### 2AC

**Your ballot should affirm solidarity – the 1AC was an act of politics from below – our discussion of the intersectionality of militarism and racism in the context of the War and Terror and our call for an end to indefinite detention** [should not be read as an act of speaking for others – instead, our advocacy of political action on the behalf of those marginalized by those policies in the context of our own white privilege] **is a crucial ethical moment – exposing the internal contradictions of detention policy despite claims of legal equality represents solidarity with those detained or killed.**

**This avoids the police order of politics as usual – using our privileged status to undo structures of privilege is an essential component of ethical politics – We solve their impact claims and the permutation avoids the links – our strategy of calls for political action on behalf of those marginalized by politics as usual is an act of “sharing” that avoids domination in recognition of equality – a call for action by those with a part in politics for those without allows for critical reflexivity to widen the scope of ethical political action to include additional perspectives**

**May 7** (Todd, SubStance 36.2 (2007) 20-36, “Jacques Rancière and the Ethics of Equality,”Professor of Philosophy at Clemson University. He is the author of seven books of philosophy, most recently Gilles Deleuze: An Introduction (Cambridge, 2005) and The Philosophy of Foucault (Acumen, 2006). His book Jacques Rancie're's Political Thought is forthcoming from Edinburgh Press in 2008.)

How shall we characterize what is proper to contemporary anarchism? What quality or qualities make it anarchist and not something else? What distinguishes its critique of capitalism from Marxism, or its anti-authoritarianism from nihilism? What draws the various threads of different anarchisms together into a single weave? **At one time, people thought that the uniqueness of anarchism lay in its critique of the state.** While Marxists sought to take over the state, or to establish a dictatorship of the proletariat until such time as the state would wither away, anarchists sought instead to abolish the state outright. Is it not Proudhon himself who writes, "To be GOVERNED is to be watched, inspected, spied upon, directed, law-driven, numbered, regulated, enrolled, indoctrinated, preached at, controlled, checked, estimated, valued, censured, commanded, by creatures who have neither the right nor the wisdom nor the virtue to do so" (293-4). And Bakunin, in his criticism of Marx's program, points out that "the doctrinaire revolutionaries, whose objective is to overthrow existing governments and regimes so as to create their own dictatorship on their ruins, have never been and will never be enemies of the state…They are enemies only of existing governments because they want to take their place" (137). For Marx, the central category of oppression is exploitation, the extraction of surplus value from the worker. **If exploitation is the problem, there is no bar to commandeering the forces of the state in order to dismantle it.** True, the state will no longer be necessary once exploitation has ceased, and then it can disappear of its own accord. But in the meantime, the state must be seized as a powerful source for the revolution of the means of production. **In contrast, it is said, anarchism finds the problem to lie not primarily in exploitation but in power itself**. Any institution that can exert power is to be resisted, and the state, which possesses the most power, is to be resisted above all. **This is a misreading of anarchism. We should not see the difference between Marxism and anarchism as lying in the argument between those who would lay the blame for oppression at the feet of the economy and those who instead would lay it at the feet of the state**. While this [End Page 20] characterization captures Marxism rightly, it misreads anarchism. **What anarchism criticizes is not power, strictly speaking, but domination.** What is the difference? We might say that domination is power that operates deleteriously. The deleteriousness can happen in many ways. A boss dominates a worker by the mere fact that he can withhold the worker's means of subsistence. The mainstream media dominates the public by veiling the interests of the elites that fund it. **Domination can happen in more subtle ways as well, ways that involve no conscious intention**. Michel **Foucault's works**, especially Discipline and Punish and the first volume of his History of Sexuality, **are analyses of domination without intentional dominators**. In the former he details the ways people come to be dominated by the practices of discipline to which they become subject, and by the practices of psychology and psychiatry that form the epistemic basis of that discipline. **There are those who benefit from this domination**, in particular the economic elites of capitalism. **But the beneficiaries do not engage in the domination; in fact, they are unaware of its occurrence.** The History of Sexuality depicts how sexual domination has arisen over the course of the last several centuries. But again, it is not a history of how some people sexually dominate others, but of how the very category of the sexual can become a form of domination. **Anarchism, then, should be seen as a critique of domination, rather than as a critique of the state**. Unlike Marxism, anarchism does not concern itself with a particular type of oppression—exploitation—that arises in a particular arena—the mode of capitalist production. Rather, it concerns itself with the various dominations that occur throughout the social arena. **The state may stand out as a particularly egregious instigator of domination, because of its concentration of bureaucratic and military power. However, it is not the only source of domination, and under certain conditions—for example the current situation of transnational capitalism—it is perhaps not even the most oppressive one**. What concerns thinkers like Bakunin is not the state itself as the source of all domination, but the state as a particular instigator of it. Further, in his view, Marx's inability to see this would lead to a repetition of the very ills Marx sought to cure. In this, of course, Bakunin is not mistaken. Have we then isolated what is proper to anarchism? Is anarchism the political view that seeks to critique and to eradicate, to the extent possible, all forms of domination? This is an important element of anarchism, but I want to argue that it is not all there is, or at least not all there should be. Seen thus, anarchism is defined in a purely negative manner; it is defined by what [End Page 21] it is against. Recent attempts to replace the historically loaded label "anarchism" with other terms, such as "anti-authoritarianism," reflect this negative orientation. There is something right about the negative orientation. **By defining anarchism negatively, one does not impose a particular solution to the domination it opposes. One does not draw up the blueprint of a better set of social arrangements, and then seek to impose them or to lead others toward them. This attempt, like Marx's, would only result in a repetition of what is being fought**. The blueprint becomes a new form of domination, and the circle is complete. Must we, then, settle for a negative definition of anarchism? Or **can we articulate a more positive conception of anarchism that allows us to say more about what anarchism is without recreating at another level the domination anarchism seeks to oppose**? Here is where the political writings of the French historian and theorist Jacques **Rancière** become relevant to us. Rancière has **developed**, particularly in two works in the mid-1990s—Disagreement and On the Shores of Politics—**a thought of equality that allows us to think anarchism in a positive fashion without permitting it to become programmatic in a way that repeats the mistakes associated with Marxism.