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#### We live in a new age of logistics, not one driven by exclusion, but endless access - the endless desire to fill jobs and expand the rhythm of work to every aspect of society. This pathological desire for work seeks endless control and the destruction of subjectivity.

Harney 1, Stefano. "Hapticality in the Undercommons." (2015): 332. (Professor of Strategic Management Education at Singapore Management University)//Elmer + gord0

**The coming post-colonial nations must break not only with the negations of history, culture, and personality wrought by colonialism but also with the ‘rhythm of work’ imposed by the European model.** And he clarifies: No, there is no question of a return to Nature. **It is simply a very concrete question of not dragging men [people] towards mutilation, of not imposing upon the brain rhythms that very quickly obliterate it and wreck it. The** pretext of catching up must not be used to push man around, to tear him away from himself or from his privacy, to break and kill him. Here is that word ‘rhythm’ again. ‘Rhythms imposed on the brain’ this time, imposed by a drive to ‘catch up’**. Catching up was a phrase much circulated in the takeoff theories of capitalist development pushed by the United States in the Cold War.** But, Fanon points out, this catching up institutes a rhythm that ‘breaks’ and ‘kills’ man**. This is a rhythm that ‘tears man away from himself’, that ‘obliterates’ and ‘wrecks’ his brain**. Fanon uses the metaphor of the ‘caravan’ for an entire system that tears man away from himself. No, we do not want to catch up with anyone. What we want to do is to go forward all the time, night and day, in the company of Man, in the company of all men. **The caravan should not be stretched out, for in that case each line will hardly see those who precede it; and men who no longer recognize each other meet less and less together, and talk to each other less and less. The ‘caravan’, or what would come to be called globalization, or indeed what might be termed more precisely, logistics.** Notice that the caravan, a term of trade, is here transposed to a chain of work, a line, an assembly line with a rhythm that breaks and kills man. This is a pathological caravan that ‘tears apart the functions’ of man. It is a question of the Third World starting a new history of Man, a history which will have regard to the sometimes prodigious theses which Europe has put forward, but which will also not forget Europe’s crimes, of which the most horrible was committed in the heart of man, and consisted of the pathological tearing apart of his functions and the crumbling away of his unity. **Fanon reminds us here too of the ‘prodigious theses’, Marxism and the history of enlightenment thought. But it has not been enough to prevent ‘the most horrible crimes.’ These crimes are racism and colonialism but these crimes wrap another at the heart of the model – this ‘pathological tearing apart of his functions’, Fanon says. It is this rhythm of work, this pathological global caravan of work, that is not only at the heart but is the truth of the European model. Even if racism and colonialism cannot be reduced to the crime of slave, indentured, and colonial labour, this truth lies at the heart. The European model of domination,** Fanon reminds us in his conclusion, was to steal land and people not to support their mode of production as in past empires, but **to impose a new rhythm of work on a global scale, a global assembly line tearing apart the functions of man. Social** **Factory Of course, there is an important difference between the rhythm of work Fanon is describing and the historical institution of Fordist and Taylorist rhythms of the assembly line. The Fordist and Taylorist factory had an outside, however unstable and unjust. Control of cooperation at work was given up, but was supposed to return individually, at least for white men and settlers, in politics, in rights, and votes. In the European model imposed on the colonies, there was no return.** **The rhythm was all in factory, field, and mine, on the ship, the road, and the rail, in the shop and the house. Or at least, this was the system’s intent.** In this sense **the colony was the first social factory. Everywhere you went in the colony it was work, or else it was criminality.** And any other connection, any other line, was conspiracy. **No citizenship, no consumers, no land, nation, or culture, no outside. That was the regime, the rhythm.** Fanon feared post-colonial nations would keep the regime and merely erect the outside, with flags, anthems, and new ruling classes. Who can say he was wrong? But Fanon’s warning was more than a post-colonial critique of the idea of the outside. It was an analysis of the European model and its tendency towards producing this rhythm without an outside. **Indeed Fanon saw the colony as the first social factory, where worker replaces subject in society as a whole. In the colony, in the first social factory, any move to other social being was, as it is today, criminal, conspiratorial.** The only sound in the social factory is the rhythm of work because that is what takes place in a factory. This may sound surprising to say: that there are no subjects in the social factory or that the rhythm of work is omnipresent today. **We face millions without work or not enough work in the North and amongst the migrants from the Global South seeking to reach the North or in it without being of it. We are told that the future of work in both ‘developed’ and ‘emerging’ economies is subjective, creative, professional, and most of all managerial, not rhythmic.** And at any rate from more reliable sources like Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2011) we understand that we are living in an era when immaterial labour – cognitive and affective labour - dominates and commands other forms of labour, even if factories and warehouses are still widespread. **But** **this should not make us deaf to the rhythm we hear no matter where we go, the rhythm that breaks and kills humans.** **We have heard a lot from business about how we can become entrepreneurial, or how we can transform ourselves into leaders, of how we can become responsible for our own careers. And again from our comrades we have received a more accurate picture: conceptions of the artist, the bohemian, the researcher and the performer have been twisted by business to make us work harder, to convince us we can fulfil ourselves through work.** Andrew Ross’s (2004) work is excellent here. **Christian Marazzi has written about the way our bodies are today a kind of constant capital, machines for which we are responsible, which we must upkeep because they are the site of production. He is right.** Franco Berardi (2009) speaks of the way our psyche and our souls descend into work as if engulfing our whole being, and Emma Dowling (2007) of the way even our affect is measured and managed, brought into metrics. It is easy to feel that work for those who have it is about the risk of having your subjectivity and your talents swallowed whole, about having your virtuosity consumed as Paolo Virno (2004) might put it. But a factory is neither a collection of machines nor a collections of workers however skilled, however virtuoso. A factory is a line.

#### Economic policy has become a question of Operations Management. There is no longer a distinction between in-here and out-there, the factory has become ingrained within us, the constant rhythm that controls our thoughts. Opportunity has become a façade for Control
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Social Factory Of course, there is an important difference between the rhythm of work Fanon is describing and the historical institution of Fordist and Taylorist rhythms of the assembly line. The Fordist and Taylorist factory had an outside, however unstable and unjust. Control of cooperation at work was given up, but was supposed to return individually, at least for white men and settlers, in politics, in rights, and votes. In the European model imposed on the colonies, there was no return. The rhythm was all in factory, field, and mine, on the ship, the road, and the rail, in the shop and the house. Or at least, this was the system’s intent. In this sense the colony was the first social factory. Everywhere you went in the colony it was work, or else it was criminality. And any other connection, any other line, was conspiracy. No citizenship, no consumers, no land, nation, or culture, no outside. That was the regime, the rhythm. Fanon feared post-colonial nations would keep the regime and merely erect the outside, with flags, anthems, and new ruling classes. Who can say he was wrong? But Fanon’s warning was more than a post-colonial critique of the idea of the outside. It was an analysis of the European model and its tendency towards producing this rhythm without an outside. Indeed Fanon saw the colony as the first social factory, where worker replaces subject in society as a whole. In the colony, in the first social factory, any move to other social being was, as it is today, criminal, conspiratorial. The only sound in the social factory is the rhythm of work because that is what takes place in a factory. This may sound surprising to say: that there are no subjects in the social factory or that the rhythm of work is omnipresent today. We face millions without work or not enough work in the North and amongst the migrants from the Global South seeking to reach the North or in it without being of it. We are told that the future of work in both ‘developed’ and ‘emerging’ economies is subjective, creative, professional, and most of all managerial, not rhythmic. And at any rate from more reliable sources like Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri (2011) we understand that we are living in an era when immaterial labour – cognitive and affective labour - dominates and commands other forms of labour, even if factories and warehouses are still widespread. But this should not make us deaf to the rhythm we hear no matter where we go, the rhythm that breaks and kills humans. We have heard a lot from business about how we can become entrepreneurial, or how we can transform ourselves into leaders, of how we can become responsible for our own careers. And again from our comrades we have received a more accurate picture: conceptions of the artist, the bohemian, the researcher and the performer have been twisted by business to make us work harder, to convince us we can fulfil ourselves through work. Andrew Ross’s (2004) work is excellent here. Christian Marazzi has written about the way our bodies are today a kind of constant capital, machines for which we are responsible, which we must upkeep because they are the site of production. He is right. Franco Berardi (2009) speaks of the way our psyche and our souls descend into work as if engulfing our whole being, and Emma Dowling (2007) of the way even our affect is measured and managed, brought into metrics. It is easy to feel that work for those who have it is about the risk of having your subjectivity and your talents swallowed whole, about having your virtuosity consumed as Paolo Virno (2004) might put it. But a factory is neither a collection of machines nor a collections of workers however skilled, however virtuoso. A factory is a line. Operations Management The area of management studies concerned with the factory is operations management. **Operations management has always been pretty clear about what a factory is, and however much it has expanded its understanding of the factory, this definition has not wavered. This is business ‘knowledge’, with all its ideological limits, but it can be helpful to our own considerations here. For operations management, the factory is the scene of a process.** This is process in the sense of **procession, procedure and movement**. Inputs go into the factory to move along a process, a line, and outputs come out of the factory. **Most importantly what machines and especially workers do, according to operations management, is work on the process not the product.** In contemporary operations management theory this has meant improving that process. This is often designated by the Japanese term ‘kaizen’ originally associated with workers and managers devoting themselves to the continuous improvement of the line’s efficiency in Toyota factories. Soon kaizen expanded throughout service, extraction, information, and other sectors. Rather than attention to the product, including the immaterial product, which remains as much as ever the purview of a small fraction of the workforce, most workers are subjected to increased attention to the ‘assembly’ line**. For management science, this is what a factory is: a line, a process, a procession, a movement, a rhythm through from inputs to outputs. For operations management metrics differ from management precisely because they measure progress on the line itself, the improvement of the process, an improvement which knows no end, and so unlike measurement, metrics move**. And this too is what the social factory is. Its name is accurate even if we have sometimes been distracted by everything from the propaganda of creative classes to the critical discourse of the precariat. The social factory is about making and remaking the line better and better. But that is not all. Kaizen has been accompanied by another development in the line. This is the extension of the management of inputs and outputs, of the extension to supply chains understood as part of the line, not just raw clusters of labour, natural resources and machines waiting outside the door of the factory. And with logistics and reverse logistics this line is expanding exponentially, or rather, algorithmically. **Logistics and supply chain management extend the metrics of line in both directions, towards inputs and outputs which now have their own work rhythms.** **Synaptic Labour** This algorithmically expanding line means the outside of the factory is measured like the inside, aligned with the processual inside. And when the factory is virtual, post-Fordist, a social factory, the algorithms of the line extend the **rhythm of production, of assembly across our lives.** The two meanings of assembly, or perhaps two modes of assembly, begin to merge; to assemble is both to come together and to make, anywhere, anytime. **But what is made when we assemble and reassemble is the line itself first and foremost, not a product or a service. And we might go so far to say, with Marx, the first thing we make is ourselves as the line, not as subjects.** This is our work today. We take inventories of ourselves for components not the whole. We produce lean efforts to transconduct. We look to overcome constraints. We define values through metrics. These are all terms from operations management but they describe work far better than recourse the discourse of subject formation. Creativity itself, supposedly at the heart of the battle for the subject today, is nothing but what operations management calls variance in the line, a variance that may lead to what is in turn called a kaizen event, an improvement, and is then assimilated back into an even more sophisticated line, which in turn demands more. **Today ours is primarily the labour of adapting and translating, being commensurate and flexible, being a conduit and receptacle, a port for information but also a conductor of information, a wire, a travel plug.** We channel affect towards new connections. We do not just keep the flow of meaning, information, attention, taste, desire, and fear moving, we improve this flow continuously. We must remain open and attuned to the rhythm of the line, to its merciless variances in rhythm. This is primarily a neurological labour, a synaptic labour of making contact to keep the line flowing, and creating innovations that help it flow in new directions and at new speeds. **The worker operates like a synapse, sparking new lines of assembly in life. And she does so anywhere and everywhere because the rhythm of the line is anywhere and everywhere. The worker extends synaptic rhythms in every direction, every circumstance. With synpatic work, it is access not subjects that the line wants, an access, as Denise Ferreira da Silva (2007) reminds us, was long at the heart of the abuse of the affected ones, the ones who granted access out of love, out of being, out of the consent not to be one, even before tha­­­­t granting was abused.**

#### A federal job guarantees is not neutral but an active incorporation into systems of Debt and Credit that sustains Logsitics – work to pay off your debts to society and gain credit. This process of Financialization, recuperating systems of value through racialized labor, containerizes individuals as commodities to ensure maximum productivity via governance

Moten and Harney 10 Fred Moten and Stefano Harney March 2010 "Debt and Study" <https://www.e-flux.com/journal/14/61305/debt-and-study/> (Stefano Harney is the Professor of Strategic Management Education at Singapore Management University., Fred Moten is the professor of Performance Studies at New York University and has taught previously at University of California, Riverside, Duke University, Brown University, and the University of Iowa)//Elmer + gord0

Debt and Governance **We hear them say that what’s wrong with you is your bad debt. You’re not working. You fail to pay your debt to society. You have no credit, but that is to be expected. You have bad credit, and that is fine. But bad debt is a problem—debt seeking only other debt, detached from creditors, fugitive from restructurin**g. Destructuring debt, now that’s wrong. But even still, what’s wrong with you can be fixed. First we give you a chance—**that’s called governance, a chance to be interested, or even disinterested. That’s policy. Or if you are still wrong, still bad, we give you policy. Bad debt is senseless, which is to say it cannot be perceived by the senses of capital.** But therapy is available. Governance wants to reconnect your debt to the outside world. You are on the spectrum, the capitalist spectrum of interests. You are the wrong end. Your bad debt looks unconnected, autistic, in its own world. But you can be developed. **You can get credit after all. The key is to have interests. Tell us what you want. Tell us what you want and we can help you get it, on credit. We can lower the rate so you can take interest. We can raise the rate so you will pay attention. But we can’t do it alone. Governance only works when you work, when you tell us what you want, when you invest your interests back in debt and credit.** Governance is the therapy of your interests, and your interests will bring your credit back. You will have an investment, even in debt. And governance will gain new senses, new perceptions, new advances into the world of bad debt, new victories in the war on those without interests, those who will not speak for themselves, participate, identify their interests, invest, inform, demand credit. Go**vernance does not seek credit. It does not seek citizenship, although it is often understood to do so. Governance seeks debt, debt that will seek credit. Governance cannot not know what might be shared, what might be mutual, what might be common. Why award credit, why award citizenship? Only debt is productive, only debt makes credit possible, only debt allows credit to rule. Productivity always precedes rule,** even if the students of governance do not understand this, and even if governance itself barely does. But rule does come, and today it is called policy, the reign of precarity. And who knows where it will hit you, some creditor walking by you on the street. You keep your eyes down but he makes policy anyway, smashes anything you have conserved, any bad debt you are smuggling. **Your life reverts to vicious chance, to arbitrary violence, a new credit card, a new car loan, torn from those who hid you, ripped from those with whom you shared bad debt. They don’t hear from you again.**

#### The Economy is logistics. Rhetoric of uplift and improvement through government jobs creates the trope of the self-sufficient subject that sustains Logistics. This is a self-fulfilling prophesy, whose eternal growth and mastery over the world drives it to render all violence as justified ensuring environmental destruction, global war, and genocide

Harney et Al 18 (, Stefano, Cuppini, Niccolò, and Mattia Frapporti. "Logistics Genealogies: A Dialogue with Stefano Harney." Social Text 36.3 (136) (2018): 95-110. (Niccolo Cuppini is a PhD University of Applied Sciences and Arts of Southern Switzerland · Department of Business Economics, Health and Social Care (DEASS), Mattia Frapporti is a PhD in Economics at the University of Bologna)//Elmer + gord0

Amidst these prefiguring’s, however, something also starts to emerge — something Du Buois would teach us about as he came to understand the global color line. (I recommend the unmatched work of Nahum Chandler on Du Buois here.) **These global supply chains and the way they are labored, most especially by African slave labor, by the motley crew, and by indentured colonial labor, produced a new kind of collectivity that runs not only along those lines but along and across the ones collectively forged insight from these lines — the archive of curves, swerves, revisions, and improvisations of logisticality**. This is Nadia Ellis’s being “at large.” And of course, we hear an echo of criminality in the notion of being at large, uncaptured, escaped. **The lines and the curves mean such collective being can show up anywhere. Collectivity at large, logisticality, produces the generalized fears of blackness, of communism, of queerness. Being at large along these lines means “they could be anywhere.” Yet against these possibilities the beginnings of the factory also mark a frightening new development with which we still live and against which we must still ­fight**. As I mentioned, Fred and I have adapted that term usufruct to talk about this coming together at the end of the eighteenth century of **two kinds of improvement — economic improvement and especially the improvement of property, including human property — and self-improvement, especially the quest to prove one can improve oneself and by so doing be quali­fied to supervise the improvement of property and of others.** The **rise of this self-improving “subject” who needs only himself to improve, to be self-authoring, self-suf­ficient is truly a genocidal and geocidal ­gure**. This ­figure has been threatening since the birth of European colonialism, but he was initially guided by anti-Moor Christianity then and thus not self-improving, as only God can improve someone, though this makes the ­figure no less brutal in his way. But he really takes hold with the combination of improvement in commercial and plantation agriculture and the improvement ideologies of the Enlightenment**. And then he becomes the factory owner. His claims to self-suff­iciency, to being self-made, are as ludicrous and as dangerous as the idea that the colonial fort was sovereign and self-suffi­cient.** Of course, it relied on the land and people it was built to attack continuously for their resources**. So, too, with this self- made, self-improving bourgeois subject — he too requires massive resources to pronounce himself self-suff­icient, resources he can never acknowledge. Beyond all the social reproductive labor of women, children, the elders, and servants, he requires these supply chains and the labor on them, and the assembly line and all the labor on that, and behind this the massive exploitation of the earth upon which that system is based, monocrop destruction of biospheres, mining, et cetera.** That’s the “self- suf­ficient” bourgeois subject, the entrepreneur, and with his “democratization,” as Angela Mitropolous says, through what Du Buois calls democratic despotism “he and his” confront us still with genocidal and geocidal consequences. Of course the proliferation of these modern subjects chases the logisticality of those who reject the idea of the individuation all around the globe. Thus, the situation is more volatile than ever worldwide. **Continuous improvement only barely “holds the line” against continuous revolution.**

#### Thus, we affirm that the Undercommons ought to provide a haptic jobs guarantee.

#### This is a process of Haptic care, understanding our mutual indebtedness to each other. Instead of abiding by the rules of financialization pre-figured by the resolution’s call for state care, we affirm communal care. Caring for each other no matter what, no matter who. You should “feel at home with the homeless, at ease with the fugitive, at peace with the pursed”. This feeling is the Undercommons.

