

## **1AC: The Race War (899)**

We are in the midst of a race war. 21<sup>st</sup> century racialized white nationalist hate is the extended order of historical oppression. White humanity in all its hypocrisy structures the status quo: perpetual violence that “*is steeped in an edifice of accessibility*”. Narratives of racial progress ignore - “*resurgent white nationalism*” Revolution is possible, but it must come from the classrooms. **Rodriguez 19**: Contrary to liberal narratives, the white national form is everywhere, Against all evidence of racial progress, promises postponed futurity for racial domestic war. Blurring conflation of human life with Mankind in its mastery, Subjects of a domestication incarcerated perpetual war . cultural-juridical-military statutes constantly reconstruct the anti-civilizational profile. Civil war is always global. They're upset you can't appreciate how far you've come. Supremacy is violently enforced from genocidal to low-intensity. The end of official apartheid are maneuvers of sustainability toward flexible racial power precisely because White ascendancy already assembles common sense. Rebellions of the classroom bear insurgency among people who refuse to participate in an oppressive system, don't rely on mass numbers. Willingness of committed collectives has capacity to spark revolution

Trump is President. DEI is repealed. January 6<sup>th</sup> protesters and ICE have free reign. The “*racial agenda*” is on full display with unique exclusion. **Sellers 25**: This time is different. Anti-DEI or canceling identity celebrations like Black History Month. In spite of this, many of us have grown numb . What is our voice? Trump's rhetoric invoking race and division reversed an order that prohibited federal employment discrimination. Stopped every civil rights and police reform and pardoned white supremacists who organized insurrection.

The classroom is being colonized everyday, ensuring the inevitable rise of racist attitudes. The banning of critical race theory aims to “Refocus American education on cultivating patriotic citizens. The White House argues classroom time should be dedicated rather than discuss race and systematic inequality; don't want that propaganda taught!” **Martin 25**: Trump ban CRT Schools that continue CRT lose federal aid.

The alternative is militant preservation. It harnesses the energy of sociality to refuse the violent corrective of White Being in favor of a new feeling, a haptic relationality where we open ourselves to the possibilities of possibilities **Melamed 16**: A performative event repeated with each reading. Rupture institutionality to undo their logics of individualizing, reducing and commanding the individual. Sociality itself is resistance. Policy' is political control and command. Diagnosing 'incorrectness' counterpose 'planning' begins with “militant

preservation” To escape proceduralism “hapticality, or love,” to feel others in the undercommons’

Movements are ongoing resistances that happen in our thoughts, actions, provocations, and explorations. Our model of debate seeks to extend towards new levels of understanding and immanent processes of resistance that unleash beautiful insurgencies from the ground up.

**Shukaitis et Graeber 07:** Investigation and social research expand possibilities for political action. Militant investigation discovers new possibilities within the present, turning dead ends into joyful insurgency. True revolutionary knowledge would have to be a pragmatic form of knowledge that lays bare all pretensions; deeply embedded in the logic of transformational practice. Reject formal politics for genuine revolutionary change.

Debate is a unique medium through which discourse can be shaped. It's independent enough from traditional academia to be isolated from governmental regulations as to where the race war can be confronted. **Stafford:** debates provide a very unique space. People are actually forced to listen to what you say. The debate space is a vehicle to start social change.

The method is voting for the aff

We can't end the race war, the K is our way of surviving it. – thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the best way to survive the race war. Rev v Rev debates create competition to find the best way to deal with our current crisis. Dismiss claims of “unpredictability” and appeals to “stasis” as the insulation of debate from being forced to confront its racism. **Sugino 23:** Rev v. rev debates challenge hegemony of white politics present clash outside stasis . White traditional debate as the referent of excellence, framing critical challenges as unpredictable.. Race lies at the core of every resolution not neutral consensus, but normalized racialized assumptions. None of the words in resolution mean hypothetical imagination. Fiat is arbitrary, only predictable based on a traditional overrepresentation of white debaters. Important debates between non-state-strategies Sexton Wilderson and Moten only move beyond a narrow view, limits too restrictive. Rev v. rev pushes us to consider debate's potential.

Social movements can't be topical, policies leave out minority movements. **Traber 18:** Fiat is uniquely bad for activists. There is no topical version . Insisting on fiat means we can't run politics outside the state. Debaters assume the only pragmatic " politics" occur through the state. Not the case. feminist movements intervention on norms are examples state politics conceals the necessity of non-state politics. The percent of debaters who will have a chance to be internal to the state is minuscule, but all debaters could engage in non-state. None of the major social movements were driven by policy action policies are driven by movements. Radical politics exclude by insisting fiat The insistence on fiat functions erase minority perspectives empirically.

The ballot is key because wins and losses shape the direction of the activity, a vote for our advocacy inspires others to run it as well. A cascade of rev v rev debates encourage competition to create the best model of surviving the race war.

## Cut Case

**We are in the midst of a race war. 21<sup>st</sup> century racialized white nationalist hate is the extended order of historical oppression. White humanity in all its hypocrisy structures the status quo: perpetual violence that “*is steeped in an edifice of accessibility*”. Narratives of racial progress ignore - “*resurgent white nationalism*” Revolution is possible, but it must come from the classrooms.**

**Rodríguez '19** [Dylan Rodríguez; professor of Ethnic Studies at University of California, Riverside. teacher, scholar, organizer and collaborator who has worked at the University of California-Riverside since 2001. He is a faculty member in the recently created Department of Black Study as well as the Department of Media and Cultural Studies. Dylan served as Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies from 2009-2016, Chair of the UCR Academic Senate from 2016-2020, and has worked as the Co-Director of the UCR Center for Ideas and Society since 2021. As the Co-Director of the Center, he created the Decolonizing Humanism(?) programming stream, which features scholars, artists, and intellectuals based in revolutionary, anti-colonial, and liberationist movements from all over the world. Dylan was elected President of the American Studies Association by his peers in 2020, the same year in which he was named to the inaugural class of Freedom Scholars, a national award program that intends to “recognize the role that Freedom Scholars play in cultivating and nurturing movements for justice and freedom.” Dylan’s lifework focuses on liberationist, anticolonial, and abolitionist confrontations with the antiblack, colonial, and white supremacist violences that permeate the ongoing Civilization project. He is devoted to studying and teaching the historical, collective genius of rebellion, survival, and insurgent futurity that radically challenge dominant forms of authority, power, and institutionality. “Insult/Internal Debate/Echo” in Propter Nos, Vol 3 : Anti-/Non-, Winter 2019, True Leap Press, P 125–131 <https://trueleapress.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/pn3-rodri%CC%81guez-insultinternal-debateec-ho-final.pdf>] recut Aaron // recut VK

Suspicion and accusation are a minimal disturbance to a force that spills endless violations of spirit, memory, and flesh. There is no state of exception, just a grinding

normal that concedes reform in the demand, inventing and refurbishing a Civilizational imperative. White supremacy is but a minimal term for this extended order of things. Its dangers become refined and acute under changing protocols of recruitment, retention, expulsion, and elimination. The white nationalist imperative surges and retreats. Contrary to liberal narratives of the reaction's periodic and exceptional rise on waves of mobilized xenophobia, misogyny, and populist racialized "hate," the white national form is constantly in evidence, everywhere shaping the multiculturalist diversity initiatives that re-embody the inheritances of 1619 and Manifest Destiny.

The nominal abolition of United States apartheid has been followed by more than half a century of proliferating, innovative, and sometimes authentically new regimes of gendered racial domination and state sanctioned racist violence. Against all apparent and sometimes spectacular evidence of its absurdity, there is a resilient narrative of national racial progress, characterized by the insult of an insistence. The depth and normalcy of the interdisciplinary, multimedia, terror-inducing methodologies of racist reaction are not mere resurgences or disruptions, but are affirmations that such racial progress is in fact at hand. There is no hypocrisy in the gestures of subjection when they are already enmeshed in the coercive promises of postponed or suspended futurity for those who fit the civil-enemy profile of gendered racial domestic war. In such instances, survival tends to be a question raised for the absolute present tense, and so the edge of the insult is in the insistence that there is a future to be shared, in fact, that there is a "humanity" within the deadly span of raciality that can ever even be remotely common, familial, or universal.

internal debate (redemption)

The United States, if it is to exist as such, is always necessarily a theater of racial nation- building with vacillating movements and subtitles: post-civil rights multiculturalism, resurgent white nationalism, post-racial liberalism, law-and-order, the War on Drugs, the War on Terror, and the infrastructures of tolerance and repression are never finally separable. There is a deadly coherence to the historical variations of this statecraft and cultural formation, crystallizing in the allegation that certain counter-positions within their fields correspond with redemptive possibilities.

The historical record shows what the allegation of redemption entails when waged and executed by the subjects of a transatlantic, hemispheric, and global promise of white human vindication: formed in the crucible of the Encounter, it is the making of Mankind in White Being (with all its gendered correlates) that determines the economics, jurisprudence, political philosophy, social science, and geographic coordinates of conquest-in-permanence. There is preliminary and always-unfolding violence in raciality as a principle term in Mankind's cohering of language, vision, feeling, science, spirit, and subjectivity in this globality of imagination and economy.

The fraud of the post-racial and the post-civil rights allegations, then, is not merely in the unbroken chain of racist casualties produced through systemic and scene specific assaults on both collective physiology and the mere possibility of shared, symbolic integrity. The deepest discrepancy is in the pretense that there is any possibility for categorical rather than piecemeal (temporary, fleeting, flimsy) inclusion in this apartheid speciation of "humanity," an apartheid that cannot be dismantled in law or even nominally abolished, unless Mankind—and crucially, the material and symbolic grounds of Mankind's global integrity as such—becomes the subject of a creative disintegration (some will call this terrorism, others call it their hope for tomorrow). The speciation draws its dominance from a changing circuit of abstraction and embodiment: there is a template for humanity's progress, there are terms (scientific, Biblical, politico-economic, or otherwise) through which the most evolved, blessed, modern, and autonomous of the human species may be recognized as such, and these abstractions are always tied to notions of manifest personhood, including but not limited to genes, spirit, blood, epidermis, and cranial capacity (such is the rough description of humanity's speciation—a narrative of differentiation within the category of human being that militarizes the terms of the ascendant species-group). These are the premises of White Being.

Apprehend the United States, in the fullest distensions of its colonial and chattel formation, as an internal debate over the relative violence, vulgarity, sophistication, and political capaciousness of white humanity. The latter, you will recall, is the position that offers humanitarian favors against the wish and urge to violently decline them. There is a claim that persists beneath the din of civil accommodations, that changes in tenor but not in premise. Accusations of backwardness, savagery, tribalism, and even fundamentalism become self-replicating when such humanitarianism is rejected by the ungrateful, suspicious antagonists of white humanity's creeping universals. The language of urban-to-rural insurrection—when the people "riot," "loot," burn, and destroy—moves from a vocabulary of anti-humanitarianism (which, in this sense, is also a recalibration of the world to mirror the evil) to insist that it is in the moment when the representatives of white humanity extend the helping hand that there must be a state of militant opposition; a tensing against the insult. It is in times like this that the white human creates the groundwork of its forcible universality.

This is the other side of the aforementioned redemption: a rejection of the invitation to thrill in the absolute violence of a charity. There are different versions of the gesture—modernization, independence, full citizenship, franchise, rights, Appendages of another body, an alien body. Rejection comes later, when the charity is experienced as

redemption in their evil, white evil, which created the need for their industrialized condescension in the first place. It is part of the generalized fact that the white human condition—the condition of Mankind’s restoration, remaking, and periodic reconstruction—is already steeped in an edifice of accessibility (the common sense of humanism rests on the myth of access). This human in the seat of humanism calls on other species to feed, to shit, to vote, to work, to speak, to dance, to enlist, to sit at the table in the house for a little while (but don’t overstay your welcome, because you should beware of the grounds of such hospitality). What if, after “American Apartheid,” there is only more chattel, more displacement, more of apartheid’s spatial and physiological order- ing? echo

Meanwhile, there is a darker echo that restates the gestures of global white assistance— philanthropic, structurally adjusted, diversity inclusive, military occupied, and otherwise—as a conjugated dehumanization. The echo shudders an anti-colonial and plantation-burning violence, another kind of redemption in the symbolic genesis of white humanity’s de-centering. In this instance, it is not the dark suffering that matters, but rather the fact of the exposure, the vulnerability, the imminence and inevitability of the suffering—this is what explodes the presumptuous arrogance of the white humanist universal, which is another way of saying that in this glimpse, we are daring to privilege the inheritance of a sensibility that the world exists on Mankind’s terms, and this is an intimacy with the most alienating feeling. To be in a world not of your making, to be told that you must become in a manner alien to the conditions of your exposure.

It is often this alienation that fosters another differentiation, one that speaks collective genius in the imagining and fugitive practice of Mankind’s obsolescence, the denaturing of the human speciation and thus, the reduction of white evil (by extension, white liberal humanism) to a localized, dysfunctional, even tribal matter that finally has little or nothing to do with the insurgency of all other life, including the other humans who have fantasized the demise of Mankind over many generations. The violence of which they accuse the savages and the slaves is often attributed to this idea. Merely the idea.

In Dallas a few are felled by a sniper’s rounds in the midst of a demonstration for Black lives that was irreparably, painstakingly, also pro-police. A scattering thereafter, unsure how to read the blood on tar, a few wondering aloud what would happen if the fleeting moment of anti-state terror were socialized against its dense congruence with the proto-genocidal facts of Blackness. Here is another opportunity to alter the protocols of war by considering the absolute asymmetries of fatality and casualty—another way of showing the identity of law and brutality, thus the misapplication of our common phrase, “police brutality.”

Consider the recent periods of crisis, emergency, and militant reformist demand as a political inheritance in continuity with the limits of that internal “American” debate. In this framing, the stakes are entirely affixed to the reorientations of Mankind and the question of whether a potential transformation (expansion) of its imagined collective is remotely capable of altering the intensity of casualties that fabricate the Indian, the Negro, the Alien, et al. The blurring confluences of human life (in all its vulnerability and incommensurable wildness) with Mankind (in its self-narratives of autonomy, mastery, and ascendancy) provoke the other allegations of redemption, which are only ever aspirational. It is why, in contemporary parlance, “diversity” is always tethered to “tolerance and respect:” the vulnerable wild ones are the subjects of a domestication that never quite works.

The sources of the echo are the involuntary inhabitants of the blurring, outside Mankind (subhuman, colonized, expropriated, chattel) and incarcerated by the contingencies of white civil society’s freedoms. To live inside the blur in this way is to be intimately familiar with the perpetual condition of war and conquest, even as there is constant struggle to apprehend the consequences of the totality, because there are counter-positions within the blur. There are casualties of varying intensity, some contingent and others paradigmatic. Yet there remains a persistent demand that crosses these counter-positions, anchored in the demand for security of body and the dream of collective futurity. This demand-dream runs the risk of coalescing with the terms of the internal debate. It is the militancy of an insistence on becoming the tolerated and respected, which of course is not really a becoming at all. This is when the echo is most open to misreadings, disciplined-harnessed-monetized by the organized entrepreneurial compromises of the “Non-Governmental Organizations” and the Non-Profit Industrial Complex.

We should be clear that the problem is not necessarily in the desire for redemption as a protective capacity in circumstances of duress. (At times, finding redemption through faith and spiritual practice is the only accessible pathway to insurgent mobilization around a shared social-historical as well as extra-earthly fate.) Rather, the dilemma is in the horizon of the fulfillment. What would happen on the eve of White Being’s concession that Black lives matter? The terms of the internal debate can only allow for the gesture of a concession which subsists on some peculiar idiosyncrasies: the notion of policing in equitability; a reordering of statecraft and cultural structure that affirms respect for and tolerance of those other lives; a statement of egalitarian value that nonetheless endorses another apartheid principle of human speciation, “separate but equal.” It becomes clear that redemption in

winning protective capacity is only that, and only for now. This is a problem of mistaken or misplaced horizons. Of course, horizons are open to interpretation and imagination, and must be projected as a matter of definition, so there is plenty of room to do good work here, which requires that the problem of political horizon be posed in the first place, as a problem, in fact, as the kind of problem that renders the conventional (and often indulgent or opportunist) dichotomy of “theory” and “practice” irrelevant.

