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#### Your dreams are not dreams, but rather are anti-black nightmares. The 1AC’s affirmation of labor politics as the vehicle for liberation is based in objective possibilities and class consciousness not accessible to the abstract slave, which linearly increases slavery without limits.

**Sorentino 24** [Sara-Maria Sorentino is an Associate Professor of Gender & Race Studies at the University of Alabama. Her research and teaching excavate philosophical connections between anti-black violence, real abstraction, and social reproduction, focusing on the methodological and political challenges involved in routing German Idealism and Marxism through the problem of slavery. “Impossible Labour History: Solidarity Dreams and Antiblack Subsumption” Oxford Literary Review, Volume 46, https://doi.org/10.3366/olr.2024.0428, Number 1, https://www.euppublishing.com/doi/10.3366/olr.2024.0428] cmeow

**Labour history dreams of the coming of consciousness.** In its more dynamic dreams, class consciousness is preceded by class struggle.1 Shopfloors cultivate the social conditions of conflict—the separation of workers from the means of production and subsistence—that can precipitate class consciousness. Much hinges on the conditional status of this precipitation. **Working-class unity, the fantasy of labour historians, runs on a treadmill of becoming, where what was ‘in itself’ becomes ‘for itself’ and where the eternal object of history is revealed to be the creative activity of labour.** In this dream, creative activity can, when injected with the right combination of critical insight and collective purpose, overthrow relations of production themselves and jumpstart a new, more emancipatory epoch. Depending on the perspective, however, this **dream** can take on **nightmarish proportions.**

For labour to be **‘for itself’**, it might also have to be **‘against itself’**. Class consciousness appears at this precipitous edge: ‘**the dissolution of the existing world order’**. Class, in this respect, is both an affirmative concept and a critical one to the degree to which it furthers the circuits of capital or points towards capital’s dissolution.2 The labourer is called to abolish themselves in the same breath that they discover themselves. The labour historian’s trade, their methods and objects of study, bears the mark of this tension between preservation and abolition, dreams and nightmares. At times, **labour history presents itself as** merely articulating **what is immanently possible**—making the latent manifest—but its dreamlife also involves a conviction that history itself should be considered the **‘proper vehicle’** for manifesting political life and social existence.3 The historical trade, in other words, harbors a not-so-secret belief that it alone has the requisite tools to clear blockages that would otherwise condense and displace possibilities into tragic repetitions of the given. It does so by imagining that possibilities are always immanent and that the stuff of life can become transparent to historical processes. My suspicion is that this ‘transparency thesis’, as Denise Ferreira da Silva calls it, is part of the **technology of race-making** and **cannot** itself be the **vehicle for solidarity.**4

By most conceivable measures, capitalism itself conditions the possibility for class consciousness. Only through capitalism’s contradictions, the dialectic in which the self-consciousness of the labourer coincides materially with the ‘self-consciousness of the commodity’, does consciousness of oneself as an object bring ‘about an objective structural change in the object of knowledge’.5 This **‘objective possibility’**, in Georg Lukács’s formulation, is contrasted with the contingent possibility of the slave, whose objectification in the slave- form of antiquity is thought to coincide with the object only accidentally. The contingency of such a **generalised slave** (different, I will argue, from the **‘abstract slave’** whose materialised necessity presupposes racial slavery) means that the slave’s knowledge cannot impinge upon its own conditions. Lukács writes that ‘Between a “thinking” slave and an “unconscious” slave there is no real distinction to be drawn in an objective social sense’.6 One’s relative knowledge of slavery does not have any practical bearing on one’s own condition. Like all sublations, the history of labour contains something of what it sublates—it is both not-slavery and slavery’s fulfilment. The objective possibility of consciousness, coiled in labour’s formal freedom and latent capacity, is what makes the labourer, across the Marxist terrain, a distinct social actor. **Class struggle, in this sense, is presupposed by the struggle not to be a slave;** the struggle of ‘the worker’, who ‘perceives the split in his being preserved in the brutal form of what is, in its whole tendency, a slavery without limits’, combats a **slavery** simultaneously more complex, because it is more mediated, and implicitly more emancipatory, because it **materialises objective possibility**.7 Capitalist critique finds its emancipatory openings through possibilities generated internal to capitalism, not from a transcendental outside—these objective possibilities, when framed through its historiographical understanding of **slavery’s abolition, mean it is workers, not slaves, who can become revolutionary actors.**8 Labour, for capitalist critique, is not just slavery analogised—it is slavery without limits, slavery materialised and expanded. In what follows, I track symptoms of this sublation of slavery by labour in the telling of ‘new labour history’, working through labour history’s investment in objective possibilities, and counter with ‘objective impossibility’ as a more open and efficacious diagnostic for the political nightmare of the ‘black worker’.

#### The 1AC is a process of mythmaking that is complicit in historical revisionism in order to strengthen civil society and white supremacist institutions through the guise of labor rights.

**Sorentino 24** [Sara-Maria Sorentino is an Associate Professor of Gender & Race Studies at the University of Alabama. Her research and teaching excavate philosophical connections between anti-black violence, real abstraction, and social reproduction, focusing on the methodological and political challenges involved in routing German Idealism and Marxism through the problem of slavery. “Impossible Labour History: Solidarity Dreams and Antiblack Subsumption” Oxford Literary Review, Volume 46, https://doi.org/10.3366/olr.2024.0428, Number 1, https://www.euppublishing.com/doi/10.3366/olr.2024.0428] cmeow
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When in 1963 E.P. Thompson dreamt of **class-consciousness**, he dreamt of the means to interpret traces of an already existing English class struggle. In detecting agency where previous historians only found structure, he sought to ‘rescue’ his subjects ‘from the enormous condescension of posterity’ that had obliterated working- class experiences in the structural annals of early industrialisation.9 ‘Historical consciousness’, Thompson proffered, ‘ought to assist one to understand the possibilities of transformation and the possibilities within people’.10 Across the seas, Herbert G. Gutman commenced a now storied rescue mission of his own, translating Thompson’s possibilities into tales of American workers making ‘their own history’.11 **These new waves of labour history wade in the particular, recovering usable pasts and foretelling the fruits of complexity and regional articulations along the way. Interpreting racism as class struggle’s most politically divisive tool**, the vanguard labour historian dreams the possible into being and makes new origin stories in its service. **Myths proliferate—from Bacon’s Rebellion is generalised a rebellious history of black and white indentured servant solidarities as the nightmare of the white ruling class**, this despite the accumulation of ‘documentary scraps’ and ‘numerous clues’ that from its inception early Virginia codified an antiblack order before ‘race’ proper, a ‘separate and inferior status for all blacks, slave or free, from the outset, without discernibly different class attitudes among whites’.12 As a form of political wish-fulfilment, **new labour history coordinates subjective desire**, transforming ‘**historical givens** into **historical contingencies’**, enlivening **exceptional experiences** and **providing context** for how things could always have been otherwise because, we are told, they were otherwise.13

**New labour historians chart their sense of the possible less by unifying objects and subjects of critique and more by drawing on ‘mantra-like repetitions’ of difference to delineate their methods from those supposedly moribund structural histories of old.**14 Against troubling static essences, we are told, is found the dynamism of existence. As substance gives way to subjects, **class is thought to be liberated for the imagination, freed from its relegated role as ‘structural location’ unto its vitalisation as ‘social relation’.**15 **Whereas the old guard reifies class, new labour history experientialises it. Whereas working- class people were once cast as stagehands in a grander drama, new labour history’s ‘listening to the inarticulate’ aims to put them centre stage, spotlighting their dreams and desires.**16 Whereas old labour history designated unions the provenance of whiteness (both directly and by omission), this new populist history-from-the-bottom-up can’t but encounter and metabolise the social and cultural worlds that incubate race. **From its inception, new labour history has been catalysed by the challenges of civil rights and anticolonial movements in ways both understood and understudied**.17

Of course, these rescue missions cannot be confined to the challenges of the 1960s. In dreaming of the past, new labour history finds echoes in the Marx that led ‘A Workers’ Inquiry’ or in C.L.R. James’s emphasis on worker ‘self-activity’. In this respect, new labour history is neither new nor singular. It parallels and draws legitimacy from new readings of agency and resistance in the study of slavery, and it returns to and recovers W.E.B. Du Bois’s genealogical rendering of ‘the plight of the white working class throughout the world today’ as ‘directly traceable to Negro slavery in America’.18 What is new is the relative neutralisation of form. This, at least, is a lesson that can be derived from certain ‘value-form’ interpretations of Marxism, where the form of labour tells us something about its social conditions that cannot be wished away. Labour, in these readings, take on a transhistorical life because of certain inversions built into material reality; the naturalisation of labour, operating as if it is an ahistorical constant, against whose background one can discern elements of freedom, is what capitalism presupposes for exchange. In order to combat this paradoxical positioning of labour, one needs to be attentive to the ways labour is form-determined by capitalism.19 New labour history’s heterodox Marxism, however, rejects the double-character of labour (exchange-value and use-value), their focus on the concrete and agential elaborating what we might decipher as a politicised, but ultimately uncritical, ‘fetishism of particularity’.20 By decreeing one must not go beyond the partial struggles of one’s contextual subjects, new labour history has difficulty extrapolating out into patterns or theorising the mediating work of social structures.