** I would like to investigate here a particular aspect of this thought, one that Rancière himself has not pursued, in order to show that the politics he describes also has within it an ethics to which the politics can appeal. The advantage of this ethics is that it provides a structure of justification for the politics he embraces. **Contemporary French thinkers are often criticized by people like Jürgen Habermas or Nancy Fraser, for example, for failing to have coherent political positions or for not grounding the positions they do have in a reasonable ethical framework. One response to the latter charge is to claim that such grounding is not necessary**, **and that in fact it may reflect an already outmoded way of thinking about politics**. I would argue that **in Rancière's case there can be such ethical grounding**. **This grounding cannot be transcendental or founded in the way many earlier philosophers sought with their ethics. The grounding is more pedestrian. Rancière's politics appeal to a value that has an important place in our thinking, and the burden ultimately falls upon those who would oppose that value to show why we should abandon it. This does not offer any transcendental guarantees, but in a philosophical world that has jettisoned the idea of such guarantees, it is the best one can hope for**. Before turning to the ethics implicit in Rancière's thought (an ethics that is distinct from the type of ethics he disparages in some of his recent writings),1 it would perhaps be best to offer an overview of his political [End Page 22] position. Although a number of his works are now being translated into English, he is hardly a household name in intellectual circles in the U.S. Rancière started his career as a student of the Marxist Louis Althusser, but abandoned that position when he became convinced that Althusser's thought is one of inequality rather than equality. As he writes in his book La Leçon d'Althusser, "Althusser needs the opposition between the 'simplicity' of nature and the 'complexity' of history: if production is the affair of the workers, history is too complex a thing for them and must be left to the specialists: the Party and Theory" (33). This split between the workers and the intellectuals implies an inequality that he finds intolerable. After years doing archival work on workers' movements, particularly pre-Marxist ones, in the 1990s Rancière began laying out a theoretical position that places equality at the center of his thought. In his view, **most of what passes for politics is instead what he calls policing**. "Politics is generally seen as the set of procedures whereby aggregation and consent of collectivities is achieved, the organization of powers, the distribution of places and roles, and the systems for legitimizing this distribution. I propose to give this system of distribution and legitimization another name. I propose to call it the police" (D, 28). What is this politics and why call it the police? **What Rancière defines here is mainstream politics as we have come to live it. It involves elections, bureaucracies, the shifting of power relations in the state and the economy,** the procedures for such shifts, and the justifications that are offered both for particular elements of this system and for the system as a whole. **The police is politics as it is usually conceived,** and as it is practiced by very few. We are subject to the police. We do not, however, participate in either its creation or maintenance. The exception to this is voting, an act that serves more to legitimize the police than to change it—which is perhaps why so few people vote. By naming this form of politics policing, Rancière surely intends the resonances of coercion and repression often associated with the police. However, there is another, more historical reference to the term, one that has been analyzed by Michel Foucault. Policing refers to the set of practices, emergent particularly in the eighteenth century, that seek both to utilize and to maintain the population of a state. Police practices are concerned with the demographics, health, and safety of a population, so that it can contribute optimally to the welfare of the state.2 If we look at the current state of mainstream politics, we see the relevance of this association as well. Although it is not only the state but also corporate elites who benefit from the population's stability, the general idea remains much the same. [End Page 23] **What is wrong with mainstream politics**? **Many things, of course. Rancière focuses on a particular wrong: the inequality it presupposes**. Mainstream politics acts as though certain persons know both the public good and the good of others, while those others are incapable of achieving this good without the intervention of those properly situated to run the affairs of a society. Mainstream politics, which Rancière calls the police, is predicated on a refusal to recognize that people can run their own affairs, and so must have them run for them. "From Athens in the fifth century B.C. up until our own governments, the party of the rich has only ever said one thing, which is most precisely the negation of politics: there is no part of those who have no part" (D, 14). What, then, is politics, politics not as policing but as something that undermines the police order? Rancière says: I propose now to reserve the term politics for an extremely determined activity antagonistic to policing: whatever breaks with the tangible configuration whereby parties and parts or lack of them are defined by a presupposition that, by definition, has no place in that configuration—that of the part that has no part…an assumption that, at the end of the day, itself demonstrates the sheer contingency of the order, the equality of any speaking being with any other speaking being. (D, 29-30) **Politics is, in short, the undoing of the police order through the presupposition of the equality of all speaking beings**. Why "speaking beings," and whose presupposition is this? Speaking beings, because anyone capable of hearing and understanding an order is capable of interacting with others in order to participate as an equal in the creation of a meaningful life. There is order in society because some people command and others obey, but in order to obey an order at least two things must are required: you must understand the order and you must understand that you must obey it. And to do that, you must already be the equal of the person who is ordering you. (D 16) Anyone capable of understanding an order is no longer in need of one. **As to whose presupposition it is, it is the presupposition of those who act. It is the presupposition of the part that has no part, when that part decides to assert itself in the public realm in the name of its own equality**. In that sense, politics is not merely a proof to those in power, but a proof to oneself through one's own actions. "This is the definition of a struggle for equality which can never be merely a demand upon the other, nor a pressure put upon him, but always simultaneously a proof given to oneself" (UD, 48). Politics creates a political subject—it creates a people—through the actions by which they come into being as a people who at once see and impose themselves as equal. [End Page 24] The effect of the presupposition of equality is to undo the classifications of the police order—classifications by which some are given authority over others, whether by virtue of wealth, race, gender, or status. "The essence of equality is in fact not so much to unify as to declassify, to undo the supposed naturalness of orders and to replace it with the controversial figures of division" (EP, 32). This does not mean that there is no unity within politics. **What politics accomplishes is to divide the social order**, to introduce what Rancière sometimes calls a dissensus into it. **The "part that has no part," the people who are considered less than equal in a given police order no longer assent to that order**; they split themselves off from it. They may have unity among themselves, but they introduce division into the social order. This is inevitable, inasmuch as any social order functions on a presupposition of inequality. This undoing of the naturalness of police orders, this concerted action out of the presupposition of equality, is, in Rancière's eyes, the only real meaning that can be attached to the term democracy. "Every politics is democratic in this precise sense: not in the sense of a set of institutions, but in the sense of forms of expression that confront the logic of equality with the logic of the police order" (D, 101). Democracy is the practice of politics; it is the expression of the logic of equality through its assertion by those who have been told, for one reason or another, that they have no part in the determination of their collective lives. The anarchism of Rancière's view is evident here. **In contrast to those who would seek a politics from above**—be it a liberal politics of the state and its limits or a Marxist politics of the avant-garde party—**Rancière's politics remains rigorously a politics from below. It is those who participate, and who participate on the basis of their mutual pre-supposition of equality, who create the political character of any politics**. **Moreover, it can be seen how the presupposition of equality allows us to conceive of anarchism in a positive way, without falling into the trap of speaking for others.** If the critique of domination is one side of the anarchist coin, the presupposition of equality is the other. It is because equality is presupposed, that domination becomes intolerable. The use of power over another is deleterious in that it violates that person's equal ability to determine his or her life. This, it seems to me, is the vital nerve of all anarchist thinking and practice. **Finally, the presupposition of equality allows one to retain the anarchist concept of domination as a plastic one, applicable to a variety of situations**. The presupposition of inequality is instantiated in different ways in societies, whether through gender oppression or economic exploitation or racism or homophobia or some other form of domination. [End Page 25] To act from the presupposition of equality, then, is to champion that presupposition in a particular situation, in the face of a particular domination. Acting from the presupposition of equality does not aim at the same political target or require the same political behavior across all situations. It is as flexible as the concept of domination, leaving the character of political movement as well as the political analysis of domination in the hands of those who have "no part" in a particular situation. Before turning to the ethical status of the presupposition of equality, **it is worth pausing over an objection that might be raised to Rancière's project.