Perhaps there is already a solution to the problem, an ingenious rearticulation of the dilemma of mis-imagined, dys-imagined horizon that unfolds in basements, classrooms, and text message strings all the time, everywhere: there is an understanding that resonates in the dark echoing of the problem solvers (the children, the students, the elders, the shamed, the punished, the abnormal, the sick, the crazy—or so they say). The understanding forms as a byproduct of coerced overfamiliarity with what it means to seek redemption in evil, a knowledge that the adjudication of the internal debate occurs in a general symbiosis with the enforcement of cultural-juridical-military statutes that constantly reconstruct and affirm the anti-civilizational profile; that of those who are drawn into the profile, there are some old, some new, because criminals, terrorists, deviants, aliens, have always been around, some longer than others, and there’s little mistaking the Black and Aboriginal common denominator in all of it. The understanding grows and spreads, that the anti-civilizational is an honorable inheritance, because it surges into domesticities that are always again frontiers; the plantation is an idea as much as a place, which is why it never goes away, territory (land) is always invoked, and it all materializes in the endlessly justifiable homicide that defines “freedom’s” limits. Move, then, to the margins of the reputable, just beneath the high ground, flourishing in the tears and sobbing, studying within the mourning and grieving, theorizing the pain, it’s already happening, and it needs no refinement.

echo (protest)

A delusion guides much of the righteous protest. It is the belief, tragic in its aversion to historical truth, that They don’t have The Right to do this (to us, to others, to the death). The protest stakes its high ground on the claim that the violence is beyond Their Right. Its furnace of outrage is fueled by the demand that They cease and desist, stop stop stop stop the beating killing brutal degrading displays of savage-sophisticated contempt for skin, bones, still-beating hearts. The protest demands recognition that the (your) other human life is worthy of integrity. The protest grasps for words that will somehow touch the brutalizers’ thin and nerveless membranes of decency. The protest claims the objects of violence embody dignity, manhood, motherhood, queer citizenship, and perhaps it will also remind them that “we are not criminals.” This activity is not naïve, for the delusion is not derivative of dumb ignorance, but rather of a willful one. The protest works hard to believe in the redemption of Rights forsaken. It is a religious belief—this is what we mean by willful delusion. It is a powerful delusion, to project that the manic aggression of Their world can be harnessed by anything remotely so abstract as Rights. (Of course, abstraction is as well a method of and for revolt, which is why Their colleges and universities are increasingly overrun by an instructional logic of vocational indoctrination, especially in sites of “diversity.”)

Always hiding in these soon-discarded terms of protest appeal is another kind of recognition, popping through the delusion like unwelcome glares from behind. It is the knowledge—a deep knowing in friction with anything actually formally learned—that nothing is beyond Their Right, which is to say, They cannot dialog with the protest, they can only ever tolerate it. There is another way to view the relation of power: that in Their maddening assumption of Right as capacity for self-making brutality (a.k.a. policing, governing, civilizing), They are daring you to violate the long-settled limits of the appeal to decency and respect. The residual power of the delusion is the always-available temporality of its belief—some of you know as well as I that the righteous protest is never far from next-level noise, of a kind that turns the deputies’ presence into a beast of law.

The end of protest is nearby, as it has always been, even if the form of the convening riff-raff looks familiar to Them. It is another way of saying that there is an inherent, beautiful danger to the theater of collective consciousness when it is fixated on the correction of errors and hypocrisies that are, in the long historical script, the productive technologies of US nation-building.

the end of Hope

There are times when things change so rapidly it feels like breathing myth. Walls fall, nations implode, colonies collapse, apartheid melts, but only because people move with each other even as they are at odds, quaking the placid plains of history with the unmatched danger of other surging human species. Mankind begins to panic amidst cold calculations of austerity reform and military extermination, knowing that civil war is always a global war, an epochal war, when the fate of the species is at stake. Those who have been enslaved, occupied, displaced, trapped, and dominated find power in the fight. Of course, when some of us think about the truth of inhabiting these kinds of places, we realize that there has never been anything but a fight. It is a species-specific knowledge.

But then, the end of hope is a morbid thing. When the fiction of a better future, a revived present, a shared anticipation of life—good life—fades, a certain wildness ensues. There is a creeping sensibility that aggressive, violent neglect is the structuring principle of the modern world, interrupted only by the acute attention of the police and their analogues. They are, in their own way, attuned to our sensibilities in the manner of owners feeling the primal species-needs of their domestic animals—the dog is hungry, it is lonely, the pace of its wagging tail shows it is antsy, it needs to go outside and piss—but

their reactions tend to be less generous and nurturing. They know you are upset over the always-bare fact of your naked disempowerment, but they are equally perturbed that you cannot appreciate how far your people have come, for after all, a few of you are here sitting at the conference table with them, drinking their coffee and being treated as classmates, peers, and colleagues.

Supremacy is an inherently armed and threatened regime. It must be reiterated, fortified, and violently enforced (usually across

a broad, deep spectrum of violence—from genocidal to low-intensity, cultural-symbolic to physiological and environmental). There is little doubt that white supremacy is the convening animus of the United States of America and most of the Western world, and that its liberal disavowals in the era of diversity and official multiculturalism not only fail to displace white supremacy's paradigmatic role in defining social life and the distribution of wealth, poverty, health, and systemic suffering, but actually instigate white supremacist revivals at every conceivable social scale. The argument here is not that white supremacy has disappeared or faded from the ensemble of racial-social power assembled over the last half-century, but rather that it has been incessantly disowned by White Being as such, even as white supremacy galvanizes and organizes white publics into organized and semi-organized fronts for white self-defense, white autonomy, and white rights.

The ascendancy of White Being thus supervises the logic of White Reconstruction. It disciplines and reforms classical white supremacist institutions and their methods of human domination while still ensuring that white supremacy permeates the order of things. In this way, the end of official apartheid and the formal elimination of particular forms of racial colonialism are maneuvers of sustainability, more precisely, toward a flexibility of racial power (and suppleness of racial Being) that can absorb “anti-racist” reform for the sake of “human equality” precisely because the White Being's ascendancy already assembles the material boundaries, methodology, and common sense pre-conceptions of the Human who is to participate in that egalitarian social wager.

Within the cultural politics and delimited upward socioeconomic mobilities endorsed by White Reconstruction (which both relies on and despises “affirmative action” as a mechanism for re-ordering the epidermal layers of its generally-but-not-always-white human species), there is a production of new possibilities for attachment, allegiance, and affinity to White Being. There is, in other words, an invitation of sorts to thrill in its fiction, which is to say, to fantasize a “people of color” future within the ascendancy, even when material conditions yield palimpsests of degradation and humiliation within the allegations of the egalitarian. (This is why eugenics is simultaneously an embarrassment to modern biological and forensic science, while obviously persisting as a structuring logic of contemporary social engineering, from its liberal reformist to reactionary racist variations.)

The ascendancy of White Being has toxified most of us for multiple generations, in ways that we are constantly mapping, mourning, recreating, and theorizing. It is an ascendancy that, despite its allegations of Civilizational and natural permanence, is subjected to varying intensities of radical, irruptive challenge from below and periodic implosions from above.

On the other hand, rebellions and movements have many points of origin: the high school and college classroom, church/mosque/temple, community organization, warehouse, prison cell, hospital waiting room, living room couch, or apartment complex are as likely as any site to bear the fruit of social insurgency among people who refuse to be passive victims of (or willing participants in an oppressive system). These forms of action do not necessarily rely on massive numbers to make their imprint on the surrounding world—rather, they pivot on the willingness of committed collectives of people (large and small) to analyze, strategize, and act on their surrounding social conditions. Such collective work, often beginning with numbers in the single digits, has shown the capacity to accomplish everything from stopping patterns of domestic violence in an apartment complex and disrupting citywide police brutality to sparking anticolonial revolutions and overthrowing repressive national governments. I think this is the work, as in some ways it has always been.

**Trump is President. DEI is repealed. January 6<sup>th</sup> protesters and ICE have free reign. The “racial agenda” is on full display with unique exclusion. Sellers ’25**

[Bakari T Sellers; American attorney, political commentator, and politician. Sellers served in the South Carolina House of Representatives for the 90th District from 2006 to 2014, and was the 2014 Democratic nominee for Lieutenant Governor in South Carolina. Since 2015, Sellers has served as a political commentator on CNN; No One Is Safe From Trump's Racist Agenda, 2-5-2025; Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/feb/05/trump-agenda-racism>; accessed, 2-8-2025] Aaron

I found myself cheating on CNN, where I'm a political commentator, with MSNBC last weekend. I just had to watch my friend, Nikole Hannah-Jones, articulate a great point that many have missed: Donald Trump is pursuing a racial agenda, not an economic one.



This isn't historically novel. Most progress is met by this kind of backlash – from the “Red Shirts” and Klansmen who used brutal violence against Black citizens following the gains of the Reconstruction era, to the voting restrictions that followed the election of Barack Obama. But **this time is different**

This time isn't about Pete Hegseth, US secretary of defense, Sean Duffy, the secretary of transportation, and Trump using the recent American Airlines plane crash in Washington DC to envelop themselves in **anti-DEI** (diversity, equity and inclusion) outrage. This isn't about Maga devotees fighting against anti-discrimination measures, eliminating pronouns, pushing anti-vaccine pseudoscience or changing the name of the Gulf of Mexico or canceling identity-driven celebrations like the ones during **Black History Month**.

It's about the fact that in spite of all this, **many of us have grown numb** to this brand of **rightwing viciousness and cruelty**. As Trump and Elon Musk try to disassemble the greatest nation on earth at its core, Washington Democrats don't even look like they're up to the task to stop it. Even as the House minority leader, Hakeem Jeffries, rolls out his “resistance agenda”, questions remain. Where have Democrats been since 5 November? **What is our message? What is our voice?** Why aren't we in spaces where this voice can be heard?

Meanwhile, Trump continues to use **hyperbolic rhetoric invoking race and division**, pushing his agenda instead of the economic populist message he ran on. His ICE raids aren't just targeting immigrants, they've also ended in the detainment of US citizens, including a veteran.

Trump reversed the 60-year-old executive order that prohibited **federal** contractors from engaging in **employment discrimination**, putting countless minority small business owners on the chopping block. He **stopped every** single Department of Justice **civil rights investigation and police reform agreement** – that includes the agreements in Louisville, Kentucky, and Minneapolis, Minnesota, that were reached following the **killings of Breonna Taylor and George Floyd**. These aren't abstract political principles we're talking about. This is about **real people with real lives on the line**.

Trump's attack on civil rights and his agenda rooted in racial division don't just affect people of color, they reach other citizens as well. Do you know what would have happened if a federal judge hadn't paused the Trump spending freeze? It means your lead water pipes don't get replaced. It means doctors working to cure cancer or fight Alzheimer's have to stop their research. It means your daily commute is even more dangerous because crews stopped fixing the roads and bridges and, if you have one of the more than 330,000 clean energy jobs created by the Inflation Reduction Act, Trump tried to freeze your paycheck.

Meanwhile, the price of eggs keeps going up.

So I don't care if Trump wants to buy Greenland or not. I care that he's **pardoning white supremacists who already organized one insurrection**. I care that he fired every FBI agent and DoJ official who worked on any of the multiple investigations against him. I care that he got rid of the independent inspectors general of at least 12 major federal agencies.

**The classroom is being colonized everyday, ensuring the inevitable rise of racist attitudes. The banning of CRT aims to “Refocus American education on cultivating patriotic citizens. The White House argues classroom time should be dedicated rather than discuss race and systematic inequality; don't want that propaganda taught!”<sup>1</sup>**

**Martin '25** [Raquel Martin; Washington D.C. Bureau; President Trump Signs Executive Order Banning Critical Race Theory In K-12 Schools, 2-3-2025; abc27, <https://www.abc27.com/news/washington-dc/president-trump-signs-executive-order-banning-critical-race-theory-in-k-12-schools/>; accessed, 2-5-2025] Aaron //recut VK



WASHINGTON (NEXSTAR) — **President Donald Trump has signed an executive order banning the teaching of critical race theory (CRT) in K-12 schools, a move his administration says is aimed at refocusing American education on fundamental subjects such as math and reading. Schools that continue CRT-related lessons risk losing federal aid.**

“The president believes American education should **focus on cultivating patriotic citizens** who are ready for the workforce,” White House Press Secretary Karoline Leavitt said.

The executive order follows the release of the latest National Assessment of Educational Progress, which showed reading scores declining and math scores stagnating nationwide in 2024. The White House argues that **classroom time should be dedicated to core subjects rather than discussions on race and systemic inequality.**

Sen. Josh Hawley (R-Mo.) praised the executive action, arguing that **lessons portraying the U.S. as founded on slavery are inaccurate.**

**“I don’t want that propaganda taught to my kids or any kid in Missouri,”** Hawley said.

**The alternative is militant preservation. It harnesses the energy of sociality to refuse the violent corrective of White Being in favor of a new feeling, a haptic relationality where we open ourselves to the possibilities of possibilities**

**Melamed ‘16** [Jodi Melamed, Associate professor of Africana and English Studies at Marquette University, “Proceduralism, Predisposing, Poesis: Forms of Institutionality, In the Making”, English Faculty Research and Publications, 4/1/2016]  
<https://csalateral.org/issue/5-1/forum-alt-humanities-institutionality-making-melamed/>

For our purposes, Stefano Harney and Fred Moten’s *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study*, **a performative event repeated with each reading**, can be seen to work for a **rupture** of neoliberalized and liberal modes of **institutionality**. It works to **undo** and estrange **their** constitutive and constituting **logics**, their modes of **individualizing**, rationalizing, politicizing, critiquing, and formalizing social being into dominant ‘institutions’ and their ‘**will to fix**’ (apprehension of) **the conditions of the material and the real**. From the **matrix of meaning the Undercommons creates**, liberal and neoliberal modes of institutionality come into focus as continuous within a developing genealogy of unfreedom and truncations of social life, whose strategies include racial capitalist, settler colonial, and liberal democratic logics and practices alike. One description of the university’s institutionality captures this perfectly: “The University Is the Site of the Social Reproduction of Conquest Denial.”<sup>26</sup> Another description makes it clear that **the university institutionalizes the same violence as the prison**: “The university, then, is not the opposite of the prison, since **they are both involved, in their way, with the reduction and command of the social individual**.”<sup>27</sup> Thus for Moten and Harney, neo/liberal institutionality, generally considered, abhors social being outside its forms. **Thus sociality itself** (along the lines of what they call “**consent not to be one**”) **is resistance**.<sup>28</sup> The performance of *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study* is structured around the play of two categories of terms: 1) **terms that distill the specific violences of neo/liberal modes of institutionality, which reduce and harm human capacities of sociality and continuously refresh the** coloniality and raciality of institutional forms, and 2) **terms that help us think and organize desire for forms of social being that are illiberally collective, unoccupied by professionalism, sociopoetical, in-the-making, and shared beyond the logics of democratic capitalist humanist Enlightenment traditions or critical moves that fall under the category of legitimization-by-reversal** (i.e., the commons as reverse legitimization of privatization, redistribution as the reverse legitimization of dispossession, the critical professional as the reverse legitimization of the university as site of the social reproduction of conquest denial). While some of the terms in the first category incline towards a critique of liberal institutionality (‘politics’ and ‘critique’), many of them catch hold of a neoliberalization of institutionality, including ‘policy’ and ‘logistics.’ For

