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### T

#### a. Interpretation and violation---the affirmative should defend the desirability of topical government action

#### Most predictable—the agent and verb indicate a debate about hypothetical government action

Jon M Ericson 3, Dean Emeritus of the College of Liberal Arts – California Polytechnic U., et al., The Debater’s Guide, Third Edition, p. 4

The Proposition of Policy: Urging Future Action In policy propositions, each topic contains certain key elements, although they have slightly different functions from comparable elements of value-oriented propositions. 1. An agent doing the acting ---“The United States” in “The United States should adopt a policy of free trade.” Like the object of evaluation in a proposition of value, the agent is the subject of the sentence. 2. The verb should—the first part of a verb phrase that urges action. 3. An action verb to follow should in the should-verb combination. For example, should adopt here means to put a program or policy into action through governmental means. 4. A specification of directions or a limitation of the action desired. The phrase free trade, for example, gives direction and limits to the topic, which would, for example, eliminate consideration of increasing tariffs, discussing diplomatic recognition, or discussing interstate commerce. Propositions of policy deal with future action. Nothing has yet occurred. The entire debate is about whether something ought to occur. What you agree to do, then, when you accept the affirmative side in such a debate is to offer sufficient and compelling reasons for an audience to perform the future action that you propose.

#### Debate over a controversial point of action creates argumentative stasis—the resolution is key to avoid a devolution of debate into competing truth claims

Steinberg and Freely 08

(David L., lecturer of communication studies – University of Miami, and Austin J.,Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, “Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making” p. 45//wyoccd)

Debate is a means of settling differences, so there must be a difference of opinion or a conflict of interest before there can be a debate. If everyone is in agreement on a tact or value or policy, there is no need for debate: the matter can be settled by unanimous consent. Thus, for example, it would be pointless to attempt to debate "Resolved: That two plus two equals four," because there is simply no controversy about this statement. (Controversy is an essential prerequisite of debate. Where there is no clash of ideas, proposals, interests, or expressed positions on issues, there is no debate. In addition, debate cannot produce effective decisions without clear identification of a question or questions to be answered. For example, general argument may occur about the broad topic of illegal immigration. How many illegal immigrants are in the United States? What is the impact of illegal immigration and immigrants on our economy? What is their impact on our communities? Do they commit crimes? Do they take jobs from American workers? Do they pay taxes? Do they require social services? Is it a problem that some do not speak English? Is it the responsibility of employers to discourage illegal immigration by not hiring undocumented workers? Should they have the opportunity- to gain citizenship? Docs illegal immigration pose a security threat to our country? Do illegal immigrants do work that American workers are unwilling to do? Are their rights as workers and as human beings at risk due to their status? Are they abused by employers, law enforcement, housing, and businesses? I low are their families impacted by their status? What is the moral and philosophical obligation of a nation state to maintain its borders? Should we build a wall on the Mexican border, establish a national identification can!, or enforce existing laws against employers? Should we invite immigrants to become U.S. citizens? Surely you can think of many more concerns to be addressed by a conversation about the topic area of illegal immigration. Participation in this "debate" is likely to be emotional and intense. However, it is not likely to be productive or useful without focus on a particular question and identification of a line demarcating sides in the controversy. To be discussed and resolved effectively, controversies must be stated clearly. Vague understanding results in unfocused deliberation and poor decisions, frustration, and emotional distress, as evidenced by the failure of the United States Congress to make progress on the immigration debate during the summer of 2007.¶ Someone disturbed by the problem of the growing underclass of poorly educated, socially disenfranchised youths might observe, "Public schools are doing a terrible job! They are overcrowded, and many teachers are poorly qualified in their subject areas. Even the best teachers can do little more than struggle to maintain order in their classrooms." That same concerned citizen, facing a complex range of issues, might arrive at an unhelpful decision, such as "We ought to do something about this" or. worse. "It's too complicated a problem to deal with." Groups of concerned citizens worried about the state of public education could join together to express their frustrations, anger, disillusionment, and emotions regarding the schools, but without a focus for their discussions, they could easily agree about the sorry state of education without finding points of clarity or potential solutions. A gripe session would follow. But if a precise question is posed—such as "What can be done to improve public education?"—then a more profitable area of discussion is opened up simply by placing a focus on the search for a concrete solution step. One or more judgments can be phrased in the form of debate propositions, motions for parliamentary debate, or bills for legislative assemblies. The statements "Resolved: That the federal government should implement a program of charter schools in at-risk communities" and "Resolved: That the state of Florida should adopt a school voucher program" more clearly identify specific ways of dealing with educational problems in a manageable form, suitable for debate. They provide specific policies to be investigated and aid discussants in identifying points of difference.¶ To have a productive debate, which facilitates effective decision making by directing and placing limits on the decision to be made, the basis for argument should be clearly defined. If we merely talk about "homelessness" or "abortion" or "crime'\* or "global warming" we are likely to have an interesting discussion but not to establish profitable basis for argument. For example, the statement "Resolved: That the pen is mightier than the sword" is debatable, yet fails to provide much basis for clear argumentation. If we take this statement to mean that the written word is more effective than physical force for some purposes, we can identify a problem area: the comparative effectiveness of writing or physical force for a specific purpose.¶ Although we now have a general subject, we have not yet stated a problem. It is still too broad, too loosely worded to promote well-organized argument. What sort of writing are we concerned with—poems, novels, government documents, website development, advertising, or what? What does "effectiveness" mean in this context? What kind of physical force is being compared—fists, dueling swords, bazookas, nuclear weapons, or what? A more specific question might be. "Would a mutual defense treaty or a visit by our fleet be more effective in assuring Liurania of our support in a certain crisis?" The basis for argument could be phrased in a debate proposition such as "Resolved: That the United States should enter into a mutual defense treatv with Laurania." Negative advocates might oppose this proposition by arguing that fleet maneuvers would be a better solution. This is not to say that debates should completely avoid creative interpretation of the controversy by advocates, or that good debates cannot occur over competing interpretations of the controversy; in fact, these sorts of debates may be very engaging. The point is that debate is best facilitated by the guidance provided by focus on a particular point of difference, which will be outlined in the following discussion.

#### Decisionmaking is the most portable skill—key to all facets of life and advocacy

Steinberg and Freely 08

(David L., lecturer of communication studies – University of Miami, and Austin J.,Boston based attorney who focuses on criminal, personal injury and civil rights law, “Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making” p. 9-10//wyoccd)

