1. Without our interp, all strategies will amount to just another weapon for the targeted killing regime

**1ACCCC**

**For example, my body, my people have been targeted for killings and torture because the color of our skin justifies gratuitous violence under the logic of white supremacy.Deviation from whiteness has situated us as black. And thus disposable.**

**Sakai in 1989 explained that…**

Influential Contemporary Liberationist Thinker

(J. Sakai, “Settlers: The Mythology of the White Proletariat”, Published by the Morningstar Press. Third Addition 1989)

In the Philippines the liberation struggle had ¶ alreadv reached the formation of a new Filipino Govern- ¶ ment.-s¶ purred on by the Katipunan, the secret armed ¶ organization of workers and peasants, the revolutionaries ¶ had created a large peoples' army. By the time the first ¶ U.S. troops landed on June 30, 1898, the Filipino revolu- ¶ tionaries had already swept the Spanish Colonial Army ¶ and administration out of virtually the whole of the Philip- ¶ pines, besieging the last isolated holdouts in the old walled ¶ city of Manila. Under the pretext of being "allies" of the ¶ Filipinos, U.S. troops landed and joined the siege of the ¶ Spanish remnants. It is a fact that in the siege the Filipino ¶ patriots held 15% miles of the lines facing the Spanish destroying all organized social and economic life in guer- ¶ rilla areas. Villages would be burned down, crops and ¶ livestock destroyed, diseases spread, the People killed or ¶ forced to evacuate as refugees. Large areas were declared ¶ as "free fire zones" in which all Filipinos were to be killed ¶ on sight. (12) ¶ Of course, evenEuro-Amerikan settlers needed ¶ some indoctrination in order to daily carry out such ¶ crimes. *Indiscriminate killing,* looting and torture were ¶ publicly encouraged by the U.S. Army command.¶ Amerikanreporters were invited to witness the daily tor- ¶ ture sessions, in which Filpinos would be subjected to the ¶ "watercure" (having salt water pumped into their ¶ stomachs under pressure). The Boston Herald said: ¶ "Our troops in the Philippines ... look upon all ¶ Filipinos as of one race and condition, and being dark¶ men, they are therefore 'niggers', and entitled to all the ¶ contempt and harsh treatment administered by white ¶ overlords to the most inferior races." (13) ¶ U.S. Imperialism took the Philippines by literally ¶ turning whole regions intosmolderinggraveyards. U.S. ¶ Brig. Gen. JamesBell, upon returning to the U.S. in 1901, ¶ said thathis men hadkilled one out of every six Filipinos ¶ on the main island of Luzon (that would be some one ¶ million deaths just there). It is certain that at least 200,000 ¶ Filipinos died in the genocidal conquest. In Samar pro- ¶ vince, where the patriotic resistance to the U.S. invaders ¶ wasextremelypersistent, U.S. Gen. JacobSmith ordered ¶ his troops to shoot every Filipino man, woman or child ¶ they could find "over ten" (years of age). (14)

**Thus, We advocate black liberation as strategic resistance to the regime of targeted killing.**

**THIRD, The Filipino tradition of resistance – Countless groups across the Philipines have mounted resistance struggles against the intervention of white powers – the people power movement that my family experienced in the 80s was not only accessible it created activist networks for generations to continue the struggle against white supremacist state-building**

Deats 11 (Richard, Super Consciousness, "The People Power Revolution in the Philippines," http://www.superconsciousness.com/topics/society/people-power-revolution-philippines)

