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**Framing**

## ROTJ

### Judge = Intellectual

#### Since the ballot confers the truth of the resolution, the judge is the assumed intellectual of the round. As an intellectual, your primary obligation is to deconstruct the regime of truth

**Foucault[[1]](#footnote-1)**

It seems to me that what must now be taken into account in **the intellectual is not the ‘bearer of universal values.’ Rather, it’s the person occupying a specific position – but whose specificity is linked, in a society like ours, to the general functioning of an apparatus of truth.** In other words, the intellectual has a three-fold specificity: that of his class position (whether as petty-bourgeois in the service of capitalism or ‘organic’ intellectual of the proletariat); that of his conditions of life and work, linked to his condition as an intellectual (his field of research, his place in a laboratory, and political and economy demands to which he submits of against which he rebels, in the university, the hospital, etc.); lastly, the specificity of the politics of truths in our societies. And it’s with this last factor that his position can take on a general significance and that his local, specific struggle can have effects and implications which are not simply professional or sectorial. The intellectual can operate and struggle at the general level of that regime of truth which is so essential to the structure and functioning of our society. **There is a battle ‘for truth,’ or at least ‘around truth’** – it being understood once again that by truth I do not mean ‘the ensemble of truths which are to be discovered and accepted,’ but rather ‘the ensemble of rules according to which the true and false are separated and specific effects of power attached to the true’, it being understood also that it’s not a matter of a battle ‘on behalf’ of the truth, but of a battle about the status of truth and the economic and political role it plays. It is necessary to think of the political problems of intellectuals not in terms of ‘science’ and ‘ideology’, but in terms of ‘truth’ and ‘power’. And thus the question of the professionalization of intellectuals and the division between intellectual and manual labour can be envisaged in a new way. All this must seem very confused and uncertain. Uncertain indeed, and what I am saying here is above all to be taken as a hypothesis. In order for it to be a little less confused, however, I would like to put forward a few ‘propositions’ – not firm assertions, but simply suggestions to be further tested and explained. ‘Truth’ is to be understood as a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements. **‘Truth’ is linked in a circular relation with system of powers which produces and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it. A regime of truth.** This regime is not merely ideological or superstructural; it was a condition of the formation and development of capitalism. And it’s this same regime which, subject to certain modifications, operates in the socialists countries (I leave open here the question of China, about which I know little). **The essential political problem for the intellectual is** not to criticize the ideological contents supposedly linked to science, or to ensure that his own scientific practice is accompanied by a correct ideology, but **that of ascertaining the possibility of constitution a new politics of truth. The problem is not changing people’s consciousness’s –** or what’s in their heads – **but the political, economic, institutional regime of the production of truth. It’s not a matter of emancipating truth from every system of power** (which would be a chimera, for truth is already power) **but of detaching the power of truth from the forms of hegemony, social economic and cultural, within which it operates at the present time.**

#### This is the most important role of the judge because normative truth that is not critiqued becomes a meaningless list of rules entrenched within us by the regime

**Schlag[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**Normative legal thought cannot wait to enlist epistemology, semiotics, social theory or any other enterprise in its own ethical-moral argument structures about the right, the good, the useful, the efficient** (or any of their doctrinally crystallized derivatives). **It cannot wait to reduce world views, attitudes, demonstrations, provocations, and thought itself, to norms.** In short, it cannot wait to tell you (or somebody else) what to do. In fact, normative legal thought is so much in a hurry that it will tell you what to do even though there is not the slightest chance that you might actually be in a position to do it. For instance, **when was the last time you were in a position to put the difference principle into effect, or to restructure [anything?] the doctrinal corpus of the first amendment?** “In the future, we should ….” When was the last time you were in a position to rule whether judges should become pragmatists, efficiency purveyors, civic republicans, or Hercules surrogates? Normative legal thought doesn’t seem overly concerned with such worldly questions about the character and the effectiveness of its own discourse. It just goes along and proposes, recommends, prescribes, solves, and resolves. Yet despite its obvious desire to have worldly effects, worldly consequences, normative legal thought remains seemingly unconcerned that for all practical purposes, its only consumers are legal academics and perhaps a few law students – persons who are virtually never in a position to put any of its wonderful normative advice into effect. If there’s no one in charge at the other end of the line, why then is normative legal thought in such a hurry to get its message across? And why, particularly, is it always in such a hurry to repeat the same old boring moves? There is an edge to these questions. And the edge comes in part from our implicit assumption that normative legal thought is a kind of that and that, as thought, it is in control of its own situation, its form, its own rhetoric. But it isn’t so. If normative legal thought keeps repeating itself, and if it is incapable of understanding challenges to its own intellectual authority, **that is because it is not simply or even fundamentally a kind of thought[, but]. Normative legal thought is in part a routine** – our routine. **It is the highly repetitive, cognitively entrenched, institutionally sanctioned, and politically enforced routine of the legal academy – a routine that silently produces our thoughts and keeps our work channeled within the same old cognitive and rhetorical matrices. Like most routines, it has been so well internalized that we repeat it automatically, without thinking.**

### Judge = Educator

#### The judge must be an educator who promotes “teaching against the grain”, or disrupting normal modes of thought to reform society

**Trifonas[[3]](#footnote-3)**

domination and subordination, I imply that they are relations of power. **In an educational context, the exercise of power is accomplished in interactions** (i.e., in a social organization), **manifesting itself as acts of** exclusion, **marginalization**, silencing, and so forth. Thus, **paying attention to how power operates along axes of** gender, race, **class**, and ability (that is, recognizing that social differences are not given, but are accomplished in and through educational settings) **is a step toward educational equity**. What does the above discussion mean in the educational context? It means that in the interactions of teachers with students in the classroom, or in other contexts, attention needs to be directed toward how dominant and subordinate relations (be they based on race, gender, class, or ability) permeate these contexts and intersect in complicated ways to produce inequality and marginalization. The frequently used and well-meaning phrase, “I treat everyone the same, ” often used by teachers and administrators to indicate their lack of bias in a diverse educational setting, in fact masks unequal power relations. Similarly, educational policies that assume that people are the same or equal may serve to entrench existing inequality precisely because people enter into the educational process with different and unequal experiences. These attempts, well meaning though they may be, tend to render inequality invisible, and thus work against equity in education. In her exploration of white privilege in higher education in the United States, Frances Rains (1998), an aboriginal-Japanese American woman, states emphatically that these benign acts are disempowering for the minority person because they erase his or her racial identity. The denial of racism in this case is in fact a form of racism. Thus, **in moving toward equity in education** that allows us to address multiple and intersecting axes of difference and inequality, I recommend that **we** try to **think and act “against the grain” in developing educational policies and handling** various kinds of **pedagogical situations**. 5 To work against the grain is to recognize that education is not neutral; it is contested. Mohanty puts it as such: … [E]ducation represents both a struggle for meaning and a struggle over power relations. [It is] a central terrain where power and politics operate out of the lived culture of individuals and groups situated in asymmetrical social and political positions. (Mohanty 1990:184) **We need to awareness of the power dynamics operative in institutional relations-and of the fact that people participate in institutions as unequal subjects**. Working against the grain is to take a proactive approach to understanding and acting upon institutional relations, whether in the classroom, in other interactions with students, or in policy development. Rather than overlooking the embeddedness of gender, race, class, ability, and other forms of inequality that shape our interactions, **working against the grain makes explicit the political nature of education and how power operates to privilege**, silence, **and marginalize individuals** who are differently located in the educational process. In her exploration of feminist pedagogy, Linda Briskin (1990) makes a clear distinction between nonsexist and antisexist education critical to our understanding here. She asserts that nonsexism is an approach that attempts to neutralize sexual inequality by pretending that gender can be made irrelevant in the classroom. Thus, for instance, merely asserting that male and female students should have equal time to speak-and indeed giving them equal time-cannot adequately rectify the endemic problem of sexism in the classroom. One of Briskin's students reported that in her political science tutorials that when the male students spoke, everyone paid attention. When a female student spoke, however, the class acted as if no one was speaking (13). Neutrality is an attempt to conceal the unequal distribution of power. An against the grain approach would acknowledge explicitly that we are all gendered, racialized, and differently constructed subjects who do not participate in interactional relations as equals. This goes beyond formulating sexism, racism, abilism, and class privilege in individualist terms and treating them as if they were personal attitudes. Terry Wolverton (1983) discovered the difference between nonracism and antiracism in her consciousness-raising attempt: I had confused the act of trying to appear not to be racist with actively working to eliminate racism. Trying to appear not racist had made me deny my racism, and therefore exclude the possibility of change. (191) Being against the grain means seeing inequality as systemic and interpersonal (rather than individual), and combatting oppression as a collective responsibility, not just as a personal attribute (so that somehow a person can cleanse herself or himself of sexism, racism, abilism, or class bias). It is to pay attention to oppression as an interactional property that can be altered (see Manners 1998). Roger Simon (1993) suggests, in his development of a philosophical basis for teaching against the grain, which shares many commonalities in how I think about an integrative approach to equity in education, that **teaching against the grain is** fundamentally **a moral practice**. By this he does not mean that teachers simply fulfill the mandate and guidelines of school authorities. He believes that **teachers must expose the partial and imperfect nature of existing knowledge, which is constructed on the basis of asymmetrical power relations** (for instance, who has the power to speak and whose voices are suppressed?). **It is the responsibility of the** teacher or **educator to show how dominant forms of knowledge and ways of knowing constrict human capacities**. In exposing the power relations integral to the knowledge construction process, **the educator**, by extension, **must treat teaching and learning as a mutual and collaborative act between teachers and students**. What may this ideal look like in practice? Marilyn Cochran-Smith (1991) also explores the notion of teaching against the grain in her research on how teachers and students worked together in a preservice program in the Philadelphia area. Borrowing from Gramsci's formulation that action is everyone's responsibility, she asserts that teaching is fundamentally a political activity. In practical terms, she outlines what it may mean to teach against the grain in an actual teaching and learning situation. Her succinct articulation is worth quoting at length: To teach against the grain, teachers have to understand and work both within and around the culture of teaching and the politics of schooling at their particular schools and within their larger school system and communities. They cannot simply announce better ways of doing things, as outsiders are likely to do. They have to teach differently without judging the ways other teach or dismissing the ideas others espouse…. [They] are not at liberty to publicly announce brilliant but excoriating critiques of their colleagues and the bureaucracies in which they labor. Their ultimate commitment is to the school lives and futures of the children with whom they live and work. Without condescension or defensiveness, they have to work with parents and other teachers on different ways of seeing and measuring development, connecting and dividing knowledge, and knowing about teaching and schooling. They have to be astute observers of individual learners with the ability to pose and explore questions that transcend cultural attribution, institutional habit, and the alleged certainty of outside experts. They have to see beyond and through the conventional labels and practices that sustain the status quo by raising unanswerable and often uncomfortable questions. Perhaps most importantly, teachers who work against the grain must name and wrestle with their own doubts, must fend off the fatigue of reform and depend on the strength of their individual and collaborative convictions that their work ultimately makes a difference in the fabric of social responsibility. (Cochran-Smith 1991:284-85) For me, to be against the grain is therefore to recognize that the routinized courses of action and interactions in all educational contexts are imbued with unequal distribution of power that produce and reinforce various forms of marginalization and exclusion. Thus, a commitment to redress these power relations (i.e., equity in education) involves interventions and actions that may appear “counter-intuitive.” 6 Undoing inequality and achieving equity in education is a risky and uncomfortable act because **we need to disrupt the ways things are “normally” done [by]. This involves a serious (and frequently threatening) effort to interrogate [interrogating] our privilege as well as our powerlessness.** It obliges us to examine our own privilege relative though it may be, to move out of our internalized positions as victims, to take control over our lives, and to take responsibilities for change. It requires us to question what we take for granted, and a commitment to a vision of society built on reflection, reform, mutuality, and respect in theory and in practice. Teaching and learning against the grain is not easy, comfortable, or safe. It is protracted, difficult, uncomfortable, painful, and risky. It involves struggles with our colleagues, our students, as well as struggles within ourselves against our internalized beliefs and normalized behaviors. In other words, it is a lifelong challenge. However, as Simon (1993) puts it, teaching against the grain is also a project of hope. We engage in it with the knowledge and conviction that we are in a long-term collaborative project with like-minded people whose goal is to make the world a better place for us and for our children.

#### The role of the judge is to act as an educator interested in validating the real world action of students acting and discussing in the interest of oppressed bodies.

