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**The only question of this debate is whether the affirmative offers a strategy to challenge capitalism. The political ontology of anti-black settlerism is locked into place through the alienation of black and native labor and abstraction through the form of capital – their spontaneous planning ignores the contingency of capital risk.**

**Amaro, 18**  (Ramon Amaro, Lecturer in the Department of Visual Cultures at Goldsmiths, University of London; Research Fellow in Digital Culture at Het Nieuwe Instituut in Rotterdam; worked as Assistant Editor for the SAGE open access journal Big Data & Society; 2018, PhD, Philosophy, Centre for Cultural Studies, Goldsmiths; 2013, MA, Sociological Research, University of Essex; 1999, BSe, Mechanical Engineering, University of Michigan; “Machine Learning, Black Labour and Bio-epistemic Resistance,” presented as part of *After Work: Life, Labour and Automation*, a symposium exploring work and resistance through and against technology. Transcription from rvs, finders credit and cutting goes to tessa)

Okay, hi. My name is Ramon Amaro. Thank you to the organizers for having me here today. I’m actually going to diverge a second and take the conversation to an ontological and theoretical point that can hopefully emerge to different conversations as we go on later. Namely, what I want to begin with is the idea of bare life of the black female body, an idea that Alessandra Raengo argues must be understood if we are even to critique modern forms of capital, as what we know as the black form is already subsumed in the monetary form of capital and the fictive substance of race. What I mean, and what I would like to propose here in following Raengo, is what she calls “**the ontological scandal**” perpetuated by slavery. This scandal, according to Raengo, **is repeated “with each instance of alienated black labor**, **each time blackness functions as the commodity form**, and with each repetition they continue to be reified.” But what’s important is **Raengo’s** gesture presupposes **that the production and subsequent** domination **of colonial** nations todayare predicated on the abstract reification of the black female body as a mode of currency. To even begin to address this ontological scandal, we must first think through how the black body is individuated as a currency of exchange within modern financial systems. For instance, extensive work has been done by **Spillers, Hartman, and others** to **illuminate the important role of** the cargo ship on **the Middle Passage as a scene of** capital **exchange and racial subjection**. However, **I want to build on this work to think through** the genesis of the black self as already informed by the logics of innumeration and speculative risk, where the pre-individuated state of black being is always already contaminated by the conditions of labor-based capital accumulation. But **this accumulation also informs a dissonance between the real black sense of self and any social agreement that may abstract the black self into**, as Denise DeSilva argues, a formative system of monetary value. In other words, as Ian BacComb describes, the growth of Anglo-European financial domination was not merely a cycle of labor and exchange, but a scaled transaction of quantifiable insurance risk associated with the contingency of death and illness aboard slave cargo ships. BacComb points to the British economy in particular to discuss the granting of a real existence of enslaved bodies inasmuch as the survival and the successful delivery of these bodies can be bought virtually as the hidden substance of insurance contracts and bills of credit. Or in the case of the British slave ship Zong, the enslaved body is underwritten as the speculative risk of capital, and public outrage. In this way, **the importance of the enslaved body to modes of capital is not predicated to actual material flesh, or even the potential for that body to labor, but was instead articulated as an abstract flow of enumeration and probability**. If, under this premise, we are to take W.B. DuBois at face value and consider the double consciousness of the racialized individual, then we are immediately confronted with the fragmentation of black genesis as a tension between what is made visible as blackness or black non-being, which Sylvia Wynters arguesis already owned by ontology as a problem of bio-epistemic compliance and the regime of prototypical capital existence, which I argue is symptomatic of a larger logic of social quantification. So I just wanna diverge for a second and return to the issue of the Zong for those who aren’t familiar, the issue of the slave body on the British slaver was the start and emergence of the British insurance industry. If anyone knows, there was an illness that broke out on the slave ship, in the middle of the Atlantic, seven crew members died, and I think it was in term of like twenty slaves, and the captain of that ship decided that, actually, it was cheaper to throw all the slaves overboard and claim the insurance than it was to continue the passage. And when he returned back to England, he sued the insurance company, and that was the start of litigation -- of the body itself as being a virtual point of risk. And what I’m arguing is that, since that development, obviously we know how pervasive the insurance industry is, how pervasive capital mechanisms are at identifying risk and probability, and what I’m arguing here is, following Raengo, is that what we know today as modern capitalism in the UK is already predicated on the violence of the black female body. So, to continue, as **the terms of contemporary capital depart from the derivation of value as the direct engagement with the** body **to the technics of labor practice**, so in other words, it no longer became about the actual slave being delivered to do manual labor – the financial gain was greater from actually deriving insurance risk on the body itself. **So** the body only became a black body once it was subsumed into capital types of risk. These engagements emerged as adaptive forms of information exchange that, unlike popular believe, are indifferent to the specificity of the body. However, it is specific only as much as the racialized body can be extracted into quantifiable forms of data and pre-emption**, which continues today to be defined as social value in contemporary techno-capital institutions.** What I’m attempting to highlight is that while the technology of shipping and insurance risk**,** predicated on violence and the abstraction of the black body, **were once the lens through which blackness was made visible, the emergence of new generative types of technology, like machine learning, enact an accelerated form of targeting and visibility that no longer require physicality, but depend on the meta-abstraction of all social phenomenon to locate the body as a measure of correlation and probability**. So, in other words, after the Zong, following Raengo here, after the Zong, the idea of abstracting the body into actual risk, of course, further objectified the black body, but it also set a precedent of actual citizenship being viewed as potential financial gain or potential investment.

#### The drive to accumulate spawned technologies of anti-Blackness and indigenous violence – the prior condition is value and its circulation

Franklin 21, senior lecturer in contemporary literature in the Department of English at King’s College London. (Seb, “Elemental Space: Coloniality and Flexibility” in *The Digitally Disposed: Racial Capitalism and the Informative of Value*, University of Minnesota Press)

In this respect, Wiener’s celebration of the “merchant adventurers” of New England, which grounds the human use of human beings in abstract ideals of flexibility and mobility, foreshadows Bernhard Siegert’s claim that the techniques of Iberian colonial expansion turned ships into “cybernetic machines."\* These machines, Siegert suggests, foreshadow the digital operation because they function through a homeostatic mechanism—"a loop comprised of measurement, adjustment [and] commands to the rudder and rigging"—that renders “the elemental space of the sea’ legible and navigable.° The critical difference is that where Siegert’s cybernetic formulation of transatlantic shipping emphasizes technical ‘processes in order to undermine the notion of untrammeled agency that continues to demarcate the conceptual parameters of modern person- hood, Wiener’s installs the process of steering—the feedback loop be- ‘tween entity and environment—as the basis of that agency. The difference ‘might be resolved by observing the process through which the human subject is produced as autonomous by an informatic mechanism that conditions and sets limits on its autonomy. But neither Wiener nor Siegert identifies the informatics of value that precede and condition the cybernetic conceptualization of shipping as a physical procedure for the transmission of abstractions. Consequently, neither can account for the “message” that determines the actual practices of shipping that lie behind their conceptualizations, which is to say, neither includes in their cybernetic diagram of shipping the accumulation drive that animates circulation and the practices of colonial expansion. If the ship is a cybernetic machine, then it is so before the feedback loop of map and shipping route, rudder, and rigging facilitates its triangular movement between Europe, Africa, and the New World. Before the movement of value-bearing bodies and things there is always already the movement of values around the quasi-autonomous space of a network that must constantly expand and increase its granularity. Before the possibility of imagining the ship as a cybernetic machine are the informatics of value.

Wiener’s utopian prescriptions, which elevate a perpetually moving (or adventuring) human actor in an open mesh of possibility, show how the digital inheritor of liberal personhood emerges from linked histories of dispossession and racialized differentiation. By mapping concrete practices of exploration, occupation, and expropriation onto abstract ideals of communicative mobility, he shows how human flourishing is premised on the perpetual renewal of conditions that require transparent humanity's affectable others to be either differentially integrated into networks of communication or rendered literally nothing, as in Wiener’s ‘account of the “empty land” beyond the frontier.

