### 1NC

#### We call this intralocality

#### Darnall Moore explains that…

(Darnell L. Moore 2011, writer and activist whose work is informed by anti-racist, feminist, queer of color, and anti-colonial thought and advocacy. Darnell's essays, social commentary, poetry, and interviews have appeared in various national and international media venues, including the Feminist Wire, Ebony magazine, and The Huffington Post, "On Location: The “I” in the Intersection," http://thefeministwire.com/2011/12/on-location-the-i-in-the-intersection/)

The most general statement of our politics at the present time would be that we are actively committed to struggling against racial, sexual, heterosexual, and class oppression and see as our particular ask the development of integrated analysis and practice based upon the fact that the major systems of oppression are interlocking. The synthesis of these oppressions creates the conditions of our lives. As black women we see black feminism as the logical political movement to combat the manifold and simultaneous oppressions that all women of color face. -The Combahee River Collective in A Black Feminist Statement Many radical movement builders are well-versed in the theory of intersectionality. Feminists, queer theorists and activists, critical race scholars, progressive activists, and the like owe much to our Black feminist sisters, like The Combahee River Collective, who introduced us to the reality of simultaneity–as a framework for assessing the multitude of interlocking oppressions that impact the lives of women of color–in A Black Feminist Statement (1978). Their voices and politics presaged Kimberlé Crenshaw’s very useful theoretical contribution of “intersectionality” to the feminist toolkit of political interventions in 1989. Since its inception, many have referenced the term—sometimes without attribution to the black feminist intellectual [genealogy](http://thefeministwire.com/2011/12/on-location-the-i-in-the-intersection/) from which it emerged—as a form of en vogue progressive parlance. In fact, it seems to be the case that it is often referenced in progressive circles asa counterfeitlicense(as in, “I understand the ways that race, sexuality, class, and gender coalesce. I get it. I really do.”) to enter resistance work even if the person who declares to have a deep “understanding” of the connectedness of systemic matrices of oppression, themselves, have yet to discern and address their own complicityin the maintenance of the very oppressions they seek to name and demolish. I am certain that I am not the only person who has heard a person use language embedded with race, class, gender, or ability privilege follow-up with a reference to “intersectionality.” My concern, then, has everything to do with the way that the fashioning of intersectionality asa political framework can lead toward the good work of analyzing ideological and material systems of oppression—as they function “out there”—and away from thegreat work of critical analyses of the ways in which we, ourselves, can function as actants in the narratives of counter-resistance that we rehearse. In other words, we might be missing the opportunity to read our complicities, our privileges, our accesses, our excesses, our excuses, our modes of oppressing—located “in here”—as they occupy each of us. Crenshaw’s theorization has provided us with a useful lens to assess the problematics of the interrelated, interlocking apparatuses of power and privilege and their resulting epiphenomena of powerlessness and subjugation. Many have focused on the external dimensions of oppression and their material results manifested in the lives of the marginalized, but might our times be asking of us to deeply consider our own “stuff” that might instigate such oppressions? What if we extended Crenshaw’s theory of intersectionality by invoking what we might name “intralocality”? Borrowing from sociologists, the term “social location,” which broadly speaks to one’s context, highlights one’s standpoint(s)—the social spaces where s/he is positioned (i.e. race, class, gender, geographical, etc.). Intralocality, then, is concerned with the social locations that foreground our knowing and experiencing of our world and our relationships to the systems and people within our world. Intralocality is a call to theorize the self in relation to power and privilege, powerlessness and subjugation.It is work that requires the locating of the “I” in the intersection. And while it could be argued that such work is highly individualistic, I contend that it is at the very level of self-in-relation-to-community where communal transformation is made possible.Might it be time to travel into the deep of our contexts? Might it be time for us—theorists/activists—to do the work of intersectionality(macro/system-analysis) in concert with the intra-local (micro/self-focused analysis)?Intersectionality as an analysis, rightly, asks of us to examine systemic oppressions, but in these times of radical and spontaneous insurgencies—times when we should reflect on our need to unoccupythose sites of privilege(where they exist) in our own lives even as we occupysome other sites of domination—work must be done at the level of the self-in-community.We cannot—as a progressive community—rally aroundnotions of “progression” and, yet, be complicit in the very homo/transphobias, racisms, sexisms, ableisms,etc. thatviolently terrorize the lives ofso many others. If a more loving and just community is to be imagined and advanced, it seems to me that we would need to start at a different location than we might’ve expected: self.

Yancy 8 (George, Prof of Philosophy at Duquesne University, *Black bodies, white gazes : the continuing significance of race*, p. 229)

The white student'sobjection raised the issue of how white interlocutors, when in discussions involvingrace and racism, may(more than they realize) deploytheoryasawayofnotbeingforcedtoexamineaspectsoftheirownwhitesubjectposition. 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, goodintentions, posturalgestures, 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 cryoutforthepoliticalandexistentialurgencyfortheimmediateundoingof 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. Doingtheoryin the service of undoing whitenesscomes with its ownsnares and seductions, its own comfort zones, andreinscriptionofdistances. Whiteswhodeploytheoryin the service of fighting against white racism must caution againstthe seduction of white narcissism, the recenteringof whiteness, even if it is the object of critical reflection, and, hence, the processofsequestration from the realworld ofweeping, suffering, and traumatized Black bodies impacted by the operations of white power. As antiracist whitescontinue to make mistakes and continue to falter in the face ofinstitutional interpellation and **habituated racist reflexes**, tomorrow,aBlackbodywillbemurderedasitinnocentlyreachesforitswallet.Thesheerweightofthisrealitymocksthepatienceoftheory.

#### – hip hop plots an accessible course to pursue alternatives

Viola 13 (Michael, UCLA, "Hip - Hop and Critical Revolutionary Pedagogy: Blue Scholarship to Challenge "The Miseducation of the Filipino"," http://www.jceps.com/PDFs/04-2-08.pdf)