After several days of intense debate, first the United States House of Representatives and then the U.S. Senate voted to authorize President George W. Bush to attack Iraq if Saddam Hussein refused to give up weapons of mass destruction as required by United Nations's resolutions. Debate about a possible military\* action against Iraq continued in various governmental bodies and in the public for six months, until President Bush ordered an attack on Baghdad, beginning Operation Iraqi Freedom, the military campaign against the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein. He did so despite the unwillingness of the U.N. Security Council to support the military action, and in the face of significant international opposition.¶ Meanwhile, and perhaps equally difficult for the parties involved, a young couple deliberated over whether they should purchase a large home to accommodate their growing family or should sacrifice living space to reside in an area with better public schools; elsewhere a college sophomore reconsidered his major and a senior her choice of law school, graduate school, or a job. Each of these\* situations called for decisions to be made. Each decision maker worked hard to make well-reasoned decisions.¶ Decision making is a thoughtful process of choosing among a variety of options for acting or thinking. It requires that the decider make a choice. Life demands decision making. We make countless individual decisions every day. To make some of those decisions, we work hard to employ care and consideration; others seem to just happen. Couples, families, groups of friends, and coworkers come together to make choices, and decision-making homes from committees to juries to the U.S. Congress and the United Nations make decisions that impact us all. Every profession requires effective and ethical decision making, as do our school, community, and social organizations.¶ We all make many decisions even- day. To refinance or sell one's home, to buy a high-performance SUV or an economical hybrid car. what major to select, what to have for dinner, what candidate CO vote for. paper or plastic, all present lis with choices. Should the president deal with an international crisis through military invasion or diplomacy? How should the U.S. Congress act to address illegal immigration?¶ Is the defendant guilty as accused? Tlie Daily Show or the ball game? And upon what information should I rely to make my decision? Certainly some of these decisions are more consequential than others. Which amendment to vote for, what television program to watch, what course to take, which phone plan to purchase, and which diet to pursue all present unique challenges. At our best, we seek out research and data to inform our decisions. Yet even the choice of which information to attend to requires decision making. In 2006, TIMI: magazine named YOU its "Person of the Year." Congratulations! Its selection was based on the participation not of ''great men" in the creation of history, but rather on the contributions of a community of anonymous participants in the evolution of information. Through blogs. online networking. You Tube. Facebook, MySpace, Wikipedia, and many other "wikis," knowledge and "truth" are created from the bottom up, bypassing the authoritarian control of newspeople. academics, and publishers. We have access to infinite quantities of information, but how do we sort through it and select the best information for our needs?¶ The ability of every decision maker to make good, reasoned, and ethical decisions relies heavily upon their ability to think critically. Critical thinking enables one to break argumentation down to its component parts in order to evaluate its relative validity and strength. Critical thinkers are better users of information, as well as better advocates.¶ Colleges and universities expect their students to develop their critical thinking skills and may require students to take designated courses to that end. The importance and value of such study is widely recognized.¶ Much of the most significant communication of our lives is conducted in the form of debates. These may take place in intrapersonal communications, in which we weigh the pros and cons of an important decision in our own minds, or they may take place in interpersonal communications, in which we listen to arguments intended to influence our decision or participate in exchanges to influence the decisions of others.¶ Our success or failure in life is largely determined by our ability to make wise decisions for ourselves and to influence the decisions of others in ways that are beneficial to us. Much of our significant, purposeful activity is concerned with making decisions. Whether to join a campus organization, go to graduate school, accept a job oiler, buy a car or house, move to another city, invest in a certain stock, or vote for Garcia—these are just a few of the thousands of decisions we may have to make. Often, intelligent self-interest or a sense of responsibility will require us to win the support of others. We may want a scholarship or a particular job for ourselves, a customer for out product, or a vote for our favored political candidate.

#### Debate needs middle of the road constraints; unbridled affirmation destroys dialogue that are key to political discussion {GREEN}

Hanghoj 08

(Thorkild Hanghøj, Phd, DREAM (Danish Research Centre on Education and Advanced Media Materials at the Institute of Literature, Media and Cultural Studies at the University of Southern Denmark. 2008 http://static.sdu.dk/mediafiles/Files/Information\_til/Studerende\_ved\_SDU/Din\_uddannelse/phd\_hum/afhandlinger/2009/ThorkilHanghoej.pdf//wyoccd)

Debate games are often based on pre-designed scenarios that include descriptions of issues to be debated, educational goals, game goals, roles, rules, time frames etc. In this way, debate games differ from textbooks and everyday classroom instruction as debate scenarios allow teachers and students to actively imagine, interact and communicate within a domain-specific game space. However, instead of mystifying debate games as a “magic circle” (Huizinga, 1950), I will try to overcome the epistemological dichotomy between “gaming” and “teaching” that tends to dominate discussions of educational games. In short, educational gaming is a form of teaching. As mentioned, education and games represent two different semiotic domains that both embody the three faces of knowledge: assertions, modes of representation and social forms of organisation (Gee, 2003; Barth, 2002; cf. chapter 2). In order to understand the interplay between these different domains and their interrelated knowledge forms, I will draw attention to a central assumption in Bakhtin’s dialogical philosophy. According to Bakhtin, all forms of communication and culture are subject to centripetal and centrifugal forces (Bakhtin, 1981). A centripetal force is the drive to impose one version of the truth, while a centrifugal force involves a range of possible truths and interpretations. This means that any form of expression involves a duality of centripetal and centrifugal forces: “Every concrete utterance of a speaking subject serves as a point where centrifugal as well as centripetal forces are brought to bear” (Bakhtin, 1981: 272). If we take teaching as an example, it is always affected by centripetal and centrifugal forces in the on-going negotiation of “truths” between teachers and students. In the words of Bakhtin: “Truth is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction” (Bakhtin, 1984a: 110). Similarly, the dialogical space of debate games also embodies centrifugal and centripetal forces. Thus, the election scenario of The Power Game involves centripetal elements that are mainly determined by the rules and outcomes of the game, i.e. the election is based on a limited time frame and a fixed voting procedure. Similarly, the open-ended goals, roles and resources represent centrifugal elements and create virtually endless possibilities for researching, preparing, presenting, debating and evaluating a variety of key political issues. Consequently, the actual process of enacting a game scenario involves a complex negotiation between these centrifugal/centripetal forces that are inextricably linked with the teachers and students’ game activities. In this way, the enactment of The Power Game is a form of teaching that combines different pedagogical practices (i.e. group work, web quests, student presentations) and learning resources (i.e. websites, handouts, spoken language) within the interpretive frame of the election scenario. Obviously, tensions may arise if there is too much divergence between educational goals and game goals. This means that game facilitation requires a balance between focusing too narrowly on the rules or “facts” of a game (centripetal orientation) and a focusing too broadly on the contingent possibilities and interpretations of the game scenario (centrifugal orientation). For Bakhtin, the duality of centripetal/centrifugal forces often manifests itself as a dynamic between “monological” and “dialogical” forms of discourse. Bakhtin illustrates this point with the monological discourse of the Socrates/Plato dialogues in which the teacher never learns anything new from the students, despite Socrates’ ideological claims to the contrary (Bakhtin, 1984a). Thus, discourse becomes monologised when “someone who knows and possesses the truth instructs someone who is ignorant of it and in error”, where “a thought is either affirmed or repudiated” by the authority of the teacher (Bakhtin, 1984a: 81). In contrast to this, dialogical pedagogy fosters inclusive learning environments that are able to expand upon students’ existing knowledge and collaborative construction of “truths” (Dysthe, 1996). At this point, I should clarify that Bakhtin’s term “dialogic” is both a descriptive term (all utterances are per definition dialogic as they address other utterances as parts of a chain of communication) and a normative term as dialogue is an ideal to be worked for against the forces of “monologism” (Lillis, 2003: 197-8). In this project, I am mainly interested in describing the dialogical space of debate games. At the same time, I agree with Wegerif that “one of the goals of education, perhaps the most important goal, should be dialogue as an end in itself” (Wegerif, 2006: 61).