‘This should make it clear that the relationship between form and formlessness is nonlinear. As Wynter observes, the fifteenth-century Portuguese integration of ‘areas of West Africa into a mercantile network and trading system, on the basis of the exchange of their goods for gold or slaves" was a “necessary and indisputable prelude, not only to Columbus: ‘own voyage but also to the specific pattern of relations of which Cerio speaks between Christian Europe and the non-Christian peoples of the world to which Columbus and his crew had newly arrived."\*In this exemplary case, the integration of people into networks of exchange—as merchants and as commodities—requires market-mediated reproduction in West Africa be rendered formless; the resultant accumulation of capital makes possible a subsequent imposition of formlessness onto unpropertized land and non-market-dependent people in the New World; and this imposition of formlessness makes possible the formalization of bodies, land, and resources through their integration into networks of accumulation; and so on. To flourish, Wiener’s human requires the perpetual renewal of this arrangement. Both the informatics of value and the colonial imaginary they inform require the conceptual implementation of elemental spaces (the sea, unconquered land) and bodies (natives, slaves) through and across which the value network can expand and intensify its operations. And this relationship between form and formlessness, as an ‘outcome of that between value-mediation and its externalized preconditions, is recursive. Formlessness is constructed as the outside of formal, value-mediated processes; and the demands of capital accumulation often lead the form that has been allocated through value-mediated processes to be either rescinded through ejection or rendered intermittent through flexibilization. ‘Fanon diagrams this reticulated construction of “empty” space, “affect- able” bodies, and value-informatic personhood when he writes of a “becalmed zone” in which “the sea has a smooth surface, the palm tree stirs gently in the breeze, the waves lap against the pebbles, and raw mate- rials are ceaselessly transported, justifying the presence of the settler.” In this realm of frictionless circulation, Fanon ironically remarks, “the settler makes history” while native populations “form an almost inorganic background for the innovative dynamism of colonial mercantilism.”” This “innovative dynamism’ perfectly describes the development of techniques and technologies for constituting and differentially integrating un- formatted space and bodies. Raw materials and land are the materialized forms of this integration, the measures of the value networks content and reach. And the processes of constitution, integration, and materialization tend to reproduce a double projection through which those spaces and bodies marked as formless simultaneously connote sites of limitless possibility and sources of limitless danger, both of which require the invention and deployment of regulatory techniques.

Equiano underscores the quite different opportunity for self-possession that the smooth sea offers the enslaved. “One day, when we had a smooth sea, and moderate wind,” he recounts, “two of my wearied countrymen, who were chained together (I was near them at the time), preferring death to such a life of misery, somehow made through the nettings and jumped into the sea... and I believe many more would soon have done the same, if they had not been prevented by the ships crew."\*Yet even this mark of circulation’s violence can be remapped according to the logic of value, appearing as the risk of lost cargo and diminished returns that animate financialized forms of insurance. James Wallace captures the ‘trader's sense of financial risk in his 1795 history of Liverpool, writing that “the African commerce holds forward one constant train of uncertainty, the time of slaving is precarious, the length of the middle passage uncertain, a vessel may be in part, or wholly cut off, mortalities may be great, and various other incidents may arise impossible to be foreseen.” "So the “becalmed zone’ is also that about which there is nothing “automatically propitious.” It is a space in which “one single storm” can turn a shipowner ‘or merchant from “a rich man into a beggar,” and which thus necessitates the constant production of new technologies—from the nets and the readiness of the crew Equiano observes to new navigational techniques and instruments of insurance—to maintain and inflate the notion that values circulate and expand in an autonomous and frictionless manner." In the same way, when measured against modern, legal forms of property (whether as self-ownership or the ownership of external objects), the putatively inorganic background composed of “natives” presents an obstruction to productive land use that is evoked to naturalize and inflate the value that can be “set free” through occupation. This construction gives rise to all manner of “improper” forms of use, which is to say, social practices that appear non- or not-quite-human when measured against the value-informatic parameters of the possessive individual.

#### They concede to fascists – debate creates vast resources to strategize. Vote neg on presumption -- regardless of the benefits of their method for them, fragmented politics are fundamentally non-unique and non-inherent.

**Hester 17**  
(Helen Hester is Associate Professor of Media and Communication at the University of West London. Her research interests include technofeminism, sexuality studies, and theories of social reproduction. She is a member of the international feminist collective Laboria Cuboniks. “Promethean Labors and Domestic Realism” 25 September 2017 <http://www.e-flux.com/architecture/artificial-labor/140680/promethean-labors-and-domestic-realism/> rvs)

There has been an excess of modesty in the feminist agendas of recent decades. Carol A. Stabile is amongst those who have been critical of an absence of systemic thinking within postmodern feminisms, remarking upon a “growing emphasis on fragmentations and single-issue politics.”1 Stabile dismisses this kind of thinking which, in “so resolutely avoiding ‘totalizing’—the bête noire of contemporary critical theory—[…] ignores or jettisons a structural analysis of capitalism.”2 The difference in scope and scale between that which is being opposed and the strategies being used to oppose it is generative of a sense of disempowerment. On the one hand, Stabile argues, postmodern social theorists “accept the systemic nature of capitalism, as made visible in its consolidation of power and its global expansion […] Capitalism’s power as a system is therefore identified and named as a totality”; on the other hand, these theorists “celebrate local, fragmented, or partial forms of knowledge as the only forms of knowledge available” and criticize big-picture speculative thinking for its potentially oppressive tendencies or applications.3 Nancy Fraser, too, has addressed this apparent “shrinking of emancipatory vision at the fin de siècle,” linking this with “a major shift in the feminist imaginary” during the 1980s and 1990s—that is, with a move away from attempting to remake political economy (redistribution) and towards an effort at transforming culture (recognition).4 The legacies of this kind of political theorizing—legacies some might describe as “folk political”—are still being felt today, and continue to shape the perceived horizons of possibility for progressive projects.5 Yet these projects, which are frequently valuable, necessary, and effective on their own terms, are not sufficient as ends in themselves. To the extent that they are conceptualized in detachment from an ecology of other interventions, operating via a diversity of means and across a variety of scales, they cannot serve as a suitable basis for any politics seeking to contest the imaginaries of the right or to contend with the expansive hegemonic project of neoliberal capitalism. It is for this reason that Nick Srnicek and Alex Williams’s work positions itself as somewhat skeptical about fragmentations and single-issue politics, pointing out that problems such as “global exploitation, planetary climate change, rising surplus populations, [and] the repeated crises of capitalism are abstract in appearance, complex in structure, and non-localized.”6 As such, a politics based around the ideas that “the local is ethical, simpler is better, the organic is healthy, permanence is oppressive, and progress is over” is not always the best weapon in an attempt to contend with the complex technomaterial conditions of the world as it stands.7 There is a persistent kind of abstraction anxiety hanging over progressive politics; an anxiety that haunts a contemporary leftist feminism still unwilling or unable to critically reappraise the tendencies that Stabile identified in the 90s. Recently, however, a renewed appetite for ambitious and future-oriented emancipatory politics has begun to make itself felt at the fringes of the left—and indeed, to gather momentum and popular support more broadly.8 Perhaps the most remarkable example of this tendency within philosophically-inflected political theory circles has been accelerationism, with its calls to build an “intellectual infrastructure” capable of “creating a new ideology, economic and social models, and a vision of the good to replace and surpass the emaciated ideals that rule our world today.”9 These so-called “Promethean” ideas have generated widespread interest, arguably both reflecting and contributing to the changing tenor of activist discourse. Interestingly, this term has to some extent emerged in opposition to the pejorative “folk political,” acting as a shorthand for a very different set of values and perspectives. In a recent critical piece, Alexander Galloway suggests that “Prometheanism” could be defined as “technology for humans to overcome natural limit.”10 Peter Wolfendale, meanwhile, sees it as a “politics of intervention”—one that starts from the insistence that nothing be exempted in advance from the enactment of re/visionary processes.11

**Claiming “debate space” as a site for organic, horizontalist politics sells out radical change to the private sphere of individual performance. It particularizes the struggle and makes transformation impossible**

**Marcus 12** – associate book editor at Dissent Magazine (Fall, David, “The Horizontalists”, http://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/the-horizontalists)

