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**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 fugitivity as strategic resistance to the regime of targeted killing.**

Hartman explains…

[Saidiya, Prof of African American History and Literature @ Columbia, *Scenes of Subjection*, 1997 p. 65-7]

When the enslaved slipped away to have secret meetings, they would call it "stealing the meeting," as if to highlight the appropriation of space and the expropriation of the object of property necessary to make these meetings possible. Just as runaway slaves were described as "stealing themselves," so, too, even shortlived "flights" from captivity were referred to as "stealing away." "Stealing away" designated a wide range of activities, from praise meetings, quilting parties, and dances to illicit visits with lovers and family on neighboring plantations. It encompassed an assortment of popular illegalities focused on contesting the authority of the slave-owning class and contravening the status of the enslaved as possession. The very phrase "stealing away" played upon the paradox of property's agency and the idea of property as theft, thus alluding to the captive's condition as a legal form of unlawful or amoral seizure, what Hortense Spillers describes as ''the violent seizing of the captive body from its motive will, its active desire.'' 49 Echoing Proudhon's "property is theft," Henry Bibb put the matter simply: "Property can't steal property." It is the play upon this originary act of theft that yields the possibilities of transport, as one was literally and figuratively carried away by one's desire.5o The appropriation of dominant space in itinerant acts of defiance contests the spatial confinement and surveillance of slave life and, ironically, reconsiders the meaning of property, theft, and agency. Despite the range of activities encompassed under this rubric, what these events shared was the centrality of contestation. Stealing away was the vehicle for the redemptive figuration of dispossessed individual and community, reconstituting kin relations, contravening the object status of chattel, transforming pleasure, and investing in the body as a site of sensual activity, sociality, and possibility, and, last, redressing the pained body. The activities encompassed in the scope of stealing away played upon the tension between the owner's possession and the slave's dispossession and sought to redress the condition of enslavement by whatever limited means available. The most direct expression of the desire for redress was the praise meeting. The appeals made to a "God that saves in history" were overwhelmingly focused on freedom.51 For this reason William Lee said that slaves "couldn't serve God unless we stole to de cabin or de oods."52 West Turner confirmed this and stated that when patrollers discovered such meetings they would beat the slaves mercilessly in order to keep them from serving God. Turner recounted the words of one patroller to this effect: ''If I ketch you here servin' God, I'll beat you. You ain't got no time to serve God. We bought you to serve us. "53 Serving God as a crucial site of struggle, as it concerned issues about styles of worship, the intent of worship, and, most important, the very meaning of service, since the expression of faith was invariably a critique of the social conditions of subordination, servitude, and mastery. As Turner's account documents, the threat embodied in serving God was that the recognition of divine authority superseded, if not negated, the mastery of the slave owner. Although by the 1850s Christianity was widespread among the enslaved and most owners no longer opposed the conversion or religious instructions of slaves, there was nonetheless an ethical and political struggle waged in religious practice that concerned contending interpretations of the word and styles of religious \_worship. Even those slaves whose owners encouraged religion or sent them to white churches found it important to attend secret meetings. They complained that at white churches they were not allowed to speak or express their faith in their own terms. "We used to slip off in de woods in de old slave days on Sunday evening way down in de swamps to sing and pray to our own liking. We prayed for dis day of freedom. We come from four and five miles to pray together to God dat if we don't live to see it, to please let 0ur chillen live to see it, to please let our chillen live to see a better day and be free, dat they can give honest and fair service to the Lord and all mankind everywhere. nd we'd sing 'our little meetin's about to break, chillen, and we must part. We got to part in body, but hope not in mind. Our little meetin's bound to break.' Den we used to sing 'We walk about and shake hands, fare you well my sister's, I am going home.' "54 These meetings held in "hush arbors" or covertly in the quarters illumi­ nate the significant difference between the terms of faith and the import of Chris­ tianity for the master and the enslaved. For example, the ring shout, a form of devotional dance, defied Christian proscriptions against dancing; the shout made the body a vehicle of divine communication with God in contrast to the Christian vision of the body as the defiled container of the soul or as mere commodity. And the attention to the soul contested the object status of the enslaved, for the exchange of blacks as commodities and their violent domination were often described in terms of being treated as if one did not have a soul 55. Freedom was the central most important issue of these meetings. According to William Adams, at these meetings they would pray to be free and sing and dance. 56 The avid belief in an imminent freedom radically challenged and nullified the gospel of slavery, which made subordination a virtue and promised rewards in the ''kitchen of heaven." Elizabeth Washington stated that ministers would "preach the colored people if they would be good niggers and not steal their master's eggs and chickens and things that they might go to the kitchen of heaven when they died." It was not uncommon for slave owners to impart a vision of Christianity in which the enslaved would also attend to them in the afterlife. As one mistress stated, "I would give anything if I could have Mal'ia in heaven with me to do little things for me. "57 For the enslaved the belief in a divine authority minimized and contained the do­ minion of the master. As well, these meetings facilitated a sense of collective identification through the invocation of a common condition as an oppressed people and a shared destiny. Serving God ultimately was to be actualized in the abolition of slavery. Stealing away involved unlicensed movement, collective assembly, and an abrogation of the terms of subjection in acts as simple as sneaking off to laugh and talk with friends or making noctumal visits to loved ones. 58 Sallie Johnson said that men would often sneak away to visit their wives.59 These nighttime visits to lovers and family were a way of redressing the natal alienation or enforced "kinlessness" of the enslaved, as well as practices of naming, running away, and refusing to marry a mate not of one's choosing or to remarry after a husband or wife was sold away; all of these were efforts to maintain, if not reconstitute, these ties. 60 Dora Frank's uncle would sneak off at night to see his woman. On one occasion, he failed to return by daylight, and "nigger hounds" were sent after him. He was given 100 lashes and sent to work with the blood still running down his back.61 Dempsey Jordan recognized that the risks involved in such journeys were great but slipped off at night to see his girl in spite 0f them: ''I was taking a great chance. I would go and see my girl lots of nights and one time I crawled 100 yards to her room and got in the bed with her and lay there until nearly daylight talking to her. One time I was there with her and them patterollers come that night and walked all around in that mom and this here negro was in her bed down under that moss and they never found me. I sure was scared."62 The fact that the force of violence and the threat of sale did not prevent such actions illustrates the ways in which the requirements of property relations were defied in the course of everyday practices. The consequences of these small-scale challenges were sometimes life threatening, if not fatal. Fannie Moore remembered the violence that followed the discovery of a secret dance. They were dancing and singing when the patrollers invaded the dance and started beating people. When Uncle Joe's son decided it was "time to die" because he couldn't sustain another beating and fought back, the patrollers beat him to death and whipped half a dozen others before sending them home. 63 According to Jane Pyatt, if slaves had a party or a prayer meeting and they made too much noise, patrollers would beat them and sometimes would sell them. The patrollers took two of her brothers, and she never saw them again.64 Generally, the punish­ ment for unlicensed assembly or travel was twenty-five to fifty lashes. Stealing away was synonymous with defiance because it necessarily involved seizing the master's property and asserting the self in transgression of the law. The trespasses that were invariably a part of stealing away were a source of danger, pride, and a great deal of boasting. Garland Monroe noted that the secret meetings he participated in were held in the open, not in huts or arbot. They were confident that they could outwit and defy patrollers. If the patrollers came, the slaves took advantage of a superior knowledge of the territory to escape capture or detection.6s Physical confrontations with patrollers were a regular feature of these accounts, and a vine stretched across the road to trip the patrollers' horses was the most common method of foiling one's pursuers.66 As James Davis bragged, "I've seen the Ku Klux in slavery times and I've cut a many grapevine. We'd be in the place dancin' and playin' the banjo and the grapevine strung across the road and the Ku Klux come ridin' along and run right into it and throw the horses down. "67 The enslaved were empowered by the collective challenge posed to power and the mutual reinforcement against fear of discovery or punishment. From this perspective, pastoral and folksy slave gatherings appear like small-scale battles with the owners, local whites, .and the Law. These day-to-day and routine forms of contestation operated within the confines of relations of power and simultaneously challenged those very relations as these covert and chameleonic practices both complied with and disrupted the demands of the system through the expression of a counterdiscourse of freedom. In the course of such gatherings, even the span of the Potomac could be made a bridge of community and solidarity. As James Deane remembered, they would blow conch shells at night to signal a gathering. "We would all meet on the bank of the Potomac River and sing across the river to the slaves in Virginia, and they would sing back to us."68 Such small-scale infringements of the law also produced cleavages in the spatial organiza­ tion of domination. The play on "stealing," "taking or appropriating without right or leave and with the intent to keep or make use of wrongfully" or "to appropriate entirely to oneself or beyond one's proper share," articulates the dilemma of the subject without rights and the degree to which any exercise of agency or appropriation of the self is only intelligible as crime or already encoded as crime.69 As well, it highlights the transgression of such furtive and clandestine peregrinations since the very assertions and activity required to assemble at praise meetings, dances, et cetera, were nothing less than a fundamental challenge to and breach of the claims of slave property-the black captive as object and the ground of the master's inalienable right, being, and liberty. The agency of theft or the simple exercise of any claims to the self, however restricted, challenged the figuration of the black captive as devoid of will. 70 Stealing away ironically encapsulated the impossibility of self-possession as it exposed the link between liberty and slave property by playing with and against the terms of dispossession. The use of the term "play" is not intended to make light of the profound dislocations and divisions experienced by the enslaved or to imply that these tentative negotiations of one's status or condition were not pained or wrenching but to highlight[s] the performative dimension of these assaults as staged, repeated, and rehearsed-what Richard Schechner terms "twice-behaved behavior. "71 Through stealing away, counterclaims about justice and freedom were advanced that denied the sanctity or legitimacy of rights of property in a double gesture that played on the meaning of theft. Implicit within the appropriation of the object of property was an insistence that flew in the face of the law: liberty defined by inalienable rights of property was theft. Stealing away exploited the bifurcated condition of the black captive as subject and object by the flagrant assertion of unlicensed and felonious behavior and by pleading innocence, precisely because as an object the slave was the very negation of an intending consciousness or will. The disruptive assertions, necessarily a part of stealing away, ultimately transgressed the law of property. Similarly, stealing away defied and subversively appropriated slave owners' de­ signs for mastery and control-primarily the captive body as the extension of the master's power and the spatial organization of domination. Stealing away involved not only an appropriation of the self but also a disruption of the spatial organization of dominance that confined slaves to the policed location of the quarters unless provided with written permission of the slaveholder to go elsewhere.n As well, the organization of dominant space involved the separation of public and private realms; this separation reproduced and extended the subordination and repression of the enslaved. If the public realm is reserved for the bourgeois citizen subject and the private realm is inscribed by freedom of property ownership and contractual transactions based upon free will, then in what space is the articulation of the needs and desires of the enslaved at all possible?73 How does one contest the ideological codification and containment of the bounds of the political? Ultimately, the struggle waged in everyday practices, from the appropriation of space in local and pedestrian acts, holding a praise meeting in the woods, meeting a lover in the canebrake, or throwing a sun-eptitious dance in the quatters to the contestation of one's status as transactable object or the vehicle of another's rights, was about the creation of a social space in which the assertion of needs, desires, and counterclaims could be collectively aired, thereby granting property a social life and an arena or shared identification with other slaves. Like de Cetteau's walker who challenges the disciplinary apparatus of the urban system with his idle footsteps, these practices also create possibilities within the space of domination, transgress the policed space of subordination through \_unlicensed travel and collective assembly across the privatized lines of plantation households, and disrupt boundaries between the public and private in the articulation of insurgent claims that make need the medium of politics.74
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**Dillon 13**