#### b. Vote neg

#### 1. Preparation and clash—changing the topic post facto manipulates balance of prep, which structurally favors the aff because they speak last and permute alternatives—strategic fairness is key to engaging a well-prepared opponent

**This year’s resolution offers a crucial opportunity for political engagement --- policy relevant debate about war powers decision-making is critical to hold the government accountable for their hypocrisy --- only engaging specific proposals and learning the language of the war-machine solves**

--we can use these categories to critique them; simulation does not undercut our potential for critique

--have to roll-play the enemy to know their language and learn their strategies

**Mellor, European University Institute Graduate Student, 13**

(Ewan E. Mellor, “Why policy relevance is a moral necessity: Just war theory, impact, and UAVs,” Paper Prepared for BISA Conference 2013, http://www.academia.edu/4175480/Why\_policy\_relevance\_is\_a\_moral\_necessity\_Just\_war\_theory\_impact\_and\_UAVs, accessed 10-20-13, CMM)

**This** section of the paper **considers** more generally **the need for just war theorists to engage with policy debate about the use of force**, **as well as to engage with the** more fundamental moral and philosophical principles of the **just war tradition**. **It draws on** John **Kelsay’s conception of just war thinking as being a social practice**,35 as well as on Michael Walzer’s understanding of the role of the social critic in society.36 It argues that **the just war tradition is a form of “practical discourse” which is concerned with questions of “how we should act.”**37 ¶ Kelsay argues that: [**T]he criteria of jus ad bellum and jus in bello provide a framework for structured participation in a public conversation about the use of military force** . . . **citizens who choose to speak in just war terms express commitments . . . [i]n the process of giving and asking for reasons for going to war, those who argue in just war terms seek to influence policy by persuading others that their analysis provides a way to express and fulfil the desire that military actions be both wise and just**.38 ¶ He also argues that **“good just war thinking involves continuous and complete deliberation**, in the sense that one attends to all the standard criteria at war’s inception, at its end, and throughout the course of the conflict.”39 This is important as **it highlights the need for just war scholars to engage with the ongoing operations in war and the specific policies that are involved.** The question of whether a particular war is just or unjust, and the question of whether a particular weapon (like drones) can be used in accordance with the jus in bello criteria, only cover a part of the overall justice of the war. **Without an engagement with the reality of war, in terms of the policies used in waging it, it is impossible to engage with the “moral reality of war,**”40 **in terms of being able to discuss it and judge it in moral terms**. ¶ Kelsay’s description of just war thinking as a social practice is similar to Walzer’s more general description of social criticism. **The just war theorist, as a social critic, must be involved with his or her own society and its practices**. In the same way that the social critic’s distance from his or her society is measured in inches and not miles,41 **the just war theorist must be close to and must understand the language through which war is constituted,** interpreted and reinterpreted.42 **It is only by understanding the values and language that their own society purports to live by that the social critic can hold up a mirror to that society to demonstrate its hypocrisy and to show the gap that exists between its practice and its values.**43 **The tradition itself** provides a set of values and principles and, as argued by Cian O’Driscoll, **constitutes a “language of engagement” to spur participation in public and political debate**.44 T**his language is** part of “our common heritage, **the product of many centuries of arguing about war**.”45 **These principles and this language provide the terms through which people understand and come to interpret war, not in a deterministic way but by providing the categories necessary for moral understanding and moral argument about the legitimate and illegitimate uses of force**.46 **By spurring and providing the basis for political engagement the just war tradition ensures that the acts that occur within war are considered according to just war criteria and allows policy-makers to be held to account on this basis.¶ Engaging with the reality of war requires recognising that war is**, as Clausewitz stated, **a continuation of policy.** **War,** according to Clausewitz, **is subordinate to politics and to political choices and these political choices can, and must, be judged and critiqued**.47 **Engagement and political debate are morally necessary as the alternative is disengagement and moral quietude**, which is a sacrifice of the obligations of citizenship.48 **This engagement must bring just war theorists into contact with the policy makers and will require work that is accessible and relevant to policy makers,** **however this does not mean a sacrifice of critical distance or an abdication of truth in the face of power.** **By engaging in detail with the policies being pursued and their concordance or otherwise with the principles of the just war tradition the policy-makers will be forced to account for their decisions and justify them in just war language.** In contrast to the view, suggested by Kenneth Anderson, that “the public cannot be made part of the debate” and that “[w]e are necessarily committed into the hands of our political leadership”,49 it is incumbent upon just war theorists to ensure that the public are informed and are capable of holding their political leaders to account. To accept the idea that the political leadership are stewards and that accountability will not benefit the public, on whose behalf action is undertaken, but will only benefit al Qaeda,50 is a grotesque act of intellectual irresponsibility. As Walzer has argued, **it is precisely because it is “our country” that we are “especially obligated to criticise its policies**.”51 ¶ Conclusion ¶ This paper has discussed the empirics of the policies of drone strikes in the ongoing conflict with those associate with al Qaeda. It has demonstrated that there are significant moral questions raised by the just war tradition regarding some aspects of these policies and it has argued that, thus far**, just war scholars have not paid sufficient attention or engaged in sufficient detail with the policy implications of drone use.** As such it has been argued that **it is necessary for just war theorists** to engage more directly with these issues and **to ensure that their work is policy relevant**, **not in a utilitarian sense of abdicating from speaking the truth in the face of power, but by forcing policy makers to justify their actions according to the principles of the just war tradition,** principles which they invoke themselves in formulating policy. **By highlighting hypocrisy and providing the tools and language for the interpretation of action, the just war tradition provides the basis for the public engagement and political activism that are necessary for democratic politics**.52

## 2

#### Their naming of racism and imperialism as the root cause of oppression is a symbol of their failing to recognize the true nature of domination—they only recognize one aspect of the imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchal hegemony. We need to name the system appropriately in order to know how to effectively fight it—rather than framing oppression through a lens of dualism, we need to appropriately name dominator culture

hooks, b. (2013).*Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge. P 36-37

When I fi rst began to use the phrase imperialist white supremacist¶ capitalist patriarchy to characterize the interlocking systems that shape¶ the dominator culture we live within, individuals would often tell¶ me that they thought it was just too harsh a phrase. In the past ten¶ years, when I’ve used the phrase at lectures, more often than not audiences¶ respond with laughter. Initially, I thought this laughter was an¶ expression of discomfort, that the true nature of our nation’s politics¶ were being exposed. But as the laughter followed me from talk to talk¶ I began to see it as a way to defl ect attention away from the seriousness¶ of this naming. Time and time again critical theory has taught us the¶ power of naming accurately that which we are challenging and hoping to transform. But one way to silence accurate naming is to make it¶ appear ridiculous, too strident, too harsh. Rarely am I asked the value¶ of calling attention to interlocking systems of domination. Yet when¶ we examine the cultural circumstances that provided the groundwork¶ for fascism in the twentieth century ( looking particularly at the roots¶ of fascism in Germany, Spain, and Italy), we fi nd similar traits in our¶ nation (i.e., patriarchal, nationalistic, racist, religious, economic power¶ controlled by a minority in the interests of wealth, religion, etc.). In¶ fascist regimes, teaching populations to fear “terrorism” is one way¶ the system garners support. Concurrently, dissident voices challenging¶ the status quo tend to be silenced by varied forms of censorship. Most¶ recently in our nation, the use of media to suggest that anyone who¶ criticizes government is a traitor deserving of condemnation and even¶ arrest eff ectively silences many voices.¶ Meaningful resistance to dominator culture demands of all of us¶ a willingness to accurately identify the various systems that work together¶ to promote injustice, exploitation, and oppression. To name¶ interlocking systems of domination is one way to disrupt our wrongminded¶ reliance on dualistic thinking. Highlighted, these interlocking¶ systems tend to indict us all in some way, making it impossible for any¶ of us to claim that we are absolutely and always victims, calling attention¶ to the reality of our accountability, however relative. When we are¶ accountable, we eschew the role of victim and are able to claim the¶ space of our individual and collective agency. For many folk, especially¶ those who are suff ering exploitation and/or oppression, that agency¶ may seem inadequate. However, asserting agency, even in small ways,¶ is always the fi rst step in self-determination. It is the place of hope.