**Working-class politics**, we might press further, is impossible precisely because its politics points beyond the working class. It is this **impossibility** that constitutes its **politics.** Once historians abdicate analysis of this impossibility, however, they cannot make claims about the constraining shape of possibilities, their patterns, or conditions of actualisation; they instead become constrained to investments in possibility as such, opening themselves to the same ahistoricity they find political cause to reject.21 Gutman, for example, responds with a rejection of the premises of the question ‘**Why has there been no mass socialist movement in the United States?’** Such a ‘nonhistorical question’, he replies, reproduces an ‘“essentialist” view of workers’ and a ‘predetermined pattern of historical development’.22 **Ungrounded possibility** shapes the **dreamwork** of historians: what is manifest is the quality of lived experience—the individual who can choose to activate this or that political consciousness—which is thought to supply sufficient material for revolutionary possibilities. **Yet the nightmare lingers**, the sense that something has gone wrong in the process of **class formation**, that **academic halls** don’t incubate **radical thought**, that **‘white wage-earners** found more to celebrate than to curse in the achievements of a **liberal state** and **civil society’**, that the **labourer’s loyalties** lie with **mystifying forces** other than those of **class-based struggle.**23

**Labour history’s methodological contradictions only intensify when attempting to unify race and class, as race increasingly comes to stand in for the relative failures or successes of the labour movement.** While labour history has made strides in recognising the empirical fact of racial antagonism, it has not been able to make much sense of the continued failures of interracial unity, apart from as failures of adequate calibration or ‘endurance’.24 The structural location of the problem of race, for labour history, oscillates between organisational leadership and the rank-and-file, often settling on the racial fixations of black workers themselves. Meanwhile, so-called ‘racial egalitarianism’, while contested and difficult, is preserved as a feature of productive experience: ‘For many white industrial workers’, it is claimed, ‘the benefits of successful solidarity, even on a day-to-day level, often outweighed the benefits of racial exclusion and division. In the long run, antiegalitarianism was a losing strategy for almost all workers’.25 **History’s emancipatory thematic—possibility—continues to reach for positive content to manifest the ‘seldom-met ideal’26 or ‘unfulfilled promise’**27 **of working-class solidarity.**

As Eldridge Cleaver writes of labour unions and workers, ‘Of course, they are racist, but this is not the full explanation’.28 It is not that labour history does not address race, which has indeed become an ‘academic growth industry’.29 Occasionally the force of race, its problem for thought, even works to challenge and ‘redramatize’ presuppositions of class.30 Here, particularly, questions of what counts as work and organisation push the frame, moving from the political to infrapolitical, the organised to unorganised, from ‘history from below’ to Robin D.G. Kelley’s history of ‘way, way, below’.31 **Without a supplementary or alternative explanatory principle, however, unfixing the proletariat identity and opening up alternative historical sources does not necessarily punctuate the ‘mythic-making’ structure of labour history, as Herbert Hill appoints it, which perceives barriers of race before theorising either race or its status as barrier.**32

**Possibility’s mythic structure is not false simply by virtue of being a myth—after all, Georges Sorel defended the mythic ‘general strike’ as a radical demand whose negative image was powerful precisely because it was indeterminate and open to new content on the way to abolishing the present order.**33 **But new labour history tends to mythologise in the opposite direction, filling in content that can serve as a positive indication of its desired past, present and future**. In David Roediger’s estimation, it is precisely because of ‘the very strength of the new history’s emphasis on daily life’ that it becomes ‘less- than-quick to understand the symbolic and political importance of whiteness’.34 Faithful immersion in the immediacy of life relinquishes insight into the mediating structures of social existence, despite the fact that the former cannot be understood without reference to the latter. **Meanwhile, the ‘cultural “lags” and distortions’ thought to interrupt working-class potential can only be interpreted as immediate blockages,35 the long chain of exclusions of black workers from theory, history and politics thought to represent exceptional vestiges, outdated attitudes and ill-conceived compositions for generating and generalizing possibility.** A not-so-subtle shift ferries blame from **‘extra-economic’ racial divisions** to **black workers themselves**, where advocacy along **racial lines** is seen as ‘**interference’**,37 where a **black fixation** on the past **blocks emancipation** in the now and where **race is rendered** a ‘**spurious totality’** for the development of capitalist critique.38

#### US hegemony is racist and imperialist.

**Marquez 24** [Abraham Marquez is a freelance writer from Inglewood, California and a member of the National Association of Hispanic Journalists (NAHJ). He is a 2021 USC Annenberg Center for Health Journalism fellow, and writes about social movements, sports, politics, and immigration. Geopolitical Economy Report, https://geopoliticaleconomy.com/2024/05/07/protests-palestine-israel-us-hegemony/] cmeow

Since October 2023, the world has witnessed the emergence of a revolutionary movement challenging US imperialism and its extension: the Zionist project of colonialism in Palestine.

**US imperialism’s** violent power and ability to use its force anywhere on the planet manifests itself most vividly in the killing of Indigenous people, whether it be in the Americas, Asia, Africa, or Palestine.

In addition to this brutal and often lethal oppression, we now see the use of force by police across the US. Cops are violently repressing a movement that is being led by college students and young people.

**The United States and Israel have used the same misleading language to denounce this student-led movement, claiming it is “antisemitic” to criticize Israel’s bombing of civilians, while defaming the Palestinian resistance as “terrorists.”**

**To deceive the public into supporting Israel, the US government portrays the settler-colonial state as a “victim”, while demonizing and suppressing activists and organizers who strive to counter injustices and put an end to a genocide.**

According to Washington’s absurd narrative, opposing a genocide is now “antisemitic.”

**The US government is actively facilitating and perpetuating Israel’s genocide to advance its imperial goals in a strategic region.**

Clear evidence of this is found in Joe Biden’s remarks during his tenure as a senator, when he asserted, “**It is the best $3 billion investment we make.** Were there not an Israel, the United States of America would have to invent an Israel to protect her interests in the region.”

Today, as president, Joe Biden wants the public to think he lacks influence over Israel’s action in Gaza, despite the obvious fact that the US government possesses the capability to halt Israel’s siege in Gaza.

Every day that goes on, in which hundreds of Palestinians are massacred, Biden decides not to support peace.

This is why ordinary people in the US are mobilizing in all aspects of life to stop and shed light on the plight of Palestinians. Biden’s refusal to stop a genocide has ignited outrage, led to protests, and triggered a closer **examination** of the legitimacy of the US political **system itself.**

The Biden administration has voiced strong support for Ukraine in its war with Russia. However, Washington has condemned Palestinian resistance to Israeli aggression, while supplying billions in weaponry to Tel Aviv.

This is despite the fact that the International Court of Justice (ICJ) ruled that Israel can be investigated on charges of violating the Genocide Convention.

Palestine has no army, navy, police, or conventional armed forces to defend itself.

The hypocrisy of the Biden administration and the entire Western political elite has pushed the so-called “rules-based world order,” which they claim to champion, to an irreversible brink.

With full support, Western **backing of Israel’s** devastating actions in Gaza has starkly revealed the West’s **double standards** concerning **h**uman **r**ights **and i**nternational **l**aw.

There is no retreat now, and the US must squarely face the consequences of its hubris.

**The Biden administration has lectured China, Iran, North Korea, Nicaragua, Cuba, and Venezuela about “democracy” and “human rights”, while presiding over an international system where it repeatedly vetoes calls for a ceasefire or a Palestinian state that is supported by the vast majority of humanity.**

Millions of people are coming to recognize that the US empire deceives the world to maintain its dominance.

To advocate for a free Palestine, it is crucial to comprehend the accompanying state violence. Understanding the role of the US empire in Palestine is paramount.

The uprising across the US has exposed the contradictions of the capitalist system.

#### US hegemony is a fundamental contradiction in 2025 – especially true in the context of Israel and Africa. It’s entire mechanism is meaningless and unethical to affirm.

**Caines 24** [Erica Caines is a poet, writer and organizer in Baltimore and the DMV. She is an organizing committee member of the anti war coalition, the Black Alliance For Peace as well as an outreach member of the Black centered Ujima People’s Progress Party. Caines founded Liberation Through Reading in 2017 as a way to provide Black children with books that represent them and created the extension, a book club entitled Liberation Through Reading BC, to strengthen political education online and in our communities. “Selective Democracy: U.S. Hegemony and Global Consequences” Black Agenda Report, https://www.blackagendareport.com/selective-democracy-us-hegemony-and-global-consequences] cmeow

**The United States** often claims to promote democracy and human rights, but its actions reveal a deeper agenda of spreading global **hegemony**, exposing the hypocrisy in its foreign policy. A glaring example is the Biden-Harris administration’s simultaneous rhetoric of humanitarian concern and unwavering support for Israel, despite the latter’s ongoing military actions in Gaza. This contradiction exposes the inauthenticity of the U.S.’s commitment to democratic principles and human rights, especially when these principles conflict with its strategic alliances.