Stephen, Ph.D Candidate, University of Minnesota

(“Fugitive Life: Race, Gender, and the Rise of the Neoliberal-Carceral State”, May 2013, http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/11299/153053/1/Dillon\_umn\_0130E\_13833.pdf)

¶ For Brand, the Middle Passage and chattel-slavery compose the original template for ¶ ¶ modern power. The door of no return is the site from which all disciplinary and ¶ ¶ biopolitical regimes emanate. It (and not it alone) determines the ways people are ¶ ¶ regulated, visualized, mobilized, positioned, and organized. Yet, the deathly touch of ¶ ¶ terror and the warm embrace of inclusion are not just stained from the original scene. What began at the door is also transmitted, transformed, renewed, and repositioned in our ¶ ¶ present day.33 This is what Saidiya Hartman calls the “afterlife of slavery,” where ¶ ¶ premature death, incarceration, limited access to healthcare and education, and poverty ¶ ¶ are structured by the logics and technologies of chattel-slavery.34 Under this analytic, the ¶ ¶ past does not give way to the present, slowly dissolving under the bright shinning light of ¶ ¶ progress; slavery’s afterlife is the past’s possession of the present. The past holds the ¶ ¶ present captive—structuring, surrounding, and inhabiting it. The fabrication of concrete ¶ ¶ and compartmentalized conceptions of time and space dissolves under the crushing ¶ ¶ weight of the blood stained gate. But this possession does not just take the form of the ¶ ¶ tactile, visible, and known. Part of the afterlife of slavery emanates from an absence that ¶ ¶ cannot be recovered or repaired. The door of no return is not a place, it is a gap that ¶ ¶ founds the now—it is history as the unknown. The present rests upon this rupture, upon ¶ ¶ the unknowable, upon the forgotten, and upon the dead.

