## Case

#### **Derrida’s politics explicitly encourage action- voting aff IS voting for real grassroots change, not just academic pandering. Miller 09** (J. Harris, *Derrida’s Politics of Autoimmunity,* Originally published 2008 in Discourse Journal, updated May 23, 2009, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/dis/summary/v030/30.1-2.miller.html>)

Nor did Derrida’s politics remain purely theoretical. He did not¶ remain in his armchair in his study or safely before his computer¶ screen. He took stands. He acted politically, often in ways that were¶ risky. He suffered anti-Semitic persecution by the French in Algeria¶ during World War II. He resigned from Tel Quel because he was¶ opposed to Maoism. He chose never to join the Communist Party, at¶ a time when it was difficult not to join it, if you were, as he was, an¶ intellectual on the left. He took a public and somewhat unpopular¶ stand of qualified solidarity during the student rebellions in France¶ in 1968. Years later, Derrida was arrested in Czechoslovakia for giving¶ a clandestine seminar there. He attacked Apartheid vigorously¶ and visited Mandela in South Africa. Specters of Marx is dedicated to¶ Chris Hani, an avowed communist and a hero of the resistance¶ against apartheid. Hani was assassinated in South Africa on 10 April 1993, just as Derrida was finishing his book on Marx. That book was¶ given as lectures at the University of California at Riverside on 22¶ and 23 April 1993. Derrida spoke out in the United States against¶ U.S. legalization of capital punishment. He accused us, correctly,¶ vigorously, and publicly, of being the only so-called first world country¶ still to have capital punishment. He harbored a homeless African¶ immigrant in his home outside Paris, allowing that man to use the¶ Derrida address as his own to avoid deportation. At that time in¶ France, an immigrant could stay if he or she had a valid address.¶ Derrida did not just sit around and think or write about politics,¶ however complex contradictory, aporetic, and ambiguous he may¶ have seen political action to be. That should never be forgotten. Derrida is in many places quite explicit and specific about our¶ obligation to act as well as to think politically. Here is one example¶ in “Force of Law” (1992). In this case, Derrida declares our obligation¶ to pass new emancipatory laws to deal with a whole series of specific¶ contemporary social problems:¶ Left to itself, the incalculable and giving idea of justice is always very close¶ to the bad, even to the worst for it can always be reappropriated by the¶ most perverse calculation [le calcul le plus pervers]. It’s always possible.2 . . .¶ This requirement [L’ordre de ce il faut] does not properly belong either to¶ justice or law. It only belongs to either of these two domains by exceeding¶ each one in the direction of the other. Politicization, for example, is interminable¶ even if it cannot and should not ever be total. To keep this from¶ being a truism or a triviality, we must recognize in it the following consequence:¶ each advance in politicization obliges one to reconsider, and so¶ to reinterpret, the very foundations of law [les fondements mêmes du droit]¶ such as they had previously been calculated or delimited. This was true for¶ example in the Declaration of the Rights of Man, in the abolition of slavery,¶ in all the emancipatory battles that remain and will have to remain in¶ progress, everywhere in the world, for men and for women. Nothing¶ seems to me less outdated than the classical emancipatory ideal. . . . But¶ beyond these identified territories of juridico-politicization on the grand¶ geopolitical scale, beyond all self-serving interpretations [au-delà de tous les¶ détournements et arraisonnements intéressés], beyond all determined and particular¶ reappropriations of international law, other areas must constantly¶ open up that at first seem like secondary or marginal areas. This marginality¶ also signifies that a violence, indeed a terrorism and other forms of¶ hostage-taking, are at work (the examples closest to us would be found in¶ the area of laws on the teaching and practice of languages, the legitimization¶ of canons, the military use of scientific research, abortion,¶ euthanasia, problems of organ transplant, extrauterine conception, bioengineering¶ [Derrida might now have said “stem-cell research” (JHM)],¶ medical experimentation, the social treatment of AIDS, the macro-or¶ micropolitics of drugs, the homeless, and so on, without forgetting, of¶ course, the treatment of what we call animal life, animality [l’énorme question¶ dite de l’animalité].3

Debate causes students to actively engage in the public sphere- it’s real action that directly prevents violence in the real world.

Giroux ‘11

Henry A Giroux, Truthout, Occupy Colleges Now: Students as the New Public Intellectuals, 21 November 2011, http://truth-out.org/index.php?option=com\_k2&view=item&id=5046:occupy-colleges-now--students-as-the-new-public-intellectuals

Students are starting to recognize that it is crucial to struggle for the university as a democratic public sphere and the need to use that sphere to educate a generation of new students, faculty and others about the history of race, racism, politics, identity, power, the state and the struggle for justice.  They are increasingly willing to argue in theoretically insightful and profound ways about what it means to defend the university as a site that opens up and sustains public connections through which people's fragmented, uncertain, incomplete narratives of agency are valued, preserved, and made available for exchange while being related analytically to wider contexts of politics and power. They are moving to reclaim, once again, the humanities as a sphere that is crucial for grounding ethics, justice and morality across existing disciplinary terrains, while raising both a sense of urgency and a set of relevant questions about what kind of education would be suited to the 21st-century university and its global arrangements as part of a larger project of addressing the most urgent issues that face the social and political world.  The punishing state can use violence with impunity to eject young people from parks and other public sites, but it is far more difficult to eject them from sites that are designed for their intellectual growth and well-being, make a claim to educate them, and register society's investment and commitment to their future. Students can be forced out of parks and other public spaces, but it is much more difficult to force them out of those sites designed to educate them - places that are identified with young people and register the larger society's obligation to their future and well-being. The police violence that has taken place at the University of California campuses at Berkeley and Davis does more than border on pure thuggery; it also reveals a display of force that is as unnecessary as it is brutal, and it is impossible to justify. These young people are being beaten on their campuses for simply displaying the courage to protest a system that has robbed them of both a quality education and a viable future.