Moten and Harney, capital today “wants control of the means [of social reproduction...]by gaining access to and directly controlling the informal experiment with the social reproduction of life itself.”<sup>29</sup> In neoliberal times, this requires the use of directly political forms in addition to economic compulsion. **‘Policy’ is a name for the form political control and command takes. It is a deputized, dispersed form of command which controls social reproduction by diagnosing ‘incorrectness’ for those it represents to be in need of improvement, of change, of policy.** Moten and Harney **counterpose ‘planning’ to ‘policy.’** “Planning is self-sufficiency at the social level, and it reproduces in its experiment not just what it needs, life, but what it wants, life in difference, in the play of the general antagonism.”<sup>30</sup> **It begins with “militant preservation” in the face of ‘policy’.**<sup>31</sup> **To escape the proceduralism of ‘policy,’** Moten and Harney offer the sociopoesis of the statement, “There’s nothing wrong with us.”<sup>32</sup> Similarly, **‘logistics’ is a name for the “capitalist science” of the moment, which “wants to dispense with the subject altogether,” to containerize “bodies, objects, affects, information” for circulation as capital,** “as if it could reign sovereign over the informal, the concrete and generative indeterminacy of material life.”<sup>33</sup> **To “logistics” Harney and Moten counterpose “hapticality, or love,” “the capacity to feel through others, for others to feel through you, for you to feel them feeling you,”** a capacity attached in sociopoetic imagination to the bodies of people captured in the hold of slave ships (the first form of logistical transportation).<sup>34</sup> **The Undercommons, in this way, repeatedly performs the defeat of neoliberal proceduralism by the sociopoetical imagination,** asserting “the necessarily failed administrative accounting of the incalculable.”<sup>35</sup> **In these performances, the concept of the ‘undercommons’ holds a special weight of desire and meaning, circulating as a term for “the nonplace of abolition,” a beneath and beyond of the university inhabited by maroons, castaways, and fugitives, and an “appositionality” of “being together in homelessness.”**<sup>36</sup> **How do the streams of meaning performatively attached to ‘the undercommons’ as a tool for sociopoesis frame or interact with the concept of ‘institutionality,’ as we’ve been discussing it here?** In the interview that makes up the last chapter of text, in answer to a question about the relationship between the university and the undercommons, Harney states, I don’t see the undercommons as having any necessary relationship to the university.... [T]he undercommons is a kind of comportment or on-going experiment with and as the general antagonism, a kind of way of being with others[. I]t’s almost impossible that it could be matched up with particular forms of institutional life. It would obviously be cut through in different kinds of ways and in different spaces and times.”<sup>37</sup> As a “kind of comportment,” a way of being and doing, the undercommons is not in contradiction with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s dictum that there is no such thing as “a noninstitutional environment.”<sup>38</sup> Rather, it’s a kind of practice that cannot be encompassed by “institutional life.” **It may be thought of as the placeholder for a vision of sociality without institutionality, or perhaps the sociality that happens all the time beyond and below the incorporative maneuvers of dominant institutions.** On the other hand, the ‘undercommons’ might be thought of in relation to institutionality as an excessive and ruptural sociality, a sociopoesis which demands that the active social content institutionality congeals returns to fluidity through a generative unthinking of the “hard materiality of the unreal.”<sup>39</sup> **My suggestion for thinking about pedagogy is to advocate for thinking and teaching that renews our sense of institutions as sites where the form and appearance of social being and collectivity is determined through social action and contest, even as we problematize institutions as always explicitly incorporative, as constituted out of the durable predispositions of adaptive hegemonies.** Inspired by Ferguson and Harney and Moten, **my call is perhaps to work for a disruptive institutionality, to work with the paradox of institutionality**—which pits congealed social process against lived presence—to plan for what Audre Lorde called “a new and more possible meeting,” **for a broader sense of collective social being than neo/liberal forms of institutional power let us imagine and practice.**<sup>40</sup> **Infused with the disruptive potential of illiberal discourses of collectivity, “institutionality” can be made to line up anti-intuitively with critical rubrics that empower us to try to inhabit social being otherwise (undercommons, abolition, fugitivity), while reminding us that “radical change requires structure.”**<sup>41</sup>

**Movements are ongoing resistances that happen in our thoughts, actions, provocations, and explorations. Our model of debate seeks to extend towards new**

**levels of understanding and immanent processes of resistance that unleash beautiful insurgencies from the ground up.**

**Shukaitis and Graeber ‘7** [Stevphen Shukaitis is Senior Lecturer at the University of Essex, Centre for Work and Organization, and a member of the Autonomedia editorial collective. David Rolfe Graeber is an American anthropologist and anarchist activist, perhaps best known for his 2011 volume *Debt: The First 5000 Years*. He is professor of anthropology at the London School of Economics. “Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations Collective Theorization.” ISBN 978-1-904859-35-2. Library of Congress Number: 2006924199 ©2007] //recut VK

Thoughts. Provocations. Explorations. Forms of investigation and social research that expand possibilities for political action, proliferating tactics of resistance through the constituent power of the imagination. Walking, we ask questions, not from the perspective of the theorist removed and separate from organizing, but rather from within and as part of the multiple and overlapping cycles and circuits of struggle. For the removed theorist, movements themselves are mere abstractions, pieces of data to be categorized, analyzed, and fixed. The work of militant investigation is multiple, collectively extending forms of antagonism to new levels of understanding, composing flesh-made words from immanent processes of resistance. Far from vanguardist notions of intellectual practice that translate organizing strategies and concepts for populations who are believed to be too stupid or unable to move beyond trade union consciousness, it is a process of collective wondering and wandering that is not afraid to admit that the question of how to move forward is always uncertain, difficult, and never resolved in easy answers that are eternally correct. As an open process, militant investigation discovers new possibilities within the present, turning bottlenecks and seeming dead ends into new opportunities for joyful insurgency. A beautiful example of this is John Holloway’s book, *Change the World Without Taking Power*. Holloway, a soft-spoken Scottish political philosopher, was associated with the “Open Marxism” school developed at the University of Edinburgh where he taught in the 1970s and ’80s. In 1991, he moved to Mexico where he took a position with the Instituto de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales in the Universidad Autónoma de Puebla. After the Zapatista rebellion broke out in 1994, he quickly became one of its chief intellectual supporters. In 1998, he helped compile a book of essays on the Zapatistas called *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*; this was his attempt to think through the implications of this new revolutionary paradigm, one which rejected classic Marxist ideas of vanguardism and the very project of trying to seize state power for one of building autonomous communities rooted in new forms of direct democracy, using the categories of Marxist theory. The result was an extremely dense book. At certain points, it reads like a mixture of Marxist jargon and lyric poetry: In the beginning is the scream. We scream. When we write or when we read, it is easy to forget that the beginning is not the word, but the scream. Faced with the mutilation of human lives by capitalism, a scream of sadness, a scream of horror, a scream of anger, a scream of refusal: NO. The starting point of theoretical reflection is opposition, negativity, struggle. It is from rage that thought is born, not from the pose of reason, not from the reasoned-sitting-back-and-reflecting-on-the-mysteries-of-existence that is the conventional image of the thinker. We start from negation, from dissonance. The dissonance can take many shapes. An inarticulate mumble of discontent, tears of frustration, a scream of rage, a confident roar. An unease, a confusion, a longing, a critical vibration. More than anything else, it’s a book about knowledge. Holloway argues that reality is a matter of humans doing and making things together: what we perceive as fixed self-identical objects are really processes. The only reason we insist on treating objects as anything else is because, if we saw them as they really are, as mutual projects, it would be impossible for anyone to claim ownership of them. All liberatory struggle therefore is ultimately the struggle against identity. Forms of knowledge that simply arrange and classify reality from a distance—what Holloway refers to as “knowledge- about”—may be appropriate for a vanguard party that wants to claim the right to seize power and impose itself on the basis of some privileged “scientific” understanding, but ultimately it can only work to reinforce structures of domination. True revolutionary knowledge would have to be different. It would have to be a pragmatic form of knowledge that lays bare all such pretensions; a form of knowledge deeply embedded in the logic of transformational

**practice.** Furious debates ensued. Leninists and Trotskyites lambasted the book as utopian for adopting what they considered a naïve anarchist position—one that was completely ignorant of political realities. Anarchists were alternately inspired and annoyed, often noting that Holloway seemed to echo anarchist ideas without ever mentioning them, instead writing as if his positions emerged naturally from a correct reading of classic Marxist texts. Others objected to the way he read the texts. Supporters of Toni Negri's Spinozist version of Marxism denounced the book as so much Hegelian claptrap; others suggested that Holloway's argument that any belief in self-identical objects was a reflection of capitalist logic seemed to imply that capitalism had been around since the invention of language, which ultimately made it very difficult to imagine an alternative. In Latin America, where the battle was particularly intense, a lot of the arguments turned around very particular questions of revolutionary strategy. Who has the better model: the Zapatistas of Chiapas or Chavez's Bolivarian Revolution in Venezuela? Were the Argentine radicals who over- threw four successive regimes in December of 2001 right to refuse seizing power, to reject the entire domain of formal politics and try to create their own autonomous institutions? Or had they allowed an opportunity for genuine revolutionary change to slip through their grasp? For many in the global justice movement in Europe and North America, the book provided the perfect counterpoint to Michael Hardt and Negri's *Empire*, then being hailed in the media as the bible of the movement. Where Hardt and Negri were drawing on an Italian autonomist tradition that saw capital not as imposing itself on labor but as constantly having to adjust itself to the power of workers' struggle, Holloway was arguing that this approach did not go nearly far enough. In fact, capital was labor and capitalism the system that makes it impossible for us to see this. Capitalism is something we make every day and the moment we stop making it, it will cease to exist. There were endless Internet debates. Seminars and reading groups were held comparing the two arguments in probably a dozen different languages.

**Debate is a unique medium through which discourse can be shaped. It's independent enough from traditional academia to be isolated from governmental regulations as to where the race war can be confronted.**

Victoria **Stafford**, xx-xx-xxxx, "Kritiks," debate guru, Victoria Stafford, served as both president and policy captain of the Logan High speech and debate team in Utah between 2016-17. I had been an active member of this program since my freshman year.

[https://thedebateguru.weebly.com/kritiks.html?c=mkt\\_w\\_chnl:aff\\_geo:all\\_prtmr:sas\\_subprtmr:1538097\\_camp:brand\\_adtype:txtlnk\\_ag:weebly\\_lptype:hp\\_var:358504&sscid=21k9\\_xabwc&utm\\_source=ShareASale](https://thedebateguru.weebly.com/kritiks.html?c=mkt_w_chnl:aff_geo:all_prtmr:sas_subprtmr:1538097_camp:brand_adtype:txtlnk_ag:weebly_lptype:hp_var:358504&sscid=21k9_xabwc&utm_source=ShareASale) {2-24-2025 // VK}

Whether you believe it or not, debate rounds provide a very unique space for students. It's one of the only activities where people are actually forced to listen to whatever you have to say, respond to what you have to say, and make informed decisions about what you said. As a result, many students have decided to use the debate space as a vehicle to start social change, sharing their own narratives and launching personal projects that may only slightly relate to or may even completely ignore the resolution. In this regard, kritikal debate has allowed for debaters to make the space whatever they want and talk about things they consider important in their every day lives.

**The method is voting for the aff**

**We can't end the race war, the K is our way of surviving it. – thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the best way to survive the race war. Rev v Rev debates create competition to find the best way to deal with our current crisis. Dismiss claims of “unpredictability” and appeals to “stasis” as the insulation of debate from being forced to confront its racism.**

**Sugino '23** [Corinne Mitsuye Sugino, Gonzaga University, former debaters at Wake Forest. 2023. “Clash of the Uncivilized: An Alternative Approach to Policy Debate”, <https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=cad>] pfox recut Aaron

Evolving scholarly debates over social movements, critical theory, race, and rhetoric have the potential to provide fruitful scholarly grounds upon which **rev v. rev debates** might draw on. As we contend in this section, **these debates not only constitute rhetorics of agitation that challenge the hegemony of white-dominated establishment politics but present a model for considering clash between two strategies outside of government reform**. Although traditional debate considers the hypothetical imagination of government reform to be the natural stasis of debate writ-large, this **stasis is justified through social construction**, not inherent limits on the scope of the topic. As Robert Krizek and Thomas Nakayama (1995) highlight, whiteness functions as the unspoken, universal standard of communication, in which the ideas, identities, and experiences of white people are presumed as a “neutral” consensus. Sylvia Wynter (2003) speaks to the “overrepresentation of Man as human,” in describing how **white people stand in as the metaphysical referent point for what it means to be human itself**. Similarly, the **white traditional policy debater stands in as the rhetorical, intellectual and practical referent point of debate par excellence framing critical challenges** forwarded by Black and minority debaters **as peripheral, threatening, and unpredictable**. This is not to say that only white debaters advance policy arguments and only Black and minority debaters advance critical arguments. Nevertheless, traditional debate continues to overrepresent white debaters while critical debate has largely been responsible for increasing Black and minority participation. More importantly, critical debate has been racialized through Blackness because much of the anxiety surrounding its inception associates critical debate with questions of identity, privilege, and personal experiences of racial domination. Much of this anxiety surrounded Louisville in particular and race-based performance and critical debate writ-large. In her examination of the Los Angeles Riots, Tamara Nopper (2006) argues that despite the participation of Latino/a/x people in the riots, the riots themselves are associated with Blackness as a signifier for criminality in the American cultural imagination, and therefore the Latino/a/x rioters were understood through this racializing frame. Similarly, one can understand how the supposed threats posed by critical debates are associated with the threat of Blackness, insofar as Blackness stands in for and gives coherency to threats to the civility, stasis and sovereignty of white policy debate as its constitutive outside (Kelsie, 2019). That Solt identified the shift from “culture war” to “clash of civilization” speaks to the way in which these forms of debate were considered particularly threatening to the activity – likely in no small part due to underlying anti-Blackness. **That white policy debate remains overrepresented as debate writ large does not point to its inherent center of any given resolution**. Consider for example, Lisa Flores’ (2016) consideration of racial rhetorical criticism in the discipline of communication. She contends that despite the fact that minority scholars and scholarship concerning race remain marginalized in the canon, that rhetorical studies at its core is bound up with questions of race. This is because rhetoric is concerned with politics, publics, and cultural discourses, and race is central to all of those aspects. **We suggest scholars ought to consider the ways in which race lies at the core of every resolutional question in different ways, as each year the resolution typically considers topics relevant to political publics and social change**. One may object that by design, the resolutional question is meant to change the surrounding scholarship every year so that it is topic-specific and thus allowing scholarship on race to be at the heart of every topic is problematic. However, this does not discard the fact that different areas of scholarship on race might be connected to each topic, just like each year policy debate continually draws from the disciplines of international relations, political theory, and legal theory, even though their particular cases vary with each resolution. **Proponents of a traditional policy interpretation of the topic often contend specifically that the mechanism, or the actor, in the resolution is necessary to make it predictable. However, as we have been arguing throughout this essay, traditional policy debate’s overrepresentation of debate is not neutral consensus, but a normalized process informed by racialized assumptions. Traditionally the words in the resolution are assumed to describe fiat, or hypothetical imagination. Yet none of the words in any given resolution can be described definitively as meaning hypothetical imagination**. A team could read a plan text and then describe the affirmative case as irony. They could also read a plan text as a metaphor. These would technically conform to the words in the resolution, and thus reveal it is not the words that limit out “unpredictable” mechanisms but a community norm. In this regard, **fiat is technically speaking an arbitrary, extra-topical inclusion**. It does not gain authority from the words in the resolution, instead it informs how debaters and coaches ought to interpret those words. Put differently, fiat is not inherently predictable based on the resolution, but **only predictable based on a tradition**. However, as Louisville and other Black and critical teams have pointed to, that tradition is steeped in the **overrepresentation of white debaters, their interests, their desires, and their claims to what the activity ought to look like**. When this aspect is taken into consideration with our aforementioned point that the topic selection and resolutional wording process is itself informed by racialized archival processes, new conceptualizations of clash beyond this restrictive framework become necessary. In addition to engaging with the heart of the resolution, **rev v. rev debate and critical debate more broadly might be thought of as an engagement not with any particular social movement or revolution but rather with the question of what moves the**



**social** In McGee's (1980) essay on the rhetoric of social movements, he draws a distinction between perspectives that approach social movement as "phenomenon" and social movement as "meaning." The essence of this distinction is that while prior scholars have often treated social movements as discrete, self-contained entities that in reality scholars of communication ought to address social movements not as a noun but as a verb. He contends that social movements are not clearly delineated phenomena but instead are processes that develop as collective and impact the world through rhetoric. Thus, the question for him is not what a social movement is, but instead what moves the social. Similarly, instead of examining a single self-contained policy action, or

considering a hypothetical activist action, much of critical debate considers questions of ontology, language orientation and representation. Contrary to the idea that these debates do not think about material action (Solt, 2004), we suggest they shift the paradigm of debate from a particular policy phenomenon to think critically about **what**

**moves the social**. As Happe (2013) suggests, racism continues not simply as an overt idea or discriminatory action, but through the ritualistic performance of material-discursive practices in media, legal, academic, and everyday settings. Thus, in considering the ways in which language practices, political orientations, and performative expressions impact race relations in debate, critical debate confronts the material terrain on which race and domination are enacted and reenacted. Taking rev v. rev and critical debate seriously thus requires reconceptualizing how we approach social change, and this viewpoint is supported in social movements literature. Rev v. rev debate enables scholars and debaters to consider the complexities of social change in a more nuanced way. Critical theory and social movements scholarship provide important grounds for challenging traditional state-based politics, in some ways enacting what John Bowers and Donovan

