counterplan:

The CP text is to endorse the affirmative advocacy, but implement reparations superfunds. **BERRY[[1]](#footnote-1)** Beyond reparations to individuals, there should be a “Reparations Superfund” as historian V.P. Franklin suggests. Monies could come from institutions and corporations that profited from slave labor; additional funds could come from banks and insurance companies that had been guilty of racial discriminatory practices, such as redlining and predatory financial lending. The fund, administered by a federal agency, would ideally have an independent oversight board composed of African-American representatives whose responsibility would be to identify promising programs and projects. Community groups and other nonprofit organizations serving slave-descendant African-Americans could apply for funds to address housing, health, education, employment, entrepreneurship and other needs as their members determine.

The counterplan competes ideologically – the 1ac refuses to specify a particular policy. Abstract discussions merely create principles of ideal theory and not direct practical proposal, sidelining practical discussion. There are numerous disadvantages:

AT conyers:

non-unique - he would also be ignored if he proposed a general resolution. Congress will not listen to reparations not because it is a specific law but because our legislative ysstem is profoundly racist that is not resolved by being abstact. The question is whether that is a more produtive discusssion than simply the abstract question of if we should not be anti black, which I already agree with. The question is where do we go from here? The aff refusal to engage that discussion represents refusal to engage in nonideal theory discussions.

DAs to perm:

1) turn: Your performance cannot solve becuase whenever you incorporate specifics into abstraction the specifics never get acted on, but just become illustration for the abstract. The material becomes a footnote, so all the perm does is footnote the material consideration as an instance of the aff and then returns to abstract consideration of the 1ac.

2) turn: When the abstract endorses a particular it allows everyone else to feel like their obligation is relieved because the universal has suggested a policy which now does not apply to them. If the person who starts by generically saying reperations good then says white churches should pay reparations, everyone who is not a Christian sighs with relief because the generic call has now been satisfied. If we start with the specific obligation that each group has nothing over and broader can be satisfied by doing any particular action because it is not seen as the main group being satisfied in their demand.

3) turn: When you engage in asbtraction first you exclude those who feel they don’t have the academic training to participate in the discussion; they leave the conversation before their perspective is included on the material issues upon which they speak with authority. If at an academic conference we discussed specific reperation policies it woudl be a bad idea becasue those with persepctives on specific matters would not be present, so starting with abstraction drives out the mateiral perspective from inclusion.

4) turn: Starting with abstraction allows individuals to engage in a nirvana fallacy because they have an ideal set up before them, they can always put off the particular because it is not quite what we want thus we spend all the time trying to make the perfect proposal because we started with an abstract utopia which any material suggestion always ends up unequal to.

5) turn: Using abstract principles of justice allows us to legislate from a God's eye perspective. To claim that we in the abstract know what is right and wrong without discussion of any particularities. But that sort of abstract claim to generic knoweldge is the exact logic of colonial modernity indicted by Curry that justifies oppression.

6) turn: When you start with abstraction and then move to the material you alter the categories with which you understand teh material. So the exmple here is that aristotlean scientists actually claimed that when you throw a ball it will go in the direction yuo throw it for a while and then just fall directly down without a parabolic arch the reason is beause they had a theory which then meant there observations were theory laden and they interperated the particualr interms of the thoery they already had but that is a huge problem becuase it means that we will just see what we expect in terms of reparatiosn and that will prevent us from adopting policies as we need to because our prior abstract account orients away from accurate understanding of the particualr when we try to consider the particular.
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