There is a much-recycled and certainly apocryphal tale told of an ethnographer traveling in India. Journeying up and down the Ganges Delta, he encounters a fisherman who claims to know the source of all truth. “The world,” the fisherman explains, “rests upon the back of an elephant.” “But what does the elephant stand on?” the ethnographer asks. “A turtle.” “And the turtle?” “Another turtle.” “And it?” “Ah, friend,” smiles the fisherman, “it is turtles all the way down.” As with most well-circulated apocrypha, it is a parable that lacks a clear provenance, but has a clear moral: that despite our ever-dialectical minds, we will never get to the bottom of things; that, in fact, ***there is nothing*** at the bottom of things. What we define as society is nothing more than a set of locally constructed practices and norms, and what we define as history is nothing more than the passage of one set to the next. Although we might “find the picture of our universe as an infinite tower of tortoises rather ridiculous,” as one reteller admitted, it only raises the question, “Why do we think we know better?” Since the early 1970s we have wondered—with increasing anxiety—why and if we know better. Social scientists, literary critics, philosophers, and jurists have all begun to turn from their particular disciplines to the more general question of interpretation. There has been an **increasing uneasiness with universal categories of thought**; a whispered suspicion and then a commonly held belief that the sum—societies, histories, identities—never amounts to more than its parts. New analytical frameworks have begun to emerge, sensitive to both the pluralities and localities of life. “What we need,” as Clifford Geertz argued, “are not enormous ideas” but “ways of thinking that are responsive to particularities, to individualities, oddities, discontinuities, contrasts, and singularities.” This growing anxiety over the precision of our interpretive powers has translated into a variety of political as well as epistemological concerns. Many have become uneasy with universal concepts of justice and equality. Simultaneous to—and in part because of—the ascendance of human rights, freedom has increasingly become understood as an individual entitlement instead of a collective possibility. The once prevalent conviction that a handful of centripetal values could bind society together has transformed into a deeply skeptical attitude toward general statements of value. If it is, indeed, turtles all the way down, then decisions can take place only on a local scale and on a horizontal plane. **There is no overarching platform from which to legislate; only a “local knowledge.”** As Michael Walzer argued in a 1985 lecture on social criticism, “We have to start from where we are,” we can only ask, “what is the right thing ***for us*** to do?” This shift in scale has had a significant impact on the Left over the past twenty to thirty years. Socialism, once the “name of our desire,” has all but disappeared; new desires have emerged in its place: situationism, autonomism, localism, communitarianism, environmentalism, anti-globalism. Often spatial in metaphor, they have been more concerned with where and how politics happen rather than at what pace and to what end. Often local in theory and in practice, they have come to represent a shift in scale: from the large to the small, from the vertical to the horizontal, and from—what Geertz has called—the “thin” to the “thick.” Class, race, and gender—those classic left themes—are, to be sure, still potent categories. But they have often been imagined as spectrums rather than binaries, varying shades rather than static lines of solidarity. Instead of society, there is now talk of communities and actor networks; instead of radical schemes to rework economic and political institutions, there is an emphasis on localized campaigns and everyday practices. The critique of capitalism—once heavily informed by intricate historical and social theories—has narrowed. The “ruthless criticism of all,” as Karl Marx once put it, has turned away from exploitative world systems to the pathologies of an over-regulated life. As post-Marxists Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe declared in 1985, Left-wing thought today stands at a crossroads. The “evident truths” of the past—the classical forms of analysis and political calculation, the nature of the forces in conflict, the very meaning of the Left’s struggles and objectives—have been seriously challenged….From Budapest to Prague and the Polish coup d’état, from Kabul to the sequels of Communist victory in Vietnam and Cambodia, a question-mark has fallen more and more heavily over the whole way of conceiving both socialism and the roads that should lead to it. In many ways, the Left has just been keeping up with the times. Over the last quarter-century, there has been a general fracturing of our social and economic relations, a “multiplication of,” what one sociologist has called, “partial societies—grouped by age, sex, ethnicity, and proximity.” This has not necessarily been a bad thing. Even as the old Left—the ***vertical*** Left—frequently bemoaned the growing differentiation and individuation, these new categories did, in fact, open the door for marginalized voices and communities. They created a space for more diversity, tolerance, and inclusion. They signaled a turn toward the language of recognition: a politics more sensitive to difference. But this turn was also not without its disadvantages. Gone was the Left’s hope for an emerging class consciousness, a movement of the “people” seeking greater realms of freedom. Instead of challenging the top-down structures of late capitalism, radicals now aspired to create—what post-Marxists were frequently calling—“spaces of freedom.” If one of the explicit targets of the global justice movement of the late 1990s was the exploitative trade policies of the World Trade Organization, then its underlying critique was the alienating patterns of its bureaucracy: the erosion of **spaces for self-determination and expression**. The crisis of globalization was that it stripped individuals of their rights to participate, to act as free agents in a society that was increasingly becoming shaped by a set of global institutions. What most troubled leftists over the past three or four decades was not the increasingly unequal distribution of goods and services in capitalist societies but the increasingly unequal distribution of power. As one frequently sighted placard from the 1999 Seattle protests read, “No globalization without participation!” Occupy Wall Street has come to represent the latest turn in this movement toward local and more horizontal spaces of freedom. Occupation was, itself, a matter of recovering local space: a way to repoliticize the square. And in a moment characterized by foreclosure, it was also symbolically, and sometimes literally, an attempt to reclaim lost homes and abandoned properties. But there was also a deeper notion of space at work. Occupy Wall Street sought out not only new political spaces but also new ways to relate to them. By resisting the top-down management of representative democracy as well as the bottom-up ideals of labor movements, Occupiers hoped to create a new politics in which decisions moved neither up nor down but horizontally. While embracing the new reach of globalization—linking arms and webcams with their encamped comrades in Madrid, Tel Aviv, Cairo, and Santiago—they were also rejecting its patterns of consolidation, its limits on personal freedom, its vertical and bureaucratic structures of decision-making. Time was also to be transformed. The general assemblies and general strikes were efforts to reconstruct, and make more autonomous, our experience of time as well as space. Seeking to escape from the Taylorist demands of productivity, the assemblies insisted that decision-making was an **endless process.** Who we are, what we do, what we want to be are categories of flexibility, and consensus is as much about repairing this sense of open-endedness as it is about agreeing on a particular set of demands. Life is a mystery, as one pop star fashionista has insisted, and Occupiers wanted to keep it that way. Likewise, general strikes were imagined as ways in which workers could take back time—regain those parts of life that had become routinized by work. Rather than attempts to achieve large-scale reforms, general strikes were improvisations, escapes from the daily calculations of production that demonstrated that we can still be happy, creative, even productive individuals without jobs. As one unfurled banner along New York’s Broadway read during this spring’s May Day protests, “Why work? Be happy.” In many ways, the Occupy movement was a rebellion against the institutionalized nature of twenty-first century capitalism and democracy. Equally skeptical of corporate monopolies as it was of the technocratic tendencies of the state, it was ultimately an insurgency against control, against the ways in which organized power and capital deprived the individual of the time and space needed to control his or her life. Just as the vertically inclined leftists of the twentieth century leveraged the public corporation—the welfare state—against the increasingly powerful number of private ones, so too were Occupy and, more generally, the horizontalist Left to embrace the age of the market: at the center of their politics was the anthropological “man” in both his forms—*homo faber* and *homo ludens*—who was capable of negotiating his interests outside the state. For this reason, the movement did not fit neatly into right or left, conservative or liberal, revolutionary or reformist categories. On the one hand, it was sympathetic to the most classic of left aspirations: to dismantle governing hierarchies. On the other, its language was imbued with a strident individualism: a politics of anti-institutionalism and personal freedom that has most often been affiliated with the Right. Seeking an alternative to the bureaucratic tendencies of capitalism and socialism, Occupiers were to frequently invoke the image of autonomy: of a world in which social and economic relations exist outside the institutions of the state. **Their aspiration was a society based on organic, decentralized circuits of exchange and deliberation—on voluntary associations, on local debate**, on loose networks of affinity groups. If political and economic life had become abstracted in the age of globalization and financialization, then Occupy activists wanted to re-politicize our everyday choices. As David Graeber, one of Occupy’s chief theoretical architects, explained two days after Zuccotti Park was occupied, “The idea is essentially that “the system is not going to save us,” so “we’re going to have to save ourselves.” Borrowing from the anarchist tradition, Graeber has called this work “direct action”: the practice of circumventing, even on occasion subverting, hierarchies through practical projects. Instead of attempting “to pressure the government to institute reforms” or “seize state power,” direct actions seek to “build a new society in the shell of the old.” By creating spaces in which individuals take control over their lives, it is a strategy of acting and thinking “as if one is already free.” Marina Sitrin, another prominent Occupier, has offered another name for this politics—“horizontalism”: “the use of direct democracy, the striving for