## K Of Liberalism

### Notes

#### The affirmative is an attempt to “reclaim” liberalism. This kritik argues that is a bad approach to combatting racism. This argument mainly draws on literature about “Antifa”, or anti-fascism. While the media has portrayed many different groups as “Antifa” what this evidence is talking about is should we use counterspeech or direct action to combat racism. So for example, someone in class says something racist. The affirmative would argue that their speech should be met with counterspeech, the negative would say someone should interrupt or disrupt the speaker before their ideas get out their.

#### Many articles about free speech and Antifa discuss the difference between a speech strategy and a “violence” strategy like punching a Nazi. In this case, remember the aff is a kritik of a physical violence/nonviolence distinction. Because of that you will want to explain the links slightly differently than you may see the issues discussed on Facebook.

#### 1. Liberalism/Reason- one of the premises of liberalism is a belief in reason. The idea is that in a democracy we can tackle problems together by talking them out, brainstorming the best solutions, and debating them- this is often called the “marketplace of ideas”. While the affirmative does not endorse the marketplace, it does still argue persuasion/deliberation are important means to combat racism. The kritik would argue that you can’t “reason” with a racist/fascist, and that belief in speech basically gives them a green light to continue hate speech, or more likely escalate to larger scale violence. There are a variety of reasons counterspeech might be ineffective but one highlighted in the 1NC is that different speakers have different amounts of power. It would be ineffective to rely on students using speech to check racism by a teacher or administrator for example because of the massive power disparities between them

#### 2. Equality-one of the central claims of the affirmative is that equality is a good goal, which seems unobjectionable at first glance. The kritik argues that this belief in equality is ultimately a mirage- powerful segments of society will never voluntarily give up their wealth and other advantages. Even a “reclaimed” liberalism still rooted in egalitarianism would mask these inequalities because it presumes its possible through liberal politics to eliminate them. This could be viewed as a question of competing “methods”-what is the best tactic for combating racism

#### 3. Schools as training grounds- the affirmative argues censorship in schools is uniquely bad because it trains students to internalize and accept censorship later in life. You can use this argument to turbo charge alternative solvency and the link. If students learn love for liberal principles in school than the affirmative has argued that will “spill over”. If they instead learned direct confrontation, it would similarly spill over.

#### The important part of debating this kritik will be “spin”. Though there is evidence on each issue for both sides you will want to rely less on evidence and more on explanation because as mentioned the debate won’t really be analogous to media debates about free speech. The affirmative will say “no link- we are a different kind of liberalism than your evidence assumes” so you will need to be ready to explain (using examples from their 1AC) where they deploy the concepts/ideas you are kritiking.

### 1NC

#### A.The 1AC claims speech is emancipatory, a fundamental tenant of liberalism. This view ignores massive inequalities in access to speech that make it an ineffective terrain for struggle

Dean, PhD, 3-4-17

(Jodi, http://jdeanicite.typepad.com/i\_cite/2017/03/civil-war-and-free-speech.html)

The US is in a civil war, a civil war that is at its core a class war. There are different terrains, forms of struggle and violence. Casualties come from different proximate causes -- police attacks, suicide, overdose, slow death from alcohol and despair, toxic environments, crashes and shooters -- but it's one war. Terrains of struggle include streets and institutions, workplaces and domestic spaces, bodies and bathrooms, science and museums, churches, media, prison, farms, libraries, hospitals, and universities. There is no space external to this war. The Left needs to defend whatever spaces we can. We have to make the cost of far right speech too high for them to continue it. The Right makes cultural gains by manipulating liberal ideas of tolerance and neutrality -- whether this is in the form of the white supremacism of Charles Murray and Milo or the climate denialist industry funded by the Koch brothers. Liberal condemnation of the students who push back against these speakers when they comer to their campuses legitimate these speakers' views as worthy of consideration, as matters worth debating because reasonable people may disagree. Not only do most of these condemnations confuse protests against white supremacist speakers with state action (suggesting that there are liberals who can only think from a police perspective), but they proceed as if we were not in a civil war, a class war. They proceed as if society were a seminar or courtroom, not a war zone where people are daily under attack and where their attackers seek the cover of liberal institutions to justify these attacks. Particularly incoherent is the way that so many liberals decry Trump as a fascist, yet remain unwilling to confront what this entails for so-called liberal practices and institutions, namely, that they are not functioning in a liberal society but are being made to serve fascist ends. This unwillingness suggests that either they don't really believe Trump is a fascist (and so their rhetoric is disingenuous), that they think that liberalism can defeat fascism (which has never happened), that they don't ideas seriously, or that arguments that some groups are genetically inferior are permissible liberal views. Also galling is the way that resistance, protest, and "standing up and fighting back" is being championed by liberals and Democrats even as they quickly reject actual standing up and fighting back. Protests that remain controlled and symbolic are permitted. Direct action that shuts things down, that pushes back, that has effects is decried as too far. It appears, then, that for some liberals, protests are only early-stage campaign events, precursors to the only political acts they actually accept: writing letters, signing petitions, and the holy-of-holies, voting. Some liberal arguments address tactics. They say that it’s a tactical mistake to protest far right speakers on college campuses because it gives conservative media fodder for criticism. Of course, right wing media will always attack the Left; they particularly like attacking liberals as leftists. The Left should welcome the attacks as opportunities to show we are fighting back and will continue to fight back. We should be the power the right fears, the power of the people as the rest of us, the oppressed against the oppressors, the many in solidarity against the few. Liberals might care about being depicted as biased, not neutral. Anyone on the Left should take it as a matter of course that we are in no way neutral. The Right uses whatever opportunities they can get to spread their influence. We have to block them, shut them down, shut them out, refuse the pretense that we are in a rational debate between equally valid positions. We’re not. It's a war. There are sides.