## K

**Perm - Embracing our ethic of hospitality is necessary to redefine social relations**

Jane **Munksgaard 13** (“Who is Really Burdened by Hospitality? Gender and the Conditions of Possibility for Social Change in Derrida’s Hospitality,” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the NCA 95th Annual Convention, Chicago Hilton & Towers, Chicago, IL, <http://citation.allacademic.com/one/www/research/index.php?cmd=www_search&offset=0&limit=5&multi_search_search_mode=publication&multi_search_publication_fulltext_mod=fulltext&textfield_submit=true&search_module=multi_search&search=Search&search_field=title_idx&fulltext_search=%3Cb%3EWho+is+Really+Burdened+by+Hospitality%3F+Gender+and+the+Conditions+of+Possibility+for+Social+Change+in+Derrida%C2%92s+Hospitality%3C%2Fb%3E&PHPSESSID=6q7auuc367qmh6q30t7kf5ngu6>)

While contemporary social and political contexts point to the question of what it means to be hospitable, gender, race, and class dynamics further complicate contemporary understandings of hospitality. For example, history reveals the many obligations placed on women in the name of hospitality. This gendered relationship leads us to the necessary question: Can contemporary feminist theory re-appropriate hospitality in a manner that works to reconnect and repair the world without an oppressive gendered division of labor? While we have recently been privy to feminist theory and analysis that has brought new angles to social and political concepts, these conversations reveal the double-edged sword of gendered implications of meanings and precepts. Nonetheless, this paper posits that overall, a concept of hospitality can both engender a viable social ideal of feminist citizenship and operate as a strategic concept for women’s empowerment. Hospitality can classify gender as one register of the other. In fact, Derrida has already engaged the other at various registers. The other figures variously as the visitor, the alter ego, the founding violence of law, and the cut. Derrida argues that this other, or alterity, is immanent in the term that appears to oppose and subordinate it, i.e., the invited, the ego, the conserving violence of law, the opening. Derrida argues that these apparent presences differ from themselves. This radical alterity conditions the possibility of the event. The event does not exist as a presence, but rather as a displacing rupture, a readable unreadability. Hospitality is an undervalued concept that has lacked significant theoretical attention. Moreover, the meaning of hospitality is undergoing renegotiation given a number of prominent social forces and international developments. The escalation of global violence and the decline in diplomatic practice and civil speech make hospitality seem anachronistic. Also, commercialization and globalization increasingly reduce human interactions to commoditized transactions as found in the identification of hospitality with the hotel and restaurant industry. Despite these attacks on hospitality, larger global unrest, issues of citizenship, and growing economic disparity, speak to a need to sharpen and clarify social obligations for hospitality in the face of shifting sentiments and resources.

**Hospitality is the most effective method to overcome racism in policy. Our discussion in this very round is the key first step.**

Nathan **Crawford 09** (“Race and Hospitality: Pursuing Racial Reconciliation through Derrida’s Understanding of Hospitality,” October 6 2009 http://theotherjournal.com/2009/10/06/race-and-hospitality-pursuing-racial-reconciliation-through-derrida%E2%80%99s-understanding-of-hospitality/)

Lastly, the white person must understand that because racism exists as a result of the majority and because members of the majority are the beneficiaries of racism, overcoming racism is not the responsibility of the other but the responsibility of the majority. In practicing hospitality, the majority must take responsibility and action on part of the minority, not allowing them to continue living in oppression through structures that say they end racism when they continue to perpetuate it. This means the creation of a society where people can exist differently, where the majority is not threatened by the minority, and where the minority is given the opportunity to become what it can through the actions of the majority. The necessity here, then, is to create a structure that is not hegemonic or totalizing, but moves with the other. This is what hospitality does. By taking responsibility for the other, the majority speaks with the other by critiquing the structures that have perpetuated racism. This means that the majority enters into serious dialogue with the other, dialogue that is meant to give voice to the other, not to tell the other how she is supposed to live or exist. By taking responsibility for the other, the majority works toward an alternative structure that avoids promoting injustice and oppression through things like housing projects, which usher the poor minority out of the sight of the majority, and builds a place where the other exists in the sight and hearing of the majority, like putting a housing project next to Central Park in New York City or on the Magnificent Mile in Chicago. Here, no longer can the majority ignore the plight of those who have been oppressed so that the majority can exist and prosper financially; rather, by taking responsibility for the other, the majority brings the other into the very structures that have kept her out. We see, then, that a structure of hospitality, in contrast to the current liberal approach, takes seriously the place and plight of the minority by opening oneself to the other in order to understand the other. Minorities do not need to become like whites, but they need to be given the resources to overcome the systems of oppression that continue to impede them. These resources cannot be structures that look to end oppression but really perpetuate it; rather, the resources must be our very selves, speaking with the other to the majority to overcome the racism that continues to oppress. A society that approaches the issue of race through hospitality offers such an approach by not necessitating a method or right way of action but by pursuing a state of being-with the minority and thereby overcoming together the racism of American society. The liberal approach refuses to do this because it continues to measure success against the white ideal. The approach of hospitality counters the liberal approach by arguing that there is no white ideal and that liberalism upholds oppressive structures which cause injustice and actually endorse the white ideal. In contrast, hospitality welcomes the other, listens to the other, exists with the other, and in so doing, takes responsibility for the other in a way that brings the other to resist the oppression of the majority.