**The Contradiction of Words and Actions**

In a recent convention speech, President Joe Biden embarked on what can only be described as a journey into an alternative universe of political guile. Just six days earlier, he had approved a $20 billion military aid package to Israel, which is currently engaged in the genocide of the Palestinian people. Yet, in front of a roaring crowd, Biden spoke of working tirelessly to prevent a wider war, reunite hostages with their families, and alleviate the suffering of Palestinians through health and food assistance. The incongruity of these statements with the administration’s actions was stark, yet it was met with applause—a testament to the power of political narrative over moral clarity.

The applause during Biden’s speech underscored the grotesque moral obtuseness present in the convention hall. While the president praised and embraced Vice President Kamala Harris as the Democratic Party’s nominee for President, symbolizing the administration’s continuity, this same continuity of support was being extended to Israel’s military endeavors. This highlights the U.S.’s commitment to maintaining its support for Israel, even when that support directly contributes to the suffering of an entire population. The Biden-Harris administration’s efforts to portray itself as a mediator for peace while simultaneously fueling the conflict reveal a disturbing pattern of **double standards** on full display during the convention.

**The** Democratic National Convention **(DNC)** encapsulates this **hypocrisy**. **It begins with a land acknowledgment**—a gesture meant to recognize historical injustices—yet quickly pivots to pledging unconditional **military support to Israel**. **This duality defines the liberal praxis of the DNC and its NGO base: as long as the rhetoric passes the marketing test, the material consequences are deemed irrelevant. This is the same logic that justifies colonial apologia, where the supposed benefits of empire are used to whitewash the atrocities committed under its banner.**

Furthermore, the cynical use of “joy” as a theme for the DNC seemingly stands in contrast to the Trump administration’s often gloomy rhetoric, especially during a period of widespread despair. However, this calculated emphasis on joy not only serves as superficial opposition to Trump’s dour image but also masks the DNC’s deeper complicity in the ongoing genocide in Gaza. By promoting “joy” as a distraction, the DNC attempts to pacify and divert attention from its role in supporting violent policies abroad. This co-opting of joy becomes a tool of **counterinsurgency**, undermining genuine resistance by cloaking continued complicity in the suffering of others with a veneer of positivity.

As British writer and Journalist George Orwell famously said, **“Those who control the present control the past, and those who control the past control the future.”** The Biden administration is acutely aware of this truth. **By controlling the current narrative—emphasizing humanitarian efforts, peace, and joy—the DNC is attempting to reshape the past and create a future where these contradictions are normalized.** This manipulation of reality is not new in American politics, but **the stakes are higher when the consequences involve life and death for millions of people in Palestine, Haiti , Sudan , Congo , and countless more nations.**

**The Biden- Harris administration’s double-talk is emblematic of a broader pattern in U.S. policy: the illusion of progress. They are working on a ceasefire, just as they are working on gun control, structural racism, housing, education, healthcare, climate change, income inequality, and abortion. In each case, the rhetoric of action masks a reality of inaction or, worse, complicity in the perpetuation of the very problems they claim to address.**

In the case of Gaza, this pattern is especially pronounced. Benjamin Netanyahu’s government, emboldened by U.S. support, seeks any excuse to delay a ceasefire and continue its military operations. The U.S., in turn, provides diplomatic cover by pretending that **negotiations are** a **positive** step forward. This charade is intended to paint the Palestinian resistance as irrational and unreasonable, shifting the blame for continued violence onto those defending their right to exist. Yet, it is not the resistance that is being unreasonable; it is the occupation that continues to defy international law and accepted terms, with the backing of the United States.

**The only real obstacle to a ceasefire is Netanyahu’s government, yet the U.S. continues to act as though the problem lies elsewhere.** This not only undermines the possibility of peace but also reveals the extent to which U.S. foreign policy is driven by strategic interests rather than genuine concern for democracy and human rights.

The political hypocrisy exposed at the DNC—**promoting ‘democracy’ while funding a genocide—is a damning indictment of its foreign policy, which Harris’ top advisor has explicitly stated she intends to continue, including no arms embargo .** The contradiction between the rhetoric at the DNC, the Biden-Harris administration, and its actions lays bare the moral bankruptcy at the heart of the Democratic Party. The narrative of democracy and human rights that the U.S. projects to the world is meaningless when it is used to justify or obscure the very violations it purports to condemn.

#### Western nations like the US are to blame for nuclear conflict with Russia. Continuing militarization uniquely heightens conflict, and ensures oppressive racist economic institutions that makeup the nation-state.

**Hood Communist et. al 22** [Multiple organizations who write and fight for black liberation struggles, such as NBLM National Unity Initiative, New African People’s Organization, Black Workers for Justice, Mapinduzi, Black Alliance for Peace, All African People’s Revolutionary Party, New African Independence Party, Lowcountry Action Committee, Spirit of Mandela, Cooperation Jackson, Pan-African Community Action, Hood Communist, Imam Jamil Action Network, and Parable of the Sower Intentional Community. Black Agenda Report, “A Statement on Ukraine from the Black Liberation Movement” https://blackagendareport.com/statement-ukraine-black-liberation-movement] cmeow

The ongoing crisis and war in Ukraine threatens to pull the world into a disastrous nuclear confrontation. **Disinfo**rmation, **lies, and propaganda from the US** and other western media are aimed at **confusing millions** of people inside the US and around the world to view Russia as the aggressor, while hiding the US role in the evolution of this conflict. One major example of this manipulation is that western media has not been honest about the massive role that **the US played in facilitating a 2014 coup in Ukraine that overthrew the country’s democratically elected president, and funneled support to neo-Nazi forces who were favorable to US/EU interests, helping them rise to power in Ukraine.**

**We, the undersigned organizations and individuals of the Black Liberation Movement and the various mass organizations and movements fighting for justice inside the US, call on all peace loving, Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities to condemn and oppose US involvement in the Ukraine and across Europe through its various corporate and political interests and its military arm, The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).**

We, Black people living in the United States, are a people of African descent oppressed inside the United States. We have been barred from the right to housing, to food, to medicine, to clean air, healthy environments, education and livable wages. Our grandmothers make difficult decisions monthly between keeping on the lights or being able to afford insulin. As 13% of the US population, we face disproportionate levels of violent police repression and make up 40% of US prisoners. Those corporate and elite ruling class forces in the US who are making the policies to expand NATO across the 12,500 miles of Russia’s borders from Central Asia to Eastern Europe, including Ukraine, are the same ruling elites that maintain the oppressive policies inside the US that leave our communities in the racist economic and political peril we have suffered here for hundreds of years.

**We further condemn the blatant hypocrisy of the US government as a capitalist, imperialist, patriarchal predator power that has invaded and undermined numerous countries for regime change and other schemes, in order to control the politics, wealth, and natural resources of those nations. The United States is the strongest and largest imperialist power in the world and has repeatedly invaded other nations such as Grenada (1983); Afghanistan (2001); Iraq (2003); Libya (2011); and at least 21 others since 1945. The US military arm on the African continent is known as AFRICOM, a force that breeds violence and instability in maintaining US corporate interests across Africa.**

**In these imperialist wars, it is the Black, Brown, Indigenous, working and poor families who suffer the losses of dislocation, the deaths of loved ones, and other forms of agony. Black people in this country have fought in every US war while our families and communities continue to suffer the ravages of hatred, discrimination, poverty, disease, and death. In the Ukraine conflict, racism is showing its ugly face in the denial of immigration rights to African and other non-white people’s seeking to escape the degradation and violence of this conflict, like all others living in Ukraine.**

We join with Black and Brown people in other countries in Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, and Latin America who uphold the right of all nations to sovereignty and security, including Russia, who has historically been invaded by the forces of imperialism and fascism across its borders several times in the 20th century. The Russian people lost millions of lives to defeat fascism during WWII, fighting Hitler’s Nazi invasion of the USSR in 1941. This history of invasions of Russia also lies at the root of the Russian concerns about its security and the Ukraine/NATO expansion scheme that has provoked this war.

We call upon every community and organization fighting for justice and peace to adopt and sign this statement calling for the Dismantling of NATO, an end to US Support of the War in Ukraine, and to Rescind the Billions of Dollars in military aid to Ukraine. Those military funds sent to Ukraine should be reallocated to the needs of people inside the US for universal healthcare, universal childcare, affordable housing, education, liquidation of all student loan debt, minimum incomes and other human needs.