#### B. Support for free speech is mutually exclusive with revolution, it requires protecting the rights of fascists

Eagleberger and Hart 17

(Hart and Jack, 2-3, http://www.leftvoice.org/In-Support-of-the-Anti-Milo-Berkeley-Antifa-Action

Another classic objection to antifa politics is that of free speech. Doesn’t attacking fascists when they try to assemble, some question, violate their freedom of speech (in a broad sense; not just the protections in the First Amendment that simply limit the state from restricting speech)? Yes, of course it does. But the revolutionary left would be mistaken to defend freedom of speech on principle — doing so would commit it to a position such as the ACLU’s when it defended the right of Nazis to march through a town of Jewish Holocaust survivors. We have no interest in facilitating the terrorizing of oppressed minorities like the ACLU does. And demeaning and terrorizing oppressed groups is exactly what Milo Yiannopoulos does. This would be bad enough, but at the UC Berkeley appearance, he was reportedly going to identify undocumented students at the school. This would put those students in direct danger of repression by not just right-wing provocateurs, but by the state. Furthermore, his appearances serve as a rallying point for his “alt-right” followers, one of whom shot an IWW member at a recent event. Liberals often expect a consistent defense of freedom of speech, while ignoring that this freedom is quite unevenly applied. Preventing bigoted provocateurs like Yiannopoulos from speaking becomes a minor national crisis, while — to mention only one recent example — a coordinated nationwide police attack on protest encampments passes with nary a peep from free speech defenders. Why should the far left defend freedom of speech when it is a principle so often denied to it, specifically for political reasons? The fact is, freedom of speech is a democratic right vis-a-vis the state, but in capitalist society the ability to speak publicly is controlled by the ownership of meeting spaces, newspapers, salaried website staffs and so forth. Freedom of speech is constitutionally upheld by the government but withheld in practice every time an institution gives its platform to the forces already in power, rather than those oppressed by it. Lenin wrote, “‘Freedom of the press’ in bourgeois society means freedom for the rich systematically, unremittingly, daily, in millions of copies, to deceive, corrupt and fool the exploited and oppressed mass of the people, the poor." Bannon and his Breitbart cronies (such as Yiannopoulos) entirely agree; only liberals are foolish enough to think that property ownership is not the true meaning of American ‘freedom’ and ‘democracy.’ The alt-right presently commands billions of dollars worth of capital in media access, as well as the support and protection of the executive branch. Yiannopoulos personally benefits from capitalist funding for his politics in a way that socialists, who have much broader support, never will. And UC Berkeley, which is supposed to be an institution for the public, is in fact an arm of the capitalist state offering a scarce resource that, everyone knows, will be used as a platform to attack the oppressed. Shutting down fascists and racists is not a conflict about free speech but the means for organizing politically. When we prevent the right from gaining strength and credibility by stopping their meetings, we have a better opportunity to organize as workers, and to fight the capitalists directly. Equal access to information is a fundamental demand of socialism, and the way to get it under capitalism is to fight for democratic control of communications by whatever means necessary. The best way to even the scales right now is to disrupt the efforts of the far-right from organizing a fascist weapon that inevitably will be used against us and our own ability to speak. Shutting down fascists is a power that the working class can exercise now, while simultaneously building up its own organizations to communicate and fight better in the future.

#### C. Violence is “baked in” to the structure of liberalism. The aff views violence as an irrational aberration to be “persuaded” away-this project is doomed to error replication

Thisell, PhD Student, 16

(Karl, <http://bunkermag.org/liberal-governance-war/>, 3-6)