Ochs (1971) refer as a "rhetoric of agitation" in which those outside of traditional decision-making institutions attempt to produce social change. However, rev v. rev debate not only encompasses those affirmative or negative cases which would seek to challenge the state, but also contain important debates between two non-state-based strategies and scholarship. One might consider, for example, the collegial scholarly debates between afro-pessimists like Jared Sexton (2009) and Frank Wilderson (2010) and scholars such as Fred Moten (2013) over how to approach the relationship between Black social life and social death. There exists as well fruitful debate between settler colonial studies and Black studies, involving interlocutors such as Tiffany King (2013). Moreover, intramural debates exist between a focus on physical structures of racial capitalism versus the affective ways in which emotion produces social violence (see Robinson, 1983; Wang,

2018; Ahmed, 2004). These are only some of the examples of overlapping, interdisciplinary scholarly conversations that occur outside of policymaking amongst different scholars theorizing race and other structures of power that debate has heretofore marginalized in favor of a focus solely on public policy. What these disciplinary debates point to are untapped resources for expanding the nuances of debate's theoretical repertoire. Moreover, they present the opportunity for understanding social change in a more nuanced way. Palczewski and Harr-Lagin

(2016) contend that rhetorical scholars of social movements ought to move beyond a narrow view of social movements only occurring along the binary of protesters/establishment in order to explore contestation that occurs between two actors or groups outside of the establishment. After Roe v. Wade, pro-life activists could no longer appeal to the state to crack down on abortion clinics, so they went directly to the clinics to protest. In response, an Iowa City clinic appealed for protection, but the state denied their request on the grounds that the pro-life activists had a right to free speech. The clinic then created a "Pledge-A-Picketer" campaign, in which they asked supporters to pledge a certain amount of money for as long as a picketer was there protesting the clinic. They would broadcast to the pro-life activists that they were actually raising money for the clinic to perform abortions and other procedures. Palczewski and Harr-Lagin (2016) contend that this is but one example of the types of social change and contestation occluded by a focus only on state actors versus agitators. Instead, they contend that two groups can contest each other over creating social change outside of state involvement. Taking this into consideration, then, rev v. rev debates present the opportunity to make debate's analysis of social change more nuanced, as the debates between them not only mirror academic debates but strategies for negotiating social change outside of academic settings. In her exploration of the afterlife of slavery and the possibilities for navigating an anti-Black world, Christina Sharpe (2016) speaks to the ways in which Black academics are often forced to read, think, and write within white-dominated academic disciplines that work in service of their oppression. Arguing against the impulse to structurally adjust one's work to fit the confines of constraining disciplinary norms, she (Sharpe, 2016) writes "we must become undisciplined. The work we do requires new modes and methods of research and teaching; new ways of entering and leaving the archive of slavery" (p.13). The sanctioned limits of the resolution, which only encompass the boundaries of public policy, **remain far**

**too restrictive**. Both critical debate and rev v. rev debate aim to challenge the disciplining structure of policy debate and consider new research methods for combatting ongoing violence. Rev v. rev debates and critical debate challenges the overrepresentation of white policy debate as debate itself, pushing the activity to encompass new research methods and scholarly conversations that might aid in the liberation of people of color in general and Black people in particular. Put differently, rev v. rev pushes us to consider the how the limits of the resolution are drawn in power-laden ways and what alternative forms of debate might arise if we release our attachments to policy debate as representative of debate's full and only potential. In light of this meditation on the scholarly grounding for rev v. rev as an alternative form of clash and engagement, we conclude by connecting this discussion to a reflection on the legacy of Louisville and how contemporary forms of non-traditional debate might counteract the way in which white policy debate has laid claim to the limits of debate itself.

## Social movements can't be topical, policies leave out minority movements

**Traber 18** (Becca Traber, PhD candidate at Yale University in Political Science, in the subfield of political theory. My research focuses on American social movements and their close intellectual collaborators, specializing in deliberative democracy, political epistemology, and political thought about race, gender, and sexuality. NSD Staff Writer, <https://www.nsdebatecamp.com/nsdupdate/fiat-and-radical-politics> shree)

This trend in debate has ignored, however, what I see as the most pertinent question. Namely, what sort of skills are actually conducive to radical political action? We might think that we need to engage in the state as activists, but what does state engagement as activists look like? There has been a systematic failure of imagination in terms of thinking through what politics looks like when it is done by marginalized people and in favor of radical causes. My argument is that the idea of fiat is uniquely bad training for activist, leftist, or radical politics.

Fiat fundamentally distorts radical advocacies. This article does not argue that we should care about how debate trains us for activism—I take as given that we should be concerned with the sort of education that we are getting and we should tailor our education toward developing students capable of engaging in radical politics. By radical politics, I mean politics that aims to intervene on the status quo predominately by asking for a substantial shift in favor of marginalized positions, people, or perspectives. This is obviously not a formal definition and is not intended to be. I'm aiming to talk

about a group of political perspectives with a family resemblance that characterizes them oppositionally to mainstream party politics. This includes both “pragmatic” leftist framing as well as what is known as “high theory” kritiks. The definition of fiat that I’m relying on that it is the act of imagination that allows us to avoid the contradiction between solvency and inherency, typically through the assumption of the passage of a state-based policy option without consideration of the political likelihood of that passage. Fiat is structured such that the negative debater is unable to question the likelihood of something happening as long as the aff debater defends the normal means of that thing happening. This is a way of thinking that only makes sense if the only thing we are able to fiat is state legislative action. For all other forms of political action, there is no real way to separate normal means, passage of the “policy,” and effects of the “policy.” The ideal of state politics is such that we imagine congress passes a bill and does so in a way that the content of the bill is separable from the wheeling and dealing that allowed for it to be created. This is problematic as an assumption on its face— implementation through the rest of the government is undeniably affected by the way the bill was argued and, indeed, the judicial branch often considers congressional intent when evaluating a bill. Additionally, bills passed through congress typically are too vague to actually implement on their own and need a significant amount of bureaucratic interpretation and adjustment through the executive branch in order to be implemented. But all that aside, there is at least a sensible way of separating the literal bill from the vote that got it passed. If you are not advocating for the state, the separation between a policy and the means by which it is passed necessitated by fiat is impossible. What policy was passed by the feminist movement? The movement was the advocacy and the actions taken by the feminist movement was the advocacy. The “solvency” of collective action cannot be separated from the things that are done in the collective action. This is true for all non-state actors who don’t have a formal parliamentary procedure. A community creating institutions for itself typically doesn’t have strict bylaws which outline what normal means for change would be. This puts the kritikal debater in an impossible dilemma when they are asked to fiat or implement some sort of policy. People who run these types of implementation arguments should stop pretending that the kritik they are arguing against would be possible at all, in any meaningful way, if it were to fiat. There is no fair version of the kritik that is at all meaningfully similar to the kritik and there is no topical version of critical affs. The way we construct implementation and fiat in debate can only be thought as a state action. Insisting on fiat in all cases functionally means that we cannot run arguments about politics outside the state without radically distorting the nature of that politics. Many debaters assume that the only “practical” or “pragmatic” politics occur through the state. However, this is not the case. Things like the feminist movements intervention on norms of sexual harassment are examples of politics outside the state. Collapsing the recent backlash to sexual harassment precipitated by Harvey Weinstein and others to possible state action ignores that the state could not possibly intervene in an adequate way to change those norms. The norms about sexual behavior in the workplace must change, but they can only reasonably change through politics engaged outside the state. Thinking of it in terms of state politics conceals the necessity of non-state politics. This is uniquely bad because the reality of the situation is that the percentage of debaters who will have a chance to be internal to the state is minuscule, but all debaters could plausibly engage in non-state movement politics. All the evidence that people read in favor of fiat and state-based implementation makes education claims that assume the necessary training one needs to engage in politics involves thinking about the state, but fiat is not the tool to do that. Fiat doesn’t ask us to think about how to engage in politics as citizens who live under a state, it asks us to pretend that we are the state. In a real way, it is also inadequate as a way of roleplaying a policy-maker, because the reality of politics as a legislature is significantly more complicated than being able to wave a magic wand and implement whatever policy is wanted. Fiat is a construction where we don’t even roleplaying as a human, much less as plausibly political actors. Pretending that radical non-status quo politics are something that could be implemented by the state fundamentally distorts how we think about those politics. One popular option to deal with the above dilemma is to import radical politics into the state and imagine policies that would result from particular radical political ideologies. This is what happens when someone advocates, for instance, that the USFG gives back the land to indigenous people as a fiat affirmative plan. There is a range of ways this is executed. On one end of this spectrum, you have policies which are barely different from what is advocated by mainstream politicians. On the other extreme, you have policies which are explicitly intended to serve as the downfall of the USFG in their passage or intend to provoke uprisings from parts of the population. The reality is that while radical and leftist politics occasional results in policy action, conceiving of it in terms of policy action distorts the nature of that politics. If one were to set about with the goal of combating anti-blackness, as history has demonstrated, the first step cannot be to try to be a policy maker. A politician with a radical advocacy cannot get elected until that advocacy has enough support that people will vote for her. For instance, a politician who ran on dismantling the United States or erasing all distinctions between animals and people to solve anthro would not have a constituency without a substantial social movement to develop that constituency. This problem is inherent to any advocacy which significantly challenges status quo ideals. Things in the status quo are in the status quo because a lot of people and powerful people agree with them. Before that can change more than incrementally, a lot of people have to change their mind. If you were to seriously consider how to implement a



strategy of radical politics, it would make no sense to have the first step be electoral. **None of the major social movements were driven by policy action— policies are driven by social movements.** Fiating radical politics hides the **radical politics** entirely. Focusing on policy actions, in this context, actively distorts how we should consider radical politics. Even if it were the case that we would eventually need policy actions to finally solve issues of marginalization, that does not mean that we should start off with a question of fiat. **Fiat erases the work necessary to allow for policy changes. It does not help us think about the movements we will have to create and the ways we will have to persuade. This means that claims about the necessity of state action are besides the point— state action is only caused by a lot of non-state action that we have to think about first and that fiat erases. The conceptual work that debaters often want to exclude by insisting of fiating policy is exactly the type of thing that radical politics does. Radical politics needs to persuade and imagine new possibilities, first and foremost. Fiating away the process of change by which radical politics would be implemented makes irrational critical parts of radical politics in the real world. A good example is the alternate social institutions implemented by Black nationalist organizations like the Black Panther Party.** If we don't have to consider the process of change, the benefit of having alternate institutions becomes significantly less. The types of benefit are different, as well. In a world of fiat, the only benefit of creating an institution outside of the state would be incidental to the immediate effects of the institution. **Why develop free breakfast outside the school system when we could just fiat free breakfast inside of it?** The fact that it would not be possible in the immediate future to implement the breakfast in the school system or the state and people need breakfast (or other help) right now should be relevant to the consideration of what political strategy to use. **Fiat is a crutch that prevents us from seeing ways we can intervene in our communities to create good things, right now, without relying on the vast institution of the state. Fiat trains debaters to think like legislators, not like organizers, but the only way to have substantial change from the status quo is to organize. The available set of options in legislative space can change, but it can only change from the outside. Using fiat erases this and is fundamentally incompatible with what it would take to organize.** There is an inherent conservatism in the insistence on fiat, in that fiat is only comprehensible with extremely incrementalist politics. **The type of policies that are able to be enacted by people already in positions of power are always going to be close to the policies that are already in place.** Not debating about the means through which policies get enacted means that we can never explore changes that involve changing the means of policy enactment. The reality is, however, that there are occasionally radical changes in public life. These changes are never in a meaningful way first caused by the passage of the policy and always rely on a process of social change that came before. **Fiat assumes we already know the realm of the possible and erases any potential of thinking about changing it. This means that arguments focusing on the fact that the state can be useful in radical politics misunderstand the issue.** Even if the state is a useful part of political change at some point in the process, it certainly isn't the initial step. And even if we need to think about politics while acknowledging that the state is a real force (ie "use the state as a heuristic"), we must do so by imagining what our movements look like in the world as it is. That is, we should not ignore that the state exists, but it's existence doesn't mean that we should fiat a policy action in the state as a way of implementing a radical policy solution. It would be enough to take seriously the state as an obstacle for non-state politics, while still advocating for non-state politics. And, moreover, the idea of using the state as a tool for change ignores the reality of what social change takes. This means **fiating with radical politics is not only misleading, it actively teaches wrong things about what radical politics looks like. The type of education it provides is counterproductive if we actually want our debates to help further a political project.** One thing someone could think is that we need to imagine fiating a policy option as a first step in a political project, because we need to imagine what the goal of the political project should look like. Fiat, as a form of ideal theory, helps us determine the possibilities of political action. However, this as a framing necessarily means that we would be determining the political goals of radical politics without considering the process through which those goals are created over the course of the development of a movement. That is, the discussion of the effects of a policy as the first step in thinking about politics abstracts away from the reality of differential epistemic access to the world. When a debater offers her policy action, she is not doing so in conversation with all the relevant communities that could be affected by that policy. She is not participating in a conversation—she is stopping the conversation and asserting that a policy "would be best" in the abstract. **Different perspectives can give guidance on how we ought to understand what a desirable policy action would be.** What this means is that the purpose of radical political action should always develop in a fluid way, through the actual practice of political change and from within the movement itself. We don't need to decide at the beginning what we ought to do in an absolute sense and the attempt to do so forecloses conversation. **Objectives in social movements are determined in a more fluid way than a formal policy white paper. We determine our objectives in the process of conversation. This means the model of fiating the final goal of radical politics not only distorts the nature of social movements and collective action, it assumes a certainty about the objective of politics in a way that prevents the possibility of minoritarian critique.** The process of developing a politics changes the objectives of political movements and to ignore this process forecloses the real radical possibility of diverse collective action. **The insistence on fiat in round functions to erase minority perspectives empirically.** If the AC has a radical policy option, they will often use policy making good arguments to take out various critiques that try to point out how the AC is missing the perspectives of minority voices. The focus on policy making is used as a weapon to preclude discussion. This not only is a moral harm in itself, it means that we will be engaging in bad politics. **A policy making first framework excludes epistemic contributions from people**

outside the mainstream, meaning that we will inevitably miss harms to marginalized populations at the core of our advocacies. The erasure of critique from the outside means we cannot trust that the plan will do what it claims to do without horrible externalities. Further, advocacies and alternatives which are centered around processes and conceptual frameworks are significantly more similar to the nature of goal-setting in the real world. Take the example of the anarchist-influenced Food Not Bombs. You may think that this would be a case where it would be easy to graft fiat onto a social movement because they are so strongly associated with a specific action—namely, feeding the homeless. However, in fact, this seemingly straightforward political goal had a variety of complicated trade offs and considerations. Should they prioritize food or the anarchist literature that they tended to pass out with the food? What neighborhoods should they serve with their food? How should they interact with the police and with disruptive people who interrupted their food service? Should they apply for permits for serving food? Should they associate with religious organizations doing similar work? How should white organizers respond to critiques from black participants and black organizers? How should they manage a class disconnect between the people serving food and the people eating it? In debate, we would be significantly more attracted to a fiat specific “policy” of “serving food to the homeless,” abstracting away from all these issues as normal means. People work to be non-committal about the issues above for strategic reasons and they are able to do so because of fiat. But in many ways, characterizing the political project of Food Not Bombs in concrete terms is less accurate than characterizing it in conceptual terms. The “fiated policy” over-simplifies the reality, which is that they are an organization framed around a conceptual commitment to direct action and serving people outside of the state. Having a commitment to concepts rather than specific policy options is in a real sense more pragmatic than specific policy actions that are able to be fiated because the concepts allow you to resolve disputes over objectives that inevitably rise in the process of executing a specific action. For instance, if the foundational principle of Food Not Bombs is about spreading consciousness of anarchist principles and the possibilities of outside the state, they shouldn’t refrain from having political material if that was a condition of getting a permit from the state. The strategic incentives of fiat push debaters away from the crucial questions of specific decisions that activists make, into vague and idealized conjecture about how the world works. This is to say, if we are legitimately thinking about what sort of thing a person engaging in movement based radical or leftist politics needs to know, the answer will never first be the actually implementable goal that has the possibility of “solvency.” It is not useful for an anarchist to think of the precise mechanism by which she intends to dismantle the state. It is also not useful to think about intermediate steps as concrete policy actions. Specific things that radical political groups do are better thought of as instantiations of conceptual commitments. This means that people who insist kritiks fiat for educational reasons have it exactly backwards. The things we learn when we fiat are useless in comparison to the discussion of what conceptual commitments we ought to have, even in terms of the most hard-nosed evaluation of political effects. It also means that to say it is unfair because you can’t link certain types of arguments just demonstrates a failure of creativity and a conservative insistence on all types of politics adhering to a narrow window of political tactics.]