**Evans 13**

(Rashad, JD Two-time first round debater. CEDA Champion, NDT Semifinalist, and Championship Head coach

“[The NDT & The Anti-Blackness Hangover](http://www.rwesq.com/the-ndt-the-anti-blackness-hangover/)”, August 20, 2013, http://www.rwesq.com/the-ndt-the-anti-blackness-hangover/)

First, the 3-2 decision in favor of Emporia State was historic and epic.  Equally as epic was the published ballot that followed.  That ballot, despite being cast in favor of Emporia State, was largely a love letter to the losing team from Northwestern and to the history of a debate community that had been indicted as exclusionary, anti-black and anti-gay.  That ballot was also critical of the “resistance” movement in debate and called for those who self-identified as in resistance to be more reflective.  Oddly, the author offered no such advice to the majority of the community and revealed no such self-reflection of his own.  The ballot seems to suggest that those in resistance are aggressors, that we are the trouble makers, that we are making this racism stuff up and that really everyone is on our side.  This, of course, is gormet bullshit.  Resistance is not the problem, debate is the problem.  Resistance exists to resist your bullshit.  The anti-blackness in this ballot was turned up to say the least.  This is especially true given the lengths to which the author went to explain how sexist the activity is while offering ZERO insight into blackness and queerness…the subject of the debate.  Is it ironic or predictable that a black NDT champion would be crowned with such a simultaneous anti-black pronouncement? Second, the 3-2 decision in favor of Wake Forest over Louisville and corresponding move by some in the NDT committee to consider criminal charges against a Black debater after he threatened a Wake debater who used a racial slur further solidifying that Black debaters can only be aggressors and never the victim.  Setting aside the specifics of the debate, the response is outrageous.  Particularly outrageous to me because Black people are threatened by non-Black people in this community EVERY DEBATE TOURNAMENT.  Every time a debater says “the community will backlash if you vote for X performance” they have made a threat.  Every time a judge votes for that argument, they have entered into the conspiracy.  Given that Black debaters in this community already live in isolation and social death, the only logical conclusion is that the threat of a backlash is a threat to escalate to physical violence.  Given the violent history of white people, particularly towards Black people I have every reason to believe that non-Black debaters in the community will make good on this threat.  In generally, I am quite disgusted that the NDT and the community at large has not considered a more productive way to address the racial tensions in the community than (1) figure it out in the debates and (2) prosecute the Black folk.  Acting like there is no problem, or worse, like this is a Black problem only makes future racial violence inevitable and this will be bad for everyone involved in this activity.  Get your shit together NDT.

**Boyle 12**

Professor of International Law, University of Illinois College of Law

(Francis A, “Unlimited Imperialism and the Threat of World War III. U.S. Militarism at the Start of the 21st Century

The Legacy of Two World Wars”, December 25, 2012, http://www.globalresearch.ca/unlimited-imperialism-and-the-threat-of-world-war-iii-u-s-militarism-at-the-start-of-the-21st-century/5316852)

Historically, this latest eruption of American militarism at the start of the 21st Century is akin to that of America opening the 20th Century by means of the U.S.-instigated Spanish-American War in 1898. Then the Republican administration of President William McKinley stole their colonial empire from Spain in Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines; inflicted a near genocidal war against the Filipino people; while at the same time illegally annexing the Kingdom of Hawaii and subjecting the Native Hawaiian people (who call themselves the Kanaka Maoli) to near genocidal conditions. Additionally, McKinley’s military and colonial expansion into the Pacific was also designed to secure America’s economic exploitation of China pursuant to the euphemistic rubric of the “open door” policy. But over the next four decades America’s aggressive presence, policies, and practices in the “Pacific” would ineluctably pave the way for Japan’s attack at Pearl Harbor on Dec. 7, 194l, and thus America’s precipitation into the ongoing Second World War.¶ Today a century later the serial imperial aggressions launched and menaced by the Republican Bush Jr. administration and now the Democratic Obama administration are threatening to set off World War III.¶ By shamelessly exploiting the terrible tragedy of September 11 2001, the Bush Jr. administration set forth to steal a hydrocarbon empire from the Muslim states and peoples living in Central Asia and the Persian Gulf and Africa under the bogus pretexts of (1) fighting a war against international terrorism; and/or (2) eliminating weapons of mass destruction; and/or (3) the promotion of democracy; and/or (4) self-styled “humanitarian intervention”/responsibility to protect. Only this time the geopolitical stakes are infinitely greater than they were a century ago: control and domination of two-thirds of the world’s hydrocarbon resources and thus the very fundament and energizer of the global economic system – oil and gas. The Bush Jr./ Obama administrations have already targeted the remaining hydrocarbon reserves of Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia for further conquest or domination, together with the strategic choke-points at sea and on land required for their transportation. In this regard, the Bush Jr. administration announced the establishment of the U.S. Pentagon’s Africa Command (AFRICOM) in order to better control, dominate, and exploit both the natural resources and the variegated peoples of the continent of Africa, the very cradle of our human species. Libya and the Libyans became the first victims to succumb to AFRICOM under the Obama administration. They will not be the last.¶ This current bout of U.S. imperialism is what Hans Morgenthau denominated “unlimited imperialism” in his seminal work Politics Among Nations (4th ed. 1968, at 52-53): ¶ “The outstanding historic examples of unlimited imperialism are the expansionist policies of Alexander the Great, Rome, the Arabs in the seventh and eighth centuries, Napoleon I, and Hitler. They all have in common an urge toward expansion which knows no rational limits, feeds on its own successes and, if not stopped by a superior force, will go on to the confines of the political world. This urge will not be satisfied so long as there remains anywhere a possible object of domination–a politically organized group of men which by its very independence challenges the conqueror’s lust for power. It is, as we shall see, exactly the lack of moderation, the aspiration to conquer all that lends itself to conquest, characteristic of unlimited imperialism, which in the past has been the undoing of the imperialistic policies of this kind… “¶ It is the Unlimited Imperialists along the lines of Alexander, Rome, Napoleon and Hitler who are now in charge of conducting American foreign policy. The factual circumstances surrounding the outbreaks of both the First World War and the Second World War currently hover like twin Swords of Damocles over the heads of all humanity. The US has embarked on a military adventure, “a long war”, which threatens the future of humanity. US-NATO weapons of mass destruction are portrayed as instruments of peace. Mini-nukes are said to be “harmless to the surrounding civilian population”. Pre-emptive nuclear war is portrayed as a “humanitarian undertaking”.¶ While one can conceptualize the loss of life and destruction resulting from present-day wars including Iraq and Afghanistan, it is impossible to fully comprehend the devastation which might result from a Third World War, using “new technologies” and advanced weapons, until it occurs and becomes a reality. The international community has endorsed nuclear war in the name of world peace. “Making the world safer” is the justification for launching a military operation which could potentially result in a nuclear holocaust.¶ Nuclear war has become a multibillion dollar undertaking, which fills the pockets of US defense contractors. What is at stake is the outright “privatization of nuclear war”.¶ The Pentagon’s global military design is one of world conquest. The military deployment of US-NATO forces is occurring in several regions of the world simultaneously.¶ Central to an understanding of war, is the media campaign which grants it legitimacy in the eyes of public opinion. A good versus evil dichotomy prevails. The perpetrators of war are presented as the victims. Public opinion is misled.¶ Breaking the “big lie”, which upholds war as a humanitarian undertaking, means breaking a criminal project of global destruction, in which the quest for profit is the overriding force. This profit-driven military agenda destroys human values and transforms people into unconscious zombies.