** This objection is particularly evident in light of recent French poststructuralist and postmodernist thought. One of the central tenets of this thought is that there is no essential human nature. **Positing a human essence is anathema to** those for whom **history** (Foucault), **ontology** (Deleuze), **ethics** (Levinas) **or language** (Derrida) has, in one way or another, undone either the unity of humanity, the concept of essence, or both. Inasmuch as Rancière embraces the presupposition of equality, is he not ignoring the lessons of these thinkers? **Does he not reintroduce the concept of a human essence into political thought**—a reintroduction that would be at best nostalgic and at worst a repetition of the problems to which Foucault, Deleuze, Levinas, Derrida and others have called our attention? **Rancière's commitments at this crucial point are not essentialist, for two reasons**. The first has to do with the content of the presupposition itself, and the second with the role the presupposition plays in his political thought. The content of the presupposition requires nothing more than people's being equally intelligent to run their own lives. In his book The Ignorant Schoolmaster, Rancière traces the life of French revolutionary Joseph Jacotot. After the Restoration, Jacotot flees to Flanders, where he takes up the position of schoolteacher even though he does not know a word of Flemish. All he has to teach with is a copy of Telemachus in both French and Flemish. He requires the students to write a paper in French on Telemachus, using only that book as their guide to French. What he finds is that the students are eminently capable of turning in high quality work on this topic, and from this he develops the idea that people are equally intelligent. "What stultifies the common people," Rancière writes (although we might take this book to have a dual author: Rancière/Jacotot), "is not the lack of instruction, but the belief in the inferiority of their intelligence" (IS, 39). This belief in equal intelligence is not, of course, a belief that everyone can score the same on an SAT exam or conceive advanced theoretical physics. It is the belief [End Page 26] that we can all speak with one another (the equality of every speaking being) and can together and separately construct worthwhile lives and run our affairs. **To hold this assumption about human beings is not to ascribe to them a deep essence**. There is nothing here that runs afoul of the critique of humanism leveled, for instance, by Michel Foucault in his genealogical writings. Nor is it to return to the nineteenth-century conception of human beings as inherently good, often associated, rightly or wrongly, with the early anarchists**. It is simply to assume that people are capable of political action on their own behalf.** In this sense, **it is an assumption without which progressive politics cannot even be conceived. Without assuming this**, without "trusting the people" to this minimal extent, **one cannot even begin to critique the hierarchies and dominations of a given social order.** Moreover, and this is the second point, **the presupposition of equality does not function as an ontology of human beings. It is not a political ontology, but rather a political assumption**. "[O]ur problem isn't proving that all intelligence is equal. It's seeing what can be done under that presupposition. And for this, it's enough that the opinion be possible—that is, that no opposing truth be proved" (IS, 46). **The role of the presupposition of equality is not one of showing people to be equal, but of starting with that presupposition to see where politics can lead**. It is an experiment, grounded in some empirical observation, to be sure, but not in order to make a case for a human essence so much as to make a case for political action. With this understanding of the presupposition of equality and its role in Rancière's thought, we can turn to the question of its ethical status. The presupposition of equality plays a dual ethical role—one regarding those against whom one is pressing the presupposition, and another regarding those alongside of whom one is pressing it. In Rancière's terms, **the presupposition of equality has an ethical role to play regarding those who "have a part" and a different role to play with those who "have no part**." We must look at each in turn, because the presupposition of equality functions differently in the two cases. **When one acts out of the presupposition of equality, particularly in societies that think of themselves as democratic, one confronts the elites, those who have a part, with a contradiction**. The contradiction does not belong to the political actors, but to the elites. **It is a contradiction that is usually veiled; political action brings it out into the open.** On the one hand, elites in a nominally democratic society believe in equality. It is woven deeply into the belief structure of such societies that everyone is [End Page 27] equal. Whether this belief is a purely normative matter—that everyone should be treated equally—or is more deeply ontologically grounded—that people are indeed equal in whatever sense is important for politics—is irrelevant. What is relevant is that the belief in equality is held. On the other hand, **there is a commitment to inequality**. That commitment is usually not doxa; it is not a belief in inequality per se. Rather, **it involves the commitment to the hierarchies and dominations of a given police order.** To believe that a given hierarchical police order is just or proper is to be committed, implicitly, to the inequality of speaking beings. It is to believe that the distribution of roles, which places some in the role of speaking for others, of ordering them, of exploiting them—in short, dominating them—is at least ethically permissible and indeed ethically proper. To be sure, this commitment is rarely made explicit in the thinking of the elites. Rather, it follows from their other, consciously held commitments.3 (Admittedly, some among the elites may even believe explicitly in the inequality of those with no part, but this is more rare in nominally democratic societies.) **This is the contradiction. On the one hand, those who have a part, at least in nominally democratic societies, hold to a principle of equality. On the other hand, by ratifying a hierarchical police order, they hold to a principle of inequality**. If one were to follow a traditional Marxist line, one might be tempted to say that the former commitment is ideological while the latter one is real. The commitment to equality is no more than a formal, legal commitment that serves only to conceal the real relations of inequality that lie behind or beneath it. **Rancière rejects this way of thinking about the contradiction. He suggests instead that we take both ends of the contradiction seriously, and that one of the roles of political action—that is, acting out of the presupposition of equality—is to bring them out into the open**. Rancière offers a historical example of making a contradiction explicit. The preamble to the French Charter of 1830 stated that all French people are equal before the law. However, in practice workers were treated unequally, and in a variety of ways. In fact, Rancière quotes a public prosecutor saying that, "Everything which the Law has done against press license and against political associations would be lost if workers were daily to be given a picture of their position, by comparison with a more elevated class of men in society, by repeated assurances that they are men just like those others, and that they have a right to enjoy the same things" (UD, 46). While one might read this as a more explicit rejection of equality by the public prosecutor, the prosecutor would in all likelihood also have acknowledged the preamble to the Charter of 1830, without recognizing the contradiction involved. [End Page 28] **What does political action do in this case? It forces the contradiction to be recognized**. "If [the prosecutor] is right to say what he says and do what he does, the preamble of the Charter must be deleted. It should read: the French people are not equal. If, by contrast, [the preamble] is upheld, then [the prosecutor] must speak or act differently" (UD, 47). Here is the core of the ethical situation. It lies not in the violation of a principle that is inescapable, or in acting contrary to universal reason. It lies in contradicting one's own stated principles. **If we are to abandon foundationalism in ethics, we can do no better than this by way of ethical critique.