#### Our impacts turns and outweighs the case.

**Bledsoe and Wright 19** [Adam Bledsoe is an associate professor in the Department of Geography, Environment & Society at the University of Minnesota. His research interests concern the experiences of Black populations in the Americas and how Diasporic populations analyze, critique, and seek to change the societies in which they live. Willie J. Wright is an Assistant Professor of Geography and Africana Studies at Rutgers University. He studies the intersections of (anti)blackness and urban spatial change, particularly how black residents create and sustain a sense of place in working class communities. “The anti-Blackness of global capital”, Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 2019, Vol. 37(1) 8–26 ! The Author(s) 2018 Article reuse guidelines: sagepub.com/journals-permissions DOI: 10.1177/0263775818805102] cmeow \*edited for language\*

Global capital and its effects

Expressions of **violence** are often the result of **structural arrangements**. Much of the rou- tinized violence of the present day is tied to localized manifestations of global capitalism. These manifestations have resulted in new social and spatial relations, labor regimes, and specific practices of organizing and managing built and “natural” environments, as well as the populations therein. Regarding Afro-descendant populations, these changes result in new manifestations of violence. Cowen and Lewis (2016) argue that **anti-Blackness takes on** specific characteristics based on **“shifts in the social order.”** These shifts are part of emerging global political economic trends. Phenomena like **white flight**, urban **renewal, and Black spatial displacement**—which have affected the lived experiences of Black populations in the United States—are examples of how urban spaces in the **United States** have shifted in their social, economic, and material **makeup over the past five decades.**

**While capitalism has always had a global reach, the late 20th century saw capitalist power achieve unprecedented levels of influence. This consolidation of capitalist power occurred, in part, as a response to the struggles of racialized populations and workers’ unions which**, in the mid to late 20th century, **demanded dignified employment, livable wages, social pro- grams,** and land reform, among other things (Gilmore, 2007: 39–40; Harvey, 2007: 7; Kaufman, 2013; Woods, 2017: 188). **As a result of the organizing capabilities and political demands made by those in labor movements, the Civil Rights movement, the Black Power movement, and land reform activists, new manifestations of capitalism emerged that worked to reverse and appropriate the gains made by these movements and reify the influence of capitalist actors.** Huey Newton diagnosed this phenomenon in 1971, noting that capital (specifically within the United States) has not only expanded its territorial boundaries but also shifted its forms of control such that there exists a global capitalist power that controls **“all the world’s lands and people”** (Newton, 2002: 186–187 emphasis in original).

According to Newton, one effect of the expanding reach of global capitalism is that the roles of nation-states fundamentally change. **While previously nation-states maintained greater control of the political and economic aspects of their territory, the increased power of capital now means that nation-states’ “self-determination, economic determination, and cultural determination have been transformed by the imperialists of the ruling circle”** (Newton, 2002: 170). More specifically, the governing role of the nation-state has become subordinated to the agenda of capital(ists), so that **corporations**’ actions “directly structure and articulate **territories** and **populations**. They tend to make **nation-states** merely instruments to record the flows of the **commodities**, **monies**, and **populations** that they set in motion” (Hardt and Negri, 2000: 31). In addition, sovereign state actions such as policing, military interventions, state and municipal funding, and taxes (or lack thereof) are increasingly influenced by, and manipulated for, the propagation of global capital. In short, expressions of state sovereignty are co-opted to benefit capital. **As global purveyors of capital increasingly replace the nation-state as controllers of sovereign space, the various populations within these formerly bounded territories become subject to a number of shifts. In order to counter labor organizing, capital uses the “spatial fix” to find labor pools and regulations that it can more profitably exploit** (Harvey, 2001). **This manifests in phenomena like capital flight and “outsourcing,” in which production moves to new locations. It is, in part, through such arrangements that the deindustrialization of cities like Detroit, Milwaukee, Baltimore, and Pittsburgh occurred, as the owners of the means of production moved manufacturing facilities to areas with cheaper sources of labor and less stringent financial and environmental regulations** (Boggs, 1968). **A result of this geographic rearrangement of production is that labor practices which previously provided stable, long-term, unionized jobs are replaced by “flexible” arrangements defined by temporary, low-paid, insecure, and nonunionized employment. Simultaneously, precarious laborers, now under- and unemployed, occupy neighborhoods where land precipitously drops in value.** With time, these undervalued locations become sites of real estate speculation and urban renewal (Marable, 2000; Taylor, 2016). **These effects often take on both class and racial characteristics. Newton** (2002), for instance, **notes how globalized capital leads to increasing numbers of ~~Blacks~~ [Black people] falling into the category of the lumpen proletariat** (196; 210). **Class**ed subordination **is not the only (nor necessarily the most fundamental) form of oppression Black people face, however. Indeed, in the modern epoch, anti-Blackness does not simply “follow” global capitalism. Rather, through perpetual and multifaceted enactments of violence, anti-Blackness makes possible the accumulation necessary for capitalist reproduction.**

Violent forms of domination accompany (and make possible) the reproduction of global capitalism. This violence targets all manner of people, specifically those who do not exhibit a form of humanity normalized under Western modernity (e.g., lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans- gender, and queer (LGBTQ) and gender nonconforming folk, Muslims, Latinx, and undocumented immigrants) or a manner of spatiality that adheres to the tenets of capitalist notions of individual ownership (Mitchell, 2003). Under this new phase of **capitalism**, ever-expanding groups of people are subjected to precarious life (Mbembe, 2017). Still, experiences of **anti-Blackness remain unique**, as the openness of Black people to violence and the assumed a-spatial nature of Black populations remain constitutive factors of the modern world. The logics underpinning anti-Black violence are inheritances of chattel slav- ery. These logics cast **Black geographies** as **empty** and t**hreatening**, **open to occupation**, and **subject** to surveillance and assault. Indeed, **capitalism’s perpetuation** relies as much on **anti-Blackness** as it ever has. The following section seeks to clarify the ways in which anti- Blackness makes capital accumulation possible.

#### Reject the 1AC in favor of placing a wager of blackness. That requires disposing of the conception of labor radicalism as a vehicle for emancipation in order to reject the false promise of freedom for the abstract slave. It is this pessimistic negativity that empowers impossible dreams beyond exploitation and plantation logics through a dance with social death.

**Sorentino 24** [Sara-Maria Sorentino is an Associate Professor of Gender & Race Studies at the University of Alabama. Her research and teaching excavate philosophical connections between anti-black violence, real abstraction, and social reproduction, focusing on the methodological and political challenges involved in routing German Idealism and Marxism through the problem of slavery. “Impossible Labour History: Solidarity Dreams and Antiblack Subsumption” Oxford Literary Review, Volume 46, https://doi.org/10.3366/olr.2024.0428, Number 1, https://www.euppublishing.com/doi/10.3366/olr.2024.0428] cmeow

**Slavery’s ‘perfection’ in its formal abolition provides a critical alternative to explanations that embed its afterlife primarily in structures like the New Jim Crow (structures that when pushed, end up being conceptually indistinguishable from capitalism) and can help make sense of the contemporary discrepancy between interest in black lives mattering and a ‘generalized incapacity to locate, particularly revealing in progressive circles, the antiblack logic [. . .] that, unexamined, continues to systematically generate Black suffering’.**75 Under the sign of this contradiction, we might identify how **‘antiracism’**, sliding from confrontations with police brutality to claims for representation, **reproduces the problem of race, regenerating the positivism of class and the promise of solidarity.** If this is the logic of antiblackness in motion, then we seem to be in a deadlock, a stumbling point so intractable that it bears witness either to the paucity of antiblackness as an explanatory paradigm (in Reed’s assessment, one ‘experiencing a crisis of its own interpretative authority’) or the paradigm’s depth (as Sexton infers, a problem ‘compounded by every effort to eliminate it’).76

But an **impossible compounding** of **antiblackness** can also be considered the beginning of analysis—not solidarity’s failure to calibrate anti-capitalism but abolition’s impetus in a totality that exceeds its appearance and our modes of understanding. Generalised possibility, structured by capitalism, misapprehends why claims in the world, and even claims against the world, are claims of the non-black, and why, as Wilderson has enunciated, ‘**eradication** of the generative mechanisms of **Black suffering** is also not in the interests of **Black revolutionaries’**.77 Building from such an impossible assumption— blackness as the negation that cannot be named or claimed, only violently figured through race—we arrive at a different picture than that of a compromised **black capitalist class:** race-as-a-problem-for- anti-capitalism is converted into race-as-a-problem-for-blackness, in which it could be said that ‘**the slave uninterested in emancipation is actually closer, psychically, to freedom than the slave or even the nominal “free person of color” seeking the route of petition, protest, or politics’.78**