**The ballot is key because wins and losses shape the direction of the activity, a vote for our advocacy inspires others to run it as well. A cascade of rev v rev debates encourage competition to create the best model of surviving the race war.**

## **1AC: The Race War (899)**

We are in the midst of a race war. 21<sup>st</sup> century racialized white nationalist hate is the extended order of historical oppression. White humanity in all its hypocrisy structures the status quo: perpetual violence that “*is steeped in an edifice of accessibility*”. Narratives of racial progress ignore - “*resurgent white nationalism*” Revolution is possible, but it must come from the classrooms. **Rodriguez 19:** Contrary to liberal narratives, the white national form is everywhere, Against all evidence of racial progress, promises postponed futurity for racial domestic war. Blurring conflation of human life with Mankind in its mastery, Subjects of a domestication incarcerated perpetual war . cultural-juridical-military statutes constantly

reconstruct the anti-civilizational profile. Civil war is always global. They're upset you can't appreciate how far you've come. Supremacy is violently enforced from genocidal to low-intensity. The end of official apartheid are maneuvers of sustainability toward flexible racial power precisely because White ascendancy already assembles common sense. Rebellions of the classroom bear insurgency among people who refuse to participate in an oppressive system, don't rely on mass numbers. Willingness of committed collectives has capacity to spark revolution

Trump is President. DEI is repealed. January 6<sup>th</sup> protesters and ICE have free reign. The “*racial agenda*” is on full display with unique exclusion. **Sellers 25**: This time is different. Anti-DEI or canceling identity celebrations like Black History Month. In spite of this, many of us have grown numb. What is our voice? Trump's rhetoric invoking race and division reversed an order that prohibited federal employment discrimination. Stopped every civil rights and police reform and pardoned white supremacists who organized insurrection.

The classroom is being colonized everyday, ensuring the inevitable rise of racist attitudes. The banning of critical race theory aims to “Refocus American education on cultivating patriotic citizens. The White House argues classroom time should be dedicated rather than discuss race and systematic inequality; don’t want that propaganda taught!” **Martin 25**: Trump ban CRT Schools that continue CRT lose federal aid.

The alternative is militant preservation. It harnesses the energy of sociality to refuse the violent corrective of White Being in favor of a new feeling, a haptic relationality where we open ourselves to the possibilities of possibilities **Melamed 16**: A performative event repeated with each reading. Rupture institutionality to undo their logics of individualizing, reducing and commanding the individual. Sociality itself is resistance. Policy’ is political control and command. Diagnosing ‘incorrectness’ counterpose ‘planning’ begins with “militant preservation” To escape proceduralism “hapticality, or love,” to feel others in the undercommons’

Movements are ongoing resistances that happen in our thoughts, actions, provocations, and explorations. Our model of debate seeks to extend towards new levels of understanding and immanent processes of resistance that unleash beautiful insurgencies from the ground up.

**Shukaitis et Graeber 07**: Investigation and social research expand possibilities for political action. Militant investigation discovers new possibilities within the present, turning dead ends into joyful insurgency. True revolutionary knowledge would have to be a pragmatic form of knowledge that lays bare all pretensions; deeply embedded in the logic of transformational practice. Reject formal politics for genuine revolutionary change.

Debate is a unique medium through which discourse can be shaped. It's independent enough from traditional academia to be isolated from governmental regulations as to where the race war can be confronted. **Stafford**: debates provide a very unique space. People are actually forced to listen to what you say. The debate space is a vehicle to start social change.

The method is voting for the aff

We can't end the race war, the K is our way of surviving it. — thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the best way to survive the race war. Rev v Rev debates create competition to find the best way to deal with our current crisis. Dismiss claims of “unpredictability” and appeals to “stasis” as the insulation of debate from being forced to confront its racism. **Sugino 23**: Rev v. rev debates challenge hegemony of white politics present clash outside stasis . White traditional debate as the referent of excellence, framing critical challenges as unpredictable.. Race lies at the core of every resolution not neutral consensus, but normalized racialized assumptions. None of the words in resolution mean hypothetical imagination. Fiat is arbitrary, only predictable based on a traditional overrepresentation of white debaters. Important debates between non-state-strategies Sexton Wilderson and Moten only move beyond a narrow view, limits too restrictive. Rev v. rev pushes us to consider debate's potential.

Social movements can't be topical, policies leave out minority movements. **Traber 18**: Fiat is uniquely bad for activists. There is no topical version . Insisting on fiat means we can't run politics outside the state. Debaters assume the only pragmatic " politics" occur through the state. Not the case. feminist movements intervention on norms are examples state politics conceals the necessity of non-state politics. The percent of debaters who will have a chance to be internal to the state is minuscule, but all debaters could engage in non-state. None of the major social movements were driven by policy action policies are driven by movements. Radical politics exclude by insisting fiat The insistence on fiat functions erase minority perspectives empirically.

The ballot is key because wins and losses shape the direction of the activity, a vote for our advocacy inspires others to run it as well. A cascade of rev v rev debates encourage competition to create the best model of surviving the race war.

## Cut Case

**We are in the midst of a race war. 21<sup>st</sup> century racialized white nationalist hate is the extended order of historical oppression. White humanity in all its hypocrisy structures the status quo: perpetual violence that “*is steeped in an edifice of accessibility*”. Narratives of racial progress ignore - “*resurgent white nationalism*” Revolution is possible, but it must come from the classrooms.**

**Rodríguez '19** [Dylan Rodríguez; professor of Ethnic Studies at University of California, Riverside. teacher, scholar, organizer and collaborator who has worked at the University of California-Riverside since 2001. He is a faculty member in the recently created Department of Black Study as well as the Department of Media and Cultural Studies. Dylan served as Chair of the Department of Ethnic Studies from 2009-2016, Chair of the UCR Academic Senate from 2016-2020, and has worked as the Co-Director of the UCR Center for Ideas and Society since 2021. As the Co-Director of the Center, he created the Decolonizing Humanism(?) programming stream, which features scholars, artists, and intellectuals based in revolutionary, anti-colonial, and liberationist movements from all over the world. Dylan was elected President of the American Studies Association by his peers in 2020, the same year in which he was named to the inaugural class of Freedom Scholars, a national award program that intends to “recognize the role that Freedom Scholars play in cultivating and nurturing movements for justice and freedom.” Dylan’s lifework focuses on liberationist, anticolonial, and abolitionist confrontations with the antiblack, colonial, and white supremacist violences that permeate the ongoing Civilization project. He is devoted to studying and teaching the historical, collective genius of rebellion, survival, and insurgent futurity that radically challenge dominant forms of authority, power, and institutionality. “Insult/Internal Debate/Echo” in Propter Nos, Vol 3 : Anti-/Non-, Winter 2019, True Leap Press, P 125–131 <https://trueleappress.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/01/pn3-rodri%CC%81guez-insultinternal-debateecho-final.pdf>] recut Aaron // recut VK

Suspicion and accusation are a minimal disturbance to a force that spills endless violations of spirit, memory, and flesh. There is no state of exception, just a grinding normal that concedes reform in the demand, inventing and refurbishing a Civilizational imperative. White supremacy is but a minimal term for this extended order of things. Its dangers become refined and acute under changing protocols of recruitment, retention, expulsion, and elimination. The white nationalist imperative surges and retreats. Contrary to liberal narratives of the reaction’s periodic and exceptional rise on waves of mobilized xenophobia, misogyny, and populist racialized “hate,” the white national form is constantly in evidence, everywhere shaping the multiculturalist diversity initiatives that re-embody the inheritances of 1619 and Manifest Destiny.

The nominal abolition of United States apartheid has been followed by more than half a century of proliferating, innovative, and sometimes authentically new regimes of gendered racial domination and state sanctioned racist violence. Against all apparent and sometimes spectacular evidence of its absurdity, there is a resilient narrative of national racial progress, characterized by the insult of an insistence. The depth and normalcy of the interdisciplinary, multimedia, terror-inducing methodologies of racist reaction are not mere resurgences or disruptions, but are affirmations that such racial progress is in fact at hand. There is no hypocrisy in the gestures of subjection when they are already enmeshed in the coercive promises of postponed or suspended futurity for those who fit the civil-enemy

**profile of gendered racial domestic war.** In such instances, survival tends to be a question raised for the absolute present tense, and so the edge of the insult is in the insistence that there is a future to be shared, in fact, that there is a “humanity” within the deadly span of raciality that can ever even be remotely common, familial, or universal.

internal debate (redemption)

The United States, if it is to exist as such, is always necessarily a theater of racial nation- building with vacillating movements and subtitles: post-civil rights multiculturalism, resurgent white nationalism, post-racial liberalism, law-and-order, the War on Drugs, the War on Terror, and the infrastructures of tolerance and repression are never finally separable. There is a deadly coherence to the historical variations of this statecraft and cultural formation, crystallizing in the allegation that certain counter-positions within their fields correspond with redemptive possibilities.

The historical record shows what the allegation of redemption entails when waged and executed by the subjects of a transatlantic, hemispheric, and global promise of white human vindication: formed in the crucible of the Encounter, it is the making of Mankind in White Being (with all its gendered correlates) that determines the economics, jurisprudence, political philosophy, social science, and geographic coordinates of conquest-in-permanence. There is preliminary and always-unfolding violence in raciality as a principle term in Mankind’s cohering of language, vision, feeling, science, spirit, and subjectivity in this globality of imagination and economy.

The fraud of the post-racial and the post-civil rights allegations, then, is not merely in the unbroken chain of racist casualties produced through systemic and scene specific assaults on both collective physiology and the mere possibility of shared, symbolic integrity. The deepest discrepancy is in the pretense that there is any possibility for categorical rather than piecemeal (temporary, fleeting, flimsy) inclusion in this apartheid speciation of “humanity,” an apartheid that cannot be dismantled in law or even nominally abolished, unless Mankind—and crucially, the material and symbolic grounds of Mankind’s global integrity as such—becomes the subject of a creative disintegration (some will call this terrorism, others call it their hope for tomorrow). The speciation draws its dominance from a changing circuit of abstraction and embodiment: there is a template for humanity’s progress, there are terms (scientific, Biblical, politico-economic, or otherwise) through which the most evolved, blessed, modern, and autonomous of the human species may be recognized as such, and these abstractions are always tied to notions of manifest personhood, including but not limited to genes, spirit, blood, epidermis, and cranial capacity (such is the rough description of humanity’s speciation—a narrative of differentiation within the category of human being that militarizes the terms of the ascendant species-group). These are the premises of White Being.

Apprehend the United States, in the fullest distensions of its colonial and chattel formation, as an internal debate over the relative violence, vulgarity, sophistication, and political capaciousness of white humanity. The latter, you will recall, is the position that offers humanitarian favors against the wish and urge to violently decline them. There is a claim that persists beneath the din of civil accommodations, that changes in tenor but not in premise. Accusations of backwardness, savagery, tribalism, and even fundamentalism become self-replicating when such humanitarianism is rejected by the ungrateful, suspicious antagonists of white humanity’s creeping universals. The language of urban-to-rural insurrection—when the people “riot,” “loot,” burn, and destroy—moves from a vocabulary of anti-humanitarianism (which, in this sense, is also a recalibration of the world to mirror the evil) to insist that it is in the moment when the representatives of white humanity extend the helping hand that there must be a state of militant opposition: a tensing against the insult. It is in times like this that the white human creates the groundwork of its forcible universality.

This is the other side of the aforementioned redemption: a rejection of the invitation to thrill in the absolute violence of a charity. There are different versions of the gesture—modernization, independence, full citizenship, franchise, rights. Appendages of another body, an alien body. Rejection comes later, when the charity is experienced as redemption in their evil, white evil, which created the need for their industrialized condescension in the first place. It is part of the generalized fact that the white human condition—the condition of Mankind’s restoration, remaking, and periodic reconstruction—is already steeped in an edifice of accessibility (the common sense of humanism rests on the myth of access). This human in the seat of humanism calls on other species to feed, to shit, to vote, to work, to speak, to dance, to enlist, to sit at the table in the house for a little while (but don’t overstay your welcome, because you should beware of the grounds of such hospitality). What if, after “American Apartheid,” there is only more chattel, more displacement, more of apartheid’s spatial and physiological ordering? echo

Meanwhile, there is a darker echo that restates the gestures of global white assistance— philanthropic, structurally adjusted, diversity inclusive, military occupied, and otherwise—as a conjugated dehumanization. The echo shudders an anti-colonial and plantation-burning violence, another kind of redemption in the symbolic genesis of white humanity’s de-centering. In this instance, it is not the dark suffering that matters, but rather the fact of the exposure, the vulnerability, the imminence and inevitability of the suffering—this is what explodes the presumptuous arrogance of the white humanist universal, which is another way of saying that in this glimpse, we are daring to privilege the inheritance of a sensibility that the world exists on Mankind’s terms, and this is an intimacy with the most alienating feeling. To be in a world not of your making, to be told that you must become in a manner alien to the conditions of your exposure.

It is often this alienation that fosters another differentiation, one that speaks collective genius in the imagining and fugitive practice of Mankind's obsolescence, the denaturing of the human speciation and thus, the reduction of white evil (by extension, white liberal humanism) to a localized, dysfunctional, even tribal matter that finally has little or nothing to do with the insurgency of all other life, including the other humans who have fantasized the demise of Mankind over many generations. The violence of which they accuse the savages and the slaves is often attributed to this idea. Merely the idea.

In Dallas a few are felled by a sniper's rounds in the midst of a demonstration for Black lives that was irreparably, painstakingly, also pro-police. A scattering thereafter, unsure how to read the blood on tar, a few wondering aloud what would happen if the fleeting moment of anti-state terror were socialized against its dense congruence with the proto-genocidal facts of Blackness. Here is another opportunity to alter the protocols of war by considering the absolute asymmetries of fatality and casualty—another way of showing the identity of law and brutality, thus the misapplication of our common phrase, "police brutality."

Consider the recent periods of crisis, emergency, and militant reformist demand as a political inheritance in continuity with the limits of that internal "American" debate. In this framing, the stakes are entirely affixed to the reorientations of Mankind and the question of whether a potential transformation (expansion) of its imagined collective is remotely capable of altering the intensity of casualties that fabricate the Indian, the Negro, the Alien, et. al. The blurring confluences of human life (in all its vulnerability and incommensurable wildness) with Mankind (in its self-narratives of autonomy, mastery, and ascendancy) provoke the other allegations of redemption, which are only ever aspirational. It is why, in contemporary parlance, "diversity" is always tethered to "tolerance and respect:" the vulnerable wild ones are the subjects of a domestication that never quite works.

The sources of the echo are the involuntary inhabitants of the blurring, outside Mankind (subhuman, colonized, expropriated, chattel) and incarcerated by the contingencies of white civil society's freedoms. To live inside the blur in this way is to be intimately familiar with the perpetual condition of war and conquest, even as there is constant struggle to apprehend the consequences of the totality, because there are counter-positions within the blur. There are casualties of varying intensity, some contingent and others paradigmatic. Yet there remains a persistent demand that crosses these counter-positions, anchored in the demand for security of body and the dream of collective futurity. This demand-dream runs the risk of coalescing with the terms of the internal debate. It is the militancy of an insistence on becoming the tolerated and respected, which of course is not really a becoming at all. This is when the echo is most open to misreadings, disciplined-harnessed-monetized by the organized entrepreneurial compromises of the "Non-Governmental Organizations" and the Non-Profit Industrial Complex.

We should be clear that the problem is not necessarily in the desire for redemption as a protective capacity in circumstances of duress. (At times, finding redemption through faith and spiritual practice is the only accessible pathway to insurgent mobilization around a shared social-historical as well as extra-earthly fate.) Rather, the dilemma is in the horizon of the fulfillment. What would happen on the eve of White Being's concession that Black lives matter? The terms of the internal debate can only allow for the gesture of a concession which subsists on some peculiar idiosyncrasies: the notion of policing in equitability; a reordering of statecraft and cultural structure that affirms respect for and tolerance of those other lives; a statement of egalitarian value that nonetheless endorses another apartheid principle of human speciation, "separate but equal." It becomes clear that redemption in winning protective capacity is only that, and only for now. This is a problem of mistaken or misplaced horizons. Of course, horizons are open to interpretation and imagination, and must be projected as a matter of definition, so there is plenty of room to do good work here, which requires that the problem of political horizon be posed in the first place, as a problem, in fact, as the kind of problem that renders the conventional (and often indulgent or opportunist) dichotomy of "theory" and "practice" irrelevant.