What foremost separates liberal governance from the regimes of old is that it, in appearance, rules by allowance rather than restriction. While this only serves to obscure the actual violence of the system, the liberal governance modus operandi still radically differ from that of its predecessors. Reid and Dillon describes liberal governance as organic, cells of institutions, NGOs and parliamentary bodies forming a information network. It upholds no central ideal of governance but rather function on a basis of evolutionary “fitness”, constantly restructuring and reorganizing to improve its function to apply either soft or hard power within society. Liberal governance thus never allows itself to be seen as a distinct part of the state, such as the monarch or the party-form, but rather subverts any opposition and uses it to further its own existence. Even the most staunches critics of the system can flexibly be appropriated into the machinery. (Weizman) Liberal governance will thus not allow any serious enemy or external political entity to form, all oppositions must exist within its own framework. Liberalism is thus truly totalitarian; unlike the ideologies of old it does not even leave space for a competing narrative, since the grand narratives are decreed dead. (Reid & Dillon) In its totalitarianism we also enter the second trait of liberal governance, globalism. Within the liberal narrative there exists no opposition, only exceptions. It’s from this mind-set that liberalism develops a theory of war without enemies, aptly named Strategic Communication. Strategic communication relies on a view of the warzone as Human Terrain, by this theory the hearts and minds of warzone populace becomes equally (if not more) important as the geography. The key to victory is found not in defeating the enemy force through orthodox kill-centred tactics, but forcibly dismantling it by removing its base of support. In this idea of warfare, there is thus no clear enemy force, but rather an in-becoming ally. After all, since liberalism is presumed not as ideological, but a natural state, the dissent against it can only be explained as a flaw in communication. As the very icon of liberal war, it’s very fitting that this stratagem was developed jointly with public relations experts and the marketing industry. (Holmqvist) The Failings of Liberal Governance in War One of the foremost presumptions of classical warfare is that war begins with an aim, and should end when that aim has been reached and secured. By the very aims of liberal war and strategic communication this is axiom crumbles, the aim of liberal war is the war against dissent – thus the dissent created by warfare necessitates continued warfare to manage that dissent… repeated ad infinitum. The most prized operational from of liberal warfare is units that operates on liberal principles. Units that operates in evolving networks that should rapidly utilize new intelligence. Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) targets central nodes of human terrain networks (read, high value targets), strike teams quickly share information acquired from their operations with other teams who then locates a new target that has a high likelihood (confirmation not necessary) of being another node in the network. We look here at something more akin to a lawyer’s office than a regular army. To quote one of it’s senior officers: “The aim was to go after the middle of their network – in a regular army, their senior noncommissioned officers. We tried to cause the network to collapse…. We took it to an art form. It really became a machine.” – Stanley A. McChrystal (Cited in Niva) What we’re noticing is that JSOC makes no attempt to seriously crush the enemy force man by man, it’s instead harasses and cripple it. As born from a theory that presumes enemy grievances as not serious dissent but an anomaly, it becomes part of a doctrine that makes no real effort to address the cause of war in the first place. (Niva) Steve Niva describes this state of eternal war of short-term strikes as “moving the grass”. War becomes an eternal policing operation. We might also ask if the opposite is happening, how much does the behaviour of the US police force differ from that of an occupying army? When the JSOC fails to hinder the spread militant Islamism, does armoured trucks hinder crime?

#### D. The alternative is to embrace direct confrontation

Lennard, Journalist, 1-19-17

(Natasha, writer for the nation, Al-Jazeera, and The Intercept, https://www.thenation.com/article/anti-fascist-activists-are-fighting-the-alt-right-in-the-streets/)