Harney and Moten 13 (Harney, Stefano, and Fred Moten. "The undercommons: Fugitive planning and black study." (2013): 1. Pgs 87-91 (Stefano Harney is the Professor of Strategic Management Education at Singapore Management University., Fred Moten is the professor of Performance Studies at New York University and has taught previously at University of California, Riverside, Duke University, Brown University, and the University of Iowa)//Elmer

Never being on the right side of the Atlantic is an unsettled feeling, the feeling of a thing that unsettles with others. It’s a feeling, if you ride with it, that produces a certain distance from the settled, from those who determine themselves in space and time, who locate themselves in a determined history. To have been shipped **is to have been moved** **by others, with others**. It is to feel at home with the homeless, at ease with the fugitive, at peace with the pursued, at rest with the ones who consent not to be one. Outlawed, interdicted, intimate things of the hold, containerized contagion, logistics externalizes logic itself to reach you, but this is not enough to get at the social logics, the social poesis, **running through logisticality**. Because while certain abilities – to connect, to translate, to adapt, to travel – were forged in the experiment of hold, they were not the point. As David Rudder sings, “how we vote is not how we party.” The hold’s terrible gift was to gather dispossessed feelings in common, to create a new feel in the undercommons. Previously, this kind of feel was only an exception, **an aberration, a shaman, a witch, a seer, a poet amongst others**, who felt through others, through other things. Previously, except in these instances, feeling was mine or it was ours. But in the hold, in the undercommons of a new feel, another kind of feeling became common. Tis form of feeling was not collective, not given to decision, not adhering or reattaching to settlement, nation, state, territory or historical story; nor was it repossessed by the group, which could not now feel as one, reunified in time and space. No, when Black Shadow sings “are you feelin’ the feelin?’’ he is asking about something else. He is asking about a way of feeling through others, a **feel for feeling others feeling you**. Tis is modernity’s insurgent feel, its inherited caress, its skin talk, tongue touch, breath speech, hand laugh. Tis is the feel that no individual can stand, and no state abide. This is the feel we might call hapticality. Hapticality, the touch of the undercommons, the interiority of sentiment, the feel that what is to come is here. Hapticality, the capacity to feel though others, for others to feel through you, for you to feel them feeling you, this feel of the shipped is not regulated, at least not successfully, by a state, a religion, a people, an empire, a piece of land, a totem. Or perhaps we could say these are now recomposed in the wake of the shipped. To feel others is unmediated, immediately social, amongst us, our thing, and even when we recompose religion, it comes from us, and even when we recompose race, we do it as race women and men. Refused these things, we first refuse them, in the contained, amongst the contained, lying together in the ship, the boxcar, the prison, the hostel. Skin, against epidermalisation, senses touching. Thrown together touching each other we were denied all sentiment, denied all the things that were supposed to produce sentiment, family, nation, language, religion, place, home. Tough forced to touch and be touched, to sense and be sensed in that space of no space, though refused sentiment, history and home, we feel (for) each other. A feel, a sentiment with its own interiority, there on skin, soul no longer inside but there for all to hear, for all to move. **Soul music is a medium of this interiority on the skin, its regret the lament for broken hapticality, its self-regulatory powers the invitation to build sentimentality together again, feeling each other again, how we party**. This is our hapticality, our love. This is love for the shipped, love as the shipped. There’s a touch, a feel you want more of, which releases you. The closest Marx ever got to the general antagonism was when he said “from each according to his ability, to each according to his need” but we have read this as the possession of ability and the possession of need. What if we thought of the experiment of the hold as the absolute fluidity, the informality, of this condition of need and ability? What if ability and need were in constant play and we found someone who dispossessed us so that this movement was our inheritance. Your love makes me strong, your love makes me weak. What if “the between the two,” the lost desire, the articulation, was this rhythm, this inherited experiment of the shipped in the churning waters of flesh and expression that could **grasp by letting go ability** and need in constant recombination. If he moves me, sends me, sets me adrift in this way, amongst us in the undercommons. So long as she does this, she does not have to be.

#### A Haptic Job Guarantee escapes the rhythm of work by re-directing its thoughts – its care that’s unconditional rather than transactional, the “beat that will save your life”. These lines of fugitive thoughts are a process of stealing and occupying sites of logistics to generate care within us and each other
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The rule of the line persists beyond the factory in time and space, and its rhythm makes the time and space of our lives. There is no outside to the line, or rather we might say the line runs through the outside promised in Fordism and supposed to be so heterogeneous in post-Fordism. A rhythm that tears us apart, a rhythm that obliterates and wrecks our brain. In some places the line is all that is left of the factory, and logistics in this expanded sense is all that is left of the production. The science of operations management becomes the science of society, the common sense of our lives. No wonder Fanon feared this rhythm, and warned against participating in its pathological caravan, its global logistics. But this is why I turn to him now. Because we need more than the European theses to fight the European model in its fully realized form. Anti-colonial critique, and its grounding in the black radical tradition give us something more, launched as they are from a world with no outside but the criminal one, the fugitive one, conspiratorial one, a world where we are nothing but an input but somehow remain responsible for upkeep, improvement, and innovation of the line. The colonial world and the slave world were just that: populated by those who simultaneously had to care for and improve that world while being nothing in it. But of course nothing was not nothing. The critique included practices of resistance, autonomy, and most of all a tradition of producing other lines, other rhythms, in a militant arrhythmia. The banning of the drum could not destroy these rhythms, nor the rejection of hospitality, or of common land, or any number of everyday practices that turn an inside out with another rhythm. There is a rich history for logistical populations to draw upon here and synaptic workers around the globe have finally caught up to it though it has been with us all along, in the undercommons. I will invoke Walter Rodney (2001), the great Guyanese historian, himself a part of this tradition, talking about this tradition, of a Rasta community in the poorest part of Kingston, Jamaica: But with these black brothers you learn humility because they are teaching you … these brothers who up to now are every day performing a miracle. It is a miracle how these fellows live. They live and they are physically fit, they have vitality of mind, they have a tremendous sense of humour, they have depth. How do they do that in the midst of the existing conditions? And they create, they are always saying things. Rodney advises: You have to listen to them and you hear them talk about Cosmic Power and it rings a bell. I say, but I have read this somewhere, this is Africa. You have to listen to their drums to get the message of the Cosmic Power. These Rasta sisters and brothers are studying, making a line they call ‘groundations’. This is **the line of flight** when there is nowhere to run that Fred Moten calls Black Op. This is the undercommons. **It’s beat that will save your life**. It is there in the way, as Horace Campbell notes, the Rasta community dealt with ‘false Rastas’ by going deeper into the rhythm, and it is there in the contemporary art that inherits these groundations. I want to take just two examples, very different. The first is the performance artist Athi-Patra Ruga. The second is photographer and filmaker Zarina Bhimji. I don’t intend to read these artists nor to place them in school or tradition. I want to say instead that they inspire me to think about the line today and its killing rhythm, and to think about the ways this line runs through us, and how it bypasses subject formation at work. But most of all I want to look at their work to think about what Fred calls Black Op, and the undercommons their work invites us to feel around us, their militant arrhythmia. When Athi-Patra Ruga stages his synchronized swimming in a bath bathed in bright colored lights, or when he or his models appear in balloon suits, or in helmuts of black hair and high heels, or naked wearing a white boy kabuki mask, climbing police stations or strolling down dusty roads or painting studios with their bodies, there is no question of ‘who am I’. **There is nothing chameleon here, no subject in transformation. Instead there is a kind of militant access to the materials, to light, bright colours, hair, but also to flesh, intelligence, movement, liveliness**. Ruga offers a practice of what runs through but not based on the protocols of work, or a killing rhythm. This is a practice that helps me to see that access is already granted by the time it is granted, that what is found to be beautiful, erotic or painful, or mournful is what is already conducted, transduced in the flesh and the intellect before the arrival of the performance, the figure, the bursting embroidery of the painting. This is the line before the line that makes us vulnerable to abuse, and always more than that abuse. The rhythm of the line is unsettled by such practices not because these practices unsettle the subject, something about which capital could care less today, one way or the other. Ruga **unsettles with what passes through**, what recombines, what mocks and dances **around the social factory** in plain sight, late at night, on the lunch break, in the undercommons, in a differing rhythm. The line may speak of its innovation, entrepreneurship and logistical reach, but it appears like the dull rhythm that is next to Ruga’s work, **next to the hapticality that lets us feel our own access.** Empty but not unoccupied, rooms, buidings, and fields, the access in Zarina Bhimji’s aesthetically gorgeous film Yellow Patch at first might seem to be about memory. But memory for the line is a matter of metrics, of not making the same mistake twice. It is useful for improvement. And Bhimji’s camera resists the application of memory to the present for purposes of improvement. Her sound rumbles with labour and logistics, above the empty buildings, echoing in the rooms. But with her we enter a militant preservation, not keeping up, not improving, **not looking for productive variance**. I would say that old administrative papers stacked on the aging wooden office bookcases, or the yellow shutters cut by blocks of light from outside are aestheticized not to make memory useful through nostalgia, where it can be preserved and sold, or judgement where is can be used for improvement. Instead her film displays a calmness, peace, rest, in history, in contemporary history. Not the de-historicized rest of the meditation industry nor the preservation of the history industry, but a militant rest for history, in history, in struggle, right now. Her rooms, ships, fields, and bays do not leave history to give us preservation or provide us with rest in the struggle. Other lines are right here, the film suggests to me, the undercommons is never elsewhere, its touch is also a reach. Its touch is a rest, a caress. Hapticality occupies these rooms with a tap, tap, stroke rhythm of love.

#### Stefano Harney asks, “How can it be that jay-walking has become punishable by death?” Align yourself w/ the glitches in the system that block access – the sociality that Logistics can never understand

Harney 4 Stefano Harney September 2015 "Jay-Walker. How can it be that jay-walking has become punishable by death?" <https://transversal.at/blog/Jay-Walker> (Professor of Strategic Management Education at Singapore Management University)//Elmer

How can it be that jay-walking **has become punishable by death**? Making jay-walking a legal offense was part of the transition from colonial capitalism to industrial capitalism in the US. A ‘jay’ was someone from the country who walked in the middle of streets, fast becoming reserved for emerging automobile traffic. There was a public campaign to keep people from wandering in the street and thereby slowing up this traffic stream, this production line of cars. But when **Michael Brown was shot down for jay-walking** in Ferguson, Missouri, something had changed. Of course, it was also quickly pointed out that nothing had changed. But these two statements cannot be understood without each other. Because what had changed made what had not changed even more unchangeable. I will try to explain what I mean in what follows. But I begin simply with this proposition. Today’s logistical capitalism requires generalised access to us as never before but this unlimited access has a history amongst those who were both most subjected to it, and most liberated from it. I am speaking of course of the original logistics moment in capitalism, the slave trade, and its cruel cargo. But I am also speaking of history in which access has been not only denied but sabotaged and liberated. Michael Brown’s **jay-walking was an act of sabotage**, and in the protest movement of Ferguson we see the **liberation of access at work** once more, in the jaywalking footsteps of the black radical tradition. Cedric Robinson famously said **the black radical tradition is the critique of Western Civilisation**. Here I want to inherit it as the critique of Western idea and practice of access to others, an idea and practice that requires first the denial of access of others to oneself, as Denise Ferreira da Silva shows us, and then the development of the right to access to others, especially to what Hortense Spillers designates as the indeterminate flesh of others. In case you think I am speaking in metaphors, or speaking romantically, or with an optimism of the will. Yes, I am, but I am also speaking materially - more materially indeed than all of the misplaced calls to link race and class (on the contrary, they will never be separated). More exactly, I would like to say Michael Brown’s **sabotage was symbolically material**. And in order to understand this we must have recourse to the way logistical capitalism has developed and why the denial of access and pursuit of other forms of movement comes into direct conflict (again) with this form of capitalism. We will have to enter the hidden realm of operations management in the 1960’s and 1970’s, when industrial capitalism is beginning to shape shift into what we could not yet identify. We call it variously post-modern or post-industrial capitalism, globalisation or cognitive capitalism. But now we can see that one way to name it is as logistical. And by naming it this way we also come to explain how the long vicious history of state and extra-state violence against those who most embody this psychotic demand for access has now entered a new phase of intensity. This psychotic demand for more and more access has never gone away but it finds new life, and new life to suck, in the unlikely hidden abode of operations management. Hidden abode Two things happen to operations management in the 1970’s. The first is kaizen. The second is logistics. By the 1970’s the Japanese practice of continuous improvement, or kaizen, had become widely influential in operations management and the management practices it in turn influences. With kaizen the eye of management **shifted its focus from the worker and the machine, to the assembly line**. The assembly line was no longer the way to organise workers and machines, the workers and machines were there to organise the assembly line, which became an end in itself. As Deborah Cowen rightly points out in her excellent book, The Deadly Life of Logistics, this is also the period in time when operations management notices logistics. The result will be a new understanding of how the assembly line is assembled, and as a result of this, in combination with kaizen, how it might be disassembled and reassembled through society to seek out continuous improvement through ever greater demands for access. When I say operations management notices logistics what I mean is that until this point, operations management restricted itself to what it could oversee within the walls of the factory. It concerns began at the entrance dock and ended at the exit gates. But as workers put pressure on the factory (and movements put pressure on the state) operations management began to look at the problems of securing supplies at one end and ensuring sales at the other end. And they began to look at these problems as production problems, as extensions of the assembly line beyond the factory doors, as continuous improvement of a continuous line. One could say, although here again it would be symbolically material to say so, that operations management followed the workers in their exodus from the factory. By beginning to regard all the materials coming into the factory not only as part of the calculation of production, rather than just as costs at the outset of production, but especially by believing this calculation could be itself subject to kaizen, operations management, as much as any capitalist science, gave birth to the social factory. But it also allows us to understand the social factory from another angle. To do this we have to stay with operations management just a bit more to see how it is also the origins of everything from private equity firms, to the derivative, and most importantly to the figure of the consultant, to whom I will return. With the shift in attention from the worker and the machine to the assembly line itself value comes to be spoken about differently by management. Management now sees the assembly line not as a static cost - while the men and machines in combination are what will produce surplus value through relative increases in productivity - but the reverse. It is the assembly line that is dynamic. It is the process where value is to be found, and especially value is to be found in the potential of the assembly line. With this potential comes speculation. (And of course the other obsession of management do not entirely disappear with the appearance of a new obsession. Indeed we could also see a speculative shift in the movement from personnel management to human resources management and from static book-keeping to dynamic forms of accounting in the continued attention to worker and machine – in both these shifting fields speculation, or the future right now, becomes the object of analysis.) This speculation on the production line is boosted tremendously by the incorporation of logistics and by advances in the algorithm. Soon management began to find value in the improvement of the assembly line not just in the factory, but beyond, in all the moments of supply, distribution, and consumption occuring outside the factory gates. And the best way to do this was to apply the growing capacity of the algorithm, first through implementing a series of management systems internally, and then by linking algorithms at work in logistics, in transport and warehousing initially, and then also in consumption, first in customer relations, and then in what would one day become big data. This culminates in corporations like SAP and in 4G Logistics companies, where **the firm is basically gone**, not into finance, but into the assembly line. **The idea that there was always a better way to arrange the assembly line, to arrange the flow of the process, to improve continuously that process, is given tremendous confidence by the algorithm**. This is because in part at least the algorithm enacts this exercise, working on itself, especially in so-called genetic and evolutionary algorithms. The algorithm gives the impression of never being satisfied with itself, and it appears to improve itself. Indeed it has no goal but this, and it propels the fantasy that the assembly line too should be its own goal – who works on it and how it is mechanised or computerised or indeed what it makes are all secondary to its own goal of efficiency. And this idea of an assembly line that can itself become more and more efficient and therefore produce more and more value, produces a speculation on the assembly line. **The easiest way to illustrate this is to think about these leaders who move from institution to institution or firm to firm. They may know nothing of the people or machines at work in these places. But it does not matter. They know how to make the assembly line in these place ever more efficient**. This is their sole and only necessary qualification. At the level of the firm, this is what private equity claims too. They need not know anything about the product in the companies they are buying. Indeed they sell themselves precisely on an indifference to the product. They know how to get knew value out the assembly line. I hasten to add that even if we know this is not the whole story, the disavowal in the business world is almost complete in this regard. This is what I mean when I say there is a speculation on the assembly line – a bet or wager, an investment, that this line can flow ever quicker, ever more precisely, ever more creatively, indeed ever more, no matter what the product or goal. Sunup to sundown But what is new world of speculation for capital is a new nightmare of deconstruction for labour. I use deconstruction in its philosophical resonance. Derrida can be forgiven for not reading operations management but his unfinishing of thought has its parallel at exactly the same moment history in the unfinishing of work, of the labour process itself. While it has been remarked that this unfinishing is the property of new commodities - immaterial commodities - this describes only the surface of things. The class power that capital develops in logistical capitalism comes not from the unfinished commodity, or not alone, but from unfinishing work, preventing its closure, haunting it with incompleteness, and indeed with the thought of an excess of value yet to be captured in every labouring moment, every assembly of the line. Not only Derrida, but Bataille then. Or Bataille through Derrida: the restricted economy of the factory encounters the general economy of the algorithmic society. Work is undone by its excessive potential which for management, though it may be dressed in the rhetoric of creativity at work, is in fact a very material matter of demanding more and more access by never agreeing to close or limit the labour contract. There is for management now always the potential, always the metric, to access more in order to quantify more. This is the meaning, to put it bluntly, of everything from the zero-hour contract for coffee baristas to the deregulation of coffee markets for coffee bean sorters, to the micro-tasking of Amazon’s mechanical turk, to the private temporary butler ‘app’ called Alfred. It is true **work never stops**, nor does its mythology as Peter Fleming correctly points out in his new book. But it never stops because it is never finished. Or more precisely because the assembly line, and therefore its labour process, is never complete. Indeed the labour process is actively unfinished. And not only must this process constantly undone but it must be constantly reassembled. We now must assemble ourselves collectively in order to assemble the production line in the social factory. We must assemble ourselves collectively to assemble the assembly line because the labour process is no longer formally the reponsibility of management (if it ever was informally). It is the responsibility of workers scattered through the social factory. And what is that responsibility? What form does it take? Connection, flexibility, availability, reorganisation on demand, translatability, in short, access, radical access to labour. But not just to labour, this means full and unfettered access to the earth, to all its organic and inorganic matter, and indeed to capital, though usually in the form of debt, and therefore we might better say with Randy Martin’s pioneering work access to financialisation, that is, a radical openness to being financialised. The consultant Of course there is both resistance to this logic and other self-directed logics and logisticalities at work in the undercommons. But this logic of unfinishing the labour process and requiring our assembly has a powerful bearer. I will call this bearer of the logic of logistical capitalism, the consultant. I do not mean by this designation strictly those who call themselves consultants. Nor do I mean even the act of offering consultation and producing consultative reports. I mean all those who carry and spread the virus of the algorithm of work. To speak of the consultant I have briefly to go back to the earlier figures of which he is both an heir and a frightening new advance in (extra-) legalized theft and violence. Primitive accumulation, or what I would prefer to call slave and colonial capitalism is characterised by the emergence not of access – people have suffered from such demands so long as the history of the world has been the history of class struggle – but **this radical, unceasing, psychotic demand for access**. If you like this is the difference, in short-hand, between traditional practices of slavery, including in parts of Africa, and the first great horrible logistics – African chattel slavery. Total violence accompanied the insane demand for total access to the flesh of Africans, for labour and for sex. Prefigured or accompanied by a similar demand of aboriginal peoples and followed by versions of indentured and migrant slavery to the present day. This is the core of primitive accumulation. The bearer of this insane demand for access was the settler. But of course the settler did not present himself as bearing this relation. He presented himself openly as the **bearer of property and race. W**ith the rise of industrial capitalism – the settler does not disappear though he sometimes becomes the jay, or the farmer’s daughter as we will see with the traveling salesman later – and we have a new figure of domination, the citizen. The citizen might be said to bear nationalist heteropatriarchy as capitalist social relations. In other words the class relations is established differently even if both capitalisms and both bearers overlap and persist in uneven ways. It is in this lineage that I place the emergence of the consultant. **The consultant bears the unfettered, insane demand for absolute access, and this he does by hosting the algorithm**. For this reason, both nationalism and property suffer new contradictions with the consultant, premised as they are on the restriction of access. (And indeed we might say some changes in the exclusive of heteromale privilege, although as with property and nation this is accompanied by a violent reaction to any new access, an access that is at any rate itself a form of violence, we should remember.) The consultant is characterised by a two-fold character much like the previous and still operative settler and citizen. The consultant believes [they are] he or she is an algorithmic agent actively reorganising people, firms, institutions, and even countries. But the consultant is also a problem for the algorithm, an obstacle to that reorganisation, though the consultant is unaware of this, seeing himself or herself as a revolutionary agent. Far from it, however. If we take the consultant’s origins in the traveling salesman we can see this two-fold character. The traveling agent literally becomes a problem – the ‘traveling salesman problem’ in the capitalist science of logistics. This problem is well known. It is about how to move a salesman, or an oil truck, or anything really, on a route that is most efficient, but more importantly, in a way that can anticipate changes in what most efficient means. In other words, it is the search for an algorithm **that embodies continuous improvement**. Now the point is that the salesman is prone to human error and bound human time, as is the truck driver. It is the same with the consultant. Ultimately **they are in the way of the algorithm**, not is bearer. This is why it does not matter what a consultant does or says (as anyone who has listened to one will know). The consultant is a pattern experiment, an experiment now not in movement and delivery of goods, but movement and deconstruction of the labour process. The consultant is a like an agent used to dissolve something else, in this case an existing assembly line, and ultimately should then dissolve himself or herself when this job is done. This is why the consultant is, unknown to him or her, a problem, and a solution only in this other chemical sense. Of course, the consultant, like the settler and citizen, has ‘back-up.’ **What Fred Moten and I have elsewhere called policy, policy-making, policy implementation, policy hustling.** This is the weapon of choice when the consultant meets resistance, when the consultant senses planning in the undercommons, another kind of access, another kind of assembling. The consultant and his policy-makers, his version of night riders remind us again why Nahum Chandler is right to insist on the continued importance of Dubois’s term democratic despotism. **Liberalism never separated the state and the economy except in ideology and neither has neo-liberalism. These figures of the consultant and the policy hustler in logistical capitalism are more intimate than ever with each other as they demand access**. Hands up But this insane demand brings to the fore again primitive accumulation and its specific if equally psychotic demand for access to undifferentiated flesh and land in the colonies. With this, the figure of the slave, who never went away, comes back with renewed powers of inaccessibility, which is nothing other than **radical accessibility to others**. **It makes all who carry the figure of the slave and its related histories of total access, all the indentured, migrant, female, queer figures appear as direct threats to the production line, saboteurs scattered along the social factory’s assembly line**. Logistical capitalism is accompanied by a state form that demands the same kind of immediate access. It does not call you out and by doing so make you a citizen. It just demands to see you ID, if it demands anything before it **demonstrates access to your life with its violence**. To allow a kind of absolute access against and before these violent demands for access from logistical capitalism and its psychotic agents, to live as radically accessed, affected as Denise Ferreira da Silva would say, is to practice, indeed it is to illuminate the ongoing practice that Fred Moten and I have called hapticality, a open feel for being felt feeling. They could not see his hands up, but his hands were up, just not to them, but to us. They held us up, these hands up. It looked like a demon to them, too many eyes, too many tongues, too many hands. But to us it looks beautiful.

