## 1AC

#### I’m gonna tell you why the University of Puget Sound has 20 cherry trees planted in front of our Student Union Building. In 1942, when the racist imperial projects of the United States federal government called for the removal of Japanese-American citizens the University of Puget Sound was complicit in the forced relocation of thirty of their students of Japanese descent.

#### Those students were forcibly relocated to the Pinedale Assembly Center in Fresno, California, where they joined 4800 other Japanese bodies who were marked and targeted by the forces of national security which conspire and collude to achieve a total dominance over national life. Over 100,000 total bodies were incarcerated in makeshift prison work camps; the project of securitized mastery regulates an internal political order only on the basis of identifying, locating and incarcerating each and every subject that appears out of place.

The Puget Sound Trail 2013 (Vonnie Keatsguts, anonymous/pseudonymous collective writing for the University of Puget Sound Trail Student Newspaper, “The Cherry Tree Signs,” http://trail.pugetsound.edu/2013/03/the-cherry-tree-signs/)CJQ

In a deviation from the kind of stories that we usually publish at The Combat Zone, we’ve decided to give you something completely ridiculous, the cold, hard, absolutely factual truth! No, but seriously. All true. Over the past several weeks, we here at The Trail have noticed a lot of confusion regarding the mysterious appearance of signs bearing Japanese names underneath the cherry trees outside of the Student Union Building. Some letters merely question the purpose of the signs while others demand their immediate removal, with reasons ranging from a general aversion to change to anger at why this school celebrates black history month by memorializing people of clearly Japanese descent. Astoundingly, none of the authors of the quite literally thousands of letters we received seemed aware of the true meaning of the signs. Clearly there has been a breakdown somewhere in the educational chain. So, where others fail The Combat Zone steps in to share the truth behind those mysterious signs. The signs bear the names of the 30 Japanese American students at the College of Puget Sound that were sent to internment camps in 1942. Those Japanese students hailing from the Seattle or Puyallup areas were the first to be interned. Tacoma locals remained on campus until May of 1942. When it became clear that the remaining students would be forcibly relocated to the Pinedale Assembly Center outside of Fresno, California, they ceremonially planted 20 cherry trees on campus.

On May 15, 1942, before being forced to leave, Shigeo Wakamatsu read an address on behalf of the other Japanese students to the student body.

“We hope that each spring you will watch the cherry trees bloom and grow. It is our hope that those cherry trees will remind you of us. It has been our only tangible contribution to the college, and we leave it behind as a token of our appreciation and thanks for all that you have done for us.” The world they found waiting at the camps was a far cry from their (and our) sheltered North Tacoma home.

#### Our proximity to these atrocities as students who learn from an institution complicit with the cultural genocide of all minority bodies only exposes that there are other types of disciplinary networks at play; the school-to-prison pipeline, border controls, neo-Nazi anti-immigration legislation, institutionalized homelessness for queer youths and the daily extermination of thousands of the poor reveal themselves as one grand network of white supremacy, pursuing both a domestic and international project of nation-building.

Rodriguez 2010 (Dylan, Prof. Ethnic Studies at UC-Riverside, “The Terms of Engagement: Warfare, White Locality, and Abolition,” Critical Sociology 2010 36: 151)CJQ