In l986 millions of unarmed Filipinos surprised the world by nonviolently overthrowing the brutal dictator Ferdinand Marcos, known at the time as “the Hitler of Southeast Asia.” They called their movement “people power,” demonstrating in an amazing way the power of active nonviolence, the power of truth and love, similar to what was seen in the Gandhian freedom struggle in India and the civil rights movement in the United States. Beginning with the assassination in l983 of the popular opposition leader Senator Benigno (Ninoy) Aquino, the movement against Marcos grew rapidly. Imprisoned for seven years by Marcos, Aquino had experienced a deep conversion in his concentrated study of the Bible and Gandhi. This led him to begin advocating a nonviolent revolution against dictatorship. His subsequent martyrdom fueled the determination of many Filipinos to continue in his radical nonviolent path. I felt a strong affinity with this emerging movement. I had taught social ethics at Union Theological Seminary in the Philippines for thirteen years. Coming from the southern US where I was part of the civil rights struggle, the parallels with the Philippine situation were strong: Martin Luther King, Jr., the leading spokesman of the nonviolent movement against entrenched injustice had also been killed but his message and approach lived on. In 1984, the Little Sisters of Jesus, a community of nuns who worked among the poorest of the poor in metropolitan Manila, took it upon themselves to contact Jean and Hildegard Goss-Mayr, nonviolence lecturers and trainers in Europe who had worked for many years for the International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR) in situations of revolution and war. The nuns asked the Goss-Mayrs, a French-Austrian couple, to come to the Philippines to help assess the situation. Having lived under Nazism in World War II, they were acquainted with struggling against tyranny. They came and met with church leaders (the country is over ninety percent Christian), peasants, labor and student leaders and community organizers. Out of these meetings came the decision to build a nonviolent movement that would oppose the dictatorship. Also a part of the IFOR and having lived and worked in the Philippines, I joined in this campaign. Long active in anti-war efforts and the civil rights movement, I returned to the Philippines and joined in the nonviolence trainings, accompanied by Stefan Merken, Jewish pacifist, photographer and writer also active in the IFOR. Our training team consisted of myself, Merken and Professor Hilario Gomez and six students from Union Seminary who were part of an activist group, FOJ— Friends of Jesus. Our efforts spread over a wide swath of Luzon, the main island of the Philippines. We traveled by public bus from place to place where our workshops were held: in local churches, a rural life center, a college, a labor center and at the headquarters of the National Council of Churches. Due to dictatorial rule in the country, we tried to keep “under the radar” so as not to be arrested should the content of our workshops become known to the government. The trainings were for invited persons only and were not publicly announced or noticed. After an opening worship, with hymns and prayers, at each workshop Gomez presented a socio/political analysis of the country-the Filipinos called such a lecture a “situationer.” Then Gomez and I talked about the nonviolent understanding of biblical faith that pursues justice, that stands with the oppressed and that challenges cruel authority as was seen in the biblical prophets, in Jesus, in the Asian Gandhi and the African-American King. We did role plays, where participants would take