#### The Role of the Judge is to affirm Debate as an act of Planning, not Policy – instead of forcing normative outcomes via spaces of study, you should affirm acts of self-preservation within political spaces

Greer 18, G. H. "Who Needs the Undercommons? Refuge and Resistance in Public High Schools." Brock Education: A Journal of Educational Research and Practice 28.1 (2018): 5-18. (Concordia University (Canada), Art Education Department, Graduate Student.)//Elmer

Planning While study in the undercommons is a sociality that provides **refuge, joy, and resilience**, planning is the ongoing process of resistance which protects study. In the terms of complexity theory, planning creates the conditions for study to emerge. Planning defends study, for example, by attending **to methods**, when economic forces are oriented toward outcomes. In such a case, study thrives in the fascination required to build a car from scratch but is extinguished by a production line. Planning may then take the form of activism against the process of de-skilling workers. Generally, study is in trouble where labour is detached from purpose, discovery, and agency; and planning poses resistance to such divisions. Resistance may take a passive form like absenteeism or an active form like student strikes; it is an ongoing social experiment. The subjects of difference who inhabit the undercommons initiate planning in support of further difference: “planning in the undercommons is not an activity, not fishing or dancing or teaching or loving, but the ceaseless experiment with the future presence of the forms of life that make such activities possible” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 74). Importantly, “[p]lanning is self-sufficiency at the social level, and it reproduces in its experiment not just what it needs, life, but what it wants, life in difference…” (p. 76). Planning resists the austerity of conformity. Difference may bring the concept of diversity to mind for social justice educators. There are a number of distinctions between the difference that propels planning in the undercommons and diversity as it is understood in the field of education. Social justice education organized around diversity involves “eliminating the injustice created when differences are sorted and ranked in a hierarchy that unequally confers power…” (Adams, Bell, Goodman, & Joshi, 2016, p. 3, emphasis in original). In this sense, equitable diversity is an end goal that is, significantly, often supported by the implementation of policy. Planning, on the other hand, is a process, rather than an outcome, that resists policy, as explained below. Planning appears distorted, if at all, **from the commons where the rules are made**: “Because from the perspective of **policy it is too dark in there, in** the black **heart of the undercommons, to see**” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 79). Planning may become invisible or **appear criminal in the light**. Historical examples of such distortions are plentiful. The Freedom Riders were planning in 1961, boarding buses into their own brutalization to desegregate the southern United States; in the light of curricular history, Freedom Riders disappear and are replaced by parliamentary motions. There was planning at the Stonewall Riots in June of 1969 when homeless queer kids led by trans women of colour revolted against police brutality; the political necessity of Stonewall disappears in the parade lights of Pride every year on its own anniversary. Planning made visible but distorted is apparent in current events in the criminalization of self-preservation: from immigration (Ackerman & Furman, 2013), to activism (Matthews & Cyril, 2017; Alonso, Barcena, & Gorostidi, 2013), to panhandling (Chesnay, 2013). Educators who wish to see the planning of the undercommons, or to make it visible to students, must research to discover the exclusions of curriculum. When we include stories like the Stonewall Riots or the Freedom Riders in our teaching, we offer a connection to students who see their lives reflected therein. Stories of resistance to injustice, particular to local contexts, are important educational resources. In addition to these, pedagogical models which support the development and scholastic direction, of planning skills among students include: problem-based learning (Walker, Leary, Hmelo-Silver, & Ertmer, 2015), choice-based art education (Douglas, & Jaquith, 2009), critical media literacy (Funk, Kellner, & Share, 2016), and anti-oppressive education (Kumashiro, 2000). Policy From the perspective of the undercommons, policy inevitably conflicts with the forms of study and planning described above. Policy is the **instrument of efficiency**; it seeks measurable, predictable outcomes. The immeasurable social experiments and emerging differences of planning and study cannot be reconciled with administrative control as exercised through policy. Policy from the perspective of the undercommons operates under three rules. First, it diagnoses planners as problematic and prescribes itself as the solution; “This is the first rule of policy. It **fixes others**” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 78). Second, policy requires the participation of planners in the fixing of themselves; “Participating in change is the second rule of policy.” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 80). In this way, participantsimplicate themselvesin order to fulfill the third rule of policy: that “wrong participation” (Harney & Moten, 2013, p. 81) provokes all manner of crises. If there is no crisis then the participant is fixed and may be deputised in order to fix others. More commonly, any crisis at all proves that policy was right about the planners all along; and of course, they were bound to fail. The circular logic of policy as viewed from the undercommons reflects what Spade (2015) calls administrative violence. Spade (2015) details a story which I relate here to clarify the operations of policy. Bianca, a trans girl, was sent home from her high school in 1999 for wearing clothing that affirmed her gender. She was not allowed to return to her classes. Bianca’s parents called the school and received no response. Spade met Bianca in 2002 when she was homeless, unemployed, and attempting to leave an abusive relationship. Bianca had enrolled in a welfare work program but was outed as a trans woman by her male identification (ID). She was subsequently harassed and forced to quit, losing her income and making her ineligible for Medicaid. She became homeless, and because of her male ID she was barred from women’s shelters and fearful of further abuse at shelters for men. Without an address, medical benefits, or an income Bianca was unable to complete the process to correct her ID and could not afford the hormone treatments that allowed her to maintain a feminine appearance. Bianca’s ability to pass as a cisgender woman protected her on the street from further harassment by both the public and the police. In order to afford hormone injections, Bianca engaged in sex work. The injections were not regulated because they had to be obtained illegally which placed Bianca at increased risk of infection by HIV, hepatitis, and other diseases. Although Bianca’s story is not recent, the factors that contributed to her difficulties are relevant: transgender youth are still significantly over-represented in groups of early school leavers, homeless youth, and survivors of violence (Morton et al., 2018; Keuroghlian, Shtasel, & Bassuk, 2014). In the language of the undercommons Bianca planned to survive by expressing her gender, but this plan was subverted by school policy, causing her not to graduate and significantly reducing her prospects for employment. Following the first rule of policy according to the undercommons, Bianca’s school would not accept her attendance until she fixed her gender. Bianca then followed the second rule of policy and made attempts to become a participant. She tried to stay at shelters and enrolled in a social welfare work program. In each of these cases, she experienced the crisis of harassment. Following the third rule of policy, these crises were framed as the result of Bianca’s wrong participation: she did not have the right identification. For survival, Bianca must then become a fugitive by engaging in criminalized activity: sex work and the illegal procurement of hormones. In an educational context, considering policy, according to The Undercommons, pushes educators to ask how the rules in our schools create, rather than respond to, fugitivity among students. Fugitivity Being a fugitive according to The Undercommons means being marked as an outsider. Fugitivity happens to people when: first they act, and second policy outlaws those actions. But fugitivity must also be embraced. Those who refuse the rules of policy, as outlined above, become fugitive. Fugitives will not be fixed, refuse to participate, and deny responsibility for the crises that befall them. Fugitivity recognises systemic racism, classism, ableism, and cis/heteronormativity in the disallowance of demographic-specific behaviour. It is fugitive sociality that composes the undercommons in order to provide refuge and resistance. In high schools, the undercommons provides social refuge in the form of patient listening and covert smiles to: hat wearing, cell phone texting, hall running, affection displaying, fugitive students; and granola bar giving, grade fudging, student failing, smiling before Christmas, fugitive teachers. These now-fugitive activities are planning behaviours, they sustain study for those that commit them. These things have been happening since before policy determined that education is a predictable and measurable thing. Fugitive planners generate study with unforeseeable ends and immeasurable learning. Turning planners into fugitives has some effects: ease of administration and evaluation is one; the reinforcement of unjust hierarchies is another.

### Old Cards

#### Haptic Job Guarantees is a relationality that exists outside transactions – it’s the baker who gives food to the unemployed subway worker or the bike shop owner who lets their homeless friend sleep in the shop. It’s a process of guaranteed care that exists outside logistics.

Hall 20, Richard. "Covid-19 and the Hopeless University at the End of the End of History." Postdigital Science and Education (2020): 1-8. (De Montfort University, Leicester, UK)//Elmer

As a professor, I am trying to militate against the anxieties and stresses in my own life, by managing the institution’s expectations from me, and by providing support to students and staff with whom I work. Through my performance plan, agreed with my line manager, I have local objectives grounded in academic citizenship, which I am amplifying at this time, in order to support my colleagues, upon whose work much of my own privilege rests. I have several strategic objectives, focused upon writing and generating research proposals, which have been thrown into confusion by the virus that has infected the fabric of our knowing, doing, and being. This tension between local objectives grounded in academic citizenship and sociability, and strategic objectives that are framed by external competition, has been revealed by the virus. Yet, this is a deeply emotional time as well, and work feels secondary whilst psychologically important. I am currently helping my aunt to care for my nan, who is 102. She has care four times a day, and until two weeks ago, I was travelling to see her twice a week. This was a two-hour round trip, plus spending time with her. I lived with her and my Granddad for a while in my early years, and she is the light of my life. I cannot see her now, as we have made the decision that only my aunt will go, in order to reduce the risk. If my aunt falls ill, I will go, but as my partner is in a vulnerable group, this means I will need to self-isolate from her. Whilst I deal with grief that erupts from the reality that I will possibly never see my nan again, and that I may not be able to attend any funeral for her, I also cannot see my dad, who is an hour and a half away, and who is on peritoneal dialysis. I am concerned about him, because he is also self-isolating and extremely vulnerable. Then, my father-in-law, who is three hours away, has a heart condition and had pneumonia that required critical care two years ago. And we are also approaching the anniversary of my mum’s death. And I am concerned for my friend who has young-onset Parkinson’s, and my friend with Crohn’s disease, and my friends with asthma, and my friends who work in the health service. How is it possible to work, and also offer help and think about the contingency plans that are needed? The virus has made plain the **connections and weaknesses**; it has **infected and inflected our sociality**; it has infected our institutions and the sectors that regulate them. The concern about the welfare and well-being of my colleagues and students sit on top of a deeper set of anxieties about particular members of my family and friends, and buried beneath these are a deeper set of anxieties about my own mental well-being, 10 months out of long-term therapy. These interconnections mean that I continue to sit with feelings of grief about the world and my relationships in it. I am grief-stricken about the present, and I have to listen to myself and the world, in order to do that grief justice. I mourn the potential, austerity-driven, authoritarian, populist, and neo-fascist future, inside which our hopes for education and pedagogy at the level of society have been rendered impossible. Will technologized, bureaucratic control be enforced, including through the forms/structures, cultures/pathologies and activities/methodologies of the University? Is there space for futures-thinking that involves the University (Facer 2020)?. Increasingly, I wonder at the power of Andreotti et al.’s (2015) invitation to hospice the University, as we would hospice some of our relationships to others and the world, and thereby to grieve and move beyond. This feels so very necessary before we consider any radical and democratic possibilities (Amsler 2015), which themselves might take the form of braiding a new tapestry of life from the threads of the old (Elwood et al. 2019). This is compounded because I feel tired about managing my role in the institution, following a strike that was exhausting, and my feelings of redundancy when people talk about business continuity or business-as-usual. My adrenal glands feel emptied as I consider how best to support my family and friends. I am coping with these feelings by: speaking with people every day (either online, or over the garden wall); starting a diary project for people in my street (The Coronavirus Diaries 2020); trying to support a local mutual aid group in a city-wide mutual aid group; and considering how best to progress my writing. I am thinking about the podcasts that mean so much to me, and how I make time to sit and listen to them, rather than listening whilst doing something else. And I have my bike on my roller and my Tai chi, and I have promised my friend I will learn to play chess. I have made my first spelt flour, sourdough starter, and there is the music of Bon Iver, Caribou, Four Tet, Keeley Forsyth, Little Dragon, Low, Rufus Wainwright, Tame Impala, This Is the Kit, and Yves Tumor. And this will not be forever. In the Border Trilogy, McCarthy (2013: 824) has one of his elderly, wise characters state, in response to a conversation about **the fragility of young love: ‘it is an uncertain business… You must persevere. To persevere is everything’.** This is what I learned from a decade in therapy: perseverance. We persevere through the events and relationships that cause us so much pain. And the pain is a new opportunity to learn and grow from our need to persevere. Part of my process is listening to the world as it has been recalibrated through shock, in a way that forces me to think through the potential for a transformation to another world beyond this capitalist dystopia that we have made. I think about the psychological shock of closing down what is, and trying to reimagine what might be. But first, I must mourn. The capitalist University-as-is cannot halt the systemic devouring of our present lives, in the face of the desperate institutional need to accumulate surplus in the future. The capitalist University cannot save us, because it is driven by short-term economic interests, rather than the long-term conditions of life. It is pathological; it is diseased; it functions through cultures of silence, obfuscation, paranoia, intensification, and wait and see. It has lost control of the anxiety that gave it form and content through overwork and ill-being. This very anxiety has tipped beyond uncertainty into contempt, fear, anger, and disbelief. This anxiety has made real the undercommons of the University **as a moment of survival and of fugitive planning** (Moten and Harney 2013). Our hope lies in understanding how crises are the very material of capitalist expansion, predicated upon the renewed exploitation of life and living labour, and in returning to struggle. Academic labourers, professional services’ staff, and students are in a very real struggle inside-and-against the University. We have generated new energy and new organising power through our strikes against inequality, casualisation, workload, and precarious futures. What do we do now with our indignation at the handling of Covid-19? How do we respond to the institutional focus upon its own economic and financial welfare, over our corporeal and psychological well-being? I am reminded that years ago, I spoke and wrote about whether universities care enough about students, or whether universities care too much about students. I argued: As the corporate university tries to develop the characteristics of the entrepreneur in its students, it cares to discipline its labour-force through performance management and the rate of profit. However, inside and against this fragmented space, groups of academics and students are attempting to move beyond the pedagogy of debt, to define something more care-full, where the staff/student relationship can become the beating heart of an alternative vision for higher education as higher learning beyond the University and inside the fabric of society. This is the true psycho-social scope of care in these educational relationships. (Hall 2012) So we might now ask, can we use this coronavirus moment for emancipatory ends? How might we use it to remember ourselves? How might we abolish the University-as-is, and re-think education-as-will-be (Meyerhoff 2019)? In a time of pandemic, moving beyond is an act of self-care and love.

