready-made solutions for all time is not our affair, then we realize all the more clearly what we have to accomplish in the present – I am speaking of a ruthless criticism of everything existing, ruthless in two senses: The criticism must not be afraid of its own conclusions, nor of conflict with the powers that be.” “If we argue that state violence is merely a manifestation of anti-blackness because that is what we see and feel, we are left with no theory of the state and have no way of understanding racialized police violence.” Study groups introduced me to C. L. R. James, Frantz Fanon, Walter Rodney, Barbara Smith, Angela Davis, Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Vladimir Lenin, Chancellor Williams, George E. M. James, Shulamith Firestone, Kwame Nkrumah, Kwame Turé, Rosa Luxemburg, Antonio Gramsci, Chinweizu Ibekwe, Amílcar Cabral, and others. These texts were our sources of social critique and weapons in our class war on the bourgeois canon. As self-styled activist-intellectuals, it never occurred to us to refuse to read a text simply because it validated the racism, sexism, free-market ideology, and bourgeois liberalism against which we railed. Nothing was off limits. On the contrary, delving into these works only sharpened our critical faculties. Love and study cannot exist without struggle, and struggle cannot occur solely inside the refuge we call the university. Being grounded in the world we wish to make is fundamental. As I argued in Freedom Dreams nearly fifteen years ago, “Social movements generate new knowledge, new theories, new questions. The most radical ideas often grow out of a concrete intellectual engagement with the problems of aggrieved populations confronting systems of oppression.” Ironically I wrote these words with my students in mind, many of whom were involved in campus struggles, feeling a bit rudderless but believing that the only way to make themselves into authentic activists was to leave the books and radical theories at home or in their dorms. The undercommons offers students a valuable model of study that takes for granted the indivisibility of thought and struggle, not unlike its antecedent, the Mississippi Freedom Schools.

#### Anti-Blackness is a political project – not a fait accompli. Their totalizing, universalistic, theory of civil society ignores resistance and creates a self-fulfilling prophecy. The metric they use for measuring the efficacy of resistance is myopic and crushes a potential for an alternative future, which is possible because all human systems are incomplete and changeable.
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The first thing to bear in mind you may wonder why in the beginning of the talk I talked about philosophical anthropology. And many people when they are trying to talk about social change they never think about *what a human being is* and this is something Fanon pays attention to. Many people want to have closed conceptions of human beings because then human beings can be predicable. In fact, in fanons writing he gave an example. One of the problems is that when he would walk in reason seems to walk out. One problem we have to bear in mind when we try to look at the question of human beings in terms of rigid closed systems is that we often are trying to get as a model of how we work as theorists on issues of social change that are actually based on what we can call law like generalizations. Now what is a law like generalization? It is when you make sure that whatever you say has no contradiction down the line. So if you are to say this much [gestures with hand] the next stage must be consistent with that, and the next stage until you are maximally consistent. Do you get that? But here is the problem – and I can just put it in a nut shell- nobody, nobody in this room would like to date, be married to, or be a best friend with a maximally consistent person. You know what that is. Its hell. And this tells you something, because if somebody where maximally consistent, you know what you would say that person is not reasonable. And we have a person here who does work on Hegel that can point out this insight, that a human being has the ability to evaluate rationality. Now why is that important? Because you see the mistake many of us make is many of us want to push the human being into that maximized law like generalization model. So when we think about our philosophical anthropology, some people, our question about intersectionality for instance, what some people don’t understand is nowhere is there ever a human being who is one identity. People talk about race – do you ever really see a race walking? You see a racialized man or woman, or transman or transwoman. Do you ever see a class walking? Class is embodied in flesh and blood people. And we can go on and on. So if we enrich our philosophical anthropology we begin to notice certain other things. And one of the other things we begin to realize is that we commit a serious problem when we do political work. And the problem is this. The question about Wilderson for instance. There is this discussion going on (and allot of people build it out of my earlier books). I have a category I call, as a metaphor, an antiblack world. You notice an indefinite article – an anti-black world. The reason I say that is because the world is different from an anti-black world. The project of racism is to create a world that would be completely anti-black or anti-woman. Although that is a project, it is not a fait accompli. People don’t seem to understand how recent this phenomenon we are talking about is. A lot of people talk about race they don’t even know the history of how race is connected into theonaturalism. How, for instance, Andalucia and the pushing out of the