**There are dreams to be translated and there are dreams that exceed translation, dreams that in Robin D. G. Kelley’s poetic figuring have ‘no birth date, no expiration date, no trademark’, dreams that ‘go somewhere that exists only in our imaginations— that is, “nowhere”’ (though Kelley, not an Afro-pessimist in the last instance, or even the first, subsumes these dreams to the overcoming of capitalism)**.79 **We might pose these dreams of nothing and nowhere as including the problem of work by registering against work, general strikes ‘on a wide basis against the conditions of work’, against the plantation order, against the formal freedom offered by Reconstruction and against the Marxist freedom in which labour is its unstable standpoint or the decolonial freedom in which the sovereignty of land provides the pivot for emancipation.**80 **The labour movement can thus be considered downstream of the black general strike** (instead of, as in labour history, its improvement) **with histories of slavery and emancipation constituting ‘the political unconscious of antiwork Marxism’.**81 **Abolishing labour would more fundamentally mean abolishing its metaphysical and methodological surround in slavery—the ground of life and death, the weaving together of time, law, possibility and freedom into labour’s fleeting gift.**

We can then return to histories of resistance among the unorganised, whose excess to labour history appears as distortion, as ‘pilfering, slowdowns, absenteeism, tool breaking’, as solidarity’s refusal and as criminality, lawlessness, a ‘stealing away’ that cannot be subsumed.82 Most radical in the black radical tradition is a complication of tradition, where the radicalism ‘handed down’ is, in Jacqueline Dowd Hall’s terms, ‘harder to simplify, appropriate, and contain’.83 **Here we can decipher demands that point beyond the ‘legible Black political subject who, in the multiracial political bloc, uses Black suffering as a bargaining tool’, the rage and refusal in the air manifests the rejection of ‘institutional mechanisms of redressing grievances’, from the appearance of the law, tradition and organization.**84 **These incipient, seemingly uncoordinated movements can never be concretely divorced from legitimate and legible structures, but they can be theorised as an ‘objective impossibility’ that exercises a disordering power in every political struggle. It is thus not the black worker who forms a subjective blockage to revolutionary unity; rather, the continued reactionary erosion of labour radicalism, the holding on to something instead of embracing nothing, blocks black revolutionary impossibility.**

Jodi Dean’s ‘wager of comradeship’ appears to approach a radical end to nothingness in the wager of life and death: ‘if white people are willing to put their lives on the line in the struggle for black liberation, then black people’s own interest in communism should lead them all to be comrades’.85 The obvious rebuttal—that **white death becomes the condition for its own fascinated renewal, that such self- abolition might mandate, through race, recurrent reminders of the ‘the zero point of possibility, what is left after everything else is gone, remainders existing in ruins, at the negative place of beginning**’86 — **is never opened because this would expose an alternative relationship to race, one that is exhausted neither by class nor identity.** **When negativity is collapsed into possibility too quickly, ‘attachment to identity’ can only be understood as ‘pathological’: an ‘attachment to a fantasy of wholeness or certainty’ that sublimates the ‘split, contested sites of class struggle’.**87 **But if refusals of solidarity (and solidarity’s sophistication in synonyms from allyship to accomplice to comrade) move in a pessimistic register, it is not necessarily out of a lack of hope or because of a depressive disposition (though these may also be elements). Rather, such refusals can also be taken as entreaties to a different order of questioning: ‘How do we think the possibility and the law of outlawed, impossible things?**’ 88

**Let us propose a different wager: the ‘wager of blackness’, a political and pedagogical provocation that positions impossibility as the slave’s material-objective-discursive condition. Such a provocation proceeds on political and rhetorical grounds, working to expose the violence of belonging and legitimacy, the violence of actuality, in ways otherwise subsumed by the balm of liberal and Marxist possibility—from the animating impetus of coalition to the utility of ‘people of color’, the dilution of intersectionality, the forward march of time, the positivisation of knowledge** and the continued kernel of consent for working-class consciousness and capitalist critique. The point of this inversion would be less to fill out parameters of impossibility and more to tarry with a gesture before or alongside the presumption of a field in which community and identity (either as sameness or difference, freedom or actuality) could ever be transparent to their own articulations. **Staying within this tension might afford other ways of being, of imagining, but not in ways that can be pre-determined.** If the black worker is outside conventional and radical conceptual schemas— not fully captured by capitalism or by the critique of it—the point is not necessarily to craft an alternative apparatus that can interpret black class consciousness without remainder. Such work remains stymied both by the difficulty of its enterprise and by something about the black worker that remains unassimilable and inexhaustible by any given frame.

\*

If, in the organizational and theoretical pursuit of such impossibility, non-economic black excess remains a supplement to a capitalist given, then political goals themselves will remain mired in a pragmatic particularization whose coincidence with reality proffers only the simulacra of critical thought. **Goals cannot be equivalent with the world from which they emerge, possibilities cannot be forever immanent, else we miss the mystic font of our politics, whose repetitive character we can wager as most expansively addressed through antiblackness and the destructive force such an impossibility implies for politics, desires and dreams. Without this wager, and its accompanying injunction to ‘dance with death’, non-~~blacks~~ [black people] who organise through the axis of labour, even in its critical ‘comrade’ form, continue to reproduce the antiblack drive, not recognising that what Hortense Spillers calls the ‘zero degree of social conceptualization’ has always been the o  
uter current that is animated by such a drive**.89 Labour’s own self-abolition founders here, at the race-class axis that channels subjection into subjectivity. **Likewise with race—without a critical analytic of antiblackness felt and foregrounded, not as a transparent signifier but as a problem for thought, popular engagements with antiracism cannot but collapse into a capitalist infrastructure that sustains, instead of abolishes, the possible lives of the proletariat.**

#### Extinction discourse is violence that subsumes Black suffering into a monolithic conception of human collectivity.

Douglass 21, assistant professor of gender, sexuality, and feminist studies at Duke University. (Patrice D., March 2021, “Unnatural Causes: Racial Taxonomies, Pandemic, and Social Contagion”, *Prism: Theory and Modern Chinese Literature*, 18:1, pg. 262-263, https://doi.org/10.1215/25783491-8922273)

In “Blackness and the Pitfalls of Anthropocene Ethics,” Axelle Karera interrogates discourses of disaster and crisis in relation to perceptions of ecological disaster. Karera contends that analyses of the immense of disaster are predicated on an insistence on collectivity that is bolstered by racial erasure. Thus, the discussion of the Anthropocene by many theorists presupposes a Human or ecological teleological progression, together with threats of demise that ahistorically subsume Blackness into a collective form of being that is central to Black suffering. Karera argues that, “insofar as the constant recognition of our existential interdependency cannot substantially challenge the many forms of segregations on the steady rise in our current times, it seems to me that assuming the inevitability of our ontological entanglement may need some re-thinking.”24 After citing the work of Fred Moten in relation to what she calls “relationality’s inability to maintain its ethical currency when faced with the extended rupture blackness sustains on ethics,” Karera continues, “In other words, relationality is inherently not only a position that the black cannot afford or even claim. The structure of relationality is essentially the condition for the possibility of their enslavement. I wonder, therefore, whether our naïve reliance on a type of inherent co-dependence has recently done more harm than good—that is to say, has instead worked to obstruct the very possibility of a positive transformation of our ethical sensibilities.”25 According to Karera, the linking of structural relationality to the conditions of slavery is key. For Blackness, segregation, interdependency, and slavery are relational rather than legally imposed. As such, the interdependence thesis (that we are all in this together) overshadows how the social structuring of Black life and death makes the collective “we” a structurally impossible equivalency, despite the affective and emotional desire for such to be true. Integration also constitutes a problem of relationality or the lack thereof. More to the point, the constitution of “we” is a form of violence that makes the particularities of Black suffering indiscernible under the auspices of equal rights and liberties in private and public spaces. In this respect, Hartman contends that “a slippage between race and status can be detected in the uncertain identi­fi­cation of the source of black degradation,” where the locus of suf­fering is frequently underscored because of the insistence on perceiving the problem as the lack of relational congruency across races with respect to specific phenomenon like global sickness.26 Rather, the conditions of suf­fering must be scaled outward, rather than inward with a narrow focus on pandemic and disease, to address the ethical stakes at the heart of Black death. Thus, employing Karera’s “positive transformation of our ethical sensibilities” to address the conditions of Gatewood’s death requires an acknowledgment of negligence on the part of Beaumont Hospital, together with a cognitive mapping of how care, protection, and safety as conceptual frameworks isolate Blackness as an excisable contagion that is subjected to gratuitous violence that so often leads to spectacularized or muted death. By muted death, I mean forms of death produced by anti-Blackness that go unseen, unaccounted for, or unknown.

#### Debate itself is a site of black fungibility and native genocide. In response, only a model of debate that deplatforms anti-black and colonial modes of statist argumentation can harness the greatest power of all. That produces the best clash because theorizing from and through genocide is an opportunity for refusal of the rules and procedures of the Settler/Master form.