**Freire[[4]](#footnote-4)**

**Authentic education is** not **carried on by** "A" *for* "B" or by "A" *about* "B," but rather by **"A" *with* "B,"** mediated by the world—a world which impresses and challenges both parties, giving rise to views or opinions about it. These views, impregnated with anxieties, doubts, hopes, or hopelessness, imply significant themes on the basis of which the program content of education can be built. **In its desire to create an ideal model of the "good [human]," a naively conceived humanism often overlooks the** **concrete, existential,** **present situation of real people. Authentic humanism**, **in Pierre Furter’s words,** **"consists in permitting the emergence of the awareness of our full humanity, as a condition and as an obligation, as a situation and as a project. "**We simply cannot go to the laborers—urban or peasant—in the banking style, to give them "knowledge" or to impose upon them the model of the "good man" contained in a program whose content we have ourselves organized. Many political and educational plans have failed because their authors designed them according to their own personal views of reality, never once taking into account (except as mere objects of their actions) the *men-in-a-situation* to whom their program was ostensibly directed. **For the truly humanist educator and the authentic revolutionary, the object of action is the reality to be transformed by them together with other people—not other men and women themselves.** The oppressors are the ones who act upon the people to indoctrinate them and adjust them to a reality which must remain untouched. Unfortunately, however, in their desire to obtain the support of the people for revolutionary action, **revolutionary leaders often fall for the banking line of planning program content from the top down**. They approach the peasant or urban masses with projects which may correspond to their own view of the world, but not to that of the people.**They forget that their fundamental objective is to fight alongside the people for the recovery of the people's stolen humanity**, not to ' Avin the people over" to their side. Such a phrase does not belong in the vocabulary of revolutionary leaders, but in that of the oppressor. **The revolutionary's role is to liberate, and be liberated, with the people—not to win them over.**

#### And pedagogy is never neutral—every position is actively promoting some way of understanding. The only defensible position is one that challenges and makes students aware of oppressive power structures.

**Espinoza 03[[5]](#footnote-5)**

Critical pedagogy has put forth the notion that **classroom practice integrates particular** curriculum **content** and design, **instructional strategies** and techniques, **and** forms of **evaluation.** It argues that **these specify** a particular version about **what knowledge is of most worth, what it means to know** something, **and how we might construct a representation of our world and** our **place within it** (McLaren 1998)**.** From this perspective, **the pedagogical is inherently political.** For us a decolonizing pedagogy encompasses both an anticolonial and decolonizing notion of pedagogy and an anticolonial and decolonizing pedagogical praxis. It is an anticolonial and decolonizing theory and praxis that insists that colonial domination and its **ideological frameworks operate and are reproduced** in and **through** the curricular content and design, the **instructional practice**s, the social organization of learning, **and** the **forms of evaluation that** inexorably **sort** and label **students into** enduring **categories of success and failure** of schooling. Thus, an **anticolonial** and decolonizing pedagogical **praxis** explicitly **works to transform these dimensions** of schooling **so** that **schools become sites for** the **development of** a **critical** decolonizing **consciousness** and activity that work to ameliorate and ultimately end the mutually constitutive forms of violence that characterize our internal neocolonial condition. For us, a decolonizing pedagogy addresses both the means and the ends of schooling.

## ROTB

### Medina—Genealogy

//Note: I always read this with Foucault framing at the top

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who better performs a genealogy that brings subjugated knowledges to light. Genealogy is key—it mobilizes marginalized groups by tapping into their experiences

**Medina 1[[6]](#footnote-6)**

**Subjugated knowledges remain invisible to mainstream perspectives**; they have a precarious subterranean existence that renders them unnoticed by most people and **impossible to detect by those whose perspective has already internalized certain epistemic exclusions.** And with the invisibility of subjugated knowledges, certain possibilities for resistance and subversion go unnoticed. **The critical and emancipatory potential of Foucaultian genealogy resides in challenging established practices of remembering and forgetting by excavating subjugated bodies of experiences** and memories, bringing to the fore the perspectives that culturally hegemonic practices have foreclosed. **The critical task of the scholar and the activist is to** resurrect subjugated knowledges—that is, to revive hidden or forgotten bodies of experiences and memories—and to **help produce insurrections of subjugated knowledges.**4 In order to be critical and to have transformative effects, **genealogical investigations should aim at these insurrections, which are critical interventions that disrupt and interrogate epistemic hegemonies and mainstream perspectives** (e.g. official histories, standard interpretations, ossified exclusionary meanings, etc). **Such insurrections involve the difficult labor of mobilizing scattered, marginalized publics and of tapping into the critical potential of their dejected experiences and memories. An epistemic insurrection requires a collaborative relation between genealogical scholars/activists and the subjects whose experiences and memories have been subjugated: those subjects by themselves may not be able to destabilize the epistemic status quo until they are given a voice at the epistemic table** (i.e. in the production of knowledge), **that is, until room is made for their marginalized perspective to exert resistance**, until past epistemic battles are reopened and established frameworks become open to con- testation. On the other hand, the scholars and activists aiming to produce insurrectionary interventions could not get their critical activity off the ground if they did not draw on past and ongoing contestations, and the lived experiences and memories of those whose marginalized lives have become the silent scars of forgotten struggles.

#### And marginalized groups aren’t powerless, just subjugated—genealogies are key to deconstructing dominant discourse by mobilizing other forms of knowledge

**Medina 2[[7]](#footnote-7)**

And it is of course crucial that we regard power and knowledge not only as intimately related but as inseparable, which is why Foucault and Foucaultians have used the cumbersome expression ‚power/knowledge.‛ **One may naively think that the opposite of power/knowledge would be powerlessness/ignorance, so that those excluded or marginalized in the discursive practices that produce certain epistemic and power effects would be simply subjects without any knowledge and any power**, quasi-non-agents. **But the pluralistic genealogical approach that Foucault sketches goes completely against those views** that portray the oppressed as merely powerless and ignorant. In fact, this approach unmasks as an important misconception the view that the oppressed simply lack power and knowledge because of the forms of exclusions and marginalization they suffer. **That distorted characterization plays in the hands of the dominant ideologies and grants too much to them: namely, it grants the very definition of what counts as legitimate power and legitima[cy]te knowledge [to dominant ideologies].** Instead, **a more accurate characterization would be the one that describes oppressed groups as those whose powers and knowledges have been demeaned and obstructed.** This is why, after drawing the contrast between genealogy and history of knowledge, Foucault goes on to say that **the critical task that genealogy confronts us with is ‚an immense and multiple battle, but not one between knowledge and ignorance, but an immense and multiple battle between knowledges in the plural**—knowledges that are in conflict because of their very morphology, because they are in the possession of enemies, and because they have intrinsic power-effects.‛ 7 **How do we fight against power on this view?** Not by trying to escape it (as if liberation consisted in standing outside power altogether), but rather, **by turning power(s) against itself(themselves), or by mobilizing some forms of power against others. Similarly, how do we fight against established and official[, oppressive] forms of knowledge when they are oppressive? Not by trying to escape knowledge altogether, but rather, by turning knowledge(s) against itself(themselves), or by mobilizing some forms of knowledge against others.**

Additionally prefer

1. Pre-requisite. Bringing subjugated knowledges to light is key to weighing other frameworks since these knowledges can’t be considered as methodological options before they have a seat at the table. For example you can’t read colonialism as a role of the ballot without first understanding the colonialist roots of national service through genealogy. Thus even if there exists a better role of the ballot, the only way we can assess all our options is to do a genealogy first.
2. Emancipating the debate space. Not only do structures of power manipulate our understanding of the truth surrounding the resolution, but they structure the topical engagement we have in the debate space in the first place. For example not only does the regime of truth make security an objective good, but it makes all debates about international relations focus on security. Therefore deconstructing the truth is key to unleashing the true potential of the discussions we have in the debate space, leading to more unique and valuable education.

### Rodriguez—Abolition

//can also combine w/ Foucault ROTJ

#### Schooling is based off the model of prisons—our modes of thought are shaped by “the teacher”, who just replicates the forms of knowledge of the state. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best engages in abolitionist pedagogy.

**Rodriguez 10[[8]](#footnote-8)**

A compulsory deferral of abolitionist pedagogical possibilities composes the largely unaddressed precedent of teaching in the current historical period. It is this deferral—generally unacknowledged and largely presumed—that both undermines the emergence of an abolitionist pedagog- ical praxis and illuminates abolitionism’s necessity as a dynamic practice of social transformation, over and against liberal and progressive appropriations of “critical/radical pedagogy.” Contrary to the thinly disguised ideological Alinskyism that contemporary liberal, progressive, critical, and “radical” teaching generally and tacitly assumes in relation to the prison regime, what is usu- ally required, and what usually works as a strategy for teaching against the carceral common sense, is a pedagogical approach that asks the unaskable, posits the neces- sity of the impossible, and embraces the creative danger inherent in liberationist futures. About a decade of teaching a variety of courses at the undergraduate and graduate levels at one of the most demographically diverse research univer- sities in the United States (the University of California, Riverside) has allowed me the opportunity to experiment with the curricular content, assignment form, pedagogical mode, and conceptual orga- nization of coursework that directly or tangentially addresses the formation of the U.S. prison regime and prison indus- trial complex. Students are consistently (and often unanimously) eager to locate their studies within an abolitionist gene- alogy—often understanding their work as potentially connected to a living his- tory of radical social movements and epistemological-political revolt—and tend to embrace the high academic demands and rigor of these courses with far less resistance and ambivalence than in many of my other Ethnic Studies courses. There are some immediate analytical and scholarly tools that form a basic pedagogical apparatus for productively exploding the generalized common sense that creates and surrounds the U.S. prison regime. **In fact, it is crucial for teachers and students to collectively understand that it is precisely the circulation and concrete enactment of this common sense that makes it central to the prison regime, not simply an ideological “supplement” of it. Put di erently, many students and teachers have a tendency to presume that the cultural symbols and popular discourses that signify and give common sense meaning to prisons and policing are external to the prison regime, as if these symbols and discourses (produced through mass media, state spokespersons and elected o cials, right-wing think tanks, video games, television crime dra- mas, etc.) simply amount to “bad” or “deceptive” propaganda that conspirato- rially hide some essential “truth” about prisons that can be uncovered. This is a seductive and self-explanatory, but far too simplistic, way of understanding how the prison regime thrives. What we require, instead, is a sustained analytical discussion that considers how multiple layers of knowledge—including common sense and its di erent cultural forms—are constantly producing a “lived truth” of policing and prisons that has nothing at all to do with an essential, objective truth.** Rather, this fabricated, lived truth forms the tem- plate of everyday life through which we come to believe that we more or less understand and “know” the prison and policing apparatus, and which dynamically produces our consent and/or surrender to its epochal oppressive violence. As a pedagogical tool, this framework compels students and teachers to examine how deeply engaged they are in the violent common sense of the prison and the racist state. Who is left for dead in the com- mon discourse of crime, “innocence,” and “guilt”? How has the mundane institution- alized violence of the racist state become so normalized as to be generally beyond comment? What has made the prison and policing apparatus in its current form appear to be so permanent, necessary, and immovable within the common sense of social change and historical transforma- tion? **In this sense, teachers and students can attempt to concretely understand how they are a dynamic part of the prison regime’s production and reproduction— and thus how they might also be part of its abolition through the work of building and teaching a radical and liberatory com- mon sense** (this is political work that any- one can do, ideally as part of a community of social movement). Additionally, the abolitionist teacher can prioritize a rigorous—and vigorous— critique of the endemic complicities of liberal/progressive reformism to the transformation, expansion, and ultimate reproduction of racist state violence and (proto)genocide; this entails a radical cri- tique of everything from the sociopolitical legacies of “civil rights” and the oppressive capacities of “human rights” to the racist state’s direct assimilation of 1970s-era “prison reform” agendas into the blue- prints for massive prison expansion dis- cussed above.17 The abolitionist teacher must be willing to occupy the di cult and often uncom- fortable position of political leadership in the classroom. To some, this reads as a direct violation of Freirian concep- tions of critical pedagogy, but I would argue that it is really an elaboration and ampli cation of the revolutionary spirit at the heart of Freire’s entire lifework. at is, how can a teacher expect her/ his students to undertake the courageous and di cult work of inhabiting an abo- litionist positionality—even if only as an “academic” exercise—unless the teacher herself/himself embodies, performs, and oozes that very same political desire? In fact, it often seems that doing the latter is enough to compel many students (at least momentarily) to become intimate and familiar with the allegedly impossible. Finally, the horizon of the possible is only constrained by one’s pedagogical willingness to locate a particular political struggle (here, prison abolition) within the long and living history of liberation movements. In this context, “prison aboli- tion” can be understood as one important strain within a continuously unfurling fabric of liberationist political horizons, in which the imagination of the possible and the practical is shaped but not limited by the speci c material and institutional condi- tions within which one lives. It is useful to continually ask: on whose shoulders does one sit, when undertaking the auda- cious identi cations and political prac- tices endemic to an abolitionist pedagogy? ere is something profoundly indelible and emboldening in realizing that one’s “own” political struggle is deeply con- nected to a vibrant, robust, creative, and beautiful legacy of collective imagination and creative social labor (and of course, there are crucial ways of comprehending historical liberation struggles in all their forms, from guerilla warfare to dance). While I do not expect to arrive at a wholly satisfactory pedagogical endpoint anytime soon, and am therefore hesitant to o er prescriptive examples of “how to teach” within an abolitionist framework, I also believe that rigorous experimentation and creative pedagogical radicalism is the very soul of this praxis. **There is, in the end, no teaching formula or pedagogical system that nally ful lls the abolition- ist social vision, there is only a political desire that understands the immediacy of struggling for human liberation from precisely those forms of systemic violence and institutionalized dehumanization that are most culturally and politically sanctioned, valorized, and taken for granted within one’s own pedagogical moment.** To refuse or resist this desire is to be unaccountable to the historical truth of our moment, in which the structural logic and physi- ological technologies of social liquidation (removal from or e ective neutralization within civil society) have merged with history’s greatest experiment in punitive human captivity, a linkage that increas- ingly lays bare racism’s logical outcome in genocide.18