**bell hooks explains…**

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

(“Love as the Practice of Freedom”, Essay, No Date

<http://www.clas.ufl.edu/users/dreznik/Love%20as%20the%20Practice%20of%20Freedom%20by%20bell%20hooks.pdf>)

Black folks entering the realm of racially integrated, American life ¶ because of the success of civil rights and black power movement suddenly found we were grappling with an intensification of internalized ¶ racism. The deaths of these important leaders (as well as liberal white ¶ leaders who were major allies in the struggle for racial equality) ushered ¶ in tremendous feelings of hopelessness, powerlessness, and despair. ¶ Wounded in that space where we would know love, black people collectively experienced intense pain and anguish about our future. The absence of public spaces where that pain could be articulated, expressed, ¶and shared meant that it was held in-festering, suppressing the possibility ¶ that this collective grief would be reconciled in community even as ways ¶ to move beyond it and continue resistance struggle would be envisioned. ¶ Feeling as though "the world had really come to an end," in the sense that ¶ a hope had died that racial justice would become the norm, a life-threat- ¶ ening despair took hold in black life. We will never know to what extent ¶ the black masculinist focus on hardness and toughness served as a barrier ¶ preventing sustained public acknowledgment of the enormous grief and pain in black life. In World as Lover, World as Self; Joanna Macy emphasizes in her chapter on "Despair Work" that ¶ the refusal to feel takes a heavy toll. Not only is there an irnpoverishment of our emotional and sensory life . . . but this psychic numbing " ¶ also impedes our capacity to process and respond to information. ¶ The energy expended in pushing down despair is diverted from more ¶ creative uses, depleting the resilience and imagination needed for ¶ fresh visions and strategies. ¶ If black folks are to move forward in our struggle for liberation, we must ¶ confront the legacy of this unreconciled grief, for it has been the breeding ¶ ground for profound nihilistic despair. We must collectively return to a ¶ radical political vision of social change rooted in a love ethic and seek ¶ once again to convert masses of people, black and nonblack. ¶ A culture of domination is anti-love. It requires violence to sustain ¶ itself. To choose love is to go against the prevailing values of the culture. ¶ Many people feel unable to love either themselves or others because they ¶ do not know what love is. Contemporary songs like Tina Turner's ¶ "What's Love Got To Do With It" advocate a system of exchange around ¶ desire, mirroring the economics of capitalism: the idea that love is ¶ important is mocked. In his essay "Love and Need: Is Love a Package or a ¶ Message?" Thomas Merton argues that we are taught within the frame- ¶ work of competitive consumer capitalism to see love as a business deal: ¶ "This concept of love assumes that the machinery of buying and selling ¶ of needs is what makes everything run. It regards life as a market and love ¶ as a variation on free enterprise." Though many folks recognize and cri- ¶ tique the commercialization of love, they see no alternative. Not knowing ¶ how to love or even what love is, many people feel emotionally lost; 0th ¶ ers search for definitions, for ways to sustain a love ethic in a culture that ¶ negates human value and valorizes materialism.

**Dillon 12**

Ph.D. candidate in American Studies at the University of Minnesota.

(“State of White Supremacy: Racism, Governance, and the United States” (Book Review) August 28, 2012, http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2012/08/28/book-review-state-of-white-supremacy-darkmatter-journal/)

Here, the first two essays discuss racial discrimination in education. George Lipsitz provides a masterful reading of U.S. court cases (including a powerful rereading of Brown v. Board of Education) concerning racial discrimination in education to highlight how racism continues under the names equality, desegregation, and protection. As Lipsitz observes, the wording of Brown allows school districts to declare non-discriminatory intentions without taking reparative action. In this way, the state uses laws intended to end white supremacy in order to preserve it. Thus, the law (like the citizen and the human) is a not a vehicle of liberation but a tool of subjection. Lipsitz’s analysis of legal white supremacy authorized by Civil Rights legislation is complemented by the work of Sanford Schram, Richard Fording, and Joe Soss on what they term “neoliberal-paternalism.” Neoliberal paternalism apprehends the ways contemporary forms of poverty governance resurrect older modes of population management in order to connect them to more recent neoliberal modes of governance. Past forms of racialized state violence become sutured to newer forms of control and punishment. As more and more poor people of color abandoned by neoliberal restructuring are captured by an unprecedented regime of incarceration, welfare has increasingly mimicked the penal sphere. We might add the education system to the massive network of racialized state power outlined by Schram, Fording, and Soss. This almost unimaginable regime of racialized management and control produces a system where, as Joy James writes, “Whites are to be protected, and Black life is to be contained in order to protect whites and their property (both personal and public or institutional)” (169). These critiques of the state are powerfully extended by the work of Andrea Smith and João H. Costa Vargas in the book’s final section. Smith continues the collection’s critique of the law by observing that “genocide has never been against the law in the United States” because “Native Genocide has been expressly sanctioned as the law” (231). Like Rodríguez, Smith argues for a politics of abolition and undoing rather than reform and inclusion. In her analysis of hate crimes legislation, Smith argues that instead of making racialized and gendered violence illegal (given that racialized and gendered violence is already executed through the law in the prison, reservation, and the ghetto), we must make our organizing, theorizing, and teaching against the law. If the state is foundational to racialized, gendered, and heterosexist violence, then the state should not be the mediator of pain and grievance because “the state is now going to be the solution to the problem it created in the first place” (232). The work of João H. Costa Vargas complements this analysis by making clear the ways the law produces anti-black genocide. For Vargas, the black diaspora is a “geography of death” where the premature and preventable deaths of black people are authorized by a “cognitive matrix” that systematically renders black life devalued. Vargas would surely understand the preventable deaths produced by the medical industry as a form of genocide, namely because intent is not central to his theorization of the concept. Instead, creating or tolerating conditions that produce mass-based uneven vulnerability to premature death is genocidal, making white supremacy itself a genocidal project. Accordingly, genocide is at the core of our ethical standards, is foundational to modern politics, and is central to our cognitive apparatuses (269). To challenge genocide we must undo the epistemologies that support systems of value and disposability and make possible the slow deaths that are the “condition of possibility for our present subjectivities and modern politics” (269).

**Birt 9**

(Robert, “Transcendence in the Thought of bell hooks: Some Reflections on Resistance and Self-Creation” Volume 08, Number 2 Spring 2009 NEWSLETTER ON PHILOSOPHY AND THE BLACK EXPERIENCE, http://c.ymcdn.com/sites/www.apaonline.org/resource/collection/950518C1-3421-484C-8153-CDA6ED737182/v08n2Black.pdf)