A more recent history of antifa in both Europe and the United States illustrates the success these tactics can have, particularly when it comes to expunging violent racist forces from our neighborhoods and defending vulnerable communities, while also creating networks of support that do not rely on structurally racist law enforcement for protection against racists. Anti-fascist tactics focused primarily around physical force proved effective in forcing neo-Nazi groups out of entire neighborhoods in Europe and the United States in the 1980s. Back then, as longtime organizer and member of the Industrial Workers’ World General Defense Committee (GDC) Kieran Knutson told The Nation, fascist and anti-fascist formations grew out of youth subculture scenes. Taking on and largely defeating neo-Nazi gangs, multi-racial crews of anti-racist skinheads and punks coalesced and grew into semi-formal Anti-Racist Action (ARA) chapters nationwide. “At its peak, in an era without cell phones or internet, ARA had over 100 chapters across the US and Canada,” explained Knutson, adding that students, older leftists, feminists and more joined efforts to counter a broader group of racist organizations, from the white power music scene to KKK rallies. The network faded in the 2000s, drifting in part to the anti-globalization movement, but as Knutson “the several thousand veterans of this movement are still out there—many still involved politically in anti-racist, feminist, queer, labor, education and artistic projects.” The need for this sort of community and street resistance will not be contingent on Trump carrying out repressive policies—the emboldening of far right racists is a fait accompli. At the end of November, the Southern Poverty Law Center released a report documenting nearly 900 separate incidents of bias and violence against immigrants, Latinos, African Americans, women, LGBT people, Muslims and Jews in the ten days that followed Trump’s win. Physical confrontation is just a small aspect of antifa direct action, but the history of anti-fascist, anti-racist action is not one of so-called allies standing in polite disapproval or donning safety pins. “Fascism is imbued with violence and secures itself politically through the use or threat of it, so it is inevitable that anti-fascists have to countenance some involvement in violence themselves,” wrote M.Testa, author of Militant Anti-Fascism: A Hundred Years of Resistance. The ability to “countenance” some involvement with violence is itself a privilege that so many people of color and LBGTQ individuals in this country cannot enjoy—violence is not countenanced but systematically thrust upon them. The question of whether the counter-violence should be a tool of resistance in the Trump era will no doubt cleave some anti-Trump unities currently breaching the liberal center, the left, and far left. Those of us who long before Trump have defended counter-violence against oppression—as in Ferguson, as in Baltimore, as in Watts, as in counter-riots against the Klu Klux Klan, as in slave revolts—know where we stand. The number of people willing to engage with explicitly anti-fascist organizing and rhetoric has certainly increased with Trump’s rise, “As an empirical measure, our Twitter followers have almost quadrupled from the beginning of this year,” organizers for NYC Antifa told me via e-mail, “new groups are popping up everywhere, and we are fielding requests from all over the country about how to get involved.” Whether this means a significant number of people are willing to engage in anti-fascist physical confrontation in Trump’s America remains to be seen. “We don’t think it’s useful to rehash the same old [violence versus non-violence] arguments,” NYC Antifa noted. “If Trump tries to register Muslims and engage in mass deportations, a Change.org petition is not going to stop it.” (Indeed, mass deportations and the mass surveillance of Muslims under the Obama administration would not have ended with a petition either.) But the old canard of violent versus non-violent protest is already finding a new locus in debates around whether or not to give the racist far right a platform. When neo-Nazi Richard Spencer at his National Policy Institute held their annual conference in DC last November, anti-fascist activists exposed the event, its attendees, and where its members were dining, and attempted to not only protest but disrupt and shut down the conference, as well as Spencer’s dinner plans (succeeding, at least, in dousing the white nationalist in “a foul smelling liquid’). News and monitoring sites like NYC Antifa, Anti-fascist News and It’s Going Down have been reporting on the NPI, exposing their members and their conferences since before Trump’s candidacy. “Now that Steve Bannon, who has positioned himself as a champion of the alt-right, is heading to the White House, the NPI’s seig-heiling and fashion sense is a trending topic covered by most major media outlets,” NYC Antifa noted, “Yet, for the most part, all these journalists do is reproduce Spencer’s sentiments, which he frames in liberal rhetoric to gain appeal, and feign outrage. Our approach is to expose and confront them.” The forms of physical force that served against neo-Nazis in the street in the 1980s are harder to deploy against the contemporary suit clad neo-Nazi holding a conference with professional security details, or a position in the White House. It will be an uphill battle to beat the alt-right in the dromological battlefield of social media resonance. For one, fascism lends itself to meme form, as fascist form itself purports to give a simple solution to a complex problem; memes aren’t inherently fascist, of course, but their reductive format is well-suited to fascist content. Leftists have reductive phrases and catchphrases, too, and no one would diminish the popularity of Birdie Sanders. But weaponizing meme form is, I believe, easier for a political project that itself takes the form of reduction and over-simplification. The antifa task, I believe, is not to make better memes, but to expose the fascists behind the Pepe avatars, reveal their connections, and chase them away. Committed neo-Nazis deserve no more privacy than they deserve public platforms, or safety, even though antifa groups have been known to grant second chances. “We’ve had success with this tactic, and have gotten people to leave groups who did not want to be publicly shamed,” the NYC Antifa organizers told The Nation. “One guy’s boss was Jewish and he didn’t want it known he was working with Holocaust deniers. We took him off our website after he promised to leave the group he was in. We believe second chances are important—our goal is to get people to leave racist and fascist movements.” The alt-right might not seek us in the streets, and might trounce us in trolling, but disruption, confrontation, doxxing and altercation remain tactics anyone taking seriously a refusal to normalize Trump-era fascism should consider. Liberals who reject such a strategy in defense of the right to free of speech and assembly engage in an historical NIMBYism, in which only in the past, or in other countries, has militancy against white supremacy been a legitimate resistance. They forget, too, that while the First Amendment ensures that the government will not interfere with free speech, this has no bearing on neo-fascists having the right to be heard or countenanced by the rest of us. For the radical left, no such bad thought takes hold, because militant tactics against white supremacy never stopped being necessary—in the fight against slavery, Jim Crow, red-lining, and mass incarceration—with or without explicit white nationalists in center political stage.

### L: Capitalism

#### Resistance to white supremacy can't be a unifying concept- using it as a rallying point is counterproductive and undermines efforts to challenge capitalism.

M. **Cole,** research professor in education and equality at Bishop Grosseteste University College Lincoln, 11-23-0**7** http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storyCode=311222&sectioncode=26