### Kaya—Rap Pedagogy

//lmfao this is p dope imo. Sad I never got to use it in an actual tournament but I def think it’s v interesting

#### You as the judge are a “border intellectual”, sitting at the crossroads of multiple forms of knowledge. The role of the ballot is to engage in rap pedagogy in context of the resolution in order to bring minority perspectives across to mainstream discourse

**Kaya[[9]](#footnote-9)**

This article claims that hip-hop community culture has the potential to provide migrant youth with a shield to be used against the detrimental effects of the age of neo-liberalism, consumerism and commodification. Hip-hop culture, in general, attempts to localise power and to produce a space for the excluded youth to exist against official institutions such as police, education and media. Rap and graffiti, in particular, emerge for suburban youth as the cultural form of resistance against social exclusion in the age of deindustrialisation. They are liberating youths from the restraints of traditional and official pedagogy programmed to assimilate the others into the mainstream set of values Traditional pedagogy has so far aspired tohomogenize the nation in a way that assimilates differences into the dominant culture. However, rap pedagogy stands out as a form of critical pedagogy recognising the otherness of the other and the potential it bears. However, it should bestated that this work does not intend to discuss what pedagogy refers to. Instead, itwill suggest that critical rap pedagogy may provide a kind of third space, or abridge, connecting the majority and minority.It is apparent that schooling is at stake with the decline of welfare state in the west. **The most important ideological challenge to the dissolution of the modern form of schooling has come from the rising power of New Right, or neo-liberalism.** The major reason **which** has led to the reign of the New Right, and thus to the decline of welfare state, is the world economic recession starting in the early 1970s. The New Right hold extremely strong libertarian views on the rights of the individual, and on free market capitalism. The support of the New Right for the primacy of human freedom over all other values such as equality, human dignity, morality, social justice, social welfare state leads them to be profoundly antagonistic to the notion that the state ought to have much of a role in providing an equalitarian society. In a sense, the New Right tends to deny the existence of social rights and displaces social rights with social duties, and freedom with equality. The New Right is committed to the classical liberal doctrine that the collective good can be properly realized in most cases by private individuals acting in competitive isolation, pursuing their interests with minimal state interference. **Hence, the neo-libertarianism dissolves the sense of society. In fact, the New Right, as Hall and Held already argued, “is concerned with how to advance the cause of liberalism against democracy” or “freedom against equality” by limiting the possible uses of state power.** After the decline of the welfare state, which aimed to integrate the lower classes to the system in the West, upon the breakdown of the sense of community, the concept of 'underclass' appeared in the post-industrial states. The recent social movements which mainly derive from the under-class urban communities in the form of ethnic, religious or racial antagonism, indicate that the New Right economic-social policies have deprived a certain number of people from civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights of citizenship. The more number of people loose their economic power and get outside the traditional class system, the more they lose to benefit from their civil, political, social and cultural rights. Market forces abstract youth from the language of justice, reciprocity, and compassion through commodification and privatization of leisure time; and exploit their bodies to sell products and to manufacture desires. It is also a fact that corporations merge fashion and art to shape images of the youth body in the interests of commodification while providing prob-lematic role models and forms of identity for youth. Giroux (2001b) isconcerned that youth are being driven out of the public space of active democratic citizenship into private space where they are positioned asconsumers. Furthermore, the increasing isolation of academics and intel-lectuals from the world around them reflects corporate culture’s power to define pedagogy as a technical and instrumental practice rather than as amoral and political act. Removed from the world of practical politics and everyday life, many educators are all willing to renounce culture as a terrain of politics and struggle. Reinforced by the pressures of professionalism and its attendant calls for neutrality, objectivity, and rationality, thereis little room in this approach to engage how ideologies, values, and powershape all aspects of the pedagogical process. **This is what the Enlighten-ment idea has already prescribed: the separation of culture and politics: what is cultural is not political.** Culture belongs to the private space, and politics to the public space. Giroux addresses the social costs and implications of removing youth from the inventory of ethical and political concerns through policiesreplacing social compassion with containment while increasingly aban-doning youth to the dictates of a repressive penal state in which govern-ment addresses social problems through the police, courts, and prisonsystem. Ideology of New Right has turned the state into a minimal state abstracting it from social, economic and cultural spheres, and imprisoning it into security realm in alliance with domestic militarization. Lack of recreational space is another outcome of the New Right policies. Recreational space is now privatized as a profit-making venture. There are nolonger youth centres, city public parks, outdoor basketball courts, or emptyfields where kids can play football. Play areas are now rented out to thehighest bidder. Young people are increasingly excluded from publicspaces outside schools that once offered them the opportunity to hang outwith relative security, work with mentors in youth centers, and developtheir own skills.The war against youth can be seen as part of an attack on the welfarestate, public schooling, and democratic culture during the New Right erastarting from the late 1970s. It is also lately quite remarkable to see howthe media have been scapegoating youth, especially working-class, mi-grant and minority youths, as the source of social problems and the escala-tion of violence in urban space. Rising representation of youths as crimi-nals in the USA, Britain, France, and in several other countries avoids critical commentary on the connections between the escalation of violencein society and the role of poverty and social conditions in promoting violence. Media usually depict youth as decadent, corrupt, and in need of discipline and control. Giroux argues that misrepresentations of youth in media culture and scapegoating of youth through negative media images and discourses are efforts to justify cutbacks in education and harshercriminal penalties. Invisible Colleges: Border youth and alternative means of education The modernist world of certainty and order has given way to a planet inwhich hip-hop and rap condense time and space into what Paul Virilio calls “speed space”. **No longer belonging to any location, youth increasingly inhabit shifting cultural and social spheres characterized by a plural-ity of languages, cultures, ethnicities and identities. Identities are no longer fixed, they are rather fluid and constantly changing.** Gilroy finds this actualized in rapper Rakim‟s suggestion that „it ain‟t where you‟re from, it‟swhere you‟re at,‟ a claim which “grants a priority to the present, emphasizing a view of identity as an ongoing process of self-making at a time when myths of origins hold so much appeal”. For many youths, meaning is lost, and media has become a substitute for experience, and what consti-tutes understanding is grounded in a decentred and diasporic world of difference, displacement, and exchanges. **For many commentators, youth have become “strange”, “alien”, “disconnected from the real world”,“lost”, and “aimless”. However, such commentators are captured in anintervention by Andrew Kopkind, an observer [part] of slacker (idler) culture:** “Slacking is a rational response to casino capitalism, the randomization of success, and the utter arbitrariness of power. If no talent is still enough, why bother to hone your skills? If it is impossible to find a good job, why not slack out and enjoylife?” Slacking sometimes becomes a culture of resistance among the youths of migrant origin. As Michéle Tribalat put it “what is the point in working hard for success at school if you are going to be discriminated against?” What educators need to do is to make the pedagogical more political by addressing both the conditions through which they teach and what it means to learn from a generation that is experiencing life in a way that is vastly different from the representations offered in modernist versions of schooling. **Educators should also learn from student experience and then form this into a philosophy of learning and a praxis of transformation.** One should not underestimate the fact that the way culture is attained by individuals may change from generation to generation. The distinctions made by the anthropologist Margaret Mead in this regard are quite expressive. Mead makes a three-fold of definition of the ways in which culture islearnt: postfigurative culture in which children learn primarily from theirforebears; cofigurative culture in which both children and adults learnfrom their peers; and prefigurative culture in which adults also learn fromtheir children. Those defined by Mead in the late 1960s as the children of the future are today‟s children who are far more dynamic and prone to change and development. Having access to several other sources of infor-mation, not only to what their parents can teach them, modern-day youthhas a great capacity to have a stronger impact on their educators. Knowing the fact that educators may also learn from youths paves the way to a formof education, which may create a liminal space between the educator and the educated. This form of education is the one in which a true dialogue, exchange and translation could be practiced. **Contemporary youth has been lately exposed to several challenges from violence in the home and on the streets, to the crippling dislocations of de-industrialisation, to the politics of sexuality, and to the domestic militarization. Such overwhelming circumstances may lead to the formation of a culture of despair in a way that prompts conservative politicians to carve pathological portraits of young people that have justified new right social policies.** French interior minister Nicolas Sorkozy said “You’ve had enough of this gang of scum, haven‟t you? [...] Well we‟regoing to get rid of them.”to residents in a Paris suburb affected by urbanrioting in July 2005. The words used by Sarkozy illustrate his policy of zero tolerance when it comes to violence. **However, we could no longer expect [this] all the youth to generate a culture of despair under such circum-stances, as they have access to aforementioned alternative sources of imagination different from official schooling.** Although some youngsters may be out of formal schooling machine, they have created their own freespaces in which they benefit from community-based educative activities. Border Intellectuals: **Border-crossing Giroux redefines educators [are] as cultural workers, border crossers and border intellectuals who engage in intertextual negotiations across different sites of cultural production. Border crossing takes place not only be-tween the locations of identity-formation, politics and struggle, but also between the institution and the street**; between the public and the private; and between high and popular cultures. As educators increasingly define themselves either through the language of the market place or through adiscourse that abstracts the political form the realm of the cultural for thesphere of the social, they are rather being pressured to become either servants of corporate power or disengaged specialists devoted to the impera-tives of a resurgent and degrading academic professionalism. Border pedagogy facilitates a deterritorialization of knowledge and power which should emanate from the margins rather than being fixed in apredscribed and coded center in order to locate and redefine the complex and multiple realities of students‟ lives. **Pedagogy is not simply about self-improvement but also about social transformation aimed at creating the conditions for the oppressed to overcome material, ideological, and psychological forms of domination while reviving and expanding the fabric of democratic institutions.** Music is said not only to express differences but also to articulate them creatively, affecting social and cultural realities while at the same time being shaped by them. Music-making and other forms of popular culture serve as a specific site for the creation of collective identity as wellas shaping and reflecting dominant and subordinate social and culturalrelations. In some cases, **music [is] might become a social force attempting to transform the existing social system.** Rap is very instructive in this sense. For instance, the Last Poets told stories “to the oppressed about theoppressor ”in a language with intelligence, minimal aggressivity and high-grade humor “When you start out with a lieyou got no alibi for the liethen you got to alibi for the alibi.Go to the liebury,all the lies are buried in the liebury”The term “ Liebury”was used by the Last Poets, a rap group of fourAfrican-Americans in New York, in the early 1970s to express theircritical intervention to the modern idea of „library‟. The last Poets claimedthat “library” is where the lies are buried, because it consists of biasedinformation acumulated by the opressors. As organic intellectuals, the rappers transform „common -sense‟ knowledge of oppression into a new critical awareness that is attentive not only to ethnic but also to class con-tradictions. These organic intellectuals attempt to build a „historicalblock ‟- a coalition of oppositional groups united around counter-hegemonic ideas -against the „traditional elite‟ who try to „manage con-sent‟ by making domination appear natural, voluntary, and inevitable. Forinstance, as I mentioned elsewhere the efforts by Turkish rappers in Berlin in 1990s to enter the mainstream by forming a „Turkish community‟ r e-flect their struggle to assemble a „historical block‟ capable of challenging the ideological hegemony of German cultural domination. Furthermore,rap music, as a popular cultural form, becomes a powerful vehicle which allows today‟s Turkish migrant youth to gain a better understanding of their heritage and their present identities when official channels of remem-bering and identity formation continually fail to meet their needs. The rappers strongly adhere to a notion of community, and principally do notassume that this community is pre-given and exists naturally; rather, theyconsider that it must be constructed and created against all odds, in theface of the threat of decimation. One could claim that rap has become the representative voice of ur-ban youth. In addition to acting as voices in the urban community, manyrappers consider themselves educators and see at least a portion of theirmission as raising the consciousness of their communities. The rappers Iworked with so far made me conscious about their own social identities. The more I analysed their lyrics and narratives, the more I realised that they are what Antonio Gramsci called „organic intellectuals‟ and/or what Walter Benjamin called „storytellers‟ of their own local communities. These two terms are quite complementary. Organic intellectual refers tothe intellectual who originates in subaltern groups, as in the urban ghetto communities. Gramsci‟s definition of „organic intellectual‟ presupposes the existence of a dominant class or group, exercising hegemony anddomination on the subaltern classes or groups, through the State and ju-ridical government. The „organic intellectual‟ serves to raise the interests of his/her newly organised class or group, who aim to be incorporated intothe system and to take their place in the process of distribution of re-sources. They attempt to disrupt the social, political and cultural hegem-ony of dominant groups. The Turkish rappers in Berlin, for instance, try tocontribute to the formation of a sense of unified community as opposed tothe exclusion, segregation, misrepresentation and racism prevailing in thecountry of adaptation. A storyteller, on the other hand, “is a man [sic] who has counsel for his readers [...]