assigned parts, such as a tenant farmer dealing with an oppressive landlord, or a worker stopped by an armed soldier for questioning. We talked about “the pillars of oppression”, e.g., the army, the government, the upper class. Participants shared their opinions and experiences and began to feel strength that came from verbalizing and acting out internal struggles that often had been held in silence. Learning of what had happened in India, in the US and other places was a powerful incentive for action. Ordinary people had done extraordinary things creating a contagion out of which movements had been born. Merken fascinated the participants with his Jewish perspective on biblical nonviolence. Most of them in this Asian nation had never even met a Jew, much less heard a Jewish pacifist discuss the first recorded act of civil disobedience when a midwife disobeyed the king’s edict to kill Hebrew male babies by hiding the infant Moses in the bulrushes, thereby saving his life. So nonviolent resistance wasn’t just a Gandhian idea! We had lively discussions. There was universal disgust with dictatorship but some thought one just had to passively endure it. “Bahala na” they would say, a Filipino expression that means “That’s just the way things are, the way they will be.” Others thought only violence could be effective against evil oppressors. As a bishop said to me, “I used to believe in nonviolence but Marcos is too cruel; only a bloody revolution will work against him.” When I asked him how long such a revolution would take, he said, “Ten years.” (Neither of us had any idea, of course, that less than a year later Marcos would have fled the country when faced with nonviolent masses of Filipinos). Others refused to sanction violence even in a just struggle. Some had heard I worked for the CIA; others had heard I was really a communist! But some had heard that I was part of monthly vigils against the Vietnam War; others had been my students in seminary and had seen me at student demonstrations favoring democracy. The workshop became a safe place where these contradictory ideas and accusations were aired. Along with vigorous discussion were also moments of humor that joined us together in shared laughter. Through it all, the examination of Gandhi, King and Aquino led to an emerging understanding that, as Dr. King had said, “The arc of the universe is long but it bends towards justice.” Perhaps the time of reckoning was at hand. The martyrdom of Senator Aquino heightened the determination of the people to end their long tyranny. Maybe his death was a signpost, not another dead end. The seeds planted in the workshops among Catholics, Protestants, Muslims and others of no particular faith; clergy and laity, intellectuals, students, peasant and labor leaders began to give birth to intensive efforts around the country to build a resistance community. Little by little, but also in unexpected leaps and bounds, there emerged a solid core of activists - including many key leaders - ready for a showdown with the Marcos dictatorship. The workshops of 1984 and 1985 were catalysts that awakened new possibilities into being. Age old habits of fatalism gave way to a determination for a better future. From cardinals and bishops to local priests and nuns, ministers and women deacons, brave students and farmers, a chorus rang out calling for change - dangerous and daring but absolutely necessary. Activists sprang into action, breathing new life into communities, forming new organizations, boldly speaking out about this “third way” - active nonviolence, the path between violence and passivity. I watched in awe at the creativity and boldness of “the unarmed forces” of the Philippines.

