### 1AC

**Sakai in 1989 explained that…**

Influential Contemporary Liberationist Thinker

(J. Sakai, “Settlers: The Mythology of the White Proletariat”, Published by the Morningstar Press. Third Addition 1989)

In the Philippines the liberation struggle had ¶ alreadv reached the formation of a new Filipino Govern- ¶ ment.-s¶ purred on by the Katipunan, the secret armed ¶ organization of workers and peasants, the revolutionaries ¶ had created a large peoples' army. By the time the first ¶ U.S. troops landed on June 30, 1898, the Filipino revolu- ¶ tionaries had already swept the Spanish Colonial Army ¶ and administration out of virtually the whole of the Philip- ¶ pines, besieging the last isolated holdouts in the old walled ¶ city of Manila. Under the pretext of being "allies" of the ¶ Filipinos, U.S. troops landed and joined the siege of the ¶ Spanish remnants. It is a fact that in the siege the Filipino ¶ patriots held 15% miles of the lines facing the Spanish destroying all organized social and economic life in guer- ¶ rilla areas. Villages would be burned down, crops and ¶ livestock destroyed, diseases spread, the People killed or ¶ forced to evacuate as refugees. Large areas were declared ¶ as "free fire zones" in which all Filipinos were to be killed ¶ on sight. (12) ¶ Of course, evenEuro-Amerikan settlers needed ¶ some indoctrination in order to daily carry out such ¶ crimes. *Indiscriminate killing,* looting and torture were ¶ publicly encouraged by the U.S. Army command.¶ Amerikanreporters were invited to witness the daily tor- ¶ ture sessions, in which Filpinos would be subjected to the ¶ "watercure" (having salt water pumped into their ¶ stomachs under pressure). The Boston Herald said: ¶ "Our troops in the Philippines ... look upon all ¶ Filipinos as of one race and condition, and being dark¶ men, they are therefore 'niggers', and entitled to all the ¶ contempt and harsh treatment administered by white ¶ overlords to the most inferior races." (13) ¶ U.S. Imperialism took the Philippines by literally ¶ turning whole regions intosmolderinggraveyards. U.S. ¶ Brig. Gen. JamesBell, upon returning to the U.S. in 1901, ¶ said thathis men hadkilled one out of every six Filipinos ¶ on the main island of Luzon (that would be some one ¶ million deaths just there). It is certain that at least 200,000 ¶ Filipinos died in the genocidal conquest. In Samar pro- ¶ vince, where the patriotic resistance to the U.S. invaders ¶ wasextremelypersistent, U.S. Gen. JacobSmith ordered ¶ his troops to shoot every Filipino man, woman or child ¶ they could find "over ten" (years of age). (14)

**Thus, We advocate black liberation as strategic resistance to the regime of targeted killing.**

**THIRD, The Filipino tradition of resistance – Countless groups across the Philipines have mounted resistance struggles against the intervention of white powers – the people power movement that my family experienced in the 80s was not only accessible it created activist networks for generations to continue the struggle against white supremacist state-building**

Deats 11 (Richard, Super Consciousness, "The People Power Revolution in the Philippines," http://www.superconsciousness.com/topics/society/people-power-revolution-philippines)