consensus” and “processes in which everyone is heard and new relationships are created.” It is a politics that not only refuses institutionalization but also imagines a new subjectivity from which one can project the future into the present. Direct action and horizontal democracy are new names, of course, for old ideas. They descend—most directly—from the ideas and tactics of the global justice movement of the 1990s and 2000s. Direct Action Network was founded in 1999 to help coordinate the anti-WTO protests in Seattle; *horizontalidad*, as it was called in Argentina, emerged as a way for often unemployed workers to organize during the financial crisis of 2001. Both emerged out of the theories and practices of a movement that was learning as it went along. The ad hoc working groups, the all-night bull sessions, the daylong actions, the decentralized planning were all as much by necessity as they were by design. They were not necessarily intended at first. But what emerged out of anti-globalization was a new vision of globalization. Local and horizontal in practice, direct action and democracy were to become catchphrases for a movement that was attempting to resist the often autocratic tendencies of a fast-globalizing capitalism. But direct action and horizontal democracy also tap into a longer, if often neglected, tradition on the left: the anarchism, syndicalism, and autonomist Marxism that stretch from Peter Kropotkin, Emma Goldman, and Rosa Luxemburg to C.L.R. James, Cornelius Castoriadis, and Antonio Negri. If revolutionary socialism was a theory about ideal possibilities, then anarchism and autonomism often focused on the revolutionary practices themselves. The way in which the revolution was organized was the primary act of revolution. Autonomy, as the Greco-French Castoriadis told *Le Monde* in 1977, demands not only “the elimination of dominant groups and of the institutions embodying and orchestrating that domination” but also new modes of what he calls “self-management and organization.” With direct action and horizontal democracy, the Occupy movement not only developed a set of new tactics but also a governing ideology, a theory of time and space that runs counter to many of the practices of earlier leftist movements. Unlike revolutionary socialism or evolutionary social democracy—Marx’s Esau and Jacob—Occupiers conceived of time as more cyclical than developmental, its understanding of space more local and horizontal than structural and vertical. The revolution was to come but only through everyday acts. It was to occur only through—what Castoriadis obliquely referred to as—“the self-institution of society.” The seemingly spontaneous movement that emerged after the first general assemblies in Zuccotti Park was not, then, sui generis but an elaboration of a much larger turn by the Left. As occupations spread across the country and as activists begin to exchange organizational tactics, it was easy to forget that what was happening was, in fact, a part of a much larger shift in the scale and plane of Western politics: a turn toward more local and horizontal patterns of life, a growing skepticism toward the institutions of the state, and an increasing desire to seek out greater realms of personal freedom. And although its hibernation over the summer has, perhaps, marked the end of the Occupy movement, OWS has also come to represent an important—and perhaps more lasting—break. In both its ideas and tactics, it has given us a new set of desires—autonomy, radical democracy, direct action—that look well beyond the ideological and tactical tropes of socialism. Its occupations and general assemblies, its flash mobs and street performances, its loose network of activists all suggest a bold new set of possibilities for the Left: a horizontalist ethos that believes that revolution will begin by transforming our everyday lives. It can be argued that horizontalism is, in many ways, a product of the growing disaggregation and individuation of Western society; that **it is a kind of free-market leftism: a politics jury-rigged out of the very culture it hopes to resist.** For not only does it emphasize the agency of the individual, but it draws one of its central inspirations from a neoclassical image: that of the self-managing society—the polity that functions best when the state is absent from everyday decisions. But one can also find in its anti-institutionalism an attempt to speak in today’s language for yesterday’s goals. If we must live in a society that neither trusts nor feels compelled by collectivist visions, then horizontalism offers us a leftism that attempts to be, at once, both individualist and egalitarian, anti-institutional and democratic, open to the possibilities of self-management and yet also concerned with the casualties born out of an age that has let capital manage itself for far too long. Horizontalism has absorbed the crisis of knowledge—what we often call “postmodernism”—and the crisis of collectivism—what we often call “neoliberalism.” But instead of seeking to return to some golden age before our current moment of fracture, it seeks—for better and worse—to find a way to make leftist politics conform to our current age of anti-foundationalism and institutionalism. As Graeber argued in the prescriptive last pages of his anthropological epic, *Debt: The First 5,000 Years*, “Capitalism has transformed the world in many ways that are clearly irreversible” and we therefore need to give up “the false choice between state and market that [has] so monopolized political ideology for the last centuries that it made it difficult to argue about anything else.” We need, in other words, to stop thinking like leftists. But herein lies the problem. Not all possible forms of human existence and social interaction, no matter how removed they are from the institutions of power and capital, are good forms of social organization. Although it is easy to look enthusiastically to those societies—ancient or modern, Western or non-Western—that exist beyond the structures of the state, they, too, have their own patterns of hierarchy, their own embittered lines of inequality and injustice. More important, to select one form of social organization over the other is **always an act of exclusion**. Instituting and then protecting a particular way of life will always require a normative commitment in which not every value system is respected—in which, in other words, there is a moral hierarchy. More problematically, by working outside structures of power **one may circumvent coercive systems but one does not necessarily subvert them**. Localizing politics—stripping it of its larger institutional ambitions—has, to be sure, its advantages. But without a larger structural vision, it does not go far enough. “Bubbles of freedom,” as Graeber calls them, may create a larger variety of non-institutional life. But they will always neglect other crucial avenues of freedom: in particular, those social and economic rights that can only be protected from the top down. In this way, the anti-institutionalism of horizontalism comes dangerously close to that of the libertarian Right. The turn to previous eras of social organization, the desire to locate and confine politics to a particular regional space, the deep skepticism toward all forms of institutional life not only mirror the aspirations of libertarianism but help **cloak those hierarchies** spawned from non-institutional forms of power and capital. This is a particularly pointed irony for a political ideology that claims to be opposed to the many injustices of a non-institutional market—in particular, its unregulated financial schemes. Perhaps this is an irony deeply woven into the theoretical quilt of autonomy: a vision that, as a result of its anti-institutionalism, is drawn to all sites of individual liberation—even those that are to be found in the marketplace. As Graeber concludes in *Debt*, “Markets, when allowed to drift entirely free from their violent origins, invariably begin to grow into something different, into networks of honor, trust, and mutual connectedness,” whereas “the maintenance of systems of coercion constantly do the opposite: turn the products of human cooperation, creativity, devotion, love and trust back into numbers once again.” In many ways, this is the result of a set of political ideas that have lost touch with their origins. The desire for autonomy was born out of the socialist—if not also often the Marxist—tradition and there was always a guarded sympathy for the structures needed to oppose organized systems of capital and power. Large-scale institutions were, for thinkers such as Castoriadis, Negri, and C.L.R. James, still essential if every cook was truly to govern. To only “try to create ‘spaces of freedom’ ‘alongside’ of the State” meant, as Castoriadis was to argue later in his life, **to back “down from the problem of politics**.” In fact, this was, he believed, the failure of 1968: “the inability to set up new, different institutions” and recognize that “there is no such thing as a society without institutions.” This is—and will be—a problem for the horizontalist Left as it moves forward. As a leftism ready-made for an age in which all sides of the political spectrum are arrayed against the regulatory state, it is always in danger of becoming absorbed into the very ideological apparatus it seeks to dismantle. For it aspires to a decentralized and organic politics that, in both principle and practice, shares a lot in common with its central target. Both it and the “free market” are anti-institutional. And the latter will remain so without larger vertical measures. **Structures, not only everyday practices, need to be reformed**. The revolution cannot happen only on the ground; it must also happen from above. **A direct democracy still needs its indirect structures**, individual freedoms still need to be measured by their collective consequences, and notions of social and economic equality still need to stand next to the desire for greater political participation. Deregulation is another regulatory regime, and to replace it requires new regulations: institutions that will limit the excesses of the market. As Castoriadis insisted in the years after 1968, the Left’s task is not only to abolish old institutions but to discover “new kinds of relationship between society and its institutions.” Horizontalism has come to serve as an important break from the static strategies and categories of analysis that have slowed an aging and vertically inclined Left. OWS was to represent its fullest expression yet, though it has a much longer back story and still—one hopes—a promising future. But horizontalists such as Graeber and Sitrin will struggle to establish spaces of freedom if they cannot formulate a larger vision for a society. Their vision is not—as several on the vertical left have suggested—too utopian but not utopian enough: in seeking out local spaces of freedom, they have confined their ambitions; they have, in fact, come, at times, to mirror the very ideology they hope to resist. In his famous retelling of the turtle parable, Clifford Geertz warned that in “the search of all-too-deep-lying turtles,” we have to be careful to not “lose touch with the hard surfaces of life—with the political, economic, stratificatory realities within which men are everywhere contained.” This is an ever-present temptation, and one that, in our age of ever more stratification, we must resist.