For example, each ballot is momentum; an increase in our bounty. Just as in the case of Assata Shakur, the bounty and ballot are a means of raising the profile of the targeted killing regime. We hope to awaken conscious to the need of black liberation, just like the bounty hunter pursuit of Assata Shakur inspired YasinBey.

He writes…

(YasinBey, aka Mos Def. Rapper, Actor, Political Activist, “The government’s terrorist is our community’s heroine by YasiinBey(MosDef)”, May 5, 2013

http://freedomhallblog.wordpress.com/2013/05/05/the-governments-terrorist-is-our-communitys-heroine-by-yasiin-beymos-def/)

Early in May, the federal government issued a statement in which they labeledJoanne Chesimard, known to most in the Black community asAssata Shakur, as a domestic terrorist. In so doing,theyalsoincreased the bounty on her head from $150,000 to an unprecedented $1,000,000.¶Viewed through the lens of U.S. law enforcement, Shakur is an escaped cop-killer. Viewed through the lens of many Black people, including me, she is a wrongly convicted womananda hero of epic proportions.¶My first memory of Assata Shakur was the “Wanted” posters all over my Brooklynneighborhood. They said her name was Joanne Chesimard, that she was a killer, an escaped convict, and armed and dangerous.¶They made her sound like a super-villain, like something out of a comic book. But even then, as a child, I couldn’t believe what I was being told.¶When I looked at those posters and the mug shotof a slight, brown, high-cheekboned woman with a full afro, I saw someone who looked like she was in my family, an aunt, a mother.¶ She looked like she had soul.Later, as a junior high school student, when I read her autobiography, “Assata,” I would discover that not only did she have soul, she also had immeasurableheart, courage and love.¶And I would come to believe that that very heart and soul she possessed was exactly why Assata Shakur was shot, arrested, framed and convicted of the murder of a New Jersey State Trooper.¶ There are some undisputed facts about the case. On May 2, 1973, Assata Shakur, a Black Panther, was driving down the New Jersey State Turnpike with two companions, Zayd Shakur and SundiataAcoli.¶ The three were pulled over, ostensibly for a broken tail light. A gun battle ensued; why and how it started is unclear. But the aftermath is not. Trooper Werner Forester and Zayd Shakur lay dead.¶SundiataAcoli escaped (he was captured two days later). And Assata was shot and arrested. At trial, three neurologists would testify that the first gunshot shattered her clavicle and the second shattered the median nerve in her right hand. That testimony proved that she was sitting with her hands raised when she was fired on by police.¶ Further testimony proved that no gun residue was found on either of her hands, nor were her fingerprints found on any of the weapons located at the scene. Nevertheless, Shakur was convicted by an all-White jury and sentenced to life in prison.¶ Six years and six months to the day that she was arrested, and aided by friends, Shakur escaped from Clinton Women’s Prison in New Jersey. As a high school student, I remember seeing posters all around the Brooklyn community I lived in that read: “Assata Shakur is Welcome Here.” In 1984, she surfaced in Cuba and was granted political asylum by Fidel Castro.¶ There are those who believe that being convicted of a crime makes you guilty. But that imposes an assumption of infallibility upon our criminal justice system.¶ When Assata Shakur was convicted of killing Werner Foerster, not only had the Black Panther Party been labeled by then FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as “the greatest internal threat” to American security, but Assata herself had been thoroughly criminalized in the minds of the American public.¶ She’d been charged in six different crimes, ranging from attempted murder to bank robbery, and her acquittal or dismissal of the charges outright notwithstanding, to the average citizen, it seemed she must be guilty of something. And she was.She was guilty of calling for a shift in power in America and for racial and economic justice.¶Included on a short list of the many people who have made that call and were either criminalized, terrorized, killed or blacklisted are Paul Robeson, Martin Luther King, Schwerner, Chaney and Goodman, Medgar Evers and Ida B. Wells.¶ Perhaps what is most insulting about the government’s latest attack on Assata is that while they vigorously pursue her extradition, a few years ago using it as a bargaining chip for lifting the embargo itself, they have been decidedly lackadaisical in pursuing the extradition to Venezuela of an admitted terrorist, Florida resident Luis Posada Carriles. Carriles is likely responsible for blowing up a Cuban airline in 1976, an act which claimed the lives of some 73 innocent civilians.¶ For those of us who either remember the state of the union in the 1960s and 1970s or have studied it, when we consider Assata Shakur living under political asylum in Cuba, we believe that nation is exercising its political sovereignty and in no way harboring a terrorist.¶Cubans sees Assata as I and many others in my community do: as a woman who was and is persecuted for her political beliefs.¶ When the federal government raised the bounty on her head this May 2, one official declared that Assata was merely “120 pounds of money.” For many of us in the Black community, she could never be so reduced. For many of usin the Black community,she was and remains,to use her own words,an “escaped slave,” a heroine, not unlike Harriet Tubman.

**2ACCCC**

**Dillon 12**

Ph.D. candidate in American Studies at the University of Minnesota.

(“State of White Supremacy: Racism, Governance, and the United States” (Book Review) August 28, 2012, http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2012/08/28/book-review-state-of-white-supremacy-darkmatter-journal/)