The problem with standard critical race theory is the narrowness of its remit, says Mike Cole. One of the main tenets of critical race theory is that "white supremacy" is the norm in societies rather than merely the province of the racist right (the other major tenet is primacy of "race" over class). There are a number of significant problems with this use of the term "white supremacy". The first is that it homogenises all white people together in positions of power and privilege. Writing about the US, critical race theorist Charles Mills acknowledges that not "all whites are better off than all non-whites, but ... as a statistical generalisation, the objective life chances of whites are significantly better". While this is, of course, true, we should not lose sight of the life chances of millions of working-class white people. To take poverty as one example, in the US, while it is the case that the number of black people living below the poverty line is some three times that of whites, this still leaves more than 16 million "white but not Hispanic" people living in poverty there. In the UK, there are similar indicators of a society underpinned by rampant colour-coded racism, with black people twice as poor as whites, and those of Pakistani and Bangladeshi origin more than three times as poor as whites. Once again, however, this still leaves some 12 million poor white people in the UK. That such statistics are indicative of racism, however, is beyond doubt, and to interpret them it is useful to employ the concept of "racialisation". Given that there is widespread agreement among geneticists and social scientists that "race" is a meaningless concept, racialisation describes the process by which people are falsely categorised into distinct "races". Statistics such as these are indicative of **racialised capitalism rather than white supremacy.** A second problem with "white supremacy" is that it **is inherently unable to explain non-colour-coded racism.** In the UK, for example, this form of racism has been and is directed at the Irish and at gypsy/traveller communities. There is also a well-documented history of anti-Semitism, too. It is also important to underline the fact that Islamophobia is not necessarily triggered by skin colour. It is often sparked by one or more (perceived) symbols of the Muslim faith. Finally, a new form of non- colour-coded racism has manifested itself recently in the UK. This has all the hallmarks of traditional racism, but it is directed towards newly arrived groups of people. It has been described by A. Sivanandan, director of the Institute of Race Relations, as "xeno-racism". It appears that there are some similarities in the xeno-racialisation of Eastern European migrant workers and the racialisation of Asian and black workers in the immediate postwar period, a point I address in my latest book. "**White supremacy" is counterproductive as a political unifier and rallying point against racism**. John Preston concluded an article in The Times Higher advocating critical race theory ("All shades of a wide white world", October 19) by citing the US journal Race Traitor , which seeks the "abolition of the racial category 'white'". Elsewhere, Preston has argued "the abolition of whiteness is ... not just an optional extra in terms of defeating capitalism (nor something which will be necessarily abolished post-capitalism) but fundamental to the Marxist educational project as praxis". Indeed, for Preston, "the abolition of capitalism and whiteness seem to be fundamentally connected in the current historical circumstances of Western capitalist development". **From my Marxist perspective, coupling the "abolition of whiteness" to the "abolition of capitalism" is a worrying development that, if it gained ground in Marxist theory, would most certainly further undermine the Marxist project.** I am not questioning the sincerity of the protagonists of "the abolition of whiteness", nor suggesting in any way that they are anti-white people but merely questioning its extreme vulnerability to misunderstanding. Anti-racists have made some progress in the UK at least in making anti- racism a mainstream rallying point, and this is reflected, in part, in legislation. Even if it were a good idea, the chances of making "the abolition of whiteness" a successful political unifier and rallying point against racism **are virtually non-existent.** The usage of "white supremacy" should be restricted to its everyday meaning. To describe and analyse contemporary racism we need a wide- ranging and fluid conception of racism. Only then can we fully understand its multiple manifestations and work towards its eradication.

### L: Liberalism

#### History proves reason and principle can’t fight fascism- free speech is a distraction, we need direct action

Ciccariello-Maher, PhD, 17

(George, Associate Professor of Politics and Global Studies at Drexel University interviewed by Daniel Denvir – Part 2 – (continued from Part 1 here) – transcribed from The Dig, Episode 10 – (slightly edited for clarity) (note this edit was done by the website not me) 2-25 https://abolitionjournal.org/nazi-punching-praxis-against-the-liberal-theology-of-reason-non-violence/)

GCM: This is really important and the question is well posed. I think what is being missed is the fact that this is a praxis, that this is not simply a performance—it’s not an expression of frustration. It’s an actual political practice that is constructive and creative. The effects that punching Nazis creates include, first, as Richard Spencer through his own absurd inability to think strategically has admitted, it has made his life a living hell already. He admitted that it’s making it very difficult for them to organize. He’s admitted, in other words, everything that many of us have said about how Nazis need to be treated and about this famous apocryphal quote from Hitler that says, “If someone had recognized early on and crushed our movement with the utmost brutality of violence, then we would never have been able to grow.” This is where you find not only historical Nazism and fascism growing in the context of what Carl Schmitt and Gramsci – right and left – recognized as the inability of liberalism to grapple with real tensions and contradictions. Liberalism’s frozen inability to face these problems head on and to offer real solutions is a breeding ground for these kind of movements. So the political effect is to first of all shut down Nazis and make it perfectly clear to them that this is not an acceptable way to be or an acceptable thing to be. This is where I actually like the reframing that some people have offered which is very convincing which says, “The question is not whether or not it’s ok to punch a Nazi; the question is whether or not it’s ok to be a Nazi.” If you’ve made that decision, then maybe consequences follow… There is this sort of liberal theology that reason defeats unreason. DD: The marketplace of ideas. GCM: Right. If you understand history, you understand that this is very rarely the case. The Trump election is a very good example of this, in which unreason is powerful. Unreason does not respond to reason. You cannot convince a white supremacist that they are wrong. You have to defeat them by material means, and this is one of those means. What is so effective and interesting and useful about Richard Spencer being punched at this moment in time is that – and this gets back to what happened to me as well – it’s a moment in which people are, in the aftermath of the election, really grappling with questions of legitimacy and questions of struggle and questions of violence. You’ve got a lot of just liberals today saying, “Well, he is a Nazi after all. I believe in certain principles that I’ve been taught, and yet Captain America punched Nazis. And yet my grandfather killed Nazis. Not because it was a radical thing to do, but because it was what you do.” So I think this is a very productive conversation that is being had in the mainstream media. If a year or two ago you had said we would be talking about the legitimacy of punching Nazis on the front page of the New York Times or in Teen Vogue or that the National Park Service would be tweeting the things that it’s tweeting, then I would have told you that you were crazy. We’re living in incredibly interesting times and I think these questions of legitimacy that are being raised in this moment are really productive because it’s a question of taking these mobilized, frustrated liberals, and splitting them. Some of them will be able to be mobilized towards more radical ends and some of them will flow back into some version of Democratic party hegemony in the future.