At the forefront in theorizing revolutionary critical pedagogies, McLaren’s work upholds the belief that the more conscious people become of **exploitative social relations**that lie at the root of a global division of labor and the corporatization of our world, the more people willin quantity become active inthe **changing**of **society**. Only through the imagination and creation of a world outside of the capitalist law of value, will people come to realize that struggle is their historic right and work to attain the intense desires of freedom that burn within. Echoing this sentiment in his latest book, Rage and Hope, McLaren asserts: Revolutionary critical pedagogy can assist us in understanding history as a processin which human beings make their own society, although in conditions most often not of their own choosing and therefore populated wit h the intentions of others...The actions of human beings are what shapes history. History is not given form and substance by abstract categories. The idea that a future society comes into being as a negation of the existing one finds its strongest expression in class struggle (19). In their lucid essay, “Rethinking Critical Pedagogy and the Gramscian and Freirean Legacies,” Peter McLaren and Gustavo Fischman answer a crucial question presented in Gramsci’s Prison Notebooks, where he poses: "is it better to ‘think,’ without having a critical awareness, ... or, on the other hand, is it better to work out consciously and critically one’s own conception of the world?" 30 McLaren and Fischmanhighlight the importance of a collective critical consciousness that transcends a social relation of dominationas they support the capacity of human beings to not only understand the world but more importantly to transform it. McLaren and Fischman recover Gramsci’s notion of hegemony from theorists who employ its use but disregard the fundamental social contradictions between capital and labor. Furthermore, they make clear that the strategy to recreate society must take place not only in the transformation of civil society but more comprehensively in the creation of proletari an hegemony. They state: The problem with [uncritical] view[s] of hegemony is that in their emphasis, to distance themselves from what they consider to be a crude economism, they often seriously neglect the fundamental social contradictions between capital and labor and resecured the prohibitions on challenging th e contradictions of capitalism... 31 They go on to argue that such exclusions in Gramsci’s notion of hegemony, have effectively caused domination to hemorrhage into a pool of relational negotiation s in which certain ideological positions are won through consent. Here, we need to be reminded that intellectuals themselves are always the products of new forms of collective labor power brought about and consolidated by the forces of production. 3 2 Hip - Hop and the Naming of the World Gramsci believed that “ordinary men and women could be educated into understanding the coercive and persuasive power of capitalist hegemony over them.” 3 3Gramsci highlighted the important roles of intellectuals who aligned with subalterns and acted to transform the social existence of oppressed communities. He states, The...new intellectual can no longer consist in eloquence, which is an exterior and momentary mover of feelings and passions, but in active participation in practical life, as constructor, organizer, ‘permanent persuader, ’ and not just a simple orator. 3 4 As I have mentioned in my article, “Filipino American Hip - Hop and Class Consciousness: Renewing the Spirit of Carlos Bulosan,” the oral expression central to hip-hop comes from our nation’s racialized youth, who are surviving in a system that mandates inequality and exploitation. 33 Hip-hop artistsoften speak “in active participation in practical life” revealing people’s present needs for adequate food, shelter, and security. Furthermore, hip-hop is an important musical outlet that possesses the ability to leave a lasting imprint in the hearts and minds of the struggling. For instance, the Seattle based group Blue Scholars, contributesin the development of a revolutionary critical pedagogyas they disseminate lyrical messages that demystify the exploitative nature of capitalism while at the same time sharpen the lens for social analysis, untie the tongue for cultural critique, and strengthen the heart for activism among those who listen and relate. Through their music, Blue Scholars assist in the development of a critical consciousness by naming the world and helping to uncover the material reality for many Filipinos and other oppressed communities who are “shack led in the chains of international capital gain.” 3 6 In their song Southside Revival, Blue Scholars identify how the critique of capital and the satisfaction of human needs are at the roots of their musical philosophy: “Hungry is an adjective attached to my philosophy, You got to be, progress revolves around economy. I can see the consequences of capital first hand, Monorail construction push[es] the tenants off the land.” The Word Employed to Unveil and Transform The musical duo of Blue Scholars, consisting of Filipino - American, Geologic (vocals) and Sabzi (DJ) are examples of hip - hop artists who serve as intellectuals and “permanent persuaders” whose purpose is to serve the social groups with whom they share fundamental interests. They use their music as an organizing tool to reclaim history, challenge what is viewed as “natural,” and engage with the masses in charting alternativesto capitalism. Through their various performances in mainstream concerts, community organized benefits, and anti-imperialist conferences, Blue Scholars work to build relational knowledge of and with the masses to help them develop a critical and collective reflectiveness. As Paulo Freire emphasized, critical inquiry and unveiling is not enough for social transformation. Freire asserts, If it was possible to change reality simply by our witness for example, we would have to think that reality is changed inside of our consciousness. Then it would be very easy to be a liberatory educator! All we would have to do is an intellectual exercise and society would change! No, this is not the question. To change the concrete conditions of reality mean a tremendous political practice, which demands mobilization, organization of the people...all these things, which are not organized just inside the school . 3 7 Freire’s words remind us that the transformation of the society does not take place only within the individual basis of self - reflection but through the collective actions of people. Through their connection with the pro-democratic organizations, Blue Scholars directly engage with youth, workers, and students in translating theory into concrete strategies for improving their communities. Demonstrating this commitment, Blue Scholars performed a benefit concert to financially support a national Filipino youth conference organized by the group Sandiwa. 35 The conference, in recognition of this year’s centennial of Filipino migration to the United States, brought Filipino youth from around the country to critically examine the role Filipino s have played as cheap labor in the sugar plantations of Hawaii, the agricultural fields of California's Central Valley, and the canneries of the Pacific Northwest. Sandiwa proclaims their hope “that this conference connects our history with the ongoing s truggle millions of Filipinos face today in search of new homelands away from the existing conditions in the Philippines.” In a workshop organized by the youth collective, Anakbayan (whom Geo is an active member), to honor Filipino labor organizer, writer , and activist, Carlos Bulosan, Anakbayan proclaims: we hope to improve our conditions by studying and educating others about the rich culture and proud revolutionary heritage of the Filipino peoples continuing struggle. We also work towards building anti - imperialist unity among all people to expose and oppose U.S. imperialist intervention in the Philippines . 3 9 Because their music isintimatelyconnected with Seattle’sworking class community of color who are politically active in reflecting and acting up on the problems that engulf their lives, Blue Scholars is not simply employing resistance (which is largely passive and individual in focus) but more significantly serving as committed agents to make possible another world. Lyrical Examination Blue Scholars’ music substantiate the testament that “‘everyone’ is a philosopher and that it is not a question of introducing from scratch a scientific form of thought into everyone’s individual life, but of renovating and making ‘critical’ already existing activity.” 