Perhaps there is already a solution to the problem, an ingenious rearticulation of the dilemma of mis-imagined, dys-imagined horizon that unfolds in basements, classrooms, and text message strings all the time, everywhere: there is an understanding that resonates in the dark echoing of the problem solvers (the children, the students, the elders, the shamed, the punished, the abnormal, the sick, the crazy—or so they say). The understanding forms as a byproduct of coerced overfamiliarity with what it means to seek redemption in evil, a knowledge that the adjudication of the internal debate occurs in a general symbiosis with the enforcement of cultural-juridical-military statutes that constantly reconstruct and affirm the anti-civilizational profile: that of those who are drawn into the profile, there are some old, some new, because criminals, terrorists, deviants, aliens, have always been around, some longer than others, and there's little mistaking the Black and Aboriginal common denominator in all of it. The understanding grows and spreads, that the anti-civilizational is an honorable inheritance, because it surges into domesticities that are always again frontiers; the plantation is an idea as much as a place, which is why it never goes away, territory (land) is always invoked, and it all materializes in the endlessly justifiable homicide that defines "freedom's" limits. Move, then, to the margins of the reputable, just beneath the high ground, flourishing in the tears and sobbing, studying within the mourning and grieving, theorizing the pain, it's already happening, and it needs no refinement.



echo (protest)

**A delusion guides much of the righteous protest. It is the belief, tragic in its aversion to historical truth, that They don't have The Right to do this (to us, to others, to the death).** The protest stakes its high ground on the claim that the violence is beyond Their Right. Its furnace of outrage is fueled by the demand that They cease and desist, stop stop stop stop the beating killing brutal degrading displays of savage-sophisticated contempt for skin, bones, still-beating hearts. The protest demands recognition that the (your) other human life is worthy of integrity. **The protest grasps for words that will somehow touch the brutalizers' thin and nerveless membranes of decency. The protest claims the objects of violence embody dignity, manhood, motherhood, queer citizenship, and** perhaps **it will** also **remind them** that **"we are not criminals."** This activity is not naïve, for **the delusion is** not derivative of dumb ignorance, but rather of a **willful** one. The protest works hard to believe in the redemption of Rights forsaken. It is a religious belief—this is what we mean by willful delusion. It is a powerful delusion, to project that the manic aggression of Their world can be harnessed by anything remotely so abstract as Rights. (Of course, abstraction is as well a method of and for revolt, which is why Their colleges and universities are increasingly overrun by an instructional logic of vocational indoctrination, especially in sites of "diversity.")

Always hiding in these soon-discarded terms of protest appeal is another kind of recognition, popping through the delusion like unwelcome glares from behind. It is the knowledge—a deep knowing in friction with anything actually formally learned—that nothing is beyond Their Right, which is to say, They cannot dialog with the protest, they can only ever tolerate it. There is another way to view the relation of power: that in Their maddening assumption of Right as capacity for self-making brutality (a.k.a. policing, governing, civilizing), They are daring you to violate the long-settled limits of the appeal to decency and respect. The residual power of the delusion is the always- available temporality of its belief—some of you know as well as i that the righteous protest is never far from next-level noise, of a kind that turns the deputies' presence into a beast of law.

The end of protest is nearby, as it has always been, even if the form of the convening riff-raff looks familiar to Them. It is another way of saying that there is an inherent, beautiful danger to the theater of collective consciousness when it is fixated on the correction of errors and hypocrisies that are, in the long historical script, the productive technologies of US nation-building.

the end of Hope

There are times when things change so rapidly it feels like breathing myth. Walls fall, nations implode, colonies collapse, apartheid melts, but only because people move with each other even as they are at odds, quaking the placid plains of history with the unmatched danger of other surging human species. Mankind begins to panic **amidst cold calculations of austerity, reform, and** military **extermination**, knowing that **civil war is always a global war**, an epochal war, when the **fate of the species is at stake**. **Those who have been enslaved, occupied, displaced, trapped, and dominated find power in the fight.** Of course, when some of us think about the truth of inhabiting these kinds of places, we realize that there has never been anything but a fight. It is a species-specific knowledge.

But then, the end of hope is a morbid thing. **When the fiction of a better future,** a revived present, **a shared** anticipation of life—**good life—fades**, a certain **wildness ensues**. There is a creeping sensibility that aggressive, violent neglect is the structuring principle of the modern world, interrupted only by the acute attention of the police and their analogues. They are, in their own way, attuned to our sensibilities in the manner of owners feeling the primal species-needs of their domestic animals—the dog is hungry, it is lonely, the pace of its wagging tail shows it is antsy, it needs to go outside and piss—but

their reactions tend to be less generous and nurturing. **They know you are upset over** the always-bare fact of **your** naked **disempowerment, but they are** equally **perturbed that you cannot appreciate how far your people have come**, for after all, **a few of you are here sitting at the conference table with them**, drinking their coffee and **being treated as classmates, peers,** and colleagues.

**Supremacy is** an **inherently armed** and threatened regime. It must be reiterated, fortified, and **violently enforced** (usually **across** a broad, deep **spectrum** of violence—**from genocidal to low-intensity, cultural-symbolic to physiological and environmental**). There is little doubt that white supremacy is the convening animus of the United States of America and most of the Western world, and that its liberal disavowals in the era of diversity and official multiculturalism not only fail to displace white supremacy's paradigmatic role in defining social life and the distribution of wealth, poverty, health, and systemic suffering, but actually instigate white supremacist revivals at every conceivable social scale. The argument here is not that **white supremacy** has disappeared or faded from the ensemble of racial-social power assembled over the last half-century, but rather that it **has been incessantly disowned** by White Being as such, **even as** white **supremacy** galvanizes and **organizes white publics** into organized and semi-organized fronts **for white self-defense, white autonomy, and white rights.**

**The ascendancy of White Being thus supervises the logic of White Reconstruction.** It disciplines and reforms classical white supremacist institutions and their methods of human domination while still ensuring that white supremacy permeates the order of things. In this way, **the end of official apartheid** and the formal elimination of particular forms of racial colonialism **are maneuvers of sustainability**, more precisely, **toward a flexibility of racial power** (and suppleness of racial Being) that can **absorb "anti-racist" reform** for the sake of "human equality" **precisely because the White Being's ascendancy already assembles** the material boundaries, methodology, and **common sense** pre-conceptions of the Human who is

to participate in that egalitarian social wager.

Within the cultural politics and delimited upward socioeconomic mobilities endorsed by White Reconstruction (which both relies on and despises “affirmative action” as a mechanism for re-ordering the epidermal layers of its generally-but-not-always- white human species), there is a production of new possibilities for attachment, allegiance, and affinity to White Being. There is, in other words, an invitation of sorts to thrill in its fiction, which is to say, to fantasize a “people of color” future within the ascendancy, even when material conditions yield palimpsests of degradation and humiliation within the allegations of the egalitarian. (This is why eugenics is simultaneously an embarrassment to modern biological and forensic science, while obviously persisting as a structuring logic of contemporary social engineering, from its liberal reformist to reactionary racist variations.)

The ascendancy of White Being has toxified most of us for multiple generations, in ways that we are constantly mapping, mourning, recreating, and theorizing. It is an ascendancy that, despite its allegations of Civilizational and natural permanence, is subjected to varying intensities of radical, irruptive challenge from below and periodic implosions from above.

On the other hand, rebellions and movements have many points of origin: the high school and college classroom, church/mosque/temple, community organization, warehouse, prison cell, hospital waiting room, living room couch, or apartment complex are as likely as any site to bear the fruit of social insurgency among people who refuse to be passive victims of (or willing participants in) an oppressive system. These forms of action do not necessarily rely on massive numbers to make their imprint on the surrounding world—rather, they pivot on the willingness of committed collectives of people (large and small) to analyze, strategize, and act on their surrounding social conditions. Such collective work, often beginning with numbers in the single digits, has shown the capacity to accomplish everything from stopping patterns of domestic violence in an apartment complex and disrupting citywide police brutality to sparking anticolonial revolutions and overthrowing repressive national governments. I think this is the work, as in some ways it has always been.

## **Trump is President. DEI is repealed. January 6<sup>th</sup> protesters and ICE have free reign. The “racial agenda” is on full display with unique exclusion. Sellers ’25**

[Bakari T Sellers; American attorney, political commentator, and politician. Sellers served in the South Carolina House of Representatives for the 90th District from 2006 to 2014, and was the 2014 Democratic nominee for Lieutenant Governor in South Carolina. Since 2015, Sellers has served as a political commentator on CNN; No One Is Safe From Trump’s Racist Agenda, 2-5-2025; Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/feb/05/trump-agenda-racism>; accessed, 2-8-2025] Aaron

I found myself cheating on CNN, where I’m a political commentator, with MSNBC last weekend. I just had to watch my friend, Nikole Hannah-Jones, articulate a great point that many have missed: Donald Trump is pursuing a racial agenda, not an economic one.

This isn’t historically novel. Most progress is met by this kind of backlash – from the “Red Shirts” and Klansmen who used brutal violence against Black citizens following the gains of the Reconstruction era, to the voting restrictions that followed the election of Barack Obama. But this time is different

This time isn’t about Pete Hegseth, US secretary of defense, Sean Duffy, the secretary of transportation, and Trump using the recent American Airlines plane crash in Washington DC to envelop themselves in anti-DEI (diversity, equity and inclusion) outrage. This isn’t about Maga devotees fighting against anti-discrimination measures, eliminating pronouns, pushing anti-vaccine pseudoscience or changing the name of the Gulf of Mexico or canceling identity-driven celebrations like the ones during Black History Month.

It’s about the fact that in spite of all this, many of us have grown numb to this brand of rightwing viciousness and cruelty. As Trump and Elon Musk try to disassemble the greatest nation on earth at its core, Washington Democrats don’t even look like they’re up to the task to stop it. Even as the House minority leader, Hakeem Jeffries, rolls out his “resistance agenda”, questions remain. Where have Democrats been since 5 November? What is our message? What is our voice? Why aren’t we in spaces where this voice can be heard?

Meanwhile, Trump continues to use hyperbolic rhetoric invoking race and division, pushing his agenda instead of the economic populist message he ran on. His Ice raids aren't just targeting immigrants, they've also ended in the detainment of US citizens, including a veteran.

Trump reversed the 60-year-old executive order that prohibited federal contractors from engaging in employment discrimination, putting countless minority small business owners on the chopping block. He stopped every single Department of Justice civil rights investigation and police reform agreement – that includes the agreements in Louisville, Kentucky, and Minneapolis, Minnesota, that were reached following the killings of Breonna Taylor and George Floyd. These aren't abstract political principles we're talking about. This is about real people with real lives on the line.

Trump's attack on civil rights and his agenda rooted in racial division don't just affect people of color, they reach other citizens as well. Do you know what would have happened if a federal judge hadn't paused the Trump spending freeze? It means your lead water pipes don't get replaced. It means doctors working to cure cancer or fight Alzheimer's have to stop their research. It means your daily commute is even more dangerous because crews stopped fixing the roads and bridges and, if you have one of the more than 330,000 clean energy jobs created by the Inflation Reduction Act, Trump tried to freeze your paycheck.

Meanwhile, the price of eggs keeps going up.

So I don't care if Trump wants to buy Greenland or not. I care that he's pardoning white supremacists who already organized one insurrection. I care that he fired every FBI agent and DoJ official who worked on any of the multiple investigations against him. I care that he got rid of the independent inspectors general of at least 12 major federal agencies.

**The classroom is being colonized everyday, ensuring the inevitable rise of racist attitudes. The banning of CRT aims to “Refocus American education on cultivating patriotic citizens. The White House argues classroom time should be dedicated rather than discuss race and systematic inequality; don't want that propaganda taught!”<sup>1</sup>**

**Martin '25** [Raquel Martin; Washington D.C. Bureau; President Trump Signs Executive Order Banning Critical Race Theory In K-12 Schools, 2-3-2025; abc27, <https://www.abc27.com/news/washington-dc/president-trump-signs-executive-order-banning-critical-race-theory-in-k-12-schools/>; accessed, 2-5-2025] Aaron //recut VK

WASHINGTON (NEXSTAR) — President Donald Trump has signed an executive order banning the teaching of critical race theory (CRT) in K-12 schools, a move his administration says is aimed at refocusing American education on fundamental subjects such as math and reading. Schools that continue CRT-related lessons risk losing federal aid.

“The president believes American education should focus on cultivating patriotic citizens who are ready for the workforce,” White House Press Secretary Karoline Leavitt said. The executive order follows the release of the latest National Assessment of Educational Progress, which showed reading scores declining and math scores stagnating nationwide in 2024. The White House argues that classroom time should be dedicated to core subjects rather than discussions on race and systemic inequality.

Sen. Josh Hawley (R-Mo.) praised the executive action, arguing that lessons portraying the U.S. as founded on slavery are inaccurate.

“I don't want that propaganda taught to my kids or any kid in Missouri,” Hawley said.

**The alternative is militant preservation. It harnesses the energy of sociality to refuse the violent corrective of White Being in favor of a new feeling, a haptic relationality where we open ourselves to the possibilities of possibilities**

**Melamed '16** [Jodi Melamed, Associate professor of Africana and English Studies at Marquette University, "Proceduralism, Predisposing, Poesis: Forms of Institutionality, In the Making", English Faculty Research and Publications, 4/1/2016]  
<https://csalateral.org/issue/5-1/forum-alt-humanities-institutionality-making-melamed/>

For our purposes, Stefano Harney and Fred Moten's *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study*, **a performative event repeated with each reading**, can be seen to work for a **rupture** of neoliberalized and liberal modes of **institutionality**. It works **to undo** and estrange **their** constitutive and constituting **logics** their modes of **individualizing**, rationalizing, politicizing, critiquing, and formalizing social being into dominant 'institutions' and their **'will to fix'** (apprehension of) **the conditions of the material and the real**. From the **matrix of meaning the Undercommons creates**, liberal and neoliberal modes of institutionality come into focus as continuous within a developing genealogy of unfreedom and truncations of social life, whose strategies include racial capitalist, settler colonial, and liberal democratic logics and practices alike. One description of the university's institutionality captures this perfectly: "The University Is the Site of the Social Reproduction of Conquest Denial."<sup>26</sup> Another description makes it clear that **the university institutionalizes the same violence as the prison**: "The university, then, is not the opposite of the prison, since **they are both involved, in their way, with the reduction and command of the social individual**."<sup>27</sup> Thus for Moten and Harney, neo/liberal institutionality, generally considered, abhors social being outside its forms. **Thus sociality itself** (along the lines of what they call "consent not to be one") **is resistance**.<sup>28</sup> **The performance** of *The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study* **is structured around the play of** two categories of terms: 1) **terms that distill the specific violences of neo/liberal modes of institutionality, which reduce and harm human capacities of sociality and continuously refresh the** **coloniality and raciality of institutional forms**, and 2) **terms that help us think and organize desire for forms of social being that are illiberally collective, unoccupied by professionalism, sociopoetical, in-the-making, and shared beyond the logics of democratic capitalist humanist Enlightenment traditions or critical moves that fall under the category of legitimization-by-reversal** (i.e., the commons as reverse legitimization of privatization, redistribution as the reverse legitimization of dispossession, the critical professional as the reverse legitimization of the university as site of the social reproduction of conquest denial). While some of the terms in the first category incline towards a critique of liberal institutionality ('politics' and 'critique'), many of them catch hold of a neoliberalization of institutionality, including 'policy' and 'logistics.' For Moten and Harney, capital today "wants control of the means [of social reproduction...] by gaining access to and directly controlling the informal experiment with the social reproduction of life itself."<sup>29</sup> In neoliberal times, this requires the use of directly political forms in addition to economic compulsion. **'Policy' is a name for the form political control and command takes. It is a deputized, dispersed form of command which controls social reproduction by diagnosing 'incorrectness' for those it represents to be in need of improvement, of change, of policy.** Moten and Harney **counterpose 'planning' to 'policy.'** "Planning is self-sufficiency at the social level, and it reproduces in its experiment not just what it needs, life, but what it wants, life in difference, in the play of the general antagonism."<sup>30</sup> **It begins with "militant preservation" in the face of 'policy'**<sup>31</sup> **To escape the proceduralism of 'policy,'** Moten and Harney offer the sociopoesis of the statement, "There's nothing wrong with us."<sup>32</sup> Similarly, **'logistics' is a name for the "capitalist science" of the moment, which "wants to dispense with the subject altogether," to containerize "bodies, objects, affects, information" for circulation as capital,** "as if it could reign sovereign over the informal, the concrete and generative indeterminacy of material life."<sup>33</sup> **To "logistics" Harney and Moten counterpose "hapticity, or love," "the capacity to feel through others, for others to feel through you, for you to feel them feeling you,"** a capacity attached in sociopoetic imagination to the bodies of people captured in the hold of slave ships (the first form of logistical transportation).<sup>34</sup> **The Undercommons**, in this way, **repeatedly performs the defeat of neoliberal**