#### The aff fetishizes non violent resistance- it only works when supplemented by more radical action

Ciccariello-Maher, PhD, 17

(George, Associate Professor of Politics and Global Studies at Drexel University interviewed by Daniel Denvir – Part 2 – (continued from Part 1 here) – transcribed from The Dig, Episode 10 – (slightly edited for clarity) (note this edit was done by the website not me) 2-25 https://abolitionjournal.org/nazi-punching-praxis-against-the-liberal-theology-of-reason-non-violence/)

GCM: Absolutely. It is a question of whether or not you’re getting ahead of things. There are people who have been engaging in Nazi-punching for many, many years, and in some of those other moments, with different historical contexts, it may have been a close to irrelevant political tactic. What we’re seeing today is that it’s at the center of mainstream anxieties and debates. We should always be wary of the way that certain tactics get fetishized. But we also have to be aware that the tactic of nonviolence is probably the most fetishized tactic in US liberalism, because it enters into movement-building as a brake on struggles. For example, as just one example, protestors in the Inauguration are facing more than ten years on felony riot charges and yet people are still talking about property violence as being unnecessarily provocative or aggressive or a bad tactic. So I think if anything, there is a lot of fetishization going on all around. The first things that need to be de-fetishized, the first things that need to be critically grappled with, are certain assumptions: what I call theological assumptions about non-violence. The assumption that history moves forward, again through reason, through people getting together and conversing and ‘good ideas defeat bad’ and ‘we’re all non-violent and then suddenly the world gets better’ – when that’s never how these things have happened. We don’t have civil rights because of non-violent struggle convincing white people that they were wrong. We have civil rights – a very limited accomplishment, we should be clear – because non-violent movements that were militant, that were also engaged in self-defense, existed alongside openly combative and violent movements, and because people were rioting in the streets and rebelling and demanding justice and appealing to the ethical foundations of the country as well as pushing beyond those foundations to demand equality. Just as we’re having these conversations today in part, not because people suddenly realized that mass incarceration and police murder were wrong, but because people took to the streets of Ferguson and Baltimore aggressively, violently, burning things down, in an attempt to press forward this conversation.

### A: Enables politics

#### Resistance enables speech and politics- uncritical acceptance of speech is the problem

Ciccariello-Maher, PhD, 17

(George, Associate Professor of Politics and Global Studies at Drexel University interviewed by Daniel Denvir – Part 2 – (continued from Part 1 here) – transcribed from The Dig, Episode 10 – (slightly edited for clarity) (note this edit was done by the website not me) 2-25 https://abolitionjournal.org/nazi-punching-praxis-against-the-liberal-theology-of-reason-non-violence/)

GCM: Absolutely. I think you hit it right on the head when you said there’s a radically democratic element here. There’s nothing more radically democratic than thousands of students showing up and making it utterly impossible for Richard Spencer, Milo, or these other far-right speakers to enjoy the platform that a university provides. I think that is well and fully within their own expressive rights. We need to think harder about how it is that we build a left platform in which free speech is taken seriously, but which doesn’t become in many ways a hindrance. You can’t have a left that says we should allow Milo to get up and speak and harass and encourage violence be brought down on a trans student at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and the left stands by silently. This is not in any way a viable left politics. So we need to understand how speech can fit in with our substantive concerns and how, for example, to demand the ability to express radically egalitarian politics, and to demand the ability to have an equal platform for reactionary genocidal white supremacist arguments, are not the same thing.

### AT: Chomsky

#### Chomsky is wrong about the effectiveness and history of Antifa

Libcom Editors 17

(8-18, https://libcom.org/blog/6-reasons-why-chomsky-wrong-about-antifa-18082017)

Chomsky describes Antifa as "a minuscule fringe of the Left, just as its predecessors were" with "some limited similarity to the Weather Underground". While we might take issue with Chomsky's description of contemporary Antifa, another problem is his misrepresentation of its "predecessors". Antifa's predecessors have almost nothing to do with the Weather Underground. Rather, they can be seen in the mass mobilisation against Mosley's Blackshirts in Cable Street, East London, as well as less famous mobilisations in Manchester, Liverpool, Newcastle, Hulme and Stockton. They are the 43 Group and the 62 Group, Jewish-led organisations who took it upon themselves to smash Mosley's attempts to reorganise after the Second World War. They are in the mass mobilisation of locals in Lewisham, South East London, in 1977, the Southall Youth Movement who fought skinheads in the streets and Anti-Fascist Action, who regularly routed fascists throughout the country from the mid-1980s to the late-1990s. In Europe, they are the Red Warriors of Paris or the Revolutionary Front in Sweden. And in North America they were the Teamsters who formed a defense guard against the Silver Shirts in the 1930s, or Anti-Racist Action who took on Klansmen and the National Socialist Movement from the 1980s until very recently. None of these can or should be dismissed as easily as Chomsky seems to. 2) Antifa are 'a major gift to the Right, including the militant Right, who are exuberant'? When the extreme-right get smashed by anti-fascists, they are not exuberant. When anti-fascists in Liverpool wiped the floor with the 2015 White Man March in Liverpool, they were not exuberant; they were utterly humiliated. When the English Defence League were chased out of Walthamstow in 2012, they were not exuberant, they were utterly humiliated. The 43 Group, 62 Group and Anti-Fascist Action successfully disrupted organised street fascism in the UK for decades after World War Two. In all these cases, physical defeats led to increased divisions in the far-right, mutual recriminations and, most importantly, a puncturing of the invincible street-fighter image these groups like to cultivate for themselves. Of course they will try and spin every defeat as them being victimised. But, they would just as much spin any unopposed march as a successful show of force, especially if they go searching for targets afterwards, as they have done in the past; 'ignore fascists until they go away' only works if you have the privilege of being ignored by them as well. A physical defeat is not a gift to the militant right; it is one of the most effective ways of keeping them weak.