40 In their song, “Wounded Eyes,” Blue Scholars reflect upon the conditions of their racialized and working class communities who they describe as “poverty stricken folks, constantly liv[ing] in hope. American dreams angling from a rope.” Further exposing the difficult realities many people face in their communities, rapper, Geologic declares, “I study to survive... ...where the struggle and the hustle coincide. In this moment in time, a shift in the tide. Get the blindfold lifted from your eyes, and see what we see. And stop pretending it’s all right.” 41 Paralleling the writings of Antonio Gramsci, Blue Scholars recognize that as artists their music must not consist solely “in eloquence [as] an exterior and momentary mover of feelings and passions.” As “permanent persuaders” in their community, Blue Scholars utilize their music as an outlet for study as well as a conduit to promote the transformation of the systems that have left many without proper food, housing, and education. In the same song, the y state, “My wounded eyes seen through the lies. Many brutalized, so we rise and fight for the future we strive. ...Who am I? A student. Observing my environment to see contradictions, In concrete conditions. Evidence we’re living in an obsolete system. ...I got folks working in the public school sector, who lose one youth to death per semester. I guess the cost of living is going up, While the chance of living is going down.” 42 Supporting the dialectical process of praxis, Blue Scholars pull at the roots of a material relation (between labor and capital) that dehumanize those left with no other option but to sell their labor power. Scrutinizing the personal effects of such a system, in his song “Cornerstone” vocalist, Geologic rhymes how he, like many people, “don’t really own a damn thing, except for my labor. And maybe, a couple thousand pages of my rhymes.” He goes on to assert that this system has placed our brains in a cage, unless “...knowledge itself is given proper prospective. To see how politicians keep the dollars protected... [with their] false prophesy, promising we will all be free. As long as we fall in line with the flawed philosophy... [while]the ranks start to swell, in the hoods and jail cells.” 43 Providing further explanation of this “f lawed philosophy” I turn to the writings of Epifanio San Juan, Jr. At a talk he gave at the Carlos Bulosan Symposium in Washington D.C., San Juan lucidly provides the characteristics of the present social system that dichotomizes society leaving the major ity “deprived of land, tools or animals...confined to sell their labor - power and do manual ‘labor’ while those free from laboring with their hands, supposedly educated, occupy a higher position or status.” He maintains that those who occupy the lower rungs in this division of labor are there not as “a result of being uneducated, but of being dispossessed, racialized and colonized.” 44 As I have shown with the education policies in the Philippines and the United States, the educational apparatus in its present form legitimizes inequality by assigning individuals to unequal social positions. Blue Scholars provides further detail into this system that disseminates a “false philosophy” to the majority of the people in society. In their song “Commencement Day,” Blue Scholars sing, “you know they made curriculums designed to create obedient drones.” They elaborate, “They never tell you the conditions in which to apply the math. Only 65 percent of your peers, freshman year, are still here. And half that total will move on, But three out of four, will drop out in two years. Add it up and it equals some shit has gone wrong. Now the snakes gave the education budget rollback, No Child Left Behind is just a backdoor draft... It’s the next generation of miseducatedyouth , next time ask them for proof.” 4 5 Lyrics such as this strongly conflict with the endorsements made by educational bureaucrats who claim that privatization is the panacea for students, parents, and teachers. For instance, Education Secretary, Margaret Sp ellings, recently defended the policy of No Child Left Behind stating that “the law works.” She argues that people who are “critical of the law simply fear the results.” 46 Ironically, Spellings is not entirely wrong. Many youth of color, are fearful of r ecent education legislation as they witness their peers entering militarized zones as opposed to school zones. Authors such as Angela Davis and Mumia Abu - Jamal have already revealed the harsh reality for many African Americans in the United States whose a ttendance in prisons exceeds the numbers for those in institutions of higher learning. Education, Economy, and War Education in the Philippines was transformed in 1982 to further produce the necessary labor for an export - oriented economy. In the United S tates the economy does not evolve around export but rather a “military - industrial complex.” As the United States fights its wars in the occupied countries of Afghanistan and Iraq, the country’s labor force must meet the demands of a war - based economy. Th e “backdoor draft” that Blue Scholars allude to in their song “Commencement Day” further discloses how No Child Left Behind is utilized to serve the labor needs of the U.S armed forces. Currently, the U.S. ruling elites promoting the occupations in the Mi ddleEast are calling for an expansion of their “wars on terrorism” to such places as Iran and Venezuela. However, public support for U.S imperial aggression dwindles reflected not only in the millions of people who have taken to the streets in protest bu t also in the military’s failure to maintain monthly recruitment goals. Provisions in NCLB legislation assist the U.S. military with their recruitment problems. Buried on page 559 of the legislation’s 670 total pages, a small section requires that school s turn over names, phone numbers, and addresses of all students to the military or risk losing NCLB funding. 47 Succinctly explaining this precarious connection between education policy and war, Blue Scholars explains that the elite’s “solution for the poo r, [is to] recruit them for the war.” 48 The common denominator that links education and war is found in the system of capitalism. 4 9 This is not a new phenomenon. Author and social activist, Rosa Luxemburg, echoed these sentiments at the turn of the 20 th century. She said, “if we consider history as it was not as it could have been or should have been – we must agree that war has been an indispensable feature of capitalist development.” 50 It is impossible to omit war and imperialism in the histories of F ilipino Americans. Echoing Luxemburg’s words in their song, “The Long March,” Blue Scholars state, “War? What the fuck is it good for? Absolutely everything that this country has stood for.” 51 The words of both Rosa Luxemburg and Blue Scholars, while ex pressed in two different centuries, embody a continuing past, which began with the conquest of the Philippines and carries on in its present forms characterized by U.S. “military training” in the Philippines, secret prisons throughout Eastern Europe, and t he ongoing occupations in the Middle East. Ever - imminent Hope The central objective of education should be for the formation of men and women with minds and attitudes that are in tune to the needs of its people. This is expressed wonderfully in the music of Blue Scholars as they state, “My purpose as of now is to serve the people to the fullest.” 52 Serving the people of all colors, genders, ages, and religions requires the development of a consciousness critical of our present social order. As I have introduced throughout this essay, the lyrics of Blue Scholars participates in the development of this consciousness by naming the world. Furthermore, developing a critical consciousness is only the first step in a collective path towards equality and justice. Contrary to the widespread belief that “there are no alternatives” to a system responsible for global environmental degradation, widespread impoverishment, and perpetual war, we must actively seek to attain what many believe to be impossible. The present system will not collapse on its own. As it has transpired throughout history, the small group of elites will continue to make the necessary changes of appeasement in order to accomplish their parochial objectives for profit and power. For those who demand more, the lyrics of Blue Scholars provide a strategy. They call us to “look critical and begin to organize quietly, underneath the sugar coated surface of society.” 53 Such messagesthat inject the people with courage and hope are indispensable in the long march ahead. The obstacles in our path will continue to be great and for many they will seem be an unsurpassable. However, closing with the words of Blue Scholars, “No uprising fails. Each one is a step forward towards the victory at the end of the trail.” 54