Brough 23 (Taylor Brough is a PhD student at UCSD, assistant professor and debate coach at Wake Forest University. They are also the CEDA 2016 Champion and coach of the 2023 NDT/CEDA Champions) "Eleazar, Native Debate, and The Stakes of Concession," Contemporary Argumentation and Debate: Vol. 38, Article 6. Pgs. 93-97 Available at: https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cad/vol38/iss1/6

Embedded in the response that regards my previous work as referendum is the assumption that antagonisms to the form of debate are inherently restrictive. This accusation derives from a misreading of Black debate as limitation rather than invitation; in other words, this misreading presumes there is no creativity inside antagonism. One of the fundamental insights of Black debate has been that deforming mastery is a creative project that can only be undertaken from a position that does not take the form of debate as a neutral or inevitable fixture. Against this presupposition, I would ask, has Black debate persisted because of the formalisms of debate,

15 In debate, “set col” is a very common abbreviation for settler colonial theory, or, worse, Native Studies.

16 In debate, the “cap K” refers broadly to Marxist and anti-capitalist thought, which has been wholly assimilated to Settler/Master formalisms and generally imposes conservative elements of debate onto Black and Native debaters.
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or in spite of them? Indeed, as Harney and Moten (2013) instructively note, “Form is not the eradication of the informal. Form is what emerges from the informal.” (p. 128) In this regard, Black debate is an informal, always-present invitation to more fully theorize one’s position and the raciality of the rhetorical situation, and to begin from one’s position in order to enact and perform an otherwise. As Reid-Brinkley (2019) identifies, “Black radical debate practice has been persistently successful because it forces individual white people and white institutions to react to the immediacy of the competition space.” (p. 231) Black debate has not attempted to draw upon preexisting protocols or build new ones in order to sustain or write its (non)existence into the future. Rather than pose referendums or delimit the boundaries of debatable thought, Black debate envisions the myriad potentialities of exceeding moments of capture through attempting to make every avenue of capture susceptible to question and therefore not inevitable or fixed. Thus the informal deformation of mastery that emerges from the antagonism is the only true creation, as adherence to debate’s formalisms merely writes the existence of deliberative democracy into the future as the only possible forum for argumentation.

Native debate has something to learn from this creativity. Rather than presume a performative distance from genocide as a vector that dictates debate practice and conditions Native participation in debate, debaters, coaches, and judges might consider theorizing the form of debate itself as genocidal. In order to do so, Native debate must begin to more fully critique the rituals of civility, critical distance, and the presumption of neutrality and universality that have secured the solidarity between the Native and the Settler/Master. My work on this issue is thus neither a referendum nor a prescription for a delimited political program.

This troubling dynamic between Black debate and Native debate is also present in the differential imaginaries of Black studies and Native studies about the work each is attempting to do. Noting that Native studies tends to de-escalate the antagonism of genocide to the level of an intra-Human conflict, Jared Sexton (2014) argues that Native studies practitioners frequently presume that “settler colonialism is something already known and understood” and that, therefore, the role of Native studies is both to illuminate this set of facts and to “announce the decolonial intervention” through posing its critical work as itself the alternative to the object of its critique (p. 10). In contrast to this consciousness-raising project, Sexton situates Black studies as “dwell[ing] within an un-inheritable, in-escapable history and mus[ing] upon how that history intervenes upon its own field, providing a sort of untranscendable horizon for its discourse and imagination” (2014, p. 10) Thus, while Black studies is “as susceptible to a politics of resurgence or recovery as any other mode of historical inquiry,” and while “racial slavery remains the unthought ground of thought within Black studies as well,” the constitutive difference is, again, one of form and not content (Sexton, 2014, p. 10).

The endeavor I suggest Native debate undertake would be fruitless and merely reproduce the shared interpretive community between the Native and the Settler/Master if it did not include a deep and ongoing reckoning with the indebtedness of Native debate to Black debate and Blackness. Dillard-Knox (2014) notes that the alternative debate practices forwarded by Black students and coaches at Louisville and other institutions in the early 2000’s have enabled the recruitment of Native people and others marked by racial domination. Similarly, I argue elsewhere that “it has been the work of Black people in debate that has made Native debate possible at all, as tenuous and numerically small as we are.” (Brough, 2017). Too many non- Black Native people in debate indulge themselves in the illusion that self-determination (as a vestige of sovereignty) means we don’t have to acknowledge our indebtedness to or entanglements with Black debaters, coaches, and judges who have invented and innovated the grounds for our participation in intercollegiate policy debate. Theorizing genocide does not automatically render Native speakers or theorists ethical or “not anti-Black,” as has been assumed in some readings of my previous (2017) piece. Rather, theorizing from and through genocide is an opportunity for refusal of the rules and procedures of the Settler/Master form of debate in a manner that would allow Native debate to take shape as a force as opposed to an identity within a multicultural regime of recognition.17 If we desire the overhaul and subversion of the centuries- long civilizing missions we are imbricated within, it is imperative that we situate our creative refusals of debate’s particular (but not exceptional) civilizing mission in their entanglements with Black debate.

Posing the Question: An Anti-Civilizational Inheritance

I have gestured above towards the durability of the enthymemes of sovereignty and vitality in their capacity to produce a shared interpretive community between the Settler/Master

17 For clarification on my use of identity here, see “Open letter to non-Black Native people in debate.”

and the Native. As Stefano Harney and Fred Moten (2017) write, “Maybe the problem is the separability, the self-imposed loneliness-in-sovereignty, of the concept and its representations (as embodiment or individuation or subject or self or nation or state).” Surely Eleazar is lonely in the archive, represented only through sparse words about his grief for a white man. Surely there is another way to be with others. What, then, is made manifest in these refusals to recuperate the form of the Settler/Master? In the informal deformation of mastery I’ve suggested above, what kinds of entanglements become possible?

Citing the two-pronged counter-insurgencies of the militarized U.S. state and the incorporative capabilities of multiculturalism following the Black and Red insurgencies of the 1960’s, Wilderson (2010) writes,

Consequently, the power of Blackness and Redness to pose the question—and the power to pose the question is the greatest power of all—retreated as did White radicals and progressives who “retired” from the struggle. The question lies buried in the graves of young Black Panthers, AIM warriors, and Black Liberation Army soldiers, or in prison cells where so many of them have been rotting (some in solitary confinement) for ten, twenty, or thirty years, and at the gates of the academy where the “crazies” shout at passersby. (p. 4)

In non-Black Native peoples’ fear of the risk posed by revolutionary entanglement with Black people and Blackness, many of us have participated in this abdication. The power to pose the question changes the stakes, and the gravity, of potential Native/Black entanglements and interventions that do not rest on the loneliness of sovereignty. As Dylan Rodríguez (2019) says,

[T]he anti-civilizational is an honorable inheritance, because it surges into domesticities that are always again frontiers; the plantation is an idea as much as a place, which is why it never goes away, territory (land) is always invoked, and it all materializes in the endlessly justifiable homicide that defines “freedom’s” limits. Move, then, to the margins of the reputable, just beneath the high ground, flourishing in the tears and sobbing, studying within the mourning and grieving, theorizing the pain, it’s already happening, and it needs no refinement. (p. 129)

To endeavor to pose the question, then, is to accept what countless theorists of the Native and Black entanglements of the surround have been trying to tell us with their lives (and often deaths): that the end of the world will either be made or foreclosed depending on our commitment to the uncivilized.

#### Fiat trains worst activists, while distorting radical advocacies. CX Proves!

**Traber 18** (Becca, NSD Staff Writer, http://nsdupdate.com/2018/fiat-and-radical-politics-by-becca-traber/ shree) recut cmeow