How is it that a national project so consistently and openly reproduced through technologies of warmaking in its domestic and/or immanent geographies of nation-building (including multiple frontiers and borderlands) can now generally avoid a scrutiny of critical intellectual(and radical political) emergency? Can a theoretical rubric that focally situates the peculiar (though not ‘unique’ or globally exceptional) white supremacist social logic of US nation-building facilitate such a critical, radical scrutiny and praxis? I have chosen to elaborate these overarching arguments and provocations through brief meditations on two overlapping, symbiotic, and historically specific articulations of US domestic warfare: a) the current statecraft of Homeland Security as a formally multiculturalist and ‘democracy-building’ national project that sustains a white supremacist technology of locality-making (the social fabrication of a sense of ‘place’); and b) the post-1970s emergence of a US racist state that persistently enunciates itself as a commonly domestic warmaking regime, such that its established terms of political engagement elaborate the structural necessity of racist state violence – as ‘policing’ – to the viability of the US national form itself. These projects mutually reproduce white bodily integrity as a fundamental and necessary national-racial entitlement, a historically situated reification that forms the political and conceptual premises of national, popular, and ‘critical’ discourses more generally. In both cases, I am concerned with displacing the arrested, default liberal political discourses and activist practices of an establishment/progressive left that is politically unwilling and structurally unable to adequately address the conditions of US white supremacy in its current articulations. Because the intent of these tracings is to suggest a genealogical trajectory rather than to fully exhaust the analytical and textual depths of each topic, the primary task of this essay is to clarify the premises and embedded implications of a specific analytical framework as well as to elaborate a political articulation that derives from this theoretical and conceptual positioning. I ask the reader to conceptualize this as praxis, or activist theoretical work, rather than a conventional academic essay that moves from the pretenses of objectivity or scientific disinterest.

#### And, the Department of Homeland Security calcifies these subterranean racial antagonisms into a national agency with strategically deploys state violence and coercion against deviant bodies who are rendered potential terrorists—DHS regulates the American “homeland” as a white local space that needs to be protected “out there” in the Middle East, East and South Asia, not to mention the Latin and South Americas. Domestic warfare in our immediate communities is the precondition for war deployed as a tool of governance elsewhere.

Rodriguez 2010 (Dylan, Prof. Ethnic Studies at UC-Riverside, “The Terms of Engagement: Warfare, White Locality, and Abolition,” Critical Sociology 2010 36: 151)CJQ

The rubric of ‘Homeland Security’ is a weaponry that deploys within and beyond the American domestic sphere: it is a political and cultural technology that constitutes an interpretive framework through which the articulation between ‘post-9/11’ state discourse and the materiality of new forms of domestic warfare may be easily accessed by a putative national public. As such, the statecraft of Homeland Security-building is embedded in its own allegation of possibility – a sweeping, quasi-juridical order of protection against that imminent danger it cannot do without.

#### Dylan Rodriguez goes on to quote the text of the Executive Order creating the Department of Homeland Security, materializing the authorities of the United States President in the form of a massive federal bureaucracy to target black, brown, red and yellow bodies with a persistent and aggressive strategy of assimilation and extermination:

 (Dylan, Prof. Ethnic Studies at UC-Riverside, “The Terms of Engagement: Warfare, White Locality, and Abolition,” Critical Sociology 2010 36: 151)CJQ

Executive Order Establishing Office of Homeland Security

George W. Bush The White House October 8, 2001. By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, it is hereby ordered as follows: Section 1. Establishment. I hereby establish within the Executive Office of the President an Office of Homeland Security (the ‘Office’) to be headed by the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security. Sec. 2. Mission. The mission of the Office shall be to develop and coordinate the implementation of a comprehensive national strategy to secure the United States from terrorist threats or attacks. The Office shall perform the functions necessary to carry out this mission, including the functions specified in section 3 of this order. Sec. 3. Functions. The functions of the Office shall be to coordinate the executive branch’s efforts to detect, prepare for, prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist attacks within the United States. (Office of the White House Press Secretary 2001)

#### The materialization of the Department of Homeland Security represents the continuation of a history of domestic policing efforts, where warfare abroad and police efforts in local neighborhoods become increasingly indistinct. White subjectivities are ultimately deputized as little police operatives by the homeland security apparatus conducting a war against racially marked Others.

Rodriguez 2010 (Dylan, Prof. Ethnic Studies at UC-Riverside, “The Terms of Engagement: Warfare, White Locality, and Abolition,” Critical Sociology 2010 36: 151)CJQ