#### Capitalism causes existential climate change, nuclear war, democratic collapse, extreme inequality, and perpetual exploitation of the global south — try or die for a transition.

Foster 19, Sociology Professor @ Oregon (John Bellamy, February 1st, “Capitalism Has Failed—What Next?” *The Monthly Review*, Volume 70, Issue 9, <https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/>, Accessed 06-30-2021)

Less than two decades into the twenty-first century, it is evident that capitalism has failed as a social system. The world is mired in economic stagnation, financialization, and the most extreme inequality in human history, accompanied by mass unemployment and underemployment, precariousness, poverty, hunger, wasted output and lives, and what at this point can only be called a planetary ecological “death spiral.”1 The digital revolution, the greatest technological advance of our time, has rapidly mutated from a promise of free communication and liberated production into new means of surveillance, control, and displacement of the working population. The institutions of liberal democracy are at the point of collapse, while fascism, the rear guard of the capitalist system, is again on the march, along with patriarchy, racism, imperialism, and war. To say that capitalism is a failed system is not, of course, to suggest that its breakdown and disintegration is imminent.2 It does, however, mean that it has passed from being a historically necessary and creative system at its inception to being a historically unnecessary and destructive one in the present century. Today, more than ever, the world is faced with the epochal choice between “the revolutionary reconstitution of society at large and the common ruin of the contending classes.”3 Indications of this failure of capitalism are everywhere. Stagnation of investment punctuated by bubbles of financial expansion, which then inevitably burst, now characterizes the so-called free market.4 Soaring inequality in income and wealth has its counterpart in the declining material circumstances of a majority of the population. Real wages for most workers in the United States have barely budged in forty years despite steadily rising productivity.5 Work intensity has increased, while work and safety protections on the job have been systematically jettisoned. Unemployment data has become more and more meaningless due to a new institutionalized underemployment in the form of contract labor in the gig economy.6 Unions have been reduced to mere shadows of their former glory as capitalism has asserted totalitarian control over workplaces. With the demise of Soviet-type societies, social democracy in Europe has perished in the new atmosphere of “liberated capitalism.”7 The capture of the surplus value produced by overexploited populations in the poorest regions of the world, via the global labor arbitrage instituted by multinational corporations, is leading to an unprecedented amassing of financial wealth at the center of the world economy and relative poverty in the periphery.8 Around $21 trillion of offshore funds are currently lodged in tax havens on islands mostly in the Caribbean, constituting “the fortified refuge of Big Finance.”9 Technologically driven monopolies resulting from the global-communications revolution, together with the rise to dominance of Wall Street-based financial capital geared to speculative asset creation, have further contributed to the riches of today’s “1 percent.” Forty-two billionaires now enjoy as much wealth as half the world’s population, while the three richest men in the United States—Jeff Bezos, Bill Gates, and Warren Buffett—have more wealth than half the U.S. population.10 In every region of the world, inequality has increased sharply in recent decades.11 The gap in per capita income and wealth between the richest and poorest nations, which has been the dominant trend for centuries, is rapidly widening once again.12 More than 60 percent of the world’s employed population, some two billion people, now work in the impoverished informal sector, forming a massive global proletariat. The global reserve army of labor is some 70 percent larger than the active labor army of formally employed workers.13 Adequate health care, housing, education, and clean water and air are increasingly out of reach for large sections of the population, even in wealthy countries in North America and Europe, while transportation is becoming more difficult in the United States and many other countries due to irrationally high levels of dependency on the automobile and disinvestment in public transportation. Urban structures are more and more characterized by gentrification and segregation, with cities becoming the playthings of the well-to-do while marginalized populations are shunted aside. About half a million people, most of them children, are homeless on any given night in the United States.14 New York City is experiencing a major rat infestation, attributed to warming temperatures, mirroring trends around the world.15 In the United States and other high-income countries, life expectancy is in decline, with a remarkable resurgence of Victorian illnesses related to poverty and exploitation. In Britain, gout, scarlet fever, whooping cough, and even scurvy are now resurgent, along with tuberculosis. With inadequate enforcement of work health and safety regulations, black lung disease has returned with a vengeance in U.S. coal country.16 Overuse of antibiotics, particularly by capitalist agribusiness, is leading to an antibiotic-resistance crisis, with the dangerous growth of superbugs generating increasing numbers of deaths, which by mid–century could surpass annual cancer deaths, prompting the World Health Organization to declare a “global health emergency.”17 These dire conditions, arising from the workings of the system, are consistent with what Frederick Engels, in the Condition of the Working Class in England, called “social murder.”18 At the instigation of giant corporations, philanthrocapitalist foundations, and neoliberal governments, public education has been restructured around corporate-designed testing based on the implementation of robotic common-core standards. This is generating massive databases on the student population, much of which are now being surreptitiously marketed and sold.19 The corporatization and privatization of education is feeding the progressive subordination of children’s needs to the cash nexus of the commodity market. We are thus seeing a dramatic return of Thomas Gradgrind’s and Mr. M’Choakumchild’s crass utilitarian philosophy dramatized in Charles Dickens’s Hard Times: “Facts are alone wanted in life” and “You are never to fancy.”20 Having been reduced to intellectual dungeons, many of the poorest, most racially segregated schools in the United States are mere pipelines for prisons or the military.21 More than two million people in the United States are behind bars, a higher rate of incarceration than any other country in the world, constituting a new Jim Crow. The total population in prison is nearly equal to the number of people in Houston, Texas, the fourth largest U.S. city. African Americans and Latinos make up 56 percent of those incarcerated, while constituting only about 32 percent of the U.S. population. Nearly 50 percent of American adults, and a much higher percentage among African Americans and Native Americans, have an immediate family member who has spent or is currently spending time behind bars. Both black men and Native American men in the United States are nearly three times, Hispanic men nearly two times, more likely to die of police shootings than white men.22 Racial divides are now widening across the entire planet. Violence against women and the expropriation of their unpaid labor, as well as the higher level of exploitation of their paid labor, are integral to the way in which power is organized in capitalist society—and how it seeks to divide rather than unify the population. More than a third of women worldwide have experienced physical/sexual violence. Women’s bodies, in particular, are objectified, reified, and commodified as part of the normal workings of monopoly-capitalist marketing.23 The mass media-propaganda system, part of the larger corporate matrix, is now merging into a social media-based propaganda system that is more porous and seemingly anarchic, but more universal and more than ever favoring money and power. Utilizing modern marketing and surveillance techniques, which now dominate all digital interactions, vested interests are able to tailor their messages, largely unchecked, to individuals and their social networks, creating concerns about “fake news” on all sides.24 Numerous business entities promising technological manipulation of voters in countries across the world have now surfaced, auctioning off their services to the highest bidders.25 The elimination of net neutrality in the United States means further concentration, centralization, and control over the entire Internet by monopolistic service providers. Elections are increasingly prey to unregulated “dark money” emanating from the coffers of corporations and the billionaire class. Although presenting itself as the world’s leading democracy, the United States, as Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy stated in Monopoly Capital in 1966, “is democratic in form and plutocratic in content.”26 In the Trump administration, following a long-established tradition, 72 percent of those appointed to the cabinet have come from the higher corporate echelons, while others have been drawn from the military.27 War, engineered by the United States and other major powers at the apex of the system, has become perpetual in strategic oil regions such as the Middle East, and threatens to escalate into a global thermonuclear exchange. During the Obama administration, the United States was engaged in wars/bombings in seven different countries—Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan.28 Torture and assassinations have been reinstituted by Washington as acceptable instruments of war against those now innumerable individuals, group networks, and whole societies that are branded as terrorist. A new Cold War and nuclear arms race is in the making between the United States and Russia, while Washington is seeking to place road blocks to the continued rise of China. The Trump administration has created a new space force as a separate branch of the military in an attempt to ensure U.S. dominance in the militarization of space. Sounding the alarm on the increasing dangers of a nuclear war and of climate destabilization, the distinguished Bulletin of Atomic Scientists moved its doomsday clock in 2018 to two minutes to midnight, the closest since 1953, when it marked the advent of thermonuclear weapons.29 Increasingly severe economic sanctions are being imposed by the United States on countries like Venezuela and Nicaragua, despite their democratic elections—or because of them. Trade and currency wars are being actively promoted by core states, while racist barriers against immigration continue to be erected in Europe and the United States as some 60 million refugees and internally displaced peoples flee devastated environments. Migrant populations worldwide have risen to 250 million, with those residing in high-income countries constituting more than 14 percent of the populations of those countries, up from less than 10 percent in 2000. Meanwhile, ruling circles and wealthy countries seek to wall off islands of power and privilege from the mass of humanity, who are to be left to their fate.30 More than three-quarters of a billion people, over 10 percent of the world population, are chronically malnourished.31 Food stress in the United States keeps climbing, leading to the rapid growth of cheap dollar stores selling poor quality and toxic food. Around forty million Americans, representing one out of eight households, including nearly thirteen million children, are food insecure.32 Subsistence farmers are being pushed off their lands by agribusiness, private capital, and sovereign wealth funds in a global depeasantization process that constitutes the greatest movement of people in history.33 Urban overcrowding and poverty across much of the globe is so severe that one can now reasonably refer to a “planet of slums.”34 Meanwhile, the world housing market is estimated to be worth up to $163 trillion (as compared to the value of gold mined over all recorded history, estimated at $7.5 trillion).35 The Anthropocene epoch, first ushered in by the Great Acceleration of the world economy immediately after the Second World War, has generated enormous rifts in planetary boundaries, extending from climate change to ocean acidification, to the sixth extinction, to disruption of the global nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, to the loss of freshwater, to the disappearance of forests, to widespread toxic-chemical and radioactive pollution.36 It is now estimated that 60 percent of the world’s wildlife vertebrate population (including mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and fish) have been wiped out since 1970, while the worldwide abundance of invertebrates has declined by 45 percent in recent decades.37 What climatologist James Hansen calls the “species exterminations” resulting from accelerating climate change and rapidly shifting climate zones are only compounding this general process of biodiversity loss. Biologists expect that half of all species will be facing extinction by the end of the century.38 If present climate-change trends continue, the “global carbon budget” associated with a 2°C increase in average global temperature will be broken in sixteen years (while a 1.5°C increase in global average temperature—staying beneath which is the key to long-term stabilization of the climate—will be reached in a decade). Earth System scientists warn that the world is now perilously close to a Hothouse Earth, in which catastrophic climate change will be locked in and irreversible.39 The ecological, social, and economic costs to humanity of continuing to increase carbon emissions by 2.0 percent a year as in recent decades (rising in 2018 by 2.7 percent—3.4 percent in the United States), and failing to meet the minimal 3.0 percent annual reductions in emissions currently needed to avoid a catastrophic destabilization of the earth’s energy balance, are simply incalculable.40 Nevertheless, major energy corporations continue to lie about climate change, promoting and bankrolling climate denialism—while admitting the truth in their internal documents. These corporations are working to accelerate the extraction and production of fossil fuels, including the dirtiest, most greenhouse gas-generating varieties, reaping enormous profits in the process. The melting of the Arctic ice from global warming is seen by capital as a new El Dorado, opening up massive additional oil and gas reserves to be exploited without regard to the consequences for the earth’s climate. In response to scientific reports on climate change, Exxon Mobil declared that it intends to extract and sell all of the fossil-fuel reserves at its disposal.41 Energy corporations continue to intervene in climate negotiations to ensure that any agreements to limit carbon emissions are defanged. Capitalist countries across the board are putting the accumulation of wealth for a few above combatting climate destabilization, threatening the very future of humanity.