Human being is transcendence. We are characterized more by a dynamic of becoming than the fixity of being; or rather our being is becoming. We are never wholly what we are— never merely teacher or student, worker or boss, colonizer, native, or “Negro.”1 We are always more and other than what we are. We are as perpetual surpassing, an unending going beyond. Ultimately we are human insofar as we make ourselves subject—self-creation being perhaps the most unique manifestation of human freedom. But when transcendence is thwarted by social oppression, it must assert itself as resistance if it is to thrive as self-creation. Transcendence as resistance and self-creation (sometimes politically termed “self-determination”) is an enduring theme in African-American thought. This essay offers brief reflections on this theme in bell hooks, though only in a thin slice of her copious works. bell hooks does not philosophically thematize transcendence, but it is central to her conception of subjectivity—especially “radical black subjectivity.”2 Whether she is discoursing on “postmodern blackness,” making critiques of racial essentialism, challenging “white supremacist capitalist patriarchy,” or promoting the “decolonization” of black consciousness, hooks’ essential concern is the enabling of self- creation and a liberated identity. In her own words her concern is with “how the dominated, the oppressed, the exploited make ourselves subject.”3 Now this emphasis on “making” ourselves subject clearly indicates the primary importance of praxis, and even perhaps the philosophical premise that the human being is primarily action.4 We could not meaningfully speak of making ourselves subject if free, creative action were not intrinsic to our existence, or if we were bound by a fixed and given nature. In a sense the human being is always subject. Human being is transcendence even when loaded with chains. But what becomes of transcendence when loaded with chains? Is it not blocked, cut off, thrown back upon itself, denied? The subject is made object. Black philosopher Frantz Fanon attests to this when he writes that he had come “into the world imbued with the will to find a meaning in things” only to discover himself (under racist French colonialism) to be an “object in the midst of other objects.”5 Similar experiences are attested to throughout the history of African-American literature and popular culture. bell hooks, who has studied Fanon and resembles him in her emphasis on a politics of decolonization, also notes how the imperial white gaze and a culture of white supremacy works to reduce blacks to the status of objects. “A culture of domination,” she writes, “demands of all its citizens self-negation. The more marginalized, the more intense the demand.”6 For American Blacks, as a domestically colonized people, this “demand” has often meant being compelled to “assume the mantle of invisibility, to erase all traces of their subjectivity...”7 Oppression is a dam which blocks the free flow of transcendence. It can be breached only with the weapons of resistance. Transcendence must become insurgent, consciousness oppositional. Without resistance self-creation is impossible. 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.

**Dillon 13**

Stephen, Ph.D Candidate, University of Minnesota

(“Fugitive Life: Race, Gender, and the Rise of the Neoliberal-Carceral State”, May 2013, http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/11299/153053/1/Dillon\_umn\_0130E\_13833.pdf)

The books of imprisoned authors like Eldridge Cleaver, George Jackson, and ¶ Malcolm X (which sold hundreds of thousands of copies) exposed something about the ¶ United States that only they could know. In the original introduction to Jackson’s ¶ Soledad Brother, Jean Genet wrote that Jackson’s prison writing exposed “the miracle of ¶ truth itself, the naked truth revealed.”20 For Genet and many readers of this literature, the ¶ prisoner had access to a unique formation of knowledge which led to alternative ways of ¶ seeing and knowing the world. Indeed, scholars like Dylan Rodríguez, Michael-Hames ¶ Garcia, and Joy James have argued that the knowledge produced by the prisoner exposes ¶ a truth about the United States that cannot be accessed from elsewhere.21 The prisoner ¶ could name what others could not even see. At the same time, thousands of political ¶ fugitives wrote devastating critiques of the United States as they bombed and robbed ¶ their way to what they hoped would be a better world. Underground organizations like ¶ the Weather Underground, Black Liberation Army, and George Jackson Brigade did ¶ more than attack symbols of state violence; they also wrote poetry, stories, memoirs, ¶ communiqués, magazines, and made films. These groups understood culture as ¶ foundational to the production and survival of alternatives to things as they were. In this ¶ way, culture became a site for the emergence of alternative forms of knowledge. ¶ I turn to the cultural products of imprisoned and underground activists as a record ¶ of what has been forgotten by hegemonic epistemologies. As Roderick Ferguson writes, ¶ “Epistemology is an economy of information privileged and information excluded” under ¶ which “national formations rarely disclose what they have rejected.”22 Yet, the prisoner ¶ and the fugitive index the histories and forms of knowledge that were erased and ¶ excluded by law and order and neoliberal economics. Fugitive Life explores the ways ¶ that imprisoned and underground activists responded to the changing operations of (and ¶ new technologies central to) racialized and gendered power under late capital. In ¶ addition, I contrast the forms of knowledge arising from the underground to the ¶ epistemologies central to build-up of the neoliberal-carceral state. In this way, I argue ¶ that the prisoner and the fugitive are figures that produced epistemologies that ¶ undermined the political and historical fictions underpinning this process. For example, ¶ while law and order politicians argued that policing and penal technologies were ¶ instruments of safety and liberty, and neoliberal economists argued that poverty was the ¶ outcome of individual pathology, Davis and countless others labored to name the ¶ racialized and gendered violence cloaked by these new discourses.

**BC 3**

Black Commentator, Magazine Dedicated to addressing the issues of the African-American Community

(“Racism and War, Perfect Together”, Issue Number 33 March 13, 2003, <http://www.blackcommentator.com/33/33_cover_story.html>)