To follow the social logic and political genealogy of this Executive Order is to strip the Homeland Security state of its auspices of novelty, that is, to disentangle it from the alleged domestic legacies of ‘9/11’. Responding to the particular ascension of the Ashcroft/Bush state bloc, I am interested in examining the structure of sentimentality, allegiance, and embodiment that forms the condition of possibility for this moment. The current American policing modality, in continuity with its predecessors, blurs the boundaries and limits of legitimated racist state violence. This political mobilization and crafting of the state entails more than the institutionalization of police impunity: it calls for the deputization of white civil society itself. George W. Bush’s October 2003 pronouncement of the Homeland Security Appropriations Act is enunciated as no less than such: On September the 11th, 2001, enemies of freedom made our country a battleground. Their method is the mass murder of the innocent, and their goal is to make all Americans live in fear…The danger to America gives all of you an essential role in the war on terror. You’ve done fine work under difficult and urgent circumstances, and on behalf of a grateful nation, I thank you all for what you do for the security and safety of our fellow citizens. (Office of the White House Press Secretary 2003) While white citizens have always served as appendages of the US racist state, its self-appointed (and juridically sanctioned) eyes and ears, the distinctiveness of the current moment lies in the technologies of interpellation which imbue a differently ‘global’ conception of white locality – white Americana is a ‘here’ that is, in practice, entitled (even compelled) to be everywhere, renovating the conventions of white supremacist globality that have defined historical epochs from the conquest era forward.

#### Our proximities to these sites of white supremacist violence, to the kinds of unmarked and yet highly racialized spaces like Puget Sound’s own Lawrence Plaza, where the 1942 cherry trees are planted, are the only sites where we can meaningfully resist the technologies of white supremacy. The campus is an activist space where we can engage in anti-racist, anti-heterosexist, and anti-capitalist struggles that intertwine in resistance to the globalization of white subjectivities through international wars on terror.

Rodriguez 2010 (Dylan, Prof. Ethnic Studies at UC-Riverside, “The Terms of Engagement: Warfare, White Locality, and Abolition,” Critical Sociology 2010 36: 151)CJQ

The ascendance of the Obama administration signifies this complex tension between universal (white) humanity, “non-white” subjection to logics of disposability/genocide, and multiculturalist empowerment in continuity with the violence of the white supremacist state. White supremacy is historically characterized by a periodic flexibility of phenotype (e.g. “first black president” as white supremacist nation-building’s moral/political vindication) that is already determined by the structural durability of the social logics of racial dominance/violence. Thus, To consider white supremacy as essential to American national formation (rather than an extremist deviation or incidental departure from it) inaugurates a deeper theorization of how this material logic of violence overdetermines the social, political, economic, and cultural structures that compose American white locality/globality and, crucially, generates the common sense indispensable to its ordering. It thus is within the confines of Homeland Security as white supremacist territoriality – a structure of feeling that organizes the cohesion of racial and spatial entitlement – that ‘multiculturalism’ is recognized as a fact of life, an empirical feature of the world that is inescapable and unavoidable, something to be tolerated, policed, and patriotically valorized at once and in turn. On the one hand, white locality is a site of existential identification that generates (and therefore corresponds to) a white supremacist materiality. As subjects (including ostensibly ‘non-white’ subjects) identify with this sentimental structure – a process that is not cleanly agential or altogether voluntary – they enter a relation of discomforting intimacy with embodied threats to their sense of the ‘local’. Those alien bodies and subjects, whose movement suggests the possibility of disruption and disarticulation, become objects of a discrete discursive labor as well as material/military endeavors. Most importantly, they become specified and particularized sites for white locality’s punitive performances: racialized punishment, capture, and discipline are entwined in the historical fabric of white supremacist social formations from conquest and chattel enslavement onward, and the emergence of white locality’s hypermobility has necessitated new technologies commensurate with the hyperpresence – actual and virtual – of white subjectivities. As white bodies and subjects exert the capacity to manifest authority and presence in places they both do and do not physically occupy (call the latter ‘absentee’ white supremacy for shorthand), the old relations of classical white supremacist apartheid are necessarily and persistently reinvented: racial subjection becomes a technology of inclusion that crucially accompanies – and is radically enhanced by – ongoing proliferations of racist state and state-sanctioned violence. Further, this logic of multiculturalist white supremacist inclusion does not exclusively rely on strategies of coercion or punishment to assimilate others – such as in the paradigmatic examples of bodily subjection that formed the institutional machinery of Native American boarding and mission schools (Adams 1995; Smith 2005), but instead builds upon the more plastic and sustainable platforms of consensus and collective identity formation. I do not mean to suggest that either consensus building or identity formation are benign projects of autonomous racial self-invention, somehow operating independently of the structuring relations of dominance that characterize a given social formation. Rather, I am arguing that the social technologies of white supremacy are, in this historical moment, not reducible to discrete arrangements of institutionalized (and state legitimated) violence or strategies of social exclusion (Da Silva 2007) but are significantly altered and innovated through the crises of bodily proximity that white locality bears to its alien (and even enemy) populations. It is in these moments of discomfort, when white locality is internally populated by alien others who have neither immigrated nor invaded the space, but have in multiple ways become occupied by the praxis of white locality-construction, that logics of incorporation and inclusion become crucial to the historical project of white supremacist globality.