** The reason for this is complex, but its outlines can be given here.4 If we reject the idea that there have to be ethical principles to which everyone is committed by virtue of being human, or rational, or the children of God, then we can only engage in ethical critique utilizing principles that are actually held (or, alternatively, principles that are not held but follow from other principles that are actually held). This can happen in at least two ways. First, **one can criticize someone who does not hold certain ethical principles precisely for the failure to hold them. This is a dogmatic position, but one that is sometimes inescapable. It occurs at the point where ethical dialogue breaks off, and force usually begins. For instance, faced with someone who persists in claiming, in the face of all evidence, that Jews or Palestinians or African-Americans are inferior to other races** (assuming one can make sense of the concept of a race), **ethical discussion has nowhere to go. One must choose either to allow the person to act on a prejudice that violates one's own principles, or to stop him/her.** Although this situation can arise, and is highlighted in certain publicly visible cases like abortion, **I suspect it is more exceptional than the second way in which ethical critique can occur. This second way involves internal contradiction rather than external critique**. We have already seen it in the example Rancière provides. Rather than chastising someone for failing to recognize an ethical principle, one shows instead that the principle is recognized, but that it conflicts with other principles one also holds, or that one is implicitly committed to by virtue of other commitments or actions. Here the failure is one of consistency: the person criticized is in contradiction with himself or herself. Rancière points out that, in the case of the French Charter, there are two possibilities open to the prosecutor: to deny the principle of equality, or to act in ways consistent with the principle. (It should be noted that there is, logically, a third possibility: the prosecutor can commit himself to inconsistency. However, the problems with this position are manifest; it leads to incoherence.) In the passage where Rancière discusses this [End Page 29] case, one may suspect a bit of irony at work. Who, one might ask, would seriously deny the principle of equality, and thus ask for a revision of the preamble? And, indeed, the possibility may ring strange to the ears of many of us. However, it is a possibility that must be taken seriously at the philosophical level. In the absence of foundationalism, nothing commits one to choose one way rather than another. There is nothing inconsistent about choosing against equality, nothing in fact that requires the acceptance of any particular ethical principle. The prosecutor can, without violating any dictates of rationality, accept a principle of inequality. If he does, then anyone opposing him is forced to return to the first position: external critique. **This does not mean that it is arbitrary which principle will be accepted. In a nominally democratic society, there is a strong motivation to embrace some kind of principle of equality. And it is the point of political action**—in Rancière's sense—**to widen the scope of that embrace, by showing its contradiction to much current social and mainstream political practice**. **In a single gesture, political action provides proof of equality to those with no part, and proof of contradiction to those holding a part.** The second aspect of that gesture is at once political and ethical, and, as Rancière recognizes, offers no guarantee of success: Whereas Jacotot's critique confined the verification of equality within the continually recreated relationship between a wish to say and a wish to hear, such a verification becomes "social," causes equality to have a real social effect, only when it mobilizes an obligation to hear. (CE, 86) I would suggest that that obligation is mobilized through the staging of a contradiction. This is one side of the ethical coin. The other side concerns "the part that has no part." This segment does not have to be confronted with a contradiction. By presupposing its own equality, it has already, in the moment it acts, overcome any contradiction between a belief in equality and an implicit commitment to inequality. This is already over the moment politics begins. However, **there is an ethical character to the bond created by political action that has its own integrity.** Rancière rarely discusses it, but it can be derived from his characterization of the bond itself. **What political action does**, Rancière tells us, **is to create a subject where there was none before**. As Foucault and others have taught us, the supposition of a subject—of the type liberal theory envisions underlying its actions and decisions—is deeply problematic. Rancière does not deny this. **There is no political subject that first exists and then decides to act. A political subject—a collective political subject—is created [End Page 30] through action, and specifically through action that expresses the presupposition of equality. It does not pre-exist its own activity.** How can this be? **Before political action, there are simply diverse individuals acting in accordance with the roles allotted them by the police order**. People are classified and, through their behavior if not their beliefs, accept their classifications. **To engage in the presupposition of equality is at once to reject one's classifications—politics declassifies—and to create oneself as a subject: an actor with no name other than that of being equal**. "By subjectification I mean the production through a series of actions of a body and a capacity for enunciation not previously identifiable within a given field of experience, whose identification is thus a part of the reconfiguration of the field of experience" (D, 35). The proletariat is not the name of a group that pre-exists political action. Before such action there are only workers. The proletariat is the name of a group that emerges when it assumes the name proletariat, along with the internal unity and equality that that name implies. "**Politics does not happen just because the poor oppose the rich. It is the other way around: politics (that is, the interruption of the simple effects of domination by the rich) causes the poor to exist as an entity**." (D, 11) What is the ethical character of this subjectification? What happens among those who form a democratic community in action? Rancière is suggestive, but only suggestive here. I would like to follow the hints provided in two passages in his essay "The Uses of Democracy." He tells us that "Democracy is the community of sharing, in both senses of the term: a membership in a single world which can only be expressed in adversarial terms, and a coming together which can only occur in conflict" (UD, 49). He ends the essay with the words, "**The test of democracy must ever be in democracy's own image: versatile, sporadic—and founded on trust"** (61). Sharing (partage) and trust (confiance)5 —**these are the ideas we must follow in order to grasp the ethical nature of political action—that is, the appearance of a democratic community.** We might initially suspect that the ethical character of a democratic community would be broadly Kantian. People would treat others with equal respect, as ends rather than merely means, and as co-participants in a kingdom of ends. This would not be mistaken. However, the Kantian flavor of this characterization misses something important. It is too cognitive. It remains embedded in the language of obligation and duty. Considered as obligation, Kantian morality has admittedly captured the internal ethical character of a democratic community. But we should suspect that this ethical character is not exhausted by obligation. There is something more to it. [End Page 31] We can approach that excess by recognizing that the concepts of sharing and trust do not lend themselves to an entirely cognitive approach. Sharing and trust are based not on reason—at least not solely—but also on an affective bond that eludes the formal morality of a Kantian (or even utilitarian) approach. Kant makes a strict division between acting for the sake of duty and acting out of inclination. [T]o preserve one's life is a duty, and besides this everyone has also an immediate inclination to do so. But on account of this the often anxious precautions taken by the greater part of mankind for this purpose have no inner worth, and the maxim of their action is without moral content. They protect their lives in conformity with duty, but not from the motive of duty. (Kant, 35) The non-cognitive aspect of sharing and trust efface such a distinction between duty and inclination. **This is a lesson taught to us by feminist theorists of ethics, from Carol Gilligan onwards.