African Americans know full well that white Americans are, in the mass, crazy. The white supremacist fantasy is integral to the American identity, and remains intact. White people hide facts like drunks conceal bottles. They are known to kill fact-bringers, while elevating racial liars to the highest offices. They want to be told that they are sane and good and kind when all the evidence proves them to be delusional and cruel and grasping - as surely most must suspect, at least every now and then, under life's ceaseless onslaught of recalcitrant facts. When carefully hidden facts nevertheless leap out to pierce the delusion, American whites retreat temporarily into innocence. If only they had known the harm that they were doing, or was being done in their name. We are so... naïve, trusting, optimistic, innocent, they say, feigning contrition while waiting for the moment to reassume character. Trent Lott, racist? We didn't know. A million African Americans in jail? How could that have happened? Hundreds of thousands of Iraqi children dead because water systems were purposely targeted by the U.S. in the first Gulf War? We thought that was anti-American propaganda. Oh, my. Premeditated Mass Murder Americans know more about the crime that is about to be committed in the Middle East than Germans ever knew about the conduct of their government in World War Two. They are less innocent of what is going to be done in their name and with their consent than any population in the history of armed aggression on the planet Earth. The facts of Shock and Awe have been presented to the public in great detail, in the form of Pentagon releases regurgitated by media household names. Americans know what a city of five million looks like. They have seen what two airplanes acting as missiles can do to an urban landscape, and can imagine as well as the next human what 800 cruise missiles, thousands of dumber missiles, many thousands more smart and conventional bombs, and an unlimited number of artillery shells can do to a teeming metropolis. It does not faze them. Polls tell us some things, and conceal others. Anti-war activists peer into the contradictory numbers - responses to prejudiced questions based on false premises - and find slim, silver linings of peace sentiment. The Bush men come to opposite conclusions, or rely on a public change of heart if Americancasualties are kept to a minimum. <http://www.blackcommentator.com/free_sign_up.html>The Pirates know their fellow Americans well. What the polling data consistently show is that white Americans are afraid of getting hurt. They would much rather have company when the time comes to wreck Iraq. They worry about being the sole targets of retaliation, and would prefer that a peanut gallery of foreigners cheer "our" guys into battle. However, white America does not give a damn for Iraqi lives. A Zogby/Atlanta Journal-Constitution survey released in February reveals the murderous intent of most white American males and at least a third of their wives, daughters, mothers, and sisters. The pollsters asked: "Would you support or oppose a war against Iraq if it meant thousands of Iraqi civilian casualties?" A solid majority of white men answered in the affirmative, as did more than a third of white women. Only seven percent of African Americans favored a war that would kill thousands. (See "[Blacks favor peace, whites opt for war](http://www.blackcommentator.com/29/29_issues.html), February 13.) Hispanics, who were nearly as warlike as whites when asked the general, pro- con- question (60 percent of Hispanics and 62 percent of whites said yes to war), balked when presented with the prospect of a bloodbath. Only 16 percent of Latinos favored a war that would kill thousands of Iraqi civilians. The best that can be said for the white American public is that it is split between those who harbor adepraved indifference to human life, and those who may be decent human beings. However, the "decent" white cohort is likely to be half mirage, a masquerade of false innocence and feigned ignorance straining to appear to be decent. As of last week, according to [Zogby](http://www.zogby.com/news/ReadNews.dbm?ID=682), white support for the general prospect of war remained at 62 percent, while only 19 percent of African Americans said yes to the general question - down four points from February. It is obvious that many of the "decent" people are shamming. In the interim between the February and March Zogby polls, the Bush men distributed to pliant media vivid and detailed descriptions of the full dimensions of Shock and Awe, including possible use of the 21,000-pound MOAB ("Mother of all Bombs," or "daisy-cutter") anti-personnel weapon, the biggest conventional bomb in the U.S. arsenal. MOAB's explosive force "looks and feels" like Hiroshima, said a CNN reporter invited by the Pentagon to cover the very public detonation of the device, in Florida. The American people know that thousands of Iraqi civilians will be fried, decapitated, carbonized, smothered, and otherwise snuffed out in the first days of the war. They have been made aware that Iraqi civilian infrastructure - such as water and electricity - will be targeted. They have been informed that up to two million refugees will be forced from their homes. Shock and Awe is psychological warfare on the grandest scale. It is the purpose of the U.S. that the entire world bear witness to unimaginable destruction. "That's the whole point," wrote in January. "The War Party wants the world to know that there is no escape from the raging superpower." "The sheer size of this has never been seen before, never been contemplated before," said an unnamed Defense Department official, describing U.S. attack plans. Shock and Awe author Harlan Ullman bragged that the effect of the strategy developed by his group for the Pentagon will be "rather like the nuclear weapons at Hiroshima." The Bush regime spoon-feeds the entire war scenario to the corporate media, refreshing the 24-hour news cycle at regular intervals with blood curdling new angles and sidebars. Those Americans who claim not to know what is in store for Iraq, are lying. The pro-war majority is comprised mainly of (overwhelmingly white) people who are eager to kill Iraqi civilians, and a smaller group who know full well that thousands of innocents will die, pretend to wish it were not so, but give Bush their blessing, anyway. Media and people are one To white America, Iraqis - or Arabs in general ("Sand niggers," in redneck-speak), or Iranians (same difference), or Africans ("niggers" by a hundred names), or the Vietnamese "gooks" and the "Japs" of bygone days - are just Indians. White Americans find it easy to kill such people, a rather basic definition of racism. We reject the argument offered by many on the white Left, now as during the Vietnam War, that the broad masses of white Americans are innocent dupes of the lying corporate media. The media certainly do lie, but the dupes are most often willing consumers. 's publishers are veterans of the corporate media, former network correspondents. The hundreds thousands of human cogs in the corporate media machine are made up of "normal," mostly white, middle class Americans. They share a common, white American worldview, shot through with native racism. (A worldview that many non-whites in corporate media attempt mightily to assimilate.) The people who create the "news" neither need nor get top office supervision as they go about the daily business of constructing false realities. White Americans have lived in a warped and artificial bubble of their own self-serving creation since they killed their first "red savage" and whipped their first "nigger brute." On issues of race, the homogeneity of the American media predates corporate conglomerization. Mexican bus crashes are only news on the weekend. Deaths in the ghetto must come in multiples to make the cut. [http://ccprod.roving.com/roving/sa/fp.jsp?plat=i&p=f&m=8s7sqrn6&ea= - CustEMail%22](http://ccprod.roving.com/roving/sa/fp.jsp?plat=i&p=f&m=8s7sqrn6&ea=#CustEMail%22)With very little executive intervention, media operatives choose the truths that are comfortable to them, and discard the rest. White Americans, in and outside of media, build their peculiar discourse around facts and fantasies of convenience. They believe what they want to believe. They want to believe that killing Iraqis will make them safe. They also must believe that they are justified in sanctioning the coming carnage - after all, are they not a kind and generous people? As this commentary is being written, CNN reports that 72 percent of Americans believe that Saddam Hussein "had something to do with" the events of September 11. Did the corporate media drum this idea into their passive, innocent heads? If so, what mojo have Black Americans been working to immunize themselves from the corporate spellbinders? And why does the corporate magic seem to work only on white Americans, while bouncing ineffectively off the skulls of Europeans, Asians, Africans, Australians, Latin Americans, even most Canadians - in a world inundated with hard and soft American propaganda, and in which there is little advantage in opposing the United States? In fact, the U.S. corporate media found themselves unable to vouch for the Bush-Powell linkage of Saddam Hussein and Al Qaida. The corporate press were obliged and eager to megaphone every repetition of the baseless charge by the President, the Secretary of State and the rest of the regime'snewsmakers. The world's media did likewise, in covering the biggest story on the planet. But the major American media players did not build a case for this, the wildest of the Bush men's tales, if only because there was nothing to build a case around. Bush reckoned correctly that his kind of Americans would, in the end, choose of their own volition to believe his lies, because the Bush-Powell lie is all that is available to justify the mass murder that a majority of white Americans are intent on committing. Bush knows his people. Black America knows them, too. Black Commentator agrees that white Americans suffer from "false consciousness" - but of the most acute, pathological kind. Let us be clear about the roots and severity of the mental disorder. Too many white people of good will have for far too long offered mitigating explanations for mass white American outrages that would serve just as well to absolve Germans under Hitler, their (initially) elected leader: they were afraid, insecure, psychologically wounded, gullible, ignorant, provincial. African Americans have heard all the permutations of apology for homicidal racism. The images that utterly defeat every exculpatory analysis, the scenes that are more searing to the soul than any medieval rendition of Hell, are the photos of white American families at lynchings. They laugh. They bring their children, and picnic baskets. They greet neighbors and kinfolk among the thousands who have been brought together for the festivities. Some have driven many miles to join in the camaraderie of shared experience, a bonding. The focal point of the gathering cooks on a pyre of hastily gathered planks and branches, mouth agape, eyes gouged out, extremities disintegrating like charcoal. Was he guilty of the crime? Who? says the young woman, tipsy from the contents of her paper cup. Oh, the nigger? I guess so. What was his name? Uh, Sammy something, I heard. Did he have children? Hell, I don't know, what's the difference? Why you askin'? The people who achieved their national identity through centuries of mass murder, the theft of a continent, and the enslavement of millions are impatient to impose their piratical diktat on the globe. Maybe next week. "The Bush cabal," we wrote back in January, "devoutly believe they are at a Hiroshima-like juncture in history - that they have at their disposal the means to start the world over in an apocalyptic spasm of swift and terrifying violence." Black America's problem is the entire planet's affliction, now.