## 2AC

### Case

#### Indefinite detention and the prison-industrial complex are the latest materialization of antiblackness directly traceable to institution of slavery—specifically, the failure to appreciate our everyday instances with legacies of racial violence perpetuate the psychological geography that makes possible the white supremacist carceral order in the first place.

Rodriguez 2006 (Dylan, Prof. Ethnic Studies at UC-Riverside, “(Non)Scenes of Captivity: The Common Sense of Punishment and Death,” Radical History Review Issue 96 (Fall 2006))CJQ

The racialized bodily dominance so excruciatingly rendered in the photos is neither unique nor unprecedented, but is rather organically connected to a complex (and historically ongoing) material lineage of carceral punishment. This is to say, the tortures at Abu Ghraib are part of a genealogy of incarceration and punishment and are thus inseparable from the contingent and multiple histories of carceral violence that have focused on the racialized body as the focal point of juridical innovation, punitive technological invention, and pleasure making. The literary and cultural theorist Saidiya V. Hartman has convincingly argued that this genealogy of human captivity is founded on the black captive’s/slave’s availability for the multiply invested coercions of the free white master community: “The fungibility of the commodity makes the captive body an abstract and empty vessel vulnerable to the projection of others’ feelings, ideas, desires, and values; and, as property, the dispossessed body of the enslaved is the surrogate for the master’s body since it guarantees his disembodied universality and acts as the sign of his power and dominion.”31 Prison torture, within and beyond Abu Ghraib, can (and must) be conceptualized as a technology of captivity that is traceable to the epochal everyday of slavery’s regulated antiblack violence. Read through Hartman’s genealogy, then, Abu Ghraib becomes scandalous only as a globally visible production of the illicit, the private (or secret), and the normal of the United States as a social and racial formation that is not only inseparable from, but in fact produced by, its regimes of bodily capture and disintegration. The pageantry of embarrassment and shame is, in this sense, the primary cultural exhibition scripted by the Abu Ghraib photos — a ritualized exorcism that definitively chases away the (living) ghosts of a durable American archetype of carceral punishment and death. As was and is the case with the cultural productions of other empires, the process of revelation and embarrassment has not led to the undoing of consensus for the war. Instead, it has catalyzed a durably ahistorical common sense that is structured by a steadfast denial of the novelty, contingency, and conditions of possibility for the reproduction of the United States as a social, political, and cultural (global) order. The Abu Ghraib photos failed, in this sense, to provoke a movement of critical discourse beyond the rhetorical parameters of unjust or ineffective war making, and instead have been assimilated into a critical pro-war sensibility. While this sensibility stipulates the possibility and likelihood that Operation Iraqi Freedom was waged on deceitful and even illegal grounds, it concedes the fundamental legitimacy of the United States as a global hegemonic power and leaves intact the possibility and principle of the righteous (justified and effective) American war. This assumptive patriotism, driven by the lasting ideological amplifications of 9/11, renders an exceptionalist vision of the “good” American pursuit of local and global dominance, whether through military action or other forms of coercion, and strives for an oxymoronic ideal of global democracy (sometimes posited as global civil society) over which the United States implicitly would preside. The attachment to Americanism as a global way of life preempts a broader and more radically oppositional discussion of an authentically and essentially criminal American military (a conversation generally reserved for armed forces of the third world). It also preempts a discussion of the historical formation of American state violence and gendered white supremacist warfare as the current condition of possibility for the more valorized pursuits of democracy, national security, and civil society at home and around the world. Finally, it makes virtually impossible a critical analysis of the proliferation of the U.S. prison regime in the current moment, including its mobilization and institutional transplantation across a state-declared American Homeland that now claims a global expanse as its terrain of influence, occupation, and, ultimately, dominion.