In l986 millions of unarmed Filipinos surprised the world by nonviolently overthrowing the brutal dictator Ferdinand Marcos, known at the time as “the Hitler of Southeast Asia.” They called their movement “people power,” demonstrating in an amazing way the power of active nonviolence, the power of truth and love, similar to what was seen in the Gandhian freedom struggle in India and the civil rights movement in the United States. Beginning with the assassination in l983 of the popular opposition leader Senator Benigno (Ninoy) Aquino, the movement against Marcos grew rapidly. Imprisoned for seven years by Marcos, Aquino had experienced a deep conversion in his concentrated study of the Bible and Gandhi. This led him to begin advocating a nonviolent revolution against dictatorship. His subsequent martyrdom fueled the determination of many Filipinos to continue in his radical nonviolent path. I felt a strong affinity with this emerging movement. I had taught social ethics at Union Theological Seminary in the Philippines for thirteen years. Coming from the southern US where I was part of the civil rights struggle, the parallels with the Philippine situation were strong: Martin Luther King, Jr., the leading spokesman of the nonviolent movement against entrenched injustice had also been killed but his message and approach lived on. In 1984, the Little Sisters of Jesus, a community of nuns who worked among the poorest of the poor in metropolitan Manila, took it upon themselves to contact Jean and Hildegard Goss-Mayr, nonviolence lecturers and trainers in Europe who had worked for many years for the International Fellowship of Reconciliation (IFOR) in situations of revolution and war. The nuns asked the Goss-Mayrs, a French-Austrian couple, to come to the Philippines to help assess the situation. Having lived under Nazism in World War II, they were acquainted with struggling against tyranny. They came and met with church leaders (the country is over ninety percent Christian), peasants, labor and student leaders and community organizers. Out of these meetings came the decision to build a nonviolent movement that would oppose the dictatorship. Also a part of the IFOR and having lived and worked in the Philippines, I joined in this campaign. Long active in anti-war efforts and the civil rights movement, I returned to the Philippines and joined in the nonviolence trainings, accompanied by Stefan Merken, Jewish pacifist, photographer and writer also active in the IFOR. Our training team consisted of myself, Merken and Professor Hilario Gomez and six students from Union Seminary who were part of an activist group, FOJ— Friends of Jesus. Our efforts spread over a wide swath of Luzon, the main island of the Philippines. We traveled by public bus from place to place where our workshops were held: in local churches, a rural life center, a college, a labor center and at the headquarters of the National Council of Churches. Due to dictatorial rule in the country, we tried to keep “under the radar” so as not to be arrested should the content of our workshops become known to the government. The trainings were for invited persons only and were not publicly announced or noticed. After an opening worship, with hymns and prayers, at each workshop Gomez presented a socio/political analysis of the country-the Filipinos called such a lecture a “situationer.” Then Gomez and I talked about the nonviolent understanding of biblical faith that pursues justice, that stands with the oppressed and that challenges cruel authority as was seen in the biblical prophets, in Jesus, in the Asian Gandhi and the African-American King. We did role plays, where participants would take assigned parts, such as a tenant farmer dealing with an oppressive landlord, or a worker stopped by an armed soldier for questioning. We talked about “the pillars of oppression”, e.g., the army, the government, the upper class. Participants shared their opinions and experiences and began to feel strength that came from verbalizing and acting out internal struggles that often had been held in silence. Learning of what had happened in India, in the US and other places was a powerful incentive for action. Ordinary people had done extraordinary things creating a contagion out of which movements had been born. Merken fascinated the participants with his Jewish perspective on biblical nonviolence. Most of them in this Asian nation had never even met a Jew, much less heard a Jewish pacifist discuss the first recorded act of civil disobedience when a midwife disobeyed the king’s edict to kill Hebrew male babies by hiding the infant Moses in the bulrushes, thereby saving his life. So nonviolent resistance wasn’t just a Gandhian idea! We had lively discussions. There was universal disgust with dictatorship but some thought one just had to passively endure it. “Bahala na” they would say, a Filipino expression that means “That’s just the way things are, the way they will be.” Others thought only violence could be effective against evil oppressors. As a bishop said to me, “I used to believe in nonviolence but Marcos is too cruel; only a bloody revolution will work against him.” When I asked him how long such a revolution would take, he said, “Ten years.” (Neither of us had any idea, of course, that less than a year later Marcos would have fled the country when faced with nonviolent masses of Filipinos). Others refused to sanction violence even in a just struggle. Some had heard I worked for the CIA; others had heard I was really a communist! But some had heard that I was part of monthly vigils against the Vietnam War; others had been my students in seminary and had seen me at student demonstrations favoring democracy. The workshop became a safe place where these contradictory ideas and accusations were aired. Along with vigorous discussion were also moments of humor that joined us together in shared laughter. Through it all, the examination of Gandhi, King and Aquino led to an emerging understanding that, as Dr. King had said, “The arc of the universe is long but it bends towards justice.” Perhaps the time of reckoning was at hand. The martyrdom of Senator Aquino heightened the determination of the people to end their long tyranny. Maybe his death was a signpost, not another dead end. The seeds planted in the workshops among Catholics, Protestants, Muslims and others of no particular faith; clergy and laity, intellectuals, students, peasant and labor leaders began to give birth to intensive efforts around the country to build a resistance community. Little by little, but also in unexpected leaps and bounds, there emerged a solid core of activists - including many key leaders - ready for a showdown with the Marcos dictatorship. The workshops of 1984 and 1985 were catalysts that awakened new possibilities into being. Age old habits of fatalism gave way to a determination for a better future. From cardinals and bishops to local priests and nuns, ministers and women deacons, brave students and farmers, a chorus rang out calling for change - dangerous and daring but absolutely necessary. Activists sprang into action, breathing new life into communities, forming new organizations, boldly speaking out about this “third way” - active nonviolence, the path between violence and passivity. I watched in awe at the creativity and boldness of “the unarmed forces” of the Philippines.