. The storyteller takes what he tells from experience -hisown or that reported by others. And he in turn makes it the experience of those who are listening to his tale”. Benjamin also states that “the storyteller joins the ranks of the teachers and sages”. Hence, **the rapper is an intellectual storyteller who has counsel for his/her audience, and who wishes to mobilise his/her local community against the power of the hegemonic and/or coercive group.** The rapper also reminds us of what we are already inclined to forget, i.e., the „communicability of experience‟ which is destined to decrease. In this sense, rap turns out to be a critique of the modern urban way of life which disrupts the „communicability of experience‟. In other words, rap helps to communicate symbols and meanings, articulating intersubjectively the lived experience of social actors. The expression of the black French rapper, MC Solaar, gives the rationale behind rapping: “If you rebel, you isolate yourself. If you explain, people learn”. Thus, **the rationale behind the hip-hop nation is the quest for communication and dialogue with the hegemonic social classes/groups.** Rap: an alternative curricula and a third space **Hip-hop is a kind of youth culture, which, on the one hand, incorporates marginalised minority youths into the global mainstream culture; and onthe other hand, it provides youngsters with the opportunity to establish solidarity networks against major clusters of modernity such as capitalism,industrialism, racism, surveillance, egoism, loneliness, insecurity, struc-tural outsiderism and militarism.** These forms of youth countercultures, ina way, constitute what Michel Maffesoli calls „postmodern tribes‟ or „pseudo tribes‟. In fact, these terms can be extended to many interest-based collectivities such as hobbysts, sports enthusiasts, environmentalmovements, consumer lobbies, and mafia, or to religious, ethnic, and epis-temic communities whose primary orientation is to survive. As known, theidolization and defence of social group as the most primitive form of re-ligiosity is important because Tribus (tribes, „bund’) become the highestsocial good for their members. Out of the ethos of these tribes emergeethical orientations and a form of natural law challenging the legitimacy of traditional and official norms. These solidarity networks, built in the form of hip-hop communities,may lead to two antithetical formations for individuals, Autonomy and heteronomy. On the one hand, hip-hop family structures provideyoungsters with necessary equipment to struggle against the destabilisingeffects of those challenges. In other words, hip-hop serves a platform toyouths whereby they could perform a politics of identity in a way thatcorresponds to what Ulrich Beck calls „subpolitics‟, or what Anthony Giddens calls „life politics‟. This provides the youngsters with a kind of politics through which they could emancipate themselves from the arbi-trary hold of tradition, parental culture, and material deprivation. This sortof politics of identity is not a politics of life chances, as Giddens phrased,but of life style. It is concerned with how individuals (as rational actors)should live in a world where what used to be fixed either by nature ortradition is now subject to human decisions. Such a politics of identityrefers to a shield, which makes youngsters attempt to develop their auton-omy. Whereas hip-hop community formation could also be interpreted as asurvival strategy for youths developed against the feeling of insecurity and loneliness. Forming a „crew‟ or a „posse‟may comfort the youths in a timeof ambiguity and isolation. These groups have what Michel Maffesoli calls puissance, an inherent energy and vital force of the people, as opposed tothe power of formal institutions. Thus, while the community formation,on the one hand, embodies autonomous self, it also gives rise to whatZygmunt Bauman calls Heteronomy in a way that pleases individuals in thesafe environment of community. Nevertheless, **hip-hop communities, in general, are socially con-scious and critical of the increasing discrimination, segregation, exclusionand racism in society. Consciousness of a shared position of subordinationin society is expressed via the words of rap music, graffiti on the citywalls, paintings and drawings, in a way that branches out into new andgrowing social movements against violence, inequality, poverty, unem-ployment, racism and discrimination. These new syncretic forms of ex-pressive youth cultures expose a social movement of urban youth that already has [have] a distinct political ideology.** Gilroy defines this movement inthe British context as an utopian extension of the boundaries of politics, apowerful cultural formation, and an alternative public sphere which mayoffer a significant alternative to the misery of hard drugs and the radicalpowerlessness of inner urban life. These new forms of syncretic youthcultures like hip-hop constitute a philosophical discourse because they reject “the modern, occidental separation of ethics and aesthetics, culture and politics”. On the contrary, culture is inherently pedagogical and political: It forms, shapes, cultivates individuals and groups. This is why it is an important site for politics. Bearing in mind that hip-hop communities constitute what Maffesoli calls postmodern tribes and/or what Baumancalls heteronomous groups, I shall rather scrutinise the other side of the coin, which gives youths a critical position. This critical position, which will be named in what follows as the „third space‟ is, in fact, **contrary to the ways in which many of commentators have hitherto defined those youths as “strange”, “alien”, “disconnected from the real world”, “lost”,“disoriented”, “degenerated” and “aimless”.** Schooling has usually been an agent of those political and intellectual technologies associated with what Michel Foucault terms „govern-mentality‟. Governmentality refers to the practices which characterise theform of supervision a state exercises over its subjects, their wealth, their misfortunes, their customs, their souls and their habits. Foucault‟s modern„administrative state‟ is based on the idea of a „society of regulation‟ which differs from „the state of justice‟ of the Middle Ages which was built on the idea of a „society of laws‟. According to Foucault the mod-ern state regulates our bodies, souls, habits and thoughts by giving us asense of freedom. In the modern societies freedom has become a fruitfulresource for government. Paulo Freire makes a critical analysis of themodern education, which turns youths into passive receivers: “The more students work at storing the deposits entrusted to them, the less theydevelop the critical consciousness which would result from their intervention in theworld as transformers of that world. The more completely they accept the passiverole imposed on them, the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is andto the fragmented view of reality deposited in them.” “It is time to recognize that the true tutors of our children are not school teachers or university professors but filmmakers, advertising executors andpop culture purveyors. Disney does more than Duke, Spielberg outweighsStanford, MTV trumps MIT” says Benjamin R. Barber. Similarly, DianaCrane wrote more than thirty years ago about the ways in which knowl-edge is produced through Invisible colleges. Her concern was principallywith (scientific) knowledge production clearly distinguished, as in the„official‟ discourse, from teaching. Youths do not only learn by means of official curricula but also through unofficial curricula (e.g. film, TV, internet, music compact discs, rap albums, video games, comic books, etc.), orthrough what Mahiri calls pop culture pedagogy and popular learningsettings (e.g. community centers, churches, mosques, peer groups, etc.).Pop culture pedagogy practiced by contemporary youth through invisiblecolleges seems to have changed the relationship between youths and for-mal schooling. Instead of attending classes in schools, some youngstersprefer internet and other communicative connections including online journals, distance learning classes, bookstores, libraries, museums, mov-ies, TV, music compact discs, rap albums, video games, and comic books.There is a discrepancy between these „unschoolers‟ and traditional peda-gogic methods. It is evident that technological changes have transformedthe new generations. This kind of transformation is the central tenet of popculture pedagogy. One of its early material and symbolic expressions was Transformers, toys that came out more than two decades ago. Trans-former, mechanical characters who could instantly change into otherforms, complies with multiple identity changes of youths of the contempo-rary age. Furthermore, pop culture pedagogy provides youths with elec-tronically mediated multiple identities. Rap has a rather critical stand vis-À-vis modern education. Rap couldbe defined an alternative curricula, raising key questions about everyday life of marginalized people. Giroux defines rap as a „public and performative pedagogy‟, which is sensitive to the shifting nature of knowl-edge and identity, and one that operates in new spaces outside school. Rap pedagogy is a path to democratization because it invokes counterhegemonic voices from the margins to start a dialogue enacting identifica-tions and alliances. Rap pedagogy constitutes a unique experience in thesense that they expose a cultural identity formation process which is a critique of the Cartesian binary oppositions. Those youngsters who are engaged in hip hop culture display a unique subjectivity, a third position, where one can abstain oneself from dichotomies. This subjectivity isgenerally phrased as a „third culture‟ or „third space‟ by scholars such asHomi Bhabha, Stuart Hall, Paul Gilroy, Mike Featherstone, Felix Guattariand Gilles Deleuze who are inclined to break up the Cartesian duality. The third culture is a bricolage in which elements from different cultural traditions, sources and discourses are constantly intermingled and juxta-posed with each other. The third space is what Homi Bhabha calls a „dif-ferential communality‟, and what Felix Guattari refers to as the „process of heterogenesis‟. By processes of heterogenesis Guattari negates the Marxist dialectic, the aim of which is the „resolution‟ of opposites. Heargues that „our objective should rather be to nurture individual cultures, while at the same time inventing new contracts of citizenship: to create anorder of the state in which singularity, exceptions, and rarity coexist under the least oppressive conditions‟. He describes this formation „as a logicof the “included middle”, in which black and white are indistinct, in which the beautiful coexists with the ugly, the inside with the outside, the “good”object with the bad‟, and the self with the other. The process of heterogenesis, or the process of cultural bricolage, is expected to lead tothe emergence of strong subjectivities. The term rhizome, for instance,phrased by Deleuze and Guattari, corresponds to this phenomenon, whichis exposed by many contemporary youths: rhizome is a rootlikeunderground stem that produces roots below and sends up shoots from theupper surface. In exposing what rhizome means, Deleuze and Guattariprovide us with a convincing standpoint: “A Rhizome has no beginning or end; it is always in the middle, between things,interbeing, intermezzo. The tree is filiation, but the rhizome is alliance, uniquely alliance. The tree imposes the verb „to be,‟ but the fabric of the rhizome is con- junction, „and … and … and …‟ This conjunction carries enough force to shake and uproot the verb „to be‟. Where are you going? Where are you coming from? What are you heading for? These are totally useless questions. Making a cleanslate, starting and beginning again from ground zero, seeking a beginning or afoundation all imply a false conception of voyage and movement American literature, and already English literature, manifest this rhizomatic direction to aneven greater extent; they know how to move between things, establish a logic of the AND, overthrow ontology, do away with foundations, nullify endings andbeginnings. They know how to practice pragmatics. The middle is by no means anaverage; on the contrary, it is where things pick up speed.” The „middle‟ does not refer to „caught betwixt and between‟; it rather connotes a separate space in itself where, for instance, many youths,cosmopolitans and hybrids dwell. Thus, knowing that such new cosmo-politan forms spring from the third space, we might open ourselves up to arelationship that transcends us, that exists beyond and apart from us, in-stead of fully explaining and assimilating the other, thereby reducingher/him to our world. This syncretic culture, as Melucci has correctly stated, is “the journey into unfamiliar territory [which] teaches us torecognise ambivalence, encourages us to acknowledge different points of view, and thereby stimulates awareness of potential freedoms...” [section about graffiti omitted] Conclusion Youth is no longer just a stage of human life course. Youth have beenrecently commodified, and become the object of capitalism. Youth as astage of human life course has been extended along with the prolongationof formal higher education until the age of late 30s. The rise of deindus-trialization in the last few decades has intensified the discontent of mar-ginalised segments of youth in urban space; marginalized youth such asworking class, ethnic minority and migrant youth have rather been con-ceived as scapegoat for all the evil by the media and political elite. Mar-ginalized youth have already given up expecting formal education to so-cially mobilize them upward. Local and central governments have remark-able financial cut-backs in building recreational spaces for unemployed,uneducated and unschooler youth. Those youths have rather been inclined with producing their own channels of education through alternative invisible colleges‟ such as music, rap albums, TV, internet, communitycenters and films. Rap pedagogy criticizes the intellectual standardization and exclu-sive preoccupation with the high-cultural norm in modernist education. Rap pedagogy in particular, hip-hop pedagogy in general, is a critical pedagogy. This is what Henry Giroux called „border pedagogy‟. In borderpedagogy, cultural and social practices are no longer mapped or referencedsolely on the basis of the dominant models of Western modernity. Rapprovides a ground for the subaltern to speak. Rap may turn the classroominto a place of invention, the teacher into a transformer, and the studentinto a kind of bricoleur, a handy-man. Students take up the thoughts, ex-periences and stories of others and make them their own. They may act asorganic intellectuals, or storytellers. Working on language, working onmusic opens up possibilities for a different kind of language and music ina way that leads to mediation and affiliation. Rap music is a terrain which can empower students. Rap pedagogy could allow knowledge to emanate from student experience rather than from an outside authority. **Rap pedagogy could also democratize[s] the class-room experience by making the students expressive about their own everyday life realities.** Students expressing themselves through their own rap lyrics could also meet in a liminal space where a dialogue of experiencesand thoughts could be materialized in a way that crosses racial, cultural,economic and geographic boundaries. Thus, rap pedagogy attempts to givevoice to students to articulate their criticisms of the dominant culture andto form their own subcultures, discourses, styles, cultural forms and identi-ties. In this regard, critical pedagogy tries to challenge the reduction of schooling to prepare students to get better test scores and fit into the newglobal economy. Similarly, graffiti also provides the youth with a opportu-nity to construct a counter-hegemonic space in opposition to the assimila-tionist, normalizing and homogenizing regimes of power.