#### Align yourself w/ the glitch that was never meant to be – embrace this explosion!

Beller 17 (Jonathan Beller – director of the Graduate Program in Media Studies, Pratt Institute, and the author of The Cinematic Mode of Production (2006) and The Message is Murder: Substrates of Computational Capital (2017). “The Fourth Determination”, *e-flux* Journal #85 – October 2017 – ERW)//Re-cut by Elmer

Analogous to the land- and water-based commons that was planet earth, the cognitive-linguistic, the visual-poetic, and the imagination have undergone massive colonial expropriations, following immediately upon their separation and “liberation” from traditional ties to the body, and have entered directly into capitalist servitude. Bernard Stiegler refers to this phenomenon of cognitive collapse and short-termist thinking, organized by what he refers to as mnemotechnologies (technologies of memory that include print, cinema, and computation), as the “proletarianization of the senses.” This follows upon and overlaps with the proletarianization of the masses by the long industrial revolution and the capture and unspeakable violation of designated bodies by the slave trade. These aggressive and oftentimes annihilating encroachments on corporality, the senses, and the linguistic commons, achieved by cybernetic means, are mediological and technical phenomena as much as they are sociopolitical ones. Put another way, the mediological and the technical have been sociopolitical all along—to such an extent that with the level of technical saturation present today, “the political” has been lost. The “loss of the political” is an acknowledgement of the subsumption of policies and programs by capitalized financial calculus that chains representation to the process of accumulation. What indeed can “political” mean in a world increasingly characterized by algorithmic governance and platform sovereignty, that is, where capitalist power is increasingly automated, and discursive and affective labor is posited as a mere subroutine of capitalized computational processes—as engines of value creation? What of the political when “politics” has become a subroutine of computational capital and its discourses and actions are a modality of value extraction? It is an old lesson but it still applies (and we can see it from Israel to Burma): if subalterns use the same media and therefore modes of value extraction as oppressors in their struggles, then politics is simply a war over who will get the spoils of exploitation. The expropriation of the cognitive-linguistic by capital reduces discursive production—including the discourse of politics—to the subroutine of an abstract machine. This “machine,” though abstract, is nonetheless functional and material—we recognize it as the increasingly ubiquitous, increasingly networked computer or discrete state machine, but we must not see it as mere technology. The universal Turing machine, which when unified posits what I call the World Computer (“the invisible hand” codified as AI), has become the preeminent form of fixed capital. Machinic enslavement, whether to the assembly line, to the “media,” or to the computer, is indeed enslavement by other means, though we must insist that many of the “older” methods of extraordinary servitude stubbornly persist and the pain, like the profit, remains unevenly distributed. Following a backlash, in August 2017 the popular “FaceApp” removed a series of racially themed filters it had issued. The app had allowed digital blackface, yellowface, brownface, and a Caucasian setting to be added to selfies. Inequality, now sedimented into institutions and machines as materialized abstractions and designed into apparatuses, operationalizes historically variegated injustice, to produce and reproduce a planetary culture that at bottom is founded upon racism, gender inequality, national and cultural codifications, modern slavery, and a near total dispossession for billions. Machines, too, must be understood as racial formations. Given the data-logical nature of financialized systems underpinning “cultural” expression and iterated in and as machines, it is no surprise that Facebook’s machine-learning algorithm “Deep Face” imaged the minimally recognizable human face as that of a white man. Converting social life and social history into digital information and digital machines facilitates the as yet un-transcendable program of quantification that runs parallel to social-historical processes of social differentiation for the purpose of accumulation. The social emerges not as an abstract idea, but as a concrete substrate of computation. Sociality is posited then programmed as a series of leveraged accumulation strategies operating above or below or explicitly in and through everyday consciousness. Public faces are forms of data visualization and, circulating as images, are both programs and programmable. Bodies become “necessary media” of machinic digital operations that require from us (us bodies) attention, cognition, neuro-power, virtuosity, and sheer survival. As the auto-enthnography that is critical theory in the West might indicate, the remainders—interiorities and isles of awareness that fall away from informatic throughput—are in large part melancholic, cynical, disaffected, and abject laments. The rise of actually existing digitality thus appears as inseparable from the development and intensification of capitalism, that is, of media technologies as media of capital, which is also to say as media for the leveraging of agency and representation, such that decisions are made hierarchically and systemically while many aspects of life become almost unrepresentable and thus also unknown and unknowable. The ordinary taxonomies of social history continue to index zones and inflection points of this total and in certain definitive respects totalitarian process of digital enclosure. Our situation is effectively one of platform totalitarianism in which (the social) metabolism itself is captured by a leveraged exchange with capital and our media and machines are not only social relations but racial formations. This leveraged exchange of metabolism for forms of currency at rates set by platform capitalism is managed by ambient and ubiquitous computation, an electro-mechanical network that is composed primarily of fixed capital. The skeins of accumulation by means of informatic uptake lay closely upon body, mind, and time, and what value is extracted are the products of these. Thought and feeling are rendered quantifiable, computable, and indeed programmable. However, it is always a mistake to imagine that the impact of technology flows only in one direction: technical form emerges in a dialectics of domination and struggle. The global, technical evolution in the scale and granularity of the metabolic capture of what was once called labor power and social cooperation—a capture that fragments and cellularizes populations as well as bodies, minds, and neural networks—is not without its emancipatory potentials, as a Benjamin or a Brecht might remind us were they alive today. “The bad new things” are built out of and in response to new forms of struggle, and as Antonio Negri has always emphasized, the innovations of capitalist techné come from below, from the ways that the oppressed outflank domination and persist in living. A survey machine for customer feedback on the "immigration experience"—as long as the feedback is expressed in the form of smiley or frowny emojis. Towards a Reclamation of Value How then to investigate the capture and neutralization of the political domain and its uncountable longings by media-interfaced Computational Capitalism? How to transform and reprogram the failing powers of analysis, sensibility, and action such that they may function beyond the horizon of capitalist control? Four main hypothesis can guide us: 1) Computational Capitalism is an ambient financial calculus of value extraction working through any and all media. 2) Computational Capitalism is a development of Racial Capitalism and is thus also Computational Colonialism: vectors of race, gender, nation, sexuality, and other forms of social difference have been configured by and as strategies of value extraction and, like “structural racism,” have been sedimented into the operating systems and machine architectures of our machines. 3) The specter of revolution is everywhere visible if one knows how to see it. 4) For the first time in history a thoroughgoing revolution is possible that does not replicate the failed strategies of the radical break so tragically characteristic of twentieth-century revolutionary movements, but instead works to decolonize computation by transforming the money-form from within. I take it as axiomatic that the items telegraphically listed in the previous paragraph have become inseparable. What we thought of simply as computation is in fact computational capital—a supple and adaptive machine-mediated calculus on the social metabolism, one that can be gleaned through a deeper reflection on the notion of convergence. To illustrate aspects of convergence, we note that racialization and nationalization, along with regimes of gender, sexuality, borders, and incarceration, are part and parcel of the overall process of corporeal inscription, codification, and programmatic control endemic to digitization. Niche marketing and profiling are but two of the ways in which our bodies and practices are coded for capitalist and state-capitalist processing. One could add here the attempted subsumption of entire demographics under codifications indexed by “thug” and “terrorist.” Historical codes, including but not limited to race, gender, nation, class, and sexuality, are inscribed on our bodies, read, written, and rewritten by informatic machines. This functionalization of social difference (representational, biometric), to say nothing of the branding and scarring of bodies that is both past and present at so many levels, serves both as a means and a medium of capitalization and value extraction and as a necessary substrate to the development of computation. Within and at the scenes of inscription, the code works us and we work the code—again with historically overdetermined statistical variance. This is how it is at both the micro and the macro levels of struggle and organization. IBM’s role in the Holocaust, to give but one example, must also be understood as the Holocaust’s role in IBM and in the development of Hollerith punch cards and computational architectures, including search engines. Sociality and global lifetimes themselves have become the conditions of possibility for what, writ large, is the totalitarian emergence of the World Computer. That is why no existing political discourse can approach this horizon because current concepts and the activities of thought itself are fully circumscribed by it—ideas themselves have become operators (media) fully functionalized by and in the matrix of information. Understanding the transformation of semiotic process by information functioning as a form of capital, we can take the general formula for capital M-C-M’ (where M is money, C is commodity and, M’ is a greater quantity of money) and rewrite it as M-I-C-I’-M’, where I is image and C is code. The commodity as a distributed social relation has, with computation, become both produced and distributed in nonlinear networked operations that, unlike the assembly line, depend upon digital forms of attention, cognition, images, and codes for full valorization. This dependence on transformed conditions of labor germane to the social factory is (now) true even of older forms of production (e.g., automobiles) inasmuch as they are also networked in the world of information, advertising, Instagram, and the like. The valuation of a commodity requires a calculus of the image that modifies code, as does any interaction that transfers rights and value to said commodity (what used to be called sales). Production, circulation, valuation are all mediated by image and code, and that mediation occurs on a global scale. As the Anthropocene and its derivative concepts might testify, little or nothing remains untouched by this process of computational capital that penetrates down to the level of atoms. Here I want to propose further that this formula can be further modified to read M-I-M’, where I is information. To put this modification simply, money becomes more money through the movement of discrete state machines, the motor force of which is ultimately the bios (what was once thought of as the human life-world) struggling to survive its informatic capture. Labor becomes informatic labor and, as I endeavor to show in The Message is Murder, M-I-M’ means less that the commodity is one form of information, and more that the domain of intelligibility known as “information” directly emerges in the footprint of the value-form. Data visualization by computational processes screen-interfaced with the bios is a fundamental condition of the current regime of accumulation sometimes called post-Fordism. In generating M’ from M, it also effects what Paolo Virno calls “the communism of capital.” The programmable image as a worksite transforms and colonizes nearly all mental, sensual, and neuronal process while submitting them to interoperable regimes of background monetization. This financialization of everyday life, where everyone is forced to continuously throughput information in order to manage volatility and risk, facilitates a machinic enslavement profoundly enabled by and integrated with inherited forms of oppression. Navigating the matrix of capital-information is not an option, it is a matter of survival. Somewhere along the way, “consumer society” and “conspicuous consumption” became a semiotic game of survival. In the dominant order, these encodings are among the terms of wealth and power and only those who strive to organize in accord with a different order (or disorder) altogether have more than an inkling that there are better ways to be. We are dealing with the failure of revolutions, the overcoding of bodies and practices, and the absorption of political energy by strategies of accumulation. Computational capital names the integration of discrete state machines with fixed capital and sociality such that Marx’s “vast automaton” has become a global financialized socio-cybernetic system. “Politics” has been operationally reduced to a mere subroutine in the encroachment of this computationally integrated system on planetary life, and as Harney and Moten have pointedly underscored, “politics” and “policy” are today always on the side of the state—and the state is a state of capital.

# 1ar Case

### OV

### Logistics have infiltrated debate – concession of the Greer evidence means the role of the judge is to focus on debate as planning like the Stonewall riots – Harney reminds us that this logic preserves debtedness toward each other and has culminated in a form of Operations Management that causes war, genocide and violence through the logic of self authoritization. Thus the 1ac is a move towards a Haptics Job guarantee which is a process of caring for one another in the space known as the undercommons to pay our debt to one another which is only possible through forms of hapticality.

### AT: Presumption

#### Reject presumption –

#### a. Conservative – it pre-supposes the status quo is good and safe when the status quo is risky and staying in it is bad which is the system-justification the 1AC is critiques

#### b. Will to Productivity – Within the realm of logistical productivity debate must be transferred into planning for the future like the Louisville Project or blackened debate, moving debate away from policy is good.

# 1ar Framework Blocks

## Framework

### T/L

#### 1] I can weigh the case

1. **Mooting 6 min of offense**
2. **Leveraging the case is part of debate, if it was a policy aff and a disad I leverage the policy aff**
3. **L/T – our model is accessible which avoids white echo-chamber spaces**

#### 2] I meet: Haptic jobs guarantees are a reshaping of the way that federal jobs guarantees are implemented – hapticality occurs in the under commons as a system of caring for one another to rupture logistics, which functionally meets the resolution. Pragmatics first because a semantic interpretation always relies on a pragmatic justification.

#### 3] C/I – the 1AC must engage in planning on the Resolutional Question – a] Core of the Topic and predictable for those in the Undercommons, b] Non-exclusionary since it engages in Collective Care, c] exports K v K Debates outweigh since they generate portable skills and survival skills which outweighs on scope

#### 4] Top-Level DA’s:

#### a] Logic of Correction DA – that’s Greer – Policy marks survival and disorder which creates static humanist subjects and marks otherized bodies for extermination – i.e. calling the police on black debaters

#### b] General Antagonism DA – that’s Moten and Harney – grouping all “K Debaters” together without ever accounting for difference – creates coercive subject formation which ruins individualisms and ties us into commonality

#### c] Cruel Optimism DA – that’s Moten and Harney - Forcing voting as purely political views violence as a party problem, not a paradigm one – constantly funnels new Presidents that only shift the aesthetic of genocidal management – results in racial battle fatigue and psychological violence

**d] Logistical Capitalism DA – The resolution’s call to provide a federal jobs guarantee strengthens the system of logistic capitalism because it provides the United States with the jurisdiction to access the topographical flow of production through capital labor, but that productivity is useless and doesn’t achieve success within logistics which was done on the case page.**

#### 5] Fairness Debate:

#### a] Fairness isn’t an impact – if we’ve won the Game is violent, you shouldn’t preserve it – if we win Framing – our args come 1st

#### b] Fairness 1st is a Fallacy of Origin – shuts down revolutionary potential by refusing to question the grounds we debate in – this is a sequencing question

#### lbl

#### 6] TVA solves none the Aff – a] It’s what debate could be, but not should – teams will always run to the margins w/ Policy instead of Planning, b] Cruel Optimism DA takes it out – future-not-yet realized which always postpones the power of here-and-now

#### 7] Ground should control limits –they have offense from robust case debates on humanism, the state, the law, politics, jobs guarentees, etc. along with critical ground including Afropess, Movements, Cap, Baudrillard.

### 1ar – SSD

#### The resolution is negative state action – reading on the negative means K’s are less likely to win due to the resolutions attempt to deradicalize logistical scholarship.

#### Teams read FW in the 1ar against the K meaning their model of debate just allows the continuation of disregarding actual discussions of our scholarship through false hypothetical scenarios.

### 1ar – Skills

#### 1] Through counter-logistically the affirmative creates a pedagogical model that creates skills that allow social kinship and fugitive resistance to the structure of logistics.

#### 2] Even if their skills spill over they just lead to debaters becoming fucked up policy makers like Jason Patil who tortures for the United States or Michael Gottlieb who engages in COIN operations in Afghanistan both of which were in policy debate.

### 1ar – Clash

#### We solve clash – we provide a model of debate that constantly questions the ontological and metaphysical foundations of the resolutional questions and allow discussions over structures of violence and theories of power.

### 1ar – Truth Testing

#### There is no bright line for truth testing – Their case arguments, off case, and the ground we provide all prove why you have the ability to effectively test the aff.

# 1ar Kritik Blocks

## K – Capitalism

**1ar – Top Level**

1. **Top Level framing: Capitalism has shifted from creating hierarchies of control through inclusion but rather control from access. Logistical Capitalism streamlines individuals into containers. This frames the way you view the Links because Sociality is the Status Quo and the Alt trades-off with it by expanding corporate influence.**
2. **The Aff comes 1st – you should only vote on impacts you can control – voting Aff acts as a refusal of governability to generate Sociality by using logistics against itself in-here vs the Alt’s claim of a vague extinction impact out-there. The Aff comes prior because logistical capitalism is happening right now.**
3. **Perm do the alternative through the lens of the aff – Our Moten and Harney evidence about sociality solves all of their collectivity arguments because our strategy allows black people to engage in movements that resist governmental structures.**
4. **Link Turn – Hapticality undercuts the smooth flows of Disaster Capitalism that Robinson concludes would lead to War and Climate Change – Logistical Capitalism is never-ending and creates crises for profit which makes the K impacts inevitable.**
5. **Crackdown DA: Their alternative makes their movements and collective organizing transparent to the government which provides the state with the justification for surveillance and attacking protesters i.e. The red scare when communists were tracked and targeted – their alternative gets coopted and leads to more violence specifically against black populations.**
6. **Governance DA: Framing the Aff as “ceding the political” is a means of trapping blackness within a hold of political death that becomes inevitable in a state of paraontology. The Alt is inevitably co-opted by Anti-Black forms of governance**
7. **Alt can’t solve the Aff – Sociality is an embracement of the hold that operates in the frequencies outside the law – policy can never access it because blackness is always locked in opposition to those structures.**
8. **Pathologization DA : Their enforcement of a specific form of collectivity onto black bodies pathologizes resistance and re-instates Anti-Blackness**

**Jain 17** (Uday, PhD student at University of Chicago, MA (Hons) Political Science at the University of Edinburgh, “White Marxism: A Critique of Jacobin Magazine” 8/11/17 https://newsocialist.org.uk/white-marxism-critique/)