For example, each ballot is momentum; an increase in our bounty. Just as in the case of Assata Shakur, the bounty and ballot are a means of raising the profile of the targeted killing regime. We hope to awaken conscious to the need of black liberation, just like the bounty hunter pursuit of Assata Shakur inspired YasinBey.

He writes…

(YasinBey, aka Mos Def. Rapper, Actor, Political Activist, “The government’s terrorist is our community’s heroine by YasiinBey(MosDef)”, May 5, 2013

http://freedomhallblog.wordpress.com/2013/05/05/the-governments-terrorist-is-our-communitys-heroine-by-yasiin-beymos-def/)

Early in May, the federal government issued a statement in which they labeledJoanne Chesimard, known to most in the Black community asAssata Shakur, as a domestic terrorist. In so doing,theyalsoincreased the bounty on her head from $150,000 to an unprecedented $1,000,000.¶Viewed through the lens of U.S. law enforcement, Shakur is an escaped cop-killer. Viewed through the lens of many Black people, including me, she is a wrongly convicted womananda hero of epic proportions.¶My first memory of Assata Shakur was the “Wanted” posters all over my Brooklynneighborhood. They said her name was Joanne Chesimard, that she was a killer, an escaped convict, and armed and dangerous.¶They made her sound like a super-villain, like something out of a comic book. But even then, as a child, I couldn’t believe what I was being told.¶When I looked at those posters and the mug shotof a slight, brown, high-cheekboned woman with a full afro, I saw someone who looked like she was in my family, an aunt, a mother.¶ She looked like she had soul.Later, as a junior high school student, when I read her autobiography, “Assata,” I would discover that not only did she have soul, she also had immeasurableheart, courage and love.¶And I would come to believe that that very heart and soul she possessed was exactly why Assata Shakur was shot, arrested, framed and convicted of the murder of a New Jersey State Trooper.¶ There are some undisputed facts about the case. On May 2, 1973, Assata Shakur, a Black Panther, was driving down the New Jersey State Turnpike with two companions, Zayd Shakur and SundiataAcoli.¶ The three were pulled over, ostensibly for a broken tail light. A gun battle ensued; why and how it started is unclear. But the aftermath is not. Trooper Werner Forester and Zayd Shakur lay dead.¶SundiataAcoli escaped (he was captured two days later). And Assata was shot and arrested. At trial, three neurologists would testify that the first gunshot shattered her clavicle and the second shattered the median nerve in her right hand. That testimony proved that she was sitting with her hands raised when she was fired on by police.¶ Further testimony proved that no gun residue was found on either of her hands, nor were her fingerprints found on any of the weapons located at the scene. Nevertheless, Shakur was convicted by an all-White jury and sentenced to life in prison.¶ Six years and six months to the day that she was arrested, and aided by friends, Shakur escaped from Clinton Women’s Prison in New Jersey. As a high school student, I remember seeing posters all around the Brooklyn community I lived in that read: “Assata Shakur is Welcome Here.” In 1984, she surfaced in Cuba and was granted political asylum by Fidel Castro.¶ There are those who believe that being convicted of a crime makes you guilty. But that imposes an assumption of infallibility upon our criminal justice system.¶ When Assata Shakur was convicted of killing Werner Foerster, not only had the Black Panther Party been labeled by then FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover as “the greatest internal threat” to American security, but Assata herself had been thoroughly criminalized in the minds of the American public.¶ She’d been charged in six different crimes, ranging from attempted murder to bank robbery, and her acquittal or dismissal of the charges outright notwithstanding, to the average citizen, it seemed she must be guilty of something. And she was.She was guilty of calling for a shift in power in America and for racial and economic justice.¶Included on a short list of the many people who have made that call and were either criminalized, terrorized, killed or blacklisted are Paul Robeson, Martin Luther King, Schwerner, Chaney and Goodman, Medgar Evers and Ida B. Wells.¶ Perhaps what is most insulting about the government’s latest attack on Assata is that while they vigorously pursue her extradition, a few years ago using it as a bargaining chip for lifting the embargo itself, they have been decidedly lackadaisical in pursuing the extradition to Venezuela of an admitted terrorist, Florida resident Luis Posada Carriles. Carriles is likely responsible for blowing up a Cuban airline in 1976, an act which claimed the lives of some 73 innocent civilians.¶ For those of us who either remember the state of the union in the 1960s and 1970s or have studied it, when we consider Assata Shakur living under political asylum in Cuba, we believe that nation is exercising its political sovereignty and in no way harboring a terrorist.¶Cubans sees Assata as I and many others in my community do: as a woman who was and is persecuted for her political beliefs.¶ When the federal government raised the bounty on her head this May 2, one official declared that Assata was merely “120 pounds of money.” For many of us in the Black community, she could never be so reduced. For many of usin the Black community,she was and remains,to use her own words,an “escaped slave,” a heroine, not unlike Harriet Tubman.