####  We need to start by recognizing our role in the dominator culture. Bethany and I have been imprinted since birth by society to implicitly affirm white supremacy. By recognizing our role in the imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchal hegemony, we create a starting point that allows us to have a more open conversation about race. Analyzing dominator culture as a whole is key because it doesn’t privilege one system of oppression over another, but recognizes that they affect one other.

hooks, b. (2013).*Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge. 3-6

Signifi cantly, despite class diff erences, as a group, white people (whether consciously or unconsciously) maintain some degree of bonding despite diversities of standpoint. White supremacist thinking continues to be the invisible and visible glue that keeps white folks connected irrespective of many other diff erences. Politically, white supremacist thinking was created to serve this purpose. Imprinted on the consciousness of every white child at birth, reinforced by the culture, white supremacist thinking tends to function unconsciously. This is the primary reason it is so diffi cult to challenge and change. In order to talk openly and honestly about race in the United States it is helpful to begin with the understanding that it is white supremacist thinking and practice that has been the political foundation undergirding all systems of domination based on skin color and ethnicity. When describing the political system that we live within here in the United States, more often than not, I use the complicated phrase imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy. This phrase is useful precisely because it does not prioritize one system over another but rather off ers us a way to think about the interlocking systems that work together to uphold and maintain cultures of domination. However, in talking and writing about these systems for more than thirty years, I have found that most citizens of the United States resist the notion that ours is a nation founded and colonized on a foundation of white supremacist thought and action. And yet, as a nation we have always had a public discourse about race and racism. And, when leaders of our nation have called for a national dialogue on these issues, there has been little resistance. The United States was colonized and founded by a white supremacist politics that necessitated endless thinking, writing, and discussion about race. White folks from all places and classes, speaking all manner of languages, migrated here in the hopes of creating a better, more prosperous, freer life for themselves. They, for the most part, collectively, accepted a national identity based on the fi ctions of race and racism created by white supremacist thought and action. Bonding on the basis of shared whiteness provides the foundation for a sense of shared meaning, values, and purpose. With the battle cry of preserving whiteness, imperialist colonization became the belief system that supported the mass murder of indigenous natives, the blatant stealing of their lands, and the creation of segregated reservations. Despite the presence of African individuals who came to the so-called new world before Columbus—as documented in Ivan Van Sertima’s seminal work They Came Before Columbus—white supremacist thinking and action condoned the enslavement of black Africans, supporting their brutal exploitation and oppression. Living as they did in close proximity with enslaved black folks, relying on them to serve obediently and subserviently, white dominatorsneeded a psychological mode of colonization that would keep everyone in check, that would teach everyone their place in the race-based hierarchy that is the aim of white supremacist thinking and practice. At this point, notions of white supremacy were fl uid and constantly changing to meet the needs of dominating white colonizers. When white supremacist logic decreed that all black folks were diseased and unclean, that train of thought then had to be shifted a bit to leave just enough room for it to be deemed acceptable for some black folks to cook for white owners and to care for their children. When white supremacist logic decreed that the brains of black folks were smaller than those of whites, thus rendering them intellectually inferior, and then well-educated black genius asserted itself, there had to be space made within the theory of white superiority for exceptions. Clearly, one of the awesome aspects of white supremacist logic has been its fl uidity, its ability to adjust and change according to need and circum stance. Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth century, dialogues about white supremacy were common. Few, if any, white folks would have found it odd for there to be silence on the subject. Yet talk of white supremacy in our society is deemed not only taboo, but also irrelevant. When addressed openly there is always a listener eager to insist that the term white supremacy has little meaning in the contemporary United States, that it is too harsh a reality to be relevant to discussions of race and racism. When I speak with audiences about imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy, the one piece of these interlocking political systems that individuals most resist acknowledging is white supremacy. And yet if we cannot as a culture accept the way white supremacist thinking and practice informs some aspect of our lives irrespective of skin color, then we will never move beyond race. Unlike race and racism, which does not overtly harm masses of folk in ways that causes direct damage, white supremacy is the covert ideology that is the silent cause of harm and trauma. Think of the black children, both rich andpoor, who watch long hours of television that imprints their young minds with the notion that white is good and black is bad. All over the United States, parents who assume they have taught their families to be actively anti-racist are shocked when they discover that their children harbor intense anti-black feelings. This is just one example. Another example might be the interracial couple in which the white individual proclaims their undying love for a black partner but then later in conversation talks about their belief that black people are intellectually inferior. This is not an expression of conventional racial prejudice. It does however remind us that one can be intimate with black folks, claim even to love us, and yet still hold white supremacist attitudes about the nature of black identity.

#### Link - Blame/politics of accountability/diversity education

hooks, b. (2013).*Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge. P 28-31