proceduralism by the **sociopoetical imagination**, asserting “the necessarily failed administrative accounting of the incalculable.”<sup>35</sup> In these performances, the concept of the ‘undercommons’ holds a special weight of desire and meaning, circulating as a term for “the nonplace of abolition,” a beneath and beyond of the university inhabited by maroons, castaways, and fugitives, and an “**appositionality**” of “**being together in homelessness**.”<sup>36</sup> How do the streams of meaning performatively attached to ‘the undercommons’ as a tool for sociopoesis frame or interact with the concept of ‘institutionality,’ as we’ve been discussing it here? In the interview that makes up the last chapter of text, in answer to a question about the relationship between the university and the undercommons, Harney states, I don’t see the undercommons as having any necessary relationship to the university.... [T]he undercommons is a kind of comportment or on-going experiment with and as the general antagonism, a kind of way of being with others[. It’s almost impossible that it could be matched up with particular forms of institutional life. It would obviously be cut through in different kinds of ways and in different spaces and times.”<sup>37</sup> As a “kind of comportment,” a way of being and doing, the undercommons is not in contradiction with Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak’s dictum that there is no such thing as “a noninstitutional environment.”<sup>38</sup> Rather, it’s a kind of practice that cannot be encompassed by “institutional life.” It may be thought of as the placeholder for a vision of sociality without institutionality, or perhaps the sociality that happens all the time beyond and below the incorporative maneuvers of dominant institutions. On the other hand, the ‘undercommons’ might be thought of in relation to institutionality as an excessive and ruptural sociality, a sociopoesis which demands that the active social content institutionality congeals returns to fluidity through a generative unthinking of the “hard materiality of the unreal.”<sup>39</sup> My suggestion for thinking about pedagogy is to advocate for thinking and teaching that renews our sense of institutions as sites where the form and appearance of social being and collectivity is determined through social action and contest, even as we problematize institutions as always explicitly incorporative, as constituted out of the durable predispositions of adaptive hegemonies. Inspired by Ferguson and Harney and Moten, my call is perhaps to work for a disruptive institutionality, to work with the paradox of institutionality—which pits congealed social process against lived presence—to plan for what Audre Lorde called “a new and more possible meeting,” for a broader sense of collective social being than neo/liberal forms of institutional power let us imagine and practice 40 Infused with the disruptive potential of illiberal discourses of collectivity, “institutionality” can be made to line up anti-intuitively with critical rubrics that empower us to try to inhabit social being otherwise (undercommons, abolition, fugitivity), while reminding us that “radical change requires structure.”<sup>41</sup>

**Movements are ongoing resistances that happen in our thoughts, actions, provocations, and explorations. Our model of debate seeks to extend towards new levels of understanding and immanent processes of resistance that unleash beautiful insurgencies from the ground up.**

**Shukaitis and Graeber ‘7** [Stephen Shukaitis is Senior Lecturer at the University of Essex, Centre for Work and Organization, and a member of the Autonomedia editorial collective. David Rolfe Graeber is an American anthropologist and anarchist activist, perhaps best known for his 2011 volume *Debt: The First 5000 Years*. He is professor of anthropology at the London School of Economics. “Constituent Imagination: Militant Investigations Collective Theorization.” ISBN 978-1-904859-35-2. Library of Congress Number: 2006924199 ©2007] //recut VK

Thoughts. Provocations. Explorations. Forms of investigation and social research that expand possibilities for political action, proliferating tactics of resistance through the constituent power of the imagination. Walking, we ask questions, not from the perspective of the theorist removed and separate from organizing, but rather from within and as part of the multiple and overlapping cycles and circuits of struggle. For the removed theorist, movements themselves are mere abstractions, pieces of data to be categorized, analyzed, and fixed. The work of militant investigation is multiple, collectively extending forms of antagonism to new levels of understanding, composing flesh-made words from immanent processes of resistance. Far from vanguardist notions of intellectual practice that translate organizing strategies and concepts for



populations who are believed to be too stupid or unable to move beyond trade union consciousness, it is a process of collective wondering and wandering that is not afraid to admit that the question of how to move forward is always uncertain, difficult, and never resolved in easy answers that are eternally correct. As an open process, **militant investigation discovers new possibilities within the present**, turning bottlenecks and seeming **dead ends into new opportunities for joyful insurgency**. A beautiful example of this is John Holloway's book, *Change the World Without Taking Power*. Holloway, a soft-spoken Scottish political philosopher, was associated with the "Open Marxism" school developed at the University of Edinburgh where he taught in the 1970s and '80s. In 1991, he moved to Mexico where he took a position with the Instituto de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales in the Universidad Autónoma de Puebla. After the Zapatista rebellion broke out in 1994, he quickly became one of its chief intellectual supporters. In 1998, he helped compile a book of essays on the Zapatistas called *Zapatista! Reinventing Revolution in Mexico*; this was his attempt to think through the implications of this new revolutionary paradigm, one which rejected classic Marxist ideas of vanguardism and the very project of trying to seize state power for one of building autonomous communities rooted in new forms of direct democracy, using the categories of Marxist theory. The result was an extremely dense book. At certain points, it reads like a mixture of Marxist jargon and lyric poetry: In the beginning is the scream. We scream. When we write or when we read, it is easy to forget that the beginning is not the word, but the scream. Faced with the mutilation of human lives by capitalism, a scream of sadness, a scream of horror, a scream of anger, a scream of refusal: NO. The starting point of theoretical reflection is opposition, negativity, struggle. It is from rage that thought is born, not from the pose of reason, not from the reasoned-sitting-back-and-reflecting-on-the-mysteries-of-existence that is the conventional image of the thinker. We start from negation from dissonance. The dissonance can take many shapes. An inarticulate mumble of discontent, tears of frustration, a scream of rage, a confident roar. An unease, a confusion, a longing, a critical vibration. More than anything else, it's a book about knowledge. Holloway argues that reality is a matter of humans doing and making things together: what we perceive as fixed self-identical objects are really processes. The only reason we insist on treating objects as anything else is because, if we saw them as they really are, as mutual projects, it would be impossible for anyone to claim ownership of them. All liberatory struggle therefore is ultimately the struggle against identity. Forms of knowledge that simply arrange and classify reality from a distance—what Holloway refers to as "knowledge- about"—may be appropriate for a vanguard party that wants to claim the right to seize power and impose itself on the basis of some privileged "scientific" understanding, but ultimately it can only work to reinforce structures of domination. **True revolutionary knowledge would have to be different. It would have to be a pragmatic form of knowledge that lays bare all such pretensions: a form of knowledge deeply embedded in the logic of transformational practice**. Furious debates ensued. Leninists and Trotskyites lambasted the book as utopian for adopting what they considered a naïve anarchist position—one that was completely ignorant of political realities. Anarchists were alternately inspired and annoyed, often noting that Holloway seemed to echo anarchist ideas without ever mentioning them, instead writing as if his positions emerged naturally from a correct reading of classic Marxist texts. Others objected to the way he read the texts. Supporters of Toni Negri's Spinozist version of Marxism denounced the book as so much Hegelian claptrap; others suggested that Holloway's argument that any belief in self-identical objects was a reflection of capitalist logic seemed to imply that capitalism had been around since the invention of language, which ultimately made it very difficult to imagine an alternative. In Latin America, where the battle was particularly intense, a lot of the arguments turned around very particular questions of revolutionary strategy. Who has the better model: the Zapatistas of Chiapas or Chavez's Bolivarian Revolution in Venezuela? Were the Argentine radicals who over- threw four successive regimes in December of 2001 right to refuse seizing power, to reject the entire domain of formal politics and try to create their own autonomous institutions? Or had they allowed an opportunity for genuine revolutionary change to slip through their grasp? For many in the global justice movement in Europe and North America, the book provided the perfect counterpoint to Michael Hardt and Negri's *Empire*, then being hailed in the media as the bible of the movement. Where Hardt and Negri were drawing on an Italian autonomist tradition that saw capital not as imposing itself on labor but as constantly having to adjust itself to the power of workers' struggle, Holloway was arguing that this approach did not go nearly far enough. In fact, capital was labor and capitalism the system that makes it impossible for us to see this. Capitalism is

something we make every day and the moment we stop making it, it will cease to exist. There were endless Internet debates. Seminars and reading groups were held comparing the two arguments in probably a dozen different languages.

**Debate is a unique medium through which discourse can be shaped. It's independent enough from traditional academia to be isolated from governmental regulations as to where the race war can be confronted.**

Victoria **Stafford**, xx-xx-xxxx, "Kritiks," debate guru, Victoria Stafford, served as both president and policy captain of the Logan High speech and debate team in Utah between 2016-17. I had been an active member of this program since my freshman year.

[{2-24-2025 // VK}](https://thedebuguru.weebly.com/kritiks.html?c=mkt_w_chnl:aff_geo:all_prtnr:sas_subprtnr:1538097_camp:brand_adtype:txtlnk_ag:weebly_lptype:hp_var:358504&sscid=21k9_xabwc&utm_source=ShareASale)

Whether you believe it or not, debate rounds provide a very unique space for students. It's one of the only activities where people are actually forced to listen to whatever you have to say, respond to what you have to say, and make informed decisions about what you said. As a result, many students have decided to use the debate space as a vehicle to start social change sharing their own narratives and launching personal projects that may only slightly relate to or may even completely ignore the resolution. In this regard, kritikal debate has allowed for debaters to make the space whatever they want and talk about things they consider important in their every day lives.

**The method is voting for the aff**

**We can't end the race war, the K is our way of surviving it. – thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the best way to survive the race war. Rev v Rev debates create competition to find the best way to deal with our current crisis. Dismiss claims of “unpredictability” and appeals to “stasis” as the insulation of debate from being forced to confront its racism.**

**Sugino '23** [Corinne Mitsuye Sugino, Gonzaga University, former debaters at Wake Forest. 2023. “Clash of the Uncivilized: An Alternative Approach to Policy Debate”, <https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1007&context=cad>] pfox recut Aaron

Evolving scholarly debates over social movements, critical theory, race, and rhetoric have the potential to provide fruitful scholarly grounds upon which rev v. rev debates might draw on. As we contend in this section, these debates not only constitute rhetorics of agitation that challenge the hegemony of white-dominated establishment politics but present a model for considering clash between two strategies outside of government reform Although traditional debate considers the hypothetical



imagination of government reform to be the natural stasis of debate writ-large this stasis is justified through social construction, not inherent limits on the scope of the topic. As Robert Krizek and Thomas Nakayama (1995) highlight, whiteness functions as the

unspoken, universal standard of communication, in which the ideas, identities, and experiences of white people are presumed as a “neutral” consensus. Sylvia Wynter (2003) speaks to the “overrepresentation of Man as human,” in describing how white people stand in as the metaphysical referent point for what it means to be human itself. Similarly the white traditional policy debater stands in as the rhetorical, intellectual and practical referent point of debate par excellence framing critical challenges forwarded by Black and minority debaters as peripheral, threatening, and unpredictable. This is not to say that only white debaters advance policy arguments

and only Black and minority debaters advance critical arguments. Nevertheless, traditional debate continues to overrepresent white debaters while critical debate has largely been responsible for increasing Black and minority participation. More importantly, critical debate has been racialized through Blackness because much of the anxiety surrounding its inception associates critical debate with questions of identity, privilege, and personal experiences of racial domination. Much of this anxiety surrounded Louisville in particular and race-based performance and critical debate writ-large. In her examination of the Los Angeles Riots, Tamara Nopper (2006) argues that despite the participation of Latino/a/x people in the riots, the riots themselves are associated with Blackness as a signifier for criminality in the American cultural imagination, and therefore the Latino/a/x rioters were understood through this racializing frame. Similarly, one can understand how the supposed threats posed by critical debates are associated with the threat of Blackness, insofar as Blackness stands in for and gives coherency to threats to the civility, stasis and sovereignty of white policy debate as its constitutive outside (Kelsie, 2019). That Solt identified the shift from “culture war” to “clash of civilization” speaks to the way in which these forms

of debate were considered particularly threatening to the activity – likely in no small part due to underlying anti-Blackness. That white policy debate remains

overrepresented as debate writ large does not point to its inherent center of any given resolution. Consider for example, Lisa Flores’ (2016) consideration of racial rhetorical criticism in the discipline of communication. She contends that despite the fact that minority scholars and scholarship concerning race remain marginalized in the canon, that rhetorical studies at its core is bound up with questions of race. This is because rhetoric is concerned with politics, publics, and cultural discourses,

and race is central to all of those aspects. We suggest scholars ought to consider the ways in which race lies at the core of

every resolutional question in different ways as each year the resolution typically considers topics

relevant to political publics and social change. One may object that by design, the resolutional question is meant to change the surrounding scholarship every year so that it is topic-specific and thus allowing scholarship on race to be at the heart of every topic is problematic. However, this does not discard the fact that different areas of scholarship on race might be connected to each topic, just like each year policy debate continually draws from the disciplines of international relations, political theory, and legal theory, even

though their particular cases vary with each resolution. Proponents of a traditional policy interpretation of the topic often contend

specifically that the mechanism, or the actor, in the resolution is necessary to make it predictable.

However, as we have been arguing throughout this essay, traditional policy debate’s overrepresentation of debate is not neutral consensus, but a normalized process informed by racialized assumptions.

Traditionally the words in the resolution are assumed to describe fiat, or hypothetical imagination. Yet none of the words in any given resolution can be described definitively as meaning hypothetical imagination. A team could read a plan text and then describe the affirmative case as irony. They could also read a plan text as a metaphor. These would technically conform to the words in the resolution, and thus

reveal it is not the words that limit out “unpredictable” mechanisms but a community norm. In this regard, fiat is technically speaking an arbitrary,

extra-topical inclusion. It does not gain authority from the words in the resolution, instead it informs how debaters and coaches ought to interpret those words. Put

differently, fiat is not inherently predictable based on the resolution, but only predictable based on a tradition. However, as Louisville and other Black and critical

teams have pointed to, that tradition is steeped in the overrepresentation of white debaters, their interests, their desires, and their

claims to what the activity ought to look like. When this aspect is taken into consideration with our aforementioned point that the topic selection and resolutional wording process is itself informed by racialized archival processes, new conceptualizations of clash beyond this restrictive framework become necessary. In addition to engaging with

the heart of the resolution, rev v. rev debate and critical debate more broadly might be thought of as an engagement

not with any particular social movement or revolution but rather with the question of what moves the

social. In McGee’s (1980) essay on the rhetoric of social movements, he draws a distinction between perspectives that approach social movement as “phenomenon” and social movement as “meaning.” The essence of this distinction is that while prior scholars have often treated social movements as discrete, self-contained entities that in reality scholars of communication ought to address social movements not as a noun but as a verb. He contends that social movements are not clearly delineated phenomena but instead are processes that develop as collective and impact the world through rhetoric. Thus, the question for him is not what a social movement is, but instead what moves the social. Similarly, instead of examining a single self-contained policy action, or

considering a hypothetical activist action, much of critical debate considers questions of ontology, language orientation and

representation. Contrary to the idea that these debates do not think about material action (Solt, 2004), we suggest

they shift the paradigm of debate from a particular policy phenomenon to think critically about what

moves the social. As Happe (2013) suggests, racism continues not simply as an overt idea or discriminatory action, but through the ritualistic performance of material-discursive practices in media, legal, academic, and everyday settings. Thus, in considering the ways in which language practices, political orientations, and performative expressions impact race relations in debate, critical debate confronts the material terrain on which race and domination are enacted and reenacted. Taking rev v. rev and critical debate seriously thus requires reconceptualizing how we approach social change, and this viewpoint is supported in social movements literature. Rev v. rev debate enables scholars and debaters to consider the complexities of social change in a more nuanced way. Critical theory and social movements scholarship provide important grounds for challenging traditional state-based politics, in some ways enacting what John Bowers and Donovan

Ochs (1971) refer as a “rhetoric of agitation” in which those outside of traditional decision-making institutions attempt to produce social change. However, rev v. rev debate not

only encompasses those affirmative or negative cases which would seek to challenge the state but also

contain important debates between two non-state-based strategies and scholarship. One might

consider, for example, the collegial scholarly debates between afro-pessimists like Jared Sexton<sup>(2009)</sup> and Frank