### 2AC

**Birt 9**

Bowie State University

(Robert, “Transcendence in the Thought of bell hooks: Some Reflections on Resistance and Self-Creation” 2009, NEWSLETTER ON PHILOSOPHY AND THE BLACK EXPERIENCE, Volume 08, Number 2 FROM THE EDITORS, JOHN MCCLENDON & GEORGE YANCY)

It is evident throughout hooks’ numerous works that resistance, opposition even within spaces of marginality, is indispensable to the freedom of self-creation. This is so especially insofar as oppressed peoples tend to internalize their oppression—the crippling internalizing of white supremacist and patriarchal values by African-Americans being of special concern for her. But is resistance only a *necessary condition* of self-creation, or is it an active and positive part of self-creation? bell hooks’ own words suggest a clear distinction:¶ How do we create an oppositional worldview, a consciousness, an identity, a standpoint that exists not only as that struggle which also opposes dehumanization but as that movement which enables *creative, expansive self-actualization*? Opposition is not enough. In that *vacant space* after one has resisted there is still the necessity to *become*—to *make oneself anew*. Resistance is that struggle we can most easily grasp. ...That space within oneself where resistance is possible remains. It is different then to talk about becoming subjects.8¶ Professor hooks’ language seems to reveal a certain tension. Is resistance or opposition merely negative, merely negation of oppression and dehumanization? Or can it also be at least the beginning of the process of “becoming subjects”? In short, is opposition or resistance already the beginning of self-creation, of “creative, expansive self-actualization? bell hooks seems to stop short of making the latter claim, emphasizing only the power of at least some forms of resistance to “enable” creative self-actualization. But enabling creative self-actualization is not the same as *constituting* or bringing it about. And Professor hooks’ talk of a “vacant space” *after* resistance wherein it is still necessary to “become” and “make oneself anew” certainly implies a great distinction between resistance and self-creation. Of course, her description of a vacant space after resistance may be read metaphorically.9 Yet the very force of that metaphor suggests that there is in hooks’ understanding of subjectivity a transcending movement of resistance which aims to liberate us from what Fanon calls a “crushing objecthood,” and a quite *different* and distinctive transcending movement of self-creation.¶ But is there necessarily a blank space after resistance? Could it be that at least the beginning of self-creation, of making oneself anew is part of the very movement of resistance itself? We can agree with Professor hooks that resistance is not enough insofar as it is mere negation. Any human identity is likely to be impoverished if it exhausts itself in mere resistance. But what if resistance cannot be genuine if it is not also creative? What if it is an affirmation as well as a negation? Perhaps there is something to Fanon’s claim that decolonization, itself a movement of resistance, is also a veritable creation of “new men” with “a new language and a new humanity.”10¶ Now, I do not allude to Fanon gratuitously or as mere coincidence. bell hooks has frequently mentioned in her writings the intellectual influence of Frantz Fanon. And we can find between them a common emphasis on the need for decolonization and for radically making oneself anew—in Fanon’s language trying to “set afoot the new man.”11 For both of them this entails a radical transformation of the social structure and human consciousness. This transformation is seen by both of them as being as much moral, spiritual, and cultural as it is political and economic. For both thinkers this transformation must be radicalif it is not to be deflected and thwarted.12¶ But for Fanon this radical transformation of person and society must at least begin during the phase of