James 11 (Robin, Assistant Professor in the Philosophy Department at UNC Charlotte - Her research engages contemporary continental philosophy with musicology and popular music studies, feminist theory, and critical race/postcolonial theory, " These.Are.The Breaks”: Rethinking Disagreement Through Hip Hop," Issue No. 19   2011 — Rancière: Politics, Art & Sense

http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue\_19/article\_05.shtml)

The idea of the “break” is central to both Jacques Rancière’s theory of disagreement and to hip hop aesthetics. Hip hop’s four elements (rapping, DJing, breakdancing, and graffiti) all practice the cutting and remixing of samples (of other rappers words, of songs, of gestures, or of images). While the Kurtis Blow quote in the title refers to the sampling of “breakbeats” (the most rhythmically active part of a song is called the “break,” and this is often what DJs sample and remix), Tricia Rose identifies “the cut” and “rupture” as a central element of hip hop aesthetics. [[1]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#1) The break is also the focal point of Rancière’s theory of dissensual politics. Arguing that “politics comes about solely through interruption” (Rancière, Disageement 21), Rancière describes the staging of disagreement as “an interrupted current” that “short-circuits” the social order(13). As I will discuss in more detail below, disagreement is a “break” in a society’s otherwise coherent distribution of sensibility, a break that forces a reconfiguration or “remixing” of hegemonic distributions. In this paper, I argue that it is productive to read Rancière’s theory of political practice – what he calls “disagreement” – with and against KodwoEshun’s theorization of hip hop. Thinking disagreement through hip hop helps flesh out how, exactly, disagreement works, particularly at the level of individual embodiment and consciousness. While Rancière himself gives us many examples of interruptions to the political body (the demos speaking, Jean Derion asserting the non-universality of “universal” man, etc.), I am interested in examining how these interruptions work in, on, and through individual bodies. How is it that we become aware of the ways that distributions of sensibility – particularly hegemonic ones, which are most likely to be normalized and imperceptible by virtue of their ubiquity – structure our corporeal schemas?How does one’s corporeal schema reinforce or interrupt dominant distributions of sensibility? Can we stage an interruption of our own corporeal schemas, and if so, how? In what follows, I respond to these questions by first situating them in the context of Rancière’s general theory of politics, and in particular his concept of “disagreement.” Then, I look to Eshun’s argument that sampling is a form of “motion capture” which grants us access to and conscious awareness of the body’s prereflective habits and comportments. Early hip-hop DJs sampled a song’s “break,” the most rhythmically active part of a piece. Eshun claims that these breaks are human movement (sense perceptions, dance moves), encoded in music; accordingly, in the remixing of songs, the body itself is remade. The sampling and remixing of sounds produces corporeal disagreement – it interrupts the body’s habitual distributions of sensibility. Because, as we know from feminism and from Foucault, the personal is political, the interruption of individuals’ corporeal schemas canhave wider and more far-reaching impacts. [[2]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#2) Following and expanding on Eshun, I argue that because sample-based musics interrupt distributions of sensibility, they can be tools forboth raising awareness of and intervening in dominant distributions. One final aim of this paper concerns less what it directly argues and more with how it suggests some new directions for Rancière scholarship. First, I want to begin by opening Rancière’s work, which focuses almost exclusively on visual and literary arts, to the study of music, musicology, and music theory. I focus on the musical dimensions of hip hop because rapping and DJing are very well-known and widespread practices of musical sampling. In general, hip hop differs from other styles of musical sampling (e.g., musique concrete) because it is informed by Afrodiasporic aesthetic priorities – e.g., the cut, the privileging of rhythm, etc. – that often resonate with Rancière’s own theoretical and politico-aesthetic commitments. Thus, second, because Rancière is so resistant to the very idea of “identity,” I want to start to consider the ways that his critique of the Western tradition often parallel critiques made by/in the name of identity-based groups. So, I choose to focus on hip hop in this article in order to open Rancière’s work to discussions of music and of social identity. 1. Rancière’s theory of politics: “Fuck tha Police”/“Bring the Noise” [[3]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#3) Here I sketch out Rancière’s basic framework and describe in some detail the specific concepts that are most pertinent to my argument below. First, I explain three fundamental ideas in Rancière’s oeuvre: politics, the police, and the distribution of sensibility. Then, I argue that “disagreement,” Rancière’s term for the specific kind of activity he considers “political,” functions much like the practice of sampling and remixing: disagreement and remixing both begin from the assumption of the equality of all parts and parties, and appropriate others’ utterances in ways that transform its meanings, intentions, and contexts. Most importantly, disagreement and remix both elicit a reconfiguration of parts, parties, and the relationships among them. a. Politics and the Police Rancière’s work begins from the principle of “the sensible,” the corporeal-perceptual domain that contains the set of a prioris that structure and make possible all other claims and endeavors. A regime of sensibility “determin[es] what presents itself to sense experience” (Rancière, Politics of Aesthetics 13) by privileging certain modes, objects, and subjects of perception over others. As Rancière explains, “the distribution of the sensible [is] the system of self-evident facts of sense perception that simultaneously discloses the existence of something in common and the delimitations that define the respective parts and positions within it” (12). For example, whiteness, heterosexuality, and masculinity are all forms of sensibility that are, in the language of much counter-hegemonic discourse, **“centered” by contemporary American norms, institutions, and practices**; the centering of whiteness, heterosexuality, and masculinity doles out privilege to those who are perceived to conform to these norms, andliterally marginalizes those who are perceived to be insufficiently white, heterosexual, and/or masculine.A stable, hegemonic distribution constitutes what Rancière terms “the police order” (Rancière, Disagreement 29). Rancière argues that the practice of politics disrupts the police order by demonstrating the possibility of phenomena whose supposed impossibility renders a given regime consistent and coherent. Politics happens, for example, when plebes or natives show that what was thought to be the “mere noise” emitted from their mouths is in fact proper speech.“Political activity,”explains Rancière, “makes understood as discourse what was once only heard as noise” (Rancière, Disagreement, 29-30). In the words of N.W.A. and Public Enemy, then, one “brings the noise” in order to “fuck the police.” My reference to late-1980s hip hop is more than glib wordplay, because Rancière thinks that a police order of aurality can only be reconfigured through a confrontation with what this regime constitutively excludes. [[4]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#4)Rancièrean “politics” is aspecific way of **disrupting the police order**; it is abreak in or interruption of the sensible by that which the system renders inaudible or invisible. Politics is “whatever breaks with the tangible configuration whereby parties and parts or lack of them are defined by a presupposition that, by definition, has no place in that configuration – that of the part of those who have no part” (29; emphasis mine). b. Disagreement as remix When the part sans part demonstrates that it can, in fact, participate in the commons constituted by its exclusion, it forces a reconfiguration of this commons which, in turn, redistributes modes of participation (or non-participation) in it. “This break” in the police order “is manifest in a series of actions that reconfigure the space where parties, parts, or lack of parts have been defined. Political activity is whatever shifts a body from the place assigned to it or changes a place’s destination (Rancière, Disagreement 29; emphasis mine). As an interruption or “cut” in the police order that rearranges the composition of the commons, disagreement is, I argue, a form of remix. [[5]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#5) New Media theorist Lev Manovich defines remix as “a systematic re-working of a source” (Manovich 3). In Rancièrian politics, this “source” is a hegemonic distribution of sensibility (i.e., the police): “politics acts on the police…in the places and with the words that are common to both, even if it means reshaping those places and changing the status of those words” (33). Disagreement and remixing both involve cutting new parts out of an established fabric of relationships, and then seeing what arrangements can be composed from these new parts (thus “shifting” parts and “reshaping” places). Just as the DJ crafts tracks from samples of other songs, or as the MC signifies on the “proper” meaning of common words (e.g., using “ill” or “bad” to mean “good”), the instigator of disagreement “has to borrow the others’ words in order to say that it is saying something else entirely” (xi). Such borrowing is possible because remixing assumes the commutability of different texts: any text can be put to any use. In the same way that equality’s interruption of the police “imposes on the very carving up of the social body the law of mixing, the law of anyone at all doing anything at all” (Rancière, Disagreement 19; emphasis mine), remixing treats any recording as “equal to” or interchangeable with any other. Not only can the refrain of white orphan girls serve as the background for black gangsta macho posturing, but vocal samples can be used as the rhythmic basis of a