Therefore prefer

1. Slacker culture—the new right has based their war on youth based off this culture, but rap pedagogy has empirically empowered youth to actually become political and challenge oppressive conditions. Thus using rap in the debate space is better for us students ourselves
2. Transcending dialogue—in the status quo rap and our youth counterculture are dismissed from mainstream perspectives, and the hip-hop movement is completely other to the New Right. The NC is an attempt to bridge this divide by utilizing the debate space to manifest our stories in context of the resolution
3. Coalition building—rap uniquely allows youth to form networks with one another by transforming it from something that we listen to into a site around which we can collectively express our perspectives and mobilize against the war against us.
4. Storytelling—most discussion leaves the oppressed as a faceless group, while rap tells real stories and real perspectives of individuals in this disposition. This is key to creating real change since bringing new, individual stories to light is more likely to change mindsets then regurgitating the same, official narrative about the system.
5. Most importantly, this ROTB outweighs any other framing since we as youth are engaged in a war against the new right, who are seeking social changes to shut out our liberal perspectives, meaning mobilization in the debate space is a pre-requisite to any other discussion.

### Asante—Colonialism

#### Colonialism is more than occupation of land—colonized modes of thought are reflected in education today, which is why we need a politics of resistance

**Asante[[10]](#footnote-10)**

In Anti-Colonialism and Education: The Politics of Resistance, George J. Sefa Dei and Arlo Kempf have given us a stimulating intellectual account of the issues surrounding the active attempt for educational liberation.The authors who have contributed to the volume have been well chosen to present creative approaches to this abiding problem in most of the world. **As we engage the legacies of colonialism we are more certain today that the nonmaterial legacies are as important in our thinking as the material ones when we engage questions of resistance and recovery.** The colonizer did not only seize land, but also minds. **If colonialism’s influence had been merely the control of land that would have required only one form of resistance, but when information is also colonized, it is essential that the resistance must interrogate issues related to education, information and intellectual transformations. Colonialism seeks to impose the will of one people on another and to use the resources of the imposed people for the benefit of the imposer. Nothing is sacred in such a system as it powers its way toward the extinction of the wills of the imposed upon with one objective in mind: the ultimate subjection of the will to resist.** An effective system of colonialism reduces the imposed upon to a shell of a human who is incapable of thinking in a subjective way of his or her own interest. **In everything the person becomes like the imposer; thus in desires, wishes, visions, purposes, styles, structures, values, and especially the values of education, the person operates against his or her own interest. Colonialism does not engender creativity; it stifles it, suppresses it under the cloak of assistance when in fact it is creating conditions that make it impossible for humans to effectively resist.** And yet there has always been resistance and there are new methods of resistance gaining ground each day. The intricacies of engaging colonialism are as numerous as the ways colo- nialism has impacted upon the world. Indeed, the political-economic, social- behavioral, and cultural-aesthetic legacies of the colonizing process have left human beings with a variety of ways to confront the impact of those legacies. **What we see in Anti-Colonialism and Education is a profound attempt to capture for the reader the [there are] possibilities inherent in educational transformation through the politics of resistance. Professors Dei and Kempf have exercised a judicious imagination in selecting the authors for the chapters in this book. Each author is an expert in the area of the topic, skilled in presentation of the facts based upon current theories, and articulate in the expression of a need for educators to understand the pressures both for and against colonialism. However, they all take the position that it is necessary to explore all formulations that might achieve a liberated sphere of education. Since education normally follows the dominant political lines in a country where you have colonial political principles you will find colonial education. If you have the vestiges of past colonial practices, you will see those practices re- flected in the educational system.** I remember a colleague from Algeria saying to me that when the French ruled the country the students learned that their ancestors were the Gauls. When independence came to Algeria, he said, the people were taught that their ancestors were Arabs. The fact that this was only true for those individuals who had Arab origins, and thirty percent did not have such ancestry, was uninteresting to the political agenda. And so it has been in every nation where you have a political intention to mold a country on the basis of domination you will also have resistance. One seems to go with the other regardless to how long the process seems to take to commence. This is not just an exciting work intellectually; it is a beautiful book edited with intelligence and executed with the kind of research and scholarship that will bring us back to its pages many times. Each author seems to feel the same desire to teach us to be truly human; that is enough for us to inaugurate our own anti-colonialism campaign in our schools and colleges. I shall gladly join the fray to make the world better.

### Giroux—Militarism

#### Militarism puts down critical thought and creates the metaphor of refugee camps, where those who challenge the government are excluded from society—we need to reject this depoliticization in the debate space as a means of restoring democracy. The role of the ballot is to vote for the advocacy that best challenges our militaristic culture of violence.

**Giroux 13[[11]](#footnote-11)**

Right-wing market fundamentalists want to root out those considered defective consumers and citizens, along with allegedly unpatriotic dissidents. They also want to punish the poor and remove their children from the possibility of a quality public education. Hence, they develop **schools that are dead zones of the imagination for most children and highly creative classroom environments free of the frenzy of empiricism and test-taking for the children of the rich.** It gets worse. In Pennsylvania, right-wing Gov. Tom Corbett and Philadelphia Mayor Michael Nutter are intent on destroying the public school system. Instead of funding public schools, Corbett and Nutter are intent on crushing the teachers union and supporting vouchers and charter schools. They also are fond of claiming that money can’t help struggling public schools as a pretext for closing more than 23 schools “while building a $400 million state prison.”[xv] As Aaron Kase reports, “Things have gotten so bad that at least one school has asked parents to chip in $613 per student just so they can open with adequate services, which, if it becomes the norm, effectively defeats the purpose of equitable public education, and is entirely unreasonable to expect from the city’s poorer neighborhoods.”[xvi] Vouchers and under-regulated charter schools have become the unapologetic face of a vicious form of casino capitalism waging war on the imagination while imposing a range of harsh and punitive disciplinary methods on teachers and students, particularly low-income and poor white minorities.[xvii] **The vast stores of knowledge and human creativity needed by young people to face a range of social, economic and political problems in the future are not simply being deferred, they are being systematically destroyed. When the emancipatory potential of education does emerge, it is often couched in the deadening discourse of establishing comfort zones in classrooms as a way of eliminating any pedagogy that provokes, unsettles or educates students to think critically. Critical knowledge and pedagogy are now judged as viable only to the degree that they do not make a student uncomfortable. There is more at stake here than the death of the imagination; there is also the elimination of those modes of agency that make a democracy possible.** In the face of such cruel injustices, neoliberalism remains mute, disdaining democratic politics by claiming there are no alternatives to casino capitalism. Power in the United States has been uprooted from any respect for public value, the common good and democratic politics. This is not only visible in the fact that 1 percent of the population now owns 40 percent of the nation’s wealth or took home “more than half of the nation’s income,” it is also evident in a culture that normalizes, legitimates and thrives in a politics of humiliation, cruelty, racism and class discrimination.[xviii] Political, moral and economic foundations float free of constraints. **Moral and social responsibilities are unmoored, free from any sense of responsibility or accountability in a permanent war state. Repression is now the dominant mantra for all of society. As Zygmunt Bauman and David Lyons point out, the American public has been turned into “security addicts,” ingesting mistrust, suspicion and fear as the new common sense for a security state that seems intent on causing the death of everything that matters in a democracy.**[xix] The surveillance state works hard to not only monitor our phone conversations or track our Internet communication but to turn us into consumers, ratchet up the desire to be watched, and enforce new registers of social exclusion between those inside and outside the official temples of consumerism, social rights and captainship itself. Confining, excluding and vigilantism is one register of the new face of authoritarianism in the US. **As America enters a historical era dominated by an authoritarian repressive state, the refugee camp [is] as a symbol of exclusion and suffering is everywhere, visible in the material encampments for the homeless, urban ghettoes, jails, detention centers for young people, and in the tents propping up alongside highways that hold the new refugees from the suburbs who have lost their jobs, homes and dignity. The refugee camp also has become a metaphor for those who question authority, because they are increasingly rendered stateless, useless and undesirable. Critical thought is now considered dangerous, discomforting and subject to government prosecution, as is evident in the war being waged against whistleblowers in the name of national (in)security.**[xx] **The technologies of smart missiles hunt down those considered enemies of the United States, removing the ethical imagination from the horror of the violence it inflicts while solidifying the “victory of technology over ethics.”**[xxi] Sorting out populations based on wealth, race, the ability to consume and immigration status is the new face of America. The pathologies of inequality have come home to roost in America.[xxii] Moreover, as suffering increases among vast swaths of the population, the corporate elite and rich use the proliferating crises to extract more wealth, profits and resources.[xxiii] Crises become the new rationale for destroying the ideologies, values and institutions that give power to the social contract. [xxiv] The ethos of rabid individualism, hyper-masculinity and a survival-of-the-fittest ethic has created a society of throwaways of both goods and people. The savage ethic of economic Darwinism also drives the stories we now tell about ourselves. The state of collective unconsciousness that haunts America has its deepest roots not only in the writings of Friedrich Hyek, Ayn Rand, Milton Friedman and other neoliberal philosophers but also in the increasing merging power of private-sector corporations that, as John Ralston Saul has argued, has its roots in the “anti-democratic underpinnings of Fascist Italy in particular, but also of Nazi Germany.”[xxv] Today this “corporatism [is] so strong it that it has taken the guts out of much of daily democratic life.”[xxvi] Combined with the power of the national surveillance state, it is fair to say, again quoting Saul, that “corporatism, with all of the problems attached to it, is digging itself ever deeper into our society, undermining our society.”[xxvii] Clearly, those words echoed a few years ago were not only prescient but vastly underestimated the growing authoritarianism in the United States, in particular. We now live in a society in which leadership has been usurped by models of corporate management, self-interest has triumphed over the ethical imagination, and a respect for others is discarded for the crude instrumental goal of accumulating capital, regardless of the social costs. Intellectuals in too many public spheres have become either dysfunctional or they have sold out. Higher education is no longer the city on the hill. Instead it has become a corporate boardroom/factory in which Bill Gates wannabes govern the university as if it were an outpost of Wall Street. Outside of the boardrooms, intellectual violence prevails aimed largely at faculty and students, who are reduced to either grant writers or consumers. To make matters worse academic knowledge is drowning in firewalls of obtuseness, creating a world of dysfunctional intellectuals, at least those who have tenure. Those who don’t have such security are tied to the harsh rhythm and rituals of contingent subaltern labor and barely make enough money to be able to pay their rent or mounting debts - never mind engage in teaching critically and creatively while writing as a sustained act of dissent. At the same time, the wider culture is sinking under a flood of consumer and celebrity idiocy. **There are some who suggest that such critiques of the growing authoritarianism and repression in American society are useless and in the long run do nothing more than reinforce a crippling dystopianism. I think this line of argument is not only wrong but complicitous with the very problems it refuses to acknowledge.** From a left suffocating in cynicism, there is the argument that people are already aware of these problems, as if neoliberal hegemony does not exist and that its success in building a consensus around its ideology as a mode of common sense is passé. At the same time, liberals detest such criticism because it calls into question the totality of American politics rather than focus on one issue and gestures toward a radical restructuring of American society rather than piecemeal and useless reforms. The call for such a restructuring rather than piecemeal reforms sends liberals into fits of hysteria. Of course, the right in all of its varieties views criticism as a virus that destroys everything they admire about America - a society in which democracy has been eviscerated and largely benefits the top ten percent of the population. **Most importantly, the banality of evil lies less in the humdrum cruelty of everyday relations but in its normalization, [and] the depolicitizaton of culture, and, at the present moment, in the reproduction of a neoliberal society that eradicates any vestige of public values, the ethical imagination, social responsibility, civic education and democratic social relations.** The enemy is not a market economy but a market society and the breakdown of all forms of social solidarity that inform democratic politics and the cultural, political and economic institutions that make it possible. **The authoritarianism that now shapes American society is not a matter of fate but one rooted in organized struggle and a vision built on the recognition that there are always alternatives to the existing order that speak to the promise of a democracy to come. The contradictions of neoliberalism are unraveling, but the consensus that informs it is alive and well. And it is at that level of educational intervention that the war against market authoritarianism in all of its diverse forms has to be fought first. Commonsense has become the enemy of critical thought. Hope is no longer part of the discourse of the left, only a dreary sense of despair with no vision of how to imagine a radical democracy. Manufactured ignorance has become a virtue instead of a liability in a society ruled by the financial elite. And as such we have no serious crisis of ideas. Instead, we have a crisis of power relations and structures that needs a new political language if it is to be contested at the level of both a pedagogical and political struggle.** The current neoliberal drive to ruthlessly extend the never-ending task of accumulating capital is matched only by its ruthless determination to produce[s] a notion of common sense that reinforces the idea that there is no way to think beyond the present system. The American public needs to break the authoritarian dysimagination machine that affirms everyone as a consumer and reduces freedom to unchecked self-interest while reproducing subjects who are willingly complicit with the plundering of the environment, resources and public goods by the financial elite. Class and racial warfare are alive and well in the United States. In fact, racism and the class warfare waged by right-wing politicians, bankers, hedge fund managers and the corporate rich are intensifying. **Americans need to reject a politics in which public goods are demonized and eradicated, African-American youths become the fodder for wars abroad and the military-prison-industrial complex, the underclass disappears, public servants are disparaged, youths vanish into debt and despair, and the middle class passes into oblivion.** While politics must be connected to its material moorings, it is not enough to imagine a different future than the one that now hangs over us like a suffocating sandstorm. **Those intellectuals, workers, young people, artists and others committed to a radical democracy need to develop a new vocabulary about how to think about the meaning of politics, human agency and the building of a formative culture through which organized collective struggles can develop in the effort to imagine a new and more democratic future.**