resistance, perhaps as part of the resistance, or it is unlikely to be realized at all. The transformation which begins to “set afoot the new man” must certainly continue after revolutionary resistance to the colonial system has triumphed, and most profoundly after that triumph. For if the process of personal and social transformation does not continue, colonialism may be replaced by neocolonialism; and the formerly colonized native may then learn from painful experience that “exploitation can wear a black face” as well as a white one.13 But the process of self- transformation, self-creation, does not seem to begin in a blank space after resistance. Resistance and self-creation seems at least coterminous in Fanon, with perhaps more of a continuum than a blank space.¶ bell hooks, who is no less desirous of radical change than Fanon, and who, as a *revolutionary* feminist black woman, goes further than Fanon in radically criticizing patriarchy and rethinking gender relations, puts more emphasis on the difference between resistance and self-creation. In her essay “Love as the Practice of Freedom,” she mentions how her reading of one of Dr. King’s essays reminded her of where “true liberation leads us.” And she finds that it “leads us beyond resistance to transformation.”14 Of course, genuine¶ transformation of self cannot simply reduce itself to resistance. Yet I wonder if it isn’t possible from within bell hooks’ own conceptual framework to understand resistance and self- creation as at least partially coinciding in one movement of transcendence.¶ In her essay on love hooks recalls Dr. King’s statement that the aim of the freedom movement is “the creation of the beloved community.” Yet Dr. King believed he saw at least the beginnings of the beloved community in the Selma movement— in the struggle against disfranchisement of blacks. In *Black Looks*, bell hooks notes that the “oppositional black culture that emerged in the context of apartheid and segregation has been one of the few locations that have provided a space for the kind of decolonization” which makes “loving blackness possible.”15 Yet in *Yearning*, bell hooks recalls within that very space of resistance a vital experience of community, of deep relational love that she thinks so essential to self-transformation.16 And in the “Politics of Radical Black Subjectivity” she quotes with obvious approval Toni Cade Bambara’s comment that “it perhaps takes less heart to pick up the gun than to face the risk of creating a new identity...*via* commitment to the struggle.”17 But isn’t creating a new identity *via* commitment to struggle self- creation through resistance? And when bell hooks calls upon her black brothers to “reconstruct black masculinity,” and to radically challenge limiting “phallocentric” and “conventional construction of patriarchal masculinity,”18 isn’t she advocating a transformation of self and consciousness so radical as to be already a praxis of resistance? To what extent is a liberating self- creation itself a form of resistance? Perhaps what is called for is a more thoroughgoing inquiry into the meaning(s) of resistance itself. At least some forms of resistance are movements of self- creation. At least some efforts at self-creation are inexorably praxes of resistance.19¶ In short, while we may agree with hooks that “opposition is not enough,” we may still wonder if there may not be creative moments within resistance rather than a “vacant space” preceding the making of ourselves anew. A transcending movement of “expansive self-actualization” may coincide with, and partly emerge from, the transcending movement of resistance. Self-creation may prove to be coterminous with resistance. Instead of a blank space, we have a continuum. Human transcendence always involves becoming, but for oppressed people whose transcendence is denied self-creation often finds its founding moments in resistance. For people who are radically oppressed it may be otherwise impossible to reclaim their transcendence at all.¶