Wilderson<sup>(2010)</sup> and scholars such as Fred Moten<sup>(2013)</sup> over how to approach the relationship between Black

social life and social death. There exists as well fruitful debate between settler colonial studies and Black

studies, involving interlocutors such as Tiffany King (2013). Moreover, intramural debates exist between a focus on physical structures

of racial capitalism versus the affective ways in which emotion produces social violence (see Robinson, 1983; Wang,

2018; Ahmed, 2004). These are only some of the examples of overlapping, interdisciplinary scholarly conversations that occur outside of policymaking amongst different scholars theorizing race and other structures of power that debate has heretofore marginalized in favor of a focus solely on public policy. What these disciplinary debates point to are untapped resources for expanding the nuances of debate's theoretical repertoire. Moreover, they present the opportunity for understanding social change in a more nuanced way. Palczewski and Harr-Lagin

(2016) contend that rhetorical scholars of social movements ought to move beyond a narrow view of social movements only occurring along the binary of protesters/establishment in order to explore contestation that occurs between two actors or groups outside of the establishment. After Roe v. Wade, pro-life activists could no longer appeal

to the state to crack down on abortion clinics, so they went directly to the clinics to protest. In response, an Iowa City clinic appealed for protection, but the state denied their request on the grounds that the pro-life activists had a right to free speech. The clinic then created a "Pledge-A-Picketer" campaign, in which they asked supporters to pledge a certain amount of money for as long as a picketer was there protesting the clinic. They would broadcast to the pro-life activists that they were actually raising money for the clinic to perform abortions and other procedures. Palczewski and Harr-Lagin (2016) contend that this is but one example of the types of social change and contestation occluded by a focus only on state actors versus agitators. Instead, they contend that two groups can contest each other over creating social change outside of state involvement. Taking this into consideration, then, rev v. rev debates present the opportunity to make debate's analysis of social change more nuanced, as the debates between them not only mirror academic debates but strategies for negotiating social change outside of academic settings. In her exploration of the afterlife of slavery and the possibilities for navigating an anti-Black world, Christina Sharpe (2016) speaks to the ways in which Black academics are often forced to read, think, and write within white-dominated academic disciplines that work in service of their oppression. Arguing against the impulse to structurally adjust one's work to fit the confines of constraining disciplinary norms, she (Sharpe, 2016) writes "we must become undisciplined. The work we do requires new modes and methods of research and teaching; new ways of entering and

leaving the archive of slavery" (p.13). The sanctioned limits of the resolution, which only encompass the boundaries of public policy, remain far

too restrictive. Both critical debate and rev v. rev debate aim to challenge the disciplining structure of policy debate and consider new research methods for combatting ongoing violence. Rev v. rev debates and critical debate challenges the overrepresentation of white policy debate as debate itself, pushing the activity to encompass new research methods and scholarly conversations that might aid in the liberation of people of color in general and Black people in particular. Put differently, rev v. rev pushes us to consider the how the limits of the resolution are drawn in power-laden ways and what alternative forms of debate might arise if we release our attachments to policy debate as representative of debate's full and only potential. In light of this meditation on the scholarly grounding for rev v. rev as an alternative form of clash and engagement, we conclude by connecting this discussion to a reflection on the legacy of Louisville and how contemporary forms of non-traditional debate might counteract the way in which white policy debate has laid claim to the limits of debate itself.

## Social movements can't be topical, policies leave out minority movements

**Traber 18** (Becca Traber, PhD candidate at Yale University in Political Science, in the subfield of political theory. My research focuses on American social movements and their close intellectual collaborators, specializing in deliberative democracy, political epistemology, and political thought about race, gender, and sexuality. NSD Staff Writer, <https://www.nsdebatecamp.com/nsdupdate/fiat-and-radical-politics> shree)

This trend in debate has ignored, however, what I see as the most pertinent question. Namely, what sort of skills are actually conducive to radical political action? We might think that we need to engage in the state as activists, but what does state engagement as activists look like? There has been a systematic failure of imagination in terms of thinking through what politics looks like when it is done by marginalized people and in

favor of radical causes. My argument is that the idea of fiat is uniquely bad training for activist, leftist, or radical politics.

Fiat fundamentally distorts radical advocacies. This article does not argue that we should care about how debate trains us for activism—I

take as given that we should be concerned with the sort of education that we are getting and we should tailor our education toward developing students capable of engaging in radical politics. By radical politics, I mean politics that aims to intervene on the status quo predominately by asking for a substantial shift in favor of marginalized positions, people, or perspectives. This is obviously not a formal definition and is not intended to be. I'm aiming to talk about a group of political perspectives with a family resemblance that characterizes them oppositionally to mainstream party politics. This includes both "pragmatic" leftist framing as well as what is known as "high theory" kritiks. The definition of fiat that I'm relying on that it is the act of imagination that allows us to avoid the contradiction between solvency and inherency, typically through the assumption of the passage of a state-based policy option without consideration of the political likelihood of that passage. Fiat is structured such that the negative debater is unable to question the likelihood of something happening as long as the aff debater defends the normal means of that thing happening. This is a way of thinking that only makes sense if the only thing we are able to fiat is state legislative action. For all

other forms of political action, there is no real way to separate normal means, passage of the "policy," and effects of the "policy." The ideal of state politics is such that we imagine congress passes a bill and does so in a way that the content of the bill is separable from the wheeling and dealing that allowed for it to be created. This is problematic as an assumption on its face— implementation through the rest of the government is undeniably affected by the way the bill was argued and, indeed, the judicial branch often considers congressional intent when evaluating a bill. Additionally, bills passed through congress typically are too vague to actually implement on their own and need a significant amount of

bureaucratic interpretation and adjustment through the executive branch in order to be implemented. But all that aside, there is at least a sensical way of separating the literal bill from the vote that got it passed. If you are not advocating for the state, the separation between a policy and the means by which it is passed necessitated by fiat is impossible. What policy was passed by the feminist movement? The movement

was the advocacy and the actions taken by the feminist movement was the advocacy. The "solvency" of collective action cannot be separated from the things that are done in the collective action. This is true for all non-state actors who

don't have a formal parliamentary procedure. A community creating institutions for itself typically doesn't have strict bylaws which outline what normal means for change would be. This puts the kritikal debater in an impossible dilemma when they are asked to fiat or implement some sort of policy. People who run these types of implementation arguments should stop pretending that the kritik they are arguing against would be possible at all, in any meaningful way, if it were to fiat. There is **no fair version** of the kritik that is at all **meaningfully similar to the kritik** and **there is no topical version** of critical affs. The way we construct implementation and fiat in debate can only be thought as a state action. **Insisting on fiat in all cases functionally means that we cannot run arguments about politics outside the state** without radically distorting the nature of that politics. Many **debaters assume that the only "practical" or "pragmatic" politics occur through the state**. However, this is **not the case**. Things like the **feminist movements intervention on norms** of sexual harassment **are examples** of politics outside the state. Collapsing the recent backlash to sexual harassment precipitated by Harvey Weinstein and others to possible state action ignores that **the state could not possibly intervene in an adequate way to change those norms**. The norms about sexual behavior in the workplace must change, but they can only reasonably change through politics engaged outside the state. Thinking of it in terms of **state politics conceals the necessity of non-state politics**. This is uniquely bad because the reality of the situation is that **the percentage of debaters who will have a chance to be internal to the state is minuscule, but all debaters could plausibly engage in non-state** movement politics. All the evidence that people read in favor of fiat and state-based implementation makes education claims that assume the necessary training one needs to engage in politics involves thinking about the state, but fiat is not the tool to do that. **Fiat doesn't ask us to think about how to engage in politics as citizens who live under a state, it asks us to pretend that we are the state. In a real way, it is also inadequate as a way of roleplaying a policy-maker, because the reality of politics as a legislature is significantly more complicated than being able to wave a magic wand and implement whatever policy is wanted.** Fiat is a construction where we don't even roleplay as a human, much less as plausibly political actors. Pretending that radical non-status quo politics are something that could be implemented by the state fundamentally distorts how we think about those politics. One popular option to deal with the above dilemma is to import radical politics into the state and imagine policies that would result from particular radical political ideologies. This is what happens when someone advocates, for instance, that the USFG gives back the land to indigenous people as a fiat affirmative plan. There is a range of ways this is executed. On one end of this spectrum, you have policies which are barely different from what is advocated by mainstream politicians. On the other extreme, you have policies which are explicitly intended to serve as the downfall of the USFG in their passage or intend to provoke uprisings from parts of the population. The reality is that while radical and leftist politics occasional results in policy action, conceiving of it in terms of policy action distorts the nature of that politics. **If one were to set about with the goal of combating anti-blackness, as history has demonstrated, the first step cannot be to try to be a policy maker.** A politician with a radical advocacy cannot get elected until that advocacy has enough support that people will vote for her. For instance, a politician who ran on dismantling the United States or erasing all distinctions between animals and people to solve anthro would not have a constituency without a substantial social movement to develop that constituency. This problem is inherent to any advocacy which significantly challenges status quo ideals. Things in the status quo are in the status quo because a lot of people and powerful people agree with them. Before that can change more than incrementally, a lot of people have to change their mind. **If you were to seriously consider how to implement a strategy of radical politics, it would make no sense to have the first step be electoral. None of the major social movements were driven by policy action—policies are driven by social movements.** Fiating radical politics hides the **radical politics** entirely. Focusing on policy actions, in this context, actively distorts how we should consider radical politics. Even if it were the case that we would eventually need policy actions to finally solve issues of marginalization, that does not mean that we should start off with a question of fiat. **Fiat erases the work necessary to allow for policy changes. It does not help us think about the movements we will have to create and the ways we will have to persuade. This means that claims about the necessity of state action are besides the point—state action is only caused by a lot of non-state action that we have to think about first and that fiat erases. The conceptual work that debaters often want to exclude by insisting of fiating policy is exactly the type of thing that radical politics does. Radical politics needs to persuade and imagine new possibilities, first and foremost. Fiating away the process of change by which radical politics would be implemented makes irrational critical parts of radical politics in the real world. A good example is the alternate social institutions implemented by Black nationalist organizations like the Black Panther Party.** If we don't have to consider the process of change, the benefit of having alternate institutions becomes significantly less. The types of benefit are different, as well. In a world of fiat, the only benefit of creating an institution outside of the state would be incidental to the immediate effects of the institution. **Why develop free breakfast outside the school system when we could just fiat free breakfast inside of it?** The fact that it would not be possible in the immediate future to implement the breakfast in the school system or the state and people need breakfast (or other help) right now should be relevant to the consideration of what political strategy to use. **Fiat is a crutch that prevents us from seeing ways**

we can intervene in our communities to create good things, right now, without relying on the vast institution of the state. Fiat trains debaters to think like legislators, not like organizers, but the only way to have substantial change from the status quo is to organize. The available set of options in legislative space can change, but it can only change from the outside. Using fiat erases this and is fundamentally incompatible with what it would take to organize.

There is an inherent conservatism in the insistence on fiat, in that fiat is only comprehensible with extremely incrementalist politics. The type of policies that are able to be enacted by people already in positions of power are always going to be close to the policies that are already in place. Not debating about the means through which policies get enacted means that we can never explore changes that involve changing the means of policy enactment. The reality is, however, that there are occasionally radical changes in public life. These changes are never in a meaningful way first caused by the passage of the policy and always rely on a process of

social change that came before. Fiat assumes we already know the realm of the possible and erases any potential of thinking about changing it. This means that arguments focusing on the fact that the state can be useful in radical politics misunderstand the issue. Even if the state is a useful part of political change at some point in the process, it certainly isn't the initial step. And even if we need to think about politics while acknowledging that the state is a real force (ie "use the state as a heuristic"), we must do so by imagining what our movements look like in the world as it is. That is, we should not ignore that the state exists, but it's existence doesn't mean that we should fiat a policy action in the state as a way of implementing a radical policy solution. It would be enough to take seriously the state as an obstacle for non-state politics, while still advocating

for non-state politics. And, moreover, the idea of using the state as a tool for change ignores the reality of what social change takes. This means fiating with radical politics is not only misleading, it actively teaches wrong things about what radical politics looks like. The type of education it provides is counterproductive if we actually want our debates to help further

a political project. One thing someone could think is that we need to imagine fiating a policy option as a first step in a political project, because we need to imagine what the goal of the political project should look like. Fiat, as a form of ideal theory, helps us determine the possibilities of political action. However, this as a framing necessarily means that we would be determining the political goals of radical politics without considering the process through which those goals are created over the course of the development of a movement. That is, the discussion of the effects of a policy as the first step in thinking about politics abstracts away from the reality of differential epistemic access to the world. When a debater offers her policy action, she is not doing so in conversation with all the relevant communities that could be affected by that policy. She is not participating in a conversation—she is stopping the conversation and asserting that a policy "would be best" in the abstract. Different perspectives can give guidance on how we ought to understand what a desirable policy

action would be. What this means is that the purpose of radical political action should always develop in a fluid way, through the actual practice of political change and from within the movement itself. We don't need to decide at the beginning what we ought to do in an absolute sense and the attempt to do so forecloses conversation. Objectives in social movements are determined in a more fluid way than a formal policy white

paper. We determine our objectives in the process of conversation. This means the model of fiating the final goal of radical politics not only distorts the nature of social movements and collective action, it assumes a certainty about the objective of politics in a way that prevents the possibility of minoritarian critique. The process of developing a politics changes the objectives of political movements and to ignore this process forecloses the real radical possibility of

diverse collective action. The insistence on fiat in round functions to erase minority perspectives empirically.

If the AC has a radical policy option, they will often use policy making good arguments to take out various critiques that try to point out how the AC is missing the perspectives of minority voices.

The focus on policy making is used as a weapon to preclude discussion. This not only is a moral harm in itself, it means that

we will be engaging in bad politics. A policy making first framework excludes epistemic contributions from people outside the mainstream, meaning that we will inevitably miss harms to marginalized populations at the core of our advocacies. The erasure of critique from the outside means we cannot trust that the plan will do what it claims to do without horrible externalities.

Further, advocacies and alternatives which are centered around processes and conceptual frameworks are significantly more similar to the nature of goal-setting in the real world. Take the example of the anarchist-influenced Food Not Bombs. You may think that this would be a case where it would be easy to graft fiat onto a social movement because they are so strongly associated with a specific action—namely, feeding the homeless. However, in fact, this seemingly straightforward political goal had a variety of complicated trade offs and considerations. Should they prioritize food or the anarchist literature that they tended to pass out with the food? What neighborhoods should they serve with their food? How should they interact with the police and with disruptive people who interrupted their food service? Should they apply for permits for serving food? Should they associate with religious organizations doing similar work? How should white organizers respond to critiques from black participants and black organizers? How should they manage a class disconnect between the people serving food and the people eating it? In debate, we would be significantly more attracted to a fiated specific "policy" of "serving food to the homeless," abstracting away from all these issues as normal means. People work to be non-committal about the issues above for strategic reasons and they are able to do so because of fiat. But in many ways, characterizing the political project of Food Not Bombs in concrete terms is less accurate than characterizing it in conceptual terms. The "fiated policy" over-simplifies the reality, which is that they are an organization framed around a conceptual commitment to

direct action and serving people outside of the state. Having a commitment to concepts rather than specific policy options is in a real sense more pragmatic than specific policy actions that are able to be fiated because the concepts allow you to resolve disputes over objectives that inevitably rise in the process of executing a specific

action. For instance, if the foundational principle of Food Not Bombs is about spreading consciousness of anarchist principles and the possibilities of outside the state, they shouldn't refrain from having political material if that was a condition of getting a permit from the state. The strategic incentives of fiat push debaters away from the crucial questions of specific decisions that activists make, into vague and idealized conjecture about how the world works. This is to say, if we are legitimately thinking about what sort of thing a person engaging in movement based radical or leftist politics needs to know, the answer will never first be the actually implementable goal that has the possibility of "solvency." It is

not useful for an anarchist to think of the precise mechanism by which she intends to dismantle the state. It is also not useful to think about intermediate steps as concrete policy actions. Specific things that radical political groups do are better thought of as instantiations of conceptual commitments. This means that people who insist kritiks fiat for educational reasons have it exactly backwards. The things we learn when we fiat are useless in comparison to the discussion of what conceptual commitments we ought to have, even in terms of the most hard-nosed evaluation of political effects. It also means that to say it is unfair because you can't link certain types of arguments just demonstrates a failure of creativity and a conservative insistence on all types of politics adhering to a narrow window of political tactics.]

**The ballot is key because wins and losses shape the direction of the activity, a vote for our advocacy inspires others to run it as well. A cascade of rev v rev debates encourage competition to create the best model of surviving the race war.**