King 64

Martin Luther, Nobel Peace Prize Winner, Social Activist & Civil Rights Champion

(“Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community?” “The World House”, 1967, <http://www.theworldhouse.org/whessay.html>)

Among the moral imperatives of our time, we are challenged to work all over the world with unshakable determination to wipe out the last vestiges of racism. As early as 1906 W.E.B. DuBois prophesied that “the problem of the twentieth century will be the problem of the color line.” Now as we stand two-thirds into this exciting period of history we know full well that racism is still that hound of hell which dogs the tracks of our civilization. The classic example of organized and institutionalized racism is the Union of South Africa. Its national policy and practice are the incarnation of the doctrine of white supremacy in the midst of a population which is overwhelmingly black. But the tragedy of South Africa is not simply in its own policy; it is the fact that the racist government of South Africa is virtually made possible by the economic policies of the United States and Great Britain, two countries which profess to be the moral bastions of our Western world. In country after country we see white men building empires on the sweat and suffering of colored people. Portugal continues its practices of slave labor and subjugation in Angola; the Ian Smith government in Rhodesia continues to enjoy the support of British-based industry and private capital, despite the stated opposition of British Government policy. Even in the case of the little country of South West Africa we find the powerful nations of the world incapable of taking a moral position against South Africa, though the smaller country is under the trusteeship of the United Nations. Its policies are controlled by South Africa and its manpower is lured into the mines under slave-labor conditions. During the Kennedy administration there was some awareness of the problems that breed in the racist and exploitative conditions throughout the colored world, and a temporary concern emerged to free the United States from its complicity, though the effort was only on a diplomatic level. Through our Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, there emerged the beginnings of an intelligent approach to the colored peoples of the world. However, there remained little or no attempt to deal with the economic aspects of racist exploitation. We have been notoriously silent about the more than $700 million of American capital which props up the system of apartheid, not to mention the billions of dollars in trade and the military alliances which are maintained under the pretext of fighting Communism in Africa. Nothing provides the Communists with a better climate for expansion and infiltration than the continued alliance of our nation with racism and exploitation throughout the world. And if we are not diligent in our determination to root out the last vestiges of racism in our dealings with the rest of the world, we may soon see the sins of our fathers visited upon ours and succeeding generations. For the conditions which are so classically represented in Africa are present also in Asia and in our own back yard in Latin America. Everywhere in Latin America one finds a tremendous resentment of the United States, and that resentment is always strongest among the poorer and darker peoples of the continent. The life and destiny of Latin America are in the hands of United States corporations. The decisions affecting the lives of South Americans are ostensibly made by their governments, but there are almost no legitimate democracies alive in the whole continent. The other governments are dominated by huge and exploitative cartels that rob Latin America of her resources while turning over a small rebate to a few members of a corrupt aristocracy, which in turn invests not in its own country for its own people’s welfare but in the banks of Switzerland and the playgrounds of the world. Here we see racism in its more sophisticated form: neo-colonialism. The Bible and the annals of history are replete with tragic stories of one brother robbing another of his birthright and thereby insuring generations of strife and enmity. We can hardly escape such a judgment in Latin America, any more than we have been able to escape the harvest of hate sown in Vietnam by a century of French exploitation. There is the convenient temptation to attribute the current turmoil and bitterness throughout the world to the presence of a Communist conspiracy to undermine Europe and America, but the potential explosiveness of our world situation is much more attributable to disillusionment with the promises of Christianity and technology. The revolutionary leaders of Africa, Asia and Latin America have virtually all received their education in the capitals of the West. Their earliest training often occurred in Christian missionary schools. Here their sense of dignity was established and they learned that all men were sons of God. In recent years their countries have been invaded by automobiles, Coca-Cola and Hollywood, so that even remote villages have become aware of the wonders and blessings available to God’s white children. Once the aspirations and appetites of the world have been whetted by the marvels of Western technology and the self-image of a people awakened by religion, one cannot hope to keep people locked out of the earthly kingdom of wealth, health and happiness. Either they share in the blessings of the world or they organize to break down and overthrow those structures or governments which stand in the way of their goals. Former generations could not conceive of such luxury, but their children now take this vision and demand that it become a reality. And when they look around and see that the only people who do not share in the abundance of Western technology are colored people, it is an almost inescapable conclusion that their condition and their exploitation are somehow related to their color and the racism of the white Western world. This is a treacherous foundation for a world house. Racism can well be that corrosive evil that will bring down the curtain on Western civilization. Arnold Toynbee has said that some twenty-six civilizations have risen upon the face of the earth. Almost all of them have descended into the junk heaps of destruction. The decline and fall of these civilizations, according to Toynbee, was not caused by external invasions but by internal decay. They failed to respond creatively to the challenges impinging upon them. If Western civilization does not now respond constructively to the challenge to banish racism, some future historian will have to say that a great civilization died because it lacked the soul and commitment to make justice a reality for all men.

McClintock 9

(Anne, Simone de Beauvoir Professor of English and Women’s and Gender Studies at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, "Paranoid Empire: Specters from Guantánamo and Abu Ghraib," Muse)