It is in this spirit I propose the following thesis**. As long as the emergent Jacobin-centred public sphere refuses to seriously engage with what they have derisively termed “identity” politics, it will alienate the most vital sections of a twenty-first century Marxist coalition and repeat the mistakes made by white socialist movements in the Western core** throughout the twentieth century. As I will discuss in the conclusion, both Corbynism in the UK, and the Jacobin-centred public sphere more broadly, have much to gain from a serious engagement with what the latter have derisively termed “identitarian Leftism”. Foregrounding the histories, victories, and struggles of indigenous, Black, queer, feminist, disabilities, and migrant movements and how they have successfully theorized and contested patriarchal, racial, capitalist, and imperialist hierarchies only deepens a socialist analysis and ensures that the failures of exclusionary, one-dimensional forms of organising are not repeated. I use the term Jacobin-centred public sphere advisedly. The magazine’s wide range of published work includes a range of positions on race, gender, and class that can’t easily be categorized as being simply for or against identity politics as such. Yet, a sense remains – one that is substantiated by the tone and the content of strong polemical interventions by Vivek Chibber, Walter Benn Michaels, Nivedita Majumdar, and Adolph Reed - that **one story that Jacobin is always ready to tell is the story of the apparent betrayal of class politics by an American “Identitarian Left”.** The Fable of the Non-identitarian and identitarian Left The story goes something like this. There was once a non-identitarian left, a Left in America that emphasized nothing but class, that picked only the right battles and won them. This Left had its heyday in the unionist movements from the 1920s to the 1940s and brought about many of the victories of FDR’s New Deal. It had all the strengths of a trade-unionist organization. It was working-class, firm, strong, and decisive. Then starting in the 1960s, with the cultural revolution and the emergence of a theoretically prolix post-modernism, a demonic identity politics emerged fully-formed – ready to be appropriated by the bourgeoisie and destroy this powerful class-first Left once and for all. These New Leftists got so obsessed with philosophical and literary speculation about cultural oppression that they lost track of the real issues. So keyed into ‘intersectionality’ were these identitarians that vigourous contestation against the boss fell by the wayside. In fact, **Michaels suggests, this obsession with identity was a way for these ‘Leftists’ to mask their own complicity with the bourgeois ruling class in its legitimation of a diversified capitalism.** These New Leftists retreated to the academy, conjuring up ever more intricate and complex critiques of capitalism without ever offering a clear picture of how to fight it. Chibber adds that the misfortune of “social theory classes” in the last twenty-five years has been to make Leftists too obsessed with “margins”, misunderstanding the centrality of the working-class as a revolutionary subject. And so these Jacobin contributors – often promoted and foregrounded in the Jacobin public sphere - registered their profound intellectual and political disagreement with the post-1960s academic and political Left. Intersectional thought, cultural politics, identity politics, all of these tendencies fragmented a united Left by focusing on the fragments and the margins. They created a Left too theory-minded to understand the bloody realities of capturing power. These elitist “identitarian” academics and activists, born of the 1960s cultural revolutions, are held responsible for misunderstanding the basics of a Marxist class war and running the “Left” into a cul-de-sac that they deserve to stay in if they keep insisting on their current modes of thought and action. The role of Jacobin or at least these rather polemical interventions in the Jacobin pages is to bring class back, to make the “Left” Left again, to make the “Left” great again; and get us going on the march to working-class victory. White Marxism? **The elisions and confusions entailed in this anti-identitarian story go a long way in explaining why** in many radical circles **Jacobin is** now seen, fairly or unfairly, as a **white socialist** magazine. A magazine intent on erasing all the historic gains made by feminists, Black, and indigenous radical movements in favour of a reductionist, white-centric politics that harks back to a supposed golden age of the 1940s [1]. First of all, words have meaning. **When** such senior academics and activists as **Michaels, Reed,** Chibber, and Majumdar **go out of their way to single out “intersectionality”, frames of analysis that focuses on the “margins”, and questions of “identity” as responsible for the comprehensive abatement of class politics in the American left, they can’t but be aware that they are not so subtly pinning the responsibility for this failure on Black feminists**. After all, Kimberlé Crenshaw’s famous article, on how Black women’s experiences of male violence are conditioned by specific intersections of racism and sexism in American society, an analysis then missed in antiracist and feminist debates, was titled “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color”. **Intersectionality as a political and intellectual project was developed by Black women scholars and activists to address the simple fact that as Black women, they are materially exploited, excluded, and subject to violence, due to distinct hierarchical structures that are largely ignored by a white, patriarchal, and racial capitalist society**. In fighting and naming this oppression, they necessarily had to complicate easy unities of a given working-class identity, or even a unified Black experience to lay out precisely how patriarchal violence and racial capitalism affected Black women distinctly from how it affected white men, how it exploited Black working-class women differently from how it exploited white working-class men. If one reads anything in the Black feminist canon, such as books and articles by Audre Lorde, bell hooks, Angela Davis, Patricia Hill Collins, or Kimberlé Crenshaw, and this is not mentioning the hundreds of thousands of other scholars and activists who continue this work, one can scarcely get a sense that they are uninterested in class or have backgrounded capitalism and class politics for a simplistic “identitarianism”. One wonders if those who propound this anti-Identitarian line have actually read a word of Black feminist literature at all. Idealist Fables Second, **this anti-Identitarian fable is a profoundly idealist**, and as such is an anti-Marxist, analysis of the history of the last sixty years. **It presumes that the battle between labour and capital was won entirely by capital in the academies of the Western core**. In this story, somehow simultaneously, Stuart Hall, Selma James, Silvia Federici, Robin D. G. Kelley, Judith Butler, and scores of other leading Leftists around the world nefariously invented post-modernism to fit the ideological requirements of neoliberalism and thus convinced their many students to stop fighting capital and instead take up fighting endless social media wars about culture and popular representations of identity. **The contempt one must have for feminists’ essential work on describing the mutual imbrication of patriarchy and capitalism** – of the central role of gender in capitalist society’s division of labour and its extraction of surplus value by rendering childcare and housework unpaid – **to make this case is startling**. On the one hand, **the story completely misses the foundational new insights and frameworks that so many Marxists in so many different spaces and countries developed** in understanding the racial, gendered, and imperial dimensions of modern capitalism. Dimensions that actively hinder worker-solidarity and worker-leadership and that must be understood to sustain any successful revolutionary politics. On the other hand, **it deeply misunderstands the history of the post-1960s class struggle**. **Neoliberalism didn’t win because post-modernism hypnotized the Western core’s middle classes into somnolence. Neoliberalism won because the ruling classes fought** and fought **with the might of the state.** Neoliberalism also won because the social-democratic parties that the middle-classes of the Western core continued to vote for essentially gave up on their working-class constituencies. Social-democratic parties that were supported by unions representing a labour aristocracy more interested in maintaining a nationalist class compromise with large firms than challenging the racial, gendered, and imperialist relations of expropriation which sustained Western economic growth. In the US, the Democratic party went on to break unions, retrenched the welfare state, perpetuated a racial backlash to Black power in the 1960s in the form of brutal mass incarceration, and undertook permanent war in the political-economic peripheries to shore up imperial value-chains. The very scholars and organizers who most astutely theorized, identified and enacted important acts of rebellion to halt the advance of heterosexist patriarchal imperialist capitalism – as bell hooks puts it - come under fire from Jacobin radicals for missing class altogether. The Freedom to make inconvenient Arguments? Now, those in the Jacobin public sphere who hold these views have responded to these critiques in two ways. One, they say that all the people named above are people of colour, and so to critique these academics as perpetuating a “white socialism” is to erase their identity and thus perpetuate a new form of erasure of POC views that are apparently “inconvenient” for most radicals. This is a bad-faith critique, because if the Jacobin public-sphere is against the confusions of identity politics altogether, then why put forward the identities of these scholars as relevant to the discussion at all? Presumably, this is to get at the arbitrariness and meaningless of one’s identity positions in trying to explain one’s political positions, and that a clean line cannot be drawn from the former to the latter. That to describe a person of colour’s political analysis as “white” is to deny them the freedom to make inconvenient arguments. But if race, gender, and empire are central dimensions of contemporary capitalist exploitation, and we have seen above a series of writers who seem interested in minimizing these dimensions for a nationalist class-first analysis; the consequences of such an analysis are that by being blind to how class itself is racialized and gendered, it would fail to question the very hierarchies people of colour and feminists are trying to fight. Second, some in the Jacobin public sphere respond by lumping together feminists on the radical left and radical people of colour who make these substantial critiques with centrists and contemporary neoliberals who have weaponised a superficial politics of representation as a single, all-powerful group: the Identitarian left. Once again, any knowledge of the history of the Black, feminist, and LGBTQ movements in the US will yield the simple fact that they have been and continue to be heavily contested between liberal reformist and radical Marxist currents - among many others - and that no generalization can be made about these large mobilizations as inherently neo-liberal. These puzzling arguments merely heighten the sense that such anti-identitarian critiques are woefully under-theorised and are perhaps made to incite controversy and anger more than thought and action. The fact of the matter is that Jacobin’s politics are already intersectional to some degree. That they consistently foreground the work of leading scholars and activists from all of the “identitarian” movements suggests that they implicitly presuppose the radical victories that identity politics has won for the radical Left: the inclusion of women, people of colour, indigenous people, lesbian, gay, trans and queer people, and a principled international solidarity with anti-imperialist struggles around the world at the heart of radical politics. **There seems to be no need to prosecute this clumsy culture-war against such a poorly defined identitarianism per se, especially one that pointedly appears to erase the significant contributions that Black feminists have made in theorizing and organizing large communities against neoliberalism**; most recently in leading the Movement for Black Lives and bringing forward prison abolition as a central struggle in the fight against racial capitalism. Words have meaning, and they have consequences. **Continuing to deplore “the margins” as a frame of analysis and insisting on an imagined working-class unity will only continue to antagonize those on the Left who have long been organizing against patriarchal imperialist racial capitalism** and will continue to do so, with or without certain Jacobin contributors’ seal of approval on the effectiveness of their politics. Practical Consequences What are some other practical consequences of this line of analysis? One, it is perniciously false on its own terms and refuses to engage seriously with radical queer, feminist, Black, and internationalist political movements that have continued to contest patriarchal racial capitalism in the last forty years: from forcing American civil society, the state, insurance, and pharmaceutical industries to address the treatment of HIV/AIDS, to materially denting the ability of Israel to carry out business and promote apologia for its apartheid regime around the world, to building coalitions with prisoners that bring together violently policed working-class Black and Latino communities in deindustrialized cities (as Ruth Wilson Gilmore documents in “Golden Gulag”). Indeed, the recent legislative victory of forcing Republican senators to vote against their own healthcare bill was secured to a large extent by the courage and steadfast mobilization of disability rights campaigners in the past year. Through personal testimonies and consistently disruptive direct action, they have made it clear that Trump’s healthcare bill is going to kill them; that their illnesses incur medical costs which they are not able to pay, that the rise in insurance premiums will be fatal. The lens of disability and race forcing us to confront the fact that capitalist healthcare is eugenics. If one tries to explain these victories as either identitarian reformism on the one hand, or inadequate grasps at class struggle on the other; one misses the significantly novel ways in which they have helped form radical communities that make a working-class rather than presume one. Finally, in failing to be internationalist, this kind of class-first analysis – one which relies on a notion of an accepted common sense which any socialist politics should effectively mobilize (a notion usefully criticized in this piece in New Socialist) fails to challenge pervasive white-supremacist and bourgeois ideas about who it is that constitutes a worker, and who a foreign parasite, who it is that can govern themselves and who needs to be policed, or deported. The temptation to mobilize what appears so obviously “working-class angst” without interrogating how it is racialized and gendered or whether the targets are capitalists and not migrant workers is something UK Labour has consistently struggled with before and during the era of Blairism. In recent comments, Jeremy Corbyn offered a plainly false argument that it was the “wholesale importation” of Central European workers which destroyed labour conditions in the construction industry. As Maya Goodfellow argues here, migration doesn’t bring down wages, union-busting does. Further, Corbyn’s comments, like much discussion around Brexit, made no mention of non-EU nationals: Asian and African migrants living in the UK. Support for Leave and more broadly, support for “controls on immigration” is to a measurable degree driven by racial animus towards non-European migrants. A socialist Labour movement must respond by challenging these sentiments on the level of ideology and putting forth a clear legislative agenda for abolishing Theresa May’s (and Tony Blair’s) brutal Home Office and its ICE-like incarceration and deportation regime.

### 1ar – Hester

#### Link Turn – The affirmative’s theorization of logistically and blackness as the focal point for analysis isn’t fragmented but rather allows us to better understand all forms of violence through the ways that anti-black violence make it possible.

#### Links to Them – They understand materiality and pragmatism as the only forms of knowledge production useful to progress. Meaning they disavow spiritual and psychological forms of reprieve that the right capitalizes on to continue forms of violence.

### 1ar – Fisher

#### This Fisher card relies on them winning that capitalism is a prior and necessary discussion to logistically and blackness – If we win their theory of power is incorrect then you reject this card because their model of resistance obfuscates the role of blackness in the creation and maintenance of capitalism.

#### This evidence works for everyone except black people – Attempting to stray from identity categories is impossible, black people are defined by their epidermal schema making it intrinsic to their existence.

**1ar – Burgum**

1. **This card is pathology – Their characterization of the aff as apathetic recreates tropes of blackness as useless, inaccurate, and not serious enough to refute. Our actions are the ONLY real movement because we create a departure from status quo paradigms of whiteness**
2. **Turn - Their lens of resistance only being material is violent because it disregards all forms of black solidarity that are seen as not good enough which creates a violent lash out and a trade-off with the movements towards sociality the aff tries to create.**

### 1ar - Alvarez

#### Link Turn – We destroy the process of communicative capitalism because instead of falling into the assembly line of debate we engage in a process of logistically that disrupts the smooth flow of capitalism.

#### Links to them – Their alternative is a discursive practice that fails to engage in any material action, they are seduced by the game of debate just as much if not more than us.

**1ar – Extinction (0:20)**

**Their apocalyptic rhetoric is used to fracture black movements and leads to the same forms of neoliberal silencing of black participation they try to solve**

**Neimanis** 20**15** – Astrida Neimanis, PhD, Lecturer at the University of Sydney, Associate Editor of the journal *Environmental Humanities* (Duke University Press); Cecilia Åsberg, PhD, Full Professor and chair of Gender, Nature, Culture at Linköping University, Sweden; Johan Hedren, PhD, Associate Professor of Water and Environmental Studies, Linköping University (“Four Problems, Four Directions for Environmental Humanities: Toward Critical Posthumanities for the Anthropocene,” *Ethics and the Environment* doi: 10.2979/ethicsenviro.20.1.67)

“Climate Change: Arctic Sea Ice Melting Twice as Fast as Models Predict” (Osborne 2014);“Climate change is 'great demon of our day'” (Trimmer 2014); “Climate change more dangerous than terrorism” (Wolfgang 2015). This is a small sample of local and global headlines from both major news outlets and more specialized blogs from 2014 and 2015, but such **dire surmisals pepper our media daily**. As with any discourse, **communication is dependent not only on the “facts” but on connotations, associations, imagery and tone.** As this sample of climate change communication highlights, **in the context of the Anthropocene, a negative tone of urgency is taking considerable hold.** While issues such as water pollution, habitat loss, and rising global temperatures are certainly troubling, **consistently negative, even apocalyptic, framing may not lead to effective citizen participation and may stifle opportunities for innovative thinking around environmental challenges. Uncertainty about the future may not be avoidable, but how we frame such uncertainty can have significant impact.** For example, as recent studies by Morton et al. demonstrate, “**higher uncertainty combined with a negative frame** (highlighting possible losses) **decreased individual intentions to behave environmentally**. However when higher uncertainty was combined with a positive frame (highlighting the possibility of losses not materializing) this produced stronger intentions to act” (Morton et al. 2011, 103). Other researchers point out that apocalyptic narratives may have some awareness-raising value (e.g. Yusoff and Gabrys 2011), but we aver that they must be balanced with alternative narratives that can inspire more creative problem solving and a strong sense of participation and involvement. It is worth pointing out that **apocalyptic or doomsday scenarios are** also, perhaps somewhat more **perniciously, related to prior discourses within sociobiology that worked to pose “no future” scenarios for already vulnerable populations (usually racialized and colonized people, and of low socio-economic means).** As Yasmin Gunaratnam and Nigel Clark highlight, drawing on the work of Paul Gilroy, **white supremacism has often functioned through a denial of the right of black populations to the future or to be future-oriented. These authors relate this to climate change in terms of a “moral climatology” that must be fought against** **through a close intertwining of questions of racial justice with climate justice ones** (Gunaratnam and Clark 2012). **This** example **could be extrapolated to all sorts of environmental “crises” that position colonized, marginalized or vulnerable groups at the brink of disaster** and extinction—**not only are they materially more vulnerable** to many forms of ecological generation, **but their agency and future imaginaries are also placed under erasure discursively.** Moreover, we could link this problem directly to the lack of investment that many elite communities in the temperate global North and West may feel in regards to climate change—a complacence that is more easily enacted when one still has a discursive link the future.

# 1ar TT Blocks

## AT Truth Testing

### TT proper

#### A2 A priori reasoning – Prefer sociology –

#### [1] It actually determines the subject in the material world, even if philosophy can explain the subject rationally, the world is not a thought experiment

#### [2] The a priori has been reproduced by logistics– even if there was an a priori subject that construction has been replaced by whiteness

#### [3] Hijack – once the subject is philosophically formulated it interacts in the material world through sociology which means the aff comes first.

#### A2 Logic – Assumes you’re winning truth testing is THE rule which we’ve answered

#### A2 Fiat illusory – That’s offense for us – proves debate is meaningless because it doesn’t do shit

#### A2 Inclusion –

#### [1] Impact turn – the university is violent, and we should force its collapse

#### [2] Analysis of the material world is good – debate exists in the real world so we’re ethically responsible for the violence of the space.

#### A2 Normativity –

#### [1] There’s nothing more normative than a sociological condition that structures the entire world – the aff is a pre-req to any normative question since they’re all conditioned by the hyperreal

#### [2] We question epistemology – that’s a prior q to any ethical calculus.

#### A2 Isomorphism –

#### [1] Scalar mechanisms are preferable since binary questions are irresolvable if both have offense

#### [2] TT doesn’t solve – we can still weigh offense.

#### A2 Echo-chamber – We don’t claim to resolve jack, that’s the point of the aff.

#### A2 Langseth – The point is to cause paradoxes, this is offense for the aff since it proves the meaninglessness of the university and its rules

#### A2 Affirm and Negate – To negate means *to contradict*[[1]](#footnote-1) affirm means to express agreement[[2]](#footnote-2) - proves no link to constitutivism or jurisdiction.

#### A2 Constitutivism –

#### [1] Conflates absolute rules for suggestions – you deduce a possible meaning of the ballot from a definition, that’s not a constitutive claim like sides and speech times

#### [2] Even if you win we should follow the rule, breaking it is offense for us since it proves the absolute meaninglessness of the enforcement of norms

### Vote aff

#### [1] Auto-affirm to prevent logistical override– if we win the method of the aff then it proves the system cannot avoid its own symbolic obligation which proves you have a jurisdictional obligation to vote aff for no reason.

#### [2] It’s impossible to defeat the aff from other indexes since every other index has been influenced by logistics so using them to criticize our aff proves it true since logistical structures influenced it and is trying to take down our movement

#### [3] Denying the aff is impossible – since we are an exposure of productive capital, any argument starts from the premise the aff is true, but to deny the aff is to deny any referent for your surroundings and why you are in here.

# 1ar Counterplan Blocks

**1ar – Topic Counterplans**

#### Top level framing issue: We are winning a theorization about the way arms sales is part of a larger system of logistically and neoliberalism – meaning even if they claim to address arms sales, the inability to question the larger structure leads to a recreation of international violence through interventionism and financialization.

#### Cross apply the Logistical Capitalism DA from the FW flow – The negative’s counterplan strengthens the system of logistical capitalism because it provides the United States with the international jurisdiction to access the topographical flow of resources across the geopolitical schema – That causes interventionist violence, domestic militarization through the 1033, and international surveillance systems.