### Framework

#### Our counterinterpretation is to understand the United States Federal Government as the relations of domination that make possible American white supremacy—only accounting for the power relations of everyday life captures the totality of the state’s presence.

Rodriguez 2010 (Dylan, Prof. Ethnic Studies at UC-Riverside, “The Terms of Engagement: Warfare, White Locality, and Abolition,” Critical Sociology 2010 36: 151)CJQ

‘The state’ is fundamentally a conceptual term that refers to a mind-boggling array of geographic, political, and institutional relations of power and domination. It is a term of abstraction: certainly the state is ‘real’, but it is so massive and institutionally stretched that it simply cannot be understood and ‘seen’ in its totality. Thus, the way a given public comes come to comprehend the state’s realness – or more accurately, the way the state makes itself comprehensible, intelligible, and materially identifiable to ordinary people – is through its own self-narrations and institutional mobilizations. By way of example, consider the narrative and institutional dimensions of the ‘war on drugs’ during its most heightened period of political currency: New York City mayor Edward Koch, in a gesture of masculine challenge to the Reagan-era federal government, offers a prime example of such a narration in a 1986 op-ed piece published in the pages of The New York Times: I propose the following steps as a coordinated Federal response to [the war on drugs]: Use the full resources of the military for drug interdiction. The Posse Comitatus doctrine, which restricts participation of the military in civilian law enforcement, must be modified so that the military can be used for narcotics control … Enact a Federal death penalty for drug wholesalers. Life sentences, harsh fines, forfeitures of assets, billions spent on education and therapy all have failed to deter the drug wholesaler. The death penalty would. Capital punishment is an extraordinary remedy, but we are facing an extraordinary peril … Designate United States narcotics prisons. The Bureau of Prisons should designate separate facilities for drug offenders. Segregating such prisoners from others, preferably in remote locations such as the Yukon or desert areas, might motivate drug offenders to abandon their trade. Enhance the Federal agencies combating the drug problem. The Attorney General should greatly increase the number of drug enforcement agents in New York and other cities. He should direct the Federal Bureau of Investigation to devote substantial manpower against the cocaine trade and should see to it that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is capable of detecting and deporting aliens convicted of drug crimes in far better numbers than it now does. Enact the state and local narcotics control assistance act of 1986. This bill provides $750 million annually for five years to assist state and local jurisdictions increase their capacities for enforcement, corrections, education and prosecution. Rodríguez: The Terms of Engagement 163 These proposals offer no certainty for success in the fight against drugs, of course. If we are to succeed, however, it is essential that we persuade the Federal Government to recognize its responsibility to lead the way. (Koch 1986, emphasis added) Koch’s manifesto builds a mechanism of self-legitimating violence: the state (here momentarily manifest in the person of the New York City mayor) constantly tells stories about itself, facilitated by a politically willing corporate media. This storytelling – which through repetition and saturation assembles the popular ‘common sense’ of domestic warfare – is inseparable from the on-the-ground shifting, rearranging, and recommitting of resources and institutional power that we witness in the everyday mobilizations of a state waging intense, localized, militarized struggle against its declared internal enemies, structurally embodied in the nationalist animus that epidermally 3 (Fanon 1967) criminalizes black and indigenous populations and distends into localized racist state violence waged on differently racially and ethnically pathologized brown populations, from Puerto Ricans and Filipinos to Mexicans and Iranians. Consider, for example, how pronouncements like Koch’s are consistently accompanied by the operational innovation of different varieties of covert ops, urban guerilla war, and counterintelligence warfare that specifically emerge through the state’s declared domestic wars on crime/drugs/gangs/etc. (Parenti 2000) Hence, it is no coincidence that Mayor Koch’s editorial makes the stunning appeal to withdraw (‘modify’) the Posse Comitatus principle (tantamount to a call for martial law), in order to facilitate the federal government’s formal mobilization of its global war apparatus for battle in the domestic urban theater of the war on drugs.