Moors. The history of how race connected to Christianity was formed. A lot of people don’t understand – from the standpoint of a species whose history is 220,000 years old, what the hell is 500 years? But the one thing that we don’t understand to is we create a false model for how we study those last 500 years. We study the 500 years as if the people who have been dominated have not been fighting and resisting. Had they not been fighting and resisting we wouldn’t be here. And then we come into this next point because you see the problem in the formulation of pessimism and optimism is they are both based on forecasted knowledge, a prior knowledge. But human beings don’t have prior knowledge. And in fact – what in the world are we if we need to have guarantees for us to act. You know what you call such people? Cowards. The fact of the matter is our ancestors – let’s start with enslaved ancestors. The enslaved ancestors who were burning down those plantations, who were finding clever ways to poison their masters, who were organizing meetings for rebellions, none of them had any clue what the future would be 100 years later. Some had good reason to believe that it may take 1000 years. But you know why they fought? Because they knew it wasn’t for them. One of the problems we have in the way we think about political issues is we commit what Fanon and others in the existential tradition would call a form of political immaturity. Political immaturity is saying it is not worth it unless I, me, individually get the payoff. When you are thinking what it is to relate to other generations – remember Fanon said the problem with people in the transition, the pseudo postcolonial bourgeois – is that they miss the point, you fight for liberation for other generations. And that is why Fanon said other generations they must have their mission. But you see some people fought and said no I want my piece of the pie. And that means the biggest enemy becomes the other generations. And that is why the postcolonial pseudo-bourgeoisie they are not a bourgeoisie proper because they do not link to the infrastructural development of the future, it is about themselves. And that’s why, for instance, as they live higher up the hog, as they get their mediating, service oriented, racial mediated wealth, the rest of the populations are in misery. The very fact that in many African countries there are people whose futures have been mortgaged, the fact that in this country the very example of mortgaging the future of all of you is there. What happens to people when they have no future? It now collapses the concept of maturation and places people into perpetual childhood. So one of the political things – and this is where a psychiatrist philosopher is crucial – is to ask ourselves what does it mean to take on adult responsibility. And that means to understand that in all political action it’s not about you. It is what you are doing for a world you may not even be able to understand. Now that becomes tricky, because how do we know this? People have done it before. There were people, for instance, who fought anti-colonial struggles, there are people (and now I am not talking about like thirty or forty years ago, I am talking about the people from day one 17th 18th century all the way through) and we have no idea what we are doing for the 22nd century. And this is where developing political insight comes in. Because we commit the error of forgetting the systems we are talking about are human systems. They are not systems in the way we talk about the laws of physics. A human system can only exist by human actions maintaining them. Which means every human system is incomplete. Every human being is by definition incomplete. Which means you can go this way or you can go another way. The system isn’t actually closed. How do we know it? The reason we are seeing all of this brutality in the world today is because the systems are breaking down. If the systems were working they wouldn’t have to worry. You know how have an effective system? You make people mentally be their own prisoners. IF the system were really working, you wouldn’t have to have the police because you all would do it for them. It’s the very fact that the system is breaking down that we are seeing heightened brutality. The problem with heightened brutality is that it is not sustainable. There are studies, for instance, if you look at a paper called Mr. Y, done by the military advisors in this country. They argue that using military force to maintain the United States is not sustainable. They argue what is sustainable is for a nation to learn to be good citizens in the world. Which means it has to build up its infrastructure, education, human relations, it has to deal with the ecology, the environment, all of those things. And this is what many people are learning all over the world. And so one of the things we have to bear in mind then is this: when we begin to engage in these struggles we have to understand how we have to think differently. If we look at neoconservativism, they want to take us back to the 17th century, Hobbseianism, its all about order, control. That is what you are seeing in the streets right now, here in this country, and Latin America, and some parts of Europe. And then you have neoliberalism. Neoliberalism wants to have free markets and at the same time it wants to create a unique form of vulnerability which it places through 19th century thought which is that you are supposed to look at yourself as an individual. Neoliberals say that they don’t believe in group rights, only individual rights. Now you know what an individual is when you are dealing with a government or society. An individual is simply a vulnerable being. So in effect, that conception of rights is