**hooks 1**

Distinguished Professor of English at City College in New York. \*No Capitalization to distinguish from grandmother and to deemphasized author

(bell, “all about love: New Visions”, pg. 54, 2001, First Perrenial Edition)

Many people find it helpful to critically examine the past, particularly childhood, to chart their internalization of messages that they were not worthy, not enough, that they were crazy, stupid, monstrous, and so on. Simply learning how we have acquired feelings of worthlessness rarely enables us to change things; it is usually only one stage in the process. I, like so many other people, have found it useful to examine negative thinking and behavioral patterns learned in childhood, particularly those shaping my sense of self and identity. However, this process alone did not ensure self-recovery. It was not enough. I share this because it is far too easy to stay stuck in simply describing, telling one’s story over and over again, which simply can be a way of holding on to grief about the past or holding on to narrative that places blame on others. While it is important for us to understand the origins of fragile self-esteem, it is also possible to bypass this stage (identifying when and where we received negative socialization) and still create a foundation for building self-love. Individuals who bypass this stage tend to move on to the next stage, which is actively introducing into our lives constructive life affirming thought patters and behavior. Whether a person remembers the details of being abused is not important. When the consequence of that abuse is a feeling of worthlessness, they can still engage in a process of self-recovery by finding ways to affirm self-worth.

**Birt 9**

Bowie State University

(Robert, “Transcendence in the Thought of bell hooks: Some Reflections on Resistance and Self-Creation” 2009, NEWSLETTER ON PHILOSOPHY AND THE BLACK EXPERIENCE, Volume 08, Number 2 FROM THE EDITORS, JOHN MCCLENDON & GEORGE YANCY)