Clearly the future of diversity lies in creating greater awareness and greater critical consciousness about the importance of ending domination, of challenging and changing white supremacy. Riane Eisler urges in her partnership model that we shift from an us-versus-them attitude to a worldview where we place the “same standards of human rights and responsibilities provided by the partnership model to all cultures.” She contends: “In a world where technologies of communication and destruction span the globe almost instantaneously, creating a better world is a matter of enlightened self-interest.” Now more than ever we need to create learning communities that make learning the theory and practice of diversity essential aspects of curriculum. In my recent book Teaching Critical Thinking: Practical Wisdom, I call attention to the way in which issues of diversity both inside and outside the classroom are slowly being pushed back into the realm of silence and misinformation. As I wrote: “More than ever before, students need to learn from unbiased perspectives, be they conservative or radical. More than ever before, students and teachers need to fully understand diff erences of nationality, race, sex, class, and sexuality if we are to create ways of knowing that reinforce education as the practice of freedom.” Learning to challenge and change binary thinking—the us-and-them paradigm—is one way to create a foundation that can be sustained. Holding onto binary thinking actually keeps dominator culture in place, for one aspect of that culture is the projection outward onto an enemy, an “other,” whenever things go wrong, and this casting of blame in turn helps to promote a culture of victimization. When we are more energized by the practice of blaming than we are by eff orts to create transformation, we not only cannot fi nd relief from suff ering, we are creating the conditions that help keep us stuck in the status quo. Our attachment to blaming, to identifying the oppressor stems from the fear that if we cannot unequivocally and absolutely state who the enemy is then we cannot know how to organize resistance struggle. In the insightful book Ruling Your World: Ancient Strategies for Modern Life, Mipham Rinpoche talks about learning to understand others rather than blaming them. He shares: “I remember my father and others of the older generation of Tibetan lamas saying that they did not blame the Communist Chinese for the destruction of Tibet. They felt that blaming the Chinese would not solve anything. It would only trap Tibetans in the past.” Similarly, any critical examination of the history of the civil rights struggle in the United States will show that greater progress was made when leaders emphasized the importance of forgiving one’s enemies, working for reconciliation and the formation of a beloved community, rather than angry retaliation. Casting blame and calling for vengeance was an aspect of militant movements for black power that have really failed to sustain the climate of unlearning racism previously forged by nonviolent anti-racist struggle. In the aftermath of sixties rebellion, the more black folks were encouraged to vent rage, to “blame” all white folks for race-based exploitation and domination, and to eschew any notion of forgiveness, the more an internalized sense of victimhood became the norm. Tragically, today many black folks are more despairing of any possibility that racism can be eff ectively challenged and changed than at other similar historical moments when white supremacist aggression was more overtly life threatening. Unenlightened white folks who proclaim either that racism has ended or that they are not responsible for slavery engage a politics of blame wherein they disavow political reality to insist that black folk are never really victims of racism but are the agents of their own suff ering. Dualistic thinking, which is at the core of dominator thinking, teaches people that there is always the oppressed and the oppressor, a victim and a victimizer. Hence there is always someone to blame. Moving past the ideology of blame to a politics of accountability is a diffi cult move to make in a society where almost all political organizing, whether conservative or radical, has been structured around the binary of good guys and bad guys. Accountability is a much more complex issue. A politics of blame allows a contemporary white person to make statements like, “My family never owned slaves,” or “Slavery is over. Why can’t they just get over it?” In contrast, a politics of accountability would emphasize that all white people benefi t from the privileges accrued from racist exploitation past and present and therefore are accountable for changing and transforming white supremacy and racism. Accountability is a more expansive concept because it opens a fi eld of possibility wherein we are all compelled to move beyond blame to see where our responsibility lies. Seeing clearly that we live within a dominator culture of imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy, I am compelled to locate where my responsibility lies. In some circumstances I am more likely to be victimized by an aspect of that system, in other circumstances I am in a position to be a victimizer. If I only lay claim to those aspects of the system where I defi ne myself as the oppressed and someone else as my oppressor, then I continually fail to see the larger picture. Any eff ort I might make to challenge domination is likely to fail if I am not looking accurately at the circumstances that create suff ering, and thus seeing the larger picture. After more than thirty years of talking to folks about domination, I can testify that masses of folks in our society—both black and white— r esist seeing the larger picture.

#### Even if they have a good starting point for one aspect, they fail to recognize their role in larger dominator culture—race is only one aspect. There are masses of people of color whose religions actively teach modes of patriarchal thinking. We are taught this in our families and in our holy spaces and

hooks, b. (2013).*Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge. P 33-36

And patriarchy begins at home. Again, it is the one aspect of¶ dominator culture that we tend to learn from family, from folks who¶ purport to care about us. In the past, patriarchal thinking learned in¶ the family was mirrored in the patriarchal teachings of the church¶ or other religious institutions. But, while religion was once a major¶ forum for the teaching of racist thought, this is no longer an accepted¶ norm. Christian white people are not overtly taught in church settings¶ that god has ordained that they are superior to people of color and¶ should rule over them. Indeed, even among the most fundamentalist¶ Christians, there is a widespread eff ort to recruit people of color to¶ join with them in worship. This welcoming stance is present even¶ though churches in the United States are primarily racially segregated.¶ Yet all the major religions of the world continue to openly teach¶ patriarchal thinking. Concurrently, masses of people of color globally¶ denounce white supremacy and racism while actively perpetuating¶ patriarchy.¶ Nowadays many of our nation’s citizens no longer attend church¶ so the family has become the primary institution for the dissemination¶ of patriarchal thought to children. Patriarchal females as primary¶ caregivers of children are the people who teach patriarchal gender¶ roles. Yet most males and females in our society rarely if ever use the¶ word patriarchy or even understand its meaning. Patriarchy is a political¶ and social system that insists males are inherently dominating, superior to everything and everyone deemed weak, especially females, and¶ endowed with the right to dominate and rule over the weak as well as¶ the right to maintain that dominance through various forms of psychological¶ abuse and violence. No contemporary movement for social¶ justice has changed the nature of how we live other than the feminist¶ movement. Acknowledgment through law and public policy that¶ women are the equals of men and deserve equal rights changed the¶ nature of work, of economics, of home life. And while much is blamed¶ on the feminist movement, the truth remains that females and males¶ have greater access to gender equity in all spheres of life because of¶ the feminist movement. It is precisely the myriad successes of feminist¶ reform that have led to anti-feminist backlash.¶ Challenging and changing patriarchy threatens a core foundation¶ of dominator culture. If boys are not socialized to embrace¶ patriarchal masculinity and its concomitant violence, then they will¶ not have the mindset needed to wage imperialist war. If females and¶ males are taught to value mutuality, then partnership rather than¶ the ethics of domination will be valued. Since patriarchal thinking¶ creates psychological distress, new models of partnership off er¶ the promise of well-being and therefore undermine the capitalist¶ consumer culture, which exploits psychological pain. The positive¶ changes created by the feminist movement were so widespread that¶ the backlash has been fi erce. Mass media, especially media targeting¶ young children, teenagers, and young adults, continually reinscribes¶ sexist thinking about gender roles. It has been the primary tool portraying¶ feminists and/or powerful women in negative ways. In The¶ Power of Partnership, Eisler emphasizes that one form anti-feminist¶ backlash in media has taken is promoting “domination and submission¶ in the relations between parents and children and between¶ women and men.” Explaining further she contends:¶ The reason is that these intimate relations are where we fi rst¶ learn to accept domination and control as normal, inevitable, and right. . . . This is why many of the most repressive modern regimes . . . have sprung up where family and gender relations¶ based on domination and submission are fi rmly in place.¶ It is also why, once in power, these regimes have vigorously¶ pushed policies that have as their goal the reinstatement of¶ a punitive father in complete control of his family. We see¶ this pattern all too clearly in one of the most serious aspects¶ of the dominator regression of our time: the rise of so-called¶ religious fundamentalism. I say so-called because, if we look¶ closely, it’s clear that what many fundamentalist leaders¶ preach—be it in the Middle East or the United States—is not¶ religious fundamentalism but the domination/control model¶ with a religious spin.¶ Given the role patriarchy plays as a system that exploits familial¶ relationships in order to teach dominator values, there are clear benefi ts¶ to everyone—female and male, adult and child—when patriarchy is¶ challenged and changed. Yet changing patriarchy will not bring an end¶ to dominator culture as long as the other interlocking systems remain¶ in place. When the feminist movement was bringing revolutionary¶ changes to the status of women and men, imperialism, capitalism, and¶ racism were all systems gaining strength globally.