### Ward—Western Epistemology

#### The role of the ballot is to resist Western epistemologies. Opening up space for alternative epistemologies is the best strategy for resisting a Western worldview that subjugates indigenous knowledges.

**Ward[[12]](#footnote-12)**

**There has always existed an uneasy tension between Western academic rationality and indigenous knowledge systems. The latter has invariably been subjugated by the former, but have somehow survived, albeit in colonised forms, through to the present.** The Grand Narratives of Progress and Individual Emancipation and Anthropomorphism, worked through the matrix of scientific technical rationality have displaced and colonised indigenous cosmologies associated with cyclic temporalities, relatedness and species interdependency. Critics of the Western systems of knowledge – critical pedagogues with their roots in Marxist analysis have tended until recently to focus on the social, political and economic shortcomings of western knowledge systems and education – ignoring, for the most part ecological and environmental concerns, save as a peripheral outcome of capitalist excess.1 As critical education theorist Ilan Gur- Ze’ev has noted: “Until today, Critical Pedagogy almost completely disregarded not just the cosmopolitic aspects of ecological ethics in terms of threats to present and future life conditions of all humanity. It disregarded the fundamental philosophical and existential challenges of subject-object relations, in which “nature” is not conceived as a standing reserve either for mere human consumption or as a potential source of dangers, threats, and risks.”2 More recently, **critical pedagogues have begun to recognize and to insist on the need to include subjugated epistemologies of those previously excluded, oppressed and silenced communities – particularly indigenous communities - as an important requirement for building a broad consensus of popular resistance through education**, to the overarching free-market-driven imperative of Late Capitalism.3 For the most part, these critical pedagogues have tended to imagine a kind of melding of western and indigenous rationalities and epistemologies in pursuit of political, cultural and economic transformation. They link their project to the search for new forms of understanding of key concepts such as Education, Democracy, Multiculturalism, Identity etc. – concepts that are still grounded in a western rationality. In this attempt to embrace epistemological difference, the one key concept that is rarely, if ever, discussed - and the one that ultimately distinguished the indigenous (pre-colonial) cosmology - is The Spiritual. Western attempts to include indigenous knowledge systems are willing to grant them a greater degree of sensitivity to environmental systems, a more refined understanding of ecological interrelatedness drawn from local experience, a deeper awareness of cultural and social relations and a more comprehensive conception of both self-sufficiency and sustainability. But when it comes to the spiritual framework upon which all such knowledge systems rest, western (and westernised) scholars seem at a loss. Talk of spirit-beings, katchinas, guardians, spirit-helpers, fairies, and ancestor-helpers seem perhaps too freaky, too alien to take on board. Indeed, it is hard to imagine how they might be taken on board without the complete fragmentation and disintegration of a western perspective.4 The epic recounting of Carlos Castaneda’s experiences with the Yaqui sorcerer Don Juan Matus offer ample evidence of this dichotomy.5 **Don Juan told Carlos that in order to become a "[hu]man of knowledge" [one] he must practice "stopping the world" through a process of 'stopping the internal dialogue". He placed great emphasis upon the fact that being a "man of knowledge" involves a cessation of the normative meanings which language carries, and that it is the role of the teacher to facilitate this process: "The first act of a teacher is to introduce the idea that the world we think we see is only a view, a description of the world. Every effort of a teacher is geared to prove this point to an apprentice. But accepting it seems to be one of the hardest things one can do; we are complacently caught in our particular view of the world, which compels us to think and act as if we knew everything about the world. A teacher, from the very first act he performs, aims at stopping that view. Sorcerers call it "stopping the internal dialogue" and they are convinced that it is the single most important technique that an apprentice can learn."6** Language, which forms the basis of our internal conversations about the world is therefore fundamental not just to the process of describing reality, but in constructing and maintaining it. And since language is a social phenomenon, it follows that our conception of reality is mediated by the social forms which structure everyday life. Social groups who use the same language (be it everyday language or specialised technical language) implicitly reproduce and convey through their conversations a model of the world imbued with particular meanings and associations of which they themselves may not be fully aware, but which bind together the concrete reality, the world in question.7 In addition, we should keep in mind that, as Wittgenstein reminds us, the meanings inherent in language itself do not come ready-made:“...a word hasn’t got a meaning given to it, as it were, by a power independent of us, so that there could be a kind of scientific investigation into what the word really means. A word has the meaning someone has given to it.”8 **What all of this boils down to is the suggestion that western academics have tended to interpret indigenous realities and meanings through their own western lens provided by their own culturally/linguistically-determined understanding.** The Spiritual in this sense, has defied easy interpretation and stands still, **in stark aloofness from our ability to incorporate, assimilate or otherwise digest it.** What follows is one simple, local example of this problematic.

## Misc.

### Oppression First—Epistemology

#### Resisting oppression precludes all other impacts since we can only approach knowledge once we untangle it from regimes of power.

**Bleiker[[13]](#footnote-13)**

‘**It is within discourse**,’ one of Foucault’s much rehearsed passages (1976, 133) notes, ‘**that power and knowledge articulate each other.’** The work of the French historian and philosopher epitomizes what is at stake in questions of discourse and agency. For Foucault, **discourses** are subtle mechanisms that frame our thinking process. They **determine the limits of what can be thought,** talked and written in a normal and rational way. In every society the **production of discourses is controlled**, selected, organized **and diffused by certain procedures. This process creates systems of exclusion in which one group of discourses is elevated to a hegemonic status**, while others are condemned to exile. Discourses give rise to social rules that decide which statements most people recognize as valid, as debatable or as undoubtedly false. They guide the selection process that ascertains which propositions from previous periods or foreign cultures are retained, imported, valued, and which are forgotten or neglected (see Foucault, 1969, 1971, 1991, 59–60). Not everything is discourse, but everything is in discourse. Things exist independently of discourses, but we can only assess them through the lenses of discourse, through the practices of knowing, perceiving and sensing, which we have acquired over time. Discourses render social practices intelligible and rational F and by doing so mask the ways in which they have been constituted and framed. **Systems of domination gradually become accepted as normal and silently penetrate every aspect of society.** They cling to the most remote corners of our mind, for, as Nietzsche (1983, 17) once expressed it, ‘all things that live long are gradually so saturated with reason that their emergence out of unreason thereby becomes improbable.’

#### Any truth claim is epistemically suspect thus there is always a higher order obligation in rejecting oppression so excluded voices can be incorporated into our epistemologies.

**Clifford and Burke 08[[14]](#footnote-14)**

**Our view** of the nature **of ethics** admits the possibility of giving reasons, **draw[s]**ing **on both knowledge about the social world**, **and on** the feelings that are common (and uncommon) to **human experience**, but without assuming that rationality, empirical evidence or human feelings can either by themselves or even together provide an absolute basis for ethics**.** Too much is known about the variability of human values and the limitations of human rationality to make such an assumption complacently. **[But] There are many inequalities of** wealth, status and **power,** both **reflecting and leading to** cultural and structural **social divisions.** The **social context** of the professional working with vulnerable individuals and groups **demands recognition** of the need to act in a way that minimizes or overcomes some of the complex effects **of discrimination and oppression**, rather than adding to them through collusion, neglect or lack of self-awareness**.** Even worse, obviously, would be intentionally adding to existing oppression and exploitation. **What matters is the possibility of dialogue between individuals and groups – the attempt to act in an anti-oppressive way is** itself **a**n endless **search for ethical values in which we continually** negotiate with and **learn from each other – and especially from the ‘other’,** in **the** sense of **one who is socially and culturally different.**

### A2 Ideal Theory

On your ideal theory,

#### First, their abstract ideal theory can never solve concrete injustice, and at best would just maintain whiteness in the status quo

**Mills[[15]](#footnote-15)**

**Now how can this ideal—a society not merely without a past history of racism but without races themselves—serve to adjudicate the merits of competing policies aimed at correcting for a long history of white supremacy manifest in Native American expropriation, African slavery, residential and educational segregation, large differentials in income and huge differentials in wealth, nonwhite underrepresentation in high-prestige occupations and overrepresentation in the prison system, contested national narratives and cultural representations, widespread white evasion and bad faith on issues of their racial privilege, and [more] a corresponding hostile white backlash against (what remains of) those mild corrective measures already implemented? Obviously, it cannot.** As Thomas Nagel concedes: **“Ideal theory enables you to say when a society is unjust, because it falls short of the ideal. But it does not tell you what to do if, as is almost always the case, you find yourself in an unjust society, and want to correct that injustice”** (2003a, 82). **Ideal theory represents an unattainable target that would require us to roll back the clock and start over. So in a sense it is an ideal with little or no practical worth. What is required is the nonideal (rectificatory) ideal that starts from the reality of these injustices and then seeks some fair means of correcting for them**, recognizing that in most cases the original prediscrimination situation (even if it can be intelligibly characterized and stipulated) cannot be restored. Trying to rectify systemic black disadvantage through affirmative action is not the equivalent of not discriminating against blacks, especially when there are no blacks to be discriminated against. Far from being indispensable to the elaboration of nonideal theory, ideal theory would have been revealed to be largely useless for it. But the situation is worse than that. As the example just given illustrates, it is not merely a matter of an ideal with problems of operationalization and relevance, but of an ideal likely to lend itself more readily to retrograde political agendas. If the ideal ideal rather than the rectificatory ideal is to guide us, then a world without races and any kind of distinctiondrawing by race may seem to be an attractive goal. One takes the ideal to be colorblind nondiscrimination, as appropriate for a society beginning from the state of nature, and then—completely ignoring the nonideal history that has given whites a systemic illicit advantage over people of color—conflates together as “discrimination” all attempts to draw racial distinctions for public policy goals, no matter what their motivation, on the grounds that this perpetuates race and invidious differential treatment by race. In the magisterial judgment of Chief Justice John Roberts in the June 2007 Supreme Court decision on the Seattle and Louisville cases where schools were using race as a factor to maintain diversity, “The way to stop discrimination on the basis of race is to stop discriminating on the basis of race,”6 a statement achieving the remarkable feat of depicting not merely as true, but as tautologically true, the equating of Jim Crow segregation and the attempt to remedy Jim Crow tion! **What is ideally called for under ideal circumstances is not, or at least is not necessarily, what is ideally called for under nonideal circumstances. Claiming that all we need to do is to cease (what is here characterized as) discrimination ignores the differential advantages and privileges that have accumulated in the white population because of the past history of discrimination.** So the defense in terms of ideal theory is doubly problematic. In the first place, ideal theory was never supposed to be an end in itself, but a means to improving our handling of nonideal matters, and the fact that Rawls and his disciples and commentators have for the most part stayed in the realm of the ideal represents an evasion of the imperative of dealing with what were supposed to be the really pressing issues. And in the second place, it is questionable in any case how useful the ideal ideal in the Rawlsian sense is or ever would have been in assisting this task. So it is not merely that ideal theory has not come to the aid of those dealing with nonideal injustice but that it was unlikely to have been of much help when and if it ever did arrive.