#### Standards don’t arise in a vacuum—their educational practices reproduce heterosexist ideologies and are incapable of addressing foundational antagonisms within academic communities.

Kumashiro 2003 (Kevin, Center for Anti-Oppressive Education, “Queer Ideals in Education.” Kumashiro, Kevin K. Co-published simultaneously in Journal of Homosexuality Vol. 45, No. 2/3/4, 2003, pp. 365-367)CJQ

Troubling movements are underway in U.S. schools. At both local and national levels, conservative groups are gaining more and more influence over education, helping to develop and impose “standards” that prescribe what students are to learn and even how teachers are to teach. Perhaps not surprisingly, these standards are quite problematic: They reinforce only certain ways of making sense of ourselves and the world in which we live, especially ways that ignore or even justify an inequitable status quo. Students are not often learning things that help them to recognize and challenge the different forms of oppression that are already in play in schools and society. This needs to change. I am not suggesting that we abandon what we currently teach and replace it with “better” standards of the “correct” perspectives and knowledges and skills. Any set of standards will be partial, that is, will be defined by only certain people to include only certain things. Even perspectives that critique social inequities cannot help but be partial, offering only certain ways of thinking about oppression and social change that can themselves be critiqued. Instead, I am suggesting that troubling the standards already in place requires teaching and learning about this partial nature of standards. It requires teaching and learning that different perspectives and knowledges and skills can have different political implications–some that maintain an oppressive status quo of society, but some that challenge it, and some that suggest very different social possibilities. It requires challenging ways that the standards normalize only certain ways of teaching and define all others as pretty queer ways to teach. Standards often function in similar ways in higher education, even among academics committed to social justice. Higher education often places higher value on only certain kinds of research, such as those that use “valid” methodologies or draw on “credible” literature or appear in “reputable” journals. It places higher value on only certain kinds of teaching, such as those that conform to commonsense ideas of “good” teaching or those that have been “proven” effective by research. It places higher value on only certain ways of being a professor, such as those that involve “required” forms of service that do not “detract” from official responsibilities. In contrast, it does not often value research that explores alternative ways to know or alternative ways to write, or teaching that explores alternatives meanings of “teaching” and “learning,” or service endeavors that explore alternative ways of impacting schools and local communities. And this is the case, despite the decades of research that points to the oppressions already in play in academia, including in these common and commonsense approaches to research, teaching, and service. “Being” a college or university professor often requires repeating what others have already asserted to be the best or most important ways to research, teach, and serve, which do not often center explicitly on issues of social justice. Sometimes informally and sometimes not, standards of higher education often suggest that being a professor who focuses on challenging different forms of oppression is a pretty queer way to be. There is something significant, then, about the “queer” in education. There is something significantly disruptive about those educational practices that some in society want to silence. This is where I find much value in queer theory. I find that queer theory has much to offer those of us working to change the fields of educational research and practice in our movements toward social justice

#### Queerness--This demarcation of subjects from their historical contexts transforms white masculinity into the unmarked but always-assumed paradigm of governance.

Winnubst 2006 (Shannon, Asst. Prof. Women’s Studies, “Queering Freedom,” 2006 Pp. 45)CJQ

Broad cultural structures of race and sexual difference thus surface as a complicated nexus of power relations in post-bellum practices such as miscegenation, the one-drop rule, and lynching. In these practices, the intersections of race and sex produce a confusing conflation of values that serve as smoke screens to obfuscate the protected, unmarked subject position of the white man. Values such as purity, virginity, and passivity are written on the female body as inherent qualities. In what should appear as an obvious contraposition, values such as bestiality, aggression, and uncivilized nature are written on the black body. The black female body, left in the wreckage of embodying these contradictory ‘natural’ traits, becomes a general aberration that is treated with confusion and fear. And the white male body emerges as the unmarked, normative mode of subjectivity. Or, to put this in the terms above, the white male body solidifies his position as the modern man—the rational, transcendental man in control of both nature and history. The mode of rationality that defines high modernity—namely, as instrumental, transcendental, and detached from history—expresses itself directly in the mode of subjectivity inhabited by white propertied Christian (straight) men in the post-bellum United States. It is what enables and ensures their power over nature and the social field of relations, and their subsequent freedom.