Here, the first two essays discuss racial discrimination in education. George Lipsitz provides a masterful reading of U.S. court cases (including a powerful rereading of Brown v. Board of Education) concerning racial discrimination in education to highlight how racism continues under the names equality, desegregation, and protection. As Lipsitz observes, the wording of Brown allows school districts to declare non-discriminatory intentions without takingreparative action. In this way, the state uses laws intended to end white supremacy in order to preserve it. Thus, the law (like the citizen and the human) is a not a vehicle of liberation but a tool of subjection. Lipsitz’s analysis of legal white supremacy authorized by Civil Rights legislation is complemented by the work of Sanford Schram, Richard Fording, and Joe Soss on what they term “neoliberal-paternalism.” Neoliberal paternalism apprehends the ways contemporary forms of poverty governance resurrect older modes of population management in order to connect them to more recent neoliberal modes of governance. Past forms of racialized state violence become sutured to newer forms of control and punishment. Asmore and morepoorpeople of color abandoned by neoliberal restructuring are captured by an unprecedentedregime of incarceration, welfare has increasingly mimicked the penal sphere. We might add the education system to the massive network of racialized state power outlined by Schram, Fording, and Soss. This almost unimaginable regime of racialized management and control produces a system where, as Joy James writes, “Whites are to be protected, and Black life is to be contained in order to protect whites and their property (both personal and public or institutional)” (169). These critiques of the state are powerfully extended by the work of Andrea Smith and João H. Costa Vargas in the book’s final section. Smith continues the collection’s critique of the law by observing that “genocide has never been against the law in the United States” because “Native Genocide has been expressly sanctioned as the law” (231). Like Rodríguez, Smith argues for a politics of abolition and undoing rather than reform and inclusion.In her analysis of hate crimes legislation, Smith argues that instead of making racializedand gendered violence illegal (given thatracialized and gendered violenceis alreadyexecuted through the law in the prison, reservation, and the ghetto), we must make our organizing, theorizing, and teaching against the law. If the state is foundational to racialized, gendered, and heterosexist violence, then the state should not be the mediatorof pain and grievance because “the state is now going to be the solution to the problem it created in the first place” (232). The work of João H. Costa Vargas complements this analysis by making clear the ways the law produces anti-black genocide. For Vargas, the black diaspora is a “geography of death” where the premature and preventable deaths of black people are authorized by a “cognitive matrix” that systematically renders black life devalued. Vargas would surely understand the preventable deaths produced by the medical industry as a form of genocide, namely because intent is not central to his theorization of the concept. Instead, creating or tolerating conditions that producemass-based uneven vulnerability topremature death is genocidal, making white supremacy itself a genocidal project. Accordingly, genocide is at the core of our ethical standards, is foundational to modern politics, and is central to our cognitive apparatuses (269). To challenge genocide we must undo the epistemologies that support systems of value and disposability and make possible the slow deaths that are the “condition of possibility for our present subjectivities and modern politics” (269).

1. **It violently limits both people and modes of scholarship, preventing accessibility.**

**Evans 13**

(Rashad, JD Two-time first round debater. CEDA Champion, NDT Semifinalist, and Championship Head coach

“[The NDT & The Anti-Blackness Hangover](http://www.rwesq.com/the-ndt-the-anti-blackness-hangover/)”, August 20, 2013, http://www.rwesq.com/the-ndt-the-anti-blackness-hangover/)

First, the 3-2 decision in favor of Emporia State was historic and epic.  Equally as epic was the published ballot that followed.  That ballot, despite being cast in favor of Emporia State, was largely a love letter to the losing team from Northwestern and to the history of a debate community that had been indicted as exclusionary, anti-black and anti-gay.  That ballot was also critical of the “resistance” movement in debate and called for those who self-identified as in resistance to be more reflective.  Oddly, the author offered no such advice to the majority of the community and revealed no such self-reflection of his own.  The ballot seems to suggest that those in resistance are aggressors, that we are the trouble makers, that we are making this racism stuff up and that really everyone is on our side.  This, of course, is gormet bullshit.  Resistance is not the problem, debate is the problem.  Resistance exists to resist your bullshit.  The anti-blackness in this ballot was turned up to say the least.  This is especially true given the lengths to which the author went to explain how sexist the activity is while offering ZERO insight into blackness and queerness…the subject of the debate.  Is it ironic or predictable that a black NDT champion would be crowned with such a simultaneous anti-black pronouncement?Second, the3-2 decision in favor of Wake Forest over Louisville and corresponding move by some in the NDT committee to consider criminal charges against a Black debater after he threatened a Wake debater who used a racial slur further solidifying that Black debaters can only be aggressors and never the victim.  Setting aside the specifics of the debate, the response is outrageous.  Particularly outrageous to me because Black people are threatened by non-Black people in this community EVERY DEBATE TOURNAMENT.  Every time a debater says “the community will backlash if you vote for X performance” they have made a threat.  Every time a judge votes for that argument, theyhave entered into the conspiracy.  Given that Black debaters in this community already live inisolation andsocial death, the only logical conclusionis that the threat of a backlash is a threat to escalate to physical violence.  Given the violent history of white people, particularly towards Black people I have every reason to believe that non-Black debaters in the community will make good on this threat.  In generally, I am quite disgusted that the NDT and the community at large has not considered a more productive way to addresstheracial tensionsin the communitythan (1) figure it out in the debates and (2) prosecute the Black folk.  Acting like there is no problem, or worse, like this is a Black problem only makes future racial violence inevitable and thiswill be bad for everyone involved in this activity.  Get your shit together NDT.