#### Black men need feminist thinking—the only way to solve for race is by resisting all forms of domination—these matrices are interlocking

hooks, b. (2013).Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice. New York, NY: Routledge. P 182-183

Concurrently, we cannot heal the crisis in black life without incorporating in our struggle for black self-determination the struggle to end sexism and male domination. Family life (committed marriages and partnerships) in diverse black communities is daily undermined by patriarchal thinking that makes acceptable male domination in the forms of violence, psychological terrorism, betrayal, and abandonment. Adultery, child abuse, marital rape, and date rape are all expressions of black male sexism. And that sexism is often condoned by black women who support and embrace patriarchal thinking. Black on black male violence is a feminist issue. Black men need feminist thinking to resist being brainwashed by white supremacist patriarchal thinking into believing that being a man is about the will to do violence and coerce others. We have seen again and again that black men and women who oppose racism often support sexism and class exploitation, that white women who are outraged by sexism help perpetuate and maintain structures of racism and white supremacy, that progressive white men who critique capitalism do not challenge sexist and racist thinking and behavior. As long as any of us support domination in any form, we keep in place the structure which upholds racism and white supremacy. Racism and white supremacy cannot be effectively challenged and changed in our society until all of us learn to resist domination in all its forms. Loving justice means that we are willing to see the ways racism, sexism, and class exploitation are interconnected. It would serve us well to heed the warning posed by Martin Luther King when he prophetically declared in his “Beyond Vietnam” speech that we needed “a revolution of values in this society” emphasizing: “When machines and computers, profi t motives and property rights are considered more important than people, the giant triplets of racism, materialism, and militarism”—and here I would add sexism— “are incapable of being conquered.” Our hope lies in facing these truths and rededicating ourselves to a vision of life where freedom and justice for all is no longer a dream but the reality to be embraced if we are to survive, if the planet is to survive. It is only as we work for change that we see clearly that change can happen, that our lives can be transformed, that we can always renew our spirits and rekindle our hope.

#### Resisting just antiblackness won’t solve—we need to resist every form of interlocking domination—a prerequisite needs to be analyzing our position in patriarchy especially because currently, progressive folk denounce imperialism, racism, and capitalism, but don’t talk about patriarchy—means that their silence on this is them colluding with the imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchal hegemony

hooks, b. (2013).*Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge. P 33-36

Even though origin stories which fi nd the invention of patriarchy to be the root of domination may seem inaccurate, what is true is that in dominator culture the family is one of the primary pedagogical locations for the teaching of dominator thought and practice via the acceptance and perpetuation of patriarchy. Hence, working to challenge and change patriarchy continues to be essential to any eff ort to transform dominator culture. Progressive folks, especially prominent male thinkers and activists on the left, openly denounce imperialism, racism, and capitalism but rarely talk about the need to challenge patriarchy. And while all people of color, all black people, are socialized to embrace white supremacist thinking, few, if any, individuals from these constituents openly advocate racism. Individual black people who straighten their hair because they have been taught to believe their natural hair texture is ugly are perpetuating a white supremacist aesthetic even as they may be adamantly anti-racism. These contradictions reveal the myriad ways dominator culture shapes our thoughts and actions in ways that are unconscious. It is precisely because dominator thinking is so deeply embedded in our psyches that eff orts to decolonize minds through the cultivation of critical consciousness needs to be an essential aspect of resistance struggle. When individuals who are psychologically confused engage in resistance struggle, they often are dysfunctional and act out in ways that undermine or negate their eff orts to create constructive change. Since dominator culture relies on interlocking systems (imperialism, white supremacy, capitalism, patriarchy) to sustain itself, it seeks to cover up the connections between these systems. Or it allows for only one aspect of the system to be challenged at a time: for example, allowing anti-racist critiques while silencing anti-capitalist or anti-sexist voices.

#### We need to reject the 1AC starting point and instead embrace a mindset of critical consciousness. Critical consciousness is the only way to solve for dominator culture because it is the only way that we can have honest discussions about race.

hooks, b. (2013).*Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge. P 193

Since all citizens of our nation are subjected to some form of indoctrination that socializes us to embrace, however unconsciously, aspects of white supremacist thought and action, however relative, we must consciously choose to acquire the necessary critical consciousness that empowers us to think and act diff erently, to resist. Resistance to white supremacy, to racism, requires constant critical vigilance because in every aspect of our society white supremacy is normalized. Therefore we (irrespective of racial identity) can only move beyond the prejudicial beliefs and assumptions racism off ers us by applying strategies of decolonization— that is, strategies aimed at strengthening our awareness of the true reality beyond domination and providing us with an oppositional liberating worldview. We change our minds and hearts by changing our habits of thinking and being. Internalized white supremacy and racism prevent everyone from achieving emotional well-being; this is especially the case for black people who lack critical consciousness. As long as most black folks are emotionally crippled by internalized white supremacist thinking, they are trapped in split-mind enacting behaviors that reinforce patterns of racist stereotypes even as they may voice anti-racist sentiments.

# 2nc

### Impact – Black Collusion

#### The impact of this anti-naming mentality is black collusion—by refusing to name dominator culture as the root cause, this is collusion with the system because they’re trying to place one struggle on a pedestal.

hooks, b. (2013).*Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge. P 179-182

Now, clearly white racism cannot be seen as the only factor in the production of images of blacks in mass media which reinforce white supremacy, for these images could not exist without the collusion of black folks who play the roles. To understand black complicity we need to highlight the link between white supremacy capitalism and the politics of greed. I have written elsewhere about the enormous grief and despair felt by black people when major leaders for civil rights were assassinated. The psychological despair that racism would never end, that justice could not prevail, that white people would not divest of white supremacy and racism was a perfect breeding ground for nihilism. Clearly we must reject any analysis of black life in America that would have us believe that nihilistic thinking is solely the outcome of poverty. During the poorest years of economic depression in this nation, black folks were not nihilistic. Poverty in and of itself, no matter how extreme, does not lead to nihilism. In many of the poorest countries in the world children have better self-esteem than children in more affl uent societies. Psychological depression is one consequence of traumatic racist assault coupled with despair about whether racism can be challenged and changed, which has troubled the collective psyche of black Americans. Where once our spirit of resistance had been fueled by hope, a love ethic rooted in compassion and forgiveness, the energy of the late sixties shaped by militaristic patriarchal black males, many of whom had pathologically low self-esteem which proclaimed violence and coercion as the best means of change, led to the decline of a humanitarian value-based civil rights struggle for justice, which ultimately lowered morale. When assertions of force were met with even more force (the assassination of King, Malcolm X, the destruction of the Black Panther Party), the message black folks received was that justice would never be a reality. These events left masses of black folks with two choices: despair or collusion with the existing social structure. Depression and despair made the setting ripe for widespread addiction. Addiction brought to black communities a greed-based drug economy sanctioning dehumanization and violence. It created the context for black fl ight on the part of the materially privileged. Most predominately black communities in the United States were made up of diverse classes, and prior to recent racial integration in real estate markets, more wealthy black folks lived in black communities. Bourgeois lifestyles and habits of being set the standards. Education was valued as the primary vehicle of racial uplift. Once the drug economy and lack of employment opportunities (unemployed folks are more prone to depression—have more time on their hands, etc.) created war zone type–communities, only the underclass and the low-income working-class people remained. Black communities which had previously been safe neighborhoods were rendered unsafe. As a nation, as black thinkers, we have yet to produce a large body of work that examines and challenges the impact of widespread addiction on the disintegration of black communities spiritually, physically, and materially. This is holocaust, protracted, slow, invisible. And it is not caused by economics, by poverty. The politics of greed informs masses of poor and working-class black folks’ passive acceptance of life-threatening drug economies into diverse black communities. Throughout this nation, despair about the possibility that the world could change, that people could live in peace and harmony, that there could be justice and freedom for all led many people to embrace the consumer capitalist message that you are what you can buy—and that all pain can be escaped with the proper drug, whether it be alcohol, heroin, crack, or shopping. By the early eighties, masses of Americans were turning their back on the American dream of democracy and justice and turning toward a view of life where money is god, and consumption, paradise. Many black leaders continue to act as though the collective crisis of black America can be solved by money. In an article in Emerge magazine focusing on black academics at Harvard, Henry Louis Gates spoke of his desire to see more black folks enter the middle class. Implicit in this assertion is the notion that acquiring more money improves life. Yet the black bourgeois and members of the ruling class wealthy in this society who are black have been among that group most invested in destructive color caste, looking down upon and showing contempt for the poor, pushing the notion that you are what you buy (and that’s all that matters). More and more, mainstream society, particularly white Americans, are giving testimony that material affl uence alone does not give life meaning. In our society, life-threatening addictions are as widespread among those groups with economic privilege as among the poor, and so is domestic violence (incest, rape, etc.). The diff erence is these groups have available resources—therapists, mental health care facilities, excellent medical care to confront their dilemmas and to fi nd the place of healing if they so desire. I think it is important to refuse to resist both patriarchal and capitalist thinking that insists the acquisition of greater sums of money is the only way to improve one’s life because embracing this belief means that we doom the poor to meaningless lives. More black men and women, people of color, and white women are falling into the ranks of the poor every day. More fall into addiction to ease the pain and shame they feel about poverty. A culture of addiction breeds violence. And ultimately their lives come to embody the nihilism that the dominant culture identifi es with the poor. This nihilism exists among all classes in the United States. It is the direct consequence of the total devaluation of human life, of what happens when things become more important than people.