#### Their offense relies on a false dichotomy- we can resist and educate

Libcom Editors 17

(8-18, https://libcom.org/blog/6-reasons-why-chomsky-wrong-about-antifa-18082017)

Chomsky's claim that one of the "costs" of physical confrontation with fascists is the "loss of the opportunity for education, organizing, and serious and constructive activism" is a false division. Moreover, it's one that shows a lack of real-life contact with anti-fascists. In reality, anti-fascists often are involved in activity beyond 'anti-fascism' whether that be migrant solidarity, union organising, anti-police violence or whatever else. They hold film screenings, concerts and football tournaments. The fact that Chomsky misses all this says more about him than it does anti-fascists. If people are prepared to put their lives and safety on the line to resist fascism that's a choice which should be celebrated. Community self-defense can create space for other organising to happen, whereas un-opposed fascists will happily crash and disrupt left meetings and organising. A big contingent of antifascist mobilisations in the US have been associated with the IWW, a radical union which puts huge importance on serious, constructive education and organising. You can organise at work Monday to Friday and oppose fascists when they occasionally come to town on Saturday, that's not much of an 'opportunity cost.' Ultimately, it's important to remember that 'anti-fascism' will never be enough to defeat fascism; in fact, there is no defeating fascism without defeating capitalism. That means building a mass, working-class political culture that stands as an alternative to both the far-right and the liberal politics of 'business as usual': vibrant workplace organisations both inside and out of traditional unions, community groups fighting on housing, police brutality, proper provision for survivors of domestic violence, migrant solidarity, and so much more it couldn't possibly fit here. We mustn't think of antifa as an end in and of itself. But we don't need the left's most prominent public intellectuals to throw them under the bus either.

### AT: Counterspeech etc

#### Free speech is insufficient- it’s a defensive move

Ciccariello-Maher, PhD, 17

(George, Associate Professor of Politics and Global Studies at Drexel University interviewed by Daniel Denvir – Part 2 – (continued from Part 1 here) – transcribed from The Dig, Episode 10 – (slightly edited for clarity) (note this edit was done by the website not me) 2-25 https://abolitionjournal.org/nazi-punching-praxis-against-the-liberal-theology-of-reason-non-violence/)

GCM: Academic freedom is a very fraught category. I think academic freedom is an essential shield that we need that we cannot relinquish, because it allows us, for example, to speak freely despite the political pressures that are already beginning to come down on us as academics. However, I think it is very important to distinguish between academic freedom and free speech. To even refer to my tweets in terms of academic freedom is a little worrying, because it implies the idea that universities should be discussing the speech of faculty that happens outside of the academic sphere. Academic freedom in the classroom means allowing students and faculty to engage in thoughtful conversations. This has also become a route of attack for the far-right that wants to infiltrate the classroom, record conversations, and even use anti-discrimination law against faculty by claiming that students don’t feel safe, by claiming that they feel discriminated against. In other words, by using laws that are meant to protect people of color and women against these hurt white feelings in the classroom. This is dangerous as well and this is where the whole question gets very complicated. You’ve got people trying to provoke with these campus tours. You know, Milo, Richard Spencer, trying to be invited to campuses to provoke controversy over whether or not they’re allowed to speak and trying to frame that as a free speech question. Here I think the left needs to very careful. There are some arguments out there which I would understand to be free speech absolutist, that say free speech is a primary freedom and the left needs to first and foremost defend free speech. But the left has to first and foremost defend a program of progressive and radical transformation and change. Free speech and academic freedom are shields, and we need swords to move forward.

### AT: Self Care

#### Selfcare disconnected from broader analysis is disciplinary neoliberalism

Low End Theory 13

(<http://www.lowendtheory.org/post/50428216600/on-audre-lordes-legacy-and-the-self-of>, 5-14)