#### Next, their ideal theory ignores its past legitimization and current maintaining of systems of oppression—we think of racists as outliers but they were normalized by these same ethics

**Curry[[16]](#footnote-16)**

Asserted as axiom and sustained as a transformation in the "hearts and minds" of whites ad populum, the civil rights movement and its accompanying policy of integration continues to be understood as a fundamental shift in American race relations from an era of Jim Crowism and terrorism against Blacks during segregation to **[in] the more present day where racism is seen to be remnants of the past sustained by racial misunderstanding and collective ignorance.** Following this logic, atonement theorists base the possibility of racial reconciliation on an unfounded optimism rooted in the continuation of civil rights era reforms. **For these scholars, racism is a question encountered at the extremities of unethical behavior. As presently understood, racism is a choice—an act of free will—to believe that skin color demarcates a real difference about that person and to treat said person or persons as inferior based on that difference. The racist act, then, becomes an attempt to realize in the world one's privations, not as an imaginative act, but an act cultivated by the realization that the world can in fact accept and support one's privations as reality. Thus the racist, as Fanon (1967) maintains is normal, not constrained by ethical calculations of morality, but empowered by them to not only act, but to act for the sake of "their" others.** Traditionally we have taken ethics to be, as Henry Sedgwick claims, "any rational procedure by which we determine what individual human beings 'ought'—or what is right for them—or to seek to realize by voluntary action” (1981:1). This rational procedure is however at odds with the empirical reality the ethical deliberation must concern itself with. **To argue, as is often done, that the government, its citizens, or white people should act justly, assumes that the possibility of how they could act defines their moral disposition. If a white person could possibly not be racist, it does not mean that the possibility of not being racist, can be taken to mean that they are not racist.** In ethical deliberations dealing with the problem of racism, **it is common practice to attribute to historically racist institutions, and individuals universal moral qualities that have yet to be demonstrated. This abstraction from reality is what frames our ethical norms and allows us to maintain[s], despite history or evidence, that racist entities will act justly given the choice. Under such complexities, the only ethical deliberation concerning racism must be antiethical, or a judgment refusing write morality onto immoral entities.** In the case of reparations, this would entail a prima facie rejection of atonement, because these theories assume the morality of historically immoral racist actors, be they governmental or individual. When morality is defined not by the empirical acts that demonstrate immorality, but the racial character of those in question, our ethics become nothing more than the apologetics of our tyrannical epoch.

Even if their fw doesn’t include solving for oppression AT WORST their framework is exclusionary because it can’t help minorities and keeps them stuck at the bottom of society.

### State Good

#### And debates about pro-social state action in educational spaces are key to combat depoliticization and prevent government actors from controlling politics

**Giroux[[17]](#footnote-17)**

**The decline of democratic values** and informed citizenship **can be seen in research studies** done by The Justice Project in 2001 in which a substantial number of teenagers and young people were asked what they thought democracy meant. The answers testified to **a growing depoliticization of American life** and largely consisted of statements along the following lines: "Nothing," "I don't know," or "My rights, just like, pride, I guess, to some extent, and paying taxes," or "I just think, like, what does it really mean? I know its our, like, our government, but I don't know what it 6 technically is." The transition from being ignorant about democracy to actually sup- porting antidemocratic Tendencies can be seen in a number of youth surveys that have been taken since 2000. For instance, a survey released by the University of California, Berkeley, revealed that 69 percent of students support school prayer and 44 percent of young people aged fifteen to twenty-two support government restric- tions on abortions. A 2004 survey of 112,003 high school students on First Amendment rights showed that one third of students surveyed believed that the First Amendment went too far in the rights it guarantees and 36 percent believed that the press enjoyed too much freedom. This **suggests not just a failing of education, but a crisis of** citizenship and **democracy. One consequence** of the decline in democratic values and citizenship literacy **is that all levels of government are being hollowed our, their role reduced to dismantling the gains of the welfare state** as they increasingly construct policies that criminalize social problems and prioritize penal methods over social investments. **When citizenship is reduced to consumerism**, it should come as no surprise that **people develop an indifference to civic engagement and participation in democratic public life. Unlike some theorists who suggest that politics** as critical exchange and social engagement **is** either **dead** or in a state of terminal arrest, **I believe that the current depressing state of politics points to an urgent challenge: reformulating the crisis of democracy as a fundamental crisis of vision**, meaning, education, **and political agency.** Central to my argument is the assumption that **politics is not simply about power, but** also, as Cornelius Castoriadis points out, "**has to do with political judgments** and value choices," **meaning that questions of civic education**—learning how 8 to become a skilled citizen—**afe central to democracy itself. Educators** at all levels **need to challenge the assumption that politics is dead, or the nature of politics will be determined exclusively by government leaders** and experts m the heat of moral frenzy. **Educators need to take a more critical position, arguing that** knowledge, **debate**, and dialogue **about pressing social problems offer individuals** and groups some **hope in shaping the conditions that bear** down **on their lives. Public civic engagement is essential if** the concepts of social life and **the public sphere are to be used to revitalize the language of civic education** and democratization **as part of a broader discourse of political agency and critical citizenship** in a global world. **Linking the social to democratic public values represents an attempt**, however incom- plete, **to link democracy to public action**, as part of a comprehensive attempt **to revitalize civic activism and citizen access to decision-making while simultaneously addressing basic problems of social justice** and global democracy. **Educators within public schools need to** find ways to **engage political issues by making social problems visible** and by debating them in the political sphere. **They** also **need to be at the forefront of the defense of the most progressive** historical advances and **gains of the state**. 1-rcnch sociologist Pierre Bourdieu is right when he calls for collective work by educators to prevent those who arc mobilized against the welfare state from destroying the most precious democratic conquests in labor legis- lation, health, social protection, and education.'' At the very least, this would suggest that educators should defend schools as democratic public spheres, struggle against the de-skilling of teachers and students that has accompanied the emphasis on teach- ing for test-taking, and argue for pedagogy grounded in democratic values rather than testing schemes that severely limit the creative, ethical, and liberatory potential of education.

**Specific K Stuff**

## Capitalism

### Ethics Impact

#### And cap destroys ethics by reducing decision-making to economic calculation—means cap comes first.

**Morgaridge 98[[18]](#footnote-18)**

**Now none of these philosophers are naive: none of them thinks that sympathy, love, or caring determines all, or even most, human behavior.** The 20th century proves otherwise. What **they do offer, though, is the hope that human beings have the capacity to want the best for each other. So now we must ask, What forces are at work in our world to block or cripple the ethical response?**  This question, of course, brings me back to capitalism. But before I go there, I want to acknowledge that capitalism is not the only thing that blocks our ability to care. Exploitation and cruelty were around long before the economic system of capitalism came to be, and the temptation to use and abuse others will probably survive in any future society that might supersede capitalism. Nevertheless, I want to claim, the putting the world at the disposal of those with capital has done more damage to the ethical life than anything else. To put it in religious terms, capital is the devil. To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx. **Under capitalism, Marx writes, everything in nature and everything that human beings are** **and can do becomes an object: a resource for, or an obstacle, to the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of markets, and the circulation of money. For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own. Mountain streams, clean air, human lives -- all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only if they can be used to turn a profit.**1If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products. **If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them [they] must be unrepresented or silenced.** Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well being of human beings and the planet we live on. Capital profits from the production of food, shelter, and all the necessities of life. The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth. **If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each others faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life. But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry. In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people. As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth. Therefore ethics, the overriding commitment to meeting human need, is left out of deliberations about what the heavyweight institutions of our society are going to do.** Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable. People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress. They still think they can't stop it. And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership. Only a minority ("idealists") can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making. **Only [at] when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seat at the table.**

### Oppression Impact

#### Class focus must come first – it is the root cause of all oppression.

**Kovel 07[[19]](#footnote-19)**

If, however, we ask the question of efficacy, that is, which split sets the others into motion, then priority would have to be given to class, for the plain reason that class relations entail the state as an instrument of enforcement and control, and it is the state that shapes and organizes the splits that appear in human ecosystems. Thus **class is both logically and historically distinct from other forms of exclusion** (hence we should not talk of "classism" to go along with "sexism" and "racism," and "species-ism"). This is, first of all, **because class is a**n essentially **man-made category**, without root in even a mystified biology**.** We cannot, in other words, imagine a human world without gender distinctions - although we can imagine a world without domination by gender. But a world without class is eminently imaginable - indeed, such was the human world for the great majority of our species' time on earth, during all of which considerable fuss was made over gender. Historically, the difference arises because **"class" signifies one side of a larger figure that includes a state apparatus whose conquests and regulations create races and shape gender relations.** Thus **there will be no true resolution of racism so long as class society stands**, inasmuch as a racially oppressed society implies the activities of a class-defending state**.**" **Nor can gender inequality be legislated away so long as class society**, with its state, **demands** the super-**exploitation of woman's labor.** Class society continually generates gender, racial, ethnic oppressions, and the like, which take on a life of their own, as well as profoundly affecting the concrete relations of class itself. It follows that class politics must be fought out in terms of all the active forms of social splitting. It is the management of these divisions that keeps state society functional. Thus though each person in a class society is reduced from what s/he can become, the varied reductions can be combined into the great stratified regimes of history - this one becoming a fierce warrior, that one a routine-loving clerk, another a submissive seamstress, and so on, until we reach today's personifications of capital and captains of industry. Yet no matter how functional a class society, the profundity of its ecological violence ensures a basic antagonism which drives history onward. **History is the history of class society - because no matter how modified, so powerful a schism is bound to work itself through to the surface, provoke resistance (i.e. "class struggle"), and lead to the succession of powers.** The relation of class can be mystified without end - only consider the extent to which religion exists for just this purpose, or watch a show glorifying the police on television - yet so long as we have any respect for human nature, we must recognize that so fundamental an antagonism as would steal the vital force of one person for the enrichment of another cannot be conjured away. The state is what steps forward to manage this conflict so that the ruling class gets its way without causing society to fly apart. It is the state's province to deal with class contradiction as it works itself out in numberless ways - to build its armies and use them in conquest (thereby reinforcing patriarchal and violent values), to codify property, to set forth laws to punish those who would transgress property relations, and to regulate contracts, and debts between individuals who play by the rules, to institutionalize police, courts and prisons to back up those laws, or to certify what is proper and right in the education of the young, or the marriage of the sexes, or establish the religions that justify God's ways to mere man, or to institutionalize science and education - in sum, to regulate and enforce the class structure, and to channel the flux of history in the direction of the elites. The state institutionalizes patriarchy as well as class, and hence maintains the societal ground for the gendered bifurcation of nature. Furthermore, inasmuch as the modern state is also a nation-state, it employs the attachment of a people to its land as a source of legitimation, and thus incorporates the history of nature into myths of wholeness and integrity. All aspects of the domination of nature are in fact woven into the fabric by means of which the state holds society together, from which it follows that to give coherence to this narrative and make a difference in it, we have to attend to the state and its ultimate dependence upon maintaining the class structure. All of this is to play a basic role in the unfolding of contemporary ecological struggles, as we discuss in the next section.

## Colonialism

### Intersectional Framing

#### The overall colonial power matrix has created the intersectionality of global oppression, not what the aff is claiming—reject aff framing to deconstruct true intersectional oppression

**Grosofoguel 07[[20]](#footnote-20)**

It is not an accident that the conceptualization of the world-system, from decolonial perspectives of the South will question its traditional conceptualizations produced by thinkers from the North. Following Peruvian Sociologist, Anı´bal Quijano (1991, 1998, 2000), we could conceptualize the present world-system [is] as a historical-structural heterogeneous totality with a specific power matrix that he calls a ‘colonial power matrix’ (‘patro´n de poder colonial’). This matrix affects all dimensions of social existence such as sexuality, authority, subjectivity and labor (Quijano 2000). **The sixteenth century initiates a new global colonial power matrix that by the late nineteenth century came to cover[s] the whole planet.** Taking a step further from Quijano, **I conceptualize the coloniality of power as an entanglement or, to use US Third World Feminist concept, intersectionality (Crenshaw 1989, Fregoso 2003) of multiple and heterogeneous global hierarchies (‘heterarchies’) of sexual, political, epistemic, economic, spiritual, linguistic and racial forms of domination and exploitation where the racial/ethnic hierarchy of the European/non-European divide transversally reconfigures all of the other global power structures. What is new in the ‘coloniality of power’ perspective is how the idea of race and racism becomes the organizing principle that structures all of the multiple hierarchies of the world-system** (Quijano 1993)**. For example, the different forms of labor that are articulated to capitalist accumulation at a world-scale are assigned according to this racial hierarchy [where]; coercive (or cheap) labor is done by non-European people in the periphery and ‘free wage labor’ in the core. The global gender hierarchy is also affected by race: contrary to pre-European patriarchies where all women were inferior to all men, in the new colonial power matrix some women (of European origin) have a higher status and access to resources than some men (of non-European origin). The idea of race organizes the world’s population into a hierarchical order of superior and inferior people that becomes an organizing principle of the international division of labor and of the global patriarchal system.** Contrary to the Eurocentric perspective, **race, gender, sexuality, spirituality, and epistemology are not additive elements to the economic and political structures of the capitalist world-system, but an integral, entangled and constitutive part of the broad entangled ‘package’ called the European modern/colonial capitalist/patriarchal world-system (Grosfoguel 2002). European patriarchy and European notions of sexuality, epistemology and spirituality were exported to the rest of the world through colonial expansion as the hegemonic criteria to racialize, classify and pathologize the rest of the world’s population in a hierarchy of superior and inferior races.**