It is evident throughout hooks’ numerous works that resistance, opposition even within spaces of marginality, is indispensable to the freedom of self-creation. This is so especially insofar as oppressed peoples tend to internalize their oppression—the crippling internalizing of white supremacist and patriarchal values by African-Americans being of special concern for her. But is resistance only a *necessary condition* of self-creation, or is it an active and positive part of self-creation? bell hooks’ own words suggest a clear distinction:¶ How do we create an oppositional worldview, a consciousness, an identity, a standpoint that exists not only as that struggle which also opposes dehumanization but as that movement which enables *creative, expansive self-actualization*? Opposition is not enough. In that *vacant space* after one has resisted there is still the necessity to *become*—to *make oneself anew*. Resistance is that struggle we can most easily grasp. ...That space within oneself where resistance is possible remains. It is different then to talk about becoming subjects.8¶ Professor hooks’ language seems to reveal a certain tension. Is resistance or opposition merely negative, merely negation of oppression and dehumanization? Or can it also be at least the beginning of the process of “becoming subjects”? In short, is opposition or resistance already the beginning of self-creation, of “creative, expansive self-actualization? bell hooks seems to stop short of making the latter claim, emphasizing only the power of at least some forms of resistance to “enable” creative self-actualization. But enabling creative self-actualization is not the same as *constituting* or bringing it about. And Professor hooks’ talk of a “vacant space” *after* resistance wherein it is still necessary to “become” and “make oneself anew” certainly implies a great distinction between resistance and self-creation. Of course, her description of a vacant space after resistance may be read metaphorically.9 Yet the very force of that metaphor suggests that there is in hooks’ understanding of subjectivity a transcending movement of resistance which aims to liberate us from what Fanon calls a “crushing objecthood,” and a quite *different* and distinctive transcending movement of self-creation.¶ But is there necessarily a blank space after resistance? Could it be that at least the beginning of self-creation, of making oneself anew is part of the very movement of resistance itself? We can agree with Professor hooks that resistance is not enough insofar as it is mere negation. Any human identity is likely to be impoverished if it exhausts itself in mere resistance. But what if resistance cannot be genuine if it is not also creative? What if it is an affirmation as well as a negation? Perhaps there is something to Fanon’s claim that decolonization, itself a movement of resistance, is also a veritable creation of “new men” with “a new language and a new humanity.”10¶ Now, I do not allude to Fanon gratuitously or as mere coincidence. bell hooks has frequently mentioned in her writings the intellectual influence of Frantz Fanon. And we can find between them a common emphasis on the need for decolonization and for radically making oneself anew—in Fanon’s language trying to “set afoot the new man.”11 For both of them this entails a radical transformation of the social structure and human consciousness. This transformation is seen by both of them as being as much moral, spiritual, and cultural as it is political and economic. For both thinkers this transformation must be radicalif it is not to be deflected and thwarted.12¶ But for Fanon this radical transformation of person and society must at least begin during the phase of resistance, perhaps as part of the resistance, or it is unlikely to be realized at all. The transformation which begins to “set afoot the new man” must certainly continue after revolutionary resistance to the colonial system has triumphed, and most profoundly after that triumph. For if the process of personal and social transformation does not continue, colonialism may be replaced by neocolonialism; and the formerly colonized native may then learn from painful experience that “exploitation can wear a black face” as well as a white one.13 But the process of self- transformation, self-creation, does not seem to begin in a blank space after resistance. Resistance and self-creation seems at least coterminous in Fanon, with perhaps more of a continuum than a blank space.¶ bell hooks, who is no less desirous of radical change than Fanon, and who, as a *revolutionary* feminist black woman, goes further than Fanon in radically criticizing patriarchy and rethinking gender relations, puts more emphasis on the difference between resistance and self-creation. In her essay “Love as the Practice of Freedom,” she mentions how her reading of one of Dr. King’s essays reminded her of where “true liberation leads us.” And she finds that it “leads us beyond resistance to transformation.”14 Of course, genuine¶ transformation of self cannot simply reduce itself to resistance. Yet I wonder if it isn’t possible from within bell hooks’ own conceptual framework to understand resistance and self- creation as at least partially coinciding in one movement of transcendence.¶ In her essay on love hooks recalls Dr. King’s statement that the aim of the freedom movement is “the creation of the beloved community.” Yet Dr. King believed he saw at least the beginnings of the beloved community in the Selma movement— in the struggle against disfranchisement of blacks. In *Black Looks*, bell hooks notes that the “oppositional black culture that emerged in the context of apartheid and segregation has been one of the few locations that have provided a space for the kind of decolonization” which makes “loving blackness possible.”15 Yet in *Yearning*, bell hooks recalls within that very space of resistance a vital experience of community, of deep relational love that she thinks so essential to self-transformation.16 And in the “Politics of Radical Black Subjectivity” she quotes with obvious approval Toni Cade Bambara’s comment that “it perhaps takes less heart to pick up the gun than to face the risk of creating a new identity...*via* commitment to the struggle.”17 But isn’t creating a new identity *via* commitment to struggle self- creation through resistance? And when bell hooks calls upon her black brothers to “reconstruct black masculinity,” and to radically challenge limiting “phallocentric” and “conventional construction of patriarchal masculinity,”18 isn’t she advocating a transformation of self and consciousness so radical as to be already a praxis of resistance? To what extent is a liberating self- creation itself a form of resistance? Perhaps what is called for is a more thoroughgoing inquiry into the meaning(s) of resistance itself. At least some forms of resistance are movements of self- creation. At least some efforts at self-creation are inexorably praxes of resistance.19¶ In short, while we may agree with hooks that “opposition is not enough,” we may still wonder if there may not be creative moments within resistance rather than a “vacant space” preceding the making of ourselves anew. A transcending movement of “expansive self-actualization” may coincide with, and partly emerge from, the transcending movement of resistance. Self-creation may prove to be coterminous with resistance. Instead of a blank space, we have a continuum. Human transcendence always involves becoming, but for oppressed people whose transcendence is denied self-creation often finds its founding moments in resistance. For people who are radically oppressed it may be otherwise impossible to reclaim their transcendence at all.¶