1. **Harmonization Turn – The counterplan is an attempt to harmonize the world through the imposition of Western values and reinforces global interventionism as the violent perfection of white liberalism and anti-black violence.**

**Ohenewah 15** (Ohenewah, Christine E. "Liberalism: An Obstacle to Black Unification." Tapestries: Interwoven voices of local and global identities 4.1 (2015): 21.) /aymen

**International discourse has long rendered liberalism as an ideology of optimism, aiming to attain specific objectives: the proliferation of democracy, support for human rights, capitalist expansion, international cooperation, and pacifism.** Liberal ideology affirms that the establishment of ‘correct’ political systems and domestic groups is likely to encourage states to engage in international cooperation. Although **seemingly benign in its efforts to reinforce international harmony,** I contend **that liberalism augments cultural hegemony and homogenization**. As a mode of Western imperialism, it assumes the guise of world peace to ensure self-interests and ‘ideal’ paradigms, while increasing the global jurisdiction of dominant nation-states. Scholar Patrick Morgan asserts, “It is not that international politics must eventually embrace and inculcate these particular norms, but that, as an elaborate social activity, international politics needs elements of community including a structure of norms. Liberalists are busy pushing their preferred norms with this in mind.” Said another way, states must seek cooperation rather than sovereignty and autonomy and be flexible towards embracing normalized values. We must however question the ‘acceptance of norms’ as a feature of liberalism. In analyzing the mission to spread liberalism to other non-democratic countries**, we must interrogate which actors are promoting preferred norms and practices for the international community and at whose expense these norms are being enforced**. **conquests and national glory** (Solingen 1998). Proponents also defend that liberalism is marked by a strong support for democracy, which is crucial to the legitimacy of governmental systems. **Western nations have historically upheld this belief by advocating democracy as a means to restore peace within a region**. In this vein, scholars contend that sovereignty is not simply a right to national autonomy**; it is the responsibility of a government to treat its society with decency. Failure to do so may result in international intervention**. Said another way, **liberalism refuses to endorse violence as a coercive method unless the political order in question denies all opportunity for peaceful, democratic transition** (Martin 1948). Proponents of liberalism finally observe that liberal ideology supports rights and opportunities for women, religious freedoms, and civil rights, among many others. They argue that within liberal ideology, the preservation of human rights is one of its most salient characteristics, as it is derived from states’ long-held concerns about how their prominent religious and ethnic groups are treated by neighboring states. Diplomatic pressures, military interventions, and peace agreements further agitate such concerns (Krasner 1999). Where human rights are involved, liberalism further encourages self-determination, or the acceptance of the present world order’s norms and values, over separatism, claiming that states should deemphasize sovereignty and autonomy. Because most countries are multiethnic, endorsing separatism would invite chaotic dissolutions by fracturing the unity of international states. In examining the arguments in favor of liberalism, it is clear that proponents view this ideology as a means of fostering international cohesion. States are generally non-strict about their autonomy and center sovereignty on their government’s obligation to treat its society with decency. A nation’s inability to do this, however, may result in international intervention. Liberalism further commits itself to propagating capitalist and democratic values on a global scale, and in addition to defending human rights, the notion of self-determination is also one of its essential components. The above claims portray liberalism as a wholly optimistic approach that holds the interests of states at heart and offers a resolution for enhancing world peace. I however contend that **liberalism’s attempts to reduce state autonomy, expand capitalism and democracy, and augment international cooperation convey a fundamental hypocrisy**. **Proponents of liberalism fail to deeply examine whom the values of capitalism and democracy are modeled after**, **who benefits from promoting such norms**, **and which entities bear their repercussions**. **This nod towards world homogenization reveals a colonial remnant within modern-day liberalism that reinforces global White supremacy**. Opponents of Liberalism In contrast to its proponents, opponents of liberalism defend that the ideology reflects Western dominance. In its more forceful version**, liberalism is an updated expression of Western imperialism; a rationalization of hegemonic efforts to spread Western values so that the global environment remains palatable for the West**. As Ayers (2009) asserts, “In particular, the regime of ‘democratisation’ and the curtailing of democratic freedom constitute a principal means through which imperial rule is articulated.” This means that Western governments are consistently eager to see the overturn of numerous political systems along with a drastic alteration of their social and economic structures. Ayers further refutes the notion of self-determination that liberalism’s proponents support. For Ayers, **self-determination is a concept based in non-autonomy and signifies the freedom to “embrace rules, norms, and principles of the emerging liberal global order.”**

# 1ar Disadvantage Blocks

## Toolbox

### 1ar – K of Warming

**Climate apocalypticism is used to fracture black solidarity and erases forms of black spiritual hope**

**Neimanis** 15( – Astrida Neimanis, PhD, Lecturer at the University of Sydney, Associate Editor of the journal Environmental Humanities (Duke University Press); Cecilia Åsberg, PhD, Full Professor and chair of Gender, Nature, Culture at Linköping University, Sweden; Johan Hedren, PhD, Associate Professor of Water and Environmental Studies, Linköping University (“Four Problems, Four Directions for Environmental Humanities: Toward Critical Posthumanities for the Anthropocene,” Ethics and the Environment doi: 10.2979/ethicsenviro.20.1.67)

“Climate Change: Arctic Sea Ice Melting Twice as Fast as Models Predict” (Osborne 2014);“Climate change is 'great demon of our day'” (Trimmer 2014); “Climate change more dangerous than terrorism” (Wolfgang 2015). This is a small sample of local and global headlines from both major news outlets and more specialized blogs from 2014 and 2015, but such **dire surmisals pepper our media daily**. As with any discourse, **communication is dependent not only on the “facts” but on connotations, associations, imagery and tone.** As this sample of climate change communication highlights, **in the context of the Anthropocene, a negative tone of urgency is taking considerable hold.** While issues such as water pollution, habitat loss, and rising global temperatures are certainly troubling, **consistently negative, even apocalyptic, framing may not lead to effective citizen participation and may stifle opportunities for innovative thinking around environmental challenges. Uncertainty about the future may not be avoidable, but how we frame such uncertainty can have significant impact.** For example, as recent studies by Morton et al. demonstrate, “**higher uncertainty combined with a negative frame** (highlighting possible losses) **decreased individual intentions to behave environmentally**. However when higher uncertainty was combined with a positive frame (highlighting the possibility of losses not materializing) this produced stronger intentions to act” (Morton et al. 2011, 103). Other researchers point out that apocalyptic narratives may have some awareness-raising value (e.g. Yusoff and Gabrys 2011), but we aver that they must be balanced with alternative narratives that can inspire more creative problem solving and a strong sense of participation and involvement. It is worth pointing out that **apocalyptic or doomsday scenarios are** also, perhaps somewhat more **perniciously, related to prior discourses within sociobiology that worked to pose “no future” scenarios for already vulnerable populations (usually racialized and colonized people, and of low socio-economic means).** As Yasmin Gunaratnam and Nigel Clark highlight, drawing on the work of Paul Gilroy, **white supremacism has often functioned through a denial of the right of black populations to the future or to be future-oriented. These authors relate this to climate change in terms of a “moral climatology” that must be fought against** **through a close intertwining of questions of racial justice with climate justice ones** (Gunaratnam and Clark 2012). **This** example **could be extrapolated to all sorts of environmental “crises” that position colonized, marginalized or vulnerable groups at the brink of disaster** and extinction—**not only are they materially more vulnerable** to many forms of ecological generation, **but their agency and future imaginaries are also placed under erasure discursively.** Moreover, we could link this problem directly to the lack of investment that many elite communities in the temperate global North and West may feel in regards to climate change—a complacence that is more easily enacted when one still has a discursive link the future.

### 1ar – K of Nuclear War

**Emphasis on nuclear war papers over the quotidian forms of nuclear devastation minorities face every day.**

**Omolade 89** [1989, Barbara Omolade is a historian of black women for the past twenty years and an organizer in both the women’s and civil rights/black power movements, “We Speak for the Planet” in “Rocking the ship of state : toward a feminist peace politics”, pp. 172-176] //Elmer

Recent **efforts** by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and President Ronald Reagan **to limit nuclear testing, stockpiling, and weaponry**, while still protecting their own arsenals and selling arms to countries and factions around the world, vividly **demonstrate how "peace" can become an abstract concept within a culture of war**. Many **peace activists are similarly blind to the constant wars and threats of war being waged against people of color and the planet by those who march for "peace" and by those they march against**. These **pacifists, like Gorbachev and Reagan, frequently want people of color to fear what they fear and define peace as they define it.** **They are unmindful that our lands and peoples have already been and are being destroyed as part of the "final solution" of the "color line."** **It is difficult to persuade the remnants of Native American tribes**, **the starving of African deserts**, **and the victims of the Cambodian "killing fields" that nuclear war is the major danger to human life on the planet and that only a nuclear "winter" embodies fear and futurelessness for humanity.** **The peace movement suffers** greatly **from its lack of a historical and holistic perspective, practice, and vision that include the voices and experiences of people of color;** **the movement's goals and messages have therefore been easily coopted and expropriated by world leaders who share the same culture of racial dominance and arrogance**. **The peace movement's racist blinders have divorced peace from freedom,** **from feminism, from education reform, from legal rights, from human rights, from international alliances and friendships, from national liberation, from the particular** (for example, black female, Native American male) **and the general** (human being). Nevertheless, social movements such as **the civil rights-black power movement** in the United States **have always demanded peace with justice, with liberation, and with social and economic reconstruction** and cultural freedom at home and abroad. **The integration of our past and our present holocausts and our struggle to define our own lives and have our basic needs met** **are at the core of the inseparable struggles for world peace and social betterment.** The Achilles heel of the organized peace movement in this country has always been its whiteness. In this multi-racial and racist society, no allwhite movement can have the strength to bring about basic changes. It is axiomatic that basic changes do not occur in any society unless the people who are oppressed move to make them occur. In our society it is people of color who are the most oppressed. Indeed our entire history teaches us that when people of color have organized and struggled-most especially, because of their particular history, Black people-have moved in a more humane direction as a society, toward a better life for all people.1 Western man's whiteness, imagination, enlightened science, and movements toward peace have developed from a culture and history mobilized against women of color. The political advancements of white men have grown directly from the devastation and holocaust of people of color and our lands. This technological and material progress has been in direct proportion to the undevelopment of women of color. Yet the dayto- day survival, political struggles, and rising up of women of color, especially black women in the United States, reveal both complex resistance to holocaust and undevelopment and often conflicted responses to the military and war. The Holocausts Women of color are survivors of and remain casualties of holocausts, and we are direct victims of war-that is, of open armed conflict between countries or between factions within the same country. But women of color were not soldiers, nor did we trade animal pelts or slaves to the white man for guns, nor did we sell or lease our lands to the white man for wealth. Most men and women of color resisted and fought back, were slaughtered, enslaved, and force marched into plantation labor camps to serve the white masters of war and to build their empires and war machines. People of color were and are victims of holocausts-that is, of great and widespread destruction, usually by fire. The world as we knew and created **it was destroyed in a continual scorched earth policy of the white man**. The experience of Jews and other Europeans under the Nazis can teach us the value of understanding the totality of destructive intent, the extensiveness of torture, and the demonical apparatus of war aimed at the human spirit. A Jewish father pushed his daughter from the lines of certain death at Auschwitz and said, "You will be a remembrance-You tell the story. You survive." She lived. He died. Many have criticized the Jews for forcing non-Jews to remember the 6 million Jews who died under the Nazis and for etching the names Auschwitz and Buchenwald, Terezin and Warsaw in our minds. Yet as women of color, we, too, are "remembrances" of all the holocausts against the people of the world. We must remember the names of concentration camps such as Jesus, Justice, Brotherhood, and Integrity, ships that carried millions of African men, women, and children chained and brutalized across the ocean to the "New World." We must remember the Arawaks, the Taino, the Chickasaw, the Choctaw, the Narragansett, the Montauk, the Delaware, and the other Native American names of thousands of U.S. towns that stand for tribes of people who are no more. We must remember the holocausts visited against the Hawaiians, the aboriginal peoples of Australia, the Pacific Island peoples, and the women and children of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. We must remember the slaughter of men and women at Sharpeville, the children of Soweto, and the men of Attica. We must never, ever, forget the children disfigured, the men maimed, and the women broken in our holocausts-we must remember the names, the numbers, the faces, and the stories and teach them to our children and our children's children so the world can never forget our suffering and our courage. Whereas the particularity of the Jewish holocaust under the Nazis is over, our holocausts continue. We are the madres locos (crazy mothers) in the Argentinian square silently demanding news of our missing kin from the fascists who rule. We are the children of El Salvador who see our mothers and fathers shot in front of our eyes. We are the Palestinian and Lebanese women and children overrun by Israeli, Lebanese, and U.S. soldiers. We are the women and children of the bantustans and refugee camps and the prisoners of Robbin Island. We are the starving in the Sahel, the poor in Brazil, the sterilized in Puerto Rico. We are the brothers and sisters of Grenada who carry the seeds of the New Jewel Movement in our hearts, not daring to speak of it with our lipsyet. Our holocaust is South Africa ruled by men who loved Adolf Hitler, who have developed the Nazi techniques of terror to more sophisticated levels. Passes replace the Nazi badges and stars. Skin color is the ultimate badge of persecution. Forced removals of women, children, and the elderly-the "useless appendages of South Africa"-into barren, arid bantustans without resources for survival have replaced the need for concentration camps. Black sex-segregated barracks and cells attached to work sites achieve two objectives: The work camps destroy black family and community life, a presumed source of resistance, and attempt to create human automatons whose purpose is to serve the South African state's drive toward wealth and hegemony. Like other fascist regimes, South Africa disallows any democratic rights to black people; they are denied the right to vote, to dissent, to peaceful assembly, to free speech, and to political representation. The regime has all the typical Nazi-like political apparatus: house arrests of dissenters such as Winnie Mandela; prison murder of protestors such as Stephen Biko; penal colonies such as Robbin Island. Black people, especially children, are routinely arrested without cause, detained without limits, and confronted with the economic and social disparities of a nation built around racial separation. Legally and economically, South African apartheid is structural and institutionalized racial war. The Organization of African Unity's regional intergovernmental meeting in 1984 in Tanzania was called to review and appraise the achievements of the United Nations Decade for Women. The meeting considered South Africa's racist apartheid regime a peace issue. The "regime is an affront to the dignity of all Africans on the continent and a stark reminder of the absence of equality and peace, representing the worst form of institutionalized oppression and strife." Pacifists such as Martin Luther King, Jr. and Mahatma Gandhi who have used nonviolent resistance charged that those who used violence to obtain justice were just as evil as their oppressors. Yet all successful revolutionary movements have used organized violence. This is especially true of national liberation movements that have obtained state power and reorganized the institutions of their nations for the benefit of the people. If men and women in South Africa do not use organized violence, they could remain in the permanent violent state of the slave. Could it be that pacifism and nonviolence cannot become a way of life for the oppressed? Are they only tactics with specific and limited use for protecting people from further violence? For most people in the developing communities and the developing world consistent nonviolence is a luxury; it presumes that those who have and use nonviolent weapons will refrain from using them long enough for nonviolent resisters to win political battles. To survive, peoples in developing countries must use a varied repertoire of issues, tactics, and approaches. Sometimes arms are needed to defeat apartheid and defend freedom in South Africa; sometimes nonviolent demonstrations for justice are the appropriate strategy for protesting the shooting of black teenagers by a white man, such as happened in New York City. **Peace is not merely an absence of 'conflict that enables white middleclass comfort, nor is it simply resistance to nuclear war and war machinery. The litany of "you will be blown up, too" directed by a white man to a black woman obscures the permanency and institutionalization of war, the violence and holocaust that people of color face daily**. Unfortunately, **the holocaust does not only refer to the mass murder of Jews, Christians, and atheists during the Nazi regime; it** also **refers to the permanent institutionalization of war that is part of every fascist and racist regime. The holocaust lives. It is a threat to world peace as pervasive and thorough as nuclear war.**

### 1ar – K of Economic Growth

**Their call for economic growth and security cannot be separated from it’s historical foundations of anti-blackness - the process of asset securitization and financial risk relies on the a priori determination of black bodies *as* interest to be secured in relation to risk.**

**Dannreuther and Kessler 17**(Charles Dannreuther, University of Leeds, UK, Oliver Kessler University of Erfurt, Germany, “Racialised Futures: On Risk, Race and Finance,” Millennium: Journal of International Studies 2017, Vol. 45(3) 356–379, KB