1. Their“education” teaches us to speak loudly but have no voice whileusing the topic to reproduce white supremacy

Jones 11

FIU Theses and Dissertations.

(Douglas, “Constructing a Revolutionary Narrative: Black¶ ¶ Liberation and the Political Uses of the Past in the¶ ¶ United States and South Africa, 1960-1975”, March 31st, 2001, http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1465&context=etd)

An essential part of Black Power was its call for racial separatism ¶ approximating the “separatism” practiced by other ethnic groups in American ¶ history. As Christopher Lasch pointed out in his 1968 essay on Black Power in the ¶ New York Review of Books, this coexisted with and contradicted the other theme in ¶ Black Power, namely its call for guerrilla warfare against colonialism.113 Lasch’s¶ criticism notwithstanding, both of these tendencies drew heavily on a picture of the ¶ past. Carmichael claimed the “separatist” trend was widespread and noted that ¶ “Throughout this country, vast segments of the black communities are beginning to ¶ recognize the need to assert their own definitions, to reclaim their history, their ¶ culture; to create their own sense of community and togetherness.”114 Carmichael ¶ presented this not as a prescription but in recognition of what was going on around ¶ him. Although he did not offer specifics, he claimed that African Americans “are ¶ becoming aware that they have a history which pre-dates their forced introduction to this country.”115 In other words, African Americans were simply following the ¶ path the Italians, Irish, Jews, and other immigrant groups had trod before them, ¶ engaging in a cultural reclamation project and constructing a national identity. ¶As in South Africa, this memory was recalled in opposition to dominant forms ¶ of white memory, whichCarmichael claimed had been used to keep blacks in ¶ submission. “Too long have [African Americans] been kept in submission by being ¶ told they had no culture, no manifest heritage, before they landed on the slave ¶ auction blocks in this country. If black people are to know themselves as a vibrant, ¶ valiant people, they must know their roots.”116 Grounded by a sense of history, the ¶ “new consciousness” would be the “vital first step” in tackling the problem of race in ¶ America.117 Malcolm X offered a similar interpretation, claiming that black ¶ schoolchildren were taught nothing about African American contributions to ¶ history: “When we send our children to school in this country they learn nothing ¶ about us other than that we used to be cotton pickers. Every little child going to ¶ school thinks his grandfather was a cotton picker.”118¶

1. Our use of “targeted killing” is good.

This Week In Blackness 13

("Drone Policy Is the Most Important Racism," http://thisweekinblackness.com/2013/07/25/drone-policy-is-the-most-important-racism/)