### Capitalism K

#### Marxism relies on a construction of the human which is always-already a white proletarian worker; this distances political subjects from their proximity to systems of racial domination. The affirmative draws connections between systems of class and racial authority which are inextricably linked.

Rodriguez 2010 (Dylan, Prof. Ethnic Studies at UC-Riverside, “The Terms of Engagement: Warfare, White Locality, and Abolition,” Critical Sociology 2010 36: 151)CJQ

To revise the classical Marxist formulation, the sustenance of white bodily integrity is the structural logic that produces state, economic, cultural, and social formations, and is the usually unspoken discursive logic through which the ‘Homeland’ obtains its narrative and material gravity.2 The political crises and social contradictions that emerge from these arrangements – including those articulated as ‘antiwar’, ‘antiracist’, pro-civil and human rights, and pro-diversity – are inevitably and necessarily framed as conflicts to be decisively mediated by white civic subjects whose terrain of struggle is rendered coherent by the mandate of white bodily integrity. Suppression or resolution of crisis and contradication, in this case, can only be intelligible when articulated or (at least) sanctioned by a decisively white community of (national) interest, and it is here that white locality becomes a flexible, rigorously innovative formation of white supremacist dominance: the lived locality of Homeland/National Security is the propertied fantasy of embodied white subjects – from scales across the narcissistic individual to the audaciously collective or national, the fantasy of Homeland belongs to them – at a time when the discursive structures of white supremacy find coherence in the trappings of multiculturalism (consider the formulaic and rigorously enforced ‘diversity’ of the White House police forces, and the US military, for example). The political and cultural technology of Homeland Security is also an expressive rhetoric of solidarity between a durably white supremacist state (the executor of ‘Security’) and the realm of the everyday, the ordinary, the mundane (the ‘Homeland’). Persistent spectacles of domestic and global warfare – domestic police and dispatched American soldiers are expressions of the same impulse – arrive through a cultural apparatus that always already interprets, shapes, and delegates their viscerality and consumption. The political coordinates of this white supremacist (though still multiculturalist) social formation suggest a critical departure from Marxist critic Georg Lukács’s (1986 [1968]: 83) venerated conception of ‘reification’ as the mystification of a ‘relation between people.’ (Emphasis added.) Lukács, for all his insight, was echoing a Marxist universalism of the ‘human’, and was theorizing a relation between the essential subjects of modernity: capitalists, workers, Europeans, Euro-Americans. How might the terms of ‘reification’ be drastically reformulated to encompass the relation between those whose fortified personhood exists within a structure of racial entitlement (white beings are always, if nothing else, human beings), and those others who live absent the presumption of their own bodily integrity, whose historical subjectivity is never a given but must always be struggled for? Can the social praxis – in fact, the authentic dominance – of white locality and white bodily integrity be understood as exceeding the mystification of white existence/bodies, and encompassing the reification of a normalized condition of ‘warfare in the homeland’ (James 2007) ?

#### 1AC case outweighs—the worker retains asymmetrical exchange and labor value while the slave is overcome by relations of force which means it can never enter into any kind of transaction value—the demand of the body incarcerated by its very blackness is uniquely powerful against capitalism.