piece. [[6]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#6) Thus remixing, like Rancièrian disagreement, rests on the principle of the empty “equality of anyone and everyone” (61). [[7]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#7) By introducing the principle of equality into an otherwise stable and manifestly unequal distribution of sensibility, political disagreement is “the interminable war between ways of declaring what a body can do” (Rancière, “Thinking Between Disciplines” 11). While Rancière repeatedly emphasizes the fact that disagreement concerns bodies – which kinds of bodies can have what kinds of capacities – he never focuses explicitly on how disagreement plays out in and on the body. For example, he describes “dissensus” as “the sensible rupture of the relation between a body and what it knows,” but locates this phenomenon as a “division of the body politic within itself” (7). [[8]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#8) But what happens when this division is within one’s own body, when disagreement concerns not the body politic, but one’s own corporeal schema? This is an important question not only because a fractured corporeal schema is, as Frantz Fanon has famously argued, a characteristic feature of non-white identity in a normatively white/Euroethnic regime, but also because our body is our primary interface with “the sensible.” Regimes of sensibility are not abstract structures; they are realized in, on, and through individual bodies. Following Judith Butler’s claim that if the personal isindeed political, thenone can work on the political by working on one’s own body, I argue that one’s own body is aparticularly productive theater upon/within which disagreement can be staged.[[9]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#9)Thus, while somereaders of Rancièrearguethat politics can only be public and collectivein the most traditional senses (i.e., as opposed to the private and the personal), feminist theory teaches us that distinctions between the public and the private, the individual and the collective, are, at best, quite slippery.[[10]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#10) Supposedly “individual” experiences that may appear to be mere “self-involvement” (May 116) – e.g., bodily comportment or musical taste – are in fact productive stages of political contestation.[[11]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#11) In the following section, I read KodwoEshun’s theorization of hip hop practice as an attempt to account for the corporeal dimension of disagreement. Because it both stages disagreement and gives rise to new distributions of sensibility, “motion capture,” as Eshun theorizes it, functions as “political art” in Rancière’s narrow sense. 2. “Express Yourself”: hip hop as political art and corporeal disagreement In the same way that, in Rancière’s account, not all misunderstandings are “disagreements” and not all manifestations of government or relations of power are “politics,” not all art objects function as “art” (Rancière, Aesthetics 25-26). “Art,” “politics,” and “disagreement” only occur when established distributions of sensibility are contested and reworked. “The specificity of art,” Rancière explains, “consists inbringing about a reframingof material and symbolic space. And it is in this way that art bears on politics” (34). Artistic objects and practices become “art” when they perform the work of politics in Rancière’s narrow sense: “art” interrupts, upsets, and reworks dominant distributions of sensibility. Like politics and disagreement, the practice of art is concerned with “bodily positions and movements” (Rancière, Politics of Aesthetics 19), and effects a “change of the rapport between what the arms know how to do and what the eye is capable of seeing” (Rancière, “Thinking Between Disciplines” 4) – that is to say, art works in, on, and through individual bodies and their “corporeal schemas” (i.e., one’s own cognitive and kinesthetic sense of one’s body and embodied relation to the material and social world). In this section, I examine Afrofuturist music theorist KodwoEshun’s notions of “motion capture” and “metafoolishness” in order to (1) show how hip hop is a musical instance of “art” in Rancière’s narrow sense (which is also to say that it is “politics” in his narrow sense), and (2) think through some of the ways that disagreement contests not only broad distributions of sensibility, but individual corporeal schemas. a. Motion Capture: Eshun’s theory of hip hop Eshun uses the idea of sampling as aural “motion capture” in order to explain how hip hop remixes not only music, but corporeal schemas. In visual animation, motion capture is the process of transforming human movement into digital data: an actor wears a suit fitted with many small sensors that a computer program then uses to track and create a 3-D model of the actor’s movements. Similarly, musical recordings are, for Eshun, “kinesthetic engines which capture your motion” (Eshun 02[108]), because they exist between human movement (i.e., the danceability of the breakbeat) and code, thus doing musically what motion capturing does visually. Early hip-hop DJs sampled a song’s “break,” the most rhythmically active part of a piece.[[12]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#12) If these breaks are human movement (dance moves, sense perceptions), encoded in musical notation, then DJs do more than merely “capture” human motion – they induce new aesthetic experiences and new ways of living one’s corporeality. In the remixing of songs, the body itself is remade. “Music is the science of playing human nervous systems” (Eshun 09[161]). It is not only musical structures that are being reconfigured here, but also (and perhaps more importantly) distributions of sensibility. By capturing and remixing human movement and perceptual faculties/habits, sample-based music can point to contradictions and inconsistencies within a regime of sensibility, in turn revealing its contingency and constructedness.When you hear a familiar sample in its unfamiliar original context (e.g., when a fan of MC Hammer’s “U Can’t Touch This” first encounters Rick James’s “Superfreak”), the sample is “a Motion Capturer that seizes your skin memory, flashbacks your flesh” (Eshun 03[058]). Hearing the familiar in its original yet unfamiliar context produces a corporeal uncanniness that, according to Eshun, leads the listener to a critical awareness of the sample’s involvement in artistic and social discourses. Eshun describes this process: It’s the habitualness…. The motions you have to make to put a needle onto the record as the flight of the stylus takes across the groove: think of the hundreds of thousands of times that you’ve made that motion, the habitualness of putting it on.… When you hear a sound, you have a memory flash, but you almost have a muscular memory, you remember the times you danced to it. You don’t just remember the times you danced to it, you remember the times you bent over to put the needle on the record to play that bit. Sometimes you love that bit so much, you even remember going over and over that bit again. So when you hear that sound that you love, when you hear the recognizable sample in the middle of alien sound, that sound is recognizing your habitualness, and it’s really incredible, you suddenly get a glimpse of yourself as a habitform, as a habitformed being, a process of habit formation. You suddenly see yourself over the years, how you loved this record. It’s incredible, the sound takes a picture of your habits; it snaps your habits. And you suddenly see it very clearly. (A[190)]; emphasis mine) As Eshun describes it, sound produces, in corporeal experience, the sort of critical clarity conventionally described with visual metaphors – “you suddenly see it very clearly.” Hearing a familiar sample in an unfamiliar context, one’s habitual corporeal response to it is disturbed. In Rancière’s terms, this “shift in [the sample’s] discursive register, its universe of reference, or its temporal designations” (Rancière, “Dissenting Words” 120) interrupts established distributions of sensibility and gives us pause to reconsider – and, if we follow Eshun – rework them. What are samples if not “blocks of speech circulating without a legitimate father to accompany them toward their authorized addressee” (Rancière, Politics of Aesthetics 39)? Deregulating the musical order of who can say what and what can go where, “these locutions take hold of bodies and divert them from their end or purpose” (Rancière, Politics of Aesthetics 39), and thus deregulate the general police order. [[13]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#13) If we closely follow Eshun’s account, we see that this interruption occurs not in some collective and/or abstract “sensible,” but in one’s own corporeal schema: it’s your habits that get snapped and reorganized. An example will help me cache out this phenomenon of corporeal disagreement that Eshun points to in the quote above. b. “It’s Dre on the MicGettin’ Physical” Upon hearing, in a Botox ad, the sample from Charles Wright Watts 103rd Street Band’s “Express Yourself” made newly famous in NWA’s track of the same title, one might first recognize the groove in the sample as belonging to its most recently familiar context – a classic 1990s G-funk track about the disenfranchisement of economically underprivileged black men. [[14]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#14)[[15]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#15) Even though the “groove” (the horn line and the lyric “express yourself”) on both the Watts Band’s and NWA’s version is basically identical, each version implies a different set of dance moves, a different mode of bodily comportment. The different comportments can be seen in the different ways the women in the Botox ad dance to the Watts Band, and the way Dr. Dre and NWA carry themselves in their video. In these two contexts, one “expresses oneself” in differing ways which quite neatly map onto race and gender stereotypes. The women in the ad dance in a stereotypically white, feminine, sensual way, while Dre and NWA walk and gesture to the beat in ways that reinforce both their masculine toughness and their fluency in the gestural rhetoric common to West Coast rappers of the era. In fact, when I first saw the commercial, I went over to the television, and, upon seeing the white women dancing in the ad, I realized that I, a white woman (albeit one who grew up watching a lot of hip-hop videos), was dancing and “expressing myself” to this music in a way completely different than the way the white women in the Botox ad were. In fact, I was moving more like the black men in the NWA video than I was the white women in the Botox ad (I was keeping the beat with my head and shoulders while using hand gestures for emphasis, as rappers commonly do in hip hop videos. The women in the commercial were moving mainly from the pelvis/hip area.) While it was entirely appropriate for dancing to 90s G-funk, my movements seemed, in the context of the ad, totally inappropriate for my race and my gender. The recontextualization of this Watts Band/NWA sample literally captured my motion in a way that allowed me to first recognize and then reflect on both the complexities of my own corporeal habits (i.e., the mode of my dancing), and of raced and gendered norms/habits of embodiment more broadly. Eshun calls this reflective attention to normative embodiment “metafoolishness.”A “sudden awareness of the game you’re in[,]… metafoolishness hips you to how the human biocomputermetaprograms itself” ( Eshun 08[145]). In Rancière’s terms, these “metaprograms” are the police order, and this sample is an agent of political subjectification. According to Rancière, “political subjectification redefines the field of experience that gave to each their identity with their lot (Rancière, Disagreement 40). The “Express Yourself” sample points to two parties or “identities” in the contemporary American police order – white femininity and black masculinity – but it does so in a way that forces a redistribution of these parties and parts. Insofar as “a well-ordered society would like the bodies which compose it to have the perceptions, sensations and thoughts which correspond to them” (Rancière, “Thinking Between Disciplines” 9), I should identify with the women in the Botox ad. However, because I associate this sample with a specific performance of black masculinity, I actually feel estranged from the norms governing both their and my embodiment as a white woman. A “political interval” has been “created by dividing a condition” – i.e., white femininity – “from itself” (Rancière, Disagreement 138). Though I am, by all accounts, a white woman, my experience with this Botox ad demonstrates that my corporeal schema is neither that of a “white woman” nor a “black man” – if these are even meaningful categories anymore. The fact that I, a white woman, can more readily identify with the black masculinity in a 90s G-funk video than the white femininity in a recent TV commercial destabilizes both identity categories or “metaprograms.”[[16]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#16) What is specifically “black” or “masculine” about this mode of bodily comportment if I, a thirtysomething middle-class white woman, can perform it more convincingly than some modes of middle-class white female bodily comportment?[[17]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#17) By carving a break in two songs, the “Express Yourself” sample affected a break in my body’s capacity to perform/inhabit prescribed race-gender norms. This break induces “disagreement” in Rancière’s narrow sense. Regardless of which context is considered the sample’s “original” or “proper” one, this sample, like the plebes’ affirmative response to the “Do you understand?” question, is an “utterance…[that] finds itself extracted from the speech situation in which it functioned naturally. It is placed in another situation in which it no longer works” (Rancière, Disagreement 47).[[18]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#18) To hear this sample that I and many other people primarily associate with ‘90s gangsta rap in an ad meant to convince wealthy white women that this cosmetic medical procedure will not prevent them from “expressing themselves” (Botox is widely known to reduce wrinkles by paralyzing facial muscles) juxtaposes the privilege accorded to Botox’s target market (they’ll pay to lose the expressive capacities they already possess), and the marginalization of those whose situation NWA describes (whose voices are already discounted in the mainstream media, or, those for whom “expressin’ with full capabilities” lands one in “correctional facilities”). If “the political act… consists in building a relationship between these things that have none, in causing the relationship and the nonrerelationship to be seen together as the object of dispute” (41), then the “Express Yourself” sample functions as a political agent by producing a commonality between two things that supposedly have nothing in common: middle-class beauty regimes and the prison-industrial complex.[[19]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#19) In so doing, the sample shifts our attention from the songs’ lyrical and musical content to the situation of the parts and parties involved in its production and reception; it has produced a situation of disagreement. Because it does the work of art (i.e., interrupting and reconfiguring the police order of race-gender identities), this Botox advertisement is no mere product of the culture industry, but “art” in Rancière’s narrow sense. While this example evinces a fairly by-the-book instance of political disagreement, it also effects “disagreement” at the level of individual bodily experience. Here, disagreement concerns not just a speech situation, but also a corporeal schema. My experience with the Botox ad neither disrupted nor reworked the regime of white Western heteropatriarchy. It did, however, disrupt my own performance of classed and racialized gender norms. Race, class, and gender (and other social identities) are primarily norms governing bodily difference (or, in more Rancièrian terms, they are ways of distributing bodies around a white/Western, bourgeois, heteromasculine ideal). Thus, in order to transform the consensus/postdemocratic “identity politics” Rancière so detests into genuinely counter-hegemonic politics, it is necessary to politically engage individual bodily experience – i.e., to stage disagreements that are corporeal. So, how might one go about staging corporeal disagreements? If “the need to create another body and another way of seeing than that which oppresses them” (Rancière, “Thinking Between Disciplines” 3) is a necessary component of liberatory struggles, how does one do this? How might art help? Eshun offers some suggestions. In Eshun’s account, audio technologies such as samplers and synthesizers elicit new aesthetic experiences that in turn change the way one experiences one’s habitual body; he describes this phenomenon as “hyperembodiment via the Technics SL 1200” (-002; Technics, pronounced “techniques,” is a brand of turntables widely used by DJs). By producing sounds and compositional structures that are too fast, too complex, or otherwise materially impossible to make with analogue instruments and human musicians, technologies like turntables, samplers, synthesizers, and drum machines produce sounds and aural experiences for which we have yet to develop adequate listening and analytical conventions. In other words, musicians are making works that we haven’t really learned how to hear, for which our ears are literally not trained and conditioned (in the sense that an athlete is trained and conditioned for physical performance).[[20]](http://www.transformationsjournal.org/journal/issue_19/article_05.shtml#20) Accordingly, Eshun argues that these new musical technologies and the works produced on them “deman[d] a new neuromuscular interface” (01[003]). These new sounds make our bodies work differently. As Eshun puts it, “the nervous system [is] reshaped by beats for a new kind of sensory condition” (A[182]). Hip hop reprograms our metaprograms, so to speak. 3. Conclusion: “To magnify the misperception inherent in everyday hearing” (Eshun 03[047]) Eshun’s account of motion capture illustrates some specific ways that art – in particular, hip hop– creates new modes of sense perception. Rancière claims politics in general “make[s] visible what is not perceivable” (Rancière, “Dissenting Words” 124), and that art is political when it is “concerned with aesthetic acts as configurations of experience that create new modes of sense perception” (Rancière, Politics of Aesthetics 9; emphasis mine). Clearly, then, hip hop as Eshun describes it is a practice both political and artistic. Rancière’s discussions of sensibility and sense perception tend toward the abstract and the broadly generalizable: he focuses mainly on “regimes,” “distributions,” and orders, on the body politic rather than specific experiences of concrete embodiment. Feminist, queer, and critical race/postcolonial theorists have established that one’s personal corporeal schema is political in the general sense, and I argue that it is also “political” – and artistic – in Rancière’s narrow sense. Both art and politics can do their work on, in, and through both individuals’ corporeal schemas and a society’s regimes of sensibility. Charles Mills has argued that white supremacy/normative whiteness is a “cognitive dysfunction that is socially functional”: while the perception that non-whites are not fully human(and thus not fully entitled to human rights) isempirically incorrect, normative whiteness masks this error and posits the empirically unsound position as the only credible, consistent, and coherent view(Mills 18). In his discussion of the plebes’ demonstration of their ability to speak words (rather than make noise), Rancière gives an example of this “socially functional” erroneousness: “before becoming a class traitor, the consul Menenius, who imagines he has heard the plebes speak, is a victim of sensory illusion” (Rancière, Disagreement 24; emphasis mine). This “illusion” is like the “dysfunction” of which Mills speaks: while apparently incorrect, given the norms of the dominant distribution of sensibility, it is in fact completely and brutally accurate (in more Rancièrian terms, it recognizes the police order’s “miscount” as such). While Mills focuses on the cognitive, Rancière’s work draws attention to the corporeal dimension of this “dysfunctionality.” The problem then becomes how to incite more of these “sensory illusions.” As my Botox ad/NWA example and Eshun’s discussion of the effects of technological innovation on sense perception demonstrate, art practices like hip hop can successfully rupture hegemonic modes of perception, “magnify the misperception inherent in everyday hearing,” and cause one tosee, hear, and experience one’s embodiment in new ways.