** In describing many women's approach to ethics, she tell us, Sensitivity to the needs of others and the assumption of responsibility for taking care lead women to attend to voices other than their own and to include in their judgment other points of view. Women's moral weakness, manifest in an apparent confusion of judgment, is thus inseparable from women's moral strength, an overriding concern with relationships and responsibilities. (16-17) **Ethics need not be solely a matter of duties and obligations. Principles can be lived as connections with others rather than simply as obligations to them. When one is confronting an adversary, when those who have no part act politically against those who do, then the appeal to duties and obligations is more pertinent.** There is no meaningful connection to those who are dominating one, or who are gaining by domination. **But the creation of a collective subject through political action is the creation of internal connections, and the ethical character of that subject would be incompletely described if one did not recognize them. Sharing and trust are markers of a set of connections that arise through the political process of subjectification. They indicate a willingness to expose oneself to those alongside whom struggle takes place. To share6 is to offer part of what one has to another or to others, to make a part of oneself available in a way that does not require an equal return**. **It is, in that sense, asymmetrical**. Sharing can be contrasted with the symmetry of exchange, in which the act of giving is coupled with the expectation of return. **And because it is distinguished from exchange, sharing carries with it a political significance. In an economy governed by expectations of personal gain** (expectations that play into the hands of those best situated to obtain personal gain), **sharing is a [End Page 32] deviant relationship. It stakes out an alternative to the police order of a capitalist society**. Trust, concomitantly asymmetrical, is an affective relationship of vulnerability toward the other. Like sharing, it constitutes a rejection of exchange relationships. Trust can arise only in a context where one considers others as more than vehicles for personal gain and, in addition, as similarly motivated. Trust, then, both relies on and contributes to the presupposition of equality within a process of subjectification. Sharing and trust do not exclude a more cognitive set of obligations. Rather, the affective and the cognitive are woven together. **In a political movement, not everyone is motivated by trust or inclined to share, and no one is so motivated all the time. There is also a role played by the cognitive recognition—against what one is often taught—that those others with whom one is engaging in political action are indeed one's equals.** If Kant is not exhaustive in understanding the ethical character of political action, neither is he irrelevant. **But the ethical character of political action is not the same among those engaged in the action as it is among those confronted by it. In the latter case, a contradiction of principles is central to the ethics of politics; in the former case, the principles at play are at times grasped cognitively, at times lived affectively, and at times both. In political action, the tapestry of this weaving together of cognitive and affective elements around the presupposition of equality has a name, although that name is rarely reflected upon. It is solidarity. Political solidarity is nothing other than the operation of the presupposition of equality internal to the collective subject of political action**. It arises in the ethical character of that collective subject, a subject that itself arises only on the basis of its action. **When one joins a picket line, or speaks publicly about the oppression of the Palestinians** or the Tibetans or the Chechnyans, or attends a meeting whose goal is to organize around issues of fair housing, or brings one's bicycle to a ride with Critical Mass, **one is not—if one is engaged in what Rancière calls politics—doing so from a position above or outside those alongside whom one struggles. Rather, one joins the creation of a political subject (which does not mean sacrificing one's own being to it). One acts, in concert with others, on the presupposition of the equality of any and every speaking being**. **And here is where the justificatory character of the ethics of political action lies**. It cannot lie, as we have seen, in an ethical framework that possesses an ultimate foundation. It lies instead in a principle—the presupposition of equality—that can ground and justify political action only to the extent to which it is accepted by those alongside whom and [End Page 33] against whom one struggles. It is, in that sense, an optional ethical principle. But, as we have also seen, this does not mean that it is an arbitrary one. In our world, **the presupposition of equality is embedded deep within the ethical framework of most societies. Even when it is honored in the breach, it remains honored. Political action consists in narrowing the breach.** There remain two questions to ask about this ethics. The first one is interpretive and can be answered quickly: What is the relationship of this ethics to a vision of contemporary anarchism? The second is normative, and can only be responded to, at least at this moment, with a theoretical gesture: What, if any, implications for the specifics of political action does this ethical framework have? The interpretive question concerns the relation of the ethics of Rancière's politics to anarchism. I hope that the bond between the two will be obvious to those who have either studied or acted within the framework of anarchism. **Anarchism's rejection of an avant-garde politics, its concern with the process of political action, its sensitivity to various forms of domination both in society at large and in political communities themselves, and its orientation toward radical equality, are all accounted for in the ethics and politics of the presupposition of equality**. What Rancière's work does politically and implies ethically is of a piece with the deepest concerns of much of contemporary anarchism. Moreover, he offers a coherent way to frame those concerns and to bring them forward theoretically. **Unlike traditional Marxism, anarchism, in its concern for equality, has often been reluctant to engage in theoretical reflection. If what has been said here is correct, that reluctance is unwarranted. There is much to be understood in politics, and many who can contribute to that understanding.** Among what is to be understood is the second question alluded to above: **what, if anything, do the ethics of political action imply for the character of political action itself? I would suggest that the pre-supposition of equality among those who act cannot remain limited to those alongside whom one acts. It must also apply to one's adversaries. If those who have no part are to see themselves as equal to those who have a part, then they must also see those who have a part as equal to them. This has implications for political action.** I would suggest that such a presupposition of equality among all parties must orient political action toward non-violent means. One must, insofar as possible, refrain from treating those against whom one struggles as beneath consideration, as open game, or as what Kant would call solely a means to one's own ends. **This requires political action to be more than just a struggle for [End Page 34] suppression of the adversary, even where the adversary engages in cynical domination. It must be creative in its expression of the presupposition of equality**. Nonviolence in politics is often confused with passivity. This is not the place to explain the nature and possibilities of nonviolent action,7 however it must be understood that nonviolence often lies at the opposite pole from political passivity, further away from it than violent resistance. Violent resistance remains in many cases the norm. One is dominated, so one dominates; one is oppressed, so one oppresses. In that sense, violence is always the easy political option. It reverses the power in a relationship. What nonviolence can achieve is something else: not a reversal of power, but an effacing of the terms in which a context of power has been conceived. In the framework of a political orientation whose task is to declassify, nonviolent action carries with it more radical possibilities for declassification than the simple inversion that is the standard consequence of violent resistance. **If this line of thinking is right, or even if it is wrong in a fruitful way, then the perspective that Rancière has opened for us is not so much a framework within which we can fit our political thinking as it is a door through which we must walk in order better to reflect upon that thinking. The presupposition of equality opens political thought to new vistas**—vistas that, given the history of the last century, should appear more attractive to us now than they might once have done. **In this sense, anarchism lies before us rather than behind us, as a political task to be thought and engaged rather than as a historical footnote to be buried alongside other challenges to the pervasive and multifarious dominations of our world.**