What is important here is that **slave trades were instructive for the development of modern insurance practices upon which financial markets would later grow.** For example, **the practice of defining an interest that can be insured and traded**, **practices which we see today in asset securitisation and credit default swaps**, **shared qualities with the mercantile insurance of the slave trade.** Slave trades were not ‘unique’ and maritime insurance had already developed an extensive pedigree before imperial states emerged. The practice of ‘bottomry’, in which a ship’s captain could draw a debt against the keel of the vessel that would be exonerated should the ship be lost, had been practiced broadly since medieval times.36 The industry was governed by fierce cultural and political opposition to the practices of usury and taking wagers. Italian port cities grew by servicing the insurance requirements of ship companies in the treacherous Mediterranean as Hanseatic practices were outlawed as usury. **Within these cultural constraints on maritime insurance the practice emerged of creating an object that was insurable in order to create an insurance premium to charge a fee against.** This was mentioned explicitly in Williams’ 1803 Treatise On Insurance. He observes that **in order to generate a legitimate financial transaction a specific identity had to be created**:37 **There cannot be an indemnity without a loss nor a loss without an interest.** **A policy**, therefore, **without an interest is not an insurance but only a mere wager**.38 **Slave trades were**, as important subjects of insurance, **also defined as an ‘interest’**, **and so the practice categorised slaves as objects or as cargo.** Indeed **the 1745 Gambling Act, which formally introduced the concept of an ‘insurable interest’ or a property that could be insured against losses**, **included slaves in this category**.39 **The concept of an interest, whose loss was insurable against, was pivotal to the emergence of modern insurance.** The form of property insurable in the maritime trade reflected the wide breadth of economic activities associated with slave trading in this particular period and helped to differentiate ‘modern’ from ‘ancient’ slavery. Roman slaves were often captured and brought home by Legions to take on senior roles as imperial administrators or teachers. In contrast, **New World slavery** was strictly a commercial enterprise. It **flourished through market forces that linked the production of commodities, like sugar, in one continent with consumers in another.** **The slaves were also attributed more sharply delineated racialised characteristics to differentiate their value as assets.**40 **Slaves were wholly treated as the property and chattels of another**, **rather than a serf tied to his master by labour or a worker tied to his job by a wage**. As Paul Fickelman explains: **slavery was not simply a system of exploitive labor. Rather, it was a system of treating people like property** **– without the power to control their own lives, without the right to own land or personal property, without the power to speak out about their own liberty, without the power to even control their families.**41 As a property **the slave could**, either individually or as part of another set of interests, **be insured against measurable risks** **and a fee could be charged.** The rewards generated by slavery for the insurance industry were significant. **Around 15 percent of risks insured by value and a third of maritime premium income was from West Indian and African slave trades.**42 Inikori suggests that **63 percent of premium incomes was from slave trading in the West Indies in the 1790s,**43 **while Eltis catalogues the costs of insurance in the illegal slave trade as fluctuating around 29 percent around Cuba between 1826 and 1865, and between 13 and 24 percent of the total cost around Southern Brazil between 1831 and 1850.**44 **Defined as an interest**, **slaves could be insured in relation to risks.** **Income from premiums could be derived accordingly.** **This allowed insurers to protect traders all over the world and against all manner of risks, including that of apprehension by the authorities.** **Between 1738–1731 the exposure of maritime risk was predominantly orientated to trade between North America and the West Indies.**45 Regardless of the volumes of wealth created through these transactions, **the capacity of the insurance sector to accommodate the sums insured was managed through conditions placed on the interests insured.** **Explicit clauses required that slaves be disciplined: the assured doth hereby agree to warrant the ship sheathed** [**in copper to protect against sea worm damage**], **to take upon himself all loss or damage by death or insurrection of slaves and all loss or damage by prohibited trade**.46 Entering into an insurance contract involved a specific obligation on the insured to take measures to protect their interests. The standards, such as those above, had significant consequences. With slave ships poorly supplied and conditions harsh, their crews were living in poor conditions too. **Slaves who starved would be tossed into the sea so that their loss could be recorded as due to disease and insurance claimed.** **Williams describes a specific judgement over the ship Zong on which a massacre occurred in 1871:** Short of water, **the captain had thrown 132 slaves overboard**, **and now the owners brought an action for insurance alleging that the loss of the slaves fell within the clause of the policy which insured against “perils of the sea”**…. **Damages of thirty pounds were awarded for each slave**, **and the idea that the captain and crew should be prosecuted for mass homicide never entered into the head of any humanitarian.**47 **The construction of the slave as cargo that could be insured as an interest**, **and the obligations that this placed on the insured, shows the de-humanising effect of risk management and how it was closely linked to insurance practices.**48 **The value of slaves was defined quantitatively and in accordance with clear sets of rules designed to neutralise empathy and humanity in dealings with slaves.** **Joint stock companies provided institutional as well as geographical separation of the investor from the harsh reality of the slave trade, as did the normalisation of absentee plantation ownership in Britain.** **The necessity of insuring assets and offering financial services to clients with interests all over the world offered opportunities for innovation and expansion to the financial sector.** **Slavery was an inherently risky business and the challenges of managing credit terms or even securing payment created significant problems for slavers. These could be managed for a fee by financial services like factoring and the management of credit** **and** **remittances**.49 **The subordination of slaves was reproduced across society and in its commercial and social institutions.** Slaves were treated differently to other servants in ways that penetrated social relations and endured, separating slaves from ‘normal’ society. This was the case in the political as well as the domestic spheres. As a young man, the future liberal Prime Minister William Gladstone, whose father owned significant plantation estates, showed how **freedom**, for slaves at least, **would be conditional on the fitness of the slave to be free**: let emancipation go hand in hand with fitness to enjoy freedom; and let fitness be promoted and accelerated by all possible means, which the Legislature can devise. Such has ever been, such is and such please God shall be my language.50 **Being liberal allowed people to express support for the freedom of man but only on condition that he conformed to certain forms of behaviour.** As Seth observes: We are accustomed to think that the social contract theorists of the 17th century awoke to the fact that men are born free, rational and equal, equipped with the capacity for willing, desiring and promising. In reality, there was often an anxiety underlying the seemingly self-assured pronouncements of these thinkers, an anxiety born of the recognition, or half-recognition, that this individual was less a premise that could be taken for granted and more something which had to be forged. 51 Whether Gladstone knew of the suffering of those on his father’s plantation or not is irrelevant. These were abstractions of humanity conceived against an ideal and committed to in terms of Parliamentary action and heavenly oversight. There was no reference to the emotional or relational context in which slaves experienced their humiliation. As one participant in the Parliamentary debates over slavery put it: the question of the abolition of the slave trade, was a question between humanity on the one side, and interest on the other.52 **The rich and powerful** of the London society **and even many abolitionists** **were** therefore **able to reconcile slave ownership with their liberal values by distancing their ownership through the construction of interest and by equating their status with their property**, **of which slave ownership was a clear part.** **At the end of the slave era, even Abolitionists were investing in docks dedicated to the importation of sugar and other slave dependent trades.**53 **By the time of Abolition, slave ownership was typical in towns and villages across the country.** As the new data base assembled by the University College London Legacies of Slavery project demonstrates, **claims for compensation for emancipated slaves was spread broadly**, **demonstrating both the banality of slave ownership and the extent to which society at large was linked to the slave economy** (see Figure 1).54

### 1ar – K of Extinction Reps (Baldwin)

**The rhetoric of extinction reveals an anxiety and prescription for how we should politically imagine a world that prioritizes white-supremacist and sovereign futures and continues affective attachment normativity and whiteness.**

**Baldwin 12** (Andrew. "Whiteness and futurity: Towards a research agenda." Progress in human geography 36.2 (2012): 172-187. (Professor of Geography at Durham University)//Elmer

This paper argues that research on whiteness and geography is oriented almost exclusively around some notion of the past. While this is perhaps to be expected given that whiteness studies builds off two past-oriented bodies of scholarship – US labour studies (Roediger, 1991) and postcolonial theory (Said, 1994) – the argument is that privileging the past when researching geographies of whiteness risks overlooking the ways in which **whiteness and** hence various forms of **racism are configured in relation to** a different temporal horizon: **the future**. In pressing this claim, the argument is not to suggest that history is irrelevant for understanding the politics of whiteness. Analysing the past remains indispensable for understanding the numerous forms whiteness can take. Instead, the argument is that **analysing discourses of ‘the future’ can reveal important insights about** the ways in which **white geographies** are configured that might otherwise be foreclosed if the past is privileged as the exclusive time-space through which such geographies are produced and maintained. As such, **any politics seeking to challenge whitenesses and** their hold on **racist social imaginaries may benefit by analysing how the future is invoked in articulations of white identity** and how such future-oriented articulations shape geographies of all kinds.¶ Why the future? By future I refer to an imagined time that is yet-to-come. The future can be understood to follow sequentially from a past-present trajectory, or it can be understood as a form of absent presence. **From tropes of uncertainty**, Utopia, **apocalypse, prophesy, hope, fear, possibility and potentiality, the future shapes the present** in all manner of ways. For instance, **in politics, rights are often suspended to safeguard against future events of** insurrection, **catastrophe and terror**. In religion, moral judgements in the present are shaped by a concern for one’s safe passage into a future afterlife, and, in finance, the pricing of securities necessarily entails some calculation of future risk. Given the ubiquity of the future in the present, it is perhaps no surprise that the future is an important object of inquiry in contemporary thought (see, for example, Adams and Groves, 2007; Anderson, 2010b; Jameson, 2005; Luhmann, 1993).¶ Ben Anderson (2010a) provides a useful sketch of this research in a recent article in this journal. His point is that **the future is rendered knowable through specific practices (i.e. calculation, imagination and performance) and, in turn, intervenes on the present** through three anticipatory logics (i.e. pre-caution, pre-emption and preparedness). So, too, others have made the case that **pre-empting the future is now a common feature of contemporary political life** (Braun, 2007; Cooper, 2006). **Futurity is** also **an important feature of the affective dimensions of daily life. Take, for instance, fear** (Pain, 2009) and hope (Anderson, 2006; Anderson and Holden, 2008). Both **are** simultaneously **embodied experiences and atmospheric qualities animated by imagined futures**: one fears the yet-to-come and the other hopes for better things to come. In both, **the here-and-now of the psyche** or of collective mood **is shaped by the yet-to-come**. Or, as Brian Massumi (2002) argues, **affect occurs precisely in the overlap between the actual and the virtual**, which I take to mean an overlap between that which is and a very specific form of the virtual – the yet-to-come. By virtual I refer to things that are real but not actual (Shields, 2003); in this way, **the future is exemplary of the virtual. It can be known and hence real**, as Anderson suggests, **but because it can never be fully actualized as the future, the future remains a permanent virtuality**. **Thus, analysing atmospheres of fear** and hope, for instance, **may tell us something about the way politics takes shape through the conjugation of the actual and the virtual, or at the threshold of the future event.**¶ But the future as an object or orientation of inquiry is not limited to the affective, and nor is it confined to an actual-virtual binary. Hegel, for instance, paid considerable attention to transactions of the actual and the possible. For Hegel, the dialectic is made possible by the actual-possible relation where the dialectical movement of the actual is the possible.1 So, too, Heidegger argued that the future is indispensable to meaning. For instance, the significance that attaches to certain kinds of information would vanish were it not for the anticipated (i.e. future) consequences that lay dormant in information. Currency exchange rates would matter little, for instance, were it not for the anticipated consequences of exchange rate volatility. Although radically different, the Hegelian and Heideggerian traditions share in common the idea not simply that politics take shape through the collision of social forces that gathered pace in the past, but that political contests are shaped by the future as well.¶ **This essay** argues for a research agenda that **situates the future at the centre of analyses of white geographies.** It shows how the geographic literature on whiteness is past-oriented and suggests how this literature might benefit by attending to the ways in which **white geographies are infused by notions of futurity.** I develop this argument more fully below. For now let me offer a few preliminary thoughts about geographies of whiteness. By whiteness I refer to a racialized subject position that is remarkable for its seeming invisibility (Dwyer and Jones, 2000; Dyer, 1997). In this sense, whiteness is only partially about skin. More important, whiteness plays a foundational role in racist epistemology by serving as the norm against which others come to be viewed as different (Dwyer and Jones, 2000; Kobayashi and Peake, 2000). As such, whiteness does not name a set of stereotypes, so much as a set of ‘narrative structural positions, rhetorical tropes and habits of perception’ (Dyer, 1997: 12) that stand in for the normal. This makes defining whiteness almost impossible but then, as Richard Dyer (1997) argues, the power of whiteness lies in its capacity for almost infinite variability (see also Kobayashi, 2003; Vanderbeck, 2006). For myself, the power of racisms rest in their capacity to normalize their corresponding whitenesses (Kobayashi and Peake, 2000).¶ What, then, are geographies of whiteness? For my purposes here, they refer to geographies – spaces, places, landscapes, natures, mobilities, bodies, etc. – that are assumed to be white or are in some way structured, though often implicitly, by some notion of whiteness (Bonnett, 1997; McCarthy and Hague, 2004; Vanderbeck, 2006). The argument put forward in this paper is that research on geographies of whiteness is almost invariably past-oriented (Bonnett, 1997, 2000; Hoelscher, 2003; Pulido, 2000). By ‘past-oriented’ I mean that whiteness, whether understood as a past or present phenomenon, tends to be explained, accounted for and examined as an expression of social relations that took shape in the past (Satzewich, 2007). In the paper, I aim to show how this work is dominated by an orientation that looks to the past as the temporal horizon through which research and learning about past or present white racial identity occurs. By and large, this work assumes that in order to challenge or reconfigure whitenesses and their corresponding racisms whiteness must be diagnosed using some form of past-oriented analysis (Bonnett, 1997). The racist past is, thus, used to explain the racist present. A brief example makes the point. In an essay that many (Baldwin, 2009a; Dwyer and Jones, 2000; Jackson, 1998; McCarthy and Hague, 2004) suggest is a main point of reference for debate about whiteness in geography, Alastair Bonnett (1997) argues that whiteness ought to be understood as a function of historical geography.2 As such, Bonnett privileges a methodological approach that reaches into the past for answers about contemporary race and racism. Elsewhere, Audrey Kobayashi and Linda Peake (2000) make a similar claim that whiteness is a historically constructed position: to understand whiteness requires understanding its multiple genealogies.¶ I do wonder, though, whether a past-oriented approach to the study of white geographies reproduces the teleological assumption that white racism can be modernized away. Such an assumption privileges an ontology of linear causality in which the past is thought to act on the present and the present is said to be an effect of whatever came before. Consequently, efforts to understand racism are thought to proceed from, or be enhanced by, some correct historical analysis of whiteness. According to this kind of temporality, the future is the terrain upon or through which white racism will get resolved. It cleaves the future from the present and, thus, gives the future discrete ontological form. Yet, in so doing, this kind of temporality disregards the ways in which **the future is very often already present in the present not as a discrete ontological time-space, but as an absent or virtual presence that constitutes the very meaning of the present** (Anderson, 2010a; Massumi, 2007). This is a rather significant oversight when attempting to account for geographies of whiteness because it means that such geographies are not simply a function of the past but of the future as well.¶ So, then, what about the future? To what extent are geographies of whiteness a function not just of the past but of the future? How are white geographies maintained in relation to the future? **In what ways is the future already present in various forms of whiteness?** It seems that the geographic literature on whiteness is silent on these questions. In pointing this out, I do not mean to indict or discredit the historicist approach that has come to dominate understandings of whiteness. Again, past-oriented analyses of various kinds have been and continue to be critical for understanding whitenesses and the various racisms to which they give rise. I simply wish to acknowledge that by foregrounding the past in the present the geographic study of whiteness risks overlooking how whitenesses are made and maintained in relation to futures both distant and immanent. Here, the task for a future-oriented geographic research on whiteness might be to understand how both contemporary and past forms of whiteness relate to the future (Anderson, 2010a), or how specific geographic **expressions of whiteness are contingent on the future**. For instance, the task might be to understand how **discourses of futurity shape various forms of white supremacy from right-wing xenophobias to left-nationalisms to practices of liberal humanitarianism**, and how these shape, for instance, geographies of place, nature, space, mobility, bodies and so on. A worthwhile starting point for this work might be to analyse how **discourses of white crisis, such as** those found in Great Britain in the early 1900s (Bonnett, 2004) or throughout the West **during** processes of post-Second World War **decolonization** (Thobani, 2007), relate to and **are shaped by notions of futurity.** They do relate to the future. The question is: how and to what effect?¶ Acknowledging how the future is made present in white geographies is important for at least three reasons. First, as many now argue (Grusin, 2010; Massumi, 2007), **the future is an important site through which individuals and societies are governed** (Anderson, 2010a). A focus on whiteness and futurity provides scope for thinking about the way in which **governing through the future might inaugurate new or reconfigure old forms of whiteness**. Eugenic science is a useful example here. Eugenics was underwritten by an imagined future eradicated of human imperfections. Thus we might seek to understand how **white geographies are reproduced through new future-oriented technologies, like genetic screening and nanotechnology** (Rose, 2007). Second, understanding how white geographies articulate with discourses of futurity opens up new terrains for conceptualizing and challenging racism. If white supremacy is, in part, reproduced through shared practices of futurity, what then are these practices? What kinds of futures do such practices seek to expunge or produce, and how can they be resisted? The case of genetic medicine is again illustrative. For instance, individual gene mapping allows ‘genetic citizens’ to witness their ‘future’ health by assessing their genetic predisposition for disease (Rose, 2007). Genetic citizenship is, in turn, shaped by new practices of bodily purification aimed at foreclosing certain ‘unhealthy’ futures. We might ask whether and how these practices are white. Third, **a focus on whiteness and futurity points to the idea that affect shapes white racial formation** (Hook, 2005). For **the future can never exist except as a form of virtual present, and affect can be understood**, in part, **as a generalized attitude towards the presencing of particular futures**. (Important, however, is that affect can also be understood as a generalized attitude towards presencings of the past. Think, for example, affects of nostalgia and loss.) **Thus, we might ask:** **what futures infuse the affective logics of whiteness? How does this future presencing occur?** And how, if at all, are these futures constitutive of specific white spatio-temporalities? These reasons together provide a rationale for a research agenda concerned with understanding how the future works as a resource in the geographic expression of whitenesses.

### 1ar – K of Extinction (Warren)

**The negative is staunchly invested in an anti-black attachment to scientific rationality in its attempt to calculate the endpoint of death. This humanist calculation is weaponized against black ~~being~~ through the ontocidal process of antiblackness.**

**Warren 18** (Calvin Warren, Assistant Professor at Emory. He received his ph.D. in African American/American Studies from Yale University. “Ontological Terror; Blackness, Nihilism, and Emancipation”, pg. 113-118) GL