to ensure you have a population that’s completely vulnerable to the domination of the system. Now the problem is, many people when they respond to neo-conservatism and neo-liberalism, attack it through being anti-globalism. Because we’ve got neo-conservative globalism and neo-liberal globalism. So what they do is abrogate, they give up the concrete levels in which people can build alternative ways of imagining a global future. Now, here’s the thing. On neo-liberalism, the idea is to make you forget the 20th century. Why? The 20th century was the age of revolution. They want you to think 19th, 18th, and 17th century. And then they tell you every revolutionary effort in the 20th century failed and this is where Fanon is interesting. Because you see, he brings an insight that you need to understand the concept of failure differently. And I’ll give an example. A lot of things that I’ve worked with, in groups that I’ve worked with, communities where we work together, every time we have a project, we always had people and somebody who says “don’t do that.” And you’ll say “why?” And they’ll say “we tried.” You see where I’m getting at? If I couldn’t do it, nobody could do it. But what they don’t understand is that their failure already started setting the conditions for a new kind of relation. When I was president of the Caribbean Philosophical Association I went and lectured in nearly every country in which there were slaves, to deal, in 2008, with the end of the British Atlantic slave trade. If you hear the popular histories, you’ll hear that “slave revolts failed.” The crappy history you have is that one day a group of people in England, in France, in Denmark said “you know, slavery is a really bad thing, let us get rid of it.” Now that is not the actual history, everywhere I went and looked at the archives and local history, every single instance, there was a slave revolt. Every single one --- the Sharpe Rebellion in Jamaica is what led to the question of getting rid of the Atlantic Slave Trade. If you look at Denmark, if you look among the Dutch, the Dutch, had a much larger slave trade, the British were pirates, they took it over. And when you go look at history, and I’ll give you an example, a lot of y’all don’t know that Denmark had a big, had a whole colonial structure. And if you go to Copenhagen, you’ll see a statute of a man, I forget his name, a governor, and it says “freed the slaves.” Okay? Now, you go to St. Martin you’ll get the real story, here is the story. It always boggles my mind how slavery functions, they had the fort, and they had enslaved people bring the supplies and everything into the fort. It also boggles my mind that slave masters had slaves cook for them, but anyways, the people would come in and deliver supplies and one morning the governor woke up and outside the entire fort, it was surrounded by black enslaved people wearing white. You better watch out when you see some Africans wearing white. They have machetes, pitchforks and they just looked at the fort. The governor looked out and said “disband,” and they just stood there. And then he said, he ordered to aim the guns to them, “disband or we’ll shoot.” And the people stood, and then he ordered “fire.” And none of the guns worked, because every day they came in they replaced gunpowder with sand. And then you know what he said? “Well now you’re all free.” The thing about Danes is that they were all Lutherans, their law was the governor’s law, and if he says you’re free, you’re free. And now, those islands were not of use to the Danes and there was a period of equality, rights, and they sold the islets to the United States that implemented segregation and all kinds of other things, but the point is different. The point is you have one history where it says he freed the slaves, and then the actual history where the slaves freed themselves. Nowhere in history, this is the Fanonian point, nowhere in history, any kind of domination, not just enslaved communities, we’re talking about structural violence of many kinds, and people talk about, for instance: Who created the women’s movement? The answer is women, and men, but mostly women, who cared about their liberation. We are able to look at the world different because women fought. It’s not that they sat down and said “treat me better.” They got up and went out in the streets. Every instance of anyone doing political activism *really works.* The error people make is that they think just because in the past, there were, so called “overcome” rebellions, they don’t realize that rebellions change the conditions. And thus there is no such thing, this is why I brought in the Fanon example, he didn’t fight with the presumption he would win, he fought because he had to. And why did he have to? It wasn’t in the sense of self-defense, he had to precisely because he knew it was the right thing to do. Real political work is about doing what is necessary when an understanding because it should be done and it’s not about you. If we come to the concrete levels, you need to argue, look closely at what you’re doing, if it’s going to be action beyond you, you know what you call that? If it’s only about you, it’s not only narcissism and selfishness, and even hate, but if it’s about those that transcend you, if you are not the reason, but because it’s right and for subsequent generations, what do you call if when you really do something for others? The word, and it connects to the revolutionary force that you see in the entirety of the black radical tradition, is a word that may sound corny, but it’s true, the word is love. There’s a difference in political work connected to love because its purpose is to make grow, and to make happen that which is absent. Love and power, in that sense, works.