#### Authenticity tests shut down debate– it’s strategically a disaster

**SUBOTNIK 98**

Professor of Law, Touro College, Jacob D. Fuchsberg Law Center.

7 Cornell J. L. & Pub. Pol'y 681

Having traced a major strand in the development of CRT, we turn now to the strands' effect on the relationships of CRATs with each other and with outsiders. As the foregoing material suggests, **the central** CRT **message is not simply that minorities are being treated unfairly**, or even that individuals out there are in pain - assertions for which there are data to serve as grist for the academic mill - **but that the minority scholar himself or herself hurts and hurts badly**.

An important problem that concerns the very definition of the scholarly enterprise now comes into focus. **What can an academic** trained to [\*694] question and to doubt n72 **possibly say to Patricia Williams when effectively she announces, "I hurt bad"?** n73 **"No, you don't hurt"? "You shouldn't hurt"?** "Other people hurt too"? Or, most dangerously - and perhaps most tellingly - "What do you expect when you keep shooting yourself in the foot?" If the majority were perceived as having the well- being of minority groups in mind, these responses might be acceptable, even welcomed. And they might lead to real conversation. But, **writes Williams, the failure by those "cushioned within the invisible privileges of race and power**... to incorporate a sense of precarious connection as a part of our **lives is... ultimately obliterating**." n74

"Precarious." "Obliterating." **These words will clearly invite responses only from fools and sociopaths; they will, by effectively precluding objection, disconcert and disunite others**. **"I hurt," in academic discourse, has three broad though interrelated effects**. First, **it demands priority from the reader's conscience. It is for this reason that law review editors, waiving usual standards, have privileged a long trail of undisciplined - even silly** n75 **- destructive and, above all, self-destructive arti** [\*695] **cles.** n76 **Second, by emphasizing the emotional bond between those who hurt in a similar way, "I hurt" discourages fellow sufferers from abstracting themselves from their pain in order to gain perspective on their condition**. n77

 [\*696] **Last, as we have seen, it precludes the possibility of open and structured conversation with others**. n78

 [\*697] **It is because of this conversation-stopping effect** of what they insensitively call "first-person agony stories" **that Farber and Sherry deplore their use.** "The norms of academic civility hamper readers from challenging the accuracy of the researcher's account; it would be rather difficult, for example, to criticize a law review article by questioning the author's emotional stability or veracity." n79 Perhaps, a better practice would be to put the scholar's experience on the table, along with other relevant material, but to subject that experience to the same level of scrutiny.

If **through the foregoing rhetorical strategies CRATs succeeded in limiting academic debate**, why do they not have greater influence on public policy? **Discouraging white legal scholars from entering the national conversation about race**, n80 I suggest, **has generated a kind of cynicism in white audiences** which, in turn, has had precisely the reverse effect of that ostensibly desired by CRATs. **It drives the American public to the right and ensures that anything CRT offers is reflexively rejected.**

In the absence of scholarly work by white males in the area of race, of course, it is difficult to be sure what reasons they would give for not having rallied behind CRT. Two things, however, are certain. First, **the kinds of issues** raised by Williams **are too important** in their implications  [\*698]  for American life **to be confined to communities of color.** If the lives of minorities are heavily constrained, if not fully defined, by the thoughts and actions of the majority elements in society, **it would seem to be of great importance that white thinkers and doers participate in open discourse** to bring about change. Second, given the lack of engagement of CRT by the community of legal scholars as a whole, the discourse that should be taking place at the highest scholarly levels has, by default, been displaced to faculty offices and, more generally, the streets and the airwaves.

### Perm

#### The uneven landscape of globalization requires those in a position of privilege to orient their ethics toward the suffering they don’t necessarily encounter face to face

Elfstrom 1998 (Gerald Elfstrom 1998, Contemporary Ethical Issues, International Ethics, pp. X)

We never see many of these people, and we are unaware of the existence of many thousands of others, but their actions affect our lives in many ways, and our actions affect them in turn. We are also able to affect the lives of people with whom we have no ties of commerce or friendship. For example, a century ago it would have been nearly impossible for people in the United States to become aware of the suffering of a child in Nepal, and vastly more difficult to do anything about it. Now, we are able to get information about suffering elsewhere, and we are also able to take measures to ease that suffering. One result of the changes prompted by globalization is that we are facing new issues of ethical responsibility. The common ethical beliefs we carry are based on the assumption that we will have face-to-face contact with those human beings who are morally important to us. Now we must ask whether we have moral obligations to those whom we may never see in person and whose personal ties with us are only fleeting. My aims in writing this book are to introduce readers to these new issues, explain how they have developed, and provide information on some of the people and organizations who have made an important impact in the ethics of international relations.