### Multinational Corporations Link

#### Greedy, profit-driven corporations represent a new-era of colonialism, exploiting developing nations once again

**Sager 13[[21]](#footnote-21)**

**In the past, nation-states have set up colonial outposts in less powerful areas of the world in order to build their empire[,]. Colonies facilitated trade, acted as military outposts, and allowed the colonial powers to siphon resources from the indigenous populations.** Such colonial empires formed during the expansion of the 1500s and were sustained by numerous European nations—including the British colonies which eventually became the United States—until the mid-1900s, by which time a variety of geopolitical factors (ex. revolts, over-extension, etc.) had led most “empires” to dissolve. **While colonialism by nations has decreased across the world, it appears that an era of corporate colonialism is upon us. Unlike in the past—when nations would set up physical empires—giant multi-national corporations have started to set up de-facto empires across multiple sovereign nations. This new era of corporate colonialism will be characterized by giant corporate interests capturing power in society through economic and social factors, and then using their power to exploit humanity for a massive profit.**

### Poverty/Structural Violence Impact

#### Colonial conquest leads to unending poverty and structural violence that manifests the poverty experienced is a form of structural violence also representative of colonialism

**Gilman[[22]](#footnote-22)**

THE HUMAN TENDENCY toward, and preparations for, open warfare are certainly the most spectacular obstacles to peace, but they are not the only challenges we face. For much of the world’s population, hunger, not war, is the pressing issue, and it is hard to imagine a genuine peace that did not overcome our current global pattern of extensive poverty in the midst of plenty. **Hunger and poverty are two prime examples of what is described as “structural violence,” that is, physical and psychological harm that results from exploitive and unjust social, political and economic systems.** It is something that most of us know is going on, some of us have experienced, but in its starker forms, it is sufficiently distant from most North American lives that it is often hard to get a good perspective on it. I’ve come across an approach that seems to help provide that perspective, and I’d like to describe it. […] **How [it is] legitimate is it to ascribe these deaths to the structural violence of human institutions, and not just to the variability of nature [since]?** Perhaps the best in-depth study of structural violence comes from the Institute for Food and Development Policy (1885 Mission St, San Francisco, CA 94103). What they find throughout the Third World is that **the problems of poverty and hunger often date back hundreds of years to some conquest – by colonial forces or otherwise. The victors became the ruling class and the landholders, pushing the vast majority either on to poor ground or into being landless laborers. Taxes, rentals, and the legal system [was] were all structured to make sure that the poor stayed poor. The same patterns continue today.**

## Race

### Race Talk Good Framing

Colorblindness rejects the issue of racism in the first place—talking about racism is key to actually solving it, net benefit to the advocacy

**López 10[[23]](#footnote-23)**

**Colorblindness is a form of racial jujitsu**: co-opting the moral force of the civil rights movement, **it uses** that **power to attack[s] racial remediation and simultaneously to defend[s] structural racism. In the criminal context, it does so directly by insist[s]ing that massive racial disparities are "not racism"; and indirectly, but still more powerfully, by providing cover for transparent invocations of racial stereotypes, so long as expressed in cultural or behavioral terms rather than attributed to innate dispositions.** 83 Just as colorblindness rationalizes the continuation of stark racial inequalities in the death penalty context, so too does **it help[s] ensure that racialized mass incarceration has largely escaped opprobrium.** **None of the numerous racial disparities in the crime control context demonstrate racism, we are told, unless and until they can be blamed on an express and malicious use of race.** Yet, the lack of social outcry concerning pervasive racial inequalities in the penological context reflects more than the insulating properties of colorblindness. **Perhaps even more fundamentally, there exists a longstanding perception, traceable to the days of white supremacy, that racial inequality reflects the natural order of things.** The seeming naturalness of racial inequality may support, and in turn be supported by, the colorblind proscription on race-talk, but it seems to be an independent, powerful aspect of racial commonsense. **For many Americans, racial disparities in the criminal justice system not only fail to evoke a sense of moral outrage, but engender instead a belief in the basic fairness of the world as currently organized.** **Recent polling data confirms a prodigious gap between whites and blacks in their perception of whether the American criminal machinery is basically fair.184 When asked whether "[t]he justice system in this country treats people fairly and equally," 56 percent of whites agreed, compared to only 26 percent of blacks.'** 85 Pointedly emphasizing race, the same poll also described a hypothetical traffic encounter that involved the police "brutally beating a [white/black] motorist who had been stopped for questioning."' As the brackets indicate, the pollsters variously described the motorist-victim as white or black, and then asked whether a fair investigation was likely.'87 Black respondents were "much less likely" to think there would be a fair investigation when the scenario involved a black motorist; but among white respondents, there was virtually no difference.'88 The authors conclude: "Whites (who tend to assume that the system is color-blind) apply their fairness beliefs as if the race of the victim has no bearing on whether the police would conduct a fair investigation"' 8 -even in the context of police brutality. These numbers reveal a sociologically enormous difference in how whites and blacks view the criminal system. In addition, they raise a troubling implication: emphasizing race in the crime control system may not sensitize many whites to the existence of racial bias. As it turns out, the situation might be worse than this. Perversely, emphasizing racial unfairness may increase white support for discriminatory policies. In a separate study, pollsters asked whites about their support for the death penalty. In one iteration they asked simply whether "you favor or oppose the death penalty," while in another they prefaced this question with the statement that "[b]lacks are about 12% of the U.S. population, but they are almost half (43%) of those currently on death row." 90 When informed of its racially disproportionate effect, there was no significant reduction in the proportion of whites who supported the death penalty.191 Testing whether this finding was anomalous, the authors measured support for the death penalty against information suggesting actual bias, rather than simply disproportionate impact. Respondents were asked either about their support for capital punishment absent any other information, or after first hearing a prefatory statement that "[a]t present, someone who murders a white person is much more likely to be sentenced to death than someone who murders a black person."l92 Again, the racial information failed to diminish support among whites for capital punishment. As the study's authors concluded, "[w]hatever else these results may show, emphasizing the persistent bias in application of the death penalty to those who murder Whites does nothing to enhance or reduce how many or even which Whites support the death penalty." 93Reacting to this result, another set of scholars attempted to test whether "more direct and argumentative messages are necessary to move support for capital punishment." 9 4 Replicating the earlier format, the pollsters asked aboutthe death penalty without more, as well as after an introductory statement that "Some people say that the death penalty is unfair because most of the people who are executed are African Americans."195 At last, those hearing the prefatory claim shifted their views on the death penalty-by increasingtheir support. When simply asked about capital punishment, 65 percent of whites somewhat or strongly favored it, but when informed that it was "unfair" to African Americans, support surged by 18 percent.196 Among those who claimed to "strongly favor" the death penalty, support leaped a precipitous 44 percent.1 97 Whites were far, far more likely to strongly favor execution when told it is "unfair" to blacks. In the words of the study's authors, "our most startling finding is that many whites actually become more supportive of the death penalty upon learning that it discriminates against blacks." 9 8 Startling, indeed. This conclusion runs directly counter to the dominant belief that the polity will turn against policies shown to be racially unjust.To explain the dramatically counterintuitive finding, the authors delved deeper. They showed that those more likely to support the death penalty were also more likely to ascribe crime to dispositional factors such as violent temperaments, versus embracing structural explanations such as poverty or limited work opportunities.199 The authors hypothesized that respondents, convinced that criminals committed crimes because they were bad, not only rejected claims of unfairness as patently wrong, but actually reacted to such claims in a "backlash" or "boomerang" fashion by increasing their support for punitive 200 While this explanation seems entirely plausible, I suggest an additional, deeper possibility. Partly through colorblindness and partly through the accumulated weight of cultural beliefs and historical practices, **most Americans accept that major American institutions are race-neutral and that these institutions produce vast racial disparities.** If this is so, then simply informing whites about dramatic race-correlated differences will not challenge, let alone change, their beliefs, because they already recognize and accept such inequalities as a legitimate feature of social reality. Indeed, with racial injustice seemingly a natural condition, an emphasis on numbers alone will tend to solidify rather than destabilize dominant understandings of society's basic fairness.20 1 What does this naturalization of injustice imply for efforts to reign in the war on crime? Because whites may increase their support for the current criminal system when lectured about racial injustice, one could argue that references to race should be eschewed in favor of "stealth" strategies that do not mention race at all. "Our results," one set of authors argue, "suggest that a more effective argument for encouraging opposition to the death penalty is one that frames the unfairness of the policy more generally, without focusing on race, thereby avoiding whites' resistance to more direct racial appeals."202 There is something to this argument, especially if "racial appeals" mean nothing more than providing data on racial disparities or, apparently worse, coupling such data with a sermuncle on fairness. 203 But exactly **because racial injustice has become commonsense, simply dropping race from the discussion hardly helps over the long term.** Just the reverse, this approach leaves the seeming naturalness of racial hierarchies undisturbed and unchallenged. **The effort to challenge racial inequality cannot be conducted by accepting the basic methodology of colorblindness, its principal legitimating ideology. Racial reconstruction requires more race talk, not less-it requires, in fine, a concerted effort to demonstrate how racism continues to operate in our post-racial context.204 We must proceed by developing and disseminating a countervailing narrative about race as a form of social stratification-a narrative that pushes far beyond the numbers and the disparities to explain how racism actually functions in today's society.**

### Prison-Industrial Complex Link

#### Imprisonment is a cover-up for social problems like racism—they get ignored and fed into the prison industrial complex

**Davis 98[[24]](#footnote-24)**

**Imprisonment has become the response of first resort to far too many of the social problems that burden people who are ensconced in poverty. These problems often are veiled by being conveniently grouped together under the category "crime" and by the automatic attribution of criminal[s] behavior to people of color. Homelessness, unemployment, drug addiction, mental illness, and illiteracy are [some] only a few of the problems that disappear from public view when the human[s] beings contending with them are relegated to cages.** Prisons thus perform a feat of magic. Or rather the people who continually vote in new prison bonds and tacitly assent to a proliferating network of prisons and jails have been tricked into believing in the magic of imprisonment. **But prisons do not disappear problems, they disappear human[s] beings. And the practice of disappearing vast numbers of** **people from poor, immigrant, and racially marginalized communities has literally become big business.** The seeming effortlessness of magic always conceals an enormous amount of behind-the-scenes work. When prisons disappear human beings in order to convey the illusion of solving social problems, penal infrastructures must be created to accommodate a rapidly swelling population of caged people. Goods and services must be provided to keep imprisoned populations alive. Sometimes these populations must be kept busy and at other times -- particularly in repressive super-maximum prisons and in INS detention centers -- they must be deprived of virtually all meaningful activity. Vast numbers of handcuffed and shackled people are moved across state borders as they are transferred from one state or federal prison to another. All this work, which used to be the primary province of government, is now also performed by private corporations, whose links to government in the field of what is euphemistically called "corrections" resonate dangerously with the military industrial complex. **The dividends that accrue from investment in the punishment industry, like those that accrue from investment in weapons production, only amount to social destruction.** Taking into account the structural similarities and profitability of business-government linkages in the realms of military production and public punishment, the expanding penal system can now be characterized as a "prison industrial complex." **To deliver up bodies destined for profitable punishment, the political economy of prisons relies on racialized assumptions of criminality -- such as images of black welfare mothers reproducing criminal children -- and on racist practices in arrest, conviction, and sentencing patterns.** Colored bodies constitute the main human raw material in this vast experiment to disappear the major social problems of our time. **Once the aura of magic is stripped away from the imprisonment solution, what is revealed is racism, class bias, and the parasitic seduction of capitalist profit. The prison industrial system materially and morally impoverishes its inhabitants and devours the social wealth needed to address the very problems that have led to spiraling numbers of prisoners. By segregating people labeled as criminals, prison simultaneously fortifies and conceals the structural racism of the U.S. economy.** Claims of low unemployment rates -- even in black communities -- make sense only if one assumes that the vast numbers of people in prison have really disappeared and thus have no legitimate claims to jobs. The numbers of black and Latino men currently incarcerated amount to two percent of the male labor force. According to criminologist David Downes, "[t]reating incarceration as a type of hidden unemployment may raise the jobless rate for men by about one-third, to 8 percent. The effect on the black labor force is greater still, raising the [black] male unemployment rate from 11 percent to 19 percent."
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