### Link

#### Black liberation – Strong patriarchy fails- Equate black liberation with strong black patriarchy

hooks, b. (2013).*Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge. P. 23

The pursuit of liberal individualism sanctioned by imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy has allowed all collective calls for black self-determination to be co-opted by the hunger to participate as pseudo equals in the existing dominator culture. Amiri Baraka reminds us of this in his important essay “Malcolm as Ideology,” stating that “Malcolm’s fundamental ideological stance to white supremacy is opposition and an attempt to destroy it.” However, as black male leaders in the black power movement began to equate black liberation with the formation of a strong black patriarchy, as has already been stated, issues of psychological trauma faded into the background and the focus was on money and masculinity.

#### Critical consciousness and active listening are the only way to bond across borders—the politics of blame and exclusion of the 1AC necessitate both ignoring critical consciousness and preventing coalition building necessary to overthrow dominator culture.

hooks, b. (2013).*Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge. P 148-150

Certainly, active listening is essential to the process of learning and connecting across diff erence. When we stop making assumptions and allow folk the opportunity to share their backgrounds with us, to let us know how they see themselves, there is a much stronger will to connect. And that connection is central to the process of building community. Curiosity is a trait that strengthens all our eff orts to meet across diff erences. In dominator culture most of us have been taught from childhood on that curiosity is dangerous. Even the common childhood expression “curiosity killed the cat” suggests to children that there is a problem with seeking knowledge beyond what is deemed acceptable. In my work I write about the place of “radical openness” as a useful standpoint to approach the world of diff erence and otherness. Sharing humor is crucial to bonding across diff erence. Laughing together is always a way to intensify intimacy. When we can laugh at mistakes, laugh even in the midst of our tears, we affi rm that what keeps us together is always more important than what can separate us. Laughter often serves as a powerful intervention when the issues we are confronting are hard and painful. It off ers a way to change the channel, to let us “chill” for a moment and really cool down, returning to states of calmness that make communication possible. Shared laughter helps create the context for feelings of mutuality to emerge. When the feminist movement was at its peak, there was so much talk about the need for equality. It was presented as a basis for sisterhood. Of course as women began to speak our diff erences we were exposed to all that made relationships between females unequal. The theory had to change. Visionary feminists began to talk about the importance of mutuality, of a partnership. Using such a model as a basis for connection opened the possibility that there could be grave diff erences between people but that diff erence need not lead to domination. Knowing, for example, that a straight person has unearned heterosexual privilege can lead that person to mindful awareness about how to interact with gay folks in ways that affi rm that all our identities are acceptable. Mutuality calls us to respect one another. Since the root meaning of the word respect is “to look at it,” we can use our visions to learn one another, to see who we really are behind the mask of categories. We can move beyond diff erence. My early childhood was spent in the hills of Kentucky. Mama’s family were people from the backwoods. There was no welcoming of diff erence in our lives. We were taught to stay with the same and to fear the strange. Given that our world was one of racial apartheid, learning to fear white folks was crucial to survival. It compelled us to be ever vigilant. Even so, the hills were the only racially integrated places, poor whites living in isolated hollows where poor blacks also lived. It was there that I learned to be curious about folks not like myself, to move past fear. And in that movement I became someone my family saw as diff erent. To them it was not “natural” to want to move beyond relations with family and kin and to connect with strangers. Throughout my teen years I bonded with strangers who were, like me, deemed diff erent because we shared a common outsider status. I learned that it was possible to make a soul connection with someone; to move past race and all the other estranging categories. Meeting across all that might divide us showed me that a life of diversity was a more meaningful life. Just recently, one of my white students shared that she felt fearful of her longing to move beyond race and bond with people of color. She fears that even that desire is a small manifestation of unearned white privilege. Not wanting her to be afraid of this longing, instead, I encouraged her to trust in her capacity to be critically vigilant. That means she has to trust her knowledge of dominator culture so that she can have faith in her own strategies of resistance. We can all have confi dence in our strategies of resistance when we see the positive ways our lives and our habits of being are changed. I trust the white folks with whom I am allied because of their commitment to peace and justice, to ending domination. It was this will to work for change that motivated their bonding across diff erence. And it is our shared longing to live in solidarity with one another that helps us forge sustained bonds of fellowship and camaraderie.

#### Class – No black monolith – It is no longer possible to speak of blackness – class, gender, and religious diversity suggests there is no longer a common black identity to use as a platform for solidarity. Only critical consciousness can solve the intersecting modes of power

hooks, b. (2013).*Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Class – p 2-3

Public discourses about race and gender did create new ways of¶ thinking and knowing. Talking about class and the various ways class¶ differences separate groups has been much harder. Class standing and¶ status tend frequently to link us more intimately to the dominant¶ economic system and its concomitant hierarchies. For example: it¶ is much more likely that a white person will bond with a black¶ person when the two share a common class lifestyle. It is less likely¶ that a materially prosperous person will establish a mutual bond with¶ someone who is poor and indigent. One of the most diffi cult and¶ delicate subjects to discuss among African Americans is the reality of¶ class diff erences and of class diff erence among us. The central position¶ race has occupied in our political discourse has often obscured the¶ way in which class diff erences disrupt notions of racial unity. And yet,¶ today, class diff erences coupled with racial integration have created¶ a cultural context where the very meaning of blackness and its impact¶ on our lives diff ers greatly among black people. There is no longer¶ a common notion of shared black identity.¶ In other words, a sense of shared identity is no longer a platform that¶ can draw folks together in meaningful solidarity. Along with class, gender¶ issues and feminist awareness have served to place black folks in diff erent¶ camps, creating confl icts that can only be resolved through education¶ for critical consciousness. There is also the reality of changing religious¶ practices. There was a time in our nation when it was just assumed that¶ every black person was a Christian or at least coming from a Christian¶ background. This is simply no longer the case. Black children today have¶ diverse religious practices. Some are raised in Muslim and Buddhist¶ traditions with no understanding of Christian beliefs. And more young¶ black people than ever before choose no religious practice at all. Hence the¶ shared theological language that once served as a basis of communication¶ and bonding can no longer be assumed.