#### Exclusive focus on the local in politically debilitating – your evidence is methodologically flawed

Hinrichs 1998 (Clare Hinrichs et al, Associate Professor of Rural Sociology at the University of Park, 1998 “MOVING BEYOND "GLOBAL" AND "LOCAL”” http://www.ces.ncsu.edu/depts/sociology/ne185/global.html)

If this is so, why have we been so fixated on "local," "localness," and "locality?" There are several reasons. First, lots of people and big thinkers are doing the same thing. A wide variety of well known and very influential analysts (e.g., Barnet and Cavanagh 1994; Berry 1996; Brecher and Costello 1994; Korten 1995; Shuman 1998) are proffering various versions of "going local" as a premier means of confronting social and ecological problems. Too often, however, these paeans to the "local" are founded on axioms and assumptions rather than on good evidence. Second, this emphasis on the local as a solution is the flip side of a similar fixation on the "global." Globalization is THE issue of the day. Having defined the "global" as the problem, it is easy to look to the "local" for relief (Mander and GoldsmithÆs book The Case Against the Global Economy and for a Turn to the Local is a paradigmatic manifestation of this tendency). As suggested above, the "global/local" pivot is a false dichotomy, but dualistic thinking remains a difficult pitfall to avoid-- even when you know it is there. In fact, the local can be confining and oppressive and the global can be expansive and liberating û as well as vice versa (see Henwood 1996; Young 1996). Third, there is now a tremendous amount of interesting and inspiring activity going on at the local level, especially in the area of food systems. From the community kitchens of Lima to the CSAs of WisconsinÆs "driftless region," people in particular places are organizing what are often small scale initiatives that challenge and provide alternatives to conventional food systems. Those of us interested in working to realize a sustainable food system would be seriously remiss if we did not honor and engage these projects. But while it is important to understand why this opposition is appearing in particular (local) places, it is perhaps equally important to investigate the broader context in which such opposition is emerging, and and to explore possible connections between different local manifestations of "resistance." Fourth, locality is closely associated with traditional notions of community and the positive elements of intimate face to face human interaction. We suspect that those of us with an interest in farming and food are particularly susceptible to the strain of Jeffersonian idealism that has long been an integral feature of agricultural thought in the United States and that this gives "localization" a special appeal. A tendency to romanticize the local is not necessarily a bad thing - we do, after all, need to give meaning to what we do. Knowing what we want allows us to bring an energy to our work. But we need to be clear-eyed about our normative inclinations if we are to work effectively. Following romantic tendencies too far can ultimately have debilitating effects: a slide into reaction or utopianism, commitments to pasts that never were or futures that never can be.

### A2: Whiteness Is Root Cause

#### Anti-blackness cant be the root cause of all racism- history of other races justifying violence based on racialization

Spickard 2009 Paul Spickard, Graduated Harvard, Ph.D in History from UC Berkeley, professor of history at UC Santa Barbara, review of “Amalgamation Schemes: Antiblackness and the Critique of Multiracialism”, in American Studies, vol 5 num 1/2, MUSE

For Sexton (as for the Spencers and Gordon) race is about Blackness, in the United States and around the world. That is silly, for there are other racialized relationships. In the U.S., native peoples were racialized by European intruders in all the ways that Africans were, and more: they were nearly extinguished. To take just one example from many around the world, Han Chinese have racialized Tibetans historically in all the ways (including slavery) that Whites have racialized Blacks and Indians in the United States. So there is a problem with Sexton's concept of race as Blackness. There is also a problem with his insistence on monoraciality. For Sexton and the others, one cannot be mixed or multiple; one must choose ever and only to be Black. I don't have a problem with that as a political choice, but to insist that it is the only possibility flies in the face of a great deal of human experience, and it ignores the history of how modern racial ideas emerged. Sexton does point out, as do many writers, the flawed tendencies in multiracial advocacy mentioned in the second paragraph above. But he imputes them to the whole movement and to the subject of study, and that is not a fair assessment.

### Psychoanalysis

**Psychoanalysis wrongly assumes that the observer can objectively analyze a subject creating hidden forms of psychic domination and taint alternative solvency**

Celia **Brickman** (is a clinical, faculty and research member of the Center for Religion and Psychotherapy of Chicago) **2003** “Aboriginal Populations in the Mind: Race and Primitivity in Psychoanalysis” p. 192-193.

The authority of early anthropologists and psychoanalysts alike had been bolstered by the attempts **of their respective disciplines** to model themselves along scientific lines **as a way of placing their new forms of knowledge within a recognizable framework of legitimacy. Contemporary anthropology now** distances itself not only from its colonial ancestry but from the positivism of earlier social science approaches—**attempts to ground knowledge of social worlds in the observation, measurement, and quantification of elements of human behavior**; while certain trends in contemporary psychoanalysis have begun to distance themselves from the model of the natural sciences, which attempts to ground knowledge of the natural world by studying phenomena in laboratory conditions that ensure an uncontaminated source of data. **Both these models presupposed a scientific observer, the integrity of whose observations and conclusions depended on his or her detachment and separation from the subjects under investigation.** They presupposed a separate and preexisting anthropological or psychological reality that would be decoded by the neutral and unimplicated scientist, assisted by universalizing theories and undisturbed by any consideration of the political processes governing these encounters. 6 Such models allowed practitioners of anthropology to ignore not only the embeddedness of both members of the anthropological encounter within historically constructed and politically interacting contexts but also the domination of their own world views through their interpretations and representations of the subjects they attempted to describe. Similarly, by rendering the unconscious as the pristine object of a scientific investigation, psychoanalysts hid their domination of the psychoanalytic subject, replacing recognition (a mutual act) with observation (a unilateral act) and camouflaging their influence as disinterested interpretation.The psychoanalyst, like the anthropologist, **was hailed as the agent who** would make authoritative interpretations and judgments concerning the passive human objects **of investigation** whose own knowledge was treated as the raw material, rather than part of the final product, of the investigation.