**The Communist Party solves – only democratic centralist dual power organizing can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct unproductive tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for international liberation.**

**Escalante 18**  
(Alyson Escalante, you should totally read her work for non-debate reasons, Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/> rvs)

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: **in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party.** It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for **holding party members accountable**, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, **party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions.** It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that **a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement.** Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism. The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

### 2

#### Interpretation The affirmative should have to defend that the end goal of the affirmative is the United States Federal Government substantially increasing prohibitions of anticompetitive business practices by the private sector by at least expanding the scope of its core antitrust laws. Resolved means a policy

Louisiana House 5

(http://house.louisiana.gov/house-glossary.htm)

Resolution A legislative instrument that generally is used for making declarations, stating policies, and making decisions where some other form is not required. A bill includes the constitutionally required enacting clause; a resolution uses the term "resolved". Not subject to a time limit for introduction nor to governor's veto. ( Const. Art. III, §17(B) and House Rules 8.11 , 13.1 , 6.8 , and 7.4)

#### Federal government is the legislative, executive and judicial

US Legal No Date (United States Federal Government Law and Legal Definition https://definitions.uslegal.com/u/united-states-federal-government/)

The United States Federal Government is established by the US Constitution. The Federal Government shares sovereignty over the United Sates with the individual governments of the States of US. The Federal government has three branches: i) the legislature, which is the US Congress, ii) Executive, comprised of the President and Vice president of the US and iii) Judiciary. The US Constitution prescribes a system of separation of powers and ‘checks and balances’ for the smooth functioning of all the three branches of the Federal Government. The US Constitution limits the powers of the Federal Government to the powers assigned to it; all powers not expressly assigned to the Federal Government are reserved to the States or to the people.

#### Should requires action

AHD 2k

(American Heritage Dictionary 2000 (Dictionary.com))

should. The will to do something or have something take place: I shall go out if I feel like it.

#### Violation: The affirmative refuses engagement with the state. The aff method does not result in the a resolutional action as they do not call for institutional change from the status quo.

#### Reason to prefer

#### Method Specific Education Good – Specific method debates designed to produce political change to the status quo - allow left v left debates to weigh potential benefits and consequences of methods or political actions from within the leftist frame. Makes us better decision-makers around leftist politics, key to leftist advocacy skills and political planning. We must understand the complexity of internal operations of the state to guide tactics and strategies designed to produce material change. Debate can train activists and organizers on how to act against the state that forces the state into stances or actions contrary to its self-interest.

#### Cede the political DA: Radical demands require concrete proposals. Absent an institutional method radical demands serve white elite interests.

Love 2020 [Dayvon, Leaders of a Beautiful Struggle and 2008 CEDA Champion, “The Colonization of ‘Radical Politics’,” https://lbsbaltimore.com/the-colonization-of-radical-politics/?fbclid=IwAR00hZHKZgmUNvVYL54oES2L7NxPeHzB\_HH7EFOpI7Thw1ND0sc-JM6cZLI//ak47]