Care as extravagance. Historically speaking, it is here, in the Reagan era, that the “self” of self-care emerged. Donald Vickery and James Fries’s bestseller Take Care of Yourself: A Consumer’s Guide to Medical Care was published in 1981, and formed part of a larger explosion of “self-help” publications that encouraged a readership increasingly clobbered by a neoliberal assault—against liveable wages, workers rights, social services, and the welfare state writ large—to take it upon themselves to manage the consequences of that clobbering. And I would argue that the “self” of self-care came into being precisely as an effect of that management, as well as of the clobbering that both preceded and accompanied it. It euphemizes as a goodwill gesture (the benevolent “take care of yourself!”) an imperative that, if elaborated, looks much more like a relation of coercion and discipline (“take care of yourself or your job will go to someone who does”; “take care of yourself lest you fall ill and get saddled with medical debt”; “take care of yourself because you have no right to expect that society will”; “take care of yourself…or else”). The self of self-care, all of this is to say, has a history that should serve as a caution toward attempts to make self-care an unqualified good. It is a self that is specifically calibrated as a defensive reaction to the combination of austerity politics with reinvigorated forms of gendered racism that cut across the entire social formation. Especially for those of us who were born and/or grew up in the Reagan and Bush I eras, the self of self-care was the form of selfhood that hegemonic institutions taught us to internalize. This is not to say that there is nothing of value to be found in the language of practice of self-care. It is to suggest, rather, that self-care is not simply a form of struggle but the outcome of various struggles that have played out on a larger scale than we tend to acknowledge when we speak of it. This struggle involved, among other things, the disqualification of initiatives by the radical labor movement to establish universal health care as a right rather than a “benefit” restricted to and contingent upon employment in certain sectors. It involved the marginalization of years of efforts by the Black Panther Party and the National Welfare Rights Organization both to establish community clinics and to redefine health care not as a commodity but as both a fundamental question of justice and a condition of community self-determination.[4] With all of this said, what do we make of this Audre Lorde quote?: “Caring for myself is not self-indulgence, it is self-preservation, and that is an act of political warfare.” It is both thrilling and affirming, I think, to sit with the possibilities of redefining self-care as though it were going on the political offensive. This may especially be the case in a context where the dominant meaning of “care” either has become industrialized in such a way that it consolidates (instead of contests) one’s'alienation from her conditions of existence, or from the means necessary to inform herself about, determine, and pursue the course of care and wellbeing that she needs. But what I think is especially important about this now regularly cited quotation is what comes before the first comma, what comes before, that is, the moment when self-care finds its euphemistic, sunny resolution as “political warfare”: the disavowal of self-care as “self indulgence.” What, after all, is wrong with self-indulgence, with stealing time to enjoy the self, to pursue ways of being and living that are not necessarily productive, even if to do so is to steal away from the justifiably voracious appetites of left political desire? Lorde’s rewriting of self-care as political warfare seems to me to be symptomatic of a philosophy of movement building that has an unacknowledged investment in surveilling the behavior of its members (and demanding that they surveil themselves), a philosophy that is so deeply committed to the idea that everything is political that it cannot see the ways it enforces that definition through the implicit demand that its members justify all their behavior on its terms. Everything is political, in other words, can be a particularly disciplinary and disciplining definition of the political because of the way that it privileges a kind of ruthless scrutiny, assessment, and justification of one’s behaviors on the basis of whether or not they generate political value. At the same time, it tends to regard the political less as a contestation over social transformation than as the sum total of “good” or “bad” political behaviors. At worst, everything is political can privilege a kind of left version of austerity logic, one that calls implicitly for the abstention from behaviors that don’t serve the Higher Purpose of generating and assessing individual behavior in the form of political value. It can only handle self-indulgence and extravagance when those things can be given a justifiable political form, when they can be commended or valorized, in other words, for how radical they are. It can only handle self-indulgence and extravagance, in other words, when they cease to be self-indulgent or extravagant at all, and claim, on the flip, to be productive and progressive. Austerity logics, whether they come from the left or the right, get articulated through the bodies of black women by making certain kinds of demands on them. An important thing to understand about these demands is that they do not simply take the form of general devaluation. They do not simply take the form of the welfare queen stereotype. They can also take the form of a general overinvestment or hypervaluation—in feelings and performances of excessive admiration, deference, and high regard. They can inhabit the expectation—an expectation that, again, can have the force of a demand—that black women embody a kind of superhuman strength, or that they inherently possess an exceedingly resolute political consciousness. Unlike the bad faith that underwrites the demonization of black women as unproductive, this leftist hypervaluation of black women often takes the form of love. Love: Killing love, perhaps. It is the kind of love that solicits a constant performance from black women, one that demands that they be endlessly productive, endlessly working, for the movement, even after death. It is for this reason that I spent some time in the last post attempting to contest the deification of Lorde: I want to make visible just how much work is implicitly called for in the desire for black women to be adequate to what is asked of them–which they very well may also want of themselves. The point is that any politics that seeks to celebrate the seemingly superhuman accomplishments of black women can become the unwitting collaborator with the entire field of the political that we might want to contest, a field in which the superhuman demands placed on black women are nothing short of murderous. The point is, while it may appear to honor the Audre Lordes (1934-1992) and the Barbara Christians (1943-2000) and the VèVè Clarks (1944-2007) and the Sherley Anne Williamses (1944-1999) with the demand that they rest in power, there may also be an ethics, if not also a justice, in insisting on their right to rest in peace. And the point is that our discussions about self care are particularly impoverished when they fail to engage broader questions about the structure of health care, the social distribution of wealth, and the conditions in which we live and work. This is the thread I’ll pick up in the third and final installment of this piece by addressing last year’s series of debates on self-care and community care.