### 1NR Card

#### You don’t “think” your way into a different way of acting; you “act” your way into a different way of thinking-That means vote neg

Smith 13 (Andrea, intellectual, feminist, and anti-violence activist, Founder of INCITE - A National Activist Organization of radical feminists of color, "The Problem with “Privilege”," http://andrea366.wordpress.com/2013/08/14/the-problem-with-privilege-by-andrea-smith/)Si

In my experience working with a multitude of anti-racist organizing projects over the years, I frequently found myself participating in various workshops in which participants were asked to reflect on their gender/race/sexuality/class/etc. privilege. These workshops had a bit of a self-help orientation to them: “I am so and so, and I have x privilege.” It was neverquite clear what the point of these confessions were. It was not as if other participants did not know the confessor in question had her/his proclaimed privilege. It did not appearthat these individual confessionsactually led to any political projects to dismantle the structures of domination that enabled their privilege. Rather, the confessions became the political project themselves. The benefits of these confessions seemed to be ephemeral. For the instant the confession took place, those who do not have that privilege in daily life would have a temporary position of power as the hearer of the confession who could grant absolution and forgiveness. The sayer of the confession couldthen be granted temporary forgiveness for her/his abuses of power and relief fromwhite/male/heterosexual/etc guilt. Because of the perceived benefits of this ritual, there was generally little critique of the fact that in the end, it primarily served to reinstantiate the structures of domination it was supposed to resist. One of the reasons there was little critique of this practice is that it bestowed cultural capital to those who seemed to be the “most oppressed.” Those who had little privilege did not have to confess and were in the position to be the judge of those who did have privilege. Consequently, people aspired to be oppressed. Inevitably, those withmore privilegewould develop new heretofore unknownforms of oppression from which they suffered. “I may be white, but my best friend was a person of color, which caused me to be oppressed when we played together.” Consequently, the goal became not to actually end oppression but to be as oppressed as possible. These rituals often substituted confession for political movement-building. And despite the cultural capital that was, at least temporarily, bestowed to those who seemed to be the most oppressed, these rituals ultimately reinstantiated the white majority subject as the subject capable of self-reflexivity and the colonized/racialized subject as the occasion for self-reflexivity. These rituals around self-reflexivityin the academy and in activist circles are not without merit.Theyare informed by key insights into how the logics of domination that structure the world also constitute who we are as subjects. Political projects of transformation necessarily involve a fundamental reconstitution of ourselves as well. However, for this process to work, individual transformation must occur concurrently with social and political transformation. That is, the undoingof privilege occurs not by individuals confessing their privilegesor trying to think themselves into a new subject position, but through the creation of collective structures that dismantle the systems that enable these privileges. The activist genealogies that produced this response to racism and settler colonialism were not initially focused on racism as a problem of individual prejudice. Rather, the purpose was for individuals to recognize how they were shaped by structural forms of oppression. However, the response to structural racism became an individual one – individual confession at the expense of collective action. Thus the question becomes, how would one collectivize individual transformation? Many organizing projects attempt and have attempted to do precisely this, such Sisters in Action for Power, Sista II Sista, Incite! Women of Color Against Violence, and Communities Against Rape and Abuse, among many others. Rather than focus simply on one’s individual privilege, they address privilege on an organizational level. For instance, they might assess – is everyone who is invited to speak a college graduate? Are certain peoples always in the limelight? Based on this assessment, they develop structures to address how privilege is exercised collectively. For instance, anytime a person with a college degree is invited to speak, they bring with them a co-speaker who does not have that education level. They might develop mentoring and skills-sharing programs within the group. To quote one of my activist mentors, Judy Vaughn, “You don’t think your way into a different way of acting; you act your way into a different way of thinking.” Essentially, the current social structure conditions us to exercise what privileges we may have. If we want to undermine those privileges, we must change the structures within which we live so that we become different peoples in the process.