White liberals are not accountable to Black people. White people often construct and advocate for their ideas of the course of action that Black people should take without having to deliver any significant material change to the lives of Black people. Particularly in the academy, and in activist spaces, ideas like the socialist revolution, armed struggle, and ending civil society can be advocated without any expectation that you can/will accomplish these objectives or that you are accountable for the consequences for advocating these positions. In other words, one can claim to be radical because they advocate the abolition of prisons, make commentary on social media about it, and participate in panel discussions. Yet this self-proclaimed ‘radical’ prison abolitionist may not have a comprehensive vision of what an alternative social arrangement would look like, have an ability to effectively influence politics/policy in that direction or have a relationship with organized groups of people who are incarcerated. I am not saying that only people with these conditions should advocate for prison abolition. Rather, that without those conditions, any activity or advocacy to this end is simply an expression of a strong opinion and not radical political activity. Only people with tremendous privilege can speak publicly about empowering Black people while maintaining a livelihood disconnected from the condition of Black people and relatively insulated from the consequences of advocating radical political positions. I want to be clear that the use of the prison abolition example is not a critique of the national conversation about prison abolition. I use this example to characterize the way that folks in the Baltimore-Metro area have taken a legitimate radical political perspective and have participated in its commodification. Given my level of involvement with political activity in Baltimore, I can speak on this phenomena with a high degree of credibility. I will provide specific examples later on in the piece. The privilege of being able to make radical sounding political pronouncements or gestures without any expectation that you will have to bring those demands to fruition is the basis for the revolutionary fantasies that are most prominent in the academy, social media, and amongst professional organizers. The calls to burn the system down and start a revolution are only possible when you don’t actually have the expectation that you will have to make good on these declarations. It trivializes the level of sacrifice it took for those in the Black Radical Tradition who actually did take up arms and paid the ultimate price. It is an insult to the Black Liberation Army, The Deacons of Defense, the Mau Mau, and many others when folk claim the radicalism of violent confrontations with the state without having to actually make the level of sacrifice that our ancestors made. There are many political prisoners who have spent their entire lives in jail because of their sacrifice and others that are now dead. I am not saying that we should not put these ideas on the table for political conversation, but to claim these radical politics without any real ability to carry out these ideas is an act of commodifying radical politics that is inauthentic and politically dishonest. This doesn’t just apply to some of the more revolutionary kinds of activity that I mentioned earlier, this also applies to issues like politics and public policy. In the academy, someone can advocate a militant political position on criminal justice without having to be accountable for making it happen or being accountable for the actual consequences of that policy. In some ways, this is good if it serves the purpose of testing ideas to be used politically. It becomes a problem when an organization advocates a position that they don’t have the ability to execute. Organizations of this nature are like mannequins wearing the garments of revolutionary discourse, in the shopping mall of the non-profit industrial complex. Additionally, political advocacy that is authentically radical requires a base, and as it relates to Black Liberation, a Black base that is substantially working-class and diverse. The ideas alone are not enough to be truly radical. There must be a majority Black base that is composed of real Black bodies, not symbols of interaction in cyberspace. And the base should not be composed primarily of white people. A good example of this in Baltimore is the People’s Power Assembly (PPA). The organization’s stated goal is “to empower workers and oppressed people to demand jobs, education & healthcare while fighting against racist police terror, sexism, LGBTQ and ableist oppression.” The organization is best known for leading demonstrations in Baltimore, particularly during times of major unrest. Their most visible leader is a white woman and many of the organizations in Baltimore that advocate for policies that would benefit the masses of Black people barely know that PPA exist. They have no major policy or organizing victories that they can legitimately claim and have not demonstrated an ability to influence local policy. However, they receive some coverage in local media because of their ability to draw attention to themselves by making radical political proclamations. In fact, on Monday June 8th 2020 at a rally that they convened outside of city hall, their leader, Sharon Black, made the claim that defunding police means “not a penny goes to the police department” and described this as her organization’s political objective. She goes on to say their goal is to accomplish that policy objective within a year. This is a radical proclamation, but PPA has very little ability to actually bring this into fruition. The policy work that it would take to accomplish this goal and the alternative community safety infrastructure that would need to be developed to make this happen in a year is just fantasy. This does not make PPA bad people, but this is not radical political activity, it is revolutionary fantasy. When you look them up online there is no clear sense of who to hold accountable, which tells me that they are more of a brand than an organized political organization. There are many so-called radical organizations like PPA that claim radical political objectives but do not have a way to execute on these objectives and also don’t have a majority Black base that consistently supports their work. They are mere brands of revolutionary posturing that contribute to an echo chamber of leftists political impotence. I have observed in Baltimore some Black people who have some level of familiarity with Black radical political literature (and in many cases, just the buzzwords that are commonly recited on social media) and start organizations or develop platforms based on Black radical ideas and expect to recruit Black people to their efforts. What ends up happening is that most of their base ends up being comprised of white liberals and progressives that frequent places like Red Emmas, Station North, Maryland Institute College of Art (MICA), or Impact Hub. Additionally, the Black people that are typically in those formations are non-profit professionals or other Black people who have social, professional and political networks that are very white (this is not a moral judgement on these Black folks, it is a statement of the nature and culture of their networks). What is buried under the radical rhetoric is deeply anti-Black approaches to community organizing that ultimately drive Black people away. In radical political literature, there is often a call for “educating the masses” as it relates to efforts at community organizing. The nexus between the call for educating the masses and the general notion of Black inferiority that is ubiquitous in American Civil society creates a dynamic where Black people who are politically and intellectually uninitiated in the canon of radical politics are understood to be people that need to be lectured to about their perceived un-enlightenment. Black people are often lectured to by activists and community organizers about all the stuff that they need to learn, all the stuff that is wrong with the world, and are told what they need to do to address our issues. Embedded in this is the assumption that there aren’t Black people who already know our current reality, or who are already working to address these issues, or who just disagree. This does not mean that political education is not important, but it is a notion that is often abused by people who use it as an opportunity to demonstrate their perceived intellectual or moral superiority over “the masses.” Additionally, Black people have been subjected to the advocacy of activists and community organizers who call themselves radical yet have not demonstrated an ability to deliver any material results to them. For these reasons, Black people are not inclined to support people like that. Black people who are not predisposed to social justice and activist culture are a tough crowd and for good reason. You don’t get to be credible with any substantial population of Black people without demonstrating an ability to both build relationships beyond an advocacy campaign and an ability to impact their lives. The masses of Black people do not have the luxury of making radical political declarations without being held accountable for it. White people are a much easier crowd. They don’t have to actually be accountable to Black people for who they support or the consequences of their advocacy; as long as their board of directors or shareholders are satisfied they can mostly do what they want. They often promote Black people who espouse ideas that reflect the centrality of European intellectual traditions. They elevate Black people who feed their negrophillic, sadomasochistic fetishes for the consumption of Black images of spectacle and suffering. Mary Helen Washington in her compilation of Zora Neale Hurston’s writings called “I Love Myself When I am Smiling and Then Again When I Look Mean” says: Lippincott, rejected her proposal for a book on the lives of upper-class blacks. In the essay “What White Publishers Won’t Print,” written in 1950 for Negro Digest, Hurston indicates her belief that the racist American publishing industry was uninterested in the “average struggling non-morbid Negro,” because there was more money to be made exploiting the race problem with stereotyped stories of simple, oppressed sharecroppers. Mary Helen Washington, in her compilation of Zora Neale Hurston’s writings called “I Love Myself When I am Smiling and Then Again When I Look Mean” says: Lippincott, rejected her proposal for a book on the lives of upper-class blacks. In the essay “What White Publishers Won’t Print,” written in 1950 for Negro Digest, Hurston indicates her belief that the racist American publishing industry was uninterested in the “average struggling non-morbid Negro,” because there was more money to be made exploiting the race problem with stereotyped stories of simple, oppressed sharecroppers. Mary Helen Washington, “I Love Myself When I am Smiling and Then Again When I Look Mean” The dynamic that Hurston is describing is fundamental to the way that white people engage the lives of Black people. Black people who build institutions that can actually confront the white supremacist power arrangement of the state and corporate sector are not typically the kind of people who are esteemed by white liberals. This would threaten the self-serving paternalism that structures the relationship between Black people and white liberals. An organization or effort that is reliant on, and whose most consistent support comes from non-Black people and white adjacent Black people, is not radical. It is a caricature of Black Liberation. The psychology of imposter syndrome and injected oppression The psychological, cultural, and spiritual impacts of Enslavement remains very present in the collective existence of Black people in America. It manifests in the way that Black people have adopted the societal belief of our worthlessness. One of the things that I learned from an excellent training with the AYA Institute and its Warrior Healer Builder Collective is that we often use the things that we do to affirm our worth as human beings, instead of acknowledging our inherent worth as people. This is not something that is exclusive to Black people, but with us, it is exacerbated by the societal propaganda regarding the belief in our inherent inferiority. The result of this dynamic is widespread insecurity. Many of us are terrified at confronting our weaknesses because it would inflame fears of our own inadequacies. Given the toxicity of our collective experiences of Enslavement, we are prone to exert violence against other Black people as a function of our struggle with self-worth. Organizing amongst Black people is hard because we often have to endure these toxic conditions that are not financially lucrative. This is why investing in our collective healing is so important, because it has real implications on our ability to organize in a self determined way. As a person who has organized primarily amongst Black people, doing the work to move through the toxicity that are the residues of Enslavement in a healthy way is essential to truly build Black Power. It is much easier to organize amongst white people who are prone to a paternalistic attitude that prioritizes a Black person’s passion and feelings over an actual willingness to be accountable to Black people and secure material improvements in our collective of quality of life. Also, it is more financially lucrative to spend a lot of time proximate to white people and their institutions. White people also have the ability to create platforms for Black people that can elevate them to leadership without having been immersed in Black life. Being truly radical means valuing Black formations that are not highly esteemed by white institutions, and seeing them as a source of power. This means that those afterschool programs led by Black people, football coaches, small business owners, local artists, etc are more important than the credibility that comes from being affiliated with philanthropy, or celebrities, or academics. This is truly a sacrifice because this approach does not lend itself to making money to sustain a quality livelihood. Additionally, it forces an organizer to test their ability to bring along people who may not agree with them. For instance, one of the issues that many so-called radical activists and organizers fail to address is the issue of gun violence and homicide in places like Baltimore. The lack of concern about this issue among people who call themselves radicals is a shortcoming in their political analysis. Black elders that live in communities plagued by violence don’t have the luxury of waiting for the end of capitalism to live in a safe environment. As a person who believes in the goal of abolishing prisons and the police state, I am also clear that this won’t happen overnight, and requires a tremendous amount of infrastructure development to make this happen. In light of that, it becomes important to advocate for reforms that can address some of the immediate issues like the ability for people to be safe in their neighborhoods, which are also steps in the direction of police and prison abolition. For example, LBS has advocated for a decrease in the police budget, and an increase in investments in grassroots, community-based anti-violence programs. The more that the police budget decreases, and the more effective community-based anti-violence programs are at demonstrating their ability to address violence, the closer we can get to police abolition. The point here is that being radical is not just about advocating a radical position. It is about being able to organize around the concrete issues that Black people face, delivering results that impact people’s lives, and building a base of Black people that allows for true Black autonomy and confrontation of white corporate power. This also helps to move our community in the direction of police abolition because they are able to see the benefits of that perspective in their lives. The true metric for an organization or individual being radical is their ability to make powerful institutions make substantive concessions that meaningfully undermine their power and as a result, puts more power in the hands of the masses of Black people. Being disruptive in rhetoric or actions does not constitute being radical. White people have an interest in the latter as a metric for radicalism because it allows them the appearance of anti-racism, without giving up any power. They can elevate Black people who are superficial disruptors, sell them to the public as an advocate for social justice, and marginalize those who are interested in actually shifting power into the hands of Black people. This is how white liberals have colonized the term “radical.” They have striped the term of having a meaning that is directly connected to concrete transformation of the global system of white supremacy and oppression. Being radical is fundamentally about confronting and shifting power. Any definition of radical where that is not central, ill-serves our community. Being radical should mean things like one or more of the following: You have substantial military capability that can be used against the state or white corporate power. You can mobilize large numbers of people to participate in actions in the absence of a national media context (like widespread social unrest) that meaningfully disrupt white corporate, institutional, government or commercial activity. You can meaningfully and consistently influence public policy against the interest of white corporate power. The ability to produce widespread propaganda that can influence public opinion against the interest of white corporate power. Removing the power of white institutions to control the organizations that are tasked with the socialization of Black youth.

#### Critical Switch Side Debate is Good and key to all your offense – Black SSD proves hard left affs can be both topical and anti the state and civil society. Conviction Based Debate (CBD) results in debates where the debaters have already decided their position in debate and the world such that we do not consider our relationship to Others. It produces insular debates that destroy education, ethics and reproduces settler colonialism.