### Yancy

Yancy Explains

(George, Prof of Philosophy at Duquesne University, Black bodies, white gazes : the continuing significance of race, 2008 p. 229)

The white student's objection raised the issue of how white interlocutors, when in discussions involving race and racism, may (more than they realize) deploy theory as a way of not being forced to examine aspects of their own white subject position. Indeed, the deployment of theory can function as a form of bad faith. **Whiteness**, after all, **is a master of concealment**; it is insidiously embedded within responses, reactions, good intentions, postural gestures, denials, and structural and material orders. Etymologically, the word "insidious" (insidiae) means to ambush-a powerful metaphor, as it brings to mind images and scenarios of being snared and trapped unexpectedly. Whiteness as a form of ambushing is not an anomaly. The operations of whiteness are by no means completely transparent. This is partly what it means to say that whiteness is insidious. The moment a white person claims to have arrived, he/she often undergoes a surprise attack, a form of attack that points to how whiteness ensnares even as one strives to fight against racism. Shannon Sullivan states, "Rather than rest assured that she is effectively fighting white privilege, when engaging in resistance **a person needs to continually be questioning the effects of her activism on both self and world**.,,3 Although there are many white antiracists who do fight and will continue to fight against the operations of white power, and while it is true that the regulatory power of whiteness will invariably attempt to undermine such efforts, it is important that white antiracists realize how much is at stake. While antiracist whites take time to get their shit together, a luxury that is a species of privilege, Black bodies and bodies of color continue to suffer, their bodies cry out for the political and existential urgency for the immediate undoing of the oppressive operations of whiteness. Here, the very notion of the temporal gets racialized. My point here is that even as whites take the time to theorize the complexity of whiteness, revealing its various modes of resistance to radical transformation, Black bodies continue to endure tremendous pain and suffering. Doing theory in the service of undoing whiteness comes with its own snares and seductions, its own comfort zones, and reinscription of distances. Whites who deploy theory in the service of fighting against white racism must caution against the seduction of white narcissism, the recentering of whiteness, even if it is the object of critical reflection, and, hence, the process of sequestration from the real world of weeping, suffering, and traumatized Black bodies impacted by the operations of white power. As antiracist whites continue to make mistakes and continue to falter in the face of institutional interpellation and habituated racist reflexes, tomorrow, a Black body will be murdered as it innocently reaches for its wallet. The sheer weight of this reality mocks the patience of theory.

**Ogbar 1**

(Jeffrey O, “The Formation of Asian-American Nationalism in the Age of Black Power”, 2001)

The black power movement had a profound effect on the symbolism, rhetoric, and tactics of radical activism outside of the African-American community during the tumultuous late 1960s. Scholars have long credited the civil rights movements of women, gays, and others in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Although the black struggle for civil rights undoubtedly affected the growing efforts of other marginalized and oppressed groups in the United States, it was the black power movement that had some of the most visible influences on the radical activist struggles of Latinos, Asians, and Native Americans, giving rise to a visible movement of radical ethnic nationalism.. By 1968, young activists from Asian-American communities had been impressed and inspired by the militarancy, political analysis, and organization as well as symbolism of black nationlist and black power advocates. No organization influenced these burgenoining militants more than the black panther party. The Black Panther party experienced precipitous growth in 1968, with over thirty chapters emerging across the country. Thousands of African-American militants were willing to embrace the Black Panther Party as a vanguard organization to lead the national struggle against oppression, and Asian Americans took notice. Not only black people but other people of color and even poor whites had languished under the domination of white supremacy in the United States. In the late 1960s, the militant call for black power also reverberated in the barrios and ghettos throughout the country, engendering such organizations as the Brown Berets, Young Lords, Red Guard, and American Indian movement.