### A2: White Knowledge Production

#### Don’t let them get away with playing the “all your evidence is a product of racism” card – you should hold their arguments to rigorous logical standards and not simply dismiss our evidence as ‘just another link’

John McWhorter (Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute, Associate Professor of Linguistics at UC Berkeley after teaching at Cornell University) 2000 “Losing the Race: Self-Sabotage in Black America” p. 54-5

As the spawn of Victimology, Separatism shares with its progenitor a tendency to be allowed to trump truth in cases that require choosing between them. In this vein, a considerable amount of black academic work downplays logical argument and factual evidence in the service of filling in an idealized vision of the black past and present, which is founded not upon intellectual curiosity but upon raising in-group self-esteem. Mother Egypt “Afrocentric History,” for example, is primarily founded upon a fragile assemblage of misreadings of classical texts to construct a scenario under which Ancient Egypt was a “black” civilization (was Anwar Sadat a “brother”?), raped by the Ancient Greeks, who therefore owed all notable in their culture to them. Professional classicists easily point out the errors in these claims, only to have their proponents dismiss them as “racists” for having even questioned them, neglecting in the process to provide actual answers. Indeed, to insist upon facts – or apparently, to master the complex classical languages in which the original documents were written – is “inauthentic.” The goal here is not to weigh evidence carefully in order to unearth the truth, but to construct interpretations of evidence that bolster a pre-conceived “truth,” like “creation scientists” whose objectivity is decisively crippled by a fundamental conviction that God must be the driver of the universe. Uninterested in any information inapplicable to the construction of the Afrocentric myth and closed to constructive engagement, these people may be many wonderful things, but one thing they are not is scholars. Yet they are respectfully addressed as “professor” by gullible students, and one eminent black undergraduate profiled in Ebony cited a volume of this kind of history as the most important book she had read that year. Ideally, an afrocentric academia is conceivable in which people simply apply the tools of the mainstream academia to illuminating black concerns. This is the vision most defenses of Afrocentric work are based on. However, in practice, the centrality of victimhood in the black cultural identity subverts this ideal. All too often, black scholarship is devoted not to general scholarly inquiry about black people, but a subset of this: Chronicling black victimhood past and present, and to remedy that victimhood, celebration and legitimization of black people past and present. Because black people are no more perfect than anyone else and life past and present is complex, this abridged conception of academic inquiry inherently conflicts with the commitment to mainstream academia to striving for assessment as unbiased as possible. In this conflict between victimology and truth, Victimology is naturally allowed the upper hand. The result is a sovereign entity where the outward forms of academia – articles, books, conferences, symposia – are harnessed to a local set of rules: a Separatist conception of academia. In “black” academia, as often as not, comment is preferred over question, folk wisdom is often allowed to trump rigorous argumentation, and sociopolitical intent is weighted more heavily than the empirical soundness of ones conclusions. There are certainly quite a few excellent black scholars, but overall, Separatist academic standards are pervasive enough to make black conferences quite often perceptibly less rigorous than mainstream ones. Many mainstream scholars would be, or have been, surprised at the sparseness of serious, constructive debate at may black conferences, unaware that because of the grips of victimology and separatism, this kind of debate would be superfluous to the proceedings, and even unwelcome. After four decades, many black academics have spent their entire careers in this alternate realm, and as such, have never been required to assess the full range of facts applying to a case, to construct rigorous arguments, or to address anything but the very politest and most superficial of criticism. Here is the beginnings of the notions at the center of “Afrocentric History” such as that Cleopatra was “black,” that Aristotle stole books from an Egyptian library that wasn’t even built until twenty-five years after he died, etc. Moderate black academics are more likely to say of the most egregious Afrocentric work that “more work needs to be done” than to actually pin it as nonsense, which makes complete sense when we realize that the fundamental commitment of much black academic work is not assessment of facts and testing of theories, but chronicling victimhood and reinforcing community self-esteem

### A2 Subjectivity

#### Policy gaming is a key pedagogical practice for understanding and criticising how complex systems like the state function

Sands and Shelton 2010 (Eric C. Sands, assistant professor of government and international studies at Berry College, and Allison M. Shelton, graduate student in political science and international affairs at the University of Georgia's School of Public and International Affairs, January 2010, “Learning by Doing: A Simulation for Teaching How Congress Works,” PS: Political Science & Politics, Vol 43, Issue 1, Cambridge Journals)

The use of simulations first became popular in the education community in the 1960s as educational psychologists recognized the innate ability of student-centered activities to enhance both the cognitive and affective (relating to value judgments) absorption of knowledge (Boocok and Schild 1968; Dewey 1966; Holt 1967; Smith and Smith 1966.) Over the next 40 years, this recognition evolved into a general acceptance of interactive activities as more effective teaching methodologies than standard didactic instruction (Bandura 1977; Greenblat 1973; Greenblat and Duke 1975; Heitzmann 1974; Kolb 1984; Maxson 1974).¶ Scholars grounded this acceptance in an understanding that it was through the active engagement, processing, and constructing of material that students learned, not through the mere passive reception of information typical of a lecture hall (Bolles 1988; Klionsky 2001). This conceptualization of learning extended even beyond the study of education pedagogy, as it was adopted by brain research specialists who began studying “whole brain learning,” or the concept of teaching to the multiple intelligences of the brain (Gorovitz 1982).¶ As a result of this extensive scholarship, the use of simulations has become an established practice in classrooms pursuing higher-order cognitive and affective objectives. In fact, the effectiveness of simulations has been so widely established that they have been adopted in academic, business, and military settings around the world (Assa 1982; Crookall 1995; Rohn 1986).¶ To be sure, political scientists have not ignored the value that simulations play in teaching students about politics. It has long been recognized (Walcott 1980; Dodge 1983) that simulations are a valuable tool in helping students to understand the complex dynamics of institutions and political systems, and this lesson has been applied to many areas of the discipline, including comparative politics (Shellman 2001; Galatas 2006; Kaarbo and Lantis 1997), international relations (Jefferson 1999; Winham 1991; Dougherty 2003), and American politics (Hensley 1993; Thomas 2002; Endersby and Webber 1995; Ciliotta-Rubery and Levy 2000). In short, it has become increasingly accepted by teachers of political science that simulations “have the power to recreate complex, dynamic political processes in the classroom, allowing students to examine the motivations, behavioral constraints, resources and interactions among institutional actors … after a simulation, participants have a deeper understanding of institutions, their successes and failures” (Smith and Boyer 1996, 690).