# 1nr

### Double Turn

#### White supremacy – White and non-black persons of color should acknowledge that the most intense forms of racial assault and discrimination have been directed at black people – decolonization of our minds from the grasp of white supremacy is key to see the value in identification with blackness rather than competition for white supremacist attention which seeks to divide and conquer difference in order to maintain the status quo

hooks, b. (2013).*Writing beyond race: Living theory and practice*. New York, NY: Routledge. P. 13

Certainly it serves the interest of dominator culture to promote a shallow understanding of race politics that consistently makes it appear that the issues of race in the United States solely rest on the status of darker skinned people. It may well be that the growing Hispanic population (which too is invested heavily in white supremacist aesthetics) will help push the discourse of race past issues of black and white and toward the issue of white supremacist thought and action. Every black person who talks about race has an experience where they have been interrogated about their focus on issues of black and white. Rarely does a person of color who is non-black acknowledge that the most intense forms of racial assault and discrimination in our nation have been directed primarily at black people. Professing this understanding and allegiance with black anti-racist struggles would do more to affi rm challenges to white supremacy than competing for the status of who will receive more attention. The fact is when black people receive that greater attention from the dominant white society it is usually negative. Despite gains in civil rights a huge majority of white Americans and some non-black people of color continue to believe that black people are less intelligent, full of rage, and more likely to express anger with violence than all other groups. Even though negative racist stereotypes about Asian identities abound, there is no overwhelming consensus on the part of white Americans that they are incapable of intelligent rational thought. It is troubling that so many of the hateful negative stereotypes the dominant culture uses to characterize black identity are endorsed by non-black people of color. Their endorsement is an expression of collusion and solidarity with white supremacist thought and action. If all people of color and even our white allies in struggle were decolonizing their minds, challenging and changing white supremacy, they could see value in identifi cation with blackness rather than feeling there must always be competition over who will receive the most attention from white folks. They would see clearly that the system of domination that remains oppressive and exploitative is ever ready to recruit and train as many black, brown, red, and yellow people as are needed to maintain the status quo. A thorough understanding of the complex dynamic of white supremacist thought and action would provide all citizens with a way to understand why this nation can elect a black man to be its leader and yet resist any system-wide eff orts, both public and private, to challenge and change racial inequality. From the moment he entered the oval offi ce, Obama’s actions have been continually subject to policing to ensure he does act in any way that brings particular benefi ts to African American citizens. Sadly, even though there have been wonderful advances in anti-discrimination–based civil rights laws and public agendas, there has been no profound eff ort to destroy the roots of racism. Instead we live in a society that claims via our government and public policy to condemn racial discrimination even as imperialist white supremacist capitalist patriarchy shapes our politics and culture.

### Malcom X

#### The use of Malcolm X as a guiding force in anti-racist struggle is just a representation of the necessity of charismatic leaders which ignores the grassroots organizational movement vital to change

Edwards 12

[Erica R. Edwards, Associate Professor of English @ U. of California Regents, specializes in African American literature, gender and sexuality, and black political culture, Ph.D. Duke University, “Charisma and the Fictions of Black Leadership,” 2012 p 56-63, wyo-sc]
Note \*same as MLK 2NC Link, just retagged and rehighlighted to express focus on Malcolm X

Hagiographic accounts of the civil rights movement and Black Power era center Martin Luther¶ King and Malcolm X as moral exemplars and semidivine martyrs who sacrificed their lives for the¶ future of the race. This public memory of the movement can be traced to both the seductive draw of¶ charismatic black political leadership as a narrative technology and the sources by which historians,¶ both academic and popular, access the history of the movement. In his historical analysis of the¶ media's ignorance of the political organizing process in the South during the 1960s, Charles Payne¶ points out that "the frames used to cover the civil rights movement were multiple and shifting, but they¶ were always such as to obscure the organizing process." Linking this obfuscation of the organizing¶ process to the dramatic appeal of charismatic leadership, he suggests that the press may have "found¶ it hard to take seriously the idea that uneducated southern Blacks could be important political thinkers¶ and actors" and argues, "The undervaluation of the leadership role played by ordinary people¶ corresponded to an overconcentration on the role of national leaders, Dr. King in particular."' The¶ fact that journalists covering the civil rights movement preferred to represent the movement as a¶ spectacle of singular national leadership rather than to chronicle the unglamorous work of grassroots¶ political organizing supports Toni Morrison's claim that in the production of an official story,¶ spectacle plays a central role.' Charisma as an explanatory fiction and a performative political¶ regime, as a story of black nationhood and a script for performing it, is the cultural material that¶ authors and authorizes the official story of the civil rights movement through spectacle, providing¶ images of its charismatic heroes that are frozen in time and space. This cultural regime insists that black struggle against domination is unthinkable in the absence of leading men, that gifted leadership¶ makes history, and that the heterogeneity of black political subjectivity and movement can be reduced¶ to hagiography.

#### This functions as a new link to the criticism

#### The use of black charismatic male leadership fractures political movements because people feel they can’t live up to the charisma of leadership and denies the role of female agency in creating change

Robert 13

[Pascal Robert, Iconoclastic Haitian American Lawyer, “Ella Baker and the Limits of Charismatic Masculinity”, 02/19/2013, http://www.blackagendareport.com/content/ella-baker-and-limits-charismatic-masculinity, \\wyo-bb]

Moreover, Ella Baker was very critical of the hot shot Black preachers who would seem to mesmerize their audience with soaring oratory then leave and expect others to implement an agenda. As Ransby further notes at one point Ella Baker asked Dr. King directly “…why he allowed such hero worship, and he responded simply, that it was what people wanted. This answer did not satisfy Baker in the least.”¶ Ella Baker did not mince words on her thoughts of Dr. King’s leadership style and vocally spoke out on its limitations:¶ “Baker described [Dr. King] as a pampered member of Atlanta’s black elite who had the mantle of leadership handed to him rather than having had to earn it, a member of a coddled ‘silver spoon brigade.’ He wore silk suits and spoke with a silver tongue.¶ “...In Baker’s eyes King did not identify enough with the people he sought to lead. He did not situate himself among them but remained above them.¶ “…Baker felt the focus on King drained the masses of confidence in themselves. People often marveled at the things King could do that they could not; his eloquent speeches overwhelmed as well as inspired.”¶ “Obama has been as anemic in delivering real change and effective at stifling progress as Ella Baker worried Dr. King would have been.”¶ The limitations of this charismatic masculinity noted by Ella Baker are profound, particularly in today’s political age when we have a president like Barack Obama who often tries to channel the traditions of charismatic leadership and oratory from the Black tradition. Ironically, Obama has been as anemic in delivering real change and effective at stifling progress as Ella Baker worried Dr. King would have been. So perhaps in a strange twist, we have found a similarity between King and Obama after all.¶ Often in America, when discussing prominent Black trailblazers who fought the injustices of segregation and racial oppression, we see the same images of a variety of men. I somewhat jokingly call them our superhero black male icons. This phenomenon mimics the more noxious western patriarchal fascination with viewing history as a series of events being shaped and guided by the hands of a strong capable man embodying all our fantasies about leadership, masculinity, and sometimes fatherhood.¶ The danger of such imagery is that it often both obscures and denies the scope of nuanced factors, issues, and circumstances in shaping the events from which our societies were born. Furthermore, such narratives often exclude any consideration of female agency in effecting the great events that have transpired over time.