There are several incidents of privilege-blindness among the mostly white male drone-obsessed elite. First, their public angerover the drone program seemed to begin when Eric Holder made [statements](http://www.cnn.com/2013/03/05/politics/obama-drones-cia) extending the legal justification for the program to killing U.S. citizens on U.S. soil.  That implies that these critics thinkthat the U.S.governmentkillingU.S.citizens is new or unusual, when a simple surface-level review of this country’s history shows that the government has always committed sustained and fatal violence against brown people, women, gay people, transpeople, disabled people, and poor people among others. People who insist on talking about drones as an ultimate evil ignore this history of violence, which is well-knownin communities not their own. And, the likelihood that white men personally will be targeted by a droneis absurdly small, compared to the likelihood that a member of a marginalized community will continue to suffer from the government’s active and passive violence. So, hearing these critics air their feelings of being “targets” for the first time is offensive to thosefrom communitiesthat have lived under the gun for generations, especially because these feelings exclude points of view from those communities. If you are privileged enough to suddenly feel scared of thegovernment, you are complicit in denying the violence against marginalized people that has always existed.The other part of white male critics’ anxiety comes from recognition that the world order is changing. Traditionally, the American president has been a white man who identifies and legitimizes white men’s problems as American Problems. Now, President Obama is the public face of America, and when he identifies a traditionally invisible Black People’s Problem, it becomes, for the first time, an American Problem. Bystubbornly forcing Obama’s statements about TrayvonMartininto the framework of opposition to drone strikes, white male publicintellectuals are attempting to return to white men the power to define American Problems. White criticsinsist that Obama addresses drone strikes above all other expressions of white supremacy, while claiming that they are the “true” soldiers against racism. They apparently believe that they get to decide which policies are “important-racist” and which ones are “unimportant-racist.” It must be a coincidence that the “unimportant-racist” policies are the ones that most directly validate white upper-class male privilege. Also, by arguing that drones exhibit “important racism,” these critics reinforce the narrative that killing Black people is “unimportant racism,” and not as valuable as executing white men’s philosophical priorities.

1. This is a flawed orientation to the classroom-They posit the perfect as the enemy of the good. We have entered into this space and extended our hand as a step in the right direction, what they have done is slapped it away solely in the name of deconstruction. This mode of pedagogy not only prevents progress, but it deemphasizes the need for material change

**Jones 9**

Van, president of the Ella Baker Center for Human Rights, in Oakland, California (ellabakercenter.org) and a National Apollo Alliance steering committee member. interviewed by the Public Rhetorics and Permanent War research collective

(Mirpuri, A., Feldman, K. P. and Roberts, G. M., Antiracism and Environmental Justice in an Age of Neoliberalism: An Interview with Van Jones. Antipode, 41: 401–415 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/store/10.1111/j.1467-8330.2009.00680.x/asset/j.1467-8330.2009.00680.x.pdf>?v=1&t=h9db4rfu&s=4eb93e106487916d817d5ed955a183bd99085437)

This is the way Progressives need to be thinking, not whether it’s neoliberal or not. Jeez, I had that conversation in 1997. I can guarantee you that every single action or proposal that comes across the transom, there will be some very clever Leftist who will besitting there waving his handin the back of the roomsaying, “I know how to critique this one. I know how to critique this one.” That’s become the slogan on the Left. “I know how to critique this one.” As if what this country’s missing, and the reason that we’re all miserable is because we haven’t figured out the best critique of our situation.It’s a highly idealistic mode of politics and I think that the outcome is very clear. The campusesactuallyused to produce usable activists and organizers who could come into an organization, run the photocopier, get a clipboard, walk out into the community, knock on the door, and within a few weeks be reasonably decent community change-agents. You now have to spend with these people coming off the campuses about two years just getting them to speak plain English and not attack everybody. There’s something happening on the campuses where deconstruction is everything and reconstruction is off the table, outside of some sort of socialism on the moon. That’s what the campuses are producing. I think that it’s extremely dangerous. You need those folks to be idealistic and militant, and a little bit unreasonable, but primarily aimed at changing the balance of forces in the country. What’s happening now is that you have people who are certainly militant in a kind of sardonic way, too-clever-by-half kind of militants, who are very good at explaining what’s wrong with everything and have a very hard time finding anything to be joyful about, or anything to be hopeful about. That kind ofdressed-up cynicism, a cynicism adorned with polysyllables and a certain pose, will not move the country, will not move working-class people, will not actually change the course of history. And yet it’s a well-defended pose. There’s a lot of conversation that keeps it in place, but what’s happened is we’ve not produced a political movement. The Left is producing a political subculture, and a subculture is very different than a movement. A subculture vigorously polices its own ideas, identity, and boundaries.It’s very concerned with who’s in and who’s out, who’s cool and who’s not. It’saself-limiting thing. Whereas a political movement is constantly trying to figure out how to get bigger and bigger sections of society on its side.