This trend in debate has ignored, however, what I see as the most pertinent question. Namely, **what sort of skills are actually conducive to radical political action?** We might think that we need to engage in the state as activists, but what does state engagement as activists look like? There has been a systematic failure of imagination in terms of thinking through what politics looks like when it is done by marginalized people and in favor of radical causes. My argument is that the idea of **fiat is uniquely bad training for activist, leftist, or radical politics. Fiat fundamentally distorts radical advocacies.** This article does not argue that we should care about how debate trains us for activism–I take as given that we should be concerned with the sort of education that we are getting and we should tailor our education toward developing students capable of engaging in radical politics. By radical politics, I mean politics that aims to intervene on the status quo predominately by asking for a substantial shift in favor of marginalized positions, people, or perspectives. This is obviously not a formal definition and is not intended to be. I’m aiming to talk about a group of political perspectives with a family resemblance that characterizes them oppositionally to mainstream party politics. This includes both “pragmatic” leftist framing as well as what is known as “high theory” kritiks. The definition of fiat that I’m relying on that it is the act of imagination that allows us to avoid the contradiction between solvency and inherency, typically through the assumption of the passage of a state-based policy option without consideration of the political likelihood of that passage. **Fiat is structured** such that the **neg**ative debater is **unable to question** the likelihood of something happening as long as the aff debater defends the normal means of that thing happening. This is a way of thinking that only makes sense if the only thing we are able to fiat is state legislative action. For all other forms of political action, there is no real way to separate normal means, passage of the “policy,” and effects of the “policy.” **The ideal of state politics is such that we imagine congress passes a bill and does so in a way that the content of the bill is separable from the wheeling and dealing that allowed for it to be created.** This is problematic as an assumption on its face— implementation through the rest of the government is undeniably affected by the way the bill was argued and, indeed, the judicial branch often considers congressional intent when evaluating a bill. Additionally, bills passed through congress typically are too vague to actually implement on their own and need a significant amount of bureaucratic interpretation and adjustment through the executive branch in order to be implemented. But all that aside, there is at least a sensical way of separating the literal bill from the vote that got it passed. If you are not advocating for the state, the separation between a policy and the means by which it is passed necessitated by fiat is impossible. What policy was passed by the feminist movement? The movement was the advocacy and the actions taken by the feminist movement was the advocacy. The “solvency” of collective action cannot be separated from the things that are done in the collective action. This is true for all non-state actors who don’t have a formal parliamentary procedure. A community creating institutions for itself typically doesn’t have strict bylaws which outline what normal means for change would be. This puts the **kritikal debater** in **an impossible dilemma** when they are asked to **fiat** or **implemen**t some sort of policy. People who run these types of implementation arguments should stop pretending that the kritik they are arguing against would be possible at all, in any meaningful way, if it were to fiat. There is no fair version of the kritik that is at all meaningfully similar to the kritik and there is no topical version of critical affs. The way we construct implementation and **fiat in debate** can only be thought as a **state action**. Insisting on fiat in all cases functionally means that we cannot run arguments about politics outside the state without radically distorting the nature of that politics. Many debaters assume that the only **“practical”** or **“pragmatic”** politics occur **through the state.** However, **this is not the case.** Things like the **feminist movements** intervention on norms **of sexual harassment** are examples of politics outside the state. Collapsing the recent backlash to sexual harassment precipitated by Harvey Weinstein and others to possible state action ignores that the state could not possibly intervene in an adequate way to change those norms. The norms about **sexual behavior** in the workplace must change, but they can only reasonably change through **politics engaged outside the state.** Thinking of it in terms of **state politics** conceals the necessity of non-state politics. This is uniquely bad because the reality of the situation is that the percentage of debaters who will have a chance to be internal to the **state is minuscule**, but all debaters could plausibly engage in non-state movement politics. All the evidence that **people read in favor of fiat and state-based implementation makes education claims that assume the necessary training one needs to engage in politics involves thinking about the state, but fiat is not the tool to do that. Fiat doesn’t ask us to think about how to engage in politics as citizens who live under a state, it asks us to pretend that we are the state.** In a real way, it is also inadequate as a way of roleplaying a policy-maker, because the reality of politics as a legislature is significantly more complicated than being able to wave a magic wand and implement whatever policy is wanted. Fiat is a construction where we don’t even roleplaying as a human, much less as plausibly political actors. Pretending that radical non-status quo politics are something that could be implemented by the state fundamentally distorts how we think about those politics. One popular option to deal with the above dilemma is to import radical politics into the state and imagine policies that would result from particular radical political ideologies. This is what happens when someone advocates, for instance, that the USFG gives back the land to indigenous people as a fiated affirmative plan. There is a range of ways this is executed. On one end of this spectrum, you have policies which are barely different from what is advocated by mainstream politicians. On the other extreme, you have policies which are explicitly intended to serve as the downfall of the USFG in their passage or intend to provoke uprisings from parts of the population. The reality is that while radical and leftist politics occasional results in policy action, conceiving of it in terms of policy action distorts the nature of that politics. If one were to set about with the goal of **combating anti-blackness**, as history has demonstrated, **the first step cannot be to try to be a policy maker.** A politician with a radical advocacy cannot get elected until that advocacy has enough support that people will vote for her. For instance, a politician who ran on dismantling the United States or erasing all distinctions between animals and people to solve anthro would not have a constituency without a substantial social movement to develop that constituency. This problem is inherent to any advocacy which significantly challenges status quo ideals. Things in the status quo are in the status quo because a lot of people and powerful people agree with them. Before that can change more than incrementally, a lot of people have to change their mind. If you were to seriously consider how to implement a strategy of radical politics, it would make no sense to have the first step be electoral. **None of the major social movements were driven by policy action— policies are driven by social movements. Fiating radical politics hides the radical politics entirely.** Focusing on policy actions, in this context, actively distorts how we should consider radical politics. Even if it were the case that we would eventually need policy actions to finally solve issues of marginalization, that does not mean that we should start off with a question of fiat. Fiat erases the work necessary to allow for policy changes. It does not help us think about the movements we will have to create and the ways we will have to persuade. This means that claims about the necessity of state action are besides the point– **state action is only caused by a lot of non-state action** that we have to think about first and that fiat erases. The conceptual work that debaters often want to exclude by insisting of fiating policy is exactly the type of thing that radical politics does. Radical politics needs to persuade and imagine new possibilities, first and foremost.

## ON
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#### 1] No slow growth impact.

Carter 19 – Assistant Professor at the Department of Political Science and International Relations at the University of Southern California and non-resident scholar at the UCSD 21st Century China Center, Visiting scholar at Stanford's Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law, Ph.D. in Government from Harvard University.

Erin Baggot Carter, “Diversionary cheap talk: economic conditions and US foreign policy rhetoric, 1945-2010”, International Interactions: Empirical and Theoretical Research in International Relations, Volume 46, Issue 2, December 3, 2019, https://doi.org/10.1080/03050629.2020.1688319

This study argues that when economic conditions deteriorate, Democratic presidents use hostile foreign policy rhetoric to build domestic support. By cueing national identity, they elicit an ingroup rally that boosts their popularity. The quantitative evidence is consistent with the theory. Poll data show that citizens evaluate leaders more highly after they engage in hostile foreign policy rhetoric. The effect is strongest for Democratic presidents among Independent and Republican voters. Economic data suggest that leaders are more likely to engage in hostile foreign policy rhetoric when unemployment and inflation are higher. Further strengthening the notion that this behavior is strategic, rallies only materialize when leaders target traditional rivals, since threatening outgroups render intergroup distinctions most stark. I find no evidence for diversion in the form of material conflict initiation. For leaders choosing between hostile rhetoric, economic reform, and international conflict to increase domestic popularity, hostile rhetoric is the least costly and risky option, even though it is a short term solution because sustained rhetorical belligerence may invite criticism from party elites. For Democratic presidents, cheap talk pays.

Future research should proceed in several directions. While the theory suggests that we should expect a causal link between hostile foreign policy rhetoric and presidential approval, the empirical analysis is a proof of concept that demands future research, ideally in an experimental setting. This could help advance several theoretical debates. For instance, how does the information environment surrounding a leader influence her rhetorical strategy and its persuasiveness? Baum and Philip (2015) argue that strong opposition parties and competitive media environments make leader statements more credible, yet Carter and Carter (2019) find that leaders can generate credibility even in institutionally weak environments. More crossnational research is needed to explore how domestic constraints influence leaders’ foreign policy rhetoric. In particular, there is relatively little research on political rhetoric in autocracies, despite anecdotal evidence that it is profoundly important. Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hugo Chávez gained popularity in part because of their anti-American rhetoric. Chinese policymakers routinely bluster about the South China Sea to increase their domestic legitimacy.

#### 2] Economic decline won’t cause war.

**Walt 20** [Stephen M. Walt is the Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University. “Will a Global Depression Trigger Another World War?”, May 13th, https://foreignpolicy.c om/2020/05/13/coronavirus-pandemic-depression-economy-world-war/]

On balance, however, I do not think that even the extraordinary economic conditions we are witnessing today are going to have much impact on the likelihood of war. Why? First of all, if depressions were a powerful cause of war, there would be a lot more of the latter. To take one example, the United States has suffered 40 or more recessions since the country was founded, yet it has fought perhaps 20 interstate wars, most of them unrelated to the state of the economy. To paraphrase the economist Paul Samuelson’s famous quip about the stock market, if recessions were a powerful cause of war, they would have predicted “nine out of the last five (or fewer).” Second, states do not start wars unless they believe they will win a quick and relatively cheap victory. As John Mearsheimer showed in his classic book Conventional Deterrence, national leaders avoid war when they are convinced it will be long, bloody, costly, and uncertain. To choose war, political leaders have to convince themselves they can either win a quick, cheap, and decisive victory or achieve some limited objective at low cost. Europe went to war in 1914 with each side believing it would win a rapid and easy victory, and Nazi Germany developed the strategy of blitzkrieg in order to subdue its foes as quickly and cheaply as possible. Iraq attacked Iran in 1980 because Saddam believed the Islamic Republic was in disarray and would be easy to defeat, and George W. Bush invaded Iraq in 2003 convinced the war would be short, successful, and pay for itself. The fact that each of these leaders miscalculated badly does not alter the main point: No matter what a country’s economic condition might be, its leaders will not go to war unless they think they can do so quickly, cheaply, and with a reasonable probability of success. Third, and most important, the primary motivation for most wars is the desire for security, not economic gain. For this reason, the odds of war increase when states believe the long-term balance of power may be shifting against them, when they are convinced that adversaries are unalterably hostile and cannot be accommodated, and when they are confident they can reverse the unfavorable trends and establish a secure position if they act now. The historian A.J.P. Taylor once observed that “every war between Great Powers [between 1848 and 1918] … started as a preventive war, not as a war of conquest,” and that remains true of most wars fought since then. The bottom line: Economic conditions (i.e., a depression) may affect the broader political environment in which decisions for war or peace are made, but they are only one factor among many and rarely the most significant. Even if the COVID-19 pandemic has large, lasting, and negative effects on the world economy—as seems quite likely—it is not likely to affect the probability of war very much, especially in the short term.