### 2NC – Reformism Module

#### **This debate should be focused on questions of HOW we approach the law instead of simply what laws should we pass – instead of seeking to reform the law we should reject the affirmative as a means of dismantling and decentering law based approaches – this focus on process over product is necessary to focus on the intersectional oppression at the heart of restricting war powers – we must sequence this question with any policy questions because our method for approaching the law informs what policies we create and how we’ve conceptualized the policy problem in the first place**

Spade 13 (Dean, Associate Professor at Seattle University School of Law – teaches Administrative Law, Poverty Law, and Law and Social Movements, "Intersectional Resistance and Law Reform," Vol. 38, No. 4, Intersectionality: Theorizing Power, Empowering Theory (Summer 2013), pp. 1031-1055)

More than twenty years ago, Kimberle Williams Crenshaw coined the term “intersectionality” to describe a method of analysis that reveals the dynamics of subjection hidden by what she called single-axis analysis and to suggest avenues for intervention and resistance that are eclipsed by single-axis approaches. Crenshaw demonstrated that projects aimed at conceptualizing and remedying racial or gender subordination through a single vector end up implicitly positing the subject of that subordination as universally male, in the case of single-axis antiracist analysis, or as universally white, in the case of single-axis feminist analysis. The experiences of women of color become untellable ð Crenshaw 1991 Þ . Crenshaw’s articulation of intersectionality brought to legal theory a key set of insights from women-of-color feminism and other critical intellectual traditions about the limits of “equality” and added these understandings to the interrogations of the discrimination principle taken up in critical race theory. What does intersectional resistance look like on the ground, and what is its relationship to law? In this essay, I examine some of the key concepts and questions that contemporary anticolonial, antiracist, feminist resistance employs and argue that the demands emerging from it bring not only the United States but the nation-state form itself into crisis. Understanding intersectional harm necessitates an analysis of population-level state violence as opposed to individual discrimination that resistance movements sometimes articulate through the concept of population control. Social movements **frequently** splinter between those employing a single-axis analysis to demand civil rights and legal equality and those employing intersectional analysis to dismantle legal and administrative systems that perpetrate racialized-gendered violence. This essay seeks to draw connections between some of the key methodologies of resistance utilized by intersectional scholars and movements. I am interested in how these methodologies bring attention to the violences of legal and administrative systems that articulate themselves as race and gender neutral but are actually sites of the gendered racialization processes that produce the nation-state. Intersectional resistance practices aimed at dismantling population control take as their targets systems of legal and administrative governance such as criminal punishment, immigration enforcement, environmental regulation, child welfare, and public benefits. This resistance seeks out the root causes of despair and violence facing intersectionally targeted populations and in doing so engages with the law differently than rights-seeking projects do. Critically analyzing the promises of legal recognition and inclusion from systems that they understand as sources of state violence and technologies of population control, intersectional resisters are demanding the abolition of criminal punishment, immigration enforcement, and other functions and institutions that are central to the nation-state form. Such demands are profoundly perplexing to many scholars, even scholars interested in intersectionality. This essay examines how intersectional analysis leads to the production of such demands and discusses how law reform tactics shift, but do not disappear, when such demands emerge. In the first section of this essay, I briefly review some of the key critiques of legal equality offered by critical scholars, especially critical race theorists. Next, I introduce the concept of population control and highlight the importance of attention to population-level conditions and interventions in intersectional scholarship and activism. The reproductive justice movement illustrates how an intersectional critique of single-axis politics and its demands for legal rights leads to a focus on population-level systems that distribute harm and violence through gendered racialization processes. The reproductivejusticemovement’s critiques of white reproductive rights frameworks — particularly the assertion that reproductive justice for women of color requires interventions into criminalization, child welfare, environmental regulation, immigration, and other arenas of administrative violence — illustrate how intersectional critique and activism move away from individual rights and toward a focus on population control. Third, I take up the assertion from many critical traditions that legal equality or rights strategies not only fail to address the harms facing intersectionally targeted populations but also often shore up and expand systems of violence and control. They do this in at least three ways: by mobilizing narratives of deservingness and undeservingness, by participating in the logics and structures that undergird relations of domination, and by becoming sites for the expansion of harmful systems and institutions. Activists and scholars have argued that the use of criminalization to combat domestic violence and human trafficking constitutes a co-optation of feminist resistance that expands criminal enforcement systems that target and endanger women and queers of color. This analysis illustrates the danger that legal reforms can expand violent systems by mobilizing the rhetoric of saving women combined with frameworks of deservingness that reify racist, ableist, antipoor, and colonial relations. I further argue that equality and legal rights strategies can be divisive to social movements. I use three exam- ples of movement splits to illustrate this: the divide between reproductive rights and reproductive justice, the divide between disability rights and disability justice, and the divide between the gay and lesbian rights framework and the racial and economic justice – centered queer and trans resistance formations that have critiqued it and created alternatives. For each of these examples, I trace how rights strategies mobilize single-axis analyses that, their critics argue, both fail to meet the needs of constituents facing intersectional harm and reify harmful dynamics and systems. Fourth, I observe that these critical traditions strategically reject narratives that declare that the US legal system has broken from the founding violences of slavery, genocide, and heteropatriarchy. Critics refute the notion that such founding violences have been eradicated by legal equality. They instead trace the genealogies of purportedly neutral contemporary legal and administrative systems to these foundations, arguing that the state-making, racializing, and gendering functions of founding violences like enslavement and settler colonialism continue in new forms. This analytical move exposes the fact that declarations of legal equality do not resolve such violence and generates demands like prison abolition and an end to immigration enforcement that throw the US legal system and the nation-state form into crisis. Finally, I examine how such intersectional resistance engages with law reform demands. I suggest that rejecting legal equality and using a population- control framing leads to a strategy focused on dismantling the violent capacities of racialized-gendered systems that operate under the pretense of neutrality. I take as examples the involvement of gender- and sexuality- focused organizations in recent campaigns to stop gang injunctions in Oakland, California, and to stop local jurisdictions from participating in the Secure Communities immigration enforcement program. These campaigns have law reform targets yet resist many of the traps of legal equality arguments because they center on the material concerns of those who are perpetually cast as undeserving, because their demands aim to produce material change in terms of life chances rather than symbolic declarations of equality, and because they conceptualize gender and sexual justice and freedom through the experiences of those who are intersectionally targeted by purportedly race- and gender-neutral systems. Through these examples and arguments, I aim both to draw connections between key intersectional methods and to illustrate what forms intersectional resistance is taking in contemporary politics, what targets it identifies, and what demands it makes.