Professor Frank Wilderson 2003 (Prof. at University of California at Berkeley, “Gramsci’s Black Marx: Whither the Slave in Civil Society? FRANK WILDERSON,” in Social Identities, Vol. 9 No. 2, 2003)CJQ

What I am saying is that the insatiability of the slave demand upon existing structures means that it cannot find its articulation within the modality of hegemony (influence, leadership, consent) — the black body cannot give its consent because ‘generalised trust’, the precondition for the solicitation of consent, ‘equals racialised whiteness’ (Barrett). Furthermore, as Patterson points out, slavery is natal alienation by way of social death, which is to say that a slave has no symbolic currency or material labour power to exchange: a slave does not enter into a transaction of value (however asymmetrical) but is subsumed by direct relations of force, which is to say that a slave is an articulation of a despotic irrationality whereas the worker is an articulation of a symbolic rationality. White supremacy’s despotic irrationality is as foundational to American institutionality as capitalism’s symbolic rationality because, as West writes, it dictates the limits of the operation of American democracy — with black folk the indispensable sacrificial lamb vital to its sustenance. Hence black subordination constitutes the necessary condition for the flourishing of American democracy, the tragic prerequisite for America itself. This is, in part, what Richard Wright meant when he noted, ‘The Negro is America’s metaphor’. (1996, p. 72) And it is well known that a metaphor comes into being through a violence that kills, rather than merely exploits, the object so that the concept might live. West’s interventions help us see how marxism can only come to grips with America’s structuring rationality — what it calls capitalism, or political economy; but cannot come to grips with America’s structuring irrationality: the libidinal economy of white supremacy, and its hyper-discursive violence that kills the black subject so that the concept, civil society, may live. In other words, from the incoherence of black death, America generates the coherence of white life. This is important when considering the Gramscian paradigm (and its progenitors in the world of US social movements today) which is so dependent on the empirical status of hegemony and civil society: struggles over hegemony are seldom, if ever, asignifying — at some point they require coherence, they require categories for the record — which means they contain the seeds of anti-blackness.

#### Their Marxism is methodologically unable to account for the antagonism of race—only the permutation can resist domestic warfare at the intersection of both capital and racial oppression—white supremacy is the way capital unleashes violence.

Professor Frank Wilderson 2003 (Prof. at University of California at Berkeley, “Gramsci’s Black Marx: Whither the Slave in Civil Society? FRANK WILDERSON,” in Social Identities, Vol. 9 No. 2, 2003)CJQ

Any serious consideration of the question of antagonistic identity formation — a formation, the mass mobilisation of which can precipitate a crisis in the institutions and assumptive logic which undergird the United States of America — must come to grips with the limitations of marxist discourse in the face of the black subject. This is because the United States is constructed at the intersection of both a capitalist and white supremacist matrix. And the privileged subject of marxist discourse is a subaltern who is approached by variable capital — a wage. In other words, marxism assumes a subaltern structured by capital, not by white supremacy. In this scenario, racism is read off the base, as it were, as being derivative of political economy. This is not an adequate subalternity from which to think the elaboration of antagonistic identity formation; not if we are truly committed to elaborating a theory of crisis — crisis at the crux of America’s institutional and discursive strategies. The scandal with which the black subject position threatens Gramscian discourse is manifest in the subject’s ontological disarticulation of Gramscian categories: work, progress, production, exploitation, hegemony, and historical self-awareness. By examining the strategy and structure of the black subject’s absence in Antonio Gramsci’s Prison Notebooks and by contemplating the black subject’s incommensurability with the key categories of Gramscian theory, we come face to face with three unsettling consequences. Firstly, the black American subject imposes a radical incoherence upon the assumptive logic of Gramscian discourse. In other words, s/he implies a scandal. Secondly, the black subject reveals marxism’s inability to think white supremacy as the base and, in so doing, calls into question marxism’s claim to elaborate a comprehensive, or in the words of Antonio Gramsci, ‘decisive’ antagonism. Stated another way: Gramscian marxism is able to imagine the subject which transforms her/himself into a mass of antagonistic identity formations, formations which can precipitate a crisis in wage slavery, exploitation, and/or hegemony, but it is asleep at the wheel when asked to provide enabling antagonisms toward unwaged slavery, despotism, and/or terror. Finally, we begin to see how marxism suffers from a kind of conceptual anxiety: a desire for socialism on the other side of crisis — a society which does away not with the category of worker, but with the imposition workers suffer under the approach of variable capital: in other words, the mark of its conceptual anxiety is in its desire to democratise work and thus help keep in place, ensure the coherence of, the Reformation and Enlightenment ‘foundational’ values of productivity and progress.