By now it is fair to say that the United States has come to be dominated by two grand and dangerous hallucinations: the promise of **benign US globalization** and the permanent threat of the “war on terror.” I have come to feel that we cannot understand the extravagance of the violence to which the US government has committed itself after 9/11—two countries invaded, thousands of innocent people imprisoned, killed, and tortured—unless we grasp a defining feature of our moment, that is, a deep and disturbing doubleness with respect to power. Taking shape, as it now does, around **fantasies of global omnipotence** (Operation Infinite Justice, the War to End All Evil) **coinciding with nightmares of impending attack**, the United States has entered the domain of **paranoia**: dream world and catastrophe. For it is only in paranoia that one finds simultaneously and in such condensed form both **deliriums of absolute power and forebodings of perpetual threat.** Hence the spectral and nightmarish quality of the “war on terror,” a limitless war against a limitless threat, a war vaunted by the US administration to encompass all of space and persisting without end. But the war on terror is not a real war, for “terror” is not an identifiable enemy nor a strategic, real-world target. The war on terror is what William Gibson calls elsewhere “a consensual hallucination,”[4](http://muse.jhu.edu.go.libproxy.wfubmc.edu/journals/small_axe/v013/13.1.mcclintock.html#f4) and the US government can fling its military might against ghostly apparitions and hallucinate a victory over all evil only at the cost of catastrophic self-delusion and the infliction of great calamities elsewhere. [End Page 51] I have come to feel that we **urgently need to make visible** (the better politically to challenge) those established but **concealed circuits of imperial violence** that now animate the war on terror. We need, as urgently, to illuminate the continuities that connect those circuits of imperial violence abroad with the vast, internal shadowlands of prisons and supermaxes—the modern “slave-ships on the middle passage to nowhere”—that have come to characterize the United States as a super-carceral state.[5](http://muse.jhu.edu.go.libproxy.wfubmc.edu/journals/small_axe/v013/13.1.mcclintock.html#f5) Can we, the uneasy heirs of empire, now speak only of national things? If a long-established but primarily covert US imperialism has, since 9/11, manifested itself more aggressively as an overt empire, does the terrain and object of intellectual inquiry, as well as the claims of political responsibility, not also extend beyond that useful fiction of the “exceptional nation” to embrace the shadowlands of empire? If so, how can we theorize the phantasmagoric, imperial violence that has come so dreadfully to constitute our kinship with the ordinary, but which also at the same moment renders extraordinary the ordinary bodies of ordinary people, an imperial violence which in **collusion** with a complicit corporate media would **render itself invisible**, casting **states of emergency** into fitful shadow and fleshly bodies into specters? For imperialism is not something that happens elsewhere, an offshore fact to be deplored but as easily ignored. Rather, the force of empire comes to **reconfigure**, from within, the nature and violence of the nation-state itself, giving rise to perplexing questions: Who under an empire are “we,” the people? And who are the ghosted, ordinary people beyond the nation-state who, in turn, constitute “us”? We now inhabit a crisis of violence and the visible. How do we insist on seeing the violence that the imperial state attempts to render **invisible**, while also seeing the ordinary people afflicted by that violence? For to allow the spectral, disfigured people (especially those under torture) obliged to inhabit the haunted no-places and penumbra of empire to be made visible as ordinary people is to forfeit the long-held US claim of moral and cultural exceptionalism, the traditional self-identity of the United States as the **uniquely superior, universal standard-bearer of moral authority, a tenacious, national mythology of originary innocence now in tatters**. The deeper question, however, is not only how to see but also how to theorize and oppose the violence without becoming beguiled by the seductions of spectacle alone.[6](http://muse.jhu.edu.go.libproxy.wfubmc.edu/journals/small_axe/v013/13.1.mcclintock.html#f6) Perhaps in the labyrinths of torture we must also find a way to speak with ghosts, for specters disturb the authority of vision and the hauntings of popular memory disrupt the great forgettings of official history. [End Page 52] Paranoia Even the paranoid have enemies. —Donald Rumsfeld Why paranoia? Can we fully understand the proliferating circuits of imperial violence—the very eclipsing of which gives to our moment its uncanny, phantasmagoric cast—without understanding the **pervasive presence of the paranoia** that has come, quite violently, to manifest itself across the political and cultural spectrum as a defining feature of our time? By paranoia, I mean not simply Hofstadter’s famous identification of the US state’s tendency toward conspiracy theories.[7](http://muse.jhu.edu.go.libproxy.wfubmc.edu/journals/small_axe/v013/13.1.mcclintock.html#f7) Rather, I conceive of paranoia as an **inherent contradiction** with respect to power: a **double-sided phantasm** that **oscillates precariously between deliriums of grandeur and nightmares of perpetual threat**, a deep and dangerous doubleness with respect to power that is held in unstable tension, but which, if suddenly destabilized (as after 9/11), can produce **pyrotechnic displays of violence**. The pertinence of understanding paranoia, I argue, lies in its peculiarly intimate and peculiarly dangerous relation to violence.[8](http://muse.jhu.edu.go.libproxy.wfubmc.edu/journals/small_axe/v013/13.1.mcclintock.html#f8) Let me be clear: I do not see paranoia as a primary, structural cause of US imperialism nor as its structuring identity. Nor do I see the US war on terror as animated by some collective, psychic agency, submerged mind, or Hegelian “cunning of reason,” nor by what Susan Faludi calls a national “terror dream.”[9](http://muse.jhu.edu.go.libproxy.wfubmc.edu/journals/small_axe/v013/13.1.mcclintock.html#f9) Nor am I interested in evoking paranoia as a kind of psychological diagnosis of the imperial nation-state. Nations do not have “psyches” or an “unconscious”; only people do. Rather, a social entity such as an organization, state, or empire can be spoken of as “paranoid” if the dominant powers governing that entity cohere as a collective community around **contradictory cultural narratives, self-mythologies, practices, and identities that oscillate between delusions of inherent superiority and omnipotence,** and phantasms of threat and engulfment. The term paranoia is analytically useful here, then, not as a description of a collective national psyche, nor as a description of a universal pathology, but rather as an **analytically strategic concept**, a way of seeing and being **attentive to contradictions within power**, a way of making visible (the better politically to oppose) the contradictory **flashpoints of violence** that the state tries to conceal. [End Page 53] Paranoia is in this sense what I call a hinge phenomenon, articulated between the ordinary person and society, between psychodynamics and socio-political history. Paranoia is in that sense dialectical rather than binary, for its violence **erupts from the force** of its multiple, **cascading contradictions**: the intimate memories of wounds, defeats, and humiliations condensing with cultural fantasies of aggrandizement and revenge, in such a way as to be productive at times of **unspeakable violence**. For how else can we understand such debauches of cruelty?

## 1AR

1. **Our education is key-It is a necessary act in knowledge production-Dominant epistemologies ensure power is locked into how we learn and what we learn. Their “education” teaches us to speak loudly but have no voice while using the topic to reproduce white supremacy. Only our fugitive study can escape this cycle of error replication.**

**Dillon 13**

Stephen, Ph.D Candidate, University of Minnesota

(“Fugitive Life: Race, Gender, and the Rise of the Neoliberal-Carceral State”, May 2013, http://conservancy.umn.edu/bitstream/11299/153053/1/Dillon\_umn\_0130E\_13833.pdf)

The books of imprisoned authors like Eldridge Cleaver, George Jackson, and ¶ Malcolm X (which sold hundreds of thousands of copies) exposed something about the ¶ United States that only they could know. In the original introduction to Jackson’s ¶ Soledad Brother, Jean Genet wrote that Jackson’s prison writing exposed “the miracle of ¶ truth itself, the naked truth revealed.”20 For Genet and many readers of this literature, the ¶ prisoner had access to a unique formation of knowledge which led to alternative ways of ¶ seeing and knowing the world. Indeed, scholars like Dylan Rodríguez, Michael-Hames ¶ Garcia, and Joy James have argued that the knowledge produced by the prisoner exposes ¶ a truth about the United States that cannot be accessed from elsewhere.21 The prisoner ¶ could name what others could not even see. At the same time, thousands of political ¶ fugitives wrote devastating critiques of the United States as they bombed and robbed ¶ their way to what they hoped would be a better world. Underground organizations like ¶ the Weather Underground, Black Liberation Army, and George Jackson Brigade did ¶ more than attack symbols of state violence; they also wrote poetry, stories, memoirs, ¶ communiqués, magazines, and made films. These groups understood culture as ¶ foundational to the production and survival of alternatives to things as they were. In this ¶ way, culture became a site for the emergence of alternative forms of knowledge. ¶ I turn to the cultural products of imprisoned and underground activists as a record ¶ of what has been forgotten by hegemonic epistemologies. As Roderick Ferguson writes, ¶ “Epistemology is an economy of information privileged and information excluded” under ¶ which “national formations rarely disclose what they have rejected.”22 Yet, the prisoner ¶ and the fugitive index the histories and forms of knowledge that were erased and ¶ excluded by law and order and neoliberal economics. Fugitive Life explores the ways ¶ that imprisoned and underground activists responded to the changing operations of (and ¶ new technologies central to) racialized and gendered power under late capital. In ¶ addition, I contrast the forms of knowledge arising from the underground to the ¶ epistemologies central to build-up of the neoliberal-carceral state. In this way, I argue ¶ that the prisoner and the fugitive are figures that produced epistemologies that ¶ undermined the political and historical fictions underpinning this process. For example, ¶ while law and order politicians argued that policing and penal technologies were ¶ instruments of safety and liberty, and neoliberal economists argued that poverty was the ¶ outcome of individual pathology, Davis and countless others labored to name the ¶ racialized and gendered violence cloaked by these new discourses.