#### 3] World peace incoming!

**Xinhua 9/11/25** [Author and Reporter for the Global Times, “China, US should work together for world peace, prosperity: Chinese FM”, China Diplomacy, Global Times, https://www.globaltimes.cn/page/202509/1343206.shtml] cmeow

**Chinese** Foreign **Minister Wang** Yi said Wednesday that in this new era, **China** and the **United States** should **work together** for **world peace** and **prosperity**, tackle **global challenges** and **shoulder** their due **responsibilities** as **major countries.**  
  
**Wang**, also a member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of China Central Committee, made the **remarks** while holding a phone **conversation** with U.S. Secretary of State **Marco Rubio**.  
  
**Wang** said to ensure that the **two giant ships** of **China** and the **United States** move **forward together** without deviating from their courses or losing speed, it is necessary to adhere to the strategic guidance of the **two heads of state** and to **implement** the important **consensus** reached by the two heads of state **without compromise.**  
  
The recent **negative words** and **deeds** from the U.S. side have undermined China's legitimate rights and interests, interfered in China's internal affairs, and are **detrimental** to the improvement and development of **China-U.S. relations**, said Wang, noting that China clearly opposes such behavior.  
  
He urged **the United States to exercise caution in its words and actions, especially on issues concerning China's core interests such as Taiwan.**  
  
China and the United States once fought side by side during World War II to defeat militarism and fascism, while in this new era, the **two sides** should **work together** for **world peace** and prosperity, tackle global challenges and shoulder their due responsibilities as major countries, said Wang.  
  
**Both sides** believed that the call was **timely**, **necessary** and **fruitful**, and stressed the need to further leverage the strategic leading role of head-of-state diplomacy in China-U.S. relations, properly manage **differences**, explore practical **cooperation**, and **promote** the stable development of **bilateral relations.**

#### 4] No US pursuit.

**Dongping 25** (Han Dongping Professor, Warren Wilson College) “Why China and the US will not go to war”, https://www.thinkchina.sg/politics/why-china-and-us-will-not-go-war, 01 JAN 2025, DM

**Many academics think that war will break out between China and the US over Taiwan or the South China Sea.** But I **beg to differ, because the cost is too high and the returns too little.**

The **US is already deep in debt and will not readily initiate wars. It is not worthwhile to engage in a fate-altering war with China over Taiwan.** The **US will not undertake an unprofitable venture**. At the same time, the **US will not engage in a showdown with China over the South China Sea, effectively in China’s backyard. The US simply cannot afford to lose.**

The **US seeks to challenge and create trouble for China, but it will not engage in unprofitable ventures.** It has **never waged an all-out war against a comparable adversary and will not enter conflicts without a high probability of victory.**

This level of military power is unprecedented. The cost of challenging such a colossal adversary is self-evident.

Today, **China’s military capabilities are comparable to that of the US.** With a population of 1.4 billion, China can mobilise a wartime force of nearly 300 million. Its steelmaking capacity is about ten times that of the US, while its manufacturing output surpasses that of the US, Japan, Germany and France combined.

**This level of military power is unprecedented**. The **cost of challenging such a colossal adversary is self-evident.** Thus, the so-called Thucydides’s Trap simply does not exist between China and the US. Both **China and the US are aware that a war between them would have no winner, only mutual destruction** — **a catastrophe that neither country, nor the world, can bear. In the face of such devastation, fighting for global dominance becomes utterly meaningless.**

#### 5] AI makes unionizing and participation impossible.

**Scott 24** (Grace Scott, Main Logo Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy) “Labor Organizing and AI Surveillance in the Workplace”, https://www.law.georgetown.edu/poverty-journal/blog/labor-organizing-and-ai-surveillance-in-the-workplace/, January 14, 2024, DM

This sort of **anti-union use of AI monitoring is an open secret at workplaces like Amazon, which are already defined by both traditional and AI-enabled surveillance.**[10] **In workplaces where every step, every conversation, and every bathroom break is recorded and retained, what’s to stop employers from merely adjusting how they use that information to detect union organizing**? Indeed, **monitoring workers is no longer the realm of especially controlling employers but is now the norm**: It seems a majority of employers currently employ some sort of tracking technology, a shift which appears to have been inspired by the **changing workplace norms brought on by the pandemic**.[11] Whether or not safety was their true motive, employers took the opportunity presented by the pandemic **to introduce new and more invasive forms of surveillance: Amazon, for example, introduced a system of AI-enabled cameras to track employees’ whereabouts, purportedly to ensure social distancing in its plants.**[12] Amazon, which uses **extensive camera tracking (both AI and human-supervised) to monitor its warehouse employees, also counts time spent interacting with other workers as “time off task,” a metric that, if logged for more than 30 minutes in a single day, can result in a written warning**.[13] **Even when surveillance is not explicitly directed at union organizing activity, it targets the same activities necessary to union organizing: Interaction with other employees (often at the job site) is necessary to collecting the signatures needed to begin seeking union representation**.[14] Additionally, **remote workers’ interactions with other employees may be equally subject to AI scrutiny for organizing tendencies: Interactions between some workers have been tracked using AI initially designed to map terrorist cells, put to new use to detect groups of workers interested in seeking union representation**.[15].

#### 6] Russia-Ukraine war is inevitable under a Trump presidency.

**Most 25** (Doug Most is a lifelong journalist and author whose career spanned newspapers and magazines up and down the East Coast, with stops in Washington, D.C., South Carolina, New Jersey, and Boston, before he came to Boston University to lead the editorial division in Marketing & Communications) “United States Sides with Russia, Breaks with Europe, in Ukraine War Resolution”, https://www.bu.edu/articles/2025/us-sides-with-russia-ukraine-war-resolution/, Feb 25, 2025, DM

Last week, **Trump had foreshadowed the events that occurred Monday when he called Ukraine President Volodymyr Zelensky a dictator and falsely claimed that Ukraine, rather than Russia, had started the war.**

Lukes says that as shocking as the United States decision was, it’s complicated by the fact that there is no longer a strong block of European countries in lockstep with one another.

“Unfortunately they are not united,” he says. “There is not a block. There is Hungary. There is Slovakia, and then we have countries that are divided internally, such as Germany, which has a right-wing extremist party and a left-wing extremist party. Europe, despite decades of the European Union, is still divided enough to not have one reaction to this. And **Trump will play up that division and cause them to get even deeper.”**

Lukes suggests that even Russian President Vladimir **Putin was likely surprised by having the support of the United States.** “I heard someone say that **Putin treated Trump as his asset and thought he was exaggerating, a figure of speech, to grab someone’s attention.** But I have to say now, I don’t know how else to react to the news. I would bet this is beyond anything Mr. Putin could have imagined.”

And, **he says, having the United States and Russia aligned against Ukraine will actually hurt the people in both countries—Russia and Ukraine.**

“**Trump** has **cemented Putin as a hero to the Russian people** by **suggesting [nothing is wrong] with his style of government**, where **he murders anybody who disagrees with him,**” Lukes says. “I am a long-term optimist, and a short-term pessimist. But **this is obviously very bad for Ukraine.”**

#### 7] Putin won’t go nuclear.

**Este 24** (Jonathan Este Senior International Affairs Editor, Associate Editor, University of Bradford BA, “Ukraine recap: Russia won’t attack Nato countries says Putin, believe it or not”, March 29, 2024, https://theconversation.com/ukraine-recap-russia-wont-attack-nato-countries-says-putin-believe-it-or-not-226844) ree

Vladimir Putin says he has no intention of attacking any Nato members. Visiting an airbase in Torzhok, on the road between Moscow and St Petersburg, the Russian president told a group of pilots he didn’t plan to spark a war with any members of the western alliance which might bring in the US, with its massively greater defence budget.