**Joe’s death is not a physical death,** however (we might call this, after Heidegger, “perishment”).5 He makes a distinction between death and the corrosion of the body (perishment). Dr. Wragg’s astonishment is really a misunderstanding; **in fact, the entire treatment procedure is predicated on a fallacy—blurring the distinction between metaphysical death and biological death—a blurring that is necessary as a form of disavowal, a not seeing of the metaphysical destruction Joe endures**. Thus, Joe’s selfdiagnosis, his madness, is **an ontometaphysical condition**. **He is, indeed, already dead, awaiting his physical demise. Death is an ontological murder**. The body is the least of Joe’s concerns (in fact, he is all but happy to get rid of the corporeal casing). The metaphysical holocaust is a blind spot (anamorphic) to the scientific eye and its hegemonic vision, despite its purported acuity**.** Again, this is not a Heideggerian death—where death is actually an aperture onto life, authentic life with Being—but is **an onticide, a destruction of all ontological grounds and relation to Being. What we have, then, is the limit of science and the beyond it cannot fully broach, but can only medicalize away**. Had Dr. Wragg actually taken Joe seriously, actually listened to what antiblackness muffles, he would understand that mental alienation is the only condition possible for black being in an antiblack world. The term alienation is but an inadequate placeholder for onticide, which severs the flesh from the body. **Science can neither suture nor cure this fracturing. And it is this death, reconfigured as the nothing of a metaphysical world, which constitutes the limit of scientific thinking.** **Indeed, this type of death is a horror for science, since it is unable to transform it into an object of knowledge**. This untranslatability is recast as madness. Joe’s madness is the nihilistic condition of the metaphysical holocaust, of living in perpetual obliteration. David Marriott provides a contrast to the Heideggerian understanding of death (as the authentic opening up onto Being through the mood anxiety). For Marriott, **black death is “having lived without ever being truly alive; dead because never alive . . . black life is meaningless and so black death is meaningless—a legacy in which death is nothing . . . it is a death that cannot ever die because it depends on the total degradation and disavowal of black life. Ipso facto: death emerges as a transcendental fact of black existence but without transcendence (similarly, black existence is one condemned to live without the possibility of being) [emphasis mine].”6 Black death is nothing (existence without the possibility of being). It is not only that black death is nothing in the sense that it is meaningless or pointless (rather than paving the way for human freedom, it paves nothing**), but also that it is metaphysical nothing, an entity without being. Black death is the symbolic form of nothing that Dr. Wragg could not understand (he needed to think philosophically). For what he pathologized and attempted to treat was nothing itself. Joe’s pronouncement is really about this nothing and not his physical perishment. He was never alive, and any life perceived is erroneous. The treatment, then, inverts the ontometaphysical problem: if Joe were to pronounce that he was alive and well, that would be a disjuncture between reality and perception. Dr. Wragg’s cure, then, is the true symptom in the diagnosis. We might call Joe’s ontometaphysical condition “the already dead,” following Eric Cazdyn. But in this case, **black death is a chronic condition of modernity, without cure**.7 Abdul R. JanMohamed would consider this disjuncture a “death bound subject,” which constitutes “a zone between the status of ‘flesh’ and that of ‘meat,’ neither quite alive nor quite dead.”8 Joe’s body is meat, the object of a rapacious, antiblack appetite. What is the ontological status of this interstice between flesh and meat? Or, what is the status of the zone of indistinction between metaphysical death and biological life? This is the proper metaphysical question that science broaches from a distance. We can also consider the “Remarkable Case of Mental Alienation” as an allegory of sorts, or a paradigm for thinking science with black being. For science cannot understand black death, or the nothing that is black death. When science reaches its limit, when its episteme is unable to comprehend, it diagnoses the impasse as madness. Madness, I would argue, is the name for answering the proper metaphysical question, nihilistically. One is mad because one is always already dead, although appearing fully alive. Joe also allegorizes the plight of black being: it is vulnerable to the viciousness of scientific thinking and its devastating procedures. Hortense **Spillers identifies medical science as a particularly terroristic field in relation to blackness. Reading through the work of William Goodell, she traces out the vicious profit motive, which creates an economy of selling and purchasing diseased, damaged, incurable, disabled, and otherwise worthless black bodies**. She suggests, “This profitable ‘atomizing’ of the captive body provides another angle on the divided flesh: we lose any hint or suggestion of a dimension of ethics, of relatedness between human personality and its anatomical features, between human personality and cultural institutions. To that extent, the procedures adopted for the captive flesh demarcate a total objectification, as the entire captive community becomes a living laboratory.”9 **What Spillers describes here is a metaphysical procedure: what is totally objectified is more than just the captive’s body. The real object of analysis is nothing.** (It is the attempt to make nothing an object through the captive’s abject body.) **Thus, the essence of science is not scientific. 10 This nothing horrifies science, and, consequently, the black body also horrifies science.** This horror, however, translates into both a will to know and a process of disavowal (the Heideggerian conflict), and both reinforce/generate each other. In other words, **black bodies become living laboratories because these bodies hold the secret of science**—what it most wishes to know and what it most wishes not to know. This play between knowing and not knowing, desiring and detesting, hating and admiring would seem to land us in Lacanian territory, something like a scientific unconscious. Science is obsessed with this nothing—its limit and its possibility. As Heidegger asserted, when science attempts to explore its own essence, it relies on this very nothing it rejects and detects for the exploration.11 The atomizing Spillers describes is a philosophical procedure under the guise of scientific objectivity. Andrew Curran would describe this scientific atomization as a textualization of the African through discourses such as anatomy.12 Textualizing the black body would require a vicious hermeneutical-semiotic practice of reading blackness as a sign of abject nothingness. The black body, then, is a scientific mediator of sorts between the dreaded nothing and a scientific field determined to calculate, schematize, and dominate this nothing. **This is precisely why black being is so valuable to science: black being enables the total suspension of limits (ethical, moral, and spiritual), and this suspension leaves the scientific imagination unbounded in its antiblack quest for knowledge, truth, and power. A living laboratory has no rights that a white scientific mind is bound to respect, no limitations on scientific creativity, and no resistance against scientific objectification**. As equipment in human form, black being broaches infinity, nothing encased in a body. Our aim, then, is to understand the function of science in this metaphysical holocaust and to dispel the myth of objectivity, which masks metaphysical cruelty behind the auspices of scientific discovery. (continued) Heidegger’s critique of calculative thinking entails the destructive use of numbers to quantify man, to restrict his spontaneity and capture him in predictability.14 Badiou revisits this critique and revises it to dethrone “1,” which metaphysical philosophy uses to understand the subject and being.15 We might say, following Badiou, that “1” begins metaphysical violence: man is reduced to this “1,” a quantifiable thing of science. But, if we read McKittrick through Badiou’s critique, we understand that the purpose of antiblack schematization is to deny black being metaphysical “1.” As an ontological designator, mathematics of the unliving must begin with unending subtraction of the nonexistent—a calculus that takes us into imaginary numbers, purely functional but lacking tangibility. (Badiou’s theory, then, leaves power and violence untheorized in relation to mathematics, and this is why McKittrick’s conceptualization is essential to Badiou’s revelation that “ontology is mathematics.”) What I am suggesting, here, is that mathematics of the unliving does not calculate a metaphysical “1,” which can be infinitely multiplied and added—this is the mathematics of humanism (and Badiou’s infinitely multipliable set theory cannot help us in this calculation; since black being is impossible to factor, it is both infinity and nothing [or something else], and the operational procedure rebounds into nonsense. Perhaps blackness enables ontological operation, as mathematics, by its exclusion from both metaphysical “1” and the null set). We might say the drive of black humanism, its endless romance with metaphysics, is to translate this nonsense number (whatever it is) into a quantifiable “1”—the indivisible human. This entails the ontological component of what Patricia Cline would call numeracy—the obsession with numbers, quantifying, and calculation in antebellum society.16 The metaphysical violence of the Three-Fifths Compromise, for example, is purportedly resolved by adding the alienated two-fifths to this fractioning; and somehow, we finally arrive at this metaphysical “1.” (Most of romantic humanism and emancipatory logic is the attempt to reunite black being with this “1.”) But I read a certain impossibility in McKittrick’s term mathematics of the unliving, since such an additive procedure is a fantasy. Why is this the case? I would argue that the fractioning/fracturing is the mathematical component of the metaphysical holocaust—the alienated two-fifths is the severing of the flesh, the primordial death. It is irretrievable. Black being is precisely this three-fifths (the ontometaphysical remainder, its refuse), not a metaphysical “1”—no multiplicative procedure can produce this fantastical “1” (the three-fifths is, in fact, the numerical stand-in for nonsense, since the human cannot be fractioned from the “1.” Thus, the black is not a metaphysical human, following this mathematical scheme, but something other—equipment). And since we lack a calculus to arrive at this “1,” the promises of emancipation are but a ruse. Black being remains a nonsense sign within metaphysical arithmetic, even when one is holding freedom papers. Black being is an untranslatable variable (if we can even call it that) mathematically—it is imaginary and is used to perform the function of settling the limits of humanism (the function of imaginary numbers is to resolve an irresolvable equation). Emancipation is predicated on faulty mathematical ontology: it cannot incorporate black being into the “1” metaphysics uses to determine and identify a human. (continued) **Scientific and mathematical thinking “calculates and factors blackness,”** as George Yancy might suggest.17 And our task is to expose the essence of these calculations as the terror of nothing, black as nothing. Scientific thinking needs blackness because blackness is the living laboratory—a laboratory that functions biologically, but is dead ontologically. We will investigate a few instances of this thinking and how they contend with nothing in various forms.

### 1ar – K of China Relations

**The attempt to secure US-China relations reinforces dominant racial views through the trading of anti-black tropes**

**Fennell ’13** (Vera Leigh Fennell is Associate Professor of Political Science at Lehigh University. She joined the department in 2008. She earned a doctorate and master’s degree in political science from the University of Chicago and a bachelor’s degree in East Asian studies from Princeton University. “Race: China’s Question and Problem”, Review of Black Political Economy 40:245–275)

Although it is now a commonly accepted truth that race and racial difference has no cultural, or scientific/biological basis, race has a social truth that has been buttressed by and reflected through history and power. That social truth came from meanings that have been assigned over time to certain physical features of the body—the shape of the head, skin color, hair texture, eye shape, and body type**. Perpetuating the meanings and values attributed to these physical features is/was an expression of power. This means that Western definitions of race traveled wherever powerful Western states have.** Yet, as Dikotter has pointed out, an **awareness of a classificatory hierarchy based on relative skin color existed in China long before the arrival of Euro-American missionaries and colonialists**. Stories of **contact between the Chinese and Africans** from the Tang (618–907) and Song (960–1279) Dynasties **are part of the historical narrative**. There is the story of Du Huan, an officer in the Tang Dynasty, who wrote about his travels in Africa (possibly Eritrea) in the 8th century. According to other narratives, Canton was already the site of an Islamic trading enclave by the 10th and 11th centuries and interest in the lands in the “southwest”, as Africa was referred to, was growing. With trade as the primary purpose of these exchanges, **merchants of the Tang and Southern Sung Dynasties wrote of their initial disappointment with these regions**, but by the 13th century, opportunities for trade seemed more favorable. This increasingly favorable impression led to expanded economic interest. **Chinese writers of the time began describing African** wildlife, the landscape, and the nomadic **people** of the east African coast. **Descriptions focusing on skin-color appeared as early at the 4th century and there seems to have been a time when dark-skinned persons were presented to the Chinese imperial court as slaves, called “Kunlun”** (initially meaning “...primeval chaos”.... and then coming to mean something close to “...peoples from a magical western mountain...”). The Chinese Columbus, Zheng He, arrived in the 15th century and trade and Chinese exploration of Africa accelerated. **The repeated telling of these stories shows how the Chinese incorporated Africans into their cosmology.** The Chinese held a belief of the cosmological ordering of the universe that included a structured a hierarchy of civilizations with the Chinese imperial order at the core and placed other civilizations in descending degrees of civilization radiating in concentric circles out from this core. Notions of skin color mapped these radiating circles of civilization. But these ideas about skin color and the recognition of skin color differences were not absolute; attaining civilization defined skin color. At this time, China did not share the absolutist notions of skin color of the European Enlightenment not did they believe that the state was a container for those differences. For example, the Chinese imperial clan was thought of as “white” because white was the center of the civilized world. Chinese laborers were considered uncivilized and, therefore, black.4 In this discursive field, those from the Kunlun, the outskirts of the known world, would be described as black. So, skin color and a sense of racial hierarchy mapped onto a spatial hierarchy based on civilizational attainment. Initially, Europeans, coming from a place far from the civilizational core, were considered just as strange as Africans.Yet, **the addition of Western notions of racial identity and difference should not be minimized Beginning with the late imperial era, the confluence of Chinese notions of the civilizational basis of fundamental difference and Western racial classification hierarchy shaped the discourse surrounding the creation of the modern state**. The questions to ask interrogate the understandings of China’s 19th and 20th century reformers and revolutionaries, like Kang Youwei [康有为] (1858–1927), Liang Qichao [梁启超] (1873–1929), Sun Yatsen [X中山] (1866–1925), and Mao Tsetung [毛泽东] (1893–1976) and Zhou Enlai [周恩来] (1898–1976) about the role of race and racial difference to the global order as they attempted to construct a modern Chinese political order. Did they see a racialized picture of global difference, hierarchy and power? Did race and racial difference play a role in their understanding of the modern state form? Did that racialized understanding influence the form of the modern state in China? **The concept of the modern state as a sovereign participant in a global community of Westphalian states was a raced concept**. Enlightenment thinkers like Kant, Linnaeus, and Locke believed that there was a direct association between appearance, culture, and political acumen and the capacity for self-rule. **Used as the premise for scientific classification, European whites were defined** (by European whites) **as being the most advanced group and, despite the differences between various groups within the white group, inhabited and controlled the most powerful states.** Coinciding with Europe’s transition from feudalism to capitalism, this concept was used to justify their control not just of the territory where they lived but also their expansion to lands far from their capitals. European power, expressed by their expansion beyond their territorial borders, also spread and imposed the meaning of sovereignty and ideas about those who were not worthy of nor ready for self-rule. Their power also served to inculcate the meaning and relevance of the inferiority to those they ruled over. This created a psychological feedback loop whereby the inequalities created by racial classifications increasingly reflected economic inequalities. As Baum has written, “...it [was] not race that [gave] rise to inequality but inequality that [gave] rise to race...” **The American and European states with ethnically and racially diverse populations were, nonetheless, politically, economically, and socially dominated by those who based their claims on their European descent and their proof was white skin color. Western notions of “race” entered the minds of the Chinese elites in two ways. First, elites in Japan attempted to answer the critical question: what was the secret of white Europe?** It was in Japan that many exiled Chinese reformers, fleeing from the Empress Dowager’s coup after the 100 Days reforms of 1898, first encountered translations of Western political and social philosophical texts on the use of Spencerian Darwinism to understand the international political order. **They also defined the modern state form as the central vehicle for national survival in the global struggle for dominance**.6 Reading both Darwin’s writings and the commentaries that (mis)used Darwin to analyze con- temporary societies and politics, **Liang began to write about a global race competition between states in neo-Darwinist terms.** For the groups to successfully compete with one another, they had to accentuate their ability to unite together for a common purpose or goal. **What created this ability to group? The recognition of a common essence.** Kang and Liang, along with other reformers used the term “tongzhong” (同种), meaning similar kind or similar/same seed, to describe this sense of groupness. Skin color seemed to be a visible manifestation of the ability to group. **The second way that Western notions of race entered the Chinese society was through Westerners living and working in China. They circulated ideas about skin color as race, identity as singular and fixed, culture as inheritable that were translated into notions of superior state power.** Western missionaries in mission schools, for example, taught that the ability to politically group as a nation was a manifestation of race. According to Dikotter, these missionaries even taught their students how to recognize the characteristic colors of the world’s races, with the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipinos as the “yellow” race, the Europeans as “white”, Africans and the American slave population, as “black”. They taught about the hierarchical order of races, with whites and North American/European states at the top and blacks, held in slavery in the West and colonized in territorial Africa, at the bottom.

### 1ar – K of Russia Relations

**The negative reduces blackness as a piece on the chessboard for global dominance and management of the geopolitical order.**

Michel 17 (Casey Michel, 9-26-2017, "How Russia keeps exploiting anti-black racism in the U.S.," No Publication, https://thinkprogress.org/russias-sordid-history-of-exploiting-anti-black-racism-in-the-u-s-df3b83b4dd86/)

On Tuesday, the Washington Post confirmed what had previously been assumed about Russia’s campaign of buying Facebook ads to tilt the presidential election, and to stir racial tensions in the U.S. As the Post summed, the Russian ads took aim at U.S. racial divides, paralleling efforts from the Trump campaign. The efforts mirror prior attempts from foreign actors to inflame racial divisions in the U.S. – the most notable of which have come, perhaps unsurprisingly, from Moscow. **Where many African-Americans**, especially in the 1920s and 1930s**, saw the Soviet Union as a beacon of racial equality – a role Kremlin higher-ups willingly played up, despite Soviet collectivization leading to the deaths of millions, especially among minority populations – the post-World War II period saw a rise in covert operations directed at American racial divisions. “Russia often looked to use anti-black racism in the US as a way of exposing what they believed was the moral bankruptcy of Western capitalism and the hypocrisy of American ‘democracy,'**” said Jennifer Wilson, a postdoctoral fellow in the University of Pennsylvania’s Department of Slavic Languages and Literature. “**Russia has always seen the problem of anti-black racism in the U.S. as a political tool.”** The fight for fair elections is not dead. For instance, as described in Christopher Andrew’s The Sword and the Shield, a detailed composition of KGB operations compiled by a former KGB archivist, Soviet operations to stoke racial tensions spiked in the 1960s and 1970s. **In 1967, Moscow aimed at removing Martin Luther King, Jr., from his leadership role within the broader civil rights movement.** Per Andrew, KGB higher-ups approved a plan to “place articles in the African press, which could then be reprinted in American newspapers, portraying King as an ‘Uncle Tom’ who was secretly receiving government subsidies to tame the civil rights movement and prevent it threatening the Johnson administration.” (Writes Andrew, MLK “was probably the only prominent American to be the target of active measures by both the FBI and the KGB.”) As War is Boring’s Darien Cavanaugh added, the campaign sought to replace King with Stokely Carmichael, hoping a less pacifist leader would help spark a race war within the U.S. The drive also included, in a harbinger of the Facebook ads to come, distributing fabricated pamphlets that showed far-right groups bent on “developing a plan for the physical elimination of leading figures in the Negro movement in the U.S.” Growing bolder by the early 1970s, **the KGB moved beyond innuendo into a far more violent strain of its campaign. Moscow higher-ups – including then-KGB chief Yuri Andropov, who would eventually lead the Soviet Union in the early 1980s – signed off on pamphlets, to be sent to African-American militants, which said that Jewish vigilante groups viewed them as “black mongrels.”** Writes Cavanaugh, the pamphlets “were distributed to 30 black militant groups in the New York area.” Meanwhile, **the KGB approved a plan to release explosives in “the Negro [black] section of New York,” with one KGB official suggesting bombing “one of the Negro [black] colleges” as a back-up option**. Following the planned bombing, KGB agents would then issue anonymous phone calls “to two or three black organizations, claiming that the explosion was the work of the Jewish Defense League.” The planned bombing, thankfully, never went off, and the KGB’s operations to stoke a broader race war in the U.S. ultimately failed. (A series of forged letters claiming to be from the KKK, which said the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics would be “FOR THE WHITES ONLY!” and which were sent to a number of Asian and African delegations, also predictably fell flat.) However, the campaigns, and the broader notion that the U.S. could collapse in on itself along racial lines, set a precedent we’ve seen play out over the past few years. To wit, during the 2014 Ferguson protests, Russian state media hyped the racial fracture on display. Wrote BuzzFeed’s Max Seddon, “America is gripped in the throes of a violent race war as retribution for the bloody revolution it had plotted against Moscow’s allies in Ukraine, according to the pro-Kremlin press.” One RT article even predicted a possible American implosion in the aftermath of Ferguson, with another headline from Russian outlet MK asking if Ferguson could “become a second Donetsk.” Other Russian media dubbed the protests “AfroMaidan,” in a nod to Ukraine’s 2014 “EuroMaidan” revolution, while Maria Katasonova, who has rapidly become one of the faces of Russian nationalism (and Trump support within Russia), even tried to get a hashtag that translates to “Black Russia” to trend. Much like their Soviet-era precedent, **Russian actors have continued targeting both sides of the racial divide in the U.S., with black and white nationalists alike recently constructing their own links with those in Moscow.** However, with the continuing revelations regarding the Facebook ads, fake pages, and attempts at organizing on-the-ground rallies throughout 2016, it’s clear that Moscow’s social media campaign has far exceeded any prior attempt – in reach and success alike – at inflaming U.S. race relations. Much like the Trump campaign, and Trump presidency, these Facebook ads and pages, paralleling KGB attempts decades ago, aimed directly at America’s racial fault lines – all attempting to stoke the types of racial fracture the U.S. hasn’t seen in decades.

1. https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/contradict [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. http://www.dictionary.com/browse/affirm [↑](#footnote-ref-2)