## Case

### 1NC — Presumption

#### Vote negative on presumption:

#### 1)    Conflation – they conflate scholarship with praxis --- setting the burden for aff solvency at simple introduction of “new” knowledge just devolves into infinitely regressive debates about how new is new enough and means lectures, seminars, articles, and books all solve. Failure to forward a material strategy of an honorable harvest means:

#### a.    There’s no mechanism to resolve their impacts

#### b.    There’s only a risk the aff is net worse than seminar discussions because they’ve introduced it in a competitive activity which necessitates negation, not dialogue

#### 2)    Unending story – it’s impossible to determine when we’ve sufficiently embraced the honorable harvest and can now translate it outside debate which means we never actually resolve their impacts --– encourages affs to forward un-nuanced descriptions of the squo which

#### a.    Disincentivizes research over specific theories of power and violence and turns their model of debate

#### b.    Pacifies radical activism and context-specific education and ignoring material instances of violence in favor of broad over-arching theorizations

### 1NC – Ontology

#### Settlerism is not a structure. They flatten history into a binary of settled versus settler – creates impossible goals that reinforce institutional failure and creates complacency when we assume a ballot solves.

Busbridge 18

Research Fellow at the Centre for Dialogue, La Trobe University (Rachel, “Israel-Palestine and the Settler Colonial ‘Turn’: From Interpretation to Decolonization,” Theory, Culture & Society Vol 35, Issue 1, 2018, dml)

The prescription for decolonisation—that is, a normative project committed to the liberation of the colonised and the overturning of colonial relationships of power (Kohn & McBride, 2011: 3)—is indeed one of the most counterhegemonic implications of the settler colonial paradigm as applied to IsraelPalestine, potentially shifting it from a diagnostic frame to a prognostic one which offers a ‘proposed solution to the problem, or at least a plan of attack’ (Benford & Snow, 2000: 616). What, however, does the settler colonial paradigm offer by way of envisioning decolonisation? As Veracini (2007) notes, while settler colonial studies scholars have sought to address the lack of attention paid to the experiences of Indigenous peoples in conventional historiographical accounts of decolonisation (which have mostly focused on settler independence and the loosening of ties to the ‘motherland’), there is nevertheless a ‘narrative deficit’ when it comes to imagining settler decolonisation. While Veracini (2007) relates this deficit to a matter of conceptualisation, it is apparent that the structural perspective of the paradigm in many ways closes down possibilities of imagining the type of social and political transformation to which the notion of decolonisation aspires. In this regard, there is a worrying tendency (if not tautological discrepancy) in settler colonial studies, where the only solution to settler colonialism is decolonisation—which a faithful adherence to the paradigm renders largely unachievable, if not impossible. To understand why this is the case, it is necessary to return to Wolfe’s (2013a: 257) account of settler colonialism as guided by a ‘zero-sum logic whereby settler societies, for all their internal complexities, uniformly require the elimination of Native alternatives’. The structuralism of this account has immense power as a means of mapping forms of injustice and indignity as well as strategies of resistance and refusal, and Wolfe is careful to show how transmutations of the logic of elimination are complex, variable, discontinuous and uneven. Yet, in seeking to elucidate the logic of elimination as the overarching historical force guiding settler-native relations there is an operational weakness in the theory, whereby such a logic is simply there, omnipresent and manifest even when (and perhaps especially when) it appears not to be; the settler colonial studies scholar need only read it into a situation or context. It thus hurtles from the past to the present into the future, never to be fully extinguished until the native is, or until history itself ends. There is thus a powerful ontological (if not metaphysical) dimension to Wolfe’s account, where there is such thing as a ‘settler will’ that inherently desires the elimination of the native and the distinction between the settler and native can only ever be categorical, founded as it is on the ‘primal binarism of the frontier’ (2013a: 258). It is here that the differences between earlier settler colonial scholarship on Israel-Palestine and the recent settler colonial turn come into clearest view. While Jamal Hilal’s (1976) Marxist account of the conflict, for instance, engaged Palestinians and Jewish Israelis in terms of their relations to the means of production, Wolfe’s account brings its own ontology: the bourgeoisie/proletariat distinction becomes that of settler/native, and the class struggle the struggle between settler, who seeks to destroy and replace the native, and native, who can only ever push back. Indeed, if the settler colonial paradigm views history in similar teleological terms to the Marxist framework, it does not offer the same hopeful vision of a liberated future. After all, settler colonialism has only one story to tell—‘either total victory or total failure’ (Veracini, 2007). Veracini’s attempt to disaggregate different forms of settler decolonisation is revealing of the difficulties that come along with this zero-sum perspective. It is significant to note that beyond settler evacuation (which may decolonise territory, he cautions, but not necessarily relationships) the picture he paints is a relatively bleak one. For Veracini (2011: 5), claims for decolonisation from Indigenous peoples in settler societies can take two broad forms: an ‘anticolonial rhetoric expressing a demand for indigenous sovereign independence and self-determination… and an “ultra”-colonial one that seeks a reconstituted partnership with the [settler state] and advocates a return to a relatively more respectful middle ground and “treaty” conditions’. While both, he suggests, are tempting strategies in the struggle for change, though ‘ultimately ineffective against settler colonial structures of domination’ (2011: 5), it is the latter strategy that invites Veracini’s most scathing assessment. As he writes, under settler colonial conditions the independent polity is the settler polity and sanctioning the equal rights of indigenous peoples has historically been used as a powerful weapon in the denial of indigenous entitlement and in the enactment of various forms of coercive assimilation. This decolonisation actually enhances the subjection of indigenous peoples… it is at best irrelevant and at worst detrimental to indigenous peoples in settler societies (2011: 6-7). The ‘primal binarism of the frontier’ plays a particularly ambivalent role in Veracini’s (2011: 6) formulation, where the categorical distinction between settler and native obstructs the ‘possibility of a genuinely decolonised relationship’ (by virtue of its lopsidedness) yet is a necessary political strategy to guard against the absorption of Indigenous people into the settler fold, which would represent settler colonialism’s final victory. The battle here is between a ‘settler colonialism [that] is designed to produce a fundamental discontinuity as its “logic of elimination” runs its course until it actually extinguishes the settler colonial relation’ and an anti-colonial struggle that ‘must aim to keep the settler-indigenous relationship going’ (2011: 7). In other words, the categorical distinction produced by the frontier must be maintained in order to struggle against its effects. Given the lack of options presented to Indigenous peoples by Veracini (2014: 315), his conclusion that settler decolonisation demands a ‘radical, post-settler colonial passage’ is perhaps not surprising – although he has ‘no suggestion as to how this may be achieved and [is] pessimistic about its feasibility’. Scholars have long reckoned with the ambivalence of the settler colonial situation, which is simultaneously colonial and postcolonial, colonising and decolonising (Curthoys, 1999: 288). Given the generally dreadful Fourth World circumstances facing many Indigenous peoples in settler societies, it could be argued that there is good reason for such pessimism. The settler colonial paradigm, in this sense, offers an important caution against celebratory narratives of progress. Wolfe (1994), it must be recalled, wrote the original articulation of his thesis precisely against the idea of ‘historical rupture’ that dominated in Australia post-Mabo, and was thus as much a scholarly intervention as it was a political challenge to the idea of Australia having broken with its colonial past. Nonetheless, the fatalism of the settler colonial paradigm—whereby decolonisation is by and large put beyond the realms of possibility—has seen it come under considerable critique for reifying settler colonialism as a transhistorical meta-structure where colonial relations of domination are inevitable (Macoun & Strakosch, 2013: 435; Snelgrove et al., 2014: 9). Not only does Wolfe’s ontology erase contingency, heterogeneity and (crucially) agency (Merlan, 1997; Rowse, 2014), but its polarised framework effectively ‘puts politics to death’ (Svirsky, 2014: 327). In response to such critiques, Wolfe (2013a: 213) suggests that ‘the repudiation of binarism’ may just represent a ‘settler perspective’. However, as Elizabeth Povinelli (1997: 22) has astutely shown, it is in this regard that the totalising logic of Wolfe’s structure of invasion rests on a disciplinary gesture where ‘any discussion which does not insist on the polarity of the [settler] colonial project’ is assimilationist, worse still, genocidal in effect if not intent. Any attempt to ‘explore the dialogical or hybrid nature of colonial subjectivity’—which would entail working beyond the bounds of absolute polarity—is disciplined as complicit in the settler colonial project itself, leaving ‘the only nonassimilationist position one that adheres strictly and solely to a critique of [settler] state discourse’. This gesture not only disallows the possibility of counter-publics and strategic alliances (even limited ones), but also comes dangerously close to ‘resistance as acquiescence’ insofar as the settler colonial studies scholar may malign the structures set in play by settler colonialism, but only from a safe distance unsullied by the messiness of ambivalences and contradictions of settler and Native subjectivities and relations. Opposition is thus left as our only option, but, as we know from critical anti-colonial and postcolonial scholarship, opposition in itself is not decolonisation.